
INTEGRATION DISCOURSE: MODERN AND POSTMODERN

AL DUECK

*Graduate School of Psychology
Fuller Theological Seminary*

THOMAS D. PARSONS

*Graduate School of Psychology
Fuller Theological Seminary*

Psychologists and theologians are culture bound beings whose construals take place within history such that traces of the social context flow into their scholarly dialogue. The authors argue for the legitimacy of diverse voices – modern and postmodern – as they emerge in a sample of theologies and psychologies. It is proposed that conscious and unconscious precommitments to modern and postmodern assumptions shape the dialogue between psychologists and theologians. Three criteria will be used to differentiate discourses: epistemological foundationalism, autonomous individuality and the universality of scientific knowledge. While each discourse may limit the way spirituality is expressed, the authors argue that the differences in discourse should be recognized and explored.

The relationship between culture and language is complex. We learn language within culture and so the grammar of a culture's values is reflected in discourse. Societies that value gender equality also value gendered discourse. Conversely, language shapes the contours of culture as well (Whorf, 1956). As psychologists and theologians we are culture-bound and culture-creating beings. Whether the subject of our reflection is the God beyond history or the mystery of the human psyche, our thinking takes place within history, tradition and language. Traces of the social and linguistic context flow into our construals. Hence our creations are principally interpretable from within traditions. Gadamer (1975/2000) reminded us that to understand requires a horizon within which our perceptions and interpretations can take on meaning. MacIn-

tyre (1988) has similarly maintained that meaning emerges in the context of traditions.

It is an act of scholarly humility to recognize the finite nature of our efforts, the limits of language and the historical containment of imagination. The enterprise of integrating faith and psychology often appears ahistorical, a matter of relating the content of two disciplines without regard to the implicit ways the disciplines have been culturally shaped. Quite apart from the issue of which psychology can be correlated with which theology (Bouma-Prediger, 1990), there is a deeper question of *what cultures are shaping the discourse within each scholarly community and between communities.*

While the categories are too broad, the definitions often conflicted and the time-lines vague, nonetheless pre-modernity, modernity and postmodernity are useful markers of larger socio-cultural movements. We speak of 'movements' because neither modernity nor postmodernity are monolithic cultures (Tanner, 1997). Postmodernity, in particular, lacks consistency and at times appears to be primarily a reaction to modernity. In any case, to the extent that each achieves a measure of coherence as a culture or subculture, our discourse may unconsciously be influenced. Furthermore, in a self-conscious manner, we may seek to communicate to individuals within and across any one of these cultures. For example, a modern therapist may seek to communicate with a person from premodern or postmodern cultures.

We will argue for the legitimacy of voices in modern and postmodern register as they emerge in a sample of theologies and psychologies. We propose that conscious and unconscious precommitments to modern and postmodern assumptions shape the dialogue between psychologists and theologians. While each discourse may limit the way spirituality is expressed, we will argue that

The authors are grateful to the following for their comments on earlier drafts of this essay: Todd Hall, Richard Gorsuch, Randall Sorenson and several anonymous reviewers. Correspondence concerning this article may sent to Al Dueck, PhD, Graduate School of Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary, 180 N. Oakland Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101. E mail: adueck@fuller.edu

the differences in discourse should be recognized and explored. We will not argue that at this point we must choose between the versions presented of modern or postmodern cultures and their correlative integration discourses. We would affirm both realist and constructivist discourses, both individual and community orientations, both particular and universal perspectives.

For several reasons our concern is not which integration discourse is right, ideal or theologically correct. First, theologically we do not wish to 'baptize' either modern or postmodern cultures and the correlative integration discourses. The Good News of the Gospel has found root in many different cultures and we believe that the Reign of God can emerge in unique ways in premodern, modern or postmodern cultures. The confession that Christ is Lord is made in the midst of these cultures and is a response to them (Yoder, 1997).

Following Barth (1955) we assume that we need not choose between cosmologies, cultures, or anthropologies as a whole, but rather to recognize their relative strengths and weaknesses. Barth reviewed several major anthropologies (naturalistic, existential, noetic), critiqued each in terms of their inability to recognize "the human" from a Christological perspective and then argued that each was still useful. In like fashion, we seek neither to endorse nor condemn modern and postmodern sensibilities. It is the responsibility of Christian communities to assess a given discourse in terms of its helpfulness to and consistency with its own vision.

Secondly, affirmation of a diversity of traditions is more peaceable. Some thirty years ago Charles Taylor (1971/1992) called for a peaceful coexistence between scientific and hermeneutic psychologies. In some ways his dichotomy parallels the distinction between modern and postmodern discourses, and Taylor's sage advice is that there is a place for both models but it will require the more powerful partner to recognize the limits of its paradigm. Further, what is needed is not simply arms length toleration but a dialogue which enriches both partners. We would encourage a plurality of discourses (Feyerabend, 1975). In a larger political context, Stout (2004) has recently argued that in democratic societies some voices are given less credence and that what is critical is to enable all voices to be heard in the public square. He suggests that each tradition should be

given the freedom to give reasons for its proposal in their own tongue to translate as is necessary and to be open to the questioning of its conversation partners. It is then the task of the republic to adjust to the diversity of traditions, not the other way around. It is more peaceable.

Third, from a psychological and pastoral point of view, most of our clients and parishioners have functioned within a modernist framework for most of their lives. Another generation is now beginning to view the world differently. An important first step is to articulate the similarities and differences between the discourses and then to explore the gifts and limitations of each discourse. Our argument for not rejecting one discourse over another is then a pastoral one.

The structure of this essay is as follows. We begin with a brief explanation of discourse analysis. We then discuss the ways in which integration discourses are and can be constructed on the basis of pre-commitments to modernity or postmodernity. We begin with a brief analysis of two foundationalisms of modernity (reason and experience) and then illustrate how foundationalist discourse emerges in both conservative and liberal theologies, contemporary psychology, and integration models. We then outline the effect of postmodern assumptions on theological and psychological perspectives and illustrate the trajectory for integration discourse.

Integration Discourse

Throughout this paper we will present both modernity and postmodernity as forms of discourse. Although we grant that we know better the vocabulary and grammar of modernity, it is possible to discern the outlines of a variety of postmodern dialects. In doing so we follow Wittgenstein (1958) who argued that the meaning of a word is dependent on a community of language users. The later Wittgenstein's (1958) *Philosophical Investigations* illustrates this linguistic self. He completely rejected a positivistic conception of words and maintained that language use is a constituent of "language games" which make up a community's "form of life". Human meaning emerges out of the unique uses given to specific words in a communal context. Language (and its uses) is rule governed; there is a grammar that shapes a language. Grammar is not simply agreement of plural subjects with plural verbs but more

abstract. The meaning of a proposition is found in the set of rules governing the use of the expression in practice. These rules are merely useful for the particular applications in which a community applies them or they are not. An example might be to assume that the human self could be spoken of apart from the body.

Disciplines, like tribal languages, are examples of language games (Dueck, 2002). The rules (or grammar) that shape a language game may differ from one language community to another. It is then exceedingly difficult to engage in conversation across language communities (theology and psychology) because there is no standpoint beyond the language communities from which one can engage in conversation. One cannot know in advance the commensurability of two language games. Such a language-sensitive approach to integration will involve careful linguistic analyses sensitive to both modern and postmodern cultures.

Integrative discourse, we propose, takes on different forms if the participants in the dialogue are committed to either modern or postmodern linguistic traditions. If one of the two partners in the dialogue between theology and psychology represents one version of modernity and the other a unique postmodern narrative, it is difficult to image a meaningful dialogue. Psychologists and theologians committed to one form of modernism, classical foundationalism (the idea that we must have certain self-evident and apodictic truths for knowledge claims), may fail in their attempts to converse with psychologists and theologians representing a variety of postmodern perspectives. Similarly postmodern psychologists with their epistemological commitments may find modernist theological discourse confusing. While there are mediating positions philosophically between modernity and postmodernity, we have gravitated toward those construals most prevalent in the theological and psychological communities.

INTEGRATION DISCOURSE IN THE MODERNIST TRADITION

With the demise of the medieval world the need surfaced for self-evident truths (foundations) from which a new worldview could be constructed. Modernity is a period that resulted from challenges to the perceived authoritarianism of

religion and the superstitious nature of premodern beliefs. Jeffrey Stout (1988) has referred to modernity's disavowal of traditional worldviews as a "flight from authority." Modernists replaced what they perceived to be a superstitious medieval worldview with a "foundation" on which to construct a social consensus. Most scholars consider modernity and its conceptualization of knowledge to be a product of the Enlightenment, in which, the principal motifs include the autonomy of the human subject, the cumulative nature of knowledge, and the possibility of correspondence between word and object.

The most articulate spokesperson for classical foundationalism was René Descartes (1637/1978) who believed that if one could hypothesize something "clearly and distinctly," one could have certainty of its veracity and build the rest of one's knowledge upon it. For Descartes a system of beliefs (i.e., knowledge) can be conceived of as being like a building. This system of beliefs like any stable construction needs a foundation. Descartes felt a need to replace the unstable foundation found in the old building of tradition with the more stable foundation of indubitable beliefs. Stephen Toulmin (1990) has argued that Descartes' search for foundations emerged during thirty years of religious wars (1618-1648). What could replace warring traditions and create a unifying foundation? That which could not be doubted was the fact that there is one who doubts. Since doubting is a form of thinking—*cogito ergo sum*—reason became the new foundation. According to Toulmin, modernity emerged from Renaissance humanism and Descartes' plea for "decontextualized rationalism."

Foundationalism has developed beyond that proposed by Descartes to include modifications by John Locke and Thomas Reid. Locke (1707/1961) rejected Descartes' formulation of one's foundational or basic beliefs as consisting in innate ideas from which one deduces other beliefs. Instead, Locke asserted a form of empiricism, in which the foundation for one's knowledge lies in observation, from which one may induce conclusions. While Descartes believed that properly basic and foundational beliefs are either self-evident or about one's own immediate states of consciousness (evidential relation between beliefs is deductive), Locke views the evidential relation between beliefs to be probabilistic and

seems in places to include evidence from the senses. The resulting foundationalism includes properly basic beliefs that are resistant to doubt or error.

Thomas Reid (1788/1983) extended the range of foundational or basic propositions considerably beyond what is allowable in the Cartesian tradition. Reid's "modest foundationalism" does not make claims about infallibility of one's foundations (basic beliefs) or about a need to know of which beliefs are foundational (basic). Instead of claiming that one's foundations (basic beliefs) are certain, Reid and the modest foundationists believe that such beliefs can be made ineffective. However, the beliefs are treated as foundational unless one has good reasons for thinking that they have been shown to be untenable (Wood, 1998). Reid's "modest foundationalism" has been lauded by G. E. Moore early in the century, and more recently by Christian philosophers such as William Alston (1991) and Alvin Plantinga (1993a, 1993b, 2000).

Although some contemporary epistemologists accept a modest emphasis upon foundations, much of conservative theology and contemporary psychology readily adopted foundationalism for their projects of providing sure knowledge. Regardless of the form of foundationalism, there tends to be an emphasis upon the truth value of individual propositions; a proposition is declared to be "veridical" if and only if it corresponds with some foundation (a correspondence theory of truth).

Hence, modernity emphasizes a search for that which is veridical, and finds certainty in objective notions of reality. For example, the logical positivists of the Vienna Circle developed a "verificationist" perspective that built from sense data to facts about the world and was dedicated to the view that empiricism exhausts genuine knowledge. This approach was reflected in their theory of language, which limited meaning to reference—the meaning of words lies in the absolute correspondence to the facts described. Language references reality and different words describe different realities. For the modernists, "verification" would mean the words describe a given reality accurately.

Modernist discourse, whether spoken by psychologists or theologians, tends to (a) use the language of a certain foundation on which knowledge

can be constructed, (b) endorse the language of an autonomous and expressive individual who takes precedence over sociality, and (c) affirm that which is universal over that which is particular. First, modernists tend to follow the Newtonian model of a stable, external, and objective order (Rorty, 1967, 1979, 1991a). The discourse is realist in nature. Scientific knowledge is "grounded in data that are intersubjectively univocal" (Taylor, 1992, p. 70). The resulting knowledge is representational and a theory is considered true when there is consensus that it accurately reflects an external reality. As a result, subject/object and fact/value distinctions are acceptable to modernists.

Second, the individual is considered sacrosanct. The resources for change, the locus of responsibility and the center of spirituality all reside within the individual. The modernist's understanding of self reveals an isolated self that can trust his or her intuitions apart from tradition (Taylor, 1989).

Third, the emphasis on the universal is evident in the assumption that human nature is constant and that truth is ahistorical and acultural. Like the structure of language (Jakobson & Halle, 2002), moral principles of justice and individual rights are presumed to be universal (Rawls, 1971). The products of abstract rationality and scientific reason are universally applicable. Among religionists it is apparent in the belief that there are core spiritual experiences across all humanity and that regardless of the particularities, there is a universal structure to religions.

Theologies as Modern

Theology constructed within a particular culture may well reflect that culture and it appears that Western theologies have clearly been shaped by the emergence of modernity as a culture. Mark Noll (1985) and George Marsden (1980) have pointed out the profound influence of the Scottish school of Common Sense Realism on Evangelical theology. Noll (1985) quotes R. A. Torrey as calling for the use of modern methods of science in biblical studies. Greer (2003) suggests that modernist commitments are apparent in theological conservatism in its commitment to evidentialist apologetics, the assumption that theological conclusions can be drawn from neutral facts. He points out, furthermore, that modernism appears in theology when it presumes to discover what is timeless and changeless. Demarest and Lewis (1996) view the theological task as amassing true statements, factual propositions. The truth is

ahistorical and acultural.

Nancey Murphy (1996) has argued that a modernist epistemology can be found in *both* conservative and liberal theologies. Conservatives have emphasized God's transcendent intervention into the world of natural and human affairs while liberal theologians have focused on God's immanence in human experience. For the conservative theologian, revelation is a representational account of heavenly realities. For the liberal theologian, revelation is correlative to human discovery; God is disclosed through genuine human means. According to Murphy, the conservative's use of scripture is an attempt to provide unassailable foundations from which to begin constructing the theological edifice. Conservatives treat scripture as foundational "acts of God, not of human discovery, and emphasize the factual character of their contents." Further, for the conservative, "Scripture provides precise and true accounts of supernatural realities" (p. 97). On the other hand, liberals, Murphy asserts, view "Scripture as belonging to a class of writings that express, with different degrees of aptness, insights regarding God and human life that arise from religious experience" (p. 97). So liberals assume religious experience is foundational while conservatives turn to scripture. Both treat their foundations as sources of universal truth.

Murphy has argued that the epistemology of conservative theologians is "outside - in." It begins with an agreed upon external reality. For the conservative, theology is the science of God (see for example Strong, 1907). The objective fact of revelation is the ground of theology. Scripture becomes an inerrant, indubitable foundation for theological construction (Bloesch, 1978). The role of human experience is then secondary to the primary role of scripture in the theological enterprise.

The epistemology of the liberal theologian, on the other hand, is "inside - out," Murphy suggests. Murphy (1996) uses Schleiermacher (1799/1976) as an example. He began his theological construction on the foundation of "awareness of absolute dependence". Such a consciousness of God was assumed to be universal. Theological constructions such as doctrines were then tested by this experience (Kaufman, 1996; Tracy, 1978, 1981). In this approach we begin with experience as described in ordinary language. The test of adequacy is the acceptability of the theological con-

struction in the larger public rather than a particular religious body.

The nature of religious language for the conservative tends to be propositional while that of the liberal is expressivist. Like the scientist, the conservative hopes that theory will match or correspond to reality. The liberal assumes a consensus on reality is impossible but that we can begin with our common human experiences. The conservative sees more potential in overlap between science and theology than does the liberal.

Thus it can be argued that both modern conservative and liberal theologians are foundationalist in their approach—both essentially modernist in discourse. The theological language that emerges from each of these foundations perceives God's activity in the world differently. The conservative discourse focuses on the God who intervenes in nature and history (transcendentalism). The liberal discourse emphasizes how God acts in and through nature (immanentism). The dilemma we are left with is how to get from inward experience to God beyond human experience, or from God as objective to inner human experience.

While we have not demonstrated conclusively that conservative theology is modernist, there are a number of voices making that case. They suggest that there is some confirmation that extant theologies reflect our three criteria for modernism: foundationalism, expressive individualism and the universal validity/reliability of scientific knowledge.

Psychologies as Modern

Since the beginning of the last century, the academic discipline of psychology has been constructed on the sure foundation of an objective reality that can be rationally comprehended. On the one hand, with its emphasis upon a falsificationist research design that uses random samples, operationally defined variables, and statistical analysis, psychology is clearly positivist. As a result, an area of psychology like psychoanalysis cannot claim to have scientific status because it is not genuinely predictive (Popper, 1959). Psychoanalytic theories by their nature are insufficiently precise to have negative implications, and so are immune from experimental falsification.

On the other hand, there is in modern psychologies the Romanticist's commitment to primacy of personal experience. Like nature, one

can trust the inner core of the human. What is needed is the removal of the shackles of tradition and the encouragement to personal expression and imagination (Taylor, 1989). There continues to exist psychological discourse in the modernist perspective where the individual is to be viewed as an isolated self with a private language (Cushman, 1995; Dueck, 1995).

Consistent with the ethos of modernity, much of current clinical psychology focuses on a scientist/practitioner model as a significant foundation for the proficiencies, values, and progress of the profession. Following the Boulder conference on Graduate Education in Clinical Psychology (see Benjamin & Baker, 2000), some psychologists called for a greater emphasis to be placed upon directly integrating science and practice (Shapiro, 1967). The model was of a clinician working scientifically. This emphasis has been reflected in the American Psychological Association's interest in promoting the awareness and use of empirically supported treatments as part of a broader movement that was initially known as evidence-based medicine (Sackett et al., 1997). Increasingly clinical psychology emphasizes the use of validated methods of assessment or treatment. In situations where validated assessments are lacking, the modern clinician applies a systematic approach of observation, hypothesis formation, hypothesis testing, and hypothesis evaluation (scientific method) to the individual patient. Within modernist oriented psychology, there is an emphasis upon evidence-based approaches in which formal evidential criteria are employed to draw up lists of empirically supported treatments (Chambless & Ollendick, 2001). Modernist psychology carefully defines the therapy or therapies in the form of a treatment manual, which acts as a statement of the principles and procedures of a psychological intervention (Kendall & Chambless, 1998; Kendall, Chu, Gifford, Hayes, & Nauta, 1998).

Few would question that current psychology is modernist in nature. Our three criteria for modernism (foundationalism, expressive individualism, and universal knowledge) appear to be acknowledged and affirmed. Given the long road to scientific respectability, psychologists will be reluctant to trade in their hard won reputation for the apparent subjectivism and relativism of postmodern pundits.

Modernist Integration

If both our theology and psychology are shaped by modernity, we might well expect that integrative discourse will reflect that perspective. A modernist theology comports well with a modernist psychology constructed on individual reason and experience. When theology is a rational process of ordering propositional truth and scientific psychology is a development of generalizable propositions about reality, then epistemologically there is considerable compatibility. Integrative research has then a clear directive—constructing a body of knowledge that is fair to each discipline, that recognizes differences and that finds consistencies or overlap. Much of the integration literature in the modernist paradigm aims at developing a unified body of knowledge in which propositional truth can be corroborated in scientific findings. Here again we find the three criteria for modernism: foundationalism, individual expressivity, and the reliability of the scientific method for producing universal knowledge.

The emphasis upon experimental falsification in Western culture has served to marginalize integrationists from the rest of psychology. Scientism relegated religion to the realm of the non-factual. When psychological science is the foundation, religion is then either, at worst, irrelevant, or at best, complementary. Integration in modernist perspective is exemplified in research that seeks to demonstrate the veracity of biblical teaching in relationship to a more culturally acceptable form of discourse—standard scientific protocol. Referring to the research of Larson & Larson (1994), Gorsuch (2002a) states:

The scientific evidence for the validity of the Bible lies in the meshing of its teachings with the human condition. Under the hypothesis that the God who created us is also the God who gave us the Bible, it would be a good guide to maximize human health and happiness. And so it seems to be. At the recent conference on Spirituality and Health, scientists knowledgeable in their fields concluded that U.S. Christians have better physical health than U.S. non-Christians. (p. 72)

In the past decade religious research psychologists have demonstrated a positive link between religion and health (Pargament, 1997; Koenig, 1998; Koenig, McCullough, & Larson, 2001). Religiosity is accompanied by fewer mental health problems and less substance abuse (Gorsuch, 1995). In a well-known and oft-quoted study, Rebecca Propst and her colleagues (Propst, Ostrom, Watkins, Dean, & Mashburn, 1992)

demonstrated that those patients receiving religious cognitive therapy or pastoral counseling scored lower on measures of depression. Furthermore, there was greater social adjustment and reduced general symptomatology for religious individuals receiving religious cognitive therapy. In a modernist model of integration, religion is the independent variable with physical and psychological health as the dependent variable.

Gorsuch (2002a, 2000b) focuses explicitly on relationships between theology and psychology and some of his writing illustrates integrationist discourse in a modernist register. He accepts psychology as a scientific discipline that discovers the truth of God's order in nature and human nature. He defines science as replicable data consistencies. Such a view seems to assume that the world observed is stable since God is the same yesterday, today and tomorrow (Hebrews 13:8). Science cannot depend on capricious deities. Consistent with the prescription in Genesis to have dominion over the created world (1:28), the relationship between persons and the world is one of control. Psychology tells us much about how God created us to live and it can research the best way to live so as to maximize our spirituality.

Gorsuch's model defines the disciplines of psychology and theology/spirituality as separate but complementary. On the one hand psychology is a science capable of predicting human behavior. The result of a scientific psychology that carefully replicates its findings is the establishment of an objective fact. Subjectivity means lack of agreement and hence phenomenological analyses are not appropriate for science. Spirituality, on the other hand, is the "quest for understanding ourselves in relationship to our view of ultimate reality, and to live in accordance with that understanding" (2002a, p. 8). For Gorsuch spirituality and theology demand a different epistemology, that of the humanities. Scientific psychology takes the physical sciences as foundational while in theology and the humanities, knowledge is constructed on personal human experience, history, biography and literature. The sciences are nomothetic, seeking basic principles that govern all situations while the humanities, including theology, are idiographic, concerned with what is unique. He accepts both models of knowledge but they are separate since "...scientific paradigms must meet scientific criteria and spirituality paradigms must

meet spiritual criteria" (2002a, p. 49). Integration is for Gorsuch interdisciplinary dialogue on a common subject or problem (2002a); it is the integration of two trusted bodies of knowledge.

Both science and religion deal with truths; truths that, because they ultimately are all based in personal experience, can enter into dialogue with each other. But they are not the same, which is why both are needed. Together, they can provide a theological approach to humanity that more adequately addresses the complexity of being human (Gorsuch 2002b, p. 1838).

He proposes no single model of integration and eschews reductionism of one to the other. In interdisciplinary work, one role of a discipline is to comment or make suggestions to the other. Neither dictates to the other but each learns about its own tasks by listening to the other. Science can only describe and is not prescriptive. Hence it has no basis for making pronouncements about the nature of evil.

Integration research can reflect modernist assumptions in a variety of ways. Research results are assumed to be objective and generalizable, descriptive and explanatory. The language tends to be representational and the research design assumes a correspondence between word and reality. Words are presumed to point to stable, objective reality. The relationship between a religious intervention and its effect is assumed to be causal.

Integrative discourse in modernist mode reflects the pre-commitments to the culture it addresses, whether consciously or unconsciously. It is a discourse that for many emerging Christian social scientists continues to encourage dialogue with a profoundly modern, secular discipline. Modernity is our dominant cultural discourse and one way to construe integration research is as an attempt to be faithful to one's Christian convictions within that social reality.

Since different discourses usefully serve different cultural purposes, we do not support a wholesale rejection of modernist discourse. The realist discourse of modernity is "essential to the achievement of complex forms of human coordination" whether in aviation, medicine or psychology (Gergen, 2001a, p. 18). In these contexts we share a common language about reality and common practices related to this language.

Realist discourse is a language of mutual trust; it unites participants in a way that promotes order and predictability. At the same time, such discourse also functions as an instrument of control. It cordons the domain of possibility and thus favours forces of conservatism and the institutional status quo. It pro-

motes distrust of all those who do not share the conventions of understanding (2001a, p. 18).

We believe realist discourse has an important role to play in integrative discourse but there are some clear limitations. First, there is a tendency for realist traditions to reify the social *status quo*. It is most susceptible to becoming mechanistic, reductionist, and deterministic (Cushman, 1995; Richardson, Fowers, & Guignon, 1999). Second, objectivist approaches are less sensitive to mystery, miracle and meaning. Wendell Berry (2001) comments:

The problem, as it appears to me, is that we are using the wrong language. The language we use to speak of the world and its creatures, including ourselves, has gained a certain analytical power (along with a lot of expertish pomp) but has lost much of its power to designate *what* is being analyzed or to convey any respect or care or affection or devotion toward it. As a result we have a lot of genuinely concerned people calling upon us to "save" a world which their language simultaneously reduces to an assemblage of perfectly featureless and dispirited "ecosystems," "organisms," "environments," "mechanisms," and the like. It is impossible to prefigure the salvation of the world in the same language by which the world has been dismembered and defaced. (p. 8)

Further, there has been a concern raised that modernity shrinks religion to its needs and research adapts religion to its parameters. Religion then becomes instrumentalized, useful for healing (Shuman & Meador, 2003).

POSTMODERN ASSUMPTIONS AND INTEGRATION DISCOURSE

Postmodernity is another and different cultural discourse, one we think does exist and will continue to exist concurrently with modernity. Postmodernism has been described as a reaction that developed in the past century to certain presuppositions of the Western tradition. What moderns accepted, postmoderns seem to question. In part, postmodernity is a reaction to the modernist faith in foundations, individuality, the possibility of universal, objective truth, and the inevitable progress of science. While postmoderns are a varied collection of theorists, generally, they begin neither with a form of foundationalism nor with the autonomous, expressive self. In spite of their clear opposition, we argue that both voices deserve to be heard and considered.

First, in epistemology, postmoderns assert that there is no independent, human viewpoint from which to begin, one that transcends all particularities, a view from nowhere (Nagel, 1986). Reality is con-

structed more than it is discovered. The representational correspondence between words and objects is not to be considered univocal; instead, our observations are mediated linguistic performances socially constructed by communities of speakers. From current postmodern perspectives, it is generally assumed that the foundationalist epistemology of neutrality and objectivity in the human sciences is untenable (Gadamer, 1975/2000; Bernstein, 1983; Taylor, 1989). Scientific praxes occur within a scientific community that cannot perform its undertakings without some set of historically received beliefs. According to Thomas Kuhn (1970), scientific knowledge changes, not through confrontation with the hard facts, but by a social struggle between contending interpretations of intrinsically ambiguous evidence. Although Kuhn hardly mentioned truth as a concern of science, many of the new hermeneuticists (Feyerabend, 1991; Derrida, 1987; Foucault, 1972) rejected the possibility of any kind of universal, objective "truth." Instead, all of science is considered to be interpretation. "Reality" is only accessible to persons in terms of how persons understand and interpret it. Thus, if there is no "reality" to be independently compared with a persons knowledge, all one can do is oppose one interpretation to another, and each of these is ultimately going to be as well motivated by the "facts" as any other. Richard Rorty (1988, 1991a, 1991b, 1998) asserts that persons must reject the quest for the "true picture" of reality. There are no foundational pieces of knowledge.

Second, the notion of the autonomous, expressive self is severely critiqued in postmodern circles. Wittgenstein (1958) pointed out that if persons did indeed have private inner experiences, it should be possible to represent them in a corresponding language. On detailed examination, however, he concluded that the very notion of such a private language is utterly nonsensical. Wittgenstein utilized the illustration of a human being experiencing pain to make his point. If any of one's experiences were entirely private, then the pain that one perceived would surely be among them. Yet other people commonly are said to know when one is in pain. Indeed, Wittgenstein pointed out that one would never have learned the meaning of the word "pain" without the aid of other people, none of whom have access to the supposed private sensations of pain that one feels. For the word "pain" to have any meaning at all presupposes some sort of external

verification, a set of criteria for its correct application, and they must be accessible to others as well as to one's self. Thus, the traditional way of speaking about private experiences (pain) needs to be abandoned altogether.

Third, there are postmoderns who are more concerned to celebrate particularity and difference than universality and continuity. Hence the local is valorized; totalizing metanarratives are suspect (Lyotard, 1984). Lyotard and his fellow postmodernists argue that the postmodern individual is one who is suspicious of universal pronouncements. Space is created for the particular communities and the relational self. Levinas (1969, 1981/1998) argued that the other is not the sum of one's cognitive constructions. Moderns assumed that human nature is co-extensive with nature and that, beyond all appearance, there is a substrate of being that is common to all humanity. This commonality is capable of being observed, measured and described. Levinas charts a different course. That which confronts one is not being in general, but the specific face of another, a face that makes a demand on one rather than inviting one to discover an order in human nature. The face of the other is unique; it cannot be reduced to totalizing, ontic beingness. The temptation is to see the other as of the same substance as oneself. Levinas rejects all encounters with the other that reduce the person to what is universal, neutral or objective. The person who faces one is irreducible to categories, generalizations or essences.

It has also been argued that assumptions about universality mask issues of power. Postmoderns like Foucault (1980) analyze how universalized knowledge has served those in positions of power. The process of deconstruction can be used to reveal bureaucracies and theories developed for the purpose of controlling knowledge (Foucault, 1979; Fox & Prilleltensky, 1997). Foucault (1972, 1979, 1980) argued that conceptions of "truth" reflect the power structure of the given historical period in which they are formulated. Psychology and theology in the postmodern turn are then local symbolic systems of meaning, socially particular constructions.

Postmodern Theologies

A number of evangelical philosophers and theologians (Grenz, 2001; Hauerwas, Murphy, & Nation, 1994; Smith, 2000; Volf, 1998) embrace a nonfoundationalist approach. Grenz (2001) asks rhetorically whether we must "finally appeal to some court

beyond the Christian faith itself, some rational 'first principle' that supposedly carries universality? In the end, must we inevitably retreat to a foundationalist epistemology?" (p. 42). Together with other postmodern theologians, Grenz argues that modernity with its propositional systems of truth based on universal reason is coming to an end. The concern is less to develop timeless theologies but to develop unique theologies that are more situated within diverse and changing cultures. They view the demise of acultural theologies as an opportunity for Christian theology to reclaim its own voice (Grenz, 1998) while modern theology attempted to conform to secular standards of scientific "objectivity." There are postmodern theologians that critique pure reason and recognize that all thought is situated in specific cultural and linguistic systems (Milbank, 1990). Some postmodern theologians tend to be deconstructionist in that they believe that there can be no objective or absolute knowledge of the meaning of language, including the text of the Bible. Smith (2000) argues for a creational hermeneutic which allows for a plurality of interpretations. Although biblical interpretations can be meaningful and true, the interpretations are multiple (Lindbeck, 1984). Each of the gospels provides us with slightly different accounts of Jesus' life and the Scriptures include more than one view of atonement. While modern theology attempts to systematize the text into an absolute system, postmodern theologians, according to Ward (1997), make use of the "insights and analyses of postmodern thought to reread foundational Christian texts and, with reference to the Scripture, liturgy, and creeds, construct new Christian theologies in, through, and at the margins of postmodernism" (p. 586).

A number of postmodern theologians seek to balance the role of the individual with that of the community. Lindbeck (1984) argues, we should take a "cultural-linguistic" approach to religion, church, and doctrine, locating theology's roles within its community and narrative contexts. Volf (1996, 1998) explores this postmodern emphasis in the relationship between persons and community in theological discourse. According to Volf, the focus should be upon the "community of grace" instead of a modern emphasis upon individualism. As such, he endeavors to develop an understanding of the church that acknowledges both person and community. Similarly, Grenz (2001) focuses on the centrality of the church as the context for the nurturing of faith rather than faith as final product of doubting. The church

provides the lens through which faith is interpreted.

The reaction to universality is an emphasis on particularity. Though not a theologian, Levinas (1969) has profoundly influenced postmodern theologians. Levinas admits that his philosophy is a translation of his Jewish convictions. He has been tirelessly reminding us that God is mystery, which is other than being. All ontological descriptions of God fall short. By implication, ontological descriptions of the self are then similarly tainted. From his rejection of ontology as foundational emerges a different understanding of knowledge and ethics. The call of the other in the context of a face-to-face encounter makes a demand on the self and constitutes personal identity.

Postmodern Psychologies

Postmodernity makes us keenly aware of the historical and cultural location of the empiricist tradition in psychology. Psychological functioning is significantly embedded within the cultural milieu. Danziger (1997) comments: "Looking at psychological categories and concepts with a historical perspective runs directly counter to one of the most deeply embedded features of modern psychology: its ahistoricism" (p. 9). Postmodern psychologists challenge foundationalist assumptions regarding knowledge, objectivity, and truth. They place much greater emphasis upon the communal construction of knowledge, objectivity as being a relationally achieved, and language as a pragmatic medium through which local truths are constituted (Gergen, 2001b). For prominent postmodern psychologists such as Harlene Anderson (1997, 2001), John Shotter (1975, 1984, 1993a, 1993b) and Kenneth Gergen (1985, 1991, 1994a, 1994b, 1997), the "givens in reality" are reframed as social constructions. The latter would include our construals of beauty and the female body, health and disease, illness, suicide, gender, deviance, cognitive processes, anger, emotion, anorexia and bulimia, depression, foul and fragrant smell, mental development, multiple personality disorder, and boredom (Gergen, 2001a).

Some postmodern psychologists refer to their approach as "hermeneutic," following the work of Gadamer (1975/2000). In doing so they view the person as an interpreter of experience, as deeply immersed in a horizon of meaning. Clients coming to therapy are stuck in one way of constructing their world and successful therapy involves a fusion of alternative horizons. Martin and Sugarman (1997) view

the personal theoretical constructions of clients as embedded in sociocultural, historical contexts, and psychotherapy as an interpersonal, social context that might furnish material that clients might internalize, and that might lead to revisions in their personal theories. (p. 380)

Such a view of the human person precludes the more modern notion of a fixed human nature that transcends social contexts.

Postmodern psychotherapy appears different than modern psychotherapies. Modern approaches to psychotherapy tend to consist of grand metanarratives and systems created by individual theorists. Postmodern psychotherapists contend that the grand metanarrative theories developed in modernity are no longer helpful, if not actually harmful. They assert that the developers and sustainers of the grand metanarratives had to reduce their own theorizing into truncated and empirically verifiable manuals for publication. For the postmodern psychotherapist, the process of the conversation itself is more important than the reduction of therapy to an empirically verifiable system. Postmodern psychotherapists prefer dialogue in community, hearing what the authors have to say, instead of following what has been written in an empirically verifiable manual.

Postmodern Integrative Discourse

What are the contours of a postmodern approach to the dialogue between theology and psychology? We will use the work of Steven Sandage (Sandage, 1998; Shults & Sandage, 2003), Randall Sorenson (2004) and James Olthuis (2001) as examples of individuals who think it is possible to use the preferable aspects of the postmodern critique, while navigating through the disallowing aspects of postmodern relativism and over-reaching Christian metanarratives. There are evangelical integrationists who self-consciously move away from foundationalist epistemology, autonomous individuality and universalized knowledge claims. Increasingly one encounters an emphasis on community and particularity. Some begin confessionally from within the particularity of the Christian tradition and explore its implications for postmodern psychological practices.

Olthuis's (2001) work reflects a mosaic of postmodern themes. First, he eschews the modernist emphasis on control and technique. "Psychotherapy is modernism's therapeutic arm, the method designed to extend our mastery of the external world

into mastery of the internal one" (p. 30). Second, he argues that in a postmodern context psychotherapy must honor and nourish difference. He points out that the unity of truth has been purchased through violence. Third, in contrast to the individualism of modernity, his approach is relational and covenantal. Following Levinas, he calls for a psychology that is interconnected, that begins with responsibility rather than freedom. Fourth, in terms of integration, Olthuis calls for a radically spiritual psychology, one that is sensitive to mystery. Olthuis is prepared to think of psychological disorders as psychopathology but also in terms of the dynamics of evil. Fifth, following the work of Derrida (1990), Olthuis sees the first task of psychotherapy as an act of hospitality, of welcoming and blessing of those who come for counsel. He is more concerned that those who come for therapy are cared for and blessed than cured. Thus, the relationship between therapist and client is viewed less as expert and novice than as coach and fellow sufferer.

Given the criteria we have used so far in this essay for defining modernity and postmodernity, there is, first, a non-foundationalist theme that emerges in the postmodern integrationists we are focusing on. Rather than assuming a common foundation from which conversation can begin, postmodern integrationists think that conversation between disparate communities will be a more *ad hoc* procedure (Werpehowski, 1986). That is, on the basis of conversation, we can discover points of agreement about what is true or just and then enlarge on these agreements. For the postmodern integrationist, the term "postmodern" is viewed in the "constructive" sense developed by Toulmin (1982), as opposed to the deconstructive sense found in the writers on broader cultural and political issues (Jameson, 1991). By "constructive," we mean a "transformative" and/or "revisionary" postmodernism that endeavors to include communities and enliven traditions while a "deconstructive postmodernism" eliminates ideas like God and meaning.

Sorenson's (2004) approach to the integration of spirituality in therapy is strongly post-positivist and explicitly non-foundationalist. Methodologically he is pluralist, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches and affirming constructivist and narrative perspectives on psychotherapy. In contrast to a classic foundationalist perspective, Sorenson illustrates how impossible it is to prove from a culturally transcendent position what should be the starting point

for others based on reasons we can all accept in advance. It is possible to confess one's own position and welcome accountability and consistency within that framework.

Secondly, these integrationists tend to mirror the postmodern critique of the autonomous individual. Sandage (1998) has reviewed the nature of postmodern selfhood and outlines a Christian response. He affirms a hermeneutic of suspicion because of the role power plays in the construction of knowledge. The self in postmodernity is socially constructed and therapy is narrative, moral and political. He comments favorably on a postmodernism that understands the truly tragic dimension to life, that exposes the naive confidence of modernity in autonomous self-control and that reminds evangelicals that Christian selfhood must be historically and culturally situated. Sandage sees the cross of Jesus Christ as an appropriate response to Foucault's accusation of the collusion of power and knowledge. Furthermore, "The resurrection reconstitutes the self in the hope of this larger horizon for life and selfhood, and this proleptic promise of a communal telos enables us to tolerate His present hiddenness" (Sandage, p. 73).

Sandage, together with theologian Shults, (Shults & Sandage, 2003) examines forgiveness from a more postmodern perspective of "face." Consistent with Levinas, they reflect on forgiveness from a relational perspective, affirm a hermeneutical approach and recognize semantic differences in the meaning of forgiveness depending on the community in which the word is used. They note that "the philosophy of Levinas is consonant with our postmodern intersubjective understanding of forgiveness" (Shults & Sandage, p. 45). Hence they argue that forgiveness is an "intersubjective interaction of our own faces and the faces of others, including our offenders" (p. 41). Our faces give cues regarding the level of our forgiveness. Reading the face of the other in terms of interpersonal intentions they refer to as a "facial hermeneutics." Forgiveness is reconciliation, a seeking of the face of the other. Theologically, we seek the face of God, "the face that does not go away." The authors critique forgiveness as discussed in American theology and churches for being driven by a forensic model and "abstracted from the concrete practices of shared life together in community" (p. 104). When they focus on the face of God, they emphasize the mysterious, the invitation to seek the face of God, the ubiquitous presence of God. Following Levinas, they note that

Jacob says to Esau, "for truly to see your face is like seeing the face of God - since you have received me with such favor" (Genesis 33:10). In the face of Jesus we see the Father (John 14:9). Interestingly, Shults and Sandage do not conclude the book with a theoretically integrated model of forgiveness that is both psychological and theological. Instead they close with two case studies in which both perspectives are expressed but without a theoretical integration except insofar as face and forgiveness are common to both interpretative frameworks.

The third postmodern theme that appears in the integrative perspectives being reviewed here is that they appear to be more confessional, assuming that there is no universal, conviction-free place from which to evaluate the disciplines of theology and psychology. It is possible to state confessionally one's point of departure. A postmodern commitment to pluralism permits us to affirm the Christian tradition as that community which shapes the grammar of our language and praxis as psychologists. Sorenson (2004) illustrates this trend when he is explicit about his theological and personal, confessional starting point. He writes as a clinical psychoanalyst who encourages his peers to mind spirituality in their practice from a postmodern perspective. Unabashedly, he proposes that as therapists we "take an interest in our patients' spirituality that is respectful but not diffident, curious but not reductionistic, welcoming but not indoctrinating" (Sorenson, p. 1). Sorenson writes as a confessing Christian not only because that is his tradition and what he knows best, but also because belonging to a tradition is a precondition for dialogue (rather than, as modernity presupposes, an impediment to dialogue by being "biased"). Writing for the larger public and fellow psychoanalysts, Sorenson states explicitly that the hymn found in the letter to the Philippians (2:6-11) is paradigmatic for understanding a kenotic relationship with clients. The example of Christ's self-emptying shapes his understanding of therapy as a form of 'soul donorship' by the therapist to the client.

As Sorenson proceeds he makes a case for integration that pays more attention to the languages that are being "integrated." He points out that his "goal is not to spiritualize psychoanalysis, to psychoanalyze spirituality, or to harmonize or minimize differences by subsuming one discipline into the other, but rather to let each stand in genuine conversation with the other and to welcome ongoing difference" (2004, p. 26). Such an

approach would eschew reductionist approaches to the integration of psychology and theology and allow for the integrity of each discipline in its own right. Psychological theories and theological approaches provide us with two very different universes of discourse. The language games or rules that shape them seem very different. Hence the reduction of one language to the other would be neither possible nor encouraged.

At times Evangelical psychologists appear paranoid about postmodern views. Granted there are forms of postmodernism which encourage a pluralism that leads to a complete relativism and nihilism. One might point to the possibly corrosive effects of postmodern perspectives in terms of its antisubjectivism, arbitrariness, and relativism. We would suggest that a postmodern commitment to particularity affords Christians an opportunity to be quite public about their thoughts and actions related to issues of faith and integration. Constructivist discourse can be "...a liberating agent, challenging the taken-for-granted and opening new realms of comprehension and action. Yet, in doing so it also undermines the legitimacy of precious traditions, along with the practices of complex coordination and dispositions of mutual trust" (Gergen, 2001a, p. 18).

As might be expected, postmodern discourse is critiqued for its dismissal of the discourse of reality but, as we suggested above, realist discourse may be a gift of modernity. Realism is still part of everyday discourse and creates a sense of commonality (Billig et al., 1988). It is the basis of complex forms of human coordination from assessing neurological injury to developing a learning plan for a learning disabled child. The language of a common reality promotes order and predictability; it favors unity and social solidarity. Even an avowed postmodern such as Gergen (2001a) admits that realist discourse is needed alongside the language of constructivism. The plurality of languages in a contemporary society includes the modernist discourse of reality. Postmodernists who celebrate pluralism need not reject the language of "reality." Religious postmoderns might argue that the language of reality is helpful in understanding how Christianity is not simply an idea, that God is not only spirit and that the Christian life is profoundly practical.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted to make two points. First, there are a plurality of cultural voices and that modern and postmodern discourses each deserve attention and careful assessment. Secondly, we have suggested that there is a semantic and grammatical coherence in theological and psychological reflections that reflect larger modern and postmodern discourses. The discourse of integrationists we have reviewed who endorse postmodern perspectives appears different from those who do so from a more explicitly modernist point of view. The former emphasize difference rather than continuity, confessional particularity rather than universality, methodological plurality rather than one method, relationality over the individual self, mystery over certainty.

Must we choose between modern and postmodern subcultures, practices, discourses, or epistemologies? We think not. While the philosophical presuppositions which drive these discourses are radically different, we argue for their retention and viability. Psychologists continue to live in a pluralist world. Martin and Sugarman (2000) comment:

At the same time as psychologists and educators resonate to postmodern themes of difference, plurality, peculiarity, and irregularity as refreshing changes from past adherence to sameness, universality, and strict rationality, they actually maintain many time-honored views of themselves and continue to believe in some version of progressive, warranted enlightenment as afforded by their developing, changing understanding. In effect, having labored within the straightjacket of modernity, they enjoy the ludic romp of postmodernism's radical problematizing without really believing its full social constructionist and deconstructivist implications for themselves and their everyday and professional practices. (p. 397)

Gergen (2001a) has argued forcefully that realist and constructivist theories are both useful forms of discourses. We use language to negotiate daily life whether we take a realist or constructivist stance, are modern or postmodern in orientation.

To the extent that such discourses are useful for various groups, we are also positioned to see them as cultural resources, modes of intelligibility developed within certain cultural traditions and now adding to the contemporary cultural repertoire. In this frame we can explore more pointedly the situated utility of both such discourses. This analysis, in turn, may yield a new range of options for going on together. (Gergen, p. 15)

The dual vocabularies of modernity and postmodernity exist side by side in contemporary culture. At times they appear incommensurate while at other times overlapping. There are construc-

tivists who use data to demonstrate the constructed nature of science! And there are realists who point out the circularity of the constructed nature of the constructivists proposal with an infinite regress of argument as the result.

Christianity preceded modernity and may continue well after the demise of postmodernity. Nonetheless, it is imperative that we examine the ways our language reflects the cultures we inhabit and explore the ways the Good News can be construed in new linguistic contexts. It is less a matter of choosing between modernist versus postmodernist integrative discourse as it is recognizing our particularities and empowering others to speak the languages that emerge out of their unique cultural contexts, whether modern or postmodern. It is our hope that integrative dialogue can be faithful to our original, life-giving story in many cultural contexts.

REFERENCES

- Alston, W. P. (1991). *Perceiving God: The epistemology of religious experience*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Anderson, H. (1997). *Conversation, language, and possibilities: A post-modern approach to therapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Anderson, H. (2001). Becoming a postmodern collaborative therapist: A clinical and theoretical journey. Part II. *Journal of the Texas Association for Marriage and Family Therapy*, 6, 4-22.
- Barth, K. (1955). *Church dogmatics*. Vol. III, Part 2, Section 44, Number 2, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, pp.71-131.
- Benjamin, L.T., & Baker, D.B. (Eds.) (2000). History of Psychology: The Boulder Conference. *American Psychologist*, 55, 233-254.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Berry, W. (2001). *Life is a miracle: An essay against modern superstition*. New York: Counterpoint Press Imprint Basic Books.
- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A.R. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bloesch, D. G. (1978). *Essentials of evangelical theology*, Volume 1: God, authority, and salvation. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Bouma-Prediger, S. (1990). The task of integration: A modest proposal. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 18, 21-31.
- Chambless, D.L., & Ollendick, T. H. (2001). Empirically supported psychological interventions: Controversies and evidence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 685-716.
- Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*. Boston: Addison-Wesley Pub.

- Danziger, K. (1997). *Naming the mind: How psychology found its language*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Demarest, B. A., & Lewis, G. R. (1996). *Integrative theology: historical, biblical, systematic, apologetic, practical*. Grand Rapids Mich: Zondervan.
- Derrida, J. (1987). *The post card: From Socrates to Freud and beyond* (Alan Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Derrida, J. (1990). Some Statements, etc. In Carroll, D. (Ed.), *The states of theory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Descartes, R. (1978). *A discourse on method: Meditations on the first philosophy; Principles of philosophy*. London: Dent. (Original work published 1637)
- Dueck, A. C. (1995). *Between Jerusalem and Athens: Ethical perspectives on culture, religion, and psychotherapy*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Dueck, A. C. (2002). Babel, Esperanto, Shibboleths, and Pentecost: Can we talk? *Journal of Psychology & Christianity*, 21, 72-8
- Feyerabend, P. K. (1975). *Against method*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.
- Feyerabend, P. (1991). *Three dialogues on knowledge*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan-Smith, Trans.). London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power-knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. 1972-1977 (5th ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fox, D., & Prilleltensky, I. (1997). *Critical psychology: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1975/2000). *Truth and method*. New York: Continuum.
- Gergen, K. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40, 266-275.
- Gergen, K. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. (1994a). *Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gergen, K. (1994b). *Toward transformation in social knowledge* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Gergen, K. (1997). The place of the psyche in a constructed world. *Theory and Psychology*, 7, 723-746.
- Gergen, K. J. (2001a). *Social construction in context*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gergen, K. J. (2001b). Psychological science in a postmodern context. *American Psychologist*, 56, 803-813.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1995). Religious aspects of substance abuse and recovery. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 65-83.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (2002a). *Integrating psychology and spirituality?* Westport: Praeger
- Gorsuch, R. L. (2002b). The pyramids of sciences and of humanities: Implications for the search for religious "truth." *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45, 1822-1838.
- Greer, R. (2003). *Mapping postmodernism: A survey of Christian options*. Downers Grove Ill: InterVarsity Press.
- Grenz, S. (1998). An agenda for evangelical theology in the post-modern context. *Didaskalia*, 9, 1-16.
- Grenz, S. J., & Franke, J. R. (2001). *Beyond foundationalism: Shaping theology in a postmodern context*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Hauerwas, S., Murphy, N. C., & Nation, M. (1994). *Theology without foundations: Religious practice and the future of theological truth*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Jakobson, R., & Halle, M. (2002). *Fundamentals of language* (Reprint of the 2nd rev. ed.). New York: Mouton.
- Jameson, F. (1991) *Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kaufman, G. D. (1996). *God, mystery, diversity: Christian theology in a pluralistic world*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Kendall, P. C., & Chambless, D. L. (Eds.). (1998). Empirically supported psychological therapies. *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychologies*, 66, 3-167.
- Kendall, P. C., Chu, B., Gifford, A., Hayes, C., & Nauta, M. (1998). Breathing life into a manual: Flexible and creativity with manual-based treatment. *Cognitive Behavior Practice*, 5, 177-178.
- Koenig, H. G. (1998). *Handbook of religion and mental health*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Koenig, H. G., McCullough, M. E., & Larson, D. B. (2001). *Handbook of religion and health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Larson, D. B., & Larson, S. S. (1994). *The forgotten factor in physical and mental health: What does the research show?* Bethesda: David and Susan Larson.
- Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity*. (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence*. (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Lindbeck, G. (1984). *The nature of doctrine: Religion and theology in a postliberal age*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.
- Locke, J. (1961). *An essay concerning human understanding*, 5th edition, Volume II. New York: E.P. Dutton. (Original work published 1707)

- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Noll, M. A. (1985). Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought, *American Quarterly* 37, 216-38.
- Marsden, G. M. (1980). *Fundamentalism and American culture: The shaping of twentieth century evangelicalism, 1870-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J., & Sugarman, J. (1997). The social-cognitive construction of psychotherapeutic change: Bridging social constructionism and cognitive constructivism. *Review of General Psychology*, 1, 375-388.
- Martin, J., & Sugarman, J. (2000). Between the modern and the post-modern: The possibility of self and progressive understanding in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 55, 397-406.
- Milbank, J. (1990). *Theology & social theory: Beyond secular reason*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Murphy, N. C. (1996). *Beyond liberalism and fundamentalism: How modern and postmodern philosophy set the theological agenda*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.
- Nagel, T. (1986). *The view from nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olthuis, J. (2001). *The beautiful risk*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan
- Pargament, K. I. (1997). *The psychology of religion and coping: Theory, research, practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Plantinga, A. (1993a). *Warrant and Proper Function*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Plantinga, A. (1993b). *Warrant: The Current Debate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Plantinga, A. (2000). *Warranted Christian Belief*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Popper, K. (1959). *The logic of scientific discovery*. London: Hutchinson.
- Propst, L. R., Ostrom, R., Watkins, P., Dean, T., & Mashburn, D. (1992). Comparative efficacy of religious and nonreligious cognitive-behavioral therapy for the treatment of clinical depression in religious individuals. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 60, 94-103.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Reid, T. (1983). Essays on the active powers of man, In Reid, T., Beanblossom, R. E., & Lehrer, K. *Thomas Reid's Inquiry and essays* (1st ed.). Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co. (Original work published 1788)
- Richardson, F. C., Fowers, B. J., & Guignon, C. B. (1999). *Re-envisioning psychology: Moral dimensions of theory and practice* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rorty, R. (1967). *The linguistic turn: Recent essays in philosophical method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1988). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1991a). *Objectivity, relativism, and truth: Philosophical Papers I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1991b). *Essays on Heidegger and others: Philosophical papers II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1998). *Truth and progress: Philosophical papers III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sackett, D. L., Richardson, W. S., Rosenberg, W., & Haynes R. B. (1997). *Evidence-based medicine*. New York: Churchill Livingstone.
- Sandage, S. J. (1998). Power, knowledge, and the hermeneutics of selfhood: Postmodern wisdom for Christian therapists. *Mars Hill Review*, 15, 65-73.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1799/1976). *The Christian faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. (Original work published 1799)
- Shapiro, M. B. (1967). Clinical psychology as an applied science. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 113, 1039-1042.
- Shotter, J. (1975). *Images of man in psychological research*. London: Methuen.
- Shotter, J. (1984). *Social accountability and selfhood*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shotter, J. (1993a). *Cultural politics of everyday life: Social constructionism, rhetoric and knowing of the third kind*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Shotter, J. (1993b). *Conversational realities: The construction of life through language*. London: Sage.
- Shults, F. L., & Sandage, S. J. (2003). *The faces of forgiveness: Searching for wholeness and salvation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Shuman, J. J., & Meador, K. G. (2003). *Heal thyself: Spirituality, medicine, and the distortion of Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, J. K. A. (2000). *The fall of interpretation: Philosophical foundations for a creational hermeneutic*. Downers Grove Ill: InterVarsity Press.
- Sorenson, R. L. (2004). *Minding spirituality*. Hillsdale: Analytic Press.
- Stout, J. (1988). *The flight from authority: Religion, morality, and the quest for autonomy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Stout, J. (2004). *Democracy and Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Strong, A. H. (1907). *Systematic theology: A compendium and common-place-book*. Philadelphia: Judson Press.
- Tanner, K. (1997). *Theories of culture: A new agenda for theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Taylor, C. (1992). Peaceful coexistence in psychology. In Miller, R. B. (Ed.), *The restoration of dialogue: Readings in the philosophy of clinical psychology*. Washington: American Psychological Association, 70-84. (Original work published 1971)

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of the modern identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S. (1982) *The return to cosmology: Postmodern science and the theology of nature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Toulmin, S. (1990). *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tracy, D. (1978). *Blessed rage for order: The new pluralism in theology*. New York: Seabury Press.

Tracy, D. (1981). *The analogical imagination: Christian theology and the culture of pluralism*. London: SCM

Volf, M. (1996). *Exclusion and embrace: A theological exploration of identity, otherness, and reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Volf, M. (1998). *After our likeness: The church as the image of the trinity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ward, G. (1997). Postmodern theology. In David Ford (ed.), *The modern theologians* Oxford: Blackwell, 585-602

Werpchowski, W. (1986). Ad hoc apologetics. *Journal of Religion*, 66, 282-301.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings*. Cambridge: M.L.T. Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical investigations* (Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Wood, W. J. (1998). *Epistemology: Becoming intellectually virtuous*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Yoder, J. H. (1997). *For the nations: Essays evangelical and public*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans.

AUTHORS

AL DUECK, Graduate School of Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary, 180 N. Oakland Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101. *Title:* Professor of Psychology. *Degrees:* BA, B.Th, MA, PhD, (Stanford University). *Specializations:* Integration, Religious psychotherapy, History and Systems of Psychology. E-mail: adueck@fuller.edu

THOMAS D. PARSONS, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill School of Medicine, Department of Neurology. *Degrees:* BA, MA(Theology), MA(Psychology), PhD. (Fuller Theological Seminary). *Specializations:* Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology. *Address:* Thomas D. Parsons, Ph.D., University of North Carolina Medical School, CB #7025, Rm 751 Clinical Sciences Bldg., Chapel Hill, NC. 27599. Email: tparsons@neurology.unc.edu