

THE GREATEST WORK ON EARTH

Julie was placed by God at a key point in the history of education. Catholic education is one expression of the Church's divine commission to teach. It is therefore under the general protection of the Holy Ghost. Whenever in the Church's history there has been need for a renewal or reshaping of educational concepts, the Holy Spirit has raised up pioneer saints to meet the emergency. St. Benedict's monastic schools answered the challenge of the barbarian invaders; the great scholastics of the middle ages: St. Albert, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, captured the universities; the Jesuits, the Ursulines, St. Peter Fourier and St. Jeanne de Lestonnac met the errors of the renaissance and of the reformation. Such times of educational crisis are rare but they are for that very reason important, as they determine future development for several generations to come. The work of the pioneer saints is to gather up at such times the educational tradition of the Church, and to express it in a new form. Their contribution to education, therefore, has in it much that is typical of its own period, much that is traditional and much that is personal to the saint in question. The last period that was critical for educational development was the later eighteenth century, from about 1750 to Napoleon, and it is no coincidence to find that the dates of Julie's life (1751-1816) cover these years exactly. Fifty years earlier her work would have been impossible, fifty years later it would have come too late. Providence placed her exactly when and where her life could be most fruitful.

Julie's dates were important because during her lifetime the lines of development for the next century and a half took shape. The great questions which were first asked then are still being asked now: What is education meant to do? Who should be educated? Who should be responsible for education? Theories vital for the future were put forward, but they were conceived in the light of eighteenth century rationalism and in the spirit of revolt. Rousseau, Voltaire and La Chalotais had each his own views on the purpose, nature and provision of education. The Parlement of Brittany nodded sagely over proposals for state-provided neutral schools. Reform was in the air, simply awaiting an opportunity to be reduced to practice; but the new ideas were non-Christian and, when the great chance came in the sweeping away of the old order by the revolution of 1789, the question was: How is this chance to be taken? There were two answers, that of the revolution and that of the Church.

The program of the revolution was put forward in an atmosphere of revolt: intellectual, political, social and religious. Voltaire and the *encyclopedistes* with their cynical spirit of mockery reflected the superficiality to which the intellectual revolt led, and the moral breakdown that was the logical consequence of its rejection of the principle of authority. The new government, new society, new calendar even, showed the lengths to which the political and social leaders would go in their determination to make a complete break with the past, however unrealistic such a break might be. In the religious field, the rebellious spirit was

evident in Gallicanism and Jansenism long before the revolutionary government condemned a whole generation to ignorance by its policy of de-Christianization. The underlying philosophy of the revolution was rationalism and its educational expression was found in state-controlled, neutral schools whose code was that of republican ethics.

The Church's program, on the other hand, was given in an atmosphere of order and authority. A sound and deep intellectual, social and moral training, filled with the spirit of reverence, stood in sharp contrast to the rationalist revolt of the mind. Far from rejecting the past as such, Catholic education struck a balance between past and present, bringing the best of one into the service of the other. In the sphere of religion, devotion to the Sacred Heart and to the Holy See, and a renewal of Christian life, helped to build up even to the heroism of martyrdom, the Catholicism that the revolution was so bent on destroying. The foundation of the Church's educational work was faith, and its expression was found in thoroughly catholic schools whose code involved full commitment to the Christian ideal. Each of the two contrasting viewpoints was powerful to shape the future. Indeed, the later division of the world into two camps, those of the Church and of state materialism, is seminally contained in them. It is the glory of Julie as an educator that she gave a magnificent practical expression to the Church's point of view and in so doing determined to some extent the future course of catholic education.

Her own thought was in the French tradition and yet peculiarly personal. She could not have been a Frenchwoman and not have been interested in schooling, for the very character of the nation, practical, lucid and mentally stable, made it tend towards an interest in things educational. France had her diocesan *petites écoles*, her writing schools and her charity schools from an early time, and nearly all the Church's great teaching orders were either French or had strong French connections. Moreover, France had tried, through St. Peter Fourier, Françoise de Bremond and St. Jean Baptiste de la Salle, to provide a complete free educational system at all levels, and to form congregations of women who would devote themselves to the work of making such a system available for girls. There had been the hope of education for the poor and of teachers trained to give it, but until the revolution such ideas had remained utopian. To realize them would have involved a totally new concept of religious life: a congregation without enclosure, free from the obligation of reciting the office, with a central government and preferably with no distinction between choir and lay sister. It meant a kind of religious liberty, equality and fraternity which no Church authority from the Middle Ages until the revolution was prepared to allow. Julie appreciated perfectly its desirability and its necessity. She knew too that the world to which the former prohibitions had corresponded had gone for ever with the disappearance of the old social order. She conceived her work therefore on radically new lines. Ideals, dear to the hearts of French saints of whose educational work she was ignorant, found their realization in her achievements.

She would have been the first to rejoice in the unconscious connection, had she known of it.

Julie's achievement, however, remains her own. The buoyant, engaging and dynamic personality that was hers, her depth and balance, her vivacity and humor, her strength and vision are met in every point of it and her entire thought and work re-echo her unflinching and smiling, "Isn't God good!"

She was a practical educator, not a theorist. She never wrote a treatise on the training of children, and she was so busy doing the work that she never paused to elaborate her educational philosophy. In her letters, however, written in moments snatched here and there and in her instructions to the young sisters, we find most of her educational ideas; and fortunately these sources give a clear picture of her views on the dignity, aims and nature of education.

In the first place, Julie saw education as a sublime work, uplifting and inspiring. It was a privilege to be engaged in it for it was essentially apostolic, a sharing in and an extension of the work of our Lord himself, of the apostles and of the teaching Church. "You would have to be God himself to understand its greatness," she said. It was redemptive: "the most important work that can be done on earth." Therefore she wanted it to be done with a great spirit of faith, on broad and generous lines as befitted the liberty of the children of God. Her views were always wide. "*Au large!*" she urged constantly. "Do not whittle down the grandeur of the children's Christian vocation! We cannot have anything petty or superficial in our work!" In her eyes only the total commitment of the teacher to her task could measure up to what was demanded by an educational vocation. She liked her teachers to forget themselves in the greatness of what had to be done.

In her views on the aims of education, Julie was no less definite. There were primary aims which were based on principle and were therefore unchanging, and secondary ones which were variable, requiring adaptation to different times and places. The primary aim was twofold. It affected the individual in that it envisaged the full development, both natural and supernatural, of each child; but it also reached out to society, as it proposed a renewal of Christian family life through the training of the mothers of the next generation. Julie's individual approach was famous. To put each child in the way of salvation was the height of her ambition, and she could say with conviction that she would be well satisfied if God had gathered the whole congregation together for the sake of one single soul. This ultimate objective of all catholic life, the glory of God and the salvation of souls, was the main aim and motive of Julie's educational work; but her mind was clear that, within this general missionary intention, there was contained the more restricted, specific object of education seen as the development of the child's natural God-given gifts. Intellectual growth, social training, manual skill were each important, and to help the child to acquire them was education's secondary aim. Julie called them *les petites sciences* to

distinguish them from *la grande science* which was the knowledge of God, but she never underrated them. She would have been indignant to hear catholic schools accused of substituting catechetics and religious culture for other necessary kinds of instruction, and allegations that a catholic education does not really train the mind would have struck her as nonsense. She put religious instruction first, and rightly; but she insisted too on hard, serious intellectual work and on steady effort to acquire the practical skills. Far from the saving of souls being a pretext for not preparing thoroughly the arithmetic, French or penmanship that was the subject of the moment, it was precisely because the teachers were there to save souls that the secular subjects had to be well taught. These subjects would change, she knew. "What is necessary to equip the children for life" was Julie's summary of *les petites sciences*. But their value in bringing children to the one thing necessary would not change, and the standard which Julie fixed for them was an abiding one.

When she considered the nature of education, Julie thought of it as being at once an individual process of growth for the child and a social process in which the teacher handed on the past to the pupil. Both processes took place simultaneously and required the right kind of environment. The home in which the parents taught their children in an atmosphere of Christian kindness and security was clearly the place where education began but, as the children grew up and had to take their place in a complex society, the school came to take over many of the responsibilities of the home. In fact, most of Julie's observations were about children and teachers in school.

She saw the children with the eyes of faith. Each one had a mixture of good to be encouraged and evil to be checked. But the child was a child and not a small adult (*an adult writ small*). The kind of school life that the child needed was not a smaller edition of what would have suited a grown-up, but something quite different that suited the child himself. Julie was so convinced of this that she would not even let the children dress, as was the custom, in styles that were miniature versions of their mothers' fashions. When one good doyen of the parish wanted the children to wear long, black dresses that were 'semi-religious,' Julie protested that the children were not nuns. "They are only children," she said. "Let us dress them like children." She warned her teachers to teach at the children's speed and not at their own, to vary the types of lessons "because the interest does not last," to give breaks for recreation because concentration in young children is very limited. She suggested too that the little ones needed a sense of security and of affection: "The teacher must have the good will of the child, otherwise she can do nothing. Too much severity is not good in training young people. Later on, so as not to be like you, they will fall into the opposite extreme." Julie's main concern was with the teacher. Contrary to some theorists, she believed that the teacher should exercise a positive influence, and for her the impact of the mature mind of the teacher on the immature mind of the child was of the very essence of education. So important did she consider this that she made the training of teachers a fourth vow in the early days of Notre Dame, and

it always remained the great means of promoting the work of the congregation. "You do more good by training one good teacher than by looking after a hundred boarders," she said. In her own day it was a question of training religious teachers, but the tradition formed by her has been handed down and extended so that the colleges at Bastogne, Berchem, Dowanhill and Mount Pleasant and the education departments in Boston, Belmont and Washington are doing a work which must be close to her heart.

Julie trained her future teacher in three ways: as a person, as an educator and as a technician in the classroom. It was essential that the candidate should have the right qualities before being admitted to professional training for, as Julie remarked: "What the teacher is, is more important than what she does or than what she knows." She looked first for sincerity of Christian conviction. A person who was genuinely christian and totally committed to the implications of the Christian life would have the right moral influence on developing minds and hearts. She would know the difference between the letter of the catechism and the life-giving depths of revealed truth. She would be able to communicate the fullness and attractiveness of Christian teaching with the warmth and enthusiasm that came from her own living of it. Firmness, virility and courage Julie looked for too, and the steady purpose which would be able to persevere when the children seemed to make no progress or when the accumulation of worries was oppressive. She was fond of exhorting her teachers to have a "manly courage." "Never mind what people think!" she would remark. "You go your own way. Oh for some maturity instead of all these wretched hesitations." Calmness and self-control were qualities that she expected in a candidate. These would make the teacher consistent in action and able to reflect before giving commands. Peace and order would then reign in the classroom, and the children would have the right conditions for work. But Julie knew that, as well as these strong foundation qualities, a trainer of children would need the cheerfulness, zest and joy that appeal so strongly to young people. Her own smile and buoyancy were proverbial, and she liked gaiety in others. "You know," she wrote to the superior of one school, "parents will never want to send their children if they think that you are as solemn as a row of nightcaps."

Personal qualities therefore came first: "What we want is a combination of strength and sweetness, of firmness and gentleness, energy and peace; plenty of effort, courage and activity but without hastiness or fuss ... Everything must be done peacefully; that is absolutely necessary with children ... This firm calmness is much more than *savoir-vivre* and it is not something that you simply acquire by education. It goes very deep and argues a complete possession of one's own soul." To give the young teacher that self-possession was the aim of all the training of mind and will that was Julie's first concern. She did not think of the training for teaching as being purely a matter of professional efficiency, for such efficiency in the hands of the wrong person would endanger the children. Just as today the training of students must be the training of the whole person, which

goes far beyond academic work and teaching practices; so for Julie, the development of the right character and personality was supremely important.

Granted the right kind of applicant, willing to accept personal training, Julie would proceed to professional preparation. Here she thought of the teacher as an educator first and then as a mistress competent in the classroom. Her concept of the educator involved more than being a good class mistress. It required a good grounding in the fundamental truths on which a system of education could logically be built, and an awareness of the imponderables that would influence thought and decision. Julie therefore ensured that her teachers understood that education involves the whole man, body and soul: that it is directed to man's final end: that in the case of Christian education it must be Christ-centered, respecting the supernatural in man and allowing for the fact of original sin. She formed concepts of authority, order and discipline and in general gave a wide version of what we now call principles of education.

All this she considered necessary before the future teacher could begin her classroom teaching. Without the right fundamental attitudes, habits and sense of values, there was danger that the professional preparation would be like a quotation out of its context. The candidate must know the who and what of teaching before she could profitably come to the what and how. Julie was wise in maintaining the balance between principles and practice: and she avoided the later error of overstressing methods and techniques for immediate use, as if it were this kind of efficiency alone which made a teacher.

Yet she was undoubtedly thorough in her professional work. She planned it in a twofold way: courses of study for the matter of the lessons, and practice in class for methods. Studies were both religious and secular, and adequate time had to be given to each as a matter of justice. Julie herself took a great deal of the religious teaching. She was a kind of patron saint of the catechism, and her special gift was to win the children's hearts by her clear and attractive explanations. She used a variety of sources: sacred scripture, Church history, the liturgy, hymns, prayers, devotions, pictures. All gave her material for practical Christocentric instruction in which she was not content merely to reach the minds of the children, but went on to open out to them the life "hidden with Christ in God" that she was prepared to lead with them. The first teachers of the congregation would watch her explain a truth, illustrate and discuss it and then follow up the lesson with memory work connected with it. The "introduce, explain and apply" of the present kerygmatic approach to catechetics is exactly the pattern which Julie adopted. Moreover, she anticipated later developments in insisting that the combining of the Old Testament with the new was necessary to cast light on both, and "gave great sublimity to religion." Her model lessons were always based on revealed truth. "*Parlez raison*" ("Talk sense"), she would say. Piety had its place but it was no substitute for the rock of scripture, dogma and the liturgy: "The children come to us for the bread of sound doctrine." She wanted to be sure that her teachers could give it.

In secular subjects she considered it a matter of strict justice that a teacher should know her material well: "The work must be well prepared and how can you teach what you do not know?" The amount of knowledge was very limited according to modern standards, but more limited still was the store with which the candidate began. The teacher of 1807 struggling with a dictation was probably just as taxed in her intellectual resources as the present day student who is trying to manipulate an intractable thesis. Beginning from the very ABC, as Julie put it, the future teacher had to learn the art of reading with clarity and fluency. She had to develop a pleasing intonation and that power of phrasing correctly which comes from a text being well understood. Many a one was invited to expend her eloquence on a tree in the garden until she could modulate her own voice properly. Penmanship involved acquiring both English and French hands, and composition required the writing up of instructions in short essay form. For arithmetic, a former doctor of the Sorbonne, Père Thomas, used to give a course, often using the paved floor of the classroom as his blackboard. Needlework and lace-making were the forerunners of the later craft departments. There was singing, but not music and art as we now know them. Geography was rudimentary and science nonexistent. The course, however, such as it was, had to be taken thoroughly. "We must always go on learning," Julie would say. "Consider study one of your chief duties."

The academic work was always with a view to teaching and never for its own sake. Julie felt that learning was something to be used for the general good in the apostolate, and a right balance had to be kept between study and the actual work in school. She said: "Too great an absorption in school work, particularly in study, can be harmful. It gets hold of you and crowds out other things which are more important. For training children we need something quite different (from book learning) and this training is an obligation which rests on every one of our teachers without exception."

Classroom methods came last, but Julie suggested them in a variety of ways. There were lessons, lectures, debates and prepared discussions out of school, and periods of practice with demonstration and criticism lessons in class. Meetings every so often enabled beginners to compare notes on their experiences. It is interesting that when hearing lessons Julie liked to be in the corridor, so that she heard the teaching as it was naturally and not in the rather heightened atmosphere of a formal visit. She was careful too to place an inexperienced teacher in the charge of someone well used to class work, at least for the beginning of her teaching career.

The first sisters, therefore, went out into the schools of Amiens and Namur knowing that their function in class was to exercise a carefully considered influence on their children. They knew that they were to control and guide them methodically, leading and stimulating them while at the same time recognizing their dignity and respecting their initiative. They had a clear idea of order and

discipline as necessary conditions for learning, and they had been shown in practice how to create those conditions. They were aware too that they must rouse in the children willingness to respond to their teaching. Had not Julie reminded them constantly that “what the teacher does herself matters little, it is what she causes to be done that is all important?” They went out with zeal, eager to justify her confidence in sending them, and quite unconsciously they began to build up the educational system of the congregation.

The schools in which they taught were usually attached to the convents either as boarding schools or academies, day schools or poor schools. They were of the simplest: ordinary large dwelling houses in which the lower rooms were given to class-work and the upper ones to the community. The opening was announced by the ringing of a bell in the streets and the children would flock in to sit round the walls with their “desk” on their knees. The desk, which was a wooden box with a flat, polished lid for writing and a wooden hook at one end, was hung on the wall at the end of the day on the pegs which served for “cloaks” during the session. There was no apparatus other than that which the sisters made for themselves. Smooth stones would serve as blackboards, and books were provided either by the efforts of the teachers who wrote and copied them, or by making anthologies with the children and then sewing them together for future use. Pictures were few, and the ones which Julie used to give as rewards for good work were small black and white lithographs with hearts and anchors and other symbols of the virtues, unexciting enough from an artistic point of view but probably adding to the prestige of the recipient. From the remains of the earliest schools at Ghent and Zele, it is clear that material conditions due to poverty and overcrowding must have been hard. It is no wonder that Julie spent so much of her time trying to get better school buildings.

Whatever the conditions, however, the schools had to have the right atmosphere: Christian, homey and efficient. Julie preferred small classes, even little groups led by *dixainieres*, and she looked to her sisters to have the motherly qualities of evenness, affection and reasonableness that would make them in the classroom what the mother was in the home. “If we have a fund of Christian kindness we will know how to be little with the little ones,” she said. “When we have finished teaching the children, we have sometimes almost to become children ourselves like them, so as to share their interests and help them to enjoy their recreations.” Visiting masters for accomplishments she banned entirely, in flat contradiction of the accepted views of her day. She remarked: “Women should teach girls. Only they know how to deal with them properly.” So out went the music, dancing, elocution and deportment masters, “Never shall they set foot in one of our establishments!” Efficiency with her was a matter of quality, not of speed. It involved such things as order, silence, right use of time, uniform, cleanliness and the general happy smooth running of the school. She would never have estimated a school’s efficiency only by its examination results, although she would not have despised these as an indication of efficiency in one department of school life. She preferred to take a more general view.

The curriculum that Julie prescribed was dictated by the needs of her time and by her own sound common sense, which would not let her plan for advanced work while there was still need to lay the foundations. Her timetable was therefore simple: religious instruction, the basic subjects, needlework and singing. She had little time for the accomplishments dear to the female seminaries and academies of the eighteenth century. Ribbons, fringes, beads and braids had no place in her needlework rooms. "What is the use of elegant stitches on a scrap of muslin," she said, "if they don't know the kind of sewing they will have to do at home?" Keen as she was on reading, she would not tolerate the fairy stories and romances which filled the children's minds with will-o'-the-wisps and took them away from reality. "They are a pure waste of time," she said. "They fill the children's minds with romantic castles in the air and give them a disgust for the ordinary round of life ... Once the taste is aroused, it is like dancing . . . there is no putting an end to it, and you can't expect young people to show any sense in the matter." Art and music came later to the Notre Dame schools, as did history, geography, languages and the sciences; but there was an elementary kind of physical education, with gardening as a hobby, even in Julie's day.

Had the foundress been asked to expound her philosophy of education she would probably have been at a loss to do so, for she did not evolve the theory first and then apply it. Rather her thought developed as her system grew. She taught, she trained teachers and she opened schools in nine places in France and eleven in Belgium, having two more in preparation at Liège and Dinant at the time of her death. Originally she had intended to found small schools in rural areas, all of them for the poor; but as her experience widened she came to see the need of other types of establishment also and she adapted herself to the situation, creating a system which took the education of girls further than it had hitherto gone. Poor schools would always be the privileged part of the congregation's work, but Julie opened in addition day schools, academies, evening classes, Sunday schools and a kind of vocational school where older girls who so wished could learn to make a living by sewing or lace-making. There was thus a comprehensive educational pattern in the young congregation by 1816. It also had definite characteristics, reflections of Julie herself, which were to remain with it in the years to come. It was thoroughly Christian in its principles and practice, its motives and its traditions. Free as yet from any form of state pressure, it had adopted the principle of adaptability advocated by St. Paul, "all things to all men;" and was prepared to accommodate itself as far as it could, to whatever circumstances might demand. It was simple too in its directness of aim, its unaffected methods, its uncomplicated organization and its single-minded concentration on education. Thoroughness characterized its spirit of work from the beginning, and was seen especially in the congregation's willingness to take on unrewarding schools. Julie had also seen to it that her system was womanly, conceived by women for girls and modeled on that perfect pattern of womanhood who is Notre Dame's first patron. Finally the system was popular in that it was

addressed always to those in greatest need, and that it commanded from an early date a generous measure of support from parents, clergy and hierarchy.

Julie thus accomplished a great deal; but if we are content to regard her as a historical figure, no matter how attractive or influential, we shall miss much of her significance. It is part of God's providential choice of her that she was given circumstances very similar to ours, that she faced problems like ours and that her teaching is therefore highly relevant at the present time. After a period of war and devastation, she was confronted with the complete ignorance of the generation that Taine said was "doomed by the Jacobins." Family life was breaking down, the divorce rate during the revolution reached figures never before dreamed of, and immorality was flagrant. Moreover, the rationalists had propagated materialism, which tended to choke Christian principles; and actively antireligious policies were followed by the freemasons and the republican extremists. Lack of priests after the years of persecution created a great need for an apostolic laity. Above all there was the sense of a new age, a new discovery. "Liberty" was written on France's flag and on broadsheets and posters. The age of liberty made the most glorious developments possible. We, after two world wars, turning over UNESCO's reports on world ignorance and hunger or noticing the newspaper columns on divorce and abortion, the moral level of advertisements, the materialism of our standard of living, the anti-religious activities of communism, the need for united Christian action, cannot but feel that there is a striking similarity between Julie's age and our own. The sense of a new era is probably the most outstanding thing in common. Space exploration gives to us today the sense of unbounded possibilities that political liberty gave to the men of 1789.

It is natural therefore that the educational problems of the two periods should be parallel. Julie like us was trying to prepare girls for life and for a hard life in a world where their standards would not be understood and where there would be much to militate against them. She, like us, was trying to renew society by strengthening the Christian family, and, like us, she wanted to establish loyalty to the Church in a divided world. Even her difficulties have their modern counterparts. At Ghent she found the mentality of teenagers a problem. There was a loss of the sense of authority and of reverence and respect. She attributed this to lack of proper parental control and to a want of interest and co-operation on the part of many parents, though she qualified her statement by saying that these parents were themselves the irreligious children of the revolution. There is a modern note in her remark that "there are too many distractions for girls today" and "they do not work as they should because they do not seem able to concentrate."

If she were to advise us now from her own experience, Julie's message would not bear on details of method, though her scripture teaching, liturgy and catechetics were remarkably up-to-date. Nor would she speak on the psychological approach to education, though she was a shrewd psychologist.

She would not refer either to educational philosophy, though her views on education for life and the training of the whole child have a curiously modern ring. Her advice would be on a different plane altogether for, like the saints, she belongs to every period and sees education as God himself sees it: not as a profession or career, not as a matter of qualifications and requisitions and state departments, but as an apostolate. She would remind us that education is a work of faith, for faith made her believe that the work was great even when no outward evidence revealed its grandeur. It is a work of hope, for only hope could keep her steadfast in the fatigue and pain that were inseparable from her redemptive activity. "You get nothing for nothing," she would say. It is a work of charity and by charity all souls were dear to her, for the love of Christ urged her on and impelled her to embrace the whole world in her educational work. It is a work of penance, too, as she well knew, for she found the application and the patience necessary for teaching an excellent mortification. But it is also a work of prayer, "Only by prayer can our work bear any fruit in the souls of the children," she said, and she would enlist the prayers of the sick sisters for the work in the classroom. In this way she kept the whole congregation united, directly or indirectly, in its single-minded apostolate.

Julie is outstanding as one of the greatest educational foundresses that God has given to the Church. Truer than her rationalist contemporaries because her views are based on eternal truth more lasting in her impact than her revolutionary compatriots because she built up whereas they destroyed. She conceived a philosophy and a system of education which have proved apt to the problems of a hundred and fifty years and to the situations of four continents. It is difficult to sum up the inspiration of such a rich and saintly personality, but there is one sentence of her own which gives the key to her thought and work. She used it very often to express her idea of the mission of the congregation: "The sublime vocation of a Sister of Notre Dame is to gather up moment by moment the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in order to apply it to souls, then to cast these souls thus purified by the merits of this precious blood into the divine heart of our good Jesus." This was the level and these were the terms on which Julie conceived the aim, the means and the end of education.