

Apr 1st, 1:15 PM - 1:30 PM

Of Education: Milton and the Common Core State Standards

Alexander D. MacPhail-Fausey
Cedarville University, amacphailfausey@cedarville.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/research_scholarship_symposium

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

MacPhail-Fausey, Alexander D., "Of Education: Milton and the Common Core State Standards" (2015). *The Research and Scholarship Symposium*. 9.

http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/research_scholarship_symposium/2015/podium_presentations/9

This Podium Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Cedarville, a service of the Centennial Library. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Research and Scholarship Symposium by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Cedarville. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@cedarville.edu.

Alexander MacPhail-Fausey

Wilfong on High

LIT 4450

5 December 2014

Of Education: Milton and the Common Core State Standards

In 1640, the nephews of John Milton, along with a few other English boys, would experience four years of an education system radically different than that traditionally implemented in England. This system was designed by Milton to amend the faults he saw in the curriculum he had experienced over the course of his own schooling (Parker 5). Similarly, the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] implemented in 2010 are an attempt to change the traditional education system of the United States (CGCS). Through changing the method by which American schools teach Reading, Language, and Mathematics, the CCSS hope to improve the curriculum to match international standards and better prepare students for university. Through examining Milton's *Of Education*, the Common Core State Standards can be argued as a 21st Century reinvention of Milton's theory on education within the context of a postmodern society due to its tier-based curriculum and focus on preparing students to become active members of society.

Firstly, an understanding of Milton's own education is necessary to create a contrast between his experience and the system he developed to replace the schooling he received. Milton attended St. Paul's School in London until he turned sixteen and moved on to Christ's College, Cambridge. Unfortunately, most information on Milton's early education is not based on "documentary evidence" but rather on "inference and conjecture" (Clark 17). In 1666, the

great fire of London consumed all records of St. Paul's school, losing all records of Milton's education. The fact that Milton even attended St. Paul's is a result of documentation from Cambridge, stating that he was a student under Master Gill, the head of St. Paul's (17). Due to the fire, Milton's date of entrance into grammar school is uncertain, however, A.F. Leach, a noted historian of grammar school in England, claims that "In Milton's day,... seven was the normal age for boys to go to school" (27). He also argues that, since Milton was displaying a developed skill in Latin verse at age eleven, and Latin verse was not taught until the fourth year of grammar school, Milton would have started his education at age seven around 1615 (27-28). Therefore, Milton would have spent nine years in grammar school before attending university.

At St. Paul's, Milton received a humanistic, grammar school education. An accurate comparison of the curriculum Milton attended against the one he proposed can only be found in outlining the course schedule by which St. Paul's operated. First, however, it is necessary to understand St. Paul's pedagogy. The school based itself on a humanist approach to learning, which focused on a rebirth of the classical educational system, meaning that of the Greeks and Romans (Clark 4). There were seven subjects of education valued most by Imperial Rome and, due to the resurgence of classical schooling, Renaissance England were "Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, and Astronomy," and most importantly, "Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic" (3). In regards to the literary focus of humanist education, St. Paul's would have a "preoccupation with language, with purity of vocabulary, correctness of grammar, and beauty of style" (105). This preoccupation with strict grammar is due, in part, to the approach that the literary aspect of writing is more important than the moral, or meaning of the text (102).

This understanding of St. Paul's pedagogy leads to an outline of its curriculum.

Unfortunately, due to the 1666 fire in London, there is not an exact curriculum of the time Milton spent at the school. However, there is a manuscript of a course schedule from fifty years after Milton attended; the closest date available. Scholars are confident that the curriculum had not changed drastically within those fifty years due to comparisons with course schedules predating Milton that were preserved from the fire at Trinity College, Cambridge (Clark 109-110). At St. Paul's, the student would spend every morning learning grammar, the afternoons either reading the classics or more grammar, and every day would have an exercise in verse, with primarily either the Psalms or Proverbs from the Bible. Grammar was stressed primarily in the first class, in which the student engaged no literary texts except for the biblical Proverbs. Furthermore, these Proverbs were likely read in Latin, since first year students had only just begun studying Latin, and would not cover Hebrew until the eighth class (110-113). In terms of the grammar of other languages, the students at St. Paul's would spend their first four years learning Latin, the next three learning Greek, and their last year in Hebrew. Each of the classes examined classical texts in their respective languages, as well as the languages they have already learned. However, as previously mentioned, the texts were examined for their relevance to the grammar and literacy of the students. This curriculum provided an excellent base for Milton to continue his own studies, although Milton would later propose changes to this system in his tract *Of Education*.

After he finished grammar school at St. Paul's, Milton attended Cambridge University in 1625. However, Cambridge did not fulfill Milton's desires for education. Some of this failure may be the result of Milton's inability to become a minister in the church; the practices of the

church at that time keeping him from a clerical position (Forsyth 21). Most of his disappointment can be attributed to the fact that, although Milton was a highly successful student at Cambridge, his studies at the university did not match his expectations of education. Due to disagreements with a tutor, William Chappell, Milton was rusticated, or sent home from the university for a time (24). During this time, Milton resumed his personal education with his own books, which he enjoyed more than the study at Cambridge. It was this individual study that Milton would later continue in his study abroad post-university, which would help him design his own pedagogy teaching students, not only to be educated citizens, but also to think for themselves. Biographer Neil Forsyth compares Milton's experience at Cambridge to his time at St. Paul's, claiming that "Milton was disappointed academically by Cambridge" (24). Forsyth explains how Milton did not like the educational practices of Cambridge university and so "charged the universities with bringing the students to 'a hatred and contempt of learning'" in *Of Education* (27). Much of his disagreement with the university came as the result of political differences, Milton believing that Cambridge's tendency to force students to accept the school's political stance without teaching them to think for themselves was a form of tyranny (27).

This traditional schooling affected Milton's methods as he designed his own pedagogy. Milton used his classical education, especially his mastery of Latin and rhetoric, to defend English liberties through his tracts and his time working as the Latin secretary under Oliver Cromwell (Clark 4). However, Milton does not credit his ideas to educators he interacted with personally, but rather acclaims the ancient schools of thought from Greece, Italy, and Asia (Bongiorno 104). Now, this statement, when examined in tandem with his own private study of

these ancient schools, shows why Milton argued for a reformation of the education system in England. He did not attribute any of his schooling to the actual grammar school or university he attended, but rather to the ancient schools that were taught by the contemporary schools of his era. Scholar Elbert Thompson explains that the tract *Of Education* begins with “purely destructive criticism” of how England’s schools were educating students (Thompson 160).

In *Of Education*, Milton responds to Master Samuel Hartlib, who asked Milton for a reform to the educational system of England. Milton’s purpose with the tract is to create a curriculum “for the want whereof this nation perishes,” meaning that, according to Hartlib and Milton, the educational system at the time of Milton’s writing was not preparing students to thoughtfully engage society (Milton 630). Milton, who had been denied a clerical position, had instead used his writings to engage the church and the pursuit of “the enlargement of truth, and honest living” (630). However, as he wrote to Hartlib, he realized that “those aims” which he had sought in engaging the church were also applicable to the educational system in England (630). He proposes that his own pedagogy can teach students to be thinking citizens in much less time than the traditional system could. It is important to note that Milton’s educational system was not simply a theory, he had implemented this curriculum on his nephew and a few other boys, and therefore he knew that this system worked and had potential to replace the traditional system. Since he has seen the progress of what his system can do, Milton asserts that the “nation hath extreme need” for a new system, namely, his curriculum (631).

Milton notes how the education system of England failed, especially in the fields of Greek and Latin languages. He argues that, if a student does not learn those languages well, he is only as good as any “yeoman or tradesman competently wise in his mother dialect only” and

his education is useless (Milton 631). Therefore, the system needs reformation because Milton believed that he could teach both languages in one year to the same level as all eight years of grammar school. He credited the grammar school's inability to adequately teach students to a failure to properly develop subject matters. Thompson claims Milton believed "that the orthodox discipline in grammar must yield" to the modern study of realities, meaning that education should start at a reasonable place and continue within that reason (Thompson 161). Milton wrote that the schools who should have taught first year students "with arts most easy," instead "present[ed] their young unmatriculated novices at first coming with the most intellectual abstractions of logic and metaphysics" (Milton 632). Thus, the students are subjected to the tyranny of education, because they are unable to fully comprehend the material, they are subject to a "conscientious slavery" when the teachers force them to except the material without giving them the ability to critically think about it (632). Therefore, Milton suggests building on education, beginning with attainable subjects, and logically progressing in a tier-like system.

This reasonable place and pace are exemplified in the outline of Milton's own curriculum. Firstly, where grammar schools like St. Paul's began educating students at age seven, Milton proposes that a student's formal education "may be done between twelve, and one and twenty" (Milton 633). Thereby, Milton implies that his pedagogy is more efficient than that of traditional education, potentially contributing to Milton's praise of ancient schools. Yet, similarly to St. Paul's, Milton proposes that students "should begin with the chief and necessary rules of some good grammar" (633). However, unlike grammar school, Milton says that they should also practice Italian pronunciation, so that their speech will not "smatter Latin with an

English mouth” (633). With a grasp on spoken language, the students will engage in reading Latin texts to lay a groundwork for them to grasp how the grammar and syntax of the language work without rote memorization. At the same time they are working on grammar, they should also learn the rules of arithmetic and the elements of geometry (634). Then, instead of reading verse, like St. Paul’s, Milton’s students will read “authors of agriculture” to gain a technical understanding of how the land works in England (634). Then, the student will learn Greek the same way he learned Latin, through reading texts to understand the idiom of the language.

With this foundation, the student builds their knowledge to handle more difficult subjects. The student, then, “may descend in mathematics” to trigonometry, fortification and architecture, or in the natural sciences from agriculture to anatomy (Milton 634-635). In the more advanced subjects, the students will build another foundation of economics, politics, and law, by which they can engage societal issues through the legal system (634-636). The student now has more freedom to choose the literature they read, because, by this point, they should have a mastery of Latin, Greek, and Italian. It is with this second foundation that Milton argues for the teaching of theology. To Milton, the goal of education is to create not only functioning members of society, but also functioning members of the church. Therefore, while St. Paul’s had first year students reading biblical Proverbs, Milton waits until his students have a firm foundation on grammar and social knowledge before they begin theology, so that the students are prepared for the difficulty of understanding the Bible.

Just like Milton wanted to reform the educational system in 17th Century England, the Common Core State Standards are designed to reform American public schools. In their journal *Common Core Standards: The New U.S. Intended Curriculum*, authors Andrew Porter, Jennifer

McMaken, Jun Hwang, and Rui Yang focus on how the Common Core curriculum is a shift in the pedagogy of US education (Porter 103). The article outlines how the CCSS will benefit education, through the standardization of schools. This standardization allows educators to assess how the students are developing more accurately than with previous pedagogies, thereby allowing for possible improvements in the curriculum to ensure the students are actually learning the material, instead of just timing out of the system. They present a series of statistics showing how the CCSS compared directly to various school system's established curriculums, ultimately displaying that the students are retaining more of the knowledge they learn (106).

The CCSS is an attempt to bridge the education gap in American schools. The education gap is the term for how, historically, schools in the States have been segregated through location, financial capability, and educational standards (CGCS). This differentiation is not intentional, but is caused by a lack of central standard by which to hold or fund schools. The CCSS are an attempt to close these gaps in education throughout the States. Primarily through the introduction of the tier system, where students have certain steps they have to take in order to progress in their education toward becoming a professional and a reformer in the socio-political sphere (CGCS). This tier system works within all aspects of the CCSS, and allows for educational development at a reasonable pace. For example, the essential practice frame for learning to read and comprehend complex texts is comprised of three major tiers: foundational core practices, crosscutting core practices, and high-impact core practice. The foundational practices are based around using the students preexisting language capabilities to determine the complexity of those capabilities through structuring tasks which require

authentic communication. The crosscutting practices are divided into three sections. The first is clarifying complex language, accomplished through using clarification methods designed by the Common Core to help students understand oral and written academic language. Then, in the second section, students model use focused and thorough models of complex texts to deconstruct the target language and develop linguistic skills. The third section involves the teacher assessing the students learning and guiding their exercises to fit their capabilities. The final tier involves the student engaging and using complex texts and language to develop their literacy skills and build language and critical thinking (Zwiers 16).

However, although the tier system is designed to help all students begin and progress at a reasonable pace, the CCSS does also allow for advanced students to expedite their progression through modifying the standards. One of these specific tracks of the CCSS is called the Da Vinci Curriculum, which is a slightly more accelerated version of the original Common Core, yet it focuses more on the literary and artistic side of education. Harry Chaucer proposes a differentiated education, which could be argued as Miltonic; that the classroom move past simply reading and writing practices such as hearing *The Odyssey* read aloud as the Greeks would have when Homer first told it (Chaucer 35). This way the students experience more than only the accepted practice of forcing students to read, thereby hindering the development of the students who, as Milton would say, could learn Greek in a year if they studied it in their own individual style. Yet, even with this shift toward differentiated instruction, the CCSS are still focused on standardizing, so all students experience the same education within the Da Vinci Curriculum (36-41). This specific track is designed to emphasize the use of the Common Core to create educated citizens who are capable of adding to the Republic through engaging

democracy in an educated manner, much like Milton's belief that the ends of learning is to create educated, engaged citizens (16-17).

The Da Vinci Curriculum, of all possible tracks of the CCSS, is the closest to the educational system proposed by Milton. The track begins in seventh grade, building off of the progression of education experienced until that grade. As the name suggests, the Da Vinci track is designed to resemble Renaissance style education. Each year has an overarching theme, each associated with a certain time period covering from 20 BYA to potential outcomes for the future. The themes and time periods, from seventh to twelfth grades in order, are: Truth and Universe 20 BYA-10000 YA, Into Civilization 6000 BCE-200 CE, Age of Faith 200 CE-1400 CE, Discovery and Invasion 1400 CE-1700 CE, The Reach of Europe 1700 CE-1917 CE, and The Global Community 1917 CE-Future (Chaucer 103). Each of these themes are divided into six or seven units which, in continuity with the tier system, all build upon each other. Within each of the Units, students will cover "Historical or Scientific Texts, Science Investigations, Writing, Literature, Geography, Religions, Performing Arts, Visual and Musical Arts, and Mathematics" (109). Each of these individual topics will follow tier development patterns similar to those previously explained with the teaching of complex texts (Zwiers 16).

With this basic understanding of Milton's educational upbringing, the reason for his call to educational reform, and the ideology behind the Common Core State Standards, it is possible to draw comparisons between Milton's *Of Education* and the CCSS, showing how the CCSS is a contemporary reinvention of Milton's own pedagogy. Firstly, it is important to note that the CCSS does not exactly model Milton's proposed school. Although one part of Milton's views on education involve the development of the mind to create a useful citizen, his true goal of

education is “to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him, [and] to be like him” (Milton 630). Milton’s view of the poet priest impacted his theory of education, because in order to fully develop the mind, the student must live in a way worthy of the calling of God (Festa 155). However, the goal of the CCSS is to bridge the education gap and give all students the opportunity to be competent citizens, God is not part of the system. In this way, Milton’s views differ from the Common Core, because public schools in the States reject the notion of a transcendent signified influencing education. Since the CCSS is being implemented in American schools, religion cannot be a goal of education to due the federal separation of church and state. Although, as displayed in the Da Vinci Curriculum, world religions can be addressed as a subject of education, they cannot be the end of learning as Milton suggests (Chaucer 109). Then, while Milton’s school covered all subjects pertaining to education, the CCSS currently only addresses reading, English, and mathematics (CGCS). Milton also “objected to the waste of time” in schools (Parker 3). Subsequently, his proposed curriculum drastically cut the amount of time spent in formal education, encompassing both grammar school and university, from twelve to seven years. The CCSS, however, is designed to work within the preexisting timeframe of the standard American school system.

Yet, these differences do not separate Milton’s *Of Education* and the CCSS. In her essay *Milton on Education*, Marjorie Nicolson argues to read Milton through a 17th Century perspective since postmodern understanding of humanism is so vastly different from the Renaissance understanding. Therefore, Milton’s thoughts on education could not be implemented in contemporary society in their original form. Thus a reinvention is necessary, which could be the Common Core (Nicolson 198). As outlined in the curriculum of St. Paul’s

grammar school, the biblical Proverbs were taught in schools, displaying how, historically, religion and education were synonymous in Milton's era. This is no longer true for postmodern America. Thereby, the change in historical context allows the CCSS to adopt Miltonic principles without the religious focus Milton had. Then, even though Milton's school covered all range of subjects, he still valued the Renaissance education. This education, as previously mentioned, had seven primary subjects, which include grammar, rhetoric, and arithmetic (Clark 3). Thereby, the subjects impacted by the CCSS, although fewer than those covered by Milton, are still relevant to Milton's pedagogy. Also, Milton's model focuses on the education, not the amount of time spent on the education, even though his model progresses considerably faster than the public schooling being implemented in his era. This idea relates to the Common Core, even though the curriculum still takes the same amount of time, the CCSS focus on the attainment of knowledge relevant to functioning in society outside of school (Parker 3).

Now, with the major differences between Milton's school and the CCSS addressed, the evidences presenting the CCSS as a postmodern reinvention of Milton's pedagogy can be examined. Firstly, the tier system used by the CCSS is similar to Milton's idea that education should start at a reasonable place and continue within that reason (Thompson 161). As previously explained and modeled, one of the foundations of the Common Core is the complexity staircase, which is the series of tiers where each students is stopped and forced to take an assessment before they can progress. This staircase is standard throughout the US, meaning that every student must learn and understand the same things, where Milton's education calls for a more individual approach to learning, although Milton wanted all of England to be educated in the classics (McKnight 83). Similarly, as outlined in Milton's own

curriculum, after they have begun with “arts most easy,” on which they build a foundation, students “may descend” into the more difficult topics of education (Milton 632, 634). To Milton, this concept of building on subjects is vital, because his own education at grammar school failed to progress with a tier like system. St. Paul’s taught the biblical Proverbs in the first class, but would not teach the student the means to read the Proverbs in their original language until the eighth class (Clark 110-113). Whereas in *Of Education*, Milton proposes teaching students the skills they need in order to engage certain texts before they begin them “so that it will be then seasonable for them to learn,” and “they might be then capable to read” those texts (Milton 634).

Of Education, then, outlines the use of method, or the proper sequence of education. For Milton, this was making sure the progression from beginning school to arriving at university was a simple, logical advancement of learning. His students would start with no education, and would then learn the basics to create a foundation before moving to the next level of education (Riggs 454-455). Throughout the text, Milton continually asserts his argument for this method by claiming that certain aspects of education are designed to follow the progression of learning. When he writes, “These are not matters to be wrung from poor striplings,” Milton means that students should start at a reasonable place, and then progress their education until they are able to comprehend the more difficult work (Milton 632). This reasonable place assures that the students will only cover subjects that “their age permits” and only once the students “have well laid their grounds” (638). Ultimately, the tiers progress to a time which allows “men to discourse and write perspicuously” (636).

Within the CCSS, the tier system is designed to bridge the education gap. Milton's pedagogy uses a tier system to accomplish a similar goal, although his is not specific toward the differences between geographical, ethnic, or economic demographics. He writes, "I doubt not by ye shall have more ado to drive our dullest and laziest youth, our stocks and stubbs from the infinite desire of such a happy nurture," examining how the traditional school hinders those students not favored by the system (Milton 632). To Milton these would be the students incapable of comprehending difficult material when it was presented at a young age, and to the CCSS are students in lower income or less privileged schools. This system also hinders the gifted students because it "drag[s] our choicest and hopefulest wits to that asinine feast of sowthistles and bramble which is commonly set before them" when it forces those students to memorize facts without actually learning how to understand them (632). Therefore, the goal of the tier system is comprehension of the subjects, ultimately leading to what Milton calls "a graceful and ornate rhetoric" (636).

In order to accomplish this goal of a capable rhetoric, the students in the education system have to learn to comprehend language. The tier system of the CCSS is designed to help students comprehend and retain the knowledge they acquire. Porter, McMaken, Hwang, and Yang argue that the Common Core, when compared directly to various school system's established curriculums, displays that the students are retaining more of the knowledge they learn (Porter 106). Scholar Thomas Festa interacts with Milton's views on the comprehension of Greek, one of the more significant arguments in *Of Education*, which correlate with the Common Core's emphasis on reading comprehension over rote memorization (Festa 30). In *Of Education*, Milton proposes "a better education, in extent and comprehension far more large"

(Milton 631). He wanted to accomplish this comprehension through eliminating rote memorization of a language without actually learning how that language works. He argues that students should not only study the simple vocabulary of language, but “the solid things in them as well,” referring to the functionality of the idioms of Greek and Latin (631).

Milton writes on education forcing students to write essays without a full comprehension of the language saying, “that which casts our proficiency therein so much behind, is our time lost partly in too oft idle vacancies given both to schools and universities, partly in a preposterous exaction” (Milton 631). This preposterous exaction is a result of the traditional school focusing on rote memorization, without actually giving the students the ability to understand the language. However, compared to Milton’s education, which focused heavily on the works of the classics, CCSS emphasizes reading comprehension through reducing the amount of time spent with the classics and focusing more on informational text, reflecting the shift from Renaissance thought to postmodern thought (Zwiers 21). Instead, Milton focuses on classical Greek, and shows how students could learn the actual idiom of Greek, as opposed to simply memorizing vocabulary, if “they were led to the praxis thereof in some chosen short book lessoned thoroughly to them” (Milton 632). He claims that simply memorizing facts or grammar without actually comprehending them is the same as if they were “unlearnt” (632). Thereby, as opposed to traditional education, Milton has his curriculum “not beginning, as some have done from the cradle,” but from an age when the student could comprehend the material he was being taught (639). This idea reflects the tier system of the CCSS where students have certain steps they have to take in order to progress in their education (CGCS).

This tier system is designed to develop the second aspect of Milton's *Of Education* reinvented by the CCSS, the preparation of students to become active members of society. Although the CCSS is designed to prepare students for university, ultimately the goal is to provide students with an education that will allow them to impact the socio-political sphere of their nation. For both Milton and the CCSS, everything within their curriculums "contributes to something else; it *builds* toward a clearly defined goal, and nothing is irrelevant or peripheral to that goal" (Parker 8). This goal is impacting the socio-political field. For the CCSS, this comes primarily through bridging the gap by standardizing schools to create equal opportunities for a diverse range of students (Zwiers 1). In *Of Education*, the end of learning is to make man more knowledgeable of God, and thereby to create citizens who could impact the socio-political sphere with religion. However, in a now postmodern context, the Common Core would be unable to base the virtue of the educated man in the doctrine of Christ. As a result, the core focuses more on the second half of Milton's end of learning, or the creation of a citizen capable of reforming the socio-political sphere (Hillway 377).

Milton begins *Of Education* showing how the traditional school did not prepare students to influence society. He examines how the students lacked "prudent and heavenly contemplation of justice and equity," arguing that these virtues were "never taught them" (Milton 632.) The students had "souls so unprincipled in virtue," meaning they were not taught to think for themselves and therefore don't understand right and wrong apart from what the authorities dictate, "instilling their barren hears with a conscientious slavery" (Milton 632).

However, Milton proposed a system to radically change traditional education. His curriculum would teach students to "perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously all the offices

both private and public of peace and war” (Milton 632). He would accomplish this training through engaging texts which could benefit the whole of society. Like the CCSS, Milton has his students engage informative texts, which is basically the difference between text as art and text as tool, informative texts being the latter (Zwiers 6). However, Milton’s goal with the informative texts is not only to provide the student with a work they can comprehend, but also through that understanding they can benefit their society. He has his students read the authors of agriculture to teach them how “to improve the tillage of their country” (Milton 634). The student would also learn anatomy and medicine so that he may be “not only a great physician to himself, and to his friends, but also may at some time or other, save an army by this frugal and expenseless means only” (634).

Since one of Milton’s goals in education was to create a body of capable socio-political reformers, this nationalism was vital to his aim of instilling a desire for change in England, just as he had seen with the civil war. In the same way, the Common Core wants to change the socio-political status of education within the United States, to eliminate the education gap and to compete with international schools (Bongiorno 110). He intended his students to be “perfect in the knowledge of personal duty” (Milton 635). Not only would the students have a sense of duty to engage their society, but they would also “be able writers and composers in every excellent matter” able to engage not only university, but also post-university life as capable citizens (637). This educational training and sense of personal duty would then lead the students to “mightily redound to the good of this nation” (639).

Then, Milton asserts that this curriculum allows students to determine the difference between not only good and bad art, but also the morally right and wrong. He writes, “This

[education] would make them soon perceive what despicable creates our comm rhymers and play-writers be,” meaning that the education provides the student with the ability to discern the quality of art (637). This provides the student with the skills necessary that they “may with some judgment contemplate upon moral good and evil” (635). With this discernment of right and wrong, the student “shall deserve the regard and honour of all men where they pass” (639). Which, although the CCSS does not claim to teach good and evil, because to do so would be difficult in a postmodern context, the students would focus specifically on highly the “sophisticated language and literacy of each discipline” under the CCSS (Zwiers 1). So that they would be prepared to use those disciplines to later impact the external factors contributing to the education gap (CGCS).

Therefore, through the use of the tier system and the development of students to affect the socio-political sphere, the Common Core State Standards are a postmodern reinvention of Milton’s views on education expressed in his tract *Of Education*. Although the CCSS cannot have the same emphasis on God, or on the knowing of good and evil do to the nature of the postmodern society within which it was formed, the major aspects of the Milton’s pedagogy and that of the Common Core share similar traits, as previously examined.

Works Cited

- Bongiorno, Andrew. "Tendencies in Milton's "Of Education"". *The Journal of General Education* 4.2 (1950): 104-111. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Nov. 2014.
- CGCS. "Three-Minute Video Explaining the Common Core State Standards." *Vimeo*. Common Core State Standards Initiative, n.d. Web. 06 Nov. 2014.
- Chaucer, Harry. *A Creative Approach to the Common Core Standards: The Da Vinci Curriculum*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2012. Print.
- Clark, Donald L. *John Milton at St. Paul's School: A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Print.
- Festa, Thomas. *The End of Learning: Milton and Education*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Forsyth, Neil. *John Milton: A Biography*. Oxford: Lion Hudson PLC, 2008. Print.
- Hillway, Tyrus. "Milton's Theory of Education." *College English* 5.7 (1944): 376-79. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Nov. 2014.
- McKnight, Katherine. *The Common Sense Guide to the Common Core: Teacher-Tested Tools for Implementation*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit Publishing Inc, 2014. Print.
- Nicolson, Marjorie. "Milton on Education". *Modern Language Notes* 45.3 (1930): 197-199. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Nov. 2014.
- Parker, William Riley. "Education: Milton's Ideas and Ours". *College English* 24.1 (1962): 1-14. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Nov. 2014.
- Porter, Andrew, Jennifer McMaken, Jun Hwang, and Rui Yang. "Common Core Standards: The New U.S. Intended Curriculum." *Educational Researcher* 40.3 (2011): 103-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Nov. 2014.

Riggs, William G. "Poetry and Method in Milton's "Of Education"". *Studies in Philology* 89.4 (1992): 445-469. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Nov. 2014.

Thompson, Elbert N.S. "Milton's "Of Education"". *Studies in Philology* 15.2 (1918): 159-175. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Nov. 2014.

Zwiers, Jeff, Susan O'Hara, and Robert Henry Pritchard. *Common Core Standards in Diverse Classrooms: Essential Practices for Developing Academic Language and Disciplinary Literacy*. Portland: Stenhouse, 2014. Print.