



Theatre Academy

Geliş Tarihi: 14.10.2022

Kabul Tarihi: 30.01.2023

Araştırma Makelesi/Research Article

Memory and Recalling in Shelagh Stephenson's *The Memory of Water*

Shelagh Stephenson'ın *The Memory of Water* adlı Oyununda Hafıza ve Hatırlama

Kader GÜZEL

Arş. Gör., Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü

k.mutlu@alparslan.edu.tr

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9277-2128>

Abstract

Memory, through which knowledge, memories, and experiences are conserved in mind, is of great importance for the history of humankind. It is not a novel idea that the ability of memory constitutes the human identity and consciousness. Psychological studies, as well as philosophical assumptions, demonstrate the significance of recollection of past events in conducting life and constructing a healthy personality. In light of those preliminary observations, this paper focuses on the historical development of the subject of memory and turning points of memory studies. In addition to the chronological description of memory, how it is evaluated under the effect of historical development as well as the significance of it in the life cycle of human beings is likewise specified in this study. Expressing the thoughts and research of various thinkers and philosophers, this study represents the variable approaches to memory. While discussing Shelagh Stephenson's award-winning play, *The Memory of Water* (1996), the central concern is to analyse how subjective and mutual memories have formed and influenced the characters' lives. The play reveals the portrayal of the prominence of remembering and reminiscing, which are directly related to our constitution of self and well-being. In light of scientific research and the recollections of the characters, the significance of remembering and reminiscing actions that are directly related to our constitution of self and well-being is specified. The play stresses the paramount importance of communicating and sharing among the family members or within a social environment, as misattribution shows up as an imperfection of memory.

Keywords: Memory, Recalling, Shelagh Stephenson, *The Memory of Water*

Öz

Anıların, öğrenilmiş bilgilerin ve deneyimlerin zihinde tutulduğu alan olarak tasvir edilen bellek, insanlık tarihi boyunca büyük bir öneme sahip olmuştur. Belleğin insan benliğini ve bilincini yapılandırdığı düşüncesi yeni değildir. Psikolojik çalışmalar ve felsefi varsayımlar geçmiş yaşantılara ve olaylara yönelik birikimlerin bir hayatı sürdürme ve sağlıklı bir kişilik inşa etmede belleğin ve hatırlamanın önemini vurgulamışlardır. Bu ön gözlemler ışığında, bu makale bellek konusunun tarihsel gelişimine ve bellek çalışmalarının dönüm noktalarına odaklanmıştır.

Belleğin kronolojik olarak tanımlanmasının yanı sıra, tarihsel gelişimin etkisi altında nasıl değerlendirildiği ve insanın yaşam döngüsündeki önemi belirtilmiştir. Çeşitli filozof ve düşünürlerin bellek konusundaki düşünce ve araştırmalarının tartışıldığı çalışmada bellek ile ilgili çeşitli yaklaşımlar incelenmiş ve Shelagh Stephenson'ın *The Memory of Water* adlı ödüllü oyunu analiz edilmiştir. Karakterlerin geçmişiyle ilgili bireysel ve ortak anılarının hayatlarını nasıl etkileyip şekillendirdiği ve cenaze töreninin çocuklukların travmatik anılarının canlanması üzerindeki etkileri incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmada anılarımızı hatırlamamızın nedenleri ön plana çıkarılmıştır. Bilimsel araştırmalar ve kız kardeşlerin anıları ışığında, benlik ve öznel iyi oluşla doğrudan ilgili olan eylemleri hatırlamanın ve anımsamanın önemi belirtilmiştir. Bireysel ve ortak anıların karakterlerin hayatının nasıl etkilediği ve şekillendirdiği tartışılmış, hatırlamanın benlik gelişimi üzerindeki önemli etkisi açığa çıkarılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Bellek, Hatırlama, Shelagh Stephenson, *The Memory of Water*

Introduction

Stephenson's first stage play, *The Memory of Water* had its debut in 1996 at the Hampstead Theatre and then transferred to the West End. The play received the Olivier Award for Best Comedy in 2000. Epitomising the problematic relationships and tensions within the lives of a middle-class English family immediately after the death of the mother, the play represents a direct analysis of the past experiences and memory through the personalities of the three sisters and their mother, who appears on the stage posthumously.

Born in 1955, in Tynemouth, Northumberland, the playwright Shelagh Stephenson attracted considerable attention for her plays from the mid-1990s to the middle of the 2000s. She studied drama at Manchester University and before being identified as a successful playwright, she had a career as an actor with the Royal Shakespeare Company. In addition, she was taking part in television dramas, essentially in supporting roles (Billingham, 2011). Stephenson's writing career proceeded with *Five Kinds of Silence* (2000), originally broadcast on BBC Radio 4 and rewarded with the Writers' Guild Award for the Best Original Radio Play in 1996. The play, which is a ferocious representation of domestic abuse and its consequences, is often evaluated as the "strongest and most distinctive piece" written by Stephenson (Billingham, 2011, p. 475). Her other award-winning play, *An Experiment with an Air Pump* (1998) was inspired by a Joseph Wright painting, 'An Experiment on a Bird with an Air Pump' (1768). The play doubles four contemporary characters with four characters from a different time, which allows Stephenson to present a

defamiliarisation of the present with the perspective of the past, and familiarisation of the past through the angle of the present (Billingham, 2011). Her writing career has been secured in recent years with plays such as *Mappa Mundi* (2002), *Enlightenment* (2005), *The Long Road* (2007), and *A Northern Odyssey* (2010). In addition to these, she was the co-writer and co-producer of the television drama *Enid* (2010), which received much critical acclaim.

Initiating Stephenson's career in the British theatre world, *The Memory of Water* has had a distinct place among its contemporaries because of its conventional style of narration, traditional character types, language, and dramatic form. The three sisters' return to the family house for the funeral of their departed mother provokes a re-examination of their lives in the light of shared memories as each member in the family has apparently carried back home the complicated and contradictory recollections of their childhood. In this highly problematic trip into their past, emotional crossroads determine future considerations about their familial relationships.

This study focuses on the historical development of the subject of memory and turning points of memory studies. Discussing the thoughts and researches of various philosophers such as Aristotle, Plato, John Locke, David Hume, Friedrich Nietzsche, Henry Bergson and neurologist Sigmund Freud on memory, it examines the variable approaches to memory. In addition to the chronological description of memory, how it is evaluated under the effect of historical development as well as the significance of it in the life cycle of human beings is likewise specified in this study. While exploring Stephenson's award-winning play, *The Memory of Water* which represents incompatible memories of three sisters and a recently departed mother, the central concern is to examine how subjective and mutual memories, related to the characters' past, have formed and influenced their lives, and the effect of the funeral on the reactivation of the traumatic moments of their childhood. This study scrutinizes the reasons why we recall our memories come into prominence. In the light of scientific researches and the recollections of the sisters, the significance of remembering and reminiscing actions which are directly related to our constitutions of self and well-being is specified. Throughout the study, the hypothesis that individuals' discovering their past determines the perception of who they are, is emphasised in the light of their experiences at specific times and places. The play under examination signifies the indispensable roles of individual and social relationships in the formation of memory.

The specified thoughts and assertions of the researchers and philosophers indicate the reality that memory inherently has the capability of distorting past experiences and situations in the minds of the individuals. At that particular point, the reliability of the memory is questioned throughout the study in line with the conversations related to past experiences and recallings. In conclusion, *The Memory of Water*, ensures a profound platform to discuss the aspects of memory across a wide perspective, through the statements of the characters related to their mutual experiences. The play is noteworthy in terms of its exploration of memories formed by different views of events or misconceptions because it focuses on how inconsistent recollections have a significant impact on the lives and personalities of the three sisters who come together for their mother's death. The incidents that take place throughout this dramatic work raise issues regarding how we recall our lives, why different people remember things in different ways, and why emotional experiences tend to leave a more lasting impression on our minds than frequently encountered events. This modern theatrical portrayal embodies the idea of the trustworthiness of memory in addition to challenging the value of memory for humans.

Memory from Past to Present

How much similarity must there be between the two moments in order for the one to count as a memory of the other? How much of the content of the experience must be reproduced and how accurately? How many portions of the past is the present connected to in a condensed memory, and how is this determined?

(Marya Schechtman, 1994)

Defining memory is a challenging task as there are a number of difficult questions involved when it comes to issues regarding the human mind. To put it simply, memory is our basic access to the history of ourselves. Schechtman above poses questions about the very core of memory and investigates the time necessary to constitute a memory, the proportion of experiences that can be remembered, and the criteria of accuracy in terms of generating a true recollection of happenings (1994). Memory, throughout and after childhood, is arguably the most basic cognitive capacity that human beings have (Hansen, 2015). Without the capacity of memory, we could never make our recollections applicable to the present, and we would be completely

deprived of the ability to think about our past (Hansen, 2015). As a cognitive ability, memory, which was given considerable importance and generated a prominent research concern in the twentieth century, has occupied a remarkable place in philosophical and psychological investigations from the fifth century BC to date.

Memory, through which knowledge, memories and experiences are conserved in the mind and applied to at will in desired times or unintentionally, is of great importance for the history of humankind. According to Hansen, “it is difficult to get a perspective on memory because it is so intricately bound up with cognition and identity” (Hansen, 2015, p. 201). To be associated with two prominent aspects of human beings makes the investigation of memory both challenging and demanding. As memory has a comprehensive connection to such distinct natural features of human beings as cognition and identity, a broad examination is necessary in order to express a valid opinion on the subject of memory. As Richard Terdiman writes, memory is “so omnipresent, so fundamental to our ability to conceive the world that it might seem impossible to analyse it at all” (1993, p. 8). The multidimensionality of memory and its significance in perception makes it a challenge to make an exact analysis of it. In fact, no detailed study of memory exists before Plato and Aristotle (Sprague, 1968). There is only an anonymous work called *Dissoi Logoi* or *Dialexeis*, which was written prior to these philosophers and has survived to this day. This work is considered to be the first work that attempts to do a memory review. In *Dissoi Logoi*, memory is presented merely as a human ability that needs to be developed to make memorisations and strengthen the remembering capacity. Memory, defined as “the greatest and fairest discovery has been found to be... useful for everything, for wisdom as well as for the conduct of life”, is considered as a research topic via which the features and connections of it to human nature can be analysed; thus, it comprises methods by means of which a person can remember a text that should be recited (Sprague, 1968, p. 166).

It should be noted that throughout “the classical period of Greek thought, the question of what memory is was linked intimately with the problem of how we know what we know, and what the object of knowing essentially is” (Coleman, 1992, p. 4). In terms of that kind of investigation, to explain what memory is, it can be said that “the most obvious starting point is Plato’s description of memory in *Theaetetus* (c. 360 BC), which established an important and influential model for later thinkers” (Whitehead,

2006, p. 15). In one part of this book, which is constructed upon a dialogue between Socrates and Theaetetus, a student, Theaetetus is asked to conceptualise “that our minds contain a wax block, which may vary in size, cleanliness and consistency in different individuals, but in some people is just right” and which is thought to be a gift of Mnemosyne, the mother of the Muses (Draaisma, 2000, p. 24). While explaining the extent of remembering, Socrates utilises the example of a wax block. For instance, he claims that the mental impressions of a person will be explicit, intense, and permanent if s/he possesses a smooth and consistent wax. For him, that is a precondition for quick learning and good memory. Conversely, those whose waxes are too soft will have impressions in their minds that are ambiguous and inclined to be blurred. As a result, these individuals are capable of learning in an adequate time but are rather prone to forgetfulness. Extending his metaphor, Socrates continues:

[...] whatever we want to remember of the things we see, hear, or we ourselves think of, by submitting it to our perceptions and thoughts, we strike off into this, as if we were putting in the seals of signet-rings. [...] whatever is wiped off or cannot get impressed, that we forget and do not know. (Plato, 1984, p. I-61)

As indicated above, when we want to keep the details of an experience or impression, we imprint it cognitively. On the other hand, anything that does not get enough attention tends to be forgotten. As long as the images related to the happenings are preserved, they will be remembered. However, when the images or impressions disappear, anything related to the subject of remembrance will concurrently disappear.

Throughout the dialogue between Socrates and Theaetetus, the definition of memory gains both active and passive features. According to Socrates, who verbalises the thoughts of Plato on memory, remembering is initially active; that is to say it is merely our mind that has the privilege of deciding what to remember in that we “subject the block to the perception or the idea and stamp the impression into it” when we want to remember (Draaisma, 2000, p. 24). In this respect, the individual’s own desires have an effect on the process of remembering. However, Paul Ricoeur, who is one of the prominent philosophers of the twentieth century and a supporter of Plato’s wax metaphor, defends the passive component of memory and states that the concept of the stamping process for Plato contains at the same time “the external causality of an impetus ... which is itself at the origin of pressing the seal into the wax” (2004, p. 51). Memory, to him, then, has two dimensions, as both comprising the things that we

ourselves desire to keep in mind and the things which are more passively experienced and leave a trace in our minds. This suggests that memory is situated somewhere between what we endeavour consciously to retain and what leaves an impression upon us.

The metaphor of the wax tablet, which Plato used in his writings on memory, is later perpetuated by Aristotle who nevertheless disagrees with him on various points. According to Douwe Draaisma, “more than Plato, Aristotle stresses physiological aspect of memory [...] gives the metaphor of the wax tablet, which in Plato is still a playful image, a more literal meaning” (2000, p. 25). More influenced than Plato by empirical thinking, Aristotle believed that the receiving sense organ carries the impressions of the material forms of external things (Whitehead, 2006). When the perception is over, the second process commences, and the image of the senses is then transferred to the soul, which serves as a vehicle for the acts of remembering and thinking. Hence, the images of the senses and the images of memory differ from each other. The latter is produced by, or derived from, the first through a kind of printing process. According to Aristotle, memory consists precisely of images acquired through senses. He does not subscribe to the idea of Plato that objects can exist independently of the sensual and material world. In this respect, Aristotelian memory may be identified as a physical process through which “something is literally stamped into the body, an impression with physiological features, a material trace” (Draaisma, 2000, p. 25). It can thus be concluded that the metaphor of the wax tablet gains a more authentic meaning with Aristotle. To him, the physical traces can endure unnoticed, embedded and without effect, which is to say that the individual may not be aware of these traces. However, they can be retained as images and any single sign can bring them to recollection level so the action of remembering is actualised.

In the very beginning of his book, *On Memory and Recollection*, Aristotle declares his thoughts about memory. To him, “memory is of the past”; it cannot be defined as a sensation or concept; instead it is a state of possessing them or the affection that originates from them in the process of time. The act of sensation belongs to the present, while the concept is related to the future. Based on this observation, he concludes that memory develops through time (Aristotle, 350 B.C.E/2007, pp. 25-27). He indicates that the stamping process is generated by recording the impression of the perception with respect to the past. The movement and change in this stamping

process are reminiscent of people using seal rings. A definite change occurs in mind, just like the change created on the wax while using a seal ring. To him, the happenings which are learned, experienced, and perceived leave traces in body and soul (Bloch, 25). Thus, memory is constituted by these traces of feelings and recollections. Plato considers memory as the “heart” of the soul and assigns an active role to it in the acts of thinking and demanding (Plato, ca. 369 B.C.E./1984, 194d). He thus paves the way for a memory design capable of predicting the future. An individual can plan the future by taking into consideration past happenings. Aristotle, on the other hand, unambiguously determines the boundaries and the subject of memory and posits that memory does not have such a realm of authority.

Hume endeavours, in *A Treatise of Human Nature* in Section III ‘Of the Ideas of the Memory and Imagination’ to define memory and imagination in order to make a distinction between their components. According to him, when an impression occurs in our mind, it comes back as an idea. If the new aspect of the impression has substantially retained its original vitality, it turns into a memory in mind. On the other hand, if the original impression is unclear and faded, it does not develop as a recollection but as imagination. As a consequence, the ideas of memory are more vivid and are stronger than those of the imagination:

When we remember any past event, the idea of it flows in upon the mind in a forcible manner; whereas in the imagination the perception is faint and languid, and cannot without difficulty be preserved by the mind steady and uniform for any considerable time. (Hume, 2009, p. 28)

Discriminating between imagination and memory, Hume stresses that there is a difference between them in terms of the efficacy of the recall processes related to them. When a previous happening is recalled, it reappears in mind in a persuasive and vivid manner. Conversely, in the process of imagination, what is sensed is dim and it requires effort to be retained by the mind. In addition, in this process, it is challenging for the mind to sustain the perception in a straight and perpetual form. In another section, entitled ‘Of the Impressions of the Senses and Memory’, Hume refers to the inclination of memory to degrade over time. He indicates that, after a long period of time, memory may inevitably be corrupted even if it is not completely erased. In the same way, it is difficult to determine whether an image is drawn from memory or

imagination as it does not have vivacity (2009). As a result, it is possible for imagination and memory to substitute for each other.

In the nineteenth century, a perception that memory was principally subjective and appertained to an inner life gathered momentum. In the late modern period, “individual subjectivity is overwhelmed by the persistence of the past and comes to seem dominated, indeed possessed by it” (Terdiman, 1993, p. 84). This was the result of a developing preoccupation concerning memory which arose in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century as a consequence of industrial revolution and modernisation as well as the developments in the field of technology. Traditional communities were destroyed with the outcomes of these factors, and these gave rise to the appearance of traumatic symptoms constituting the focus of Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalysis studies. The focus of memory studies changed with the unrecoverable ferocities actualised under the ideologies of Nazism and Communism, and centralised upon the memories of the people who experienced the practice of them. In addition to the effect of these ideologies, horror resulting from the Holocaust directed memory studies “producing a concentrated focus on the traumatic memories of those who survived its terrors” (Whitehead, 2006, p. 84). That massacre has been regarded as a profound point of focus on the traumatic memories of the members of the community who were exposed to its results. This anxiety both resulted in the continuity of the burden of the past on the present and suppressed individual subjectivity. Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche depicts that kind of memory as a burden. According to him, animals are happy thanks to their sudden forgetting; for the human being, on the contrary, the amassed burden of the past threatens to oppress him/her thoroughly: “he braces himself against the great and ever greater pressure of what is past: it pushes him down or bends him sideways, it encumbers his steps as a dark, invisible burden which he would like to disown” (Nietzsche, 1997, p. 61). Rebellious against this impossible burden, Nietzsche recommends forgetting the past, which becomes a complexity over time and results in the deprivation of one’s authority on the present and the ability to act.

Among the twentieth-century memory investigations, Henri Bergson’s approach to memory is particularly innovative as he was one of the prominent thinkers to highlight the significance of dealing with different kinds of memory. In his book, *Matter and Memory*, he brings into question the singularity of memory, asserting that it is virtually

a combination of two kinds of memory. First, habit memory that is formed by definite manners of automatic behaviour gained through repetition that “accumulates within the body” and second, “pure memory” which refers to the continuity of personal memories in the unconscious (Bergson, 1911, pp. 82-92). His analysis is regarded as fundamental in terms of his investigations into the importance of the body in modes of remembering. According to Edward S. Casey, Bergson was “the first philosopher to have devoted concerted attention to body memory” (1987, p. 147). His inquiry is significant in that the role of the body in methods of remembering had been overlooked until this time.

Consequently, with the contributions of the above-mentioned philosophers, memory studies have gained ground in time. In determining the function of memory and its probable effects on human life, psychology and physiology have been of great concern for different branches of science such as philosophy, psychology, literature and neurology. From a mnemonic system the subject of remembering proceeds to the act of reviving in order to generate a healthy and consistent individual identity beside the collective consciousness in a community. Philosophical assumptions as well as psychological studies indicate the prominence of recollection of past events in conducting life and constructing personality. It is at this point, that Stephenson's play *The Memory of Water* provides an opportunity of examining the significance of memory for the psychological well-being of the individuals. Containing numerous examples of recollections that bring into question the reliability of memory, the play presents a platform to discuss the relationship between memory and truth. Revealing the nature of the memory and its profound impact on individual experience, the play endeavours to demonstrate how memory forms the individual identity.

Memory and Recalling in Shelagh Stephenson's The Memory of Water

The Memory of Water presents the memories and complicated recollections of three sisters and their recently departed mother. The title of the play refers to homeopathy, a method of treating similar with similar that began in the first half of the nineteenth century. With this method, as mentioned in the play, “you can remove every last trace of the curative element from a water solution and it will still retain its beneficial effect” and that signifies the reality that water has memory: “You can dilute and dilute and dilute, but the pertinent thing remains. It's unseen, undetectable, untraceable, but

it still exerts influence” (Stephenson, 1996, p. 37). With this method, instead of the effect of the substance used to relieve the symptoms, the information copied into the water is used to abolish the knowledge of the symptoms of the poison (Emoto, 2018). In the play, the reference to the fact that a human body contains at least fifty percent of water is associated with the researches’ demonstrating the effect of both positive and negative environmental and social impact upon the individual.

Vi, the mother of the three estranged sisters, is the key person who brings together for her own funeral the middle daughter Mary who is a doctor, the eldest sister Teresa, who has a health food supplement store with her husband Frank and the youngest member of the family, Catherine, who constantly tries to draw the attention of her sisters by stating that she has always been excluded by the other family members, both in childhood and afterwards. In the play, the mother’s Alzheimer’s disease, Mary’s teenage patient who loses his memory after a kitchen accident, and the sisters perpetually recalling memories that contrast with each other are consistently interwoven by the playwright. Alfred Hicking emphasises the significance of the funeral for the plot structure of the play and opines that “there’s nothing like a funeral to bring out the worst in people” (2009). A funeral usually denotes an ending for human beings. However, in the play the funeral has an instrumental role in a re-evaluation of the past by reuniting the family members. This reunion serves several purposes, such as triggering the worst memories of their childhood, provoking fresh beginnings that unite them at the end of the play and freeing them from the misunderstandings related to collective memories of their childhood.

The play takes place in Yorkshire in winter during a snowstorm, which symbolises the atmosphere surrounding the sisters inside. Consisting of two acts, the play is performed in the departed mother’s bedroom where the siblings whom the funeral brings together quarrel from time to time as they try to organise the funeral arrangements. In that emotional atmosphere of reunion, they discuss memories related to their past which seem to have formed their lives. All the resentments and misunderstandings that have invaded their lives for years emerge, provoking an unavoidable confrontation with their past. The conflicts pertaining to their past re-emerge; and, thereby, a collision of memories is observed; and their personal secrets and thoughts are eventually unearthed. Through their conversations, the memories of each sister collide and, although they are compatible with one another in terms of time

and place, they cannot arrive at a mutual decision of who experienced what. As echoed in the final encountering of Vi, who appears on the stage posthumously in Mary's dreams, and says that she "felt like I'd gone away. Like I'd broken up into islands and in between was just a terrible muddle of old songs and odd names drifting by, men I vaguely recognized. I felt like a cut-up thing" (Stephenson, 1996, p. 86). The three sisters drift around their so-called islands of memory and cannot compromise with each other in relation to particular points of recollection. Nevertheless, their familial connection is the factor keeping them unified.

As the sisters gather in their family home for the funeral, the audience is invited to confront their mutual experiences in diversified versions. While they are all in their mother's bedroom, each sister waits for a telephone call from their partner. At this moment, Mary warns Teresa to switch off her telephone at this funeral, an act she forgot to do at their father's:

Teresa. I didn't know it was in my bag.

Mary. You could have turned it off. You didn't have to speak to them.

Teresa. I didn't speak to them.

Mary. You did. I heard you. You told them you were in a meeting.

Teresa. You're imagining this. This is a completely false memory.

Mary. All memories are false.

Teresa. Mine aren't.

Mary. Yours in particular.

Teresa. Oh, I see, mine are all false but yours aren't. (Stephenson, 1996, p. 7)

The quarrel between Mary and Teresa is one of most crucial conversations that emerge on memory and truth in the play. Teresa insistently asserts that what she remembers of their father's funeral is true. However, Mary argues with some details that Teresa is remembering wrongly; furthermore, she declares that all the recollections are false. To examine the reliability of memory, it is essential to review types of philosophical theories of memory which are the traditional archival view and the contemporary constructive view. According to the archival view of memory, memory is a passive device that works for recording, storing and reproducing the representations of significant past events when necessary. On the other hand, for constructivists, memory is not principally charged with reproducing details related to the contents of previous experiences. Because of that, remembering can actualise with

some minor misinterpretations and errors. Daniel M. Bernstein and Elizabeth F. Loftus state the constructivist location as:

All memory is false to some degree. Memory is inherently a reconstructive process, whereby we piece together the past to form a coherent narrative that becomes our autobiography. In the process of reconstructing the past, we colour and shape our life's experiences based on what we know about the world. (2009, p. 373)

In that scene, as the audience will witness at the end of the play, Teresa seems to remember the details incorrectly. However, she insists that she is truly recalling the event at that moment. Thus, the content of what Teresa persists in remembering is different from the content of the principal event. Memory preserves the content although there are discrepancies in details that turn out to be mistakes. Hume also supports the idea that memory is far from being flawless when he writes "memory preserves the original form, in which its objects were presented, and that wherever we depart from it in recollecting anything, it proceeds from some defect or imperfection in that faculty" (2009, p. 12). According to Hume, our recollections remain faithful to the initial forms but to a limited degree as, through the event of retaining, we partially lose the preciseness of what happened. As observed through the above conversation between Teresa and Mary, Teresa shows resistance to Mary's idea and does not accept the probability of not remembering accurately. Therefore, she asserts that what Mary remembers is not compatible with what really happened. The remembrance and recalling of their mutual childhood memories in falsified or changed ways shadow the reliability of their past memories. The conversation between two sisters reveals another significant detail about their memory: not only they have difficulty in interpreting their mutual experiences but also in determining which one of them is the subject of the experience. Inquiring possible answers to the questions "Can people create false memories of childhood experiences? Can people forget traumatic childhood experiences and many years later recover memories of the event?" Oakes and Hyman (2001, p. 88) declares two adverse explanations that are available: "The memory is either a false memory created in response to suggestions or a true memory recovered during adulthood" (89). Focusing on the part the self plays in fabricating memories, they allege that "Although memory helps us comprehend the self, the self also has a significant impact on memory" (p. 88). As reflected through the conversation of the

sisters, their memories are distorted, and it is obvious that their self and experiences have the crucial role in either remembering or reinventing the mutual happenings.

At the very beginning of the play, Mary and Teresa discuss their past experiences. Both of them feverishly defend their ideas about the main character of an incident they experienced when they were teenagers. The fact that they cannot reach an agreement creates uncertainty in the minds of the audience. It becomes challenging to decide which one is telling the truth. In spite of having a debate on one of their mutual recollections, they cannot come to a conclusion and end the discussion. Since enough information is not presented to the reader, the truth of the matter cannot be ascertained. According to Stan B. Klein, memory does not have to be relevant to truth. Regarding this possible lack of connection between memory and reality, he asserts:

There is no principled reason for episodic recollection to adhere to any particular degree of fidelity to the past; all that matters, from a functional perspective, is that the information supplied is beneficial to the adaptive challenges faced by the organism... Environmental regularities and the demands of reality place limits on which anticipatory behaviours will work, how well they will work, and which will fail. Nonetheless, within the (sometimes fairly broad) constraints imposed by reality, the memory content served up to consciousness need not entail 'precision of match' to past events as a criterion of success. (2014, pp. 438-439)

Episodic memory is the storage for our autobiographical personal experiences and happenings. To Klein, there are no strict rules that necessitate episodic recalls to be convenient to the past. If the provided information is satisfactory and helpful for the user in encountered situations, it would be functional. The desire of truth loaded on memory can make it difficult for the individual to sort out the convenient behaviour in different conditions. As a result, to combine past happenings and their recollections correctly need not to be an obligatory action for either Mary or Teresa. In this case, the playwright does not present a coherent agreement to finalise the discussion. This enables the audience to conclude the conversation between the two characters in their own minds, by taking into consideration the characters' personalities. The interactions between the siblings encapsulate the very essence of the reliability of the memory throughout the play. As it is not a novel or shorty story or as there is the absence of an omniscient narrator or interlocutor, the audience can solely rely on the interlocutors' transmissions of personal experiences or to some extend happening which were

witnessed by at least two characters. The crucial point that it is a play under examination restricts the audience to the examine the outburst of the sisters; make a connection between the events and their behaviours to come up with a plausible explanation for why there are disconnections and contradictions as well as to find out what actually literally happened in the past. It also provides an environment to think about their respective experiences and memory misconceptions. At this point a distinction can be made between memories which are false solely in detail and those which are entirely false. In the first case, the elements related to the experiences or happenings of the past are altered or condensed. However, in the second, there is a failure of corresponding completely with the past experiences. So, there may be errors in terms of details but that will not indicate that the memories are entirely false (Hamilton, 1998). Ainat Pansky et al. concur and further discriminate between “memory for gist” and “memory for details” (Pansky et al., 2000, p. 481). Memories can be defined as true in spite of having some deficiencies concerning the details related to the past recordings. One of the most crucial conversations of the characters which challenge the reliability of remembering brings about this subject of memory and truth:

Catherine. The only time I went to the beach, it was with you and you left me there. You forgot me. You didn't remember till you got home and Mum said, 'Where's Catherine?'

Teresa. That was Mary. She was too young, she was being a pain and showing off in Esperanto, so we ran away and left her. With no bus fare and the tide coming in. (Stephenson, 1996, p.23)

In this dialogue, in the light of the transferred recollections it can be deduced that one of the memories is false. The false memories can additionally generate into forms as temporally displaced memories and source monitoring errors. Temporally displaced memories are those in which the event reported did actually happen. However, the trouble with the time of the event is that it did not happen when the individual reported it to have done. On the other hand, source monitoring errors ensue when the individual confuses what s/he experienced first-hand with what s/he comes to learn through witnessing other sources (Bernerker, 2017). A real-life sample of that kind of relatively true memory is presented by Crombag and colleagues' research. The researchers studied the memories of one hundred Amsterdam residents when El Al Flight 1862, a Boeing 747 cargo aircraft crashed into a block of flats in Amsterdam in 1992. Although the crash was not filmed, it is found that 66 percent of the witnesses reported that they

watched the crash on television. Amsterdam residents gathered information from different sources to create an image of the accident, and for that reason, they accepted the idea that they had seen it on television (Crombag et al., 1996). In the case of the sisters, whether it was Catherine or Mary who was left on the beach, it can be assumed that Catherine reinvented the events and positioned herself as the protagonist of the happenings as explained by Mary and Teresa. The non-inferential (pure) memory allows the information content to expand. New information is constantly generated in memory, and the recalled event, unlike the experienced version, is combined with information from other sources. The information related to the happenings expands and thereby it becomes possible for someone to attach distinct notions and remember more than experienced. Here, Catherine situates herself in the position of Mary by interchanging memories. There three processes thought to be involved in the creation of false memories according to Hyman and Kleinknecht which are plausibility judgments, memory constructions and source monitoring errors (1999). The suggested event must be realistic for someone to fabricate a memory. To put it another way, the event must be something that the individual feels could have happened to them. A person must still create a memory—an image with a narrative—even if they think an event is probable or even happened. Every autobiographical memory is created by fusing personal experiences, suggestions, and demands from the present with schematic knowledge from other sources. Even if a person creates an image of a believable occurrence and thinks the image to be a personal memory, this is not a guarantee. In order to have a false memory, the participants must make a source monitoring error, they must claim the image as a personal memory (Oakes and Hyman, 2001).

The reasons behind the adoption of personally offending events belonging to childhood can be traced in the traumatic experiences and thoughts of the individual. Throughout the play Catherine perpetually complains about her childhood and her mother. Her memories and those of the other two constantly contradict each other. It can be deduced that Catherine's personal traits and life style were formed by her misevaluation of her mother and sisters. She arrives at her hometown for the purpose of participating in her mother's funeral; however, instead of instantly coming home and sharing the sorrow of that loss with her siblings, she does not inform them about her arrival or where she is staying and goes to have a drink with her friends. When she

finally comes home, she reveals that she went shopping and demonstrates what she has bought. As her behaviour expectedly disturbs the others, they remind her of the death of their mother, to which she unemotionally replies: [...] you want me to sit down and cry about it and I can't" (Stephenson, 1996, p. 14). The reason why she is so insensitive to what would normally be considered an immense loss lies in the belief that she did not love Vi and Vi did not love her. While talking about their childhood, she asserts having had "a horrible childhood" (Stephenson, 1996, p. 22). Mary and Teresa try to soothe her by asserting that they "all have the same childhood. It was not horrible" (Stephenson, 1996, p. 22). As a result of these discussions, Mary charges her with being an egomaniac and Teresa tries to persuade her to rethink by presenting the antithesis of what she remembers. Catherine utters her memories with the aim of demonstrating that she is remembering correctly: "She [their mother] had the cat put down without telling me. She shut me in a cupboard. She said it was an accident but it wasn't", "she excluded me from everything. She made me stay in the shop after closing time and count nails" (Stephenson, 1996, p. 23). The funeral and homecoming which play a crucial role in resurrecting the past, make Catherine recall these unwanted memories of childhood which have profoundly affected her entire life and thoughts. In this case, it will be beneficial to refer to involuntary memory which was first posited by Marcel Proust. Catherine recalls the moments of sorrow, grief and suffering that she involuntarily remembers. The memories she verbalises have been conserved, symbolising unhappiness and irreversible loss for her. They resurrect and reactivate the traumatic moments of her childhood. The past overwhelms her entire life and incapacitates both her present and future. According to James and Neisser memory forms an important part of how we perceive ourselves (1890, 1988). The individuals, who create false memories through various connections with their own self, can be shaped by these false memories over time, and these false memories have an important role in evaluating their selves, their positions in the social environment and their relationships with other people. As the self has a crucial role in construction of memories and as the self chooses reliable information for memory and frequently makes positive revisions to the past (Ross&Sicol, 1979), it may be deduced that under the effect of her thought of herself Catherine constructs her childhood memories in a fashion to make her family responsible for her current behaviours, feelings and lifestyle. In the light of the conversation between Mary, Catherine and Teresa, it can

be observed that they are sharing these memories with each other for the first time. As anxieties of the past emerge, discussing their misunderstandings gives the three sisters a chance of overcoming the haunting and pervasive power of the past.

When Catherine's and the other sisters' previously mentioned statements are taken into consideration, it becomes difficult to assess whether the initial representations of the events are compatible with the reminiscences of the events. As there is no possibility of directly accessing the original representation of the event and taking Catherine back to compare her recollection with the initial happening, indirect means such as existing photographs or rumours must be relied on. Validating the claimed recollections becomes a challenging task as the reliability of the event can change depending upon various conditions. Henry Habberley Price evaluates the problem as one where without relying on other memories, no one memory can be affirmed or refuted. It is commonly assumed that we may confirm or refute a memory judgment using current perception, such as by reviewing documents or records. Again, it is assumed that we will be able to do so by appealing to natural rules. Whatever, in both circumstances, we are depending on inductive generalizations, and the probability of an inductive generalization is obtained from past observations. However big the likelihood of an inductive generalization may be, its probability is determined from prior observations. We only have memory to confirm whether or not those previous observations were made, and if so, what kind of observations they were (1969, pp. 78-79). An inferential discussion on the reliability of experience turns out to be a vicious circle. It seems that the recollections of memory can only be validated by recollections of another memory. That is to say, the trustworthiness of the memory depends on presuming the authenticity of another memory. In the play, the sisters endeavour to persuade Catherine that the sorrowful events encompassing her life had not actually happened in the way she believes. Here, Mary's and Teresa's memories act as the signifiers of truth and purifying agents for Catherine to recover from her traumatic memories. This indicates that the funeral and homecoming proved beneficial as traumatic memories were confronted and challenged.

As the sisters come together for their mother's funeral, the family home triggers some old experiences which act as memory stimuli. The house, where the sisters used to live as children, reawakens the associations and feelings of them belonging to their childhood. Mary shares her feelings and thoughts with boyfriend, Mike:

Can you feel nostalgia for something that never really existed? I remember growing up here. I remember nightlights and a doll's house. I can see them in my mind's eye. And I'm not sure we had either. I find myself aching, longing for it. This half-imagined childhood. (Stephenson, 1996, pp. 37)

Mary has an opportunity to go through her memories which have faded into oblivion as there have not been reminders around her. In fact, the happenings in daily life are retained; past experiences are stored by the memory in a complete or deficient form available for present or future recollection. Conserving images and feelings belonging to experience implies that individuals are perpetually burdened by the past. The mind may carry with itself the entire memories. Here, Mary, through the stimulus of the house recalls childhood memories which are incomplete or not authentic. Her indistinct and scattered memories act as both resurrections of the past and a reconstruction of them in the present.

The other reason why Mary feels nostalgia for her past is because of the upsetting reality that she gave her child, Patrick, up for adoption. She feels incompetent and now desires to have a child. However, for her partner Mike having a child is no longer an option as he had a vasectomy. In Act II, while she dreams about her mother, Mary blames her for giving her child away. Perpetually yearning for, and wondering, about him she substitutes the loss of memory of her patient with no generated memories of her and Patrick:

Mary. I look at this patient of mine. This twenty-year-old boy lying in a hospital bed, completely blank, no memory of anything at all, just an empty vessel. And all I see is Patrick. Full of memories that I didn't put there, that someone else filled him with. And I think, did I give him anything? Is there some part of him that's still mine? Maybe he smiles like me. Maybe he walks like me. Maybe he doesn't. You made me obsessed. (Stephenson, 1996, p. 85)

Mary's condition, her questions regarding the memory generation of her son, foreground the significance of remembering and memories in individuals' lives. The reason why we recall our memories comes into prominence. Remembering and reminiscing are actions which are directly related to our construction of self and well-being. During the emergence of the modern era, John Locke had a central place in the field of memory studies as he associated memory with the concepts of personality and individualism. Ricoeur assuredly asserts that "the equating of identity, self, and memory... is the invention of John Locke at the beginning of the eighteenth century"

(2004, p. 97). Locke's characterisation of memory as an essential component of human identity is also expressed by Frances Ferguson who states that Locke demonstrated "the importance of memory for anchoring a sense of individual continuity over time" (1999, p. 509). Locke's approach to memory is crucial because, according to him, the continuity of memory actively creates the individual identity rather than merely being consistent with the behaviour or appearance. In order to have a psychological continuity, an individual should be able to construct autobiographical memories while, at the same time, narrate them to people, thus establishing a mutual relationship with parents, friends, society and finally the world (Fivush et al., 2011). Mary could not establish a healthy past in common with her son as her mother made her give him up for adoption, in order not to constrain her future ambitions and plans. That is why she recently complains about the lack of Patrick in her life and of losing the opportunity of constructing memory in common with him.

Following the three sisters' conversations, which are constructed upon misunderstandings related to their memories, the play delves into Mary and Vi's conversations, that act as a means of exculpation for Vi. Throughout their encounters, the mother and daughter have the opportunity of questioning their past and relationship. The play gives a broader picture and goes deeper into the misunderstandings and problems standing as a barrier in their mother-daughter relationship:

Vi. [...] You behave as if I'd no hand in the making of you. I took you on picnics, I got up in the night for you. And you remember the things you didn't have. Holidays not gone on. Bicycles never got. A particular type of shoe. How was I to know? When are we going to be done with this? I hear you talking and I think your memories aren't the same as mine. I remember the time of your childhood, and it seems to me that you don't remember it because you weren't there. (Stephenson, 1996, p. 53)

Witnessing all the conflicting memories of her children, Vi reproaches them for their unreal representation of their childhood memories recollected throughout the play. At that point, the assumption that one cannot question his/her own confident perceptual and memory beliefs reveals another aspect of the reliability of recall. Sydney Shoemaker indicates that "it is a necessary (logical or conceptual) truth, not a contingent one, that when perceptual and memory statements are sincerely and confidently asserted, i.e., express confident beliefs, they are generally true" (1963, p.

229). His argument proceeds with his assertion that what one believes to be true is also true of others. No one would claim that the perceptual and memory beliefs they have can potentially be false. They have to claim the authenticity of their recollections of experiences. This causes a problematic condition: the inability to question one's own confident memory beliefs does not necessitate accepting others' beliefs of confident memory without questioning. Witnessing others' incapacity to question their own confident memory beliefs is not equal to accepting them as either completely or generally true. In the play, Catherine cannot question her authenticity when reminiscing the past events. Thus, the others, who were the partners of her past and are conveying the same happenings in a contrasting form, become the references to rely on. Vi's statement also indicates that what Teresa and Mary assert happened is compatible with Vi's recollections.

The incompatibilities of memories among the family members bring their problematic relationship into question. They have built different memories about their shared experiences and have not attempted to resolve these misunderstandings until that time. This indicates the fragility of their bonds. They have daily constructed insurmountable obstacles between themselves with each misunderstanding:

Vi. I never knew how you felt. I never knew how you felt about anything. You thought your feelings were too rarefied to share with me. You cut me out. You looked straight through me. You shared nothing with me, not a joke, not a smile that wasn't patronising, you never let me in, you never let me know you. This stony punishment all these years, wanting me to be better than I am, always your mother, always responsible, always to blame. How could I apologise, when you wouldn't give me the room? (Stephenson, 1996, pp. 85-86)

The family environment, principally the attitudes of mothers and fathers, surely has crucial effects on children's styles of reminiscing. The positive and negative behaviours of parents and the emotional conditions in which mutual sharing is constructed contribute to the healthy memory formation of the children. Young children as active individuals in the family dynamics progressively construct their autobiographical self through interaction with their parents. Hence, parental practices of the shared past principally affect the style of reminiscing of the child (Wang, 2016). In addition, the vital interactions among the family members considerably affect the children's positive development (Cox and Paley 2003, p. 194). Here, Vi complains about her children's

distancing her from their activities. Throughout the play, it is clear that the family members have not engaged in any intense interaction with each other. When there was a misunderstanding or an offending action, they kept it to themselves and did not endeavour to rectify the situations that were deteriorating. This failure to talk about the experiences and their mutual memories has led to different perceptions and interpretations of past happenings. As a result, this has adversely affected their relationships and their attitudes towards each other. Here, by showing Vi in the dreams of her daughters, the playwright desires to assure her audience that all the misunderstandings are resolved and that the three sisters replace false memories with true ones so Vi can rest at peace after resolving the problems. This technique serves to promote the re-evaluation of their past in a shared environment. At the end of the play, when they are ready for the funeral, her daughters are in a state purged of false childhood memories and misunderstandings. As a result, they are also prepared for new beginnings.

One of the striking points of the play is the fact that, although she has Alzheimer's, Vi appears posthumously as a healthy woman who remembers the past correctly and who endeavours to annihilate the misunderstandings of the entire family. One may misremember either because of the fact that her/his memory malfunctions or because the representation fed into the memory process is false (Bernerker, 2017). Before dying, Vi forgets most of the things related to life and her environment as she has memory disorders because of her illness:

Teresa. Every month something else went, another wire worked itself loose. Not big things, little things. She used to put her glasses in the oven. 'What day is it?' she'd say, and I'd say, 'Wednesday,' and she'd say 'Why?' 'Well, it just is. Because yesterday was Tuesday.' And she'd say, 'There was a woman here with a plastic bucket. Who is she?' 'Elaine. You know Elaine. Your home help.' And then she'd look at me and we'd start all over again. 'What day is it?' I mean, she wasn't even that old. (Stephenson, 1996, p. 25)

Vi's disease is a key point of the play as it reminds us of the significance of remembering and having memories for human psychological health. Throughout the play, all the problems between the sisters and their mother stem from misunderstandings and wrongly established memories. When she was alive, Vi could not establish a balanced and durable relationship among the family members. Thus,

until now, their familial bonds were vulnerable to the smallest negations from their childhood years. Appearing posthumously on the stage, she, to some extent, rehabilitates their relationships and fulfills her last duty of motherhood. As a result, instead of having deficiencies of memory through to the end of her life, she acts as the secure source of past and memory in the play.

The term memory is utilised to refer to happenings through which information of the past is conserved and recalled when necessary. In *The Memory of Water*, recollections of the past function as determinants that ameliorate the poorly established fraternal and parental relationships. Each sister's perceptions and emotions ascribed to mutual experiences have put a wall between them. Nevertheless, the funeral provides the opportunity of reminiscing and examining their past and thereby eliminating the misperceptions. The play demonstrates how events can be perceived differently by each individual and how the interpretations of happenings can affect their personality. In addition to that, the play associates having memories with psychological well-being and constructing a healthy personality. The playwright interrogates the relation of memory with life through the words of Mary and thereby has the final crucial note for audiences: "But who did you feel like? Who are you if you take your memories away" (1996, p. 86). The autobiographical narratives are significant for a healthy perception of our surroundings and the world. This reality is emphasised in *The Memory of Water* by bringing forward familial relationships under the shadow of memories.

Conclusion

Memory, which has always proved to be a curious subject and studied in various scientific and philosophical contexts, also appears as a crucial issue in literature. Memory can be defined as a cognitive ability allowing retention in the mind of knowledge, experience, testimonies and memories related to the past. It plays a major role in understanding the events taking place today and the relationships established between events, in addition to trying to shape the near and far future with the deductions made from these events. It constitutes a crucial part of the human cognitive structure and has an undeniable effect on social life, personality formation and an overall perception of life. Developed and enriched as a result of experiences from an early age, memory shapes the personality of individuals and determines their social

assets. For this reason, memory that occurs as a result of both individual acquisitions and social interactions is vital for individuals.

The Memory of Water is one of the most significant contemporary British plays in which memory has been a central theme. Focusing on how inconsistent memories have an immense effect on the lives and personalities of the three sisters who gather for their mother's funeral, the play is notable in terms of its analysis of memories generated by distinct perceptions of events or misconceptions. Throughout this dramatic work, the events highlight questions about how we accumulate memories of our lives, why the ways of remembering are specific to individuals, and why the memories formed by emotional experiences are more permanent than daily experienced events.

In addition to questioning the importance of memory for individuals, this contemporary theatrical representation embodies the concept of the reliability of memory. It is revealed that an individual, who claims to make correct transferences of recollections, might have got the wrong impression at the outset of events. The way in which misunderstandings between siblings and parents have negative effects on their future relationships is explored. It is depicted, through the attitudes of the characters, that misconceptions affect their attitudes towards their family and even their seriousness towards life itself.

In *The Memory of Water*, the sisters' sense of self-construction in their family interactions facilitates both the forms and functions of their narrative identity. The audience is invited to confront the profound effects of memory and how the differences emerge in the mother-daughter or sister-sister reminiscing. Moreover, the play demonstrates how the malfunctions of memory contribute to the on-going emotional relationships and psychological well-being of the characters as well as leading to differences in an emotionally coherent sense of self. Their social interactions within the family subsequently determine the other forms of social interaction throughout their life. Their identities are constructed and understood within these social interactions. Catherine, Teresa and Mary have stories they tell about themselves. In order to be securely attached individuals or to develop a healthy identity, these stories reinforce the growth of their personalities and emotional relationships. It appears that to create

and maintain a sense of self as a secure, competent, and loved adult, healthy childhood interactions and emotional attachments have significant value.

Subsequently, *The Memory of Water* gives a broader picture of memory and delves more deeply into the inner lives of the three sisters and their mother, portraying the far-reaching effects of insecure memory and misunderstandings. Examining events from the very distinct past of the characters, Stephenson investigates the three sisters' reactions to their childhood and teenage experiences, and provokes them to confront their recollections of familial experiences, in order to reform their past from the perspective of the present. She fundamentally engages them in a nostalgic atmosphere so as to force them to foresee the future, as memory which primarily embodies the past, is also indirectly about the future.

In conclusion, adopting an emancipating attitude, for the three sisters' and their mother's revising their memories in a mental journey back to their past experiences prompts the awakening of consciousness, heals their wounds, reconstitutes dignity in their lives and achieves the reformation of their belated familial affiliations. Additionally, events centre on the reiteration of the emotional inferiority complexes of each character in the play. Upon investigating the relationship between healthy individual development and memory, the play demonstrates that the faculty of memory constitutes the human self and consciousness. From this perspective, the playwright reminds her audience of the paramount importance of communicating and sharing among the family members or within a social environment, as misattribution shows up as an imperfection of memory.

References

- Bergson, H. (1911). *Matter and Memory*. (N. M. Paul & W. S. Palmer, Trans.). New York, The Macmillan Co.
- Bernecker, S. (2017). Memory and Truth. In S. Bernecker & K. Michaelian (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Memory* (pp. 223-249). Routledge.
- Bernstein, D.M., & Loftus, E.F. (2009). How to Tell if a Particular Memory is True or False. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 370–74.

- Billingham, P. (2011). Shelagh Stephenson. In M. Middeke, P.P. Schnierer & Aleks Sierz (Eds.), *The Methuan Drama Guide to Contemporary British Playwrights* (pp. 466-486). UK, Methuen Drama.
- Bloch, D. (2007). *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection*. Boston, Brill.
- Casey, E. S. (1987). *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study*. USA, Indiana University Press.
- Coleman, J. (1992). *Ancient and Medieval Memories Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past*. UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (2003). Understanding Families as Systems. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12(5), 193–196. doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.01259
- Crombag, H.F.M., Wagenaar, W.A., & Van Koppen, P.J. (1996). Crashing Memories and the Problem of 'Source Monitoring'. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 10, 95–104.
- Draaisma, D. (2000). *Metaphors of Memory: A History of Ideas about the Mind*. (P. Vincent Trans.). UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Emoto, M. (2018). *Suyun Gizli Mesajı*. (S. Demirci, Çev.). İstanbul, Kuraldışı.
- Ferguson, F. (1996). Romantic Memory. *Studies in Romanticism*, 35(4), 509–533. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25601195>
- Fivush, R., Habermas, T., Waters, T. E.A., & Zaman, W. (2011). The Making of Autobiographical Memory: Intersections of Culture, Narratives and Identity. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(5), 321-345.
- Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The Collective Memory*. (F.J. Ditter & V. Y. Ditter, Trans.). New York, Harper and Row.
- Hamilton, A. (1998). False Memory Syndrome and the Authority of Personal Memory-Claims: A Philosophical Perspective. *Philosophy, Psychiatry, and Psychology*, 5, 283–97.
- Hansen, J. (2015). Theories of Memory and the Imaginative Force of Fiction. In Siobhan Kattago (Ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies* (pp. 197-208). ASHGATE.

- Hicking, A. (2009, 31 July). *The Memory of Water*. The Guardian, www.theguardian.com/stage/2009/jul/31/the-memory-of-water-review.
- Hume, D. (2009). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. London, The Floating Press.
- Hyman, I. E., Jr., & Kleinknecht, E. E. (1999). False Childhood Memories: Research, Theory, and Applications. In L. M. Williams, & V. L. Banyard (Eds.), *Trauma and Memory* (pp. 175-188). Sage.
- Kent S.R. (1968). Dissoi Logoi or Dialexeis. *Mind*, 77(306), 155-167.
- Klein, S.B. (2014). Autonoesis and Belief in a Personal Past: An Evolutionary Theory of Episodic Memory Indices. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, 5, 427–47.
- Koriat, A., Goldsmith, M., & Pansky, A. (2000). Towards a Psychology of Memory Accuracy. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, pp. 481–537.
- Locke, J. (1999). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. USA, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Nietzsche, F. W. (1997). *Untimely Meditations*, (D. Breazale, Ed.), (R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.) UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Oakes, M., & Hyman, I. (2001). The Role of the Self in False Memory Creation. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 4 (2), 87-103.
- Plato. (1984). *The Being of the Beautiful, Plato's Theaetetus, Sophist, and Statesman*. (S. Benardete, Trans.). USA, The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published ca 369 B.C.E.)
- Price, H. H. (1969). *Thinking and Experience*. USA, Harvard University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (2004). *Memory, History, Forgetting*. (K. Blamey & David Pellauer, Trans.). USA, University of Chicago Press.
- Ross, M., & Sicoly, F. (1979). Egocentric Biases in Availability and Attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 322-336.
- Schechtman, M. (1994). The Truth about Memory. *Philosophical Psychology*, 7, 3-18.
- Shoemaker, S. (1963). *Self-Knowledge and Self-Identity*. NY, Cornell University Press.

Spragueh, R. K. (1968). Dissoi Logoi or Dialexeis. *Mind, New Series*, 77(306), 155-167.

Stephenson, S. (1996). *The Memory of Water*. Drama Online.

Terdiman, R. (1993). *Present Modernity and the Past Memory Crisis*. NY, Cornell University Press.

Wang, Q. (2016). Remembering the Self in Cultural Contexts: A Cultural Dynamic Theory of Autobiographical Memory. *Memory Studies*, 9(3), 295-304.

Whitehead, A. (2006). *Memory the New Critical Idiom*. Routledge.