

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Clash between Two Philosophical Siblings – Science and Religion in Dan Brown's *Angels
and Demons*

A thesis submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus Faculty of
Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Suman Suwal

Roll No. 33/ 063/64

April 2008

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

This thesis entitled "Clash between Two Philosophical Siblings - Science and Religion in Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons*" submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Suman Suwal, has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

.....

Subash Acharya

Supervisor

.....

External Examiner

.....

Dr. Ananda Sharma

Head of Department of English,

Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Kathmandu.

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I express my sincere gratitude to my guru and advisor Mr. Subash Acharya, lecturer, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, for his invaluable guidance and intellectual feedback made for completion of my work successfully.

I am highly indebted to Dr. Ananda Sharma, Head of English Department; R.R. Campus, for encouraging me to proceed my work with vigor and enthusiasm. I am equally grateful to the estimable and respectable gurus Baikuntha Acharya, Prof. Satish Sukla and Prof. Raja Sharma for their precious and constructive guidelines in every step of life.

I would like to thank my brother Mr. Jivan Suwal and friendly brother Mr. Gautam Shrestha for extending helpful hands and providing me subtle support, valuable books and information about the sources. Ultimately, I would like to thank all my friends and well-wishers, without whose precious help, this research might not have been possible.

August 2008

Suman Suwal

Table of Contents

	Pages
Chapter 1 : Introduction	1
1.1 Notion of Science and Religion	1
1.2 Brownian Oeuvre and His Agendas in <i>Angels and Demons</i>	3
Chapter 2 : Tingeing Literature with Historical Wand	12
2.1 Encountering New Historicism and its Issues	12
2.2 The History of Crossing Swords between Science and Religion	19
2.2.1 Development of Science in History	19
2.2.2 The History of Religion	24
2.3 Discourse, Power Relation and Narcissism in the Clash	27
Chapter 3 : Delving into the Masterpiece <i>Angels and Demons</i>	33
3.1 The Novel and Its Background	33
3.2 Clash between two Philosophical Titans – Science and Religion	36
3.3. The Battle for Christian Identity against Science in <i>Angels and Demons</i>	40
3.4. The Camerlengo's Sisyphean Attempts and Evaluation of His Steps	50
Chapter 4 :Conclusion: Blurring the Demarcation between Science and Religion	54
Works Cited	

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Notion of Science and Religion

Religion and science are two aspects of social life, of which the former has been important as far back as we know anything of man's mental history, while the latter, after a fitful flickering existence among the Greeks and Arabs in the prehistoric time, suddenly sprang into importance in the sixteenth century, and has ever since increasingly molded both the ideas and institutions among which we live. Between religion and science there has been a prolonged conflict, in which, until the last few years, science has invariably proved victorious. But the rise of new religions in Russia and Germany, equipped with new means of missionary activity provided by science, has again put the issue in doubt, as it was at the beginning of the scientific epoch, and has made it again important to examine the grounds and the history of the warfare waged by traditional religion against scientific knowledge.

It is not easy to confine and condense the philosophical titans into a handful of words. The word "Science" has its root in the Latin *scientia*, from *scire*, meaning knowledge. Science is the attempt to discover, by means of observation, and reasoning based upon it, first, particular facts about the world, and then laws connecting facts with one another and (in fortunate cases) making it possible to predict future occurrences. Connected with this theoretical aspect of science there is scientific technique, which utilizes scientific knowledge to produce comforts and luxuries what were impossible, or at least much more expensive, in a pre-scientific era. *Oxford English Dictionary* and *Wikipedia*, the encyclopedia, share almost the common definition of science. According to the former one, science is the "knowledge about the structure and behavior of the natural and physical world, based on facts that you

can prove, for example by experiments" (1357) whereas for the latter, science is "the effort to discover, understand, or to understand better, how the physical world works..." (118).

Religion, considered socially, is a more complex phenomenon than science. A religion is a set of beliefs and practices, often centered upon scientific supernatural and moral claims about reality, the cosmos and human nature. The renowned philosopher Bertrand Russell, scrutinizing the criteria and commonly shared grounds of the religions in history, opines:

Each of the great historical religions has three aspects: i) a Church, ii) a creed, and iii) a code of personal morals. The relative importance of these three elements has varied greatly in different times and places. The ancient religions of Greece and Rome, until they were made ethical by the Stoics, had not very much to say about personal morals; in Islam the church has been unimportant in comparison with the temporal monarch; in modern Protestantism there is a tendency to relax the rigors of the creed. Nevertheless, all three elements, though in varying proportions, are essential to religion as a social phenomenon, which is what is chiefly concerned in the conflict with science.

(8-9)

Religion, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* is "one of the systems of faith that are based on the belief in the existence of a particular god or gods" (1279). But, the prominent Indian philosopher Osho (Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh) presents striking definition, contra to this popular belief. Osho says:

Etymologically, 'religion' means to unite the fragments for perfection... A pure religion is a perfect art of living. It has to neither give and take with the prayers and worship nor with temples and mosques. Hence, religion, the science of soul is art of living in bliss and super consciousness, the capability

to embrace truth, simplicity and naturality forever, the affectionate co-existence with the entire beings... (15)

In a nutshell, science is the exploration of physical world, progression to the outer world, and the study of periphery whereas religion is the advancement to the spiritual world, the journey to the innermost world and the quest to the center. Science is the spirit of matter and religion is the science of soul. Science stands for head whereas religion represents heart. Moreover, both science and religion are manifestation of man's quest to understand the divine.

1.2 Brownian Oeuvre and His Agendas in *Angels and Demons*

This short research on Dan Brown's bestseller book *Angels and Demons* is an attempt to scrutinize the increasingly heated fiery battle between the two philosophical giants - science and religion.

Dan Brown, the veritable master of intrigue, suspense and smart thriller, has made his own distinct place among the postmodern writers. Born and raised in Exeter, New Hampshire, USA, he is a graduate of Amherst College and of Phillips Exeter Academy where he also spent time as an English teacher before turning to writing full time. Brown is interested in cryptology, key, and codes, which are a recurring theme in his stories. In his works, he also uses tales from various genres - fantasy, mythology, religion, politics among the theme including puzzles, treasure hunts, secret organizations and academic lectures on obscure topics. His narrative technique has mostly connected his book to magic realism - a narrative style in which reality merges with fantasy, through which he annexes the elements of mythology, conspiracies, controversial issues with the fact strangely blending and molding it in order to give a real glimpse of his hypothesized world.

Brown's father Richard G. Brown was a well-known mathematics teacher of Phillips Exeter Academy. He received the Presidential Award for excellence in mathematics teaching.

Brown's mother Constance (Connie) had a master's degree in sacred music and was a professional Church organist. Being inspired by his mother, Brown also dabbled with a musical career, creating effects with a synthesizer, and self-producing a children's cassette. Later, he moved to Hollywood to pursue a career as singer-songwriter and pianist as well. During his days in school, he pursued advanced writing courses and was published in school literary magazines. The school, by chance, had a very strong tradition of writing and had a number of famous writers as alumni, including John Irving, Gore Vidal, Daniel Webster and Peter Benchley. At Exeter, Brown chose 'creative writing' as his senior project. At Amherst, he applied for and was accepted to a special writing course with visiting novelist Alan Lelchuck. Before devoting his complete time to writing, Brown under the pseudonym "Danielle Brown", had written a humor book *187 Men to Avoid: A Guide for the Romantically Frustrated Woman*, in collaboration with his life partner, Blythe Newlon. A few months later, Brown and his wife released *The Bald Book*, another humor book. It was officially credited to his wife, though a representative of the publisher said that it was primarily written by Brown.

Brown's first three novels had little success but the fourth novel, *The Da Vinci Code* got a roaring success and became a runaway bestseller, going to the top of the New York Times Best Seller list during its first week of release in 2003. It is now credited with being one of the most popular books of all time, with some 70 million copies sold worldwide as of 2006. Its success has helped push sales of Brown's earlier books as well. In 2004, all four of his novels were on the New York Times list in the same week, and in 2005, he made *Time* magazine's list of the 100 Most Influential People of the year. *Forbes* magazine placed Brown at #12 on their 2005 "celebrity 100" list. Currently, his novels have been translated into more than forty languages.

For Dan Brown,

Writing an informative yet compact thriller is a lot like making maple sugar candy. You have to tap hundreds of trees...boil vats and vats of raw sap...evaporate the water...and keep boiling until you've distilled a tiny nugget that encapsulates the essence. Of course, this requires liberal use of the DELETE key. In many ways, editing yourself is the most important part of being a novelist...carving away superfluous text until your story stands crystal clear before your reader. For every page in a published novel, I wrote ten that ended up in the trash.

Brown has followed a very similar approach to researching and then writing each of his four novels. The first step is to select a theme generally the "big idea". As his novels normally are research intensive, he almost took up two years' time to complete a single novel. Writing, for Brown, is a discipline much like playing instruments, as it requires constant practice and honing of skills. After the basic reading is done and any theme or "big idea" is in place, Brown starts researching and writing in earnest. He erects the frame on which to build the plot; he tries to sketch out the overall shape of the story. Because his novels are very 'location driven', he always selects a series of key settings that he wants to use in the novel. In context to his novel and his writing style, Dan Brown says:

I tried to write a book that I would love to read, I wanted every single chapter to compel the reader to turn the page. The action of my novel takes place within twenty-four hours. All of my novels take the concept of a simple hero pulled out of his familiar world and thrown into a world that he or she does not understand. I use strong female characters, travel and interesting locations, a romance between a man and a woman of complementary expertise. Structural elements are consistent in every book. The hard part of writing a novel is not

the ideas but rather the nuts and bolts of the plot and language, and making it all work. (106)

Like the recurring theme in some demonic symphony, the cryptography, keys, codes, and treasure hunts return time and again in Brown's novels. In each of his books, the treasure is an object and the entire novel hovers round it. In *Digital Fortress*, the treasure is a golden ring, in *Angels and Demons*, it is antimatter, in *Deception Point*, it is a meteorite, and in *The Da Vinci Code*, it is the Holy Grail.

His first novel *Digital Fortress* (1998) is a thriller set within National Security Agency (NSA) and Spain. When the National Security Agency's invincible code-breaking machine encounters a mysterious code it cannot break, the agency calls in its head cryptographer, Susan Fletcher, a brilliant, beautiful mathematician. What she uncovers sends shock waves through the corridor of power. The NSA is being held hostage - not by guns or bombs, but by a code so complex that if released would cripple U.S. intelligence. Caught in an accelerating tempest of secrecy and lies, Fletcher battles to save the agency she believes in. Betrayed on all sides, she finds herself fighting not only for her country but also for her life, and in the end, for the life of the man she loves - David Becker.

Dan Brown's second novel *Angels and Demons* (2000), one of the most read and widely acclaimed masterpieces after the Holy Bible, is an explosive international thriller that careens from enlightening epiphanies to dark truth as the battle between science and religion turns to war. Brown has woven an ancient secret brotherhood, the European Council for Nuclear Research (CERN), a papal conclave, mysterious ambigrams, a plot against Vatican, the increasingly heated clash between science and religion...into a single entwined colorful garland - *Angels and Demons*. Pitting scientific terrorists against the cardinals of Vatican City, this well-plotted if over-the-top thriller is crammed with Vatican intrigue and high-tech drama. Harvard professor Robert Langdon, an expert in symbology and arcane codes, is

summoned to a Swiss Research facility when Dr. Vetra, the scientist who discovered antimatter, is found murdered with the cryptic word "Illuminati" seared into his chest. What he discovers is unimaginable: a deadly vendetta against the Catholic Church by a centuries-old underground organization - the Illuminati. These Illuminati were a group of Renaissance scientists, including Galileo, who met secretly in Rome to discuss new ideas in safety from papal threat but what the long-defunct association has to do with Dr. Vetra's death is far from clear. Vetra's daughter, Vittoria, makes a frightening discovery: a lethal amount of antimatter, sealed in vacuum flask that will explode in six hours unless its batteries are recharged, is missing. Almost immediately, the Swiss Guard discovers that the flask is hidden beneath Vatican City, where the conclave to elect a new pope has just begun. Desperate to save the Vatican from a powerful time bomb, Vittoria and Langdon rush against time to recover the canister, but they are not allowed into the Vatican until it is discovered that the four principal papal candidates are missing. The terrorists who are holding the cardinals call in regarding their pending murders, offering clues tied to ancient Illuminati meeting sites and runes. Meanwhile, it becomes clear that a sinister Vatican entity with messianic delusions is in league with the terrorists. Packing the novel with sinister figures worthy of Medici, Brown sets an explosive pace as Langdon and Vittoria embark on a frantic hunt across a Michelin-perfect Rome through catacombs, deserted cathedrals, piazzas and even the most secretive vault on earth...the long-forgotten Illuminati lair to try prevent the incineration of civilization and find the antimatter before it explodes.

His third novel *Deception Point* (2001) centers on issues of morality in politics, human progress, national security and classified technology. The book explores organization such as National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and National Reconnaissance Office (NRO). The crux of the novel is the link between NASA, the military and the political pressures of big budget technology. The novel is a mind-blowing thriller

about a meteorite discovered in the Arctic - a discovery that turns out to have profound political ramifications for an impending presidential election. The set up is about the debate and exploring topics of morality in politics and science. When a NASA satellite discovers an astonishingly rare object buried deep in the Arctic ice, the floundering space agency proclaims a much-needed victory - a victory with profound implications for NASA policy and the impending presidential election. To verify the authenticity of the find, the White House calls upon the skills of intelligence analyst Rachel Sexton. Accompanied by a team of experts, including the charismatic scholar Michael Tolland, Rachel travels to the Arctic and uncovers the unthinkable evidence of scientific trickery - a bold deception that threatens to plunge the world into controversy. But before she can warn the president, Rachel and Michael are ambushed by a deadly team of assassins. Fleeing for their lives across a desolate and lethal landscape, their only hope for survival is to discover who is behind this masterful plot. The truth, they will learn, is the shocking deception of all. The novel deals with the political tug of war between the president Zachary Herney and the senator Sedgewick Sexton for the approaching presidential poll, the senator's sexual scandal with his secretary and a shocking scientific discovery. Regarding the plot and the scientific discovery in the novel, the contemporary US president Bill Clinton, in a press conference says:

If this discovery is confirmed, it will surely be one of the most stunning insights into our universe that science has ever uncovered. Its implications are as far-reaching and awe inspiring as can be imagined. Even as it promises answers to some of our oldest questions, it poses still others even more fundamental. (7th Aug. 1997)

Dan Brown's fourth novel *The Da Vinci Code* (2003) is a blockbuster perfection which has brought international as well as global fame to Brown and has set him to the pinnacle of the literary realm. The novel also drove Brown to court with the charges of

plagiarism. But in August 2005, he won the court case in New York against author Lewis Perdue who over charges of plagiarism, on the basis of claimed similarity between *The Da Vinci Code* and his novels *The Da Vinci Legacy* (1983) and *Daughter of God* (2000). Brown's publisher, Random House also won an appeal copyright infringement case brought by authors Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh. England's Court of Appeal rejected the efforts from two authors who claimed that Brown stole their ideas from *Holy Blood, Holy Grail* (1982), for his novel *The Da Vinci Code*. While in Paris, Harvard symbologist Robert Langdon is awakened by a phone call in the dead of the night. The elderly curator of the Louvre has been murdered inside the museum, his body and the floor around him covered in baffling symbols. As Langdon and a gifted French cryptologist, Sophie Neveu sort through the bizarre riddles, they are stunned to discover a trail of clues hidden in the works of Leonardo Da Vinci - clues visible for all to see and yet ingeniously disguised by the painter.

Even more startling, the late curator was involved in the Priory of Sion - an actual secret society, whose members included Sir Isaac Newton, Victor Hugo, and Da Vinci among others, - and he guarded a breathtaking historical secret. Unless Langdon and Neveu can decipher the labyrinthine puzzle - while avoiding the faceless adversary who shadows their every move - the explosive, ancient truth will be lost forever. The novel, at its core, is a treasure hunt through Paris, London, and Edinburgh. The story is blend of historical fact, legend, myth and fiction. The novel's themes include: the sacred feminine, the goddess worship, the Holy Grail, symbology, paganism, the history of Bible and its accuracy including the lost Gnostic Gospels: Templar History, the suppression of information by the church, the genealogy of Jesus, religious zealotry, nature's grand design as evidence for the existence of God and so on.

In 2006, Brown's novel *The Da Vinci Code* was released as a film by Columbia Pictures, with director Ron Howard; the film starred Tom Hanks as Robert Langdon, Audrey

Tautou as Sophie Neveu and Sir Ian McKellen as Sir Leigh Teabing. It was considered one of the most anticipated films of the year, and was used to launch the 2006 Cannes Film Festival, though it received overall poor reviews. His another acclaimed novel *Angels and Demons* is being adapted for film and is expected to be released in mid-2009 starring Oscar winning Tom Hanks. Brown has been flinging himself in the work of a new novel called *The Solomon Key*, which will reportedly take place in Washington D.C., and feature the "secret" society of the Freemasons. An exact release date has not been announced, but the most common media speculation says 2008.

This brief introduction of Brown's literary career is anticipated to be a milestone in an invaluable excavation of his masterpiece - *Angels and Demons*. It is apt to say, before *The Da Vinci Code* was broken, the world lay at the mercy of *Angels and Demons*. The twisty, turny, slippery, and surprising fictional murder mystery published three years before *The Da Vinci Code*, is a kind of "prequel" to *The Da Vinci Code* and includes many of the same themes, issues, symbols and mysteries from the history of Christianity. An ancient secret brotherhood, a devastating new weapon of destruction, an unthinkable target... are the motifs of the novel on the periphery of which the story hovers. Like his other books, *Angels and Demons* weave together fact and fiction. Much fleeting criticism centers on his claims that some details in his books are fact. Brown has been immensely extolled for the intrigue and suspense, he has used in his masterwork *Angels and Demons* by different newspapers and magazines. Some critics have compared him with Umberto Eco and Tom Clancy while others with Michael Crichton and Thomas Harris. Nancy Pearl in a library journal extols Brown's genius - "*Angels and Demons* is both literate and extremely well researched, mixing physics with religion...Right up to the riveting conclusion, Brown clearly knows how to deliver the goods" (124). A product description about *Angels and Demons* rightly puts, "No Brown library is complete without this (*Angels and Demons*) lavishly illustrated edition. No true lover or suspense

fiction will be able to resist the exhilarating blend of scholarly intrigue and relentless adventure found in *Angels and Demons*."

Science and religion had been oil and water since day one...archenemies...unmixable, though both philosophies are cut from the same cloth. The gray area in the novel also is the ongoing battle between science and religion and the faint hope of reconciliation between the two. Alarm bells start to ring and the camerlengo Carlo Ventresca loses his wink of sleep as science, like a burgeoning fiend magnifies its territory with the proliferation of debunking miracles day by day. The looming threat on horizon, like dredged from a Gothic nightmare, compels him to persecute science. By fair means or foul, Ventresca is determined to bring religion out of the doldrums and prevent it from being defunct. Hence, begins the fiery battle between the two giants - science and religion, which is the crux of the novel as well. This research will deal with the conflict between these two philosophical siblings and the kaleidoscope of confounding images - the camerlengo's psychic tornado, plight, and his misjudgment to understand science and religion. The present research is anticipated to add a new dimension in studying science and religion. The study will further explore the real causes of the conflict between the philosophies and will help douse the numerous haunting questions about life's deepest mysteries as well.

Chapter 2

Tingeing Literature with Historical Wand

2.1 Encountering New Historicism and its Issues

Historicism, the offspring of Hegelian idealism, analyzes literature with the course of time or period of which it was emerged. The historicists view history and literature having a close relationship to each other. Though historicism made its humble beginning only in the 19th century, man's acquaintance and familiarity with the intimacy and interdependence of both the realms seems to have traced its strong and deep roots as early as fourth century B.C. The renowned Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle are the pioneers to portray the nature and relationship between history and literature. Plato took literature to be the output of divine frenzy - thus false, trivial and harmful whereas Aristotle took it as true, serious and useful. Aristotle differentiates the poetic work from history giving priority to the former than latter. In Aristotle's words, the function of the poet is not "to relate what has happened, but what may happen - what is possible according to the law of probability or necessity. The poet invents or arranges his own story and thus, creates a self-sufficient world of his own" (55). He further states, "Poet and historian differ not by writing in verse or in prose but the true difference is that one relates what has happened, the other what may happen" (60). Aristotle thus laid a clear line of demarcation between history and literature by stating that historians are confined to their boundary in finding and arranging facts but on the other hand, poets are free to use their creative and potential mind in appropriate manner. Hence, Aristotle concludes, "Poetry, therefore, is more philosophical and higher thing than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular" (55). In a nutshell, history deals merely with the past whereas literature with the entire confluence of time - past, present and future. Hence, literature cannot stand aloof parting with history.

Many branches of literary study involve the use of historical evidence: questions of textual transmission and authenticity, of archaic or obsolete language, of sources and literary borrowing, of relations between an author's life and work, are all in the strict sense 'historical'. But the term 'historicism' is usually reserved for that approach to literature which sets it in the context of the ideas, conventions and attitudes of the period in which it was written. In analyzing a text, historicists consider cultural and social forces that influenced and are revealed through the text. But historicists examine not only the influence of social, cultural and historical circumstances on the work, but also the reception and significance of that work in the past and present. The aim of historicism is to make works of different periods more accessible to the modern reader by reconstructing the historically appropriate background as it affects an understanding and judgment of the work concerned.

Hippolyte Taine, generally recognized as the father of the historical method, hoisted the banner of historicism in the 19th century and played the pivotal role in the flourishing of this criticism. Hippolyte Taine, in his *History of English Literature*, treated literature as documents for the analysis of an age and people. The work of historical critic for him is to "retrace from the monuments of literature, the style of man's feeling and thoughts for centuries back" (609). Taine by his expression creates a hierarchy between literature and history by treating literature as documents helping historians understand whole people and their condition, on the other hand, he views literature superior to history as a fine novel or is more instructive than a bulk of histories.

The theory as well as the practice of historicism has not gone unchallenged. It has been argued, for instance, that a modern reconstruction of the cultural or ideological identity of a past age must still be essentially modern in its point of view. Hence, defying the historical view of literature forwarded by Taine, the new critics averred their advent on the literary horizon. For the new critics, the only thing literary historians could offer was

interesting background material about literary works. The understanding of a text's meaning, however, has nothing whatsoever to do with history, the new critics argued, because great literary works are timeless, autonomous art objects that exist in a realm beyond history. With the advent of the text-oriented New Criticism, however historically oriented critics faded into obscurity.

Around 1980, however, a form of historical criticism practiced by Louis Montrose and Stephen Greenblatt began to transform the field of Renaissance studies and to influence the study of American and English romantic literature. Greenblatt inaugurated the currency of the label "new historicism" to this new literary approach in his introduction to a special issue of the journal *Genre*, vol. 15 (1982), though it seems to have already been coined by another critic in Renaissance studies (McCanles 77-87). Joseph Litvak writes, "...some hypothetical survey of late twentieth-century criticism might well characterize the 1980s as marking the return to history, or perhaps the recovery of the referent" (247). In 1981, American Marxist critic Fredric Jameson began his book *The Political Unconscious* with the following two words and challenge: "Always historicize!" (247). The new historicists rejected both traditional historicism's marginalization of literature and new criticism's enshrinement of the literary text in a timeless dimension beyond history. For new historical critics, a literary text does not embody the author's intention or illustrate the spirit of the age that produced it as traditional literary historians asserted, nor are literary texts self-sufficient art objects that transcend the time and place in which they were written, as new critics believed. Rather, literary texts are cultural artifacts that can tell us something about the interplay of discourse, the web of social meaning operating in the time and place in which the text was written. In this sense, the historical criticism practiced in the 1980s, however, was not the same as the historical criticism of 1930s and 1940s. Indeed, if the word "new" still serves any useful purpose in defining contemporary historical criticism, it is in distinguishing it from such older

forms of historicism. New historicists believe that criticism should incorporate diverse discourses. These critics assume that works of literature both influence and are influenced by historical reality, and they share a belief in referentiality that is, a belief that literature both refers and is referred to by things outside itself. They are also less fact-and event-oriented than historical critics used to be, perhaps because they have come to wonder whether the truth about what really happened can ever be purely and objectively known. They are less likely to see history as linear and progressive, as something developing toward the present, and they are also less likely to think of it in terms of specific eras, each with a definite, persistent, and consistent *zeitgeist* (spirit of the times). Hence, they are unlikely to suggest that a literary text has a single or easily identifiable historical context.

A French philosophical historian, Foucault brought together incidents and phenomena from areas normally seen as unconnected, encouraging new historicists and new cultural historicists to redefine the boundaries of historical inquiry. Foucault's views of history were influenced by the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of *wirkliche* ("real" or "true") history. Like Nietzsche, Foucault refused to see history as an evolutionary process, a continuous development toward the present. No historical event, according to Foucault has a single cause; rather, each event is tied into a vast web of economic, social and political factors. Foucault urged historians to be aware that they are themselves historically "situated", making it difficult to see present cultural practices critically and extremely difficult to enter bygone ages. Like Karl Marx, Foucault saw history in terms of power but his view of power probably owed more to Friedrich Nietzsche than to Marx. Foucault viewed power not simply as a repressive force or a tool of conspiracy but rather as a complex of forces that produces what happens. Not even a tyrannical aristocrat simply wields power, for the aristocrat is himself empowered by discourses and practices that constitute power.

Though all new historicist critics are not Foucauldian, we cannot deny his (Foucault's) powerful impact and central influence on the new historicism. Assessing his subtle contribution, Catharine Belsey asserts:

Foucault's work gives us a methodology for producing our own history and politics, a history which is simultaneously a politics,...work on the institution of literary criticism is centrally concerned with the reception of literary texts with the text a site of range of possible meanings that may be produced during the course of history and with the knowledge inscribed in both dominant and radical discourses. Its importance seems to join together literature, history and politics in crucial ways... (405-6)

Stephen Grenblatt says, "Foucault's influence in literary theory has been strong among revisionist literary historians known as 'new historicists' who study the circulation of power through society and the literary texts that are part of it" (1133). In dealing with Foucault's concept of discourse, Raman Seldan says, "Foucault also emphasizes that discourses are always rooted in social institutions. He shows that social and political power works through discourse" (Theory 106).

This 'New Historicist' movement was paralleled by "Cultural Studies", particularly concerned with the social (and power) questions of race, class, and gender. New historicists focus upon 'textual history' and 'history of texts' whereas cultural materialists insist that whatever the textuality of context be, a culture and its literary products are always to an important degree, conditioned by real material forces and relations of the production in their historical era. Cultural materialism, therefore, studies implication of literary text in history. Their study particularly focuses on how history and culture could be mixed up from their background and made part of both context and perspective of criticism. According to cultural materialists:

One can distinguish a difference in tone, intention, meaning with the change of time because history itself, isn't full objective knowledge of a new past and complete history but an engaged reconstruction, repeated events, necessarily meditated provisional and incomplete history, i.e., always in the process of making. (234)

New historical criticism necessitates efforts to historicize the present as well as the past, and to historicize the dialectic relation between them - those reciprocal historical pressure by which the past has shaped the present and the present reshapes the past, that the text of each are inscriptions of history; and that our comprehension, representation, interpretation of text of the past always proceeds by a mixture of estrangement and appropriation as a reciprocal conditioning of the Renaissance text and the text of Renaissance. New historicist argument is then always to some degree the product of the author's personal, social, and institutional situation and can therefore only be partial and provisional. Steven Lynn in *Text and Context* suggests:

The new historicist critics would be more likely than traditional historical critic to consider the possibility that Milton's blindness was psychosomatic feigned or any other hypothesis that might be productive because new historicism assumes that history is a story, a construction, necessarily written or rewritten. (129)

Historicists come to an understanding that human, social and cultural characteristics are determined by historical situation, which indirectly suggests that the relationship between history and literature are inseparable. New historicists noting the general analogy between text and context are often interested in how different kinds of discourse interact, contradict, destabilize, cancel or modify each other.

By giving focus upon the text and history Greenblatt writes in his essay, "History cannot be divorced from textuality and the text can be compelled to confront the crisis of

undesirability revealed in the literary texts" (429). The new historicists, like the old historicists, are interested to establish the relationship between literature and history. Moreover, they focus on examining how literature reflected, shaped and represented history. According to Brannigan, a new historicist, "Literature does not reflect history as a mirror, therefore, it does not behave passively towards history, on the social and political ideas and beliefs of their time" (170). This gives a notion that literature and history are inseparable. So literature is a constitutive part of history in making of history itself. Brannigan further says, "The object of study for new historicist is not the text and its context, nor literature and its history but rather literature in history" (170).

Louis Montrose, a prominent new historicist critique views literature and history as interdependent. He claims that the key concern of new historicist critics is "the historicity of texts and the textuality of histories" (410). As he explains that the former means that all texts are embedded in specific historical conditions, therefore it must be treated with the historical context. The latter means that access to a full and authentic past is impossible. In other words, history-as-text is the key concern of new historicists as all our knowledge and understanding of the past exists only in the narrative form or textual form. New historicists make parallel reading of literature and non-literary texts, usually of the same historical period. Stephen Greenblatt says that new historicists are involved in "an intensified willingness to read all the textual traces of the past with the attention traditionally conferred only on literary text" (197).

According to Greenblatt, art "does not simply exist in all cultures; it is made up along with other products, practices, discourses of a given culture" (504). Greenblatt states that all types of art including literature are embedded within the social and economic circumstances in which they are produced and consumed. Written text is the product of social, cultural, and political forces not only the creation of an individual mind so the texts reflect the prevailing

values or ideologies of the contemporary period. The texts form discourse, which shapes and determines the values and tradition of culture and society. All forms of power operate through the medium of textual representation. Montrose thus sees the impossibility of subverting the dominant culture when he says that "a text creates the culture by which it is created, shapes the fantasy by which it is shaped, begets that by which it is begotten" (395).

History in many respects is textual as it suggests that there can be no knowledge of the past without interpretation. The old historicists saw unity, homogeneity, and totality in history whereas new historicists found contradiction, heterogeneity, and fragmentation in history. There is no single, rather multiplicity of histories. So the new historicists focus not in "history" but in "histories". For Greenblatt, "The human subject itself began to seem remarkably unfree, the ideological product of the relations of power in a particular society" (107). According to Montrose, "We live in history and that the form and pressure of history are made manifest in our subjective thoughts and action in our beliefs and desires" (394). History is not coherent body of objective knowledge. "Any reading of history," for new historicists like Salkeld, "depends upon the translatability of the past into the present" (60). The past is interpreted by different persons in different ways. The translation is not straightforward process but remains related to conditions in which interpretations are made. Hence, there is no doubt that there can be many versions of the same event of the past.

2.2 The History of Crossing Swords between Science and Religion

2.2.1 Development of Science in History

Science, as defined in earlier chapter, is systematized knowledge in any field, but usually applied to the organization of objectively verifiable sense experience. Efforts to systematize knowledge can be traced back to prehistoric times, through the designs that Paleolithic people painted on the walls of caves, through numerical records that were carved

in bone or stone, and through artifacts surviving from Neolithic civilizations. The oldest written records of protoscientific investigations come from Mesopotamian cultures; lists of astronomical observations, chemical substances, and disease symptoms, as well as a variety of mathematical tables, were inscribed in cuneiform characters on clay tablets. Other tablets dating from about 2000 BC show that the Babylonians had knowledge of Pythagoras' Theorem, solved quadratic equations, and developed sexagesimal system of measurement (based on the number 60) from which modern time and angle units stem. From almost the same period, papyrus documents have been discovered in the Nile Valley, containing information on the treatment of wounds and diseases, on the distribution of bread and beer, and on working out the volume of a portion of a pyramid. Some of the present-day units of length can be traced back to Egyptian prototypes, and the calendar in common use today is the direct result of pre-Hellenic astronomical observations. Scientific knowledge in Egypt and Mesopotamia was chiefly of a practical nature, with little rational organization. Among the first Greek scholars to seek the fundamental causes of natural phenomena was the philosopher Thales, in the 6th century BC, who introduced the concept that Earth was a flat disc floating on the universal element, water. The mathematician and philosopher Pythagoras, who followed him, established a movement in which mathematics became discipline fundamental to all scientific investigation. The Pythagorean scholars postulated a spherical Earth moving in a circular orbit about a central fire. In Athens, in the 4th century BC, Ionian natural philosophy and Pythagorean mathematical science combined to produce the syntheses of the logical philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. At the Academy of Plato, deductive reasoning and mathematical representation were emphasized; at the Lyceum of Aristotle, inductive reasoning and qualitative description were stressed. The interplay between these two approaches to science has led to most consequent advances.

During the so-called Hellenistic Age following the death of Alexander the Great, the mathematician, astronomer, and geographer Eratosthenes made a remarkably accurate measurement of the Earth. Also, the astronomer Aristarchus of Samos espoused a heliocentric planetary system, although this concept did not gain acceptance in ancient times. The mathematician and inventor Archimedes laid the foundations of mechanics and hydrostatics; the philosopher and scientist Theophrastus became the founder of botany; the astronomer Hipparchus developed trigonometry; and the anatomists and physicians Herophilus and Erasistratus based anatomy and physiology on dissection. Following the destruction of Carthage and Corinth by the Romans in 146 BC, scientific inquiry lost its impetus until a brief revival took place in the 2nd century AD under the Roman emperor and philosopher Marcus Aurelius. At this time the geocentric Ptolemaic system, advanced by the astronomer Ptolemy, and the medical works of the physician and philosopher Galen became standard scientific treatises for the ensuing age. A century later the new experimental science of alchemy arose, springing from the practice of metallurgy. By 300, however, alchemy had acquired an overlay of secrecy and symbolism that obscured the advantages such experimentation might have brought to science.

During the Middle Ages, six leading culture groups were in existence: the Latin West, the Greek East, the Chinese, the East Indian, the Arabic, and the Mayan. The Latin group contributed little to science before the 13th century, the Greek never rose above paraphrases of ancient learning, and the Mayan had no influence on the growth of science. In China, science enjoyed periods of progress, but no sustained drive existed. Chinese mathematics reached its zenith in the 13th century with the development of ways of solving algebraic equations by means of matrices, and with the use of arithmetic triangle. More important, however, was the impact on Europe of several practical Chinese innovations. These included the processes for manufacturing paper and gunpowder, the use of printing, and the mariner's

compass. In India, the chief contributions to science were the formulation of so-called Hindu-Arabic numerals, which are in use today, and in the conversion of trigonometry to a quasi-modern form. These advances were transmitted first to Arabs, who combined the best elements from Babylonian, Greek, Chinese, and Hindu sources. By the 9th century, Baghdad, on the River Tigris, had become a centre for the translation of scientific works, and in the 12th century, this learning was transmitted to Europe through Spain, Sicily, and Byzantium.

Recovery of ancient scientific works at European universities led, in the 13th century, to controversy over scientific method. The so-called realists espoused the Platonic approach, whereas the nominalists preferred the views of Aristotle. At the universities of Oxford and Paris, such discussions led to advances in optics and kinematics that paved the way for Galileo and the German astronomer Johannes Kepler.

The Black Death and the Hundred Years' war disrupted scientific progress for more than a century, but by the 16th century a revival was well under way. In 1543 the Polish astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus published *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium* (On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies), which revolutionized astronomy. Also published in 1543, *De Corpis Humani Fabrica* (On the Structure of Human Body) by the Belgian anatomist Andreas Vesalius corrected and modernized the anatomical teachings of Galen and led to the discovery of the circulation of blood. Two years later the *Ars Magna* (Great Art) of the Italian mathematician, physician, and astrologer Gerolamo Cardano initiated the modern period in algebra with the solution of cubic and quartic equations. Modern scientific methods and results appeared in the 17th century because of Galileo's successful combination of the functions of scholar and artisan. To the ancient methods of induction and deduction, Galileo added systematic verification through planned experiments, using newly invented scientific instruments such as the telescope, the microscope, and the thermometer. Later in the century, experimentation was widened through the use of the barometer by the Italian mathematician

and physicist Evangelista Torricelli; the pendulum clock by the Dutch mathematician, physicist, and astronomer Christian Huygens; and the exhaust pump by the English physicist and chemist Robert Boyle and the German physicist Otto von Guericke.

The culmination of these efforts was the universal law of gravitation, published in 1687 by the English mathematician and physicist Isaac Newton in *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. At the same time, the invention of calculus by Newton and the German philosopher and mathematician Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz laid the foundation of today's sophisticated level of science and mathematics. The scientific discoveries of Newton and the philosophical system of the French mathematician and philosopher Rene' Descartes provided the background for the materialistic science of the 18th century, in which life processes were explained on a physicochemical basis. Confidence in the scientific attitude carried over to the social sciences and inspired the so-called Age of Enlightenment, which culminated in the French Revolution in 1789. The French chemist Antoine Laurent Lavoisier published *Traite' elementaire de chimie* (Treatise on Chemical Elements, 1789) with which the revolution in quantitative chemistry opened.

Scientific developments during the 18th century paved the way for the following "century of correlation", so called for its broad generalizations in science. These included the atomic theory of matter postulated by the British chemist and physicist John Dalton; the electromagnetic theories of Michael Faraday and James Clerk Maxwell, also of the United Kingdom; and the law of the conservation of energy, enunciated by the British physicist James Prescott Joule and others. The most comprehensive of the biological theories was that of evolution, put forward by Charles Darwin in his *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (1859), which stirred as much controversy in society at large as the work of Copernicus. By the beginning of the 20th century, however, the fact, but not the mechanism,

of evolution was generally accepted, with disagreement centering on the genetic processes through which it occurs.

But as biology became more firmly based, physics was shaken by the unexpected consequences of quantum theory and relativity. In 1927 the German physicist Werner Heisenberg formulated the so-called uncertainty principle, which held that limits existed on the extent to which, on the subatomic scale, coordinates of an individual event can be determined. In other words, the principle stated the impossibility of predicting, with precision, that a particle such as an electron would be in a certain place at a certain time, moving at a certain velocity. Quantum mechanics instead dealt with statistical inferences relating to large numbers of individual events.

2.2.2 The History of Religion

It is not only difficult but almost impossible to trace the root and exact beginning date of religions in the mists of history and legend. Religion, the faith in a divinely created order of the world and the means of salvation is almost universal and as ancient as human culture itself. Religion is a central defining characteristic of civilizations, and as Christopher Dawson said, "the great religions are the foundations on which the great civilizations rest" (47). For the primitive ignorant men, the world and the natural phenomena were completely unintelligible. They thought the calamities, natural disasters, and misfortunes were caused by some divine power, to which they named God. Hence, this fear and trepidation must have been the beginning of religion.

The main feature of primitive religious consciousness, as studied among peoples such as the Polynesians or Africans, is the absence of any sharp boundary between the spiritual and the natural world, and thus between the human mind or ego and the surrounding world. For the early men, nature was the caretaker, and thus the almighty. Many ancient religions became defunct with the course of time and hardly any vestiges of their advent remain in the

mist of history. Hence, here we must begin with the survey of religions by restricting the term 'religion' to those institutions for which it has customarily been used – Judaism and its descendants, Christianity, and Islam.

The founding father of Judaism was Abraham who first prevented human sacrifice in Judaism. He believed he had a special covenant with God. Jews believed that they were the selected people of God, and had been chosen by God to have a special and permanent relation with Him. The history of Jews and Judaism is a long and a complicated story, full of blood and tears. They have tried to live at peace with the rest of mankind but this has been difficult for them because of a number of reasons. The Jews were the first monotheists, and their God was Yahweh or Jehovah.

Jesus Christ, a Jew and the founder father of Christianity, was born in Bethlehem in four A.D. (but he is said to be born in 1 A.D.) and was crucified in Jerusalem. Jesus Christ was a historical figure of staggering influence, perhaps the most enigmatic and inspirational leader the world has ever seen. As the prophesied Messiah, Jesus toppled kings, inspired millions, and founded new philosophies. Christianity brought a new paradigm of religion. Christianity represents tolerance, mercy and kindness. In the beginning, Christianity was a very progressive concept, a kind of medicine for the needy people. Focus was on the faith and revelation, and this focus continued to remain for more than one thousand years up to Renaissance. Christianity got its roaring success as it could satiate many haunting questions of contemporary times, humanity and almost every sector. Jerusalem was the centre of the Christian movement, at least until its destruction by Roman armies in AD 70, but from this centre Christianity radiated to other cities and towns in Palestine and beyond. At first, its appeal was largely, although not completely, confined to the adherents of Judaism, to whom it presented itself as "new", not in the sense of novel and brand new, but in the sense of continuing and fulfilling what God had promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Already in its

very beginnings, therefore, Christianity manifested a dual relation to the Jewish faith, a relation of continuity and yet of fulfillment, of antithesis and yet of affirmation. An important source of the alienation of Christianity from its putative parent Judaism was the change in the membership of the church that took place by the end of 2nd century. As a Jewish splinter group, it existed uneasily within the Roman Empire. After its independence from Jewish roots, its claim to be the only means of salvation brought it into sporadic conflict with the pagans as well as imperial authority. For several centuries, as the Christian movement grew throughout the empire, regional churches were periodically persecuted and individual Christians suffered martyrdom. Finally in about 313 A.D., with the Edict of Milan, Christians gained full rights of religion under the empire. Three centuries after the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, Christ's followers had multiplied exponentially. Nowadays its total membership exceeds 1.7 billion people. By the beginning of the 4th century, Christianity had grown so much in size and in strength that it had to be either eradicated or accepted. Emperor Diocletian tried to do the first and failed; Emperor Constantine did the second and unified Rome under a single religion, Christianity in 325 A.D. Hence, in its first millennium, the Christian church expanded and evangelized in a variety of ways. The conquering armies of Rome and Constantinople brought official religion in their wake. Charismatic individuals such as Columba and Boniface set out into the unknown to bring their message to whomever they encountered. Later in the 10th century, however, it was an official diplomatic mission that established the Orthodox Church in Russia. During the 4th and 5th centuries, Christianity was the dominant religion of the European and Mediterranean world. From Ireland in the west to Ethiopia in the south-east, people had converted to the new Christian faith. In England, the ritual and discipline of the early English church was largely introduced by the Celtic and Gallic missionaries and monks, until the arrival of St. Augustine of Canterbury and his missionary companions from Rome in 597. During the next four centuries, the church in

Saxon England exhibited the same lines of growth and development that characterized the church everywhere in the Early Middle Ages. After the Norman Conquest (1066 A.D.), continental influence in England strengthened the connections between the English church and the papacy. The vigorous assertions of power successfully made by popes from Gregory VII to Innocent III between the late 11th and the early 13th centuries were felt in England, as elsewhere, and clerical influence and privilege were widely extended in secular affairs. Hence Christianity ruled all over the world as a single dominant religion throughout the world. Its immense speed however was hindered since the advent of modern science in 16th century. Since those days, science seems to have got the upper hand and the scientific evidences have put many cherished Christian beliefs under the big question mark.

Besides Christianity and Judaism, Islam propounded by Muhammad in 6th century, Buddhism founded by Gautam Buddha in 6th century B.C., and Hinduism having its root in the mist of antiquity and believed to have been pioneered by *rishi munis* are some major religions of the world. Nowadays, there exist more than three hundred religions in the world.

2.3 Discourse, Power Relation and Narcissism in the Clash

Twenty years ago, 'discourse' had its traditional meaning: the ordered exposition in writing or speech of a particular subject, a practice familiarly associated with writers such as Descartes and Machiavelli. Recently the term has been used with increasing frequency and with new kinds of meaning, reflecting in part the effect on critical vocabulary of work done within and across the boundaries of various disciplines: linguistics, philosophy, literary criticism, history, psychoanalysis and sociology.

Working from a different perspective, discourse is a key term in the writings of the French philosopher and historian, Michel Foucault. For him, discourse is involved in power and the discursive practices are the result of power structure operating in the society. In other words, the real power in the society is exercised through discourse. Foucault's theory of

discourse foregrounds the philosophy of "will to power" propounded by German philosopher, Nietzsche. Nietzsche argues that all knowledge is an expression of will to power, and that the producer fills the discourse with the facts that suits his aim.

Foucault holds the opinion that 'truth' and 'power' are interrelated. In Foucault's own words, "Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and effects of power which it induces, extends out a regime of truth" (1145). This is to say the discourses are the embodiment of power, and it is the discourses through which speaks the power of ruling culture – the power to govern and control. The different 'discursive practices' within a society afford various 'subject positions' which permit us to write or speak in certain ways about certain subjects. But this cannot be equated with acts of expression or self-realization. The opposite is true: "discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing subject, but on the contrary, a totality in which the dispersion of the subject, and his discontinuity with himself may be determined" (Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 1969, trans. 1972, p65). This account of discourse expressly challenges the commonly held assumption that literature is the expressive use of language *par excellence*. For Foucault this would simply be another myth about literature in our cultural epoch, one that could be traced in the genealogy of an ideal of expressive self hood in the forms of lyric poetry. Conceived as discourse, literature no more expresses us, either as writers or readers; than do the leaves on a tree express themselves when they are blown by the wind. Hence, the analysis of discourse is a matter of research into the historical conditions which permitted, but did not guarantee, its appearance. As discourse defines its object, there are no criteria of truth external to it: the truth of a discourse is, according to Foucault, a kin to a rhetorical imposition. Thus, truth is the unrecognized fiction of a successful discourse.

History can never be presented in the complete and unbiased form as every history, like fiction, is textualized and is full of fabrication. History, therefore, is always contaminated, oblique and subjective. Dan Brown, through a mouthpiece (Leigh Teabing) speaks in *The Da Vinci Code*:

History is always written by the winners. When two cultures clash, the loser is obliterated, and the winner writes the history books- books which glorify their own cause and disparage the conquered foe. As Napoleon once said, 'What is history, but a fable agreed upon?' By its very nature, history is always a one-sided account. (276)

History has no 'meaning' though this is not to say that it is absurd and incoherent. On the contrary, it is intelligible and should be susceptible of analysis down to the smallest detail. According to Foucault, "The question of power addressed to discourse naturally has particular effects and implications in relation to methodology and contemporary historical researches" (1137). By this Foucault wanted to see how these problems could be resolved within the historical framework. As he did not believe that the problem can be solved by historicizing the subject but to arrive at an analysis which can account within a historical framework. Foucault, with his new thought, counters traditional idea of continuity, progressivism and the superior-inferior dichotomy respectively with the discontinuity, multiplicity and differences. He sees discourses as objective practices which obscure the voluntary and subjective tendencies of mankind and practices that limit the infinite potential interpretation with the rules and boundaries. Foucault does not claim that what he is saying is the truth and that these fundamentals are flawed, however, he asserts that certain assumptions lead to warped and twisted forms of reflection that distort human interpretation of reality. Just like any other discourse or text, literature does not simply reflect relations of power but actively participates in the consolidation or construction of discourses and ideologies.

Bearing the truth in mind that history is not linear and straightforward process, this research will try to locate the breaches in the clash between the giants as well. The major cause that set the ground of conflict between science and religion was their difference in perspective. Both were observing the same object from different vantage point with different conclusion. Their bird's eye view and the conclusions were akin to the blinds' groping of an elephant in a popular Indian folk tale - partially right, yet completely wrong. Moreover, they were launching the smear campaign against each other. They were trying to falsify each other's faith. Hence, had they learnt to respect each other's belief, Europe would never have been drenched with blood for a century and half. Having respect upon other's faith does not undermine one's cherished beliefs nor does it pose any threat to the truth. It is to be understood that, a river when unites with the ocean, the ocean never shrinks but the river itself broadens with pride. On the contrary, science in the 16th century, had almost leapt from nowhere, sprang into importance, and rocked the foundation of the mightiest ruler of the contemporary world – Christianity. As the maxim, "Two lions (kings) cannot dwell in a jungle," the haunting thought to remain a single powerful ruler gave ground to the brutal and tyrannical suppression against science. In addition, successive scientific discoveries have caused Christians to abandon one after another of beliefs which the Middle Ages regarded as integral parts of the faith. Science controverts some Christian dogma or some philosophical doctrine which theologian believe essential to orthodoxy. In scientific realm, when any new principles took the place of the old ones, it was deemed as the victory and signpost for the bright future. But contrary to it, religion clings to the old beliefs and never attempts to renovate them with the pace of ever-changing time. Broadly speaking the disagreement between religion and science, were at first, of the former sort, but have gradually become more and more concerned with matters which are, or were, considered a vital part of

Christian teaching. Yet, an important difference between the medieval outlook and that of modern science is in regard to authority.

In the Middle Ages, the popes and Christian churches were in their hey days of power. The religious representatives were as powerful as the Emperors. Hence, to oppose and defy Christian creeds was to invite the horrible death. Science was persecuted by the western Christianity and the scientists were condemned to death. The panic-stricken science for survival, reached on the threshold of politicians and since then the dangerous and foul play of power began. Science became Friday man (Defoe's character in *Robinson Crusoe*), a mere puppet, and Frankenstein's monster at the beck and call of the selfish politicians. Hiroshima, Nagasaki, World War I and II are the burning examples, from where the cry of orphans and innocents still resonate. Science has been a boon to us but its misuse and mispossession on the hands of the wrong people has placed the entire humanity under the Damocles' sword.

Throughout the centuries of conflict, the theists seemed extremist and stubborn. As described earlier, both titans were so stiff (religion stiffer) that they hardly had any respect for each other's conclusion. Both of them never tried to observe the same thing from one another's place. Hence, the quarrel was not surprising. As science gradually expanded its territory, and proved their cherished beliefs smoke and fiasco, the theists' egotism suffered a buffet. Hence, if not for victory, to satiate their narcissism they thought it necessary to have a triumph against science by fair means or foul.

Since the beginning of history, religion has been a beacon of hope for the world in every tribulation. Religion is that tremendous umbrella under which we huddle and get protection. But during the religious controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the so-called devotees of God were always attacking and defending. They pictured themselves as the garrison of a fort surrounded by the hostile forces. This particular picture fostered a pugnacious party spirit which really expresses an ultimate lack of faith. The church

men never wanted the unification of science and religion, for the union would have nullified the church's claim as the sole vessel through which man could understand God. On the other hand throughout the warfare, scientists endured a lot and yet with great patience were looking the way for reconciliation with religion. Newton, though an Arian, was in all other respects a supporter of the Christian faith. Cuvier was a model of Catholic correctness. Faraday was a Sandymanian, but the errors of that sect did not seem, even to him, to be demonstrable by scientific arguments, and his views as to the relations of science and religion were such as every churchman could applaud. The scientists generally did their best to avoid conflict. Copernicus, as we saw, dedicated his book to the pope; Galileo retracted; Descartes, though he thought it prudent to live in Holland, took great pains to remain on good terms with ecclesiastics, and by a calculated silence escaped censure for sharing Galileo's opinions.

Science and religion both are the great boons for human, hitherto indisputably working to quench human thirst. But the daredevil attempts of some sanctimonious obstinate theists drenched the history of a century and a half with blood. Bearing all these facts in mind Alfred North Whitehead rightly opines, "Religion will not regain its old power until it can face change in the same spirit as does science. Its principles definitely are eternal, but the expression of those principles requires continual development" (188).

Wrapping up, not only the rivalry between science and religion, but all the bloody clashes of clan, the bloody clashes of civilizations, the crusades and devastating wars are merely the manifestation of man's egotism and obstinacy. Hence, the abandonment of narcissism, the equal respect for other's values and beliefs, flexibility... only can bring reconciliation, harmony, and peace in the world.

Chapter 3

Delving into the Masterpiece *Angels and Demons*

3.1 The Novel and Its Background

"In a recent survey in America, Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons* has got the honor and acclamation of one of the most read books after the *Holy Bible*" (16). *Angels and Demons* (2000) owes this grand success to Brown's fourth book *The Da Vinci Code*. After the roaring success of *The Da Vinci Code* as New York Times Bestseller, *Angels and Demons* – the first of Robert Langdon series and the "prequel" to *The Da Vinci Code*, automatically sprang into light. Hence, before *The Da Vinci Code* was broken, the world lay at the mercy of *Angels and Demons*. *Angels and Demons* is being adapted for film, directed by Ron Howard and starring the Oscar winning Tom Hanks. However, the film had been anticipated to be released in mid-2009, it is known that Tom Hanks and his new movie *Angels and Demons* has come to a halt as Rome Diocese banned filming of *Angels and Demons* in Roman Churches. Regarding the denial of filming rights, Brown says,

...most people understand that an organization as old and powerful as the Vatican could not possibly have risen to power without acquiring a few skeletons in their closets. I think the reason *Angels and Demons* is raising eyebrows right now is that it opens some Vatican closets most people don't even know exist...It's certainly not an anti-catholic book. It's not even a religious book... The final message of the novel, though, without a doubt, is a positive one.

Angels and Demons, chronologically third book in Brown's oeuvre, has been divided into two parts, where it begins with a prologue, followed by one hundred and thirty seven chapters.

During Brown's memorable tour beneath Vatican City, a tunnel called *il passeto* - a concealed passageway used by the early popes to escape in event of enemy attack, he was informed that one of the Vatican's most feared ancient enemies was a secret brotherhood known as the Illuminati - the "enlightened ones"-- a cult of early scientists who had vowed revenge against the Vatican for crimes against scientists like Galileo and Copernicus. Brown was fascinated by images of the cloaked, anti-religious brotherhood lurking in the catacombs of Rome. Moreover, when he came to know that many modern historians believe the Illuminati is still active today and is one of the most powerful unseen forces in global politics, a bizarre idea to write an Illuminati thriller struck in his mind. Dan grew up surrounded by the paradoxical philosophies of science and religion. These complementary perspectives served as inspiration for his acclaimed novel *Angels and Demons* - an outstanding science vs. religion thriller, set within a Swiss physics lab and Vatican City.

Brown has borrowed the key terms and title of the novel 'angels' and 'demons' from religious mythology. Etymologically, 'angel' has its root in Greek '*aggelos*', meaning "messenger". Angel is a spirit believed to be a messenger, or intermediary between God, or the gods, and humankind whereas another word 'demon' has been derived from the ancient Greek term, '*daimon*', meaning 'being whose special powers placed them between people and the gods'. Daimon, is simply in many contexts, another word for god (theos). Another common early application of daimon is to the fate or fortune of an individual: the common Greek word for 'happy, blessed' is *eudaimon*, 'of good daimon', and its opposite is 'of evil daimon' (*kakodaimon*). It was Plato in the 4th century BC who began the process of change that transformed daimon into demon when he declared the daimons to be a distinct class of being intermediate between gods and men. Nowadays, the term 'demon' is used as synonymous to 'devil' with full negative meaning. The valuable pearls 'angel' and 'demon',

embedded in the crown of religious beliefs, have been used here in the novel to portray science and religion, yet entrusting complete freedom to readers to decide which term refers to science and which term represents religion. Brown's grand success lies not only in weaving ancient secret brotherhood, Swiss physics lab, papal conclave, mysterious ambigram...into his stories, and treating them in an ineffable way, keeping them so fast-paced, but also in his talent to stand aloof parting from the writer's emotion, and inclination to any side, while sketching the clash. Hence, Brown proudly asserts that *Angels and Demons* is neither anti-catholic nor religious book.

In *Angels and Demons*, Brown has adopted and revived clash between science and religion from the ancient depth of history. Beyond simply twisting the historical subject matter, Dan's book raises thought-provoking questions about very real fundamental issues including the existence of CERN, the invention of antimatter, the Illuminati and their secret lair, and many daredevil attempts of church to undermine science in the sixteenth century. To give the novel its real shape, Brown agrees to have consulted with specific individuals for the great source. Moreover, the detailed description in *Angels and Demons* depicting the intimate ritual of Vatican conclave--the threaded necklace of ballots...the mixing of chemicals ... the burning of the ballots...much of that appeared lively from a book published on Harvard University Press by a Jesuit scholar who had interviewed more than a hundred cardinals.

Though it is undisputed that Brown is a highly popular author, much criticism centers on his claims that some details in his books are fact. Another special feather on the cap of *Angels and Demons* is the unusual calligraphic technique never before seen in a work of fiction - the ambigrams--phrases that read the same upside down or right side up. Ambigrams are an ancient art form and play heavily into the mysteries of *Angels and Demons*. Ambigrams are really very unnerving when anyone first sees them, and almost everyone who sees the ambigram on the novel's cover invariably stands there for several minutes rotating

the book over and over, perplexed. Hence, whether or not someone is a thriller reader, sneaking a peak at the *Angels and Demons* book cover is certainly worth a trip to the bookstore's thriller aisle.

Characters in Brown's books are often named after real people in his life. Like in *The Da Vinci Code*, author Brown has played with names in the novel *Angels and Demons* as well. Robert Langdon is named after John Langdon, the artist who created the ambigrams used for the *Angels and Demons* CD and novel. Camerlengo Carlo Ventresca is named after "On a Claire Day" cartoonist friend Carla Ventresca. In the Vatican Archives, Langdon recalls a wedding of two people named Dick and Connie, which are the names of his parents. Robert Langdon's editor Jonas Faukman is an ambigram of Brown's real life editor Jason Kaufman.

3.2 Clash between two Philosophical Titans – Science and Religion

Science and religion both share long undulating history, yet both the giants confronted face to face almost in the 16th century. The first pitched battle between theology and science, and in some ways the most notable, was the astronomical dispute as to whether the earth or the sun was the centre of what we now call the solar system. The orthodox theory was the Ptolemaic, according to which the earth is at rest in the centre of the universe, while the sun, moon, planets, and system of fixed stars revolve round it, each in its own sphere. According to the new theory the Copernican, the earth, so far from being at rest, has a twofold motion: it rotates on its axis once a day, and it revolves round the sun once a year.

The theory, which we call Copernican, although it appeared with all the force of novelty in the sixteenth century, had in fact been invented by the Greeks, whose competence in astronomy was very great. It was advocated by the Pythagorean School who attributed it, probably without historical truth to their founder Pythagoras. The first astronomer who is known definitely to have taught that the earth moves was Aristarchus of Samos, who lived in

third century BC. Ptolemy, in about the year A.D. 130, rejected the view of Aristarchus, and restored the earth to its privileged position at the centre of the universe. Throughout later antiquity and the Middle Ages, his view remained unquestioned.

Copernicus (1473-1543) has the honor, perhaps scarcely deserved, of giving his name to the Copernican system. The theory of Copernicus, though important as a fruitful effort of imagination which made further progress possible, was itself still very imperfect. The planets, as we know now, revolve about the sun, not in circles, but in ellipses, of which the sun occupies, but one of the foci. Copernicus long delayed the publication of his theory because he feared ecclesiastical censure. Himself an ecclesiastic, he dedicated his book *On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies* (1543) to the pope, and his publisher, Osiander, added a preface saying that the theory of the earth's motion was put forward solely as a hypothesis, and was not asserted as positive truth. For a time, these tactics sufficed, and it was only Galileo's bolder defiance that brought retrospective official condemnation upon Copernicus. It is therefore not surprising that the Christian churches, protestant and catholic alike, felt hostility to the new astronomy, and sought out grounds for branding it as heretical.

The next great step in astronomy was taken by Kepler (1571-1630), who, though his opinions were the same as Galileo's, never came into conflict with the church. On the contrary, catholic authorities forgave his Protestantism because of his scientific eminence or rather, perhaps, because the Emperor valued his astrological services.

Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) was the most notable scientific figure of his time both on account of his discoveries and through his conflict with the Inquisition. It was the telescope that led Galileo on to more dangerous ground. Hearing that a Dutchman had invented such an instrument, Galileo reinvented it, and almost immediately discovered many new astronomical facts, the most important of which, for him, was the existence of Jupiter's satellites. Besides Jupiter's moons, the telescope revealed other things horrifying to theologians. It showed that

Venus has phases like the moon; Copernicus had recognized that his theory demanded this, and Galileo's instrument transformed an argument against him into an argument in his favor. The moon was found to have mountains, which for some reason was thought shocking. More dreadful still, the sun had spots! This was considered as tending to show that the Creator's work had blemishes; teachers in Catholic universities were therefore forbidden to mention sun-spots, and in some of them this prohibition endured for centuries. In this way, while the scientific world applauded, the ecclesiastics were furious. Hence, the sixteen century of our era saw the disruption of western Christianity and the rise of modern science. It was an age of ferment. Nothing was settled, though much was opened – new worlds and new ideas.

Copernicus and Vesalius were holding the banner of science but the latter scientists who tried to be in the shoes of those scientists were tortured and even condemned to death. In 16th century, a group of men in Rome fought back against the church. Some of Italy's most enlightened men – physicists, mathematicians, and astronomers – began meeting secretly to share their concerns about the church's inaccurate teachings. They feared that the church's monopoly on 'truth' threatened academic enlightenment around the world. They founded the world's first scientific think tank, calling themselves 'the enlightened ones' – "The Illuminati".

The Illuminati were hunted ruthlessly by the Catholic Church. Only through rites of extreme secrecy did the scientists remain safe. The scientists met regularly in Rome at an ultra secret lair they called the *Church of Illumination*. Many of the Illuminati wanted to combat the church's tyranny with acts of violence, but their most revered member Galileo persuaded them against it. On the other hand, church had already started a smear campaign against their adversaries labeling them 'Shaitan' (now 'Satan' in English). By fair means or foul, the so-called true devotees of God strove to corner science. The Illuminati fled from Rome, and traveled across Europe, looking for a safe roof to regroup. They went into hiding in Bavaria where they began mixing with other refugee groups fleeing the Catholic purges—mystics,

alchemists, scientists, oculists, Muslims, Jews. From this mixing pot, a new Illuminati emerged. A darker Illuminati. A deeply anti-Christian Illuminati. Later, they were harbored by another secret society Freemasons in the 1700s, and the Masons unknowingly became a front for the Illuminati. They quietly reestablished their scientific brotherhood deep within the Masons – a kind of secret society within a secret society. They set out for the creation of a single unified world state – a kind of secular New World Order, and the rest is history. But most scholars agree the Illuminati have been defunct for many years.

The proliferation of debunking miracles and the looming threat on the horizon seized the wink of sleep of the theists at that time. Giordano Bruno was brutally murdered in 1600. Though the cause for which he suffered was not that of science but that of free imaginative speculation, the death ushered in the first century of modern science in the strict sense of term. In this execution there was an unconscious symbolism: for the subsequent tone of scientific thought has contained distrust of his type of general speculativeness. In 1668, the church branded four Illuminati scientists with the symbol of the cross to purge their sins. After the brandings, the scientists were murdered, and their bodies were dropped in public locations around Rome as a warning to other scientists.

Galileo, after putting forward the contradictory view, was led to appear before the Inquisition, which commanded him to abjure his errors, which he did on February 26, 1616. Descartes, who was terrified when he heard of Galileo's condemnation, fled to Holland, where, though the theologians clamored for his punishment, the Government adhered to its principle of religious toleration. Although the theologians, after their disastrous "victory" over Galileo, found it prudent to avoid such official definiteness as they had shown in that instance, they continued to oppose obscurantism to science as far as they dared.

Holding the seam left by the precursors, now Newton appeared on the stage working on the Copernican system. As he was himself a deeply religious man, and a believer in the

verbal inspiration of the Bible, his works shook the religious orthodoxy a little. In 1775, Kant made first serious attempt to construct a scientific theory of the growth of the sun, the planets, and the stars. Kant's work remained almost unnoticed until a similar but more professionally competent nebular theory had been developed by Laplace in 1796. This theory as an equal stumbling block raised the eye brows of the theists.

Science was extending its territory day by day. The miracles spawned almost everyday in scientific experiments and Christianity was feeling the fatal blows one after another. Darwinism was as severe blow to theology as Copernicanism. Not only was it necessary to abandon the fixity of species and the many separate acts of creation which Genesis seemed to assert; not only was it necessary to assume a lapse of time, since the origin of life, which was shocking to the orthodox; not only was it necessary to abandon a host of arguments for the beneficence of Providence, derived from the exquisite adaptation of animals to their environment, which was now explained as the operation of natural selection – but, worse than any or all of these, the evolutionists ventured to affirm that man was descended from the lower animals. Gradually, with the progress of knowledge, the sacred history related in the Bible and the elaborated theology of the ancient and medieval church have become less important than formerly. Later, however its threat to scientific realm also seems to have become milder than in the 17th century. There are, it is true, still a few disturbers of the peace: on the one side, fundamentalists and stubborn Catholic theologians; on the other side, the more radical students of such subjects as bio-chemistry and animal psychology, who refuse to grant even the comparatively modest demands of the more enlightened Churchmen. But on the whole, the fight is languid as compared with what it was.

3.3. The Battle for Christian Identity against Science in Angels and Demons

Angels and Demons offers unique insights, fascinating anecdotes, and compelling debate about almost every contemporary aspect of today's headlines that go to the heart of

the new interest in the increasingly complex nexus of religion, politics, science, life, death, morality, and ethics in our culture. This novel also deals with a legendary secret society in opposition to the orthodox teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.

In the opening scene of the novel, one of the top physicist as well as Catholic priest Leonardo Vetra is murdered brutally and his chest is branded with the word "Illuminati". Maximilian Kohler, the director of CERN, calls Robert Langdon, professor of religious iconology and art history at Harvard University and he is asked to shed light on the mysterious murder case. A high tech X-33 plane transports Langdon from Massachusetts to Switzerland in a little more than an hour. Langdon had the help of Vittoria Vetra, the adopted daughter and lab partner of murdered scientist Leonardo Vetra. Leonardo in collaboration with his daughter had created the antimatter to simulate the Big Bang. But though Leonardo Vetra kept his research top-secret, some one evidently learned of both his discovery and its deadly byproduct: highly explosive antimatter, which was captured by Vittoria and suspended in canisters with magnetic fields. Vetra's murder, though, allows the largest canister to be stolen. The question of who stole the canister and what they planned to do with it is soon answered. The canister is quickly found on a security camera in Vatican City, with its LEDs counting down the time until the batteries run out. The security camera, however, is nowhere to be found, leaving the canister's whereabouts a mystery too. Langdon and Vittoria Vetra are quickly sent off to Rome and Vatican City to help find the canister and return it to CERN before it explodes at midnight. Not only does the canister threaten to destroy Vatican City, but with the recent death of the pope, the cardinals of Catholic Church are all within the city for the conclave to elect a new pope. They are all about to be locked within the Sistine Chapel where, according to church law, they must remain until a new pope is chosen. They are awaiting the *preferiti*, the four cardinals from four different European countries who are the preferred candidates to become the new pope. While Langdon and Vittoria are trying to

convince the captain of Swiss Guard and the camerlengo, the pope's chamberlain who leads the church until the new pope is named, that the antimatter bomb is real, a phone call is received from a man who claims to be from the Illuminati. He has abducted the four cardinals, whom he will murder one by one on the altars of science, and then allow the bomb to destroy Vatican City, which houses not only the church hierarchy, but also its possessions and wealth. The assassin has no demands; his only wish is the destruction of the Catholic Church in retribution for the church's treatment of scientists and the Illuminati over the centuries.

Langdon and Vittoria Vetra are in the race against time. Hoping against hope, they dig through archives and ancient mysteries to find clues, which also require an extensive background in art history and religious symbology. This makes Robert Langdon the expert tour guide through all this arcane knowledge with his congenial and scholarly fashion. Vittoria on the other hand, is determined to avenge her father's murder and keep the canister from exploding. The two of them are constantly one step behind the Illuminati, and once it is clear that the Swiss Guard and Vatican City have been penetrated by the ancient society, they do not know whom to trust. Their chase leads them through churches, fountains, crypts, forgotten passages, secret passages, and catacombs. Death stalks them at every turn in one form or another. They cannot save the four cardinals but ultimately they succeed to explode the canister without a little harm to Vatican. Robert Langdon's final discovery behind this masterful plot is really hair-raising.

The camerlengo Carlo Ventresca asserts himself to be a true devotee and chosen one for the service of the omnipotent and benevolent God but in the final countdown the cat is out of the bag. The camerlengo, naming himself Janus, had been commanding and assisting a assassin to abduct the cardinals and sear them. The assassin claiming himself the God's pawn, was simply acting at the beck and call of the camerlengo. Moreover, his divulgence

that he himself had purloined the antimatter and concealed in the Vatican underground steals the readers' thunder. The proliferation of debunking miracles in science lab heaves in sight as the horrific threat to Ventresca. Every time science is applauded, he feels the Christianity shrinking smaller and smaller. Hence, to halt the fast pace of science, he discerns a need of miracle in religious realm. Something to awaken a sleeping world. Bring them back to the path of righteousness. Restore faith. Jesus, God reminded him, had saved them all... saved them from their own apathy. With two deeds, Jesus had opened their eyes. Horror and Hope. The crucifixion and the resurrection. But that was millennia ago. Time had eroded the miracle. People had forgotten. They had turned to false idols – techno-deities and miracles of the mind. What about miracles of the heart! The camerlengo loses his wink of sleep and one night he suddenly feels the appearance of God like a beacon in his night of agony. The words of the almighty resonate in his mind - *"Apathy is death. Without darkness, there is no light. Without evil, there is no good. Make them choose. Dark or light"* (533). The camerlengo, determined to bring theology out of the doldrums, in an instance gets the solution. Fear had been an intense motivator. Fear brought people to God. Nothing unites hearts like the presence of evil. Burn a church and the community rises up, holding hands, singing hymns of defiance as they rebuilt. Fear has always brought them home. Hence, the camerlengo conceives an idea to forge modern demons for modern man. To show them the face of evil – Satanists lurking among the people, - running governments, banks, schools, threatening to obliterate the very House of God with their misguided science, the camerlengo resurrects the Illuminati. The ancient demons have been resurrected to awaken an indifferent world.

To make the bone of contention between science and religion as clear as day, the remarkable speech delivered by the camerlengo in the conclave amidst the cardinals is to be mentioned without amiss:

To the Illuminati, and to those of science, let me say this. You have won the war. The wheels have been in motion for a long time. Your victory has been inevitable. Never before has it been as obvious as it is at this moment. Science is the new God. Medicine, electronic communication, space travel, genetic manipulation...these are the miracles we herald as proof that science will bring us the answers. The ancient stories of immaculate conceptions, burning bushes, and parting seas are no longer relevant. God has become obsolete. Science has won the battle. We concede.

But science's victory has cost every one of us. And it has cost us deeply. Science may have alleviated the miseries of disease and drudgery and provided an array of gadgetry for our entertainment and convenience, but it has left us in a world without wonder. Our sunsets have been reduced to wavelengths and frequencies. The complexities of the universe have been shredded into mathematical equation. Even our self-worth as human beings has been destroyed. Science proclaims that planet earth and its inhabitants are meaningless specks in the grand scheme. A cosmic accident. Even the technology that promises to unite us, divides us. Each of us is now electronically connected to the globe, and yet we feel utterly alone. We are bombarded with violence, division, fracture, and betrayal. Skepticism has become a virtue. Cynicism and demand for proof has become enlightened thought. Is it any wonder that humans now feel more depressed and defeated than they have at any point in human history? Does science hold anything sacred? Science looks for answers by probing our unborn fetuses. Science even presumes to rearrange our own DNA. It shatters God's world into smaller and smaller pieces in quest of meaning...and all it finds is more questions.

The ancient war between science and religion is over. You have won. But you have not won fairly. You have not won by providing answers. You have won by so radically reorienting our society that the truths we once saw as signposts now seem inapplicable. Religion cannot keep up. Scientific growth is exponential. It feeds on itself like a virus. Every new breakthrough opens doors for new breakthroughs. Mankind took thousands of years to progress from wheel to the car. Yet only decades from the car into space. Now we measure scientific progress in weeks. We are spinning out of control. The rift between us grows deeper and deeper, and as religion is left behind, people find themselves in a spiritual void. We cry out for meaning. And believe me, we do cry out. We see UFOs, engage in channeling, spirit contact, out-of-body experiences, mind quests – all these eccentric ideas have a scientific veneer, but they are unashamedly irrational. They are the desperate cry of the modern soul, lonely and tormented, crippled by its own enlightenment and its inability to accept meaning in anything removed from technology. (378-380)

Since the beginning of history, a deep rift has existed between science and religion. And every time church has fought the enemies of God. Sometimes with words. Sometimes with swords. From the time immemorial, religion has been savoring questions. All questions were once spiritual. Since the days of yore, spirituality and religion have been called on to fill in the gaps that science did not understand. The rising and setting of the sun was once attributed to *Helios* and a flaming chariot. Earthquakes and tidal waves were the wrath of Poseidon. Science has now proven those gods to be false idols. Soon all Gods will be proven to be false idols. Moreover, the camerlengo is enraged not only by these invasions in religious territory, but also by the recurrently raised question by the enlightened-called scientists – Where is the God? He answers them back in following words:

Show me proof there is God, you say. I say use your telescope to look to the heavens, and tell me how there could not be a God! You ask what does God look like. I say, where did that question come from? The answers are one and the same. Do you not see God in your science? How can you miss Him! You proclaim that even the slightest change in the force of gravity or weight of an atom would have rendered our universe a lifeless mist rather than our magnificent sea of heavenly bodies, and yet you fail to see God's hand in this? Is it really so much easier to believe that we simply chose the right card from a deck of billions? Have we become so spiritually bankrupt that we would rather believe in mathematical impossibility than in a power greater than us?

Whether or not you believe in God, you must believe this. When we as a species abandon our trust in the power greater than us, we abandon our sense of accountability. Faith...all faiths...are admonitions that there is something we cannot understand, something to which we are accountable...With faith we are accountable to each other, to ourselves, and to a higher truth. (382-383)

For centuries the church has stood by while science picked away at religion bit by bit. Debunking miracles. Training the mind to overcome the heart. Condemning religion as the opiate of the masses. Science and scientists denounce God as a hallucination – a delusional crutch of those too weak to accept that life is meaningless. The camerlengo hits slings and arrows to science, "Proof, you say? What is wrong with the admission that something exists beyond our understanding? The day science substantiates God in a lab is the day people stop needing faith" (534).

Once the whole secret lay crystal clear in front of them and Vittoria finds the murderer of his physicist father, she rains a number of questions and demands the reason of

murdering her father. She pours her rage and fury criticizing the inhuman act of the camerlengo:

...the church is not the only enlightened soul on the planet! We all seek God in different ways. What are you afraid of? That God will show himself somewhere other than these walls? That people will find Him in their own lives and leave your antiquated ritual behind? Religions evolve! The mind finds answers, the heart grapples with new truths. My father was on your quest! A parallel path! Why could not you see that? God is not some omnipotent authority looking down from above, threatening to throw us into a pit of fire if we disobey. God is the energy that flows through the synapses of our nervous system and the chambers of our hearts! God is in all living things.
(534-535)

In answer to the dazzling and appalling questions, the camerlengo fires back, "Except science. Science, by definition, is soulless. Divorced from the heart. Intellectual miracles like antimatter arrive in this world with no ethical instructions attached. This in itself is perilous!"
(534)

Since the advent of science, man's mind is progressing faster than his soul. Man's morality was not advancing as fast as man's science. Mankind was not spiritually evolved enough for the powers he possessed. In this sense, science is nothing more than a Frankenstein's Monster who destroys the creator itself for the camerlengo. He severely attacks science saying:

Science, you say, will save us. Science, I say, has destroyed us. Since the days of Galileo, the church has tried to slow the relentless march of science, sometimes with misguided means, but always with benevolent intention. Even so, the temptations are too great for man to resist. I warn you look around

yourselves. The promises of science have not been kept. Promises of efficiency and simplicity have bred nothing but pollution and chaos. We are a fractured and frantic species...moving down a path of destruction.

Who is this God science? Who is the God who offers his people power but no moral framework to tell you how to use that power? What kind of God gives a child *fire* but does not warn the child of its dangers? The language of science comes with no signposts about good and bad. Science text books tell us how to create a nuclear reaction, and yet they contain no chapter asking us if it is a good or bad idea. (381)

Hence, science has been the wild horse without harness making havoc and spreading destruction everywhere. Science has made the entire world a small villa but the relation between Dhanjite and Gumane [the characters of Guru Prasad Mainali's story "Chhimeki" (Neighbor)] is no more milk and honey now. It has made man utterly selfish. The camerlengo mocks at the man's spiritual bankruptcy with the intense pace of science:

We ask not why you will not govern yourselves, but how can you? Your world moves so fast that if you stop even for an instant to consider the implications of your actions, someone more efficient will whip past you in a blur. So you move on. You proliferate weapons of mass destruction, but it is the pope who travels the world beseeching leaders to use restraint. You clone living creatures, but it is the church reminding us to consider the moral implications of our actions. You encourage people to interact on phones, video screens, and computers, but it is the church who opens its doors and reminds us to commune in person as we were meant to do. (381-382)

The camerlengo Carlo Ventresca beholds science and religion completely different as chalk and cheese. Hence, fusing science and God is the ultimate scientific blasphemy. For

him, the God's work is not done in a lab but in the heart. He further makes the demarcation between science and religion clear by saying:

Science and religion are not together! We do not seek the same God, you and I! Who is your God? One of protons, masses, and particle charges? How does your God inspire? How does your God reach into the hearts of man and remind him he is accountable to a greater power! Remind him that he is accountable to his fellow man! Man can not put God's creation in a test tube and wave it around for the world to see! This does not glorify God, it demeans God! (525-526)

He further questions the enlightened called scientists, "Did you really believe quarks and mesons inspired the average human being? Or that equations could replace someone's need for faith in the divine?" (328).

The camerlengo straightly denies the need to bring changes in religion with the pace of time. Being firm in his faith, he expresses his wrath, "The church's strength was its traditions, not its transience. The whole world was transitory. The church did not need to change; it simply needed to remind the world it was relevant." (549). In addition, the camerlengo challenges the Illuminati who were holding the banner of quid pro quo tendency and determined to destroy the entire churches, "A church is more than mortar and stone. You can not simply erase two thousand years of faith...any faith. You cannot crush faith simply by removing its earthly manifestations" (157-158).

Summing up, the entire novel draws the ground of conflict between science and religion poignantly. Throughout the novel, the camerlengo holds the religious fort against the miraculous science. Besides the major conflict, plunging into the novel, the readers do not realize how much they are learning along the way – the secret history of Illuminati, the unanticipated helping hands behind it, the secret of Vatican archives, the Illuminati emblem

and so on. Accounts of the Illuminati emblem were legendary in modern symbology. Ancient documents described the symbol as an ambigram – *ambi* meaning 'both' and *gram* meaning 'words' – signifying it was legible both ways. Hence, an ambigram is a word written in such a way that it is legible both right side-up and upside-down. Some ambigrams that hold the breath of the readers have been illustrated from the novel below:



(*Angels and Demons*, pages: _ , 30, 415, 303, 371, 277, 473 respectively.)

3.4. The Camerlengo's Sisyphean Attempts and Evaluation of His Steps

In the novel, the Camerlengo and the Catholic Church have been portrayed fairly negatively. The Camerlengo's futile attempts to fence religion not only quakes the foundation of eternal faith but also smears and tarnishes the sacred theology with blemishes. His own restless activities and psychic tornado put his own faith and dedication under a big question mark.

Moral values have always been the integral part of theology. Hence, '*harmony*' and '*peace*' are the gist and substance of every religion. Theology has always preferred love, endurance, to the quid pro quo tendency (an eye for an eye). A protagonist in Leo Tolstoy's story "Where Love is God is" reads the following words from the sixth chapter of Luke's Gospel as the bed rock of the Christianity, "To him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and from him that taketh away thy cloke withhold not thy coat also. Give to every man that asketh thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise" (128). But in the novel, the camerlengo, instead of making bridge, creates a dangerous breach between the two philosophies and discerns science and religion as adversaries. Moreover, his daredevil attempt to drag people in the Christianity through '*hope*' and '*horror*' manifests nothing but his narcissism. Religion is synonymous to piety or faith. The numinous faith that blooms in peace and generosity can never be output of hope and horror. Religiousness should emerge from our heart like aroma – the fragrance dedicated to the entire existence from your flowers of love. Religion is the blossoming of our soul. Hence, for the true religion there is no need of any priests, popes, churches, mediators and holy books. These all so called the integral parts of theology merely impose the wrong way to God. The prayer and faith to God should bloom automatically as leaves onto the trees. On the contrary, the taught or imposed ways and prayers come not from the depth of heart but from memory. Leo Tolstoy's "The Three Hermits" mocks at such imposed ways of monasteries and churches, "And in praying use not vain repetitions, as the Gentiles do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask Him" (182). Hence, the camerlengo's attempt to let the people be in the shoes of Christianity forcefully cannot bring the spring in heart. If the camerlengo had had real dedication and devotion to theology, it would not have been necessary to be as reckless as cat

on a hot tin roof. He should not have feared that religion will be defunct if there is not any miracle, hope and horror.

Since the beginning of history, religion has been a beacon of hope for the world in every tribulation. Religion is that tremendous umbrella under which we huddle and get protection. Religion is the profound faith that it safely shelters and shields us, but it is beyond our efficiency to protect it. If religion could have been saved by the attempts of some men, religion is weak and fragile. And how can such religion shield us which we have to protect? Hence, now what to say of the camerlengo's weird attempts to corner science by fair means or foul? Is it his one act of decency or a fool's errand? The omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent almighty is solution to all problems. But the camerlengo's Sisyphean activities to fence religion are the evidences that religion is as weak and inconsistent as a house of cards. If not so, the camerlengo has been holding the wrong end of stick.

The camerlengo is merely backing the wrong horse becoming as obstinate as mule while denying transience with the pace of time. His attempt to swim against the ever-changing time and cling to the conservative thought does not suit the self-proclaimed true devotee of God. Moreover, if he had really been a true saint, he should also have had respect for other's opinions as well. But his observation to other realms with the bias tinted glass made him stiffer and led him to utterly wrong conclusion that Christianity is the sole way of salvation. This conclusion merely displays his egotism. In addition, his narcissism not only led him astray from the theological path, but also made him a desperado in the novel. His serious crime of butchering the innocent cardinals, murdering the highly creative and intellectual scientists and poisoning his own father and pope are the evidences that the camerlengo is not a saint at all, let alone the true devotee of God. Moreover, declaring himself the demi-god, he tries to screen his every crime as the wish of God.

The camarlengo's bias tinted glass made him perceive the loopholes in science but had he thrown away his prejudice, he would have seen the roses amidst the thorns. The spread of the scientific outlook, as opposed to the theological, has indisputably made, hitherto, for happiness. Science has made a long stride and has dropped an uncivilized man from the miserable Stone Age to this miraculous scientific age. The victories of science are glorious and beyond description. Science has spanned the sky, measured the oceans and wrested from nature many of her hidden treasures. If a man of decade ago suddenly returns back to earth, his eyes will be dazzled with disbelief and astonishment. The new coruscating devices, modern gadgets, and amenities all belong to science. Man is no longer a helpless toy in the hands of nature but the proud master of the three worlds of land, air and water. Science has changed our outlook, our mental make-up, our thoughts and ideas, our dreams and our hope. Hence, when the camarlengo only tars science with the traditional, conservative and superstitious brush and tries to shut the door for it, he misses the Aladdin's cave forever.

Wrapping up, Carlo Ventresca in the novel has never contemplated about religion but throughout the novel he is watering his own narcissism and in doing so, he uses religion as a buckler. Thus, he is a nefarious deceiver through and through. Such sanctimonious black sheep, hoisting the banner of theology, have contaminated religion and shredded it into shrapnel of superstition.

Chapter 4

Conclusion: Blurring the Demarcation between Science and Religion

Science and religion are cut from the same cloth. Both are manifestations of man's quest to understand the divine. Religion savors questions while science savors the quest for answers. Science is looking outwards, religion is looking inwards, but both are the same kind of looking, the same kind of search. They may have different names – that does not matter at all. Science calls it observation, religion calls it awareness. Science calls it experiment, religion calls it experience. The difference of words simply signifies that their dimensions are different. Hence, science and religion are two different languages attempting to tell the same story, a story of symmetry and balance... heaven and hell, night and day, hot and cold, God and Satan.

In 13th century Europe, Christian theology was regarded as the queen of the sciences. "Science", in this Aristotelian sense, was a systematic exposition of an area of knowledge, which was ideally founded on self-evident or certain first principles. The first principles of Christian theology, it was thought, provide the most certain of all principles, since they were revealed by God. Thus theology becomes paradigm of science. Since that time, the word "science" has changed its meaning, so that now most people would regard science as an experimental investigation into a physical phenomenon, where precise observations can be made and measurements taken, where experiments are repeatable and publicly testable, and where hypothesis need to be constantly tested and re-assessed. Since the 17th century, the way we see the history and character of the material universe has been revolutionized. The human race had been directly created by God, and had fallen from a direct knowledge of God into lamentable ignorance. It seemed Eve's bite from the apple of knowledge was debt humanity is doomed to pay for eternity. Hence, man, the sinner by birth, should mourn in

sack clothes and ashes and only the God's grace could lead him to salvation. The raindrops were angel's tears coming down to wash our sins. In the 20th century, most scientists see the universe as having existed for fifteen billion years or more, human beings as having evolved from simpler forms of organic molecules, and the earth as a small planet on the edge of one galaxy out of millions in the universe.

The impact of scientific method, scientific discovery and technological change has been such that some have argued that religious faith has become wholly outdated. Hence, though many believe and claim that science replaces history in this modern era, the truth is wide of the mark. Science and religion are concerned with different areas of human life. They do not really conflict, because they talk different languages. Science is concerned with the physical, the measurable, and the repeatable, and there is plenty of that in the universe. Religion is concerned with the spiritual, the immeasurable, and the uniquely individual. It is concerned with an infinite spiritual reality, and with the sorts of conscious relationship, human beings can have with it. These are more like personal relationships, where one is not concerned with measuring, analyzing, and experimenting. In a personal relationship, one is concerned with understanding, responding, empathizing. Hence, they are the complementary activities.

The greatest intellectual scientist of the millennium, Albert Einstein, hardly having any match to hold the candle to his genius, also holds the similar view in his book *Out of My Later Years*. He writes:

Scientific experiments teach nothing more than how a fact is related to another or how they influence each other...And you cannot expect me to cut down the adventurous steps and achievements of human in this direction... However, it must also be crystal clear that the knowledge of 'what is' does not suffice to the way to the knowledge of 'what should be' (21).

And according to Einstein, this complementary part of science is religion. Religion empowers human with sight whereas science endows power. Einstein makes it as clear as day through the concise saying, "Science is lame without religion; religion is blind without science" (26). The heart-touching line said by Pope Pius XII, etched at one of the bookends, "True science discovers God waiting behind every door" that draws the protagonist Robert Langdon's eyesight in Leonardo Vetra's room, upholds the very idea (44).

Here, I heartily request not to mistake this attempt of my research to reconcile science and religion as the attempt for synthesis. The very idea of synthesis already accepts that they are not only two but opposed to each other. Synthesis is a very poor thing: somehow managing, trying hard, and making the corner less corny, giving them a little rounder shape...I bring the great Indian philosopher Osho to support my idea:

Only what I call religiousness can be an intrinsic part of science. But that is not synthesis because there is no antithesis. They are synthesized, they are continually synthesized without anybody synthesizing them; they are always in tune. Science and religion to me are just like my two hands, dancing in tune, in synchronicity. There is no question of synthesis; there can never be a synthesis. There can only be oneness. And remember, oneness and synthesis are not the same. While you are walking, do you synthesize your left and right leg, keeping alert that you do not commit some mistake? (140)

Mocking at the people's folly to synthesize the two different realms, Osho (Rajneesh) further opines:

Why cannot we accept different dimensions having their own uniqueness? Today you are synthesizing science with religion, tomorrow you will synthesize science and religion and music, and then art, and dance - but why? And you will create a hodgepodge.

Now synthesizing music and mathematics, you will destroy both. They are perfectly okay as they are, doing their own work in their own dimension. Just one thing has to be understood that life is multidimensional...All these different dimensions meet at one point, which I call religiousness.

There is no need to mix up all these dimensions with each other. Then they have to make an effort to be friendly and to be adjusting, and not to hurt anybody's feeling...All that is needed is that the physicist disappears when he is doing his work, the musician disappears when he is doing his work. This disappearance is religiousness...It is oneness. It is just like the rose opening in many petals - all the petals are separate but joined at the center, getting juice from the same source. (140-41)

Hence, the attempt to synthesize the already one is nothing more than stupidity. They are already joined at the center. So, let religion grow in its own way. Let science grow in its way. You will never find an authentic religious person in any conflict with science, art, music, dance, and so on. You will not find him in any conflict for the simple reason that he will have such wide perceptivity, such tremendous sensitivity, such a great insight, that in his perceptivity all different dimensions will merge. Hence, what is significant is very simple: science is the search into the outside world, and religion is the search in the inside world. Both are searchers enquiries about the same truth, because it is the same truth that exists outside and that exists within. Within and without are not different. So, from wherever you arrive to the truth you arrive to the same truth.

There is no need to go on comparing small details. You may have followed a different route, and on your route there may have been no trees; you may have come through a desert, and I may have traversed a jungle where there are huge, ancient trees, but if we reach to the same point...Then I go on arguing that a person reaches here who comes through huge,

ancient trees, and you go on arguing that it is impossible to reach here unless one passes through a desert. But we both have reached, that's enough proof. Therefore, here, I assert religion and science are two names of a single phenomenon.

Bertrand Russell says, "Science can guide you how to acquire the goal but it cannot guide you which goal to acquire" (312). Hence, the fore mentioned quotations of Einstein and Russell confirm that science can bloom in the hands of those people who possess both wisdom (thoughtful scientific mind) and love to truth (religious heart). Osho imagines the superman in the future having science and religion as his two hands, and *art* working as a bridge between them. He says:

Hitherto, religion has been introvert and science has been extrovert in the minute observation of matter. The theists call matter '*maya*' (illusion) whereas the modern called people say spirituality as unbelievable thing. But I say, both are the two sides of the same coin - "Jagat Satya, Bramha Satya" ("True is the world and so is the universe"). Neither I agree with Karl Marx nor with Sankaracharya. I assert: both are truths. The world is the body of the universe and the universe is the soul of the world. Both are there, so life is such beautiful. The mankind of future will be religious and scientific at the same time and such descendants are the perfect men. (11)

Men of science and religion are not unprecedented in history. Galileo was a devout catholic. He tried to soften the church's position on science by proclaiming that science did not undermine the existence of God, but rather reinforced it. He wrote once that when he looked through his telescope at the spinning planets, he could hear God's voice in the music of the spheres. In the novel, Leonardo Vetra considered physics 'God's natural law'. He claimed God's handwriting was visible in the natural order all around us. The laws of physics are the canvas laid down on which to paint His masterpiece. Thus, in this modern era, for the

first time in human history the line between science and religion is starting to blur. Particle physicists exploring the subatomic level are suddenly witnessing an interconnectivity of all things and having religious experiences. On the other hand, Buddhist monks are reading physics books and learning about experiments that confirm what they have believed in their hearts for centuries and have been unable to quantify. A recent scientific American article hailed New Physics, showing that science and religion complement each other, as a surer path to God than religion itself.

Wrapping up, science and religion are not enemies but rather allies. Science and religion are two totally compatible fields - two different approaches to finding the same truth. The two siblings set out in the journey to opposite directions to find the deepest mysteries of life.

Works Cited

- Aristotle. "Poetics." Trans. S. H. Butcher. Ed. Hazard Adams. *Critical Theory since Plato*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc; 1992. 50-66.
- Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice*. London: Methuen, 1980.
- "Bible: Number One." *Kantipur* 17 May 2008:16.
- Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, New York: St. Martins Press, 1988.
- Brown, Dan. *Angels and Demons*. New York: Pocket Books, 2000.
- . Interview with Simon and Schuster. Pocket Books, New York, 2000
<<http://www.danbrown.com>>.
- . *The Da Vinci Code*, New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Clinton, Bill. Press Conference. "Following a Discovery Known as ALH 8400". Washington D.C., 7 August, 1997.
- "Dan Brown's Personal Website." *The Free Encyclopedia*. Wikipedia online 2008. 5th July 2008.
<<http://www.danbrown.com>>.
- Dawson, Christopher. "Civilizations in History and Today." *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Ed. Huntington, Samuel P. India: Penguin Books, 1996.
40-55.
- Einstein, Albert. *Out of My Later Years*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950.
- Foucault, Michael. "Discourse." *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*. Ed. Roger Fowler, London: Routledge, 1973. 62-66.
- . "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York; Harcourt Brace, 1992. 1134-1145.

Greenblatt, Stephen and Guiles Gunn, ed. *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. New York: MLA, 1992.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance self-fashioning: from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Litvak, Joseph. "New Historicism." *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. Ed. Guerin Wilfred L., Labor Earle, Morgan Lee, Resman Jeanne C. and Willingham John R. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 247-253.

Lynn, Steven. *Texts and Contexts: Writing about Literature with Critical Theory*. New York: Harper Collins College Publisher, 1994.

Montrose, Louis. "New Historicism." *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Ed. Stephen Grennblatt and Guiles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992, 392-418.

"Official Website of Dan Brown". 7 July 2008.

<http://www.danbrown.com/novels/angels_demons/dp/product_description/0671027352>.

Pearl, Nancy. "Cheap Thrills: Novels of Suspense." Ayers, Jeff. *Library Journal*, 15 November 2000, vol. 125. Issue19. p 124, 1p, 2c. (Book Review).

Rajneesh, Bhagwan Shree (Osho). *I Teach Religiousness, not Religion*. Pune: Rebel Publishing House, 1988.

---. "Science and Religion – Two Petals of the Same Rose." *From Darkness to Light*. West Germany: The Rebel Publishing House. 11 March 1985. 134-145.

---. "The Man of Future Will Be Scientific and Religious at the Same Time." *Osho Dhara*. March 2008.

Russell, Bertrand. *Religion and Science*. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.

---. *Wisdom of the East*. New York: Doubleday and Company Ink, 1959.

Salkeld, Duncan. "New Historicism." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Ed. Christa Knellwolf and Christopher Norris. Vol. 9. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.59-70.

Seldan, Raman. *The Theory of Criticism from Plato to the Present*. London: Longman, 1972.

"Science" and "Religion." Def. *New Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 7th ed. 2005.

"Science." Def. *The Free Encyclopedia*. Wikipedia online. 2008. 7th July 2008.

<<http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/science>>.

Taine, Hippolyte. "History of English Literature." Trans. Henry Van Laun. Ed.Hazard Adams.

Critical Theory since Plato. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc; 1992, 609-620.

Tolstoy, Leo. "Where Love is, God is." *The Best Stories and Tales of Leo Tolstoy*. New Delhi:

Crest Publishing House, 1993. 126-139.

---. "The Three Hermits." *The Best Stories and Tales of Leo Tolstoy*. New Delhi: Crest

Publishing House, 1993. 182-189.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *Science and the Modern World*. New York: The New American Library, 1948.