
Ancient Wisdom, Modern Brains: Convergences Between Scripture and Neurocognitive Research

Jerry A. Smith, PhD

Prepared for the men's Bible study on Tony Evans, *No More Excuses*

A PREPRINT

Revised and expanded edition · October 2026

Abstract

Popular claims that “science has proven the Bible right” usually overreach, yet the wisdom literature, the teaching of Jesus, and the letters of Paul repeatedly describe human patterns that contemporary neurocognitive and health research also measures. This paper examines twelve such convergences, pairing a passage of Scripture (NASB 1995) with peer-reviewed research on positive emotion and immunity, neuroplasticity, attention and rumination, contemplative prayer and the default mode network, sleep and emotional memory, stress recovery, social connection and mortality, worry and physiology, co-regulation in conflict, forgiveness, social regulation of threat, and habit formation. For each pairing we read the text in context, explain the proposed neural and physiological mechanisms, report sample sizes and designs, and state what the evidence cannot show. The framing is convergence, not concordism: the studies do not prove the texts, and the texts do not need them. Each section closes with practical applications graded by strength of evidence, and a final section assembles them into an everyday rule of life for Christian men, with a thirty-day starting plan. The synthesis argues that Scripture's disciplines of attention, rest, community, gentleness, forgiveness, and repetition fit the way human beings are made.

Keywords: neuroscience and religion; psychoneuroimmunology; neuroplasticity; social baseline theory; forgiveness; habit formation; Christian practice

Contents

Introduction	3
A Note on Method and Caveats	3
1. A Joyful Heart and the Immune System	4

2. Renewing the Mind and Neuroplasticity	6
3. “Dwell on These Things”: Attention, Rumination, and Gratitude	9
4. “Cease Striving”: Stillness and the Default Mode Network	11
5. “Do Not Let the Sun Go Down on Your Anger”: Sleep and Emotional Memory	14
6. The Sabbath, Chronic Stress, and the Hippocampus	17
7. “Two Are Better Than One”: Loneliness and Mortality	20
8. “Do Not Worry About Tomorrow”: Worry and the Body’s Stress Response	22
9. “A Gentle Answer”: Co-regulation in Conflict	25
10. Forgiveness	28
11. “Perfect Love Casts Out Fear”: Social Regulation of Threat	31
Bonus: “Train Up a Child” and the Neuroscience of Habit	33
Living It Out: An Everyday Rule of Life	36
Synthesis	39
References	41

Introduction

Most of us have, at one time or another, been handed a forwarded article claiming that “science has finally proven the Bible right.” Those of us who follow science have also winced at it. The claims are usually overstated, and the underlying assumption, that Scripture needs a laboratory’s permission to be true, gets the relationship backwards.

And yet something real is going on. When you read the wisdom literature, the Sermon on the Mount, or Paul’s letters alongside the last few decades of research on stress, attention, sleep, relationships, and habit, you keep running into the same patterns. The research, coming from a different direction with different tools, often describes the same terrain.

This paper walks through eleven of those meeting points, plus one bonus pairing (twelve in all). Each section pairs a short passage (quoted from the NASB 1995) with a body of peer-reviewed research, describes what the studies actually found, explains what seems to be happening in the brain and body, and is honest about what the studies cannot tell us. Each section then closes with practical steps for living it out, and a final section gathers those steps into an everyday rule of life. The aim is neither apologetics nor debunking. It is closer to what a surveyor does when two independent maps of the same ridge line up: you note the agreement, check your instruments, and let it sharpen your attention. For a men’s group working through *No More Excuses*, where the theme is taking responsibility for how we live, these convergences are useful precisely because they are practical. They help us see why the disciplines Scripture asks of us are not arbitrary.

A Note on Method and Caveats

Before the pairings, five cautions.

First, *convergence is not concordism*. Concordism is the habit of reading modern science back into ancient texts, as if Solomon were secretly describing immune function or Paul were hinting at synaptic plasticity. He was not. The biblical writers were speaking to God’s people about wisdom, worship, and obedience, in the idioms of their own time. When I say a verse “converges” with a finding, I mean only that the human pattern the text describes and the pattern the research measures appear to be the same pattern seen from two angles. The verse does not need the study, and the study does not prove the verse.

Second, *most of this research is correlational*. People with a positive emotional style catch fewer colds; people with strong social ties live longer. Those are associations. Some studies below are experimental or prospective, but none settles causation by itself.

Third, *many neuroimaging studies are small*. Several of the brain-imaging studies cited here (fMRI and SPECT, two ways of taking pictures of which parts of the brain are working harder at a given moment) involve between three and twenty-five participants. That is normal for early imaging work, but it means the findings are preliminary and should be held loosely until replicated. Brain imaging also invites “reverse inference,” the temptation to say “region X lit up, therefore the person felt Y.” Brain regions do many things, and a blob on a scan is not a mental state.

Fourth, *Scripture’s claims are larger than any study can test*. Romans 12:2 is about being conformed to Christ, not about cortical thickness. When a finding lines up with a text, it illuminates one human dimension of what the text is talking about. It never exhausts it.

Fifth, *the practices are graded honestly*. Each practical step is labeled with how strong the evidence behind it is. Some rest on randomized trials and meta-analyses; others rest on a single small study

or on reasonable inference. Where a practice is commended mainly because Scripture commends it, I say so. Those labels describe the research, not the worth of obeying God.

1. A Joyful Heart and the Immune System

“A joyful heart is good medicine, But a broken spirit dries up the bones.” (Proverbs 17:22, NASB)

The Hebrew word translated “medicine” (*gehah*) appears only here in the Old Testament. Most translators take it as “healing” or “cure,” so the line says something like “a glad heart does good healing.” In Hebrew idiom, “bones” often stand for a person’s whole frame and vigor, as in Proverbs 3:8 and 14:30. The proverb treats inner disposition and bodily health as connected. Its neighbors help us read it. Proverbs 17 is full of relationships: a dry morsel eaten in quiet is better than a feast with strife (17:1), and “a friend loves at all times” (17:17). Proverbs 18:14 completes the thought: “The spirit of a man can endure his sickness, But as for a broken spirit who can bear it?” In Solomon’s terms, joy is not a private mood. It is the state of a heart at peace with God and neighbor.

The viral-challenge studies. The most cited evidence comes from Sheldon Cohen and colleagues at Carnegie Mellon (Cohen, Doyle, Turner, Alper, & Skoner, 2003). They interviewed 334 healthy adults on several evenings over a few weeks to measure their typical *positive emotional style* (feeling happy, pleased, relaxed) and *negative emotional style* (anxious, hostile, depressed). Then every participant received nasal drops containing a rhinovirus and was kept in quarantine to see who developed an objectively verified cold. Higher positive emotional style went with lower risk of illness in a dose-response pattern. People in the lowest third for positive emotion were about 2.9 times as likely to develop a cold as those in the highest third, after controlling for prior antibodies, age, sex, education, race, body mass, and season. Happier people did have somewhat lower stress-hormone levels and better health habits, but those differences did not explain the gap.

The obvious objection is that “positive emotion” might just be a proxy for optimism, extraversion, or feeling healthy. So the team ran the study again with 193 new volunteers and two different viruses, a rhinovirus and influenza A (Cohen, Alper, Doyle, Treanor, & Turner, 2006). They also measured optimism, extraversion, mastery, self-esteem, purpose, and self-rated health. The result held, with an adjusted odds ratio of 2.9, independent of all of those traits. The design is unusually strong because everyone gets the same controlled exposure. It is still not a randomized experiment, though. No one was *assigned* to be joyful, so these studies show prediction, not proven cause.

What might be happening in the body. The field that studies this is called psychoneuroimmunology, and it describes two main “wires” from the brain to the immune system. The first is the HPA axis. The hypothalamus signals the pituitary gland, which signals the adrenal glands to release cortisol. Short bursts of cortisol calm inflammation. The second is the sympathetic nervous system, which releases adrenaline-like chemicals that reach immune tissues directly. When a cold virus infects the nose, the body’s tissue reaction, not the virus itself, produces most of the misery. Cells release *cytokines*, chemical messengers such as interleukin-6 (IL-6) that recruit inflammation and cause congestion and symptoms.

Two findings connect emotional style to those wires. First, in a sample of infected participants ($n = 234$ from 327 exposed), lower positive emotional style went with more nasal IL-6. Statistically controlling for IL-6 substantially weakened the link between emotion and illness, which suggests IL-6 is part of the pathway (Doyle, Gentile, & Cohen, 2006). Second, Cohen and colleagues showed that long-term threatening stress can make immune cells “deaf” to cortisol’s calming signal, a state

called glucocorticoid receptor resistance. People with this resistance were more likely to develop colds and produced more inflammatory cytokines when infected (Cohen et al., 2012). In daily life, too, happiness tracks biology. Among 216 middle-aged London civil servants, the least happy fifth had about 32% higher cortisol output across a workday than the happiest fifth. They also showed a far larger stress-induced rise in fibrinogen, a clotting and inflammation protein (Steptoe, Wardle, & Marmot, 2005). Two small studies of young adults found that trait positive emotion, and awe in particular, predicted lower IL-6 (Stellar et al., 2015).

The broken spirit. The second half of the proverb is now one of the busier areas of psychiatry. Meta-analyses find that people with major depression have higher blood levels of the inflammatory cytokines IL-6 and TNF-alpha than non-depressed controls (Dowlati et al., 2010). Across community and clinical samples, depression goes with higher C-reactive protein, IL-1, and IL-6, though the effects are small (d about 0.15 to 0.35) and partly explained by body weight (Howren, Lamkin, & Suls, 2009). The traffic runs both ways. In a randomized experiment, healthy volunteers given a safe, low dose of bacterial endotoxin (which triggers a brief cytokine surge) became measurably more depressed in mood than those given placebo. Their ventral striatum, a reward hub, also responded less to anticipated rewards (Eisenberger et al., 2010; $n = 39$). Researchers think this “sickness behavior” (withdrawal, fatigue, loss of pleasure) evolved to help a wounded body rest. In modern life, social rejection and chronic threat can switch it on without any infection (Miller & Raison, 2016; Slavich & Irwin, 2014). “Dries up the bones” is not a bad description of what that state feels like.

Two honest notes keep us from forcing the fit. In the 2003 cold study, negative emotional style did *not* predict verified colds, though it did predict complaining of symptoms that had no objective basis. And across 35 prospective studies of initially healthy people, positive well-being predicted lower mortality (combined hazard ratio 0.82). That is meaningful but modest, and the authors found signs of publication bias (Chida & Steptoe, 2008). Pressman and Cohen’s (2005) major review adds a caution: intense, highly aroused bursts of positive emotion can briefly *raise* physiological strain. The calmer, everyday contentment the proverb seems to describe is what tracks with protection. The data fit the first half of the proverb more cleanly than a simple “sad people get sick” reading of the second half. That is a good reminder not to press a text and a study into perfect alignment.

For the group: Is my default emotional style something I simply have, or something I am cultivating?

Living it out

1. **Practice joy on purpose, together.** Joy in Proverbs 17 lives among friends, and the data agree. In Cohen’s hugging study (404 adults tracked for 14 evenings and then exposed to a cold virus), feeling supported protected against the rise in infection risk that came with frequent conflict. Daily hugs accounted for about a third of that protection, and among infected participants, more hugs predicted milder illness (Cohen et al., 2015). Make it concrete: greet your wife and kids with a real embrace, and hold your wife’s hand when bad news comes. In a partner study, a familiar partner’s hand (not a stranger’s) reduced threat-related brain activity in 110 adults (Coan et al., 2017). *Strength: moderate. These are prospective and lab studies, not trials showing that adding hugs prevents colds.*
2. **End each day with a short gratitude review.** Before bed, name three specific gifts from the day to God in prayer (“Rejoice always... in everything give thanks,” 1 Thess. 5:16 to 18). Randomized trials of gratitude exercises show real but small effects. A meta-analysis of 27

studies ($n = 3,675$) found $g = -0.29$ on depression and anxiety symptoms, smaller than active therapies (Cregg & Cheavens, 2021). Broader positive-psychology programs raise well-being modestly ($d = 0.34$) (Bolier et al., 2013). *Strength: moderate for mood, weak or unknown for immunity. No trial has shown that gratitude journaling prevents infection.*

3. **Make room for awe in worship and creation.** Psalm 19 and Psalm 8 model stopping to wonder. Take a walk under the night sky, or sing a hymn and actually attend to the words. In two correlational studies, awe was the positive emotion most strongly linked to lower IL-6 (Stellar et al., 2015). Over 16 years among 74,534 nurses, attending services more than once a week predicted 33% lower mortality, with social support, lower depression, less smoking, and optimism partly explaining the link (Li et al., 2016). *Strength: suggestive. These are correlational studies, and churchgoers differ in many ways.*
4. **Take a broken spirit seriously and get help.** “Who can bear” a broken spirit (Prov. 18:14) is a call to bear one another’s burdens (Gal. 6:2), not to “smile more.” If a brother has lost pleasure, energy, or hope for weeks, help him reach a pastor, doctor, or counselor. A meta-analysis of 56 randomized trials ($n = 4,060$) found that structured psychosocial treatments, especially cognitive behavioral therapy, improved immune markers, with about an 18% drop in harmful inflammatory markers that lasted at least six months (Shields, Spahr, & Slavich, 2020). *Strength: good. These are randomized trials, though the effects are modest and come mostly from clinical samples.*
5. **Defuse chronic conflict before it settles in.** The chapter that praises a joyful heart also says to stop strife “before it breaks out” (Prov. 17:14). Long-term threatening stress, often relational, is what produced cortisol resistance and higher cold risk in Cohen et al. (2012). Settle disputes quickly, and do not let grudges become a standing condition. *Strength: moderate for the stress-to-immune pathway. That conflict resolution reverses it has not been directly tested.*

2. Renewing the Mind and Neuroplasticity

“And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, so that you may prove what the will of God is, that which is good and acceptable and perfect.” (Romans 12:2, NASB)

Paul’s word for transformation (*metamorphoō*, the same verb the Gospels use for Jesus’ transfiguration in Matthew 17:2 and Mark 9:2) means a real change, not a cosmetic adjustment. Paul places the means of that change in the renewing of the mind. Context matters here. Romans 12:2 follows eleven chapters on God’s mercy and directly follows the call to present our bodies as a “living and holy sacrifice” (12:1). The renewal is a response to grace, carried out by the whole person, body included, and it is aimed at discerning God’s will. The word itself says nothing about brain tissue. But Paul does assume two things that brain research can speak to: that adult minds can really change, and that being “conformed” happens through what we repeatedly take in.

How a brain changes. In 1949 the psychologist Donald Hebb proposed that when one neuron repeatedly helps to fire another, the connection between them strengthens (Hebb, 1949). This is often summarized as “cells that fire together wire together.” Bliss and Lømo (1973) later showed the effect directly in rabbits. Brief, repeated stimulation of a hippocampal pathway made the receiving cells respond more strongly for hours afterward, a phenomenon now called long-term potentiation (LTP). LTP is the best-studied cellular model of learning. A second process works on the brain’s wiring. When a circuit is used heavily, support cells called oligodendrocytes wrap its axons in

more myelin, the fatty insulation that speeds and synchronizes signals. In mice, blocking the production of new oligodendrocytes in adulthood stopped animals from mastering a new running-wheel skill (McKenzie et al., 2014). A third piece is chemical. Brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) is a protein that neurons release when they are active, and it promotes synapse growth and strengthening (Park & Poo, 2013). Taken together, the mechanism is simple to state. Activity that is repeated changes the strength, wiring, and chemistry of the circuits that carry it. The brain becomes better at whatever it does often.

The taxi driver studies. London taxi drivers must learn “the Knowledge”: roughly 25,000 streets and thousands of landmarks. Maguire and colleagues (2000) scanned 16 licensed male drivers and 50 male controls. The drivers had more gray matter in the posterior hippocampus, a region involved in spatial memory. Across drivers, the longer a man had driven, the larger that region tended to be. The study had a less-quoted half: the *anterior* hippocampus was smaller in drivers, and smaller still in those who had driven longer. A later study compared taxi drivers with London bus drivers, who drive as much and report similar stress but follow fixed routes (Maguire et al., 2006). The hippocampal pattern appeared only in the taxi drivers. The taxi drivers were also *worse* at learning new complex visual material. Expertise appears to have had a cost elsewhere.

All of these studies were snapshots. They could not rule out that people with unusual hippocampi become taxi drivers. So Woollett and Maguire (2011) followed 79 trainees and 31 controls for three to four years. At the start, the groups did not differ in brain structure, memory, or IQ. Thirty-nine trainees qualified. Only they showed an increase in posterior hippocampal gray matter. Trainees who failed and controls showed no change. Total time spent in training did not separate the groups. The qualifiers had trained about twice as many hours *per week*. Sustained, concentrated practice, not just exposure to the same environment, went with the change.

A shorter experiment points the same way. Draganski and colleagues (2004) taught about half of 24 young adults (21 women, 3 men) to juggle over three months. Gray matter in visual-motion areas (hMT/V5) and the left posterior intraparietal sulcus increased. Three months after practice stopped, most had lost the skill and the increase had partly receded. A related study of 48 adults (24 trained, 24 untrained) found changes in the microstructure of the underlying white matter after six weeks of juggling practice (Scholz et al., 2009).

Changing how you think changes brain activity. Romans 12:2 is about the mind, not juggling, so the closer parallel is research on changing thought patterns. In cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), people learn to notice, test, and replace distorted thoughts. Goldapple and colleagues (2004) scanned 14 depressed adults with PET before and after 15 to 20 CBT sessions. Recovery came with decreased activity in parts of the frontal cortex and increased activity in the hippocampus and dorsal cingulate, a pattern different from the one seen with an antidepressant. The study was small, had no untreated control group, and compared with the drug group only after the fact. A later meta-analysis of 22 studies (352 patients) found that the most consistent change after psychotherapy for depression and anxiety was *reduced* activity in the anterior cingulate, inferior frontal gyrus, and insula, regions tied to emotional reactivity (Marwood et al., 2018). The authors concluded the mechanisms are more complex than a simple “thinking brain calms the feeling brain” story. In the short term, a meta-analysis of 48 imaging studies found that deliberately reinterpreting a situation (cognitive reappraisal) engages control regions in the frontal and parietal lobes and dampens amygdala activity (Buhle et al., 2014).

The limits. These findings deserve care. MRI “gray matter volume” is a statistical signal, not a count of neurons. No one knows exactly which cellular changes produce it in humans. A critical

review argued that many training studies have design and statistical weaknesses, and that the most robust human evidence is for exercise-related change in the hippocampus of older adults (Thomas & Baker, 2013). Changes can fade without practice (Draganski et al., 2004), and they come with trade-offs (Maguire et al., 2006). Half the taxi trainees did not qualify, and Woollett and Maguire (2011) note that individual differences, possibly genetic, may limit how much plasticity a given person shows. Plasticity is real, but it is slow, specific to what is practiced, and costly. It is not a promise that anyone can rewire anything quickly.

The convergence. What we repeatedly attend to and practice measurably shapes the organ we think with. The shaping is specific to what we practice, depends on sustained effort, and fades when practice stops. That is not what Paul means by renewal, which is the Spirit’s work in the whole person. But it is consistent with his assumption that minds really can change and with his warning against being *conformed*. The Greek *syschēmatizō* suggests being pressed into a mold. The same mechanisms that let Scripture and prayer shape a mind also let the world’s daily inputs shape it. The brain does not distinguish between holy and unholy repetition. It strengthens whatever it is given.

For the group: What am I rehearsing daily that is shaping my mind, for better or worse?

Living it out

1. **Practice in daily doses, not occasional binges.** The taxi trainees who qualified did not spend more total months training. They spent about twice as many hours each week (Woollett & Maguire, 2011). Choose a fixed daily time with Scripture, even 15 minutes, and protect it the way you would a workout. *Evidence: moderate. One strong longitudinal study, but observational. Trainees chose their own hours, so motivation is a possible confounder.*
2. **Memorize Scripture by recalling it, spread out over days.** Rereading a verse feels productive, but trying to recite it from memory produces much better retention after days or weeks (Roediger & Karpicke, 2006). Spreading practice over separate sessions beats cramming (Cepeda et al., 2006). Write a passage on a card, try to say it from memory each morning, check yourself, and review older verses on a widening schedule. That is how “the word of Christ richly dwell[s] within you” (Colossians 3:16) in practical terms. *Evidence: strong. The spacing effect rests on a meta-analysis of 317 experiments. Testing-effect findings are widely replicated, though mostly with students and prose, not Scripture.*
3. **Take thoughts captive by naming and reframing them.** When a familiar lie shows up (“I’m a failure,” “God is done with me,” “she always...”), stop, write the thought down, and answer it with what is true from Scripture. This is the core skill of CBT. Over a course of therapy it goes with measurable changes in brain activity (Goldapple et al., 2004; Marwood et al., 2018). In the moment it dampens amygdala reactivity (Buhle et al., 2014). Paul’s “taking every thought captive” (2 Corinthians 10:5) is the same move made in faith. *Evidence: moderate for symptom and brain-activity change in clinical groups. The imaging studies are small and varied. The Christian version has not been tested directly. Anyone with real depression should see a professional, not only a Bible study.*
4. **Audit your inputs, because the brain strengthens whatever it is given.** Hebbian learning has no moral filter. Hours of outrage, pornography, or anxious scrolling are rehearsals too. For one week, track where your attention goes. Then cut or replace one input. The juggling study suggests circuits that are not used tend to fade (Draganski et al., 2004). *Evidence: the*

mechanism is well established in animals. Direct human evidence that cutting a specific media habit changes brain structure is weak.

5. **Present your body, too: move it.** Romans 12:1 comes before 12:2. In a randomized trial with 120 older adults, a year of walking increased anterior hippocampal volume by about 2% and improved spatial memory, while the stretching control group declined (Erickson et al., 2011). The increase tracked higher levels of BDNF. Walk while you pray or review memory verses. *Evidence: moderate to strong. One large RCT, which a skeptical review singled out as the most robust human structural-plasticity finding (Thomas & Baker, 2013). The link to BDNF is correlational, and the sample was older adults.*

3. “Dwell on These Things”: Attention, Rumination, and Gratitude

“Finally, brethren, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is right, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is of good repute, if there is any excellence and if anything worthy of praise, dwell on these things.” (Philippians 4:8, NASB)

The NASB notes that “dwell” literally means “ponder.” Paul’s verb is an accountant’s word, *logizomai*: reckon, take into account, keep on considering. The verse does not stand alone. Two verses earlier Paul tells an anxious church to bring everything to God “by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving.” He promises that God’s peace will “guard your hearts and your minds.” The next verse adds, “The things you have learned and received and heard and seen in me, practice these things” (4:9). Paul writes this from custody and goes on to say he has “learned” contentment (4:11). So the text assumes three things. Where sustained attention goes is partly up to us. It can be trained. And thanksgiving belongs with it.

A wandering mind. Research on mind-wandering supports the premise that attention and well-being are linked. In an experience-sampling study, Killingsworth and Gilbert (2010) pinged about 2,250 adults on their phones at random moments. Their minds were wandering in 46.9% of the samples, and people were generally less happy when their minds wandered. Time-lagged analyses suggested that the wandering tended to come before the unhappiness, not after it. The finding most relevant to Paul’s list is easy to miss. When minds wandered to *pleasant* topics, people were about as happy as when they were focused. The cost came from drifting to neutral and especially unpleasant material. The sample was self-selected smartphone users and the design was correlational, but the pattern is clear: *what* the mind dwells on matters, not just *whether* it wanders.

Brain imaging gives a rough sense of where this happens. When attention drifts from the task at hand, a set of midline regions called the default mode network becomes more active. People who report wandering more show more activity in this network (Mason et al., 2007). This network is not bad. It is the machinery for remembering, planning, and thinking about ourselves and other people. The problem is what it gets loaded with.

Rumination: dwelling that loops. The darker version of dwelling is rumination, a repetitive, passive focus on one’s distress and its causes (“Why do I always...?”). In a major review, Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco, and Lyubomirsky (2008) concluded that rumination reliably predicts the onset of depression. It also deepens negative thinking, impairs problem solving, and erodes social support, and it is linked to anxiety, binge eating, binge drinking, and self-harm. Watkins (2008) made a key distinction: repetitive thought is not always harmful. It helps recovery and planning when it is *concrete* (“What exactly happened, and what is my next step?”). It harms when it is *abstract* and evaluative (“What does this say about me?”). In a small imaging study of 17 depressed

and 17 never-depressed adults, the more the default network dominated the brain’s task-focused networks at rest, the more brooding and the less constructive reflection the depressed participants reported (Hamilton et al., 2011). Treatment trials suggest the habit can be changed. In a small randomized trial ($N = 42$), adding a therapy aimed squarely at rumination to usual care improved residual depression, and the improvement was mediated by reduced rumination (Watkins et al., 2011). That trial had no attention-control group.

Reappraisal: how reframing works in the brain. Paul’s list is not a call to look away from reality. “Whatever is true” comes first. The best-studied way to change what a hard situation means without denying it is cognitive reappraisal: thinking about the same event differently. A meta-analysis of 48 neuroimaging studies found that reappraisal consistently recruits prefrontal and parietal control regions, along with areas in the lateral temporal cortex that handle meaning. It also consistently turns down activity in the amygdala, the brain’s threat detector (Buhle et al., 2014; see Ochsner & Gross, 2005). The likely route is indirect. Control regions do not simply suppress the amygdala. They change the *meaning* the brain assigns to the situation, and the altered meaning then produces a smaller threat response. That is a fair picture of “reckoning” differently.

Attention is biased toward threat. Paul is asking for effort, and the brain explains why it takes effort. Across 172 studies, anxious people showed a reliable, moderate bias toward threat-related information ($d = 0.45$). Non-anxious people showed none (Bar-Haim et al., 2007). Computer training designed to correct this bias has produced mixed results. A pooled analysis of 13 trials found benefits only under specific conditions (Price et al., 2016). Retraining attention is possible but not automatic.

Dwelling on the good: gratitude. In a set of randomized experiments, Emmons and McCullough (2003) asked participants to list things they were grateful for, list hassles, or record neutral events. The first study had 192 undergraduates making weekly entries. The gratitude groups did better on several, though not all, well-being measures. The most consistent gain was in positive mood. Kini, Wong, McInnis, Gabana, and Brown (2016) studied adults beginning psychotherapy for depression or anxiety. Some wrote gratitude letters in addition to therapy; others received therapy alone. About three months later, everyone did a “Pay It Forward” task in the fMRI scanner, passing along monetary gifts to charity to the degree they felt grateful. The gratitude-writing group reported more gratitude. In a medial prefrontal region, the pregenual anterior cingulate, their brain activity tracked their gratitude more strongly. These participants came from a larger randomized trial ($N = 293$). In that trial the gratitude writers reported better mental health at about 4 and 12 weeks than both the therapy-only group and a group that wrote about stressful experiences (Wong et al., 2018). The authors are candid that the scans had no baseline, so a pre-existing group difference cannot be ruled out. A study that did scan before and after addressed this. Thirty-three young women were randomly assigned to three weeks of gratitude journaling or neutral journaling. Journaling increased the response of a valuation region (ventromedial prefrontal cortex) when money went to a charity rather than to the participant (Karns et al., 2017). Gratitude-related activity in these medial frontal regions also appears in other work (Fox et al., 2015).

How big is the effect? We need to be honest here. Meta-analyses find that gratitude exercises help, but modestly. Davis et al. (2016) found small gains in well-being compared with neutral activities ($d = .17$). Against other psychologically active exercises, gratitude did no better. Cregg and Cheavens (2021) pooled 27 studies ($N = 3,675$) and found only a small effect on depression and anxiety ($g = -0.29$). The authors cautioned that gratitude exercises should not replace proven treatment. Gratitude is a discipline that tilts the mind, not a cure. Still, what we choose to dwell on appears not to be mentally neutral.

For the group: When my mind is idle, where does it go? What would it take to redirect it?

Living it out

1. **Answer the loop with a concrete next step.** When a worry or grievance starts circling, ask “What exactly happened, and what is the next thing I can do?” instead of “Why does this always happen to me?” Then pray about the concrete thing (Phil. 4:6) and do the next step (4:9). *Evidence: moderate.* Watkins’s (2008) review supports the concrete-versus-abstract distinction. A small randomized trial showed that targeting rumination helps (Watkins et al., 2011). Neither study tested prayer.
2. **Run the “whatever is true” test first, then reframe.** Gratitude is not denial. When you catch a dark interpretation (“my boss is out to get me”), ask what is actually true. Then ask what is honorable or right to believe about the person or situation, and name a fairer reading. *Evidence: strong* that reappraisal is a reliable regulation strategy with a consistent neural signature, including reduced amygdala response (Buhle et al., 2014). Most of this research uses lab tasks with short emotional images, not real-world problems.
3. **Keep a specific weekly “worthy of praise” list.** Once a week, perhaps Saturday night before worship, write three to five specific things God gave you that week. Make them specific, like “my son asked me to help with his car,” not just “family.” Turn them into thanksgiving in prayer. *Evidence: small but real.* Randomized studies show gains in positive mood and well-being (Emmons & McCullough, 2003), but meta-analyses find small effects that do not beat other active exercises (Davis et al., 2016; Cregg & Cheavens, 2021). Expect a gentle tilt, not a transformation.
4. **Write one gratitude letter a month to a real person.** Thank a mentor, your wife, a pastor, or a coworker, saying exactly what they did and what it meant. Delivering it is optional. *Evidence: moderate for this specific practice.* A randomized trial of 293 counseling clients found better mental health at 4 and 12 weeks than therapy alone or expressive writing (Wong et al., 2018). The brain-imaging follow-ups are small and preliminary (Kini et al., 2016; Karns et al., 2017).
5. **Choose what fills the idle moments.** Mind-wandering is normal. The harm came from wandering to unpleasant material. Decide in advance what your mind goes to in the truck, the waiting room, or the minute before sleep: a memorized verse, a psalm, a hymn, a memory of God’s faithfulness. Treat the phone’s scroll as something that loads your attention, not something neutral. *Evidence: moderate* for the link between what minds wander to and mood (Killingsworth & Gilbert, 2010; correlational). Moderate for positive distraction relieving low mood in experiments (Nolen-Hoeksema et al., 2008). Scripture memory specifically has not been tested.

If rumination has become constant, or comes with persistent low mood, gratitude lists are not enough. Talk to a doctor or counselor. The evidence-based treatments work, and using them is not a failure of faith.

4. “Cease Striving”: Stillness and the Default Mode Network

“Cease striving and know that I am God; I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the earth.” (Psalm 46:10, NASB)

Many of us learned this verse as “Be still, and know that I am God” (KJV). The NASB renders it “Cease striving,” with a footnote offering “Let go, relax.” In context the psalm is about God’s sovereignty amid war and upheaval: “God is our refuge and strength” (v. 1), the nations rage, and the LORD “makes wars to cease” (v. 9). The command to stop is grounded in who God is, not in a relaxation technique. Even so, it asks for a real human posture: we stop our anxious self-effort and fix our attention on God.

Neuroscience has a name for the brain system most involved in what our minds do when we stop working on a task. It is called the default mode network (DMN). The DMN is a set of connected regions centered on the medial prefrontal cortex (just behind the forehead) and the posterior cingulate cortex (deep along the midline toward the back of the head). These regions become most active when we are not focused on the outside world. The idea began with an unexpected finding. Using PET scans, Raichle and colleagues (2001) noticed that the same group of regions reliably *quieted down* whenever people started a demanding, goal-directed task. They concluded that the brain has an organized “default” state that it suspends when it gets to work.

Later work clarified what that default state does. Reviewing three decades of imaging, Buckner, Andrews-Hanna, and Schacter (2008) showed that the DMN is active when we recall our own past, imagine the future, and think about what other people are thinking. It is the brain’s simulation engine. It draws on memory to rehearse scenarios that concern *me*. That is a gift: it is how we plan, reflect, and understand others. But the same engine can run without a driver. When it does, we get mind-wandering and rumination. In depressed adults, Hamilton and colleagues (2011; 17 depressed vs. 17 healthy adults, correlational) found that greater dominance of the DMN over task-focused networks at rest went with more of the brooding, maladaptive kind of rumination. Section 3 reported that people are less happy when their minds wander (Killingsworth & Gilbert, 2010). The DMN is a plausible part of the machinery behind that pattern. The man lying awake at 2 a.m., replaying the meeting and rehearsing tomorrow’s disasters, is running his default network hard.

Can practice change how this network behaves? Brewer and colleagues (2011) scanned 12 experienced meditators, who averaged more than 10,000 hours of practice, and 12 matched novices. During three kinds of meditation the experienced group showed relatively less activity in the main DMN hubs. They also showed stronger coupling between the posterior cingulate and regions involved in self-monitoring and cognitive control, both during meditation and at rest, and they reported less mind-wandering. Hasenkamp and colleagues (2012) explained the moment-by-moment mechanism. They asked 14 practitioners to press a button whenever they noticed their minds had wandered. DMN regions were active during the wandering itself. Salience-network regions, which flag “something important is happening,” became active at the moment of noticing. Executive control regions took over as attention was brought back. Stillness, in this picture, is not a blank mind. It is a repeated cycle: you drift, you notice, and you return. The returning is the exercise.

At the level of behavior, the best summary is a Johns Hopkins meta-analysis of 47 randomized trials with active control groups (3,515 participants). Mindfulness programs produced small-to-moderate improvements in anxiety (effect size about 0.38 at 8 weeks), depression (about 0.30), and pain. They were not better than other active treatments such as exercise or therapy (Goyal et al., 2014). That is real but modest evidence, and it is evidence for *mindfulness*.

That distinction matters. Brewer’s and Goyal’s participants practiced mindfulness, which trains nonjudgmental awareness of the present moment and has no object beyond it. Psalm 46 points stillness at a Person. Does that difference show up in the brain? The best direct evidence comes

from Schjoedt and colleagues (2009), who scanned 20 devout Danish Christians. When they recited the Lord’s Prayer, the pattern resembled reciting a nursery rhyme. When they prayed in their own words, regions used in social cognition became active, including the medial prefrontal cortex, the temporo-parietal junction, and the precuneus. These regions are used for thinking about another mind. Making wishes to Santa Claus did not produce the same response. The authors’ interpretation is that believers treat personal prayer as a real conversation with someone who can respond. Notice that several of those areas overlap with the DMN. Christian prayer may not so much *silence* the self-referential network as reorient it, from “me and my problems” toward “me before You.” That is my inference from one small study, not an established finding.

Other Christian-practice evidence is thinner. In a preliminary SPECT study (a scan that uses a small injected tracer to map blood flow in the brain), Newberg and colleagues (2003) scanned three Franciscan nuns during repetitive, phrase-focused prayer. Compared with each nun’s own resting scan, they found increased blood flow in prefrontal, inferior frontal, and inferior parietal regions. Three participants in a lower-tier journal is a case series, not a verdict. Anthropologist Tanya Luhrmann’s work with evangelical congregations (Luhrmann et al., 2010; Luhrmann & Morgain, 2012) suggests that prayer is a learned skill. In a randomized trial, imaginative, Scripture-based prayer sharpened mental imagery and made inner experience feel more vivid and significant. The largest trial of a Christian contemplative practice is sobering. Rohde and colleagues (2024) randomized 702 Christians to 28 days of Centering Prayer with explicitly religious framing, the same practice without religious framing, or simple daily reflection. All three groups improved in well-being, and the groups did not differ. The religious framing did increase measures of daily spiritual experience. If we are honest, the data do not show that contemplative prayer is a superior stress technique. They suggest it is at least as good as secular alternatives and that it carries something the alternatives do not.

The body offers one more convergence. Bernardi and colleagues (2001) had 23 healthy adults recite the rosary’s Ave Maria in Latin. The prayer’s natural rhythm slowed breathing to about six breaths per minute. That pace produced strong, synchronized rhythms in heart rate and blood pressure and increased baroreflex sensitivity, the body’s beat-to-beat blood-pressure stabilizer. A systematic review of slow breathing below ten breaths per minute links it to greater heart rate variability, a marker of vagal (“rest and digest”) activity, and to reports of calm and reduced anxiety (Zaccaro et al., 2018). Unhurried, rhythmic prayer is, among other things, a breathing exercise.

The modest convergence is this. Practiced, focused stillness appears to change how the brain handles self-focused, wandering thought, and slow, rhythmic prayer calms the body’s stress machinery. Neither finding tells us that God is there. Psalm 46 supplies what no scanner can: the reason a man can stop striving is that the LORD of hosts is with us.

For the group: What does “ceasing striving” look like for a man who is responsible for a lot?

Living it out

1. **The ten-minute “Psalm 46” sit.** Once a day, sit for ten minutes. Read Psalm 46 slowly once, then rest on one phrase (“Cease striving and know that I am God”). When you notice your mind has drifted to the to-do list, don’t scold yourself. Name it, hand it to God, and come back to the phrase. This is the drift, notice, return cycle that Hasenkamp et al. (2012) mapped. Brewer et al. (2011) suggest that long practice changes DMN behavior. *Evidence: moderate for the mental-training mechanism (small imaging studies, consistent with meta-analytic benefits of meditation; Goyal et al., 2014). Weak and indirect for this specifically Christian form; the*

largest Christian trial found benefits equal to, not greater than, a secular comparison (Rohde et al., 2024).

2. **Pray out loud, in your own words, to Someone.** Don't let stillness become an empty mind. After the quiet, speak to God the way you would speak to a trusted friend about the thing you were striving over. Schjoedt et al. (2009) found that improvised personal prayer, unlike recited words, engaged the brain's "other minds" network. That is consistent with Psalm 46's point that stillness is relational: *know that I am God. Evidence: one fMRI study of 20 devout Christians. It shows what prayer engages, not that it produces a health benefit.*
3. **Slow the breath with the words.** In a stressful moment (in traffic, before a hard conversation), pray a short line on a slow breath: breathe in on "Be still," breathe out on "and know that I am God." Aim for about five to six breaths a minute, roughly a five-second inhale and a five-second exhale. Bernardi et al. (2001) found that rhythmic prayer at this pace strengthened cardiovascular rhythms and baroreflex sensitivity, and slow breathing reliably raises heart rate variability (Zaccaro et al., 2018). *Evidence: good for the short-term physiological effect of slow breathing (consistent small experimental studies). Long-term health effects of prayer-paced breathing specifically are untested.*
4. **Give the 2 a.m. replay a script.** When you catch yourself rehearsing worst cases at night, recognize it as the default network running without a driver (Hamilton et al., 2011). Interrupt it with a fixed pattern: name the worry, place it before God in one sentence ("Lord, the deal and the kids are Yours"), then return to a memorized verse or a slow breath. Repetitive negative thinking is a known risk factor for anxiety and depression, and meditation training modestly reduces anxiety (Goyal et al., 2014). *Evidence: moderate that attention training helps rumination in general. No trial has tested this exact bedtime practice. Persistent insomnia or depression calls for a doctor, not just a technique.*
5. **Learn it like a skill, and expect it to take time.** Commit to the practice for 30 days before you judge it, and expect the first weeks to feel awkward. Luhrmann's research found that prayer is a trainable skill. People who practiced imaginative, Scripture-based prayer reported more vivid and significant inner experience (Luhrmann & Morgain, 2012), and time spent in prayer tracked with more vivid experiences of God (Luhrmann et al., 2010). *Evidence: moderate that prayer practice changes how prayer is experienced (one randomized trial plus ethnographic and correlational work). It does not show health outcomes.*

5. "Do Not Let the Sun Go Down on Your Anger": Sleep and Emotional Memory

"Be angry, and yet do not sin; do not let the sun go down on your anger." (Ephesians 4:26, NASB)

Paul is quoting Psalm 4:4 (from the Greek Old Testament), and he does not forbid anger. He forbids letting it settle in. The next verse gives the reason: "and do not give the devil an opportunity" (4:27). A few lines later the remedy is named: put away "all bitterness and wrath and anger," and be "kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other" (4:31–32). The "sunset" is a deadline for dealing with anger, not a deadline for going to bed. In Paul's world, sunset also ended the day. The point is that anger should not be carried over into a new day, where it hardens into bitterness. Modern memory research turns out to have something to say about what happens to emotional experiences overnight. What it says is more interesting than the popular headline, and less tidy.

How a memory moves house. A new experience is first held by the hippocampus, a seahorse-shaped structure deep in the temporal lobe. It works like a fast, temporary index that binds together the sights, words, and feelings of an event. The long-term store is the neocortex, the brain’s outer layer, which learns slowly. During sleep, especially deep slow-wave sleep, the hippocampus “replays” the day’s experiences in rapid bursts. Those bursts are timed with slow cortical waves and with spindles (brief bursts of brain-wave activity). This timing lets the neocortex rehearse the memory and gradually take it over. The result is more stable, more integrated with what we already know, and less dependent on the hippocampus (Klinzing, Niethard, & Born, 2019). This is good for learning a skill or a Bible verse. It also means the brain is filing the day’s emotional events, including the argument at dinner.

The study behind the headline. Liu, Lin, Liu, Luo, Wu, Bayley, and Qin (2016) tested what this filing does to our ability to push unwanted emotional memories away. Twenty-one young men learned to pair neutral faces with disturbing pictures. One set was learned the day before scanning and one set 30 minutes before. In the scanner, they saw a face and were told either to recall the picture or to block it from mind. Blocking worked on the fresh memories: the men forgot more of them, and their skin-conductance (sweat) response, a measure of bodily arousal, dropped. For the day-old memories, blocking worked less well, and the emotional charge stayed. The brain worked harder to suppress them, with more prefrontal effort and less quieting of the hippocampus and amygdala. Pattern analyses suggested that the day-old memories had already begun shifting from hippocampal to distributed neocortical representations, out of reach of the prefrontal “brakes” that act on the hippocampus. A second cohort of 25 replicated the behavioral and arousal pattern.

The limits matter. The imaging sample was small and all male. Sleep was not recorded. Because the “old” memories differed from the new ones both by a night of sleep and by a full day of time, the authors themselves note that a wake control group is needed to show that sleep, rather than time, did the work. The study also did not measure anger or conflict. What it shows is narrower and still useful: within a day, an aversive memory becomes harder to shove out of mind by willpower alone. That is a fair picture of what Paul rules out. Stuffing anger and going to bed is not the same as putting it away.

The other side: sleep as overnight processing. Matthew Walker and Els van der Helm (2009) proposed that REM (dreaming) sleep does the opposite job. During REM, noradrenaline, the brain’s main arousal chemical, falls to its lowest level of the 24-hour cycle. Emotional memory networks are meanwhile reactivated. The idea is that the brain can replay the memory in a chemically calm state and keep the information while stripping some of the sting. In a test, 34 adults viewed emotional pictures twice, 12 hours apart, with either a night’s sleep or a waking day between (van der Helm et al., 2011). After sleep, amygdala responses went down, connection with the ventromedial prefrontal cortex increased, and the most intense ratings softened. After wake, the reverse happened. The participants who showed the largest softening had the lowest REM-sleep gamma activity, an EEG marker linked to lower noradrenaline.

The evidence here is mixed. Baran, Pace-Schott, Ericson, and Spencer (2012) found that sleep *preserved* negative emotional reactivity, and that wake reduced it. Meta-analyses find no general rule that sleep preferentially strengthens emotional over neutral memories. Effects appear only under certain methods (Lipinska et al., 2019), or when REM sleep is compared with slow-wave sleep (Schäfer et al., 2020). Taken together, sleep reorganizes emotional memories, and it may soften them under some conditions, but there is no guarantee that it will. A related line of research suggests that a stored memory becomes briefly changeable again when it is actively recalled. This is called “reconsolidation,” and it is an area of active debate about when it occurs (Lee, Nader, &

Schiller, 2017). That idea is worth holding next to Paul’s words. Bringing a grievance into the open, while it is still fresh and in the presence of grace, may be the moment it can actually be reshaped.

Sleep loss is no help either. After about 35 hours awake, amygdala responses to negative pictures were roughly 60% stronger than in rested controls, and the amygdala’s coupling with the regulating medial prefrontal cortex was weaker (Yoo, Gujar, Hu, Jolesz, & Walker, 2007; 26 adults). In a randomized trial with 142 community adults, two nights of restricted sleep increased anger and erased the normal tendency for irritation to fade with repeated annoyance (Krizan & Hisler, 2019). In couples, a night of poor sleep predicted more conflict the next day in a 14-day diary study of 78 people. In the laboratory with 69 couples, poor sleep reduced the ability to read the partner’s emotions and made resolution less likely, and one tired partner was enough to hinder it (Gordon & Chen, 2014). In 43 married couples, shorter recent sleep went with larger inflammatory responses after a conflict discussion. Couples who expressed their feelings and tried to see the other’s side did not show that inflammatory increase (Wilson et al., 2017; observational).

Why it matters for the body. Anger and hostility predicted future coronary heart disease in initially healthy people across 25 prospective studies (hazard ratio 1.19), and the association was stronger in men (Chida & Steptoe, 2009). Outbursts of anger were followed by a higher rate of heart attacks and strokes in the next two hours (Mostofsky, Penner, & Mittleman, 2014). These are correlational studies with signs of publication bias, but they are consistent.

So the lesson is not “stay up all night arguing.” It is closer to Paul’s actual point: deal with the anger the same day, by naming it, confessing your part, and seeking reconciliation. If it cannot be finished tonight, lay it down before God with a plan to return to it, and then rest. An exhausted brain is a poor peacemaker, and a stuffed grievance does not stay put.

For the group: Is there a conflict I have been letting “consolidate” for days or years?

Living it out

1. **The sunset check-in.** Before the day ends, ask your wife (or the person you clashed with), “Is there anything between us from today?” Then name your own part in one or two plain sentences: “I was short with you, and I was wrong.” Naming a feeling in words (“I’m angry,” “I felt dismissed”) lowers amygdala response and recruits right ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (Lieberman et al., 2007; fMRI, small sample). In a spider-fear exposure study, labeling reduced later physical arousal but not self-reported fear (Kircanski, Lieberman, & Craske, 2012). Evidence for labeling is moderate and mostly laboratory-based. The practice also fits Paul’s call to speak truth (Eph. 4:25) before the sun sets.
2. **Cool down before you talk, but do not wait days.** If you are too hot to talk well, take 20 to 30 minutes of something that lowers arousal: slow breathing, a quiet walk, prayer. Do not vent by punching a bag or going for a hard run. A meta-analysis of 154 studies (10,189 participants) found that arousal-*decreasing* activities reduced anger and aggression ($g = -0.63$), while arousal-*increasing* activities did nothing on average (Kjærvik & Bushman, 2024). This is strong evidence. Then come back the same evening. “Be angry, and yet do not sin” leaves room for a pause; it does not leave room for a grudge.
3. **If it can’t be settled tonight, make a covenant to return, and then sleep.** Some conflicts are too big for one evening. Say so out loud: “I love you. We’re not done. Let’s talk at breakfast.” Pray together, even briefly, and hold hands while you do it. Then go to sleep. Don’t

argue at midnight. Evidence that sleep softens emotional memories is mixed (van der Helm et al., 2011, versus Baran et al., 2012). But the evidence that being short on sleep makes anger worse and conflict resolution harder is solid, from experimental and dyadic studies (Krizan & Hisler, 2019; Gordon & Chen, 2014). What matters is the honest acknowledgment before bed, not forcing a resolution on a tired brain.

4. **Guard your sleep as a peacemaking discipline.** Aim for 7 to 9 hours. Know that after a short night you will read your wife’s face less accurately and get angry more easily, and when both of you are short on sleep, you will both be more hostile (Gordon & Chen, 2014; Wilson et al., 2017; observational). On those days, postpone hard conversations if you can and give each other extra grace. The evidence is moderate: the experimental sleep-restriction findings are strong, and the couple findings are correlational.
5. **Don’t “stuff it”; bring it into the light.** Willpower suppression of an upsetting memory gets less effective within a day (Liu et al., 2016; small, all-male, preliminary). Long-standing hostility is linked to heart disease, especially in men (Chida & Steptoe, 2009; correlational meta-analysis). If a grievance keeps coming back, don’t keep pushing it down. Tell a brother in the group, confess your part to God, and take the step toward forgiveness that Ephesians 4:32 calls for. The heart-disease evidence is consistent across many cohorts, but it shows association, not proof that letting go of anger prevents disease.

6. The Sabbath, Chronic Stress, and the Hippocampus

“Jesus said to them, ‘The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.’” (Mark 2:27, NASB)

Jesus says this while defending hungry disciples who were picking grain on the Sabbath (Mark 2:23-28). His point is not that rest is optional. It is that the Sabbath is a gift fitted to human need, not a burden laid on top of it. Neuroscience has a lot to say about what happens when that need goes unmet.

Allostatic load. Bruce McEwen of Rockefeller University and Eliot Stellar introduced the term *allostatic load* (McEwen & Stellar, 1993), and McEwen (1998) made it widely known. The idea is simple. Your body’s stress systems are built to switch on in a crisis and then switch off. When they switch on too often, or fail to switch off, the cumulative cost is wear and tear on the body.

The main hormonal stress system is the HPA axis, short for hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal. It is a three-step relay. The hypothalamus at the base of the brain signals the pituitary gland, the pituitary signals the adrenal glands above the kidneys, and the adrenals release cortisol, the main stress hormone. Working alongside it is the fast-acting sympathetic (“fight or flight”) nervous system. The cardiovascular, metabolic, and immune systems all respond to these signals, so they carry the cost when the signals never stop. In McEwen’s framework, acute stress responses are protective. Chronic activation without recovery is what does the damage.

Why the hippocampus? The hippocampus is a seahorse-shaped structure deep in each temporal lobe. It is essential for forming new memories, and it is also one of the brain’s main brakes on the HPA axis. It is packed with both types of cortisol receptor. When cortisol rises, the hippocampus senses it and helps signal the hypothalamus to turn the system back down. It is not the only brake. In animals, removing the hippocampus weakens this feedback without abolishing it (Jacobson & Sapolsky, 1991). But its high density of receptors makes it unusually exposed to cortisol, which

helps explain why stress can impair memory.

In rats, repeated stress makes the branching dendrites of neurons in the hippocampal CA3 region retract, and it suppresses the birth of new neurons in the dentate gyrus. These changes are largely reversible when the stress ends (McEwen, 1999). One worry follows naturally. If chronic stress weakens the hippocampus, the hippocampus brakes the stress response less well, and stress runs longer. That is a hypothesized vicious cycle, not an established human fact.

What the human evidence actually shows. The clearest human data come from Cushing’s disease, where a tumor drives cortisol far above normal for years. In 12 such patients, hippocampal volume was negatively correlated with cortisol levels ($r = -0.73$), and smaller volume went with poorer verbal memory (Starkman, Gebarski, Berent, & Schteingart, 1992). After surgery lowered cortisol in 22 patients, hippocampal volume increased by up to 10% (mean 3.2%), and the size of the gain tracked the size of the cortisol drop (Starkman et al., 1999). That is encouraging: the change is at least partly reversible. In a small group of older adults whose cortisol rose over several years, those with the highest levels had smaller hippocampi and poorer memory (Lupien et al., 1998). Lupien, McEwen, Gunnar, and Heim (2009) review how the timing and duration of stress-hormone exposure shape the brain across the lifespan.

Ordinary stress is a different matter. The largest PTSD imaging study, 1,868 people from 16 cohorts, found smaller hippocampi in current PTSD, but the average difference was small (Cohen’s $d = -0.17$; Logue et al., 2018). A study of identical twins suggests that some of the difference was there *before* the trauma and may be a risk factor rather than damage (Gilbertson et al., 2002). A study of 30 people with long-term occupational stress and 68 controls found no hippocampal difference at all. The reductions it did find were in prefrontal and striatal regions involved in attention and self-regulation (Blix, Perski, Berglund, & Savic, 2013). All of these studies are correlational. So we should not assume that a stressful season is shrinking anyone’s hippocampus. The stronger, safer claim is the general one: stress systems are built to cycle, and recovery is part of the design.

Recovery is something you do. Occupational research supplies the human, behavioral side. Sonnentag and Fritz (2015) reviewed cross-sectional, longitudinal, and daily-diary studies showing that *psychological detachment*, mentally switching off from work during off-hours, is a key route to recovery. Heavy workloads erode detachment, and low detachment predicts strain and burnout. A meta-analysis of 91 samples (about 38,000 employees) found that detachment goes with less exhaustion, better sleep, and greater well-being (Wendsche & Lohmann-Haislah, 2017). The effects were small to medium. Two honest limits: the data are mostly self-report, and detachment was *not* significantly related to physiological stress markers such as cortisol.

Rhythm matters as much as quantity. A meta-analysis of vacation studies found that vacations improve health and well-being ($d = 0.43$) but that the benefit fades soon after people return to work ($d = -0.38$; de Bloom et al., 2009). A once-a-year break cannot do the work of a weekly one. Sleep is part of this too. When 11 young men were restricted to 4 hours in bed for six nights, their evening cortisol rose and their sympathetic nervous system activity increased (Spiegel, Leproult, & Van Cauter, 1999). Rest that cuts into sleep is not rest.

Studies of Sabbath-keeping itself. These are few and correlational, and none measures the brain or hormones. In a survey of 5,411 North American Seventh-day Adventists, Sabbath-keeping was associated with better self-reported health. The link was partly explained by religious coping, religious support, diet, and exercise (Superville, Pargament, & Lee, 2014). In 1,316 United Methodist clergy, keeping more Sabbath days went with higher spiritual well-being and quality of life. After adjusting for other factors, though, it was not significantly related to depression, anx-

iety, or physical health (Hough et al., 2019). In a 9-month follow-up of 167 clergy after Sabbath workshops, those whose Sabbath-keeping *declined* reported more anxiety and were less likely to be flourishing. Increases in Sabbath-keeping were linked to only one modest benefit. That study had no control group, and the authors note that most findings would not survive a correction for multiple comparisons (Proeschold-Bell et al., 2022). Adventists’ well-documented longevity (Fraser & Shavlik, 2001) is usually traced to diet, exercise, and not smoking. It cannot be credited to the Sabbath alone.

So I am not aware of any neuroimaging or cortisol study of Sabbath-keeping, and I will not pretend otherwise. The convergence is at the level of design principle: a body built with a stress system that must cycle between activation and recovery, and a Creator who built a rhythm of work and rest into the week.

For the group: What would genuine detachment from work look like for me one day a week?

Living it out

1. **Keep a weekly day, not just an annual vacation.** Pick a recurring 24-hour block and guard it the way you would guard a meeting with your boss. Vacation benefits fade within weeks of returning to work (de Bloom et al., 2009), and a weekly rhythm keeps renewing them. That is closer to the creation pattern than an annual break. *Evidence:* moderate for “recovery helps and fades” (a meta-analysis of 7 studies); the Sabbath-specific benefit is only weak and correlational.
2. **Detach on purpose: close the laptop, silence the work email.** Detachment means not *thinking* about work, not just not doing it. Put the phone’s work apps in a folder you do not open on the Sabbath, and write tomorrow’s to-do list Saturday night so your mind can let go of it. This is the best-supported element: detachment is consistently linked to less exhaustion and better sleep (Sonnetag & Fritz, 2015; Wendsche & Lohmann-Haislah, 2017). *Evidence:* moderate to strong for self-reported well-being; not shown to change cortisol.
3. **Protect sleep as part of the Sabbath.** Do not trade the Sabbath for a late night of catching up. Six nights of short sleep raised evening cortisol and sympathetic activity in young men (Spiegel et al., 1999). A Sabbath that begins with a full night’s sleep starts the reset. *Evidence:* strong experimental evidence that sleep loss raises stress physiology, though in a small lab sample.
4. **Make it worship and fellowship, not just time off.** In the Adventist data, the Sabbath’s link with health ran partly through religious coping and religious support (Superville et al., 2014). Among clergy, social support was the factor most consistently tied to health (Hough et al., 2019). Spend part of the day in worship, at a shared meal, or walking with your wife or a brother from the group. *Evidence:* correlational and self-report only; plausible, but not proven.
5. **Watch for the slide, and get back on track.** In the clergy follow-up, *losing* the Sabbath was more clearly tied to anxiety than gaining it was to benefit (Proeschold-Bell et al., 2022). Ask a man in the group to check in with you weekly (“Did you keep your day?”), and treat a missed week as a signal, not a failure. *Evidence:* weak (uncontrolled, 167 participants, findings fragile after multiple-comparison correction), but it fits the broader recovery literature.

7. “Two Are Better Than One”: Loneliness and Mortality

“Two are better than one because they have a good return for their labor. For if either of them falls, the one will lift up his companion. But woe to the one who falls when there is not another to lift him up . . . A cord of three strands is not quickly torn apart.” (Ecclesiastes 4:9-10, 12, NASB)

The Preacher sets up this saying with a portrait that should make any working man uncomfortable. “There was a certain man without a dependent, having neither a son nor a brother, yet there was no end to all his labor.” Then the man finally asks, “For whom am I laboring and depriving myself of pleasure?” (Ecclesiastes 4:8). The verses on companionship answer that lonely, driven man. The answer is practical: a partner who lifts you when you fall, warmth on a cold night, and help against an attacker. The “cord of three strands” in verse 12 most naturally means that each companion added makes the bond stronger. Christians have long heard God as the third strand. That reading is a fair application, but it is not the verse’s plain sense.

This observation has some of the strongest empirical backing of anything in this paper. Holt-Lunstad, Smith, and Layton (2010) meta-analyzed 148 prospective studies covering 308,849 participants. People with stronger social relationships had about 50% greater odds of surviving the follow-up periods (odds ratio 1.50). The effect held across age, sex, initial health status, and cause of death. It was strongest for complex measures of social integration (odds ratio 1.91). It was weakest, and not statistically significant, for simply living with someone (odds ratio 1.19). A follow-up meta-analysis separated the pieces (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). Being objectively isolated, feeling lonely, and living alone each carried roughly 26% to 32% greater odds of death after controlling for other factors. Objective and subjective isolation did not differ. The associations were stronger in samples younger than 65, so this is not only an old man’s problem. The most recent synthesis, 90 cohort studies with over 2.2 million people, found a smaller but still clear signal. Social isolation was linked to 32% higher risk of death from any cause and loneliness to 14% higher risk (Wang et al., 2023). A separate meta-analysis linked poor social relationships to about 29% greater risk of coronary heart disease and 32% greater risk of stroke (Valtorta et al., 2016). In 2023 the U.S. Surgeon General issued a national advisory. It noted that roughly half of American adults report loneliness and called disconnection a public health crisis (Office of the U.S. Surgeon General, 2023).

How could loneliness get under the skin? The leading account, developed by John Cacioppo and Louise Hawkley, treats loneliness as a biological alarm signal, much like hunger or thirst. For a social species, being cut off from the group used to mean danger. So the lonely brain shifts into a self-protective mode. It scans more for social threat, reads ambiguous faces and comments more negatively, sleeps more lightly, and holds back from the very people it needs (Hawkley & Cacioppo, 2010). In a small fMRI study, lonely young adults showed weaker activity in the ventral striatum, a reward hub, when viewing pleasant pictures of people rather than objects. They also showed more visual-cortex attention to other people’s distress (Cacioppo et al., 2009). In other words, the lonely brain finds people less rewarding and more threatening. That is a vicious circle, and it is exactly the man in Ecclesiastes 4:8.

That vigilance seems to reach the immune system. Steve Cole and colleagues looked at gene expression in white blood cells. In chronically lonely people they found more activity in genes that drive inflammation (via the transcription factor NF- κ B). They also found less activity in genes that respond to cortisol’s anti-inflammatory signal and in genes for antiviral defense (Cole et al., 2007). Cole calls this pattern the “conserved transcriptional response to adversity.” The 2007 study compared only 14 people, so it was a first look. A larger follow-up tracked 141 older

adults over time. It found that loneliness was linked to heightened sympathetic (“fight or flight”) nervous system activity and to an expansion of inflammatory monocytes, a type of immune cell. Experiments in rhesus monkeys showed the same pattern, along with cells that had become less sensitive to cortisol and a weaker antiviral response (Cole et al., 2015). Put simply, the body of a chronically isolated person behaves as if it expects wounds. It readies for inflammation at the cost of fighting viruses. Over years, chronic low-grade inflammation is linked to heart disease and other illnesses. An honest limit: a meta-analysis of blood inflammatory markers found mixed results. Loneliness was linked to interleukin-6 only in the most-adjusted analyses, and not to C-reactive protein. Isolation was linked most consistently to fibrinogen (K. J. Smith et al., 2020). The pathway is plausible and partly supported, not settled. Health behaviors such as smoking, drinking, inactivity, and skipped doctor visits almost certainly add to it.

Rejection also registers in the brain as distress. In a well-known small study, people who were left out of a virtual ball-tossing game showed more activity in the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, a region also active in physical pain, and that activity tracked how distressed they felt (Eisenberger et al., 2003). Later work using more refined pattern analysis in 60 people found that the brain’s representations of physical pain and of rejection overlap in location but are distinct (Woo et al., 2014). So “rejection literally hurts like a burn” overstates the finding. What holds up is more modest: social disconnection engages the brain’s distress and threat systems.

Where does the church come in? Several large Harvard cohort studies have tracked religious service attendance. In the Nurses’ Health Study, women who attended more than once a week had 33% lower all-cause mortality over about 16 years than women who never attended. That study covered 74,534 women and 13,537 deaths (hazard ratio 0.67; Li et al., 2016). Social support explained about 23% of that association. In a second analysis of 89,708 women in the same cohort, weekly attendance was linked to a roughly five-fold lower suicide rate (VanderWeele et al., 2016). Across three U.S. cohorts that included men, weekly attenders had 26% lower mortality and less depression, hopelessness, and loneliness (Chen et al., 2021). The limits are real. These studies are observational, the strongest data come from women who were nurses, and people who attend may differ in ways no model fully captures. But the pattern is consistent: sharing life with a worshipping community travels with longer, less lonely lives.

That last detail matters for men. Sharing an address is not the same as being known. In a 2021 national survey, 15% of men reported having no close friends. That is up from 3% of all adults in a 1990 Gallup poll, though the two surveys used different methods. Only 21% of men had received emotional support from a friend in the past week, compared with 41% of women (Cox, 2021). The data favor rich, multi-stranded integration, the kind of “cord of three strands” a committed small group can provide.

For the group: Who would lift me up if I fell this week? Who would I lift?

Living it out

1. **Name your “lifter” and tell him.** Verse 10 assumes a specific person who will lift you up. Pick one or two men in this group and agree to call each other when one of you falls, whether that is a temptation, a diagnosis, or a job loss. *Evidence:* The mortality link is strongest for complex, real integration (OR 1.91) and weakest for merely living near people (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010). This is strong, consistent observational evidence, but it is not proof that adding one friend will extend your life.

2. **Make the weekly empathy call.** Call a man who is homebound, widowed, recently divorced, or new to the church, and mostly listen. *Evidence:* In a randomized trial with 240 adults, briefly trained young volunteers made empathy-focused phone calls over four weeks. Loneliness dropped (Cohen’s d about 0.48), and so did depression and anxiety, compared with controls (Kahlon et al., 2021). This is good evidence because it was randomized. But it was short, most participants were women, and the trial measured how people felt, not their health or survival.
3. **Challenge the lonely brain’s story.** When you notice yourself thinking “nobody wants me there” or “they’re judging me,” treat it as a symptom of the alarm and not as a fact. Show up anyway, and ask a brother to check your read of the situation. *Evidence:* In randomized trials, the loneliness interventions that worked best targeted these distorted social thoughts, more than simply adding social contact (Masi et al., 2011). The underlying vigilance is well described (Hawkey & Cacioppo, 2010). The evidence is moderate: the effects are real but modest.
4. **Keep the weekly rhythm of worship and small group.** Treat Sunday worship and this group as fixed appointments, not leftover time. *Evidence:* Weekly attendance is consistently linked to lower mortality, lower suicide, and less loneliness in large prospective cohorts (Li et al., 2016; VanderWeele et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2021). This is strong observational evidence, but not experimental, and much of it comes from women. Attend for Christ’s sake. The health finding is a side effect, not the reason.
5. **Use your hands as well as your words.** Put a hand on a brother’s shoulder when you pray for him, and hold your wife’s hand when she is anxious. *Evidence:* In 16 married women under threat of shock, holding their husband’s hand dampened activity in threat-responsive brain regions, and the better the marriage, the bigger the effect. A stranger’s hand helped less (Coan et al., 2006). A larger follow-up with 110 adults, 59 of them men, found the same effect for spouses, partners, and close friends, but none for strangers (Coan et al., 2017; see Section 11). These studies measured brain activity, not cortisol. *Moderate*, and it works best with people you trust.

8. “Do Not Worry About Tomorrow”: Worry and the Body’s Stress Response

“So do not worry about tomorrow; for tomorrow will care for itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own.” (Matthew 6:34, NASB)

Jesus does not deny that tomorrow will have trouble. He tells us not to borrow it. The verse closes an argument that starts at 6:25: look at the birds, look at the lilies, and remember that “your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things” (6:32). The command not to worry rests on the Father’s care, and on putting “His kingdom and His righteousness” first (6:33). It is not a relaxation technique. But Jesus also makes a claim about how human beings are built: one day’s trouble is a full load. The research described below fits that claim closely.

The hypothesis. Brosschot, Gerin, and Thayer (2006) proposed the *perseverative cognition hypothesis*. “Perseverative cognition” is the researchers’ umbrella term for worry and rumination: the mind that keeps circling the same problem. Their point was simple. A stressful event may last a few minutes. Worry stretches the body’s response to it over hours, both before the event (anticipation) and after it (rumination). They argued that this *prolonged* activation, not the brief spike, does much of the long-term damage. In their review they called the evidence “preliminary support,” and that is still the honest description.

What the body does while we worry. Daily-life studies make the idea concrete. Brosschot, Van Dijk, and Thayer (2007) had 52 healthy adults keep an hourly worry diary while wearing a heart monitor. On days with more worry, heart rate was higher and heart rate variability (HRV) was lower. The effect carried into that night’s sleep, and worry duration statistically accounted for (mediated) the link between the day’s stressors and the heart’s response. Pieper and colleagues (2010) followed 73 teachers for four days. Worry episodes raised heart rate by about 2.5 beats per minute while they were happening, about 3 beats per minute in the following hour, and about 1.5 beats per minute two hours later. The stressful events themselves were not linked to heart changes in this analysis. The thinking about them was. Both studies are correlational and small, and they cannot rule out every hidden cause. Still, they do something lab studies cannot: they watch worry act on the heart in ordinary life.

A meta-analysis then pooled the evidence. Ottaviani and colleagues (2016) combined 60 studies of healthy people. In experimental studies (where researchers asked people to worry or ruminate) and in correlational studies (where people’s normal worry was measured), perseverative cognition was linked to higher heart rate, lower HRV, and higher cortisol. Cortisol is the body’s main stress hormone, and its effect was about the same size in both kinds of study ($g = .36$ and $.32$). Blood pressure rose in experimental studies, and that was the largest effect ($g = .45$ to $.51$). It was also the only result that showed signs of publication bias, meaning small studies with null results may be missing from the record. The fair summary is that worry measurably affects the heart and the hormonal stress system. The effects are small to moderate, they come from healthy people, and the blood-pressure numbers deserve the most caution.

The mechanism: a brake that worry releases. Why would a thought change the heart? Thayer and Lane’s (2000) *neurovisceral integration model* offers an answer. The brain’s alarm system, centered on the amygdala, is always ready to fire. The prefrontal cortex, especially its middle and lower parts just behind the forehead, acts as a brake. When the prefrontal cortex judges a situation safe, it sends inhibiting signals down through the brainstem and out along the vagus nerve, which slows the heart. That vagal brake is what HRV measures. A healthy heart does not beat like a metronome. It speeds up slightly with each breath in and slows with each breath out, and the size of that swing reflects how strongly the vagus is working. A meta-analysis of brain-imaging studies found that HRV tracks activity in exactly these regions, the amygdala and the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (Thayer et al., 2012). The authors added a striking claim: the brain’s *default* response to uncertainty is threat. Unless the prefrontal cortex supplies a reason to feel safe, the alarm stays on.

Worry, on this account, is a mind that keeps telling the brain it is not safe yet. Imaging studies of generalized anxiety disorder (GAD), the clinical form of chronic worry, point the same way. Etkin and colleagues (2009) found that in 16 patients the amygdala’s links to other brain networks were less distinct than in healthy controls. Makovac and colleagues (2016) scanned 19 patients and 21 controls before and after asking them to worry. In patients, amygdala-prefrontal connectivity changed as worry rose. The size of certain amygdala-connectivity changes predicted how much HRV fell. These are small imaging studies, and they show association, not proof that one thing causes the other. But they connect the anxious thought, the brain’s threat circuitry, and the heart in a single picture.

Why worry is so hard to stop. Two lines of research explain why worry feels useful while it costs us. First, *intolerance of uncertainty*, the felt need to know how things will turn out, is strongly linked to worry and anxiety. A meta-analysis of 181 studies and more than 52,000 people found a moderate overall correlation ($r = .51$) between intolerance of uncertainty and symptoms across

many disorders (McEvoy et al., 2019). Second, the *contrast avoidance model* suggests that chronic worriers use worry to stay braced, keeping themselves in a steady negative state so that bad news never catches them off guard (Newman & Llera, 2011). Both describe the same move. We try to control tomorrow by living in it now. Jesus names the cost directly: it adds nothing to our life (Matthew 6:27) and takes away from today.

Can worry be set down? Researchers have tested a simple practice called *worry postponement* or *stimulus control*. When a worry comes up, you note it and put it off until a fixed 30-minute “worry period” each day (Borkovec et al., 1983). The results are mixed, and the paper should say so. In a randomized trial of 53 high worriers, two weeks of stimulus control reduced worry, anxiety, and insomnia more than a comparison condition did (McGowan & Behar, 2013). Among 227 Dutch schoolchildren, postponement instructions reduced how often worrisome thoughts came up (Jellesma et al., 2009). But a large online trial found no benefit (Versluis et al., 2016), and so did a study of 114 health-anxious students (Mobach et al., 2019). In a recent 14-day trial with 186 adults, postponement worked best when people made specific “if-then” plans for when and how to postpone. It cut daily worry by about 15 minutes, though sleep did not improve (McCarrick et al., 2025). The practice seems to help some people, especially when it is concrete and structured. It is not a guaranteed fix.

The convergence is this. Jesus says each day has enough trouble. The research suggests the body is built to carry today’s load: a stress response that rises and then recovers. Worry asks it to carry tomorrow’s load as well, keeping the alarm on and the vagal brake released for trouble that has not yet arrived. Jesus’ remedy, however, goes deeper than any technique. It is not “think less about tomorrow” but “your heavenly Father knows.” Trust supplies the brain’s missing safety signal from outside ourselves.

For the group: What am I carrying today that actually belongs to tomorrow?

Living it out

1. **Hand tomorrow to the Father on a schedule.** Set a fixed 15- to 30-minute “worry and prayer” appointment each evening, not near bedtime. During the day, when a worry about tomorrow comes up, write it in one line on a card or in your phone and say, “Not now, Lord; tonight.” When the appointment comes, go through the list: pray over each item, decide one concrete step if there is one, and release the rest (1 Peter 5:7). This is worry postponement, or stimulus control. The evidence is mixed: a small randomized trial and a large study of children found benefits, but two online and student trials did not (McGowan & Behar, 2013; Jellesma et al., 2009; Versluis et al., 2016; Mobach et al., 2019). Treat it as worth trying, not proven.
2. **Make it concrete with an if-then plan.** Vague resolutions (“I’ll worry less”) rarely work. Write a specific one: “If I start rehearsing Monday’s meeting while driving, then I will say ‘Tomorrow will care for itself’ and save it for my 7 p.m. list.” In the 2025 trial, adding if-then plans to postponement cut daily worry by about 15 minutes compared with postponement alone (McCarrick et al., 2025). This is one moderately sized randomized trial, so call it promising.
3. **Pray at a breathing pace.** Slow, rhythmic prayer can engage the vagal brake that worry releases. Choose a short line of Scripture, such as “The LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want,” and pray it slowly: about five seconds in, five seconds out, which is roughly six breaths a minute, for five minutes. In a small lab study (23 adults), reciting the rosary at about six breaths per minute strengthened heart-rhythm oscillations and baroreflex sensitivity, a measure

of how well the body buffers swings in blood pressure (Bernardi et al., 2001). The benefit came from the breathing rhythm, not the specific words, and a yoga mantra did the same. Separately, a meta-analysis of HRV biofeedback, which trains this same slow breathing, found large drops in self-reported stress and anxiety ($g = 0.83$ versus controls; Goessl et al., 2017). The physiology is well supported. The idea that Scripture-paced prayer adds anything beyond the breathing has not been tested.

4. **Practice trusting under uncertainty, one small step at a time.** Intolerance of uncertainty drives much of our worry (McEvoy et al., 2019). Once a week, choose one small thing you would normally over-check: re-reading an email five times, checking the forecast again, asking your wife for the third time whether the plan is set. Do it once and let it go, saying, “Your Father knows that you need all these things” (Matthew 6:32). This applies the logic of exposure work on uncertainty used in therapy for GAD. The link between intolerance of uncertainty and worry is strong (a meta-analysis of 181 studies), but this particular self-help version has not been studied as a standalone practice.
5. **Don’t carry tomorrow alone.** At the end of the study, take two minutes in pairs. Each man names one worry about tomorrow, and the other prays for him, with a hand on his shoulder if both are comfortable. Section 11 reviews evidence that supportive touch and presence reduce the brain’s threat response (Coan et al.’s hand-holding research). Here the point is that saying a worry aloud to a brother moves it from silent rehearsal into shared care (Galatians 6:2). There is no direct trial of this practice for worry, so it rests on borrowed evidence and is best treated as a reasonable application.

When to get help. If worry fills most days for months, disrupts sleep, or comes with panic, it may be generalized anxiety disorder, which is common and very treatable. Seeing a counselor or physician is not a failure of faith any more than setting a broken arm is.

9. “A Gentle Answer”: Co-regulation in Conflict

“A gentle answer turns away wrath, But a harsh word stirs up anger.” (Proverbs 15:1, NASB)

Proverbs 15 is a chapter about the tongue. The verses around our text keep coming back to how speech affects other people: “A soothing tongue is a tree of life” (15:4), and “A hot-tempered man stirs up strife, But the slow to anger calms a dispute” (15:18). The proverb is not a guarantee that soft words will always calm an angry person. Proverbs describe how life usually goes, not iron laws. It also does not say the gentle person has to give up the truth. It describes a pattern: how we answer changes the person in front of us.

That pattern turns out to be measurable. Emotions are not sealed inside individuals; they pass between people, partly through the body. Psychologists call this *co-regulation*: a two-way linkage in which partners’ emotional and physiological states influence each other, ideally helping both people settle back into a stable range (Butler & Randall, 2013). Zaki and Williams (2013) place this inside a wider field called *interpersonal emotion regulation*: the ways we use other people to calm our own feelings, and the ways we help calm theirs. A gentle answer is the second kind. It is one person deliberately lending his steadiness to another.

What happens in the body during a fight. When we perceive a threat, including a social one like a sharp tone or a contemptuous look, the brain’s threat-detection network (the amygdala, the insula, and the hypothalamus) sets off two stress systems. The fast one is the sympathetic

nervous system: heart rate, blood pressure, and sweat rise within seconds. The slower one is the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, which releases cortisol over minutes. These systems are built for running or fighting, not for listening. Amy Arnsten’s review of mostly animal research (Arnsten, 2009) shows that even mild, uncontrollable stress floods the prefrontal cortex with stress chemicals (norepinephrine and dopamine) at levels that quickly impair it. The prefrontal cortex is the region we use to hold two ideas at once, take another person’s view, and hold back an impulse. Put simply, the aroused brain gets worse at exactly what a hard conversation needs. Marriage researcher John Gottman calls this state “flooding.” It is a useful clinical label, but it is not a sharply defined physiological threshold.

The voice is one of the fastest channels for this. In a small fMRI study, Grandjean et al. (2005) found that angry *tone of voice*, even spoken in meaningless syllables, increased activity in voice-sensitive regions of the temporal cortex, separately from where listeners were directing their attention. The brain registers how something is said before and apart from what is said. The opposite also seems to hold. In an experiment with mother-daughter pairs, Seltzer, Ziegler, and Pollak (2010) stressed children with a public-speaking and math task. Girls who were then comforted only by a phone call with their mother’s voice showed a rise in oxytocin and a recovery of cortisol similar to girls who were comforted in person. That is one study, in children, about a parent’s comfort. It suggests that a soothing voice is not only a courtesy; the listener’s body can register it as a safety signal.

Linkage: how anger spreads. Levenson and Gottman (1983) recorded heart rate, skin conductance, and other measures from 30 married couples as they talked about a problem in their marriage. In distressed marriages, partners’ physiology was more tightly linked, with one spouse’s arousal tracking the other’s. Measures of physiological linkage alone accounted for 60% of the variance in marital satisfaction. In a three-year follow-up of 19 of those couples, the couples who were more physiologically aroused during the original conversations showed greater declines in satisfaction (Levenson & Gottman, 1985). Later reviews add nuance. Linkage is not bad in itself. Couples who are close also tend to be physiologically in sync, and linkage seems to become harmful when it locks two people into a shared spiral of stress (Timmons et al., 2015; Palumbo et al., 2017). That is the proverb’s “harsh word stirs up anger,” written in heart rates.

How conflicts begin and end. Two longitudinal studies of newlyweds from Gottman’s lab give the behavioral side. In a sample of 124 couples, the emotional tone of just the first three minutes of a conflict discussion predicted divorce over six years (Carrère & Gottman, 1999). In a sample of 130 couples, later divorce was predicted by harsh, negative openings to conflict, by a husband’s refusal to accept his wife’s influence, and by failing to de-escalate negativity. Stable, happy couples were marked by de-escalation, positive affect, and soothing (Gottman et al., 1998). Anger by itself did not predict divorce in that sample; escalation did. These findings come with real limits. They are correlational, and the striking “prediction accuracy” figures quoted from this work were never cross-validated; when similar models are tested on fresh data, accuracy drops sharply (Heyman & Smith Slep, 2001; Stanley et al., 2000).

It reaches the immune system. The best evidence that harshness is not “just words” comes from Janice Kiecolt-Glaser’s lab. Ninety healthy newlywed couples spent 24 hours in a hospital research unit. Spouses who were more hostile during a 30-minute problem discussion showed larger drops on several measures of immune function and larger, longer-lasting rises in blood pressure (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1993). In a later crossover experiment with 42 couples, each couple received small blister wounds and then had either a supportive conversation or a conflict conversation. Wounds healed more slowly after the conflict. Couples who were consistently high in hostility healed at about 60% of the rate of low-hostility couples and showed larger rises in inflammatory markers

(IL-6 and TNF- α) (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 2005). A meta-analysis of 126 studies with more than 72,000 people confirms that marital quality is linked to health, including mortality. The effects are small ($r \approx .07$ to $.21$), roughly comparable to those of health behaviors like diet (Robles et al., 2014).

Gentleness can be learned. The evidence is not only descriptive. In a randomized trial with 120 married couples, Finkel et al. (2013) had half the couples spend about 21 minutes in total, across one year, writing about their most recent conflict from the point of view of a neutral third party “who wants the best for all involved.” That small exercise reduced conflict-related distress and stopped the decline in marital quality that the control couples showed. It is one trial and should be replicated, but it suggests that the posture behind a gentle answer can be practiced.

The overall picture fits the proverb: in conflict, our nervous systems are coupled. A harsh word adds threat to both systems at once. A gentle answer, delivered in a calm voice, gives the other person’s threat system a reason to stand down, and it gives his prefrontal cortex a chance to come back online. None of this proves Proverbs 15:1. It describes, in the language of physiology, the same pattern Solomon saw in the language of wisdom.

For the group: In my last real conflict, whether at home, at work, at church, or with a friend, did I escalate or de-escalate?

Living it out

1. **Start soft, and watch your first three minutes.** Before you raise a hard issue, pick your opening sentence on purpose: name the problem, not the person’s character (“I’m worried about the budget this month,” not “You always...”), and say it in a lower, slower voice. *Evidence:* moderate. In two longitudinal newlywed samples ($n = 124$ and $n = 130$), harsh openings predicted divorce, and angry prosody registers in the listener’s brain on its own. But these are correlational studies, and their prediction figures were not cross-validated (Carrère & Gottman, 1999; Gottman et al., 1998; Grandjean et al., 2005; Heyman & Smith Slep, 2001). *Scripture:* “A gentle answer turns away wrath” (Proverbs 15:1); “quick to hear, slow to speak and slow to anger” (James 1:19).
2. **Call a short time-out when you are flooded, and promise to come back.** When your heart is pounding and you notice you only want to win, say something like “I want to get this right. Give me twenty minutes, and I’ll come back.” Then use the time to calm down (walk, breathe slowly, pray), not to rehearse your case. *Evidence:* the mechanism is well supported, because stress arousal impairs the prefrontal functions that listening needs (Arnsten, 2009, mostly animal work), and higher arousal during conflict predicted later decline in satisfaction (Levenson & Gottman, 1985, $n = 19$). But no randomized trial has tested the time-out by itself, and the popular “20 minutes” and “100 bpm” figures are clinical rules of thumb. *Scripture:* “the slow to anger calms a dispute” (Proverbs 15:18); “be angry, and yet do not sin” (Ephesians 4:26).
3. **Do the “neutral third party” exercise after a fight.** Three times a year, take seven minutes to write about your most recent disagreement from the point of view of a wise, neutral friend who wants the best for both of you. For a Christian, imagine how a mature brother who loves you both, or Christ himself, would see it. Then write down what keeps you from taking that view in the moment. *Evidence:* moderately strong for a single study. This is the randomized trial of 120 couples by Finkel et al. (2013), in which roughly 21 minutes a year

preserved marital quality. It has not yet been widely replicated. *Scripture*: “Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind regard one another as more important than yourselves” (Philippians 2:3).

4. **Lower the threat with your body: sit down, soften your voice, take her hand.** Physical posture and touch are part of a gentle answer. Sitting side by side, speaking more quietly, and holding your wife’s hand during a hard conversation all send safety signals before your words land. *Evidence*: moderate but indirect. In an fMRI study of 16 married women, holding a husband’s hand dampened the brain’s threat response to an impending shock, and did so most in the strongest marriages (Coan et al., 2006). A mother’s soothing voice alone sped children’s cortisol recovery after stress (Seltzer et al., 2010). Neither study tested touch or tone during an actual argument, and both samples were small. *Scripture*: “A soothing tongue is a tree of life” (Proverbs 15:4).
5. **Make the repair attempt, and receive it.** In the middle or at the end of a conflict, offer a bid to de-escalate: “I’m sorry, that came out harsh,” a touch of humor, “Let me try that again,” or “Can we pray?” When your wife, child, or coworker offers one, take it instead of pressing your advantage. *Evidence*: moderate and correlational. De-escalation and soothing marked the stable, happy newlywed couples (Gottman et al., 1998), and consistently hostile couples showed slower wound healing and higher inflammation (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 2005, n = 42 couples). “Repair attempts” as a named technique comes mostly from Gottman’s clinical writing rather than from controlled trials. *Scripture*: “Blessed are the peacemakers” (Matthew 5:9); “If possible, so far as it depends on you, be at peace with all men” (Romans 12:18).

10. Forgiveness

“For if you forgive others for their transgressions, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive others, then your Father will not forgive your transgressions.” (Matthew 6:14-15, NASB)

“bearing with one another, and forgiving each other, whoever has a complaint against anyone; just as the Lord forgave you, so also should you.” (Colossians 3:13, NASB)

Matthew 6:14-15 is Jesus’s own commentary on the one petition in the Lord’s Prayer he chose to expand: “forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors” (6:12). Colossians 3:13 sits in a list of clothing the church is to “put on” (3:12). The motive is retrospective, “just as the Lord forgave you,” and the setting is a community of people who will keep giving each other “complaints.” For the Christian, then, forgiveness is first a theological reality grounded in what God has done in Christ, and it is practiced inside ongoing relationships. It is also, as Everett Worthington has spent a career showing, a psychological process with measurable effects.

Two kinds of forgiving. Researchers now separate *decisional* forgiveness, a behavioral intention to give up revenge and treat the offender differently, from *emotional* forgiveness, the gradual replacement of resentment with other-oriented emotions such as empathy and compassion (Worthington et al., 2007). The two often come apart. A man can sincerely decide, in obedience, to cancel the debt and still feel his jaw tighten when the offender walks into the room. The research suggests the health-relevant changes track mainly with the emotional side (Worthington et al., 2007). That fits the shape of the texts: Jesus commands the decision, and Paul describes a character that is put on and worn over time.

Unforgiveness as a stress state. Worthington and Scherer (2004) argued that unforgiveness

works as a chronic stress reaction, a blend of resentment, bitterness, hostility, and fear. On that account, emotional forgiveness is a coping strategy that removes the stressor at its emotional source. The laboratory evidence is consistent. Witvliet, Ludwig, and Vander Laan (2001) had 71 adults alternate between rehearsing a real hurt and nursing a grudge, and imagining empathy and granting forgiveness to the same offender. Grudge imagery produced more negative emotion, more brow-muscle tension, higher skin conductance, and higher heart rate and blood pressure. Several of those effects carried into the recovery period after the imagery stopped. Forgiving imagery produced smaller stress responses and a greater sense of control. Lawler and colleagues found the same pattern when people were interviewed about real betrayals. In 108 college students, state forgiveness went with lower blood pressure and heart rate and less cardiovascular reactivity (Lawler et al., 2003). In 81 community adults, the link between forgiveness and fewer physical symptoms ran mostly through reduced negative emotion and reduced stress (Lawler et al., 2005).

The engine underneath is rumination: replaying the offense. McCullough and colleagues (2007) followed 115 undergraduates who had been hurt in the previous week, sampling them up to five times. On occasions when a student was ruminating more than was usual *for him or her*, salivary cortisol was higher than usual, and the link appeared to run through fear of the offender. Cortisol is the end product of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, the body’s slower stress system. Briefly, the hypothalamus signals the pituitary, the pituitary signals the adrenal glands, and the adrenals release cortisol to mobilize energy for a threat. That is useful for an emergency. It is costly when a memory keeps re-triggering it for weeks. In other words, the grudge keeps the threat system on duty after the event is over. Witvliet and colleagues (2011) then tested alternatives with 54 adults. Rumination sped the heart and lowered heart-rate variability, a marker of the parasympathetic “brake.” Both *compassionate reappraisal* (seeing the offender as a flawed human who needs to change) and simple *suppression* calmed the body. Only reappraisal also increased positive emotion and forgiveness.

What happens in the brain? Ricciardi and colleagues (2013) scanned ten healthy volunteers as they imagined hurtful scenarios (a betraying friend, an unjust boss) and were then told either to forgive or to hold a grudge. Granting forgiveness engaged a network including the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, precuneus, and right inferior parietal lobule. These regions are associated with cognitive emotion regulation, perspective-taking, and empathy. A review of the field by Fourie, Hortensius, and Decety (2020) organizes the evidence into three interacting components. The first is *cognitive control* (lateral prefrontal cortex), which holds back the urge to retaliate. The second is *perspective-taking* (temporoparietal junction), which models what was going on in the offender’s mind. The third is *social valuation* (ventromedial prefrontal cortex), which recalculates what the relationship and the person are worth. Put plainly, forgiving takes effort: you restrain the reflex, imagine the other man’s inner life, and re-value him. Ten people imagining scenarios is a long way from real betrayal. The participants were told to use reappraisal, the sample is tiny, and the authors call their results preliminary. Fourie and colleagues also warn that lab paradigms translate poorly to real wounds. Still, the pattern is consistent with what Colossians implies: forgiveness is deliberate and involves seeing the offender differently.

Health and longevity, honestly stated. Pooling 103 samples (26,043 participants), Rasmussen and colleagues (2019) found a reliable association between forgiveness and health. It was stronger for psychological than physical health, though links with heart rate and blood pressure were robust. In a five-week study of 332 adults, weeks when forgiveness rose were followed by less perceived stress and, in turn, fewer mental-health symptoms; the reverse direction fit worse (Toussaint et al., 2016). In a U.S. national sample of 1,232 adults aged 66 and older, people whose forgiveness of others was

conditional (given only if the offender apologized or made amends) had higher mortality risk over follow-up, partly through poorer physical health (Toussaint et al., 2012). These are correlational findings, and none proves that forgiving will lengthen anyone’s life.

Forgiveness can be learned, and cheaply. A meta-analysis of 54 reports found that structured forgiveness interventions increased forgiveness compared with no treatment ($\Delta = 0.56$) and with alternative treatments ($\Delta = 0.45$). The interventions also reduced depression and anxiety, and the gains held at follow-up (Wade et al., 2014). The most striking recent test was a preregistered, randomized trial of 4,598 adults in Colombia, Hong Kong, Indonesia, South Africa, and Ukraine. A self-directed REACH Forgiveness workbook, taking roughly two hours, reduced unforgiveness (standardized difference -0.53) and modestly reduced depression and anxiety (about -0.2) at two weeks, compared with a waitlist (Ho et al., 2024). The trial was short and relied on self-report, but it is large and international.

A necessary caution. Forgiving is not excusing, and it is not the same as reconciling. In a four-year study of newlyweds, spouses who were more forgiving saw their partners’ psychological and physical aggression stay level, while less forgiving spouses saw it decline (McNulty, 2011). Releasing the debt and confronting ongoing sin (Matthew 18:15) belong together.

For the group: Is there someone I have decided to forgive but have not yet emotionally released?

Living it out

1. **Pray the fifth petition with a name in it.** When you pray “forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors,” name one person and say the decision out loud: “I release him from what he owes me.” This is decisional forgiveness, the step Jesus commands in Matthew 6:14-15. Decisional forgiveness is well defined in the research but is *not* by itself the part most tied to physiological benefit (Worthington et al., 2007, a review). So treat the prayer as the starting line, not the finish. Evidence for the prayer itself as a health practice: none tested directly. Evidence that decision and emotion differ: moderate.
2. **When the replay starts, switch to compassionate reappraisal.** You will notice the mental re-run: the argument you should have won, the speech you will give. Spend two minutes deliberately picturing the offender as a whole person, someone with his own history and pressures who needs God’s work as much as you do. Then pray for his good (Luke 6:28). In lab studies this swap lowered heart rate and blood pressure, and only reappraisal (not suppression) also increased forgiveness (Witvliet et al., 2001; Witvliet et al., 2011). Evidence: good experimental support for short-term physiology in small samples ($n = 54-71$). Long-term health effects are not shown.
3. **Work through REACH with a brother, once a quarter.** REACH stands for **R**ecall the hurt (without blaming), **E**mpathize with the offender, offer the **A**ltruistic gift of forgiveness (remembering you were forgiven, Colossians 3:13), **C**ommit to the forgiveness you have experienced (write it down), and **H**old on when the old feelings return. The free workbook takes about two hours. Pair up, each pick one specific hurt, and compare notes a week later. Evidence: strong. A 4,598-person multinational randomized trial found that the workbook reduced unforgiveness, with smaller drops in depression and anxiety (Ho et al., 2024), and a meta-analysis found longer, structured programs work best (Wade et al., 2014).
4. **Write down what “it” was, then mark the date you released it.** Colossians says

“whoever has a complaint.” Name the complaint specifically on paper, and when old feelings flare, go back to the dated note rather than reopening the case (“I already released this on March 3”). This is the “Commit” and “Hold on” steps of REACH. It also targets rumination, which in a within-person study tracked with higher cortisol on high-rumination days (McCullough et al., 2007). Evidence: moderate for the link between rumination and stress hormones. The written note itself has not been tested on its own and is part of the workbook package.

5. **Forgive fully; set boundaries where sin is ongoing.** Forgiving your wife, son, or coworker does not mean pretending nothing happened or staying quiet about a continuing pattern. Release the debt, and also have the Matthew 18:15 conversation. Where there is abuse, get pastoral and professional help. Longitudinal data show that forgiving without accountability can let aggression continue (McNulty, 2011). Evidence: one well-designed longitudinal study of newlyweds; it shows forgiveness is not a stand-alone fix.

11. “Perfect Love Casts Out Fear”: Social Regulation of Threat

“There is no fear in love; but perfect love casts out fear, because fear involves punishment, and the one who fears is not perfected in love.” (1 John 4:18, NASB)

John is speaking first of God’s love and of the believer’s confidence before Him “in the day of judgment” (4:17). The fear he means is the dread of punishment, and the cure is a love that God starts: “We love, because He first loved us” (4:19). No scanner can reach that claim. But John also grounds this love in the visible community. “No one has seen God at any time; if we love one another, God abides in us, and His love is perfected in us” (4:12). The love that casts out fear is meant to be felt among people. At that human level, a small and now well-replicated line of research describes what a trusted person’s presence does to a frightened brain.

The hand-holding studies. Coan, Schaefer, and Davidson (2006) placed 16 married women in an fMRI scanner (a machine that tracks which brain areas are working harder) and showed them cues that meant either “safe” or “you may get a mild shock.” Under threat, each woman held her husband’s hand, an anonymous man’s hand, or no hand. Holding her husband’s hand produced the broadest drop in threat-related activity. A stranger’s hand helped less. And the better the marriage, the less threat-related activity there was in the right anterior insula, superior frontal gyrus, and hypothalamus, but only while she held her husband’s hand.

That study was small and all-female. So the same group ran a much larger one (Coan et al., 2017): 110 adults, 59 of them men, of more diverse racial and economic backgrounds. Each brought a partner of the opposite sex: a spouse, a live-in partner, a dating partner, or a platonic friend. Holding a familiar partner’s hand again reduced threat-related activity, mainly in the right dorsolateral and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, the dorsal anterior cingulate, and the posterior cingulate and parietal cortex. People also rated their mood as less negative. Three findings matter for us. First, the effect held in a sample that was more than half men. Second, *what kind* of relationship it was made no detectable difference; a friend’s hand worked about as well as a spouse’s (the authors note that the four groups were small, so this null result is tentative). Third, a stranger’s hand did nothing helpful. People who believed they had a supportive network of family and friends showed even less threat activity, again only with the familiar partner.

What the brain is doing. It helps to know what these regions do. The anterior insula and anterior cingulate act as a “salience network.” They notice that something matters and sound the alarm. The hypothalamus sits at the top of the body’s stress chain: it signals the pituitary

gland, which signals the adrenal glands to release cortisol (the HPA axis), and it also drives the fast adrenaline response that raises heart rate and blood pressure. The dorsolateral and ventrolateral prefrontal regions are the brain’s effortful self-control system, the part that works to hold yourself together.

The surprising finding is that a trusted hand turns *down* the self-control regions. It does not turn them up. Coan’s explanation is **social baseline theory** (Coan & Sbarra, 2015). The human brain evolved in groups, so it treats being near trusted people as the normal, expected condition. It “budgets” its effort on that assumption. When a trusted person is present, part of the job of watching for danger is shared, much as a second pair of eyes lets a sentry rest. So the brain spends less on vigilance and less on forcing itself calm. When we are alone, the brain has to do all of that work itself, which costs more. Fear is partly a matter of *appraisal*, the brain’s estimate of the threat set against the resources available to meet it. A trusted person adds to the resources side of that estimate.

The body, not just the brain. Other labs have measured the stress hormones and cardiovascular responses that the hand-holding studies did not. In a study of 183 cohabiting adults (109 men), couples who held hands for 10 minutes and then hugged for 20 seconds before a public-speaking task showed smaller rises in blood pressure and heart rate than couples who rested apart. The effect was similar for men and women (Grewen et al., 2003). In a randomized study of 67 women, a 10-minute neck-and-shoulder massage from a partner before a lab stressor lowered cortisol and heart-rate responses. Words of support alone did not (Ditzen et al., 2007). Men may respond differently. In two studies of men, *verbal* support from a best friend (Heinrichs et al., 2003; $n = 37$) or from a partner (Ditzen et al., 2008; $n = 63$) did reduce cortisol responses to stress. In Heinrichs’s study, support combined with a nasal spray of oxytocin, a brain hormone linked to bonding that quiets the HPA axis in animals, gave the lowest cortisol of all. Brain imaging points the same way. Simply looking at a partner’s photo reduced women’s pain and pain-related brain activity and raised activity in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex, a region tied to signals of safety (Eisenberger et al., 2011). A partner’s hand reduced pain and quieted a stress-and-defense circuit that includes the amygdala, hypothalamus, and periaqueductal gray (López-Solà et al., 2019, $n = 30$ women). Hand-holding during pain also increased the synchrony of the two partners’ brain rhythms, and greater synchrony went with greater relief (Goldstein et al., 2018). A 2024 preregistered meta-analysis of 137 touch-intervention studies found moderate benefits for adults’ pain, anxiety, and depressed mood (Packheiser et al., 2024).

Honest limits. These are laboratory studies of brief, mild threats. They are not studies of grief, combat, or the fear of judgment John addresses. Most samples are small, and several of the clearest touch effects were found in women only. One study found that partner support lowered pain ratings in women but not men, though it calmed both sexes’ skin-conductance responses (Reddan et al., 2020). Oxytocin findings in particular deserve caution, because many intranasal oxytocin studies were underpowered (Walum et al., 2016). And none of this shows that a brain scan can measure God’s love.

The human parallel is modest but real. In these studies, the near presence of a trusted, loving person, a spouse or a friend, measurably lowered the brain’s alarm and the body’s stress response. A stranger did not. Love that has been proven over time is what made the difference. John says the love that casts out fear is “perfected” among those who love one another. For a married man, that is a sobering reminder that the quality of our love may be part of the safety our wives feel. For every man, it raises the question of what our presence does for the people around us.

For the group: Does my presence make the people I love less afraid, or more?

Living it out

1. **Hold her hand when the news is hard.** In the waiting room, at the graveside, on the drive to the surgeon, take your wife’s hand and keep holding it. This is the most direct application of the Coan studies (2006, 2017). The brain-level effect has now been replicated in more than 100 adults, and Grewen et al. (2003) found smaller blood-pressure and heart-rate spikes after hand-holding and a hug. The evidence is moderate: the studies are well designed but come from the lab, with brief threats. The relationship-quality finding is the point. The hand works best when the marriage behind it is good, so the practice starts long before the crisis (1 John 3:18, “let us not love with word or with tongue, but in deed and truth”).
2. **Build the trust before the storm.** The strongest predictor of a calmer brain was not the touch itself. It was marital quality (2006) and believing you have a supportive network (2017). A stranger’s hand did nothing in the larger study. Invest daily in being the kind of man whose presence has earned trust: keep your word, listen, and stay safe in conflict (see Section 9). The evidence here is correlational, so it shows an association and cannot prove cause and effect, but it fits John’s picture of love that is “perfected” over time (4:12).
3. **Be there in person for a brother.** In the 2017 study a platonic friend’s hand worked as well as a spouse’s, and in two studies of men, a best friend’s or partner’s support reduced cortisol under stress (Heinrichs et al., 2003; Ditzen et al., 2008). When a man in the group faces a biopsy, a layoff, or a court date, don’t just text that you’re praying. Go and sit with him. A hand on the shoulder in prayer is the culturally natural version for men. The evidence is moderate for presence and support. The specific benefit of shoulder-touch between male friends has not been tested, so offer it, don’t force it, and respect each man’s comfort.
4. **Give ten minutes of warm touch before a stressful day.** Before a hard meeting, a hospital visit, or a tense family gathering, a few minutes of hand-holding and a real hug (Grewen et al., 2003), or a shoulder rub for your wife (Ditzen et al., 2007), lowered the body’s stress response in controlled studies. A four-week “warm touch” program for married couples raised oxytocin and lowered a stress enzyme, and husbands’ 24-hour blood pressure dropped (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2008; 34 couples). The evidence is moderate, from small randomized trials. Make it a habit, not a technique.
5. **When you can’t be there, be present.** Looking at a partner’s photo reduced pain in Eisenberger et al. (2011), and the hand-holding benefit was larger for people who trust that support is available. Keep a family photo where you face stress. Call a frightened child or wife and stay on the line. Remind each other of Romans 8:38–39, where the love that holds us does not depend on proximity. The evidence is preliminary: one small imaging study of women.

Bonus: “Train Up a Child” and the Neuroscience of Habit

“Train up a child in the way he should go, Even when he is old he will not depart from it.”
(Proverbs 22:6, NASB)

A proverb is a general observation, not an ironclad promise. Proverbs tells us how life usually goes under God’s wisdom, not how it must go in every case, and many faithful parents have prodigal children. With that said, this proverb describes something neuroscience has studied closely:

behavior that is repeated in a stable setting becomes durable, and much of what a child repeats, he first watched someone else do.

How a habit gets built. Early in learning, an action is goal-directed. You do it because you want the result, and you stop when the result stops being worth it. In animal studies this mode depends on circuits running through the dorsomedial striatum (part of the basal ganglia, a set of structures deep in the brain) and the prefrontal cortex. With extended repetition, control shifts toward the dorsolateral striatum, and the behavior becomes stimulus-driven. A cue triggers the action more or less directly, even when the payoff has been removed (Yin & Knowlton, 2006). Graybiel (2008) describes how these circuits “chunk” a sequence of steps into a single unit that runs as a whole. She suggests that the same machinery shapes habits of thought as well as motor routines, and that it may help explain why rituals have such a hold on us. That last point is her hypothesis, not a demonstrated result.

The teaching signal behind this learning is dopamine. Midbrain dopamine neurons fire most strongly when an outcome is *better than predicted*, and as learning proceeds the signal moves from the reward itself to the cue that predicts it (Schultz et al., 1997). That is how a time, a place, or a person’s presence comes to carry the urge to act. Repetition then makes the action less and less dependent on a fresh decision.

What we know in humans, and what we don’t. Human evidence is real but more modest than the animal work. In one fMRI study, extended training made participants’ responses insensitive to devaluing the reward, and cue-related activity grew in the right posterior putamen, the human counterpart of the rodent “habit” region (Tricomi et al., 2009). However, de Wit and colleagues (2018) reported five failed attempts to induce rigid habits in healthy adults by overtraining in the lab, including two attempts to replicate that study. Lab tasks of minutes or days may simply be too short to capture habits that form over months.

Field studies fill part of that gap. In diary studies, Wood, Quinn, and Kashy (2002) found that when people performed behaviors they did almost daily in stable settings, their minds were free to think about other things, and they reported less stress than during non-habitual actions. A habit takes over the routine so attention can go elsewhere. Wood and R  nger (2016) review evidence that habits are tied to *context cues* (time, place, preceding action, the people present) more than to motivation in the moment.

How long does it take? Lally, van Jaarsveld, Potts, and Wardle (2010) followed 96 adults who each chose one daily eating, drinking, or exercise behavior to perform in the same context for 12 weeks. Automaticity rose along a curve that leveled off. Among the 39 participants whose data fit that curve well, the median time to approach the plateau was about 66 days, with enormous variation (18 to 254 days, the upper end extrapolated beyond the study). Missing a single day did not derail the process. A 2024 meta-analysis of 20 intervention studies (2,601 participants) reported median times of 59 to 66 days. It also found that morning practices and self-chosen habits tended to be stronger, but most of the included studies carried a high risk of bias (Singh et al., 2024).

Why childhood matters. The brain has *sensitive periods*, windows in which experience reshapes circuits unusually strongly. Patterns laid down then become stable defaults that later learning modifies but rarely erases (Knudsen, 2004). The prefrontal regions that support deliberate self-control are among the last to mature: in repeated MRI scans of 13 children followed from age 4 to 21, higher-order association cortex matured after more basic sensory regions (Gogtay et al., 2004). In the meantime, children rely heavily on watching others. In Bandura’s classic experiment, preschoolers who watched an adult attack a doll reproduced the adult’s specific acts (Bandura et

al., 1961). Children also *overimitate*. They copy even steps that are obviously unnecessary, because they assume a purposeful adult’s actions must matter, and the tendency persists even after they are warned (Lyons et al., 2007). A child does not just learn what we tell him. He records the whole routine.

Does faith actually pass down? The best long-term data come from the Longitudinal Study of Generations, which has followed multigenerational families since 1970. In their book on that study, Bengtson, Putney, and Harris (2013) report that warm, affirming parents, fathers especially, were the most successful at passing on their faith, and that religious devotion did not make up for a cold or distant father. In an analysis of 8,341 parent-child pairs (1971 to 2016), parents’ religious intensity predicted their children’s, and transmission was stronger in emotionally close relationships (Silverstein et al., 2026). Grandparents had an influence of their own, separate from the parents’ (Bengtson et al., 2009). Among 1,084 parent-child pairs followed from 1971 to 2005, one of the four patterns researchers identified was “child returns,” a drift away followed by renewed similarity to the parent, and children who married were more likely to follow it (Min et al., 2018). That is strikingly close to “when he is old.” All of these studies are correlational, draw mostly on white, middle-class Californian families, and show that transmission has weakened in recent cohorts. Influence may also run from children to parents.

Taken together, the research supports a cautious reading of the proverb. What we repeat becomes automatic, children learn by watching more than by being told, and faith passes most reliably through warm relationships. None of this guarantees an outcome, and Lally’s work shows the same mechanisms still operate in grown men. Proverbs 22:6 is a question for every man, not only for fathers: what am I repeating, day after day, and who is watching and learning from it?

For the group: What daily rhythm am I repeating that is training someone, whether my children or grandchildren, a younger man, a coworker, or simply my own future self, whether I intend it or not?

Living it out

1. **Tie one practice to a fixed cue with an “if-then” plan.** Pick one discipline (Scripture, prayer, a blessing over your kids) and attach it to something that already happens every day: “When I pour my first cup of coffee, I open the Psalms,” or “When the car leaves the driveway for school, we pray.” A meta-analysis of 94 tests found that forming specific if-then plans like this improved goal attainment by a medium-to-large amount ($d = .65$; Gollwitzer & Sheeran, 2006), and habit research shows that stable context cues are what make a behavior automatic (Wood & Rünger, 2016). *Evidence: strong for if-then planning in general; not tested specifically on spiritual disciplines.*
2. **Commit to roughly two months, and don’t quit over a missed day.** Expect a new rhythm to feel deliberate for about eight to ten weeks, and for some men much longer. In Lally et al. (2010), missing a single day did not materially slow habit formation, though many missed days lowered the plateau people reached. Grace for a lapse is not lowering the bar; it matches how habits actually form. Morning, self-chosen practices may stick best (Singh et al., 2024). *Evidence: moderate; small samples, simple health behaviors, wide variation between people.*
3. **Let them see it, not just hear it.** Pray where your kids or grandkids can see you, read your Bible at the kitchen table instead of only in private, and bring them along when you serve. Children reproduce what adults model, including details we never meant to teach (Bandura et

al., 1961; Lyons et al., 2007), and in the generations study faith passed down most reliably from parents who practiced it consistently themselves (Bengtson et al., 2013). *Evidence: strong that children imitate what they see; correlational for how this affects religious outcomes.*

4. **Pair the training with warmth.** The single strongest relational finding in the long-term data is that a warm, affirming father passes on faith far better than a strict but distant one (Bengtson et al., 2013), and transmission was stronger in emotionally close parent-child relationships (Silverstein et al., 2026). This week, do something that is purely relational: a meal, a drive, a ballgame, asking his opinion and listening, with no lesson attached. *Evidence: consistent across a large, 45-year longitudinal sample, but correlational and drawn mostly from one region.*
5. **Train someone beyond your own house.** Grandparents showed an influence on grandchildren separate from the parents' (Bengtson et al., 2009), and children who drifted sometimes returned later in life (Min et al., 2018). If your children are grown, or you have none, the proverb still applies: invite a younger man into a regular rhythm (a weekly breakfast, a shared reading plan) so he watches you practice your faith over months, not hours. Do not write off a prodigal; the story is not over. *Evidence: correlational; the "return" pattern is one of four patterns researchers identified, not the norm.*

Living It Out: An Everyday Rule of Life

Each section above ends with practices tied to its own passage and studies. This closing section pulls them together into a simple, practical answer to the question a men's group should ask of any paper like this: *What do I actually do on Monday?*

Christians have long had a name for a pattern of practices kept on purpose: a *rule of life*. The word "rule" comes from the Latin *regula*, closer to a trellis than a cage. It is a structure that lets something living grow in the right direction. The research in this paper suggests why a trellis helps. The brain changes by repetition (Section 2 and the Bonus). The stress system needs regular recovery (Sections 6 and 8). And we were built to regulate in the presence of trusted people (Sections 7, 9, and 11). A rule of life puts all three to work.

Three cautions first. These practices are means of grace and obedience, not techniques for extracting benefits from God. We do them because He commanded them and because they are good, and the research only helps us see *why* they are good. Second, none of this replaces medical or psychological care. A man with depression, a trauma history, or a dangerous marriage needs a doctor, counselor, or pastor, not just a better habit (Section 1). Third, the evidence behind each practice varies. Below, each practice is marked **strong**, **moderate**, or **early** to show the evidence behind it, based on the ratings in the sections.

The one example to remember, stated accurately

Many of us have heard, or told, the hand-holding story. Here is the accurate version, the one worth repeating:

In brain-scan studies by James Coan at the University of Virginia, people waiting for a possible electric shock showed less activity in the brain's threat and self-control regions while holding the hand of someone they trusted. The better the relationship, the bigger the effect, and a stranger's hand did not help (Coan et al., 2006; Coan et al., 2017). Other studies have found that warm touch from a partner before stress lowers blood pressure and heart rate (Grewen et

al., 2003), and in one study a partner’s shoulder massage lowered women’s cortisol (Ditzen et al., 2007).

Note what it does *not* say. The study is by Coan, not Cohen. Sheldon Cohen is the cold-virus researcher in Section 1, and his touch study was about hugs and colds (Cohen et al., 2015). Coan measured brain activity, not cortisol. And a trusted hand *quieted* the prefrontal self-control regions; it did not strengthen them. The brain worked less hard because someone was sharing the load. That last point is the most beautiful part of the finding, and the most biblical: “Bear one another’s burdens” (Galatians 6:2).

Daily

1. **Begin with Scripture you are memorizing, recalled from memory.** Read a short passage, then close the Bible and try to say it. Retrieval spread over days builds durable memory far better than rereading (Section 2). *Strong.*
2. **Ten minutes of stillness before God.** Sit, slow your breathing to the pace of a verse such as Psalm 46:10, and pray aloud in your own words to Someone, not into the air. When your mind drifts, notice it and return without scolding yourself (Section 4). *Moderate for slow breathing and a calmer stress response; early for prayer-specific brain effects.*
3. **One concrete next step instead of a worry loop.** When a worry comes, ask “Is there one thing I can do about this today?” If yes, do it or schedule it. If no, hand it to the Father in words and set a time later in the day to think about it, if you still need to (Sections 3 and 8). *Moderate for concrete over abstract thinking; mixed for scheduled worry time.*
4. **Warm touch with the people you love.** A real embrace when you come home. Your wife’s hand in yours when the news is hard. A hand on a brother’s shoulder when you pray for him, where it is welcome (Sections 1 and 11). *Moderate.*
5. **The sunset check-in.** Before the day ends, with anyone you are at odds with, name the feeling out loud (“I was hurt when...”) and either settle it or set a time to return to it. Then sleep (Section 5). *Moderate for naming emotions and calming down before talking; early for the “before sleep” timing itself.*
6. **Three specific gifts, named to God at bedtime.** Not “family and health,” but “the way my son laughed at dinner.” Keep it short and honest (Sections 1 and 3). *Moderate for mood, small effects; no evidence yet for physical health.*
7. **Protect a full night’s sleep.** An exhausted brain reacts more to threat and regulates itself poorly. Guarding sleep is part of keeping the peace (Sections 5 and 6). *Strong for sleep loss harming emotional control.*

In the hard moment

8. **Start soft.** The first minutes of a hard conversation shape how it goes. Sit down, lower your voice, and open with “I” and a request, not “you” and an accusation (Section 9). *Moderate, correlational.*
9. **Take a time-out when you are flooded, and promise to come back.** If your heart is pounding and your words are getting sharp, say “I need twenty minutes, and I’ll come back.” Use the time to calm your body (walk slowly, breathe, pray), not to rehearse your case. Venting and “blowing off steam” do not reduce anger; calming activities do (Sections 5 and 9). *Strong for calming over venting.*

10. **When the replay starts, reappraise with compassion.** When an old hurt replays, try seeing the offender as a whole person, wounded and in need of grace like you. This kind of reappraisal both calms the body and makes forgiveness more likely. Simply clamping down on anger only does the first (Section 10). *Moderate.*
11. **Run the “whatever is true” test.** Before reframing a dark thought, ask whether it is actually true. Then ask what else is also true, honorable, and worthy of praise (Section 3, Philippians 4:8). *Strong for cognitive reappraisal as a skill.*

Weekly

12. **Keep a Sabbath day, not just a vacation.** Vacation benefits fade within weeks of returning to work. A weekly rhythm is the design (Section 6). Close the laptop, silence work email, and fill the day with worship, rest, and people. *Moderate for detachment from work; early for Sabbath-keeping as such.*
13. **Worship and small group, every week.** Frequent church attendance is linked with lower mortality in large long-term studies, partly through the friendships it creates (Sections 1 and 7). *Moderate, but observational. Churchgoers differ in many ways, and the strongest data come from women.*
14. **Name your “lifter,” and tell him.** Pick one man who would pick you up if you fell, and say so out loud. Call one isolated person each week and mostly listen (Section 7). *Moderate for the calls (a randomized trial); strong for the importance of close ties.*
15. **A short “worthy of praise” list.** Each Sunday, write down a handful of specific, good things from the week (Section 3). *Moderate, small effects.*

Monthly and seasonally

16. **One gratitude letter a month** to a real person, ideally read aloud to him or her (Section 3). *Moderate.*
17. **A forgiveness check, once a quarter.** Pray the fifth petition of the Lord’s Prayer (“forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors”) with specific names in it. Write down what “it” was and the date you released it. Consider working through a structured forgiveness workbook with a brother. One such workbook reduced unforgiveness and modestly reduced depression and anxiety in a randomized trial of nearly 4,600 adults (Section 10). Forgiveness is not the same as excusing. Where wrongdoing is ongoing, forgive and still set boundaries (Matthew 18:15). *Strong for structured forgiveness programs.*
18. **A two-month habit plan.** Pick one new practice from this list. Tie it to a fixed cue with an if-then plan (“When I pour my first coffee, I will recite my verse”). Expect it to take about two months, with wide variation, and don’t quit over a missed day (Bonus). *Strong for if-then plans; moderate for the timeline.*

Lifelong

19. **Let them see it.** Children and younger men learn far more from what they watch than from what they are told. In long-term family studies, faith passes most reliably where the parent-child relationship is warm and close (Bonus). Pray where your children can see you. Apologize where they can hear you. *Moderate, correlational.*
20. **Train someone beyond your own house.** A younger man at church or a coworker. Every

man is training someone, whether he means to or not (Bonus, Proverbs 22:6). *A matter of obedience more than evidence.*

A thirty-day start

Twenty practices is too many to begin at once, and the habit research says to start small. For the next thirty days, choose three:

- **One for the mind:** daily Scripture memory by recall (practice 1).
- **One for the body:** ten minutes of slow-breathing prayer (practice 2) or a protected bedtime (practice 7).
- **One for your people:** daily warm touch and the sunset check-in at home (practices 4 and 5), and one weekly call to a brother (practice 14).

Tie each to a cue you already have: coffee, the drive home, the light going off at night. Tell one man in the group which three you chose, and ask him to check on you in two weeks. At the end of thirty days, keep what has taken root and add one more.

For the group: Which three practices will you start this week, and who in this room will ask you about them?

Synthesis

First, *the body is not a bystander*. Joy, worry, anger, loneliness, and forgiveness are not merely “spiritual” or “emotional” states floating above our physiology. They are linked, in the studies above, to immune responses, heart rate and blood pressure, sleep-dependent memory, and measurable changes in the brain. Scripture treats us as embodied wholes, and the research is consistent with that picture.

Second, *attention is formative*. Romans 12, Philippians 4, Psalm 46, and Matthew 6 all, in different ways, tell us to direct the mind: renew it, fix it on what is worthy, still it before God, and refuse to let it run ahead into tomorrow. The neuroscience of plasticity, rumination, the default mode network, and perseverative cognition suggests that where we habitually place our attention shapes both brain and body over time.

Third, *we were not built to regulate alone*. Ecclesiastes 4, Proverbs 15, and 1 John 4 line up with research on mortality, co-regulation, and social buffering of threat. The isolated, self-sufficient man is not only a spiritual problem; on average, he tends to carry higher load.

Fourth, *rhythm and repetition matter*. Sabbath rest and the training of children both describe patterns sustained over time. The stress and habit literatures point in a similar direction: the body appears to need recovery built into the cycle, and what is practiced consistently tends to become automatic, part of who we are.

Finally, a word of humility. Several of these findings rest on small samples, some on correlations, and a few on popular interpretations that run ahead of the data. Science will revise some of what is written here. That is no threat to faith. These convergences do not prove Scripture, and Scripture does not need them. What they offer is something more modest and, for men trying to live without excuses, perhaps more useful: evidence consistent with the conviction that the disciplines God asks of us are not arbitrary rules imposed from outside, but wise instructions fitted to the way we were

made. The God who wrote the commands also designed the creature who receives them. It should not surprise us when the two fit.

For the group: Run it the other way: where does the text say more than the study can? Pick one pairing and name something the verse claims (about God, sin, grace, or eternity) that no experiment could ever measure.

For the group: Where in this paper did a convergence feel too neat? What would it look like to hold the science loosely and the Scripture firmly?

References

- Arnsten, A. F. T. (2009). Stress signalling pathways that impair prefrontal cortex structure and function. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 10(6), 410–422. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2648>
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 575–582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045925>
- Baran, B., Pace-Schott, E. F., Ericson, C., & Spencer, R. M. C. (2012). Processing of emotional reactivity and emotional memory over sleep. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(3), 1035–1042. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2532-11.2012>
- Bar-Haim, Y., Lamy, D., Pergamin, L., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2007). Threat-related attentional bias in anxious and nonanxious individuals: A meta-analytic study. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.1>
- Bengtson, V. L., Copen, C. E., Putney, N. M., & Silverstein, M. (2009). A longitudinal study of the intergenerational transmission of religion. *International Sociology*, 24(3), 325–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580909102911>
- Bengtson, V. L., Putney, N. M., & Harris, S. (2013). *Families and faith: How religion is passed down across generations*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199948659.001.0001>
- Bernardi, L., Sleight, P., Bandinelli, G., Cencetti, S., Fattorini, L., Wdowczyk-Szulc, J., & Lagi, A. (2001). Effect of rosary prayer and yoga mantras on autonomic cardiovascular rhythms: Comparative study. *BMJ*, 323(7327), 1446–1449. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.323.7327.1446>
- Bliss, T. V. P., & Lømo, T. (1973). Long-lasting potentiation of synaptic transmission in the dentate area of the anaesthetized rabbit following stimulation of the perforant path. *The Journal of Physiology*, 232(2), 331–356. <https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.1973.sp010273>
- Blix, E., Perski, A., Berglund, H., & Savic, I. (2013). Long-term occupational stress is associated with regional reductions in brain tissue volumes. *PLoS ONE*, 8(6), e64065. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0064065>
- Bolier, L., Haverman, M., Westerhof, G. J., Riper, H., Smit, F., & Bohlmeijer, E. (2013). Positive psychology interventions: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies. *BMC Public Health*, 13, 119. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-119>
- Borkovec, T. D., Wilkinson, L., Foleen, R., & Lerman, C. (1983). Stimulus control applications to the treatment of worry. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 21(3), 247–251. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(83\)90206-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(83)90206-1)
- Brewer, J. A., Worhunsky, P. D., Gray, J. R., Tang, Y.-Y., Weber, J., & Kober, H. (2011). Meditation experience is associated with differences in default mode network activity and connectivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(50), 20254–20259. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1112029108>
- Brosschot, J. F., Gerin, W., & Thayer, J. F. (2006). The perseverative cognition hypothesis: A review of worry, prolonged stress-related physiological activation, and health. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 60(2), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2005.06.074>
- Brosschot, J. F., Van Dijk, E., & Thayer, J. F. (2007). Daily worry is related to low heart rate variability during waking and the subsequent nocturnal sleep period. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 63(1), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2006.07.016>
- Buckner, R. L., Andrews-Hanna, J. R., & Schacter, D. L. (2008). The brain’s default network: Anatomy, function, and relevance to disease. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1124, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1440.011>
- Buhle, J. T., Silvers, J. A., Wager, T. D., Lopez, R., Onyemkwu, C., Kober, H., Weber, J., & Ochsner, K. N. (2014). Cognitive reappraisal of emotion: A meta-analysis of human neuroimaging studies. *Cerebral Cortex*, 24(11), 2981–2990. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bht154>
- Butler, E. A., & Randall, A. K. (2013). Emotional coregulation in close relationships. *Emotion Review*,

5(2), 202–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912451630>

Cacioppo, J. T., Norris, C. J., Decety, J., Monteleone, G., & Nusbaum, H. (2009). In the eye of the beholder: Individual differences in perceived social isolation predict regional brain activation to social stimuli. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 21(1), 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21007>

Carrère, S., & Gottman, J. M. (1999). Predicting divorce among newlyweds from the first three minutes of a marital conflict discussion. *Family Process*, 38(3), 293–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1999.00293.x>

Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 354–380. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.3.354>

Chen, Y., Kim, E. S., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2021). Religious-service attendance and subsequent health and well-being throughout adulthood: Evidence from three prospective cohorts. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 49(6), 2030–2040. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyaa120>

Chida, Y., & Steptoe, A. (2008). Positive psychological well-being and mortality: A quantitative review of prospective observational studies. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 70(7), 741–756. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e31818105ba>

Chida, Y., & Steptoe, A. (2009). The association of anger and hostility with future coronary heart disease: A meta-analytic review of prospective evidence. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 53(11), 936–946. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2008.11.044>

Coan, J. A., & Sbarra, D. A. (2015). Social baseline theory: The social regulation of risk and effort. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1, 87–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.12.021>

Coan, J. A., Beckes, L., Gonzalez, M. Z., Maresh, E. L., Brown, C. L., & Hasselmo, K. (2017). Relationship status and perceived support in the social regulation of neural responses to threat. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 12(10), 1574–1583. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx091>

Coan, J. A., Schaefer, H. S., & Davidson, R. J. (2006). Lending a hand: Social regulation of the neural response to threat. *Psychological Science*, 17(12), 1032–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01832.x>

Cohen, S., Alper, C. M., Doyle, W. J., Treanor, J. J., & Turner, R. B. (2006). Positive emotional style predicts resistance to illness after experimental exposure to rhinovirus or influenza A virus. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 68(6), 809–815. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.psy.0000245867.92364.3c>

Cohen, S., Doyle, W. J., Turner, R. B., Alper, C. M., & Skoner, D. P. (2003). Emotional style and susceptibility to the common cold. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 65(4), 652–657. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.psy.0000077508.57784.da>

Cohen, S., Janicki-Deverts, D., Doyle, W. J., Miller, G. E., Frank, E., Rabin, B. S., & Turner, R. B. (2012). Chronic stress, glucocorticoid receptor resistance, inflammation, and disease risk. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(16), 5995–5999. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1118355109>

Cohen, S., Janicki-Deverts, D., Turner, R. B., & Doyle, W. J. (2015). Does hugging provide stress-buffering social support? A study of susceptibility to upper respiratory infection and illness. *Psychological Science*, 26(2), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614559284>

Cole, S. W., Capitanio, J. P., Chun, K., Arevalo, J. M. G., Ma, J., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2015). Myeloid differentiation architecture of leukocyte transcriptome dynamics in perceived social isolation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(49), 15142–15147. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514249112>

Cole, S. W., Hawkey, L. C., Arevalo, J. M., Sung, C. Y., Rose, R. M., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2007). Social regulation of gene expression in human leukocytes. *Genome Biology*, 8(9), R189. <https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2007-8-9-r189>

Cox, D. A. (2021). *The state of American friendship: Change, challenges, and loss*. Survey Center on American Life. <https://www.americansurveycenter.org/research/the-state-of-american-friendship/>

Cregg, D. R., & Cheavens, J. S. (2021). Gratitude interventions: Effective self-help? A meta-analysis of the

- impact on symptoms of depression and anxiety. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 22(1), 413–445.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00236-6>
- Davis, D. E., Choe, E., Meyers, J., Wade, N., Varjas, K., Gifford, A., Quinn, A., Hook, J. N., Van Tongeren, D. R., Griffin, B. J., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2016). Thankful for the little things: A meta-analysis of gratitude interventions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 63(1), 20–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000107>
- de Bloom, J., Kompier, M., Geurts, S., de Weerth, C., Taris, T., & Sonnentag, S. (2009). Do we recover from vacation? Meta-analysis of vacation effects on health and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 51(1), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.k8004>
- de Wit, S., Kindt, M., Knot, S. L., Verhoeven, A. A. C., Robbins, T. W., Gasull-Camos, J., Evans, M., Mirza, H., & Gillan, C. M. (2018). Shifting the balance between goals and habits: Five failures in experimental habit induction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 147(7), 1043–1065.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000402>
- Ditzen, B., Neumann, I. D., Bodenmann, G., von Dawans, B., Turner, R. A., Ehlert, U., & Heinrichs, M. (2007). Effects of different kinds of couple interaction on cortisol and heart rate responses to stress in women. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 32(5), 565–574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2007.03.011>
- Ditzen, B., Schmidt, S., Strauss, B., Nater, U. M., Ehlert, U., & Heinrichs, M. (2008). Adult attachment and social support interact to reduce psychological but not cortisol responses to stress. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 64(5), 479–486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2007.11.011>
- Dowlati, Y., Herrmann, N., Swardfager, W., Liu, H., Sham, L., Reim, E. K., & Lanctôt, K. L. (2010). A meta-analysis of cytokines in major depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, 67(5), 446–457.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.09.033>
- Doyle, W. J., Gentile, D. A., & Cohen, S. (2006). Emotional style, nasal cytokines, and illness expression after experimental rhinovirus exposure. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*, 20(2), 175–181.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2005.05.005>
- Draganski, B., Gaser, C., Busch, V., Schuierer, G., Bogdahn, U., & May, A. (2004). Neuroplasticity: Changes in grey matter induced by training. *Nature*, 427(6972), 311–312.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/427311a>
- Eisenberger, N. I., Berkman, E. T., Inagaki, T. K., Rameson, L. T., Mashal, N. M., & Irwin, M. R. (2010). Inflammation-induced anhedonia: Endotoxin reduces ventral striatum responses to reward. *Biological Psychiatry*, 68(8), 748–754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.06.010>
- Eisenberger, N. I., Lieberman, M. D., & Williams, K. D. (2003). Does rejection hurt? An fMRI study of social exclusion. *Science*, 302(5643), 290–292. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1089134>
- Eisenberger, N. I., Master, S. L., Inagaki, T. K., Taylor, S. E., Shirinyan, D., Lieberman, M. D., & Naliboff, B. D. (2011). Attachment figures activate a safety signal-related neural region and reduce pain experience. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(28), 11721–11726.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1108239108>
- Emmons, R. A., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Counting blessings versus burdens: An experimental investigation of gratitude and subjective well-being in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(2), 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.2.377>
- Erickson, K. I., Voss, M. W., Prakash, R. S., Basak, C., Szabo, A., Chaddock, L., Kim, J. S., Heo, S., Alves, H., White, S. M., Wojcicki, T. R., Mailey, E., Vieira, V. J., Martin, S. A., Pence, B. D., Woods, J. A., McAuley, E., & Kramer, A. F. (2011). Exercise training increases size of hippocampus and improves memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(7), 3017–3022.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1015950108>
- Etkin, A., Prater, K. E., Schatzberg, A. F., Menon, V., & Greicius, M. D. (2009). Disrupted amygdalar subregion functional connectivity and evidence of a compensatory network in generalized anxiety disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 66(12), 1361–1372.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2009.104>

- Finkel, E. J., Slotter, E. B., Luchies, L. B., Walton, G. M., & Gross, J. J. (2013). A brief intervention to promote conflict reappraisal preserves marital quality over time. *Psychological Science*, 24(8), 1595–1601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612474938>
- Fourie, M. M., Hortensius, R., & Decety, J. (2020). Parsing the components of forgiveness: Psychological and neural mechanisms. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 112, 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.02.020>
- Fox, G. R., Kaplan, J., Damasio, H., & Damasio, A. (2015). Neural correlates of gratitude. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1491. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01491>
- Fraser, G. E., & Shavlik, D. J. (2001). Ten years of life: Is it a matter of choice? *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 161(13), 1645–1652. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.161.13.1645>
- Gilbertson, M. W., Shenton, M. E., Ciszewski, A., Kasai, K., Lasko, N. B., Orr, S. P., & Pitman, R. K. (2002). Smaller hippocampal volume predicts pathologic vulnerability to psychological trauma. *Nature Neuroscience*, 5(11), 1242–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn958>
- Goessl, V. C., Curtiss, J. E., & Hofmann, S. G. (2017). The effect of heart rate variability biofeedback training on stress and anxiety: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Medicine*, 47(15), 2578–2586. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291717001003>
- Gogtay, N., Giedd, J. N., Lusk, L., Hayashi, K. M., Greenstein, D., Vaituzis, A. C., Nugent, T. F., III, Herman, D. H., Clasen, L. S., Toga, A. W., Rapoport, J. L., & Thompson, P. M. (2004). Dynamic mapping of human cortical development during childhood through early adulthood. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(21), 8174–8179. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0402680101>
- Goldapple, K., Segal, Z., Garson, C., Lau, M., Bieling, P., Kennedy, S., & Mayberg, H. (2004). Modulation of cortical-limbic pathways in major depression: Treatment-specific effects of cognitive behavior therapy. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 61(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.61.1.34>
- Goldstein, P., Weissman-Fogel, I., Dumas, G., & Shamay-Tsoory, S. G. (2018). Brain-to-brain coupling during handholding is associated with pain reduction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), E2528–E2537. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1703643115>
- Gollwitzer, P. M., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 69–119. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(06\)38002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38002-1)
- Gordon, A. M., & Chen, S. (2014). The role of sleep in interpersonal conflict: Do sleepless nights mean worse fights? *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(2), 168–175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550613488952>
- Gottman, J. M., Coan, J., Carrère, S., & Swanson, C. (1998). Predicting marital happiness and stability from newlywed interactions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353438>
- Goyal, M., Singh, S., Sibinga, E. M. S., Gould, N. F., Rowland-Seymour, A., Sharma, R., Berger, Z., Sleicher, D., Maron, D. D., Shihab, H. M., Ranasinghe, P. D., Linn, S., Saha, S., Bass, E. B., & Haythornthwaite, J. A. (2014). Meditation programs for psychological stress and well-being: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 174(3), 357–368. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.13018>
- Grandjean, D., Sander, D., Pourtois, G., Schwartz, S., Seghier, M. L., Scherer, K. R., & Vuilleumier, P. (2005). The voices of wrath: Brain responses to angry prosody in meaningless speech. *Nature Neuroscience*, 8(2), 145–146. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1392>
- Graybiel, A. M. (2008). Habits, rituals, and the evaluative brain. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 31, 359–387. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.29.051605.112851>
- Grewen, K. M., Anderson, B. J., Girdler, S. S., & Light, K. C. (2003). Warm partner contact is related to lower cardiovascular reactivity. *Behavioral Medicine*, 29(3), 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08964280309596065>
- Hamilton, J. P., Furman, D. J., Chang, C., Thomason, M. E., Dennis, E., & Gotlib, I. H. (2011).

- Default-mode and task-positive network activity in major depressive disorder: Implications for adaptive and maladaptive rumination. *Biological Psychiatry*, 70(4), 327–333.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.02.003>
- Hasenkamp, W., Wilson-Mendenhall, C. D., Duncan, E., & Barsalou, L. W. (2012). Mind wandering and attention during focused meditation: A fine-grained temporal analysis of fluctuating cognitive states. *NeuroImage*, 59(1), 750–760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.07.008>
- Hawkley, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2010). Loneliness matters: A theoretical and empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 40(2), 218–227.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-010-9210-8>
- Hebb, D. O. (1949). *The organization of behavior: A neuropsychological theory*. Wiley.
- Heinrichs, M., Baumgartner, T., Kirschbaum, C., & Ehler, U. (2003). Social support and oxytocin interact to suppress cortisol and subjective responses to psychosocial stress. *Biological Psychiatry*, 54(12), 1389–1398. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223\(03\)00465-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(03)00465-7)
- Heyman, R. E., & Smith Slep, A. M. (2001). The hazards of predicting divorce without crossvalidation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(2), 473–479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00473.x>
- Ho, M. Y., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Cowden, R. G., Bechara, A. O., Chen, Z. J., Gunatirin, E. Y., Joynt, S., Khalanskyi, V. V., Korzhov, H., Kurniati, N. M. T., Rodriguez, N., Salnykova, A., Shtanko, L., Tymchenko, S., Voytenko, V. L., Zulkaida, A., Mathur, M. B., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2024). International REACH forgiveness intervention: A multisite randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Public Health*, 2(1), e000072. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjph-2023-000072>
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Birmingham, W. A., & Light, K. C. (2008). Influence of a “warm touch” support enhancement intervention among married couples on ambulatory blood pressure, oxytocin, alpha amylase, and cortisol. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 70(9), 976–985.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e318187aef7>
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Medicine*, 7(7), e1000316.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316>
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352>
- Hough, H., Proeschold-Bell, R. J., Liu, X., Weisner, C., Turner, E. L., & Yao, J. (2019). Relationships between Sabbath observance and mental, physical, and spiritual health in clergy. *Pastoral Psychology*, 68(2), 171–193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-018-0838-9>
- Howren, M. B., Lamkin, D. M., & Sulz, J. (2009). Associations of depression with C-reactive protein, IL-1, and IL-6: A meta-analysis. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 71(2), 171–186.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181907c1b>
- Jacobson, L., & Sapolsky, R. (1991). The role of the hippocampus in feedback regulation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenocortical axis. *Endocrine Reviews*, 12(2), 118–134.
<https://doi.org/10.1210/edrv-12-2-118>
- Jellesma, F. C., Verkuil, B., & Brosschot, J. F. (2009). Postponing worrisome thoughts in children: The effects of a postponement intervention on perseverative thoughts, emotions and somatic complaints. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69(2), 278–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.04.031>
- Kahlon, M. K., Aksan, N., Aubrey, R., Clark, N., Cowley-Morillo, M., Jacobs, E. A., Mundhenk, R., Sebastian, K. R., & Tomlinson, S. (2021). Effect of layperson-delivered, empathy-focused program of telephone calls on loneliness, depression, and anxiety among adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 78(6), 616–622.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.0113>
- Karns, C. M., Moore, W. E., & Mayr, U. (2017). The cultivation of pure altruism via gratitude: A functional MRI study of change with gratitude practice. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 11, 599.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00599>

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Loving, T. J., Stowell, J. R., Malarkey, W. B., Lemeshow, S., Dickinson, S. L., & Glaser, R. (2005). Hostile marital interactions, proinflammatory cytokine production, and wound healing. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62(12), 1377–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.62.12.1377>

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Malarkey, W. B., Chee, M., Newton, T., Cacioppo, J. T., Mao, H. Y., & Glaser, R. (1993). Negative behavior during marital conflict is associated with immunological down-regulation. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 55(5), 395–409. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-199309000-00001>

Killingsworth, M. A., & Gilbert, D. T. (2010). A wandering mind is an unhappy mind. *Science*, 330(6006), 932. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1192439>

Kini, P., Wong, J., McInnis, S., Gabana, N., & Brown, J. W. (2016). The effects of gratitude expression on neural activity. *NeuroImage*, 128, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.12.040>

Kircanski, K., Lieberman, M. D., & Craske, M. G. (2012). Feelings into words: Contributions of language to exposure therapy. *Psychological Science*, 23(10), 1086–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612443830>

Kjærviik, S. L., & Bushman, B. J. (2024). A meta-analytic review of anger management activities that increase or decrease arousal: What fuels or douses rage? *Clinical Psychology Review*, 109, 102414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2024.102414>

Klinzing, J. G., Niethard, N., & Born, J. (2019). Mechanisms of systems memory consolidation during sleep. *Nature Neuroscience*, 22(10), 1598–1610. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-019-0467-3>

Knudsen, E. I. (2004). Sensitive periods in the development of the brain and behavior. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 16(8), 1412–1425. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0898929042304796>

Krizan, Z., & Hisler, G. (2019). Sleepy anger: Restricted sleep amplifies angry feelings. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 148(7), 1239–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000522>

Lally, P., van Jaarsveld, C. H. M., Potts, H. W. W., & Wardle, J. (2010). How are habits formed: Modelling habit formation in the real world. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(6), 998–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.674>

Lawler, K. A., Younger, J. W., Piferi, R. L., Billington, E., Jobe, R., Edmondson, K., & Jones, W. H. (2003). A change of heart: Cardiovascular correlates of forgiveness in response to interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 26(5), 373–393. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1025771716686>

Lawler, K. A., Younger, J. W., Piferi, R. L., Jobe, R. L., Edmondson, K. A., & Jones, W. H. (2005). The unique effects of forgiveness on health: An exploration of pathways. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 28(2), 157–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-005-3665-2>

Lee, J. L. C., Nader, K., & Schiller, D. (2017). An update on memory reconsolidation updating. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 21(7), 531–545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.04.006>

Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1983). Marital interaction: Physiological linkage and affective exchange. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(3), 587–597. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.3.587>

Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1985). Physiological and affective predictors of change in relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(1), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.1.85>

Li, S., Stampfer, M. J., Williams, D. R., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2016). Association of religious service attendance with mortality among women. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 176(6), 777–785. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.1615>

Lieberman, M. D., Eisenberger, N. I., Crockett, M. J., Tom, S. M., Pfeifer, J. H., & Way, B. M. (2007). Putting feelings into words: Affect labeling disrupts amygdala activity in response to affective stimuli. *Psychological Science*, 18(5), 421–428. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01916.x>

Lipinska, G., Stuart, B., Thomas, K. G. F., Baldwin, D. S., & Bolinger, E. (2019). Preferential consolidation of emotional memory during sleep: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1014. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01014>

- Liu, Y., Lin, W., Liu, C., Luo, Y., Wu, J., Bayley, P. J., & Qin, S. (2016). Memory consolidation reconfigures neural pathways involved in the suppression of emotional memories. *Nature Communications*, 7, 13375. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms13375>
- Logue, M. W., van Rooij, S. J. H., Dennis, E. L., Davis, S. L., Hayes, J. P., Stevens, J. S., Densmore, M., Haswell, C. C., Ipser, J., Koch, S. B. J., Korgaonkar, M., Lebois, L. A. M., Peverill, M., Baker, J. T., Boedhoe, P. S. W., Frijling, J. L., Gruber, S. A., Harpaz-Rotem, I., Jahanshad, N., ... Morey, R. A. (2018). Smaller hippocampal volume in posttraumatic stress disorder: A multisite ENIGMA-PGC study: Subcortical volumetry results from posttraumatic stress disorder consortia. *Biological Psychiatry*, 83(3), 244–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.09.006>
- López-Solà, M., Geuter, S., Koban, L., Coan, J. A., & Wager, T. D. (2019). Brain mechanisms of social touch-induced analgesia in females. *Pain*, 160(9), 2072–2085. <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001599>
- Luhrmann, T. M., & Morgain, R. (2012). Prayer as inner sense cultivation: An attentional learning theory of spiritual experience. *Ethos*, 40(4), 359–389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1352.2012.01266.x>
- Luhrmann, T. M., Nusbaum, H., & Thisted, R. (2010). The absorption hypothesis: Learning to hear God in evangelical Christianity. *American Anthropologist*, 112(1), 66–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2009.01197.x>
- Lupien, S. J., de Leon, M., de Santi, S., Convit, A., Tarshish, C., Nair, N. P., Thakur, M., McEwen, B. S., Hauger, R. L., & Meaney, M. J. (1998). Cortisol levels during human aging predict hippocampal atrophy and memory deficits. *Nature Neuroscience*, 1(1), 69–73. <https://doi.org/10.1038/271>
- Lupien, S. J., McEwen, B. S., Gunnar, M. R., & Heim, C. (2009). Effects of stress throughout the lifespan on the brain, behaviour and cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 10(6), 434–445. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2639>
- Lyons, D. E., Young, A. G., & Keil, F. C. (2007). The hidden structure of overimitation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(50), 19751–19756. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0704452104>
- Maguire, E. A., Gadian, D. G., Johnsrude, I. S., Good, C. D., Ashburner, J., Frackowiak, R. S. J., & Frith, C. D. (2000). Navigation-related structural change in the hippocampi of taxi drivers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(8), 4398–4403. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.070039597>
- Maguire, E. A., Woollett, K., & Spiers, H. J. (2006). London taxi drivers and bus drivers: A structural MRI and neuropsychological analysis. *Hippocampus*, 16(12), 1091–1101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.20233>
- Makovac, E., Meeten, F., Watson, D. R., Herman, A., Garfinkel, S. N., Critchley, H. D., & Ottaviani, C. (2016). Alterations in amygdala-prefrontal functional connectivity account for excessive worry and autonomic dysregulation in generalized anxiety disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, 80(10), 786–795. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.10.013>
- Marwood, L., Wise, T., Perkins, A. M., & Cleare, A. J. (2018). Meta-analyses of the neural mechanisms and predictors of response to psychotherapy in depression and anxiety. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 95, 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.09.022>
- Masi, C. M., Chen, H.-Y., Hawkley, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2011). A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce loneliness. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(3), 219–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310377394>
- Mason, M. F., Norton, M. I., Van Horn, J. D., Wegner, D. M., Grafton, S. T., & Macrae, C. N. (2007). Wandering minds: The default network and stimulus-independent thought. *Science*, 315(5810), 393–395. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1131295>
- McCarrick, D., Prestwich, A., Ferguson, E., & O'Connor, D. B. (2025). Effects of worry postponement on daily worry and sleep: A randomised controlled trial. *Psychology & Health*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2025.2590072>
- McCullough, M. E., Orsulak, P., Brandon, A., & Akers, L. (2007). Rumination, fear, and cortisol: An in vivo study of interpersonal transgressions. *Health Psychology*, 26(1), 126–132.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.26.1.126>

McEvoy, P. M., Hyett, M. P., Shihata, S., Price, J. E., & Strachan, L. (2019). The impact of methodological and measurement factors on transdiagnostic associations with intolerance of uncertainty: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 73, Article 101778. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2019.101778>

McEwen, B. S., & Stellar, E. (1993). Stress and the individual: Mechanisms leading to disease. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 153(18), 2093–2101.

McEwen, B. S. (1998). Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 338(3), 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199801153380307>

McEwen, B. S. (1999). Stress and hippocampal plasticity. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 22, 105–122. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.22.1.105>

McGowan, S. K., & Behar, E. (2013). A preliminary investigation of stimulus control training for worry: Effects on anxiety and insomnia. *Behavior Modification*, 37(1), 90–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445512455661>

McKenzie, I. A., Ohayon, D., Li, H., de Faria, J. P., Emery, B., Tohyama, K., & Richardson, W. D. (2014). Motor skill learning requires active central myelination. *Science*, 346(6207), 318–322. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1254960>

McNulty, J. K. (2011). The dark side of forgiveness: The tendency to forgive predicts continued psychological and physical aggression in marriage. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(6), 770–783. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211407077>

Miller, A. H., & Raison, C. L. (2016). The role of inflammation in depression: From evolutionary imperative to modern treatment target. *Nature Reviews Immunology*, 16(1), 22–34. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nri.2015.5>

Min, J., Silverstein, M., & Gruenewald, T. L. (2018). Intergenerational similarity of religiosity over the family life course. *Research on Aging*, 40(6), 580–596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027517723076>

Mobach, L., van Schie, H. T., & Näring, G. W. B. (2019). Application of a worry reduction intervention in a medically unexplained symptoms-analogue student-sample. *Psychology & Health*, 34(6), 677–694. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2018.1562066>

Mostofsky, E., Penner, E. A., & Mittleman, M. A. (2014). Outbursts of anger as a trigger of acute cardiovascular events: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Heart Journal*, 35(21), 1404–1410. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehu033>

New American Standard Bible. (1995). The Lockman Foundation. (Original work published 1960)

Newberg, A., Pourdehnad, M., Alavi, A., & d'Aquili, E. G. (2003). Cerebral blood flow during meditative prayer: Preliminary findings and methodological issues. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 97(2), 625–630. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.2003.97.2.625>

Newman, M. G., & Llera, S. J. (2011). A novel theory of experiential avoidance in generalized anxiety disorder: A review and synthesis of research supporting a contrast avoidance model of worry. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 31(3), 371–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2011.01.008>

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Wisco, B. E., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Rethinking rumination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(5), 400–424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00088.x>

Ochsner, K. N., & Gross, J. J. (2005). The cognitive control of emotion. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9(5), 242–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.03.010>

Office of the U.S. Surgeon General. (2023). *Our epidemic of loneliness and isolation: The U.S. Surgeon General's advisory on the healing effects of social connection and community*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/surgeon-general-social-connection-advisory.pdf>

Ottaviani, C., Thayer, J. F., Verkuil, B., Lonigro, A., Medea, B., Couyoumdjian, A., & Brosschot, J. F. (2016). Physiological concomitants of perseverative cognition: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(3), 231–259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000036>

- Packheiser, J., Hartmann, H., Fredriksen, K., Gazzola, V., Keyzers, C., & Michon, F. (2024). A systematic review and multivariate meta-analysis of the physical and mental health benefits of touch interventions. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8(6), 1088–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01841-8>
- Palumbo, R. V., Marraccini, M. E., Weyandt, L. L., Wilder-Smith, O., McGee, H. A., Liu, S., & Goodwin, M. S. (2017). Interpersonal autonomic physiology: A systematic review of the literature. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21(2), 99–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316628405>
- Park, H., & Poo, M.-m. (2013). Neurotrophin regulation of neural circuit development and function. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14(1), 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3379>
- Pieper, S., Brosschot, J. F., van der Leeden, R., & Thayer, J. F. (2010). Prolonged cardiac effects of momentary assessed stressful events and worry episodes. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 72(6), 570–577. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181dbc0e9>
- Pressman, S. D., & Cohen, S. (2005). Does positive affect influence health? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(6), 925–971. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.925>
- Price, R. B., Wallace, M., Kuckertz, J. M., Amir, N., Graur, S., Cummings, L., Popa, P., Carlbring, P., & Bar-Haim, Y. (2016). Pooled patient-level meta-analysis of children and adults completing a computer-based anxiety intervention targeting attentional bias. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 50, 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2016.09.009>
- Proeschold-Bell, R. J., Stringfield, B., Yao, J., Choi, J., Eagle, D., Hybels, C. F., Parnell, H., Keefe, K., & Shilling, S. (2022). Changes in Sabbath-keeping and mental health over time: Evaluation findings from the Sabbath Living study. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 50(2), 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00916471211046227>
- Raichle, M. E., MacLeod, A. M., Snyder, A. Z., Powers, W. J., Gusnard, D. A., & Shulman, G. L. (2001). A default mode of brain function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(2), 676–682. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.98.2.676>
- Rasmussen, K. R., Stackhouse, M., Boon, S. D., Comstock, K., & Ross, R. (2019). Meta-analytic connections between forgiveness and health: The moderating effects of forgiveness-related distinctions. *Psychology & Health*, 34(5), 515–534. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2018.1545906>
- Reddan, M. C., Young, H., Falkner, J., López-Solà, M., & Wager, T. D. (2020). Touch and social support influence interpersonal synchrony and pain. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 15(10), 1064–1075. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsaa048>
- Ricciardi, E., Rota, G., Sani, L., Gentili, C., Gaglianese, A., Guazzelli, M., & Pietrini, P. (2013). How the brain heals emotional wounds: The functional neuroanatomy of forgiveness. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, 839. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00839>
- Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., & McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital quality and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(1), 140–187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031859>
- Roediger, H. L., III, & Karpicke, J. D. (2006). Test-enhanced learning: Taking memory tests improves long-term retention. *Psychological Science*, 17(3), 249–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01693.x>
- Rohde, J. S., Goldy, S., Graziosi, M., Ferguson, M. A., Thrul, J., & Yaden, D. B. (2024). Centering and flourishing: An online intervention study assessing the effects of a Christian contemplative practice on stress-reduction and human flourishing. *BMC Psychology*, 12(1), 373. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01836-0>
- Schäfer, S. K., Wirth, B. E., Staginnus, M., Becker, N., Michael, T., & Sopp, M. R. (2020). Sleep’s impact on emotional recognition memory: A meta-analysis of whole-night, nap, and REM sleep effects. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, 51, 101280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smrv.2020.101280>
- Schjoedt, U., Stødkilde-Jørgensen, H., Geertz, A. W., & Roepstorff, A. (2009). Highly religious participants recruit areas of social cognition in personal prayer. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 4(2), 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsn050>
- Scholz, J., Klein, M. C., Behrens, T. E. J., & Johansen-Berg, H. (2009). Training induces changes in

- white-matter architecture. *Nature Neuroscience*, 12(11), 1370–1371. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2412>
- Schultz, W., Dayan, P., & Montague, P. R. (1997). A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science*, 275(5306), 1593–1599. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.275.5306.1593>
- Seltzer, L. J., Ziegler, T. E., & Pollak, S. D. (2010). Social vocalizations can release oxytocin in humans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 277(1694), 2661–2666. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.0567>
- Shields, G. S., Spahr, C. M., & Slavich, G. M. (2020). Psychosocial interventions and immune system function: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 77(10), 1031–1043. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0431>
- Silverstein, M., Hwang, W., Yoon, J., Zhang, W., Kim, J. H., Cheng, K. J., & Brown, M. T. (2026). Transmission of religiosity across generations: Historical, cohort, and relational dynamics. *Sociology of Religion*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socrel/sraf029>
- Singh, B., Murphy, A., Maher, C., & Smith, A. E. (2024). Time to form a habit: A systematic review and meta-analysis of health behaviour habit formation and its determinants. *Healthcare*, 12(23), 2488. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12232488>
- Slavich, G. M., & Irwin, M. R. (2014). From stress to inflammation and major depressive disorder: A social signal transduction theory of depression. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(3), 774–815. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035302>
- Smith, K. J., Gavey, S., Riddell, N. E., Kontari, P., & Victor, C. (2020). The association between loneliness, social isolation and inflammation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 112, 519–541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.02.002>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1), S72–S103. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1924>
- Spiegel, K., Leproult, R., & Van Cauter, E. (1999). Impact of sleep debt on metabolic and endocrine function. *The Lancet*, 354(9188), 1435–1439. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(99\)01376-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(99)01376-8)
- Stanley, S. M., Bradbury, T. N., & Markman, H. J. (2000). Structural flaws in the bridge from basic research on marriage to interventions for couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(1), 256–264.
- Starkman, M. N., Gebarski, S. S., Berent, S., & Schteingart, D. E. (1992). Hippocampal formation volume, memory dysfunction, and cortisol levels in patients with Cushing’s syndrome. *Biological Psychiatry*, 32(9), 756–765. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3223\(92\)90079-f](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3223(92)90079-f)
- Starkman, M. N., Giordani, B., Gebarski, S. S., Berent, S., Schork, M. A., & Schteingart, D. E. (1999). Decrease in cortisol reverses human hippocampal atrophy following treatment of Cushing’s disease. *Biological Psychiatry*, 46(12), 1595–1602. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0006-3223\(99\)00203-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0006-3223(99)00203-6)
- Stellar, J. E., John-Henderson, N., Anderson, C. L., Gordon, A. M., McNeil, G. D., & Keltner, D. (2015). Positive affect and markers of inflammation: Discrete positive emotions predict lower levels of inflammatory cytokines. *Emotion*, 15(2), 129–133. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000033>
- Steptoe, A., Wardle, J., & Marmot, M. (2005). Positive affect and health-related neuroendocrine, cardiovascular, and inflammatory processes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(18), 6508–6512. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0409174102>
- Superville, D. J., Pargament, K. I., & Lee, J. W. (2014). Sabbath keeping and its relationships to health and well-being: A mediational analysis. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 24(3), 241–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508619.2013.837655>
- Thayer, J. F., & Lane, R. D. (2000). A model of neurovisceral integration in emotion regulation and dysregulation. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 61(3), 201–216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0327\(00\)00338-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0327(00)00338-4)
- Thayer, J. F., Åhs, F., Fredrikson, M., Sollers, J. J., III, & Wager, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of heart rate variability and neuroimaging studies: Implications for heart rate variability as a marker of stress and health. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36(2), 747–756.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.11.009>

Thomas, C., & Baker, C. I. (2013). Teaching an adult brain new tricks: A critical review of evidence for training-dependent structural plasticity in humans. *NeuroImage*, 73, 225–236.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.03.069>

Timmons, A. C., Margolin, G., & Saxbe, D. E. (2015). Physiological linkage in couples and its implications for individual and interpersonal functioning: A literature review. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 29(5), 720–731. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000115>

Toussaint, L. L., Owen, A. D., & Cheadle, A. (2012). Forgive to live: Forgiveness, health, and longevity. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 35(4), 375–386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-011-9362-4>

Toussaint, L. L., Shields, G. S., & Slavich, G. M. (2016). Forgiveness, stress, and health: A 5-week dynamic parallel process study. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 50(5), 727–735.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-016-9796-6>

Tricomi, E., Balleine, B. W., & O'Doherty, J. P. (2009). A specific role for posterior dorsolateral striatum in human habit learning. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 29(11), 2225–2232.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2009.06796.x>

Valtorta, N. K., Kanaan, M., Gilbody, S., Ronzi, S., & Hanratty, B. (2016). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for coronary heart disease and stroke: Systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal observational studies. *Heart*, 102(13), 1009–1016. <https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2015-308790>

van der Helm, E., Yao, J., Dutt, S., Rao, V., Saletin, J. M., & Walker, M. P. (2011). REM sleep depotentiates amygdala activity to previous emotional experiences. *Current Biology*, 21(23), 2029–2032.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.10.052>

VanderWeele, T. J., Li, S., Tsai, A. C., & Kawachi, I. (2016). Association between religious service attendance and lower suicide rates among US women. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 73(8), 845–851.

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2016.1243>

Versluis, A., Verkuil, B., & Brosschot, J. F. (2016). Reducing worry and subjective health complaints: A randomized trial of an internet-delivered worry postponement intervention. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 21(2), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12170>

Wade, N. G., Hoyt, W. T., Kidwell, J. E. M., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2014). Efficacy of psychotherapeutic interventions to promote forgiveness: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 82(1), 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035268>

Walker, M. P., & van der Helm, E. (2009). Overnight therapy? The role of sleep in emotional brain processing. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(5), 731–748. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016570>

Walum, H., Waldman, I. D., & Young, L. J. (2016). Statistical and methodological considerations for the interpretation of intranasal oxytocin studies. *Biological Psychiatry*, 79(3), 251–257.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.06.016>

Wang, F., Gao, Y., Han, Z., Yu, Y., Long, Z., Jiang, X., Wu, Y., Pei, B., Cao, Y., Ye, J., Wang, M., & Zhao, Y. (2023). A systematic review and meta-analysis of 90 cohort studies of social isolation, loneliness and mortality. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(8), 1307–1319. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01617-6>

Watkins, E. R. (2008). Constructive and unconstructive repetitive thought. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 163–206. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.163>

Watkins, E. R., Mullan, E., Wingrove, J., Rimes, K., Steiner, H., Bathurst, N., Eastman, R., & Scott, J. (2011). Rumination-focused cognitive-behavioural therapy for residual depression: Phase II randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 199(4), 317–322.

<https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.110.090282>

Wendsche, J., & Lohmann-Haislah, A. (2017). A meta-analysis on antecedents and outcomes of detachment from work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 2072. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02072>

Wilson, S. J., Jaremka, L. M., Fagundes, C. P., Andridge, R., Peng, J., Malarkey, W. B., Habash, D., Belury, M. A., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (2017). Shortened sleep fuels inflammatory responses to marital conflict: Emotion regulation matters. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 79, 74–83.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2017.02.015>

Witvliet, C. V. O., DeYoung, N. J., Hofelich, A. J., & DeYoung, P. A. (2011). Compassionate reappraisal and emotion suppression as alternatives to offense-focused rumination: Implications for forgiveness and psychophysiological well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(4), 286–299.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2011.577091>

Witvliet, C. V. O., Ludwig, T. E., & Vander Laan, K. L. (2001). Granting forgiveness or harboring grudges: Implications for emotion, physiology, and health. *Psychological Science*, 12(2), 117–123.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00320>

Wong, Y. J., Owen, J., Gabana, N. T., Brown, J. W., McInnis, S., Toth, P., & Gilman, L. (2018). Does gratitude writing improve the mental health of psychotherapy clients? Evidence from a randomized controlled trial. *Psychotherapy Research*, 28(2), 192–202.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2016.1169332>

Woo, C.-W., Koban, L., Kross, E., Lindquist, M. A., Banich, M. T., Ruzic, L., Andrews-Hanna, J. R., & Wager, T. D. (2014). Separate neural representations for physical pain and social rejection. *Nature Communications*, 5, 5380. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms6380>

Wood, W., & Rünger, D. (2016). Psychology of habit. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 289–314.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122414-033417>

Wood, W., Quinn, J. M., & Kashy, D. A. (2002). Habits in everyday life: Thought, emotion, and action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1281–1297.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1281>

Woollett, K., & Maguire, E. A. (2011). Acquiring “the Knowledge” of London’s layout drives structural brain changes. *Current Biology*, 21(24), 2109–2114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.11.018>

Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Scherer, M. (2004). Forgiveness is an emotion-focused coping strategy that can reduce health risks and promote health resilience: Theory, review, and hypotheses. *Psychology & Health*, 19(3), 385–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0887044042000196674>

Worthington, E. L., Jr., Witvliet, C. V. O., Pietrini, P., & Miller, A. J. (2007). Forgiveness, health, and well-being: A review of evidence for emotional versus decisional forgiveness, dispositional forgivingness, and reduced unforgiveness. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 30(4), 291–302.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-007-9105-8>

Yin, H. H., & Knowlton, B. J. (2006). The role of the basal ganglia in habit formation. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 7(6), 464–476. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1919>

Yoo, S.-S., Gujar, N., Hu, P., Jolesz, F. A., & Walker, M. P. (2007). The human emotional brain without sleep: A prefrontal amygdala disconnect. *Current Biology*, 17(20), R877–R878.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.08.007>

Zaccaro, A., Piarulli, A., Laurino, M., Garbella, E., Menicucci, D., Neri, B., & Gemignani, A. (2018). How breath-control can change your life: A systematic review on psycho-physiological correlates of slow breathing. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 12, 353. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00353>

Zaki, J., & Williams, W. C. (2013). Interpersonal emotion regulation. *Emotion*, 13(5), 803–810.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033839>