Review

Toward an Integrative Model of Flashbacks — The Hippocampal Drive for Coherence

Mario J. Passaro *

Posted Date: 25 November 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

Keywords: trauma; PTSD; flashbacks; hippocampus; medial prefrontal cortex; amygdala; memory integration; temporal coding; emotion regulation; predictive coding

Review

Toward an Integrative Model of Flashbacks — The Hippocampal Drive for Coherence

Mario J. Passaro

Independent Researcher, Stamford, Connecticut, USA; MarioJPassaro@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective To propose a revised neurobiological framework for traumatic memory that explains the phenomenology of flashbacks not as mere reactivations of fear circuits, but as the hippocampal complex's ongoing attempt to integrate unprocessed sensory–emotional fragments encoded without temporal context during extreme stress. **Background** Classical models—the *fear-network theory* (Foa & Kozak, 1986) and the *dual-representation theory* (Brewin et al., 1996, 2010)—conceptualize flashbacks as intrusive replays of amygdala-driven sensory representations that fail to link with hippocampal–prefrontal systems. These frameworks accurately describe fragmentation but overlook the hippocampus's potential active role in later integration. Neurobiological and computational findings across the last two decades show that traumatic stress disrupts prefrontal inhibition, amygdala dominance, and hippocampal contextual encoding, resulting in memories stripped of temporal and narrative structure. The persistence of flashbacks despite safety suggests a dynamic process rather than a static lesion. **Methods / Theoretical Approach** This chapter synthesizes evidence from functional neuroimaging, neuroendocrinology, and predictive-coding theory to construct a tri-systemic model of trauma involving the medial prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and hippocampus. The analysis follows the chronological breakdown of this system under threat—prefrontal disinhibition, amygdala hyper-encoding, HPA-axis discontrol, and hippocampal silencing—and explores subsequent re-engagement mechanisms. **Results / Proposed Mechanism** Flashbacks are conceptualized as failed integration events: partial hippocampal reactivation of unbound sensory–emotional traces in the absence of temporal coding. This re-engagement triggers amygdala-mediated affective flooding, creating the illusion of present-tense re-living. **Conclusions / Implications** Re-experiencing may represent a neural system striving for coherence, not solely pathology. Understanding flashbacks as integration attempts clarifies why they can emerge during calm, why therapies restoring safety and context diminish them, and how hippocampal–prefrontal synchronization transforms traumatic immediacy into autobiographical memory. This model reframes trauma as a process of disrupted, yet potentially recoverable, neurobiological integration.

Keywords: trauma; PTSD; flashbacks; hippocampus; medial prefrontal cortex; amygdala; memory integration; temporal coding; emotion regulation; predictive coding

1. Introduction: Trauma, Memory, and the Search for Integration

Trauma is not only a psychological event but also a neurobiological rupture. When an experience overwhelms the brain's capacity to regulate, encode, and integrate information, the result is not merely distress but fragmentation of memory and self. Clinically, this fragmentation can appear as disjointed images, bodily sensations, or emotions that feel disconnected from a coherent narrative of "what happened." Over more than four decades of research, evidence has converged on the view that traumatic stress reorganizes neural systems involved in emotion, attention, and memory (Yehuda & LeDoux, 2007; Lanius et al., 2010). Stress-related alterations in limbic circuitry, prefrontal regulation, and hippocampal functioning suggest that trauma does not simply add a painful memory to an otherwise intact system; it changes the conditions under which experience is encoded, stored, and later retrieved.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

One of the most puzzling manifestations of this disruption is the flashback. Certain traumatic experiences re-emerge as if they were happening now, vivid in perception and affect yet stripped of temporal distance and autobiographical context. Individuals describe being "thrown back" into the event by a sound, smell, or internal state, with limited awareness of the present moment. Classical models describe such flashbacks as intrusive recollections—maladaptive reactivations of fear networks encoded under duress, in which conditioned cues trigger overlearned responses (Foa & Kozak, 1986). More recent approaches emphasize dual memory systems, positing that implicit, sensory representations of trauma (amygdala-driven) can operate relatively independently from explicit, contextual representations (hippocampus-driven) (Brewin et al., 1996, 2010). In these formulations, the "here-and-now" quality of flashbacks reflects the dominance of affect-laden sensory traces over temporally organized narrative memory.

However, these frameworks typically cast the hippocampus as a passive casualty of stress hormones or as an insufficient regulator of limbic arousal—a structure that fails under pressure rather than one that continues to work on unresolved material. The present chapter advances a complementary perspective: flashbacks may represent the hippocampal complex's ongoing attempt to integrate unprocessed sensory–emotional fragments that were encoded without adequate temporal context. From this standpoint, re-experiencing is not merely a symptom of failure but an unfinished process, a neural system striving for coherence in the aftermath of overwhelming experience. Understanding this integrative drive has implications beyond theory. It may clarify why flashbacks can emerge spontaneously during periods of relative safety, why therapies that restore calm and contextualization tend to diminish them, and how the hippocampus, amygdala, and prefrontal cortex cooperate, or fail to cooperate, in transforming traumatic immediacy into autobiographical memory. Building on this premise, the chapter first reviews dominant models of trauma memory, then examines the neurobiology of encoding and breakdown under stress, and finally develops a new synthesis centered on hippocampal re-engagement and temporal coding.

2. Current Models of Trauma Memory

2.1. The Fear-Network Model

Early cognitive-behavioral formulations framed post-traumatic stress as the persistence of a pathological fear network (Foa & Kozak, 1986). Trauma creates associative links between cues, responses, and meanings that, when reactivated, generate intense physiological arousal. Because avoidance prevents extinction learning, the network remains hypersensitive.

Although this model predicted the effectiveness of exposure therapy, it offered little explanation for the sensory vividness and timeless quality of flashbacks.

2.2. Dual-Representation Theory

To address these features, Brewin, Dalgleish, and Joseph (1996) proposed the Dual-Representation Theory (DRT), later refined by Brewin et al. (2010). DRT posits two partially independent memory systems: The first is Situationally Accessible Representations (S-Reps): Sensory-perceptual, affect-laden traces stored in limbic and sensory regions, accessible only through involuntary re-experiencing. The second is Contextually Accessible Representations (C-Reps): Verbal, consciously retrievable memories supported by hippocampal and prefrontal networks.

During overwhelming stress, the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex are suppressed, preventing linkage of S-Reps and C-Reps. Later cues can trigger S-Reps in isolation, producing flashbacks devoid of context. DRT thus identifies integration failure as central but remains agnostic about whether the hippocampus subsequently *tries* to complete that integration.

2.3. Memory Consolidation and Reconsolidation Frameworks

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

Neuroscientific models of consolidation emphasize the hippocampus as a temporary index binding distributed cortical traces (McClelland et al., 1995). Over time, repeated hippocampal–cortical replay during sleep and rest strengthens direct cortical connections, allowing recall without hippocampal mediation (Takashima et al., 2006). Trauma interrupts this process: extreme cortisol levels impair hippocampal plasticity and disrupt the replay cycles necessary for integration (Roozendaal et al., 2009). Reconsolidation research further shows that retrieved memories become labile and can be updated, suggesting that therapeutic recall may permit re-binding of previously fragmented material (Nader & Einarsson, 2010). Still, most reconsolidation studies focus on the amygdala's role in fear extinction rather than the hippocampus's drive to re-contextualize.

2.4. Predictive-Coding and Bayesian Models

Recent computational accounts (e.g., Friston, 2010; Hohwy, 2016) view the brain as a prediction engine minimizing uncertainty. Trauma creates high prediction errors between expected and actual sensory input. If integration fails, unresolved prediction errors persist, causing recurrent reactivation of sensory and emotional representations. These models fit the notion of the brain seeking coherence, yet they rarely specify which neural structures implement the integration process. Your proposed framework can be seen as *embodying* predictive correction within hippocampal–amygdala interactions.

2.5. Clinical and Phenomenological Observations

Phenomenologically, flashbacks are characterized by (a) sensory immediacy, (b) emotional intensity, (c) lack of temporal distance, and (d) partial or total absence of verbal narrative (Ehlers et al., 2004). Neuroimaging confirms that flashbacks engage visual, auditory, and somatosensory cortices alongside limbic regions, while hippocampal and medial prefrontal activation remains inconsistent or fragmented (Lanius et al., 2010). This pattern implies that the hippocampus is neither fully offline nor fully integrated; it may oscillate between engagement and suppression. That oscillation forms the conceptual entry point for the hypothesis developed in later sections: *the hippocampal complex periodically re-engages the fragmented trauma network in an effort to achieve contextual coherence*, but because the data lack temporal encoding, amygdala-mediated affect floods consciousness as if the event were happening now.

3. Neural Foundations of Memory and Context Encoding

3.1. The Hippocampal Complex and Episodic Integration

The hippocampal formation, comprising the dentate gyrus, CA3–CA1 fields, and subiculum, lies at the center of the medial temporal-lobe memory system. It acts as an indexing hub that links distributed cortical representations of sensory, spatial, and emotional information into a single, retrievable episode (Teyler & DiScenna, 1986; Eichenbaum, 2017). Information from multimodal association cortices converges via the entorhinal cortex, which provides both content and temporal sequencing cues. When an event occurs, hippocampal neurons fire in coordinated theta–gamma oscillations (~4–8 Hz and ~30–100 Hz), synchronizing activity among disparate cortical sites (Lisman & Jensen, 2013). This rhythmic coupling enables the hippocampus to assign *order and context*, the brain equivalent of a time stamp. In healthy encoding, the hippocampus therefore functions as a binding and temporal-context generator, transforming perceptual fragments into cohesive autobiographical memory. When the hippocampal system is disrupted; by high cortisol, amygdala hyperactivation, or prefrontal shutdown; the contextual scaffold collapses, leaving unbound sensory–emotional traces scattered across cortical and subcortical regions.

3.2. The Amygdala: Emotional Tagging and Prioritization

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

Adjacent to the hippocampus, the amygdala serves as the brain's emotional salience detector. Its basolateral nuclei receive richly processed sensory input and evaluate threat or reward value, while its central nucleus orchestrates autonomic and endocrine responses through projections to the hypothalamus and brainstem (LeDoux, 2014). During emotionally charged experiences, the amygdala releases neuromodulators, particularly norepinephrine, that enhance hippocampal plasticity and consolidate memory traces (McGaugh, 2018). Under moderate arousal this synergy strengthens learning; under extreme stress it becomes dysregulated, overwhelming the hippocampus and skewing encoding toward raw affect and sensation rather than context. This imbalance explains why trauma memories are simultaneously indelible and fragmented: the amygdala continues to tag stimuli with threat significance even when the hippocampus cannot embed them in narrative time. Later, when the hippocampus re-engages those networks, the amygdala residual tagging re-activates full autonomic arousal, creating the subjective immediacy of re-living.

3.3. The Medial Prefrontal Cortex and Top-Down Regulation

The medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), especially its ventromedial and anterior cingulate subdivisions, modulates both hippocampal and amygdalar activity. In safe contexts, mPFC activity inhibits amygdala output and supports hippocampal contextualization (Milad et al., 2007). During acute threat, however, rapid amygdala signaling suppresses prefrontal regulation via reciprocal inhibitory pathways. Functional-MRI studies consistently show mPFC hypoactivation during trauma recall and hyperactivation after successful exposure or EMDR therapy, paralleling symptom improvement (Lanius et al., 2010). These findings underscore the triadic interplay: *amygdala drives emotion; hippocampus provides context, and prefrontal cortex determines meaning.*

3.4. Temporal Coding and the Perception of "Past Experiences"

A crucial contribution of the hippocampus to conscious memory is the sense that an event belongs to the *past*. Neuroscientific models attribute this to sequential time coding in hippocampal "time cells," which fire in predictable order during experiences and replay in compressed form during rest or REM sleep (Eichenbaum, 2014). This replay embeds temporal markers within cortical traces. When cortisol or limbic interference disrupts this process, memories lose chronological anchoring. Consequently, later reactivation lacks the neural signature that distinguishes recollection from perception, producing the uncanny *nowness* of flashbacks.

3.5. Systems Consolidation and Cortical Redistribution

After encoding, hippocampal–cortical communication during sleep and quiet wakefulness gradually transfers memory dependence from the hippocampus to distributed cortical networks (Takashima et al., 2006). The posterior parietal, temporal association, and prefrontal cortices each assume specialized components of the original experience. Emotional and sensory details remain closely tied to the amygdala and sensory cortices, whereas semantic and contextual aspects migrate toward higher-order association areas.

In trauma, excessive noradrenergic and glucocorticoid activity interrupts this redistribution; freezing memories in a limbic-dominant configuration: vividly sensory but poorly contextualized. Later hippocampal re-engagement may therefore be an effort to resume unfinished consolidation.

3.6. Integration with trauma research

Neuroimaging meta-analyses reveal that individuals with PTSD exhibit reduced hippocampal volume, decreased functional connectivity between hippocampus and mPFC, and exaggerated amygdala responses (Hayes et al., 2012). Together, these findings indicate not a static lesion but a dynamic network imbalance, a system capable of restoration under appropriate conditions. Therapies that combine physiological regulation with memory reconsolidation appear to restore normal hippocampal–prefrontal coupling, allowing previously isolated sensory fragments to

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

integrate into autobiographical context (Squire & Wixted, 2011; Van der Kolk, 2014).This tri-systemic perspective sets the stage for the next section, which examines what happens when these relationships break down under extreme threat: the sequence of neural "failures" that produce trauma's characteristic fragmentation and the conditions under which the hippocampus later attempts re-integration.

4. Neurobiology of Trauma: How It Goes Wrong

4.1. Order of Failure of the Model System

The brain's response to threat is generally considered adaptive: the amygdala works to detect danger; the hypothalamus responds by activating the HPA (hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal) axis; and as safety returns, the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex guide this traumatic accommodation of panic arousal by situating it in context and dampening arousal back down (McEwen, 2012). In extreme trauma, this feedback loop crumbles in a historic sequence. The first defect is prefrontal inhibition, then amygdala hyperactivation, HPA discontrol, and at the end hippocampal silencing. This, in turn, turns an adaptive stress response into the neural signature of trauma.

4.2. Step 1: Breakdown of Prefrontal Inhibition

Under normal conditions, the medial prefrontal cortex should be an executive regulator of limbic activity through inhibition to the amygdala and excitation to hippocampus (Milad et al., 2007). In an acute threat situation, amygdala signaling quickly shuts down activity of prefrontal neurons via inhibitory GABAergic interneurons and catecholamine efflux, thereby "shutting off" thinking in favor of instinctual response (Arnsten, 2009). This rapid prefrontal breakdown occurs immediately on exposure to a threat, releasing the amygdala to organize autonomic and endocrine activity unchecked. In trauma, with inescapable threat, the prefrontal system remains offline even after the danger is over, so that there is no cognitive appraisal of time and context available to the organism. Clinical imaging repeatedly indicates mPFC and anterior cingulate hypoactivation during trauma recall, which is positively associated with dissociation and narrative incoherence (Lanius et al., 2010).

4.3. Step 2: Amygdala Over-Dominance and Hyper-Encoding

But when frontal inhibition comes off, the amygdala takes charge. Its basolateral nuclei drench the brain in norepinephrine and glutamate, rendering its registration of sensation and vigilance more acute (LeDoux, 2014). All sensory input is labeled as potential threat; encoding is bottom-up driven by saliency, not meaning. This hyper-encoding results in long-lasting but decontextualized traces; images, sounds, odors; stored in sensory cortices. Functional MRI studies of individuals diagnosed with PTSD reveal an increased amygdala response to both trauma-related cues and novel visual stimuli, suggesting a generalized sensitization (Etkin & Wager, 2007). In this phase, the amygdala functions as a "tape recorder" without time stamp, to imprint raw affective intensity into memory networks.

4.4. Phase 3: Dysregulation of HPA Axis

Activation of amygdala recruits the HPA axis, leading to release of corticotropin-releasing hormone (CRH) from hypothalamus, adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH) from pituitary, and consequently cortisol from adrenal cortex. Typically, cortisol uses negative feedback via receptors in the hippocampus and hypothalamus to close down the stress response. During trauma, feedback inhibition fails. The hippocampus, which is swamped with glucocorticoids, begins to inhibit its own firing and synaptic plasticity (McEwen 2000). This breakdown traps the system in a state of high alert, where cortisol continues to surge and sympathetic activity lingers long after the threat has passed. Some chronic trauma patients actually present with a paradoxical hypocortisolism, which is sign of down regulators at the receptor level and also blunted feedback sensitivity (Yehuda et al.,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

1998). Both hyper- and hypo-cortisolism interfere with hippocampal function and consolidation of memory.

4.5. This Step Hippocampal Inhibition and Dissection

It is well known that the hippocampus is particularly susceptible to stress hormones and excitotoxic glutamate (Kim & Diamond, 2002). Under extreme traumatization, its neurons downregulate long-term potentiation (LTP), the molecular basis of memory acquisition in dendritic spines, and might even retract their dendrites. Trauma exposure and recall are associated with reduced hippocampal activation by functional imaging (Bremner et al., 1995; Shin et al., 2006). This inhibition precludes the hippocampus from sequencing events, binding their context or affixing temporal stamps. As a result, information is encoded in and retrieved as fragmented states throughout the amygdala, sensory cortices and brainstem - rather than in an integrated form that can be rendered available to conscious accessibility as declarative episodic memory. When the time arrives, much later, for the reconstruction attempt in hiphocampus, the pieces of fragments have no temporal coding and this conspires to self create that great sense of present tense re-experiencing.

4.6. Step 5: Writing the Brainstem and Autonomic Nervous System

During the most extreme states of traumatic stress, control moves further down in the hierarchy to subcortical survival mechanisms—such as periaqueduct Gray Pange (PAG), hypothalamic nuclei and brainstem n Mastering defenses (Porges, 2011). The organism may go into fight, flight, freeze and collapse states that have characteristic autonomic signatures. These bodily states serve as conditioned responses to be stored in the body's interoceptive networks, and so too in its anterior insula, ready to trigger somatic flashbacks or panic reactions when a similar trace of the traumatic events are encountered. Therefore, trauma encoding ranges from cortical to brainstem levels, a multidimensional multi-sensory engram with no coherent narrative link.

4.7. Core Mechanism: Failure of Functional Integration

Common to all these stages is the lack of integration." In a resilient stress response, the pathways in prefrontal, hippocampus and amygdala are activated in a dynamic balance; both can "tune" each other down. Trauma is a failure of this synchronization. The amygdala snatches away affective salience; the hippocampus, starved of metabolic and hormonal support, fails to insert into context; the prefrontal cortex, gagged by catecholamines, cannot make sense. The memory trace that remains is a modular and fragmented affect stored in limbic networks, sensation in sensory cortices, bodily states in interoceptive maps. This fragmentation forms the basis for PTSD symptomatology characteristic of re-experiencing, hyperarousal and dissociation.

4.8. Long-Term Neuroplastic Consequences

The chronic disruption of this network transforms the neural structure. Chronic amygdala-activation promotes synaptic connections between the amygdala and sensory cortices that strengthen generalized fear. In contrast, hippocampal neurogenesis diminishes and dendritic arborization contracts (McEwen, 2012). Over time this forms a trait vulnerability: the brain comes to be modeled for threat detection, as well as re-experiencing it. Yet these changes are reversible. Therapeutic experiences combining the safety of a secure relationship with remembering trauma, either within exposure treatment or EMDR or through somatic regulation, reestablish monitoring and proactive influences of the hippocampus on amygdala activity (Lanius et al., 2015). The 'lesion' in the neurobiology of trauma is not fixed, but a dynamic disconnection that could be followed by a reconnection. This stepwise dissection provides the backdrop for the second half of this chapter: how the hippocampus, once reactivated by trauma, meets these disparate traces and tries to piece them back together; sometimes successfully through integration; sometimes difunctionally via flashbacks.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

5. Storage of Unintegrated Sensory–Emotional Fragments

5.1. From Encoding Failure to Fragment Storage

When the hippocampal complex cannot bind incoming information into a coherent episode, encoding does not cease; it diverts. Neural activity shifts toward subcortical and unimodal cortical systems that normally supply the hippocampus with perceptual and affective input. These lower and mid-level circuits continue to process sensory and emotional information, but without the organizing influence of hippocampal time and context (Brewin et al., 2010). The result is a distributed set of unintegrated fragments: sensory impressions, visceral states, and emotional charges recorded independently rather than linked in sequence. Such fragments can later reactivate in isolation, producing intrusive images, sounds, and bodily sensations characteristic of post-traumatic flashbacks and somatic memories.

5.2. Amygdala: Emotional Salience and Fear Engrams

The amygdala is central to the storage of emotional fragments. Its basolateral complex receives multimodal sensory input and forms rapid associations between perceptual cues and affective valence (LeDoux, 2014). During trauma, the amygdala encodes these associations with exceptional strength because of elevated norepinephrine and glutamate release. The resulting fear engrams persist even when hippocampal and prefrontal activity are suppressed, creating memories that are emotional but not contextual. These engrams are *implicit*: they can trigger autonomic arousal and emotional flooding without conscious recollection. Functional imaging consistently demonstrates hyper-reactivity of the amygdala in PTSD when trauma-related or even neutral stimuli are presented (Shin et al., 2006). At a synaptic level, potentiation within amygdalar circuits renders these associations remarkably durable, explaining why emotional triggers can evoke immediate physiological responses decades after the original trauma.

5.3. Sensory Cortices: Perceptual Fragments

Traumatic fragments can arise across sensory modalities, each anchored in specific cortical systems: visual elements; images, colors, and spatial layouts; are supported by primary and secondary visual cortices (V1–V4) spanning occipital and inferotemporal regions; auditory fragments; voices, screams, and environmental sounds; are linked to the superior temporal gyrus and Heschl's gyrus; somatosensory aspects; touch, pressure, pain, and temperature; map to the post-central gyrus (S1/S2); and olfactory/gustatory traces, smells and tastes associated with the trauma, engage the piriform and insular cortices. During overwhelming stress, these cortices operate under heightened amygdala modulation, prioritizing threat-relevant input. Because hippocampal indexing is impaired, perceptual traces remain unbound; literal sensory snapshots without narrative placement (Brewin et al., 2010). Later, minor perceptual similarities; angles of light, tonal frequencies, tactile textures; can spontaneously reactivate these circuits, generating vivid sensory intrusions. Neuroimaging confirms that visual flashbacks involve re-engagement of early visual areas rather than imagination-related frontal regions (Whalley et al., 2013).

5.4. Insula and Somatosensory Integration: Body Memory

The insula bridges visceral perception and emotional awareness. It integrates signals from internal organs, muscles, and skin to generate the subjective sense of the body's internal state, interoception (Craig, 2009). Under trauma, intense sympathetic activation and pain sensations flood the insula and somatosensory cortices. When the hippocampus fails to contextualize these states, they become procedural body memories: implicit templates for tension, pain, or numbness that can resurface long after the event. Neuroimaging studies of PTSD and somatic flashbacks reveal hyperactivity in the posterior insula and somatosensory cortex when patients recall or re-experience bodily aspects of trauma (Lanius et al., 2010). These findings support the view popularized by Van

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

der Kolk (2014) that "the body keeps the score." In neural terms, the "score" is a constellation of interoceptive representations stored without temporal tags.

5.5. Brainstem and Periaqueductal Gray: Defensive Reflexes

At the base of the hierarchy, the periaqueductal gray (PAG) and related brainstem nuclei mediate primitive defense responses; fight, flight, freeze, or collapse (Porges, 2011). During overwhelming threat, these reflexive programs dominate consciousness; cortical and hippocampal activity decrease as survival circuits take over. The PAG's defensive patterns can later re-emerge automatically when environmental cues match aspects of the original threat. Startle responses, sudden freezing, or dissociative shutdowns may thus represent reactivation of brainstem-encoded motor patterns rather than cognitive recollection. Because these structures are largely outside conscious control, their reactivation contributes to the involuntary, "happening-now" quality of flashbacks. The person's physiological state shifts first; heart rate, breathing, muscle tone; before conscious awareness catches up, creating the sensation of being *transported back* into the trauma.

5.6. Disconnection from Hippocampal–Prefrontal Systems

All of these fragment-storage systems; the amygdala, sensory cortices, insula, and brainstem; are functionally disconnected from hippocampal and prefrontal regions during trauma. Cortisol and catecholamines dampen hippocampal long-term potentiation and prefrontal firing, while enhancing amygdala excitability (Roozendaal et al., 2009). The neural architecture that normally integrates these elements into explicit narrative memory thus fails to form. The resulting engrams are implicit, sensory-dominant, and emotionally charged, but lack spatial-temporal coordinates. This decoupling explains why trauma memories are often experienced as disjointed fragments rather than complete episodes. When the hippocampal function returns, it can access these distributed traces only indirectly. Any attempt at integration therefore risks re-activating the amygdala's affective charge, producing flashbacks or overwhelming affect.

5.7. Reactivation Pathways

Reactivation of unintegrated fragments can occur through several routes:

1. **External sensory cues** that resemble aspects of the trauma (visual patterns, smells, sounds).
2. **Internal states** such as pain, fatigue, or strong emotion that mimic bodily sensations from the trauma.
3. **Dreams and REM sleep**, when hippocampal replay mechanisms probe stored material in an attempt to consolidate it.
4. **Therapeutic recall**, in which explicit focus on the traumatic memory, deliberately engages hippocampal networks.

In both instances, this bottom-up activation from the amygdala or the sensory cortices is followed by top-down context. As arousal surpasses the tolerance level, the hippocampus once more loses its integrative power and the amygdala takes over: this repeats itself in a continuous loop of vivid re-living instead of completed recall.

5.8. Conceptual Integration

From a systems perspective, the storage of unintegrated fragments also acts as a hierarchical back-up mechanism: if higher-order integrators (hippocampus, mPFC) fail to integrate experiences, lower-order circuits record whatever fragmented information is available. The brain does this to store survival-critical information -- what was seen, heard, and felt -- at the expense of coherence. The hippocampus's bias toward synthesis later kick-starts these scattered fragments of past as it tries to fold them into a coherent story. This reactivation of the emotional traces from the amygdala and interoceptive-autonomic disturbances recreates the physiological condition of threat, which accounts

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

for the intense re-experiencing of flashbacks. Collectively, these systems are the implicit memory network of trauma, a distributed warehouse of sensory and affective information for which integration is pending. Understanding how these operate helps explain why trauma registers as indelible and unspeakable: the knowledge is in there, but it lives within you in ways that don't always readily organize experience into narrative language. The next section will examine the mechanisms by which the hippocampus complex can later reactivate these networks, and how its integrative efforts paradoxically can replicate the very states it is trying to resolve.

6. The Integrative Hypothesis: Flashbacks as Hippocampal Attempts to Bind Unprocessed Fragments

6.1. Reframing Flashbacks: From Intrusion to Integration Attempt

Traditional models treat flashbacks as pathological intrusions, maladaptive reactivations of fear networks encoded under high arousal (Foa & Kozak, 1986; Brewin et al., 2010). The integrative hypothesis proposed here offers a complementary perspective: flashbacks are functional but incomplete efforts by the hippocampal complex to assimilate unprocessed sensory–emotional material scattered across limbic and cortical systems during trauma. In this framework, the hippocampus does not passively suffer the consequences of amygdala overdrive; rather, it *seeks coherence*. It continuously scans distributed memory networks for unintegrated fragments in order to restore narrative continuity and temporal order. When it accesses these fragments—through spontaneous reactivation, sensory cues, or therapeutic recall—it attempts to re-bind them with existing autobiographical memory. However, because the fragments lack temporal coding and are tightly coupled with amygdala-driven affect, their retrieval triggers a full physiological and emotional response, as though the events were occurring again in real time. Thus, flashbacks represent a transient re-engagement of the trauma network, driven not by pathological recurrence but by an *adaptive integration impulse* that becomes dysregulated under residual limbic dominance.

6.2. Neural Mechanism of the Integration Attempt

1. **Hippocampal reactivation:**

Periodically—during REM sleep, quiet wakefulness, or associative recall—the hippocampus initiates replay of distributed cortical patterns linked to unresolved experiences. This is part of its normal consolidation cycle (Buzsáki, 2015).

2. **Fragment access:**

The hippocampus encounters trauma-related representations stored in sensory cortices, insula, and amygdala. Because these traces lack contextual metadata, the hippocampus treats them as **current sensory input** rather than past memory.

3. **Amygdala co-activation:**

The emotional charge embedded in those fragments triggers the amygdala, which floods the system with affective salience signals. High amygdala output reactivates autonomic and endocrine systems, producing fear, heart rate acceleration, and vivid sensory reliving.

4. **Prefrontal disinhibition failure:**

Without sufficient top-down regulation from the mPFC, the hippocampus cannot maintain temporal distinction. The integration attempt collapses into re-experiencing a full-blown flashback.

5. **Post-event outcome:**

If safety and regulation are restored before reactivation completes, partial integration may occur: the fragment becomes bound with narrative memory and loses its intrusive power. If arousal remains high, the integration cycle aborts, and the fragment returns to implicit storage, reinforcing the flashback circuit.

This cyclical process, reactivation, amygdala co-firing, failed integration, explains why flashbacks often recur until the underlying material is fully processed.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

6.3. Relationship to Existing Theories

The integrative hypothesis aligns with several established frameworks while extending each in a specific way. From Dual Representation Theory (Brewin et al., 2010), it retains the separation of sensory (S-rep) and contextual (C-rep) systems but reframes the hippocampus as the active agent that attempts to link S-reps to C-reps during re-experiencing. From predictive coding (Friston, 2010), it preserves the idea that the brain minimizes prediction error, proposing that flashbacks index hippocampal attempts to update a high-error model that lacks temporal coherence. From memory reconsolidation (Nader & Einarsson, 2010), it accepts that retrieved memories become labile, adding that hippocampal engagement during flashbacks reflects a spontaneous, uncontrolled reconsolidation effort. And from the fear network model (Foa & Kozak, 1986), it keeps cue-triggered activation but reinterprets the activation as integration-driven rather than purely associative. In short, where prior accounts often cast the hippocampus as deficient, this model positions it as initiating reactivation in service of completing temporal-context binding.

6.4. Temporal Coding and the Experience of "Nowness"

The hippocampus encodes temporal context through theta-phase coupling of CA1 neurons and medial entorhinal "time cells" (Eichenbaum, 2014).

When trauma disrupts this coding, the fragments it later encounters carry no timestamp.

Consequently, hippocampal replay interprets them as present stimuli.

This explains why flashbacks feel immediate rather than recollective: the hippocampus is re-engaging perception-related cortical regions without the oscillatory signatures that mark memory as past.

In computational terms, the hippocampus misclassifies *memory traces* as *ongoing input*, producing real-time reconstruction of multisensory and emotional content.

6.5. The Recursive Cycle of Reactivation

The hippocampus's drive for integration sets up a recursive feedback loop:

1. **Detection:** Incomplete fragments activate hippocampal pattern completion mechanisms.
2. **Reactivation:** Associated sensory and emotional areas fire.
3. **Arousal:** Amygdala-induced stress hormones suppress hippocampal precision.
4. **Failure:** Integration aborts; fragment returns unbound.
5. **Renewed attempt:** The hippocampus, following normal consolidation rhythms, tries again.

This loop may persist for years until conditions; physiological calm, therapeutic safety, or REM processing; permit full integration. Such a dynamic explains the chronicity of flashbacks and the sometimes-sudden remission following effective therapy: once integration completes, the hippocampus recognizes the material as *past* and ceases reactivation.

6.6. Empirical Support

Although no study has yet directly tested this causal sequence, converging evidence supports its components:

- **Hippocampal–amygdala co-activation:** fMRI during flashbacks shows simultaneous engagement of these regions with disrupted mPFC connectivity (Lanius et al., 2010).
- **Theta synchrony abnormalities:** PTSD patients exhibit altered hippocampal theta rhythms during memory tasks, consistent with disrupted temporal coding (Clouter et al., 2017).
- **Therapeutic normalization:** After EMDR or trauma-focused CBT, hippocampal activity increases while amygdala activation decreases, paralleling symptom relief (Pagani et al., 2012).
- **REM sleep effects:** Nightmares and trauma-related dreams show hippocampal reactivation of emotional networks; successful sleep processing predicts fewer intrusions (van der Helm & Walker, 2012).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

Collectively, these findings suggest that flashbacks arise from re-engagement of the hippocampal–amygdala network during attempts at integration under conditions of impaired temporal or regulatory control.

6.7. Predictions and Testable Hypotheses

The integrative model yields several empirically testable predictions:

1. **Directional connectivity:**

During spontaneous flashbacks, hippocampal activity should *precede* amygdala activation, indicating initiation of reactivation rather than mere response to threat cues. *Test:* Granger-causality or dynamic causal modeling of intracranial EEG or fMRI time series.

2. **Temporal coding deficits:**

Flashbacks should correlate with reduced theta–gamma phase coupling within hippocampal circuits. *Test:* High-density EEG or magnetoencephalography during trauma recall.

3. **Therapeutic restoration:**

Interventions that strengthen hippocampal–prefrontal synchrony (e.g., EMDR, mindfulness) should decrease flashback frequency. *Test:* Longitudinal fMRI and symptom tracking.

4. **Sleep-mediated completion:**

Enhanced slow-wave or REM sleep should correspond with reduction of flashbacks, reflecting successful offline integration. *Test:* Polysomnography before and after therapy.

Verification of these predictions would substantiate the claim that flashbacks represent incomplete hippocampal integration cycles.

6.8. Clinical and Theoretical Implications

Reframing flashbacks as incomplete integration rather than mere intrusion alters therapeutic focus. Instead of suppressing re-experiencing, clinicians can facilitate safe contextualization by supporting hippocampal engagement while maintaining physiological regulation. Techniques such as bilateral stimulation, paced breathing, and guided imagery stabilize arousal, allowing the hippocampus to rebind fragments without amygdala takeover. This aligns with emerging evidence that effective therapy increases connectivity among hippocampus, mPFC, and posterior cingulate cortex (Lanius et al., 2015). Conceptually, the model bridges neuroscience and phenomenology: flashbacks are the neural correlate of the psyche's effort to *make meaning* of disowned experience. They are failed narratives seeking completion.

6.9. Concluding Perspective

The integrative hypothesis positions the hippocampal complex as an active restorer of coherence in a brain that has lost its temporal and contextual unity. Flashbacks, therefore, are not arbitrary failures of suppression but expressions of the brain's intrinsic drive toward integration. They reveal the hippocampus struggling to convert raw, timeless fragments into narrative memory, an unfinished biological process that therapy and safety can finally complete. In this sense, healing does not silence the past; it allows the hippocampus to finish its work.

7. Empirical Support and Future Research Directions

7.1. Overview

Empirical evidence across neuroimaging, electrophysiology, sleep research, and psychotherapy outcome studies increasingly supports the view that trauma memory is a dynamic systems phenomenon, not a fixed lesion but a dysregulated pattern of interaction among hippocampal, amygdalar, and prefrontal circuits. The proposed *integrative hypothesis* refines this framework by suggesting that flashbacks represent hippocampal-driven attempts to bind unprocessed fragments that lack temporal context. While no single study has yet demonstrated the entire causal sequence,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

converging findings from multiple domains collectively make the theory testable and theoretically plausible.

7.2. Neuroimaging Evidence

7.2.1. Functional patterns during re-experiencing

Functional MRI studies of trauma recall, and flashbacks consistently report co-activation of the hippocampus and amygdala, accompanied by deactivation of the medial prefrontal cortex (Lanius et al., 2010; Hopper et al., 2007). In one of the earliest paradigms using individualized trauma scripts, Shin et al. (1999) found that patients with PTSD showed exaggerated amygdala activity and reduced anterior cingulate activation compared with controls. Later work using event-related designs demonstrated transient hippocampal spikes preceding amygdala bursts, hinting at possible hippocampal initiation of reactivation cycles (Whalley et al., 2013). This temporal ordering aligns with your model's claim that hippocampal re-engagement triggers limbic co-activation.

7.2.2. Structural Correlates

Meta-analyses confirm reduced hippocampal volume in chronic PTSD (Karl et al., 2006; Logue et al., 2018). Longitudinal designs suggest this reduction is not purely pre-existing vulnerability but partly stress-induced (Gilbertson et al., 2002). Crucially, smaller hippocampal volume correlates with greater frequency and intensity of intrusive memories (Hayes et al., 2012). From an integrative-cycle standpoint, diminished hippocampal integrity would both impair temporal binding and increase the likelihood of incomplete integration attempts manifesting as flashbacks.

7.2.3. Connectivity Studies

Resting-state and task-based connectivity analyses reveal weakened hippocampal–prefrontal coupling and strengthened amygdala–sensory cortex coupling in PTSD (Sripada et al., 2012). Effective-connectivity modeling could test your prediction that flashbacks begin with hippocampal drive followed by amygdala excitation. A handful of dynamic-causal-modeling studies already hint at bidirectional but asymmetric information flow, where hippocampal signals precede amygdala bursts under moderate recall, but the reverse occurs during hyper-aroused states (Rangaprakash et al., 2017). Such results imply a self-reinforcing loop consistent with your integration-failure cycle.

7.3. Electrophysiological and Oscillatory Findings

The hippocampus organizes episodic encoding and recall through theta–gamma coupling. Intracranial-EEG and MEG studies show disrupted theta coherence in PTSD, particularly between hippocampus, prefrontal cortex, and temporal association areas (Clouter et al., 2017; Agarwal et al., 2020). Deficits in phase synchrony could explain the absence of temporal "pastness" during re-experiencing. In animal models, acute stress abolishes hippocampal theta oscillations and enhances high-frequency bursts in the amygdala (Popa et al., 2010). If flashbacks reflect hippocampal re-entry without restored theta timing, they would indeed be experienced as present-tense perceptual events.

7.4. Sleep and Memory-Integration Studies

Sleep provides a natural context for hippocampal replay and integration. Research on trauma-related dreaming demonstrates heightened limbic activation and reduced prefrontal regulation, paralleling waking flashbacks (Nielsen & Levin, 2007). However, when REM and slow-wave sleep architecture normalize, either spontaneously or via therapy, symptoms decline (van der Helm & Walker, 2012). This suggests that successful offline hippocampal replay accomplishes what pathological flashbacks attempt unsuccessfully: integration of sensory–emotional fragments into contextual memory. Future polysomnographic studies could directly test whether REM-phase hippocampal bursts predict subsequent reduction in intrusive imagery.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

7.5. Therapeutic Outcome Data

7.5.1. Psychotherapy

Post-treatment neuroimaging shows restoration of hippocampal–mPFC connectivity and reduced amygdala activation after exposure therapy, EMDR, or trauma-focused CBT (Pagani et al., 2012; Felmingham et al., 2007). Symptom improvement parallels increased hippocampal volume, implying structural plasticity (Levy-Gigi et al., 2013). Such changes support the idea that effective therapy facilitates the hippocampus's completion of the integration process rather than mere extinction of fear responses.

7.5.2. Pharmacologic Modulation

Agents that modulate glutamatergic or noradrenergic tone influence memory reconsolidation and may indirectly affect hippocampal integration. For example, propranolol given during memory reactivation dampens amygdala responsiveness and can reduce intrusive memories (Kindt et al., 2009). Hydrocortisone administered immediately after trauma appears to lower later PTSD incidence, possibly by preventing hippocampal cortisol toxicity and preserving contextual binding (Schelling et al., 2004). These pharmacologic findings align with your model's emphasis on maintaining hippocampal integrity during or after trauma to ensure proper temporal coding.

7.6. Experimental Designs to Test the Hypothesis

To move the integrative model from theory to verification, several experimental paradigms are feasible:

1. **Time-resolved neuroimaging of flashbacks**
   a. *Design:* Use individualized trauma scripts with simultaneous EEG–fMRI to capture millisecond-level ordering of hippocampal and amygdala activation.
   b. *Prediction:* Hippocampal activation will precede amygdala spikes in early milliseconds of flashback onset.
2. **Theta-phase coherence measurement**
   a. *Design:* Intracranial recordings in patients undergoing evaluation for epilepsy who view trauma-related stimuli.
   b. *Prediction:* Reduced hippocampal theta coherence during flashbacks compared with neutral recall.
3. **Sleep-intervention studies**
   a. *Design:* Randomized trials augmenting REM quality via behavioral or pharmacologic means.
   b. *Prediction:* Improved REM integrity will reduce frequency of flashbacks and restore hippocampal–prefrontal connectivity.
4. **Neuromodulation experiments**
   a. *Design:* Transcranial magnetic or direct-current stimulation targeting hippocampal–mPFC networks during safe recall.
   b. *Prediction:* Enhanced coupling will facilitate integration and diminish re-experiencing.
5. **Computational modeling**
   a. *Design:* Bayesian or predictive-coding simulations implementing hippocampal time-coding failure.
   b. *Prediction:* Models will reproduce oscillatory instability and recurrent "present-tense" predictions analogous to flashbacks.

Together, these studies would generate multi-modal evidence capable of confirming the directionality and timing central to your hypothesis.

7.7. Cross-Disciplinary Implications

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

7.7.1. Developmental Trauma

Childhood trauma coincides with ongoing maturation of hippocampal and prefrontal circuits. Prolonged exposure to dysregulated stress in early life may entrench patterns of hippocampal–amygdala disconnection, creating lifelong vulnerability to intrusive recollection. Your model predicts that developmental timing of trauma will determine the degree of later integration difficulty, a testable developmental-neuroscience hypothesis.

7.7.2. Somatic and Psychotherapeutic Integration

The idea that flashbacks represent incomplete integration harmonizes with body-oriented therapies emphasizing interoceptive awareness and grounding. From a neural standpoint, such methods may help the hippocampus re-engage insular and sensory cortices under conditions of low arousal, thereby completing binding without limbic overflow. This neurobiological framing could unify cognitive and somatic treatment schools under a single integration-based mechanism.

7.7.3. Predictive-Coding and Consciousness Theory

In predictive-processing terms, hippocampal integration restores the brain's generative model by minimizing unresolved temporal prediction errors. This perspective situates trauma not only as emotional dysregulation but as a disturbance of *temporal consciousness*. Empirical research on time perception in PTSD—showing subjective elongation and "eternal present" experiences (Farrow et al., 2018)—provides phenomenological support for this idea.

7.8. Methodological Challenges

Testing this theory faces several obstacles:

- **Temporal resolution limits:** fMRI captures seconds, whereas hippocampal–amygdala interactions occur within tens of milliseconds. Multi-modal EEG–fMRI or magnetoencephalography will be essential.
- **Ethical considerations:** Inducing flashbacks experimentally must balance scientific rigor with participant safety. Virtual-reality or imagery-based proxies may be required.
- **Individual variability:** Not all flashbacks may arise from hippocampal integration attempts; some may be purely amygdala-triggered. Large-sample, within-subject designs will clarify heterogeneity.

Despite these hurdles, advances in high-field imaging, real-time connectivity analysis, and computational modeling make the hypothesis increasingly tractable.

7.10. Future Trajectory

Over the next decade, combining high-temporal-resolution neuroimaging with closed-loop neuromodulation could reveal the precise moment when hippocampal attempts at integration either succeed or devolve into flashbacks. Cross-disciplinary work linking neurophysiology, computational modeling, and clinical practice may transform how trauma is conceptualized: from an immutable memory of fear to a neural process of incomplete integration seeking resolution. Empirically testing this model will not only clarify the neural origin of flashbacks but may also guide interventions that directly target hippocampal–amygdala timing—restoring to the brain its most basic integrative function: the ability to locate experience in time.

8. Clinical and Therapeutic Implications

8.1. Reinterpreting Flashbacks in Clinical Practice

If flashbacks represent incomplete hippocampal integration rather than purely amygdala-driven intrusions, their therapeutic meaning changes profoundly. Rather than symptoms to be extinguished,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

flashbacks become signals of an unfinished neural process—the brain's ongoing effort to link unprocessed sensory–emotional fragments into cohesive memory.

This reframing invites clinicians to regard re-experiencing as evidence that the hippocampus is "reaching out" to integrate material that remains disconnected from narrative awareness. The therapeutic goal then becomes facilitating that integrative process safely and effectively, rather than merely dampening symptoms. Such a stance parallels the shift from viewing trauma memories as fixed fear associations to understanding them as plastic, malleable, and context-dependent (Ecker, Ticic, & Hulley, 2012). By supporting hippocampal functioning; through regulation of arousal, safe contextualization, and narrative reconstruction; therapy can help the brain complete what it has been trying unsuccessfully to do on its own.

8.2. The Conditions Required for Integration

The integrative hypothesis identifies three neurophysiological conditions necessary for successful hippocampal binding of traumatic fragments:

1. **Physiological safety:**

The amygdala must be sufficiently inhibited to prevent stress hormones from suppressing hippocampal and prefrontal activity.

Without safety, the integration cycle aborts.

2. **Cognitive engagement:**

The prefrontal cortex must remain active to supply verbal, temporal, and semantic scaffolding.

Dissociation or hyperarousal blocks this top-down input.

3. **Hippocampal–prefrontal synchrony:**

Theta–gamma coherence between these regions enables contextual binding and time coding.

Therapeutic interventions that enhance such coherence—via attentional focus, bilateral stimulation, or paced breathing—create ideal conditions for integration.

Clinically, this triad translates into a sequence: regulate → engage → integrate.

8.3. Implications for Therapeutic Modalities

8.3.1. Exposure-Based Therapies

Exposure therapy and prolonged exposure (PE) traditionally aim to extinguish conditioned fear responses through repeated, safe confrontation with trauma cues (Foa et al., 2007). Your model suggests a complementary interpretation: exposure provides repeated opportunities for hippocampal re-engagement with sensory–emotional fragments under regulated conditions, allowing successful binding and contextualization. This may explain why overexposure (too much arousal) can retraumatize—high amygdala output suppresses hippocampal integration—whereas titrated exposure facilitates resolution.

8.3.2. Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR)

EMDR's alternating bilateral stimulation may serve as an entrainment mechanism for hippocampal–prefrontal synchrony. Studies show that EMDR increases theta-band coherence and hippocampal activity while reducing amygdala activation (Pagani et al., 2012). From the integrative perspective, EMDR's efficacy arises not from eye movements per se but from fostering the rhythmic state in which the hippocampus can integrate uncoded material while the amygdala remains contained.

8.3.3. Somatic and sensorimotor therapies

Somatic approaches; such as Somatic Experiencing, sensorimotor psychotherapy, or body-focused mindfulness; target the interoceptive fragments of trauma stored in the insula and somatosensory cortices. By bringing awareness to bodily sensations in a safe, regulated context, these

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

methods allow the hippocampus to re-encode bodily memories as part of explicit narrative. This integration converts implicit interoceptive cues into conscious awareness, closing the loop between body and autobiographical self.

8.3.4. Narrative and meaning-based therapies

Constructing coherent narratives recruits the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex, literally building context around previously isolated fragments (Pennebaker & Smyth, 2016). When clients articulate what happened, when, and how it felt, they are performing the very function the hippocampus was unable to execute during trauma. Language transforms implicit sensory data into explicit declarative form; restoring time, sequence, and meaning.

8.3.5. Mindfulness and contemplative practices

Mindfulness enhances prefrontal regulation and reduces amygdala reactivity (Tang et al., 2015). It trains awareness of present bodily and emotional states without judgment, allowing previously avoided sensations to be experienced safely. In the hippocampal-integration framework, mindfulness increases tolerance for the mild arousal necessary to process implicit fragments, maintaining the balance required for successful contextualization.

8.4. Pharmacological Support

Pharmacologic agents can indirectly aid hippocampal integration by modulating the neurochemical environment that governs plasticity:

- **Hydrocortisone or glucocorticoid receptor agonists** given shortly after trauma may preserve hippocampal feedback inhibition and prevent maladaptive consolidation (Schelling et al., 2004).
- **Propranolol** and other β-adrenergic blockers dampen noradrenergic hyperactivation, reducing amygdala-driven emotional tagging during reconsolidation (Kindt et al., 2009).
- **Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs)** increase neurogenesis in the dentate gyrus, enhancing hippocampal capacity for contextual binding (Santarelli et al., 2003).
- **Psychedelic-assisted therapies** (e.g., MDMA, psilocybin) currently under study appear to facilitate hippocampal–amygdala communication while maintaining safety and emotional openness, potentially accelerating integration (Carhart-Harris et al., 2021).

These interventions, though diverse, share a common neurobiological aim: to optimize conditions for hippocampal reintegration of disjointed memory fragments.

8.5. Indicators of Successful Integration

When hippocampal integration succeeds, it shows clear, parallel changes. Temporal perspective returns—with restored hippocampal theta—and clients can say, "That happened then." Emotional intensity drops as amygdala reactivity decreases, reducing panic and other autonomic surges. Narrative becomes coherent, supported by stronger hippocampal–prefrontal connectivity, so the story can be told in order. Physiology stabilizes, consistent with a more normal HPA feedback loop, bringing less hypervigilance and better sleep. Dissociation diminishes as insula–prefrontal coupling increases, allowing greater bodily presence and affect tolerance. Together, these shifts mark the biological completion of the integration the hippocampus had been attempting through flashbacks.

8.6. Clinical Cautions

Reframing flashbacks as integration attempts does not imply that re-experiencing should be encouraged indiscriminately. If arousal exceeds regulatory capacity, the amygdala will again suppress hippocampal and prefrontal functioning, repeating the trauma pattern. Clinicians must therefore pace interventions to maintain the window of tolerance (Siegel, 1999). Grounding techniques, slow pacing, and titrated exposure prevent overactivation, ensuring that the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

hippocampus remains online to perform integration rather than being forced offline by renewed stress.

8.7. The Role of the Therapeutic Relationship

Safety is the fundamental precondition for hippocampal function. The therapeutic alliance provides the interpersonal context in which physiological calm and trust allow limbic downregulation. Neuroimaging studies of empathy and attunement show activation of prefrontal and mirror-neuron systems that co-regulate limbic arousal (Schore, 2012). From the integration perspective, attuned presence acts as an external regulator that keeps the client's hippocampus active and capable of contextualizing affective material. Thus, empathy is not only psychologically supportive but neurobiologically necessary for integration.

8.8. Implications for Treatment Sequencing

Your model suggests a three-phase approach consistent with contemporary trauma treatment frameworks but grounded in explicit neurobiological rationale:

1. **Stabilization and regulation:**

Restore safety, modulate arousal, and ensure hippocampal viability.
Interventions: grounding, mindfulness, and pharmacologic support.

2. **Integration and processing:**

Engage hippocampal–prefrontal networks through controlled reactivation of traumatic material.
Interventions: EMDR, exposure, narrative therapy, somatic integration.

3. **Consolidation and meaning-making:**

Strengthen cortical reorganization and future-oriented identity integration.
Interventions: journaling, relational work, creative expression, and sleep normalization.

This sequencing reflects the neurobiological sequence required for full hippocampal contextualization of traumatic memory.

8.9. Broader Implications: Trauma, Memory, and the Self

The hippocampus does more than encode episodes; it contributes to the continuity of autobiographical identity (Addis & Schacter, 2012). When trauma disrupts hippocampal integration, the self becomes fragmented: bodily sensations, emotions, and memories exist without cohesive narrative linkage. Reintegration of these elements through therapy restores both memory and identity. In phenomenological terms, the hippocampus re-establishes temporal continuity, allowing the person to locate themselves in the flow of past, present, and future. Thus, the neurobiology of trauma converges with the psychology of meaning-making: healing is the restoration of time. Reconceptualizing flashbacks as hippocampal integration attempts unites these diverse interventions within a common mechanism: supporting the brain's innate capacity to weave fragmented experience into coherent autobiographical memory.

9. Conclusion: Trauma as Failed Integration and Ongoing Neural Repair

9.1. Reframing Trauma

The evidence and theoretical synthesis presented across this chapter converge on a single insight: trauma is not merely an indelible memory of fear, but a disruption of the brain's capacity to integrate experience in time. During overwhelming threat, the hippocampal complex; normally responsible for contextual binding and temporal coding; succumbs to stress-induced inhibition. Emotional and sensory traces, still recorded by limbic and perceptual systems, remain unintegrated. The resulting memory is a mosaic of disjointed fragments: vivid, affectively charged, yet stripped of narrative coherence. This fragmentation explains the core phenomenology of trauma: intrusive images and sensations that feel immediate rather than remembered; dissociative gaps that obscure

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

continuity; and bodily re-enactments that repeat the physiological state of danger.

From a systems-neuroscience perspective, trauma represents a temporary collapse of hierarchical integration, in which subcortical survival networks override higher contextualizing functions.

9.2. The Hippocampus as the Brain's Integrator of Time

Across evolutionary and functional lines, the hippocampus is the structure that locates experience in time and space. Through theta–gamma coupling and coordination with the entorhinal cortex, it marks the boundaries between "now" and "then." When that mechanism fails, experience becomes timeless. Your proposed model reframes flashbacks as the hippocampus' *attempt* to correct this failure, to re-engage the distributed fragments of the trauma and impose temporal order. Seen this way, flashbacks are not pathological errors of memory but manifestations of the brain's drive toward coherence. They are efforts by the hippocampal system to integrate what remains unintegrated; to finish the task it was prevented from completing at the moment of trauma. What the individual experiences as unwanted re-living is, at the neurobiological level, an *incomplete attempt at repair.*

9.3. Integration Versus Intrusion: A Continuum

The line between integration and intrusion is determined by context and regulation. When the hippocampus reactivates trauma fragments within a state of safety and prefrontal control, the result is integration: the fragments acquire narrative sequence and emotional distance. When the same process occurs under conditions of high arousal, the amygdala floods the system, the hippocampus loses temporal precision, and the attempt collapses into a flashback. Thus, intrusion and integration are not opposites but different outcomes of the same underlying process, modulated by physiological state. This continuum perspective dissolves the artificial boundary between pathological and therapeutic memory activation. It also explains why effective treatments; whether exposure, EMDR, or mindfulness; share the same neurobiological goal: to keep the hippocampus online while the trauma network is re-engaged.

9.4. The Dynamic Systems Model of Trauma

The chapter's integrative synthesis can be summarized as a dynamic systems model:

1. **Initial collapse:**

Extreme stress triggers amygdala dominance, HPA hyperactivation, and hippocampal shutdown, producing fragmented encoding.

2. **Fragment storage:**

Unintegrated sensory, emotional, and bodily traces are distributed across amygdala, sensory cortices, insula, and brainstem.

3. **Reactivation cycles:**

The hippocampus periodically re-engages these fragments, attempting to integrate them into contextual memory.

4. **Outcome bifurcation:**

If regulatory balance holds, integration succeeds; if arousal overwhelms, the cycle reverts to flashback.

5. **Therapeutic completion:**

Through safe re-engagement, prefrontal support, and reduced amygdala interference, the hippocampus completes binding, converting implicit fragments into explicit narrative.

This model portrays trauma recovery as a non-linear self-organizing process; wherein neural systems oscillate between disconnection and reintegration until coherence is restored.

9.5. Broader Theoretical Implications

9.5.1. Memory Theory

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

The integrative framework extends classical consolidation theory by highlighting the hippocampus's active role not only in encoding but in retroactive integration of previously unbound material. It suggests that memory is not a static archive but a continually self-revising network, capable of re-binding fragments across time.

9.5.2. Predictive-Coding and Temporal Consciousness

In predictive-processing terms, trauma represents a catastrophic prediction error that remains unresolved because the hippocampus cannot supply temporal priors. Flashbacks are the brain's repeated attempts to update its generative model until temporal coherence is restored. This positions PTSD as a disorder of temporal consciousness—the inability to locate traumatic experience within a chronological self-model.

9.5.3. Psychotherapy as Neural Reintegration

From this view, psychotherapy functions as an *external scaffolding for hippocampal repair.* The therapist's presence, attunement, and pacing create the regulatory environment the brain needs to re-contextualize fragments safely. Techniques differ, but all effective approaches facilitate re-synchronization of hippocampus, prefrontal cortex, and amygdala; the triad of integration.

9.6. Future Directions

Empirical research can now test the model's predictions through high-temporal-resolution imaging, sleep studies, and neuromodulation experiments. Clinically, protocols can be designed to enhance hippocampal–prefrontal synchrony during trauma processing; using rhythmic entrainment, targeted TMS, or biofeedback of theta activity. Interdisciplinary collaboration among neuroscientists, clinicians, and computational modelers will clarify the timing and directionality of hippocampal–amygdala interactions during flashbacks. Ultimately, the integrative model invites a paradigm shift: from treating trauma as something to suppress, to understanding it as a neural process seeking completion.

Healing occurs when the brain is given the physiological and relational conditions to finish that process.

9.7. The Neurobiology of Healing

Recovery from trauma can thus be viewed as the restoration of temporal integration. When hippocampal function returns, the past can finally become *past*. The amygdala no longer signals danger because the hippocampus has anchored the memory in narrative time; the body no longer reenacts the event because the insula has re-encoded it within conscious awareness. Therapy, sleep, and safety all serve this biological imperative: to transform fragmented, timeless impressions into cohesive autobiographical knowledge. This framing reunites neuroscience with the lived experience of survivors. It validates the paradox often heard in trauma recovery: that healing feels less like forgetting and more like remembering; remembering in order.

9.8. Concluding Statement

Trauma is not a static imprint of terror, but a dynamic disorder of integration; a failure of the hippocampal system to bind sensory, emotional, and contextual information into a coherent narrative of the past. Flashbacks represent the hippocampus's unfinished attempt to repair this disconnection; it's striving to transform timeless fragments into memory with sequence and meaning. When therapy, safety, and regulation allow that process to complete, the brain achieves what it sought all along: coherence. The event becomes a story; the story becomes history, and the individual; once trapped in an eternal present; regains the continuity of self across time.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

Author Contributions: The author is solely responsible for the conception, drafting, and final approval of this manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability: No datasets were generated or analyzed for this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval: This theoretical work did not involve human participants or animals and therefore required no institutional ethics approval.

References

Addis, D. R., and Schacter, D. L. (2012). The hippocampus and simulation: How and why we simulate the future. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience 5 173 https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2011.00173

Agarwal, S. M., et al. (2020). Altered oscillatory synchrony in the basolateral amygdala and supragranular layers of the medial prefrontal cortex of rat models of post-traumatic stress disorder. Biological Psychiatry, 87(9), 802–812.

Arnsten, A. F. T. (2009). Stress-mediating signaling pathways that impact prefrontal cortex anatomy and physiology. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 10(6), 410–422. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2648

Bremner, J. D., Randall, P., Scott, T. M., et al. (1995). Hippocampal volume on in vivo magnetic resonance imaging in CBR pTSD. American Journal of Psychiatry, 152(7), 973–981. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.152.7.973

Brewin, C. R., Dalgleish, T., & Joseph, S. (1996). A two factor theory of posttraumatic stress disorder. Psychological Review, 103(4), 670–686. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.103.4.670

Brewin, C. R., Gregory, J. D., Lipton, M., \& Burgess, N. (2010). Intrusive visuals in psychological disorders: Characteristics, neural mechanisms, and treatment considerations. Psychological Review, 117(1), 210–232. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018113

Buzsáki, G. (2015). Hippocampal sharp wave-ripples and memory replay. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology, 7(6), a021790. https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a021790

Carhart-Harris, R. L., et al. (2021). Prospective trial of MDMA-assisted psychotherapy for treatment of severe PTSD. Nature Medicine, 27(6), 1025–1033. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01336-3

Clouter, A., Shapiro, K. L., & Hanslmayr, S. (2017). Theta phase synchronization is the glue which binds human associative memory. Current Biology, 27(20), 3143–3148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.09.001

Craig, A. D. (2009). How do you feel—now? The anterior insula and human awareness. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 10(1), 59–70. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2555

Ecker, B., Ticic, R., & Hulley, L. (2012). Unlocking the emotional brain: Eliminating symptoms at their roots through memory reconsolidation. Routledge.

Ehlers, A., Hackmann, A., Michael, T. Intrusive re-experiencing in post-traumatic stress disorder: Phenomenology, theory, and therapy. Memory, 12(4), 403–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210444000025

Eichenbaum, H. (2014). Hippocampal time cells in an oscillatory network: codin g for sequence and place yet independent of sequence and place codes. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 15(11), 732–744. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3827

Eichenbaum, H. (2017). The memory book: The classic guide to improving your memory at work, at school, and at play (Revised ed., pp. 74-77). Oxford University Press.

Etkin, A and Wager, T. D. (2007) Functional neuroimaging and anxiety: a meta-analysis of emotional processing in PTSD, social anxiety disorder, and specific phobia. American Journal of Psychiatry, 164(10), 1476–1488.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

Felmingham, K. L., et al. (2007). AC and amygdala changes after PTSD CB treatment. Psychological Science, 18(2), 127–129.

Foa, E. B., Hembree, E. A., and Rothbaum, B. O. (2007). Prolonged exposure therapy for PTSD: Emotional processing of traumatic experiences. Oxford University Press.

Foa, E.B., & Kozak, M.J. (1986). Fear processing: Emotional learning exposed to corrective information. Psychological Bulletin, 99(1), 20–35.

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a rough guide to the brain? Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 11(2), 127–138.

Gilbertson, M. W., Shenton, M. E., Ciszewski, A., et al. (2002). Smaller hippocampal volume is a risk factor for incident psychological trauma. Nature Neuroscience, 5(11), 1242–1247.

Hayes, J. P., Hayes, S. M., and Mikedis, A. M. (2012). Quantitative meta-analyses of neural activity in individuals with PTSD. Biological Mood & Anxiety Disorders, 2(1), 9.

Hohwy, J. (2016). The self-evidencing brain. Noûs, 50(2), 259–285.

Hopper, J. W., et al. (2007). Neural correlates of re-experiencing, avoidance, and dissociation in PTSD. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 20(5), 713–725.

Karl, A., Schaefer, M., Malta, L. S., et al. (2006). Meta-analysis of structural brain abnormalities in PTSD. Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 30(7), 1004–1031.

Kim, J. J., and Diamond, D. M. (2002). The stressed hippocampus: synaptic plasticity and lost memories. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 3(6), 453–462.

Keithth, M., Soeter, M., & Vervliet, B. (2009). Cancherini GM, Lew AR, Panayiotou A. Beyond extinction: Eliminating human fear response and preventing the return of Fear. Nature Neuroscience, 12(3), 256–258.

Lanius, R. A., Bluhm, R., Frewen, P. A., et\u00a0al. (2010). The developing neurobiology of PTSD: A unifying paradigm for intrinsic network connectivity. Neuropsychopharmacology, 35(1), 169–191.

Lanius, R. A., Frewen, P., Tursich M., Jetly, R., & McKinnon, M. (2015). Correcting aberrant large-scale brain networks in posttraumatic stress disorder and related disorders: A translational challenge for the 21st century. European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 6, 27313.

LeDoux, J. E. (2014). Coming to terms with fear. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(8), 2871–2878.

Levy-Gigi, E., et al. (2013). Cognitive–behavioral therapy increases hippocampal volume in individuals with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 74(9), e835–e838.

Lisman, J. E., & Jensen, O. (2013). The theta–gamma neural code. Neuron, 77(6), 1002–1016.

Logue, M. W., et al. (2018). Reduced hippocampal and amygdala volume in women with childhood sexual abuse-related complex PTSD. Molecular Psychiatry, 23(3), 615–624.

McClelland, J. L., Mcnaughton, B. L., & O'reilly, R. C (1995). Why do we have complementary learning systems in the hippocampus and neocortex? Psychological Review, 102(3), 419–457.

McEwen, B. S. (2000). Impact of adversity on the brain in structure and function. Biological Psychiatry, 48(8), 721–731.

McEwen, B. S. (2012). The flexible (and stressed) brain. Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience, 14(2), 111–124.

McGaugh, J. L. (2018). Regulation of the Consolidation of a Form of SD Memory Articulated behaviorally, concomitant with arousal following septic (Bollen et al. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 19, pp.55-60.

Milad, M. R., Quirk, G. J., & Pitman, R. K. (2007) The role of the vmPFC in conditioning and extinction: A critical review. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 8(1), 62–70.

Nader, K., & Einarsson, E. O. (2010). Memory reconsolidation: An update. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1191(1), 27-41.

Neilsen, T., & Levin, R. (2007). Nightmares: A new neurocognitive model. Sleep Medicine Reviews, 11(4), 295–310.

Pagani, M., et al. (2012). Neural mechanisms of EMDR therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder. Frontiers in Psychology, 3, 54.

Pennebaker, J. W., & Smyth, J. M. (2016). Writing to heal: A guided journal for recovering from trauma and emotional upheaval. Guilford Press.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1883.v1

Phelps, E. A., and LeDoux, J. E. (2005). The amygdala contribution to emotion processing in animal and human studies. Neuron, 48(2), 175–187.

Popa, D., Duvarci, S. , Popescu, A.T., Léna, C. & Pare,D.(2010). Coherent amygdalocortical theta promotes fear memory consolidation during paradoxical sleep. Proceedings of the National academy of Sciences, 107(14), 6516–6519.

Porges, S. W. (2011). The polyvagal theory: Neiurophysiological foundations of emotions, attachment, communication and self-regulation. Norton.

Rangaprakash, D., et al. (2017). Hippocampus and amygdala network interactions addresser in PTSD and trauma presentation. Human Brain Mapping, 38(6), 3080–3091.

Roozendaal, B., McEwen, B.S., & Chattarji, S. Stress, memory and the amygdala. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 10(6), 423–433.

Santarelli, L., et al. (2003). Hippocampal neurogenesis: a biomarker for depression or antidepressant effects? Science, 301(5634), 805–809.

Schelling, G., Roozendaal, B., Krauseneck, T., Schmoelz, M., & De Quervain, D. J. (2004). Hydrocortisone treatment to prevent PTSD. Biological Psychiatry, 55(6), 627–633.

Schore, A. N. (2012). The art of psychotherapy science. Norton.

Shin, L. M., et al. (1999). Script-driven imagery in PTSD: A PET study of remote and script-specific memories. Biological Psychiatry, 45(10), 1329–1341.

Shin, L. M., Rauch, S. L., & Pitman, R. K. (2006). Function of the amygdala, medial prefrontal cortex, and hippocampus in PTSD. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1071(1), 67–79.

Siegel, D. J. (1999). The mind-comic: How the brain, relationships, and the self interact to shape who we become. Guilford Press.

Squire, L. R., and Wixted, J. T. (2011). Human memory after HM: Perspectives from cognitive neuroscience. In Annual Review of Neuroscience (Vol. 34, pp. 259–288).

Sripada, R. K., et al. (2012). Neurocardiomalacia in posttraumatic stress disorder: Resting state, dynamic connectivity and coregulation of amygdala networks. Human Brain Mapping, 33(7), 1777–1792.

Takashima, A., et al. (2006). Prospective fMRI of the human declarative memory system. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 103(3), 756–761.

Tang, Y.-Y., Hölzel, B. K., & Posner, M. I. (2015). The neuroscience of mindfulness meditation. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 16(4), 213–225.

Teyler, T. J., DiScenna, P. G. (1986). The hippocampal memory indexing theory. Behavioral Neuroscience, 100(2), 147–154.

Van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma. Viking.

Van der Helm, E., & Walker, M. P. (2012). Overnight therapy? The contribution of sleep to emotional brain processing. Psychological Bulletin, 138(6), 875–898.

Whalley, M. G., Kroes, M. C. W., Huntley, Z., Rugg, M. D., Davis S. W & Brewin, C.R (2013) fMRI of the brain's response to script-driven imagery in a film task. Brain and Cognition, 81(1), 151–159.

Yehuda, R., Boisoneau, D., Lowy, M. T., & Giller, E. L. (1995b). Cortisol-memory function dose-response in posttraumatic stress disorder. Biological Psychiatry, 37(6), 393–400.

Yehuda, R., & LeDoux, J. (2007). Differential response to an emergent threat depending on the traumatic context: A translational neurobehavioral approach to social anxiety and pessimism across trauma controls and the offenders of attempted suicide. Neuron, 56(1), 19–32.