are, needless to say, considerable differences among Freud, Jung, Adler and the Object Relations theorists who would all fit in this view. Another way to envision this is to think of the taxonomy that organizes living things. Each of the five views might be considered to be more of a genus, containing within it a variety of species. As we move from the authors in Johnson's (2010a) volume to their partners in this one, we will learn that there is similarity enough, but also considerable diversity within each view. Each contributor offers *an* approach from his or her family, but by no means *the* approach. This is important to bear in mind as we proceed.

A levels-of-explanation approach. David Myers, social psychologist and prolific scholar, represents this view in both Johnson's volume (Myers, 2010a) as well as the earlier edition (Myers, 2000). His widely recognized introduction to psychology, now in its ninth edition, may be quite familiar to readers (Myers, 2010b). Despite his stress on science, Myers (2010a) makes clear his Christian commitment from the outset, stressing his work in scientific psychology does not deter him from prayer and Bible reading each day. He carefully defines psychology as "the science of behavior and mental processes" (p. 49) as he accepts the dominant scientific paradigm for the discipline of psychology. Three basic tenets of his view are that (1) science and Christianity both point to a need for humility and awareness of human fallibility, (2) much science provides support for the Bible and theology, and (3) occasionally science will challenge traditional Christian understandings. Myers illustrates point (2) with data from social scientific research and (3) by arguing that homosexuality research should make us rethink biblical teachings on the topic (an interpretation of the data that has been challenged by other Christian scholars, such as Jones and Yarhouse, 2000).

These three tenets flow from Myers's view of the levels of explanation offered by various disciplines, the concept underlying his approach to relating faith and science. Reality, Myers (2010a) contends, is a multilayered unity. So a person can be considered as a group of atoms, a dazzling assortment of chemistry, an object of beauty, a person in a community and a person for whom Christ died. Each layer can be analyzed, or explained, by certain disciplines appropriate to that level. In this particular illustration, the levels might best be examined by a physicist, chemist, artist, social psychologist or theologian, respectively. "Which perspective is pertinent depends on what you want to talk about" (p. 51). Each perspective has its

domain, and complements the others. One does not, then, "integrate" the two disciplines of psychology and theology, but honors each in its own domain. Admittedly they will conflict at times, but in general they will cohere, for "In God's world, all truth is one" (p. 52). Persons are to be studied from all levels with humility that becomes scholars of all disciplines.

Myers's position is most common among research and academic psychologists who are Christians. Those who fit in the "genus" of levels of explanation might include Donald Mackay (1991) and Malcolm Jeeves (1997), with an emphasis on neuropsychological research. Everett Worthington (2010) recently has made a compelling case for the importance of science in understanding the person—his theses (p. 13) echo Myers's three major points while his work has focused on more applied and clinical aspects of psychology.

Warren Brown (2004) takes perspectivalism a step further as he wonders if there is any *resonance* among the perspectives of, say, "a nonreductive physicalist account of human nature and a Biblical understanding of persons" (p. 118). His model sees the disciplines as resonating (amplifying and enriching each other as auditory signals in harmony) to yield truth. Brown draws from the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, which holds that knowledge comes from four sources: Scripture, experience, tradition and rationality. He adds science as a fifth source, and argues that information coming from all five sources should "resonate" together in harmony as a symphony orchestra does. When there is dissonance on a subject, the scholar is to arbitrate the differences emanating from each of the sources. This takes Myers's position a step closer to applicability in counseling by addressing the interaction of these fields while not seeing them as being "integrated."

This "resonance" is important when one seeks to draw from science to counsel believing clients as the levels of explanation merge in the counseling office. Science offers descriptions of problematic life issues and has produced techniques that are evidence based as ways to treat them, yet the moral and spiritual dimensions are more often evident in counseling than in the psychological science. In the counseling office, the levels of explanation merge (or resonate loudly) as counselors trained in empiricism serve clients who bring religious and spiritual values and interpretations to the session. These values are now considered as an area of diversity by the major players in the field. The Ethics Code of the American Psychological

Association (APA; 2010) in Principle E requires respect of clients' religion, and in the American Counseling Association's (ACA; 2005) Code, the same is stressed in standard C.5.

Therefore, these major professional organizations have begun publishing material on addressing religion and spirituality in counseling. Burke, Chauvin and Miranti (2003) illustrate the efforts of ACA, while APA's efforts include *Spiritual Practices in Psychotherapy: Thirteen Tools for Enhancing Psychological Health* by Thomas Plante (2009). So, who better to turn to from this perspective to guide us in helping Jake and in understanding how science approaches religion and spirituality in the counseling office? Dr. Plante is Professor of Psychology at Santa Clara University and is also on the adjunct faculty of Stanford University School of Medicine. He has served as president of APA's Division 36 for the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality. He is author of many books, including several addressing the issue of sexual abuse by clergy in the Catholic Church. Plante's familiarity with research and history of addressing spiritual issues in counseling makes him a valuable representative of the levels-of-explanation position.

An integration approach. Johnson (2010b) traces the roots of the second view of relating psychology and Christianity to the 1960s, seeing it arising as a middle ground between biblical counselors and the levels-of-explanation approach by its honoring the former's critique of the latter while still seeing value in scientific psychology. Thus the two disciplines overlap and can be "integrated" in some sense, though what is integrated and how it is done has prompted much discussion.

Stanton Jones (2010) presents the integration view in the Johnson (2010a) volume. He opens by defining the approach as he sees it:

> *Integration of Christianity and psychology (or any area of "secular thought") is our living out—in this particular area—of the lordship of Christ over all of existence by our giving his special revelation—God's true Word—its appropriate place of authority in determining our fundamental beliefs about and practices toward all of reality and toward our academic subject matter in particular.* (p. 102, italics in the original)

Jones concedes that the term *integration* is inadequate to carry the freight of all that is involved in relating faith and secular thought, but asserts that the