Stompin' on Scott: A Cursory Critique of Mind and Memory

EDWARD S. CASEY

State University of New York at Stony Brook

My remarks will bear on the earliest Scott and the latest, his Alpha and Omega as it were. That is to say: his first published book and a book that is about to be published, one no longer in print and one not yet in print. My strategy will be Janusian, looking back and looking forward, hoping to catch glimpses of things that illuminate what lies in between these two works. By this pincers movement—one arm embracing the first official thoughts of the man we honor today, the other reaching out to his newest thinking—we shall learn something rather different than if we had moved through his work *seriatim*, one work at a time. Instead, we shall consider two at one time, this very time: two will do.

Especially when, as in this case, the first book bears on imagination; the last on memory. Two topics I have treated myself. More importantly, two topics that call for each other, like confraternal twins and not unlike Zeus and Hades, two figures of recurrent concern to Scott: Zeus inhabiting the aithereal world of the high heavens (where free imagining is apt to place itself) and Hades the dark depths (in which memory is most at home). But as Scott himself knows better than anyone, matters are considerably more complex than this.

I

We see this complexity already at play in Charles Scott's *Boundaries in Mind*, published in 1982. Scott's first book, it was also the occasion of my first blurb on a book. I wrote then words to which I would adhere now:

> This is a work of original thought. Thanks to this volume, Scott will take his place among the foremost three or four philosophers who write in the Continental tradition. . . . I cannot think of a recent book whose scope is so extensive—cutting across philosophy, psychology, history, and religion—while its substance is so remarkably deep.[1]

Well, here we are a little more than fifteen years later, celebrating Scott as indeed one of the leading Continental thinkers of his time. It all began with *Boundaries in Mind*. This is a remarkably wide-ranging book that moves from myth to psychotherapy (its subtitle is: "Immediate Awareness Based on Psychotherapy"), while traversing an entire middle realm of mind in its many states, its polymorphic profusion. In the middle of this middle is imagination, "that gentlest force," as Hume said, "that commonly prevails."

Scott himself rarely uses the word "imagination" or even my own preferred term, "imagining." This is due to his rightful resistance to a reductive reading of imagination as having to do with "images," where these latter connote something merely secondary, a mere replica, an εἰκών that signifies a copy of something else considered superior in status or prior in generation. As Scott says: "*image* probably means to us a re-presentation: an image of the dance last night; I carry your image in my mind . . . [This] means 'imitating reality', as distinct to being real. . . . Or if not imitating, producing something that is not really real, but is like something else that is real."[2]

Missing from this replicative sense of image is what I like to call its "purely possible" dimension, its nonconfinement to the real, its sheer excess. Scott prefers to speak here of *fantasy*, reminding us of the root of this latter word in *phan-*, signifying light, manifestation, showing, coming to visibility: "*Phantasia* meant the appearing of the hidden, and in our context we can say that it meant coming to an explicit awareness of mind."[3] Thus fantasy is not a re-presentation but a *presentation* in the strong German sense of *Darstellung* that Scott borrows from Gadamer: "Fantasy, as an autonomous event, *presents something*."[4] It presents something original and not derived, as in a re-presentational image. *Phantasia* utterly exceeds εἰκασία.

Moreover, where *image* and *imagination* imply something interior, subjective, and worldless, fantasy (not to be confused with mere revery or daydream) takes us back out of the subject and into the world via such exterocentric forms as dreams and intuitions. Far from plunging us further into the subject, fantasy is a "world-event" in Scott's term. It is a happening of truth, rich with resonances of being-in-the-world. Fantasy does not take us *down* or *in* but *up* and *out*. It is, quite literally, phantastic.

Here Charles Scott does me one better. I had not fully appreciated these desubjectifying aspects of imagination when I wrote my book *Imagining* in the middle 1970s. I suspect that it was the common influence of James Hillman that turned each of us away from the subjectifying side of phenomenology. Hillman,

who presided over a heretical and philosophically suggestive form of Jungian psychoanalysis, was turning resolutely toward a concept of *anima mundi*, "soul of the world." (Scott and I had both attended the epochal first Archetypal Psychology conference at Notre Dame in 1978.) Hillman made a convincing and eloquent case for the location of archetypes in the surrounding world rather than in the collective unconscious; he proposed that the archetypal dimension *animates* the world of ordinary experience, enlivening it in our actions as much as in our thoughts. At the same time, Hillman embodied, in his person as well as in his thought, an ideal that Scott and I shared in those times: the intimate marriage of phenomenology and psychoanalysis.

Scott had found a parallel message even earlier in the existential psychoanalysis of Medard Boss, with whom he studied and talked at length in 1972–73 in Zurich. Scott's first edited collection was entitled *On Dreaming: An Encounter with Medard Boss*, published as a special issue of *Soundings* in 1977. There he wrote in his Introduction that "The self-presentations of meaning [in dreams], their availability for descriptive account, are apparent to Boss when he views them as ways of being in the world."[5] Here we have, already assembled, some of the main ingredients of Scott's view of fantasy as set forth five years later: self-presentation (i.e., *Selbst-Darstellung*, rather than anything belonging to the order of *Vorstellung*), descriptive account (i.e., phenomenology), and being-in-the-world (the Heideggerian source-concept for Boss and Scott alike). Fantasies, like dreams, are world-events—"way[s] of being related with things."[6]

Beyond these various influences, Scott made his own way in *Boundaries in Mind*. He did so mainly by his scintillating discussion of "awareness," direct or "immediate" awareness. He stressed immediacy of awareness in order to guard against an interpretative model, such as is found in Freud and Jung alike. At the same time, awareness is not coextensive with consciousness, for it is a basic premise of Scott's that *one can be aware without being conscious*. The best example is that of fantasy itself: think of all the fantasies that populate the periphery of our explicit consciousness, *demimondaines*, fugitives of mentation. These are neither focused imaginings nor repressed thoughts nor even drawn-out reveries. They are something still different from these; not explicitly conscious, they are *coming to consciousness*; not entirely unconscious, they belong to experience.

It was Scott's genius in *Boundaries in Mind* to have opened up this whole realm of immediate awareness—to have brought it to our attention in the first place, and to have explored it in considerable detail. Part of my aim in this paper is to remember this book for the signal achievement it was and still remains. In it, Scott showed more insightfully than anyone else how

> our awareness happens as dream, fantasy, intution, and [a] break [with] common sense. These awarenesses often seem foreign to us. Our awareness at first seems vast to us in comparison to the consciousness that we own as ours in particular. We tend to disown our extended awareness, to refuse the

> otherness of our own being by trivializing it or by attributing the awareness in difference to other beings, to dark outer regions, or whatever. But we are the dreams and fantasies and breakages that occur in mind. . . . The creation of fantasy in all its forms, the aware engendering of further awareness, testifies to the excess of awareness [that exists] in relation to [personal] identity.[7]

Here is a remarkable description of what might be called "laterality in mind," that is, the way the human mind occurs as much by indirection as by direction, by difference as by identity, by the marginal as by the central. In keeping with deconstructive tendencies of the time, but in his own fresh manner, Scott was removing the self-identical human subject from the center of the field of consciousness. And he was doing so by reference to what would formerly have been considered beneath the dignity of intentionality or intellection: namely, fantasy (in all its variations as dream, passing thought, abortive memory, and the like).[8] Fantasy is the unofficial, yet powerfully subversive power of mind. It is the difference (from ego, controlling self) that makes a difference (to that ego and self). It is the difference of differences: the difference from controlling agency and the difference that always occurs differently, in the most various guises. Where others sought such difference in language or the unconscious (Lacan) or in repetition (Deleuze) or in sexual difference (Irigaray) or in Différance itself (Derrida), Scott was alone in proposing that it is to be found in fantasy.

That is to say: in fantasy as the exemplary case of immediate awareness. This latter is intrinsically polymorphic:

> Our account of immediate awareness has involved us in a variety of indirections: the metaphors and myths of Hermes, the happening of fantasy, the simultaneity of being one and being many, an interpretation of mind as world-event, finding ways to speak of being aware without subjective interest, attending to depth occurrences of polyvalences, remaining in touch with a dimension of happening free of identity and sense of self, the myths of light and dark, and so forth.[9]

Now this very diversity of modes in which immediate awareness occurs calls for some kind of gathering, not as a totality[10]—any more than the ethical person is totalizable for Levinas—but in some other way. This other way is named MIND by Scott. It is what allows us to be both one and many, forever various yet forever coherent, one-and-many at once.

Mind is not anything subjective. It is more about other people, concrete things, and history than it is about any egological concept of mind. Mind occurs when "I allow each moment to dissolve as it happens, when I let things be without insisting on anything regarding them."[11] "Boundaries *in* Mind" names this paradox of being unbounded in sheer diversity outside oneself but bounded within oneself. Mind is "free for its many boundaries,"[12] since any given act of

mind occurs as *this* act of fantasy, or *that* act of remembering, or *that other* act of feeling.

Scott's premises are quite different from those of traditional epistemology. His first axiom is that "awareness is the event of mind."[13] Mind *happens* as awareness; it becomes an *event* just insofar as it is acutely aware. Only when it is restricted as event—bound to the strictures of objective evidence and deductive thinking—is it less than fully mindful. Where mind was presumed to reach its apogee as intellect in the ancient world and as understanding in the early modern era, Scott sees mind finding itself, becoming eventful, in its many modes of awareness. This is equivalent to finding itself in its own dispersion, in what Aristotle would have called contemptuously a mere "heap." But the choice is not that between the disarray of a heap and the rigorous unity of knowledge, but rather, between the ungathered outwork of many mindings and the oneness of mind gathered in upon itself.

The second axiom of the early Scott follows forthwith: *mind is world-event*. Here the full force of Scott's paradoxical view becomes manifest. Not only is mind an event—that much might have been glimpsed, however faintly, in the idea of "mental act"—but it is an event that realizes a world or, better, *is a world, happens as world*. What can this mean? How can *mind*, supposedly the most self-enclosed of entities, occur as *world*, that most open of all things? Scott answers: "Our being happens as immediate alertness, always capable of reflecting itself to itself and reflecting itself in the happening of things, always open in the presence of whatever happens, and also always capable, in its openness, of shutting itself off from parts of itself."[14] In such openness of mind, one *lets things appear*. It follows that *world*-openness "names the region of appearing"[15]—by which Scott does not mean anything like attaining full presence. He avoids recourse to plenitude—and thus the metaphysics of presence—by holding that world-openness "does not mean the absence of hiddenness, but our openness for the forthcoming of hiddenness as well as of other ways of being.[16]

In openness of mind, the world's hiddenness comes to light; mind and world meet in the middle—in the appearing (to mind) of the hidden (of the world). Given this paradigm and its two axiomatic bases, Scott can conclude that mind is a *world-event*: or rather, in his own strikingly straightforward formulation, "world happens as mind."[17] Mind does not perceive or represent world, sense or know it; these classical models presume that mind as self-enclosed reaches out to world as something independent in its being. Instead, world extends itself to mind, occurs as mind, mind is its minion rather than the other way around.

Just here I want to raise a series of questions regarding this last line of thought, the very core of *Boundaries in Mind*. First, I am left unclear as to the exact contribution of fantasy to mind—and thus to world's happening as mind. Is it—as I have been presuming—of quite signal importance in experiencing

world-events? This makes sense if it is fantasy; more than any other such event, fantasy helps us break free from the constrictions of previous paradigms of mind as representational, reproductive, etc. Yet Scott seems to undermine this pre-eminence in two ways: first, by positing a proliferation of free enactments of world-event in the realm of mind (e.g., dreaming, intuiting, unconstrained thinking, etc.) in which no single act can count as privileged; second, by saying that mind can happen equally well as fantasy or as non-fantasy: "Fantasy and non-fantasy . . . are both events of awareness. . . . Non-fantasy is a happening of mind."[18] But if non-fantasy (as examples of which, Scott gives thinking through a mathematical formula or working with a computer) is just as mindful as fantasy, then what is finally special about fantasy?[19]

A second line of questioning is this: can mind, in however expanded a sense we take it (whether it occurs mainly as fantasy or in other primary modes), really bear the brunt of all that Scott attributes to it? Certainly he is right to extend the mental far beyond the straitened limits within which empiricism and its many derivatives had attempted to confine it. But can it bear the weight of the world on its slender shoulders? Is not believing it can to incur an Atlas complex? What of the body, a mode of being rarely mentioned in this book? Does it not have at least equal responsibility for world-openness? Is it not itself a world-event of major magnitude?

A third and even more basic question is this: Why insist so staunchly on *awareness*, especially in its "immediate," "alert," and "explicit" modalities? What of the unthematized, the non-immediate, the unalert, the inexplicit? All of these latter stop short of the unconscious, and yet they, too, are valid ways of being-in-the-world. It is a momentous step to encompass consciousness with awareness as the more generous term—this is Scott's seminal contribution in the philosophy of mind—but to take this step should not hinder us from acknowledging the less than aware, even the *unaware*. It is not surprising that one of the subthemes of *Boundaries in Mind* is the importance of "heeding": "as one heeds," remarks Scott, "one takes notice."[20] But what of that domain where one does not yet, or perhaps ever, take notice? Does not this not have its own *droit de l'esprit*—with as much right of place as awareness and consciousness, on one side, and the repressed and the unconscious, on the other? Scott's expansion of the aware calls for a consequent expansion of the unaware: perhaps *these* two realms, and not just Mind and World, meet in the middle region of appearing, where everything comes to presence, to visibility, out of its endemic hiddenness.[21]

II

One thing that is *not* hidden is the manifest philosophical virtue of Scott's first book. It contains, in *status nascendi*, much to come in his later work. For exam-

ple, *difference*, a thematic that I have barely touched upon but which is indispensable to the dynamics of *Boundaries in Mind*. These boundaries themselves occur *in-difference*; they are themselves differences, among which there are various kinds of kinship.[22] "We are the differences," this book proclaims, "that are set against our identities."[23] The exploration of difference was to be pursued in Scott's next book, published five years later, *The Language of Difference*.[24]

For another example: *memory*. Already in *Boundaries in Mind* there are suggestive references to memory. Heeding, for instance, is closely linked with memory, and this is so because mind's own "first region of meaning is the experience of remembering, an experience that involves heeding, being reminded, recollecting."[25] Indeed, so deep is the link between mind and memory that we begin to wonder if memory is not more affine with mind than is fantasy—as the roots of "mind" and "memory" alike intimate (*memor* in Latin means 'mindfulness'). But Scott, having briefly acknowledged this direction of thought,[26] deftly sidesteps its implications. He also evades the question of how fantasy and memory are related to each other: here I would ask if there can be a *pure* fantasy bereft of any memorial root? His own claim as to the intrinsic historicality of awareness, its twin source in "the remembered and the forgotten,"[27] would seem to indicate that fantasy itself, that ostensibly most exemplary mode of mind, is memorious through and through. As is awareness. As is mind itself. As is the world itself. For my money, awareness as world-event occurs as much by memory as by fantasy, as much by recollection as by perception, as much by reminding as by intending. These avenues of thought are at least nascent in *Boundaries in Mind*; but the explication of memory as a major boundary in mind and of mind had to bide its time—fifteen full years of time.

III

And this brings us right to *The Time of Memory*, the newest work of Charles Scott. Ironically, the book not (quite) yet is about the no longer. The new work is a work about old things, and in particular about the loss of old things in memory. Where fantasy in the earlier work concerns *gaining* the world—gaining its openness, its eventfulness—memory in the later text is concerned mainly with the *loss* of world, its becoming uneventful, closed, and no longer open. The very description of memory alters accordingly. Where in *Boundaries in Mind* Scott could say that "in remembering we live out *continuities* in which what has gone by is linked . . . with the upcoming,"[28] now he will discover discontinuities, gaps, fissures, fadings, and the like everywhere he looks. Take, for example, his inaugural example: a moving memory of an incident of his boyhood in Weewoka, Oklahoma: he is going to a local grocery store to buy some things and finds himself suddenly wanting to be at the store before he actually

gets there, and then (after making purchases) to be home again before he gets there too: in both cases, imagining himself to be Plastic Man, leaping over the spatial interval in one instant. (I call this an "incident" of memory, although I suspect that it is in fact either a compounded memory—i.e., a memory of something that happened at least several times—or else a screen memory, that is, a later construction projected back upon an earlier time.)

Notice that fantasy is here operative *within* memory, acting as an essential supplement. What perceived (and now remembered) reality could not yield, fantasy can supply. Says Scott: "I fantasized that I was Plastic Man and could stretch my body in an instant to wherever I was going."[29] Here to fantasize is to get and gain what is missing in perception or lost in memory. The most obvious instance of this latter is the quite ordinary phenomenon of *confabulation*, wherein the remembering subject intercalates fictitious elements or events into a memory without awareness of the intercalation. Similarly, *paramnesia* is a matter of remembering something that was not ever experienced—hence the French term for paramnesia, "*faussse reconnaissance*." Paramnesia is thus the converse of *amnesia*, in which we forget what we have have in fact experienced.

What is intriguing about Scott's new project is that he is exploring a memorial zone that is not to be classified strictly either as amnesia or as paramnesia—nor, for that matter, confabulation. His interest is in the fading of memories into oblivion, that "dim boundary" (in his own term) that lies between explicit recall (what I like to call "recollection," i.e., the express visualization of a past event) and complete forgetfulness (let us call this lethic loss). The loss at issue for Scott is not complete—or else it could not be known *as loss*. In other words, it is a question of demi-oblivion, of the partially remembered and partially forgotten—in a complex commixture, however, in which what is recalled and what is forgotten may not be easily distinguishable, if at all. Old English had a word for this state of mind: the "obliviscence." But the word does not matter; it is the phenomenon that counts. Scott's description of it is telling and apt. I see it as an extension of his very first project of recounting modes of awareness that are neglected in official epistemologies—mindings at the edge of mind itself.

This is not to say that we are being treated to just another descriptive exercise, concerning merely another form of awareness. If Scott is right, this one inhabits all the rest, shadows them by its haunting presence (where "haunting" connotes an uneasy admixture of absence and presence, their mutual embroilment: "a ghostly quality of withdrawn presence,"[30] in Scott's own words). The haunting of and by memorial loss is what allows it to spread to other acts of mind and to pervade them as the coming of dusk pervades everything in its outreach. If it is true that "memorial losses are beyond my grasp,"[31] this is not a merely nugatory claim, a claim about loss pure and simple, lethic loss. "The inchoate quality [of loss]," remarks Scott, "seems to compose part of the scenic

quality [of the recollection]."[32] This means that, being ungraspable, such losses can insinuate themselves into every significant form of minding, becoming their dark underbelly as it were: Scott pushes this aspect of memorial loss to a paradoxical limit: "[the] loss of memory appears to be part of the vividness of my memory."[33]

The most convincing basis for this pan-pervasiveness of memorial loss is not merely its nebulous character, however. It is to be found in the fact that the loss bears on more than the past; it also pervades every phase of temporality. Scott gives a dramatic account of how, in remembering his childhood Weewoka experience, the loss concerns not just the past (i.e., in the form of unrecollected details, the "gaps" in memory), but the present in two senses: the *past* present of the event remembered (when loss was present in the sense that he could never catch up with where he might have been had he started to go to the store earlier, as well as in the form of a dying woman who lived on the route to the store: "Grandmother Cox" was about to become absent) and in the *present* present of remembering (when Scott is all too acutely aware of not retaining the full experience). And these two losses are in turn intimately connected: "my present experience of loss in this memory mimics part of what I experienced then as lost."[34] Even more strikingly, mnemic loss belongs to the future as well: first, in the basic facticity that *every* personal memory "will die with me," as Scott says curtly—that "it has oblivion in its (and my) future."[35] Second, in the equally basic circumstance that a past possibility that was lost *then* (e.g., getting to the store instantly like Plastic Man) is *eo ipso* a lost *future* possibility as well: once wholly lost, forever lost, in matters of memory. Or is it? Scott writes: "My experience then of a lost future belonging to a lost, past possibility is intensified as I wrote of those events in what I can now say composes for them a future that both loses them and *retains them in a dim and ghostly way*."[36]

All of time, then, is haunted by memorial loss—implicated in it, lost in it even. If it is the case that "a lot of loss . . . figures in the memory [of anything],"[37] then such loss is coextensive with time itself. Just as memorial loss figures everywhere in aware life, so the essencing of time is such as to be always at a memorial loss. Now we see why Scott chose the otherwise enigmatic main title for his book: "The Memory *of Time*." For he is not writing—as Husserl did, for example, and before him St. Augustine and Kant—about the Time of Memory, but about the way that Memory belongs to Time itself, as flesh of its flesh, existing "in the light of its flesh."

What, then, is memory? Scott defines it thus: it is the way that past events "appear in remnants of effects and affects and in present expressions and transformations of influence."[38] That is pretty abstract! As Scott himself realizes: hence his skepticism as to the ultimate definability of memory as one kind of item. "Like 'awareness', 'memory' does not suggest one thing or a unitary

phenomenon. It is not a same thing of which there are more or less dominant and subordinate parts. . . . We cannot say that memory as such 'is'."[39] Memory is not strictly definable for three reasons: first, like awareness, memory has many, indefinitely many, forms; second, it is always in flux and transformation; third, memory cannot be one kind of thing because it is literally everywhere in our lives: "memory and its loss accompany all events to which we can refer in any way."[40]

Scott's skepticism as to the desirability, indeed the possibility, of bracketing or neutralizing memory so as to get to its essence[41] contrasts with my own earlier effort to find some such essence—and precisely by phenomenological description. Curiously enough, however, after an initial and quite brief description of eidetic features and intentional structures—both part of "Keeping Memory in Mind" (the title of Part One of my book *Remembering*)—I found myself divagating from any such strictly phenomenological approach, first by delving into "mnemonic modes" such as reminiscing, reminding, and recognizing (the leading example of which, incidentally, was my recognizing Charles Scott himself at a distance in the South Bend airport at the very Archetypal Psychology conference to which I have already referred!). From there, I descended further into the morass of memory—into body memory, place memory, and commemoration. As Adrienne Rich might say, I "dove into the wreck"!

The difference between the two of us is found in the fact that I took 150 pages before I realized how messy memory really is, whereas Charles Scott knew it sagely from the start. He began *in medias memoria*. Strangely enough, however, we rejoin each other by converse courses. For in the end, Scott does discern certain structures and permanencies in memory; even if not eidetic, these are memorial constants, patterns in the life of remembering.

The patterns take four shapes. First, there are mythic invariants that he traces brilliantly through such metastable figures as Dionysus and Apollo, who take on the same guiding presence as did Hades and Zeus in *Boundaries in Mind*, though now even more effectively and powerfully. These mythical polarities—in the company of Hermes and Lethe, Mnemosyne and Lesmosyne—take Scott not only into the mess; they also teach us how to live and prosper there. Then, there is the illumination cast constantly by the leitmotif of loss. As is said so eloquently, "lost to its metaphors, lost to its [own] determination[s], passing, seemingly everywhere in human life: memory in its loss is the subject of this book."[42] In countless ways, each time new, Scott returns to this great theme. Third, once in a while Scott draws back from the abyss of loss and does, after all, offer something like a working definition of memory. I cited one of these just above (i.e., memory as an affair of effects and affects of events, etc.). Others emerge, and two in particular. On the one hand, memory is *mindful* in ways that stretch beyond cognition in any usual sense: "Memory occurs as feelings,

immediate states of mind, lost presence, and determinate senses of life."[43] On the other hand, memory happens as the appearing of *things*[44] and thus as belonging not just to human or animal mind but to the *world*—just as awareness, earlier, was shown to induce world-openness. And in both cases, the crucial category that links mind and world remains the same: EVENT. One remarkable sentence in *The Time of Memory* brings awareness and memory together precisely in terms of this category: "By showing that awareness is not necessarily an event that describes individual people, I wish to show that it is characterized by an unencompassable 'quality', by difference from an individual's consciousness [i.e., as something that inheres in things as well], and that part of its difference is found in *events* of loss and forgetting."[45]

A fourth and final way in which Scott manages to discern pattern in the midst of the morass of memory is through propounding a series of paradoxes or "tensions," as he likes to call them. Despite (or perhaps because of) the tensions, each illumines an important aspect of memory and its loss. We have just encountered one of them; there is human memory *and* there is what Merleau-Ponty calls "the world's vast Memory."[46] Each is richer for the existence of the other. Other tensions include the following:

(i) *description of memory vs. memorial content*: the necessarily abstract character of the description or formulation of what memory is like, in contrast with the experience of remembering itself; here Scott himself effects a partial resolution in his own writing, a writing that is itself memorious, steeped in memory: "Abstraction, formulation, and all other kinds of representation have their own memorial dimensions. They too are memorial events. But they are often—I would say usually—different events from those that they address, signify, and understand (or misunderstand). The tension is found in this difference."[47]

(ii) *representational vs. nonrepresentational*. This is a closely related tension. Memory, especially construed as recollection, is traditionally considered under the heading of truth of representation (e.g., via trace, isomorphism, accuracy, veracity, etc.). Yet memory itself often concerns the unrepresentable, above all in its deep dimensionality of loss: "encounters [in memory, as again in awareness] can occur with alertness and without a dominance of representation or reflection."[48] Just as memory can include the nonrepresented, the implicit and tacit, aspects of things, so writing about memory can also incorporate the same factor: Scott says defiantly that "Nothing will be 'captured' by the thinking and writing of this book. Rather than a system of memory that can be reproduced, I find memory's escape from systems and formulations."[49]

(iii) *voluntary vs. involuntary*. In fact, involuntary memory itself (Proust's term originally) generates its own tension with deliberate and willful remembering. Scott's prey throughout his new work is on what he calls "gifts without fire": memorial treasures that we do not seek and that bring back the past and its loss unbidden in bodily and mental, individual and institutional, ways.[50] This is

to reverse the entire Western tradition of privileging an actively seeking memory, already evident in Aristotle's definition of recollection as "a search in something bodily for an image."[51] Such searching certainly exists and is important; but Freud as well as Proust showed us that we must also honor the involuntary return of memories, their sudden upsurge. Scott follows suit and also notes the price: "as I describe aspects of memory—especially nonvoluntary memory—the active memorial dimension of the descriptions as well as of what I describe will often elude me."[52] But this is a price worth paying. As William James put it poignantly in his *Principles of Psychology*: "we must reinstate the value of the vague in mental life."[53] Charles Scott has made good on this exhortation in the most impressive way: by giving us the actual feel, the exact shape, the experienced morphology, of the inherently vaguely remembered.

(iv) *determinacy vs. indetermination*; one of the major themes of *The Time of Memory* is what Scott likes to call "indeterminate determination." This is closely allied to the changefulness of memories—or better, the changefulness *in* memories, their uncontrollable vagaries and vicissitudes. Despite our efforts to pin down memories—to fill in their gaps and to date and place them precisely—they remain largely indeterminate in form and occurrence (especially their *re*occurrence). Indeed, *their* indeterminacy in turn instills indeterminacy in human experience at large: a Bergsonian point that Scott expresses by claiming that "memories' seemingly infinite flexibility . . . gives most (I believe all) experiences to shimmer in nondetermination—in mere capacity for change—as they establish specific and indubitable events."[54] Notice that here, as in other paradoxical cases, one tensional epicenter supports the other, rather than merely conflicting with it: just because memories ask for (and sometimes receive) genuine determination, they can radiate indetermination all the more powerfully—precisely in the form of the irretrievable loss that belongs to them intrinsically.

We could keep pursuing this amazing capacity of memory to be *both* ends of a given tensional pair. Other pairs include singularity and generality; and the fact that memories are always both already there in some sense, yet somehow not there at all.[55] In effect, Scott is proceeding as a deconstructionist despite his explicit denial of this strategy.[56] Much like Derrida, he is arguing for a logic of "neither/nor, that is, *simultaneously* either *or*."[57] That is to say, neither one side nor the other of the various tensions we have explored is to be chosen by itself *over* the other; each is to be chosen *at the same time*, in their mutual entailment.

IV

But let me hasten to a few concluding remarks and questions. These will focus on memorial loss, the abiding theme of *The Time of Memory*. Loss is for Scott what awareness in memory mainly yields. Where fantasy reaches out to give

access to the world in its imaginative plenitude—it is a matter of pure gain, since it extends into the new; indeed creates the new—memory is awareness of impure loss: not the strict loss of amnesia, but loss in varying degrees and kinds. The loss absorbs the gain of fantasy, which when mixed with memory can no longer stand on its own and is unable to deliver its New World. When Scott employs active imagination in his ur-memory of going to the store and back—by imagining himself as a ten-year-old boy turning back and looking at the adult Scott and speaking to him—there is a heightened, not a lessened, poignancy of loss in the form of sensing the vast difference between the child and the man. Says Scott: "This instance of active imagining does not overcome loss";[58] indeed, it increases loss: "I do not understand him in many important ways. I now identify him (me), but my living event then is quite lost in its remembered moment. I lose him in recognizing him . . . I *now* . . . am utterly lost to him *then*."[59] The loss is so great that even the most active imagination is taken up within the memory, much in the manner of confabulation. Fantasy is thus not a "way out" of memory, to use Freud's phrase for sublimation. All becomes loss. (This is literally the case, since both individual memory and collective memory are matters of loss—the latter by means of the various lineages and genealogies that institutionalize loss at the level of culture and society.)[60]

Thus it behooves us to consider these last questions: What *is* memorial loss? Given its ubiquity, is there any redemption *from it*? In answer to the first question: as I see it, such loss falls into five types (beyond the question of its individuated or acculturated forms, themselves quite diverse):

- absolute loss: complete inability to recall, even in the presence of specific and elaborate cues; Scott outright denies such loss—or is just uninterested in it;
- partial loss: itself having several subtypes: (a) normal forgetting, in principle correctable, e.g., by recourse to what James terms "contiguous associates" that act as effective cues; (b) "primary memory" in James' and Husserl's sense of the term: the fading fringe, the *Absinken*, at the edge of every experience; this is the beginning of loss if not loss itself; (c) paramnesia as earlier discussed, i.e., the substitution of a nonevent for the event supposedly recalled (and this itself has several varieties);
- loss *in* memory: this is the "gappy" (*lückenhaft*) aspect of memory addressed by psychoanalytic work on childhood; it refers, moreover, to the perforated structure of all memory, the embarrassingly frequent tendency to draw a blank at almost any point, starting with proper names and extending to whole stretches of the past;
- loss *to* memory: here is the phenomenon of being unavailable to memory, missing its apprehensive powers altogether; even so, a certain return of the missed can occur: this is the paradox to which Freud pointed when he said that we can remember that of which we were never conscious in the first

place—this often happening by means of unconscious acting out, where the action itself *is* the memory;

– loss *by* memory: one of the curious corners of the memorial world is that of sheer repetition, whereby a repeated action, though it has a definite origin in a definitely recollectable past, *takes the place* of the recollection itself; this is again a concern of Freud's: one loses by "repetition" what one could gain by recollection—e.g., that realized in psychoanalytic therapy.[61] (I refer to psychoanalysis here in the very teeth of Scott's attempt to set it aside. But its relevance remains.)

These five types of memorial loss partly intersect with Charles Scott's own massive list of losses and partly add to them. Scott's gift lies in identifying and valorizing the myriad demi-memories that flit fitfully across the memorial screen and then off again, losing what they gain and gaining what they lose, appearing as they disappear and disappearing as they appear.

Granted, then, this massive, albeit subtle, loss—perhaps even larger than Scott himself allows if my list is to be believed—what is there to do about it? (Here is the second question.) Only two things, short of sheer resignation.

First of all, there is an action that Scott calls "recreation" and that he describes in this way near the end of *The Time of Memory*: "memorial occurrences are recreations . . . of past occurrences, not re-presentations of something 'there' and stable as a point of reference, but recreations in the sense that lost events are re-turned, turned in what we call memory from having happened to present happenings."[62] This present happening is characterized as the "self-presentation of memory" and is contrasted with "memories of bygone events," that is, re-presentational memory, recollective memory in my vocabulary, secondary or reproductive memory in James' and Husserl's. Thanks to the action of recreation or self-presentation, at least partial redemption is possible, for in the end, "There is no haven of pure loss—that would be death."[63] Even in the cases of the most seemingly complete loss, i.e., what I have called "absolute loss," there is for Scott a saving remnant: *not* the content remembered (this may indeed be lost forever, as in extreme Korsakoff syndrome) or even its contiguous associate or the general context. Instead, the redeeming residue is nothing but the "present happening" by which memory itself is an event of mind and world. Memory reclaims its right to exist not by its power to bring the past back intact—that would be literal representation of what is equally literally bygone—but by its own continually recreative power, its own ongoing enactment, its being the event which it is, its having the mind it does, its entering the awareness it has, and its opening the world it discloses. My only question here is whether it is right to call this multifarious action "recreation"—a word that has much too strong cosmogonic connotations to my ears. Nor is "self-presentation" adequate, given

that the *world* is manifested in memory and not just the self. Perhaps we could term this redemptive action—in keeping with Scott's many invocations of Nietzsche in this book—"non-eternal recurrence." For the past comes back, not just as it always was and will be, but in the fragmentary and finite and temporal way that Scott has himself so brilliantly set before us. Surely this is the lesson of "the memory of time *in the light of flesh*," that is, our bounded bodies as they encompass our equally bounded minds.

A second way of dealing with memorial loss is that the memorialist, if he or she is not to be overwhelmed by this loss, must practice what Scott calls "awareness *in* the transformative occurrences."[64] Awareness, the great topic of *Boundaries in Mind*, here rejoins memory as the very way in which memory can cut short its own losses: awareness of loss is coping with loss itself.[65] For memorial losses are themselves boundaries in mind—"dim boundaries" truly but boundaries nonetheless that can be discerned with the right kind of awareness. These boundaries are what recur in recreation and self-presentation. We may lose the content and the context, but we get the boundaries back.

Let us say, then, that remembering is awareness that recognizes boundaries in mind. The earliest Scott is here in close contact with the latest Scott; the baton is passed from the no longer to the not yet; the relay is happening. Not only will two works do, but the work is truly one. The man and the work I here celebrate are a man not other than the boy and a work not different from his accomplished errand. They are the same—the same crafty and compelling, deft and dazzling, sage and subtle figure whom we have come to admire so much in Continental philosophy in America.

NOTES

1. From the dustjacket cover of the first edition: Charles E. Scott, *Boundaries in Mind: A Study of Immediate Awareness Based on Psychotherapy* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).
2. Ibid., 28; his italics.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 118. my italics.
5. Charles E. Scott, ed., *On Dreaming: An Encounter with Medard Boss* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1977), 4.
6. Ibid., 6.
7. Ibid., 96.
8. On intellection as delimiting, see ibid., 158.
9. Ibid., 121.
10. "In differences, i.e., on borders, the indifference of mind is manifest, but not as any one difference or the totality of differences" (ibid., 96).
11. Ibid., 121.

12. Ibid., 147.
13. Ibid., 88.
14. Ibid. 122.
15. Ibid., 83.
16. Ibid., 83.
17. Ibid., 55. See also 28: "our goal is to see how mind happens as event."
18. Ibid., 33.
19. Also to be asked here: how is fantasy historical? Scott dodges this question adroitly, yet he insists that "awareness is intrinsically worldly *and historical*" (ibid., 139). He starts an answer by observing that "Fantasies begin in awareness. Awareness is common for the known and unknown, the remembered and the forgotten" (ibid.). If awareness qua fantasy can be remembered or forgotten, it must be historical; but historical how and in what exact way? The same question concerns mind as a whole: if it is truly historical, then must we not consider such things as character, various habitualities, the customary—all of which are here neglected by Scott.
20. Ibid., 142.
21. On visibility, see ibid., 24–25, 28, 35 f., 61.
22. On kinship, see ibid., 9–10, 39, 159.
23. Ibid., 96.
24. Charles E. Scott, *The Langauge of Difference* (New York: Humanities Press, 1987).
25. *Boundaries in Mind*, 24.
26. Later, he is more explicit on this link: "Indeed, *Mind* and *memory* might name the same 'thing'. But whether or not they are identical, they are not separable in our language" (*The Time of Memory*, MS, 9; his italics).
27. Ibid., 139.
28. Ibid., my italics. He adds in the same spirit: "Minding or reminding in this sense means reestablishing, recalling, or commemorating linkages and kinship, and hence resonance, celebration, and symbolization are important overtones of *mind*" (ibid., his italics).
29. MS, 2.
30. MS, 6.
31. MS, 4.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid. The full claim is: "*loss* of memory appears to be part of the vividness of my memory, and it carries over with no image at all in my memory of this event" (his italics).
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., 5.
36. Ibid., 7. My italics. Another partial redemption is found in the fact that "only by knowing the losses and in the losses can I remember with some clarity of understanding" (ibid., 8; my italics).
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., 6.
39. Ibid., 15.
40. Ibid., 16. For other expressions of memorial pervasiveness, see ibid., 9–10. Concerning the flux-like character of memory, see ibid., 13: "Such transformation . . . makes questionable any fixed identity that we give to memories as well as to 'memory'." Scott adds that "This transformational fluidity makes questionable my [own] use of the proper noun memory" (ibid.).
41. Ibid.: "Protean, fluid, in constant differential continuities and enablements—we do not seem able to step outside of memories as we speak of them, to bracket them or neutralize them."
42. Ibid., 12.
43. Ibid., 10.

44. "Memory seems to occur as the manifestation of things in their significance and meaning—to infuse their meaning and significance—in both their generality and particularity" (ibid., 9).
45. Ibid., 15; my italics.
46. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. C. Smith (New York: Humanities Press, 1962), 70.
47. *The Time of Memory* , MS, 10.
48. Ibid., 11.
49. Ibid.
50. On the multiplicity of kinds of involuntary memory, see esp. ibid., 161.
51. Aristotle, *De Memoria et Reminiscentia* 453a15–16; Richard Sorabji's translation.
52. *The Time of Memory*, MS, 11.
53. William James, *Principles of Psychology* (New York: Dover, 1950), vol. 2.
54. Ibid., 20.
55. On the singularity/generality of memories, see ibid., 15, 17; on their being already there and not there at all, see 16.
56. "I do not wish to engage in a deconstructive study that shows that these disciplines [i.e., psychoanalysis, neurology] in fact are permeated by the complex kind of event I am calling memory's loss" (ibid., 17).
57. Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, trans. A. Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 43, his italics.
58. *The Time of Memory*, MS, 8.
59. Ibid.; my italics.
60. On cultural memory, see ibid., 342. On the loss proper to lineage and genealogy, see ibid., 160, 162–3, 340.
61. See S. Freud, "Remembering, Repeating, and Working-Through," in *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works* (London: Hogarth, 1953–), 12:150.
62. *The Time of Memory*, MS, 342.
63. Ibid., 17. Scott adds: "or pure beginning [either], which in its indeterminacy would be dead too" (ibid.).
64. MS, 14; his italics.
65. For further profound parallels between memory and awareness, see ibid., 14–15, 16, 77. On 18 he says that "I want to pay attention to ways in which [in remembering] we are ignited in awarenesses, not necessarily into a conflagration of ecstasy or rapture, but into recognitions, evaluations, and insights that are memorial events."