Personhood cannot be defined categorically

One may have to be a Marxist to accept the assertion that with every step that science moves forward God takes a step backwards. Perhaps a more considerate view is that science opens our eyes to details that our ancient religions never knew were there. They saw water and we see water molecules. As we scientifically widen our understanding of life, armed with critical thinking, options and complexities force us to become comfortable with gray and to relinquish the comfortable certainty of black or white. The directive to choose a definitive conception of personhood is a clever mechanism to force others to have to make a decision without the benefit of details. Personhood could have begun in a metaphysical way when a man and a woman first fell in love and set a goal to form a family. And it could have not ended even when the body is sustained via external mechanical assistance. Context is what provides the answer. The complexities of adoption, abortion, child custody, and other concepts presented by Professor Sandel require painstaking debate and evolving legal remedies. Reading his book, my primary observation is that, by cornering the reader and demanding a yes/no decision on such sensitive subjects, he makes us aware of inadequacies of such short answers. So I proclaim that asking for a definition of personhood without providing context is not a valid question.