

Why can a smell bring back a memory?

Juan Segurola · All Rights Reserved

QUE · Article 036 · Simple Questions, Deep Answers · Version 0.1 EN

A familiar smell may call up a place before we have found its name. The recollection can arrive with an unusually strong feeling of being there again. That experience suggests several scientific questions, however, not one: does the smell retrieve more memories, change their emotional intensity, select older events, or make their details more accurate? These outcomes need separate measurements.

The defensible explanation begins with learned associations and retrieval cues. An odour encountered during an event can later provide part of the information that helps reactivate a representation of it. But an intense return of feeling is not itself evidence that a memory is a faithful recording. We need experiments capable of distinguishing access, feeling and accuracy.

1. A smell is a cue, not a stored scene

Imagine two people entering the same kitchen. For one, the aroma resembles food prepared during childhood; for the other, it is unfamiliar. The physical stimulus can be similar while their learning histories differ. An explanation that attributes the entire memory to the odour molecule leaves out the associations that make the cue personally meaningful.

The cue can also be ambiguous. Similar smells occur in many places, and a single event contains multiple sensory and emotional features. Retrieval therefore involves a relation between a present stimulus and a history of experience. It need not amount to opening one uniquely labelled file. The example illustrates why a mechanism must explain selective access as well as emotional force.

2. An experiment that separates selection from recollection

Herz and Schooler's 2002 study used a particularly useful design. A verbal label first prompted an autobiographical memory. A sensory cue was then presented after that memory had already been selected. The researchers reported an effect on emotional ratings in the odour condition. [1]

The order matters. If one group freely remembered a childhood celebration while another remembered yesterday's shopping, a difference in emotion might reflect the events selected. Presenting the sensory cue after retrieval helps isolate its effect on recollecting an already selected event. It does not remove every possible influence, but it makes the causal question narrower and more informative.

The bounded conclusion is about reported emotional quality under this procedure. It should not be expanded into a claim that smells always retrieve more events, that the resulting details are more accurate, or that every odour has a privileged memory attached. Those would require additional outcomes and comparisons.

3. Different measurements can give different answers

A study can measure whether a person retrieves anything, how long retrieval takes, the specificity of the event, emotional ratings, vividness or a sense of returning to its original time. Counting one as if it measured all the others is an easy way to make the phenomenon sound stronger than the evidence.

A later study of multimodal autobiographical retrieval directly compared memories associated with sensory cues and described different contributions of sensory information to recollection. Its framework distinguishes memory content and phenomenological properties rather than treating all effects as one advantage for smell. [2] In its four cue conditions, that study found no differences in the number of retrieved memories or experiential ratings. [2] This limits any universal claim that an odour cue must make recollection stronger: the task and comparison matter.

Consider a hypothetical result: an odour retrieves a specific event in six of ten trials and a picture in eight of ten, while the successful odour-cued memories receive higher emotional ratings. There is no contradiction. The picture has the higher retrieval yield; the odour has the stronger rating conditional on successful retrieval. Reporting only that odour memories are stronger erases the first result. These numbers are invented to illustrate a measurement problem, not taken from either study.

4. A mechanism must do more than name a brain region

An anatomical connection can help explain how information might travel, but it cannot by itself establish why a particular smell evokes a particular episode. The explanation must also account for learning, the cue's similarity to past experience, the availability of competing associations and the task used to prompt retrieval.

Likewise, observing greater activity in a region during emotional recollection would be a correlation under a task. To show that a particular pathway is necessary, or sufficient by itself, would demand a different intervention and stronger controls. An appealing route from nose to memory should not be mistaken for the complete causal mechanism.

At a functional level, associative retrieval predicts a distinction worth testing. A personally familiar odour may be effective because it overlaps with features encoded during a past event. An equally intense but unfamiliar odour need not retrieve that event. Matching intensity alone therefore does not match mnemonic relevance. Good controls must ask which property was actually equated.

5. Why feeling transported is not verification

Autobiographical events are difficult to check independently. A participant may sincerely report a sharp image without access to photographs, contemporaneous notes or another reliable record. Emotional intensity and confidence are themselves interesting observations, but they do not supply the missing historical comparison.

One could design a different study around experimentally controlled episodes, document what happened, and later compare errors as well as correct details under different retrieval cues. That would test accuracy more directly, although laboratory episodes would not reproduce the personal significance of a childhood memory. This is a trade-off between control and the phenomenon one wants to understand, not a reason to dismiss either approach.

The title therefore has an answer with a limit. A smell can act as a learned retrieval cue and can alter the emotional quality of recollection. The relationship depends on the person's experience and on what is being measured. What remains uncertain in a particular recollection is how its compelling present feeling relates to the event as it actually happened. Smelling the past is a metaphor; remembering in response to a smell is an observable process.

References

- [1] Herz, R. S., and Schooler, J. W. A naturalistic study of autobiographical memories evoked by olfactory and visual cues: testing the Proustian hypothesis. *American Journal of Psychology* 115(1), 21–32 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.2307/1423672>
- [2] Willander, J., Sikström, S., and Karlsson, K. Multimodal retrieval of autobiographical memories: sensory information contributes differently to the recollection of events. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6, 1681 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01681>

Related reading

Article 035: Can two different lights look like the same colour?