

The author is most familiar with the Chicago Metropolitan Center, the Metropolitan Collegiate Center of Germantown, and the Philadelphia Urban Semester of the Great Lakes Colleges Association. These form the basis for generalization about urban semesters that the author makes in the paper, although no single reference necessarily applies to all of them. Programs not included in this paper are cooperative work study programs and internships in which students live on campus, perhaps carrying other course work in addition to internship.

REFERENCES

DeHaan, Robert F., and VanWagner, Karen. "Evaluating an Experiential Learning Program. The GLCA - Philadelphia Urban Semester," *Journal of*

Educational Research, vol 7 no 4 March-April 1977 pp 222-225

Erikson Erik H., *Childhood Society*, Second Edition, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. 1963

Erikson, Erik H., *Identity, Youth and Crisis*, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1968.

Erikson, Erik H., *Identity and the Life Cycle: Psychological Issues*, Vol. 1., No. 1 New York: International Universities Press, 1959, p. 157

Havighurse, Robert J., *Developmental Tasks and Education*, Third Edition, New York: David Mc Kay, Inc., 1973, p. 70.

The Integration of Psychology and Theology: An Historical Inquiry

Dick T. Cole

Psychology, among its many concerns, is very interested in the emotional aspects of man's nature. Quentin Hyder says that the "Christian experience, especially that which involves a deep personal relationship with God in Christ, is a very emotional affair" (Hyder, 1971, p. 22). This prompts us to ask whether the study of psychology has a legitimate place within Christianity and whether the interests of psychology and Christianity are complementary or contradictory.

Some Christians say that psychology and Christianity are congruent. Psychology is seen as "a secular definition of man" that "... poses a challenge to Christian thought..." (Carter and Mohline, 1976, p. 4). This particular group of Christians sees the possibility of an integration between Christianity and the findings of psychology. They base their model of integration on three assumptions:

(a) *All truth is God's truth, therefore the truths of psychology (general revelation) are neither contradictory nor contrary to revealed truth (special revelation), but are integrative in a harmonious whole.*

(b) *Theology represents the distillation of God's revelation of Himself to man in an linguistic, conceptual, and cultural media man can understand and which focuses primarily on man's nature and destiny in God's program.*

(c) *Psychology as a science is primarily concerned with the mechanisms by which man functions and the methods to assess the functioning. Nevertheless, the content of psychology as a science (including theory) provides a statement on the nature and functioning of man (Carter and Mohline, 1976, p. 4).*

Thus integration is seen as a Christian response to secular psychology's description of man. As one author has said, "Integration... is an attempt to relate Christian thought to the challenge of contemporary cultures' attempt to define man according to a secular psychology" (Carter and Mohline, 1976, p. 4).

Other Christians see psychology and Christianity as having no relationship at all. To them the integration model mentioned above is not an acceptable solution. One author who represents this view, in response to this integration model, has said,

I can't buy your style of integration. I don't see your program as a viable option. I believe the pastor ought to be doing this work as a life calling and not someone who hangs out a shingle on his own (Adams, 1977, p. 3).

This same author continues to say that the helping professions of psychology, theology and medicine are three separate, distinct disciplines, "whose boundaries ought to be more sharply defined" (Adams, 1977, p. 3). Psychology

should limit itself to experimental research and the collection of data about the variety of functions people perform. In like manner, medicine is to deal specifically with organic problems, and theology is primarily concerned with personality change and counseling. He also suggests that the findings of psychology and medicine have been "bleeding" over into the field of theology. These disciplines are "not adequately equipped to work in the area of personality change," and further, "anything which seeks a change in persons belongs only to the pastor" (Adams, 1976, p. 3).

Thus we see that the Christian response to this recent interest in modern psychology has polarized into opposing camps, and it is the polarity, as two conflicting conceptual reactions, that is the concern of this study. This paper is basically asking whether psychology, as a scientific study of the nature of man, belongs within a Christian view of life. Its primary interest is not how these two subjects should or should not be integrated, but rather whether it is legitimate for Christianity to be concerned with the findings of psychology.

This question can be approached in two different ways. First, one could attempt to seek a solution immediately. That is, one could study the basic presuppositions and data of Scripture and the assumptions and findings of psychology, and from there attempt to argue for or against Christianity's involvement in psychology.

The second approach, which I have chosen here, involves an historical analysis. That is, how did the discipline of psychology as we know it today develop, and what has been the church's attitude toward psychology throughout history?

SECULAR PSYCHOLOGY UP TO THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY

Psychology, in one sense, has always been with man. Malcolm Jeeves has written that as man throughout history has "reflected upon his own thoughts and behavior he has tried to make sense of what he found there... Equally he has tried to understand why his fellow men behave in this way and not that" (Jeeves, 1976, p. 21).

However, a systematic understanding of man's nature and behavior did not develop until the mid-nineteenth century. The basic theme in most textbooks that deal with the history of psychology is that no adequate psychology existed until the twentieth century. In most of these texts the history of psychology is usually a chronology of reasons why this or that culture, in its ignorance, hindered the development of a systematic psychology. As Coleman writes,

The great advances that have come about during the twentieth century in the understanding and treatment of abnormal behavior become all the more remarkable when viewed against the long

backgrounds of ignorance, superstition, and fear
(Coleman, 1964, p. 25).

The science of psychology is predominately a result of a modern revolt against Platonic thinking. Until the age of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, philosophy was dominated by Platonic ideals. As Alfred North Whitehead has said, "Twenty-five hundred years of western philosophy are a series of footnotes to Plato" (Sanderson, 1970, p. 29). Although this is somewhat of an overstatement, Dr. Francis Schaeffer is crucial. . . . He saw that if there are no absolutes then the thing crucial. . . . He says that if there are no absolutes, then the individual things have no meaning" (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 144). Plato and the majority of those who came after him were consumed philosophically in attempting to understand and discover the universals that will give meaning to the particulars. In doing so, these men were more concerned with the world of ideas and knowledge and less concerned with the world of sense and experience. In Plato's day the material, or body, was considered evil; the "polis," or state, was the only good; the individual and his personal experiences were meaningless.

With this assumption at the root of all thought, one can easily understand why man did not develop a systematic discipline of psychology; the study of man, the individual, i.e., his senses, his behavior, and all other particulars of his nature. It was not until the modern revolt against Platonic thinking that modern man was freed to study the particulars of his own experience. As we shall see, it was the arguments of Rational/Empiricist philosophy and the development of modern science that gave man this freedom to explore systematically his own nature and experience. In his freedom, though, man has tended to lose this balance between the universals and the particulars and has over-emphasized the particulars, often to the exclusion of the universals. Yet, it is from this shift in man's frame of reference that we have modern psychology.

Throughout history certain men were able to break out of this Platonic ideal and make amazingly significant contributions to the field of psychology. There is no evidence, though, that any of these men developed their discoveries into a systematic body of psychological knowledge. Instead, the thoughts of these men were usually so contrary or unique to the existing culture that their ideas were quickly suppressed. The chains of Platonic thought had not yet been shed in philosophy, and, consequently, these men were not able to make the shift into the world of particulars, which is the basis for the scientific psychology we have today.

BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY UP TO THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY

As we survey the development of biblical psychology and examine the church's contribution to psychology throughout history, three assumptions must be kept in mind. First, my purpose in tracing the development of biblical psychology is to attempt to confirm that throughout history Christianity has been actively involved in the study, development and understanding of psychology. In doing so, I hope to demonstrate that the current belief that psychology and Christianity are in conflict is an assumption that is contrary to the traditional view of the church toward psychology throughout history.

Second, the reader must understand that the premise of this survey deals primarily with the attitude of Christianity toward psychology and not necessarily with the specific contributions Christianity has made to the study of psychology. Therefore, the contributions that are mentioned are to be seen primarily as an indication of a basic attitude of the church and not merely as an indication that Christianity was developing a biblical psychology.

Third, one must realize that in the early church the study of psychology is found in studies on the "soul." The word

"soul" here stems from the Greek word, "psuche," from which we get our word "psychology," i.e., the study of the soul. This is why biblical psychology, and particularly the biblical principles of the treatment of the mentally ill, is often referred to among theologians as the "cure of the souls." With these three points set before us, let us begin our survey of the development of biblical psychology.

The Christian world view of the first century believers gave him a basis and a freedom to turn to himself and to study his own experience. The concept of the Lordship of Christ over all life gave universal meaning to the particulars, thus freeing the early Christian believer from the Platonic emphasis on universals and allowing the believer to study himself in terms of his soul, i.e., his psychological nature.

McNeill calls the cure of souls a "unique and sacred profession that spans the centuries" (McNeill, 1951, p. viii). In 1855 Franz Delitzsch wrote that biblical psychology "is no science of yesterday. . . . It is one of the oldest sciences of the church" (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 3). In Delitzsch's **A System of Biblical Psychology**, we have a summary and a systematic account of all the works on biblical psychology to that date. Delitzsch informs us that as early as the second and third centuries A.D. we find in Christian literature an interest in the study of man's nature. Of these works, though, it is only the writings of Melito and Tertullian that are considered worthy contributions to the psychological literature of the church. "The work of Tertullian," writes Delitzsch, ". . . comprises all the leading dogmas on the subject of psychology. . . ." (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 3). Tertullian's **De Anima (On the Soul)**, written early in the third century, is the first attempt on the part of the church to supplant Plato's **Phaedo** and Aristotle's three books **On the Soul**.

In the fourth century we find ample contributions to the literature on biblical psychology in the works of Gregory of Nyssa, his most significant work being **On the Soul and the Resurrection from Brother Mark**. In the fifth century we move into the middle ages, and at this point psychology became the subject of many treatises. Unfortunately, it is at this time that the church began to think more Aristotelian than biblical. Thomas Aquinas, having access to many of the Greek writers, began to propose an incomplete view of the Fall. According to Schaeffer, Aquinas "thought that the Fall did not affect man as a whole but only in part. . . . In his view the will was fallen or corrupt but the intellect was not affected" (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 52).

As a result, people began to put more emphasis on human wisdom, and secular philosophy, breaking from its biblical bonds, emerged as an independent, autonomous discipline. As one can imagine, this had a significant effect on the development of biblical psychology. Delitzsch tells us that as a direct result of the influence of Greek thought, the psychological literature of this period reflected an "attempt to read immediately in the Book of Nature, and to draw out of the depth of the soul's consciousness; . . . men did not see their way to a free and undivided reference to the teaching of the Holy Scripture. . . ." (Delitzsch, 1966, pp. 5-6). Although there is much to be learned from the works of this age, "in general it is their reproach that their minds ran more in Aristotelian than in biblical modes of thought. . . ." (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 5).

It was not until the Reformation, with its proper balance between the universals and the particulars that psychological writings from an orthodox point of view began to emerge once again from the pens of Christian scholars. Delitzsch recognizes the major role the Reformation plays in the development of psychology when he writes,

It was only by means of the Reformation that a really free scriptural inquiry on all sides became possible. Psychology could then bring its traditional store of knowledge into the light of scripture, and thus it advanced into a new phase (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 6).

One of the first psychological writings to come out of the

Reformation Age was Melancthon's **Commentarius de anima** (**Commentary on the Soul**). Although Melancthon uses Aristotle as his highest authority next to scripture, the bond between the Scriptures and Greek thinking that was so typical of the Middle Ages is not contained in this work.

Science, though, did not advance as much as it could have during the Reformation period. According to Delitzsch, the Reformation Age "was deeply conservative, and was satisfied with what was already known and dogmatically formulated. . . (therefore) many a psychologically significant statement of scripture . . . was not done justice to" (Delitzsch, 1966, pp. 6-7). In the period just after the Reformation, psychology as a science of the church moved into a slump. This slump was predominately due to the overemphasis by scholars on systematizing scripture by "reference to individual texts," rather than reference to the overall "scope and harmony of scripture" (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 7). However, during this period, Caspar Bartholinus in his **Manudctio ad veram Psychologiam e sacris literis** (**Handbook to the True Psychology and the Sacred Writings**) drafted a biblical psychology which, though only a sketch and lacking in many areas, was a significant contribution to the development of biblical psychology.

At this point in our survey, let us turn to the Puritans for their contributions to the development of biblical psychology. The Puritans often come under harsh criticism by secular psychologists and historians for their practice of witch burning. However, one must realize that historical records report only one incident of Puritan witch burning here in America. This was the Salem witch trials in 1692. These trials were condemned by the majority of the church at the time, and Samuel Sewal, a judge at Salem, felt an overwhelming personal guilt for "the decisions that sent nineteen persons to their death" (Wish, 1967, p. 13).

Of the abundant Puritan writings on the soul, I will mention five that stand out as significant contributions to the growth of biblical psychology. First, the three works by John Flavel (1630-1691), **Pneumatologia: A Treatise of the Soul of Man**, which contains a section entitled, "The Love and Inclination of the Soul to the Body," **A Practical Treatise on Fear, Its Varieties, Uses, Causes, Effects and Remedies**, and **The Occasions, Causes, Nature, Rise, Growth and Remedies of Mental Errors**. And second, the two writings of Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), **A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections, in Three Parts and Narrative of Surprising Conversions**, which contains some intriguing "clinical" observations on the experience of conversion.

With the writing of **Gnomom** by John Albert Bengel, we have what Delitzsch calls, "an entirely new era of scriptural investigation" (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 8). Since the Reformation the study of scripture was almost completely involved in "The apologetico-polemical proof of truth already acknowledged" (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 8). In this new era, though, biblical scholars were interested in taking the scriptures into new areas of study in order that the depth of knowledge possessed might be further developed. One work emerging out of this new era of interpretation is Magnus Friedrich Roos' **Fundamenta Psychologiae ex sacra Scriptura collecta** (**The Fundamentals of Psychology from the Sacred Scripture**), which, although weak, gave way to other later works much more advanced in their understanding of biblical psychology. As we can see, up until the mid-nineteenth century, orthodox Christianity had a very positive and acceptable attitude toward psychology. This was seen not only in its contributions to the writings of psychology in general but also in its active attempts to develop its own biblical psychology. Thus Delitzsch's comment on the ancient church is found to be true of the church throughout Western history:

(From) . . . the multitude of Christologic and Soteriologic monographs, which entered upon psychologic problems, it is plain that the ancient

church had a psychological literature that claims respect no less for its extent than for its substance (Delitzsch, 1966, p. 5).

CHRISTIANITY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SECULAR PSYCHOLOGY

However, it is not only in its many works of psychological literature that we find evidence of the church's positive attitude toward the study and understanding of psychology. As we glance back over the development of secular psychology, we find that many of the predominant figures who were actively involved in the development of psychology were either orthodox Christians or influenced in a significant way by biblical Christianity.

Some of those who professed a belief in the Christian faith included:

- a) St. Vincent de Paul (1576-1660), who emphasized that there was no difference between physical and mental illness and who called on Christianity to treat "the one as well as the other" (Coleman, 1964, p. 4);
- b) the founders of the famous Gheel shrine (sixteenth century), a Belgian institution that has continued its work with the mentally ill up into the twentieth century. According to Coleman the Gheel shrine grew out of the ". . . more humane Christian tradition of prayer, the laying on of hands, or holy touch, and visits to shrines for cure of illness . . ." (Coleman, 1964, pp. 40-41);
- c) the orthodox Quaker, William Tuke (eighteenth century), who, as a direct result of the Wesley and Whitfield religious revivals, opened the York Retreat, "a pleasant country home where the mental patients lived, worked, and rested in a kindly religious atmosphere" (Coleman, 1964, p. 42); and
- d) the American physician Benjamin Rush (1745-1813), who is known as the father of American psychiatry and who helped to open the way for the American mental health reform movements. According to Coleman, Rush attempted the first systematic treatise on mental disorders and organized the first course in psychiatry (Coleman, 1964, p. 44).

Those who were influenced in a significant way by the basic principles of the Christian faith were as follows: The Dutch physician and founder of modern psychology, Johann Weyer (1515-1588), who performed the first psychological experiment and recorded in detail different mental disorders; and the Oxford educated Reginald Scot (1538-1599), who published a book in 1584 titled **The Discovery of Witchcraft**, in which he openly denied that mental illness is caused by demon possession. Both of these men were greatly influential in propagating the idea that witches were those suffering from mental illness rather than from demon possession.

Exactly how were these men influenced by Christianity? In order to answer this question one must first understand that the word "Christian" can be used in two distinct ways. First, "Christian" can be used in reference to one who has professed faith in Christ and who stands before God on the basis of the work of Christ on the cross. According to Schaeffer, the primary meaning of the word "Christian," when it is used in this first sense, is ". . . an individual who has come to God through the work of Christ" (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 110). This is how the word was used above in reference to St. Vincent de Paul, the founders of the Gheel shrine, William Tuke, and Benjamin Rush.

The second usage of the word "Christian" is defined by Schaeffer when he explains that "It is possible for an individual to live within the circle of that which a Christian consensus brings forth, even though he himself is not a Christian . . ." (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 110). Schaeffer then gives an example saying that

Many of the men who laid the foundation of the United States Constitution were not Christians in the first sense (that is, in the sense described

above), and yet they built upon the basis of the Reformation either directly through the *Lex Rex* tradition or indirectly through Locke" (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 110).

It was in this second sense that reference was made to the work of Johann Weyer (1515-1588) and Reginald Scot (1538-1599). Both of these men lived within the sphere of the Reformation, in countries that were highly influenced by Reformation thinking; Weyer in Holland and Belgium, and Scot in England. In commenting on this influence of Christianity on culture, Schaeffer says that,

... wherever the biblical teaching has gone, even though it has always been marred by men, it not only has told of an open approach to God through the work of Christ, but also has brought peripheral results in society . . . (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 105).

Schaeffer continues to say that in England, Holland and other Reformation countries the results of the Reformation were obvious, especially in the area of politics. The biblical emphasis on individual responsibility to the law of God "turned the political tide in those countries where the Reformation emphasis on the Bible as the only final authority took root" (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 108). Thus we can see that Christianity, through the involvement of individual believers, as well as through the sway of its system of thought, had a significant influence, both directly and indirectly, on the development of secular psychology up to the mid-nineteenth century.

CHRISTIANITY, MODERN SCIENCE AND RATIONAL/EMPIRICIST PHILOSOPHY

As we look to the development of modern psychology, the influence of the Reformation must be examined in more detail. Of particular importance is the influence of Reformation thinking on both the rise of modern science and on the emergence of Rational/Empiricist philosophy. It was the combination of these two systems of thought that broke through the bonds of Platonic thought with its emphasis on the world of the universals, and gave men the form and freedom to explore the world of the particulars. Yet we shall see that modern man lost this proper balance between the universals and the particulars, and he has now found himself in bondage to the particulars.

Christianity played a significant role in the lives of those who founded modern science. As Schaeffer writes,

... the majority of those who founded modern science, from Copernicus to Maxwell, were functioning on a Christian base. Many of them were personally Christians, but even those who were not, were living within the thought forms brought forth by Christianity, especially the belief that God as the Creator and Lawgiver has implanted laws in his creation which man can discover (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 138).

Interestingly, Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947), and J. Robert Oppenheimer (1904-1967), although themselves not Christians, both agree with Schaeffer in this conclusion (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 132). However, it should be clarified here that I am not claiming that the Reformation caused the emergence of modern science, but rather I am proposing that many of the operating principles of modern science rested on biblical truth. Because men like Francis Bacon (1561-1626), Isaac Newton (1642-1727), and Michael Faraday (1791-1867) believed that the universe was created by a reasonable God, "they were not surprised to discover that people could find out something true about nature and the universe on the basis of reason" (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 133). For this reason George M. Trevelyan, in his book, *English Social History* (1942), writes:

Robert Boyle, Isaac Newton and the early members of the Royal Society were religious men, who . . . familiarized the minds of their countrymen with the

idea of law in the Universe and with scientific methods of inquiry to discover truth. It was believed that these methods would never lead to any conclusions inconsistent with biblical history and miraculous religion; Newton lived and died in that faith (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 136).

The influence of Christianity on the growth of the Rational/Empiricist's arguments is much more indirect and not quite as blatant as its influence on the Scientific Revolution. Rene Descartes (1596-1650), who probably was not an orthodox Christian, nevertheless considered himself to be a good Catholic. He also lived within the sphere of Reformation thinking.

It was Descartes the Rationalist, with his emphasis on the dualistic nature of reality, that opened the door for Empiricist philosophy. The Rationalists said that the outside world (i.e., the world of experience) could only be comprehended in terms of measurement, and the inside world (i.e., the world of the mind) was legislative in nature, that is, the world will tend to follow the way your mind thinks. Thus, the mind and experience were two radically different realities. The Empiricists, on the other hand, pushed Descartes' views to their final end and said that all knowledge comes from experience.

An influential thinker in the Empiricist's camp who was affected in an indirect way by Reformation thinking was John Locke (1632-1704). Locke was greatly persuaded by Samuel Rutherford's work, *Lex Rex* (1644); however, Locke did not have Rutherford's Christian base. According to Schaeffer, Locke's idea of "natural rights" was not only inconsistent with his own system of thought, but he "stated the results which come from biblical Christianity without having the base which produced them . . . (in other words) he secularized Christian thinking (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 110).

MODERN SCIENCE, RATIONAL/EMPIRICIST PHILOSOPHY AND MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

As we can see, Christianity had a subtle yet significant influence on the development of both modern science and Rational/Empiricist philosophy. It is because of the Christian belief that there is a reasonable God that gives order and meaning to the particulars, that these early scientists believed that, as observers of the created order, they could discover truth about the cosmos. These men believed that there was a uniformity of natural causes existing in an open system, that is, that God was "out there" and not simply a part of the cosmos.

However, as we move into the latter half of the nineteenth century, we find a significant change taking place in scientific philosophy. With the increasing influence of the humanistic ideals of the Enlightenment, we find this concept of a reasonable God who exists "out there" slowly disappearing in the study of science. "Scientists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries," writes Schaeffer "... continued to use the word God, but pushed God more and more to the edges of their systems" (Schaeffer, 1976, pp. 146-147). Finally, by the time we come to the twentieth century, we find that modern man has completely pushed God out of his system and has begun emphasizing that there is a uniformity of natural causes in a closed system.

This shift from an open world view to a closed world view has tremendous implications. In a closed system, nothing exists outside of the system. All is part of, and subject to, the "total cosmic machine" (Schaeffer, 1976, p. 146). Consequently, not only is there no place for God in this machine but man, as a free, responsible being, does not exist either. Man becomes merely one behavioristic cog in the total machine. Thus, in the twentieth century the study of man, his nature, and his experience became simply a part of the total scientific system, that is, the study of psychology now became a "social science." According to Schaeffer:

When psychology and social science were made a part of a closed cause-and-effect system, along with physics, astronomy and chemistry, it was not only God who died. Man died. . . . People and all they do become only a part of the machinery (Schaeffer, 1976, pp. 147-148).

Jeeves tells us that at the turn of the century the study of psychology began to base its theories more on fact than opinion: "Psychologists studying sensation began to examine systematically how what is felt is related to the intensity of the stimulus applied" (Jeeves, 1976, p. 21).

Before these systematic observations could take place though, there had to occur several changes in man's understanding of himself and his world. As mentioned earlier, it was the philosophers that gave the basis for these changes. Rene Descartes' dualism, which divided man into the two distinct categories of mind and body, provided a foundation for a mechanistic view of man. The body was materialistic and, therefore, measurable, whereas the mind (soul) and spirit were not materialistic and, therefore, free from the mechanistic laws of the universe. Psychology, adopting this dualistic view of the world, began to stress the systematic study of the body and tended to lay aside its study of the mind (soul).

Andrews writes:

With mind and body so separated and with the body so easily accessible to measurement, it became an easy exercise for nineteenth century philosophers-psychologists to neglect the mind in their pursuit of scientific rigor (Andrews, 1975, p. 58).

Although there was some resistance to this change in emphasis by eighteenth century Existentialists, Andrews tells us that psychology persisted in adopting the Empiricist's methods of physics that were so successful in advancing the study of astronomy, chemistry, geology and biology (Andrews, 1975, p. 58).

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

With the emergency of the scientific emphasis in psychology in the mid-nineteenth century, the contributions of Christianity to the discipline of psychology and the development of biblical psychology came to an abrupt halt. According to Carter and Mohline, "Conservative theology does not seem to have moved beyond Delitzsch (1855) . . ." (Carter and Mohline, 1976, p. 3). Carter goes on to say that the major theological works of the twentieth century contain "large sections on God, Christ, the church, and the atonement, but the sections on man (anthropology) and the Holy Spirit's relationship to man are dwarfed by comparison" (Carter and Mohline, 1976, p. 3).

It is also significant that in all the major biblical encyclopedias and dictionaries published before or just at the turn of the twentieth century there are large and sometimes extensive entries on "Psychology," "Psychical Research," and "Psychotherapy." Some of these works are James Orr's *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (1915); James Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (1918); and *A Dictionary of the Bible* (1902); and *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (1911) by S. M. Jackson. Yet many of our modern encyclopedias and dictionaries, such as, Merrill C. Tenney's *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (1975); J. D. Douglas' *The New Bible Dictionary*; and the *Wycliff Bible Encyclopedia* (1975) do not contain articles on psychology and its related subjects at all.

What happened within the Christian community that caused it to give up its pursuit of biblical psychology? Of the many possible causes, two stand out. First, was the church's over-reaction to Freud and his somewhat radical ideas. Freud's emphasis on infant sexuality, his strong emphasis on repressed sexual desires in general, and his view that religion is merely something invented by man out of his own insecure needs, brought bitter and harsh criticism from the

church. Yet, the church in its reaction to psychoanalytic theory was grossly inconsistent. For instance, Freud's associate, Carl Jung, and other psychoanalytic pioneers recognized the social utility of religion and, consequently, won favor and acceptance among many Christian scholars. The church, though, did not understand or ignored altogether the presuppositions of these men which, like Freud's, were not in agreement with the historical Christian view of man. Pattison describes accurately the over-reaction of the church to Freud:

Freud's theories were flatly rejected by many Christians because they misunderstood his emphasis on the biological drives of human nature, while other psychoanalytic theories were accepted because they appeared more sympathetic to religion and Christian concepts. No discrimination was made between Freud's personal religious views (agnostic but not amoral), his significant clinical discoveries (the importance of biology and interdependence of mind and body), and his metaphysical speculations on man and society (interesting but myopic) (Pattison, 1972, pp. 188-189).

The second possible reason why orthodox Christianity did not maintain an adequate psychological perspective in the twentieth century was its reaction to theological liberalism. Liberal theology accepted as a whole the findings of modern science and historical study. These findings, especially in their evolutionistic emphasis, often contradicted the views of historic Christianity. In reaction to this liberal emphasis in theology, orthodox Christianity at the turn of the century began to concentrate in only one area, the defense of the faith. Thus, the church's previous interest in the field of psychology tended to deteriorate rapidly. Unfortunately, this isolation of apologetics as its predominant area of inquiry resulted not only in Christianity's losing its psychological emphasis but also in Christianity's broader scholastic concerns suffering as well.

CONCLUSION

There are two conclusions that I would like to draw from our previous study: The first is due to the lack of a development of an adequate biblical psychology in the twentieth century. As a result of this inadequacy, Christianity's present understanding of psychology, anthropology, and the emotional needs of man, is, in general, grossly deficient. Although in the past few years much progress has been made in this area, Christianity is still lagging thirty or more years behind contemporary humans present understanding of the psychological needs of humans.

The second is in response to a question that was asked at the beginning of this paper. Does this study of psychology have a legitimate place within Christianity? From the scope of this present historical inquiry, I would say that this question can be answered in the affirmative. Christianity and psychology from an historical perspective do not stand in conflict with one another. Therefore, we can conclude that those who are actively attempting to integrate the findings of psychology with historic Christianity stand more in the tradition of orthodox Christianity than those who oppose this integration. The church should therefore be encouraged to return to its traditional biblical view toward the discipline of psychology, and to once again actively pursue the development of biblical psychology. As J. Oliver Buswell has said in his *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*,

An enormous amount of work has been done in the science of psychology since Delitzsch wrote, and all of this ought to be taken account of and evaluated in any adequate biblical psychology (Buswell, 1962, p. 238).

REFERENCES

Adams, Jay E. "Variant Opinions Expressed." *Psychological Studies Institute*

Bulletin, vol. 2, no. 1 (February, 1977), 3-4
 Andrews, Allen R. "Psychology as Scientism: Alienation by Objectivity, Part I: The Growth of the Scientific Outlook." *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, vol. 27, no. 2, (June, 1975)
 Buswell, James O. *A Systematic Theology of Christian Religion*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
 Carter, John D. and Richard J. Mohline. "The Nature and Scope of Integration: A Proposal." *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, vol. 4, no. 1 (Winter, 1976), pp. 3-14.
 Coleman, James C. *Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life*. 5th Edition. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1964.
 Delitzsch, Franz. *A System of Biblical Psychology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966 (originally published in 1855).
 Hyder, Quentin O. *The Christian's Handbook of Psychiatry*, New Jersey: Spire

Books, 1971.
 Jeeves, Malcolm A. *Psychology and Christianity: The View Both Ways*. Downers Grove, Ill. InterVarsity Press, 1976
 McNeill, John T. *A History of the Cure of Souls*, Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1951.
 Pattison, Mansell E. "Psychology," *Christ and the Modern Mind*, ed. by Robert W. Smith, Downers Grove, Ill., InterVarsity Press, 1972
 Sanderson, John W., Jr. *Encounter in the Non-Christian Era*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.
 Schaeffer, Francis A. *How Should We Then Live: The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture*, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1976
 Wish, Harvey. *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1967

MacGregor, Haroutunian and Family Therapy

George Fitchett

The Issue

One of the hallmarks of our modern culture is its worship of and its expectation of healing from practitioners of medical and scientific authority. The priest is no longer much sought out when healings or cures are desired, or even for guidance or advice in troubled times. As a result, practitioners of the various modalities of psychotherapy are called on for purposes of healing and moral guidance.

This shift has its manifestations in the life of the family. In the past families were embedded in the life of the local congregation. There, support and meaning in times of stress were provided by the congregations' celebration of the rites of passage and by its regular program of weekly worship, educational, and social activities. All this served to sustain the family in times of stress and to reinforce the value of the family as a social unit. With the changes that have influenced our culture's search for healing and meaning have come factors such as, industrialization, urbanization, and related changes in our social systems which have increased the stress on the modern family. When those stresses lead to breakdown in the family unit the modern healer is no longer the priest but the family therapist.

With all this there have been changes in the role of the clergy. Some have stood steadfastly by traditional rituals and attempted to infuse them with meaning. Others have felt the loss of authority to the scientific community and have attempted to regain it through immersion and training in the techniques of modern behavioral science. Thus, we have the rise and growth in membership of such groups as The American Association of Pastoral Counselors where role identity remains a chronic problem. Additionally, countless leaders of local congregations have sought training in T.A., depth psychology, Gestalt, and family therapy as a way to reinforce their sagging sense of authority. Clebsch and Jaekle have commented on the result of this search. "Faced with an urgency for some system by which to conceptualize the human condition and to deal with the modern grandeurs and terrors of the human spirit, theoreticians of the cure of souls have too readily adopted the leading academic psychologies. Having no pastoral theology to inform our psychology or even to identify the cure of souls as a mode of human helping, we have allowed psychoanalytic thought, for example, to dominate the vocabulary of the spirit." (p. XII).

From the side of the secular psychotherapist there is also identity confusion. Halmos in studying the theory and practice of a variety of therapeutic practitioners argues, "The counselor applies himself in a way which suggests a set of convictions, a powerful mood, a moral stance, a faith. To call this exercise an outcome of faith is, I believe, well warranted for it has many of the characteristics of human experience and behaviour with which we associate the notion of faith" (p. 7). Commenting more specifically on psychoanalysis Kramer similarly asks his colleagues if they function as

scientists or as "latter-day moral philosophers? If as moral philosophers, hadn't we better say so, at least to ourselves?" (p. 442). Jerome Frank's work also outlines the common features of religious and psychotherapeutic aid for demoralized persons.

Aside from Sander's article, there has been little exploration of the particular way in which family therapy and religion are similar and/or different. With this in mind we have compared Robert MacGregor's team-family method of family therapy with Joseph Haroutunian's theology of the church and found four significant similarities. They share a common understanding of human nature as relational, of human vulnerability as isolation, of the therapeutic processes as reunion, and of human fulfillment as communion. MacGregor's team-family method while not a popular form of family therapy is representative of the systems approach to family treatment. Haroutunian's theology of the church, which he refers to as communion, is unique in some aspects but for our purposes here it can be taken as representative of Protestant ecclesiology.

The comparison was made using a conceptual framework developed by Howard and Orlinsky for the analysis of the cultural beliefs and values which are used to rationalize therapeutic practice. Such beliefs and values are seen as providing psychotherapeutic consumers and practitioners with a guidance system and a legitimating ideology. Four questions which are part of their analytic framework were used in the comparison.

1. What is their understanding of the nature of human existence, human nature?
2. What is their understanding of how we become broken or ill, human vulnerability?
3. What is their understanding of the healing process, therapeutic operations?
4. What is their understanding of the goal of treatment, human fulfillment?

These questions are applied to the work of MacGregor and Haroutunian and the similarities and differences are presented.

HUMAN NATURE: RELATIONAL

Consistent with the approach of most family therapists MacGregor knows human nature from a systems perspective. The individual is a subsystem within the larger system of the family. The family is a subsystem within the larger system of the community. Human nature is not described in terms of the individual and his/her internal drives and forces, but in terms of interpersonal relationships. "The family provides the setting within which the individual becomes a person" (p. 79).

To illustrate, the team members interpret to the family "that the offending behavior in the adolescent is relevant to the circumstances encountered in the home and community" (MacGregor, p. xvii). In fact, for MacGregor it is