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58. For the “public reach of home-based teaching” that was the aim of “domestic literacy narratives,” see Robbins, *Managing Literacy*, 67, 69.


63. Lehuu, *Carnival on the Page*, 101. For sentimental economy of exchange, see Lehuu, 78, 98.
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3. In a letter to his friend George Hillard, Hawthorne describes the “concocting of schoolbooks” and other genres as “what is called drudgery” (CE, 16:23). Lesley Ginsberg observes that he often described his adult fiction in “hardly more elevated” a fashion. See Ginsberg, “Hawthorne,” 50. In his letter to Hillard, Hawthorne also mitigates the severity of this description by phrasing it “what is called drudgery” (emphasis added), although he does not specify who calls it this; for this reason, I am inclined to read this claim as another one of his characteristically self-effacing comments about his writing, rather than as an indication of any particular animus toward children literature as a genre.
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10. The full title is Peter Parley’s Universal History on the Basis of Geography, for the Use of Families (Boston: American Stationer’s Company, 1837). Unsurprisingly, Hawthorne declined a second project from Goodrich when he was offered only $300 to write a lengthy volume “on the manners, customs, and civilities of all countries.” See Samuel Goodrich to Nathaniel Hawthorne, 13 December 1836, as quoted in Julian Hawthorne, Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1884), 1:138. Sarah Wadsworth suggests that the subsequent success of Universal History, which went through numerous editions and reportedly sold over one million copies, and of the Peter Parley series more generally, “must have been galling [to Hawthorne], considering they appeared at a time when he, having been paid so little for writing them, was diligently but unsuccessfully attempting to earn a living by his pen.” See In the Company of Books, 29.

11. McGill, Culture of Reprinting, 223.


17. The *Grandfather’s Chair* series comprised three separate volumes published between December 1840 and March 1841. The titles and publication dates for the first editions are *Grandfather’s Chair* (December 1840, but dated 1841), *Famous Old People* (January 1841), and *Liberty Tree* (March 1841).

18. It seemed to Hawthorne that the collaboration on “The Boys’ Wonder-Horn” would be “far more credible” than any of his other literary plans, “and perhaps quite as profitable” (*CE*, 15:266).

19. See, for instance, Hawthorne’s 16 May 1839 letter to Longfellow, or his 20 April 1840 letter to John O’Sullivan, in *CE*, 15:310–11, 447–48. Hawthorne’s tenure at the customhouse taught him that the cost of making a good living was an almost complete inability to write; indeed, the manuscript for *Grandfather’s Chair* was one of the few things he had been able to produce during the period. Ironically, Hawthorne had thought the appointment would provide the perfect opportunity and material for writing. For more, see Hawthorne’s 11 January 1839 letter to George P. Morris, written shortly after accepting the job, in *CE*, 15:285.


24. Wadsworth compares Hawthorne’s “relatively prosaic Parley-like historical sketches” unfavorably to his more “innovative” myths to a trace a “radical concurrent transformation of the juvenile literature market.” See *In the Company of Books*, 26. Patricia Valenti similarly sug-
gests that, as his career progressed, Hawthorne would learn to abandon the “established boundaries” and “generic conventions” that had “constrained juvenile literature and his possibilities for success in that arena.” See “‘None But Imaginative Authority’: Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Progress of Nineteenth-Century (Juvenile) Literature in America,” *Nathaniel Hawthorne Review* 36.1 (Spring 2010): 12.

25. Richard Brodhead argues that school reformers such as Mann sought to revolutionize the education system by molding the common school into a kind of “second home.” See *Cultures of Letters*, 24.


29. Hawthorne would repeat this sentiment in his 25 March 1843 letter to Horatio Bridge; see *CE*, 15:681–82.

30. For examples of this logic, one might look to the ample supply of editorials in the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, a political journal and literary magazine founded in October 1837 by Hawthorne’s friend John O’Sullivan. One editorial locates the “moral” of the Panic in the national “sin” of the credit system and its paper monies, which it likens to the immorality and excess of gambling; see “The Moral of the Crisis,” *United States Democratic Review* 1.1 (October 1837): 108, 110. Essentially, this editorial argues that the so-called “elasticity” championed by proponents of paper money actually makes such currency prone to fluctuations of the most violent and disastrous excess; in the writer’s view, what the currency, and by extension the nation, needs is not elasticity but the stability found in a currency of “intrinsic value” (here, specie), whose value exists beyond manipulation and above external turmoil (114). For further discussion of “hard” Democrats and their hostility toward the banking system, see Naomi Lamoreaux, *Insider Lending: Banks, Personal Connections, and Economic Development in Industrial New England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).


32. According to Brodhead, the antebellum fascination with sensationalized scenes of beatings, floggings, and whippings was vital to a large-scale, bourgeois consolidation of cultural power through which corporal punishment became a “sign of [the] insufficiency” and “inferiority” of “rival [cultural] formation[s],” “first of the older patriarchal New England culture,” and then of the “Irish immigrant” and “Southern planter class” cultures. See *Cultures of Letters*, 26.


34. Whereas I argue that Hawthorne harnesses the home-centered pedagogies dominating educational reform, Goodenough claims he complicates the progressive notions of childhood on which such efforts were premised—placing him outside the middle-class cultural agenda that Brodhead describes. Grandfather’s approbation of Cheever’s methods, in her view, represents Hawthorne’s own “ambivalent view of the child,” as well as his belief in “opposing pedagogical approaches for different species of children” (“Hawthorne’s ‘Deeper History,’” 37, 32). But this assertion is hard to reconcile with Grandfather’s description of the corporal punishment, the children’s reactions to it, or his own teaching methods. Goodenough herself concedes that the description lies in “direct contrast to the instructional space created by the outer ‘modern’ frame” of the book (37).


39. Quoted in Mellow, *Hawthorne in His Times*, 142.


43. For a discussion of Hawthorne’s investment in such standards of bourgeois domesticity, see T. Walter Herbert, *Dearest Beloved: The Hawthornes and the Making of the Middle-Class Family* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993). Herbert suggests that, while the “Hawthornes’ stubborn commitment to home schooling formed a sharp contrast . . . to Horace Mann’s leadership in the creation of public schools,” they “shared with [him] a belief in disciplining children through nurturing love rather than applications of the rod” (xix). If Mann was intent upon molding public schools into a second home, as Brodhead argues, then Hawthorne was equally invested in turning the home into a kind of loving school. For more on loving “domestication” as the province of children’s literature, see Karen Sánchez-Eppler, “Hawthorne and the Writing of Childhood,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Nathaniel Hawthorne*, ed. Richard H. Millington (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 143–59; for love and nationalism, see Gillian Brown, “Hawthorne’s American History,” 121–42.

44. The phrase “fair brick house” is from Cotton Mather’s *Magnalia*, a source with which Hawthorne was intimately familiar. See *Magnalia Christi Americana, Books I & II*, ed. Kenneth Murdock (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), 280. As Hawthorne’s letter suggests, his investment in children’s literature, along with the riches he conjures out of it for Sophia, might be understood as yet another compensatory fantasy of treasure marking him as a “paper money man” of the sort David Anthony has identified, albeit in a manner varying from the “tabloid” manhood at work in *The Blithedale Romance* or the attempt to put
“race into service as a means of negotiating fiscal insecurity and masculine dispossession” distinguishing *The House of Seven Gables*. See *Paper Money Men: Commerce, Manhood, and the Sensational Public Sphere in Antebellum America* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2009), 148, 157. In other words, even as Hawthorne continually excoriates the modern, paper and credit economy, seeking in children’s fiction a kind of literary analog to political hard metalism that might secure him much-deserved wealth, his early children’s writings nonetheless are, to use Anthony’s language, a “speculative project” undertaken to relieve himself of “debtor embarrassment” (Anthony, 60).

45. See Crowley, “Historical Commentary,” in *CE*, 9:523. On 16 September 1841, Hawthorne joked to Sophia, “if [Munroe] cheats me once, I will have nothing more to do with him, but will straightway be cheated by some other publisher—that being, of course, the only alternative” (*CE*, 15:573). For more on Hawthorne’s feelings about Munroe, see his 27 September 1841 letter in *CE*, 15:580–81.

46. Noting this contrast, Laffrado argues that *Biographical Stories* is Hawthorne’s effort to “write his enclosed condition, write his attempt at living his resignation” in the face of constricting personal circumstances and repeated career failures (*Hawthorne’s Literature for Children*, 63).

47. James Boswell recounts the incident thus, in Samuel Johnson’s own words: “I refused to attend my father to Uttoxeter-market. Pride was the source of that refusal, and the remembrance of it was painful. A few years ago, I desired to atone for this fault; I went to Uttoxeter in very bad weather, and stood for a considerable time bareheaded in the rain, on the spot where my father’s stall used to stand. In contrition I stood, and I hope the penance was expiatory.” See *Life of Johnson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 1357. For Hawthorne’s career-long interest in this scene from Johnson’s life, see Gloria Erlich, *Family Themes and Hawthorne’s Fiction* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1984), 127, and Helen Deutsch, *Loving Dr. Johnson* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 197–207.

48. Wadsworth argues that over-saturation of the market with Peter Parley–like children’s texts would lead Hawthorne to “new modes of juvenile writing,” as in *A Wonder-Book*. See In the Company of Books, 32.


Chapter 3


2. Quite literally, Thoreau’s remedy for the state of modern publishing consists in a return to the “classics” of literature; he defends the ancient literature of Greece and Rome, read “in the original,” as the “noblest recorded thoughts of man” (*Walden*, 106, 100).


7. In his biography of her life, Bruce Ronda argues that Peabody is a “practical intellectual,” going so far as to declare her one of the few “practitioners of praxis” in her circle. See *Elizabeth Palmer Peabody*, 4–5. Nina Baym has argued that Peabody was not a transcendentalist per se but rather a feminist “millennial thinker.” See “The Ann Sisters: Elizabeth Peabody’s Millennial Historicism,” *American Literary History* 3.1 (Spring 1991): 28. While the significance of the feminism inherent in Peabody’s Christian vision should not be understated, it is unnecessary, I think, to distinguish between the terms “Christian” and “transcendentalist” with regard to her, particularly as transcendentalism itself was not monolithic but rather eclectic and heterogeneous. In a sense, Peabody represents one point in a range of Christian-centered transcendentalisms including the likes of William Ellery Channing (who was older and whose transcendentalism was more moderate in several respects than Peabody’s) or Theodore Parker (who was younger and more socially and intellectually extreme in many of his attitudes), both of whom were her close friends and confidants. Ultimately, Peabody’s life disrupts, as Ronda suggests, a scholarly affinity for clearly defined literary categories, a propensity to organize “literary and cultural history through divisions and discontinuities rather than . . . continuities and connections.” See Ronda, “Elizabeth Peabody and the Fate of Transcendentalism,” in *Reinventing the Peabody Sisters*, ed. Monika Elbert, Julie E. Hall, and Katharine Rodier (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2006), 232.

8. For a discussion of what Monika Elbert calls the “impassioned (feminine) voice” of Peabody’s transcendentalism (206), see “Elizabeth Peabody’s Problematic Feminism and the Feminization of Transcendentalism,” in *Reinventing the Peabody Sisters*, ed. Monika Elbert, Julie E. Hall, and Katharine Rodier (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2006), 199–215. I prefer the term “feminist” to “feminine” or “feminized” when discussing Peabody’s transcendentalism because, while it was impossible for Peabody to completely escape certain conventional, bourgeois notions of women’s “place,” still, her understanding of transcendentalism was wrapped up in the promise of female intellectual equality that would “transcend” arbitrary constructions of gender. I also prefer the term “feminist” because I want to avoid any associations with the term “feminization” as either a kind of dilution of more rigorous styles of cultural thought, or as an essentialist logic that posits inherently masculine and feminine concerns or modes of expression. For a seminal discussion of the term “feminization,” see Ann Douglas’s *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1977). Finally, I use the term “cosmopolitanism” for a specific reason as well. Peabody’s bookstore and foreign circulating library appear remarkably similar in principle to historian David Hollinger’s definition of the term as:
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19. *Letters*, 152. Like Channing, Peabody felt that Alcott’s emphasis on introspection, combined with his questionable habit of having his students read their private journals aloud, gave students a forced self-consciousness (the overwrought tendency toward self-analysis) unbefitting the needs of their development, and fostered an undesirable “moral competitiveness” among them: “I think you are liable to injure the modesty and unconsciousness of good children, by making them reflect too much upon their actual superiority to others” (152). “Moral competitiveness” is Ronda’s term; see Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, 125. For more on Peabody’s growing disagreements with Alcott, see Marshall, *The Peabody Sisters*, 319–26.


22. In her eagerness to help his cause, Peabody had agreed to be his assistant, teaching only two and a half hours a day, and for “such compensation as he could afford to pay.” Both Alcott and his wife “said the terms were altogether too small—but it was not a partnership—and he could give me no more possibly—with thirty scholars as his expenses would be great.” See Elizabeth Peabody to Mary Tyler Peabody, July 1834, “Cuba Journal,” quoted in Ronda, *Elizabeth Palmer Peabody*, 115. His treatment of Elizabeth grew so bad that Mary eventually told her that if she should stay “for the sake of serving Mr. Alcott at the expense of your peace of mind, I shall think you are altogether quixotic & foolish,” especially since Alcott could easily find another recorder, “though never such an one as you are”—implying that he would have a difficult time finding someone as supportive as Elizabeth, or as patient with his faults. See Mary Tyler Peabody to Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, [1836] (6), *Horace Mann Collection*, microfilm edition, 40 reels (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1989), reel 4.

23. Mary Tyler Peabody to Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, [1836] (6), *Horace Mann Collection*, microfilm edition, 40 reels (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1989), reel 4. As Megan Marshall observes, Peabody would stay up long into the night dutifully copying over the notes she had taken during the day’s class, only to have Alcott later alter the dialogue to suit his liking (*The Peabody Sisters*, 322).
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Andrews Norton, who purportedly claimed that “one-third [of the book] was absurd, one-third was blasphemous, and one-third was obscene.” Quoted in Larry Carlson, “Those Pure Pages of Yours: Bronson Alcott’s Conversations with Children on the Gospels,” *American Literature* 60.3 (October 1988): 454; italics in original.
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30. Elizabeth Palmer Peabody to Horace Mann, 2 March 1837, in “Biography of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody” [manuscript draft] by Mary Van Wyck Church, page 304, Massachusetts Historical Society.
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55. Parker does concede that, having learned “more of the scheme through Miss Ripley, the plan strikes me as much better and the more I think of it, the more feasible it does appear.” Ultimately, he embraces the idea, declaring: “I should think you might now fill a vacancy and supply a want that has been long felt in Boston.” Theodore Parker to Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, 1 July 1840, *Theodore Parker Papers*, microfilm edition, 4 reels (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1986), reel 2.

56. Elizabeth Palmer Peabody to William Ellery Channing, 10 July 1840, in “Biography of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody” [manuscript draft] by Mary Van Wyck Church, page 402, Massachusetts Historical Society; emphasis in original.

57. Elizabeth Palmer Peabody to William Ellery Channing, August 1840, in “Biography of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody” [manuscript draft] by Mary Van Wyck Church, page 405, Massachusetts Historical Society. Not only had she “learned to keep books in a week,” but she also saw the “advantages I possess in knowing something of the interior of books. Especially in this importing business I can detect mistakes made by even the shrewd house in New York which I shall never be liable to, although I will undoubtedly to many others” (405.1, 405). Channing was never quite convinced. He tells Peabody: “I rejoice in your bright prospects. If heroic endurance entitles one to success, you may put in a claim. I cannot judge of the facts you give me as proofs of your prospering or of your business talent; but it is so pleasant to believe, that I start no objection” (*Reminiscences*, 413).
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See Elizabeth Palmer Peabody to William Ellery Channing, August 1840, in “Biography of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody” [manuscript draft] by Mary Van Wyck Church, page 405, Massachusetts Historical Society.
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Hawthorne his ‘Grandfather’s Chair,’ yet I could not fight them all successfully, and finally relinquished business.” Quoted in Cooke, *Historical and Biographical Introduction*, 1:148. She would in fact go on to publish other texts throughout the decade, but it seems she would have to temper her hopes for financial success in that business.
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