

memory feels less than satisfying. Much of the analysis specific to autobiographical memory remains chiefly on the meta level. Many arguments, while intriguing and even thought-provoking, are not accompanied by empirical evidence. Some claims seem overstated or difficult to comprehend, making the reader wonder whether, perhaps, something important was lost in translation. Phenomena such as childhood amnesia and reminiscing bump that are important for understanding the development of autobiographical memory are not given sufficient attention. The reports of the two projects conducted by the authors and their research team are surprisingly skeletal, and the findings are not connected with the larger empirical literature to allow the reader to see where they stand. The findings are also subject to alternative interpretations and do not necessarily support the overarching conclusions the authors intend to draw.

The authors characterize the emergence of shared attention and the acquisition of language each as a 'quantum leap' in the developmental course of autobiographical memory. While their theoretical rationale makes great sense, they did not provide much empirical data to support their position. Furthermore, it is not entirely clear from the discussion whether these two factors directly contribute to the development of autobiographical memory, or have primarily indirect effects that are mediated by more advanced mental faculties such as theory of mind, self-concept and narrative skills as well as by the social scaffolding of memory sharing. In addition, in contrast to the general understanding of the development of autobiographical memory as an incremental and continuous process, the quantum leaps imply abrupt shifts and fundamental 'revolutions'.

A big disappointment of the book is its treatment of culture. The sociocultural determinants of autobiographical memory, being an important component of the proposed biopsychosocial approach, are largely confined within the context of mother-child memory sharing. The idea that autobiographical memory provides synchronicity between the individual and society is brilliant, but it unfortunately does not lead to a deeper reflection on the cultural shaping of autobiographical remembering. Most problematic, the development of autobiographical memory is situated within the modern western 'strongly individualized' society that is presumably the high point, if not the final stopping place, of cultural evolution. The 'normal' form of autobiographical memory is said to be the result of 'the development of more modern societies and a more personal, dynamic and individualistic course of life' (p. 6). If one cares to glimpse into the vast cross-cultural findings – which are completely missing in the book – the message is unequivocal: there are different modes of autobiographical memory that reflect different sociocultural conditions of society, are sustained by different socialization practices and serve different psychosocial functions. A true understanding of autobiographical memory as 'a social institution' cannot be achieved without going beyond the western standpoint.

Perhaps when the ministers delivered their answer 'baby' to the king, they had a modern western middle-class baby in mind? Then the king only received partial knowledge about the universe.

H.L. Roediger, Y. Dudai and S.M. Fitzpatrick (eds)

Science of Memory: Concepts. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. xviii+446 pp. \$47.95. ISBN 0195310446

Reviewed by: John F. Kihlstrom, *University of California, Berkeley, USA*

At this point, psychologists have a pretty good idea how the mind works. That's especially true when it comes to visual perception (auditory and other modalities, maybe not so much). And I think it's also true when it comes to memory. The evidence is the book under review, which tells its readers (pretty much) everything we always wanted to know about human memory, and leaves very few questions unanswered.

Certainly, if anyone were going to give us the full scoop on memory, it would be these authors. Roddy Roediger is perhaps the most prominent of the second generation of memory researchers since the cognitive revolution in psychology (the first generation consisting of such figures as Alan Baddeley, Gordon Bower, Robert Crowder, Bill Estes, and George Mandler). Yadin Dudai is a wide-ranging cognitive neuroscientist, and author of *Memory from A to Z: Keywords, Concepts, and Beyond* (2004). Susan Fitzpatrick is a neuroscientist and vice-president of the James S. McDonnell Foundation, which sponsored a conference-cum-retreat which laid the groundwork for this book.

The volume itself is organized in a very interesting way. Each of its major sections includes a brief introduction by one of the editors, approximately three short essays on the subject and integrative comments by yet another contributor. There are 16 such sections, and there's nothing to do but list them here: Memory, Learning, Coding and Representation, Plasticity, Context, Encoding, Working Memory, Consolidation, Persistence, Retrieval, Remembering, Transfer, Inhibition, Forgetting, Memory Systems, and Phylogeny and Evolution. These topical sections are then book-ended by an introductory essay by Roediger, Dudai and Endel Tulving (another leading figure of the first generation, who was the guiding spirit of the book), and a provocative concluding essay by Fitzpatrick that looks forward to a future neuroscience of memory that, in her memorable phrase, goes beyond the 'Aplysia/monkey delayed nonmatch to sample/H.M.' science of memory.

To give the reader some sense of what is in this book, consider the two sections on 'Retrieval' (which Roediger has characterized as the key to understanding memory) and 'Remembering' (which turns out to be not at all the same thing as retrieval). J. David Sweat begins with a mostly hypothetical discussion of the molecular mechanisms that must, in principle, be involved in gaining access to information stored in the brain. Norman (Skip) Spear discusses the role of elaboration and reconstruction in retrieval, and also the consequences of retrieval for the encoded memory trace. John Gardiner discusses the distinction between 'remembering' an event and 'knowing' that it occurred. Kathleen McDermott then pulls the 'Retrieval' essays together, and suggests that future studies of episodic memory pay more attention to the self that does the remembering – and that experienced the event being remembered in the first place. Andrew Yonelinas returns to the 'remember-know' distinction and makes the case for sophisticated signal-detection methods in the study of recognition. Martin Conway describes the various mental states that are entailed in remembering – the experience of discovering (or creating) a memory, as well as the experience of the memory itself – and sets these in the context of a model of autobiographical retrieval processes. Asher Koriat discusses the role of metacognitive monitoring and control in remembering. And Suparna Rajaram brings the 'Remembering' essays together by raising the question of whether non-human animals *remember* (certainly they can retrieve information stored in memory) – and how we would know.

Is anything missing? Yes.

One omission, amazingly, is implicit memory, although priming and other forms of implicit memory get mentioned here and there. Maybe implicit memory is passé. At the same time, an awful lot of paper and conference time was consumed by implicit memory in the late 1980s and 1990s, with lots of competing theories (maybe people just got tired). Implicit memory connected the psychological study of memory with the emerging cognitive neuroscience by suggesting that memory was mediated by multiple memory systems (which do get their due in this book). And, arguably, implicit memory stimulated the rediscovery of the unconscious by cognitive psychology. It should have had a section, if only to review and settle the issues that various theorists debated so forcefully. (Implicit memory is missing from *Memory from A to Z* (Dudai, 2004), too, although that book does have a nice entry on priming.)

Another thing that's missing is attention to social and cultural memory. While psychologists are naturally interested in memory as it is represented in individual minds and brains, individual experience, thought and action also take place in a world of other people – significant others, groups, social institutions, and cultures. Social psychologists have become interested in issues surrounding memory collaboration and suggestion, stimulated by the clinical controversy over false and recovered memories of trauma. Sociologists, of course, have long entertained a notion of 'collective' memory – representations of the past that are shared by members of a group, and remembering as an activity that holds groups together. And political scientists increasingly understand that intergroup conflict is, all too often, conflict about memory. Social science, as much as neuroscience, is part of the future of memory, but there's not much of it here.

Nor is there anything on memoir, the dominant literary style of the turn of the millennium, and one which raises all sorts of questions about the accuracy of memory, and the processes involved in reconstructing – and imagining – the past.

But what's here is really good – a very handy survey of the psychology and neuroscience of memory, presented in a series of short essays, each written with a point of view. Each section is readable in a single sitting, allowing the reader to catch up with what has been going on outside his or her narrow area of specialization.

Can it serve as a textbook? Probably not. It would provide a solid basis for a graduate proseminar, where the students already have some grounding in the psychology and neuroscience of memory, but not for the undergraduate course. The individual articles often take too much for granted (though the relevant background is often found elsewhere), and the many individual articles deprive the book of the narrative flow that a textbook really needs. But for someone who already knows something about memory, and is looking for an (almost) comprehensive survey, this is it.

Reference

Dudai Y (2004) *Memory from A to Z: Keywords, Concepts, and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sarah Henstra

The Counter-Memorial Impulse in Twentieth-Century English Fiction. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. ix + 182 pp. \$80. ISBN 0230577148

Reviewed by: Jan Rupp, *University of Heidelberg, Germany*

The rise of interest in memory in the late 20th century was connected not least to a realization that the living memory of the century's atrocities would soon be lost. Despite, or because of, this dystopian constellation, the discourse on memory has been strangely optimistic, in the academic world and beyond. Whatever the fragility of memory, we view it as a powerful force for identity and as an ethical imperative that preserves us from the danger of forgetting. In this context, the purpose of commemorative practice is largely unquestioned, but there is also a reflexive moment to the current interest in memory. Only a few memorial projects and studies have dealt with 'how' we remember as well as 'what' we remember, scrutinizing the routine of commemoration that is taken for granted elsewhere.

Sarah Henstra's *The Counter-Memorial Impulse in Twentieth-Century English Fiction* is to be seen as part of this reflexive strand in current memory studies. It chooses the notion of 'counter-memory' to position itself, but there is a more circumscribed point of departure within this idiom

of counter-memory. Henstra takes the 'counter-monument' as a model, an approach in the construction of memorial sites or installations that goes against the grain of the monument tradition and deliberately thwarts visitors' expectations. The counter-monument withholds easy answers and 'meaning', problematizing the way or even the possibility of commemoration. It is in this sense that Henstra observes the counter-memorial impulse in English fiction. She produces extensive readings of novels by Ford Madox Ford, Doris Lessing and Jeannette Winterson from across the century, exploring literary strategies that correspond to the counter-monument. While the contribution of monuments and other media of memory is frequently discussed, the specific role as well as the distinctive functions of literature in memory culture still deserve greater attention. Henstra's study goes a long way towards filling that gap.

The three novels present a limited and eclectic choice, though self-confessedly so. In Ford's *The Good Soldier* (1915), the counter-memorial impulse manifests itself in the remembrance and ultimate rejection of a traditional Englishness that has vanished in the dying days of Empire and the catastrophe of the Great War. The counter-memory in Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* (1962), by contrast, is prospective, concerned with the possibility of catastrophe and future loss in the nuclear age. Jeannette Winterson's *Written on the Body* (1992) is again different from each of the other two novels; here the counter-memorial impulse is traced in a very private or personal context, the loss of a lover and her commemoration. All three novels are characterized by an 'insistent (and strategic) pessimism' (p. 6) and "'talk back" ... to commemorative norms' (p. 5).

In approaching these texts, Henstra states that rather than imposing theory on her readings she seeks to derive theory from them. This is a familiar, slightly misleading opposition, which moreover downplays somewhat the psychoanalytic framework of this study. As Terry Eagleton and others have remarked, the idea of not letting theory 'get in the way' between us and the literary work frequently just relies on another or an 'older' theory. And in fact, it is (only) by presupposing the experience and psychodynamics of loss and mourning as a common ground that the quite heterogeneous examples of individual and collective, retrospective and prospective, and social and private forms of memory are held together. Theory is central to this study and at the same time responsible for the charting of an immensely varied field that, between the covers of a book, is bound to be mapped in certain places only.

The book is most instructive where it talks about the ways memory (or the reflection on memory) is staged by specifically literary forms and means. The impact of genres and modes, especially elegy satire, and parody, is powerfully reviewed as part of a rhetoric of memory (or counter-memory), alongside other aspects of 'story' such as plot structures and the question of closure, and aspects of 'discourse' such as narrative irony, unreliability, or the 'melancholic narrator' (pp. 64ff., 119ff.). This concern with the 'rhetorical texture of counter-memorial efforts in fiction' (p. 10) makes for compelling reading, and significantly extends the scholarship of even such well-researched novels as those by Ford, Lessing and Winterson. All too often, literary texts are given credit for what they say about memory, and rightly so, but at least as much attention needs to be paid to the 'literariness' of how they say it.

Throughout, Henstra highlights the critical opposition to the rhetorical tradition of the texts she studies. Thus, 'texts ... operating under a *counter-memorial impulse*' effectively 'resist commemoration or use it disobediently' (p. 7). They 'reject the mechanisms of consolation normally achieved through the work of commemoration' (p. 7) and deliberately disappoint readerly expectations. Eventually, this oppositional stance is the 'real' ethical value in dealing with memory for Henstra, and not the professed ethics of commemorative culture. Literature's ethics essentially consist, not in providing a promise of consolation, but in 'refus[ing] to let the story stand in for loss or cover over grief' (p. 150). Counter-memorial narratives are thus informed by a certain futility of memory,