2007 Oxford Institutes of Methodist Studies
Science, Technology, and Public Policy Section
Conveners: Robin Lovin and David Wilkinson
Paper by Kathy Armistead

Feelings of Deadness: A Pathology for Our Time

by

Kathy Armistead

Abstract

Using Self Psychology, this paper understands feelings of deadness as symptoms caused by inadequate selfobjects. Dependence on the virtual world created by technology prevents persons from developing sufficient coping mechanisms that are needed when they experience threats to the self in the face of extreme anxiety. In our current culture, when a person's selfojects are insufficiently based on real human interaction, but are formed through sustained interaction with virtual reality, pathology results.

Introduction

Webcast, podcast, terminal, screen saver, e-mail, chat room, cyberspace, monitor, disk drive, nanotechnology, modem, gigabyte, SPAM, virtual reality– these words are a part of everyday language for everyday people of the twenty-first century. No one can deny that technology surrounds us. It is as essential to our work and play as the air we breathe. Yet, might technology present us with particular temptations that can lead our culture toward new forms of idolatry? In addition to its benefits, might it lead to new social ills and psychological distress? For all its good, might there be a darker side to modern technology? Might the massive cultural shifts due to recent advances in technology reframe the human existential dilemma?

This paper will use the lens of Self Psychology, and particularly the theoretical construct of selfobject, to suggest that there is a darker side to our use of technology. And that, in fact, dependence on the virtual world that technology creates can lead to the development of inadequate or insufficient human relationships, such that when faced with extreme threats to the self, an individual will experience feelings of deadness, which can be indicative of neurosis.

Feelings of Deadness

After several weeks of therapy, one of my clients confided to me that she had a hole in her midsection. Jean (not her real name) said that she felt as though she could put her hand through her stomach. According to Jean, this (absent) part of her felt dead. Over the course of many weeks, Jean figured out that feeling the hole, that deadness, made her feel afraid to the point of panic. When these feelings came upon her, she desperately tried to fill herself up. The two primary ways she tried to abate the dreadful feelings were by 1) eating and 2) having intercourse. Neither worked very long, leaving her overweight and a likely candidate for sexually transmitted disease. The client was intelligent and clearly recognized the danger associated with these behaviors. Yet, because she was dependent on destructive behaviors to stave off intolerable feelings, she could not stop, thereby eventually driving her to seek pastoral counseling.

When people complain of feeling deadness, what they describe goes beyond numbness. It is scary, in part, because through these feelings the

person experiences the antithesis of being a self. Another client came to me just after she miscarried. She was only about four weeks along and, in fact, did not even know she was pregnant. After an afternoon of shopping, she had stopped at the ladies room before driving home. As she stood up, blood gushed out. This was disturbing by itself, but then she saw a small white object. She saw the aborted fetus. For her, it was like she had given birth to death. Indeed she had experienced an extreme paradox–the antithesis of giving birth to life–she felt deadness.

Existential Predicaments: Guilt, Tragedy, Lack of Wholeness

Historically, theologians and social scientists have construed existential dilemmas in a variety of ways. Even before Augustine, the existential predicament of humanity was understood as guilt. In theological terms, the problem was guilt and the remedy was salvation. This assessment can be seen in the writings of Martin Luther and, although with some adjustments, John Wesley. In over-simplified terms, for Luther, justification became the theological remedy for guilt. For Wesley, justification and sanctification through grace became the theological remedy.

Guilt remained the primary conceptualization of the human existential dilemma well into the nineteenth century until Sigmund Freud. Freud reconceptualized humanity's predicament as tragedy. For Freud, guilt was a serious problem because it led to neurosis, both personally and corporately; but he set guilt within the larger framework of tragedy, particularly the Greek tragedy

of Oedipus Rex. A careful reading of Freud shows that most of his major concepts are like planets orbiting the Oedipal Complex. Religion, far from being able to save persons from their tragic humanity, was only an illusion that would gradually dissipate as humanity matured through evolution.[1] The hope for humanity was to be found in a realistic acceptance of one's place in the world where the most one could hope for was to make a small contribution by loving and working. This realization was best accomplished through psychoanalysis. In other words, according to Freud, there was no "cure" for tragedy, only acceptance achieved through insight. Tragedy was the existential problem, but salvation was limited at best and not to be found in religion.

Although Freud drew grand—some would say far-fetched—conclusions from his work, he was nevertheless a skilled clinician; and his propensity to universalize his clinical data should serve as a cautionary tale. Nevertheless, his convictions about the tragedy of human existence were distilled from his clinical observations and the turbulent times in which he lived.

Theologians throughout the twentieth century, especially Paul Tillich, painted a similar portrait of the human situation. Tillich's remedy for the tragedy of human existence was courage. Insight was key but so was participation in symbols like Communion. For Tillich, hope could be found in the courageous individual and, some might extrapolate, the courageous church. Hence the pastoral theology of the time advocated insight-orientated therapy to heal, guide,

[1] See *The Future of An Illusion* and *Totem and Taboo*.

reconcile, and sustain.[2] As a result pastors, pastoral counselors (a new field), and chaplains in various settings (military, hospital, jail, etc.) throughout the 1950s and into the 1960s treated individuals by encouraging strength of character, salving angst, and helping them accept, with grace, their finitude.

The preeminent pastoral theologian of the time was Seward Hiltner. Although he followed Paul Tillich's method of correlation to help sort through the ambiguities and confusions of human living, in his book, *Theological Dynamics*, Hiltner clearly understands "dynamics" to be in agreement with the "dynamic psychologies beginning with that of Freud."[3] Hence insight offers God-given self-transcendence to steer individuals through existential tensions brought about by the tragedy of anxiety.

Without rehearsing the history of pastoral theology, it is interesting to see its shifts and contours as pastors sought to offer relevant salvation to their congregants. While there are other important figures, such as Charles Gerkin, Howard Clinebell merits special attention. As it turned out, it is probably Clinebell who has had the most far-reaching impact on the field of pastoral care. Clinebell did not understand himself to be a theologian but a pastoral psychologist. That Clinebell identified himself as a psychologist rather than a theologian speaks volumes about his perception of the relevance of theology generally. One might suggest that his designation of pastoral psychologist or pastoral psychotherapist emerged out of the success of pastoral counseling as a profession. Even with a

[2] William R. Clebsch and Charles R. Jaekle, *Pastoral Care in Historical Perspective* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), 79.
[3] Seward Hiltner, *Theological Dynamics*, (Nashville, Tenn: Abingdon Press, 1972), 182.

shift back toward theology in the field of pastoral care, pastoral care seminary students still read Clinebell's classic, *Basic Types of Pastoral Care and Counseling,* [4] first published in 1966. In the increasingly complex and diverse field of pastoral care, it is probably the only text that the majority of students read.

Clinebell sought to broaden pastoral care's conceptual base using psychology, to move beyond insight-orientated therapy to a growth model. The basic existential problem for Clinebell was a lack of wholeness. To address this lack, the counselor facilitated healing and wholeness by removing obstacles to growth as persons transform their self-definition and are liberated to live more integrated lives.[5] Despite Clinebell's accentuating the positive and owing a debt to Carl Rogers, he nevertheless depends on dynamic psychology, primarily Carl Jung and Erik Erikson.[6] In a sense, Clinebell attends to tragedy by reacting against it.

In the 1980s the existential predicament of tragedy began to enter a new phase. People had always expressed concerns to pastors related to unsatisfactory relationships, including a relationship with God; but now many of these persons were designated as narcissistic, another psychological term.[7] This diagnosis was perhaps logical given the cultural emphasis on the individual.

Looking back, it is clear that the emphasis in pastoral theology had been on the individual for a long time, and it is likely that the individual was treated at

[4] Howard Clinebell, Basic Types of Pastoral Care and Counseling, (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1984).
[5] Ibid., 37.
[6] Ibid., 106-107.
[7] This is not to say that all pastoral concerns were diagnosed in psychological or medical categories. But pastoral counselors, persons who received money for counseling, were compelled to use medical categories if they received payment for service from insurance companies.

the expense of the community.[8] It is, however, beyond the scope of this paper to examine the reasons for this, other than to say that pastoral theology mirrored the broader culture. In any event, culturally, the "cult" of rugged individualism with its tendency toward narcissism, began to yield to an emphasis on community, especially in pastoral theology. This shift resulted in increased attention to helping not only individuals but also various group and system configurations of people; i.e., families, couples, and congregations. In pastoral theology and pastoral care various forms of system thinking came to the fore.[9]

The Relation between Diagnosis and Cultural Context

The story of pastoral care's development reveals often ignored connections between diagnosis and cultural context until rather recently.[10] Postmodernity offers occasions of increased awareness and sensitivity for context, in other words, greater insight. As Freud found, the prevailing culture can bring forth and cultivate particular discontents and illnesses. For example, in Freud's time, hysteria was a prevalent diagnosis, one that has all but

[8] For example, if a married couple wanted counseling for their marriage, it was not uncommon (and in some quarters, it is still common) to "treat" the couple as separate individuals. Each person might receive individual counseling by the same or different counselors. The thought was that a person can only change themselves and not another person. So there was not reason to treat them as a couple or family, because the problem was within one or both and not between them or in the "system."

[9] The transition from an emphasis on individuals to communities is cleared put forth by Nancy Ramsay in *Pastoral Care and Counseling: Redefining the Paradigms*, Nancy J. Ramsay, Editor, (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 2004).

[10] This shift in pastoral care shows clearly in the time between publication of *The Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling*, Rod Hunter, General Ed., (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1990) and *Pastoral Care and Counseling: Redefining the Paradigms*, Nancy J. Ramsay, General Editor, (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 2005). Just as the *DPCC* defined the field of pastoral care and counseling, *Redefining the Paradigms,* brought the field current.

disappeared. I do not mean to assert that culture is the efficient cause[11] of human existential dilemmas; but culture can surely mediate, nurture, exacerbate, and mitigate.

From an existential dilemma of guilt with its theological remedies of justification and sanctification through grace, to the existential dilemma of tragedy with its remedies of courage, hope, and community, pastoral care continues to evolve notions of illness, sin, and salvation. With massive cultural changes due to recent technological advances, one might expect another shift in the framing of the human predicament or existential dilemma. So the question is simply, what is the current cultural neurosis? If society nurtures repressed sexuality (à la Freud), identity crisis (à la Erikson), or even stymied growth (à la Clinebell), then what dilemma might society being encouraging today?[12]

A Culture of Virtual Reality

It can be no big surprise to anyone that we now live in a global village with the possibility of instant communication. Many of us spend more time with our computer than with real people. You don't like what she says, so you just delete her. . .message. This virtual world with virtual relationships is preferable to many people. We make serious friendships and "talk" with other people we have never met via email. People now identify with their personal technology and create their own worlds, giving the sins of hubris and concupiscence new meanings.

[11] As opposed to formal, final, and material causes.
[12] I don't want to overstate the case or give the impression that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a particular context and a particular human crisis. However, the interplay between culture and symptoms provides fertile ground for observation.

People have always been enamored with their creations; recall Pygmalian. This issue is not that people enjoy toys or even worship gods of their own making; it's just that, for many, that is all they do. When they need to shore up their self and find comfort, many people now turn to their gadgets, not another person and certainly not God. So what happens when people, who are all relational by nature, constantly turn to inanimate objects for relief, soothing, and perhaps love? What happens to people who disavow face-to-face human relationships in favor of virtual reality? Said in the language of Self Psychology, what happens when a person's selfobjects are not based on real human interaction but are formed through sustained interaction with things or virtual reality?

Feelings of Deadness

Ann Ulanov, an Analytic (Jungian) therapist, poses the quandary this way:

> The new question for our new century, I suggest, is how to be committed to realness when all feels relative, to find and create an unfolding path and live it full-out with all our hearts, minds, souls, strength, in the midst of others finding different paths?[13]

For Ulanov, the problem is how does a person make a contribution in the mass of Internet and webbed connections?[14] It is akin to saying, "Is there enough of me to be linked to the whirl and buzz of an infinite number of connections that

[13] Ann Ulanov, *The Unshuttered Heart: Meditations of Aliveness/Deadness*, (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press forthcoming Oct. 2007), 2-3.
[14] Ibid., 2.

might engulf me or, at the very least, drown out my voice?" Thus to feel alive a person needs space between self and the other. Deadness results from a collapse of the self into the other.[15] I want to suggest that Ulanov's read of the existential dilemma is accurate, but that space, while necessary may not be a sufficient antidote.

My question is not so much about "Is there enough of me?" or "How do I put space between myself and the other?" but rather "Why do I feel dead?" or more likely, "How can I stop feeling dead?" Currently pastors and other helping professionals are seeing people presenting with feelings of deadness. By this they mean they do not feel totally alive. And they are not describing their feelings using the height of irony; these people are suffering acute distress. Is this a more serious form of depression or response to trauma? Or something else?

It is difficult to know just how prevalent the presenting complaint of deadness really is. Pastors' soul care has always dealt with issues related to depression and loneliness–issues of life and death, as has the medical community. Today, for the medical community feelings of deadness can by symptomatic of Dissociative Disorders (for example, with depersonalization brought about by trauma), Narcissistic Personality Disorder, Dependent Personality Disorder, or severe depression.

Studies that measure the prevalence of mental illness do exist, but the figures need to be treated with caution. This is due in part to varying definitions and reliance on self-reporting. Even so, a recent study from Great Britain

[15] Ibid., 3.

suggests that mental illness is generally on the rise.[16] An article from the journal *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* by Hunter, Sierra, and David, reports that "symptoms of depersonalization and derealization are increasingly recognized in both clinical and non-clinical setting, but that their importance and underlying pathophysiology are only now being addressed."[17] What is certain is the emergence of new fields of inquiry related to computer culture; i.e. Cyberpsychology,[18] and Psychoanalysis and Artificial Intelligence.[19]

Whatever the prevalence, people do seek help for their distress and seemingly in greater numbers. And it is beginning to appear that more people are entering counseling suffering feelings of deadness. When people complain of feeling deadness, what they describe goes beyond numbness and can approach nonexistence. It does sound odd to talk about feeling deadness or feeling not feeling. Here is an example: it isn't so much that a person feels that her own arm is not a part of herself; rather, it is that the arm attached to her is dead. These persons suffer tremendously and are typically unable to soothe themselves in order to find relief.

---

[16] Inger Hatloy, last updated January, 2005; (www.mind.org.uk/Information/Factsheets/Statistics/Statistics=1.htm), downloaded 10/20/06.

[17] E.C.M. Hunter, M. Sierra, and A.S. David, "The epidemiology of depersonalisation and derealisation: A Systematic Review" in *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatry Epidemiology* (online), vol. 39, Number 1/January, 2004, pages 9-18; www.springerlonk.com/content/4a55k540chhq46uh*/;* downloaded 10/20/06. This research is from the Institute of Psychiatry, London, UK.

[18] For example, see Sherry Turkle's article "Whither Psychoanalysis in a Computer Culture?", originally presented as the 2002 Freud Lecture at *The Sigmund Freud Society* in Vienna on May 6, 2002. Published on KurzweilAI.net, Oct. 23, 2002 and downloaded from www.kurzweilai.net/articles/art0529.html?printable=1 on 10/20/2006. Turkle, an MIT professor, has been writing and thinking about computer culture since the early 1980's, when she first called the computer a "second self."

[19] See also Sherry Turkle's *Diary*, published in the London Review of Books, Vol. 28, No. 8, April 20th, 2006, downloaded from web.mit.edu/sturkle/www/diary.html 10/20/2006.

While some persons use the language of feeling deadness as a metaphor for their psychic pain, others are more literal in their description, as my client, Jean. She was being quite literal in saying that she felt she had a hole in her body. While feeling deadness might be a way that people are redefining depression, it might behoove students of culture, including theologians, to take a closer look. This presenting problem might point to troubling aspects of current cultural issues.

The remainder of this paper will use a theoretical framework informed by the Self Psychology of Heinz Kohut, to suggest that technology presents persons with temptations that can lead to particular idolatries, which in turn can be reified, into symptoms of feeling deadness—bespeaking of a neurosis for our time. By knowing the trials and tribulations of our time as described by hurting people, the church can then better offer the salve of ministry to alleviate suffering.

Self Psychology and Heinz Kohut

In the spirit of sharing social location, I'll begin by giving a cognitive map. Like Gaul, the grand landscape of psychology is divided into three parts: dynamic or depth psychology, humanistic psychology, and cognitive/behavioral psychology. People associated with each are Freud, Maslow, and Skinner, respectively. From these three grand divisions of psychology, others branch off. For this paper, we are concerned with dynamic psychology, which further divides into drive theory, analytic, ego psychology, object relations, interpersonal, and

self psychologies. In this paper we are in the world of self psychology as articulated by its founder, Heinz Kohut.

Kohut (1913-81) was born to a Jewish family and received his MD in neurology at the University of Vienna. Like Freud and many others, Kohut fled Austria in 1939. He settled in Chicago where he became a member of the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis and eventually its president. Kohut's contributions infused Freudian psychoanalysis with fresh ideas, causing some colleagues to ostracize him for his efforts. Even so, in a culture marked by aggressive individuality, overindulgence, greed, and rootlessness, troubled people sought him out to ease their sense of emptiness, fragility, and fragmentation. What Kohut emphasized in his treatment of these people was empathy offered within a matrix of the therapeutic relationship.

But like Freud, Kohut developed his theory on the basis of clinical observation. One of Kohut's major contributions is his assertion that there are not one but two developmental lines for persons. One line leads to mature love of other people and other areas of human interest outside the individual. These other people and areas of interest outside the self represent objects toward which the self maneuvers. Object love is emotional investment devoid of self-interest, as Freud suggested.

For Freud the culmination of mature personhood is to love another selflessly and to work loyally. Kohut agreed but adds more. Kohut observed another line of development that leads to mature narcissism. The first line leads to mature relationships outside of the individual. The second, however, leads to

a mature relationship with one's self. Kohut says clearly that narcissism does not blossom into object love. Rather it is an investment of the self toward the self. Kohut points out that just as there are infantile, mature, and pathological ways a person can love objects (others), there are infantile, mature, and pathological ways a person can love him or herself. Hence maturity is self-fulfillment in loving others and pride in accomplishment while at the same time realizing that others will sometimes disappoint us and our accomplishments will be limited, finite.

For Kohut, when a person faces extreme anxiety, feels shattered, torn apart, or wounded "to the quick," there is means through self experience to put the self back together again, to put the self "back on track," or even "lick his or her wounds." The person creates a new experience by interacting with an image of interpersonal experience to effect repairs of the self. Kohut called this "shoring up the self."[20]

This is not simply recalling a benevolent memory or an escape into pleasant childhood fantasy; it is a healthy response of a person whose self, as she knows it, is threatened. The term that Kohut used to talk about this personal representation of interpersonal experience that is called upon in the face of anxiety is "selfobject."[21]

Selfobjects originate in the lifelong human need for other people to confirm and affirm a personal self. By "self," I mean that cohesive and enduring sense of being an independent center of initiative and perception. When the integrity of

[20] Heinz Kohut, *How Does Analysis Cure?* (Arnold Goldberg, editor, with collaborator Paul E. Stepansky. (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
[21] For more about selfobjects and related topics, see M. Kathryn Armistead, *God-Images in the Healing Process,* (Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress Press, 1995).

the self is threatened or even breached, the person unconsciously begins an effort of self-repair. Kohut understands these efforts as a "shoring up."

The idea that self-repair is a shoring up of the self is interesting language. The word "shore" refers to the boundary between the land and sea–the coast. Perhaps by using "shore," Kohut implies that self-repair involves the self making a demarcation between self and other by drawing boundaries.[22] But this seems to further imply that shoring up the self is a retreat from interpersonal relationships, an effort to tighten and reinforce personal defenses. Kohut means, however, rather than retreating from interpersonal relationships into a defensive posture, the person moves toward support and embrace. The more injured the person, often the harder it is for her to move toward others, which is necessary for healing and wholeness.

Because selfobjects are forged in the matrix of human relationship, the question is what happens to a person who is starved for human interaction whether voluntarily or involuntarily? Kohut does say that when external reality is devoid of empathy or if the selfobjects available are insufficient for some reason, persons have the ability to create what he calls substitute selfobjects. These are hallucinatory products of the mind. For Kohut, God is this kind of imaginary object created using sensory data.[23] Further, these selfobjects can be reified abstract ideas, like patriotism.

[22] Note comparisons with Ann Ulanov, op.cit.
[23] Kohut talks about these a hallucinatory products using visual imagery, but this can probably be broadened to include other sensory data, like auditory or even tactile.

Shoring up the Self

The human ability to create substitute selfobjects is important because they can protect the self from suffering damage, especially during times of solitude. They can also provide a person with great strength and courage to perform acts that could not be otherwise performed without the aid of a supportive group or despite extreme social disapproval. In other words, some people, when they feel totally alone, can create a comforting presence that can protect and defend the vulnerable self. It is as though—when there is no apparent interpersonal relationship to draw upon—they have the capacity to create one.

Two things must be said about substitute selfobjects however. Substitute selfobjects, like other selfobjects, are not created *de novo*, and they may or may not have any correlation to the community's experience. For example, when God appears to the prisoner in solitary confinement, that God may have no correlation to the God of a particular faith. Even so, selfobjects *always* are formed within a matrix of an interpersonal relationship or relationships. And when called upon, selfobjects always bring to consciousness, the person's construction of real face-to-face interpersonal experience. [24]

For many the presence of a selfobject infuses the person with feelings of being totally alive. Some describe having never felt so alive in their life. Others describe the experience as life-giving or life-sustaining. Sometimes the feelings are closer to awe or even dread; but whatever the designation, the feelings are vivid. And I want to suggest, stand in stark contrast to feelings of deadness.

[24] For more explanation of selfobjects and God as a selfobject, see *God-Images in the Healing Process, op.cit.*

So it comes to this. I want to assert that feelings of deadness come about from insufficient selfobjects. These selfobjects (or substitute selfobjects) that are forged from within interpersonal relationships, are either constituted poorly or created from relationships that are insufficiently interpersonal. In other words, if an individual does not have face-to-face relationships with other persons to draw upon, that individual will be poorly equipped to deal with anxiety, especially anxiety brought about by trauma.

Importance of Face-to-face Relationships

In our culture we may find that there are some things that only real face-to-face relationships with other persons can give. Personal relationships based primarily on projection or fantasy may not be able to withstand a traumatic assault on one's personal sense of self. I am not saying that we, as a culture, disavow technology, but I am saying that it cannot, in the end, substitute for face-to-face relationships. A culture that nurtures and encourages virtual relationships at the expense of face-to-face relationships bodes trouble and perhaps engenders neurosis.

Theological Perspective

What greater tragedy could there be than humans with wounds so severe that not only is their humanity diminished but they become like dead men walking? What would salvation look like for these persons? This can be a rather gloomy picture of life, but one in which many live. What is needed for our time is

to put tragedy into perspective. When looking at the marks of maturity, Wesley's thought adds an important dimension. In *The Character of a Methodist*, Wesley gives a straight-forward account of Christian maturity.[25] Mature Christians live with holiness of heart and life in a joyful and hope-filled relation with God.[26] But he adds something more, the mature Christian lives *toward* the "glory of God." In other words the mature person lives toward a particular *telos*. While Wesley does not exegete the Twenty-Third Psalm for this purpose, he could have. In this great psalm, God the Good Shepherd walks behind us, beside us, but also before us, leading us in the paths of righteousness for God's name's sake—God's glory.

The Christian faith as ordered by John Wesley does not leave humanity in the throes of tragedy. Issues of tragedy and suffering are real; but they can be infused with grace, especially grace embodied through persons living out their discipleship. All tragedy and suffering can be redeemed. Nothing and no one is beyond the reach of God. There is no magical potion against future pain, but the Church can incarnate God's love and provide a safe place where persons can find honest, real interpersonal relationships. The Church as the Body of Christ can offer grace to endure, power to sustain, a beacon to guide, hope to reconcile, and faith to heal—salvation.

---

[25] John Wesley, *The Character of a Methodist* (1767), from http://gbhem-c.org/umhigtoyr/wesley/charmeth.stm, July 16, 2004, 1

[26] Randy Maddox has written about Wesley's theological anthropology in *A Change of Affections: The Development, Dynamics, and Dethronement of John Wesley's 'Heart Religion.'"* in *'Heart Religion' in the Methodist tradition and Related Movements,* 3-31. Edited by Richard Steele. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 2001. And in *Psychology and Wesleyan Theology: Precedents and Prospects for a Renewed Engagement,"* Journal of Psychology and Christianity 23 (2004), 101-9.