

whose *attention was formerly weak* will never allow a date to come before him without fixing it in mind by my method, and if he will also occasionally learn by heart a passage of prose or poetry by my *assimilating* methods, he will train his Attention in a pleasanter and more effective way than Hamilton did his by his studies in Euclid—besides making himself conspicuously accurate where most men are notoriously inaccurate.

[It is a most misleading mistake to suppose that the principles of the following or either of the previous chapters are to be *consciously and constantly* used by the pupil, whether he be a student or a man of business. It is only used at all during the training period—rarely afterwards. But during the training period, I desire the pupil to make as much use of the devices and principles of the system as he possibly can—and the more he uses them the sooner he no longer has occasion to use them.]

THOUGHTIVE UNIFICATIONS.

CONNECTING THE UNCONNECTED.

A Congressman could not remember the name of Zachary Taylor, the twelfth President of the United States, but he could always readily recall his nick-name, "Rough and Ready." In this case there was no *revivable* connection established in his mind between the *name* Zachary Taylor and the idea or image of the *man* known as Zachary Taylor—but there *was* a revivable connection in his mind between the name "Rough and Ready" and the idea or image of that man. Now the thing to be done to enable this Congressman to readily recall the name Zachary Taylor was to *establish or make a revivable connection* between the name Zachary Taylor and the image of him, or some characteristic of him, as it was known to that Congressman; or to connect the well-remembered name "Rough and Ready" to the usually forgotten name Zachary Taylor. This would be a *device* for helping him to revive this hitherto unrecalable name. But another and better way to aid him would be to **STRENGTHEN** his **REVIVING POWER** **GENERALLY**, so that he could readily recall the name Zachary Taylor as well as his other previous experiences; for there is no doubt that he had a *record* in his mind of the name Zachary Taylor; for whenever he failed to recall it, he *recognised* it the moment he saw it, or it was mentioned in his presence. This proved that he *knew* the name but could not *revive* it.

1. What difficulty did the Congressman have in connection with Z. Taylor? 2. What caused it? 3. What would have been his best aid to remember the name?

HOW TO HELP THE MEMORY.

There are therefore two ways of helping the memory.

(1) By a device resorted to in each separate case to help make a more vivid First Impression. Nearly all Memory Systems hitherto taught have only been such Devices; of little benefit except in the cases where they have been *actually applied*—mere temporary appliances, and many of them of doubtful value, devoid of any strengthening power. (2) By a Method of Memory TRAINING. This is the unique character of my System. It is used as a device during the process of developing the latent powers of the Memory and the Attention, but the *result of its use* is to so strengthen the Memory that, as a Device it is no longer required. As a trainer my System operates in three ways. (1) It increases the general *Impressionability*, so that all First Impressions must be more vivid than they have ever been before. (2) It increases the general *Revivability*, so that First Impressions are more under the control of the will, and can be afterward recalled when desired. (3) It compels the Intellect to stay with the senses and thereby it abolishes mind-wandering.

A one-sided view of the Memory proclaims that if vivid First Impressions are made in all cases, that is enough. This opinion implies a limited acquaintance with the different kind of memories. In some cases where a person is troubled with chronic forgetfulness, a vivid First Impression may be received, and no recollection of it will long survive. That a vivid impression was received is proved by the fact that, shortly after the occurrence, his memory of the details of it is possibly nearly perfect, and yet, after the lapse of a few days, or weeks, or months, the recollection of every trace of the occurrence has vanished. After the total oblivion of the matter in his waking moments, he will sometimes recall all the details of the affair in a dream. This is demonstration irresistible that the trouble in this

1. Did he have a *record* of the name in his mind? 2. How many ways are there of helping the memory? 3. What is the first way? 4. The second? 5. What is meant by Memory Training? 6. What is the unique character of my system? 7. What is the result of its use? 8. In how many ways does my system operate as a Trainer? 9. What are they?

case lies, not in receiving vivid First Impressions, but in the weakness of his reviving power. In fact, some memories are much oftener weak from deficiency in reviving power than from feebleness of first impressions. If, however, Impressionability be increased to the highest degree in all cases, and Revivability be strengthened to the same extent, all memories will be good, however bad some of them may theretofore have been in any or in all respects.

MODES OF ESTABLISHING CONNECTIONS.

RECOLLECTIVE ANALYSIS is used to memorise a series of words or facts between every pair of which the relation of In., Ex., or Con. exists. It equally applies to a single pair of such words or facts.

RECOLLECTIVE SYNTHESIS OR THOUGHTIVE UNIFICATION is used where *no relation exists*.

A *revivable* connection is established in such cases by means of a Correlation which always consists of one or more unifying intermediates. And the words, hitherto un-united, which are thus cemented together, are called *Extremes*.

We had experience in learning the Series in the first chapter that the application of the Laws of In., Ex., and Con. enable us to memorise those Series in much less time than it would have taken had we not known *how to make use of* those Laws. Many people could *never* have committed to memory such Series by mere *rote* or *repetition*, and not one in a hundred could have learnt to say them backwards by *rote* alone. Yet my Pupils easily learn them both ways, because Analysis affords the highest possible AID to the Natural Memory. In fact, the *deepest* and *most abiding* impression that can be made upon the Natural

1. When is Rec. Analysis used? 2. Rec. Synthesis? 3. How is a revivable connection established? 4. Have you carefully read every question at the bottom of the previous page, and *thought out* or written out answers to them? 5. Since questions are valuable helps to the learner, will you faithfully read all the questions hereafter in this lesson, and write out or think out the answers thereto? 6. What have the laws of In., Ex., or Con. enabled us to do? 7. Could all people have learned them by rote? 8. What affords the highest possible aid to the natural memory? 9. How are the deepest and most abiding impressions made on the Natural Memory? 10. What are the Memory-Senses?

Memory is by impressing it with *relations* of In., Ex., or Con.; because these are the Memory-Senses (if the phrase be allowed), these are the Eyes, Ears, Touch, Taste, and Smell of the Memory: and we have only to impress the Memory according to the laws of its own nature and the Memory will RETAIN the impression. This is exactly what my Art does: for I translate every case of Synthesis into an Analytic series by supplying one or more *Memory-intermediates* that grow out of the "Extremes," each one of which is an instance of In., Ex., or Con.—Thus, every example of Synthesis is a developed or extended Analysis. To make this translation from Synthesis into Analysis requires no intellectual ingenuity—no constructive power of imagination—but only a *recall to consciousness*, through In., Ex., or Con., of what we already know about the "Extremes." I call a specimen of developed Analysis a Correlation, because the Intermediates sustain the *direct, immediate, and specific* relation of In., Ex., or Con. to the "Extremes" (having nothing in common, in principle or nature, with the old-fashioned Mnemonical "Links," or "Phrases").

EXAMPLES OF CORRELATIONS.

Make your own Correlation (different from mine, given below) between each of the following seven pairs of Extremes:

[In. may be represented by 1, Ex. by 2, and Con. by 3]:

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----|-----------|
| 1. ANCHOR | (1) Sheet Anchor | (1) Sheet | (1) Bed | (1) | BOLSTER |
| — | (3) Capstan | (1) Night-cap | (3) Pillow | (3) | — |
| — | (3) Roadstead | (1) Bedstead | (1) | — | — |
| — | (3) Sea Bed | (1) | (1) | — | — |
| 2. PEN | (3) Ink | (1) Ink-bottle | (1) Smelling-bottle | (3) | NOSE |
| — | (1) Pensive | (2) Gay | (1) Nosegay | (1) | — |
| — | (3) Wiper | (3) | (3) | — | — |
| 3. SLAIN | (3) Battle | (3) Joshua | (3) | (3) | MOON |
| — | (1) Struck-down | (1) Moon-struck | (1) | (1) | — |
| — | (3) Fallen | (2) Risen | (3) | (3) | — |
| 4. TEA | (1) Teaspoon | (1) Spooney | (1) | (1) | LOVER |
| — | (3) Sugar | (1) Sweetheart | (1) | (1) | — |
| 5. ARROW | (3) Tell | (3) Apple | (3) Cider Mill | (1) | TREADMILL |
| — | (3) Flight | (3) Arrest | (3) Convict | (3) | — |
| 6. BEE | (1) Beeswax | (1) Sealing-wax | (3) Title deeds | (3) | ATTORNEY |
| — | (1) Queen Bee | (1) Queen's Counsel | (3) | (3) | — |
| 7. LASH | (1) Eye-lash | (1) Glass Eye | (1) Substitute | (1) | VICARIOUS |

Children and Adults, who have thoroughly learned Recollective Analysis and practised its exercises, find no difficulty in making Correlations, unless they are so afflicted with Mind-Wandering that they have never *digested* the impressions they have received, or unless their intellectual operations have been twisted out of the natural order by perversities of early education; but even in these cases the *diligent* student will be able—usually before these pages are finished—at once to correlate any word whatever to any or all the words in any dictionary. A learned Professor declared that no person unacquainted with astronomy could correlate "Moon" to "Omnibus." He did it thus: MOON—(3) Gibbous [one of the phases of the Moon]—(1) "Bus"—(1) OMNIBUS. I asked a pupil then present—a girl nine years old—to connect them. She promptly replied, "MOON—(1) Honey-moon—(3) Kissing—(1) Buss—(1) OMNIBUS." A moment after, she gave another: "MOON—(1) Full Moon—(1) 'Full inside'—(3) OMNIBUS." Once more: "MOON—(1) Moonlight—(1) Lightning—(3) Conductor"—(3) OMNIBUS." Another pupil imagined it would be *impossible* to correlate the following *letters* of the alphabet to *words* beginning with the same letters, as "A" to "Anchor," "B" to "Bull," "C" to "Cab," "D" to "Doge,"—as well as "Cooley" to "The." There are, however, no words which my Pupils cannot soon learn to correlate together with the greatest readiness, as:

"A"	(1) First Letter	(1) First Mate	(3) Ship	(3)	"ANCHOR"
" "	(1) Aviary	(3) Bird	(3) Flew	(1) Fluke	(1)
"B"	(1) Bee	(3) Sting	(1) Sharp Pain	(1) Sharp	—
" "	(1) Below	(1) Bellow	Horns	(1)	"BULL"
"C"	(1) Sea	(3) Ocean Steamer	(1) Cabin	(1)	"CAB"
"D"	(1) "D.D."	(1) Clerical Title	(1) Venetian	(1)	"DOGE"
"COOLEY"	(1) Coolly Articulated	(1) Definite	Article	(1)	"THE"

All possible cases to be memorised can be reduced to (1) ISOLATED FACTS, where each fact is correlated to some

1. What must we do in order to make the memory retain the impression?
2. Does my Art do this?
3. Into what do I translate every case of Synthesis?
4. What does it then become?
5. What is a correlation?
6. Are correlations difficult to make?

fact in its surroundings through which you must think as the *Best Known*, in order to recall it—many instances will be given in this lesson:—or, (2) SERIAL FACTS, which must be remembered in the *exact order* in which they were presented to the mind—illustrated by many examples in this Lesson.

NEVER FORGET that this System serves two distinct purposes: (1) That it is a Device for memorising any Isolated Fact or Serial Facts by means of mere Analysis, otherwise called Instantaneous Assimilation or memorised Correlations, as well as by other means. (2) And that by memorising and repeating for a considerable period Analytic Series, and especially by *making* and *memorising* one's own Correlations, it is an unequalled system of MEMORY-TRAINING. Let the ambitious Pupil learn as many examples as I give in the lessons in order to so strengthen his natural memory that he will no longer have to use the *device* for memorising, his natural memory permanently retaining all he desires to remember. This result comes only to those who carry out ALL the directions with genuine alacrity—not shirking one of them.

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS COMPARED.

It is sometimes asked, cannot "Analysis" cement together unconnected "Extremes"? This question implies a contradiction of terms. I reply, "Yes, by *accident*, and by *accident* only."

Analysis is *declaratory*—Synthesis is *constructive*. Analysis *discovers* and *describes* the relations actually existing—Synthesis applies connecting intermediates where no relations previously existed, and then Analysis characterizes the relations introduced by the cementing intermediates.

Even in the First Exercises the Series are Synthetic.

1. Do all persons find them easy? 2. What persons do not? 3. Can such persons become expert in making them? 4. How? 5. Make an original correlation of your own between these extremes. 6. To what may all possible cases to be remembered be reduced? 7. What are Isolated facts? 8. What two distinct purposes does my system serve?

Every pair of words of which such Series consists exemplifies the relations either of Inclusion, Exclusion, or Concurrence. I used to call that Lesson Recollective Analysis, because in it the pupil is engaged in familiarising himself with those Laws of Assimilation, and in *discovering* and *declaring* the character of the relations between the words of such Synthetic Series. He commits to memory such a series by *thinking* of the relations between the words. A minor object is to memorise the Series—but a greater and higher object never lost sight of in these Lessons is to train the Memory and Attention. And let the pupil clearly notice *how* this training comes about. Merely running over a Series—two words at a time—without discriminating the *kind* and *quality* of the relations between the words—hoping that the mind unpractised in the Laws of Assimilation will intuitively feel those relations, constitutes no training of the Memory. Such reading neither strengthens the old power nor develops any new power. It is a blind act of unconscious absorption, however little be absorbed. But if the mind *acts* in such cases and *tries to find* and *characterise* the relations, then the appreciation of the relations of In., Ex., and Con., is quickened and invigorated and becomes in time so intensified that those relations are thereafter almost automatically felt, and the impression they make on the Memory, henceforth, is the most vivid possible.

Every Correlation is a Synthetic Series. It can be and should *always* be analyzed, but Analysis never makes a Correlation. That is the function of Synthesis. Since "extremes" are words with no relation between them, Analysis cannot find what does not exist. But *accident* sometimes makes a *spelling* or *letter* relation between the "Extremes," and then Analysis can memorise these "extremes" by means of such accidental relations. To illustrate:—

A physician was troubled to remember on which side of the heart are the "mitral valves." As they are on the left

1. To whom only does this result come? 2. What question is frequently asked? 3. What is the reply? 4. Is analysis declaratory? 5. If so, why? 6. Is Synthesis constructive? 7. If so, explain why? 8. Why is the first lesson called Rec. Analysis?

side of the heart, he might have noticed that "mitral" ends with the letter "l," and that the word "left" begins with the letter "l"—as "l" belongs to both of these words, here would be a case of analysis. Such a device, however, could never be erected into a rule, for it is founded on accident only, and cannot be used in all cases. How much more vivid to many persons in this example is a Correlation, thus: "*Mitral valves . . . mitred Abbots. . . none left . . . left.*"

To remember which of the University crews wears *dark blue* and which *light*, we can note that the vowel "I" belongs alike to Cambridge and "Light" and is absent from Oxford and "Dark."

Take a case in Trigonometry—a *Complement* is what remains after subtracting an angle from *one* right-angle. Take 60 degrees from 90 degrees, and we have the complement 30 degrees—a *Supplement* is what remains after subtracting an angle from two right-angles. Take 120 degrees from 180 degrees and we have the supplement 60 degrees. How to remember that "Complement" relates to one right-angle, and "Supplement" relates to two right-angles, is a difficulty for a poor memory. Looking at the accidents of the subject, we see that Supplement and two right-angles have a relation in this, that Supplement begins with *S* and two begins with *T*. *S. . T.* Hence we must remember that Supplement relates to *Two* right-angles, and, of course, the word Complement to one right-angle.

Or to use the Synthetic Method: "*Complement* (compliment) . . . praise bestowed . . . prize-winner . . . won . . . *one right-angle*" (*Complement* completes right-angle . . . *one . . . right-angle*) or "*Supplement* . . . supple . . . bend double . . . 'two double' . . . *two right-angles*" (*Supplement* . . . added to . . . more than one right-angle . . . *two right-angles*).

1. What is every correlation? 2. Does Analysis ever make a correlation? 3. Why would not "A" make a good In. by sound with "Anchor" on preceding page? 4. Is the method of remembering by accidental coincidences always reliable? 5. If not, why? 6. Are there cases where it cannot be used? 7. Make an original correlation between "Mitral valves" and "left." 8. How does the accidental coincidence in connection with the University crews compare with Synthesis? 9. Does this method make an impression on the novice at first? 10. Does the novice adhere to it? 11. Why?

I could give many other illustrations of the narrow scope of this Method of Accidents, though *genuine within that scope*, and how, in *all* cases, by the Synthetic Method we can find in the facts *to be remembered* the means of their recollection. One case more: In regard to memorising the statement that "the Posterior Nerve of the Spinal Column is Sensory, and the Anterior Nerve is Motor," using this Method of Accidents, "You observe that Posterior and Sensory go together, and that Anterior and Motor go together. The initial letters of Posterior and Sensory are P and S, and the initial letters of Anterior and Motor are A and M. By considering that A and M are in the upper part of the Alphabet and P and S are in the lower part of it, you will be sure to remember that Anterior is associated with Motor and Posterior with Sensory." I admit that the *first time* one hears this elaborate method applied the novelty of the principle of it might make an impression; but, after that, the method would probably fail from its lengthy exposition; because it is difficult to retain the *steps of an argument* in a weak Memory and therefore such a method cannot certainly act as a *Means for Aiding* the Memory. How do I manage this case? By correlating Posterior to Sensory, thus: *Posterior . . . Post-Mortem . . . Insensible . . . Sensory*; or Anterior to Motor, thus: *Anterior . . . Ant . . . disturbed ant-hill . . . commotion . . . Motor*; or *Anterior . . . antediluvian . . . rush of water . . . water-power . . . Motor*. In uniting the two unconnected "Extremes" together by means of a *developed Analysis memorised*, the Natural Memory is aided in a very high degree.

By MEMORISING a Correlation, you so unite the two EXTREMES in memory, that you need not afterwards *recall the intermediates*. The intermediates drop out of the memory by what Prof. E. W. Scripture, Psychologist, of Yale University, calls the Law of Obliteration.

1. Why does the method fail? 2. Is it difficult to retain the steps of an argument in the natural memory? 3. Can you give any instances in your own experience where Analysis has helped you to cement Extremes together? 4. Can such a method act as a means for aiding the memory? 5. How would I manage the case spoken of?

HOW TO MEMORISE A CORRELATION.

To memorise a Correlation you must *at first*, if your *Natural Memory be weak*, repeat from *memory* the intermediates forwards and backwards, as:—ANCHOR . . sheet-anchor . . sheet . . bed . . BOLSTER—BOLSTER . . bed . . sheet . . sheet-anchor . . ANCHOR, at least three times each way. These six repetitions from memory, three forward and three back, are only required *at first*. In a short time you will infallibly remember every Correlation *you make*; at last, the memory will become so strong, that you will no longer have to make Correlations at all. After you have repeated the Correlation, then repeat the two extremes, thus—"Anchor" . . "Bolster." "Bolster" . . "Anchor." "Bolster" . . "Anchor." "Anchor" . . "Bolster."

Nothing else is so easy to memorise as a Correlation, for a Correlation is not a "mental picture" or "story"—it is neither a proposition, sentence or phrase. It has no rhetorical, grammatical, argumentative or *imaginative* character. It is simply an elemental primordial Psychological Sequence of Ideas in which one includes another, excludes another, or in which one idea has been so often or so vividly united with another in past experience that the two are inseparably connected in memory—and a little practice in *making* and *memorising* these Correlations soon makes it *impossible* to forget them.

ASSIMILATIVE ASSOCIATION AND MEMORY.

Probably no psychological mistake was ever fraught with greater injury to the cause of public or self-education than the too prevalent opinion amongst teachers generally that "physiological retentiveness" is the memory's sole reliance *in all stages of life*. It is nearly the sole reliance in infancy, and a partial reliance in youth. But when an

1. What is the result of uniting two unconnected "Extremes" by means of a developed Analysis? 2. What are the first steps in memorising a correlation? 3. How long are these repetitions required? 4. What will be the result in a short time? 5. What will be the final result? 6. Are correlations easy to remember? 7. What is the result of making and memorising them? 8. When does the most vivid concurrence take place?

accumulation of experiences and a fair command of language have been gained, new acquisitions are henceforward principally made by *the affiliation* of one idea upon or with another or *the making of associations between ideas already established*.

And, if this be so, then memory must be very greatly improvable, since no mental power is susceptible of so much improvement as assimilative association.

A good memory, whether natural or acquired, belongs to quick and vivid *associability* and *revivability* rather than to mere inherent and perpetual physiological *record making*.

After a certain number of experiences the child learns the appearance of a square. All his future experiences, however varied, of squares become affiliated upon, or connected with the record of this original square. If each new square had to be separately impressed on the brain as a distinct and independent physiological record, it would take as much time and trouble to learn every new square as it did to learn the first square. But the *instant* recognition of every square after learning the first one shows that the old brain record is used in the case of each new experience of squares or that the new square is interpreted by the old or original record through the Laws of Association. Again: Taking the prefixes *com., de., im., op., re., sup., &c.*, which are used in thousands of cases, and the suffixes *ment, sion, ible, ibility, &c.*, also used in thousands of words, and using these in connexion with the root word "Press" we have compress, depress, impress, oppress, repress, suppress, and also compressible, depression, re-impress, suppression, impressment, &c.

Must a new physiological record be made for each form of the sixty or more words of which Press constitutes the base, and must a new record be also made for each of the prefixes and suffixes in the thousands of combinations in which they occur? No one believes any such absurdity.

If space permitted it would be easy to offer additional considerations tending to show that after infancy and early youth new acquisitions are mainly made by combinations and recombinations of ideas already possessed, and not by new and independent records physiologically re-impressed on each occasion.

RULES FOR MAKING CORRELATIONS.

1. Never make a correlation except in conformity to In., Ex., and Con. Carelessness here is fatal to success.
2. When the pupil reads a correlation of mine, he should indicate the relations between the words by writing in the figures 1, 2, or 3, and he should pursue the same course with his own correlations.
3. Ofttimes "extremes" are in different planes of thought, so occasionally three intermediates are necessary to cement them; two are often required; but after considerable practice in making correlations one usually suffices.
4. A correlation is a *successive advance*, and an intermediate must not refer back to any except its *immediate* antecedent, never to its second or third antecedent. A pupil wrote:—*Short steps ... stepson ... real son ... more a son ... Morrison.* Here, "more a son" refers to the comparison between "real son" and "stepson," but the latter is the second antecedent so the correlation is a defective one. He might have said: *Short steps ... stepson ... Morrison.*
5. A word may be used twice but never three times. *Pen ... pensive ... gay ... nosegay ... Nose.* Here "gay" is properly used twice, and after that, it is dropped and you can go on with the rest of the word, to wit, *nose.*
6. A compound phrase including a verb is rarely allowable, since the intermediates must be the simplest elements, either sensations or perceptions [relations among sensations] or abstractions [relations among relations], or one of these with either of the others, always exemplifying either In., Ex., or Con.
7. My correlations are good for me, but they may not be so vivid to others, especially where the concurrences are used. To fix the date of Magna Charta (1215), the pupil could memorise this Correlation—MAGNA CHARTA. . .

1. What is fatal to success in making correlations? 2. What do the figures 1, 2, and 3 indicate in Rule 2? 3. How many intermediates should there be?

King John. . . Jew's teeth. . . DENTAL. But if the pupil did not know *before* that King John had granted that charter, and if he did not also know the story about the extraction of the Jew's teeth to make him pay the royal exaction, there would be no concurrence as to the first word and second, or second and third, and if he learned the Correlation it would be by mere repetition without aid from Analysis. In such a case he would make and memorise his own Correlation, perhaps thus: MAGNA CHARTA . . . magnify . . . diminish . . . DWINDLE. When a pupil makes his own Correlations, every concurrence he uses is a *real* concurrence to him, and so with his Ins. and Exs. This is a decisive reason why the Pupil should merely look upon my Correlations as models, but make and memorise *his own* Correlations in all cases, as being more vivid to *him* and, therefore, more certainly remembered, as well as more effectively strengthening the Memory in both its stages.

8. Vivid Ins. by *meaning* are better than Ins. by S. (the latter when used, should be as perfect as possible). EAR . . . EEL makes a weak In. by S. to some persons, but it would make a much more vivid first impression to most persons to deal with them in this way: EAR . . . (w)ring . . . twist . . . wriggle . . . EEL. But "Bivouac . . . aqueduct" is a perfect In. by S. as to the last syllable of the former and the first syllable of the latter, since those syllables are pronounced exactly alike. We may connect Bivouac to Rain thus: "Bivouac . . . aqueduct . . . flowing water . . . falling water . . . RAIN."

9. *Never*—in the early stages of the study of the System—make a *second* Correlation until you have *memorised the first*.

10. Although *making* and *memorising* Correlations serves the useful purpose of fixing specific facts in the memory, yet the MAIN OBJECT in making and memorising Correlations is to develop the latent power of the Natural Memory to such a degree that all facts are hereafter remembered without the aid of conscious Correlations.

11. Never try to find *analytic* date or number words until you *know the material facts connected with the date or number* before you. The student wishes to fix the date of

Voltaire's birth, in 1694. "The Shaper" and "The Giber" occur to him. If he is ignorant of the facts of Voltaire's life, he will correlate thus: "Voltaire .. (1) .. volatile .. (2) .. 'fixed' .. (1) .. 'The Shaper' *The Shaper* (1694);" or "Voltaire .. (1) .. tear to pieces .. (1) .. mocking dissector .. (1) .. *The Giber* (1694)." If he had known that Voltaire was a born writer, he would have found the analytic relation in "Voltaire ... *The Shaper* (1694)" or if he had known that he was a terrible mocker, he would have said: "Voltaire ... *The Giber* (1694)." If he wished to fix the date of the discovery of America, he might think of "*Terrapin*" (a large tide-water turtle, abounding in Maryland), and correlate thus: "Discovery of America ... (1) .. Maryland ... (3) ... *Terrapin* (1492)." But if he remembers that Con. covers all cases of Cause and Effect, Instrument or Means to End, Person by whom, &c., and if he reflects that this discovery has been a blessing to the Old as well as the New World, he would say: "Discovery of America ... (3) *True Boon* (1492)." Or, if he considers that the moment America was made known to Europe the whole of the Western Continent was open to every new-comer, he would find analytic date-words thus: "Discovery of America ... (3) ... *Door open* (1492)." If he merely wants to fix the fraction 92, he could use the first two consonants of the name of one of his ships, and say: "Discovery of America ... *Pinta* (1492)."

ISOLATED FACTS.

Correlate an *Isolated Fact* to something (to some fact in its environment or *entourage* that is BEST KNOWN and) which you are sure to THINK OF when you wish to recall the *Isolated Fact*.

HOW TO REMEMBER PROPER NAMES WHEN INTRODUCED.

An infallible method of remembering proper names is (1) Get the name when introduced. If not quite sure, ask for it. (2) *Pronounce* the name aloud whilst looking at the

person. Do this several times, if possible. The object is to produce a concurrence or connection between the *sight-image of the Person* and a *sound-image of his Name*. (3) To help the ear for sound, always pronounce everyone's name aloud whenever you meet him. This helps nature. These directions carried out never fail to make a pupil perfect in remembering proper names.

To remember PROPER NAMES in the absence of the person, correlate the Person's Name to the name of some Peculiarity of the Person (as the BEST KNOWN and) which you are sure to THINK of whenever you think of the Person. If you memorise the Correlation, you will recall the Name whenever you think of this Peculiarity (whatever struck you about him).

To remember a proper name, Mnemonists resort to In., by S. But this *alone* gives no starting point, no "Best Known" which you are certain to think of, and which will enable you to recall the name, *provided* you cement by a memorised Correlation the "Best Known" to the name itself; in fact, a similarity of sound *alone* and *by itself* is likely to mislead you into reviving itself instead of the name. A celebrated Member of Parliament (who in the days of his youth, before he had greatly tested Mnemonics, gave a high opinion of its value) was to deliver an address at the Birkbeck Institution, some years ago. Having difficulty in remembering proper names, he thought he would fix the name of its founder in his memory by the Mnemonical device of finding a word that sounded like it; he said to himself, "It reminds me of 'Pinchbeck.'" He commenced as follows: "Before coming to the subject on which I am to speak this evening, I desire to pay a deserved tribute of praise to the founder of this great Institution, the celebrated Mr. PINCHBECK." A shout of laughter revealed to him that Mnemonics may get us into trouble, and fail to help us out: he could not remember the real name, Birkbeck, until it was told him. If he had mastered this System, his NEW memory-power would have enabled

1. To what must we correlate a person's name? 2. What will be the result if we memorise the correlation? 3. To what do Mnemonists resort to remember proper names? 4. Does this *alone* give a starting point? 5. What is a similarity of sound alone likely to do?