

Capt. John Smith. } Con. A proper name may be also
Anvil. } used in other relations. The
 word, sound, or name Smith
 may also be a general term applicable to many classes of
 persons, as *coppersmith, goldsmith, silversmith, &c.* When
 we think of *Capt. John Smith* we use the word as a proper
 name. But when we think of Smith and Anvil we use the
 word Smith in its general sense. In either case it is an
 act of Concurrence. Smiths use anvils. We have thought
 of these words together, and that mental act has had a
 tendency to unite them together.

Anvil. } In. by A. & C. Anvil is a *concrete thing* that
Heavy. } possesses the attribute heaviness ; and heavy is an abstract
 term that applies to heavy things, but does not state what
 they are. The idea or thought of heaviness is *common* to
 both words, and therefore it is a case of In., and as one
 term is concrete and the other abstract, it is a case of In.
 by A. & C.

Heavy. } Things are heavy that press
Gravitation. } Con. toward the earth, in consequence of
 the action of gravity in their case.
 Gravitation, whatever that is, is what makes them tend
 toward the earth. We may say it is a Cause, and as we
 think of Cause producing Effect, and Effect as produced
 by Cause, such cases are *thought of together*, or almost
 simultaneously, and hence we have a case of Concurrence.

Gravitation. } There is no In. or Ex.
Sir Isaac Newton. } Con. here, but Con. We have
 read or heard that Newton
 discovered the Law of Gravitation. We have exercised
 our minds in regard to these two words, in thinking of
 them together, and that is concurrence.

Sir Isaac Newton. } Newton went out of his
"Diamond." } Con. library on one occasion, leav-
 ing his pet dog "Diamond"
 in the room. The dog jumped up on to the table, over-
 turned the light, which set fire to most valuable manuscripts.
 They burned up. When Newton returned and discovered
 what his pet had done, he exclaimed, "O ! Diamond,
 Diamond, thou little knowest what thou hast done." The

name Diamond becomes thus vividly associated in our
 minds with the forbearance of the great Newton. We
 cannot forget it. We hold them together hereafter by Con.

Diamond. } In. by s. A plain case of Inclusion by
Dying. } sound.

Dying. } We know that cholera *causes* numer-
Cholera. } Con. ous deaths ; that people die in great
 numbers wherever it prevails.

Cholera. } Concurrence includes all cases of
Terror. } Con. Cause and Effect, Instrument or Means
 to End, Person by whom or Thing by
 which, &c. Cholera causes terror. Terror is the *effect* of
 the existence of the cholera. Now carefully read over the
 eleven words just considered, and think out the relations
 between them.

Good Princess.
 Pocahontas.
 Capt. John Smith.
 Anvil.
 Heavy.
 Gravitation.
 Sir Isaac Newton.
 "Diamond."
 Dying.
 Cholera.
 Terror.

Now recite them from memory at least five times forward
 and backward, and then recite the entire thirty words from
 Building to Terror, and from Terror to Building, the same
 number of times.

For further training, let each pupil recite the foregoing
 series of thirty words forward and backward two or three
 times per day for an entire month. He need not stop fur-
 ther study, but whatever else he learns let him at least
 practise this daily recital for one month.

REMARKS ON THE THREE LAWS.

1. Since words have different meanings, we may some-
 times find that a pair of words exemplify all three Laws, as
 plough and sword. The relation between them may be In.,

since both of them are *cutting* instruments ; one cuts and hacks human beings and the other cuts and turns over the soil. It may be Ex., in a metaphorical sense, as one is the emblem of peace and the other of war, and it may be Con., as we have *often thought of them together* as we read in the Bible of beating swords into ploughshares.

2. Learning a series of words by heart by thinking of the *Relations* between them is wholly unlike learning it by *rote*. In the latter case, three or five words at a time or all ten words are read over from 10 to 20 times. This reading secures scarcely anything more than a *succession of sights to the eye or sounds to the ear*. No *study* of the words is required. The *action* of the *intellect* is not invoked. It is the *mere sensuous* impression of Eye or Ear or both together that holds the words together, and thus *many or endless* repetitions are required to memorise a series which a *conscious thoughtful use of those Laws* enables us to learn by *one painstaking* perusal.

Another way of learning such a series by *rote*, is to limit the *extent* of the repetitions. Instead of reading over the entire series or a large part of it many times, the series is slowly read over once or several times *by pairs*, only two words at a time, but the method of *acquisition* is precisely the same as in the former rote process. Let us look at this last proceeding in detail. (1) It is usually applied only where there is a *natural suggestiveness* between each pair of words. (2) But no previous study is prescribed in regard to what *constitutes* this suggestiveness, nor are the *varieties* of it set forth and required to be mastered. (3) But above all, no *study* of the *pairs of words themselves* is insisted upon. On the contrary, all such study is emphatically deprecated. The mind is not allowed to be *directed* to anything in *particular* in reading over the pairs. It must be *left* without a *rudder* or guide to float wherever it listeth. It is not to be "interfered with" by our will. What is this but intellectual dawdling? A method of Vacuity pure and simple—the exact opposite of Mental Assimilation. (4) If in reading over many times an entire series, only the ear and eye are mainly affected and the *intellect is left to wander*, much more must it wander here. In running over many words, the intellect might be arrested by chance. But here the

series consisting of two words only and all attempt to occupy or engage the intellect being purposely avoided, and nothing being done to enchain the attention to the consideration of the meaning or sounds of the two words, or the *relation* between them, the intellect wanders away from want of occupation. If when we wish to retain in our memories a paragraph of fine sentiment or lucid reasoning, we find our attention wanders, so it must wander here where only a pair of words is before it, and we are not only not furnished with any tests or guides or stimulus or motive for examining the words or for *finding the relation* between them, but on the contrary we are forbidden to interfere with the spontaneous action of the mind. The *intellect might be abolished* so far as its *participation* in such an operation is concerned. What is absorbed in such a case is absorbed intuitively and blindly. Hence we see that what is accomplished by these two processes of *rote* learning is weak impressions upon the memory and a distinct cultivation of mind wandering.

This method of *rote* learning by pairs was invented and first taught by Thomas Hallworth in New York in 1822. His method was adopted without acknowledgment by Carl Otto in Germany and Austria, and his followers in England and America.*

3. The opposite of these two methods of *rote* learning is my method, which injects an *active process* between each pair of words. Each pair of words is appraised and dovetailed by the Laws of Memory. And hence the reader can notice the *fundamental difference* between all other methods and mine. My method is to keep the mind in an *assimilating, absorbing condition when trying to learn* by making the Intellect stay with the Senses. In the process of *endless repetition* or learning by *rote* as evinced in the two methods above given, the mind is in a *passive* state. But when learning the above series by *my* method, it was kept in an *active* state. The *intellect* was directed by the will into cer-

* These followers make a great boast of learning a series of suggestive words in pairs and without interfering with the mind's action in doing so, when they are clearly indebted to Thomas Hallworth for this inadequate method, yet they never have the grace to acknowledge their indebtedness.

tain channels and kept there. It was *searching* for what was *in common* or *different* between the pairs of words. It was *noting* points of likeness and classifying them. *This is thinking.* And the most vivid *First Impressions* always result from the action of the *intellect* upon the sensuous *stimuli* from ear and eye. *Intellectual Assimilation* is a proper name for my methods.

4. The Three Laws are Forms or Modes of Mental Assimilation. But when used *consciously* for any length of time, they operate much more efficaciously than formerly—and they greatly increase the Impressionability and Revivability—as any student can affirm who faithfully carries out my instructions, and then his General Memory becomes largely improved without a conscious use of my method.

A TRAINING EXERCISE IN ATTENTION.

Whoever wishes to increase his permanent Memory power and his power of Attention must not omit to learn and practise the following exercise *precisely as I prescribe.* He will experience great satisfaction in carrying out my directions to the letter, because his conformity in this and in other respects will bring the reward of a NEW MEMORY power almost immediately. And if he were to disregard my directions, he will have no one to blame but himself.

He must write down the first two words, "Ice" and "Slippery," the latter word under the former. Let him ascertain the exact relation between these words. He will find that "Ice" is a concrete word, and "Slippery" indicates a quality of "Ice" and of other things. He places opposite the abbreviation In., by A. and C. In a similar way he proceeds to write down one word at a time, and at once ascertaining its relation to the previous word, and indicating that relation by the appropriate abbreviation. When he has analysed ten words in this painstaking manner he must recall them backward and forward from memory at least five times, and each time faster than the other.

Let him deal with the next ten in a similar manner in all respects, and then let him repeat the twenty words both ways at least five times, and so on till he has analysed,

learned and recited the entire one hundred words; and, finally, let him recite the one hundred words both ways at least once a day for thirty days, in connection with the Building Series and the Presidential Series and Series of English Sovereigns hereafter given.

As the result of this Analysis and recitals, the pupil will make these Laws of In., Ex., and Con. *operate hereafter in an unconscious manner*, with a power a hundred-fold greater than before practising this method.

Ice.	Hounds.	Hose.	Chicken.
Slippery.	Bark.	Rose.	Feathers.
Smooth.	Tree.	Bush.	Down.
Rough.	Woods.	Guerilla.	Up.
Ruffian.	Prairie.	Rill.	Upstart.
Prison.	Air.	Water-power.	Begin.
Crime.	Wind.	Manufacture.	Bee.
Crimea.	Hurricane.	Man.	Honey.
War.	Reign.	Manager.	Hives.
Army.	Governor.	Conductor.	Wives.
Navy.	Steam-engine.	Cars.	Mormon.
Ship.	Newspaper.	Track.	Brigham Young.
Sail.	Ream.	Trotting.	Old.
Auction.	Quire.	Fair.	Cold.
Bid.	Inquire.	Foul.	Winter.
Competition.	Inquest.	Chanticleer.	Summer.
Petition.	Jury.	Chandelier.	Ft. Sumter.
Signatures.	Decide.	Gas.	Stone.
Cygnets.	Cider.	Coal.	Mason.
Net.	Apple.	Mine.	Maize.
Ensnare.	Orchard.	Shaft.	Fodder.
Capture.	Charred.	Arrow.	Cattle.
Cap.	Burned.	Quiver.	Catalogue.
Gun.	Stove.	Indian.	Log.
Hunter.	Fire.	Black-Hawk.	Saw-mill.

I occasionally find that a bright, highly-gifted person makes a poor learner of my system, because he acts on hasty inferences of his own instead of attending to my long-tryed and never-failing methods. To illustrate: Instead of *analysing the above series in pairs*, and *discovering* and *noting the relation* between each pair as I require, *he reads over the entire series.* His previous study of the Memory Laws has, however, so impressed his mind with their influence that he is able to retain this series after only two or three perusals. Or, instead of reading over the entire series, he may even *slowly read the series in pairs*,

but without analysis, without trying to ascertain and realise the exact relation between the words. This is the method of Vacuity or Dawdling formerly mentioned. But his study of the three Laws in learning the Building Series has so sharpened and quickened his appreciation of In., Ex., and Con., that he *learned the one hundred words in this wrong way very readily.*

But why should he not follow my directions? Why not pursue my plan and thereby acquire the *full power* of my system instead of the small portion of that power gained by disregarding my direction? On the other hand, pupils of only average natural ability are very apt to follow my directions to the letter and thereby acquire an amount of Memory Improvement which the above gifted, but non-complying pupil, seems unable to understand.

If a person is afflicted with a *very* bad memory in any or all respects, and particularly if this memory weakness is traceable to *mind-wandering*, or if it co-exist with the latter infirmity, such a person may find it best to make a series of from *one hundred to five hundred words* on the model of the foregoing series, and learn the same and *recite it daily both ways* for a month or more in addition to the prescribed exercises, and if any trace of mind-wandering remain after that, let him make and memorise another series of the same extent and practise it for the same period. The *worst cases of mind-wandering and of weak memories* always yield to this training treatment.

In like manner, but in much inferior degree, *the recital of what has just been heard*, such as anecdotes, narratives, contents of plays, lectures, &c., not only tends to fix the recited matter in the memory, but also to strengthen the memory generally, *provided the recital takes place* shortly after the listening, as that is like a continuation of the original experience.

TRAINING THE INTELLECT TO STAY WITH THE SENSES.

Attention is the Will directing the Intellect into some particular channel and keeping it there. There are virtually two processes involved in Attention. The Intellect is

directed into a particular channel, but to keep it there, all intruders must be excluded. To illustrate. A student attempts to learn a proposition in Geometry. To do this he must keep his mind on the printed explanations, and if his thoughts attempt to fly away, he must repress that attempt. To guide his mind into the channel of the printed exposition, he calls into play the Directory power of the attention. To prevent intruders or extruders from withdrawing his mind from the text, he exercises the Inhibitory function of the Attention.

To fully understand what takes place when trying to study, let the pupil recall that there are three sources of knowledge.

First: The Senses carry into his mind reports from the outside world—Sensation—sight of the letters, words and sentences, &c. Second: The Intellect operates on these undigested elementary Sense-reports, or Sensations, and find *relations* among them. This is Perception, or relations among Sensations. Third: The mind acts on the *perceived relations* and finds relations among them. This is Reason or relations among relations.

Now the geometrical student in reading the printed instructions to himself or in reading them aloud, might simply occupy his *eye*, or *eye and ear* with them and his Reason might soar away to other subjects, climes or ages.

Remember that the Intellect is always active and busy, and the question for us to answer in our own case is—shall it co-operate with the senses or the matter before us, or shall it wander away?

What the geometrical student requires and what we all require in such cases is to *compel the Intellect to stay with the Senses, and follow the printed train of thought.*

Interest in the subject helps to secure this co-operation. And the *Process or Method of study*, if it be an Assimilating one, also compels this co-operation. And one of the processes which is most of all effective in TRAINING the Intellect to obey the Will and thereby to stay with the Senses (where it is not a case of pure reflection), and thereby to institute and develop the Habit of the activity of the Intellect co-operating with the action of the mere senses, is practice in the use of the Laws of In., Ex., and

Con. To illustrate : In reciting the last training example of one hundred words, the Directory power is exercised and then the Inhibitory power is brought into play, and so on *alternately*. Suppose the reciter has got to "Signatures." If he does not inhibit or exclude from his mind the word "Petition" he can make no advance. If he dwells upon "Petition" he will never reach "Cygnet." But if he inhibits "Petition" his Directory power sends him on to "Cygnet," and then inhibiting "Signatures" he proceeds from "Cygnet" to "Net," &c., &c. In this most simple, elementary way he exercises and trains the Directory and Inhibitory functions to co-operate in recalling the entire Series, and notice how many distinct and separate times he has exerted the Directory function and how many times the Inhibitory function in reciting a short series. And if *he has learned* this and other Series as I direct and then *recites them forward and backward as long as I require*, he is sure to greatly strengthen his Attention and thereby habituate the intellect to stay with the senses and thereby help to banish mind-wandering. And when the Intellect is thus trained into the Habit of staying with the sense of sight or hearing in reading or listening, the geometrical or other student can keep his mind on the subject before him until it is mastered.

IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTICS OF ANALYSIS.

It sometimes happens that we wish to quickly learn five or twenty Proper Names, the whole or part of which are *entirely new* to us, as a list of members of a committee, a series of facts in science, &c. We can usually do this by Analysis.

Recollective Analysis, or Analysis for the purpose of helping to learn by heart, is not an originating or *manufacturing* process. It simply *finds* relation *already existing* between the words or the ideas which the words suggest or evoke. But where there is *no existing relation* between the words or ideas, it is a case for Synthesis, to be taught hereafter.

The highest Analysis relates to *objects*, or rather to the *ideas* we have of them, and the lowest to *mere words*, to

mere articulated sounds, or their written or printed representatives. The great body of examples and illustrations in my lessons pertain to ideas ; but in the list of twenty-four Presidents I deal with the proper Names as words only, as words or articulated sounds—words which are nearly devoid of meaning except as marks or sounds for naming persons, or as words containing syllables which may have a general meaning in other applications. I need scarcely add that the Laws of In., Ex., and Con. apply to words merely as well as to the ideas which are, of course, suggested by the words. Let me illustrate : Ulysses S. Grant was succeeded by Rutherford B. Hayes. The initial syllables of Ulysses and of Rutherford make an inclusion by sound. The "U" of Ulysses is pronounced as if spelled "You." We then have in effect "You" and "Ru," or "You" and "Ruth"—when we are supposed to pronounce the "u" in Ruth as a long "u ;" but if it be considered to be a short sound of "u," it is only a weak case of In. by s. But if the pupil shuts his eyes, such inclusions will not be observed. It is true that such application is not so high or grand as when they govern ideas, but it is equally *genuine*. It is only a lower stratum, but still it is a part of *terra firma*, and on no account is it to be ignored.

Ideas are never words nor are *words ever ideas*, but words become so *associated* with ideas by habit, or by the Law of Concurrence, that they *arouse certain ideas* whenever they are used. They are used as *signs* of ideas—as the means of communicating them. There is rarely, if ever, any *necessary* connection that we can discover between a particular idea and the word used to stand for it. Not only do different nations use different *words* or *sounds* to arouse the *same* thought, but different words in the same language are sometimes used to portray practically *the same idea*, as in the case of Mariner, Sailor, Seaman, Jack Tar, Navigator, Skipper, &c., &c. Nor is this all—the *same sound* may awaken different ideas, as "I" and "Eye." In the first case "I" stands for the person using it, and in the last case it means the organ of sight. To the eyesight they are obviously unlike. It may be well to remark that in imposing a name in the first place, a *reason* may exist why

that name is given, as Albus (white) was given to the mountains, now more euphoniously called Alps, because they were white or snow-crowned; but Alps does not mean white to the moderns. The word now merely indicates or points out the mountains so called. A word may survive and take a new meaning after its original meaning is no longer ascertainable.

The *context* helps us to know which meaning of the word was intended when the word is spoken, and the context and spelling tell the same thing when writing or print is used. Take the words "Hounds, Bark." Here Bark means the cry or yelp of the dogs. But in "Tree, Bark," the Bark of the tree is suggested. Yet the word Bark is spelled precisely the same in both cases. The word spelled "Bark" is really used to express two different things and the *context* generally tells which is meant in any particular case.

Individual *letters* become so strongly associated with a particular meaning that although the vocal value is exactly the same, yet the one spelling goes to one man and the other to a different man. "Spenser" would never suggest to a learned man the author of the "Philosophy of Evolution," nor would "Spencer" ever suggest the author of the "Fairie Queen." "Mr. Mil" would never mean "John Stuart Mill," although the words "Mil" and "Mill" are pronounced exactly alike. We sometimes cannot recall a Proper Name, yet we feel sure that it begins or ends with S or K or L, or that a certain other letter is in the middle of the word. We usually find that we were right. In these cases *our clue to the entire word was found in only one letter of it.*

Noticing that the same letter is in common to two words, although all the other letters may be different, is one case of Inclusion by spelling. Take an example: President John Tyler was followed by President James K. Polk. Analyse the two names—Tyler and Polk. The letter "l" alone is common to the two names. Here is one letter found in totally unlike contexts. If this fact is noticed, it cannot but help hold those two names together. The exercise of learning the names of the twenty-four Presidents is a good one for this purpose. It has a *training* value entirely apart

from its practical value in that case. And I give it for its *training* value alone.

It is infinitely better for him to learn by analysis the order of the Presidents than to learn that order by the only other method the pupil has heretofore known, viz., *endless repetition*. When the pupil thinks a relation may be weak, let him consider that a weak relation *thought about* is a hundred-fold stronger than *mere repetition without any thinking at all*. It is either *thoughtless* repetition, or *thoughtful Analysis* that he must use.

HOW TO LEARN PROPER NAMES IN A CERTAIN ORDER OF SUCCESSION.

The true way to learn such lists as those of the Popes of Rome, the Kings of England and of the American Presidents is to learn them in their places in History, as parts of the Historical order of events to which they belong, as facts in the chain of causes and effects.

Their Terms, Administrations, or Reigns are, however, used by historians as landmarks, and to follow the historians to the best advantage, it may be desirable to know the series as such, as a useful preparation for the study of the Times and age. But whatever the advantages of knowing the order of the American Presidents, I deal with it here *solely* for the *training* effect in Analysis and as an example of a method of dealing with any list of *mere* names.

The mode of dealing with this Presidential series will show how all similar Series may be handled during the period of the pupil's training. I divide the series or list of the twenty-four American Presidents into three Groups: the first Group containing *seven* names, the second having *eight* names, and the third having *nine* names. The number of names in each Group is easily remembered: 7, 8 and 9.

The first Group contains the names of

GEORGE WASHINGTON,
JOHN ADAMS,
THOMAS JEFFERSON,
JAMES MADISON,
JAMES MONROE,
JOHN Q. ADAMS,
ANDREW JACKSON.

If the student has mastered the previous exercises, he ought to be able to analyse this Group of names with the greatest ease. Let him try, and if he fail, then let him study my Analysis as given below. Points of Analysis that appear weak to me may be strong for him, or *vice versa*. At all events, let him if possible learn each of the three Groups by his own Analysis, looking at my work afterwards.

FIRST GROUP.

Period of Organisation and Consolidation.

George WashiNGTON. JOHN Adams.	} In.	"Ton" and "John" make a fairly good In. by sound.
JOHN Adams. THOMAs Jefferson.		"John" and "Thom" (the "h" is silent in both names) make an In. by sound, imperfect but adequate if <i>noticed</i> .
Thomas JefferSON. James MadiSON.	} In.	Both names terminating with the same syllable, "son," makes a clear case of In. by sound and spelling.
JAMES Madison. JAMES Monroe.		This pair of names furnishes an example of perfect In. by sound and spelling in the Christian names.
James MONroe. JOHN Q. Adams.	} In.	"Mon" and "John" give us a good In. by sound.
JOHN Q. Adams. Andrew JACKson.		"Jack" is a nickname for John — a case of Synonymous In.

Now let the pupil repeat from memory the series from George Washington to Andrew Jackson at least five times, each time recalling and realizing how each pair of names was linked together. After this let the list be recalled

several times forward and backward, and more rapidly each time, without recalling the analysis.

REMARKS.

1. This group may well be termed the "Long-Term Group," since all of the seven Presidents except John Adams and his son, John Q. Adams, served two terms.
2. Three of the members of this group died after the close of their terms of office, on the *natal day* of the Republic, viz., John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, on the 4th of July, 1826, and James Monroe on the 4th of July, 1831.
3. This group also might be called the "J" group, since the initial letter of the Christian name or surname of every member of it begins with "J" or its phonetic equivalent, soft G, as George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, John Q. Adams, and Andrew Jackson.

SECOND GROUP.

Period of Territorial Expansion and the Growth of Internal Dissension.

ANDREW Jackson. Martin VAN BUren.	} In.	Two examples of In.: "An" and "Van," and "rew" and "Bu."
Martin Van BuREN. William HENry Harrison.		} In.
William HenRY John TYler.	} In. & Con.	
John TyLer. James K. PoLk.		The letter "l" belongs to both surnames, but there is no other letter in common. John and James is a case of Con., for both occur together many times in the New Testament.

James K. Polk.	}	In.	"K" is pronounced as if spelled "Kay," a good In. with "Tay."
Zachary TAYlor.			
ZachARY Taylor.	}	In.	The letters "ar" occur in both the Christian names.
MillARD Fillmore.			
MillARD Fillmore.	}	Con.	The "ar" of Millard and the "an" of Franklin is a case of Con. reversed, <i>i. e.</i> , "an" and "ar" is Con. since "n" precedes "r" in the Alphabet. Here the alphabetical order is reversed.
FRANKlin Pierce.			
FRANKlin Pierce.	}	In.	The "an" in Franklin is identical in spelling and in sound with the two "ans" in Buchanan.
James BuchANAN.			

Let the student recall the series of names from Andrew Jackson to James Buchanan several times, and at each recall let him also recall the *relation* which bound the pairs together, and then let him recall the series from Washington to Buchanan, both forward and backward, without consciously reviving the relations.

REMARKS.

1. This may be called the "Single Term Group," since none of the group served more than one term.
2. The group is notable for the fact that it is the only one in which two Presidents (William Henry Harrison and Zachary Taylor) died *natural* deaths while in office.

THIRD GROUP.

Period of Civil War and Reconstruction.

JAMES Buchanan.	}	In.	This pair of names furnishes an In. by <i>spelling</i> , not sound, "am" in both, but not pronounced alike. This must be <i>noticed</i> , as it is a weak In.
AbrahAM Lincoln.			

Abraham LinCOLN.	}	In.	The "l" in "coln," and the "h" in "John" are silent. It is a case of In. by sound. To the ear the sound of "Con." is like that of "Jon."
Andrew JOHNson.			
ANDrew Johnson.	}	In.	"An" in Andrew and in Grant has the same sound.
Ulysses S. GrANT.			
UlyssES S. Grant.	}	In.	"Es" in Ulysses and in Hayes is the same in <i>spelling</i> —but not in sound. It must be <i>noticed</i> , as it is the weakest of all. A stronger tie has heretofore been given.
Rutherford B. HayES.			
Rutherford B. HAYes.	}	Con.	There is a strong association between Hay of Hayes and the field of Garfield, as in the familiar word "Hayfield."
James A. GarFIELD.			
James A. GARfield.	}	In.	In "Gar" and "Ar" there is a strong In. by sound.
Chester A. ARthur.			
Chester A. ArTHUR.	}	In.	Between "thur" and "ver" there is a clear In. by sound.
GroVER Cleveland.			
Grover ClevelAND.	}	Con.	There is a fair In. by sound between "an" and "am;" but as they are alphabetically reversed, it makes a case of Con. reversed.
BenjAMin Harrison.			
BenjAMin Harrison.	}	In. & Ex.	Here "am" and "an" occur in alphabetical order, and is a case of In., and "jam," meaning pressing together, and "cle(a)ve" meaning to separate, are opposites, hence it is also an example of Exclusion.
Grover ClevelAND.			

Let the student, as in the case of the other groups, recall this list several times, and each time revive the relation by which each pair of names was cemented together, and

after this let him recall this list several times both ways without reviving the cementing relations, and finally let him recall several times, both ways, the entire series of Presidents from Washington to Cleveland, and from Cleveland to Washington.

REMARKS.

1. This group furnishes the notable fact that two Presidents (Lincoln and Garfield) were assassinated while in office.
2. Another peculiarity of this group is that, for the first time since the days of Washington, there was a widespread discussion and effort made to push the claims of a President (Grant) for a third term.
3. This group contains the name of the grandson (Benjamin Harrison) of William Henry Harrison, of the second group. The only other instance of relationship between the Presidents was in the case of John Adams and his son, John Quincy Adams of the first group.
4. This group contains the name of the only President (Andrew Johnson) who was ever sought to be impeached. The prosecution failed to convict, having lacked one vote of the number necessary for a conviction.
5. Grover Cleveland affords the first instance where the two terms of a President are separated by the full term of another President (Benjamin Harrison).

ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS.

A UNIQUE EXERCISE.

The method here used of memorising the order of the English sovereigns from William I., the Conqueror, to Victoria possesses the following novelties :—

(1) We learn the order of the entire series of thirty-seven sovereigns by means of the relations, direct and indirect, which we establish with the reigning sovereign, Victoria.

(2) The precise credit is claimed for this method which it is entitled to receive. In a list of proper names we sometimes have several surnames alike, with usually a difference of Christian names, as in the presidential series we have—*William Henry* Harrison and *Benjamin* Harrison, and *John* Adams and *John Quincy* Adams, and we also sometimes have the same Christian names prefixed to different surnames, as James *Madison* and James *Monroe*. But in the Sovereigns of England, from William I. to Victoria, we have many Christian names alike, and the differences indicated by *ordinal* numbers, as George I., George II., George III., George IV. This order of the English Kings is most extraordinary, neither the Popes of Rome, nor the French, nor any other list of kings, furnishing any parallel in more than a few incidents. It is these unique coincidences and recurrences that make it so easy to find relations between these sovereigns. This method is not applicable to the American Presidents, Prime Ministers of England, or hardly any other series.

(3) No accidental relations of parts of names is resorted to, as was done in the case of the American Presidents.

(4) The series is so taught that it can be recited for-