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This issue of *Criterion* is a small one compared to our winter issue on the ministry program in The Divinity School, but it is just as full of interesting reflections on the life of the Swift Hall community. Our first article is a summary of a report by William St. John to the Dean on the subject of Ph.D. placement. Mr. St. John, who is now Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Religious Studies, and Administrative Science and Business in Regis College, was asked by Dean Gannwell in 1981 to write a report funded by Lilly Endowment, Inc. on the placement patterns of Divinity School Ph.D.s over the past twenty years.

St. John's familiarity with the Ph.D. student's anxieties and concerns (stemming from his years as a doctoral student in the area of ethics and society—successfully ended in 1983, we might add) combined with his work in the field of public policy studies made him the ideal person for the job. His lively and witty style make his report both interesting and informative. If, after reading this summary of the "St. John report" (as it is called), you wish to see a copy of the original report, we the editors will be happy to help you obtain one. In addition, we would be glad to hear your response to Mr. St. John's suggestions concerning increased participation of alumni and friends of The Divinity School in the placement of Ph.D.s.

Our second piece is an essay by Patricia Ferris McGinn originally delivered to the students, faculty, and staff of The Divinity School at a Wednesday noon luncheon during the autumn quarter. Ms. McGinn is a therapist in private practice and an adjunct professor in the theology department of Loyola University who is also married to Divinity School professor Bernard McGinn. Last year her talk on the roles and expectations people bring into love relationships was so popular that Dean Lewis asked her to speak to the Swift Hall community again this year. "Love, Work, and Family: Perspectives on the Two-Career Marriage" is the topic Ms. McGinn addressed on December 1, 1982. We hope you enjoy her insights into the problems two people face in sustaining a supportive and egalitarian relationship while at the same time pursuing two satisfying and demanding careers.

If both Mr. St. John's and Ms. McGinn's articles could be called reflections on the affairs of this world, being concerned chiefly though not exclusively with the pocketbook and the heart, then the third *Criterion* piece, in contrast, is definitely other-worldly in focus. "Astral Myths Rise Again: Interpreting Religious Astronomy" by Lawrence Sullivan is an essay on changes in the study of the relationship of astronomy and religion since 1798. We hope all of you, and especially our readers interested in the contemporary fascination with astronomy and horoscopes, will enjoy reading about how other cultures have integrated the life of the heavens with their own earthly existence. Mr. Sullivan, now Associate Professor of the History of Religions in University of Missouri—Columbia, was a Junior Fellow in The Divinity School's Institute for the Advanced Study of Religion as he finished his dissertation on South American Indian cosmologies and religious healing, and was also a lecturer in history of religions in The Divinity School.

Our last contribution to this issue of *Criterion* is a sermon by Bernard O. Brown, Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel and Associate Professor of Ethics and Society in The Divinity School. This sermon entitled "Naming Death" was given in Rockefeller Chapel last year on Easter morning. We reprint it here in anticipation of the coming Christian holy season; we also hope that it will be of interest to many of our readers who are concerned about modern preoccupation with death and "indifference toward immortality."
“A Look Around”
Employment Opportunities for Ph.D.s in Religion

William St. John

In recent decades, The Divinity School has been primarily constituted by students seeking the doctor of philosophy degree. During the 1960s and 1970s, the placement of Ph.D. graduates was a fairly simple process at Chicago. In the 1980s, however, we find that one of our most significant challenges is the placement of our graduates in meaningful positions. It is no longer true that such placements can be made almost entirely in teaching.

This problem is central to The Divinity School. To it are related such matters as the character and size of the student body, and of the faculty, and therefore, the future excellence of the School. Accordingly, The Divinity School is challenged in several ways: to discover new ways to help in the placement process (for both academic and nonacademic positions), to reassess our academic programs in light of changed conditions, and to determine how these changes will affect the future of the School generally.

An essential prerequisite to these tasks was an accurate analysis of the entire placement picture. The results of this analysis formed the body of a report funded by the Lilly Endowment and carried out by a recent graduate of The Divinity School, William St. John. What follows are some summaries and comments on the report from Mr. St. John.

My report to Dean Gamwell on "Employment Opportunities for Ph.D.s in Religion" was really more a research paper than anything else. The original charge was "to go take a look around" the issue by reading some relevant literature, seeking the advice and counsel of other divinity schools and departments of religion, and talking with those who have already researched the problem generally. One of my most important sources was Mr. Bruce Campbell, who for four years (1978 to 1981) conducted an in-depth survey of the placement of Ph.D.s in religion for the Council of the Graduate Study of Religion.

But I found even more valuable than that sort of research the multitude of conversations I enjoyed with our own faculty, students, and administrators, with Divinity School alums, with persons in the churches, and in the academic, business, and professional worlds. And so, much of the analysis in the report, many of its recommendations, and a great deal of its insight were only provided, as by a conduit, through me to the Dean by many, many others.
The report itself was divided into four main sections: first, a look at some statistical data and the conflicting interpretations of it which underlie the problem of Ph.D. employment in the humanities broadly. Second, the report provided a detailed profile of the present occupations of Divinity School alums of the past twenty years. Then, in the longest section of the report, I tried to organize the many comments and suggestions of others regarding the training and preparation of our students for positions in both the academic and nonacademic world. Last, I made a set of specific recommendations and suggestions pertaining to placement for the Dean of Students and for students.

I think it fair to say that divinity students in the 1950s studied for the Ph.D. not knowing exactly where they were going to end up: as a teacher, an administrator of a YMCA, perhaps, or a hospital chaplain. That is, the end of their study was unclear to them; many occupational options were available. Students in the 1960s and 1970s, however, studied for the Ph.D. knowing pretty well where they would end up: as college professors. Most of them are still at it, which proves, I suppose, that they were right. Students nowadays, though, have this very same reference as their norm, that is, that the proper or only end of a Ph.D. education in religion is college teaching. The crumbling apart of this reference causes the present anxiety.

These anxieties are in large part based on extensive population and demographic data collected by scores of public and private researchers. Their studies are based on the fact that "the future customers of our industry have already been born," as The University of Chicago Record (November 30, 1972) put it. From there, researchers like Stephen Dretzsch and Adair Waldenberg go on to say that available demographic statistics accurately predict that "at best, rates of college entry and completion will remain constant, and at worst, may decline significantly."

It is true that the primary factor in any demand for placement of Ph.D.s as new teachers in higher education is the projection of future undergraduate enrollment. However, statistical projections of this enrollment, done primarily by the National Center for Education Statistics since 1965, are very unreliable. Indeed, ten-year projections tend to be far off base. (See, for corroboration of this, The Baker Report, The University of Chicago Record 16, May 5, 1982, especially pp. 76–81, 91, 95, and Appendix A.)

Although these projections are frightening, they are reliable in only a very gross way. They perform poorly because undergraduate enrollment, current and projected, is only one variable in forecasting what might be called a basic supply-and-demand model for academic talent. A simple, demographically driven model does show negative demand for new faculty in the next nine to ten years, but projections based on this model alone fail to incorporate more important factors than the factors they do include: for example, unanticipated (and therefore, unpredictable) political, economic, social, and cultural conditions. To give but one example: The "taste" for re-

"The successful placement of a candidate into an academic or nonacademic position properly begins during the first year of graduate school, and not at the end."

**"Academe in the Late Twentieth Century: Dis-harmony, Discontinuity, and Development," Institute for Demographic and Economic Studies, November 27, 1981, p. 19. Well, at least there is one positive word in the title of the paper.**
igious studies as an undergraduate major was higher in the sixties than it is today. What will it be in five years? Ten? That is uncertain, and cannot be the base for any solid predictions, especially given the length of time it takes to produce a humanities Ph.D. today (currently 10.6 years total time, 7.3 years registered time). By the time "high-demand" Ph.D.s reach the market, they may no longer be in real demand (I believe this is the case with certain of the sciences), while conversely, we may face a future shortage of "low-demand" Ph.D.s five to ten years hence.

The reliability of demographic data in only a very gross way indicates that the margins are critical for an institution as unique as The University of Chicago. Since it is uncertain whether placement rates into model teaching careers will rise or not, it may in fact be irresponsible, given relatively short-term constraints, to dismantle academic superstructures or to emphasize specializations only in "marketable" fields merely with an eye towards academic placement. These unorthodoxies, again, assume an accuracy in prediction supported neither by the facts nor by common sense.

Current academic placement rates at The Divinity School actually show that we compare favorably with national rates, exceeding the average particularly in placement into temporary full-time positions. The following two tables chart the rates of placement of Ph.D. graduates in religion, first, of all schools belonging to The Council on Graduate Study in Religion (CGSR) and, second, of The Divinity School in particular. The first table is the work of Bruce Campbell and charts placement rates of graduated Ph.D.s only; I have added in parentheses the parallel figures for our own Ph.D.s in 1981.

The second table illustrates placement rates of both Ph.D. and A.B.D. (all but dissertation) students at The Divinity School only.

In sum, placement rates into tenure-track teaching positions for the past two years at The Divinity School were one in three for Ph.D. only, one in two for Ph.D. and A.B.D.

I believe the second aggregate statistic indicates better than the first the strength of the School. Indeed, that some A.B.D.s secure tenure-track positions is cause for some pride. Also, if other full-time employment, for example, the ministry, into which some students always plan to go, counts on all fours with the mystical "tenure-track" job, placement rates into full-time careers are even higher.†

The demand for positions outside academics is unclear as well. Here, the variables (of talents, skills and inclinations, of open positions) are even more widely distributed. Much has been written lately on the general issue of careers for humanists, some of which I found helpful in the writing of the report, particularly, Ernest May and Dorothy Blaney, Careers for Humanists (New York, 1981). For the humanities as a whole, one finds that most non-academics hold positions that require little or no additional specialized training (administrators and managers, researchers, sales people, editors). This, of course, makes common sense.

But none of the current research deals specifically with religion Ph.D.s and therefore the evidence, since generalized, is not always illuminating. I found it much more beneficial to speak with our own alumni and alumnas, especially those other than college teachers. A short profile of Divinity School alumni follows and shows just how varied the types of jobs are that religion Ph.D.s actually hold.

Table 3 lists all determinable occupations of Divinity School Ph.D. alumni from the past twenty years.

Here are some significant statistics one can glean from Table 3: First, more than three-fourths of our alums teach. Percentages of younger alumni who teach slightly outweigh those of older alumni.
Second, a fair number of our alumni (fully 10%) are professors of subjects other than religion or ministry. One or more alumni hold positions in the following departments or fields: history, philosophy, English, psychology, psychiatry, economics, humanities, Asian studies, Far Eastern languages, Near Eastern languages, Oriental languages, sociology, counseling, and communications.

Third, twice the percentage of older alumni compared to younger alumni teach in fields other than religion or ministry.

Fourth, there are more alums working as college administrators than as ministers.

Fifth, twice the percentage of older compared to younger alumni are academic administrators (although the raw number is almost equal).

Sixth, in the field of counseling, one or more alumni hold these jobs: psychologist, pastoral counselor, psychotherapist, marriage counselor, family counselor, and employee assistance counselor.

Seventh, in business, one or more alumni call themselves: entrepreneur, restaurateur, consultant, carpenter, bank manager, retailer, or investment manager.

Last, only a couple of alums work in government.

I could find no one in the traditional nonprofit sector (foundations, institutes/think tanks, the arts, hospitals), other than those in nonprofit categories like ministry, social counseling, and academic administration, who are accounted for elsewhere.

There is a great deal of variety in the jobs held by alumni from the past twenty years, but I am not sure what conclusions to reach about that fact. The numbers of those in business and government are very small. They cannot indicate trends, only possibilities. It is understandable that some (8%) alumni Ph.D.'s would venture into the nurturing and professional religious careers of ministry and counseling/therapy. This will most probably continue to be the case.

I do find interesting the number of administrators, academic and church, who have graduated from this School in the last twenty years. Going farther back in years, the numbers, of course, are even greater. The Divinity School can point out with some pride that of the eighty-five alumni of The University of Chicago who count themselves as college or university presidents or chancellors, eighteen (21%) come from the ranks of Divinity School alumni.

The third section of the report was written with the aim of increasing possibilities for placement and strengthening candidates for positions both inside and outside the academy. It speaks to, and offers recommendations about, the training and preparation of our Ph.D. students.

What we do best at The Divinity School is teach students about religion, about theology, about their histories, and about the relationship of religion and theology to some other disciplines and ways of thought. We do all of this, by and large, extraordinarily well. But The University of Chicago also calls itself "a teacher of teachers." And it is clear from a look at the profile of recent Divinity School alumni that, in at least this aspiration, the University and The Divinity School are successful: three out of four Divinity School alumni Ph.D.'s teach in the academy. But how best to teach, and then to place, a teacher of religion?

There was little agreement among those with whom I spoke on an old argument about the philosophy of Ph.D. education: whether it is better from a placement point of view to specialize or to generalize. On the one hand, the market seeks generalists; on the other, the profession demands specialists. Some alumni professors urged the pursuit of broadly based competence; others urged narrowing in, honing a particular language or academic concentration. Some academic administrators (deans, department chairs) claimed that their first hiring choice would always be a generalist who could teach a diverse curriculum; other administrators look for specialists who could be picked up as the particular need arose and placed together in departments to form the necessary spectrum. Given this diverse opinion, perhaps the proper tack would be to continue to emphasize The Divinity School's own strength: as a department chair at "a prestigious Eastern university" analyzed it, The Divinity School...
ought to aspire to what it does best, that is, the training of generalists.

Wach and Eliade are your models. Students from the Divinity School are not specialists, are not people who push into the unknown. Your Divinity School Ph.D.'s rely and depend upon the specialists, but also, in a more important way, you form the context within which the specialists can perform their work. There ought to be no inherent conflict between the two. They are complementary positions.

Also, from many quarters came a frequent suggestion to encourage competence in more than one field, through the development of cognate disciplines, and perhaps even the taking of ancillary degrees. The interdisciplinary emphasis at The University of Chicago makes these suggestions easy realities.

Finally, this portion of the report reviewed the difficult quandary of juggling teaching experience and dissertation work with an eye towards successful academic placement. As ways to meet these often conflicting demands, the report recommends the following four strategies: integrating into the curriculum at The Divinity School specific "how to teach" courses, for example, "How to Teach 'Introduction to Religion''"; furthering the apprenticeship model between student and professor; establishing teaching and dissertation fellowships of one sort or another; and augmenting dissertation-level seminars. This last recommendation is intended to foster a helpful collegiality at the dissertation stage. Finishing required course work seems to signal the end of graduate study, and students all too frequently find themselves distanced from the everyday conversation with colleagues which helped engender previous intellectual concerns.

It appears to me that placement officers in divinity schools (and in other disciplines in the arts and humanities) can be distinguished from their brethren at Business and Law Schools on one point: placement officers in the humanities are helping people who have decided, just of late, what they want to do. Whereas an M.B.A. or a J.D. student pretty much enters business or law school with the idea of placing out as a professional business manager or lawyer, many scholars in the humanities do not come to graduate school for such similar reasons. In general, "humanists" tend to apply to graduate school more because they wish to study a subject than because they desire to become teachers.

There is, to my mind, a great refreshment in this. I found that when speaking with our students, or even reflecting upon my own past, the prime reason for coming to The Divinity School was a passion for the subject. It is that same passion and interest which hold students throughout their years in school as well.

One obviously becomes a different beast roundabout the time after qualifying examinations. At that time, the profession becomes the passion, to twist Stendahl. Given the current way of things, it is, however, too late at that stage to consider becoming anything other than a teacher. By then, as Professor Keith Baker, the namesake of the University's Baker Report, told me, "Students have become socialized into the profession." Scholarship is a cyclic process, he indicated. Schools have paradigms of the profession in mind; these are transferred to students, in some ways unacknowledged to the beneficiaries.

There is little inherently wrong with this cycle, of course. Unless it becomes a trap. I am convinced that for some students this is the case. It tells in their anger when the hoped-for academic job fails to materialize, and in their shuffling embarrassment when they report to their colleagues that they are pursuing employment outside the academy. Now system as intellectually generous as the humanities (religion!) ought to force people to have these feelings.

Molds must be broken, traps unset, assumptions unrobed. The profession must be willing to "lose" some of its own. Will it be a net waste if even large numbers of students who earn doctorates in religion continue on in rewarding work as consultants, bankers and salespeople, in government, social work, as administrators and managers? Surely not. The culture as a whole has much to gain: the subject of religion can be integral with life as a whole, if it is no more surprising that a bank president holds a Ph.D. in divinity than an M.B.A.

This section of the report, then, sought to encourage The Divinity School to think differently about the benefits, the purposes, and the results of a Ph.D. degree. Its analysis and recommendations presupposed that graduate students in religion seek to define themselves less in terms of their dissertation subjects and academic specialties or the professional roles they should play, and more in terms of their general capabilities and of the new skills they are sharpening in graduate school. It is beneficial to consider the Ph.D. less as a specifically vocational degree, that is, as preparing one only for a career in teaching, and more as an education in a certain style of thought or activity, in research, critical analysis, even communication. These skills are portable into various careers.

Specific recommendations attended to possibilities in counseling and therapy, the ministry, academic administration, seminary teaching, and business. More so here than elsewhere, I relied on the many conversations I had with Divinity School alumni and friends in these different professions.

Generally, there are two major ways The Divinity School can engender for students what I would consider a proper perspective on the employment marketplace, two ways to keep students hopeful yet realistic. One way will exercise our honesty, the other, our ingenuity.

First, as far as possible, The Divinity School ought to be up front with students about the prospects for employment, in and out of the academy, from the day they write us for an application to the moment they leave with an opportunity achieved.

Second, The Divinity School ought to establish programs or mechanisms by which living, breathing alumni, and most especially those outside the academy, are in regular contact with the student body of The Divinity School.
It is important for students to hear the stories of their forerunners in Swift Hall.

The final section of the report consisted of a variety of proposals which issued, really, from one major presupposition: that the successful placement of a candidate into an academic or nonacademic position properly begins during the first year of graduate school, and not at the end. At the end, just about everyone has a Ph.D., everyone has written a dazzling dissertation, and everyone has a dossier which contains letters of recommendation that glow in the dark.

What deans, search committees, and employers look for is that something special: extra knowledge, exceptional personal qualities, the various excellencies persons can display in how they think, analyze, and deal with people, the conviction of true self-assurance and confidence. An employer wants to know much more about a person than just the Ph.D.; search committees want to know, in addition to scholarly achievement, whether one will make a good colleague. As Elizabeth McCormick of The Rockefeller Family

“It is beneficial to consider the Ph.D. less as a specifically vocational degree, that is, as preparing one only for a career in teaching, and more as an education in a certain style of thought or activity, in research, critical analysis, even communication.”

Trust told me: “People are hired, not Ph.D.s.”

These are the sorts of things, in addition to the Ph.D., which get one in the door. But these are the sorts of things that cannot be hastily learned, or faked, or brandished only in desperation. These are the sorts of things that are the product of environment, of guidance, and of diligence. These are the sorts of things we need to concentrate on instilling from the beginning.

Generally, graduate schools and departments poorly prepare students to make the transition from student to employee. The dominant assumption seems to be “students will make it on their own.” This is the danger of functional specialization: when schools believe their only role is to teach content and scholarship. Graduate schools in the humanities do little to equip students to build any bridges between roles as student and as nonacademic.

The situation at The Divinity School is somewhat different. First, a good deal of placement machinery already exists at The Divinity School, and the Dean of Students expends great energy in keeping it oiled and running. (He carries on in the noble tradition of his predecessor.) Second, The Divinity School has built up numerous agencies which help instill in students the sorts of character I feel will differentiate them in necessary ways from many other prospective job candidates. I mean here the general tone of scholarly breadth and rigor, events like Wednesday noon luncheons, and the near infiltration by Divinity School students of the student housing administration. All of these vehicles for personal flourishing can be, ought to be, and I am sure will continue to be, encouraged, even expanded.

But there is even more that we can do to provide a more efficient, adequate, and stronger placement operation at The Divinity School.

For instance, we can build on the existing strength we enjoy in a vast group of alumni, friends, and acquaintances. I will bet that 85% of the people I asked to tell me what works best in placement at The Divinity School responded, “networking.” The key contacts we have with heads of departments of religion, with our alumni, with professional and corporate leaders, and with denominational leaders certainly ought to be kept, fostered, and massaged. There is little more crucial than this.

The report recommends that the faculty be more integral to the placement process, not only in providing more direct assistance over and above letters of recommendation, but also in helping allay some of the anxieties students inevitably feel over lack of positions in model teaching careers. The faculty, above all, can convey to young scholars that there is nothing wrong with accepting nonacademic employment.

The report ends with a long series of suggestions to the Dean of Students in particular, and to students in general, regarding dossiers, resumes, and interviewing.

Some general themes repeat themselves throughout the report, and I would like to summarize them here.

First, The Divinity School (and the University as a whole) is in fact doing some things in response to the problem of placing Ph.D.s into meaningful positions.

Second, The Divinity School is not without resources to do this: the health of the institution is apparent in many places, in its faculty, administration, and student body.

Third, we depend greatly upon the network our alumni and others provide for the discovery of job opportunities and the recommendation of our graduates to employers.

Fourth, it is true that constricting academic markets can explain some of the increase in employment outside teaching. Yet in speaking with some of our alumni who are alternatively employed, I found that many of them enjoy themselves and thrive outside the classroom. There should be nothing to prevent an increase in this pleasure.

Placement of Ph.D.s into meaningful employment is a matter of attitude more than anything else. How one looks at what one has learned is often more important than what one has learned. Students at The Divinity School are learning to assimilate masses of information, to write, to communicate something they know to others who do not, to analyze and solve problems, to research, to criticize, and to see themes amid complexities. They are gaining valuable historical perspectives and insights into human behavior. They are experiencing the value of focusing more on the process and methods of problem-solving than on the end product. They are learning the various "rhetorics" which interact in the academic and scholarly world. They are (or soon will be) ambitious, competitive, intelligent, and proud of achievement when it is earned. These are valuable resources in the distribution of human talent, and are skills portable into various careers. The point is to see them that way.
The first time I met my husband's mother, she served us dinner in her apartment in Yonkers. When we were seated at the table, she brought in the first plate of food, set it firmly in front of him, and said to me, "In this family we serve the men first."

The first time my husband met my family, I was thirty years old, had two master's degrees, and had been teaching for seven years. My father had this advice for my husband-to-be: "Keep her barefoot and pregnant."

We've come a long way since then.

I have found it very helpful, as my husband and I struggle along, making a family life with two careers, two children, and two very different personalities, to remember where we came from; it helps me be patient (well, sometimes, anyway) with his gradual process of overcoming early training to be waited on and with my process of overcoming early training to be at the disposal of a man. Of course he has resented giving up such a privileged position—who wouldn't?—and of course I have felt guilty and in conflict about pushing forward my needs and inconveniencing him—but I forced myself.

The deep imprinting most of us have about what is required to make a family is very difficult to grow out of, and I think it is often a silent, powerful, and unacknowledged enemy of the two-career partnership. When we have been raised in patriarchal families—even if we rebelled against them—it is difficult and confusing to construct a communal life when there is no wife-and-mother at home, and no husband-and-leader for the family.

Those of you who are under forty are probably convinced that you are beyond the hang-ups that we poor, be-nighted old folks have. Good for you. I am positive that you are further along than I was at your age, but I'm not sure you are out of the woods yet, unless the family into which you were born twenty to thirty years ago was pretty unusual for its time.

Some of us who have lived with roommates or housemates have learned to approach housework and chores on the basis of equality. But put a child or two in the picture and chances are the ghosts of your ancestors will rise up to haunt you. A recent article in the New York Times Magazine (November 21, 1982) pointed out the incredible stress...
that is devastating working mothers at present; as they strive to be successful mothers and successful workers, they end up unable to enjoy either role. So, one way or another, we still do not find it easy to conceive of or live out a family life without the wife-and-mother and the husband-and-leader performing their functions.

What was the function of the wife-and-mother? First, she was in charge of preserving the marriage by making her husband happy. This would ensure the social and financial stability of the family. Second, she was responsible for making the home a place in which everyone in the family could feel well cared for. Third, she concentrated on nurturing her young physically and emotionally. Fourth, she specialized in the relationships in the family. And last, her job was to be the steady, loving center, the one who was always there, the heart of the home, the "fixed foot," as John Donne called his wife. For her, "outside interests" were just that, outside. Nothing took priority over the needs of her family.

What was the function of the husband-and-leader? First, he was the chief breadwinner of the family: the whole family depended on his career for survival and social position. He had to be ultimately responsible for everyone else in the family, and they were all his dependents. Second, he was the chief leader of the family. No serious decision could be made unless he made it or at least ratified it. Third, the family was organized in a way he was comfortable with, and his needs were taken seriously and attended to. Last, he was often the final word on matters of discipline and finance.

I believe that the successful dual-career family is the one that finds some way to fulfill most of these functions within the family. If too many are missing or are inadequately accomplished, the family will have a sense of scarcity and deprivation and will begin to lose stability.

The trick we are all trying to learn is how to provide these functions when we have given up the functionaries who specialized in them. The first and in some ways the hardest part of the process is giving up the fantasy that somehow there will be some one person to be wife-and-mother and some one to be husband-and-leader.

A lot of flapping around goes on before we let go of this fantasy. For example, there is the wonder woman who tries to be both mother and breadwinner and there is the role reversal version where the man tries to be the mother while the woman is the father. There is the dig-in-the-heels, "I'll be darned if I'm going to do all the work around here," phase; the nagging parent and pouting, rebellious child phase; and the competitive, "Ha, ha, I got you to do it instead of me," phase. Finally, there is my favorite complaint, "None of my co-workers have to do any of this stuff!"

But if we live through these attempts to recreate our families, if we hang in there and keep talking and keep struggling, we grow up a little and get to the point where we can accept the fact, finally and practically, that we are both the mother, we are both the wife, we are both the breadwinner, and we are both the leader.

"The deep imprinting most of us have about what is required to make a family is ... often a silent, powerful, and unacknowledged enemy of the two-career partnership."
When we get to the point—maybe you will arrive quicker than we did—that we can really relate to each other as equals in spite of our hierarchical upbringing, we will be much more successful at standing there, eyeball to eyeball, and working out a system of cooperative team effort between friends and partners.

That's the good news. The bad news is that there is still too much work to be done.

Here are a few helpful hints for the survival of your two-career family: first, some advice about your relationship, and second, about children. Protect fiercely and nourish carefully your relationship with each other. No one else will. Your boss, your professor, your thesis advisor is not going to say, "Listen, you knock off for a weekend and get in some long hours of quality time with your beloved." You have to protect your relationship from your profession. Professional competition is tough in all fields; though academics may have flexible schedules, they often have terrible inner and outer demands to read more, write more, publish more. The only thing I know that is harder to live with than a book being written is a newborn baby. The baby is noisier. We have all known many marriages and other relationships that have caved in under the neglectful weight of professional demands.

You have to protect your relationships as well from the damage that can come from overly intense emotional and sexual involvements with people in the work world. We often look our best, feel our best, and show our most dynamic and creative sides at work. Naturally, we are rather attractive to people who share our interests there. It is a dangerous habit to bring home only our tired, boring, worn-out selves with nothing left to give but the story of our frustrations and the wounds of our tattered psyches, because we have given away all our best gifts to those at work.

You have to protect your relationships from your children, too. They have their own needs and agenda, and they will demand time and attention, as they should. It's not their job to take care of your relationship, but they will suffer terribly if you don't. We all need spousal time as well as family time. And those of you involved in ministry, church work, or community work know by now that churches and organizing and the other in charge of undermining—both have to collaborate on developing a livable system. My family is not as highly organized as some, but we live by schedules and coordinate them daily. Finally, buy all the appliances and services you can afford to do the work of the housewife, so you can spend time nourishing the relationships in the family.

What's the point of being a grown-up if you can't enjoy your sex life? You've earned it, but it can easily get lost at the end of the parade with this lifestyle. Enjoying one another sexually takes time and mental and physical leisure. If you are waiting around for that to appear in a magic, "spontaneous" moment, forget it. Some people object to regular, planned times together as "sex on a schedule," and find it distasteful. I urge you to think of it as "your special time," a time you can look forward to during the day, and save yourselves for. You can indulge in erotic fantasies about it—not while your eminent professors are lecturing, of course—and make that special time together the highlight of that day. When you were dating it was not offensive to plan your special times together; now if you don't plan them you may not have them.

Now the real biggie—children. How do you have children and careers at the same time?—with difficulty. Before I say anything more I want to say that my husband and I are both glad we did have children even though it made our lives extremely complicated.

The more flexibility and control you have over your time, the better. No two situations are alike, and within the same family needs change as the children grow and mature. The biggest crunch comes in deciding whether anyone is going to cut back on the career path and if so, who and how and for how long. If no one cuts back you will have to have another person or agency take a major role in the
lives of your children before they go to school. The key element here is that there should be as much predictability and stability for the child as possible, and as much communication and coordination between you and the caregiver as possible. Children distinguish very clearly between who is family and who is not, but I think that the more both parents are involved in all aspects of child care from the very beginning, the more security the child will have when being cared for by an outsider. I believe it helps children a great deal to experience the fact that they are safe with and can be well cared for by someone besides mother.

Most men have not been raised to care for babies and small children, but they can learn to do it, and they can even learn to enjoy some of it. The work world still relates to children and child care as a personal problem for the parents and a nuisance for everyone else, rather than seeing that the care and nurture of children is the most important thing that goes on in the world. So we usually don't get much support or help from our careers when we need to transfer some energies and time into the children. Besides this, young children and young careers often coincide, which makes the pressure very intense.

I am against having one of the partners make all the career sacrifices unless he or she really wants to center on parenting. I did it wrong both ways. I gave up too much parenting with the first baby and too much career with the second. The first resulted in guilt, the second in depression. We worked on the assumption that the man's career would not be tampered with; I would make the changes and adaptations, because I had the more flexible work situation. If there is any way to manage it, I recommend that both partners cut back some with neither giving up work altogether. This may not be possible or it may not be financially feasible, of course, but I do think that the more a sense of equality can be preserved, both in parenting and in work, the better.

On a societal level, as long as the mixing of careers and parenthood is spelled out as a woman's problem (as in the New York Times article) it will stay unsolved. Employers, academic and otherwise, need to experience pressure from their male as well as their female employees to provide flexibility for child care. And young men need to be supported by other men, peers as well as mentors, in the development of the competencies and sensitivities required for good parenting rather than being pushed only by career-minded wives. Furthermore, the support of other men might reduce or eliminate the "penalty" young parents expect to pay for slowing career development for a time in favor of child care.

You may have more room to make a flexible situation for yourself and more room to take control over your life and your time than you are using. It took me far too long to get it through my head that I did not have to place my boss first, I had to organize my family first. Lo and behold, my boss could adjust after all. Finally I got tired of bosses altogether and started my own practice as a therapist.

It is important to pay attention to things like location and convenience. It is worth it to spend more money or to do without some traditional conveniences in order to gain the greater convenience of cutting down the time and distance between all the parts of your life. The more traveling there is between work, shopping, child care, school, church, and the doctors, the more stress you are taking on, and the more there is that can go wrong when the car breaks down or the kids get sick.

No one prepared my husband and me for our two-career family, no one showed us how to do it, and that has meant frustration and conflict for us. But there is another side to all this—it is interesting to work out solutions to these new situations, and it is exciting to think of implanting new patterns of family living into the heritage of our own descendants. It is a very special kind of generativity for this time in our culture. Think on these high thoughts some morning when the car won't start, the babysitter can't come, the kid is sick, and you are both meeting important deadlines.
Astral Myths Rise Again: Interpreting Religious Astronomy

Lawrence E. Sullivan

Occasionally in a large library one comes upon a long-deserted world where people once lived. This world appeared to me not long ago in the guise of a book, De L'Origine de tous les cultes (The origin of all religious worship), by Charles François Dupuis, "citoyen français." It was the 1820 "New Edition" of the abridgement first printed in 1798. The original twelve volumes had been dedicated to the French Revolutionary Assembly in 1795 with the subtitle: Universal Religion. In the intervening twenty-five years, this last significant mythography of the Enlightenment had sold out of every edition of its three-, eight-, twelve-, and single-volume formats and had been the center of raging controversy. Joseph Priestley, the one-time Unitarian minister and scientist, refuted it at length and, in exile from England, discussed it vehemently with his new-found American friends, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. George Stanley Faber, the British divine, forwarded Dupuis' theses in his theological typologies of pagan myths and practice. The volume I held in my hand in 1982 had come to Regenstein Library as part of the "Berlin Collection." Except for its journey to the bindery in April of 1994, it had never been checked out.

There are two roads to ponder here. One would take us to a consideration of what William James called "the power of fashion in things scientific." That direction of thought is best left for another day's stroll. The second path is one which explores changes in the study of the relationship of astronomy and religion over the 184 years since DUPUIS' book was first published in post-revolutionary France. This is the one we shall take. After reviewing some early attempts at understanding the ancient links between knowledge of the stars and the meaning of existence, we shall look at two contemporary disciplines which interpret the cultural value of astronomical knowledge: archaeoastronomy, the study of the astronomical value of prehistoric material remains, and ethnoastronomy, the inquiry into the star-knowledge of contemporary folk traditions. Our purpose is to discern the prospects and pitfalls awaiting us in the process of unraveling the religious perceptions of the human place in the universe. Considering the widespread and continuous testimony to astral traditions from archaic times to the present, scholarly efforts

"By joining their destiny to the stars of heaven, people gave expression to their experience of the fullness of existence."
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to interpret them have great influence on our evaluation of the religious capacities of humankind.

Like most thinkers of his day, Charles Dupuis believed that myth was a disordered and fanciful form of thought incapable of expressing the clear truths which reason could observe in nature. He determined to demonstrate that all myths and fables were fantastic distortions of one process of nature, the regular movement of the stars. He attributed this same origin to all religious ideas and practices whose rational character was not immediately apparent. In the darkness which religious myth and fable cast over reason and nature, Dupuis caught a glimpse of references to the movements of the zodiac. Examining evidences of religious belief and practice in Chinese, Siamese, Greek, Malluccan, Persian, Philippine, Norse, Madagascan, Formosan, and Japanese traditions, he attributed the origin and order of all myth and religion to the perception of the equinoxes, solstices, the seven planets, and the twelve signs of the zodiac. Mythic life to him amounted to nothing more than an unnecessary veil of allegory drawn across visible nature, whose order could be discerned rationally. Dupuis tried to show that the significance of myth is ultimately and fully apparent. As soon as it becomes evident that myth tries in a fumbling way to refer to the ordered movements of the heavens, myth no longer relates anything of interest; the value of its contents is exhausted without remainder by more precise astronomical data. Myth's meaning harbors no further mystery. On the contrary, since myth encouraged the belief that human life was involved with the powers of the cosmos, it obstructed the acquisition of true knowledge of a nature from which the human being stood apart as a detached and objective observer. Dupuis dethroned, to his own satisfaction at least, the king-sun of myth and religion in favor of the free reign of the lucid stars of reason and astronomy.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, interest in astronomy re surfaced among scholars studying Babylonian and Assyrian civilizations and their spatial and temporal neighbors, Sumerians, Elamites, Semites, and Chaldeans. For E. Siecke myths were literal statements about the movements of heavenly bodies, especially the multifarious synodical phases of the moon. H. Lessman outlined a kind of mythic grammar—a defined order of mythic themes—based on the natural law of celestial movements. Guided by star myths, E. Böcklen studied the Old Testament in 1907. Several of the above scholars joined with H. Winckler, A. Jeremias, and E. Stucken in founding the Gesellschaft für vergleichende Mythenforschung in Berlin in 1906. These last three "Panbabylonians," as they came to be called, considered nearly all myths of the knowledge and religious life of "primitive" and archaic peoples. In delivering the American Lectures on the History of Religions in 1912, Franz Cumont evaluated the Pan-Babylonian theory: "What is true in it is not new, and what is new in it is not true." Cumont rejected the notion that all myth referred to the movements of the heavens. Unfortunately, in his discussions of astrology among the Greeks and Romans, Cumont subscribed to the same narrow historicism as the Babylonianists by arguing that the origin of Greek and Roman star lore also lay in Babylon. Nevertheless, recognizing that religion was more than distorted observation of heavenly bodies, he examined the theological, mystical, ethical, and eschatological dimensions of ancient Mediterranean astrological faith.

The decade of the 1970s witnessed an explosion of new interest in the astronomical knowledge of ancient and contemporary non-Western cultures. This interest of the social sciences shows no sign of waning. Perhaps a study in the sociology of knowledge of our own time might best be written by future generations; however, contemporary observers cannot dismiss the coincidence of increased interest in astronomical research into other cultures with our own need to feel at home in a celestial space increasingly peopled by astronauts and cosmonauts. In any case and for whatever reasons, Western scholars are turning to the experiences of our brother/sister human beings of other times and places on our planet to learn from them what it is like to be at home with the stars. The decade opened with Hamlet's Mill: An Essay on Myth and the Fate of Time (1969), a comparative study of myth and astronomy by Giorgio de Santillana and Hertha von Dechen. However, most serious investigations of cultural astronomy are culture-specific; that is, dealing with only one culture. As I mentioned above, two notable areas of study in this area are archaeoastronomy, which focuses...
on prehistoric material sites, and ethnoastronomy, a subspecialty of ethnography. Let us begin our modern survey of the study of stars and religion with the archaeoastronomers.

Archaeoastronomic study of megalithic Europe is making exciting discoveries about the scope of human knowledge displayed in that period. Drawing conclusions about the existence or nature of an astronomical science from the study of megalithic rings, standing-stones, and tombs is a most delicate business. One swallow does not make a spring, and one solstitial sightline does not make an astronomical system. Prehistorians like A. Thom, J. D. Patrick, E. W. MacKie, and R. J. C. Atkinson are looking for a complex of sightlines (solar, lunar, sidereal) which would point incontrovertibly to the existence of a science of astronomy in megalithic times. For the moment, discussions center around the existence of a widely distributed standard of measure—the “megalithic yard”—and the related questions of the existence and nature of megalithic geometry, the use of pi, the employment of a “Pythagorean” theorem in the configuration of circle-to-circle structures whose linear alignments, oriented to the moon, appear to be triangular. Some piles of stone (“outlier cairns”), placed at a significant distance from rings and tombs, may have been used to establish a line of sight pointing to the precise position of a star in the sky (“azimuth-foresights” and “backsights”). Standing at a predetermined spot in line with the backsight behind him, an observer peered at the point in the sky directly above the foresight marker. The process is similar to the one in which a sharpshooter draws the bead at the far end of a rifle barrel into the notched slot of its backsight. In this way, the observer brings his eye into the predetermined line established between the foresight marker and the backsight. That line is set at an angle to the horizon (azimuth). That megalithic peoples made astute astronomical observations and possessed a means of transmitting star-knowledge seems undeniable. MacKie holds that, without written records, megalithic astronomers memorized and transmitted verbally their cumulative knowledge. For other researchers, like D. H. Sadler, this poses a problem. How can we depend on the memory and transmission of knowledge to account for the very accurate lunar orientations whose constructions took two centuries or more, due to the effects of parallax? In comparison with such a large sweep of time, the already striking achievements of the recognition of nineteen-year lunar periods and twelve-year cycles of the extreme declination of the bright outer planet Jupiter seem short.

In Megalithic Science: Ancient Mathematics and Astronomy in Northwest Europe, Douglas C. Haggis indicates six kinds of orientations found in the investigations of megalithic sites which point to the existence of astronomical calculations. The first is an alignment of two or more “menhirs” or groups of stones in a line. Some stones have holes in them, apparently for sighting more precisely. Examples of these alignments are found in Learable Hill, Sutherland and Men-an-Tol, Cornwall. Alignments appear to be solar, lunar, or calendrical. The second orientation is a megalithic ring or ellipse whose symmetrical axis is oriented to a celestial body, for example, Stonehenge, whose summer-solstitial axis was discovered by Dr. William Stukeley in 1740.

Outliers are the third kind of orientation which denote astronomical calculations; these are stones not far from megalithic rings. From the center of the ring (or in line with some other backsight) they serve as foresights. For example, at Woodhenge in Wiltshire, England, two such outliers may have served for stellar sightings from two different centers in the ring. Megalithic tombs, Haggis’s fourth kind of evidence, often appear oriented to celestial bodies and movements. In Hünenbetten near Wildeshausen in northwest Germany, groups of large stones near the tombs could have been a lunar foresight. Newgrange, in County Meath, Ireland, is oriented toward the winter solstice.

The fifth group are lines between sites, which are exceedingly interesting, especially in those complex sites whose rings are marked in the center by stones. These include tomb-to-tomb alignments, circle-to-tomb alignments, and dolmen-to-tomb alignments. In Odry, Poland, there is a site with at least four separate rings. Situated near the center of the site is a pair of standing stones which, as a foresight, frames the midsummer’s day sunrise. Another pair of standing stones frames the midwinter sunrise. This site in Odry may possess some ten circles whose center-to-center lines orient to moments of the moon, its midwinter and midsummer “major standstills,” the solstices, and the star Capella. Such orientations would make possible more complex intercalations of celestial rhythms. Site-to-site lines at Dorset Gursus in England run some ten kilometers in length. Apparently these earthworks were used for solar and lunar orientations.

The last of Haggis’s orientations are natural foresights, geographic features remarkable enough to serve as sightmarks. One such example is found on the island of North Uist. Clach an Sagairt, an enormous stone on the island, is angled toward the nearby island of Boreraig such a way as to set up a calendrical line. In a second related case, Rueval Stone is also oriented toward the island of Boreraig fifty miles away, so that they form a line indicating a different calendrical declination. A third case, An Carra on South Uists, is likewise oriented on Boreraig and marks yet another calendrical declination.

When they speak of religion, many archaeoastronomical investigators tend curiously to impose upon the data an assumption of mutual incompatibility between “religious” (unproductive of increments in precise data) and “scientific” (practical, systematic, generative of precise knowledge) purposes built into megalithic structures. This dichotomy—a legacy of two genera-
tions of scholarly literature—between sites which may be either "astronomical observatories" or "ceremonial centers" is now extended into the assessment of the purposes of any single structural complex. In this way, for example, because the stellar sight-lines which are

"Here are peoples whose . . . religious life manifests a great capacity to bind together disparate religious experiences and forms in a creative way."

the most certain and frequent orient on Rigel of Orion, and since, in the current analysis, Rigel appears to possess no creative role in a "scientific" system (it is neither a clock star nor a warning star for sunrise on any calendar day), such stellar sight-line complexes are consigned to "religious" purposes. By way of further example, it is said that the existence of orientations to extreme declinations of the moon testifies against any practical application such as the prediction of eclipses and therefore, those orientations must have a ritual purpose. Thus, in the study of a possible megalithic astronomical science, there exists a tendency to regard as "religious" those elements which are impractical, imprecise, or "unscientific."

The point is not to deny that such orientations as those on Rigel or to the extreme declinations of the moon may have religious meaning. That is very acceptable. The issue is more subtle and important than that. The unfortunate result of this set of criteria is that one approaches the experience of megalithic religious life as if it were fractured and compartmentalized in a way similar to post-Enlightenment Western life. No historical grounds exist to make this anachronistic assumption about the nature of megalithic life. One could better make a different argument "from absence" in favor of astronomy itself (even if it proves to be precise and systematic) as a ritual activity. In fact, the association of so many astronomically oriented sites with tombs and cremations points to the religious nature of many such complexes.

In this connection, it is remarkable that the dichotomy problem is less pronounced, or absent, in the archaeoastronomic investigations of North America, Mesoamerica, the Andes, and southeast Asia. For example, in North America there are a large number of "medicine wheels" whose hubs consist of a center circle of stone or a rock pile from which lines radiate out like spokes. Occasionally there are one or more concentric circles which may be as large as one hundred meters across and several meters high. The central cairn may be ten meters across. Since these are often found on tops of mountains worn by erosion and violent weather, it is difficult to date these sites by reading the separate strata of their use.

In Majorville, Alberta, there is a medicine wheel which has had nearly continuous use since 2500 B.C., which makes it a contemporary of the Egyptian pyramids and the early stages of Stonehenge. The central cairn consists of some fifty tons of stone. The Big Horn medicine wheel in Wyoming is fairly well known and has been claimed by a number of different Plains tribes. However, its full range of meanings appears to have been lost long ago. It has six outlier cairns apparently used to mark the summer solstice and stars of midsummer dawn. Its alignments may also be oriented on Aldebaran in Taurus, Rigel in Orion, and brightest Sirius. However, John Eddy reports that this medicine wheel was last used for these purposes as many as seven hundred years ago! The point here is that it has not been necessary to distinguish between precise scientific knowledge and religious purpose in investigating such sites.

Furthermore, returning to megalithic Europe, even if we do not know as much as we would like about megalithic religion, what we do know is

"In orienting their structures to the heavens they bring about the intersection of celestial powers with those they see manifest in stone on earth."

important and revealing: the predominance of the cult of the dead; the internment of the dead in tombs; the display of stone and its power of permanence; the display of knowledge of the organization of space in ceremonial centers (and/or astronomical observatories); and the sacrifices, cremations, and periodic festivals. In addition, the cult of the Great Goddess in megalithic European culture appears to be widespread. Thanks to Gunther Zuntz' studies of megalithic architecture and cult sites in Malta, we understand better the relations of these features as a complete system. Most importantly, as Mircea Eliade has remarked, we know we are dealing with a series of original and local creations and not a simple diffusion from a single source. Each area reflects a creative reshaping of local traditions which integrated in an original way the outside influences encountered in the course of its history.

In the light of this realization, one can best appreciate the religious meaning of megalithic astronomical knowledge. Here are peoples whose remains give evidence of a complex history. We can already see that their religious life manifests a great capacity to bind together disparate religious experiences and forms in a creative way. In orienting their structures to the heavens they bring about the intersection of celestial powers with those they see manifest in stone on earth. They create a space which situates them at this intersection. We are not dealing with an astronomical science in the sense in which Dupuis would have it—a set of literal movements of heavenly bodies whose meaning is fully apparent and exhausted in the precise order of their motion. Rather, the meaning of the religious perception of the heavens is involved with the megalithic religious experience of the dead, of stone, of space ordered permanently in stone, of the Earth, and of fertility; for these are the realities brought together in megalithic material sites. The religious person in megalithic times, as always, confronts reality—even astronomical realities—as a total experience. The heavens are related to those other realities which are full of religious meaning. Astronomy adds another dimension to the megalithic religious genius: the ability to integrate, creatively, into a complex the variety of religious ideas and experiences whether these be inherited, borrowed, or discovered and whether these experiences be related to the power of lithic, post-mortem, temporal, terrestrial, feminine-divine, or celestial beings.

Ethnoastronomy, or the study of astronomic understandings of contemporary peoples in Africa, Oceania,
Australia, Asia, and the Americas, has blossomed in the last decade. The populations of native South America were any more preoccupied with astronomy than were other peoples around the globe. Judging by the abundant literature, however, it is certain that a large group of Western specialists is caught up by the life of the stars in South America. Among these experts are some of the most eminent scholars of those cultures: Otto Zerries, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Johannes Wilbert, Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff, R. T. Zuidema, and Ana Maria Mariscotti de Göriltz. Without any doubt, the most extraordinary ethnoastronomic study to emerge is Gary Urton’s *At the Crossroads of the Earth and Sky: An Andean Cosmology* (Austin, Texas: 1981). His study of the community of Misminay, near Cuzco, is far too rich to summarize here; let us mention only his discovery of the complexity of the Misminay conception of the Milky Way.

Urton found that the Misminay culture has investigated and systematized an understanding of the Milky Way, whereas our own Western intellectual tradition remained in ignorance of its ordered movements and structures until well after Copernicus and the beginning of the age of discovery. Since anthropologists seldom do field work at night, Urton asserts that they often miss out on crucial clues to the meaning of the cosmos that their host culture holds. In Misminay, the people watch the heavens at night “because,” as one young man told Urton, “we wish to live.”

Recall that the sky of the southern hemisphere, unlike that of the northern hemisphere, has no fixed pole star. How then is one to find an orientation? In Misminay this is accomplished by observing the two intercardinal axes of celestial space described by the Milky Way over that twenty-four-hour period when it is in zenith. In order to determine when the Milky Way is in its zenith, its structures must be calculated in relation to the horizon and in relation to the solstices, lunar zenith and nadir, solar zenith and nadir, the heliacal rising of several constellations, and bright stars or planets. These in turn are identified by their relation to the intercardinal zenith-axes of the Milky Way! How then is one to escape from the flux to find a fixed point? The Misminay solution to this dilemma has been to relate the movements of heavenly bodies to terrestrial rhythms of the seasonal rains, growth-cycles of vegetation and crops, the seasons of frost, and the many biological cycles of animal species as well as the menstrual cycles of women.

The Milky Way is thought of as a great river which runs through the sky, a stream of semen which flows through the center of celestial space just as the Vilcanota River, its terrestrial counterpart, flows through the center of the earth. The waters of the Vilcanota run southeast to northwest into the cosmic seas which encircle the earth at its edge. When the Milky way circles the earth, it descends into the cosmic ocean on the west, picks up the earthly water, and travels underground until it rises in the eastern sky. Gradually, the Milky Way proceeds through the heavens above the earth, spreading water through the sky. In the form of rains, fog, and hail, the water is cosmically recycled so that it falls into the headwater streams which feed the Vilcanota River. Water, the source of fertilization, passes continuously through the cosmos. In fact, the most dense and luminous section of the Milky Way makes its way across the heavens (and achieves its zenith) during the rainy season.

However, the Milky Way is not simply an amorphous, undifferentiated seminal river. It has a structure—a processual structure—of parts marked by star-to-star constellations, bright stars, and “dark cloud constellations.” Urton provides the identification of some thirty-seven single star and stellar structures associated with the structure and movements of the Milky Way. Intriguing as these are, by far the most fascinating aspect of astronomy in Misminay is the identification of at least seven constellations not generally recognized in Western astronomy. Whereas the bright stars and star-to-star constellations are all male geometric designs or architectural shapes, these “dark clouds” (*yana phuyu*) are all female animals. Dark spots of interstellar dust which stand out in contrast to the southern portion of the Milky Way where there is the greatest surface brightness, they are believed to be
manifestation of being itself.

The dynamism of the religious consciousness in Misminay resembles the "edification by puzzlement" described by James Fernandez in connection with some African riddles and sermons. Puzzling differences between entities are resolved not by reduction to abstract inner structures but by appeal to more powerful and wider sets which include all entities. The sense is not reduced but expanded; not separated out or compartmentalized but integrated into a larger category of being. Ultimately, appeal is made to a cosmic set of meaning and being. Puzzlement and the existential need for orientation form part of the religious process of edification, or construction of a cosmology which enriches meaning.

In our review of archaeoastronomy we encountered megalithic cultures which integrated into one astrospheric structure the cult of the dead, the experience of ordered space, the sacrality of stone, and the centrality of a female divinity. In Misminay, too, in connection with astronomy, we see that the religious experience is a total one: it acknowledges the relatedness of all significant entitites; the interdependence of beings is a measure of their reality. One hopes that ethnoastronomers and archaeoastronomers will resist the temptation to obscure the expansive direction of religious thought and reduce the religious experience of the heavens to the irane level of visible observation. If they avoid this pitfall, archaeoastronomers and ethnoastronomers may approach star-lore as an archive of meanings revealed in the cosmos and observed by the cultures under study. By joining their destiny to the stars of heaven, people gave expression to their experience of the fullness of existence. It is important that this awareness of plenitude and wholeness be considered in the scientific accounts, for in scholarly judgements about the relationship of myth and astronomy throughout history, the religious character of the human condition is appraised.

There is a thrill in discovering a "new key," a code which deciphers the speech of the world—the world of religious experience and the religious experience of the world. In the intellectual tradition of the West the life of the stars is a long-deserted world, one not checked out in a long-time.

"By demonstrating that the astronomy of Misminay can only be understood as a part of the wider world of processes linked together by mythic and religious ideas, Urton walks in the door which Dupuis had used as an exit."
Naming Death

Bernard O. Brown

Text: Romans 6:1–11

“Death no longer hath dominion over him.” (Romans 6:9b). The late Hannah Arendt spoke of the contemporary “indifference toward immortality.” To so act that what was created in this world would live forever, or to so live that our passage to another world would be the fulfillment of a faithful life in this—these profound motives have largely disappeared, she believed, at least from public life, and more and more from private life as well. Early in the modern era these passions were supplanted for a while by a belief in the history of the human race, a story that human beings would create and tell themselves, and which would be unending. This would be an immortality, not of our works, nor of our souls, but of the human community. That early modern faith is now as unviable as either of the ancient ones are alleged to be.

Jonathan Schell, in his important book, The Fate of the Earth, writes of the “second death” that will occur if we fall into nuclear conflict. Not only will we all die—the first death—but we will cancel life for all future generations as well—the second death. “We are not only threatening our own lives by the reckless way we conduct our political affairs,” writes Schell’s reviewer in the New York Times, “we are threatening to bring about the extinction of the species, in a sense, to abort the countless billions of people who would otherwise be destined to take our places on a healthy planet. . . . no one will be left to mourn or protest or even to record our passing.” So much for the immortality that history offers as the hope of life.

An “indifference toward immortality.” Arendt’s phrase suggests a weariness on the part of human beings even to conceive what immortality means; an insufficiency of imagery to portray it and an insufficiency of spirit to care. A truly mortal disease. It was Karl Rahner, I believe, who remarked that the Christian doctrine of eternal life has been put aside by modern theologians into a room behind a door marked “closed for repairs.”

Perhaps we are trying to name the wrong thing—immortality. We may first need to name death. Walker Percy, the novelist, suggests that if there is anyone around in the future to name our century, it will be called The Century of the Love of Death. His chief
character in the novel The Second Coming says, “Death in this century is not the death people die but the death people live. Men love death because real death is better than living death. That’s why men love wars, of course.”

If death has become the deepest motive of our actions, not immortality, then we need to name death. It may be that naming death, seeing death squarely with the eye of faith, may enable us to possess again the promise of faith. “If we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.”

How to name death? The scientists of human life have devoted much attention to identifying the moment when a human being dies, the failure of respiration and heart beat, the flattening of brain waves; these are signs they trust. We who stand helplessly beside a dying person know that with death a passage has occurred. The world of our experience is empty of someone who was responsive to our spirits. That it has occurred is beyond all doubt. How it occurs is a mystery.

But is it likely that this barely perceptible change that we call biological

“Death in this century is not the death people die but the death people live.”

depth is the dread enemy that our human kind has fought against throughout its long existence? All animal life offers resistance to biological death. But that passage can be managed fairly easily, for drugged cats and dogs as well as ourselves. However, is that all that has driven the human spirit to immense creative exertions in a desperate stand against death?

Do not go gently into that good night,
Rage, rage against the dying of the light.

Of what rage does the poet, who is Dylan Thomas, speak? Is it a rage which has suddenly calmed among us because we can see no real point in a right to live? Where is that sense of death for which it was needful that the Son of Man should die and be raised again?

Paul describes Christ’s death as a “death he died to sin, once for all.” It is not first of all the simple biological passage of which the Apostle speaks. It is not the death that happens to dogs and cats. It is the death that is known in real life, which can make real death something to be desired. That death is life despoiled by sin. It is life emptied of its grace and beauty. It is life where there is no responsiveness of spirit to spirit, as if we were corpses to one another. It is life where the innocent joy and trust of children mocks reality, instead of providing intimations of its fulfillment. That is death. And there are ways human beings have found to play with real death—with biological death—which they prefer to a death in life.

War is such a game. War is a time when men can dream of peace, and sacrifice themselves for that dream, and find that life has at least a passing interest for them as they play with death. War is a time when comrades grow in
love for one another, when they realize a love that is conceived of the necessity human beings have for one another, a necessity which war makes real, not optional. Even real death in war is not without meaning, at least in "good" wars. People want their deaths to mean something, especially when their lives have no point.

Killing ourselves with work is a game like that also. So is killing our feelings for others with sex. So is drugging our minds with chemicals or with television, or with so-called recreation. These are games that flirt with real death, that imitate real death; we play them because we know we cannot stand a life in which death has dominion.

Jesus did not come back to life. The resurrection of Christ from the dead was not the resuscitation of a corpse. Christ was raised from death. He broke through the hold of death over life. The entire reason why the life of Jesus retains its hold upon our lives is because we see in him a life that is lived from the dominion of death.

His life was a life of peace, not a dream of peace made vivid by the reality of war and death. His life was a life of comradeship in which people encountered in Jesus one who was responsive to them in their human need for companionship, in the heights of their joy, and the depths of their sorrow. Their life with Jesus was a life of mutual dependency, not artificially stimulated by terror and the nearness of death. His life was one people knew was being given up for something eternal, rather than something ephemeral, a life in which real death when it came would have its meaning, as part of God's care for his creatures. Real death would be a passage into the nearer presence of that which gave to life its goodness.

But why do we see in the life of Jesus what life truly is? Because he was raised. The life of Jesus that we find so compelling in the Gospels is a life seen by us through the prism glass of resurrection faith. Nothing of Jesus would have been remembered were it not for the Resurrection. Nor would we know God in the way he did. More than likely we would know nothing of God at all. Almost certainly we would not even be alive. Think of that if you are tempted to take lightly worshipping him, or obeying his costly commandment to love one another.

Without the Resurrection, all of the hopefulness we are able to invest in this life, because it is a hope built upon a sense for life in which death has no dominion, would have disintegrated at the Crucifixion, and been dissipated into the air. His life would be remembered, if at all, as another tissue of dreams, spun by a free-spirited, mystical type of fellow, who paid for his mystification of himself and others with his own death.

"The life he lives he lives to God." The resurrection faith is not about a man coming back to life, but of a new life given to a man, and to humankind. God is, after all, one who can do that sort of thing, since the creating, and the sustaining, and the renewing of life is what we mean when we speak of God. God is that spirit of creativity and intelligence and purpose which moves within life, over whom death holds no claim.

“So you must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus.” Paul brings the matter into our present moment. Death must have no dominion over our lives, particularly that death in life, the living death which is the operation of sin. That death he died, once for all. We are not more determined by it than he. Our lives are not more defined by death than was his. We are alive to God in Christ Jesus. That is the first truth of which we must be aware in every breath that we breathe, in every act that we undertake. We are alive to God. Death in life has been beaten down.

And that first truth of our lives will also be the last truth of our lives. It will not be less true at the moment of our real death, nor at the next moment when we are beyond that death. Again, our brother Paul fixes that promise in a phrase: "Your life is hid with Christ in God.”

Paul has named immortality.