

STRADDLING THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN
THEOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY:
THE FAITH-FEELING INTERFACE

BY

JAMES H. OLTHUIS

Reprinted with permission from Journal of Psychology
and Christianity, Volume 4, Number 1, Spring 1985,
pages 6-15.

Dr. James H. Olthuis is Senior Member in Philosophical
Theology at the Institute for Christian Studies.

Distributed by the Institute for Christian Studies
229 College Street
Toronto, Ontario M5T 1R4

Straddling the Boundaries Between Theology and Psychology: The Faith-Feeling Interface

James H. Olthuis

Today theology and psychology are entering a new era of understanding, promise, rapprochement and creative tension. The imminent danger is no longer the separation of theology and psychology, but their fusion into an amalgam which, depending on the mix, is a theologized psychology or a psychologized theology. What are the distinctive features of psychology and theology and how do we straddle their boundaries? This paper suggests a way to look at psychology and theology which avoids either a psychologistic reduction of faith to feelings or a theologistic reduction of feelings to faith. Faith and feelings are seen to be two *sui generis* modes of being in the world. Theology is defined as the study of the *faith* way of being in the world; psychology is defined as the study of the *sensitive* or emotional way of being in the world. Since every human act partakes in all ways of being in the world, including faith and sensitivity, theology and psychology are able in interdisciplinary cooperation to address the interaction of faith and feelings in every human act even as they approach the study from their own unique points.

In 1950 Gordon Allport warned that "a narrowly conceived science can never do business with a narrowly conceived religion. Only when both parties broaden their perspective will the way to understanding and cooperation open" (1950, p. vi).

Now, more than thirty years later, relations between psychology and religion are entering this new way of understanding, promise, rapprochement and creative tension. On the broad front, North American psychology is being challenged to wrestle itself free from the empiricistic, positivistic straitjacket of allegiance to a natural science model. The challenge comes from the combined influence of "third force psychology" (Maslow, Rogers, Perls), existential psychiatry (Binswanger, Rollo May, Frankl, Van Kaam), trans-personal psychology (Tart) and from those who question in more general terms the adequacy and impartiality of accepted scientific methods (Kuhn, Polanyi, Koestler, Gadamer). The pressure for psychology to be a "human science" (Giorgi, 1970; Van Leeuwen, 1982) has intensified as theorists on the frontiers of physics and mathematics themselves talk of the trans-natural, the perspectival and the mystical (Capra, 1982; Talbot, 1980).

There are more specific signs of rapprochement. From the side of psychology, Freud's reductionist view that religion has no *raison d'être* but the fulfillment of emotional needs is no longer gospel truth even in the circles of psychoanalysis. New emphasis on the self as center and agent of action rather than as product of unconscious processes has led to a more personal holistic and spiritual revision of psychoanalysis (Guntrip, Kohut, Kernberg). The influence of Carl Jung, who reported that none of his patients over thirty-five "has really been healed who did not regain his religious outlook" (1933, p. 229), is steadily growing among psychotherapists and pastoral counsellors. The burgeoning concern to interrelate psychology and religion is also, I believe, one of the main reasons for the renewed interest in William James who took religion very seriously (Browning, 1980; Vanden Burgt, 1981; Levinson, 1981). A groping for new spiritual vistas in psychology characterizes Ernest Becker's *The Denial of Death*, "a merger of psychology and mythico-religious perspective" (1973, p. xi) and James Hillman's *Revisioning Psy-*

chology, in which-to reverse James-"psychology is a variety of religious experience" (1975, p.227).

Psychotherapy itself has been faulted for assuming the prerogatives of religion and for failing to deliver on its promise of healing for humanity (Lasch, 1978; Vitz, 1977; McDonagh, 1982). "Psychiatry has lost its messianic aura" (Needleman, 1970, p. 9). Today, especially among psychotherapists committed to a holistic view of the human person, there is growing concern to give the "spiritual dimension" its due in therapy.

The impetus toward rapprochement also comes from the side of religion. A dramatic and substantial new interest in spirituality is presently rising in the West, and finds academic expression in a surge of interest in the psychology of religion. Religious movements of revival and healing have mushroomed in mainline churches, and a plea, such as M. Scott Peck makes, for a "new psychology of love, traditional values and spiritual growth" (Peck, 1978), draws powerful and widespread response.

On the narrower front common to psychotherapy and pastoral counselling, there are two movements afoot. On the one hand, while the spiritual is being re-emphasized in psychotherapy, the broad pastoral counseling movement which brought psychotherapy into the service of Christian ministry is being encouraged to bring back a "clearer moral context" to counselling" (Browning, 1979 and 1983). Along the same lines, there is renewed emphasis on the need for "spiritual direction" as a counterbalance to psychological counseling (Edwards, 1980; Leech, 1980; May, 1982).

On the other hand, psychotherapy has indeed been brought into the service of Christian ministry. And in theology, the influence of existentialist oriented and psychologically sensitive thinkers such as Kierkegaard, Buber, Tillich, Marcel, H. Richard Niebuhr, and Paul Ricoeur is becoming evident in a growing number of psychologically informed theologians such as Gregory Baum (1970), Sam Keen (1970), Matthew Fox (1983) and Donald Evans (1979). Robert Doran has recently introduced the "neglected psyche" into Lonergan's cognitive, moral and religious intentionality (1981). The integration of psychology and theology has been high on the agenda of several evangelical thinkers (Collins, 1977; Carter and Narramore, 1979). Noteworthy, too, is the rapidly developing interest in the psychology of faith development (Fowler, 1981; Moran, 1983). The dialogue between psychology and theology has now reached the stage that there is talk of "psychotheology" (Ellens, 1982); in fact, Morton Kelsey has published a volume called *Christopsychology* (1982).

Thirty-five years ago the question was: How we can broaden our understanding of religion and psychology so that the two can meet? But today our question is: Are we in danger of losing the distinction between psychology and religion? Are psychology and theology in danger of fusing into an amalgam which, depending on the mix, becomes a spiritualized psychology or a psychologized religion? What are the distinctive features of psychology and religion and how do we straddle their boundaries?

Before Freud psychological phenomena were often seen largely in religious terms. Since Freud, religion has been seen by many largely in psychological terms. What now? In this paper I want to address this "what now"? I want to discuss the faith-feeling interface. However, since the matters involved are enormous and complex, I can only suggest the contours of a model which could help guide further investigations. I am convinced that we are hampered by lack of clarity about the nature of both psychology and theology; therefore, my methodological proposal begins by delimiting the fields which theology and psychology investigate. Then I can proceed to outline how I see and experience the faith-feeling interface.

Dr. Olthuis is a Professor at the Institute for Christian Studies, Toronto, Ontario

Having a clear sense of the specific areas which belong to theology and psychology is important, particularly if we are concerned that each science has a "central viewpoint that would integrate all the phenomena of a given discipline and provide it with a unique perspective" (Giorgi, 1970, p. 18). The comparison of theology and psychology becomes especially complex because the traditional and still dominant view is that psychology is inherently anthropocentric, while theology is inherently theocentric. But reality and our experience of its complexity belies such a sharp demarcation. We know that to have gods is to be human. Conversely, the anthropological question leads inescapably to the question of ultimate concern, to the question of God. In James Hillman's arresting words: "Gods in the soul require religion in psychology" (1975, p. 167). When followed through consistently, this means that the "idea of a secular psychology becomes impossible" (1975, p. 169).

Moreover, if we maintain that theology is the study of religion and the divine, and that psychology is the study of human behaviour and human personality, then, depending on our proclivities, either theology eclipses psychology or psychology ends up eclipsing theology. Thus, the German theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg moves from the idea that God is the "all-determining reality" to the "universality of theology" as the science par excellence (1976). On the other hand, James Hillman comes to the opposite conclusion: "Psychology...has no field of its own. Rather it is a perspective on all fields. ...for it is itself a *universitas*" (1975, p. 133).

The issues involved surface just as clearly and more forcefully in discussions of the relationship between psychotherapy and religion. Already in 1950, Erich Fromm argued that a psychoanalyst, although not a theologian or a philosopher, "is concerned with the very same problems as philosophy and theology: the soul of man and its cure" (1950, p. 7). If the "salvation" of the person is our concern and we have no clear guidelines about the nature of respective contributions of psychology and theology, it is relatively easy to slide into an equation of emotional health and spiritual salvation (Lapsley, 1972). Or, if we believe that salvation belongs to religion, it is relatively easy to dismiss emotional problems as religious problems and to see emotions as epiphenomena (Adams, 1970).

Moreover, even within the traditional, separate views of theology and psychology, there seem to be some fundamental ambiguities. For example, in the West, religion is usually thought to be one component of human existence, separate and independent, codified and institutionalized. However, as Eliade, Cantwell Smith and many studies in the field of religion have shown, religion is for many a total way of life. People engage in religion with their full existence and at all times; religion is not restricted to one part or time of life.

In the field of psychology we find a similar ambiguity. On the one hand psychology often takes as its field of investigation the whole range of human behaviour including the nature of the human person or soul. On the other hand, psychology tends to focus on sensations, feelings, and emotions as one mode of life among many other modes, such as the physical, rational, moral, economic, and social. The depth of this ambiguity is strikingly obvious in Morton Kelsey's recent book. Kelsey tells us that Jung has given us "once again a description of reality that contains a spiritual or psychic dimension" (Kelsey, 1982, p. 7). Apparently the "psychic" and "spiritual" are synonyms here. But in the very next sentence Kelsey contrasts them. "According to Jung, we cannot grow psychologically unless we grow religiously and we cannot attain our spiritual maturity unless we mature psychologically." Are the psychic and the spiritual coterminous or not?

My methodological proposal aims to clear up such ambiguities and thereby promote healthy interaction between theology and psychology. The proposal can be reduced to three main propositions.

A. Every mode of being human is intrinsically spiritual or religious.

B. Faith and sensitivity are *sui generis* modes of every human act (as are also physical, biotic, logical, social, moral and aesthetic, economic, and political functioning); they are both equally human, equally spiritual and equally personal.

C. Theology investigates the faith mode of being-religious; psychology investigates the psychic or sensitive (emotional, feeling) mode of being religious.

A. Every mode of being human is spiritual.

Defining religion is notoriously difficult. There are as many definitions as there are competing religious perspectives. There seems to be no way, as James knew very well, to limit religion to any one dimension of life. I find it helpful to follow Paul Tillich's lead here and see religion as the total way of human life, as the depth relation of all human functioning to the Ultimate.

In this perspective all of life is related to and responsive to the Transcendent or the Ultimate Concern. Herman Dooyeweerd, a Dutch Christian philosopher, has attempted to capture this reality in the phrase: "Meaning is the being of created reality" (1953, p. 4). In this view, creation is an on-going process which in its very existence both reveals the Word of God and responds to the Word of God. Neither the whole of creation nor any of its dimensions are self-contained or self-sufficient, but all exhibit a radical dependence on the creator. All of life has this transcendental, spiritual reference.

Accepting the spirituality of the whole creation keeps us from depreciating and downgrading any mode of being as only human, natural, secular, as the seat of evil and sin. The natural is spiritual through and through. Our breathing and sleeping, our sexuality and emotionality are as spiritual as our thoughts, morals, and beliefs—but no more so. In a culture which still fears the body and underplays emotion, and facing the many theologies which give short shrift to the physical and emotional aspects of life, I applaud any view which promotes the full acceptance of body, sex and emotion. In our context, as we shall explain later, the spirituality of creation means that psychotherapy is as spiritual as theology.

But then how do we distinguish theology and psychology? How do we deal with the concern that spiritual direction or theology will be psychologized? (May, 1982). The answer is in my second thesis.

B. Faith and sensitivity are mutually irreducible modes of every human act.

Most theologies recognize that all human beings need faith, need a total surrender in order to achieve ultimate certainty (Smith, 1979; Gilkey, 1969; Tracy, 1975). However, this basic, human faith mode of being is all too often confused with or reduced either to the feeling or to the thinking mode of being. Sensitivity (sensing, feeling and emoting) and cognition (thinking) are two separate fundamental modes of being in the world different from the faith mode. All three modes of being are to be distinguished from our physio-organic way of being or our aesthetic, moral, social, economic or political ways of being, all of which make up the multi-dimensionality of integral human life.

Here too it is helpful to turn to Tillich, since he clearly and firmly distinguishes faith from all the other modes of being in the world. However, I have difficulty following Tillich when he moves on to consider faith to be a special act of the total personality which unites and transcends all of the other modes rather than an ordinary mode alongside all the others. Faith for Tillich not only becomes the depth function of all the other functions, but the knowledge of faith "...is experienced in an attitude which contradicts the attitude of ordinary cognition." As a result the knowledge of revelation cannot interfere with ordinary knowledge, including the knowledge of psychology, and "ordinary knowledge cannot interfere with the knowledge of revelation" (Tillich, 1953, p. 121 and 144). Entirely consistent with this view is

Tillich's belief that the separate, special attention given to God by institutional religion with its worship, cultus and prayer is attention necessary only because we have lost the depth of unity.

The outcome of Tillich's view is a basic contradiction, despite their complementarity, between faith (religion) and culture. Faith as the really real ultimately invalidates and denigrates culture even as, paradoxically, it grounds it. In the end theology again becomes the unassailable super-science.

In distinction from Tillich I suggest that faith is one of the ordinary modes of human existence, of which all are equally human, equally personal and equally spiritual. However, although the faith mode is no more spiritual than any of the other modes, it is by means of the function of faith that the intrinsic spirituality of the whole person comes to explicit consciousness and awareness. By way of the function of faith we surrender ourselves to the ultimate; we give over and let go to the god in whom and from whom we receive certitude and ground for our existence (Smith, 1979). The commitment of faith guides, integrates and validates our way of life and anchors our self-identity by giving our lives final meaning, sure purpose and firm home. Faith, as it is takes on form in basic beliefs, tells us who we are, where we are and what we are to do. And faith evokes feelings even as feelings induce faith.

The sensitive or psychic mode of being in the world involves sensing, feeling and emoting (De Graaff, 1979). Our sensing gives us an immediate non-reflective awareness and perception of the world as it is full of meaning for us. We scan the horizon for sensory meaning or, as the case may be, we close ourselves off and withdraw. In our feelings we directly respond to what we have sensed and appraise it as pleasurable or displeasurable, good or bad. We have physical feelings, sexual feelings, and moral feelings as well as "religious" or faith feelings. Emotions are immediate, intense, and bodily ways of being moved by a situation. We have all felt how such primary emotions as joy, fear, excitement, shame, disgust, anger, sadness move us toward or away from persons or situations.

Our sensing, feeling and emoting respond to the whole range of our activities—to our thinking, judging, loving, socializing, economizing and, of special interest in this context, to our faith. We sense the touch of friendship and the surrender of faith. We feel secure in the authenticity of love and the reassurance of faith. We are moved by the sadness of death or the joy of faith. Since human emotions flow from the whole person, they always belong to a specific context. There is, for example, the joy of building something, the joy of caring or being cared for, the joy of finding what is lost, or the joy of faith and ultimate surrender. That also means that our feelings and emotions as immediate responses are not in themselves good or bad. They are appropriate or inappropriate, exaggerated or distorted in terms of the larger human context and the mode of life to which they are directed.

Faith and feeling are, then, two distinct ways of being in the world. Before moving to the next point, the interaction of faith and feeling, I need to emphasize that it is the integral human self which both surrenders and feels. No way of functioning exists or acts by itself. Thinking does not think; I think. Committing does not commit; I commit. Every human act is an act of the total personality and thus holds all the modes of functioning in indissoluble coherence. I exist only as I function in many modes, but I, a human self, am not identical with and may not be reduced to any one of my modes of being (Tillich, 1963, p. 28). None of my ways of being in the world define by themselves the core of what it means to be human. This multimodal unity of the human person is the foundation for the principle that growth, health and integration means paying attention to all the sides of human functioning.

I propose that all the various modes of being are present in every human act. But human acts are of different kinds: a certain mode of functioning dominates or

qualifies each act. Thus worship, an act of faith, is qualified by the faith mode of functioning; parenting is qualified by the moral mode; singing is qualified by the aesthetic mode. But in each of these acts, all the human ways of functioning are present and can, with due attention, be recognized and described. Without physical movements and organic pulsations there is no possibility of praying, parenting or singing. As I worship, parent or sing I also have certain sensations, feelings and emotions which are embedded in my activities. Thinking takes place in all of these activities, but it does not dominate or qualify the acts as it does in the acts of analyzing or theorizing. And although my faith beliefs stand out in faith-qualified acts such as prayer, they are also tacitly present and functioning in my parenting and singing.

In general it can be said that in the fabric of every human act there will be interwoven feelings and faith-ings, as well as thinkings. But that in no way cancels out their *sui generis* character. Faith is not an aspect of feeling; feeling is not an aspect of faith. This way of understanding the distinct yet interrelated modes of being is our context for discussing the interplay of faith and feelings. It is particularly in such faith-qualified acts as confession, prayer, meditation and worship that the faith-feeling interplay stands out, for intrinsic to such acts of faith are feelings about faith.

The ultimate surrender of faith evokes feelings and invites emotional surrender to the God to whom I have entrusted my life (Evans, 1979). Emotional surrender to God in turn supports and invokes the ultimate surrender of faith. One without the other is difficult and tenuous—and betrays a lack of integration. The surrender of faith, the ultimate letting go, is more than and other than letting go emotionally. We all experience times when we are unable to surrender emotionally, even when we want to and even when we know that we are totally committed to the matter at hand. We also know how much more "alive" and "in flow" we are when we are able to surrender ourselves emotionally to the tasks at hand, whether it be worship, teaching, loving, tennis or jogging.

If we accept that faith functioning is not a feeling, a thought, a style of behaviour or a moral code, we are better able to account for how faith commitment in our lives and in the lives of others remains real even when the feelings, thoughts and actions of faith are somewhat or temporarily absent.

At the same time, a faith commitment not positively supported by our feelings and emotions is rather tenuous. Because of the indissoluble coherence of life, we need emotional motivation to live out the faith. Faith without feeling is a faith without zest and vitality, but faith based on positive feeling experiences is a powerful faith that motivates to action. The processes of faith and feeling are reciprocally interrelated. An emotionally immature person cannot have a mature faith. Likewise, emotional maturity is impossible to attain without mature faith.

Sensitive functioning and faith functioning play unique and crucial roles in personal integration, health and wholeness. Whereas faith gives perspective, certainty and ultimate grounding to our personalities, our feelings establish a robust bodily sense of our identity and groundedness. Committed, given over, we have a home base. Faith beliefs provide a guiding framework or vision of life by which we seek to realize and actualize our personal, grounded wholeness. Where faith and feeling meet, there can be health and growth.

However, faith and feeling do not always meet so well. Not every faith-vision of life promotes growth and maturity. In Erich Fromm's words: "The question is not *religion or not* but *what kind of religion*, whether it is one furthering man's development, the unfolding of his specifically human powers or one paralyzing them" (1957, p. 7). Or as Ernest Becker affirms, we need to hold beliefs which are life-affirming rather than life-destroying (Becker, 1973). Wrong beliefs can curb devel-

opment and spoon-feed immaturity. A false faith and inadequate vision can foster pathologies, feed insecurities and give rise to dogmatism rather than be guidelines for health and healing.

On the other side, it is also true, of course, that not every emotional orientation to life is healthy. Every person needs to accept and integrate feelings into the whole self. Only through our sensitive functioning can we be in immediate, spontaneous and vibrant touch with ourselves and our surroundings. If we are closed down emotionally we tend to destroy, deny and repress our experiences by projection, rationalization and other defensive manoeuvres, all of which calls the integrity of our faith-life into question.

Indeed, our emotional anxieties and defensive postures blur our vision of life and undercut our commitment. Although faith commitment is irreducible to emotional life, in the integral unity of the human personality the way we live and even the way we articulate our beliefs is inextricably connected with our emotional state. Scripted by our previous emotional experience, particularly in relation to mother and father in the first six years of our lives, we all react to life in certain idiosyncratic patterns. Early childhood experiences have formed in us certain sets of emotional feelings which give rise to deeply-felt emotional convictions which, to the degree that they are unhealthy, promote unhealthy and repressive faith-beliefs.

Emotional convictions expressed in phrases such as "I belong nowhere," "I am not accepted," "I can't trust a soul," "I am powerless," seriously undermine our faith that we are at home, accepted, forgiven, trusted, and empowered by God. These illusions can be so powerful that for all intents and purposes, they, rather than the faith to which we are committed, dictate our actions. We may feel split, experiencing deeply the conflict between emotionally rooted illusions and the core commitments of faith. The anxiety, fear, anger, and despair which feed these illusions are so potent, and the drive for unity in life is so irrepressible that we are likely to adjust the faith-vision of life or adopt a new one in order to validate and support the emotional habits of our illusions.

Sometimes, then, faith and feelings flow together; sometimes faith and its world-view empowers its adherents to make deep and coherent sense of life, sustaining them in sorrow and distress, evoking deep and pervasive attachment, and occasioning moods of deep satisfaction, joy, and peace. But in other cases, there is no emotional attachment to the vision of life confessed. Then people are divided against themselves; they feel and act contrary to their core beliefs, and suffer all the consequences of guilt, lack of self-esteem, and unhappiness. No matter how sound the vision, if the adherents are not emotionally committed to it in a communal way, they cannot live out the vision in a way of life. On the other hand, emotional commitment which is shared in community greatly facilitates healthy individual and communal existence.

I have sketched a model which allows for the mutual interaction of faith and feeling and avoids either a psychologistic reduction of faith to feelings or a theologistic reduction of feelings to faith. What might this model mean for the sciences of theology and psychology and for pastoral counseling and psychotherapy? My third major thesis begins to answer that question.

C. Theology studies the faith mode; psychology studies the sensitive mode.

I suggest that the science of theology has as its rightful field of investigation the faith mode of creaturely reality in its indissoluble coherence with all the other modes of being. Theology studies the development and structure of faith including, among other things, the norm for faith, the surrender of faith, the beliefs and rituals of faith, and the proclamation of and education of faith.

Giving to theology, just as to other sciences, a specific, delimited field of investigation in creation keeps theology from taking on the supernatural status by which it relates to other sciences as God relates to creation. This strategy also avoids the gymnastics required when theologians such as Karl Barth want to maintain that theology is science like any other science and at the same time maintain that it is the special science that deals with God.

I suggest that psychology has as its rightful field of investigation the sensitive mode of creaturely reality in its indissoluble coherence with all the other modes of being. Psychology studies the development and structure of sensitivity including, among other things, perceptions, sensations, feelings, emotions, dreams, and neurosis.

But, although I am pleading for boundaries for the separate fields which theology and psychology investigate, those boundaries set no limits on what can be studied by theologians and psychologists. Everything in reality is fair game. I am pressing the need for theologians to study all of creation from the particular and limited point of view of the faith mode, and for psychologists to study all of creation from the particular and limited point of view of the sensitive mode. If psychologists see their field of investigation to be animal and human behavior without any particular point of view, how do we distinguish their field from that of ethologists, in the case of animals, or of physiologists, sociologists, historians or political scientists, in the case of humans?

Theology studies the faith mode of entities and acts which also function in all the other modes of reality. Thus theology cannot ignore the other modes, and the respective sciences involved, which also co-determine the structure, meaning and development of the acts or entities. The same holds true analogously for psychology. The need for the interdisciplinary practice of science is obvious. If my proposal found some acceptance, both theology and psychology would possess a built-in guard against their imperialistic tendencies.

The difference between theology and psychology lies, I am saying, not in whether our study has to do with gods or not—but it most certainly does in both cases—but in our angle of approach, our central viewpoint in terms of which we relate to the gods. Theology deals with our *surrender* to or faith in the gods. Psychology deals with our *feelings*, including our feelings about the gods. Psychology of religion would study the faith-sensitivity interface in general with particular focus on the role of sensing, feeling and emoting in our faith acts.

If, as I proposed initially, all of life is religious by virtue of the transcendental reference of everything in creation, so too all sciences are by that same token sacred or religious. Every science, in its own way and from its own viewpoint, can make an important contribution to our knowledge and experience of God in that it studies an aspect of creation which is a revelation of God. This is not altered by the fact that faith (and theology as the study of faith) brings to explicit focus the God-related character of all creational life in the God-language of faith.

If faith and feeling are seen as separate modes of human life, there are important implications for pastoral counseling and psychotherapy. Pastoral counseling would focus on helping people develop, nurture and renature their faith experience and reintegrate it into their total experience, while psychotherapy would focus on helping people nurture, renature and reintegrate their emotional experience into their total experience. Since a healthy emotional life is foundational to a healthy faith life, pastoral counselors need to be aware of and work with the role of the sensitive in faith experience. However, their central task remains helping people work through their faith problems, encouraging them to integrate their faith and daily life and supporting them in appropriating a vision of life which offers them meaningful values for living and dying. Since emotional healing frees people to give them-

selves more freely and more fully to life, in the natural course of psychotherapy the ultimate meaning questions of life will surface and need to be addressed. But the focus in psychotherapy remains on the emotional mode of human personality.

What needs more development, I believe, is mutual cooperation and referral between psychotherapists and pastoral counselors. They need each other. And when each group stays with its primary task in such a team setting we do not have to either spiritualize psychotherapy or berate it as unnecessary and dangerous, nor do we have to psychologize pastoral counseling or negate it as unnecessary and irrelevant. Psychotherapists would do well to concentrate on becoming better psychotherapists and on deepening, in that context, their awareness of the relevance and importance of the ultimate meaning questions of faith. Pastoral Counselors would do well to regain a better sense of their primary calling of faith nurture without losing the concern they have gained for the emotional health of the human person.

In conclusion, I can reduce my concerns to one sentence: It is a cardinal mistake to collapse the faith mode into the sensitive-feeling mode, or for that matter into the rational or moral modes, regardless of how reciprocal these modes are in every human act.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. (1970) *Competent to counsel*, Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Allport, G.W. (1950) *The individual and his religion*, New York: Macmillan.
- Baum, G. (1970) *Man becoming*, New York: Herder.
- Becker, E. (1973) *The Denial of Death*, New York: Free Press.
- Browning, D. (1979) "Images of man in contemporary models of pastoral care," *Interpretation*, April.
- _____. (1980) *Pluralism and personality: William James and some contemporary cultures of psychology*, Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, and Toronto: Associated University Presses.
- _____. (1983) *Religious ethics and pastoral care*, Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Carter, J. and Narramore, B. (1979) *The integration of psychology and theology*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Capra, F. (1982) *The turning point: science, society and the rising culture*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Collins, G. (1977) *The rebuilding of psychology*, Wheaton: Tyndale.
- De Graaff, A.H. (1979) "Psychology: sensitive openness and appropriate reactions," Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies publication.
- Dooyeweerd, H. (1953) *A new critique of theoretical thought*. Vol. I, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed.
- Doran, R. (1981) *Psychic conversion and theological foundations*, Chico: Scholars Press.
- Edwards, T. (1980) *Spiritual friend*, New York: Paulist.
- Ellens, J.H. (1982) *God's grace and human health*, Nashville: Abingdon.
- Evans, D. (1979) *Struggle and fulfillment*, Toronto: Collins.
- Fowler, J. (1981) *Stages of faith*, San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Fox, M. (1983) *Original blessing*, Santa Fe: Bear & Company.
- Fromm, E. (1950) *Psychoanalysis and religion*, New Haven: Yale.
- Gilkey, L. (1969) *Naming the whirlwind: the renewal of god-language*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Giorgi, A. (1970) *Psychology as a human science*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Hillman, J. (1975) *Revisioning psychology*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Jung, C. (1933) *Modern man in search of a soul*, New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Keen, S. (1970) *To a dancing god*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Kelsey, M. (1982) *Christo-psychology*, New York: Crossroad.
- Lapsley, J. (1972) *Salvation and health*, Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Lasch, C. (1978) *The culture of narcissism*, New York: Norton.
- Leech, K. (1980) *Soul friend*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Levinson, H. (1981) *The religious investigations of William James*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- May, G. (1982) *Care of mind, care of spirit*, San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- McDonagh, J. (1982) *Christian psychology*, New York: Crossroad.
- Moran, G. (1983) *Religious education development*, Minneapolis: Winston.
- Needleman, J. (1970) *The new religions*, New York: Doubleday.
- Pannenberg, W. (1976) *Theology and the philosophy of science*, Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Peck, M.S. (1978) *The road less travelled*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Smith, W.C. (1979) *Faith and belief*, Princeton: Princeton.
- Talbot, M. (1980) *Mysticism and the new physics*, New York: Bantam.
- Tillich, P. (1953) *Systematic theology*. Vols. I, III, London: James Nisbet.
- Tracy, D. (1975) *Blessed rage for order*, New York: Seabury.
- Vanden Burgt, R. (1981) *The religious philosophy of William James*, Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Van Leeuwen, M. (1982) *The sorcerer's apprentice: a christian looks at the changing face of psychology*, Downer's Grove: Intervarsity.
- Vitz, P. (1977) *Psychology as religion: the cult of self-worship*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.