

and not more than this be devoted to psychology and the "no-time" critic must show that this is too much for its usefulness or what is perhaps more to the point, that these three hours a week could be more profitably spent in studying some other subject. As has already been indicated, it is not at all clear that more than about this time can be devoted profitably to psychology unless the lecturer go into very great detail by way of illustration, or something along the line of individual laboratory work or seminary work be introduced. There is, of course, more of interest and value in psychology than can be given in the suggested time, but the capacity of the student and true educational work set certain evident limits to the amount of any subject which should be attempted in a year's work. In three hours a week a fairly detailed outline of general psychology may be given with sufficiently full experimental demonstrations and applications to the work of the teacher.

With this as introduction we may now turn to the first part of the question we are to discuss, namely, why teach psychology to teachers-in-training? That is, in effect, of what value is psychology to teachers?

This question should not, however, receive too narrow an interpretation, for education, and so the work of the teacher, may be said to take two directions according as it fulfils the end of culture or that of utility. The distinction between these ends is not, however, to be sought in the nature of the subjects taught nor indeed in the way in which they are taught, but rather in the attitude of the student to what he studies. The same subject may to one man serve the highest culture while to his neighbor in the class-room its value is estimated wholly from the standpoint of its utility: he asks the question, What good is it? How will it help me to teach, to preach, to manage a business or what not? All subjects may, therefore, be *culture*-subjects when they are studied for the sake of information alone or of the general outlook they give one on the world or life, and all subjects may serve the end of utility in so far as they are studied for the sake of the immediate aid they may be in obtaining a livelihood, in doing this or that.*

*In making this distinction we do not overlook the fact that culture and utility need not at all be opposites of which one or the other may be taken but not both. However easily some subjects may become cultural and however naturally others may be utilitarian, it is still true that it is only the attitude of the student that can determine which end they actually do serve in a given case, and indeed there is no reason why they may not in many cases serve both.