

The Hippocampus

The overview that follows is offered to help the trier of fact understand the role of the hippocampus — a small structure deep in the brain that is essential to forming lasting memories — and the forms of memory loss that follow when it is damaged or impaired. The subject reaches the courtroom whenever a witness, victim, or defendant has suffered a head injury, was intoxicated, claims a blackout, or claims no memory of the events at issue. Its purpose is to define the terms a court is likely to encounter, to summarize the research on the hippocampus and amnesia, and to do so in plain language and without favoring any party. The brain basis of episodic memory generally is treated in the companion paper on episodic memory; this paper concerns the hippocampus and the amnesias.

The Hippocampus and the Case of H.M.

Much of what is known about the hippocampus began with a single patient. In the 1950s, a young man known for decades as H.M. underwent surgery that removed the hippocampus and surrounding tissue on both sides of the brain in an effort to control severe epilepsy (Scoville & Milner, 1957). The operation left his intelligence, personality, and language intact, and he could hold a thought in mind for as long as he kept rehearsing it. But he was left unable to form new lasting memories: he could not learn his new address, reread the same magazine without recognizing it, and would forget a meal within half an hour of eating it. His memory for the distant past was largely preserved. The case showed, with unusual clarity, that the hippocampus is necessary for converting experience into durable long-term memory, while leaving other mental faculties — and older, already-consolidated memories — untouched.

What the Hippocampus Does

Forming and using a long-term memory involves three stages — encoding (registering an experience), storage (retaining it over time), and retrieval (bringing it back) — and the hippocampus is centrally involved in all three for the kind of memory that supports testimony: declarative memory, the conscious memory of facts and events (Squire & Zola-Morgan, 2011). It is especially critical for consolidation, the process by which a fresh, fragile memory is gradually stabilized over time, a process in which memories become progressively less dependent on the hippocampus and more reliant on widespread cortical storage (Squire, 1992). Two distinctions matter for the law. First, the hippocampus supports long-term memory but not the moment-to-moment holding of information (working memory), which is why H.M. could carry on a conversation yet retain nothing of it. Second, because consolidation takes time, a memory is most vulnerable in the minutes and hours after an event — exactly when injury, intoxication, or extreme stress can prevent it from ever being stored.

Amnesia: Anterograde and Retrograde

Damage to or disruption of the hippocampus and related structures produces amnesia, and two forms must be distinguished. Anterograde amnesia is the inability to form new memories after the precipitating event — the person cannot retain what happens from that point forward. Retrograde amnesia is the loss of memories formed before the event, often with recent memories more affected than remote ones. The two frequently occur together but are independent, and either can appear without the other. Amnesia has many causes beyond surgery: traumatic brain injury and concussion, oxygen deprivation, stroke, certain infections, chronic alcohol abuse (as in Korsakoff's syndrome), sedative and anesthetic drugs, and transient global amnesia, a temporary and usually benign episode of profound memory loss. For the law, the central point is that a genuine amnesia reflects a memory that was never formed or can no longer be reached — not a memory that is being withheld — and that its boundaries (what is lost and what is spared) follow recognizable patterns.

Alcohol, Drugs, and Blackouts

The hippocampus is exceptionally sensitive to alcohol, and the alcohol-induced blackout is one of the most forensically important forms of amnesia. A blackout is a period of anterograde amnesia: while intoxicated, the person fails to transfer experience into lasting memory, even though, at the time, they may walk, talk, drive, and carry on complex interactions that appear normal to observers (White, 2003; Wetherill & Fromme, 2016). Blackouts may be complete (*en bloc*), with a solid gap, or partial (fragmentary), with islands of memory that cues can sometimes recover. They are common — roughly half of drinkers report having experienced one — and are produced by sedative drugs as well. The crucial and often misunderstood points are that a blackout is not the same as passing out; that a person in a blackout can be awake and functioning while forming no memory; and, above all, that the absence of memory does not mean the events did not happen. These principles bear on intoxicated witnesses and victims — including the capacity of a heavily intoxicated person to remember, or to consent — and on intoxicated defendants.

Crime-Related Amnesia

A substantial minority of defendants, particularly in homicide and other violent crimes, report amnesia for the offense itself; estimates vary widely but cluster around a quarter to a third of homicide cases. Such claims are associated with high emotional arousal and dissociation at the time, with alcohol or drug intoxication, and with offenses committed in states of extreme passion (Kopelman, 2002; Pyszora, Barker, & Kopelman, 2003). Crime-related amnesia is genuinely difficult to evaluate: a real amnesia (from intoxication, head injury, or extreme stress) and a feigned one can present similarly, and no test reliably distinguishes them in the individual case (Cima, Nijman, Merckelbach, Kremer, & Hollnack, 2004). The science can describe the conditions under which genuine amnesia is plausible, but it cannot, by itself, confirm that a particular claimed amnesia is real.

The Limits of Neuroscience as Evidence

Because brain science is persuasive to lay audiences, its limits deserve emphasis. Neuroscience can establish that the hippocampus is necessary for memory, can explain how injury or intoxication impairs it, and can show that a claimed memory loss is or is not consistent with a known mechanism. It cannot authenticate a particular memory, prove that a remembered event is accurate, or reliably determine from a brain scan whether a specific person genuinely cannot remember or is feigning. Testimony grounded in the neuroscience of the hippocampus is therefore most useful for explaining capacities and impairments in general, and least reliable when stretched to pronounce on the truthfulness of an individual's account.

The Hippocampus, Amnesia, and the Law

Amnesia arises in the law in several distinct ways, and the distinctions matter. A defendant's amnesia for the offense does not, by itself, render him incompetent to stand trial; under the framework of *Wilson v. United States* (1968), applying the competency standard of *Dusky v. United States* (1960), courts weigh case-specific factors — including how much the amnesia impairs the defense, whether the events can be reconstructed from other evidence, and the overall fairness of the trial. Separately, amnesia arising after the criminal act does not negate the mental state the defendant had at the time of the act; forgetting the crime is not the same as having lacked intent when committing it. Intoxication and blackout bear on different questions still — the capacity of a victim to remember or to consent, and the reliability and completeness of an intoxicated witness's account.

A witness with a memory impairment is not for that reason incompetent to testify; under Federal Rule of Evidence 601 the presumption of competency holds, and the effect of the impairment goes to weight. Whether an expert may explain the hippocampus, the amnesias, and the effects of alcohol and injury on memory is governed by the rules on scientific and expert evidence — *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals* (1993), *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael* (1999), and Federal Rule of Evidence 702 in federal court and the states that follow them, and the general-acceptance test of *Frye v. United States* (1923) elsewhere. Such testimony is offered to inform the trier of fact about how memory can be lost and what that loss signifies — not to opine on whether a particular person truly remembers or has forgotten, a judgment the law reserves to the fact-finder.

Special Issues in Legal Practice

The principles described above apply with equal force to every party in a legal proceeding. Memory operates the same way regardless of who is asking the questions, and the science summarized here favors no side. What differs between the parties is not the science but the vantage point — the particular places where memory issues tend to surface, and the particular errors each party is best positioned to guard against. The two summaries below identify those recurring issues. They are offered for orientation, not as litigation strategy; in every case the controlling question is what the evidence in that case will, and will not, support, and the expert's role is to inform the trier of fact rather than to advocate for either side.

Special Issues for Prosecutors

For the State, the neuroscience of the hippocampus most often clarifies what a memory gap does and does not mean. A victim's inability to recall part of an event — especially after a blackout, a head injury, or extreme stress — reflects a memory that was never formed, and does not show that the event did not occur; a blackout in particular is not unconsciousness, and a person can be unable to remember an assault that nonetheless happened, a point central to many intoxication cases. The errors the prosecution is best positioned to guard against are over-reaching with the science: treating a defendant's claimed amnesia for the offense as proof he could not have formed criminal intent (it does not), or presenting brain evidence as if it authenticated a witness's account or detected feigning, which it cannot. The constructive use is to explain, through qualified testimony, why gaps in an intoxicated or injured victim's memory are expected and what can still be reconstructed from independent evidence.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the same science supports careful, bounded use of memory-impairment evidence — and caution against its overstatement. Where a client genuinely suffered a head injury, intoxication, or other hippocampal disruption, the resulting amnesia can be real and can bear on competency under the multi-factor inquiry, on the reliability of any statements obtained while impaired, and on the conditions of the events. Equally, the defense can probe an intoxicated or injured witness's account, since a blackout or injury may mean key details were never encoded and any later, fuller account may owe more to reconstruction or suggestion than to recovered memory. The limits run both ways: a genuine amnesia for the offense does not establish innocence or negate intent at the time, and no scan can prove a memory loss is real. The law contemplates that these matters be placed before the trier of fact through the competency process, through challenge to impaired statements, and, where the governing standard is met, through expert testimony (*Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 1993; *Frye v. United States*, 1923). The aim is to ensure that genuine memory impairment is recognized and that neuroscience is neither ignored nor asked to prove more than it can.

References

- Cima, M., Nijman, H., Merckelbach, H., Kremer, K., & Hollnack, S. (2004). Claims of crime-related amnesia in forensic patients. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 27(3), 215–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2004.03.007>
- Kopelman, M. D. (2002). Disorders of memory. *Brain*, 125(10), 2152–2190. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awf229>
- Pyszora, N. M., Barker, A. F., & Kopelman, M. D. (2003). Amnesia for criminal offences: A study of life sentence prisoners. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 14(3), 475–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14789940310001599785>
- Scoville, W. B., & Milner, B. (1957). Loss of recent memory after bilateral hippocampal lesions. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, 20(1), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.20.1.11>
- Slotnick, S. D. (2017). *Cognitive neuroscience of memory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Squire, L. R. (1992). Memory and the hippocampus: A synthesis from findings with rats, monkeys, and humans. *Psychological Review*, 99(2), 195–231. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.99.2.195>
- Squire, L. R., & Wixted, J. T. (2011). The cognitive neuroscience of human memory since H.M. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 34, 259–288. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-061010-113720>
- Wetherill, R. R., & Fromme, K. (2016). Alcohol-induced blackouts: A review of recent clinical research with practical implications and recommendations for future studies. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 40(5), 922–935. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13051>
- White, A. M. (2003). What happened? Alcohol, memory blackouts, and the brain. *Alcohol Research & Health*, 27(2), 186–196.

Legal Authorities

- Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
- Dusky v. United States, 362 U.S. 402 (1960).
- Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).
- Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).
- Wilson v. United States, 391 F.2d 460 (D.C. Cir. 1968).
- Fed. R. Evid. 601.
- Fed. R. Evid. 702.

Related topic papers: [Episodic Memory](#) · [Forgetting](#) · [Stress and Memory](#) · [Trauma and Memory](#) · [Emotion and Memory](#) · [Delayed Recall](#)