

Mobilizing Christianity in the Antivivisection Movement in Victorian Britain

CHIEN-HUI LI

Chien-hui Li, Department of History, National Cheng Kung University,
Taiwan.

This article offers a historical perspective on the bearing of the Christian tradition on humans' ethical relations with other animals. Instead of focusing on major theologians and canonical texts, this article turns to the initiatives taken by laity and clergy in the mobilization of their antivivisection cause in the last quarter of the 19th century. It reveals that despite the lack of institutional support from major Churches, many reformers sympathetic to Christian ideals relied on Christianity as their moral foundation, utilizing various recourses associated with it in their fight against animal experimentation. These reformers appropriated the concepts of sin and self-sacrifice and the notion of the incarnate Christ, as well as critiques against scientific knowledge and materialism permeating the wider conflict between religion and science at the time. In this wide-ranging mobilization of resources associated with the Christian religious tradition, they sustained a generation of activism against animal experimentation while, at the same time, recreating a positive Christian subtradition in animal ethics.

KEY WORDS: antivivisection movement, Christianity, religion, animal ethics

The role of Christianity in influencing human–animal relationships has occupied the attention of scholars since the rise of the movement for nonhuman animals in the West in the 1970s. Early writers, such as Peter Singer (1975) and Andrew Linzey (1976, 1987), pointed to the anthropocentric and instrumentalist tendency in the Christian tradition as having a negative impact on people's treatment of other animals. In the course of critical assessment, beginning in the 1990s, Linzey and others sought insights from Christianity in the construction of a positive animal ethic through the reinterpretation of texts and the discovery of a more diverse range of sources, such as the apocryphal writings of the Christian tradition (Linzey, 1994; Linzey & Cohn-Sherbok, 1997; Webb, 1998; Wennberg, 2003). With the continued growth of scholarship in the area of religion and animals over the past two decades and the increasingly multidisciplinary nature of these

inquiries, the multiplicity of views within Christian and other religious traditions and the multifarious levels of intersection between the two subjects have further complicated our understanding of the field (Waldau & Patten, 2006). It seems no longer possible to regard Christianity as a homogeneous tradition with an unambiguous impact on human–animal relations. Furthermore, the overwhelmingly negative view of the Christian tradition in relation to animal ethics (Wise, 2001) has become one of many “cultural myths” of the age that warrant reexamination (Preece, 1999).

In this article, I wish to further complement our understanding of the impact of Christianity on human–animal relations by adopting a historical perspective that focuses not on the canonical texts, major theologians, or official positions of the Churches, but on the interpretation and appropriation of the Christian tradition by members of the grassroots British antivivisection movement in the 19th century. I will establish that in this first historical movement against animal experimentation, the majority of participants relied on the Christian religion as the moral foundation for their cause and actively appropriated related theological, moral, and emotional resources in order to further the objectives of the movement. I will demonstrate that many clergy and laypeople who acted on their own conscience, despite the lack of official support from the major Churches at this time, ardently embraced the Christian tradition in adopting a repertoire of positive resources in their fight against animal experimentation.

A MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CAUSE

Our cause is the cause of true progress, the sacred cause of humanity, the cause of Christ.

—John Verschoyle (1884, p. 232)

Antivivisection agitations flared in the 1870s as advancements in experimental physiology were made in Britain (Coleman & Holmes, 1988; Geison, 1978). In 1875, a Royal Commission on Vivisection was appointed to investigate the nature and extent of the practice. In 1876, with intensive lobbying from both the biomedical community and the anticruelty movement, the Cruelty to Animals Act was passed. This act, though it established a licensing and inspection system for regulating live animal experimentation, greatly disappointed the antivivisectionists.¹ In the same year, five major societies for the abolition of vivisection were founded. Over the next few decades, local branches of these organizations as well as approximately a dozen other independent societies appeared in major cities throughout Britain. This broad-based grassroots movement (French, 1975; Kean, 1995; Richards, 1986, 1992; Ritvo, 1984; Rupke, 1987) was composed largely of middle- and upper-class activists. The antivivisection movement widely adopted the repertoire of mass protests of the time, such as mass petitions, literature distribution, letters to the editor, poster displays, itinerary lectures, and public meetings, in its attempt to inform and agitate.

Though it is not fully recognized in the secularized culture of animal activism today, historians earlier identified the evangelical root and religious character of the 19th-century antivivisection movement (French, 1975; Harrison, 1982; Kean, 1998; Ritvo, 1987; Ste-

venson, 1956). From the late 18th century onward, an intense evangelical revival swept the Anglican and Nonconformist churches. Emphasizing atonement for sin, the primacy of conscience, and salvation through faith and characterized by a fervent zeal to spread the gospel and to do good work, this evangelical current had a significant influence on individuals' personal and family lives as well as the political and social life of the nation (Bebbington, 1989; Hilton, 1988). In particular, it deeply affected the sphere of public morals and helped fuel a long tradition of moral reforms, from abolition of the slave trade and the prevention of cruelty against children and animals to temperance, Sabbath-keeping, prison reform, and the suppression of vices such as gambling and prostitution (Harrison, 1982; Hunt, 2004; Roberts, 2004). Moral reformers, drawn largely from the middle classes, were concerned with the immorality and irreligiosity of the nation and tended to view social issues in moral and theological terms, framing their discourses accordingly and constantly appealing to religious sentiment and the moral conscience of the country deeply ingrained within the evangelical ethos. The antivivisection movement, being an offshoot of the anticruelty movement that rode the tide of moral reform from the early 19th century, constituted part of the moral reform tradition and shared many of its characteristics.

As with most moral reform causes of the time, the mainstream antivivisection movement posed as a movement fighting for a religious as well as moral cause from the beginning of the agitation. Though it was by no means a solely Christian movement, the Christian religion became a common banner under which the majority of reformers rallied, seeking inspiration and justification for their commitment and actions. Stevenson (1956) was the first to discuss this "ecumenical" nature of the antivivisection movement (p. 125). Using the common ground of the Christian faith, laypeople and clergy of different denominations and even people who had rejected formal Christianity but remained sympathetic to Christian moral ideals were able to transcend their religious differences and work together closely. For example, the most influential organization of the time, the Society for the Protection of Animals Liable to Vivisection (generally referred to as the Victorian Street Society, hereafter denoted as VSS) had Lord Shaftesbury (the "evangelical of evangelicals" of the age), the Archbishop of York, and Roman Catholic Cardinal Henry Manning acting as its president and vice presidents (Society for the Protection of Animals [VSS], 1876). The VSS, on the other hand, was led by Frances Power Cobbe (Hamilton, 2006; Mitchell, 2004; Peacock, 2002; Williamson, 2005), a feminist and deist writer on theological issues who earlier had rebelled against the evangelical tradition in which she was raised but nonetheless retained a strong belief in the idea of a beneficent creator and a divinely instilled morality. Early on in the campaign, Cobbe (1876), who was most vocal in **declaring the religious basis of the movement, proclaimed in the antivivisectionist newspaper the *Home Chronicler*, "Our work, then, must be a slow and steady one; a Social, not a Political movement; an ethical and religious propagandism, rather than a Parliamentary agitation"** (p. 201). Aware of the religious sentiment behind the antivivisection movement and in the country at large, parliamentary spokesmen of the movement also adopted this moral high ground in their agitation for the antivivisection

cause. Lord Shaftesbury, the most prominent evangelical philanthropist and parliamentarian during the second half of the 19th century, spoke forcefully in Parliament in support of the antivivisection bill in 1876:

It was with many of them not simply a matter of feeling, it was one of religion. He did not believe that it could be eradicated; he hardly believed that it could be partially subdued. A violent unqualified opposition to their wishes might bring on such expressions of sentiment as would end in the most coercive measures. ("Cruelty to Animals Bill," 1876, p. 1021)

The Earl of Carnarvon, the prime mover of the 1876 Act with Shaftesbury, expressed similar views in the House of Lords in 1879:

If the opinion got abroad that the Government was careless as to the enforcing of the restrictions contained in the Act . . . a strong feeling of indignation would be aroused in some of the most powerful classes, who viewed this question, not merely as a matter of sentiment, but as one of gratitude and religion. ("Cruelty to Animals Bill," 1879, p. 434)

This common self-portrayal, however, by no means suggests that the antivivisection movement was homogeneously composed of Christians alone. Even from within the antivivisection camp, from time to time protests were raised by freethinkers and secularists against their coworkers' regular assertion of the movement as an exclusively Christian one and the labeling of its opponents as atheists (Salt, 1904). Furthermore, the Protestant identity and nationalist rhetoric, wielded by participants in the movement who equated the virtue of animal protection with the humane Christian civilization that Britain most notably exemplified, worked also to alienate people of other faiths (Ritvo, 1987, p. 130), and the movement had not been unduly accused of being anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic, feelings prevalent also in society at large (French, 1975, p. 347; Rubens, 1894; Williamson, 2005, pp. 185–188).

Perhaps the best examples of profuse religious sentiment and the mobilizing functions it served were in the many great and small meetings attended mostly by workers who had been converted to the cause. These meetings were the occasions when workers assembled, shared their innermost convictions, and strengthened their collective determination to fight for the cause. At these often feverish meetings held throughout the country, Christian faith and morality were frequently proclaimed with great vitality, and the sinfulness of painful experimentation on nonhuman animals was fiercely condemned as violating the spirit of Christianity. For example, at the inaugural meeting of the Glasgow Branch of the Scottish Society for the Total Suppression of Vivisection, hearty applause accompanied the declaration that the group "took their stand on religious grounds, believing that the Almighty had decreed that all His creatures should be treated with mercy and kindness" ("Home Intelligence," 1896, p. 322). Applause also greeted the Bishop of Manchester's words at the annual meeting of the Manchester Branch of the VSS in 1896, when he stated that vivisection "is an abuse of power . . . contrary to the will of God [and] atrociously wrong" ("Annual Meeting of the Manchester Branch," 1896, p. 328). Cries of "hear, hear" roared out at the annual meeting of the Manchester Anti-Vivisection Society in 1897,

when the chairman proclaimed that the “great aim” of their committee was “the glory of God and the good of man” (Annual meeting of the Manchester Society, 1897, p. 212). The feverish religious atmosphere at these great gatherings sometimes cast a fearful, self-righteous image over the antivivisection campaign, especially when enthusiastic faith in the absolute rightness and holiness of the cause was expressed without reservation. Edward Berdoe, an antivivisection medical doctor and Browning expert with a deep Christian faith, when concluding a meeting of the Cheltenham Branch of the National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS), proclaimed,

The cause of Anti-Vivisection is holy and must win the end.
 For Right is Right since God is God,
 And Right the day shall win,
 To doubt would be disloyalty,
 To falter would be sin. (Applause.) (Important meeting in Cheltenham, 1899, p. 219)

Mrs. Henry Lee, wife of a noted consulting surgeon and a frequent speaker at antivivisection meetings, also consistently combined explicit religious rhetoric with the emotional, provocative evangelical style of oratory that aimed perhaps less at persuading opponents than at reinforcing the conviction of the converted. Note how she used a mass platform to bring the Christian faith and Jesus Christ into the center of attention, exploiting the emotional force behind the vague, yet powerful concept of the battle between the power of Christ and the power of evil at a public demonstration of the London Anti-Vivisection Society (LAVS) at St. James Hall in 1899:

Pure humanitarianism alone can never avail effectually to stem the tide of misery and wrong. Ah! doubt it not . . . there stands One in our midst to-night Whose form is like the Son of God, and He pleads with us to persevere in this mighty warfare against the powers of evil. If we would succeed in this work of mercy, the Saviour of the world must ever be the central figure on our platform. See to it, friends, that we fight this great battle in His strength, ever looking to Him for help and guidance, always remembering that by His Cross alone this evil, like all other evils, shall finally be overthrown. (Loud applause.) (London Anti-Vivisection Society [LAVS], 1899, p. 26)

Following Mrs. Lee’s conclusion with a militant Christian hymn—“Onward, Christian soldiers / marching as to war / with the Cross of Jesus / going on before” (LAVS, 1899, p. 26)—loud and prolonged cheering erupted. If vivisection had not been mentioned, the speech easily could have been mistaken for any revivalist missionary gathering or Barracks meeting of the Salvation Army.

SELF-SACRIFICE VERSUS SELFISHNESS

In terms of discourse, the antivivisection movement widely utilized Christian themes developed by the anticruelty movement since the 1820s, such as the extension of God’s merciful spirit to all creatures, humankind’s stewardship of creation, and the obligation to be God-like and merciful toward other animals (Li, 2000). For antivivisectionists,

the “atrocities” taking place in laboratories marked the gravest possible breach of trust toward defenseless animals who had been entrusted to humans by God. In addition to the arguments against cruelty to animals, antivivisectionists further appropriated the theological conception of “sin” that was central to evangelical thought. Though cruelty had long been considered a sin against God and a degradation of human nature, the idea of sin was not as persistently emphasized in the anticruelty movement as it was in antivivisection campaigns. From Lord Shaftesbury’s first condemnation of animal experimentation as “an abominable sin,” this discourse was widely adopted in the movement and soon became a standard description of the practice of vivisectionists. Two decades later, in 1898, Cobbe was still saying of the movement, “Our guiding principle, for the last twenty years, has been that vivisection is ‘an abominable sin’ (Shaftesbury’s comment) and no more to be sanctioned and licensed than robbery or rape” (Cobbe, 1898, p. 171). Upon its foundation in the same year, the British Union Against Vivisection (BUAV) also adopted “Vivisection Is a Sin” as its watchword (“Our Cause,” 1902, p. 40). Complementary to an emphasis on the sinful nature of vivisection was a long list of negative adjectives with religious overtones, such as “evil,” “fiendish,” “diabolic,” “hellish,” “devilish,” “Satanic,” and “blasphemous,” frequently used by antivivisectionists to convey their stance on the abominable nature of vivisection. These terms, which invited accusations concerning the movement’s intemperate and malicious nature, need to be understood within the religious frame through which most antivivisectionists perceived the nature of animal experimentation.

The special nature of experimental cruelty also brought forth new emotions and required new discourses to embody and articulate the campaigners’ indignation. In this respect, the concept of self-sacrifice was an archetypal theological concept from which a series of derivative discourses and powerful images were evoked in order to create a concerted impression against new developments in physiological science. The spirit of self-sacrifice, derived from the evangelical doctrine of Christ’s atonement for the sins of humankind through His crucifixion on the cross, was one of the most highly regarded virtues held by Victorian society (Hilton, 1988). This ethical ideal, together with the moral exemplar of Christ, carried a sustained cultural resonance despite developments such as biblical criticism, geological discoveries, evolutionary theories, and an intense social conscience, which had posed great challenges to traditional Christian beliefs in Victorian society. The theme of self-sacrifice was commonly evoked in Victorian social and political life, readily drawn on by reform movements such as the suffragist and socialist movements, and upheld by individuals who had lost the outer garment of their evangelical faith but nonetheless retained their inner conscience (Collini, 1991; Harrison, 1990, pp. 120–130).

In the eyes of many antivivisectionists, animal experimentation differed from other forms of cruelty in that the pain and death suffered by animals were a result not of human rage, drunkenness, negligence, indifference, or ignorance, but of calculated, conscious acts designed to advance medical knowledge. This “sacrifice,” made by animals for the

“higher and nobler” race of humankind, was in direct contradiction to the spirit of the crucified Christ, which called on the strong to serve and make sacrifice for the weak, rather than vice versa. Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, a Roman Catholic convert from Anglicanism and ecumenist who served on the executive committee of the International Association for the Total Suppression of Vivisection, stated of animals in *Moral and Religious Estimate of Vivisection*, “Their very inferiority and dependence on us . . . gives them that claim upon our kindness which the weak have upon the strong, and which it has been a special function and glory of Christianity to enforce” (Oxenham, 1878, p. 13). In a sermon on vivisection and Christianity, another speaker stressed that “the essence of Christianity is sacrifice of the higher for the lower. Hold up in every vivisection laboratory the Cross of Jesus, and then you have in awful contrast God’s way towards noble ends, and man’s” (“The Pulpit,” 1902, p. 51). One member of the Church Anti-Vivisection League (CAVL) so explicated on the sacrificial spirit:

“*Noblesse oblige*,” is not this the great lesson of the Incarnation—the Highest sacrificing Himself for the lowest. “*Noblesse dispense*,” is on the contrary the motto of the vivisector. To the real or fancied good of the higher animal, all beneath him must be ruthlessly sacrificed. Can there be a sharper contrast than that which exists between the spirit of Christ and the spirit of vivisection? (Church Anti-Vivisection League, n.d., p. 12)

In contrast to the Christian spirit of self-sacrifice were cowardice and selfishness, which in the eyes of the antivivisectionists were the roots of all evil and characterized the very nature of animal experimentation. Practices that sacrificed other species to relieve humankind of death and disease, as well as the prevalent public concern about bodily health without regard for spiritual principles, were to them signs of the ever-increasing cowardice and selfishness of the time that contrasted with the ideal of self-sacrifice (Adams, 1882; Morris, 1890; Ouida, 1900–1901). The dichotomy between selfishness and self-sacrifice, or egoism and altruism, had been a dominating theme in the Victorian public’s conception of morality. It was not only central to the Christian ideal of self-sacrifice but also a major concept in the works of leading freethinking intellectual moralists of the day, such as J. S. Mill and Leslie Stephen (Collini, 1991, pp. 60–90). As with many contemporary social and moral issues, the question of vivisection was perceived and presented in the light of a perpetual conflict between egoistic self-seeking and altruistic self-sacrifice. The stark contrast between the two conflicting spirits was frequently evoked at anti-vivisection meetings and in writings from both secular and religious perspectives. At one gathering a speaker was reported as saying that “vivisection was morally injurious to humanity. Everything that pandered to the two basest instincts we had—cowardice and selfishness—lowered the whole race” (“The British Institute at Chelsea,” 1898, p. 72). The declaration received applause and responses of “hear, hear.” A rector similarly reminded his readers that:

As a Christian you cannot take up the ground that offences perpetrated against God, and cruelties inflicted on His creatures are nothing to you. . . . This is the very essence

of selfishness. It would do away with all noble deeds. It is unmanly, un-English, and un-Christian. (Barrett, 1878, p. 11)

Charles Adams (1882), secretary of the VSS and editor of *The Verulam Review*, also contrasted these conflicting spirits in *The Coward of Science* by claiming that Christianity preaches the “Gospel of Divine Self-Sacrifice” (p. 196) and calling vivisectional physiology “a coward science in itself,” whose one “*raison d’être* . . . is to obtain for ourselves immunity from pain by the infliction of peculiarly hideous tortures upon other races” (pp. 228–229). By framing the vivisection question in this binary opposition, contrasting the concepts of self-sacrifice with selfishness, the antivivisectionists thus incorporated and resonated with the moral perspective of both the religious and secular public.

In addition to the use of reason in arguments against animal experimentation, the antivivisection movement was permeated with emotional power and a pronounced altruistic spirit resulting from incorporation of the concept of sacrifice. This sacrifice-based discourse is echoed in the urging of active members in speeches or writings to “take the bitter cup” from animals. Lord Shaftesbury, with his usual devout spirit, famously pronounced his support of Lord Truro’s Bill in the House of Lords in 1879. It was reported, “All he could say was—and he said it truly and conscientiously—that in every respect, he would infinitely rather be the dog than be the Professor (Hear, hear)” (“Cruelty to Animals Bill,” 1879, p. 430). Cobbe (1876–1877), with her more broadly conceived, but no less intense, religious faith, also prayed: “Let these dread diseases overtake me, and let me die, sooner than share any benefit from such foul rites, or ever say to this new Moloch of Science, Thou art my God” (p. 347). These serious avowals by leading figures were repeated in meeting halls and lecture rooms and printed in the movement’s literature that was often circulated in the thousands. Two decades into the campaign, the Ven. Basil Wilberforce, Archdeacon of Westminster, continued to recapitulate the words of Shaftesbury, forcefully declaring at the annual meeting of the National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS) in 1901,

I agree entirely with Lord Shaftesbury—I would rather die a man than live a vampire, and as he said, I declare before God, I would rather be the unfortunate animal crucified on the torture trough than I would be the vivisector standing at its side. (*Zoophilist*, 1901, p. 10)

CHRIST IN THE LABORATORY

Supplementing the antivivisection discourses was a series of religious imagery of the laboratory conjured up by the antivivisectionists. Because the practice of vivisection was deemed directly contrary to the teachings of Christ, the antivivisectionists frequently challenged the legitimacy of the experimental method by asking whether God or Christ himself would have approved of vivisection, a mode of questioning both prevalent and influential in a culture deeply inspired by the incarnation of Christ. In the second half of the 19th century, the harsh evangelical doctrines of eternal and vicarious punishment had been gradually replaced by a gentler Christology that emphasized Jesus as

man rather than as lamb (Hilton, 1988). Jesus became a moral teacher and a practical reformer, and the life of Jesus on earth served as a noble exemplar for both the devout and those who rejected orthodox Christianity but still remained morally committed and socially concerned. In philanthropic and reform circles, questions about Christ's own perspective—for example, “if Christ were to return to Victorian England what would he do and what would happen to him?” (Harrison, 1990, p. 126)—were often raised and were widely adopted and elaborated on by supporters of the antivivisection movement. The president of the Scottish Anti-Vivisection Society, when invited to speak at the 1893 grand annual meeting of the LAVS, asked provokingly, “Could you imagine the Divine One doing vivisectionists’ work?” (“Annual Meeting,” 1893, p. 156). In 1882, Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, an influential spokesman for the antivivisection cause since its inception, posed this question in a widely read article for the *Fortnightly Review* in response to a bishop in the Southern states in America who once asked how the Lord would look upon a slave mart in New Orleans:

I will venture on a kindred question. What would our Lord have said, what looks would He have bent, upon a chamber filled with “the unoffending creatures which He loves,” dying under torture deliberately and intentionally inflicted, or kept alive to endure further torment, in pursuit of knowledge? Men must answer this question according to their consciences. (p. 36)

These types of questions were quickly adopted and frequently posed in different forms to audiences or readers targeted by the antivivisection movement. A clergyman, after describing the nature of vivisection, asked from the pulpit, “Had these things that I have been telling you happened at Nazareth or Bethlehem eighteen hundred years ago, *what*, think you, *would Christ have said?*” (“Our Cause,” 1891, p. 27). A more common and evocative tactic involved asking the audience to visualize Christ Himself in modern laboratories witnessing His created beings tied to the vivisection tables. John William Graham, of the Manchester Friends’ Anti-Vivisection Society, envisaged Jesus in one of his speeches thus:

I can fancy I see a figure wandering among the moaning dogs tied in their troughs in the deserted laboratory, in the darkness of the long hours of night, the figure of the sorrowing Christ. “In all affliction He was afflicted,” and may we add the hope that “the Angel of His presence saved them,” even them. (“From the Battlefield,” 1894, p. 42)

Cardinal John Henry Newman in his sermon titled “The Crucifixion” compared the “inoffensive and unprotected” animal who was “fastened against a wall, pierced, gashed, and so left to linger out its life” with the suffering of Christ. He so asked the audience, “For what was this but the very cruelty inflicted upon our Lord? He was gashed with the scourge, pierced through hands and feet, and so fastened to the Cross, and there left, and that as a spectacle” (Newman, 1891).

The motifs of a sorrowful Christ in a modern lab and the interchangeability of Christ with the vivisectioned animals offered such intense, powerful images and recurrent themes in antivivisection propaganda that artists and poets also elaborated on them and visual-

ized them with their imaginative power. Against the background of a rich tradition of Victorian animal imagery (Donald, 2007), Robert Morley, a famous animal and landscape painter, created a pictorial form of the incarnate Christ in the laboratory for the LAVS in 1902. In this picture, Christ was depicted standing behind a dog tied to a vivisection table, facing the scientist handling an instrument tied around the dog's mouth. The thorn-crowned Christ appeared mournful, but the light emanating from Him lit up the darkened room and shone onto a banner inscribed with a plea, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful"—a widely quoted scriptural passage mobilized by the anticruelty movement and subsequently inherited by the antivivisection movement. The LAVS reproduced the picture with the words of the Lord Bishop of Durham and J. Graham underneath and sold it for 1s. 6d. each, hoping that it could "serve to remind professing Christians of their very obvious duty in this most up-hill crusade" ("Christ in the Laboratory," 1902, p. 57).

Another incarnation of the image of Christ in the laboratory appeared in "The City Without God" by Robert Buchanan in his epic poem *The City of Dream* (1888), a work widely quoted in the movement with the permission of the poet, himself a dedicated antivivisectionist. Instead of Christ watching over His beloved creations suffering under the vivisectioning knife, the animals themselves were transformed into the image of Christ, echoing the movement's frequent portrayal of a four-legged animal strapped to the operating table as being "crucified" for the sins of humankind:

Then, lo! A miracle—face, form and limbs,
 Changed on the instant—neither hound nor faun
 Lay there awaiting the tormentor's knife,
 But One, a living form as white as wax,
 Stigmata on his feet and on his hands,
 And on his feet and on his hands,
 And on his face, still shining as a star,
 The beauty of Eros and the pain of Christ!
 I knew Him, but none other mortal knew
 Though every tiny faun and god of the wood,
 Still garrulously babbling, named the Name;
 And looking up into the torturer's face
 He wept and murmur'd, "Even as ye use
 The very meanest of my little ones,
 So use ye Me!" (Buchanan, 1901, p. 67)

The American poet Ella Wheeler Wilcox (1913), a close ally of the British animal defense movement with theosophical and spiritualist tendencies, visualized the image of Christ in tortured animals in her poem "Christ Crucified" in a similar manner. In this poem, Christ was depicted as a sorrowful father who had come to bear the pains of His suffering creation with "hoofs and wings" and "to save mankind from sin," not only in laboratories, but at every site of cruelty, from slaughterhouses to zoos and bull rings (Wilcox, 1913, pp. 106–108).

RELIGION VERSUS SCIENCE?

Let her know her place; She is the second, not the first.

—Henry Nutcombe Oxenham (1878, p. 11)

To discover the full range of Christian resources utilized by the movement, we must further locate the movement in the larger context of the conflict between religion and science prevalent in the 19th century. Historians have correctly warned that overemphasis on a conflict model between the vaguely defined categories of religion and science conceals as much as it reveals (Brooke, 1991; Lightman, 2001; Livingstone, Hart, & Noll, 1999). However, this model served as a highly functional frame for the antivivisection movement, and up until the end of the 19th century, many supporters not only heavily evoked metaphors of the war between religion and science but also widely appropriated intellectual and rhetorical resources from controversies surrounding religion and science, such as dualistic notions of mind/matter and spiritualism/materialism, which carried wide social resonance. Despite widespread accusations of being anti-science, mainstream antivivisectionists clearly took the side of religion instead of steering the vivisection debate away from the religion-versus-science debate, portraying themselves as engaging in a fight between the opposing ethics of religion and science and frequently warning of the usurpation of science, which threatened the authority and moral order of religion. For example, Francis W. Newman, a classical scholar and moral philosopher who had broken with orthodox Christianity in the 1840s yet remained morally committed and highly religious, employed the language of warfare in issuing a warning in a mode commonly seen in wider controversies between religion and science:

But now, behold, a new horror has arisen upon us—Cruelty in the garb and pretensions of Science! Science was going to set Religion right. She held up her torch to illuminate the deformities of superstition, and display the wickedness of Religion . . . yet now Science has become a rival of the tortures of the Inquisition, and by increase of knowledge has learnt to torment still more ingeniously. (“Professor F. W. Newman,” 1876, p. 90)

No doubt, to many antivivisectionists, as with many who held on to the authority of Christianity, religion should reign supreme over science in territories such as morality and metaphysics. Ribton Cooke, editor of the *Home Chronicler* since 1881 and core member of the LAVS, also declared at an antivivisection meeting in Shrewsbury that “science . . . is a rival to the throne where only religion can rightly be seated. It must be the handmaid not mistress of religion” (“Vivisection Meeting,” 1877, p. 1130).

The metaphor of the “priesthood of science” commonly employed in wider science-versus-religion controversies was also adopted by the antivivisectionists. The antivivisectionist frequently represented the “vivisector in the lab” as a newly arrived false god or goddess demanding sacrifice on the altar; the vivisector with his white robe was compared to a new priest of science, the laboratory the temple, and animal experimentation the Inquisition or the sacrificial rite demanded by the false god of a pseudo-religion (Ouida, 1893). R. Somerville Wood, Lecturer to the National Anti-Vivisection Society, commented

at the Pioneer Anti-Vivisection Society, composed mostly of late-Victorian progressive women, “A comparatively new Goddess is now being worshipped—the Goddess of Science. The temple is the laboratory, the victims are the tortured dogs sacrificed on her unhallowed altars; the priests are the physiologists licensed to perform the unspeakable orgies of their blood-stained ritual” (Pioneer Anti-Vivisection Society, 1902, p. 34).

However, more than an opportunist appropriation of the heat and language of a greater controversy, antivivisectionist contentions with science cannot be understood in isolation from the movement’s more elaborate critique of scientific knowledge and its materialist tendencies.

The chastisement of secular greed and thirst for knowledge was a recurrent theme in the antivivisection movement. In Christianity, and particularly in evangelical theology, knowledge was not considered to be of foremost importance for human salvation but was something that could potentially lead to the endangerment and demoralization of humankind. Adam and Eve’s partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge was often said to have led to the fall of humankind and their banishment from Eden. Thus, in antivivisection campaigns, an analogy was often made between cutting up live animals as a gratification of physiologists’ curiosity and the picking of fruit from the forbidden tree of knowledge (Maitland, 1913, p. 261; “Professor Michael Foster,” 1894, pp. 303–307). In an annual sermon to the CAVL, Bishop Barry, president of the Society for United Prayer for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SUPPCA), preached on the text “Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth” (1 Corinthians 8:1) to demonstrate that although knowledge had led to technological and social advancements, still more important to human progress was the higher character of love (“London: Church,” 1901, p. 84). In a similar vein, Cobbe consistently contrasted the value of human knowledge to that of the universal law of divine love in her criticism against vivisection. She proclaimed, “The law of love and Mercy is alone Divine, while the thirst for Knowledge may be the passion of a devil” (Cobbe, 1876, p. 201). These examples illustrate an antivivisectionist framework along the lines adopted by many theologians in their fight against what was perceived as the encroachment of science on the traditional territory of religion in morality and ethics in the decades following the publication of Darwin’s *Origins of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871). Cobbe, who exerted considerable influence in the antivivisection movement, was herself a combative writer involved in wider cultural debates concerning the authority and ethics of religion and science. Though previously sympathetic to the cause of science, in the mid-1870s Cobbe began vigorously defending religion as she perceived, in the scientific spirit of the age, perils such as the increasing priority of bodily health over spiritual pursuit, the overemphasis on knowledge as compared to love, and the dominance of a selfish and pitiless utilitarian ethic brought by Darwinism and the new age of science (Cobbe, 1872, pp. 1–33; 1882, pp. 81–91; 1888, pp. 3–34; 1889, pp. 65–69; 1891, p. 4). In her eyes, the knowledge acquired by vivisectionists and the brutalizing effect of their cruel experimental practices came at the expense of morality and were not merely evils in themselves, but were indicative of a broader and more dangerous influence of science on the morals of the age, an influence that tended to foster materialism

and lead to the quashing of religious feelings and, hence, ethical impulse. Championing the supremacy of the virtues of divine love and self-sacrifice, Cobbe (1888) believed that “Knowledge, like Virtue, is not good because it is useful, but useful because it is good” (p. 170). Seen in this light, the vivisectionists’ claim to utility without regard for morality was the very proof of the perversion brought by the new moral order resulting from the usurpation of science.

Closely related to the movement’s critique of knowledge was a dualistic conception of spiritualism and materialism that the antivivisectionists in like manner appropriated and portrayed as the essential difference in spirit between antivivisection and vivisection (Lumsden, n.d., p. 6; Wright, 1881). The 1870s and 1880s, the same period during which the antivivisection movement gained popular support, saw intensified discussion of evolutionary theories offering new explanations by the physical sciences, which generated great popular debate over the issues of mind versus matter and spiritualism versus materialism. In 1874, John Tyndall’s Presidential Address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Belfast advocated the autonomy of science from the encroachment of religion and sparked another wave of fierce criticism from theologians on the materialistic and atheistic tendency of modern science (Lightman, 2004; Peacock, 2002, p. 224). From the perspective of some religious people, biological science, now breaking free from the restraints of natural theology and fast advancing in its exploration of the human body, could not only plant the seeds of materialism in the minds of its practitioners but also foster a materialist tendency at the expense of spirituality and morality in the larger society. Despite scientists’ attempts to defend their vision as not inherently materialist in character, the naturalistic interpretation of the mind and the universe advocated by crusading scientists, such as Thomas Huxley, alarmed religious individuals who cherished spiritual over physical/corporal interpretations of life (Block, 1989).

In a movement driven largely by a strong religious sentiment and moral passion, antivivisection attacks on animal experimentation often echoed wider criticisms of the materialistic explanation of life in science. Many supporters shared the concerns of the religious community in terms of the demoralizing influence of the physiologists’ attempts at “reducing thought, memory, conscience, affection, all that is highest in man or in animal, to varying functions of organized matter” (Cobbe, 1883, p. 6; “A Portrait,” 1882, p. 179). A leading article in *The Zoophilist*, after suggesting that nothing would “give the enemies of Christianity so much pleasure” as the discovery that “thought and reason are merely the product of some chemical changes in the cerebral substance or the blood currents which permeate it,” continued, “We are of course very far from asserting that the Vivisectionist or the Biologist must necessarily be a Materialist, though it would not be difficult to show that Christianity can hardly be considered at home in the physiological laboratory” (ED. Z., 1902, p. 93).

More frequently, however, in the movement’s popular literature and public platforms, the conflicts between two different outlooks on life—one spiritual, the other material—were presented in a far cruder form. In fact, labels of “materialist” or “atheist” were casually thrown about by those who regarded the vivisectionists as enemies of religion and

spiritual values. The contemporary intellectual and cultural context, rich with allusions to these concepts, only ensured that the dualistic frame adopted by the movement was able to generate a strong emotional force and attract like-minded members of the public.

CLERGY OR NO CLERGY

For a movement that often openly proclaimed itself to be on the side of religion and that drew heavily on Christian theological resources, the support of clergy and Church leaders was naturally of great importance. Most antivivisection societies vigorously courted the backing of churchmen and did receive some crucial support. Early in 1875, a total of 50 peers and bishops signed a memorial prepared by Cobbe calling on the RSPCA to promote legislative action against scientific experiments on nonhuman animals, including the archbishop of York, the primate of Ireland, the archbishop of Dublin, and the archbishop of Westminster ("Memorial Against Vivisection," 1875, p. 38; Locke, 1875, p. 12). Other religious leaders who gave their personal endorsement to the cause included William Booth of the Salvation Army and Hugh Price Hughes of the Wesleyan Methodist Church (Coleridge, 1912b, pp. 94–95). The support of leading religious figures was so valued precisely because of the lack of official support from certain Christian communities, as was the case with Cardinal Manning when the Roman Catholic Church's denial of humans' duty to nonhuman animals was widely known (Cobbe, 1884, p. 9; Coleridge, 1893, pp. 13–14). There were also religion-based societies that bound together Christian clergy and laypeople, such as the active Society for United Prayer for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Church of England Anti-Vivisection League, and the Friends' Anti-Vivisection League. In societies without any exclusive religious base, representatives from churches were customarily invited to take leading roles in public meetings. For example, seldom were annual meetings for societies such as the VSS, LAVS, and NAVS held that did not include the participation of ministers addressing the assemblies on the duty of Christians in relation to the antivivisection cause. Most prestigious societies also had impressive lists of vice presidents filled with the names of Church dignitaries, such as the NAVS, which had eight bishops and one archbishop on its vice presidents list in 1897 (National Anti-Vivisection Society, 1897, p. 130). In a petition containing 11,477 signatures to the secretary of state in 1896, urging the improved administration and stricter enforcement of the 1876 act, among the hundreds of "principal names" listed were 12 bishops and 333 ministers from different churches ("Lax Enforcement," 1896, p. 333). Additionally, Cobbe (1904) estimated that around 1892, there were at least 4,000 clergy from the Church of England who supported antivivisection (p. 674). However, despite the high visibility of clergy in the movement, the movement was never satisfied with the level of support it received, and the fact that no church of any denomination ever pledged official support for the cause especially frustrated the many Christians within the movement.

The Church Congress held at Folkestone in 1892 included perhaps the closest thing to open recognition of the gravity of the vivisection question by the established Church, yet it also gravely disappointed the antivivisection movement. On this occasion, despite

impassioned antivivisection speeches delivered by Bishop Barry—the Canon of Windsor and former primate of Australia—and the Bishop of Manchester, the Bishop of Edinburgh closed the discussion with the following remarks:

There is much that was humorous in the speech of the Bishop of Manchester . . . which I am certain does not represent the opinion of the great majority of the clergy. Nothing, I am certain, would be more disastrous to the Church of England than that it should be generally accepted that the sentiments expressed by the Bishop of Manchester and Bishop Barry are those of the Church. The Church is not hostile to science; the Church favours science . . . I venture to say . . . my entire sympathies have been with the experimentalists in this question. (Dunkley, 1892, p. 440)

The Church of England's initial discussion of the question received wide press coverage and occurred at an unfortunate time for the antivivisection camp, given that Cobbe was being accused at the time by Dr. Horsley of distorting details of his experimental procedures in her book *The Nine Circles of the Hell of the Innocent* (Cobbe, 1892). These successive events worked only to undermine the credibility of Cobbe and the antivivisection cause and, in the eyes of the public, turned Bishop Barry into an isolated extremist within the Church (“Experiments Upon Living Animals,” 1892; “The Church Congress,” 1892).

Faced with general silence or antagonism from the churches, as in the 1892 Church Congress, supporters convinced of their Christian duty to stop animal experimentation were not reserved in voicing their disappointment, anger, or even defiance. In fact, throughout the 19th century and into the early 20th century, the antivivisectionists' dissatisfaction was so frequently expressed that it constituted one of the most recurrent themes in antivivisectionist literature and speeches. However, this perhaps indicates less the real level of support received by the movement than its strong conviction of the relevance of Christianity to the antivivisection cause.

In 1882, Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, in a fashion characteristic of the evangelical piety that ultimately placed a greater importance on personal introspection and inner conscience than ecclesiastical authority (Turner, 1990, pp. 13–17), appealed to ordinary Christians to act alone or against the Churches in his influential article in the *Fortnightly Review*:

If this be so, we must with due responsibility, think and act for ourselves without authority, or, if need be, against it . . . But to any one who recognises the authority of our Lord, and who persuades himself that he sees which way that authority inclines, the mind of Christ must be the guide of life. “Shouldest thou not have had compassion upon these, even as I had pity on thee?” So He seems to me to say, and I shall act accordingly. (Coleridge, 1882, p. 236)

Three decades later, his son Stephen Coleridge, president of the NAVS, described a similar situation at a large Brighton gathering:

In a survey of the campaign against vivisection, one is struck with one thing . . . that was the very scanty assistance which their efforts received from the general body of the clergy. (Hear, hear.) . . . One would have imagined that a movement like this would

have appealed immediately to their sympathies and commanded their unswerving and enthusiastic support. (“Vivisection Denounced,” 1913, p. 10)

The remarks were followed by applause. “But, clergy or no clergy,” Arthur Newland, the clergyman who presided over the gathering and spoke after Stephen Coleridge, added, “we intend to prosecute the work and not to relax our efforts until the goal is reached” (“Vivisection Denounced,” 1913, p. 10).

The disappointment of the movement with the clergy reached its zenith in 1911, when 16 bishops and several deans and ministers became vice presidents of the Research Defence Society (RDS), the chief propagandistic organization of the pro-vivisection camp founded in 1908. As could be expected, articles of protest appeared one by one in anti-vivisection journals (Berdoe, 1914; Coleridge, 1912a; “A Bishop on Vivisection,” 1911). Sidney Trist, secretary of the LAVS, wrote a 5,000-word open letter to all of the bishops and reverend sirs on the vice president list of the RDS. Dwelling on God’s infinite mercy over all His works and threatening the church dignitaries that, by associating themselves with the RDS, they would be losing the Church’s hold on the vast majority of people, Trist ends his letter by again conjuring up a forceful image of Christ in the laboratory, with a slight variation involving the bishops acting as assistants to the vivisectors:

My Lord of Oxford, a Professor needs that scalpel! Kindly pass it. My Lord of Stepney—please tighten that band around the body—otherwise the creature may escape. My Lords of Exeter and Truro, and your dear Dean of Westminster and formerly Diocesan of Winchester—kindly touch that lever.

In my mind’s eye the Invisible Presence takes form and shape. . . . My Lords! My Lords! do you not hear His voice? . . . “*Even as ye have done it unto the least of these My little ones, ye have done it unto Me.*” (Trist, 1911, pp. 13–14)

The familiar imagery of Christ in the laboratory, with the addition of bishop assistants, clearly demonstrated the frustration of Christian workers who had long relied on the teachings and exemplar of Christ for moral and emotional support.

The ecclesiastical patronage attained by the RDS was certainly a strategic victory for the pro-vivisection camp. It also signified another peak of the vivisection controversy in the early 20th century and illustrated its pitched nature. Though by the turn of the century, several leading societies such as the NAVS (formerly VSS) and the Animal Defence and Anti-Vivisection Society had taken up the restrictionist stance, realizing the difficulty of attaining total abolition in the short run, the movement in no sense relaxed its campaigning efforts. It more frequently adopted radical tactics, such as intensive media exposure, courtroom and shop propaganda, giant poster displays, open-air meetings, and even street demonstrations (Kean, 1998; Li, 2012). Meanwhile, the pro-vivisection camp also turned from its previous policy of maintaining a “dialogue with the state while ignoring popular protest” (Willis, 2006, p. 217) to that of making a broad public appeal through the propagandist RDS. The RDS closely followed the activities of antivivisection societies and adopted countermeasures, such as distributing leaflets outside antivivisection shops, opening temporary pro-vivisection propaganda centers close to them, hiring sandwich

men to walk in front of antivivisection processions, putting up giant posters right next to antivivisection ones, and engaging in public debate with leading antivivisectionists (Research Defence Society, 1908–1919). Seen in this context, the quest to recruit religious representatives as figureheads seemed but another effective countermeasure by the RDS to undermine the antivivisectionists' long-standing attempt to portray Christianity and its dignitaries as their staunchest of allies.

CONCLUSION

Robert Darnton, a cultural historian more interested in the ideas of ordinary people than those of rarefied philosophers, once commented,

I'm not really terribly interested in the way philosophical systems are passed on from one philosopher to another. What I find interesting is how ordinary people make sense of the world and develop some strategy for finding their way through the difficulties, the circumstances surrounding them. To me, ordinary people are not intellectuals, but are certainly intelligent. (Pallares-Burke, 2002, pp. 161–162)

This portrayal aptly describes many antivivisectionists who, despite the lack of institutional support from churches, took the initiative upon themselves in turning to the Christian tradition in their attempt to make sense of and deal with the moral issues posed by new developments in the field of physiological science. Largely influenced by a religious culture that emphasized individual conscience and social action, a generation of reformers poured forth their energy into the antivivisection movement and tactfully mobilized a repertoire of intellectual, moral, and emotional resources related to the Christian tradition for the advancement of the movement. These activists may not have been the best of theologians or the most gifted thinkers of their time; nonetheless, they created from the religious tradition closest to their hearts a series of discourses, rhetoric, images, and powerful frames of reference in support of a cause that they believed to be consistent with the Christian faith. In the practical efforts and creative agency of the Christian laity and clergy, as well as those who remained sympathetic to Christian moral ideals, we uncover a positive subtradition of Christian compassion toward nonhuman animals that has made its impact in history.

Note

1. The act allowed for experimentation without anaesthetics under Certificate C, exempting scientists from being prosecuted for cruelty to animals. As such, its subsequent administration was also considered by the antivivisectionists to favor the scientists. On the antivivisectionists' dissatisfaction with the act, see Bell (n.d.), Coleridge (1900), and Westacott (1949, pp. 114–116).

References

- Adams, C. (1882). *The coward science, our answer to Prof. Owen*. London, England: Hatchards.
- Annual meeting of the LAVS. (1893, June). *Animals' Guardian*, pp. 150–164.
- Annual meeting of the Manchester branch: The bishop condemns vivisection. (1896, April). *Zoophilist*, p. 328.

- Annual meeting of the Manchester Society. (1897, April). *Zoophilist*, pp. 211–213.
- Barrett, R. (1878, July 6). May a Christian tolerate cruelty? *Home Chronicler*, p. 11.
- Bebbington, D. W. (1989). *Evangelicalism in modern Britain: A history from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London, England: Unwin Hyman.
- Bell, E. (n.d.). *Flaws in the Act*. London, England: National Anti-Vivisection Society.
- Berdoe, E. (1914, January). Progressive morality. *Zoophilist*, pp. 140–141.
- A bishop on vivisection. (1911, March). *Zoophilist*, p. 174.
- Block, E., Jr. (1989). T. H. Huxley's rhetoric and the popularization of Victorian scientific ideas: 1854–1874. In P. Brantlinger (Ed.), *Energy and entropy: Science and culture in Victorian Britain* (pp. 205–228). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- The British Institute at Chelsea: Great protest meeting in the town hall. (1898, August). *Zoophilist*, p. 72.
- Brooke, J. H. (1991). *Science and religion: Some historical perspectives*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchanan, R. (1901, June). The city without God. *The Monthly Record and Animals' Guardian*, pp. 66–67.
- Christ in the laboratory. (1902, May). *Animals' Guardian*, p. 57.
- Church Anti-Vivisection League. (n.d.). *Man's relation to the lower animals, viewed from the Christian standpoint: A lecture*. London, England: Author.
- The Church Congress. (1892, October 7). *The Times*, p. 6.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1872). *Darwinism in morals, and other essays*. London, England: Williams and Norgate.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1876, September 16). Letter to the editor. *Home Chronicler*, p. 201.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1876–1877). Mr. Lowe and the Vivisection Act. *Contemporary Review*, 29, 335–347.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1882). *The peak in Darien: With some other inquiries touching concerns of the soul and the body*. London, England: Williams and Norgate.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1883). *Physiology as a branch of education*. London, England: Victoria Street Society for the Protection of Animals From Vivisection.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1884). *The moral aspects of vivisection*. London, England: Victoria Street Society for the Protection of Animals From Vivisection.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1888). *The scientific spirit of the age and other pleas and discussions*. London, England: Smith, Elder & Co.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1889). *The modern rack: Papers on vivisection*. London, England: Swan Sonnenschein.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1891). *The significance of vivisection*. London, England: Victoria Street Society for the Protection of Animals From Vivisection.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1892). *The nine circles of the hell of the innocent*. London, England: Sonnenschein.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1898, February). Miss Frances Power Cobbe on "lesser measures." *Zoophilist*, pp. 171–172.
- Cobbe, F. P. (1904). *Life of Frances Power Cobbe as told by herself* (posthumous ed.). London, England: S. Sonnenschein.
- Coleman, W., & Holmes, F. L. (Eds.). (1988). *The investigative enterprise: Experimental physiology in nineteenth-century medicine*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coleridge, J. D. (1882). The nineteenth century defenders of vivisection. *Fortnightly Review*, 31, 225–236.
- Coleridge, J. D. (1893). *The Lord Chief Justice of England on vivisection*. London, England: Victoria Street Society for the Protection of Animals From Vivisection.

- Coleridge, S. (1900). The administration of the Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876. *Fortnightly Review*, 67, 392–398.
- Coleridge, S. (1912a, October). Dr. Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. *Zoophilist*.
- Coleridge, S. (1912b, October). William Booth, General of the Aalvation Army. *Zoophilist*, pp. 94–95.
- Collini, S. (1991). The culture of altruism: Selfishness and the decay of motive. In *Public moralists: Political thought and intellectual life in Britain* (pp. 60–90). Oxford, England: Clarendon.
- Cruelty to Animals Bill. (1876, May 22). *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*.
- Cruelty to Animals Bill. (1879, July 15). *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*.
- Donald, D. (2007). *Picturing animals in Britain, 1750–1850*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dunkley, C. (Ed.). (1892). *The official report of the Church Congress, held at Folkestone, 1892*. London, England: Bemrose & Sons.
- ED. Z. (1902, Aug). Physiology in transition. *Zoophilist and Animals' Defender*, pp. 72–73.
- Experiments upon living animals. (1892, October 25). *The Times*, p. 2.
- French, R. (1975). *Anti-vivisection and medical science in Victorian Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- From the battlefield. (1894, September). *Animals' Friend*, pp. 40–42.
- Geison, G. L. (1978). *Michael Foster and the Cambridge School of Physiology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hamilton, S. (2006). *Frances Power Cobbe and Victorian feminism*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harrison, B. (1982). *Peaceable kingdom: Stability and change in modern Britain*. Oxford, England: Clarendon.
- Harrison, J. F. C. (1990). *Late Victorian Britain 1875–1901*. London, England: Fontana.
- Hilton, B. (1988). *The age of atonement: The influence of evangelicalism on social and economic thought 1785–1865*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Home intelligence. (1896, March). *Zoophilist*, p. 322.
- Hunt, A. (2004). *Governing morals: A social history of moral regulation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Important meeting in Cheltenham. (1899, March). *Zoophilist*, pp. 217–219.
- Kean, H. (1995). The “smooth cool men of science”: The feminist and socialist response to vivisection. *History Workshop Journal*, 40(1), 16–38.
- Kean, H. (1998). *Animal rights: Social and political change since 1800*. London, England: Reaktion.
- The lax enforcement of the act on vivisection. (1896, April). *Zoophilist*, p. 333.
- Li, C. (2000). A union of Christianity, humanity and philanthropy: The Christian tradition and prevention of cruelty to animals in nineteenth-century England. *Society and Animals*, 8, 265–285.
- Li, C. (2012). An unnatural alliance? Political radicalism and the animal defence movement in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain. *EurAmerica: A Journal of European and American Studies*, 42(1), 1–43.
- Lightman, B. (2001). Victorian sciences and religions: Discordant harmonies. *Osiris*, 16, 343–366.
- Lightman, B. (2004). Scientists as materialists in the periodical press: Tyndall's Belfast address. In G. Cantor & S. Shuttleworth (Eds.), *Science serialized: Representation of the sciences in nineteenth-century periodicals* (pp. 199–237). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Linzey, A. (1976). *Animal rights: A Christian assessment of man's treatment of animals*. London, England: SCM Press.

- Linzey, A. (1987). *Christianity and the rights of animals*. London, England: SPCK.
- Linzey, A. (1994). *Animal theology*. London, England: SCM Press.
- Linzey, A., & Cohn-Sherbok, D. (1997). *After Noah*. London, England: Mowbray.
- Livingstone, D. N., Hart, D. G., & Noll, M. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Evangelicals and science in historical perspective*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Locke, J. (1875, January 27). Vivisection. *The Times*, p. 12.
- London Anti-Vivisection Society. (1899). *Against vivisection: Verbatim report of the speeches*. London, England: Author.
- London: Church Anti-Vivisection League. (1901, July). *Zoophilist*, p. 84.
- Lumsden, L. I. (n.d.). *An address given at the fourth annual meeting of the Scottish Branch of the National Anti-Vivisection Society*. London, England: National Anti-Vivisection Society.
- Maitland, E. (1913). *Anna Kingsford: Her life, letters, diary, and work* (Vol. 1). London, England: John M. Watkins.
- Memorial against vivisection. (1875, March). *Animal World*, p. 38.
- Mitchell, S. (2004). *Frances Power Cobbe: Victorian feminist, journalist, reformer*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Morris, F. O. (1890). *The cowardly cruelty of the experiments on animals*. London, England: n.p.
- The National Anti-Vivisection Society. (1897, November). *Zoophilist*, p. 130.
- Newman, J. H. (1891). *Parochial and plain sermons* (Vol. 7). London, England: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Ouida. (1893). *The new priesthood*. London, England: E. W. Allen.
- Ouida. (1900–1901). The culture of cowardice. *Humane Review*, 1, 110–119.
- Our cause and the moral law. (1902, July 15). *Abolitionist*, pp. 39–41.
- Our cause in the pulpit. (1891, June). *Zoophilist*, p. 27.
- Oxenham, H. N. (1878). *Moral and religious estimate of vivisection*. London, England: J. Hodges.
- Pallares-Burke, M. L. (2002). *The new history: Confessions and conversations*. London, England: Polity.
- Peacock, S. J. (2002). *The theological and ethical writings of Frances Power Cobbe, 1822–1904*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Pioneer Anti-Vivisection Society. (1902, June). *Zoophilist and Animals' Defender*, pp. 33–34.
- A portrait. (1882, February). *Zoophilist*, pp. 179–181.
- Preece, R. (1999). *Animals and nature: Culture myths, culture realities*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Professor F. W. Newman “on cruelty,” in “Fraser’s Magazine,” April, 1876. (1876, July 29). *Home Chronicler*, pp. 90–91.
- Professor Michael Foster on vivisection. (1894, October). *Verulam Review*, pp. 303–307.
- The pulpit: Vivisection and Christianity. (1902, April). *Abolitionist*, pp. 50–51.
- Research Defence Society. (1908–1919). Minute book. Wellcome Medical Library (SA/RDS/C1), London, England.
- Richards, S. (1986). Drawing the life-blood of physiology: Vivisection and the physiologists dilemma, 1870–1900. *Annals of Science*, 43, 27–56.
- Richards, S. (1992). Anaesthetics, ethics and aesthetics: Vivisection in the late nineteenth-century British laboratory. In P. Williams & A. Cunningham (Eds.), *The laboratory revolution in medicine* (pp. 142–169). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ritvo, H. (1984). Plus ça change: Anti-vivisection then and now. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 9, 57–66.

- Ritvo, H. (1987). *The animal estate: The English and other creatures in the Victorian age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Roberts, M. J. D. (2004). *Making English moral: Voluntary association and moral reform in England, 1787–1886*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubens, M. (1894). *Anti-vivisection exposed, including a disclosure of the recent attempt to introduce anti-Semitism into England*. Bombay, India: Education Society's Steam Press.
- Rupke, N. A. (Ed.). (1987). *Vivisection in historical perspective*. London, England: Routledge.
- Salt, H. S. (1904). Anti-vivisectionists and the odium theologicum. *Humane Review*, 4, 343–349.
- Singer, P. (1975). *Animal liberation*. New York: Avon.
- Society for the Protection of Animals Liable to Vivisection. (1876). *Statement of the Society for the Protection of Animals Liable to Vivisection on the report of the Royal Commission on Vivisection*. London, England: Author.
- Stevenson, L. G. (1956). Religious elements in the background of the British anti-vivisection movement. *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine*, 29, 125–157.
- Trist, S. (1911). *De profundis: An open letter*. London, England: London Anti-Vivisection Society.
- Turner, F. M. (1990). The Victorian crisis of faith and the faith that was lost. In R. J. Helmstadter & B. Lightman (Eds.), *Victorian faith in crisis* (pp. 9–38). Basingstoke, England: MacMillan.
- Verschoyle, J. (1884, January). The true party of progress. *Zoophilist*, pp. 232–233.
- Vivisection denounced. (1913, May). *Zoophilist*, p. 10.
- Vivisection meeting at Shrewsbury. (1877, October 27). *Home Chronicler*, pp. 1130–1132.
- Waldau, P., & Patten, K. (Eds.). (2006). *A communion of subjects: Animals in religion, science and ethics*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Webb, S. H. (1998). *On God and dogs: A Christian theology of compassion for animals*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Wennberg, R. N. (2003). *God, humans and animals: An invitation to enlarge our moral universe*. Cambridge, England: Wm B. Eerdmans.
- Westacott, E. (1949). *A century of vivisection and anti-vivisection*. Essex, England: Daniel.
- Wilcox, E. W. (1913). *Poems by Ella Wheeler Wilcox*. London, England: Hill & Co.
- Williamson, L. (2005). *Power and protest: Frances Power Cobbe and Victorian society*. London, England: Rivers Oram.
- Willis, M. (2006). Unmasking immorality: Popular opposition to laboratory science in late Victorian Britain. In D. Clifford & E. Wadge (Eds.), *Repositioning Victorian sciences: Shifting centres in nineteenth-century scientific thinking* (pp. 207–250). London, England: Anthem Press.
- Wise, S. M. (2001). *Rattling the cage: Towards legal rights for animals*. London, England: Profile Books.
- Wright, D. (1881). *No pity: A sermon*. London, England: Hamilton, Adams & Co.

由兩篇講道文論湯瑪斯·格林哲學 之當代宗教意涵

李 鑑 慧*

提 要

湯瑪斯·格林 (T. H. Green, 1836-1882) 是英國唯心論哲學傳統重要奠基者。相對於格林之政治關切，格林之宗教信念與神學思想相對較不受後代研究者重視，本文盼能彌補此方面之不足。作者企圖透過回歸 19 世紀宗教脈絡，重建宗教之於格林生命與哲學中之重要地位。第一部分首先考察格林所處時代及其信仰危機；第二部分追溯格林個人的宗教養成；第三部分主要透過格林著名的兩篇平信徒講道文，探討其神學觀及其所仰賴的唯心論哲學。我將指出，透過唯心論哲學，格林建立了一個超越證據、憑藉神聖意識且存乎於實踐之信仰觀。此信仰觀不但得以化解科學與宗教之衝突，重建道德實踐之熱情，並開拓一條超越教義、教派乃至教會等外在形式之寬廣信仰道路。

關鍵詞：湯瑪斯·格林 19 世紀宗教 信仰危機 唯心論 內在論

* 國立成功大學歷史學系助理教授
70101 臺南市東區大學路 1 號；E-mail: li.chien.hui@gmail.com

前言：問與答

一、「信仰年代」與「信仰危機」

二、格林的宗教養成

三、〈神之見證〉與〈信念〉

結 語

前言：問與答

湯瑪斯·格林 (T. H. Green, 1836-1882) 是英國唯心論哲學奠基者，也是繼彌爾 (J. S. Mill, 1806-1873) 之後，影響 19 世紀英國政治思想發展至深的哲學家。史家莫文·瑞契特 (Melvin Richter) 曾寫道：「自 1880 至 1914 年間，沒有一位思想家對英國思想及公共政策所發揮之影響力比格林更為巨大。」¹ 深受唯心論影響的牛津哲學家柯靈烏 (R. G. Collingwood, 1889-1943) 亦曾謂：

格林學派將一批批學生送入公眾生活。這些學生懷抱深刻信念，相信哲學，尤其相信他們在牛津所習得的哲學是重要之物，而其人生職志便是將之徹底落實……格林學派透過對學生心靈所起之作用，約自 1880 至 1910 年間，滲透並豐富了國家生活的每一部分。²

有別於歐陸唯心論傳統，英國唯心論最大特色之一，即是對哲學之現實效用有著強烈信念。在格林領航下，英國唯心論傳統於 19 世紀末至 20 世紀初，激勵無數學子和社會大眾抱持強烈公民責任觀，投入政黨政治、社會運動、慈善事業及教育與社區工作等牽涉眾人福祉之事務。格林之

1 Melvin Richter, "T. H. Green and His Audience: Liberalism as a Surrogate Faith," *Review of Politics* 18 (1956), pp. 444-472, at p. 444.

2 R. G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1978), p. 17. 引文中譯文為筆者自譯，下同。

典範對其身後世代之重要影響，多為史家所公認，但其影響力究竟從何而來？

柯靈烏曾謂，欲理解一人之思想，若不識其提問，將無法理解其解答。問與答，構成知識建構之整體活動。惟在研究上，當哲人思想已成經典，當其解答自成一家之言，人們往往忽略哲人真實關切，僅依其自身需要而另設提問，而這也正是「格林研究」的一項普遍缺失。³

格林研究者歷年來多為觀念史家、哲學家、倫理學家或政治理論學者，這些研究者長於思想內在理路之分析，擅於考察思想於哲學傳統中之流變，尤其能夠將之與當代理論和今日問題結合，提出切合時代需求之解答。⁴這固然有其正當性，但若欲充分理解格林，並探知其思想何以廣泛牽動人心並引發迴響，那麼，柯靈烏所建議的「問答探詢」似乎仍是最佳起點：「格林所關切之問題究竟為何？他是針對哪些問題提出回應？」對此，柯靈烏指出，我們不得不轉向歷史探究，藉由歷史脈絡之重建，方能探索其原初問答，以避免扭曲。⁵此研究理路，對於篤信思想與現實之密切關聯的格林來說，尤其不可或缺，故亦為本文所採用者。透過重建英國 19 世紀之信仰脈絡，我將指出，「宗教」乃是格林生命的核心關切，「信仰危機」則是格林所希冀回應之問題，而格林思想之所

3 Collingwood, *An Autobiography*, pp. 22-43.

4 此類型之著作，以 Isaiah Berlin 之 *Four Essays on Liberty* (中譯本：以賽·柏林著，陳曉林譯，《自由四論》[臺北：聯經出版公司，1986]) 為代表，另參閱 David O. Brink, *Perfectionism and the Common Good: Themes in the Philosophy of T. H. Green* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2003); Matt Carter, *T. H. Green and the Development of Ethical Socialism* (Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic, 2003); Maria Dimova-Cookson, *T. H. Green's Moral and Political Philosophy: A Phenomenological Perspective* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2001); Maria Dimova-Cookson, and W. J. Mander, eds., *T. H. Green: Ethics, Metaphysics, and Political Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Michael Freedon, *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978).

5 當代學者對於格林自由觀之誤解，部分即可歸諸於此一「以後代關注為主導」之解讀方式，參閱 Peter P. Nicholson, *The Political Philosophy of British Idealists: Selected Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 116-131.

以引發當代重大迴響，正是在於他適切回應了此一時代問題。

牛津哲學家、格林文集編纂者聶托胥 (R. L. Nettleship, 1846-1892) 曾指出宗教、政治與哲學三者於格林思想中不可分割的密切關聯，並肯定格林生命之特殊成就正在於他在哲學、政治與宗教之間所達致之「融通」(reconciliation)。⁶歷來的格林研究者多已充分注意到格林之強烈政治關懷，並指出其思想之重要性在於它回應了 19 世紀自由主義之危機。然而，相對於格林之政治關切，格林之宗教信仰與神學思想則相對比較不受後代研究者重視。這一方面固然是因為格林在宗教方面的正式出版品不多，另一方面也與今日宗教之相對式微及哲學與神學之分道揚鑣有關。⁷本文盼能彌補此方面探討之不足，透過回歸 19 世紀之宗教脈絡，重建宗教之於格林生命與哲學中之重要地位，並重拾格林哲學與其宗教思維之間的深刻連結。

格林所屬的牛津大學貝里歐學院 (Balliol College, Oxford) 有一項傳統，那就是在主日禮拜的前一晚，由學院中具有神職身分的教師為學生講道，做為隔日聖餐禮之信仰準備。格林並不具神職，但在幾經思考後，選擇以平信徒身分擔任這項工作，在 1870 年和 1877 年，分別進行兩場講道：〈神之見證〉 (“The Witness of God”) 和 〈信念〉 (“Faith”)。⁸

6 R. L. Nettleship, “Memoir,” in *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, *Miscellanies and Memoir*, ed. R. L. Nettleship (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1888), p. xi.

7 Turner 將英國唯心論於後世所受忽略，部分歸諸於當代宗教情境之消失及神哲分家使然，參閱 Frank M. Turner, “The Triumph of Idealism in Victorian Classical Studies,” in *Contesting Cultural Authority: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 322-361, at p. 323. 當代少數強調宗教對於理解格林思想之重要著作，參閱 Melvin Richter, *The Politics of Conscience: T. H. Green and His Age* (Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 1996 [1964]; 以下所引本書頁次為 1996 年版頁次); Denys P. Leighton, *The Greenian Moment: T. H. Green, Religion, and Political Argument in Victorian Britain* (Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic, 2004); Timothy Maxwell Gouldstone, *The Rise and Decline of Anglican Idealism in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

8 R. L. Nettleship, “Professor T. H. Green. In Memoriam,” *Contemporary Review* 41 (May, 1882), pp. 857-877, at p. 859.

在這兩場引起廣大迴響的講道中，格林以一種近乎福音主義傳道者的熱情，運用其哲學著作中罕見的大量宗教語言，完整動人地闡述其神學觀與宗教信念。格林學生、哲學家約翰·穆爾海德（John Henry Muirhead, 1885-1940）曾道，在這兩篇講道文中，格林不僅傳達其神學見解，更精煉道出了其整體哲學思想，並將之「精準有效地運用於當代智識難題上」。⁹

在這篇文章中，我將首先考察探討格林所處時代之信仰危機以及格林的宗教養成。接著，主要透過這兩篇著名講道文，探討格林的神學觀及其所仰賴的唯心論哲學；並指出，透過唯心論哲學，格林建立了一個超越證據、憑藉神聖意識且存乎於實踐之信仰觀。此信仰觀，不但得以化解科學與宗教之衝突，重建道德實踐之熱情，並開拓一條超越教義、教派乃至教會等外在形式之寬廣信仰道路。格林切合時代宗教問題之哲學處方，正是其時代影響力關鍵所在。

一、「信仰年代」與「信仰危機」

格林所處的 19 世紀英國，是一個「信仰」高度支配人們生命與國家社會運作的年代。史家克拉克（G. Kitson Clark）在論及 19 世紀時嘗言，綜觀英國史，除了幾個例外時期，宗教「不曾於國家生活中占有如此重要之角色，那些以宗教之名言說者，也未曾想望掌握如此巨大權威」。¹⁰在那個年代，宗教定義了一個人，賦予生命意義，型塑心靈，並影響其道德信念、行為模式與社會關係；宗教也同樣定義了一個年代，決定社會性格，塑造社會價值，並或隱或現地影響了社會發展的每個層面。

9 John W. Harvey, ed., *John Henry Muirhead: Reflections by a Journeyman in Philosophy* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1942), p. 42.

10 G. Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 20.

然而，究竟是什麼原因讓宗教在這個科技與工業高度發達的國度，依舊對於個人與國家具有如此巨大之支配力量？對此，我們必須回歸席捲英國社會的一場宗教復興運動。

（一）宗教復興：福音主義運動

18 世紀下半期起，福音主義 (Evangelicalism) 浪潮興起於英國各基督教派。在喬治·懷特菲得 (George Whitefield)、約翰·衛斯理 (John Wesley) 等傳道者的推動下，此一運動首先滋長於英國國教聖公會 (Anglicanism) 內部。很快地，它催生了衛理公會 (Methodism)，並蔓延到各個非國教教派如公理會 (Congregationalism)、浸信會 (Baptism)、貴格會 (Quakerism) 及長老會 (Presbyterianism) 等。由教會到社會，這股宗教浪潮對 19 世紀社會帶來全面性影響。

眾多教會內外因素，促成此一歷時將近一個世紀的跨教派宗教復興運動。在外部因素方面，18 世紀有神論思想之盛行、法國大革命後激進政治思想對社會秩序之威脅，以及新興都市下層階級之宗教和道德式微等，都使得社會中堅階層希冀透過宗教之再興，穩定社會道德與秩序；在教會內部方面，國教之坐擁特權卻喪失改革動力、教士之尸位素餐、教會之重儀式輕內涵及信仰之徒具虛名等現象，亦促使有心之士盼能再造真實信仰生命。眾多支持者所持目標儘管紛雜，但卻共同持有一信念，那就是對於宗教轉化力量之巨大信心。他們相信，透過宗教力量之重振，危機重重之教會、社會及個人道德生命，將可獲得全面性轉化。¹¹

福音主義並不以系統教義著稱，卻存在幾項特色，如皈依主義

11 參閱 James Obelkevich, "Religion," in *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950*, ed. F. M. L. Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 311-356, at pp. 321-328. 關於福音主義，另參閱 D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Routledge, 1993); John Wolffe, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland 1843-1945* (London: Routledge, 1995); John Wolffe, ed., *Evangelical Faith and Public Zeal: Evangelicals and Society in Britain 1780-1980* (London: SPCK, 1995).

(conversionism)、行動主義(activism)、聖經主義(biblicism)以及對於基督獻祭(crucicentricism)之著重。¹²首先,不滿於宗教之流於形式,福音主義者強調基督徒必須透過虔誠皈依,徹底改造個人內在靈性與外在行為。他們雖然多半不認為行為事功可帶來救贖,但依然強調因信仰而重獲新生的皈依者,應藉由實際作為與善行,證明救贖、展現「新生」,並藉此讓更多人擁抱福音。此外,教會的冰冷儀式與教條、教士之冷漠及不當權威,以及兩者所導致之疏離人神關係,也讓渴望聖靈的福音主義者更加仰賴聖經權威及個人良知,希冀藉由讀經與禱告,與聖靈直接相通。另一方面,在教義上,福音主義者尤其偏重原罪、最後審判及地獄之火等概念,這些概念所共同構築的灰暗生前與死後世界,也被用來催促人們悔罪皈依,並在基督為眾人獻祭之恩典(the atoning grace of Christ)中尋求救贖。

究其本質,福音主義所推動的乃是一種高度個人化的「心靈宗教」(religion of the heart),強調信仰之於個人生命之真實性,批判「名義上的基督教」(nominal Christianity)。在福音主義者眼中,信仰必須是「攸關生命並具實質影響」(vital and practical),同時也必須能切實在個人生命中打下烙印,才配稱為真實信仰。對福音主義者來說,生命是沉重且具有重大意義與嚴肅目的,人們來到世上並非僅為了享樂而虛度一生,而是必須在永不止息的善惡對抗中,持續不懈地約束自身遠離罪惡、邪惡與誘惑;人們不僅應該對自身道德生命負責,更應力求成為基督精兵,進一步轉化社會,解決那些在其看來源自道德墮落與個人邪惡的種種社會問題。

這些特色,讓福音主義在社會上掀起一股強大情緒力量,也帶動一股由內到外的心靈改造運動。強烈的原罪觀及皈依主義,讓信徒以嚴苛戒律檢視自身與他人的道德生活;行動主義和基督奉獻精神,驅使他們以實際作為帶動十九世紀蓬勃的傳教事業、慈善活動及道德風俗改革運動。政治上,宗教必須是「攸關生命並具實質影響」之信念,也讓政治

12 參閱 Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, pp. 2-17.

人物時時以宗教為念；除了往往視道德為政治問題之根源，並將政治做為強化與落實宗教價值之重要手段，這也造成 19 世紀特殊之「政治道德化」（moralisation of politics）現象。¹³

福音主義所展現的種種信仰特質，無形中也型塑了維多利亞時代（1837-1901）之價值觀與人格特質。首先，福音主義對於信仰之內在真實性與道德絕對性的強調，讓「真誠」（earnestness）、「嚴肅」等人格特色成為此一世代人們的顯著記號。連結於此的還包括克己、責任觀、自我犧牲、強烈工作倫理等精神；在工商迅速發展、中產階級崛起之時，這些價值迎合了資本主義社會之需要，協助中產階級建立自我認同，並擴張其文化和政治影響力。這些切合新興階層之價值觀，透過同化而為社會所普遍認可，並在福音主義逐漸消褪的 19 世紀下半期，依然深植英國社會。¹⁴是以有史家曾經這麼說：「拿掉福音主義，你也等於拿掉了維多利亞中期的道德特質（moral ethos）」，而這也正說明了，不論是在人格特質或社會集體價值上，福音主義對於維多利亞時代都有著莫大影響力。¹⁵

（二）信仰危機

弔詭的是，19 世紀不但是個高度虔誠的年代，同時也是基督教承受空前挑戰與打擊的年代。正當宗教熱情如火如荼地熾烈蔓延之際，眾多智識發展也衝擊著基督教信仰。

13 福音主義與政治、社會和經濟思想之關聯，參閱 Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought 1785-1865* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); J. P. Parry, *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867-1875* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

14 參閱 Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), pp. 183-262.

15 David Englander, "The Word and the World: Evangelicalism in the Victorian City," in *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. 2, *Controversies*, ed. Gerald Parsons (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 14-38, at p. 18.

19世紀初以來，生物學、地質學及人種學等各學科的新發現，一波波猛烈撞擊基督教義的思想根基。首先是演化論。自18世紀起，歐洲已有學者陸續提出物種於漫長時間歷程中逐漸演化而成的想法。19世紀，羅伯·錢伯斯（Robert Chambers, 1802-1871）之《受造物之自然史遺跡》（*Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, 1844）及達爾文（Charles Darwin, 1809-1882）的《物種起源》（*Origins of Species*, 1859）與《人類起源》（*The Descent of Man*, 1871）等著作，更進一步挑戰基督教義中萬物乃神於六日內所造之個別創造論（special creation），並連帶挑戰了創造論中所賦予人類的特殊地位。這對聖經及基督教核心教義之挑戰，產生骨牌效應，引發更多對於聖經之真實性、教義之可靠性乃至基督教道德正當性之質疑。¹⁶此外，地質學研究，例如查爾斯·萊爾（Charles Lyell, 1797-1875）的《地質學原理》（*Principles of Geology*, 1830-1833），也陸續藉由地層證據推論地表諸象並非旦夕所致，而是千百萬年逐步生成之結果，這也證明了世界形成年代遠比聖經所載更為古老。古生物學及人種學上對於已逝物種和世界其他地區種族的研究，更不斷顛覆聖經之歷史記載與人類系譜之真實性。

於此同時，源自德國的高等批判考證方法（Higher Criticism），也帶給基督教不亞於演化論的衝擊。自18世紀起，德意志學者如赫德（J. G. Herder, 1744-1803）、威特（W. de Wette, 1780-1849）、艾克洪（J. G. Eichhorn, 1753-1827）等人，開始以歷史考證方法檢驗聖經歷史記載並重新提出神學詮釋。19世紀中期，史特勞斯（D. F. Strauss, 1808-1874）的《耶穌生平》（*The Life of Jesus*, 1846）以及費爾巴哈（Ludwig Feuerbach, 1804-1872）的《基督教本質》（*The Essence of Christianity*, 1854）等著

16 參閱 J. H. Brooke, *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 275-320; Peter Harrison, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Science and Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); James Secord, *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

作陸續傳入英國。這些著作除了帶動本土聖經考證工作，並引發激烈神學爭議和靈魂探索，挑戰高舉聖經主義並傾向字面解的福音主義世代。¹⁷

倫理上的反彈，亦同樣銷蝕著基督教的道德權威及其道德正當性。福音主義通常予人黑暗、沉重的印象。教會、傳教士與宣教作家往往以近乎威嚇的方式宣教，諸如：人類罪行重大，唯有仰賴基督之救贖恩典方可獲得救贖，否則將在地獄烈焰中承受永世煎熬。¹⁸原罪與最後審判及永世懲罰等嚴厲教義，讓許多虔信者於靈性探究過程中，不免滋生懷疑或心生反彈；眾多神學作家與信徒不斷追問著：神若是仁慈的，為何要使人們活在因重大罪惡感而產生的無價值感及無盡懊惱與戒慎恐懼中？神若是寬容的，又何以忍心讓尚未悔罪皈依者，甚或早夭的孩童於地獄中承受嚴懲？此外，教會對於下階層貧困處境及 19 世紀迅速工業化、都市化所引發的各種社會問題的消極回應，也不斷招致道德質疑；神職人員透過教義，呼籲下層受苦者接受現況、企盼來生的慣常說法，更被認為僅是延續苦難，強化既存體制之不公。¹⁹

這種種因素，如同一個個引爆點，自 19 世紀約莫 40 年代起，引發蔓延數個世代的「信仰危機」（*crisis of faith*）。²⁰然而值得注意的是，

17 關於英國聖經批判的發展與接收，參閱 Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, part 1, 2nd ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1970), pp. 527-558; John Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century* (London: SPCK, 1984); Gerald Parsons, “Biblical Criticism in Victorian Britain: From Controversy to Acceptance?” in Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. 2, *Controversies*, pp. 238-257; Rosemary Ashton, *The German Idea: Four English Writers and the Reception of German Thought 1800-1860* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

18 參閱 Rowell Geoffrey, *Hell and the Victorians: A Study of the Nineteenth-Century Theological Controversies Concerning Eternal Punishment and the Future Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974).

19 對基督教的道德批判，參閱 Michael Bartholomew, “The Moral Critique of Christian Orthodoxy,” in Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. 2, *Controversies*, pp. 166-190.

20 關於維多利亞年代的信仰懷疑，參閱 Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, part 2, 2nd ed. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1970), pp. 112-150; Anthony Symondson, ed., *The*

此一信仰危機所代表的，卻未必是宗教對於時代影響力之消退及「世俗化」(secularisation)歷程之起點，反倒是真摯宗教信念與福音主義特色的展現，一種嚴肅看待「信仰」與「真理」之表現。²¹如田尼生(Alfred Tennyson, 1809-1892)在描繪信仰懷疑之長詩《悼念集》(*In Memoriam*)中所言：「誠實的懷疑，比諸不完全的信仰，有著更多的信心。」²²如果19世紀社會未經福音主義的洗禮，如果信仰不曾具有如此巨大的支配力量，一切對於基督教的智識與道德挑戰，也不至於構成如此重大之時代與個人危機。但19世紀恰恰是宗教提供給人們一切生存意義與國家社稷道德基礎的篤信年代，當人們將宗教視為生命一切意義的來源，將聖經視為道德與真理的化身，一切對於信仰的挑戰，正足以摧毀其存在價值並帶來天翻地覆的轉變。此一年代故弔詭地既是「信仰的年代」，同時也是「懷疑的年代」。人們並未因看重宗教而獲信仰保證，反倒因而飽受探尋與懷疑之苦；此一懷疑力道深切困擾著那些曾因信仰而再生、但也因懷疑而喪失「生命」的人們；生存世界之崩裂，也正是人們對於此一信仰危機所經常使用的強烈譬喻。²³

有論者曾謂，對於20世紀而言，信仰歧見乃是一場輕薄「喜劇」，但對於19世紀的人們來說，卻是一齣必須嚴肅以對的「悲劇」。²⁴這一喜一悲所反映的，正是人們所賦予宗教的不同重量。在那個將信仰「當

Victorian Crisis of Faith (London: SPCK, 1970); Richard J. Helmstadter, and Bernard Lightman, eds., *Victorian Faith in Crisis: Essays on Continuity and Change in Nineteenth-Century Religious Belief* (London: MacMillan, 1990).

21 參閱 Timothy Larson, *Crisis of Doubt: Honest Faith in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Gerald Parsons, "On Speaking Plainly: 'Honest Doubt' and the Ethics of Beliefs," in Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. 2, *Controversies*, pp. 192-219.

22 Susan Shatto, and Marian Shaw, eds., *Tennyson: In Memoriam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), §96, p. 114.

23 參閱 Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870*, p. 66.

24 Stephen Paget, ed., *Henry Scott Holland: Memoir and Letters* (London: John Murray, 1921), pp. vi-vii.

真」並嚴肅以對的世代，愈是執著宗教之真實價值與實質影響者，愈不會輕易在智識、道德與靈性問題上含混敷衍，而願以畢生之力尋求最終真理。格林一生的思想言行也正是此一年代虔誠信仰者的深刻寫照。

二、格林的宗教養成

格林出生於英格蘭北方約克郡，成長於一個宗教虔誠卻不落保守的開明環境。格林父親是位深受福音主義影響的虔誠聖公會牧師，但有別於國教派牧師所予人之刻板印象，格林父親相信宗教寬容並厭惡教條，同時也對非國教派和下層民眾懷有強烈認同。格林一歲喪母，自幼由父親啟蒙教導。經過多年家庭教育後，14歲的格林進入以開明宗教思想著稱的私校「魯格比」（Rugby School）。

「魯格比」於19世紀因為湯瑪斯·阿諾德（Thomas Arnold, 1795-1842）之辦學而馳名。²⁵在此之前，英國權貴子弟所就讀之私立中學，普遍因其道德鬆弛、霸凌暴力及僵化教學等問題而聲名狼藉。阿諾德除了提倡新式學科、改良教學法及改革教師聘任制等變革，尤其將基督教精神之提升與人格培育視為教育之最高目標。他反對拘泥教條，著重發自內在之真實信仰與道德生活。在民主化年代，阿諾德並特別強調社群生活的重要性，並期待基督徒能善盡公民職責，肩負起社會改造的工作。在阿諾德的帶領下，魯格比很快地成為私立中學的改革典範；它所培育出的優秀學生多具嚴肅、克己、熱衷公眾事務等特質，素來享有「基督教紳士」之美稱，並成為快速變遷之19世紀社會的中堅領導階層。²⁶

25 關於阿諾德，參閱 David Newsome, *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal* (London: Murray, 1961); Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1918), pp. 183-214; Sue Zemka, "Spiritual Authority and the Life of Thomas Arnold," *Victorian Studies* 38, no. 3 (1995), pp. 429-462.

26 關於英國私校風氣與阿諾德之改革，可參閱當代經典小說 Thomas Hugh, *Tom Brown's*

中學時期的格林，對於學校課業要求並不特別在意，但他思想早熟，特別喜愛閱讀，最偏愛的作家除了浪漫主義詩人渥茲華茲（William Wordsworth, 1770-1850）之外，還包括兼備宗教情感和社會批判意識的莫里斯（F. D. Maurice, 1805-1872）、查爾斯·金斯利（Charles Kingsley, 1819-1875）²⁷及湯馬斯·卡萊爾（Thomas Carlyle, 1795-1881）等人。被視為聖公會「異端」之莫里斯的《神學論文集》（*Theological Essays*, 1853）尤其深獲格林認同；年少時期即感嘆這本挑戰正統神學之著作的「種種優點」，與其所受之批判強度「恰成正比」。²⁸格林對於自身所關切的問題總是抱持著窮究到底的執著，慣有之道德嚴肅態度使其深獲同儕敬重。²⁹他的中學同學回憶說，當大夥聚在一塊，若有格林在場，大家自然就會避開低俗故事或不佳字眼。³⁰格林的大學同學亦回憶道，「格林的榜樣」往往可以提升人們的「道德品質」。³¹格林學生提到，每次見到格林，總不禁讓人「自慚形穢」；³²尚有人如此生動描繪：「在牛津，

Schooldays (New York: Dutton, 1952 [1857]).

27 莫里斯與金斯利為「基督教社會主義」（Christian Socialism）的代表人物。基督教社會主義興起於 1848 年歐陸革命浪潮與英國憲章運動之背景下，其成員主要來自聖公會，活躍於 1848 至 1854 年間。他們關懷工業社會與資本主義下的民眾困苦、批判自由放任經濟以及個體主義，並推廣生產、配送與消費各端的合作運動（co-operative movement）。針對教會，他們期待做為國家教會的聖公會能夠擔負起社會職責、投入社會改革，並發展適切教義，以回應變遷中的工業化社會。基督教社會主義者因其不合主流之思想，經常被指控為教會中之異端。莫里斯於 1853 年即因《神學論文集》中對於永世懲罰之教義的道德質疑，也因其社會主義思想而被倫敦大學國王學院（King's College London）開除教授職務。關於基督教社會主義運動，參閱 Stewart J. Brown, *Providence and Empire 1815-1914* (Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited, 2008), pp. 164-170.

28 Nettleship, "Memoir," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. xiv.

29 參閱 Nettleship, "Memoir," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. xiii-xv; Robert S. Rait, *Memorials of Albert Venn Dicey* (London: MacMillan, 1925), p. 37.

30 Nettleship, "Memoir," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. xv.

31 Rait, *Memorials of Albert Venn Dicey*, p. 39.

32 Evelyn Abbott, and Lewis Campbell, eds., *The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett*, vol. 2 (London: John Murray, 1897), p. 192.

無論面對真實或想像中的偉大人物，我會脫帽致敬，但面對格林，我不僅想脫帽，甚至連頭都想摘下來。」³³此一特殊人格魅力，史家彼得·克拉克認為來自格林性格中獨特之「真誠」的力量，而這份真誠，正是福音主義文化的重要產物。³⁴

經過五年的中學教育，格林於 1855 年入學牛津大學貝里歐學院就讀。貝里歐原本是個無足輕重的小學院，但自 19 世紀中期起，因歷任院長與院士的自由派改革作風，特別是班傑明·喬威特（Benjamin Jowett, 1817-1893）之帶領，漸以實才主義（meritocracy）、行政效率、開放政策及革新課程等特色，建立起卓越聲譽與學術成就。此外，在民主化浪潮下，貝里歐也逐漸揚棄學院乃國教教產與神職培育所之狹隘定位，轉而力圖開創「全國性」格局，強調信仰與學術和日漸多元之大社會之間的連結，致力於培育當代社會所需之專業領導階層。³⁵

格林入學時，適逢此波大學與學院改革浪潮，特別是受其導師喬威

33 John H. Muirhead, *The Service of the State* (London: John Murray, 1908), p. 2.

34 Clarke 將真誠之人定義為「秉持良知追尋世界意義」、「嚴肅看待信仰之絕對重要性，並視信仰為社會理想境界之根源者」，參閱 Peter Clarke, *Liberals and Social Democrats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 12-13.

35 關於貝里歐的改革，參閱 W. G. Addison, "Academic Reform at Balliol, 1854-1882: T. H. Green and Benjamin Jowett," *The Church Quarterly Review* 153 (1952), pp. 89-98; Peter Hinchliff, "Benjamin Jowett and the Church of England: or 'Why Really Great Men are Never Clergymen,'" in *Balliol Studies*, ed. John Prest (London: Leopard's Head Press, 1982), pp. 125-158; John Prest, "Balliol, For Example," in *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 7, *Nineteenth-Century Oxford*, part 2, ed. M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), pp. 159-169. 關於牛津大學自 19 世紀中期以降之自由化改革，參閱 Christopher Harvie, *The Lights of Liberalism: University Liberals and the Challenge of Democracy 1860-86* (London: Allen Lane, 1976); T. W. Heyck, *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982), pp. 155-189; Christopher Harvie, "Reform and Expansion, 1854-1871," in *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 6, *Nineteenth-Century Oxford*, part 1, ed. M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), pp. 697-730.

特的引導。³⁶喬威特是著名的柏拉圖學者，也是牛津大學中最早引進德國唯心論哲學的教授，早年對於德國唯心論哲學、神學及高等批判考證皆懷有高度興趣。在批判考證仍被教會視為洪水猛獸的年代，喬威特已運用其方法並結合唯心論觀點，進行保羅書簡的聖經研究。³⁷在教學上，喬威特也一改傳統對於亞里斯多德哲學之過度偏重，轉而提倡柏拉圖研究；他一方面積極建立古典哲學與當代政治和倫理問題之關聯，另一方面則讓披上唯心論新衣的柏拉圖，成為他批判效益主義（Utilitarianism）與挽救當代道德與信仰危機的最有力工具。³⁸在宗教問題上，貝里歐更是聖公會的開明改革派勢力「廣教會派」（Broad Church party）的重要代表。

19世紀聖公會依其成員對於聖經、教義與教會體制看法，大概可分為三大陣營。「高教會派」（High Church party）基本上代表教會高層之立場，堅持由聖公會「三十九信條」所代表的正統教義，強調聖經與教士之權威及教會儀禮之重要性。「低教會派」（Low Church party）主要則由福音主義者代表，他們相對來說較不看重教會與教士權威，但同樣將聖經視為聖靈灌注之產物、絕無謬誤之神之話語。面對當代新知識之挑戰，這兩派多採抗拒之姿，堅持聖經之絕對權威和字面真理。³⁹ 1850

36 喬威特於1870年和1882年分別出任貝里歐學院院長及牛津大學校長，其主要傳記參閱 Abbott and Campbell, *The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett*. 2 vols.; Geoffrey Faber, *Jowett: A Portrait with Background* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958).

37 參閱 Benjamin Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans* (London: J. Murray, 1855); Peter Hinchliff, *Benjamin Jowett and the Christian Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), pp. 45-68. 此一著作也使得喬威特招來「異端」罪名，被校方要求重新宣告信奉國教派之三十九信條，參閱 Melvin Richter, *The Politics of Conscience*, p. 71.

38 喬威特的柏拉圖研究，參閱 Frank M. Turner, "The Victorian Platonic Revival," in *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), pp. 369-446, at pp. 414-446; Turner, "The Triumph of Idealism in Victorian Classical Studies," in *Contesting Cultural Authority*, pp. 350-358.

39 這是最為概括性之說法。史家已注意到部分福音主義者對於科學新進展，包括演化論，並不全然拒斥，甚且積極投入研究，參閱 David N. Livingstone, D. G. Hart, and Mark A.

年代後，聖公會中的開明勢力逐漸抬頭，此即俗謂「廣教會派」。相對於前兩大陣營，廣教會派較難定義，成員思想紛雜且未必一致，許多人甚至不認同此一派別劃分，但基本上，廣教會派崇尚宗教寬容與思想自由，並積極尋求基督教與現代社會之結合。有別於高教會派對新知識之抗拒以及對僵化教條之嚴格遵守，廣教會派相信「當探索被阻擋於大門之外，懷疑將轉由窗口進入」。⁴⁰他們也因此更加願意正視當代科學之挑戰，希望透過理性與新學科之引導，重新詮釋聖經與教義，使基督教得以屹立於智識快速變遷的年代。依此粗略劃分，廣教會派可以上溯至魯格比的阿諾德及基督教社會主義者莫里斯，而喬威特則因其自由派改革傾向及聖經考證工作，再加上他在《論文與評論》(*Essays and Reviews*)之神學爭議中所扮演之重要角色，被視為 19 世紀中期廣教會派的最重要代表人物。⁴¹當然，貝里歐學院在他的帶領和影響下，自然也就被視為

Noll, eds., *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

40 B. Jowett, "B. Jowett on the Interpretation of Scripture, 1860," in *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. 3, *Sources*, ed. James R. Moore (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 26-33, at p. 26.

41 Frederick Temple et al., *Essays and Reviews* (London: J. W. Parker, 1860). 《論文與評論》是由 7 名國教派人士所寫論文構成，全書對於當代基督教最具爭議處，包括創造論、聖經無謬論、神蹟、救贖概念與永世懲罰、三十九信條及教會之社會性角色等，提出非正統看法。喬威特除了執筆前言，也在末篇論文中替聖經考證提出冗長辯護，留下「詮釋聖經應與詮釋他書無異」(Interpret the Scripture like any other book) 之名言。儘管目的不在否定或攻擊基督教，而是呼籲教會修正不合時宜之教條並正面回應歷史考證與科學思想，《論文與評論》一出版，旋即引發軒然大波，招來高、低兩派的圍剿。最後，這 7 位被冠上「異端」與「反基督」罪名之作者中，有兩位被送交聖公會法庭審判，喬威特則被移送大學懲戒單位。在這樁 19 世紀最為重大之宗教爭議中，自由派人士雖藉機鼓吹思想變革，終究難敵教會主流與社會輿論。最大的贏家，一般多認為是展現高度團結的聖公會保守勢力；廣教會派則被認為出師過急以致潰不成軍，其所欲鼓吹的聖經批判，則還要再等上一個世代，方才被教會主流接受。至於達爾文的演化思想，也直到 20 世紀初方才為神學界接納。關於此一神學思想爭議，參閱 Ieuan Ellis, *Seven against Christ: A Study of "Essays and Reviews"* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980); Gerald Parsons, "Reform, Revival and Realignment: The Experience of Victorian Anglicanism," in *Religion in Victorian Britain*,

廣教會派大本營。

格林進入貝里歐學院之際，適逢喬威特思想最為活躍之時，在牛津大學密切的師徒關係下，格林開始閱讀康德、黑格爾及杜賓根學派（Tübingen School）神學家包爾（F. C. Baur, 1792-1860）等人著作。此時格林的主要關切乃是「社會的、政治的與宗教的」，其哲學上的智識探索總是脫離不了現實關懷；⁴²神學態度上，格林十分明確認同廣教會之改革立場。比如說，在延燒多年的《論文與評論》爭議之中，格林始終支持喬威特所代表之開明勢力，並與牛津教授史坦利（A. P. Stanley）合編了一本喬威特文集，替喬威特辯護。⁴³ 1860年，當牛津主教山謬·威伯佛斯（Samuel Wilberforce, 1805-1873）與赫胥黎（T. H. Huxley, 1825-1895）於牛津大學針對演化論展開那場膾炙人口的唇槍舌戰時，格林不但在場聆聽，並率眾為赫胥黎喝采。⁴⁴在聖經考證與科學演化思想接連引發強烈爭端之時，身處牛津大學的格林正處風暴核心，其基督教

vol. 1, *Traditions*, ed. Gerald Parsons (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 14-66, at pp. 40-47; Josef L. Altholz, "The Mind of Victorian Orthodoxy: Anglican Responses to 'Essays and Reviews', 1860-1864," in *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. 4, *Interpretations*, ed. Gerald Parsons (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 28-40.

42 Colin Tyler, ed., "Recollections Regarding Thomas Hill Green," *Collingwood and British Idealism Studies* 14, no. 2 (2008), pp. 5-78, at p. 30.

43 *Statements of Christian Doctrine and Practice, Extracted from the Published Writings of the Rev. Benjamin Jowett* (Oxford: J. H. and Jas Parker, 1861), pp. 3-4. 此書並無掛名編者，但主要編輯工作乃由格林與史坦利所為，參閱 Herbert M. Schueller, and Robert L. Peters, eds., *The Letters of John Addington Symonds*, vol. 1, 1844-1868 (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967), p. 278.

44 參閱 Christopher Hollis, *The Oxford Union* (London: Evans Brothers, 1965), p. 103. 威伯佛斯乃是《論文與評論》爭議中保守派勢力的主要領導人物。這場辯論中，有一段對話最為人津津樂道：威伯佛斯語帶調侃地質問赫胥黎，究竟是他祖父或祖母那方是猴子？赫胥黎反諷道，他寧願做為猴子的後代，也不願與一個在嚴肅議題上耍嘴皮的人有所關聯。關於此場辯論，參閱 Ian Hesketh, *Of Apes and Ancestors: Evolution, Christianity, and the Oxford Debate* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); Robert Fox, "The University Museum and Oxford Science, 1850-80," in Brock and Curthoys, *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 6, part 1, pp. 641-691.

信仰雖未因之動搖，但如同廣教會派人士一般，他毋寧期盼教會能在思想與作為上積極回應當代知識發展與社會變遷；惟有如此，方能進一步鞏固宗教信念，而這也正是格林建構其哲學思維的基本期許。

格林大學畢業前後面臨職業抉擇，他猶豫是否該成為一名國教派牧師或另尋出路。1861年，格林寫信告訴父親：「我想我不太可能領受神職。」⁴⁵讓格林猶豫的，並非對於宗教信仰的懷疑。終其一生，格林似乎未曾經歷宗教懷疑者所慣有之靈性焦慮，反倒充滿對於信仰與神之篤定。格林自幼上教會，做禮拜，讀經，祈禱，這些習慣延續一生。格林友人曾說道：「他的宗教信念堅實而完全，就我所知，他甚少因懷疑而來的苦惱。」⁴⁶格林的內在精神傾向或可以堅定、平和描述之。在他寫給未婚妻的信中，格林如此傾訴：「我從未懷疑過神的愛」；⁴⁷「……我的日子充滿著『自然而發之虔誠』（natural piety），這也讓我的生命雖無積極享樂，尚且必須面對各種重大外在試煉，但整體而言卻十分平和」。⁴⁸

然而，儘管虔信之心無庸置疑，聖公會的階層體制、僵化信條及政治保守思想卻非格林所能認同。格林曾考慮是否轉而成為非國教派牧師，但教會組織事務顯然亦非其熱情所在，他曾如此寫道：「拯救靈魂是一回事，但是將體制和教條看得煞有介事，又是另一回事。」⁴⁹最後，格林在考慮到自身對於思考之偏好及易感疲憊緊張的體質下，終究沒有成為神職人員，而是踏上教學與著述的學院生涯。

45 Nettleship, "Notes for T. H. Green's Memoir," in T. H. Green Papers, Balliol College Archive, Oxford, quoted in Geoffrey Thomas, *The Moral Philosophy of T. H. Green* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), p. 10.

46 Nettleship, "Memoir," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. xxxvi.

47 Letter from Green to Charlotte Symonds, 25 June 1871, in *Collected Works of T. H. Green*, vol. 5, *Additional Writings*, ed. Peter Nicholson (Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 1997), pp. 439-440.

48 Letter from Green to Charlotte Symonds, 7 January 1871, in Nicholson, *Collected Works of T. H. Green*, vol. 5, p. 435.

49 Nettleship, "Memoir," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. xxxvi.

若在更早年代，放棄神職無異等於放棄學院院士資格，但正處變革的牛津大學，此時初廢除院士必須具有國教派牧師身分之規定，是以格林儘管沒有擔任神職，依舊能留院任教。透過喬威特的安排，格林於 1860 年先是擔任貝里歐學院古代與近代史講師，隔年獲選為院士，成為牛津大學第一批「無神職院士」(lay fellows)。⁵⁰ 1866 年，格林先後成為學院導師 (tutor) 與資深學監 (senior dean)，1878 年獲選為懷特道德哲學講座教授 (Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy)。直至其 1882 年辭世，終其一生，格林奉獻於學術，但這條哲學之路並不意味著格林自此與信仰之路分道揚鑣，更不意味著當代宗教問題已自心中抹去。我將指出，宗教始終是格林生命中深沉的關懷，哲學之路對於格林而言，正是一條信仰之路，藉其唯心論哲學，格林依舊扮演著牧師般的角色，引領同時代無數人擺脫懷疑，同行於信仰道路上。

三、〈神之見證〉與〈信念〉

(一) 哲學與宗教之連結

唯心論哲學家穆爾海德嘗言道：「英國唯心論於本質上始終就是一種宗教哲學。」⁵¹ 哲學家昆頓 (A. M. Quinton, 1925-2010) 亦曾指出，唯心論哲學之所以能在英國生根茁壯，除了時代政治需求之外，正因其回應了緊扣當代人心的信仰問題。⁵² 英國主要的唯心論哲學家，例如約翰·凱德 (John Caird, 1820-1898)、愛德華·凱德 (Edward Caird, 1835-1908) 以及布萊德利 (F. H. Bradley, 1846-1924) 等，無不或隱或顯地在其作品

50 Nettleship, "Memoir," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. lxi.

51 John H. Muirhead, *The Platonic Tradition in Anglo-Saxon Philosophy* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931), p. 197.

52 A. M. Quinton, "Absolute Idealism," *Proceedings of the British Academy* Vol. LVII (1971), pp. 303-329, at p. 305.

中灌注深刻宗教情感，直接或間接地探究信仰問題。⁵³「在格林所處的牛津」，瑞契特說道，「宗教是那盤踞人心、凌駕一切的議題」。⁵⁴或許非僅在牛津，在這個格林所謂「每一個自稱基督徒並具有思想的人，都在質問其信仰起源與權威」的年代，⁵⁵任何關注時代脈動與嚴肅看待宗教的知識分子，都很難漠視科學、聖經批判、理性精神及各類無神論思想對於基督信仰所產生的威脅，格林自然也不例外。

格林曾於多處自剖其哲學追尋始終脫離不了宗教。在格林眼中，哲學與宗教因屬不同範疇並不彼此競爭。⁵⁶宗教是人心之真實「經驗」，是靈性生命得以「完整實現其自身」的最佳方式；哲學則是認識自我靈性生命的思考嘗試，無法脫離真實經驗而獨存。哲學之於宗教的關係，猶如「花朵之連結於葉」，哲學為花、宗教為葉，兩者並共同連結於靈性生命，前者為靈性生命之直接體現；後者則是對於靈性生命之自覺與傳達。⁵⁷在寫給學生亨利·荷蘭德（Henry Scott Holland, 1847-1918）的信中，格林也曾吐露：

我從無意以哲學取代宗教。我個人對哲學的興趣，我相信，是完全出自於宗教的；哲學對我而言，並非一般所謂「宗教的婢女」，而是對於接近神之嘗試的一種理性的、智識的表達。

如果我只是栽培出宗教異端，我將懷疑我的哲學。如果我的哲學是穩當的，那它須能提供宗教生活應有的智識要素……。⁵⁸

53 這也讓部分英國唯心論哲學家傾向於將黑格爾解讀為宗教擁護者，參閱 W. J. Mander, *British Idealism: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 137-180, 43-45.

54 Richter, *The Politics of Conscience*, p. 25.

55 T. H. Green, "On Christian Dogma," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 161-185, at p. 161.

56 Letter from Green to Henry Scott Holland, 6 October 1872, in Nicholson, *Collected Works of T. H. Green*, vol. 5, p. 442.

57 T. H. Green, "Popular Philosophy in Its Relation to Life," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 92-125, at p. 121.

58 Letter from Green to Holland, p. 442.

哲學與宗教在格林心中始終緊密連結，後者乃前者之目的，前者則是後者獲取自覺之憑藉；釐清兩者關聯，正是掌握格林思想言行及其時代宗教意義的重要起始。

以著作而言，格林的神學著作相對於哲學作品，為數較少，但格林原本就是一位少產作家。反觀格林早期的講課與寫作，則以神學性質者居多，主要計有發表於牛津大學討論性社團「人類命運社」（Mortality Club）的〈論基督教條〉、評論《新約》保羅書簡和〈約翰福音〉的近十篇課堂講義和手稿，此外即是格林分別發表於 1870 年及 1877 年的兩篇平信徒講道文——〈神之見證〉和〈信念〉。⁵⁹

這些神學作品，格林從未於生前正式出版，唯曾應師生友人要求，私下印行兩篇講道文，獲得極大迴響。在格林臨終前，他特別叮囑此二講道文之出版事宜，將之交付學生阿諾德·湯恩比（Arnold Toynbee, 1852-1883）處理。⁶⁰換言之，這兩篇講道文是格林生前唯一授權出版的神學作品，其重要性可見一斑。

在接下來的部分，我將以格林這兩篇講道文為主，其他神學與哲學著作為輔，探討格林的神學觀，建立其神學與哲學思想之關聯，並進一步理解兩者之共同時代作用。

（二）超越教條：保羅的靈性式理解

如前所述，在高等批判、自然科學及理性精神的衝擊下，基督教諸多教義，包括六日造物、創造論及新舊約中的神蹟與歷史敘事似乎已不再禁得起檢驗。但是教條真能捨棄嗎？捨棄教條後，基督教又何以為立？

59 本文採用的兩篇講道文版本為 Arnold Toynbee, ed., *The Witness of God and Faith: Two Lay Sermons by the Late T. H. Green* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885). 這些手稿亦收錄於 R. L. Nettleship, ed., *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3 以及 Colin Tyler, ed., *Unpublished Manuscripts in British Idealism: Political Philosophy, Theology and Social Thought* (Exeter, UK: Thoemmes Continuum, 2005).

60 Arnold Toynbee 是一位致力於工人生活改革的經濟史家，也是史家 Arnold J. Toynbee 的叔叔。

道德又何以為繫？在凡事講究理性與科學的年代，宗教與靈性生命是否仍有存在空間？其本質為何？又是如何展現？對於這些問題，格林一一在他的神學作品和講義中提出解答。

就其基本態度而言，格林並不為教條或神蹟辯護，但也不摧毀之，而是企圖轉變人們對於「教條」乃至「神」和「信仰」的理解方式。相對於卡萊爾在《衣裳哲學》（*Sartor Resartus*, 1836）中對其熾烈的宗教信仰之單純「宣告」，⁶¹格林在兩篇講道文中則具體地以保羅書簡中的神學思維為依據，以唯心論之知識理論為基礎，提出相關思想論證。

關於對教條和信仰的理解方式，格林在其大學論文〈論基督教條〉中已有論及，格林呼應廣教會派對於教條之批判，指出基督教之最大不幸莫過於將新約聖經中的各項命題或曰「教條」（dogma）與「信條」（creed），等同於基督教。⁶²這瀰漫於神學界與信眾間的態度，格林認為，使得基督教面臨如下困境：首先，當基督教教條，尤其是聖經中的超自然（supernatural）成分，一旦與聖經考證、科學發現或理性思維有違，宗教所賴以為立的根基彷彿亦連同銷毀；其次，教條之訂定與維繫，多半仰賴教會或教士等外在權威，而非人心內在呼喚，是以吾人若將教條等同於信仰，終將損及內在真實靈性生命。藉由對於教會史的回顧，格林指出，信條之建立固然有其歷史必要性，因為基督教會在建立成為一普世宗教之過程中，必然得不斷回應並消弭異端之挑戰，而且人性之軟弱也往往使外在信條之規範成為必需。然而，人們若以為那些信條一

61 湯恩比之說法，參閱其為兩篇講道文所寫、但未收錄出版的前言：“(I.d.6) CBG’s MS copy of Arnold Toynbee’s preface to the *Two Sermons*,” in T. H. Green Papers, Balliol College Archive, Oxford. 《衣裳哲學》是一部反映維多利亞時代信仰問題的虛構文學作品，一般亦被視為卡萊爾個人的靈性表白之作。Thomas Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 [1836]).

62 Green, “On Christian Dogma,” in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. 161. 在《論文與評論》及其後續爭議中，聖公會三十九信條之解讀方式及其於信仰中所應扮演之角色，乃一主要爭議焦點。此一爭議，促成了1865年之 Clerical Subscription Act，放寬神職人員於就任與擢昇時對於三十九信條的宣誓文字。

且變動，基督教也將隨之瓦解，這就犯了一種理解上的錯誤，誤以為基督信條即為其宗教之「實質」(substance)，其實它只不過是傳達理念的一種「形式」(form)。⁶³因此，格林提出，我們應轉換看待宗教的方式，放棄歷史性、字面性以及受物質證據牽絆的理解方式，轉而以靈性式、隱喻式的方法，理解聖經話語。⁶⁴

在兩篇講道文中，格林即不斷對比這兩種理解模式所帶來的不同信仰觀：前者相較之下力量薄弱、「於本質上不值得維繫，且就長遠而言，在理性的要求下，無法維繫其自身的信仰」，⁶⁵後者則相對堅實有力，不但可以抵抗理性之考驗，並能釋放靈性力量，帶動道德實踐之信仰觀。格林指出：前者以「言語」(in word)展現，仰賴的乃是「眼見為憑」(sight)，後者則以「權能」(in power)展現其自身，憑藉的是「信心」(faith)。⁶⁶這兩者的對立，格林指出，才是《新約》中最重大的對立命題，而非一般所謂的「信仰」與「理性」的對立。⁶⁷

格林大量引述保羅書簡如〈羅馬書〉、〈哥林多前書〉、〈哥林多

63 Green, "On Christian Dogma," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. 163. 格林結合歷史研究對於教義發展所提出之分析與批判，呼應包爾所提倡之「歷史神學」(historical theology)研究；關於包爾及其學生 D. F. Strauss 等人所建立之歷史神學研究路線及其對英國神學之影響，參閱 Claude Welch, *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Volume 1: 1799-1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), pp. 147-169.

64 在這一點上，格林延續了自由派神學家，諸如山謬·柯立芝 (Samuel Coleridge)、湯瑪斯·厄斯今 (Thomas Erskine)、莫里斯、喬威特等人，對於聖經字義外的永恆道德與靈性意涵之強調，但格林特殊之處在於他對保羅書簡所做之唯心論詮釋。關於 19 世紀主要神學思維發展，參閱 Bernard M. G. Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore* (London: Longman, 1980); Welch, *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Volume 1: 1799-1870*.

65 T. H. Green, "The Witness of God," "Faith," both in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 1-50, at p. 14; pp. 51-105, at pp. 81-82.

66 格林對 "power" 一詞之使用，可溯至〈哥林多前書〉4: 20 及保羅書簡其他多處；此處參考中文和合本聖經，譯為「權能」。

67 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 52.

後書〉、〈加拉太書〉等，以呼應其主要觀點。⁶⁸在格林詮釋下，保羅神學的最大意義即在於對於屬靈式理解之肯定，揚棄字面解。在〈神之見證〉這篇講道文中，格林首先以保羅對基督獻祭與復活的理解，說明憑藉「言語」與「權能」之信仰觀的差異。相對於保羅，對於「對觀福音書」中的十二門徒而言，耶穌之存在，乃是一個經由感官建立的歷史經驗，他們的信仰，是因見證了耶穌事蹟與異能及其死後復生，其所憑藉乃是歷史事件與物質性的感官基礎；耶穌對他們的意義因之也侷限於特定歷史時空。⁶⁹但保羅雖未曾眼見基督，他的生命與基督卻有著更為真實之結合，其中關鍵正在於保羅對於基督採取了一種「純粹靈性式」的理解。⁷⁰

保羅所「見」，已非那受限於時空與物質範疇的外在形式，而是基督之死的實質內涵，或謂其精神上的永恆意義。對於保羅而言，基督之死而復生是超越時空的「永恆作為」(eternal act)，是存在於人之意識的一種意念，並可藉由所有人之實踐而「重現不絕」(perpetually

68 在格林所有的神學文字中，保羅神學 (Pauline theology) 佔了核心地位；此一偏重，部分受到喬威特及唯心論神學家包爾之影響。關於包爾神學思想，參閱 Robert Morgan, "Ferdinand Christian Baur," in *Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West*, vol. 1, ed. Ninian Smart et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 261-289. 關於喬威特與格林的神學思想關聯，參閱 Hinchliff, *Benjamin Jowett and the Christian Religion*, pp. 157-164; Ellis, *Seven Against Christ*, pp. 282-284.

69 「對觀福音書」(Synoptic Gospels) 乃指《新約》中〈馬太福音〉、〈馬可福音〉及〈路加福音〉這三個在內容與敘事安排及語言結構上具多重雷同性質之福音書。此二信仰觀之對比，另參閱 Green, "On Christian Dogma," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 183-185.

70 格林對於保羅信仰觀之詮釋，參閱 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 6-12; Green, "The Conversion of Paul (Extracts from Lectures on the Epistle to the Galatians)," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 186-189; Green, "Notes of Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans (remaining text)," "Notes on the Epistle to the Galatians," both in Tyler, *Unpublished Manuscripts in British Idealism*, pp. 88-110, 111-134.

re-enacted)。⁷¹「基督之殉身」，乃是為了眾人利益而對自我肉體之完全棄絕，代表的是感官、肉慾、罪惡及世俗智慧之遠離；「基督之復活」所代表的，則是靈性與道德之源頭及「神聖生命之開端」。⁷²兩者共同指向了藉由愛、慈善與自我犧牲等正面德性而展開之道德新生，而不再是傳統福音主義神學所著眼之人之罪性與神之憤怒。⁷³於此屬靈理解下，是否眼見基督肉身作為並不重要，唯有能理解其真實道德意涵並更新自身意念才是關鍵。經由冥思基督永恆作為之實質意涵，人們更新了意念並超脫肉體慾望與罪惡，成為新人，如〈哥林多後書〉5:17道：「若有人在基督裡，他就是新造的人，舊事已過，都變成新的了。」⁷⁴依此理解，基督並非「為我們而死」(for us)，而是「在我們之中死去」(in us)；我們隨著基督之復活而展開道德新生，一如保羅生命之與基督同生共死。⁷⁵

由此可見，在保羅信仰中，基督已然轉化為人心中之意識，而這意識也正是信仰自身。如同保羅說，「主就是那靈」(〈哥林多後書〉3:17)，

71 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 8.

72 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 21.

73 基督為眾人獻祭之恩典 (the atoning grace of Christ)，在 19 世紀上半期往往被用來強調人類力量之微渺與罪性之深重，惟有仰賴基督救贖之恩典，才有可能獲得救贖。此一「替代性救贖」(precarious atonement) 概念所展現之晦暗道德意涵，多為人所批判。喬威特亦曾運用聖經考證，主張應回歸聖經原始意義，還原基督受難之正面道德意涵。喬威特於 1850 年代末發表其見解時，廣遭神學界批判，但此類對於基督典範之正面道德意涵的強調，直至 19 世紀下半期，隨著社會整體氛圍之轉變，漸為神學界與社會大眾所接受。參閱 Benjamin Jowett, "Essay on Atonement and Satisfaction," in *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans: With Critical Notes and Dissertations*, 2nd ed. (London: John Murray, 1859), pp. 547-594; Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age*, pp. 3323-340; Hilton, *The Age of Atonement*.

74 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 10. 文中聖經中譯皆採用和合本中文聖經，除非另有註明。

75 Green, "Justification by Faith (Extracts from Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans)," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 190-206, at p. 194; Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 12-13.

主做為那驅動一切作為之靈，是一切權能的賦予者。同樣地，基督做為「神之智慧」，以及做為神所賜予人類之「聖靈」(Spirit)，與神同為那靈，並同為那權能。⁷⁶而當吾人將「神」或基督做「聖靈」或「意念」(idea)解後，基督是否具歷史性，是否曾顯神蹟，已非重點；種種教條宣示和宗教儀式亦不再具有根本重要性，一如〈哥林多前書〉4:20道：「神的國不在乎言語，乃在乎權能。」⁷⁷重要的是，人們是否讓自身成為「聖靈的殿」(〈哥林多前書〉6:19)，讓那意念進入心中，實踐基督之死所代表的極致自我犧牲與至高之愛。⁷⁸就如格林的呼喚：「我們的心靈必須成為基督的心靈，如同基督之心靈乃神之心靈。我們的自我意識，與祂同上十字架，不再屬於我們。」⁷⁹如此，神與基督之聖靈也才能真正內化於人心並落實於生命。

在格林看來，屬靈式的理解才真正掌握基督教精義。但除了格林在那兩篇講道文中所大量援用闡釋的保羅話語之外，我們如何得以確認神乃是聖靈、意念而非其他形式之存有？而此一聖靈若存在於人心，人神關係又該如何界定？這又將如何影響人之作為與道德實踐？對此，我們必須回歸格林援以支撐其神學觀的唯心論哲學。

(三) 格林的唯心論神學觀

格林的唯心論思維，起始於本體論與知識論的探討。人與世界之關係為何？人類有無可能理解世界？人類知識之本質與侷限是甚麼？這些本體論與知識論的探究，既是唯心論哲學的關切重點，同時也是格林神學與哲學所仰賴的理性基礎。在實證主義與自然主義傳統中，人類知識單純地被理解為建構於感官基礎而無涉心靈作用，唯心論反對此一簡化

76 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 13. 另參閱 Green, "Notes on the Epistle to the Galatians," in Tyler, *Unpublished Manuscripts in British Idealism*, pp. 122-125.

77 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 14.

78 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 34.

79 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 11.

觀點，並進一步凸顯主體意識在知識建構中所應扮演的關鍵性角色。在格林知識論中，一切經驗與知識皆因「自我意識」（self-consciousness）而生，一切經驗與知識亦預設了「自我」（the self）之作用。經驗無法獨立存在於自我之外，因為一切經驗皆需透過先存自我意識中諸如主客體、因果、時間與空間等概念所架構之關係，才能被理解與認知。所有經驗、知識與世界也因此是「關係性的」（relational）。易言之，所有知識皆預設了一個「自覺主體」（self-conscious subject），透過此一先於經驗、具有統合能力的主體之心靈運作，世界才得以被理解。「自我」這自覺主體也因此格林的知識理論中扮演了關鍵的角色。自我是唯一真實、唯一不具時空相對性的永恆存在，具有統合萬相和自我實現之作用。⁸⁰透過自我意識，我們得以在原本孤立不相連結的萬物之間建立關係，使之成為一整體；藉此過程，我們也得以建立起知識體系，進而建構出整個世界。知識之建構，因此是個自我擴張並涵括連結更廣大世界的過程。此一過程，格林稱之為「自我實現」（self-realisation）的歷程。⁸¹

然而，格林雖然接受「理解創造自然」（understanding makes nature）的康德先驗論基本論點，但與康德不同之處在於，格林並不區別表象與「物自身」（thing-in-itself）之對立，而是以「神聖意識」（divine consciousness）或「永恆意識（eternal consciousness）」這兩個他常互換使用的詞彙——亦即格林心中「神」之概念，來消弭此一對立。對於格林來說，「理解」並不僅僅是自然秩序之起源，同時也是自然建構過程中所須仰賴的「關係」之來源，故在個人理解體系之外，並不存在所謂「自在之物」。但是由於每個人都透過「關係建立」，各自創造了「自然」，這無數個別之存在，正預設了一個在這些相互影響的個別自然體系之外，尚存一足以涵括一切關係體系與自然之「存在」。此一「存在」即是永恆意識，與自我意識同屬靈性或精神世界，同為一關係體系（an

80 T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, ed. David O. Brink (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), §§ 99-102.

81 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§36, 77, 174.

order of relations)，但相對於自我意識之有限，永恆意識卻指涉了自然之無限性與整體性，並包容涵蓋了一切。⁸²

此一「永恆意識」，格林並不避諱將之等同於神。易言之，自我意識與永恆意識關係之界定，也正是神學首重之人神關係。⁸³人類理解自身及建構知識的過程，不僅僅是自我意識擴張並與永恆意識連結之過程，更是個人追尋永恆意識進而「與神合一」的過程。⁸⁴

依此唯心論觀點，在人、神與世界之關係這重大神學問題上，格林已揚棄了「超越論」(Transcendentalism)之基督教正統觀念，代之以「內在論」(Immanentism)。⁸⁵在這知識理論下，神並非先存且自外於其所創造之世界。相反地，神乃內化、遍存於宇宙，存在於每個自我之中，因其乃是型塑宇宙所須仰賴之關係的統合原則。在此理解下，神乃是一種「理性」(reason)或「智識意識」(intellectual consciousness)，其一切「傳達」(communication)、一切「啟示」(revelation)，皆為理性，存在於人的意識之中。一如格林在〈信仰〉中所言，「不應在自然之初始或終結之中尋找神的存在，而應往人的自身內在去追尋」。⁸⁶或如格林在

82 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 83-84; Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§26-37, 69. 關於永恆意識，參閱 Peter Nicholson, "Green's 'Eternal Consciousness,'" in Dimova-Cookson and Mander, *T. H. Green: Ethics, Metaphysics, and Political Philosophy*, pp. 139-159. 格林在許多地方清楚地將神等同於永恆意識，參閱 T. H. Green, "Introductions to Hume's 'Treatise of Human Nature,'" in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 1, *Philosophical Works* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885), §152; Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §184.

83 參閱 Green, "Introductions to Hume's 'Treatise of Human Nature,'" in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 1, §152; Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §184.

84 Green, "Introductions to Hume's 'Treatise of Human Nature,'" in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 1, §152; Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §184.

85 內在論做為一化解信仰危機之重要出路，參閱 Mark Bevir, *The Making of British Socialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), pp. 217-234. Bevir 甚至將 19 世紀文化視為一由「救贖年代」(age of atonement) 轉化為「內在論年代」(age of immanentism) 之歷程，而格林則為其中重要思想代表。

86 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 78.

《倫理學原理》(*Prolegomena to Ethics*) 中所指出，「神不僅僅是那創造我們的存有……祂同時也是我們所賴以存在的存有；我們與祂同為一體；祂的精神亦恆等於人類精神，因祂正是人類所可能成為的存有。」⁸⁷ 保羅信仰在格林看來，也正呼應了這建構在唯心認識論上的內在論觀點：「豈不知你們的身子就是聖靈的殿嗎？這聖靈是從神而來，住在你們裡頭的。」(〈哥林多前書〉6:19)；「神藉著聖靈向我們顯明了，因為聖靈參透外事，就是神深奧的事也參透了。」(〈哥林多前書〉2:10)⁸⁸

格林的唯心論觀點不僅轉變了人們對神之理解，並連帶轉變了人們對於宗教之理解。於此觀點下，基督教乃是一套「切實意念的系統」(the system of practical ideas)，「展現意念之生命」(life resting on ideas)。⁸⁹ 它無法等同於教條，更不同於任何外在體制，例如教會與宗教儀式。人類起源有多古老，此一宗教根源就有多悠長，因為真正的基督教精神乃是涵蓋一切、不限於一時一地的意念系統。具體歷史事件僅為意念或意念系統萬般可能的展現形式之一，僅能傳達其實質於萬一，卻非那關鍵意念自身，正如保羅所曾清楚區別：「〔信仰〕不是用墨的，乃是用永生神的靈寫的；不是寫在石版上，乃是寫在心版上……不是憑著字句，乃是憑著精義。」(〈哥林多後書〉3:3)⁹⁰ 那墨所寫成之字句，終究無法與其所欲傳達之真實意念等量齊觀。

回到此一信仰觀底下的人神關係，儘管人神因共享精神本質而「同一」(identical)，兩者之間依然有著因時間面向而來之差異。人之相對於神，一如自我意識之於其所預設之永恆意識，存在著部分與統合之關係。做為統合一切的概念，神是「完美的存有」(perfect Being)，完整的實現，也是最高可能想見之道德。換句話說，若說神聖意識是整體，則人之自我意識只是整體的一部分；神是完美的，人則存缺陷；神是終

87 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §187.

88 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 13, 34.

89 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 25-26.

90 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 16.

點，人則永遠在追尋的路途上。兩者關係，格林譬喻說，一如橡子之於一株完全長成的橡樹，或如胚胎之於一成熟發展的動物。⁹¹兩者儘管同一，卻無法劃上等號，後者仍須仰賴時間歷程中的實踐，才能發展以趨近前者。

然而，人神儘管有所不同，但人神於意念上的同一，或謂自我意識與神聖意識之相互蘊涵，卻才是格林闡述上的著重處。因為人神意念的同一，正意味著實踐的可能性，而那存於自我意識中的神聖意識，亦確保實踐之必然導向至高與完美，並提供其動力。何以言之呢？

首先，在格林看來，當人們展開自覺，即意識到神的時刻，也是人神意念接合、溝通之時刻。這「智識上之想見」(intellectual conception)，正是一切萬有與成就的關鍵起始，也正是唯心論之所以對於精神力量高度倚重之由來。⁹²藉由這神聖精神力量之發揮，一切知識、道德與歷史方才具有可能性；若無，則世界萬物與人類之一切作為也將無從產生。一如格林所言：「唯獨意念才能帶來實現之動力」。⁹³

這內在論信念所應許的正面生成動力，正可解釋格林為何對〈羅馬書〉10:8「這道離你不遠，正在你口裏，在你心裏」這句經文有著深刻感受，並認為當中蘊含了「基督教精髓中之精髓」，可供人類「永久道德價值發展」。⁹⁴神做為那統合一切理性之理性，一切意念之意念，非但離我們不遠，實則存於吾人意識之中。格林於〈信仰〉中所企圖傳達的，也正是那存於自我、源自於神的珍貴驅力，他所不斷鼓勵的，正是人神意念的關鍵「交流」或謂「結合」：

91 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 85; T. H. Green, "Fragment of an Address on the Text 'The Word is Nigh Thee,'" in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 221-229, at pp. 224-227. 另參閱 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§69-72, 187-189.

92 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 23.

93 二引句皆出自 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 34.

94 Green, "The Word is Nigh Thee," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. 221.

神的話語成為了人。祂在人類一切崇高努力與受苦之愛以及求真奉獻中訴說其自身，教以人類道德；祂在你的良知中與你說話。那在你之中企圖與神溝通的，正是神自身。

他接著引用田尼生的詩：

對祂說吧，祂將聽見，而靈與靈，也將會面；
祂較我們的氣息與我們更親近，
也較我們的手足與我們更緊連。⁹⁵

這也說明了格林為何儘管不執著於宗教外在儀式，卻仍鼓勵祈禱。靈與靈會合的那一刻，也正是良知甦醒、道德開展的重要起點；在祈禱這人神意念接合、人類展現對其自身最純粹想望之際，我們業已擁有「行動之開端」（incipient action）。⁹⁶

其次，相對於神聖意識，自我意識儘管永遠未盡完美，但神之完美與其所代表之至高道德，卻永恆召喚著那存在於人心且與之呼應的意念，驅使人們朝向其所預設之道路前進。因之，神是那藏於人心的橡子，是那發展中的幼樹，也是人們終將長成的橡樹。若欲理解神，我們唯有讓自身成為神之殿堂，透過具體生命之實踐，追尋那存在無限可能的「更高生命」（higher life），終而讓神聖意識得以於我們自身之中充分發展。格林曾謂：「欲知神，我們必須成為神。」⁹⁷儘管人們因其意識之侷限而永遠無法見著、亦無法充分描述那最終盡頭，但信仰正如同盼望，勢必是不可見得的，因為「那可見著之盼望已非盼望」。⁹⁸但是，

95 Alfred Tennyson, "The Higher Pantheism," from *The Holy Grail and Other Poems*, 引自 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 96.

96 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 96; Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 46-47.

97 Green, "Review of J. Caird: 'Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion,'" in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 138-146, at p. 145.

98 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 86. 原文出自〈羅馬書〉8:24，譯文為作者自譯，和合本翻譯為：「只是所見的盼望不是盼望」。意念及其實現在概念上之差異及兩者間的無法等同，另參閱 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§187, 288.

對於完美理想的想望，那神之種子，卻已存在我們心中，猶如「燈蛾對星光的嚮往，黑暗對黎明的渴望」。⁹⁹這人神關係所隱含的過程與目的論以及歷史進步觀，也正是格林神學之所以能提供巨大道德激勵與實踐動力的重要因素。

（四）回應時代宗教困境

藉助唯心論哲學，格林除了為其神學觀提供經文詮釋外的理性基礎，並且回應了宗教在此一年代中所面臨的危機，提出一個在多重意義上更為寬廣的信仰觀。

首先，格林智識上最為活躍的 1860 與 1870 年代，正是宗教與科學之爭激烈上演的年代。一如格林所描繪，這不但是一個人們將科學與宗教衝突「掛在口中、懸在心上」的年代，同時也是一個「科學彷彿讓上帝隱沒」的年代。¹⁰⁰面對這時代之爭，格林企圖以宗教為本位，尋求兩者之和解。藉助唯心論神學觀，格林指出，科學不但不足以挑戰宗教地位或讓精神與靈性世界消失，科學知識反倒證明了意識與精神，意即神之必然存在。¹⁰¹在格林的形上學與知識論中，世界乃是心靈的產物，神更「永遠是那理性」。¹⁰²當人們透過意識運用理性，藉以開展思維建立知識之際，正是自我意識與永恆意識接合之時；一切理性思維與科學探索，正是精神力量之發揮與展現。而科學做為人類追尋那完整神聖意識

99 Percy Bysshe Shelley 詩句，引自 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 87.

100 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 80, 77. 關於宗教與科學之爭，參閱 Brooke, *Science and Religion*; Bernard Lightman, "Victorian Sciences and Religions: Discordant Harmonies," *Osiris*, 2nd series, vol. 16 (2001), pp. 343-366; Livingstone et al., eds., *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*. 近來史家儘管指出這經常借用戰事比喻的二元對立觀遮蔽了歷史爭議之複雜性，但這衝突性語言，卻是人們激化爭議與推進論點的有力概念工具。

101 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 80, 77.

102 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 22.

的過程，非但不足以取代信仰，反倒步步朝向神聖意識之實現而往前邁進。科學也因之與哲學一般，「對於那些知其真實力量而非空談者，將能使神之意念更加清晰，追求聖靈之路也更加自由而無羈絆」。¹⁰³這也是為何格林儘管一生以其哲學力抗科學自然主義與物質主義，卻不反對科學研究或演化論的原因，而僅是認為應將它們擺放在一個適當的概念位置上，並認清其解釋侷限。¹⁰⁴

其次，當部分基督教義因聖經考證與科學發現而難以自圓其說之際，格林提出一個超越物質基礎與外在證據的寬廣信仰觀，使得基督教不致於因此動搖。緊抱教義的「專斷神學」(dogmatic theology)乃立基於「言語」與「眼見」，而格林神學所憑藉的則是「權能」與「信心」。神在格林思維中是意念，是理性，是統合性意識；基督教則是一套意念系統；教義、聖經乃至教會，並不同於基督教，而只是聖靈與意念系統之外在展現形式。外在展現可能隨時空移轉而不再合乎時宜，但那超越時空與物質的意念或精義卻絲毫不受時空侷限。格林如此寫道：

基督教之榮耀不在於排拒，而在於包容；它並非突然降臨於世或僅僅展現於一特定機構，更難以特定言語形式完整傳達。它是那共同精神之展現，那將萬有結合於一體的精神……我們往前找不到它的源頭，往後亦無法預見其最終力量。¹⁰⁵

103 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 42. 原文：
"Philosophy and science, to those who seek not to talk of them but to know their power, do but render His clearness more clear, and the freedom of His service a more perfect freedom."
後句見於聖公會《公禱書》(*Book of Common Prayer*)，"whose service is perfect freedom"
並可追溯至聖奧古斯丁之語 "His service is perfect freedom"，意指順服神意行走聖靈之路，方能擺脫軀體、肉慾及世俗環境影響，獲取真實自由。關於格林對此一字句之闡釋，另參閱 T. H. Green, "The Force of Circumstances," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 3-10, at p. 6.

104 格林對於自然主義與物質主義之越界的批判，參閱其主要哲學著作 *Prolegomena to Ethics*.

105 Green, "The Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 25.

但是，在這個講究「證據」(evidence)的年代，基督教若不訴諸言語之教條、依附事實的歷史事件及外在體制與儀式來證實其自身，又該如何自處？在格林的唯心論形上學中，神乃是那遍存宇宙、統合一切之抽象原則，世界因之而存在。於其之外，空無一物。換句話說，神乃是那無可化約、創造並驅動一切存有之初始力量，我們無法於其之外另尋衍生一切的物質證明。做為神聖意識的一部分，我們無法跳脫自身以驗證自身之存在，一如「自我」之概念對於我們自身而言將永具神祕性。¹⁰⁶在此一觀點下，信仰做為意念，自身即已自足，而無需任何外部證明，它是超越物質基礎與外在證據的。那唯一能彰顯其自身的，正是意念之「實現」(realisation)，正如格林於〈信仰〉中所反覆傳達：「信仰無法藉由任何取代信仰之物來保存，僅能透過其本質之展現而獲得保存。」¹⁰⁷

這也闡明了格林信仰觀的另一積極時代意義——信仰與道德之結合。道德問題始終是福音主義年代的重大懸念，「宗教」與「道德」在格林思維中也始終相連。格林曾謂，「一個能反思其自身的道德觀，必須將其自身連結於神，也就是說，它必須是宗教的」。¹⁰⁸道德概念為何必須與神連結呢？對於格林而言，道德存在於對「更佳之自我」的想像與欲求，當人們發揮自我意識以求自我實現並追尋那更高之自我時，也正是道德開展之際。在這過程中，我們必須仰賴理性在人類意識中所起之作用，透過理性這「促成道德之力量」(moralising influence)，人們才得以想見那更佳之自我並追求更高生命。¹⁰⁹也就是說，做為意識與理性，神正是人們心中道德的源頭。同時，做為統合一切的至高精神法則，神亦是「道德生活的最終目標」。¹¹⁰是故，神存在於人類的道德追尋中，

106 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§100-101.

107 Green, "The Witness of God," "Faith," both in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 31, 74, 94-95.

108 Paget, ed., *Henry Scott Holland*, pp. 30-31.

109 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §178; Green, "The Word is Nigh Thee," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, pp. 223-225.

110 Green, "The Word is Nigh Thee," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. 225.

透過神聖意識於自我意識之「運作」(operation)或「再現」(reproduction)，人們才得以想見一更佳狀態，求致至高道德的發展。¹¹¹這也是為何宗教在格林看來正是「追尋神的道德之路」(a God-seeking morality)，而「真實道德(因此)必須是宗教的，亦即須仰賴對於神之自覺」。¹¹²宗教與道德兩者，對於格林而言，也因之「完全同一」(properly identical)。¹¹³在這憂心信仰消褪將連帶導致道德瓦解的年代，格林藉由唯心論形上學，不但肯定兩者，並將兩者接合。曾有神學家指出格林之信仰「徹頭徹尾展現了倫理性」，這其實正因為格林在宗教和神之中所見著的，也正是人類所可能想見之最高道德與完美生活。¹¹⁴在格林的道德哲學代表作《倫理學原理》中，神與宗教或許相對隱而不宣，但對格林而言，宗教與道德意圖本質同一，也正確保其神學與倫理學思維不但不相違背尚且相輔相成。

然而，如前所述，信仰毋須證據，僅能藉由「實踐」以展現自身。格林寫道：「驗證所有切實想法之真實性的證據，僅存於實踐之中。」¹¹⁵意念與實踐彼此相倚，無法缺一而獨存。實踐必有意念之作用，意念亦須憑藉實際生命中之具體落實才得以展現。是以無論是神、宗教、道德或知識，做為尚未實現之意念，皆須仰賴行動方得成就，信仰亦僅存在於充分展現神聖意識之生命中。¹¹⁶如格林所指出，知識若僅僅做為那「未實現之意念——終必歸於無有」；¹¹⁷「你無法為神之概念找到證據，你

另參閱 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§180-182.

111 參閱 Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, §§72-74, 174-175, 217.

112 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 91; Letter from Green to Holland, p. 442.

113 Letter from Green to Holland, p. 442.

114 Bernard M. G. Reardon, "T. H. Green as a Theologian," in *The Philosophy of T. H. Green*, ed. Andrew Vincent (Aldershot, Hants: Gower, 1987), pp. 36-47, at p. 42.

115 Green, "Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 16.

116 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 97.

117 Green, "Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 16.

只能創造它」。¹¹⁸神做為人心中之意念，給予人類一切良善作為之最珍貴可能性；但這意念所帶來的可能性，卻仍須仰賴人類自身作為才得以成就。「實踐」與「行動」，也因此正是格林兩篇講道文中最為殷切之呼籲。他不斷提醒，欠缺具體展現的宗教只是空談；「信仰不足以成為信仰，如果基督之生命不能與信仰者之生活合而為一」；¹¹⁹唯有當人們能夠成為「基督教公民」，透過個人「不懈的靈性鍛鍊」，將神之意念落實於「所有社會生活之單位」中，神聖意識才真正與人合一，信仰也因之展現。¹²⁰格林信仰觀的強大現實指涉，回應了福音主義年代對於信仰之切實作用的殷切期盼，重新接合教會與社會之關聯，更得以讓那些質疑教條或教會者，依舊能透過群體生活之實踐而保守其宗教信念。

最後，格林之信仰觀之所以得以做為當代宗教問題之適切出路，正是來自於它對於各類信仰實踐形式之寬大包容力，而此一包容力正源自於他對於信仰之唯心論解讀方式。格林對比那呼應唯心論思維的保羅信仰觀、及憑藉外部體制權威與教條的傳統信仰觀，前者，在格林看來，是「主要意義下之信仰」（faith in the primary sense），因為它掌握到那使一切知識與道德追尋成為可能之靈性驅力；後者僅是「次要意義下之信仰」（faith in the secondary sense），因為它誤將信仰之單一可能外顯形式視為信仰本質與內涵。前者直指內在意念根源，而能賦予道德實踐的原動力，後者則因執著外在形式，錯失力量源泉而淪為「孱弱之基督教」（enfeebled Christianity）。¹²¹然而，儘管揭露後者理解上之缺失，格林並不完全抹煞它，因為，以唯心論觀之，拘泥言語或外在形式之信

118 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 97.

119 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 61.

120 Green, "Witness of God," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, pp. 23, 35. 格林在此所呼應的，乃是他其他著作中所充分闡明的自我意識與「共同良善」間的必然連結與相輔相成，參閱 T. H. Green, *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911); Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*.

121 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 63; Green, "On Christian Dogma," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. 161.

仰，亦同樣受到聖靈或意念之驅使，同樣也是展現基督教精義的方式之一。格林如此說道：「若人類所有特質……皆可歸因於神，那麼，以外顯和受限形式呈現其自身的宗教感，也應該在那與神性相融之生命中仍有一席之地。」是故，就這兩種信仰形式而言，前者可以包容後者，後者卻無法接納前者，一如格林所言：「真正的哲人心中容得下聖徒，聖徒卻容不下哲人。」¹²²透過唯心論之洞察，哲人得以看出不合時宜之教條中之精義，但那未能掌握永恆意念的聖徒，卻僅能識得其自身而無法看出萬般形式下的同一驅動意念。後者稱不上錯誤，惟欠缺一套對於自身本質的正確理解及適切表達模式，而唯心論思想所能提供的，正是這份理解與表達模式。

這也正是格林對於其所謂的哲學，也就是唯心論哲學，懷有如此巨大期許的原因。那仰賴外在字句和物質證據的舊宗教觀，終將侷限網綁那具有「無限擴張力量」（power of infinite expansion）之神聖意識的充分展現。¹²³然而，哲學透過「自覺地、系統性地對那已然運作於人類靈性生活中之權能提出詮釋」，卻得以為這權能找到一套更為適切的傳達方式，終而使其力量與本質充分彰顯。¹²⁴這也正得以解釋，在格林思想中，哲學與宗教為何始終不可分離，而哲學又為何是「對於接近神之嘗試的一種理性的、智識的表達」。¹²⁵這也是為什麼，在格林看來，這時代所面臨的根本宗教問題，其實並非「神或是理想行為法則之真實性出了問題，而是我們的表達模式出了問題」。¹²⁶唯心論哲學之最大功用，就在於提供一套適切表達模式，藉以理解並傳達靈性法則之真實力量，進而解決宗教所面臨的困境。

122 Green, "On Christian Dogma," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. 184.

123 Green, "On Christian Dogma," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, p. 185

124 Green, "Popular Philosophy in Its Relation to Life," in Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*, vol. 3, at p. 93.

125 Letter from Green to Holland, p. 442.

126 Green, "Faith," in Toynbee, *The Witness of God and Faith*, p. 104.

結 語

格林以其清晰意圖與強烈情感，發表兩篇講道文，將其諸多重要哲學思維與概念串連成為一醫治性的時代信仰宣告。在宗教面臨多重危機之懷疑年代，格林讓那些因知識進展而質疑教條與教會者重拾信仰，並重獲道德實踐力量。這更新之信仰，並不與科學或理性精神相牴觸，並且不拘泥於特定外在宗教形式，包容各種靈性追尋，並展現於多元道德實踐中。

相對於較受矚目的政治問題，格林始終掛懷的宗教問題較為人所忽視。但若欲求對格林思想言行的完整理解，我們實無法忽略那驅動其哲學研究的宗教動機及兩者之間的融通。阿諾德·湯恩比在替講道文所寫的原序中曾剖析道，對格林而言，「哲學的真實工作就是要證明對於神的信仰並非迷妄，而是理性之理解（rational apprehension）」。¹²⁷格林友人、小說家瑪莉·沃德（Mary Augusta Ward, 1851-1920）亦曾同樣解釋道，智識欲求對於格林而言僅是次要，他「畢生思考嘗試的主要鼓舞動力」，乃是「對神之渴望，以及在理性範疇替那支配他一切作為與情感之信仰，找到更為堅實穩固之基礎」，而格林之所思所想，沃德認為也只有〈詩篇〉42:2 之話語才能充分傳達——「我的心渴想神，就是永生神」。¹²⁸而格林墓碑上所刻經句——「我們行事為人是憑著信心，不是憑著眼見」（WE WALK BY FAITH, NOT BY SIGHT），也為貫穿其神學與哲學思維中那著眼於內在精義而不受外在形式羈絆之精神，做了

127 "(I.d.6) CBG's MS copy of Arnold Toynbee's preface to the *Two Sermons*," in T. H. Green Papers, Balliol College Archive, Oxford.

128 William S. Peterson, "Gladstone's Review of *Robert Elsmere*: Some Unpublished Correspondence," *The Review of English Studies*, New Series vol. 21, no. 84 (Nov. 1970), pp. 442-461, at p. 457. 沃德為魯格比之阿諾德的孫女、詩人與作家馬修·阿諾德（Matthew Arnold）的姪女；她對格林之評論出自她與英國首相威廉·格萊斯頓（William Gladstone）探討 *Robert Elsmere* 這部小說的一系列通信。

最後見證。¹²⁹

格林曾自我期許此生能寫成一書，完整道出其宗教想法，唯此書之書寫須能滿足兩項前提：一是要能夠「展現關於神、聖靈、永生與祈禱等基督教思想精髓」，二則是必須以一種對於信仰具「建設性」的方式為之。¹³⁰然而終其短暫一生，似乎未能償願，講道文的臨終出版囑託，或可視為遂願之舉。無論如何，格林一生撰述所起的根本作用，正是對於信仰和靈性之強化與提升，而其同時代人們並不曾錯失格林哲學思想背後的強烈宗教訊息。

格林學生納文生（Henry W. Nevins, 1856-1941）曾回憶他和同學對於聽課所抱持之期待，正是希望能透過格林哲學，「堅定我們動搖的宗教信念」；¹³¹荷蘭德也曾談到格林的「福音主義之心」如何使「所有受教於他的學生更加趨近於精神世界並更加篤信」，並讓「神祕經驗在我們心中翻騰，也讓理性重獲神聖職志」；¹³²穆爾海德更提到，格林作品如何讓他獲致前所未有的強烈宗教皈依經驗。¹³³這源自其人格與思想內涵的特殊信仰堅定力量，也讓格林儘管未曾領受神職，卻被譽為一「俗人牧師」（secular priest）；¹³⁴在沃德以信仰危機為主題的暢銷小說《羅伯特·埃斯米爾》（*Robert Elsmere*）中，格林化身為小說主要人物，指引主角走出信仰懷疑，展開奉獻之路。¹³⁵此外，暫且不論其他層面之思

129 出自〈哥林多後書〉5:7。格林與其妻合葬於牛津市區中的「聖墓墓園」（St. Sepulchre's Cemetery）；筆者於2014年7月20日造訪。

130 Letter from Green to Holland, p. 443.

131 Henry W. Nevins, *Changes and Chances* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1923), p. 39.

132 Henry Scott Holland, *A Bundle of Memories* (London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1915), p. 145.

133 Harvey, *John Henry Muirhead*, p. 60.

134 參閱 Hollis, *The Oxford Union*, p. 103.

135 Mrs. Humphry Ward, *Robert Elsmere* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987 [1888]). 有學者曾謂，如果卡萊爾的《衣裳哲學》是維多利亞早期的時代靈性自傳，田尼生的《悼念集》與紐曼（J. H. Newman）的《自我辯護》（*Apologia pro vita sua*）是維多利亞中期的靈性自傳，那麼，晚期代表則非《羅伯特·埃斯米爾》莫屬；見 J. Russell Perkin, *Theology*

想貢獻，格林所帶動之唯心論思想浪潮，也正是促使國教派於 19 世紀末成功推動神學自由化與社會實踐路線的最重要影響。¹³⁶

相較於格林在英國政治思想發展上所扮演之功用，格林於其時代所扮演的另一重要角色——信仰捍衛者——或許是今人所相對陌生的。然而，若欲理解格林之思想精義及其時代重要性，或在由之而來的正確理解上接續為今日提問，那與其生命和思想緊密結合的宗教關切，當是吾人不應錯失的首要認識路徑。

*此文為國科會補助專題研究計畫（101-2410-H-006-075-MY3）之部分研究成果。本文承蒙國科會之支持、兩位匿名審查人的寶貴建議，以及編輯群的悉心校正，謹此致謝。

（責任編輯：石昇烜 校對：歐陽宣）

and the Victorian Novel (Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009), pp. 198-199. 這部小說之出版，如 Henry James 所言，堪稱「一重大公眾事件」(a momentous public event)，因為它不但引發廣泛討論，並且在一年內於英國銷售 4 萬本，美國銷售 20 萬本，這尚不包括大量盜印本。格林的宗教與哲學思想也透過此一暢銷書，首度於社會大眾間流傳。參閱 Rosemary Ashton, "Introduction," in *Robert Elsmere*, pp. vii-xviii, at p. vii.

- 136 1889 年，聖公會一群高教會派教士，出版了頗富時代標誌意義的《世界之光》(*Lux Mundi*) 論文集 (Charles Gore, ed., *Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation*, 10th ed. [London: John Murray, 1890])，部分成員在荷蘭德的帶領下，於同年成立了致力於社會改革的「基督教社會聯盟」(Christian Social Union)。這 12 位聖公會高層神職中，有 11 位出身牛津大學，其中多位曾受教於格林或受其影響，大多展現唯心論思維與內在論觀點。他們不再將科學進展與聖經批判視為信仰之敵，而是力倡神學與時俱進之必要性，且力求信仰於道德生命和社會實踐中之實現。在神學發展上，他們可謂承續了《論文與評論》未竟之業，但顯然遠較前者更為成功地帶動了 19 世紀末神學界之自由化發展，並獲得廣泛社會迴響。格林對於聖公會之神學自由化與社會實踐之影響，參閱 Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age*, pp. 430-473; Hinchliff, *Benjamin Jowett and the Christian Religion*, pp. 167-181; Gouldstone, *The Rise and Decline of Anglican Idealism in the Nineteenth Century*.

引用書目

一、史料文獻

- Abbott, Evelyn, and Lewis Campbell, eds. *The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett*. Vol. 2. London: John Murray, 1897.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *Sartor Resartus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 [1836].
- Frederick, Temple, Rowland Williams, Baden Powell, Henry Bristow Wilson, C. W. Goodwin, Mark Pattison, and Benjamin Jowett. *Essays and Reviews*. London: J. W. Parker, 1860.
- Gore, Charles, ed. *Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation*. 10th ed. London: John Murray, 1890.
- Green, Thomas Hill. T. H. Green Papers. Balliol College Archive, Oxford.
- Green, Thomas Hill. *The Witness of God and Faith*. Edited by Arnold Toynbee. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885.
- Green, Thomas Hill. *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911.
- Green, Thomas Hill. *Prolegomena to Ethics*. Edited by David O. Brink. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Harvey, John W., ed. *John Henry Muirhead: Reflections by a Journeyman in Philosophy*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1942.
- Holland, Henry Scott. *A Bundle of Memories*. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1915.
- Hugh, Thomas. *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. New York: Dutton, 1952 [1857].
- Jowett, Benjamin. *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans: With Critical Notes and Dissertations*. 2nd ed. London: J. Murray, 1859.
- Jowett, Benjamin. *Statements of Christian Doctrine and Practice, Extracted from the Published Writings of the Rev. Benjamin Jowett*. Oxford: J. H. and Jas Parker, 1861.
- Jowett, Benjamin. "B. Jowett on the Interpretation of Scripture, 1860." In *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol 3. *Sources*. Edited by James R. Moore. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Muirhead, John H. *The Service of the State*. London: John Murray, 1908.
- Muirhead, John H. *The Platonic Tradition in Anglo-Saxon Philosophy*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931.
- Nettleship, R. L. "Professor T. H. Green. In Memoriam." *Contemporary Review* 41 (May 1882), pp. 857-877.
- Nettleship, R. L., ed. *Works of Thomas Hill Green*. 3 Vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885-1888.

- Nettleship, R. L. "Memoir." In Nettleship, *Works of Thomas Hill Green*. Vol. 3. *Miscellanies and Memoir*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1888.
- Nettleship, R. L. "Notes for T. H. Green's Memoir." In T. H. Green Papers, Balliol College Archive, Oxford.
- Nicholson, Peter, ed. *Collected Works of T. H. Green*. 5 Vols. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 1997.
- Paget, Stephen, ed. *Henry Scott Holland: Memoir and Letters*. London: John Murray, 1921.
- Shatto, Susan, and Marian Shaw, eds. *Tennyson: In Memoriam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Toynbee, Arnold, ed. *The Witness of God and Faith: Two Lay Sermons by the Late T. H. Green*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885.
- Tyler, Colin, ed. *Unpublished Manuscripts in British Idealism: Political Philosophy, Theology and Social Thought*. Exeter, UK: Thoemmes Continuum, 2005.
- Ward, Humphry, *Robert Elsmere*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987 [1888].

二、近人論著

- 以賽·柏林 (Isaiah Berlin) 著，陳曉林譯，〈自由四論〉。臺北：聯經出版公司，1986。
- Addison, W. G. "Academic Reform at Balliol, 1854-1882: T. H. Green and Benjamin Jowett." *The Church Quarterly Review* 153 (1952), pp. 89-98.
- Altholz, Josef L. "The Mind of Victorian Orthodoxy: Anglican Responses to 'Essays and Reviews', 1860-1864." In *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol. 4. *Interpretations*. Edited by Gerald Parsons, pp. 28-40. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Ashton, Rosemary. *The German Idea: Four English Writers and the Reception of German Thought 1800-1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Bartholomew, Michael. "The Moral Critique of Christian Orthodoxy." In *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol. 2. *Controversies*. Edited by Gerald Parsons, pp. 166-190. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Bebbington, D. W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Bevir, Mark. *The Making of British Socialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Brink, David O. *Perfectionism and the Common Good: Themes in the Philosophy of T. H. Green*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2003.
- Brock, M. G., and M. C. Curthoys, eds. *The History of the University of Oxford*. Vol. 6. *Nineteenth-Century Oxford*. Part I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Brooke, J. H. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Brown, Stewart J. *Providence and Empire 1815-1914*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited,

2008.

- Carter, Matt. *T. H. Green and the Development of Ethical Socialism*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic, 2003.
- Chadwick, Owen. *The Victorian Church*. Part 1 & Part 2. 2nd ed. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1970.
- Clark, G. Kitson. *The Making of Victorian England*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Dimova-Cookson, Maria. *T. H. Green's Moral and Political Philosophy: A Phenomenological Perspective*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2001.
- Clarke, Peter. *Liberals and Social Democrats*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Collingwood, R. G. *An Autobiography*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1978.
- Dimova-Cookson, Maria, and W. J. Mander, eds. *T. H. Green: Ethics, Metaphysics, and Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Ellis Ieuan. *Seven against Christ: A Study of "Essays and Reviews"*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.
- Englander, David. "The Word and the World: Evangelicalism in the Victorian City." In Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol. 2. *Controversies*, pp. 14-38.
- Faber, Geoffrey. *Jowett: A Portrait with Background*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Freeden, Michael. *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- Fox, Robert. "The University Museum and Oxford Science, 1850-80." In Brock and Curthoys, *The History of the University of Oxford*. Vol. 6. *Nineteenth-Century Oxford*. Part I, pp. 641-691.
- Geoffrey, Rowell. *Hell and the Victorians: A Study of the Nineteenth-Century Theological Controversies Concerning Eternal Punishment and the Future Life*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.
- Gouldstone, Timothy Maxwell. *The Rise and Decline of Anglican Idealism in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Harrison, Peter, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Science and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Harvie, Christopher. *The Lights of Liberalism: University Liberals and the Challenge of Democracy 1860-86*. London: Allen Lane, 1976.
- Harvie, Christopher. "Reform and Expansion, 1854-1871." In Brock and Curthoys, *The History of the University of Oxford*. Vol. 6. *Nineteenth-Century Oxford*. Part I, pp. 697-730.
- Helmstadter, Richard J., and Bernard Lightman, eds. *Victorian Faith in Crisis: Essays on Continuity and Change in Nineteenth-Century Religious Belief*. London: MacMillan, 1990.
- Hesketh, Ian. *Of Apes and Ancestors: Evolution, Christianity, and the Oxford Debate*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

- Heyck, T. W. *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.
- Hilton, Boyd. *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought 1785-1865*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Hinchliff, Peter. "Benjamin Jowett and the Church of England: or 'Why Really Great Men are Never Clergymen.'" In *Balliol Studies*. Edited by John Prest, pp. 125-158. London: Leopard's Head Press, 1982.
- Hinchliff, Peter. *Benjamin Jowett and the Christian Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- Hollis, Christopher. *The Oxford Union*. London: Evans Brothers, 1965.
- Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Larson, Timothy. *Crisis of Doubt: Honest Faith in Nineteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Leighton, Denys P. *The Greenian Moment: T. H. Green, Religion, and Political Argument in Victorian Britain*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic, 2004.
- Lightman, Bernard. "Victorian Sciences and Religions: Discordant Harmonies." *Osiris* 2nd Series, Vol. 16 (2001), pp. 343-366.
- Livingstone, David N., D. G. Hart, and Mark A. Noll, eds. *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Mander, W. J. *British Idealism: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Morgan, Robert. "Ferdinand Christian Baur." In *Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West*. Vol. 1. Edited by Ninian Smart, John Clayton, Patrick Sherry, and Steven T. Katz, pp. 261-289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Nevinson, Henry W. *Changes and Chances*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1923.
- Newsome, David. *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal*. London: Murray, 1961.
- Nicholson, Peter P. *The Political Philosophy of British Idealists: Selected Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Nicholson, Peter. "Green's 'Eternal Consciousness.'" In Dimova-Cookson & Mander, *T. H. Green: Ethics, Metaphysics, and Political Philosophy*, pp. 139-159.
- Obelkevich, James. "Religion." In *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950*. Edited by F. M. L. Thompson, pp. 311-356. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Parry, J. P. *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867-1875*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Parsons, Gerald. "Reform, Revival and Realignment: The Experience of Victorian Anglicanism." In *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol. 1. *Traditions*. Edited by Gerald Parsons, pp. 14-66.

- Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Parsons, Gerald, ed. *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol. 2. *Controversies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Parsons, Gerald. "Biblical Criticism in Victorian Britain: From Controversy to Acceptance?" In Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol. 2. *Controversies*, pp. 238-257.
- Parsons, Gerald. "On Speaking Plainly: 'Honest Doubt' and the Ethics of Beliefs." In Parsons, *Religion in Victorian Britain*. Vol. 2. *Controversies*, pp. 192-219.
- Perkin, J. Russell. *Theology and the Victorian Novel*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009.
- Peterson, William S. "Gladstone's Review of *Robert Elsmere*: Some Unpublished Correspondence." *The Review of English Studies*. New Series vol. 21, no. 84 (Nov. 1970), pp. 442-461.
- Prest, John. "Balliol, For Example." In *The History of the University of Oxford*. Vol. 7. *Nineteenth-Century Oxford*. Part 2. Edited by M. G. Brock & M. C. Curthoys, pp. 159-169. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Quinton, A. M. "Absolute Idealism." *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. LVII (1971), pp. 303-329.
- Rait, Robert S. *Memorials of Albert Venn Dicey*. London: MacMillan, 1925.
- Reardon, Bernard M. G. *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore*. London: Longman, 1980.
- Reardon, Bernard M. G. "T. H. Green as a Theologian." In *The Philosophy of T. H. Green*. Edited by Andrew Vincent, pp. 36-47. Aldershot, Hants: Gower, 1987.
- Richter, Melvin. "T. H. Green and His Audience: Liberalism as a Surrogate Faith." *Review of Politics* 18 (1956), pp. 444-472.
- Richter, Melvin. *The Politics of Conscience: T. H. Green and His Age*. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 1996 [1964].
- Rogerson, John. *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*. London: SPCK, 1984.
- Schueller, Herbert M., and Robert L. Peters, eds. *The Letters of John Addington Symonds*. Vol. 1. *1844-1868*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.
- Secord, James. *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Strachey, Lytton. *Eminent Victorians*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1918.
- Symondson, Anthony, ed. *The Victorian Crisis of Faith*. London: SPCK, 1970.
- Thomas, Geoffrey. *The Moral Philosophy of T. H. Green*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- Turner, Frank M. "The Victorian Platonic Revival." In *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain*,

- pp. 369-446. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Turner, Frank M. "The Triumph of Idealism in Victorian Classical Studies." In *Contesting Cultural Authority: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life*, pp. 322-361. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Tyler, Colin, ed. "Recollections Regarding Thomas Hill Green." *Collingwood and British Idealism Studies* 14: 2 (2008), pp. 5-78.
- Welch, Claude. *Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century. Volume 1: 1799-1870*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Wolffe, John, ed. *Evangelical Faith and Public Zeal: Evangelicals and Society in Britain 1780-1980*. London: SPCK, 1995.
- Wolffe, John. *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland 1843-1945*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Zemka, Sue. "Spiritual Authority and the Life of Thomas Arnold." *Victorian Studies* 38, no. 3 (1995), pp. 429-462.

Exploring the Religious Implications of Thomas Hill Green's Philosophy through his Sermons "The Witness of God" and "Faith"

Li, Chien-hui*

Abstract

Thomas Hill Green (1836-1882) is one of the most important founders of British idealism. Compared with the interest paid to Green's political ideas, his religious thought has received less scholarly attention. This article seeks to redress this imbalance by turning to the centrality of religion in Green's life and work and the connection between his philosophical and religious ideas. The first section surveys the "Victorian age of faith" in which Green lived and its "crisis of doubt". The second section traces Green's early education and the formation of his religious character. The third section turns to Green's two lay sermons, "The Witness of God" and "Faith", delivered at Balliol College, Oxford, in 1870 and 1877, respectively, and discusses their wider religious implications and the connection between his theological view and philosophy. The article points out that, through the aid of an idealist epistemology and metaphysics, Green promoted an immanentist faith that rested on the concept of "the eternal consciousness" and its realisation in human thought and action. Green's religious vision was not only able to withstand the demand of external evidence and reconcile belief and rationality in the age of science, but was

* Assistant Professor, Department of History, National Cheng Kung University.
No. 1, University Road, Tainan City 70101, Taiwan (R.O.C.);
E-mail: li.chien.hui@gmail.com.

also broad enough to encompass all creeds and sects and to sustain the moral pursuits and social activism of all. In Green's cogent responses to the Victorian crisis of religion lay his immense influence over his age.

Keywords: Thomas Hill Green, religion in 19th-century Britain, crisis of faith, idealism, immanentism.

成大歷史學報

第五十一號

西洋史專號



國立成功大學歷史學系
中華民國一〇五年十二月
2016.12
臺灣 臺南

成大歷史學報

第五十一號

中華民國一〇五年十二月

西洋史專號

特稿

工會和英國的多元主義傳統 阿拉特斯·瑞德 1

論文

在異文化的想像中展現自我： 許家琳 21
古希臘圖像中與波斯人相關的主題

1583 年倫敦商人東方行 李若庸 55

論安妮·貝森的神智學轉向：宗教、科學與改革 李鑑慧 113

加拿大與英國遠東郵遞政策：1887—1913 林志龍 171

譯稿

柏林的「歐洲中心」(1963-65)： 亞歷山大·史德邁爾 195
美國化，消費主義和國際風格的應用 陳榮鋼 譯

Cheng Kung Journal of Historical Studies

No.51

December, 2016

Monographic Volume of Western History

Trade Unions and the British Tradition of Pluralism	Alastair J. Reid	1
Self-presentation in Imagining Foreign Culture: Persians in Ancient Greek Iconography	Hsu, Chia-lin	21
London Merchants' Expedition to the East in 1583	Lee, Juo-yung	55
The Theosophical Turn of Annie Besant: Religion, Science and Reform	Li, Chien-hui	113
Canada and the British Policy on Postal Service to the Far East, 1887-1913	Lin, Chih-lung	171
Berlin's Europa-Center (1963-65): Americanization, Consumerism, and the Use of the International Style	Alexander Sedlmaier Chen, Rong-gang, trans.	195

編 言

本系除《成大歷史學報》之外，曾於 1989 年發行《成大西洋史集刊》，後來因故於 2005 年與《成大歷史學報》合併。為繼續提供西洋史學者發表的固定園地，此後學報朝向每四期能有一期為西洋史專號的目標而努力。

本刊五十一號即為「西洋史專號」，收錄特稿一篇、論文四篇與譯稿一篇。四篇論文的議題與時間涵蓋甚廣，分別探討古希臘時代人們對異文化的印象、十六世紀英格蘭海外拓殖的商業運作模式與官商關係、十九世紀末英國社運領導者安妮·貝森的神智學轉向之時代意涵，以及十九世紀加拿大與英國遠東郵遞政策制定和現實利益的關係。

至於譯稿與特稿則對作者略作說明：

譯稿原作者為英國威爾斯班戈大學 (Bangor University) 歷史學系史德邁爾教授 (Alexander Sedlmaier)，他曾於 2015 年來臺擔任「臺灣世界史討論會」系列講座主講人，這篇文章即他當時的演講主題之一。特稿則邀請英國劍橋大學格頓學院 (Girton College, Cambridge) 瑞德教授 (Alastair J. Reid) 撰寫，瑞德教授也將於 2017 年 3 月來臺擔任「臺灣世界史討論會」系列講座主講人。這兩篇文稿之後均附有作者及其學術介紹。

《成大歷史學報》向來以作為學術交流平台自勉，本次西洋史專號則進一步與「臺灣世界史討論會」的活動聯結，希望能對臺灣世界史的研究與推展略盡一己之力。這是本次專號的主要意義。

編輯部 2016.12

論安妮·貝森的神智學轉向：宗教、科學與改革

李 鑑 慧*

摘 要

安妮·貝森 (Annie Besant, 1847-1933) 是英國著名社運領導者，一生領導眾多運動，如現世運動、社會主義運動、工會運動、神智學運動及印度自治爭取運動等；由於關懷範圍廣泛，跨越各種乍似不相容的社會議題，是以其生平經常引人費解並備受爭議。本文聚焦在貝森最為令人困惑的神智學轉向，探討她為何於不惑之年投身旨在宣揚東方思想的神祕團體。相對於傳統觀點，我將指出，貝森之抉擇不但有其時代合理性，並具有高度時代標誌意義。神智學之於貝森，既是時代信仰危機下的另類靈性選項，回應基督教之僵化教義與倫理侷限而不放棄靈性追尋；同時也是對於當代科學的批判性回應，挑戰其武斷獨大與畫地自限而不揚棄理性探索；透過對於東方思想的闡揚，貝森並發展出一套強調眾生一體與自我犧牲的行動哲學，藉以持續參與於問題叢生的世紀末社會之改造工程。貝森的神智學轉向，不但可視為十九世紀末、二十世紀初人們心靈與智識探索的一個縮影，亦是對於英國社會、文化與政治發展的適切回應。

關鍵詞：神智學、神智學會、神祕主義、信仰危機、科學自然主義

* 國立成功大學歷史學系副教授
本文為科技部專題研究計劃 99-2410-H-006-133-MY2 部分研究成果
投稿日期：2014.10.08；接受刊登日期：2015.02.07；最後修訂日期：2017.01.05

The Theosophical Turn of Annie Besant: Religion, Science and Reform

Li, Chien-hui*

Abstract

Annie Besant (1847-1933) was a prominent social reformer who was involved in numerous causes in the late 19th and early 20th centuries including secularism, socialism, trade unionism, theosophy and India self-rule. Her seemingly disjointed activities and especially her conversion to theosophy have often been a subject of controversy among her contemporaries and present difficulties for historians seeking coherence in her life. The article seeks to explain why Besant joined the Theosophical Society in 1889, an occultist group dedicated to the promotion of Eastern thought. Contrary to the conventional view that this move marked a flight from reason and reality, it regards Besant's turning to theosophy as not only a reasoned response to the problems confronted by Christianity, science and reform at the *fin de siècle*, but also a prime example of the similar spiritual and intellectual quest of many reformers and intellectuals of the time. Theosophy, to Besant, was not only an alternative belief in response to the Victorian crisis of faith, but also offers a set of critiques of modern science that was becoming increasingly dominated by scientific naturalism. Through the mobilization of eastern thought, Besant further advocated an immanentist philosophy, with an emphasis on the ethical duty of self-sacrifice, that helped to sustain her unswerving commitment to practical reform.

Keywords: Theosophy, Theosophical Society, Occultism, Crisis of Faith, Scientific Naturalism

* Associate Professor, Department of History, National Cheng Kung University
Received by October 8, 2014; accepted by February 7, 2015; final revised by January 5, 2017.

前言：謎樣的貝森

1889年某日，眼尖的蕭伯納（George Bernard Shaw, 1856-1950）在英國激進報刊《星報》（*The Star*）辦公桌上瞥見〈我為何成為神智論者？〉這篇文稿，署名竟是安妮·貝森（Annie Besant, 1847-1933）——他的費邊社（Fabian Society）同志和親密友人。他於是火速衝向貝森辦公室，使出雄辯本事，對「神智學會」（Theosophical Society）提出大力抨擊，外加譴責貝森的女性善變。然而，蕭伯納終究無法讓貝森回心轉意。¹ 這一年，貝森成為「神智學會」最受矚目的新成員；兩年後，成為學會在歐洲與印度地區的實質領導人；1907年，擔任世界總會會長，直至辭世。

貝森讓蕭伯納錯愕，也讓後世史家不解的抉擇，正是本文探討焦點。什麼是「神智學」（Theosophy）？什麼是「神智學會」？正當貝森於改革圈中聲望如日中天、社會主義運動前景也一片大好之際，她為何轉向一個旨在宣揚東方宗教傳統的神祕組織（occultist group）？欲回答此一問題，勢將進一步釐清攸關維多利亞文化的幾道重要問題，亦即：「信仰危機」、「科學與宗教之爭」及「信仰與改革關聯」等等。

若說貝森為十九世紀末至二十世紀初這半個世紀間聲名最為響亮的女性改革者應不為過。英國著名報業媒體人史泰德（W. T. Stead, 1849-1912）稱貝森為當世最具影響力的奉獻使徒型（apostolic）女性。² 工黨首任財長菲利浦·斯諾頓（Philip Snowden, 1864-1937）稱許貝森不但具有「絕佳口才與聰明才智」，並且畢生「以驚人活力和超然無私的精神，獻身眾多偉大人道事業」，而這一切，「同代女性無人能及」。³ 社會主義者和工黨大將喬治·蘭斯伯利（George Lansbury, 1859-1940）更嘗言，若欲道盡貝森一生的政治參與，形同書寫一部英國社會與政治變革史。⁴

¹ Bernard Shaw, "Mrs. Besant's Passage through Fabian Socialism," in *The Annie Besant Centenary Book*, ed., James H. Cousins (Adyar, Madras: The Besant Centenary Celebrations Committee, 1947), pp. 17-24, at pp. 23-24. 貝森與蕭伯納交情匪淺，甚至傳有情愫，蕭劇 *Arms and the Man* (1894) 中主角乃以貝森性格為藍本所寫。

² W. T. Stead, "Character Sketch: October. Mrs. Annie Besant," *Review of Reviews*, 4 (Oct., 1891), pp. 349-367, at p. 349.

³ (Multiple authors) *Dr. Annie Besant. Fifty Years in Public Work* (London: Leighton, 1924), p. 25.

⁴ George Lansbury, "Mrs. Besant as a Politician," in Cousins, *The Annie Besant Centenary Book*, pp. 25-33, at p. 25.

貝森年逾八旬，一生投身無數改革運動，舉其綽綽大者，計有現世運動、社會主義運動、工會運動、神智學運動及印度自治運動等。憑藉其演說長才與犀利文筆及組織宣傳能力，貝森總是能在各項運動中迅速竄起，成為眾所矚目的焦點。然而，貝森由於多次跨越乍似不相容的社會運動領域，最後更走向神智學玄祕領域，是以經常引人費解並備受爭議。

貝森的第一部學術性傳記作者威斯特（G. West），描繪貝森一生充滿「戲劇性進展」的「奇觀」（spectacle），即便是想像力豐沛的小說家也無法創造出如此多端之變化，更難以解釋其生命各階段的「斷層」。他甚至結論道，任何企圖尋找貝森生命更深層意義的努力必將徒勞，因為在一切表象下，並不蘊藏任何「和諧」或甚至「靈魂」與「美麗」。⁵ 納德柯特（A. Nethercot）在他堪稱至今最為深入詳盡的傳記中，同樣有著類似評價；「奇怪」、「難以置信」或「謎樣般」是書中常用的形容詞；書末更表明儘管已竭盡全力，仍無法解開貝森生涯轉變之謎。⁶

部分觀察者轉向心理解釋，例如強調女子善變、好勝及自我中心，甚或缺乏獨立自主以致常受男性友人影響等等不一而足。儘管貝森大力反駁，終究不敵父權偏見而難以為一己澄清。這類觀點並因為有著蕭伯納之背書而深植人心，終而成為貝森研究中之主流評價。⁷

在貝森的各段生涯中，又以神智學會階段最受非議，構成後世史家理解上的主要障礙。為何如此？簡單來說，神智學會所投入的幾項主要工作，皆不容易獲得西方學者認可，包括：宗教與神祕傳統之復興、東方思想之推廣，以及對於「超常現象」（paranormal phenomena）⁸如降靈、念力、遙視、心電感應等超能力的探究與開發。以當代理性精神檢驗之，這些活動無異迷信、非理性且保守反動，貝森自也難

⁵ Geoffrey West, *Mrs. Annie Besant* (London: Gerald Howe, 1927), pp. 7, 12, 88.

⁶ A. Nethercot, *The First Five Lives of Annie Besant* (London: R. Hart-Davis, 1961), p. 9; A. Nethercot, *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant* (London: R. Hart-Davis, 1963), pp. 461-462.

⁷ 參閱 G. Bernard Shaw, "Annie Besant and the 'Secret Doctrine'," *The Freethinker*, December 14, 1947, p. 450; George Bernard Shaw, *An Autobiography 1856-1898* (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1969), p. 85; Arthur H. Nethercot, "G. B. S. and Annie Besant," *Bulletin (Shaw Society of America)*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Sept. 1955), pp. 1-14; Nethercot, *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant*; Anne Taylor, *Annie Besant: A Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 249, 330; Willard Wolfe, *From Radicalism to Socialism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), pp. 232-238.

⁸ 超常現象乃 1920 年代後之慣用語。十九世紀末，人們則多稱之為「精神現象」（psychic phenomenon）或「超自然現象」（supernatural phenomenon）。本文採當代用語，除非另有特定指涉。

獲正面評價，往往被認為步入神祕超驗世界，背棄先前的理性與進步理念，形同終結其改革志業。⁹

類此評價，亦有學界理論之支撐。受馬克思·韋伯（Max Weber, 1864-1920）與艾密爾·涂爾幹（Émile Durkheim, 1858-1917）等人的現代化理論影響，史學界於二十世紀大半時期，普遍將文明發展視為一逐步「除魅」（disenchantment）的歷程。在此一過程中，人們對於宇宙的理解，由宗教轉為科學，並漸趨理性。此一「世俗化」（secularisation）歷程以啟蒙為開端，標幟了「現代化」（modernisation）的起始，「世俗化」與「現代化」於是互為表裡，同為文明正向指標。在此觀點下，英國十九世紀下半期的重要發展如演化論、科學自然主義之興起、對於宗教的各類批判及基督信仰之式微等等，皆代表著英國逐步邁向「世俗化」與「現代化」的正面歷程。相對地，神智學所依附的靈學運動（spiritualist movement）、神祕學復興（occultist revival）以及不為主流科學界所認可的超常研究等，則是「前現代」之象徵，是邊緣的、反理性、反科學，乃至於反進步的。¹⁰

然而，過去數十年來，幾股底蘊相通的學術發展，逐步修正了傳統觀點，並為貝森的神智學轉向帶來了新的理解可能性。

文化史於七、八零年代的興起，首先帶動了對於非正統民間宗教與靈性運動的重視。紀斯·湯瑪斯（Keith Thomas, 1933-）在他的開創性著作《宗教與魔法之衰退》中，將史家眼光導向不容於神學正統但卻普及於民間的各種法術，包括占星學、巫術、巫醫、通靈、預言及神怪傳說等。¹¹ 在文化人類學及文學理論的持續影響下，史家開始在看似荒誕無稽的日常生活信仰與儀式中，尋找理解世界的鑰匙，相信它

⁹ 例如下述文集雖收錄貝森的社會與政治性文章，卻未納入其加入神智學會後具有同樣屬性之作品：John Saville, *A Selection of the Social and Political Pamphlets of Annie Besant* (New York: A. M. Kelley, 1970).

¹⁰ 參閱 Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation," in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 129-156. 對此史學傳統之檢討，參閱 Alex Owen, *The Place of Enchantment: British Occultism and the Culture of the Modern* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), pp. 1-16; S. J. D. Green, *Religion in the Age of Decline: Organisation and Experience in Industrial Yorkshire, 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 1-30. 史界世俗化理論代表作，參閱 Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).

¹¹ Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971), p. ix, 9. 湯瑪斯雖為主題上之開創者，並嘗試於宗教分析中納入結構主義人類學思維，但仍接受韋伯現代化/世俗化理論架構，並視其處理課題為現世化之例證，參閱 Keith Thomas, "An Anthropology of Religion and Magic, II," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 6 (1975), pp. 91-109.

們構成一套完整符號與象徵體系，經由詮釋，便可如文本般揭露過去文化與集體心靈之結構。過去被斥為異端與迷信之文化現象，例如神祕學、超自然研究、民間信仰等課題之正當性，便也隨之水漲船高，與上層的、菁英的、「理性的」思想傳統，一同競逐於史學議程之中。¹²

其次，在科學史方面，在米歇·傅柯（Michel Foucault, 1926-1984）及湯瑪斯·孔恩（Thomas Kuhn, 1922-1996）等人的影響下，打破了傳統科學真理觀；人們不再視知識建構與科學發展為一由無知到理性、單純由事實與邏輯所支配的直線進程，而是一個深涉社會文化脈絡，並具有高度政治性的協商與較勁過程。此一認知轉變，讓史家不再以當代主流科學觀點評價過去；當代科學之「真理宣稱」亦不再是史家尺規，知識也被還原為價值與利益之載體而成為社會分析對象。過去遭貶抑或忽略的「非正統」科學，如煉金術、骨相學、催眠術、神祕學及靈異研究等，紛紛躍上檯面，不再被視為「科學」的對立面，而是「科學」概念的競爭者或協同定義者，共同促成科學最終樣貌與成就。在此一修正潮流之下，科學雖失去其統一性與所謂客觀超然，顯得紛雜斷裂而難以馴服，卻也尋回科學與社會之間應有的緊密互動。¹³

此外，過去數十年來，學界亦開始挑戰「世俗化論述」（secularization theory），不再接受「科學/理性推進=宗教/心靈式微」之簡化歷史進程。¹⁴ 學者注意到，部分

¹² 參閱 Peter Burke, *What is Cultural History?* (Cambridge: Polity, 2004); Anna Green, *Cultural History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

¹³ 這方面的理論與發展回顧，參閱 Michel Foucault, *"Society Must be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-76* (New York: Picador, 1997); Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1991); Jan Golinski, *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)。與本文主題相關之近年著作，參閱 Alex Owen, *The Darkened Room: Women, Power and Spiritualism in Late Victorian England* (London: Virago Press, 1989); Roger Luckhurst, *The Invention of Telepathy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Owen, *The Place of Enchantment*; John van Wyhe, *Phrenology and the Origins of Victorian Scientific Naturalism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); Nicola Bown and Carolyn Burdett, eds., *The Victorian Supernatural* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Jill Galvan, *The Sympathetic Medium: Feminine Channeling, the Occult, and Communication Technologies 1859-1919* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010); S. McCorristine, *Spectres of the Self: Thinking about Ghosts and Ghost-Seeing in England, 1750-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); A. Butler, *Victorian Occultism and the Making of Modern Magic: Invoking Tradition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Tatiana Kontou and Sarah Willburn, eds., *The Ashgate Research Companion to Nineteenth-Century Spiritualism and the Occult* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012).

¹⁴ 此一轉變，乃因各類難以納入理論框架的實證研究所致，另一方面亦與前述學界對於知識之權力本質與日俱增之警覺有關；那假定宗教必與理性精神對立之世俗化理論，被指出同樣為一「相競信仰」而非超然解釋架構，而那受此信仰引導的思想史主流傳統，也被指出乃是承繼啟蒙傳統的二十世紀學者在自我定義與學術正當化上的有效工具及權力伸展之所。參閱 Frank M. Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Mark Poster, *Cultural History + Postmodernity: Disciplinary*

機構性宗教或許曾經歷衰退，廣義的宗教卻從未消失，反倒以更多樣形式，在不同時空脈絡下，持續發揮影響。宗教的「多元轉化」，取代了「式微」論；宗教經驗之多重形式與不同發展模式，以及宗教與現實之持續互動等，也成為史家關注的新焦點。受此影響，與神祕傳統相關的各類思想與術數，例如煉金、召靈、占星、魔術、塔羅及共濟會等，亦重新獲得重視，並與超常研究及各類「邊緣科學」，在過去十多年來，成為文化史另一快速成長領域。¹⁵

上述學術潮流轉變，為理解貝森及其神智學轉向打下基礎，各種研究成果自然也成為本文之取材。本文擱置「真偽」之辨，並不以今日認知檢驗研究主體之真理宣稱，而是透過多方面之脈絡化工作，以建立其時代合理性。¹⁶ 我將首先回顧貝森一生主要轉折，建立其生涯整體性之理解；接著，焦點轉向神智學會，以及它之於貝森及當代人們的意涵；我將以神智學的三大宗旨做為切入點，亦即從宗教、科學與社會改革等三方面，於相應時代脈絡下進行分析。

我將指出，貝森之神智學轉向，不但具有高度時代標誌意義，同時也具有時代合理性。首先，神智學之於貝森及當代眾人，乃是時代信仰危機下的另類靈性選項，滿足人們靈性與倫理需求。其次，在當代科學發展歷程中，神智學亦扮演重要批判角色，挑戰科學自然主義，並企圖融合科學與宗教。最後，透過對於東方思想的挪用，神智學會在貝森領導下，亦發展出一套強調眾生一體與自我犧牲的行動哲學，參與社會改造工作。¹⁷ 是以貝森的神智學轉向，不但可視為十九世紀末人們心靈和智識探索的一個縮影，亦是對於世紀末英國社會、文化與政治發展的適切回應。

Readings and Challenges (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 134-152.

¹⁵ 相關史學檢討，參閱 David Nash, "Reconnecting Religion with Social and Cultural History: Secularization's Failure as a Master Narrative," *Cultural and Social History*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (2004), pp. 302-325; Howard Kerr, ed., *The Occult in America: New Historical Perspectives* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), pp. 1-37; Peter Mandler, "Cultural Histories Old and New: Rereading the Work of Janet Oppenheim," *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Autumn 1997), pp. 69-105; Ira Katznelson and Gareth Stedman Jones, eds., *Religion and the Political Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); S. J. D. Green, *Religion in the Age of Decline: Organisation and Experience in Industrial Yorkshire, 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

¹⁶ 此一取向，類似 Quentin Skinner 對於信仰系統所主張的研究方法——不做真偽判斷，而只求理解信仰之時代合理性，參閱 Quentin Skinner, "Truth and Explanation in History," in M. E. H. Nicolette Mout and Werner Stauffacher, eds., *Truth in Science, the Humanities, and Religion* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2010), pp. 89-95; Quentin Skinner and Christopher Ricks, "Up for Interpretation or What Is This Thing that Hearsay Is Not?" *Literary Imagination*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (2012), pp. 125-142; Quentin Skinner, "Lecture A: Truth and the Historian," Academia Sinica, Taipei, May 2013. 另參閱持類似方法論主張的 Mark Bevir, *The Logic of the History of Ideas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chapters 5 & 6.

¹⁷ 本文亦不把神智學視為一套固定不變的知識與實踐模式，而是隨著詮釋角度的不同，而有不同的內涵風貌。神智學在十九世紀末與二十世紀初在貝森領導下，亦有其特殊發展取向。詳見第四節。

壹、由基督教到神智學

貝森於自傳中曾道，她的生命故事非其所屬，其所映照者，乃是那充滿不安與渴求的年代中無數靈魂的相同掙扎。¹⁸ 亦有學者曾謂，貝森生命似乎是「依循著維多利亞時代的通俗劇腳本寫成」。¹⁹ 貝森一生，儘管充滿戲劇性轉折，但這些轉折卻非孤立現象，而是連結於更大時代潮流：無論是由虔信到懷疑，由現世主義（Secularism）到社會主義，或是最終轉向神智學運動，盡皆如此。

安妮·伍德（Annie Wood）於 1847 年出生於虔信的維多利亞時代（1831-1901）一個愛爾蘭裔的倫敦中產階級家庭。父早逝，母親體弱，安妮自九歲起便寄居友人家中接受家庭教育。貝森的家庭教師是位虔誠的福音主義者，特別著重宗教與道德教育，並在生活上貫徹喀爾文式教規，教導安妮謹守安息日，遠離戲劇與舞會等撒旦誘惑。貝森自述，自幼充滿浪漫宗教情懷，好讀經書，仰慕基督並熱衷禱告，甚至自我鞭笞以考驗自我，並深深著迷於《天路歷程》及彌爾頓之《失樂園》中善惡交戰的故事，經常幻想自己乃是力戰惡魔終獲聖寵的英雄人物或光榮殉道者。基督的道德典範亦支配著貝森的宗教幻想，使其宗教情感染上一層濃厚的道德色彩。貝森的基督崇拜，也讓她自少女時期便渴望成為一位效法基督、摒棄自我為眾人服務的修女。²⁰

二十歲時，貝森嫁給一位聖公會牧師法蘭克·貝森（Frank Besant），她幻想牧師之妻理應是僅次於修女的神聖道路，藉以奉獻自我。但這幻想很快就被現實所摧毀。貝森丈夫接受十九世紀傳統性別觀，堅信男性乃一家之主，要求妻子凡事順從。然而，貝森卻對家管與事夫興趣缺缺，同時對於靈性生活與知識探索依然有著高度渴望，婚姻最終劃下句點。²¹

¹⁸ Annie Besant, *Annie Besant: An Autobiography* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893), p. 5.

¹⁹ Peter van der Veer, *Imperial Encounters: Religion and Modernity in India and Britain* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), p. 63.

²⁰ Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 35-57; Annie Besant, *Autobiographical Sketches* (London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1885), pp. 16-27.

²¹ Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 65-69, 71, 81.

貝森有一對兒女。1871年，兒女接連大病，幾近喪命。孩子的無辜受苦，讓維多利亞時代中期以來席捲英國社會的「信仰懷疑」(crisis of faith)風暴，驟然侵襲貝森生命。如同當代眾多信仰懷疑者，這場個人的生命重大事件，讓貝森開始強烈質疑神之存在與良善；孩童的無辜受苦，也讓貝森懷疑基督教義中的「罪愆」、「救贖」、「地獄」與「永世懲罰」等概念是否合理。她開始大量閱讀無論是虔信派、開明派或異端者的宗教作品，同時也接觸衝擊基督教信仰的各類科學理論如演化論及聖經考證等。經過激烈探索，貝森終於揚棄傳統基督教條，不再相信基督神性，並對神之存有採不可知立場。既已不接受基督神性，貝森便也無法再行聖餐禮。做為牧師之妻，這無疑是一場醜聞。夫家於是發出最後通牒，要她在基督教或離家兩者之間做一抉擇。貝森在1873年選擇了分居，帶著女兒，不忌社會眼光，展開獨立生活。²²

單身母親的生活縱然辛苦，但貝森卻利用這份自由，廣泛交遊於倫敦思想激進圈中。在友人鼓勵下，她也開始撰寫宣傳小冊，發表宗教異端思想。²³ 1874年，貝森在大英圖書館讀到「全國現世協會」(National Secular Society; 1866-)的宣傳刊物《全國改革者》(*National Reformer*)，深感共鳴之下，投身現世運動(Secularist movement)。

現世運動是活躍於1860至1880年代的一股激進政治勢力，支持者多來自中下階層，主要領導團體就是「全國現世協會」。²⁴ 它承襲了啟蒙運動及法國大革命以來的理性批判精神和現實關懷；宗教上，高舉理性與科學精神，批判基督教條與教會特權；政治上，隸屬自由黨的外圍激進團體，支持國會改革、共和主義、土地改革、愛爾蘭自治、工人與弱勢族群權益之爭取等。在〈褻瀆法〉(Blasphemy Laws)依舊存在、褻瀆神祇與批判教會動輒觸法的年代，此一運動所力爭的尚且包括信仰、言論、出版與集會結社等自由，也因之另有「自由思想運動」(freethought movement)之稱，成員則自視為「自由思想者」(freethinker)。

²² Besant, *Annie Besant*, p. 117.

²³ 此時作品包括 *On the Deity of Jesus of Nazareth* (London: Thomas Scott, 1873); *According to Saint John* (London: Thomas Scott, 1873); *On the Nature and Existence of God* (London: Thomas Scott, 1874). 婚後的貝森已有文字創作，曾撰寫聖徒故事和培靈作品，參閱 T. R. Wright, *The Religion of Humanity: The Impact of Comtean Positivism on Victorian Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 157.

²⁴ 關於現世運動，參閱 Edward Royle, *Victorian Infidels: The Origins of the British Secularist Movement 1791-1866* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1974); Edward Royle, *Radicals, Secularists and Republicans: Popular Freethought in Britain, 1866-1915* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980).

現世運動時期的貝森，雖如多數運動者一般自稱「無神論者」(atheist)，但其立場似乎更接近「不可知論」。她強調，她並非宣稱「世上無神」(no God)，而是認為不存在神之概念 (without God)，因為她無從證明神之存在。²⁵ 現世運動允許成員擁有不同神學觀點，但有一明確主張，亦即「關注神不如關注人，服侍神不如服侍人」；與其冀望虛無飄渺的死後報償，不如共創人間樂土。他們秉持效益主義，呼籲人們透過具體行動，減輕人類整體痛苦，提昇整體快樂。基督教教義如「救贖」與「永生」，在他們看來，不但無助於消弭人間疾苦，甚至往往成為教會合理化社會現況的概念工具。對於「現世」(secular) 而非天上事務的關切，也正是該運動名稱之由來。

貝森入會後不久，迅即成為「全國現世協會」副會長，與會長查爾斯·布拉德夫 (Charles Bradlaugh, 1833-1891) 齊名，攜手挑戰時下各類宗教、政治與道德禁忌。貝森的關切，此時也由宗教和靈性問題，擴展至政治問題如農民處境、土地稅賦、愛爾蘭自治、戰爭與殖民、死刑與肉體刑罰及牴觸基督教性道德觀的節育問題等。²⁶

自 1870 年代中期起，貝森領導世俗主義運動的十年之間，英國社會與政治也起了莫大變化，為貝森埋下另一轉折軌道。1870 年代末期，英國陷入經濟蕭條；國際上，面臨後來居上之工業國家的競爭；國內則面臨失業人口遽增、貧窮擴大、住屋不足與環境惡劣等問題。這一切，在在突顯經濟自由主義的弊端與窘態，並成為社會主義思想的溫床。

現世運動與社會主義運動皆屬英國激進政治傳統之一環，對於底層人民生活、弱勢族群、國會改革、言論自由等問題有著共同關注。兩者最大差異則是在於經濟思想面向。「全國現世協會」與自由黨一致，支持市場經濟和自由貿易政策；社會主義者則反對經濟上之自由放任，期待國家發揮更大功能，企圖推動土地國有化、生產工具公有化等經濟措施，以根除結構上的不平等。1880 年代，社會主義團體如

²⁵ Annie Besant, *The Gospel of Atheism* (London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1877), p. 5.

²⁶ 1876 年，貝森和布拉德夫因鼓吹節育及諾頓案 (the Knowlton trial) 而聲名大噪。故事起因於，有一名書商，因為販賣一位美國醫師諾頓所寫的鼓吹自由戀愛與節育的書籍《哲學之果實》(*Fruits of Philosophy*)，觸犯〈淫穢出版法〉(Obscene Publications Act, 1857) 而遭逮捕判刑。得知此事，兩人如法炮製，重新印刷並散發這本小冊子，以身試法，藉以挑戰言論禁忌。此案在英國言論與出版自由史上占有重要地位，但貝森也因之付出個人重大代價。她的夫婿以其不信神和不道德思想為由，指控貝森無法提供孩童良好教養，奪回女兒監護權。關於諾頓案，參閱 Susan Budd, *Varieties of Unbelief: Atheists and Agnostics in English Society 1850-1960* (London: Heinemann, 1977), pp. 56-60; Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 205-244。

「社會民主同盟」(Social Democratic Federation; 1882)、「費邊社」(1884)及「社會主義同盟」(Socialist League; 1885)陸續成立，吸納社會日增之不滿，也為改革者描繪出另一套理想社會遠景。做為新興改革勢力，社會主義運動一方面經常劍拔弩張地與現世運動激辯有關個人主義與集體主義，或自由主義與社會主義孰優孰劣之問題，另一方面則視現世運動為其最佳新血招募處，吸引大批激進工人加入。²⁷

綜觀兩者勢力消長，自 1880 年代中期社會主義勢力迅速擴展之際，也正是現世運動逐漸消退、支持者紛紛轉向社會主義陣營之時。貝森亦順應時代改革風向，接受社會主義之經濟分析，在 1885 年加入以「漸進改革」和「滲透策略」著稱的「費邊社」。²⁸

貝森此舉原本不足為奇，但她做為世俗主義運動領導人的身分，卻引發軒然大波。此事一經公開，立刻引來同志撻伐，指控貝森「變節」與「背叛」。²⁹ 做為介紹貝森加入費邊社的推薦人蕭伯納自然樂見此事。他認為，這對現世運動之衝擊，一如「尼加拉瓜瀑布被轟炸」或「宏偉教堂被地震吞沒」那樣的災難。³⁰ 詆毀貝森這女子頭腦像「牛奶罐」，總是受到男性左右等具性別歧視的各種評價，也紛紛出籠。³¹

貝森加入社會主義陣營後，夾其名望與才幹，迅即成為領導階層。此時社會主義運動者關懷目標十分多元，無論是貧窮與失業、女工待遇、兒童健康、學童教育、縮減工時、改善工作條件、救援政治犯與外國流亡人士、工會組織、爭取集會結社自由等，都少不了貝森衝鋒陷陣的突出身影。貝森此時最受矚目的兩樁事蹟，乃是 1887 年 11 月 13 日為突破特拉法加廣場(Trafalgar Square)集會禁令所舉辦的遊行，以及 1888 年的火柴女工罷工事件。前者因警方暴力鎮壓而演變為「血腥周日」(Bloody Sunday)，一人死亡、數十人受傷及上百人被捕，貝森與報界大亨史泰德後續並為被逮捕者成立「法律與自由聯盟」(Law and Liberty League)，提供司法辯護與生活協助，也為英國集會權之爭取立下重要里程碑。後者則是協助百瑞梅

²⁷ 參閱 Edward Royle, ed., *The Infidel Tradition from Paine to Bradlaugh* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), pp. 174-180.

²⁸ 參閱 Annie Besant, "Why I am a Socialist," in John Saville, *A Selection of the Social and Political Pamphlets of Annie Besant* (New York: A. M. Kelley, 1970). 此時由現世運動轉往社會主義運動的著名改革者包括 Bernard Shaw, John Burns, Edward Carpenter, J. L. Joynes, Henry Salt, William Clarke, Edward Aveling, Herbert Burrows, John Bruce Glasier, Tom Maguire, Tom Mann, George Lansbury 等人。

²⁹ 參閱 G. W. Foote, "The Latest Apostle of Socialism," *Progress*, June 1886, pp. 266-273.

³⁰ Shaw, "Mrs. Besant's Passage through Fabian Socialism," in *The Annie Besant Centenary Book*, p. 18.

³¹ Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 315-316.

(Bryant & May)火柴女工籌組工會及罷工，並發動杯葛百瑞梅產品及施壓股東等，最後贏得勝利。此一事件並帶動「新工會主義」之興起，讓英國工會運動手段日趨激烈，並擴展至為數眾多的無技術勞工。³²

不過，投入社會主義運動不到五年，亦即 1889 年，貝森再度轉換軌道加入神智學會。這也使她再度陷入爭議並蒙受更多汙名，並引來蕭伯納抨擊。

日後四十餘載，貝森將精力投注於神智學運動，未曾改變。她在自傳中說，她的生命自此「由風暴回歸平靜」，找到了「家」。³³ 但神智學會究竟是個什麼樣的組織，讓貝森甘冒大不諱，投身其中？這是否意味著貝森改革事業的終結，背叛了先前理念？我們該如何理解貝森此一轉折？以下我將分別由維多利亞時代的信仰、科學與改革等三方面來回答。

貳、神智學做為靈性選項

神智學宗旨之一：「提倡亞利安 (Aryan) 和其它東方文學、宗教與科學研究。」³⁴

欲掌握神智學會的基本屬性，必須由十九世紀下半期的信仰危機談起。

維多利亞時代雖是虔誠年代，同時也是個懷疑年代。十八世紀末，福音主義興起，帶動了英國新一波宗教復興運動，人們渴望回歸內在靈性，強調宗教之於生命之真實意義，並期盼宗教能帶來教會、社會及個人道德生命的全面轉化。這波宗教復興運動在社會上掀起強大情緒力量，帶動一股由內到外的心靈與社會改造運動，促進十九世紀蓬勃的慈善與傳教事業及道德風俗改革等運動。最重要的是，它使「宗

³² 關於此次罷工，參閱王文霞，〈英國工會運動的發展—倫敦火柴女工罷工與其對新工會主義的影響 (1888)〉，《成大西洋史集刊》，第 10 期 (2006)，頁 255-286；另參閱 Annie Besant, "To the Shareholders of the Bryant & May Company, Limited," *The Link*, Jul. 4, 1888, pp. 1-2.

³³ Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 338, 364.

³⁴ Blavatsky, *The Key to Theosophy*, p. 39. 亞利安種族此處乃指印度人。十九世紀中期的種族理論中，存有「亞利安種族」(Aryan race) 的概念，他們相信亞利安是一個居住於印度北部膚色較淺的人種，早期征服了印度南部膚色較黑的土著後，創造出吠陀宗教與印度文明。關於此一理論之檢討，參閱 Thomas R. Trautmann, *Aryans and British India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

教」深植人心，發揮了前所未有的左右力量；宗教提供人們生命意義的來源及生存目的，乃至提供道德基礎及整個國家社稷發展之依歸。

但在另一方面，十九世紀時，無論是智識、政治或社會的快速變遷，卻也讓基督教面臨空前挑戰。智識上，地質學、演化論、人種學及聖經考證等各類知識，一波波質疑著聖經中的歷史敘事與核心教義；政治上，民主思想與中產階級勢力的崛起，亦嚴厲挑戰國教派在政治上的特權，打擊教會對於政治的不當支配；在社會上，快速變遷之都市化與工業化社會中下層人們的生活處境，也每每在經濟衰退時期醞釀出巨大反體制聲浪，並映照出教會之道德漠然及其所處的既得利益位置。這一切，空前震撼了教會體制與正統教義，並自 1840 年代起，引發歷時約半個世紀的「信仰危機」。當那做為生命根基之宗教一旦動搖，個人的生命也仿如經歷一場重大災難。此時，人們往往以「洪水」、「暴風」、「沈船」或「地震」等字眼來描繪這場來勢凶猛、天崩地裂般的經驗。這個由虔信到懷疑的歷程，正是貝森所經歷，也正是維多利亞時代人們的共同生命經驗。³⁵

過去，在世俗化理論影響下，史家傾向於將這時期的「信仰懷疑」視為是單純的「信仰喪失」，認為它使社會得以「除魅」，同時也為「理性之現代」打下根基。然而，在近年來宗教社會史的重建下，我們明白，懷疑未必是靈性探索的終結或信仰的喪失；福音主義之深入人心，往往促使人們持續找尋各類攸關生命意義之宗教解答；社會與政治之快速轉變，同時也驅使人們不斷尋求相應於現實變化的信仰體系。這也造成十九世紀信仰危機之一特色，那就是，懷疑者所拋棄的並非「宗教」自身，而是宗教之「舊有形式」；他們所求的，則是宗教之「內在轉化」與其真實精神之「復興」。³⁶ 也因此，十九世紀後半期儘管基督教信念鬆動，卻有著更為多元紛雜的信仰方案，在那依舊熱絡的信仰市集中各自爭取人們的認同。而神智學會對準人們此一宗教與倫理需求，一方面持續批判傳統基督宗教，另一方面卻也將自身打造為正統基督教之外的更佳信仰替代選項。

神智學的希臘文 *theosophia* 乃「神聖智慧」之意，泛指一切有關神之知識。神

³⁵ 參閱 Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), pp. 64-67.

³⁶ 參閱 James Moore, "Theodicy and Society: The Crisis of the Intelligentsia," in Bernard Lightman and Richard Helmstadler, eds., *Victorian Faith in Crisis* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 153-186.

智學會，顧名思義，乃是要追求一切有關神之知識，涵蓋一切有關人、世界與神之起源、本質、目的與法則等課題。神智學會由俄國人海倫·布拉瓦茲基（Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, 1831-1891；後簡稱布氏）及美國軍官亨利·歐考特（Henry Steel Olcott, 1832-1907）於 1875 年在紐約創立。³⁷ 1878 年，學會轉往英國發展，並將總部遷至印度後，逐步發展成為一世界性組織。至 1925 年成立五十周年時，已遍及全球 41 個國家 1571 個分會（lodges），擁有逾四萬名活躍成員。³⁸

神智學會主要有兩個起源：西方神祕主義思想傳統（occultism）³⁹及靈學運動（spiritualist movement）。這兩個運動之興起，都與信仰危機脫離不了關係。

十九世紀下半期，在宗教與科學激烈衝突與交融之時代背景下，歐陸之知識階層再度興起一波神祕主義復興運動。在英國，諸多團體成立於 1880 年代，而神智學會乃是其中最為龐大且最具社會影響力者。⁴⁰ 做為「神祕論者」（occultists），神智學會相信世上存在著一套有關人、神與宇宙奧祕的神聖知識。在追尋這套知識的過程中，特別尊崇內在精神、主體意識與想像等力量，相信透過它們將獲得關於宇宙與生命本質更為深沉且完整的理解，並能超越傳統感官與理性的侷限。他們尚且相信，「精神」對於物質世界的支配力量遠超過人們所知；透過神祕知識的發掘及內在意識的開發，人們將可邁向更高精神境界，並獲取更大能力，帶來個人與整體世界的靈性轉化。⁴¹

³⁷ 布氏出身俄國貴族，致力於神祕研究；早年離家廣遊各地，足跡遍及歐洲、中東、美洲及印度；自稱在西藏學習七年，獲高人真傳神祕知識。歐考特則出身中產階級，活躍於紐約都會知識菁英圈中，廣泛從事社會改革工作。關於布氏生平，參閱 Sylvia Cranston, *HPB: The Extraordinary Life and Influence of Helena Blavatsky* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1993)。關於歐考特，參閱 Stephen Prothero, "From Spiritualism to Theosophy: 'Uplifting' a Democratic Tradition," *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (1993), pp. 197-216.

³⁸ 引自 Theodore Besterman, *The Mind of Annie Besant* (London: Theosophical Publishing House, 1927), p. 111.

³⁹ 西方文明兩大思想支柱——希臘理性傳統與基督教聖經傳統——之外的另一個常遭忽略的思想傳統。神祕主義內涵紛雜，不易定義。在神祕主義標籤下，匯集一組彼此連結鬆散的知識、學派與傳統，例如諾斯底主義（Gnosticism）、卡巴拉（Kabbalah）、新柏拉圖主義（Neo-Platonism）、赫密斯主義（Hermeticism）及煉金術（Alchemy）等。自文藝復興時期起，許多學者企圖融合與復興這些傳統，進而帶來共濟會（Freemasonry）、玫瑰十字派（Rosicrucianism）及瑞典堡教派（Swedenborgianism）等神祕團體的發展。有關西方神祕傳統的發展，參閱 Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, *The Western Esoteric Traditions: A Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Olav Hammer, *Claiming Knowledge: Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

⁴⁰ 此時致力於神祕研究的團體有「赫密斯會」（Hermetic Society; 1884）、「黃金黎明團」（Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn; 1888）及「煉金會」（Alchemical Society; 1912）等。

⁴¹ Occultism 與 Esotericism 常互換使用。關於 Esotericism 的界定，學界普遍接受 Antoine Faivre 於 1992 年在 *L'Esoterisme* 所歸納的四個主要與二個次要信仰特色：1. 宇宙萬般事物間的無形連結及相互影響；2. 自然乃具有生命並存有神性；3. 想像力與冥想在獲取靈性知識上的重要角色；4. 靈性轉化與成長的可

對於知識，神智論者受神祕傳統影響，持有兩項基本信念。首先，神智論者相信，各類知識傳統，尤其是各古老宗教，儘管外在形式迥異，內在核心精神卻頗為一致，蘊含共同義理。⁴² 在援引傳統上，神智學會不僅企圖融合西方傳統諸如新柏拉圖主義或源自猶太教的卡巴拉，乃至古埃及與古希臘羅馬的神話與宗教，並且也積極推展東方宗教思想，成為十九世紀末英國在宣揚印、佛等思想上最具大眾影響力的團體。

此外，神智論者相信神聖知識之「祕傳」屬性。他們認為，在歷史上，人們因害怕神聖知識遭人褻瀆與濫用或當權者打壓，刻意將之隱藏於不同形式與象徵符號下，僅少數「高人」才能擁有這些知識或通曉解讀之法；也因此，探尋神聖知識者須仰賴高人指引才得以入門。⁴³ 布氏和幾位學會核心領導，便曾宣稱獲得幾名隱居於西藏、隸屬「偉大白色兄弟團」(Great White Brotherhood)的「尊師」(Mahatmas)所親自傳授。在學會中，尊師享有最高地位，話語如聖旨，會中重大事務包括神智學會的發展方向及職務交接等，往往以尊師之名行之。那些能獲得尊師親傳者，自然也享有更大權威。⁴⁴ 尊師從未現身，但其旨意卻能神祕地浮現於信紙之上，或出現於夢中與各種異象，有時則藉布氏之「無意識書寫」(automatic writing)傳達。貝森在握有領導權後，亦宣稱其東方知識乃尊師所傳。難以驗證的尊師概念，使得神智學會常遭非議；學會亦曾因權力爭奪，發生假造尊師信件之醜聞。⁴⁵

神智學會於十九世紀末的發展，另得力於十九世紀下半期盛行於英國的靈學運動，因此往往也被史家視為靈學運動的一環。

靈學運動有個著名起源傳說。1848年，紐約州一屋宅經常傳出怪聲。家中三姊妹(the Fox sisters)認為是靈界之聲，於是發明了一套敲打溝通方式與亡靈溝通，

能性；5. 所有宗教間的一致核心真理；6. 神祕知識須經高人傳授。參閱 Christine Rhone, *Western Esotericism* (New York: State University of New York, 2010), pp. 1-24; Kennet Granholm, "The Sociology of Esotericism," in Peter Bernard Clarke, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 783-800, at pp. 784-786.

⁴² 參閱 H. P. Blavatsky, *The Key to Theosophy* (Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 2002 [1889]), p. 58; Annie Besant, *The Ancient Wisdom: An Outline of Theosophical Teachings* (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1899), pp. 5-7.

⁴³ 參閱 H. P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine* (London: Theosophical Publishing Company, 1888), p. vii, xxxiv, xl.

⁴⁴ 參閱 Arthur Lillie, *Madame Blavatsky and Her "Theosophy": A Study* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1895), p. vii.

⁴⁵ 參閱 Bruce F. Campbell, *Ancient Wisdom Revived: A History of the Theosophical Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 103-111.

得知亡靈遭人殺害的過往。姐妹中兩人後來成為專業靈媒，巡迴各地演出，帶動亡靈溝通的風潮，催生一個日後兼具靈性、科學及表演與娛樂等面向的運動。1850年代，該運動傳入英國，流行於社會各階層直至十九世紀末。⁴⁶ 無論皇室貴族、都會專業階層或工人社區，皆熱衷於降靈會（séances）或專業靈媒的公演，並企圖對各種「顯靈」（spirit manifestation）現象如發出聲響、轉動桌椅、樂器自彈、靈魂現形與靈媒傳話等提出解釋。

布氏與歐考特相遇於美國靈學運動中，兩人皆為積極參與者。在紐約，布氏常在她的曼哈頓公寓中舉辦類似降靈會活動，宣稱可隔空製造聲響，讓破碎瓷盤復原，或是讓捎自尊師的信件自天花板降落等等。⁴⁷ 但與一般通靈者不同的是，神智論者認為各類神奇顯靈並非透過靈媒中介，而是接受高人祕傳者的有意識作為；高人因通曉奧祕知識，具有操控奧祕法則的能力，得以創造出各種看似神奇的現象。也因此，神智學會在創立之初，乃是以靈學運動的改革者自居。他們強調，異能奇技並非重點，重要的是對於背後神祕知識之系統性探索。他們同時也批判那些充斥市面的詐騙靈媒及著迷於靈異現象而無意於嚴肅哲學探究者；神祕知識及其背後更為深刻的哲學和宇宙觀，才是他們所企求。⁴⁸ 因為信念上的差異，靈學運動與神智學會經常針鋒相對，關係時好時壞，但他們對於神祕現象的共同興趣，卻也讓靈學運動始終是神智學會的最佳新血招募處。神智學會於 1880 年代在英國的會員數得以大幅成長，極大程度也得歸功於時興的靈學浪潮。⁴⁹

回歸神智學會在當代仰問題上所扮演的角色。對於十九世紀下半期神祕主義的

⁴⁶ 關於英國靈學運動，參閱 Alan Gauld, *The Founders of Psychical Research* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968); Ruth Brandon, *The Spiritualists: The Passion for the Occult in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: Prometheus Books, 1984); Janet Oppenheim, *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850-1910* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Logie Barrow, *Independent Spirits: Spiritualism and English Plebeians, 1850-1910* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986); Alex Owen, *The Darkened Room: Women, Power and Spiritualism in Late Victorian England* (London: Virago Press, 1989; reprint Chicago University Press, 2004); Owen, *The Place of Enchantment*. 史家估計，靈學運動於十九世紀末、二十世紀初之成員約在一到十萬人之間，參閱 Gauld, *The Founders of Psychical Research*, p. 77; Oppenheim, *The Other World*, p. 50.

⁴⁷ 見註釋 99。

⁴⁸ 參閱 Blavatsky, *The Key to Theosophy*, p. xii, 31; H. S. Olcott, *Inaugural Address of the President of the Theosophical Society* (New York: Theosophical Society, 1875); Prothero, "From Spiritualism to Theosophy," *Religion and American Culture*, pp. 203-205.

⁴⁹ 參閱 Oppenheim, *The Other World*, pp. 162-174; Frank Podmore, *Modern Spiritualism: A History and a Criticism* (London: Methuen & Co., 1902), pp. 175-176.

復興及靈學運動的盛行，史家主要以「替代信仰」(surrogate faith) 觀點解釋。⁵⁰ 首先，神祕主義並不與宗教對立，它所企圖復興的，正是存在於西方文明中，著重「靈性」(spirituality) 與「意識」等內在心靈力量的思想與靈性傳統。而靈學運動儘管具有商業與娛樂色彩，依然具有一定的靈性內涵。降靈會中超乎一般物理法則的奇異現象，在靈學論者的解釋下，往往被用來肯定基督教的幾個重要信念，例如靈魂不朽 (immortality)、精神之個體性、未來天上生命 (future life)、人與靈溝通之可能性等，帶給懷疑世代中人們某種信仰確認與心靈慰藉。儘管靈學運動各派對於基督信仰褒貶不一，但因他們對於靈魂與永生的基本信念，卻也具有一定的靈性與宗教氣息。運動刊物中常見對於宗教主題的熱烈討論，例如靈魂本質、道德基礎、基督的倫理教誨、生命目標或如神、罪與祈禱等；⁵¹ 各團體幾乎一致地將運動定義為「真實宗教」與「靈性」之助力乃至宗教本身。儘管並無彼此一致且系統性的信仰闡述，「新宗教」之名卻也在當時即常加諸於靈學運動之上。⁵²

神智學會則有著更為明確的自我定位，一方面肯定宗教與靈性之價值，另一方面則以傳統基督教的批判者自居，期盼帶來一種更具包容性的宗教觀。自其創立以來，即以「宗教」自我定位。它如是說：「神智學不是『一門』宗教，而是宗教本身」(Theosophy is not a Religion, we say, but RELIGION itself)。⁵³ 何以致之？神智學會並不否認最終目的乃是宗教的、神聖的；然而它並無意將自身打造為「另一個」宗教，而是企圖突破宗教藩籬，回歸那蘊藏於所有宗教和思想傳統中的相通神聖智慧。一如其刊物《神智學評論》所言：「我們不是某新宗教的信徒...神智學會所傳播的教義是所有宗教的合一 (unity)，它保存並淨化所有宗教，使不同信仰者得以感受共同血族關係 (common kinship)」。⁵⁴ 貝森在加入神智學會後亦同樣宣稱：「神智學會並非一門新宗教，它屬於世界所有宗教。它崇尚的神聖智慧並不屬於任何一種宗

⁵⁰ 參閱 Gauld, *The Founders of Psychological Research*, pp. 32-65; Turner, *Between Religion and Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); John J. Cerullo, *The Secularization of the Soul* (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1992); Oppenheim, *The Other World*, pp. 63-110.

⁵¹ 參閱運動刊物如 *Spiritual Magazine* (1860-65); *Human Nature* (1867-77); *The Medium and Daybreak* (1870-1895).

⁵² 參閱 Oppenheim, *The Other World*, pp. 63-110; *The Spiritual Magazine*, No. 1 (1860), vignette; T. R., "The Mission of Spiritualism," *The Medium and Daybreak*, Vol. 1, No. 9 (Jun. 3 1870), p. 65; "The Gospel and Spiritualism," *The Medium and Daybreak*, Vol. 2, No. 58 (May 12 1871), pp. 149-150.

⁵³ (Editorial) "Is Theosophy a Religion?" *Lucifer*, Vol. 3 (Nov. 1888), pp. 177-187, at p. 179; Alexander Fullerton, "Theosophy as a Religion," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 24 (Mar. 1899), pp. 73-80, at pp. 79-80.

⁵⁴ "On the Watch-Tower: The Theosophical Society," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 27 (Nov. 1900), pp. 196-197.

教，而是如同陽光、空氣和雨水，是眾人的共有財產。」⁵⁵

此一基本態度，使神智學會具有相當大的宗教包容性。在它看來，無論是耶穌、佛陀或克里希那的倫理教導，彼此並不衝突，也因之並不要求成員放棄原先所屬宗教，反倒鼓勵人們：「通往神智學的道路，乃是經由你自身的宗教」。⁵⁶ 這也解釋了神智學會為何得以吸引眾多支持，在全球各地廣收印、佛、伊斯蘭等各教派信徒，並且在英國也同時吸納了基督教虔信者與懷疑者。

儘管肯定宗教價值，而且不排斥基督教的原始精神，但在神智論者看來，基督教會往往是真實宗教精神的傷害者。神智學會有句箴言：「沒有宗教能高過真理」（no religion higher than truth）。⁵⁷ 神智論者相信，真理超越形式藩籬，存於內在人心，唯有在自由的思想環境中才能誕生。但若以此箴言檢視基督教歷史發展，則可發現，教會所為大多與此背道而馳。教會向來自恃為真理的唯一擁有者，以教義和教會階層構築權威，否定人心內在探尋。這一切，毋寧是有害真理追尋的。神智論者因此積極參與當代對於基督教會的自由批判論述（liberal critiques of Christianity），舉凡教會不堪檢驗的各種教條、歷史上的神權統治、宗教迫害與侵略、政治特權及言論箝制及違背基督倫理教誨的一切作為等，都是他所要撻伐。⁵⁸

如《路西法》一篇社論所言：「神智學會的存在理由，從一開始，就是要高聲抗議，向教條與任何盲目信念公開宣戰。」⁵⁹ 布氏於《揭露艾西斯》這部神智學經典的〈前言〉中亦曾宣告：「我們要為靈性自由呼喊，為那被褫奪權力者請願，對抗無論是來自科學或神學的專制暴政。」⁶⁰ 藉由對於「排他的、狹隘的、殘暴的基督教會」之批判，神智學有意識地將其自身定位為一種自由且不受組織、權威與儀式所牽絆的信仰，在這同時，它亦成為十九世紀宗教與政治自由化的一股推力，⁶¹其

⁵⁵ Annie Besant, "Theosophy and the Theosophical Society," in Besant, *London Lectures of 1907* (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1909), pp. 47-67, at p. 48.

⁵⁶ "Is Theosophy a Religion?" *Lucifer*, p. 180.

⁵⁷ 參閱 Alexander Fullerton, "No Religion Higher Than Truth," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 29 (Sept. 1901), pp. 9-18.

⁵⁸ 參閱 W. Kingslan, "Theosophy and Ecclesiasticism," *Lucifer*, Vol. 7 (Dec. 1890), pp. 317-325 & Vol. 8 (Jan., 1891), pp. 380-386; H. P. B., "The Fall of Ideals," *Lucifer*, Vol. 5 (Dec. 1889), pp. 261-274.

⁵⁹ (Editorial) "Is Theosophy a Religion?" *Lucifer*, Vol. 3 (Nov. 1888), pp. 177-187, at p. 177.

⁶⁰ H. P. Blavatsky, *Isis Unveiled: A Master-Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Theology*. Vol. 1, *Science* (Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1988 [1877]), p. xlv.

⁶¹ (Editorial) "'Lucifer' to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Greeting!" *Lucifer*, Vol. 2 (Dec. 1887), pp. 241-251, at p. 251. 另參閱 Royle, *Radicals, Secularists and Republicans*, pp. 224, 328.

鮮明批判性所帶來的進步色彩，也使它得以成功吸收無數不滿傳統教會與教義但依然渴望尋找靈性解答、執著宗教「真理」的信徒，而貝森正是其中之一。

儘管歷經信仰懷疑，貝森始終沒有失去對於宗教的渴望；貝森母親臨終前曾憂心，貝森的唯一缺點就是「過於虔誠 (too religious)」。⁶²此時的貝森身為世俗運動的領導人，無疑已是主流社會所謂宗教異端，但她心中卻呼喊著：「我虔誠的心，反映在那對於宗教的熱烈駁斥，以及對於教條的反叛，」並為自己的無神論身分提出辯解：「若『牽動情感之道德』即為宗教，那我無疑是無神論者中最具宗教性者。」⁶²

蕭伯納曾說，任何運動若想留住貝森，必須有「宗教哲學」方面的誘因，⁶³一語道破貝森為何終究沒有留在現世運動與社會主義運動中。這兩個運動對於現實社會問題的共同關懷，回應了貝森的宗教奉獻熱情，使其在拋棄基督教條之後，依舊得以實踐其舊有道德信念。但現世主義運動挑戰宗教權威卻無意於靈性探索，而貝森所屬的費邊社也同樣以生冷政經分析與務實策略著稱，對於道德與靈性問題多有鄙夷。在社運界翻滾十數載之後，貝森逐漸感到某種欠缺；一方面有感於自身靈性生命無法獲得滿足，另一方面則認為社會所更需要的並非制度之改變，而是人心、道德之轉化。這份感受之強烈，讓貝森在 1888 年甚至滋生了創立新教會的念頭，一個以博愛與社會奉獻為最高精神的教會。⁶⁴但在這不久之後，藉著為《佩爾美爾報》(Pall Mall Gazette) 評論布氏著作《祕密教義》之機緣，她認識了神智學。日後，在給史泰德的信件中，貝森說道，神智學對於人類更高本性與奉獻精神的信念，彷彿回應了她「最深沉的內在本性」；這乃是她生平所欲追尋的道路。⁶⁵儘管身為現世運動中最為犀利的基督教批判者，最終貝森還是擁抱了旨在回歸並復興內在靈性的「另類」宗教團體——神智學會。

貝森之轉向神智學並非特例，而是改革運動圈的一個縮影。史家喬依·狄克森 (Joy Dixon) 曾指出，神智學會與十九世紀末的眾多改革運動，包括社會主義運動、

⁶² Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 24, 157.

⁶³ Shaw, "Mrs. Besant's Passage through Fabian Socialism," pp. 21-22.

⁶⁴ 這是貝森與報業大亨史泰德共同構想。他們計畫將之命名為「兄弟教會」(Brotherhood Church) 或「服務人群現世教會」(Secular Church of the Service of Man)，矢志「為沉默大眾與弱勢者發聲」，參閱 Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 329-330; Annie Besant, "The Ground of Our Hope," *The Link*, Feb. 11, 1888, p. 1; Annie Besant, *Duties of the Theosophist* (Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Publishing House, 1917), p. 41.

⁶⁵ Stead, "Character Sketch," *Review of Reviews*, p. 366.

女子普選權爭取運動、反疫苗運動及反動物實驗運動等，互有關聯且成員重疊。⁶⁶ 過去許多學者受世俗化理論影響，多假定此時之進步運動已「去宗教化」。但狄克森指出，此時改革者儘管多已拋棄對於教條的僵化信念，但未曾失去靈性方面的渴求，依然習慣以宗教語言傳達理念與道德關切，並從宗教傳統中汲取思想與道德資源。而在傳統基督教廣遭批判之際，神智學恰恰發揮了替代作用，滿足部分改革者的靈性渴求及倫理需要，同時也帶來政治參與動力。此時著名的社會主義運動者，包括夏洛特·戴絲帕（Charlotte Despard, 1844-1939）、賀伯·布洛（Herbert Burrows, 1845-1902）、哈登·蓋斯特（L. Haden Guest, 1877-1960）、歐拉吉（A. R. Orage, 1873-1934）以及愛德華·卡本特（Edward Carpenter, 1844-1929）等人，都以不同程度接受神智學信念，並且在運動中宣揚神智學精神。卡本特在他的回憶錄中，更將「神智學運動」與社會主義、無政府主義、女性主義、工會成長及戲劇、音樂與藝術乃至於宗教界的新發展等並列，認為它們共同構成一條引領社會發展的「大河」。⁶⁷

神祕主義思潮在進步改革圈中的盛行，或許是世俗化理論所難以解釋的現象，但在文化評論家泰瑞·伊格頓（Terry Eagleton）看來，這正反映了改革圈於世紀之交（*fin de siècle*）的一大特色；許多看似對立的事物與價值，如分析理性與神祕主義、結構轉化與內在提升、瑣碎改革與宇宙冥思等，皆可共存、激盪而不顯突兀，提供世紀末人們心靈豐沛的養分及動力。⁶⁸ 在第四節中，我將進一步探索貝森如何挪用神智學思想以做為社會改革資源。

⁶⁶ Joy Dixon, *Divine Feminine: Theosophy and Feminism in England* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001); Owen, *The Place of Enchantment*, pp. 24-27. 另參閱 Mark Bevir, "Annie Besant's Quest for Truth: Christianity, Secularism and New Age Thought," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Jan. 1999), pp. 62-93.

⁶⁷ Edward Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1916), p. 245.

⁶⁸ Terry Eagleton, "The Flight to the Real," in Sally Ledger and Scott McCracken, eds., *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 11-21.

參、神智學做為科學批判

神智學宗旨之二：「探索隱含於自然各層面之神祕及潛藏人類精神與心靈的力量」。⁶⁹

靈學運動發展至 1880 年代，開始吸引更多科學從事者與知識分子投入，企圖以嚴謹學術方法對超常現象如念力、透視力、心電感應及靈魂出體等進行研究，帶動所謂「精神研究」(psychical research)。⁷⁰ 神智學會亦參與其中，其成員樂觀相信，透過對於心靈與意識之充分開發，人類將能擴張對於自我和宇宙之認識，甚至發展出新官能；而藉此一認識與能力之提升，人們將可在一個以精神為主導的進化歷程中持續前行，打造新社會與新文明。

然而，也正因為對於「超常現象」之高度熱衷，神智學及其參與者往往背負迷信、非理性與反科學罪名。以下我將指出，這類評價，實屬勝王敗寇之議。神智學所涉之爭，乃是一場關於十九世紀科學觀與整體文化走向之爭。我將由十九世紀科學觀之歷程談起，並還原神智學在其中所扮演之參與者及批判者角色。

十九世紀的科學觀，歷經由上半期之「自然神學」(natural theology) 轉向下半期的「科學自然主義」(scientific naturalism) 之歷程；兩者並非同質與固定不變，內涵亦互有交集。但史家大抵採用這兩個概念大傘，捕捉十九世紀科學文化之典範性轉變。⁷¹ 對於自然神學論者而言，科學與神學並不衝突甚且密切結合。仰賴理性

⁶⁹ Blavatsky, *The Key to Theosophy*, p. 39.

⁷⁰ 此時的研究者基於自然主義信念，認為這些現象並非藉由傳統所知之物質媒介作用，而是與精神力量有著更大關聯，故多以「精神研究」取代「超自然研究」(supernatural research) 一詞。神智學會出於類似看法，亦多使用「精神研究」一詞。關於精神研究，參閱 Richard Noakes, "The Historiography of Psychical Research: Lessons from Histories of the Sciences," *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, Vol. 72 (2008), pp. 65-85, at pp. 76-79; Peter Lamont, *Extraordinary Beliefs: A Historical Approach to a Psychological Problem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

⁷¹ 自然神學在不同社群的消褪時間並不一致；在大眾科學文化中，其影響力至十九世紀末仍頗為顯著。關於十九世紀自然神學，參閱 John Hedley Brooke, *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), chap. 6; 李鑑慧，〈挪用自然史：英國十九世紀動物保護運動與大眾自然史文化〉，《成大歷史學報》，第 38 號，2010 年 6 月，頁 131-176。關於科學自然主義，參閱 Frank M. Turner, *Between Science and Religion: The Reaction to Scientific Naturalism in Late Victorian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); Robert Young, *Darwin's Metaphor: Nature's Place in*

之自然探究，乃是仰賴信仰（faith）之啟示神學（revealed religion）之外另一條理解神、追尋神的重要途徑；自然中一切神奇創造、精巧設計及完美秩序和法則，不但可資證明神之存在，並充分展現神之大全、智慧與良善。探究大自然之工作因此猶如宗教之追尋，可以帶領人們理解神之本質以及神對世界之計劃。科學探究之初始動機與最終目的，也因之是宗教的。受自然神學之影響，十九世紀前期之科學往往融合了神學內涵、使用宗教語言，並且在社會中扮演著強化信仰之功用。

相較於自然神學，科學自然主義者力圖打破神學對於科學研究自啟蒙時代以來的普遍支配；論者多服膺於經驗主義，相信唯有建立在理性與經驗上之知識，方為真實知識。至於其他獲取知識的傳統方法，如聖書、宗教權威、內在良知或直覺等，皆為其所駁斥。受自然主義（naturalism）影響，他們相信宇宙有其統一性（uniformity），一切現象，甚至包括人性與社會，皆受自然法則支配，故也應以自然法則解釋之。而其多數人所接受的基本自然法則，乃是十九世紀所盛行的原子論、熱力學及演化學；這三個主要科學理論被認為充分解釋了宇宙之構成、運動與發展，並為之建構起一套機械論宇宙觀；而宗教與神學在此並無容身之地。在科學自然主義者看來，自然神學之一切無從驗證的宗教宣稱及形而上概念，不但不應干涉科學，更應完全退出科學領域。依據相同理由，許多人更進一步認為，一切形上學或本體論探討，因其無法驗證，並非真實知識，故應被排除在科學乃至知識領域之外。科學自然主義者的勃勃雄心，在「英國推動科學學會」（British Association for the Advancement of Science）會長約翰·亭代爾（John Tyndall）常被引用的一段話中昭然若揭：「科學要自神學處奪回宇宙論整個領域。任何侵犯科學研究的計劃或體系，皆應放棄其所有控制意圖並反為科學所控制。」⁷²

Victorian Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Frank M. Turner, *c: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Bernard Lightman, *Evolutionary Naturalism in Victorian Britain* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009); Gowan Dawson and Bernard Lightman, eds., *Victorian Scientific Naturalism: Community, Identity and Continuity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); Bernard Lightman and Michael S. Reidy, eds., *The Age of Scientific Naturalism* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2014).

⁷² John Tyndall, *Fragments of Science* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1896), p. 197. 亭代爾(Tyndall)乃科學自然主義之活躍倡導者，常被塑造為一徹底物質主義者。但近來史家重建其完整生命哲學，指出他並不否定靈性、信仰等面向，且仍期盼科學與宗教之最終調和。參閱 Ruth Barton, "John Tyndall, Pantheist: A Rereading of the Belfast Address," *Osiris*, 2nd series, Vol. 3 (1987), pp. 111-134; B. Lightman, *The Origins of Agnosticism: Victorian Unbelief and the Limits of Knowledge* (Baltimore, 1987), pp. 146-176; Stephen S. Kim, *John Tyndall's Transcendental Materialism and the Conflict between Religion and Science in Victorian England* (Lewiston: Mellen University Press, 1996); Ursula DeYoung, *A Vision of Modern Science: John Tyndall and the Role of the Scientists in Victorian Culture* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

值得注意的是，科學自然主義在十九世紀下半期之推進，並非由知識的內在理性邏輯所驅動之「自然」歷程，而是牽涉一場社會新舊領導階層的「文化領導競爭」。傳統上，英國的科學研究者多出身傳統文化領導階層——士紳與貴族階層及國教派——主要接受古老大學如牛津、劍橋之人文教育，並無專門之科學訓練，其科學興趣也以廣博而非專精著稱，科學研究對他們而言是職志（vocation）而非職業。然而，伴隨工業社會之迅速發展及中產階級之興起，自 1840 年代以來，科學研究社群人數遽增，成員屬性亦有所變化。新一代研究者多來自中產階級，接受新興大學務實取向的專門科學教育；因無豐厚家產，亟需開創出一條職業道路，他們於是以科學自然主義為其正當性基礎，積極破除業餘主義並開創各類研究機會，帶動所謂科學之「專業化」。⁷³ 其中具社會意識者，更希望取代教士與哲人成為新文化權威，帶來一個世俗化的英國，使之由「宗教主導之文化」（religion-oriented culture），成為「科學」主導。⁷⁴

這群科學研究者，主要以湯瑪斯·赫胥黎（Thomas Huxley, 1825-1894）、約翰·亭代爾（John Tyndall, 1820-1893）、威廉·克里夫（William Clifford, 1845-1897）及約翰·洛柏克（John Lubbock, 1834-1913）等人為首，彼此密切交流。⁷⁵ 科學自然主義不但是工具，也是目標，希冀藉此掃除自然神學之影響，帶來一個不受神學干預的科學文化，更帶來一個不受神學和宗教權威干預的整體社會文化。他們積極介入教士與哲人的傳統專屬領域，努力建構他者與自身之新形象。在知識面上，他們逾越傳統自然研究界線，跨入社會，嘗試以自然法則解釋人性與道德發展乃至社會運作等問題。在社會中，他們則企圖使科學影響深入教育體系與政府官僚，並四處開闢論述戰場；一方面將教會描繪為落後、武斷、非理性且深陷派系鬥爭，另一方

⁷³ 科學之專業化為後世建構概念而未必為歷史行動者行事所依據之指引概念，繼 Turner 首先以專業化觀點闡釋新興科學研究者之崛起後，史家對此概念之運用已多所修正，關於此方面討論，參閱 Adrian Desmond, "Redefining the X Axis: 'Professionals,' 'Amateurs' and the Making of Mid-Victorian Biology—A Progress Report," *Journal of the History of Biology*, Vol. 34 (2001), pp. 3-50.

⁷⁴ Turner, *Between Science and Religion*, p. 31. 關於十九世紀科學家日益顯著之文化領導角色，參閱 T. H. Heyck, *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England* (London: Croom Helm, 1982); Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority* (1993); DeYoung, *A Vision of Modern Science*.

⁷⁵ 科學自然主義倡導者並不限於科學社群，亦有來自傳統人文領域者，其中較著名者有 G. H. Lewes、Herbert Spencer、Leslie Stephen 等人。科學自然主義倡導者與傳統業餘研究者間亦不必然存在對立關係且多有合作，且亦往往援引傳統文化資源以求自我晉身，成立於 1864 年的 X-Club 即為此些科學自然主義者藉由參與菁英紳士社交網絡成功建立自身文化權威的一個重要團體，參閱 Ruth Barton, "Huxley, Lubbock, and Half a Dozen Others: Professional and Gentlemen in the Formation of the X Club, 1851-1864," *Isis*, Vol. 89, No. 3 (1998), pp. 410-444; Paul White, *Thomas Huxley: Making the "Man of Science"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

面則將自身與啟蒙、實用、理性、反權威及思想解放等價值結合，積極說服政府與社會大眾，唯有其所代表之「新科學」方能確保英國之經濟發展、工業領先和帝國支配。⁷⁶ 整體而言，十九世紀下半期，此一新興科學社群成功地將其自身與國家命運結合並贏得政府支持；不但取得科學專業化所需之大量資金挹注、體制發展與廣泛就業機會，並創造出一個高度倚重科學專業之政治文化，甚至讓「科學崇拜」(the cult of science) 成為 1870 年代以降的一個文化新現象及嘲諷詞：科學彷彿取代了宗教，成為解決人類一切問題與憂患的新權威、新神祇，科學研究者則成為「新祭師階層」(the new priesthood)。⁷⁷

科學自然主義的推行也並非無受阻礙；十九世紀甚囂塵上的所謂「科學與宗教之爭」即因之而起。簡言之，科學自然主義之影響力雖於 1860 至 1870 年代達到高峰，但 1880 年代之後，來自社會及知識界多股批判力量卻使其聲勢受挫，⁷⁸ 例如對新科學之倫理價值提出聲討的反動物實驗運動、唯心主義思潮及威廉·詹姆士 (William James, 1842-1910)、亨利·伯格森 (Henri Bergson, 1859-1941)、詹姆士·沃德 (James Ward, 1843-1925) 等人所帶領的重返主觀意識與心靈力量的心理學新思維，⁷⁹ 乃至神祕主義運動及神智學會所參與的精神研究等，皆於世紀末年代對科學自然主義提出了批判。

欲充分理解神智學之時代意涵與吸引力，自然不應忽略它在科學自然主義建立成為社會強勢價值這過程中所扮演的角色。以下我將指出，神智學會雖然一方面熱烈歡迎十九世紀科學進展，另一方面卻也對自然科學主義多所批判，因之吸引諸如貝森那樣一些對於宗教及科學皆抱持正面期許的知識分子。曾有學者指出，在對於

⁷⁶ 參閱 Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority*, pp. 197-198; Bernard Lightman, "Huxley and the Devonshire Commission," in Dawson and Lightman, eds., *Victorian Scientific Naturalism*, pp. 101-130; James Elwick, "Economies of Scales: Evolutionary Naturalists and the Victorian Examination System," in Dawson and Lightman, eds., *Victorian Scientific Naturalism*, pp. 131-156.

⁷⁷ 參閱 Beatrice Webb, *My Apprenticeship* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926), p. 130-131。優生學先驅高頓，曾期許科學家取代傳統教士成為「科學祭師階層」(scientific priesthood)，參閱 Francis Galton, *English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture* (London: Macmillan, 1874), pp. 259-260。值得注意的是，科學做為想像未來及解決一切社會、政治與宗教問題之萬靈丹的信念，自 1820 年代末期起，透過知識推廣運動與科學出版品之激增而逐漸滲透社會，參閱 James A. Secord, *Visions of Science: Books and Readers at the Dawn of the Victorian Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)。

⁷⁸ 參閱 Turner, *Between Religion and Science*, p. 17.

⁷⁹ 參閱 Bernard Lightman, "Science and Culture," in Francis O' Gorman, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 12-42, at pp. 29-38; Jenny Bourne Taylor, "Psychology at the Fin de Siècle," in Gail Marshall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 13-30.

科學的態度上，神祕主義運動具有一弔詭特色：一方面運用科學理論與修辭以合理化其論述，另一方面卻也經常提出對於當代科學文明的批判。⁸⁰ 神智學會即具有此一雙重特性。

首先，對於科學知識的發展，神智學會不但不排斥，甚且熱烈歡迎。在其學會刊物例如《神智論者》(*The Theosophist*)及《神智學評論》(*The Theosophist*)中，有著固定學術評論專欄，關注當代科學發展；對於各類最新科學理論與發現，無論是電波、電子或鈾元素的發現等，總是予以高度肯定，其中又以領航當代科學與科技發展的物理學最受青睞。⁸¹ 例如布氏在其著作中，經常廣徵博引各項科學新知以呼應神祕傳統之古老智慧。對於科學的高度關切與推崇，無疑有助於神智學在「科學年代」中對於自身權威與正當性的提昇，但亦牽涉到神智學在知識上的信念。

科學，對於神智論者而言，是古老智慧與自我內在經驗之外的另一個主要知識來源。他們相信，一切神祕知識皆有其科學基礎，兩者並不衝突且終將交會融合；是以科學對於未知事物的探討與成就，同樣有助於揭露宇宙奧祕。十九世紀的一些重要科學進展，強化了此一信念，例如無線電報似乎解釋了心電感應的可能性；X光的發明，證實透視能力的存在；「類非物質屬性」(quasi-immateriality)及遍及宇宙的「以太」(ether)元素理論，佐證遙視與念力及宇宙統合之潛在可能性；一切對於那不可見領域的研究例如電力、原子、電子及意識等，亦皆在在提供神智學的古老智慧之科學根據，並證明了「科學、宗教與哲學終將再度聯手」。⁸² 此外，科學對於未知事物的探究精神，也呼應了神祕主義的一項基本信念，亦即宇宙仍然有太多神祕難解或超乎人類現有想像力之事物，是故，吾人應開放胸襟，持續擴張人類理解。

此外，神智學會也投入各類超常現象的研究，致力發掘背後自然法則。其早期

⁸⁰ Hammer, *Claiming Knowledge*, pp. 10, 507-508.

⁸¹ 關於十九世紀物理學發展之重要性，參閱 Iwan Rhys Morus, *When Physics Became King* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

⁸² “On the Watch-Tower,” *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 26 (Mar. 1900), p. 7; 另參閱“On the Watch-Tower,” *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 23 (Nov. 1898), pp. 195-196; Annie Besant, “Theosophy and Modern Thought,” *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 30 (Dec. 1899), pp. 339-346. 這樣一些看法與期許，亦符合世紀之交物理學界的發展。為數不少的物理學家嘗試以尖端物理學理論來解釋各種玄妙現象，參閱 Richard Noakes, “The ‘World of the Infinitely Little’: Connecting Physical and Psychical Realities circa 1900,” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 39 (2008), pp. 323-334; Richard Noakes, “Ethers, Religion and Politics in Late-Victorian Physics: Beyond the Wynne Thesis,” *History of Science*, Vol. 43 (2005), pp. 415-455.

英國成員多來自中上男性菁英階層。他們往往以中立探索者自居，強調神祕探究之科學性與學術性，排斥對於各類權威與教條之盲目接受。在實證主義與自然主義當道的年代，神智學會不斷宣稱並賴以建立其威信的，正是這樣一些科學實證原則與方法，諸如觀察、假設、實驗、解釋與驗證。降靈會中的許多神奇現象，在他看來，乃是一套經由正確觀察、驗證並重複實驗而得致之「事實」，也因之不容否認且須嚴肅面對。在對於超常現象的解釋工作上，神智學會與多數靈學論者不同，他並不將各類玄妙現象歸諸於亡靈或神明所為，而是與超常研究的最重要代表團體「精神研究會」(Society for Psychical Research; 1882)一致，否認「神蹟」或「超自然」(supernatural)的存在，認為這些現象仍然受制自然法則的支配，因此，我們所應該做的就是「超自然的自然法則化」(naturalisation of the supernatural)。⁸³ 一如布氏在《祕密教義》中所指出，神祕傳統所訴諸的從來都不是「武斷權威」，而是那大寫的「自然」及其法則；⁸⁴ 各類神奇現象，在布氏看來，並不違背科學，而是「科學」自身。⁸⁵ 貝森亦強調：「神智學之開端，起始於對超自然之駁斥……這世上並不存在神蹟」。⁸⁶

由此可見，神智學仍與科學自然主義有著重要不謀而合之處：相信宇宙有其統一性(uniformity)；一切現象均受自然法則支配；吾人應致力於對之進行科學探究，並於其間遵循觀察、假設及驗證等程序。⁸⁷ 兩者最大歧見則在於科學之正當探究範疇。

靈學運動興起之際，旋即受到科學自然主義者例如赫胥黎、亭代爾及法拉第(Michael Faraday, 1791-1867)等人的批判。即使當知識界展開對於超常現象有系

⁸³ 「精神研究會」乃由劍橋哲學家亨利·西吉維克(Henry Sidgwick)領導成立，匯聚眾多文人與科學家，為精神研究中最具名望與影響力之團體。關於精神研究會及其在精神研究專業化過程中所扮演之角色，參閱 Frank Podmore, *The Naturalisation of the Supernatural* (London: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1908); Gauld, *The Founders of Psychical Research*; Egil Asprem, "A Nice Arrangement of Heterodoxies: William McDougall and the Professionalization of Psychical Research," *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 460, No. 2 (2010), pp. 123-143.

⁸⁴ Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, p. viii.

⁸⁵ H. P. Blavatsky, *Collected Writings*. Vol. I, p. 137, 引自 Mark Bevir, "The West Turns Eastward: Madame Blavatsky and the Transformation of the Occult Tradition," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 62, No. 3 (1994), pp. 747-767, at p. 751.

⁸⁶ Annie Besant, "Why I Became a Theosophist," in Saville, *A Selection of the Social and Political Pamphlets of Annie Besant*, p. 17.

⁸⁷ 唯在這些方法之外，神智學會並不排除經典、直覺與內在感知之指引。

統的嚴肅學術探究、並吸引許多頗具名望的科學家投入時，非議情況依舊。⁸⁸ 科學自然主義者在宗教和科學之間做出明確切割，並將牽涉神、靈魂、心靈及精神等課題排除在科學領域之外。此一立場，讓他們在「可知」與「不可知」、「可探究」與「不可探究」之間劃出清楚界線並做出價值判斷。在他們看來，神智學與精神研究逾越了科學研究的界限，因此是「迷信」、「非科學」與「非理性」的。例如生理與心理學家威廉·卡本特（William B. Carpenter, 1813-1885）便以心理學角度分析，稱靈學論者為「流行性妄想」（epidemic delusion）的集體受害者，因為他們受到先入為主的想法所支配而失去「理性意志」（rational will），猶如「陷入瘋狂的病患」（insane patients）。⁸⁹ 而那些投身超常現象研究的科學家如華勒斯（Alfred Russel Wallace, 1823-1913）⁹⁰ 或「精神研究社」成員，除了有損科學形象，亦有礙科學專業與權威之建立。在這場對於究竟什麼才是「科學正當探索範疇」的較勁中，科學自然主義者一方面積極將科學連結於理性、進步、文明及效益等價值，另一方面則將對方塑造為其對立面。⁹¹ 隨著科學自然主義之逐漸取得文化優勢，那些被歸類為「不可知」、「不可探究」的研究領域則逐漸與「迷信」、「非科學」及「無益」等畫上等號。但是這「超常研究=迷信=偽科學」之評價，其實正是不同科學定義者彼此較勁下的產物，反映優勝者所樹立之知識權力結構。⁹²

但若以神智學會的立場來看，主流科學界對於一切有關神、心靈或靈性等事物的迴避乃至否定，正是當代科學諸多問題的根本。自然科學主義者所設定的狹隘探索範疇，不僅迴避了攸關人類生存之重大問題，更限制了科學發展的諸多可能性；唯有不設限的科學才是「真科學」，方才得以持續發揮其文明正面推動力。神智學會自許能破除此一局限，並相信宇宙中尚存在仍待揭露之自然法則，可供解釋精神現象。神智學成員也因之滿懷希望地投身於精神研究潮流之中，期盼藉由自身不懈之科學實踐，糾正當代科學發展之日趨狹隘。如同其他超常現象研究者，他們往往

⁸⁸ 知識界的相關組織有 Ghost Society (circa 1850)、London Dialectical Society (1867)、Psychological Society of Great Britain (1875)、Phasmatological Society (1879)及精神研究會。

⁸⁹ William B. Carpenter, *Mesmerism, Spiritualism, &c.: Historically & Scientifically Considered* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877), pp. v, 114-115.

⁹⁰ 較達爾文更早提出自然天擇說的著名自然學家與靈學論者。

⁹¹ 參閱 John Tyndall, *Fragments of Science for Unscientific People: A Series of Detached Essays, Lectures, and Reviews* (London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1871), pp. 427-435.

⁹² 參閱 Bown and Burdett, eds., *The Victorian Supernatural*, pp. xv, 23-43.

自認是人類知識疆界的開拓者，負責探索攸關人類命運之諸多嚴肅課題；⁹³ 而十九世紀科學與科技日新月異之進展，也正如一劑劑強心針，支撐了他們對於知識無限進展的高度信心。

超常研究與十九世紀當時的科學文化價值緊密結合，訴諸人們對於科學發展的信念，呼籲人們持續發揮科學家的無懼精神無盡探索，並向一切未知挑戰，其研究刊物《疆界地帶》扉頁印製牛頓箴言，生動描繪出此時研究者面對知識的態度：「我似乎是那玩耍於海邊的孩童，在我眼前，是那寬廣無垠、尚待探索的真理海洋」。⁹⁴ 其創辦者史泰德於創刊號中論道：若哥倫布見到海平線上的微弱光芒便打道回府，新世界還有可能發現嗎？若人們未竭盡全力投入蒸氣機與電力研究，英國不但將仍停留在馬車時代，電纜、電話等發明至今也仍將被「聰明人」譏為「失常大腦的古怪幻想」。⁹⁵ 至於神智學會，則往往採用更具戰鬥性的語言，指控這些畫地自限且企圖限制他人的科學從事者，才是真正的「科學的否定者」。⁹⁶

神智學會對於科學探索界限的看法，源自其「整體主義」(Holism) 信念。他們相信，所有知識，只要是真實的，彼此必定互相呼應連結而無法切割；是以科學法則與古老智慧相互呼應而不違背；神聖知識並不排除自然法則，理性也同樣有助於宇宙奧秘之探索。神智學之目標，正是要融合各宗教與思想傳統，尋找其間相通的道理，並將之與當代科學接軌。換言之，在神智學的知識世界中，並不存在科學自然主義者在「科學」與「宗教」之間所畫下的那條界線；科學應能容納宗教，而宗教也不會與科學相違背。神智學所要追尋的，就如同《祕密教義》之副標題所示：「科學、宗教與哲學的統合」。科學自然主義對於知識之切割及物質決定論，不但有害真實知識之進展，也將使英國墮入一個重物質而輕心靈的物質主義文化。因為它形同否認了人類精神與意識之存在，簡化了心靈和物質世界之間所可能存在之相互交涉；再者，它排除了藉由心靈來理解宇宙之可能性，並且迴避了攸關人類生存

⁹³ 十九世紀末相關研究刊物的名稱如《未知世界》(The Unknown World, 1894) 與《疆界地帶》(Borderland, 1893)，恰恰反映出人們對於知識疆域拓展的高度興趣。

⁹⁴ Borderland, Vol. 1-2 (1894-1895), vignette.

⁹⁵ William T. Stead, "How We Intend to Study the Borderland," Borderland, Vol. 1, No. 1 (July 1893), pp. 3-6, at p. 5.

⁹⁶ H. P. Blavatsky, "The Negators of Science," Lucifer, Vol. 3 (Apr. 1891), pp. 89-98, at p. 91. 類似對於物質主義文化的批判，可見於卡萊爾之〈時代特徵〉一文。他指出「機械年代」帶來的後果之一即是對於內在心靈探索的否定，因為「那無法以機械法則理解和探討的事物，被認為完全無法理解和探討。」參閱 Thomas Carlyle, "Signs of the Times," Edinburgh Review (Jun., 1829), pp. 98-118, at p. 105.

的倫理、意義及目的等問題。⁹⁷

這類論述廣泛存在於十九世紀的「宗教與科學之爭」中。神智學會往往亦能有效利用此一時代爭議，找到最佳戰鬥位置，時而策略性地站在宗教一方，譴責科學對於傳統宗教領域之侵犯以及對於精神世界與文明的抹煞與扭曲，時而各打五十大板，宣稱在這宗教與科學皆已窘態畢露的年代，自己才真正繼承了兩者應有的精神，才是「真實的宗教」與「真實的科學」。例如，布氏的《揭露艾希思》共分兩冊，各以「神學」與「科學」為標題，雙雙對兩者提出批判。她在前言中說道：

我們深深意識到這時代熱烈進展的唯物論與人類靈性企盼間的鬥爭，因此持續奮鬥不懈地如同提供彈藥與武器般，在許多章節中，放入各種足以幫助前者〔靈性企盼〕打擊後者〔唯物論〕的事實與論點……唯有遏止其〔唯物論〕成長，才能免受其主宰。⁹⁸

《路西法》社論中亦如此宣告：

〔神智〕學會已自發性地成為正統宗教和當代科學的腐肉清道夫 (scavenger)；對於那些為了一己之利而分離、貶抑那理應合一的兩個偉大真理之人，它同時也是無情的復仇女神。⁹⁹

此外，神智學會也歡迎任何得以支撐其整體知識信念的學術發展，並且有意識地與其他科學自然主義批判者站在同一陣線。比方說，儘管「精神研究會」早在 1885 年曾揭發布氏的神奇能力造假，¹⁰⁰但這並未影響神智學會會員的增長及兩社團之間的交流。神智學會總是持續關注精神研究會的發展，並樂於傳播能呼應其信念的相關研究，例如精神研究會創立者麥爾斯 (F. W. H. Myers, 1843-1901) 肯定靈魂不滅與

⁹⁷ 參閱 “The Negators of Science”; Besant, *An Autobiography*, pp. 346-347.

⁹⁸ Blavatsky, *Isis Unveiled*, p. xlv.

⁹⁹ (Editorial) “Is Theosophy a Religion?” *Lucifer*, Vol. 3 (Nov. 1888), pp. 177-187, at pp. 185-186.

¹⁰⁰ 布氏促使自動修復的瓷盤和從天而降的尊師信件等，皆被證實為人為機關所致，參閱 “Report of the Committee Appointed to Investigate Phenomena Connected with the Theosophical Society,” *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, Vol. 3 (1885), pp. 201-380; Oppenheim, *The Other World*, pp. 174-178.

潛意識的研究，或是擁有物理學家身分的精神研究會會長奧利佛·洛吉（Oliver Lodge, 1851-1940）之利用以太理論接合物質與心靈的嘗試及整體主義之生命與宇宙觀。此外，二十世紀初，企圖跳脫物質決定論、肯定主觀宗教經驗及直覺與創造力的心理學家如詹姆士、伯格森等，都被視為神智學盟友；他們有關人類意識之相關理論或新著，總是在神智學圈中獲得正面迴響與高度評價。¹⁰¹

總結來說，在科學與宗教經常被視為對立的年代，神智學會以調合者自居；在他看來，科學與宗教在真理探索的道路上，不但無法區隔，且缺一不可。然而，兩者於十九世紀的發展卻各有弊病：一方面，基督教會無視於智識進展，緊抱教條，遏制思想和心靈探索；而另一方面，科學自然主義引導下的當代科學，同樣也造成知識探索的侷限及心靈箝制，兩者皆不足以成為引領文明前進的深刻力量。神智學會因此自我期許能擴張並結合兩者，企圖走出寬廣的「第三條路」。

回到貝森。神智學會對於科學與知識的信念，以及對於當代科學的批判，在在呼應了貝森自 1870 年代以來所逐漸萌生的想法。在現世運動中，宗教與科學產生激烈對立，前者代表一切負面價值，例如黑暗、壓迫、落後、野蠻與不當權威等，後者則連結著理性、進步、思想自由、人類福祉及文明進展等正面價值。在打擊教會及推廣科學自然主義上，現世運動無疑做出相當貢獻；各類科學新知例如地質學、自然史、人種學及演化論等也都是它運用自如的有力工具。¹⁰²

此時的貝森亦同樣相信科學與理性乃是破除迷信與追求思想自由之利器，因此熱衷於吸收科學知識。現世運動中著名的科學推廣者愛德華·阿弗林（Edward B.

¹⁰¹ 參閱 Bertram Keightley, "Science and the Soul," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 32 (May, 1903), pp. 229-238; S. P. Sinnett, "A Great Step in Advance," *Lucifer*, Vol. 4 (Sept. 1891), pp. 43-49; "On the Watch-Tower: Dr. Oliver Lodge's Presidential Address," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 30 (Apr. 1902), pp. 102-103; "On the Watch-Tower," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 32 (Mar. 1903), pp. 2-6; "On the Watch-Tower: Sir Oliver Lodge's Creed," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 35 (Feb. 1905), pp. 483-484; G. R. S. Mead, "Reviews and Notices: Towards a Scientific Analysis of Religious Experience," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 31 (Oct. 1902), pp. 187-190; "On the Watch-Tower: The 'Subconscious Self,'" *Theosophical Society*, Vol. 30 (Aug. 1902), pp. 487-488. 關於 Lodge 以及 Bergson、James 等心理學家之研究與神祕主義之契合，參閱 Courtenay Grean Raia, "From Ether Theory to Ether Theology: Oliver Lodge and the Physics of Immortality," *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (2007), pp. 19-43; Owen, *The Place of Enchantment*, pp. 135-147.

¹⁰² 參閱 Michael Rectenwald, "Secularism and the Cultures of Nineteenth-Century Scientific Naturalism," *British Journal of the History of Science*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Jun. 2013), pp. 231-254; Ruth Barton, "Sunday Lecture Societies: Naturalistic Scientists, Unitarians, and Secularists Unite Against Sabbatarian Legislation," in Dawson and Lightman, eds., *Victorian Scientific Naturalism*, pp. 189-219. 新興科學社群於 1870 年代日漸取得體面社會地位後，刻意與激進的現世運動保持距離。

Aveling, 1849-1898) 是她的私人科學教師。1879 年，倫敦大學剛開放女子入學時，貝森即註冊攻讀科學學位，最後因宗教異端思想而未能取得文憑，但仍取得科學教師執照，獲得教授八門科學學科的資格。¹⁰³ 此一專業訓練，讓她得以投入現世運動以及神智學會的科學推廣工作。¹⁰⁴

現世運動時期的貝森，儘管對於科學充滿樂觀期盼，但對於科學自然主義卻也逐漸產生質疑。在〈我為何成為神智主義者〉演說中，貝森呼應神智學論述，嘲諷實證主義和經驗論所帶給當代科學的綑綁，指出「否認一切超越自身有限經驗的事物是荒唐的」；¹⁰⁵ 宇宙浩瀚，貝森問道，豈是人類有限經驗感官所能感知？因「無可經驗性」而否定一切可能，貝森比喻，猶如深海魚因為對淺海與陸地之無知而否認其他生物的存在，科學又怎能因為意識、心靈、夢境與主觀經驗等之難以實證而拒絕探索？此外，貝森亦不滿科學界普遍在「物質」與「思維」、「身」與「心」之間所建立的粗糙決定關係。這物質決定論，在貝森看來，簡化了人類對於生命的理解，同時也規避了攸關「生命」和「心靈」的諸多問題。人類心靈之複雜，豈是原子、動能、大腦物質或細胞活動等所能充分解釋？如同神祕論者，貝森相信，心靈與物質之間有著更為複雜之交涉，同時也相信精神對於人類生存與發展理應具有更大的決定性力量。

貝森自述，自 1880 年代起即開始關注通靈、天眼、超能聽覺、讀心術、催眠術、夢境、雙重意識及幻覺等研究，這些特異現象，讓她窺見了探究物質與心靈之複雜關聯的入口，同時也帶給她無限希望，因為它們指向一個「新思想領域」的誕生，並使她見到人類心靈力量發展的可能性。¹⁰⁶ 貝森相信，轉向神智學，正是她對於現世運動最高箴言「吾人追求真理」這一信念的持續實踐。一如神智論者，她以支持「真科學」自居，而那畫地自限的當代科學，在她看來，則是科學精神的違逆者。¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ 參閱 Besant, *Annie Besant*, pp. 246-250.

¹⁰⁴ 例如她在《我們的角落》中負責主持科學專欄，引介最新科學知識；同時也撰寫例如光學、熱力學、聲波、電力及生理學等科普書籍；加入神智學會後，她延續這項工作，同樣在《神智學評論》的〈瞭望台〉專欄固定介紹和評論當代科學進展。參閱貝森所撰寫、倫敦 Freethought Publishing Company 所出版的 *Light, Heat, and Sound* (1881), *Physiology of the Home* (1882), *Electricity* (London, 1882), *Eyes and Ears* (London, 1882).

¹⁰⁵ Besant, "Why I Became a Theosophist," p. 28.

¹⁰⁶ Besant, "Why I Became a Theosophist," p. 13.

¹⁰⁷ Besant, "Why I Became a Theosophist," pp. 6, 31. 另參閱 Annie Besant, "Among the Adepts. Madame Blavatsky

十九世紀科學文化的型塑過程中，神智學一方面是當代科學的參與者，另一方面卻也是其主流意識形態的批判者；它與諸多同樣不滿科學自然主義的社會勢力，協同參與了對於「科學」的定義。或許，在這場知識與文化權威的較勁中，神智學僅僅落得相對邊緣位置，但是，科學自然主義之推行亦無史家原先所理解地那般順利，而是面臨諸多挑戰。¹⁰⁸ 惟有充分揭露十九世紀科學觀之型塑歷程與爭議性本質，方才得以理解神智學對於當代如貝森一般的知識分子與改革者之吸引力究竟從何而來。

史家法蘭克·透那（Frank Turner）在《宗教與科學之間》一書中曾指出，超常現象之所以在十九世紀下半期足以吸引眾多知識分子投入，一方面是因為傳統基督教及其神學已難服眾，另一方面，意圖取而代之的科學自然主義亦難完全滿足人們的智識與靈性需求。眾多執意追究知識與生命之完整真相者，於是轉向精神研究，並嘗試建立結合人與自然的統合性生命觀。¹⁰⁹ 此一解釋，正也說明了對於傳統基督教與物質主義科學皆深懷不滿的貝森，為何最終選擇踏上神智學之路。

肆、神智學做為改革行動

神智學宗旨之三：「致力成為不分種族、信條、性別、種性或膚色之『普世兄弟』（Universal Brotherhood）信念的核心推動力量」。¹¹⁰

在神智學的三道宗旨中，此一宗旨排序第一，並且是唯一具有規範性。其會員可以不從事宗教與科學的探究，但卻必須認同「普世兄弟」之理念，而任何認同此

on 'The Secret Doctrine',” in Cousins, ed., *The Annie Besant Centenary Book*, pp. 38-44.

¹⁰⁸ 科學自然主義的興衰與延續，始終是史家爭議焦點。Turner 認為，1860、1870 年代是科學自然主義的全盛時期，但二十世紀初的科學發展例如相對論及測不準原理等，卻對它產生重大打擊。然而，近來史家認為，科學自然主義儘管歷經轉化，其影響力實則延續至二十一世紀之今日，參閱 Turner, *Between Religion and Science*, p. 253; Gowan Dawson and Bernard Lightman, “Introduction,” in *Victorian Scientific Naturalism*, pp. 1-24

¹⁰⁹ Turner, *Between Religion and Science*.

¹¹⁰ Blavatsky, *The Key to Theosophy*, p. 39.

一宗旨者，儘管沒有人會，也會被視同實踐了神智學之道。

此一略嫌不合時宜、以男性作為人類全稱的理念，為何被賦予如此重大意義？若能理解之，也將能理解神智學之於貝森及同代眾多人們之另一重要吸引力何在。

「兄弟情」(Brotherhood)或譯為「兄弟精神」，對於十九世紀的人們並不陌生。在過去很長一段時間，史家往往將維多利亞社會視為一個個體主義當道、人人汲汲營營於私利追尋的競爭年代，但近來學者指出，群體利益及利他精神在維多利亞時代之道德論述中，不但占有核心地位，甚至鮮受挑戰；此時思想家與知識分子，包括科學研究者，儘管對於道德基礎與道德動機各執一詞，但是對於道德之內涵，卻享有共識。社會各群體，不論是否為基督教，皆認同利他精神，視之為道德的最高理想，並將之與利己主義(egotism)對立，以前者為訓，以後者為戒。此一倫理價值的瀰漫，甚至讓史家以「利他文化」(Culture of Altruism)一詞嘗試捕捉維多利亞時代之整體精神。¹¹¹ 在這精神的影響下，具有全稱意義的「兄弟精神」(brotherhood)、「博愛」(fraternity)、「人類」(humanity)、「團體情誼」(fellowship)等，自然也就成為道德的正當關注對象，並成為具有規範意義的美德自身。無論是在基督教的慈善與社會改革傳統中，或是在具基督教批判色彩的運動如現世主義及社會主義運動中，利他精神以及象徵整體利益之詞彙如「兄弟」或「人類」，也成為人人認可之道德理念。改革浪潮迭起的 1880 及 1890 年代，「利他」更成為所有「改革者與社會主義者常掛在口邊大加闡述的對象」。¹¹² 在這樣的時代道德氛圍影響下，我們不難理解神智學會為何將「普世兄弟」訂立為唯一規範性宗旨。

在〈我為何成為神智論者？〉中，貝森闡述入會原因：一是對於物質主義科學的不滿，二即是「普世兄弟」精神的召喚：

¹¹¹ 利他精神之所以於道德論述中占有崇高地位，與浪漫主義、福音主義，以及十九世紀下半期承繼了基督教道德論述的各類反基督教思潮皆有關聯。關於十九世紀的道德論述，參閱 S. Collini, "The Culture of Altruism: Selfishness and the Decay of Motive," in *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), pp. 60-90; Thomas Dixon, *The Invention of Altruism: Making Moral Meanings in Victorian Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); J. F. C. Harrison, *Late Victorian Britain 1875-1901* (London: Fontana, 1990), pp. 120-30.

¹¹² Dixon, *The Invention of Altruism*, p. 222.

「為何加入學會？」答案很簡單。在我看來，毫無兄弟情誼、反社會性的文明，迫切需要認可那及於全體人類的兄弟精神……不僅如此，凡認同此一理念者，都應轉變自身生命並貢獻一己之力——無論多麼微小——來促其實現。¹¹³

貫穿基督教文化與改革傳統的兄弟理念，其實也貫穿了貝森各階段生命歷程。貝森曾自述，「為那超越己身之物奉獻自身」彷彿是她來自前世的呼喚，構成其生命基調。¹¹⁴ 受此一精神激發，貝森對於成為牧師之妻懷抱過度憧憬，走進婚姻，隨後察覺教會之偽善與言行不一，因而投身現實改革運動。但在運動中，貝森卻也逐漸體認到，人心的冷漠乃是運動最大阻礙；人心之轉化，相較於制度之改變，實更為迫切。¹¹⁵ 於是再度轉向不僅以拓展知識為職責、更以倫理為念的神智學會。

自其成立之初，神智學會即以道德轉化與社會進化做為倫理目標；古老智慧、超常現象與人類意識的探索，只是實現目標的手段。道德與倫理目標，才是最終目的。若非以之為念，各類探究亦將失去意義。貝森亦呼應道：「若要習其〔神智學〕哲學，你必須負其道德之軛；若要習其科學，你必須受其倫理教誨；因為倫理先於科學，責任先於得道。」¹¹⁶ 而在具體道德目標上，神智學所高舉的，便是「利他主義」與「兄弟精神」，希冀以兩者帶動文明進展。它相信，所有神聖傳統之共同精髓，不外就是萬物合一之本體論認識；由之則可推衍出倫理之應然，亦即以整體利益為念的兄弟精神，因生命一體而不可分。

神智學會發展之初，並不具備一套明確改革目標，甚至刻意與現實政治保持距離，日後隨著領導者轉換而有不同內涵與發展特色，例如，布氏偏好古典與古埃及傳統並熱衷於靈學；歐考特則獨鍾佛教，並致力於神智學的學術化工作。貝森取得領導地位後，神智學的倫理宗旨才獲得發揚與落實。以下，我將指出，貝森並非神智學的被動接收者，而是積極挪用者；在她深具個人色彩的闡述與帶領之下，神智學於十九世紀末至二十世紀初，發展出遠較先前更為顯著之倫理面向，並與改革圈

¹¹³ Besant, "Why I Became a Theosophist," p. 14.

¹¹⁴ Besant, *Autobiography*, pp. 39, 57-58, 66-67. 關於貝森的利他與奉獻精神，參閱 Annie Besant, *My Path to Atheism* (London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1885).

¹¹⁵ Stead, "Character Sketch," p. 366.

¹¹⁶ Annie Besant, "The Sphinx of Theosophy," *Lucifer*, Vol. 6 (Aug. 1890), pp. 450-460, at p. 460.

建立起密切連結。¹¹⁷

貝森加入神智學會後即長居印度，除了推展學會在印度之組織和教育工作外，同時也潛心學習梵文並鑽研印度宗教經典。貝森相信，印度之靈性傳統正是西方物質文明所欠缺之文化良方；印度思想也成為其日後宗教哲學建構工作上的主要援引傳統。1890年代，當貝森逐步取得學會領導地位後，她一方面以印度靈性典範批駁西方文明，另一方面則挪用印度宗教傳統中的核心概念例如內在論(Immanentism)、轉世(reincarnation)、業報(karma)與法(dharma)等，發展出一套強調眾生一體與自我犧牲的行動哲學。

貝森的宗教哲學建構，首先由內在論的形而上基礎展開。「內在論」或譯為「遍在論」、「衍生論」、「流溢說」或「泛神論」，主要探討神與萬物之關聯，認為神遍布於宇宙萬物之中，並參與其生成變化；神不但是萬物起源，亦是其最終歸處。因為神之泛存於萬物，萬物也因此具有一共同的神聖本質；此一本質，賦予萬物之間的一體性。¹¹⁸ 內在論有多重起源，見於猶太教神祕主義卡巴拉及新柏拉圖主義，也存在吠陀經典、印度教和佛教之中。十九世紀的德國觀念論及浪漫主義也有類似思想。內在論的多元起源，在神智論者看來，正證實了其基本信念，那就是看似殊異的宗教和靈性傳統之間，實際上乃存在著共通之首要義理(primary truth)，具有根本精神上的一致性。¹¹⁹

貝森的內在論思維主要源自印度宗教傳統，特別是她從梵文譯為英文的《薄伽梵歌》(Bhagavad Gita; 1895)。根據《薄伽梵歌》，宇宙之初始乃由此一神聖精神之化為物質形體而展開：「我是孕育一切存在的種子。任何生物，不管能移動的或不能移動的，沒有我，無法存在」；「在將我的一小部分遍佈整個宇宙後，我將留存其中」。¹²⁰ 藉由神之化為萬物，所有人類乃至宇宙萬物皆遍布神性。此一神性有如馨香之注於滿室，無一角落無有，亦有如大洋之接納百川，和合萬物為一體而不可

¹¹⁷ 貝森帶領下的神智學，與今日全球運動尊為奠定神智學思想基礎的布氏學說之間多所差異，因此被稱為「第二代神智學」或「新神智學」(Neo-Theosophy)。本文著重貝森思想，不另闢篇幅探討兩者異同；關於兩者差異及全球運動各時期之思想取向，參閱 James A. Santucci, "Theosophical Society," in Wouter J. Hanegraaff, ed., *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 1114-1123.

¹¹⁸ Blavatsky, *The Key to Theosophy*, pp. 43-47, 330.

¹¹⁹ Annie Besant, "The Universal Religion," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 39 (Feb. 1907), pp. 489-494, at p. 492.

¹²⁰ 《薄伽梵歌》10章42節，引自 Annie Besant, *Popular Lectures on Theosophy* (Chicago: Rajput Press, 1910), p. 5.

分。這無所不在的神性，指向人與神、人與萬物之間的共通本質與共享命運。如神祇毗濕奴（Vishnu）的化身克里希納（Krishna）在《薄伽梵歌》中所宣告：「我……是那萬物內心中的自我（the Self）；我是萬物之起始、中間與結束。」或如《奧義書》所言：「我是祢；祢是我」。¹²¹ 這「梵我合一」的本體論認識，不但是智慧之開端，亦為其最高目標。人若能在那無限紛雜之萬物形體下，見出「生命一體」（unity of life）或「神之統合」（Unity of God），將可體悟萬物之神聖與不可分。¹²² 那領悟者，在那「醜的、美的、高的、低的、植物乃至提婆（devas）」中將見到自身，也將在「石頭、植物、動物、野蠻人中，一如在聖人與智者中……看見自身，並看見那合一的神聖生命。」¹²³

由此本體論，貝森導出其倫理上之應然，亦即萬物間理應具有的「休戚與共」（solidarity）情感。¹²⁴ 此一遍入萬物之神性的體悟，在貝森看來，足以破除萬物間之「分離感」（separateness）而能結合彼此；人們將無法再於本質上區隔自我與萬物。這源自同一梵性的連結感，也使人們體悟到，任何對於它者之傷害，皆是對於自我之傷害。此一體認之增長，也將能促進慈悲與利他精神，使人做到至尊神所云：「對生物一視同仁，努力為一切生物造福」。（《薄伽梵歌》12: 3-4）。藉此東方本體論之支撐，「普世兄弟」理念也就成為眾生無可迴避的最高道德誠命。¹²⁵

在兄弟精神之外，貝森並結合了盛行於西方之演化概念，加上輪迴、業報及「法」等概念，發展出一套強調「職責」與「奉獻」的行動法則。

神智學宇宙觀在布氏發展下，揉合西方演化理論；不接受《聖經》〈舊約〉的特別創造觀，而是相信生物外在形體乃透過一漫長歷程演進而來；但做為物質主義科學的嚴厲批判者，卻也不接受達爾文之自然天擇說，而是認為生物體各項特徵之

¹²¹ 引自 Annie Besant, "The Law of Sacrifice," in *Laws of the Higher Life* (London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912), pp. 44-64, at p. 59.

¹²² Annie Besant, *The Three Paths to Union with God* (Madras: Theosophical Publishing House, 1925), p. 33.

¹²³ Annie Besant, "The Larger Consciousness," in *Laws of the Higher Life*, pp. 1-26, at p. 26; Besant, "The Law of Sacrifice," in *Laws of the Higher Life*, p. 58.

¹²⁴ Besant, *Popular Lectures on Theosophy*, p. 6.

¹²⁵ 參閱 Annie Besant, "The Growth of a World Religion," in *The Immediate Future and Other Lectures* (London: The Theosophical Society, 1911), pp. 26-50, at p. 36; Annie Besant, "Devotion and the Spiritual Life: A Lecture Delivered in 1895," in *Essays and Addresses. Vol. 2, The Spiritual Life* (London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912), pp. 68-89, at pp. 71-72; Annie Besant, "The Law of Duty," in *Laws of the Higher Life*, pp. 27-43, at p. 43; Annie Besant, *The New Civilisation: Four Lectures Delivered at the Queen's Hall, London* (London: Theosophical Publishing House, 1927).

淘汰與發展，包括各種道德特質與人類心靈，乃是取決於生物體之生存與繁衍能力之作用大小。在這點上，貝森與布氏看法一致，尚且更具批判性。在貝森看來，達爾文主義有以下幾點問題：一、自然天擇若是生命之所有真相，那麼，生命只不過是永無止盡且毫無意義的鬥爭、血腥與受苦；二、它剝奪了人類彌足珍貴之自由意志和心靈力量，因為人類之心靈意識與道德情感在其解釋下，不過是盲目的自然法則產物；三、它無法對萬物一切生滅與變化之目的提出解釋；四、它無法為人類高尚特質例如同情、憐憫及保護弱者等，提出一套合理的發展解釋機制及相應倫理觀。這些問題，在貝森看來，恰恰映照出英國當代文明的高度物質主義傾向，否定了靈性、道德及人類生命理應具有之更高目標。¹²⁶

達爾文的演化觀，往往被神智論者稱為「物質主義式的演化」(materialist evolution)。相對於此，他們結合了內在論與業報觀，提出另一套由精神力量而非物質因素所引導、且具最終目的的進步演化觀。此一混雜東西方思想的演化觀，也正是貝森所強調的「責任」與「奉獻」之行動法則的重要基礎。

在神智學的生命觀和演化觀中，「精神」(spirit)較物質占有更重要地位。宇宙初始乃由神聖精神之化為物質形體而展開，如至尊主在《薄伽梵歌》10章8節所言：「我是靈性和物質世界的根源。一切皆由我留生」。透過神之化身成為萬物生命泉源，萬物取得二元本性，一是較低層次之存有，包含物質性的外在形體(form)以及人的激情、情緒及本能等較低層次本性；二是較高層次的生命(life)，含有神性及較高層次本性例如個體性(individuality)、智慧(intelligence)和靈性(spirituality)等。¹²⁷ 在人類演化歷程中，物質形體雖有生死，但人之靈魂卻可永存，如《薄伽梵歌》云：「靈魂永無生死，永存永在，源於太初。驅體可殺，靈魂不可殺。」¹²⁸ 唯有高層本性具有主導力量，足以影響物質性的有形生物體之演化與發展，也因之人類須約束連結於有形肉身的低層屬性，竭力發展那無形體、不隨肉身銷毀的高層本性。依此，演化亦是「生命」逐漸戰勝或轉化「形體」的過程。此一過程，套用神

¹²⁶ 參閱 Annie Besant, "The Secret of Evolution," *Theosophical Review*, Vol. 27 (Oct. 1900), pp. 131-144; Annie Besant, "The Evolution of Man," in *Evolution and Occultism*; Annie Besant, *Necessity for Re-incarnation* (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1904).

¹²⁷ 神智學認為人乃由七元素構成：Atma, the Universal spirit、Buddhi, the human spirit、Manas, the rational soul、Kamarupa, the animal soul with its appetites and passions、Prana, the vitality, the principle of life、Linga Sharira, the vehicle of this life、Rupa, the physical body, 前三者為高層本性，後四者為低層本性，參閱 Besant, "Why I Became a Theosophist," p. 21; Besant, *Popular Lectures on Theosophy*, p. 9.

¹²⁸ 《薄伽梵歌》2章20節，引自 Besant, *Popular Lectures on Theosophy*, p. 6.

智學之宗教話語表達，正是人類內在神性逐漸彰顯、心靈意識逐漸擴張以擁抱宇宙真實的過程。演化的最終目標，正是在於理解那大寫的「恆常實在」(Reality)，超越如同外衣的物質世界，求取在意識上與那絕對存有(the Absolute, the Universal All)的完全合一。¹²⁹

然而，此一最高演化目標，並非人類短暫一生所能成就，神智學因此巧妙結合「輪迴」概念，指出人類必須藉助輪迴之積累效應，方可達至智能與心靈的最高發展。¹³⁰ 透過不滅的高層本性之積累發展，人類將可在演化道路上持續攀升。受西方十八、十九世紀興起的種族理論影響，神智論者亦曾闡述一套頗為繁複、以「種族」(race)為集體單位的人類演化進程。他們相信，透過不斷的輪迴提升，具有更高心靈意識與超能力(astral power)的人類「新種族」也將陸續誕生，終而使人臻至神之完美。¹³¹

達爾文主義的物質決定論，因其缺乏最終道德目的，常遭批判。神智學之輪迴演化觀，在貝森看來，正解決了「物質主義式演化」之窘境。於是，生存競爭不再是生命的唯一目的，精神與意識被賦予重大道德意義與決定性力量，生命亦將藉由輪迴與演化朝向梵我合一之神聖目標邁進。此外，貝森並且好談「業報」與「法」等概念，視兩者為演化與輪迴的正面推進力量，並以之建立一個以「職責」與「奉獻」為導向的實踐倫理觀。

神智論者接受「業報」作為一套支配並解釋宇宙秩序之因果法則；它解釋了人們命運為何殊異，天賦際遇也各自不同。神智論者雖然將隱含平等思想的「兄弟精神」視為最高理念，但它並不否認現實中的不平等。個人與種族間的差異，在他看

¹²⁹ 參閱 Annie Besant, *The Seven Principles of Man* (Madras: Theosophical Society, 1892); Annie Besant and Herbert Burrows, *A Short Glossary of Theosophical Terms* (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1891), pp. 3-4; W. Kingsland, *The Mission of Theosophy* (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1892), p. 4.

¹³⁰ 神智學會的輪迴觀與印度輪迴觀不盡相同，最重要差異在於，印度輪迴觀認為人類靈魂可輪迴至其他物種，神智學則認為與動物無涉。有學者因此認為，神智學會之輪迴觀，受到更多西方神祕主義傳統的影響，參閱 Wouter J. Hanegraaff, *New Age Religion and Western Culture* (New York: State University of New York, 1998), p. 481; Hammer, *Claiming Knowledge*, pp. 455-494.

¹³¹ 關於神智學種族觀，參閱 Annie Besant, "Impending Physical Changes," in *The Immediate Future and Other Lectures*, pp. 1-25; Annie Besant, *The Changing World and Lectures to Theosophical Students* (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1910), pp. 50-51; Carla Risseuw, "Thinking Culture through Counter-Culture: The Case of Theosophists in India and Ceylon and Their Ideas on Race and Hierarchy (1875-1947)," in Antony R. H. Copley, ed., *Gurus and Their Followers: New Religious Reform Movements in Colonial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 180-205; Gauri Viswanathan, *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), pp. 177-208.

來，皆由「業報」所致。個人於前世積累之因，將決定下個輪迴之果；種族所集體累積之因，也將轉變種族之集體命運。人們因此必須在輪迴中持續靈性修持，使生命成長，不斷演化攀升。但個人該依何種行為準則行事？貝森在此引入「法」的概念。

「法」又譯為「達摩」，是印度宗教中道德生活的指導原則。貝森給法的定義是：「生命開展之法則，型塑它物以展現自身」。¹³² 在演化進程中，法兼具兩層意義，一是事物在任一演化階段的內在本質，二是演化邁進的成長法則。¹³³ 換句話說，它兼具實然與應然；它首先解釋了生命所處之內在狀態，其次則指向人人依其不同地位所應盡之職責或義務。職責因各人所處之不同演化階段與輪迴境況而定。以印度種姓制度為例，婆羅門之職責在於教育眾生，刹帝利保護邦國，吠舍致力於累積財富以利生命，首陀羅則須服侍並善盡服從之義務。在內在論所蘊含之有機社會論下，人人各司其職、各盡義務，整體社會也因之得以運作與提昇。如貝森所言：「義務必須實行，世界之輪才會轉動」。¹³⁴ 實踐「法」也就是「履行職責」之過程；藉由不同責任之履行，個體靈魂將淬鍊提昇並帶動社會整體演化；人生在世之首要責任，就是認清自身於社會和輪迴之地位，正確奉行其法。法也因此是個人進步與社會演化最為關鍵的行動法則。¹³⁵

對於「法」的認知與實踐，就如同輪迴與演化，無法與內在論與梵我合一之理想分開考量。人人各司其法，是責任，也是為全體福祉所做之「奉獻」。故「法」同時也是一套弘揚奉獻精神之道德法則。全然之奉獻，或謂「犧牲」(sacrifice)，正是人類追求梵我合一之演化路上的必要元素與最高行動理念。貝森說道：「生命藉由犧牲而存續，一切演化根植於犧牲」；¹³⁶ 「所有真實的生命也將是犧牲的生命，當一切行動皆為犧牲之時，人類才有可能成為完美屬靈之人」。¹³⁷ 西方雖無種姓制度，人我之間卻同樣有著階級與際遇上的不同，貝森在面對西方大眾時，也不斷鼓舞人們考量己身位置，善盡義務，服務他人。面對學會中為數眾多的中上階級，貝森尤

¹³² Annie Besant, *Dharma* (Los Angeles: Theosophical Publishing House, 1918, 3rd. ed.), p. 9.

¹³³ Besant, *Dharma*, pp. 18, 41.

¹³⁴ Annie Besant, "Spiritual Life for the Man of the World," in *Essays and Addresses*. Vol. 2, *The Spiritual Life*, pp. 1-28, at p. 15.

¹³⁵ 貝森對法的詳盡闡釋，參閱 Besant, *Dharma*.

¹³⁶ Besant, *Laws of the Higher Life*, p. 47.

¹³⁷ Besant, "Spiritual Life for the Man of the World," in *Essays and Addresses*. Vol. 2, pp. 1-28, at p. 19.

其強調「位高責重」(*noblesse oblige*)之概念，企盼人們擔負起那因優勢而生之更高責任，共創集體未來。一如她在 1910 年於倫敦一場演說中所描繪的樂觀遠景：「當那占有優勢者準備犧牲，新時代的黎明也將浮現地平面；當財富、教育和權力被視為為了整體良善之目標所受之託付時，一個良善與高貴的國家基石也就此鋪下。」¹³⁸ 無論聽眾是印度人或英國人，是社會底層或優渥高層，「犧牲」這倫理職責以及與之連結的「梵我一體」生命本質，總是貝森所亟欲傳達給予世人的迫切訊息。¹³⁹

印度的業報輪迴觀，在十九世紀常被西方學者視為不公義且消極悲觀。因為它合理化了個人苦難、種姓制度及一切不平等；其次，它使人們將希望寄託於來世而非現世解脫，終而養成因循苟且的反改革態度。此外，梵我一體的整體思維，也被認為有違西方所標榜的個體價值之建立。這樣一些對於東方宗教的傳統看法，經常被用來解釋印度社會發展之相對落後，並正當化英國之殖民統治。¹⁴⁰ 然而，在貝森的重新詮釋下，卻發展成一套足以提供內在動力、激勵行動的正面道德論述。

貝森並不認為東方宗教思想過於消極；相較於十九世紀基督教神學，尤其是「替代性救贖」¹⁴¹ (*vicarious atonement*)、「原罪」、「地獄」及「永世懲罰」等概念，其實更加激勵人心。首先，人類救贖不再仰賴神之武斷意志，而是建立在業報這可靠的自然法則之上；其次，基督的替代性贖罪，有害個人責任觀之建立，而業報輪迴卻遵循嚴格因果，給予人們向善改過機會；第三，基督教救贖觀與達爾文主義，依貝森所見，鼓吹自利與競爭，內在論卻將個人救贖與萬物命運緊密連結，使人們隨時以整體救贖為念。¹⁴² 最後，相對於基督教所強調之人之罪性，遍存於人心之梵性卻賦予人類臻至完美之潛能，更具正面激勵行動之效。¹⁴³

¹³⁸ Besant, *The Changing World and Lectures to Theosophical Students*, p. 44.

¹³⁹ 參閱貝森在印度與倫敦之不同演說中的相同強調: Besant, *The Three Paths to Union with God*; Besant, *Laws of the Higher Life*.

¹⁴⁰ 參閱 Philip C. Almond, *The British Discovery of Buddhism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 80-90; Annie Besant, "Karma and Social Improvement," *Lucifer*, Vol. 4 (Aug. 1889), pp. 457-463.

¹⁴¹ 基督教神學一重要概念，歷代神學家雖有不同詮釋，但基本上均指向基督救贖之替代性本質。簡言之，帶有罪惡的人類，其救贖無法憑藉自身能力，而須仰賴基督之替代受罰方能獲得，此一救贖，也因之具有替代性本質。

¹⁴² 十九世紀的基督教批判者常將基督教救贖觀描繪為自私而非利它的，因為人們往往僅著眼個人救贖與來世而忽略現世中他人苦難；且儘管行善，若以個人天上回報為念，無異助長私心。

¹⁴³ 參閱 Besant, "Karma and Social Improvement"; Annie Besant, "The Place of Masters in Religion," in her *London Lectures of 1907*, pp. 27-46, at p. 33; Besant, "The Sphinx of Theosophy," pp. 459-460; Besant, *The Changing World and Lectures to Theosophical Students*, pp. 45-46.

總結來說，貝森結合了演化與東方宗教概念，闡述一套生命觀和行動哲學；在遍入萬物的神性中，見到生命共同起源與終極理想；在輪迴與演化中找到靈性發展法則；在業報與法的概念中求得行為依歸。「兄弟精神」與「奉獻職責」在嫁接了內在論、演化、輪迴、業報與法等概念後，不但獲取更為完備之形上基礎與道德規範力，同時也呼應了十九世紀末眾多改革運動乃至整體時代之共同道德信念。此外，貝森更透過具體行動，促成靈性傳統與社會改革工作結合，落實「普世兄弟」之倫理宗旨，建立起學會在改革圈中之威望。

與貝森初會面時，布氏即對貝森說，「若我有妳之辯才，將能使英國翻騰。」¹⁴⁴ 布氏的判斷並沒有錯。貝森於 1889 年加入神智學會，迅即成為最佳宣傳員。1891 年，布氏過世後，貝森接任「奧祕部」(esoteric section) 外部領導 (outer head) 職務，並成為學會在歐洲和印度的實質領導人。¹⁴⁵ 1907 年歐考特過逝，貝森成為第二任世界總會會長，學會名望和影響力也臻至歷史高峰，組織擴展和會員數都達到歷年來最大幅成長。¹⁴⁶

神智學會的成長固有其時代因素，但亦與貝森的現世關切有著密切連結。神智學會儘管具有文化批判色彩，但為維護其中立與學術性以及在印度的順利發展，有一不涉現實政治之非成文政策。¹⁴⁷ 貝森力求突破中立原則，在她的會長就任演說中暢談「開放政策」，鼓勵會員積極行動並參與社運，企圖讓各地分會成為「行動中心」而非「行動之界線」。貝森並身先士卒，在其任內落實此一理念。¹⁴⁸

1908 年，貝森成立半獨立於學會的「神智學會服務團」(Theosophical Society's Order of Service)，呼籲會員以「所有受苦者」為念，投入服務與改革工作；有意組團者只要經總部批准，即可開始運作。服務團的半獨立性，讓學會不須以團體名義

¹⁴⁴ "Address by the President," *The Vâhan*, Vol. 22 (Aug. 1912), pp. 4-6, at p. 6.

¹⁴⁵ 奧祕部乃由布氏於 1888 年創辦，致力於神祕知識之研習與傳授。此一組織之領導分為外部領導 (Outer Head) 與內部領導 (Inner Head)，前者先後由布氏與貝森擔任，後者則是由學會所尊崇之西藏高人擔任。

¹⁴⁶ 直至二十世紀初，分會數已逾四百，遍佈歐、美、亞各洲，正式會員數亦由 1907 年的 15,000 人增至 1928 年的 45,000 人。參閱 Taylor, *Annie Besant*, p. 328; J. J. Clarke, *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 90.

¹⁴⁷ 學會總部遷往印度時，印度民族自決運動已現開端。學會早期堅守政治中立原則，但仍然引起英國殖民政府的警戒與監控，參閱 Mark Bevir, "Theosophy as a Political Movement," in Copley, *Gurus and Their Followers*, pp. 159-179。

¹⁴⁸ "President Address," *The Vâhan*, Vol. 17 (Aug. 1907), pp. 1-3; Annie Besant, "The Wider Outlook," *The Theosophist*, Vol. 38 (Nov. 1916), pp. 127-40, at p. 137.

介入現實問題，卻仍得以落實兄弟理念。服務團成立後迅速發展，至 1916 年短短八年間，已有四十個聯盟，推廣另類醫療、盲人點字、促進英印關係、反女子人口販賣、反疫苗接種及反動物實驗等目標。

加入神智學會，也未終止貝森個人的改革參與。她除了持續任職「倫敦教育委員會」(London School Board)，同時也組織工會並推動電車與巴士工人減工時運動。¹⁴⁹ 移居印度後，她仍經常返英巡迴演說，並廣泛支援各類改革目標，例如女子普選權運動、社會主義運動、娼妓救援、獄政改革、素食推廣及反動物實驗運動等。例如，1909 年，反動物實驗運動因「棕狗事件」而特別激烈的那一年，貝森在「國際反動物實驗暨動物保護會議」中發表演說，並準備了一幅「神智學會服務團」的大型旗幟，率領服務團成員走在浩蕩隊伍中。¹⁵⁰ 此類做法，不但帶動學會參與社會改革，並提升學會在改革圈中的名聲。¹⁵¹

在印度方面，因為英印間的緊張關係，貝森原遵循中立原則，但在 1913 年後便大力投身現實事務，例如教育改革、印度教改革、女權爭取及自治運動等。¹⁵² 1914 年，貝森創辦兩份報紙——《政治共同體》(*The Commonwealth*)及《新印度》(*New India*)，鼓吹各類改革思想並推動印度自治。同年，她並加入「印度國大黨」(Indian National Congress)；¹⁵³ 見其疲弱無力，於是在 1916 年另外籌組更具影響力的「全印自治聯盟」(All-India Home Rule League)，積極於全印度展開自治宣傳和組訓工作，並帶動眾多學會會員投入。¹⁵⁴ 在爭取印度自治上，貝森不但透過對於印度宗教思想的

¹⁴⁹ 參閱 Besant, *Annie Besant*, p. 358.

¹⁵⁰ 關於棕狗事件及此次會議與遊行活動，參閱李鑑慧，〈由「棕狗傳奇」論二十世紀初英國反動物實驗運動策略之激進化〉，《新史學》，23: 2 (2012)，頁 155-216；“League for the Abolition of Vivisection, Vaccination and Inoculation,” *The Vâhan*, Vol. 19 (Dec. 1909), p. 59; “On the Watch-Tower,” *The Theosophist*, Vol. 30 (Sept. 1909), pp. 663-664.

¹⁵¹ 神智學會與改革運動之關聯，參閱 Dixon, *Divine Feminine*, pp. 121-151.

¹⁵² 關於貝森在印度的改革工作，參閱 Nancy Fix Anderson, “‘Mother Besant’ and Indian National Politics,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Sept. 2002), pp. 27-54; Mark Bevir, “Theosophy as a Political Movement”; Jyoti Chandra, *Annie Besant: From Theosophy to Nationalism* (Delhi: K. K. Publications, 2001); Mark Bevir, “In Opposition to the Raj: Annie Besant and the Dialectic of Empire,” *History of Political Thought*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 61-77; Joanne Strafford Mortimer, “Annie Besant and India 1913-1917,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, 18 (1983), pp. 61-78; Peter Robb, “The Government of India and Annie Besant,” *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (1976), pp. 107-130; Nancy Fix Anderson, “Bridging Cross-Cultural Feminisms: Annie Besant and Women’s Rights in England and India, 1874-1933,” *Women’s History Review*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (1994), pp. 563-579.

¹⁵³ 1885 年成立，致力於推動印度自治工作及獨立運動。1947 年印度建國後，印度國大黨成為印度主要政黨，主要由尼赫魯與甘地家族掌控，目前仍為印度兩大政黨之一。

¹⁵⁴ Bevir, “Theosophy as a Political Movement,” p. 174.

重新詮釋，提供改革圈一套源自本土思想的反對大英帝國統治之論述，¹⁵⁵其相關立場與作法，亦遠較印度知識領導階層更為激進。1917年，貝森即因為對英國殖民政府的批判和煽動言論遭軟禁三個月。此一事件引發英、印政壇軒然大波，卻也讓貝森在印度的全國性威望達至高峰，同年並當選為「印度國大黨」主席。¹⁵⁶在這之後，貝森因為與甘地的路線之爭，以及英國女性身分，領導地位漸為甘地所取代。然而，這並不稍減貝森在印度政治中所曾扮演的重要角色。今日在印度諸多大城市以貝森為名之公園和街道，比比皆是，見證貝森為印度獨立所曾作出的巨大貢獻。¹⁵⁷

伍、結語

本文嘗試理解，著名社會改革者貝森為何於不惑之年，投身致力於研究東方思想與超常現象的神祕主義團體—神智學會。

此一課題的挑戰性，首先來自史家自身思想框架所起之侷限。受限於「世俗化」與「現代化」理論框架及其背後所隱含之對於宗教與科學之價值認定，過往史家往往難以充分說明貝森此一生涯轉折，甚且多所負評。

要觸此課題而不重蹈老路，不得不由當代智識框架之檢討展開。受惠於近數十年來學界思想發展，本文揚棄了傳統世俗化論述，為理解十九世紀末宗教思想與經驗之多樣風貌闢出理解空間；也將當代科學觀視為待分析之歷史產物而非真理自身，從而恢復各類知識或真理的平等競逐地位；整體更不以今日認知檢驗歷史行動者之真理宣稱，而是透過多方面的歷史脈絡化工作，建立貝森信仰所為之時代合理性。

在這樣的重建工作上，我回歸十九世紀的宗教、科學與改革發展脈絡，指出貝森之抉擇不但有其時代合理性，並具有時代標誌意義。神智學之於貝森，既是時代信仰危機下的另類靈性選項，回應基督教之傳統教義與倫理侷限而不放棄靈性追尋；


¹⁵⁵ Bevir, "In Opposition to the Raj."

¹⁵⁶ 關於此一事件始末，參閱 Taylor, *Annie Besant*, pp. 277-326.

¹⁵⁷ 孟買的沃里 (Worli) 區有一 "Dr. Annie Besant Road"；過去名為馬德拉斯 (Madras) 而今改名為清奈 (Chennai)，有一公園名為 Dr. Annie Besant Park，當中立有一尊貝森銅像；公園前的繁忙大街，則是另一條 "Dr. Besant Road"。

同時也是對於當代科學的批判性回應，挑戰其武斷獨大與畫地自限而不揚棄理性探索；透過對於東方思想的闡揚，貝森並發展出一套強調眾生一體與自我犧牲的行動哲學，藉以持續參與於問題叢生的世紀末社會之改造工程。貝森的神智學轉向，可謂十九世紀末、二十世紀初人們心靈與智識探索的一個縮影，亦是對於英國社會、文化與政治問題的適切當世回應。此一回應，做為對於理想社會之另類建構，以今日眼光視之，或有其不合時宜處，但這卻不妨礙其做為一主流價值與傳統之批判者、挑戰者之歷史地位。且值得注意的是，諸多發端並茁壯於十九世紀之價值傳統，如科學主義，大抵仍支配影響著今日社會發展乃至學術智識傳統，這也無怪乎對於貝森後半生歷史功過之持平探討，至今難見；當然，這也解釋了為何在科技與物質文明問題叢生之今日，貝森與神智學思想，又儼然成為重返靈性力量的「新時代運動」（New Age Movement）所積極擷取之重要思想泉源而大有復興之勢。¹⁵⁸

昆汀·史金納（Quentin Skinner）在《政治的多樣視界》一書的前言曾說道，史學的珍貴意義正在於「驅魔」（exorcism），亦即驅除主流智識傳統對於我們往往如魔法般的掌控。我們若能如其所倡，以「過去眼光」理解「過往思想」，並致力於重建一切思想之「當世之用」與「所涉之爭」，將不致輕易受今日價值及受其支配之智識傳統所「迷惑」（bewitched）。如此一來，歷史理解除了「裝備我們對於各類可能性之想像」，將使我們明白，那些體現於我們「現有生命型態中之價值，以及對於這些價值的看待方式，反映的乃是人們在不同歷史時刻與不同世界可能性中，所做出的一系列決定」；此一自覺，更也將「幫助我們掙脫對於這樣一些價值以及它們該如何被理解與詮釋之霸權論述的網綁……繼而以一種嶄新的探究精神，自問我們該如何看待這些價值。」¹⁵⁹ 史金納所謂史學之驅魔之用，不外乎此。

這篇文章既非貝森生涯之完整建構，也不是神智學運動的完整交代；其所求，毋寧正是這樣一個關係著吾人或可如何看待無論是過往抑或是現今之「宗教」與「科學」以及兩者與現實世界關聯的一個小小驅魔嘗試。

¹⁵⁸ 關於神智學會與新時代運動之關聯，參閱 Bevir, “Annie Besant’s Quest for Truth,” Olav Hammer and Mikael Rothstein, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to New Religious Movements* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 240-241, 248-251; Paul Heelas, *The New Age Movement* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

¹⁵⁹ Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*. Vol. 1, *Regarding Method* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 6.

參考書目

A. 史料文獻

(一) 期刊 (不另徵引出自以下期刊之文章)

Borderland

Edinburgh Review

The Freethinker

The Link

Lucifer

The Medium and Daybreak

Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research

Progress

Review of Reviews

The Spiritual Magazine

The Theosophical Review

The Theosophist

The Unknown World

The Vâhan

(二) 書籍

(Multiple authors) *Dr. Annie Besant. Fifty Years in Public Work*. London: Leighton, 1924.

Besant, Annie. *On the Deity of Jesus of Nazareth*. London: Thomas Scott, 1873.

_____. "According to Saint John." London: Thomas Scott, 1873.

_____. *On the Nature and Existence of God*. London: Thomas Scott, 1874.

_____. *The Gospel of Atheism*. London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1877.

_____. *Light, Heat, and Sound*. London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1881.

_____. *Physiology of the Home*. London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1882.

_____. *Electricity*. London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1882.

_____. *Eyes and Ears*. London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1882.

_____. *Autobiographical Sketches*. London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1885.

- _____. *My Path to Atheism*. London: Freethought Publishing Company, 1885.
- _____. *The Seven Principles of Man*. Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Society, 1892.
- _____. *Annie Besant: An Autobiography*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893.
- _____. *The Ancient Wisdom: An Outline of Theosophical Teachings*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1899.
- _____. *Evolution and Occultism*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1904.
- _____. *Necessity for Re-incarnation*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1904.
- _____. *London Lectures of 1907*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1909.
- _____. "Theosophy and the Theosophical Society." In *London Lectures of 1907*, pp. 47-67. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1909.
- _____. "The Place of Masters in Religion." In *London Lectures of 1907*, pp. 27-46. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1909.
- _____. *The Changing World and Lectures to Theosophical Students*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1910.
- _____. *Popular Lectures on Theosophy*. Chicago: Rajput Press, 1910.
- _____. *The Immediate Future and Other Lectures*. London: The Theosophical Society, 1911.
- _____. "Impending Physical Changes." In *The Immediate Future and Other Lectures*, pp. 1-25. London: The Theosophical Society, 1911.
- _____. "The Growth of a World Religion." In *The Immediate Future and Other Lectures*, pp. 26-50. London: The Theosophical Society, 1911.
- _____. *Laws of the Higher Life*. London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912.
- _____. "The Larger Consciousness." In *Laws of the Higher Life*, pp. 1-26. London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912.
- _____. *Essays and Addresses. Vol. II, The Spiritual Life*. London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912.
- _____. "Devotion and the Spiritual Life: A Lecture Delivered in 1895." In *Essays and Addresses. Vol. II, The Spiritual Life*, pp. 68-89. London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912.
- _____. "The Law of Duty." In *Laws of the Higher Life*, pp. 27-43. London: The

- Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912.
- _____. "The Law of Sacrifice." In Besant, *Laws of the Higher Life*, pp. 44-64. London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1912.
- _____. *Duties of the Theosophist*. Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Publishing House, 1917.
- _____. *Dharma*. Los Angeles: Theosophical Publishing House, 1918, 3rd ed.
- _____. *The Three Paths to Union with God*. Adyar, Madras: Theosophical Publishing House, 1925.
- _____. *The New Civilisation: Four Lectures Delivered at the Queen's Hall, London*. London: Theosophical Publishing House, 1927.
- _____. "Among the Adepts. Madame Blavatsky on 'The Secret Doctrine'." In *The Annie Besant Centenary Book*. Edited by James H. Cousins, pp. 38-44. Adyar, Madras: The Besant Centenary Celebrations Committee, 1947.
- _____. "Why I am a Socialist," in *A Selection of the Social and Political Pamphlets of Annie Besant*. Edited by John Saville. New York: A. M. Kelley, 1970.
- _____. "Why I Became a Theosophist." In *A Selection of the Social and Political Pamphlets of Annie Besant*. Edited by John Saville. New York: M. Kelley, 1970.
- _____. and Herbert Burrows. *A Short Glossary of Theosophical Terms*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1891.
- Besterman, Theodore. *The Mind of Annie Besant*. London: Theosophical Publishing House, 1927.
- Blavatsky, Helena Petrovna. *Isis Unveiled: A Master-Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Theology. Vol. I. Science*. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1988 [1877].
- _____. *The Secret Doctrine*. London: Theosophical Publishing Company, 1888.
- _____. *The Key to Theosophy*. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 2002 [1889].
- Carpenter, Edward. *My Days and Dreams*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1916.
- Carpenter, William B. *Mesmerism, Spiritualism, &c.: Historically & Scientifically Considered*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1877.
- Cousins, James H. ed. *The Annie Besant Centenary Book*. Adyar, Madras: The Besant Centenary Celebrations Committee, 1947.

- Galton, Francis. *English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture*. London: Macmillan, 1874.
- Kingsland, W. *The Mission of Theosophy*. London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1892.
- Lillie, Arthur. *Madame Blavatsky and Her "Theosophy": A Study*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1895.
- Olcott, Henry Steel. *Inaugural Address of the President of the Theosophical Society*. New York: Theosophical Society, 1875.
- Podmore, Frank. *Modern Spiritualism: A History and a Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co., 1902.
- _____. *The Naturalisation of the Supernatural*. London: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1908.
- Shaw, Bernard. "Mrs. Besant's Passage through Fabian Socialism." In James H. Cousins ed. *The Annie Besant Centenary Book*. pp. 17-24. Adyar, Madras: The Besant Centenary Celebrations Committee, 1947.
- _____. *An Autobiography 1856-1898*. New York: Weybright and Talley, 1969.
- Tyndall, John. *Fragments of Science for Unscientific People: A series of Detached Essays, Lectures, and Reviews*. London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1871.
- _____. *Fragments of Science*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1896.
- Webb, Beatrice. *My Apprenticeship*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926.
- West, Geoffrey. *Mrs Annie Besant*. London: Gerald Howe, 1927.

B. 近人研究

(一) 專書

- Almond, Philip C. *The British Discovery of Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Barrow, Logie. *Independent Spirits: Spiritualism and English Plebeians, 1850-1910*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.
- Bevir, Mark. *The Logic of the History of Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Bown, Nicola and Carolyn Burdett, eds. *The Victorian Supernatural*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- Brandon, Ruth. *The Spiritualists: The Passion for the Occult in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. New York: Prometheus Books, 1984.
- Brooke, John Hedley. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Budd, Susan. *Varieties of Unbelief: Atheists and Agnostics in English Society 1850-1960*. London: Heinemann, 1977.
- Burke, Peter. *What is Cultural History?* Cambridge: Polity, 2004.
- Butler, Alison. *Victorian Occultism and the Making of Modern Magic: Invoking Tradition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Campbell, Bruce F. *Ancient Wisdom Revived: A History of the Theosophical Movement*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Cerullo, John J. *The Secularization of the Soul*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1992.
- Chandra, Jyoti. *Annie Besant: From Theosophy to Nationalism*. Delhi: K. K. Publications, 2001.
- Clarke, J. J. *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Clarke, Peter Bernard, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Chadwick, Owen. *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Collini, S. *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- Copley, Antony R. H., ed. *Gurus and Their Followers: New Religious Reform Movements in Colonial India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Cranston, Sylvia. *HPB: The Extraordinary Life and Influence of Helena Blavatsky*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1993.
- Dawson, Gowan, and Bernard Lightman, eds. *Victorian Scientific Naturalism: Community, Identity and Continuity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.
- DeYoung, Ursula. *A Vision of Modern Science: John Tyndall and the Role of the Scientists in Victorian Culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Dixon, Joy. *Divine Feminine: Theosophy and Feminism in England*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Dixon, Thomas. *The Invention of Altruism: Making Moral Meanings in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Foucault, Michel. "Society Must be Defended": *Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-76*. New York: Picador, 1997.
- Francis O' Gorman, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- _____. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Galvan, Jill. *The Sympathetic Medium: Feminine Channeling, the Occult, and Communication Technologies 1859-1919*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010.
- Gauld, Alan. *The Founders of Psychical Research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.
- Gerth, H. H., and C. Wright Mills, eds. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Golinski, Jan. *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas. *The Western Esoteric Traditions: A Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Green, Anna. *Cultural History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Green, Simon J. D. *Religion in the Age of Decline: Organisation and Experience in Industrial Yorkshire, 1870-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hammer, Olav. *Claiming Knowledge: Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____, and Mikael Rothstein, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to New Religious Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Hanegraaf, Wouter J., ed. *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- _____. *New Age Religion and Western Culture*. New York: State University of New York, 1998.
- Harrison, J. F. C. *Late Victorian Britain 1875-1901*. London: Fontana, 1990.

- Heelas, Paul. *The New Age Movement*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Heyck, Thomas William. *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England*. London: Croom Helm, 1982.
- Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Hunt, Lynn, ed. *The New Cultural History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Katznelson, Ira, and Gareth Stedman Jones, eds. *Religion and the Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Kerr, Howard, ed. *The Occult in America: New Historical Perspectives*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Kim, Stephen S. *John Tyndall's Transcendental Materialism and the Conflict between Religion and Science in Victorian England*. Lewiston: Mellen University Press, 1996.
- Kontou, Tatiana and Sarah William, eds. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Nineteenth-Century Spiritualism and the Occult*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2012.
- Lamont, Peter. *Extraordinary Beliefs: A Historical Approach to a Psychological Problem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Ledger, Sally, and Scott McCracken, eds. *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Lightman, Bernard. *The Origins of Agnosticism: Victorian Unbelief and the Limits of Knowledge*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- _____. *Evolutionary Naturalism in Victorian Britain*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Lightman, Bernard, and Michael S. Reidy, eds. *The Age of Scientific Naturalism*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2014.
- Lightman, Bernard, and Richard Helmstadtler, eds. *Victorian Faith in Crisis*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990.
- Luckhurst, Roger. *The Invention of Telepathy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Marshall, Gail, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Fin de Siècle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- McCorristine, Shane. *Spectres of the Self: Thinking about Ghosts and Ghost-Seeing in England, 1750-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- Morus, Iwan Rhys. *When Physics Became King*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Nethercot, Arthur Hobart. *The First Five Lives of Annie Besant*. London : Routledge, 1961.
- _____. *The Last Four Lives of Annie Besant*. London : Routledge, 1963.
- Oppenheim, Janet. *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850-1910*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Owen, Alex. *The Darkened Room: Women, Power and Spiritualism in Late Victorian England*. London: Virago Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Place of Enchantment: British Occultism and the Culture of the Modern*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Poster, Mark. *Cultural History + Postmodernity: Disciplinary Readings and Challenges*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Rhone, Christine. *Western Esotericism*. New York: State University of New York, 2010.
- Royle, Edward. *Victorian Infidels: The Origins of the British Secularist Movement 1791-1866*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1974.
- _____. *Radicals, Secularists and Republicans: Popular Freethought in Britain, 1866-1915*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980.
- _____, ed. *The Infidel Tradition from Paine to Bradlaugh*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976.
- Saville, John, ed. *A Selection of the Social and Political Pamphlets of Annie Besant*. New York: A. M. Kelley, 1970.
- Secord, James A. *Visions of Science: Books and Readers at the Dawn of the Victorian Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Skinner, Quentin. *Visions of Politics. Volume I: Regarding Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Taylor, Anne. *Annie Besant: A Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971.
- Trautmann, Thomas R. *Aryans and British India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Turner, Frank M. *Between Science and Religion: The Reaction to Scientific Naturalism in Late Victorian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

- _____. *Contesting Cultural Authority: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Veer, Peter van der. *Imperial Encounters: Religion and Modernity in India and Britain*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Viswanathan, Gauri. *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- White, Paul. *Thomas Huxley: Making the "Man of Science."* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Wolfe, Willard. *From Radicalism to Socialism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- Wyhe, John van. *Phrenology and the Origins of Victorian Scientific Naturalism*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Wright, Theodore Robert. *The Religion of Humanity: The Impact of Comtean Positivism on Victorian Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Young, Robert. *Darwin's Metaphor: Nature's Place in Victorian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

(二) 期刊論文

a. 英文

- Anderson, Nancy Fix. "Bridging Cross-Cultural Feminisms: Annie Besant and Women's Rights in England and India, 1874-1933." *Women's History Review*. Vol. 3, No. 4 (1994), pp. 563-579.
- _____. "'Mother Besant' and Indian National Politics." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*. Vol. 30, No. 3 (Sept. 2002), pp. 27-54.
- Asprem, Egil. "A Nice Arrangement of Heterodoxies: William McDougall and the Professionalization of Psychological Research." *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 46, No. 2 (2010), pp. 123-143.
- Barton, Ruth. "John Tyndall, Pantheist: A Rereading of the Belfast Address." *Osiris*. 2nd series, Vol. 3 (1987), pp. 111-134.
- _____. "Huxley, Lubbock, and Half a Dozen Others: Professional and Gentlemen in the Formation of the X Club, 1851-1864." *Isis*. Vol. 89, No. 3 (1998), pp. 410-444.

- Bevir, Mark. "The West Turns Eastward: Madame Blavatsky and the Transformation of the Occult Tradition." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. Vol. 62, No. 3 (1994), pp. 747-767.
- _____. "In Opposition to the Raj: Annie Besant and the Dialectic of Empire." *History of Political Thought*. Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 61-77.
- Bevir, Mark. "Annie Besant's Quest for Truth: Christianity, Secularism and New Age Thought." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. Vol. 50, No. 1 (Jan. 1999), pp. 62-93.
- Desmond, Adrian. "Redefining the X Axis: 'Professional,' 'Amateurs' and the Making of Mid-Victorian Biology—A Progress Report." *Journal of the History of Biology*, Vol. 34 (2001), pp. 3-50.
- Mandler, Peter. "Cultural Histories Old and New: Rereading the Work of Janet Oppenheim." *Victorian Studies*. Vol. 41, No. 1 (Autumn 1997), pp. 69-105.
- Mortimer, Joanne Strafford. "Annie Besant and India 1913-1917." *Journal of Contemporary History*. 18 (1983), pp. 61-78.
- Nash, David. "Reconnecting Religion with Social and Cultural History: Secularization's Failure as a Master Narrative." *Cultural and Social History*. Vol. 3, No. 1 (2004), pp. 302-325.
- Nethercot, Arthur Hobart. "G. B. S. and Annie Besant." *Bulletin (Shaw Society of America)*. Vol. 9, No. 1 (Sept. 1955), pp. 1-14.
- Noakes, Richard. "Ethers, Religion and Politics in Late-Victorian Physics: Beyond the Wynne Thesis." *History of Science*. Vol. 43 (2005), pp. 415-455.
- _____. "The Historiography of Psychical Research: Lessons from Histories of the Sciences." *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*. Vol. 72 (2008), pp. 65-85.
- _____. "The 'World of the Infinitely Little': Connecting Physical and Psychical Realities circa 1900." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*. Vol. 39 (2008), pp. 323-334
- Prothero, Stephen. "From Spiritualism to Theosophy: 'Uplifting' a Democratic Tradition." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation*. Vol. 3, No. 2 (1993), pp. 197-216.
- Raia, Courtenay Grean. "From Ether Theory to Ether Theology: Oliver Lodge and the

Physics of Immortality.” *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 43, No. 1 (2007), pp. 19-43.

Rectenwald, Michael. “Secularism and the Cultures of Nineteenth-Century Scientific Naturalism.” *British Journal of the History of Science*. Vol. 46, No. 2 (June 2013), pp. 231-254.

Robb, Peter. “The Government of India and Annie Besant.” *Modern Asian Studies*. Vol. 10, No. 1 (1976), pp. 107-130.

Skinner, Quentin and Christopher Ricks. “Up for Interpretation or What Is This Thing that Hearsay Is Not?” *Literary Imagination*. Vol. 14, No. 1 (2012), pp. 125-142.

Thomas, Keith. “An Anthropology of Religion and Magic, II.” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. 6 (1975), pp. 91-109.

b.中文

王文霞，〈英國工會運動的發展—倫敦火柴女工罷工與其對新工會主義的影響（1888）〉，《成大西洋史集刊》，第10期，2006年，頁255-286。

李鑑慧，〈挪用自然史：英國十九世紀動物保護運動與大眾自然史文化〉，《成大歷史學報》，第38號，2010年，頁131-178。

_____，〈由「棕狗傳奇」論二十世紀初英國反動物實驗運動策略之激進化〉，《新史學》，第23卷第2期，2012年，頁155-216。

(三) 專書論文

Barton, Ruth. “Sunday Lecture Societies: Naturalistic Scientists, Unitarians, and Secularists Unite Against Sabbatarian Legislation,” in Dawson and Lightman eds. *Victorian Scientific Naturalism: Community, Identity and Continuity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), pp. 189-219.

Eagleton, Terry. “The Flight to the Real,” in Sally Ledger and Scott McCracken eds. *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 11-21.

Collini, S. “The Culture of Altruism: Selfishness and the Decay of Motive,” in *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), pp. 60-90.

- _____. "Introduction," in Gowan Dawson and Bernard Lightman eds. *Victorian Scientific Naturalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), pp. 1-24.
- Elwick, James. "Economies of Scales: Evolutionary Naturalists and the Victorian Examination System," in Gowan Dawson and Bernard Lightman eds. *Victorian Scientific Naturalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), pp. 131-156.
- Granholm, Kennet. "The Sociology of Esotericism," in Peter Bernard Clarke ed. *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 783-800.
- Lightman, Bernard. "Science and Culture," in Francis O' Gorman ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 12-42.
- Lightman, Bernard. "Huxley and the Devonshire Commission," in Dawson and Lightman ed. *Victorian Scientific Naturalism: Community, Identity and Continuity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), pp. 101-130.
- Moore, James. "Theodicy and Society: The Crisis of the Intelligentsia," in Bernard Lightman and Richard Helmstadtler eds. *Victorian Faith in Crisis* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 153-186.
- Risseuw, Carla. "Thinking Culture through Counter-Culture: The Case of Theosophists in India and Ceylon and Their Ideas on Race and Hierarchy (1875-1947)," in Antony R. H. Copley ed. *Gurus and Their Followers: New Religious Reform Movements in Colonial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 180-205.
- Santucci, James A. "Theosophical Society," in Wouter J. ed. *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism* (Hanegraaff Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 1114-1123.
- Skinner, Quentin. "Truth and Explanation in History," in M. E. H. Nicolette Mout and Werner Stauffacher eds. *Truth in Science, the Humanities, and Religion* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2010), pp. 89-95.
- Taylor, Jenny Bourne. "Psychology at the Fin de Siècle," in Gail Marshall ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 13-30.
- Weber, Max. "Science as a Vocation," in Gerth, H. H., and C. Wright Mills eds. *From Max*

Weber: Essays in Sociology (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 129-156.

(四) 會議論文

Skinner, Quentin. "Lecture A: Truth and the Historian." Academia Sinica, Taipei, May 2013, unpublished paper.

(責任編輯：釋祖道、責任校對：楊雅蓉)