JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH, 2025
VOL 14, NO. 3, PAGE 1 – 7

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

Sacred Spaces, Clinical Encounters *Integrating Theological and Medical Perspectives*

Julian Ungar-Sargon MD PhD*

Borra College of Health Sciences, Dominican University, USA.

ABSTRACT

This paper synthesizes Dr. Julian Ungar-Sargon's theological and healing essays with comparative scholarship to develop an integrative framework for understanding the sacred dimensions of medical practice. Modern healthcare increasingly operates within a paradigm of scientific reductionism that can inadvertently reduce patients to collections of symptoms and laboratory values. Drawing upon hermeneutic philosophy, phenomenology, and theological perspectives, we argue that authentic healing emerges from recognizing the sacred-profane dialectic inherent in therapeutic encounters. The analysis explores four key domains: hermeneutic approaches to medical practice that emphasize interpretation over mere technical application; the sacred-profane dialectic in therapeutic spaces that transforms ordinary clinical settings into healing environments; evidence distortion in clinical decision-making that acknowledges the interpretive dimension of all medical knowledge; and a theological framework for physician-patient relationships grounded in covenantal rather than contractual models. By integrating these perspectives, we propose a model of healing that honors both scientific rigor and spiritual dimensions of human experience. This framework has significant implications for clinical practice, medical education, and healthcare ethics, offering concrete strategies for creating healing environments that address the full scope of human suffering. The paper contributes to ongoing interdisciplinary dialogue regarding the relationship between spirituality and medicine, particularly from Jewish theological perspectives that complement existing Christian and secular approaches.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received Date: 20 Mar 2025
Accepted Date: 29 Apr 2025
Published Date: 07 May 2025

KEYWORDS

Hermeneutics, Medical theology, Sacred space, Clinical judgment, Physician-patient covenant, Evidence-based medicine, Spiritual healing, Phenomenology of illness.

Introduction

The relationship between theological understanding and medical practice represents one of the most enduring yet contested intersections in human experience. Medical practice has increasingly moved toward scientific reductionism, while theological perspectives often struggle to find expression within modern healthcare frameworks. This apparent dichotomy, however, obscures a more fundamental unity: both domains ultimately concern themselves with human suffering, meaning-making, and the restoration of wholeness.

Dr. Julian Ungar-Sargon's essays on healing and theology [1,2] offer a unique perspective on bridging this divide. Through hermeneutic approaches to medicine, considerations of sacred and profane space in therapeutic encounters, and theological reflections on suffering, Ungar-Sargon provides a foundation for understanding healing as both a technical and spiritual endeavor. His work stands in dialogue with other physician-theologians such as Daniel Sulmasy [3], who has similarly explored the integration of spiritual and scientific dimensions of healthcare.

This paper aims to synthesize these perspectives with comparative scholarship to develop an integrative framework for understanding healing practices that honor both scientific rigor and spiritual dimensions. The analysis draws upon hermeneutic philosophy, phenomenology, and theological perspectives to articulate a model of healing that encompasses the full scope of human experience, resonating with Viktor Frankl's [4] logotherapy and Paul Tillich's [5] theological anthropology.

From Scientific Reductionism to Interpretive Understanding

Contemporary medicine often operates within a paradigm of scientific reductionism, where illness is conceptualized primarily as biological dysfunction amenable to technical intervention. While remarkably successful in many respects, this approach can inadvertently reduce patients to collections of symptoms, laboratory values, and diagnostic categories.

Hermeneutics the study of interpretation offers an alternative framework. As Fredrik Svenaeus [6] suggests, medical practice

Contact: Julian Ungar-Sargon, Borra College of Health Sciences, Dominican University, USA.

can be understood fundamentally as an interpretive activity, where clinicians engage with multiple "texts" simultaneously: the patient's narrative, physical findings, diagnostic data, and the broader context of illness. Rather than a detached technical exercise, diagnosis and treatment emerge from this interpretive dialogue. This approach parallels Richard Zaner's [7] phenomenological investigations of the clinical encounter and Eric Cassell's [8] distinction between disease (biological dysfunction) and illness (the lived experience of suffering).

Ungar-Sargon's hermeneutic approach to medicine [9] aligns with Drew Leder's [10] assertion that "clinical medicine can best be understood not as a purified science but as a hermeneutical enterprise." This perspective does not deny the importance of scientific knowledge but rather situates it within a broader framework of meaning-making that acknowledges the inherent limitations of purely technical approaches to understanding human suffering. In this respect, Ungar-Sargon's work can be seen as extending Hans-Georg Gadamer's [11] philosophical explorations of health and illness as hermeneutic phenomena, while bringing a uniquely theological perspective that Gadamer largely avoided.

Phronesis

A key element of hermeneutic approaches to medicine is the concept of phronesis, or practical wisdom. Unlike technical knowledge (techne) or theoretical understanding (episteme), phronesis concerns judgment in particular cases precisely what is required in clinical practice. As Svenaeus [6] notes, "If medical practice is conceived of as an interpretative meeting between doctor and patient with the aim of restoring the health of the latter, then phronesis is the mark of the good physician."

Ungar-Sargon's essays [12] echo this emphasis on practical wisdom, particularly in addressing the limitations of evidence-based medicine. While evidence provides essential guidance, its application always requires interpretation within unique clinical contexts. This interpretive dimension of medical practice acknowledges that healing cannot be reduced to algorithmic decision-making but requires judgment informed by experience, ethical considerations, and attention to the particular circumstances of each patient. His approach resonates with Kathryn Montgomery's [13] characterization of clinical judgment as a form of practical reasoning distinct from purely technical rationality, while adding theological depth to Montgomery's largely secular framework.

The Sacred-Profane Dialectic

The distinction between sacred and profane represents one of the most fundamental categories in religious studies. As Mircea Eliade [14] observes, sacred spaces function as "hierophanies" where the divine breaks through into the mundane world. These spaces are not merely physically distinct but represent ontologically different modes of being. Rudolf Otto's [15] concept of the "numinous" further illuminates this distinction, highlighting the experiential dimension of encountering the sacred as both fascinating and terrifying.

While traditionally applied to explicitly religious contexts, Ungar-Sargon [16] extends this framework to therapeutic encounters in ways that parallel but meaningfully differ from Thomas Moore's [17] "care of the soul" and Jean Shinoda Bolen's [18] application of sacred space to healing contexts. The clinical space whether a hospital room, physician's office, or psychotherapist's couch can function as a kind of sacred enclosure (temenos) where the ordinary rules and structures of everyday life are temporarily suspended. Within this space, vulnerability, suffering, and healing can be expressed and addressed in ways often prohibited in ordinary social interactions.

Creating Sacred Space in Therapeutic Contexts

The creation of sacred space within therapeutic contexts requires intentional practices that distinguish the encounter from everyday interactions. As studies in therapeutic landscapes have shown [19,20], spatial arrangements, ritual practices, and interactional norms all contribute to establishing a sense of the sacred within clinical settings. Ungar-Sargon's approach differs from these largely secular geographic analyses by emphasizing the theological foundations of sacred space.

Ungar-Sargon [16] emphasizes that this sacred dimension is not merely psychological but reflects a genuine ontological shift. The therapeutic encounter creates the possibility for a different kind of presence what Martin Buber [21] might term an "I-Thou" rather than "I-It" relationship. Within this sacred space, both clinician and patient can engage authentically with suffering, meaning, and the possibility of healing. This perspective shares common ground with Henri Nouwen's [22] concept of the "wounded healer" while adding a distinctly Jewish theological perspective that contrasts with Nouwen's Christian framework.

Comparative Perspectives

Cross-cultural studies of healing practices reveal remarkable convergence in the creation of sacred therapeutic spaces despite significant differences in specific beliefs and techniques. As Laurence Kirmayer [23] notes, traditional healing practices across cultures typically involve "the creation of a ritual space in which symptoms can be expressed and transformed." Jerome Frank's [24] classic work on persuasion and healing similarly identifies the creation of a healing setting as a universal feature of effective therapeutic practices.

Similarly, modern psychotherapeutic approaches often create what Donald Winnicott [25] termed "holding environments" safe psychological spaces where vulnerable emotional material can emerge and be processed. These parallels suggest that the sacred-profane dialectic represents a fundamental structure of healing encounters across cultural and historical contexts. Ungar-Sargon's contribution extends beyond these psychological frameworks by explicitly linking these clinical practices to theological traditions, particularly the Jewish concepts of kavvanah (intentionality) and makom (sacred place), offering a framework that differs from both the Christian pastoral care tradition represented by Nouwen and the secular humanistic approaches of Irvin Yalom [26].

Ideology of Sacred Space

In contrast to Ungar-Sargon's integrative approach to sacred hermeneutics and healing, Slavoj Žižek's theoretical framework offers a provocative counterpoint that would likely interpret the sacred-profane dialectic in therapeutic encounters through the lens of ideological critique. Žižek, drawing on Lacanian psychoanalysis and Hegelian dialectics, would likely view the sacralization of medical spaces as simultaneously emancipatory and problematic a form of what he terms "ideological fantasy" that both reveals and conceals underlying contradictions in healthcare systems [27].

Where Ungar-Sargon employs Jewish theological traditions to enrich medical practice, Žižek's "theology of the gap" approaches the sacred as the traumatic Real that disrupts totalizing systems [28]. This perspective would reframe the physician-patient covenant not as a transcendent relationship but as an encounter with fundamental lack both the physician's inability to fully heal and the patient's irreducible otherness. Žižek's materialist theology would further challenge Ungar-Sargon's hermeneutic approach by arguing that interpretation itself is always already caught in ideological structures that reproduce power relations within healthcare [29]. Nevertheless, both thinkers share a commitment to recognizing the limitations of purely technical approaches to medicine and acknowledge that healing necessarily engages with dimensions of human experience that exceed scientific categorization. Where they fundamentally diverge is in their response to this excess Ungar-Sargon finding in it an opening to the sacred, while Žižek would likely identify it as the traumatic kernel around which medical discourse itself is structured.

The Limits of Evidence-Based Medicine

Evidence-based medicine (EBM) has emerged as the dominant paradigm in contemporary healthcare, emphasizing the systematic application of best available evidence to clinical decision-making. While representing an important advance over purely intuitive approaches, EBM faces significant limitations when conceived as a purely technical enterprise divorced from hermeneutic understanding.

Ungar-Sargon's critique of evidence distortion [30] aligns with Trisha Greenhalgh's [31] observation that EBM often fails to account for the "complex, embodied, enacted reality of patient care." Clinical evidence typically derives from controlled studies of populations, but its application always requires interpretation within particular contexts involving unique individuals with complex needs, preferences, and circumstances. This critique shares common ground with Nancy Cartwright's [32] philosophical analysis of the limitations of randomized controlled trials, though Ungar-Sargon adds specific attention to the theological dimensions of clinical judgment that Cartwright's analysis lacks.

Maya Goldenberg's [33] feminist critique of EBM similarly highlights how the paradigm's emphasis on certain forms of knowledge can marginalize other equally valid ways of knowing. Ungar-Sargon's approach offers a complementary but distinct analysis, focusing on theological rather than feminist perspectives while arriving at some similar conclusions about the limitations of narrowly technical approaches to medical knowledge.

Cognitive Biases and Narrative Distortion

The interpretation of evidence in clinical practice is invariably shaped by cognitive biases, professional norms, institutional constraints, and narrative frameworks. As Kathryn Montgomery [13] argues, medicine operates through a form of "narrative rationality" rather than purely deductive reasoning. Jerome Groopman's [34] analysis of how doctors think similarly highlights the heuristics and cognitive shortcuts that inevitably shape clinical reasoning.

Ungar-Sargon's analysis of evidence distortion [30] highlights how preexisting narratives and cognitive frameworks inevitably shape clinical interpretation. Rather than viewing this as a flaw to be eliminated, he suggests understanding it as an inherent feature of human cognition that requires awareness and critical reflection rather than denial. This perspective resonates with Charles Taylor's [35] concept of "strong evaluation" while bringing specific attention to the theological dimensions of interpretive frameworks that Taylor's largely secular analysis lacks.

Unlike John Ioannidis [36], whose critique focuses primarily on methodological limitations in research design, Ungar-Sargon emphasizes the hermeneutic dimension of evidence interpretation. His approach more closely parallels Rita Charon's [37] narrative medicine, though with greater emphasis on theological frameworks for understanding patient stories.

Evidence-Based Practice

A hermeneutic approach to evidence-based practice acknowledges the interpretive dimension of all clinical knowledge while maintaining commitment to empirical rigor. Sietse Wieringa et al. [38] propose a model of "hermeneutic evidence-based medicine" that integrates scientific evidence with practical wisdom, patient perspectives, and contextual factors. This approach resonates with Mark Tonelli's [39] casuistic model of clinical reasoning, which similarly emphasizes the integration of multiple forms of knowledge.

Ungar-Sargon [30] similarly advocates for a more nuanced approach to evidence that acknowledges its provisional nature, and the interpretive skills required for its appropriate application. This perspective maintains the value of systematic evidence while situating it within a broader hermeneutic framework that acknowledges the irreducible complexity of clinical practice. His approach shares common ground with Ross Upshur's [40] integrated model of evidence while adding specifically theological dimensions that Upshur's secular framework does not address.

Covenantal Relationships in Healthcare

Theological perspectives offer unique resources for conceptualizing the physician-patient relationship beyond contractual or consumer models. Drawing on the concept of

covenant from biblical traditions, William F. May [41] proposes understanding healthcare relationships as covenantal rather than merely contractual characterized by fidelity, compassion, and mutual obligation. This approach contrasts with both the autonomy-focused model of Robert Veatch [42] and the paternalistic models that dominated earlier medical ethics.

Ungar-Sargon's theological essays [43] similarly emphasize the sacred dimension of healing relationships. The physician-patient relationship can be understood as a form of covenant characterized by mutual obligations that transcend merely technical or commercial considerations. This covenantal model emphasizes presence, fidelity, and commitment to the patient's flourishing. His approach shares common ground with Edmund Pellegrino and David Thomasma's [44] virtue ethics framework for healthcare, while adding specifically Jewish theological perspectives that their Catholic approach does not emphasize.

Unlike Howard Brody's [45] power-focused analysis of the clinical relationship, Ungar-Sargon emphasizes reciprocal obligation rather than power dynamics. His framework more closely resembles H. Tristram Engelhardt's [46] emphasis on the moral fabric of healthcare relationships, though from an Orthodox Jewish rather than Orthodox Christian perspective.

Suffering, Exile, and Restoration

Theological traditions have long grappled with questions of suffering, exile, and restoration themes that resonate deeply with experiences of illness and healing. Ungar-Sargon [47] draws particularly on Jewish theological concepts such as hester panim (divine concealment) and hashgachah protis (divine providence) to articulate a theological framework for understanding suffering. This approach offers a distinctive alternative to both the Christian theology of suffering represented by Stanley Hauerwas [48] and the Buddhist perspectives on suffering articulated by Jon Kabat-Zinn [49].

These concepts provide resources for addressing what Daniel Sulmasy [3] terms the "why me?" question that frequently emerges in serious illness. While not providing definitive answers, theological perspectives offer interpretive frameworks that can help patients integrate experiences of suffering into meaningful narrative structures. Unlike Ernest Becker's [50] largely secular existential framework, Ungar-Sargon's approach explicitly grounds meaning-making in theological traditions while maintaining dialogue with secular perspectives.

Rabbi Harold Kushner's [51] popular work on suffering similarly draws on Jewish theological traditions, though Ungar-Sargon offers a more philosophically and medically sophisticated analysis that integrates clinical realities with theological reflection. His approach might be contrasted with Emmanuel Levinas' [52] phenomenological ethics, which shares Jewish roots but arrives at somewhat different conclusions about the nature of suffering and responsibility.

Healing as Redemptive Practice

Theological traditions offer rich resources for understanding healing as a redemptive practice that addresses not only physical dysfunction but also spiritual and existential dimensions of suffering. As Arthur Frank [53] observes, illness often precipitates a form of "narrative wreckage" that requires not just technical intervention but narrative reconstruction. Viktor Frankl's [4] logotherapy similarly emphasizes meaning-making as essential to healing, though from a more existential than explicitly theological perspective.

Ungar-Sargon's integration of theological and medical perspectives [54] suggests understanding healing as a form of redemptive practice that acknowledges both the technical dimensions of medical care and its deeper significance as a response to human suffering. This perspective resonates with what John Swinton [55] terms "redemptive healing" healing that addresses the meaning of suffering even when cure remains elusive. Unlike the primarily Christian perspectives of both Frank and Swinton, Ungar-Sargon draws explicitly on Jewish theological traditions, offering a distinctive voice in the conversation about redemptive dimensions of healthcare.

Kenneth Pargament's [56] work on religion and coping offers empirical support for the importance of religious frameworks in navigating suffering, while Ungar-Sargon provides a more philosophical analysis of how these frameworks function in clinical contexts. His approach might be compared with Avery Dulles' [57] models of the church, offering analogous "models of healing" that integrate theological and clinical perspectives.

Integrating Technical and Spiritual Dimensions

An integrative model of healing acknowledges both technical and spiritual dimensions of healthcare practice. Rather than viewing these as competing frameworks, Ungar-Sargon [58] suggests understanding them as complementary perspectives addressing different aspects of the healing process. This approach differs from both the technical rationality critiqued by Donald Schön [59] and the exclusively spiritual approaches advocated by some alternative medicine proponents.

This integration aligns with what Hans-Georg Gadamer [11] describes as the "enigmatic" character of health something that transcends purely objective biological measures while remaining anchored in embodied experience. An integrative approach maintains rigorous commitment to scientific understanding while acknowledging the irreducible mystery of embodied human experience. Ungar-Sargon's framework might be compared with Howard Brody's [60] "healer's power," though with greater emphasis on theological dimensions and less on socio-political aspects of clinical authority.

Unlike Theodore Brown's [61] historical analysis of the mechanization of medicine, Ungar-Sargon offers a constructive rather than primarily critical perspective, suggesting pathways for reintegration rather than simply documenting fragmentation. His approach shares common ground with Eric Cassell's [8] emphasis on the distinction between disease and illness, while adding specifically theological dimensions that Cassell's largely secular humanistic framework lacks.

Practical Applications

Translating these theoretical perspectives into clinical practice requires concrete strategies for integrating spiritual and

technical dimensions of care. Ungar-Sargon's essays [62] suggest several practical approaches:

Creating intentional sacred space within clinical settings through attention to physical environment, ritual practices, and interpersonal dynamics extending Christina Puchalski's [63] work on spirituality in healthcare while adding specific attention to the sacred dimensions of physical space

Cultivating hermeneutic skills alongside technical competence in medical education resonating with Rita Charon's [37] narrative medicine curriculum while emphasizing theological as well as literary frameworks. Developing narrative competence to engage with patients' illness stories building on Arthur Kleinman's [64] work on illness narratives while adding attention to theological dimensions of meaning-making. Integrating spiritual assessment into routine clinical care extending Harold Koenig's [65] empirical research on religion and health through philosophical analysis of how spiritual frameworks shape clinical encounters. Practicing presence as a fundamental therapeutic modality resonating with Ronald Epstein's [66] mindful practice while grounding this presence in theological rather than primarily Buddhist frameworks

These practical applications provide a framework for operationalizing an integrative approach to healing that honors both scientific rigor and spiritual dimensions of human experience. Unlike the primarily administrative approaches to integrative medicine developed by Andrew Weil [67], Ungar-Sargon offers a more philosophical framework that addresses foundational questions about the nature of healing itself.

Ethical Implications

The integrative model proposed here carries significant ethical implications for healthcare practice. By acknowledging the sacred dimension of healing relationships, this approach challenges narrowly technical or commercial models of healthcare. It suggests that healing practices carry inherent moral obligations beyond technical competence or contractual requirements.

This ethical framework aligns with what Edmund Pellegrino and David Thomasma [44] term the "internal morality of medicine" ethical obligations that emerge from the nature of medicine itself rather than being imposed from external sources. By recognizing healing as a hermeneutic and spiritual practice, this approach identifies ethical obligations inherent in the healing relationship itself. Unlike the principlist approach of Beauchamp and Childress [67], which derives ethical obligations from abstract principles, Ungar-Sargon's framework grounds moral obligations in the nature of the healing relationship itself.

Leon Kass [68] similarly argues for understanding medical ethics as emerging from the internal goods of medicine rather than external constraints, though from a more explicitly natural law perspective than Ungar-Sargon's Jewish theological framework. Charles Taylor's [35] emphasis on "strong evaluation" offers parallel insights from philosophical rather than specifically medical perspectives, highlighting how all ethical frameworks presuppose some conception of the good.

Conclusion

The integration of theological and medical perspectives offers a rich framework for understanding healing as both a technical and spiritual practice. By drawing on hermeneutic philosophy, phenomenology, and theological traditions, this paper has attempted to articulate a model of healing that honors the full scope of human experience.

Dr. Julian Ungar-Sargon's essays [1,2,9,12,16,30,43,47,54,58,62] provide a valuable foundation for this integrative approach, emphasizing the hermeneutic nature of medical practice, the sacred-profane dialectic in therapeutic encounters, and theological frameworks for understanding suffering and healing. When integrated with comparative scholarship, these perspectives offer a compelling vision of healing that transcends reductionist approaches while maintaining commitment to rigorous understanding.

As healthcare continues to navigate tensions between technical and humanistic dimensions, the integrative framework proposed here offers resources for reconciling these apparent opposites within a coherent vision of healing practice. By acknowledging both scientific and spiritual dimensions of human experience, this approach points toward a more comprehensive understanding of healing that honors the depth and complexity of human suffering and resilience.

References

1. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays.
2. https://www.jyungar.com/theological-essays.
3. Sulmasy DP. The healer & 39;s calling: a spirituality for physicians and other health care professionals. New York. Paulist Press. 1997.
4. Frankl VE. Man & 39; s search for meaning Reved. New York. Washington Square Press. 1984.
5. Tillich P. The courage to be. New Haven. Yale University Press. 1952.
6. Svenaeus F. Hermeneutics of clinical practice: the question of textuality. Theor Med Bioeth. 2000; 21(2): 171-189.
7. Zaner RM. Ethics and the clinical encounter. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice Hall. 1988.
8. Cassell EJ. The nature of suffering and the goals of medicine. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press. 2004.
9. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays.
10. Leder D. Clinical interpretation: the hermeneutics of medicine. Theor Med. 1990; 11(1): 9-24.
11. Gadamer HG. The enigma of health: the art of healing in a scientific age. Stanford University Press. 1996.
12. Montgomery K. How doctors think: clinical judgment and the practice of medicine. Oxford University Press. 2006. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays
13. Eliade M. The sacred and the profane: the nature of religion. New York. Harcourt. 1959.

14. Otto R. The idea of the holy. Oxford University Press. 1958.
15. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays.
16. Moore T. Care of the soul: a guide for cultivating depth and sacredness in everyday life. New York. HarperCollins. 1992.
17. Bolen JS. Crossing to Avalon: a woman & 39; s midlife quest for the sacred feminine. San Francisco. HarperOne. 1994.
18. Williams A. Therapeutic landscapes. New York. Routledge. 2007.
19. Gesler WM. Healing places. Lanham: Rowman & amp. Littlefield. 2003.
20. Buber M. I and thou. New York: Charles Scribner & 39; s Sons. 1970.
21. Nouwen HJM. The wounded healer: ministry in contemporary society. New York. Doubleday. 1979.
22. Kirmayer LJ. The cultural diversity of healing: meaning, metaphor and mechanism. Br Med Bull. 2004; 69(1): 33-48.
23. Frank JD. Persuasion and healing: a comparative study of psychotherapy. 3rd ed. Baltimore. Johns Hopkins University Press. 1991.
24. Winnicott DW. The maturational processes and the facilitating environment: studies in the theory of emotional development. New York. International Universities Press. 1965.
25. Yalom ID. The gift of therapy: an open letter to a new generation of therapists and their patients. New York. HarperCollins. 2002.
26. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays.
27. Žižek S. The sublime object of ideology. London. Verso. 1989.
28. Žižek S. The fragile absolute: or why is the Christian legacy worth fighting for? London. Verso. 2000.
29. Žižek S. The puppet and the dwarf: the perverse core of Christianity. Cambridge. MIT Press. 2003.
30. Greenhalgh T. Evidence based medicine: a movement in crisis? BMJ. 2014; 348: g3725.
31. Cartwright NA. philosopher & 39; s view of the long road from RCTs to effectiveness. Lancet. 2011; 377(9775): 1400-1401.
32. Goldenberg MJ. On evidence and evidence-based medicine: lessons from the philosophy of science. Soc Sci Med. 2006; 62(11): 2621-2632.
33. Groopman J. How doctors think. Boston. Houghton Mifflin. 2007.
34. Taylor C. Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1989.
35. Ioannidis JPA. Why most published research findings are false. PLoS Med. 2005; 2(8): e124.
36. Charon R. Narrative medicine: honoring the stories of illness. Oxford University Press. 2006.
37. Wieringa S, Engebretsen E, Heggen K, Greenhalgh T. Has evidence-based medicine ever been modern? A Latour-inspired understanding of a changing EBM. J Eval Clin Pract. 2017; 23(5): 964-970.
38. Tonelli MR. Integrating evidence into clinical practice: an alternative to evidence-based approaches. J Eval Clin Pract. 2006; 12(3): 248-256.
39. Upshur REG. The status of qualitative research as evidence. Morse JM, Swanson JM, Kuzel AJ, editors. The nature of qualitative evidence. Thousand Oaks Sage. 2001; 5-26.
40. May WF. The physician & 39; s covenant: images of the healer in medical ethics. Philadelphia. Westminster John Knox Press. 1983.
41. Veatch RM. A theory of medical ethics. New York. Basic Books. 1981.
42. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays.
43. Pellegrino ED, Thomasma DC. For the patient & 39; s good: the restoration of beneficence in health care. Oxford University Press. 1988.
44. Brody H. Stories of sickness New Haven. Yale University Press. 1987.
45. Engelhardt HT. The foundations of bioethics. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press. 1996.
46. https://www.jyungar.com/theological-essays.
47. Hauerwas S. Naming the silences: God medicine and the problem of suffering. Grand Rapids Eerdmans. 1990.
48. Kabat-Zinn J. Full catastrophe living using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress pain and illness. New York. Delacorte. 1990.
49. Becker E. The denial of death. New York. Free Press. 1973.
50. Kushner HS. When bad things happen to good people. New York. Schocken Books. 1981.
51. Levinas E. Totality and infinity: an essay on exteriority. Pittsburgh. Duquesne University Press. 1969.
52. Frank AW. The wounded storyteller: body illness and ethics. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1995.
53. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays.
54. Swinton J. Dementia: living in the memories of God. Grand Rapids. Eerdmans. 2012.
55. Pargament KI. The psychology of religion and coping: theory research practice. New York. Guilford Press. 1997.
56. Dulles A. Models of the church. Expanded ed. New York. Doubleday. 1992.
57. https://www.jyungar.com/healing-essays.
58. Schön DA. The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action. New York. Basic Books. 1983.
59. Brody H. The healer's power. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1992.
60. Brown TM. The mechanical philosophy and the & quot animal oeconomy & quot. New York. Arno Press. 1985.

61. https://www.jyungar.com/theological-essays.

62. Puchalski CM. A time for listening and caring: spirituality and the care of the chronically ill and dying. Oxford University Press. 2006.

63. Kleinman A. The illness narratives: suffering healing and the human condition. New York. Basic Books. 1988.

64. Koenig HG. Spirituality in patient care: why how when and what. 3rd ed. West Conshohocken Templeton Press. 2013.

65. Epstein RM. Attending medicine mindfulness and humanity. New York. Scribner. 2017.

66. Weil A. The new medicine: integrating conventional and alternative medicine. Boston Houghton Mifflin. 2000.

67. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics. 8th ed. Oxford University Press. 2019.

68. Kass LR. Toward a more natural science: biology and human affairs. New York. Free Press. 1985.