

helpful to the teacher who possesses them. Still, of all these necessary qualifications, I maintain there is not one that any woman cannot attain if she will, for the simple reason that they are much more moral than intellectual. It is a point not always sufficiently recognized, that in every calling or profession the success depends really infinitely more upon the moral character than the intellectual gifts. Of course, a perfect success requires the union of both; but intellect, or "cleverness," as people rather vaguely term an indefinite amount of brains, is far from being the absolute necessity most people seem to think. A woman, therefore, who thinks her *métier* is teaching, should consider very seriously, first, whether she has the patience to go over and over her subject, never wearying, and never losing temper, till she is certain her pupil or pupils thoroughly understand it; and then, whether she has further the patience, a fortnight later, to find that they have entirely forgotten her carefully-worked-out explanation, and so to go back again and reiterate as much as is necessary, still without losing temper or heart. If she cannot do this, her teaching will not be of the enduring kind. She may introduce her pupils to much knowledge, but she will not fix it in their minds; and the result, unless they work it out in later years for themselves, will be the vague half-knowledge of a subject against which every one nowadays calls out. Next, the sympathy. By this I mean a capacity for seeing what the pupil's difficulties are; and this, I am inclined to think, is the necessary qualification for a teacher, though I have put it second. It is simply a question of observation, and this ought not to be so very difficult to most women; but it is so to a great many, from the habit we all have of thinking more of ourselves than of others. "A heart at leisure from itself" is what is

wanted here, and difficult as it often is to turn away one's thoughts so as to see with another person's eyes instead of our own, it is not impossible to those who really try to do so. It is the want of sympathy that often prevents a teacher knowing whether the pupil has really understood the explanation or not. The explanation may be an excellent one in itself, but if it does not touch the particular stumbling-block in the pupil's way it is a mere dead letter to him. He is bewildered, and both he and the teacher think him hopelessly stupid, when it is not really a case of stupidity at all. As to method, punctuality, and organization, all given above as necessary to a good teacher, I am quite aware that many, perhaps most, women are born devoid of these qualities, but there is no reason why they should die equally devoid of them. They have simply got to make up their minds that they will learn them and learn them they can. I do wish more women would see that they can make themselves what they choose; that it is a matter of their own will, and not of circumstances, or "my peculiar temperament," or "my unfortunate tendency," whether they are capable, self-reliant, and efficient, or indolent, dawdling, and untrustworthy. Of course, health has something to do with this, but much less than is commonly supposed. A really delicate woman may not get through as much in the day as a strong one, but there is no reason that what she can do should not be as well done; and here organization can work wonders. Under organization I include the sort of wise forethought that will make a teacher time her instruction judiciously, arranging it to the best advantage; and, when she has the power, so dividing it as to be the least strain upon herself or the pupils. I have left to the last the one intellectual qualification I consider necessary to a