

The Convergence

Why Mental Health May Require a Larger Conversation About Mind, Soul, Body, and Spirit

Alisha Bradley, M.A.
October 2026 | Version 1.0

Independent working paper. This paper presents developing ideas and questions and has not undergone peer review.

Abstract

Mental health is often discussed through separate vocabularies: psychology speaks about cognition, emotion, behavior, and identity; neuroscience studies brain function and neural systems; medicine attends to physiology; theology and spiritual traditions address meaning, morality, spirit, and relationship with God. My current work asks what happens when these domains are brought into disciplined conversation rather than treated as mutually exclusive explanations. This paper introduces what I call the convergence: an area of inquiry concerned with the interaction of mind, soul, physical body, and spirit in human suffering, transformation, and healing. The argument is not that every mental health condition has a spiritual cause, nor that spiritual explanations replace clinical care. It is that the human person may be poorly served by frameworks that require these dimensions to remain artificially separated. This working paper identifies the central questions I am exploring as I develop a methodology and applied modality around this convergence.

Author's Note

I am currently developing a methodology and applied modality concerned with the convergence of mind, soul, physical body, and spirit. These working papers document the questions, theoretical propositions, and research directions informing that work. They are intentionally exploratory. Where I make theological claims, I identify them as theological; where I discuss scientific findings, I distinguish those findings from my interpretations and hypotheses.

I Keep Coming Back to the Same Problem

I have spent years around psychology, transformation, faith, and human behavior, and I keep returning to the same problem: We often talk about the human person in pieces.

The brain is discussed in one room. The nervous system in another. Trauma in another. Identity in another. Spirituality in another. Scripture in another. Miraculous healing may not be allowed into the conversation at all.

But the person experiencing suffering does not experience herself in departments. Fear can be a thought, a bodily state, a learned response, a memory, a meaning system, a relational

experience, and, for a person of faith, a spiritual experience. Those descriptions can coexist without being identical.

That is the territory I am interested in.

What I Mean by the Convergence

By convergence, I mean the disciplined examination of multiple dimensions of human experience at once: mind, soul, physical body, and spirit.

The mind includes cognition, perception, attention, memory, imagination, and belief. The physical body includes the brain and nervous system but also sleep, endocrine function, immune activity, sensation, movement, and other physiological processes. I use soul as a theological and philosophical category for aspects of personal identity, desire, will, emotion, and lived interiority. Spirit refers to the dimension of human life concerned with God, transcendence, spiritual perception, worship, and relationship to realities understood within a Christian worldview as spiritual.

These are working distinctions, not settled scientific categories. Part of the research problem is determining where concepts overlap, where they do not, and which aspects can be operationalized for empirical study.

Integration Is Not Reduction

I am not interested in proving Scripture by pointing to a brain scan. If prayer is associated with activity in a particular neural network, that does not tell us whether God exists or whether God answered the prayer. The brain is necessarily involved in human experience; identifying a neural correlate does not settle the metaphysical meaning of the experience.

The reverse error is equally limiting. The existence of a spiritual interpretation should not cause us to ignore biology, trauma, medication effects, sleep deprivation, neurological disease, psychosis, or other clinical realities.

The convergence therefore requires two disciplines at once: openness and restraint. We should be open enough to investigate experiences that do not fit neatly inside conventional categories and restrained enough not to claim that evidence demonstrates more than it actually does.

Why This Is No Longer Outside Scientific Inquiry

Religious and spiritual experience is already being studied scientifically. A 2026 systematic review synthesized 105 neuroimaging and neurophysiological studies across multiple religious and spiritual traditions and practices. The literature included prayer, meditation, worship, chanting, mystical experiences, and other practices, with findings involving brain systems related to attention, emotion regulation, self-referential processing, social cognition, and reward.

That research does not establish a single 'God region' of the brain, and it should not be interpreted as proof or disproof of the supernatural. It does something more useful for my

purposes: it demonstrates that spiritual practices and experiences have measurable correlates and can be investigated with contemporary scientific methods.

Research has also examined religiously and spiritually integrated psychotherapies. Meta-analytic work suggests that integrating a client's religious or spiritual framework into treatment can be clinically meaningful for some populations. Again, that does not establish the theological truth of a particular belief system. It does challenge the assumption that spirituality must sit outside serious mental health inquiry.

The Question of Healing

Healing is where this conversation becomes especially interesting to me.

What counts as healing? Symptom reduction? Restoration of functioning? A changed sense of identity? Freedom from compulsive patterns? Reconciliation? Physiological regulation? A renewed capacity for meaning and relationship? Spiritual transformation? Some combination of these?

Clinical research needs measurable outcomes, but human beings often describe transformation in language that exceeds symptom scores. My interest is not in abandoning measurement. It is in asking whether our measurements are broad enough to capture what people mean when they say, 'I became well,' 'I became myself again,' or 'God healed me.'

The answer may require multiple levels of observation rather than a single explanatory lens.

A Developing Body of Work

I am currently developing a methodology and applied modality around this convergence. At this stage, my task is not to announce a finished system. It is to make the questions explicit, examine the literature, define terms, identify assumptions, and develop hypotheses that can eventually be tested.

My public work is intentionally bold because I believe some questions deserve to be asked before we know exactly where they will lead. My research posture must be equally disciplined. I want to be able to say, with clarity: This is what Scripture says. This is what I believe. This is what people report experiencing. This is what the evidence currently supports. This is my hypothesis. And this is what we still do not know.

That distinction is not a retreat from conviction. It is the structure that allows conviction and inquiry to remain in honest conversation.

Where I Am Going Next

The next questions in this work are practical as well as theoretical. Can the convergence be translated into a coherent intervention model? Which components already have empirical support? Which components would require new research? How can spiritual discernment be discussed without turning subjective interpretation into clinical fact? How can a Christian framework remain explicitly Christian while respecting informed consent, clinical ethics, and

the autonomy of people receiving care? And what outcomes would demonstrate that an integrated approach is actually helping?

Those questions are now part of my research agenda.

References

- Bouwhuis-Van Keulen, A. J., et al. (2024). The evaluation of religious and spirituality-based therapy compared to standard treatment in mental health care: A multi-level meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Psychotherapy Research*, 34(3).
- Husain, W., et al. (2026). The neuroscience of religious and spiritual practices: A systematic review of neurotheological evidence. *Brain and Behavior*, 16(9), e71733.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.71733>