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In December 1834, an anonymous tale entitled “Little Annie’s Ramble” appeared in the Youth’s Keepsake: A Christmas and New Year’s Gift for Young People (dated 1835), an annual gift book edited by Park Benjamin.2 Seemingly sentimental and innocuous, the sketch describes various scenes in a New England town as perceived through the innocent eyes of childhood. Readers of the sketch follow five-year-old Annie and her adult companion as they meander through town, peering into shop windows and gazing at the animals in the street and on display in a traveling menagerie. Absorbed by the enchanting sights of toys, sweets, and pictures, as well as by the domestic and wild animals they encounter, the child and the man lose track of time, along with the fact that they have strayed from Annie’s home without informing her parents. By and by, the voice of the town crier recalls them to mundane reality and alerts them that Little Annie has been declared missing. When the sketch was republished in the first edition of Twice-told Tales two years after its appearance in Youth’s Keepsake, the authorship of “Little Annie’s Ramble” was for the first time publicly acknowledged by Nathaniel Hawthorne.

While reviews of the 1837 edition of Twice-told Tales often singled out “Little Annie’s Ramble” for praise,3 twentieth-century critics have been less enthusiastic about Hawthorne’s first published attempt to write specifically for a juvenile audience.4 Certainly it lacks the dark vision and moral ambiguity which have fascinated Hawthorne’s readers since the early twentieth century; nevertheless, the tale is not without interest to readers today as an index to Hawthorne’s artistic aspirations and development as a writer of juvenile literature.

During the course of her ramble through town, Annie proceeds (with a certain implicit logic) from a confectioner’s window to a bookseller’s display. The narrator observes, “Here are pleasures, as some people would say, of a more exalted kind, in the window of a bookseller. Is Annie a
literary lady? Yes; she is deeply read in Peter Parley’s tomes, and has an increasing love for fairy tales, though seldom met with nowadays, and she will subscribe, next year, to the Juvenile Miscellany” (IX: 124). In light of the facts that within two years Hawthorne was employed as a ghost-writer for “Peter Parley,” that his journals and correspondence reveal an ongoing and increasing interest in fantasy and fairy tales for children, and that he contributed sketches to a number of juvenile publications, the narrator’s observations regarding Annie’s literary interests should not be read uncritically. Indeed, the juxtaposition of Peter Parley’s ubiquitous “tomes” and the more esoteric “fairy tales” reveals a tension in Hawthorne’s own juvenile writing between the relatively prosaic Parley-type historical sketches he authored in the 1840s and the highly fanciful mythological tales published a decade later in A Wonder Book for Girls and Boys (1851, dated 1852) and Tanglewood Tales, for Girls and Boys: Being a Second Wonder Book (1853). An exploration of Hawthorne’s career as a writer of children’s books helps account for these two disparate strands of juvenile writing. Moreover, it substantiates the view that, while the early material was a calculated attempt to tap into the enormous juvenile nonfiction market newly developed by didactic writers such as Samuel Griswold Goodrich (1793–1860) and Jacob Abbott (1803–1879), Hawthorne’s later success in the field of adult fiction freed him from the necessity of writing in a conventional juvenile mode that had already become formulaic. Finally, an examination of Hawthorne’s writing for children in the context of contemporary juvenile publishing clearly illustrates that his studied transition from conventional works of pedagogy to innovative retellings of Classical myths closely parallels a radical, concurrent transformation of the juvenile literature market, as American children, sated with histories, geographies, and other nonfiction texts designed “for the instruction and amusement of youth,” developed (along with Little Annie) an increasing taste for literature written expressly for their entertainment and delight.

“Little Annie’s Ramble” marks the beginning of Hawthorne’s career as a writer of juvenile literature, a career that spanned more than twenty years. Two other early sketches also made their debuts in juvenile magazines: “Little Daffydowndilly,” an allegory about a child who learns not to despise hard work, appeared in The Boys’ and Girls’ Magazine in August 1843, and “A Good Man’s Miracle,” an “apocryphal” account of the founding of the Sunday School movement, graced the pages of The Child’s Friend the following February. These latter tales, which reveal
further “concessions to the taste of the popular audience and the publishers
who catered to it,” appeared between the publication of the second
edition of *Twice-told Tales* (1842) and *Mosses from an Old Manse* (1846),
at a time when Hawthorne was searching for his niche in the literary
marketplace, contributing pieces to a variety of periodicals, ranging from
audience-specific periodicals such as *Godey’s Ladies’ Book* and diverse
children’s publications to journals such as *The Knickerbocker* and *New­
England Magazine*, which addressed more general audiences.12

By far the single largest market for Hawthorne’s sketches in the years
between the publication of *Fanshawe* (1828) and the first edition of *Twice­
told Tales*, however, was *The Token* (1827–1842), an annual gift book
published for the Christmas and New Year’s trade. *The Token* was
launched by Samuel Goodrich, of Peter Parley fame, who published it for
two years, went on to edit thirteen of the fifteen volumes, and contributed
prolifically to its pages. Goodrich conceived of *The Token* as an Ameri­
can version of the English *Forget Me Not*, which began publication in
1823. It was to be distinct from other American gift books, such as the
*Atlantic Souvenir* (with which it merged in 1833), in its effort to showcase
American authors, American illustrators, and American themes. As
publisher and editor of this ambitious nativist literary project, Goodrich
needed to be on the lookout for American literary and artistic talent that he
could recruit to contribute to *The Token*. It was in his capacity as acquisi­
tions editor that Goodrich became acquainted with Hawthorne. In fact,
Goodrich was one of Hawthorne’s earliest admirers. In 1829, after the
publisher of *Fanshawe* apparently tipped him off as to the authorship of the
anonymous romance, Goodrich wrote to Hawthorne to express interest in
him as a possible contributor. By way of reply to Goodrich’s overtures,
Hawthorne sent him several manuscripts in 1830, including some pieces
that he wrote specifically for *The Token*. In doing so, he joined the ranks
of such popular authors as Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Nathaniel P.
Willis, Lydia Maria Child, Lydia Sigourney, Catharine Maria Sedgwick,
and Oliver Wendell Holmes, who also contributed to *The Token*. Over the
next eight years, Goodrich published some twenty-seven of Hawthorne’s
sketches and tales, typically paying him between seventy-five cents and
one dollar per page. Many of these pieces were later collected in *Twice­
told Tales*, which Hawthorne, in the erroneous belief that Goodrich had
financed publication, considered dedicating to the editor of *The Token*.18

Demand for the Parley books and his other textbooks was so steady that
Goodrich employed a succession of freelance writers to produce new
volumes according to plans which he developed himself. Despite the fact that he felt Goodrich had exploited him in the past, Hawthorne agreed to compile, with his sister Elizabeth, one such volume: *Peter Parley's Universal History on the Basis of Geography*. Evidently, Hawthorne accepted the assignment because he regarded the work as relatively easy. In explaining the project to Elizabeth, he observed, “It need not be superiour [sic], in profundity and polish, to the middling Magazine articles” (XV: 245). Regarding compensation, he wrote, “Our pay, as Historians of the Universe, will be 100 dollars the whole of which you may have. It is a poor compensation; yet better than the Token; because the kind of writing is so much less difficult” (XV: 247). Apparently pleased with the two manuscript folios he received on 23 September 1836, Goodrich wrote to Hawthorne on 13 December with a follow-up offer: “If you are disposed to write a volume of six hundred small 12mo pages on the manner, customs, and civilities of all countries,—for $300,—I could probably arrange it with you. I should want a mere compilation from books that I would furnish. It might be commenced immediately. Let me know your views. It would go in old Parley’s name.” No record survives of Hawthorne’s presumably negative reply to this invitation to masquerade a second time for the fictitious Peter Parley.

If Hawthorne found the task of ghostwriting for this imaginary author unremunerative, he must have been aware that “old Parley” was doing quite well by his creator. Indeed, “Goodrich Enterprises,” which had occupied space in William D. Ticknor’s Old Corner Bookstore from October 1826, gradually expanded its quarters to fill the entire second floor of this Boston landmark. In his *Recollections of a Lifetime, Or Men and Things I Have Seen* (1857), Goodrich estimated that seven million of his books had been sold to date and that his books currently sold at an annual rate of three hundred thousand. Goodrich also calculated that he was “the author and editor of about one hundred and seventy volumes—one hundred and sixteen bearing the name of Peter Parley.” His first geography book, *Peter Parley's Method of Telling About Geography to Children* (1829), sold two million copies worldwide and even the *Universal History*, the volume over which Nathaniel and Elizabeth Hawthorne diligently labored, reportedly sold over a million copies. Moreover, the Hawthornes’ “Parley” was adapted for use in schools, and the revised text, which was issued concurrently with the original version under the title *Peter Parley's Common School History*, went through six editions in four months and was adopted by “many of the best schools in
the United States." The success of these volumes, if known to Hawthorne, must certainly have been galling, considering that they appeared at a time when he was earnestly, but unsuccessfully, attempting to earn a living by his pen. Perhaps even more exasperating, Goodrich published his first Peter Parley book, Peter Parley's Tales About America, in 1827— one year before Hawthorne published Fanshawe—and while only a small portion of the thousand copies of Fanshawe sold, the first Peter Parley very soon became a hit, allowing its author to achieve fame and great wealth over the course of the same ten-year period that Hawthorne grudgingly spent supplying material to The Token at the disappointing rate of (at best) a dollar a page.

Goodrich's successes in the field of juvenile literature were by no means limited to the “Peter Parley” books. In the 1820s, he entered the textbook market, generating plans for school books, hiring writers to author them, and publishing the resulting texts. By 1830, he was writing his own textbooks, which included geographies, histories, books of natural history, arithmetic texts, and a line of Goodrich Readers, which were widely used in New England. As Daniel Roselle notes, “from 1830 to 1850 Goodrich was as active in writing children’s textbooks as he was in setting down the Peter Parley tales or in editing the writings of contributors to his magazines.”

Perhaps it was Goodrich’s success in the children’s textbook market that encouraged Hawthorne to entertain plans to write pedagogical works of a similar nature. In a letter to Longfellow dated 21 March 1838, he complained of being “terribly harassed with magazine scribbling,” adding that he had received “overtures from two different quarters, to perpetrate children’s histories and other such iniquities” (XV: 266). One of these “quarters” was Horace Mann, to whom he had been recommended by Elizabeth Peabody. As Hawthorne explained in a subsequent letter to Longfellow, “Really I do mean to turn my attention to writing for children, either on my own hook, or for the series of works projected by the [Massachusetts] Board of Education—to which I have been requested to contribute. It appears to me that there is a very fair chance of profit” (XV: 288). The other quarter was the Boston firm of Marsh, Capen & Lyon, which, in January 1840, announced as forthcoming “New-England Historical Sketches by N. Hawthorne. Author of ‘Twice Told Tales,’ &c.” Although the projected volume was never published, “it seems likely that it is closely related to, perhaps indeed part of, the Grandfather’s Chair series.”
By 1840, when Hawthorne published the three volumes of the *Grandfather's Chair* series—*Grandfather's Chair*, *Famous Old People*, and *Liberty Tree*—the market for histories and inspirational biographies for children had already been well established by Goodrich, Child, the American Tract Society, and others. Considered alongside these earlier productions, Hawthorne's histories clearly manifest a superior execution and a more sophisticated narrative style and structure. Indeed, the noteworthy innovation of *The Whole History of Grandfather's Chair* (as these three volumes came to be known), in which Hawthorne organizes the tales around appearances of the old man's chair at various junctures in New England history, has been generally admired by critics. Nevertheless, the resemblance between Goodrich's "Peter Parley" books and Hawthorne's juvenile nonfiction is more than superficial, as Andrew Preston Peabody suggested when, in 1852, he described *Grandfather's Chair* as written "in the Peter Parley style." Both series consist of a sequence of framed narratives, and in *Grandfather's Chair*, as well as in the "Peter Parley" series, the narrator is an elderly gentleman addressing an audience of young boys and girls. Although rendered less artistically than the *Grandfather's Chair* series, *Biographical Stories for Children*, which followed in 1842, likewise employs a narrative frame as a middle-aged man, Mr. Temple, tells the stories to his invalid son and other members of his family circle. In addition, both *The Whole History of Grandfather's Chair* and *Biographical Stories for Children* follow the pattern of "Peter Parley" in relating, in a conversational style, factual material dressed in overtly moralistic trappings. This narrative technique is especially conspicuous in *Biographical Stories*, where, for example, the sketch of Samuel Johnson (issued separately, slightly abridged, as a Sunday School pamphlet in 1842) highlights Johnson's remorse and penance for disobeying his father. This shift toward a more didactic posture suggests the possibility that Hawthorne, after dispensing with the fanciful chair device of the earlier series, deliberately cultivated a more "Parley-like" expository mode in the later collection.

If, in adapting Goodrich's narrative techniques, Hawthorne was hoping to achieve a success with *The Whole History of Grandfather's Chair* and *Biographical Stories for Children* to rival that of "Peter Parley," he must have been sorely disappointed. While his correspondence suggests that he regarded these early juvenile stories as a kind of hackwork—writing that might bring its author money, if not literary fame—the volumes failed to fly off the booksellers' shelves. In fact, Elizabeth Peabody, who originally
published the individual volumes of the Grandfather's Chair series, evidently had a fair amount of trouble disposing of remainders and finding another publisher to take over the series.\textsuperscript{41} It wasn't until Ticknor & Fields reissued the sketches collectively as True Stories from History and Biography (1850) in the wake of The Scarlet Letter that the project finally began to pay off.\textsuperscript{42}

Hawthorne's disillusionment with what he had once regarded as a potentially lucrative line of literary labor is reflected in a letter he wrote to Samuel Colman (dated 27 September 1843), shortly after "Little Daffydowndilly" appeared in Colman's Boys' and Girls' Magazine:\textsuperscript{43}

I am afraid that I cannot find time to write a regular series of articles for the Boys [sic] & Girls' Magazine. It would give me pleasure to comply with your request; but it could not be done without interrupting other pursuits, and at a greater sacrifice than the real value of my articles. If I saw a probability of deriving a reasonable profit from juvenile literature, I would willingly devote myself to it for a time, as being both easier and more agreeable (by way of variety) than literature for grown people. But my experience hitherto has not made me very sanguine on this point. In fact, the business has long been overdone. Mr. [Jacob] Abbott [sic] and other writers have reaped the harvest; and the gleanings seem to be scarcely worth picking up. (XVI: 1)\textsuperscript{44}

Given the subsequent explosion of children's literature in the United States, it may be surprising that in 1843 Hawthorne considered the field of children's literature to be thoroughly saturated. Nevertheless, Jacob Abbott and Samuel Goodrich (whom Hawthorne must also have had in mind) were, assuredly, overwhelming forces in the juvenile literature market. Like Goodrich, whose popular success has been noted, Abbott was spectacularly prolific. He wrote an estimated two hundred books, averaging four per year. His first popular hit, The Young Christian, remained in print continuously from 1832 to 1891, but his most successful production by far was the "Rollo" series, consisting of twenty-six volumes of travel, geography, and science, plus fifteen additional "Rollo Story Books" and volumes of poetry.\textsuperscript{45} In addition, Abbott wrote numerous volumes of history for youth, as well as moral tales for the very young. With such popular authors as Abbott and Goodrich generating a steady stream of juvenile nonfiction, it is perhaps not surprising that Hawthorne should soon abandon the project of writing schoolbooks and juvenile histories in the Parley tradition—albeit wistfully and with evident reluctance, for he retained a vestigial interest in authoring children's textbooks, even as his thoughts began to turn toward new modes of juvenile writing. In a letter to
Evert A. Duyckinck (15 April 1846), he confessed, “I have had in my head, this long time, the idea of some stories to be taken out of the cold moonshine of classical mythology, and modernized, or perhaps gothicized, so that they may be felt by children of these days” (XVI: 153). Three years later, still uncertain as to which direction to pursue, he professed in a letter to Mann (8 August 1849) to be thinking of “writing a school-book—or, at any rate, a book for the young” (XVI: 293). The critical distinction Hawthorne observes syntactically between “a school-book” and “a book for the young,” emblematic of the growing division between instruction and entertainment in the juvenile literature market, foreshadows the turn his own career would take when he finally resumed writing for children in the spring of 1851.  

In his *Recollections*, Goodrich writes of a “desire [he] had long entertained of making a reform—or at least an improvement—in books for youth.” Hawthorne, too, cherished hopes of reforming children’s literature, writing to Longfellow on 21 March 1838 of his interest in collaborating on a children’s book that “may make a great hit, and entirely revolutionize the whole system of juvenile literature” (XV: 266). Earlier that month, on 3 March, Elizabeth Peabody had explained in a letter to Horace Mann that although Hawthorne had “not thriven with the booksellers,” he had always “had in his mind one great moral enterprise...—to make an attempt at creating a new literature for the young—as he has a deep dislike to the character of the shoals of books poured out from the press.” Goodrich’s “reform” had involved substituting such salubrious fare as histories, geographies, and the like for fairy tales, Mother Goose rhymes, and other “tales of horror,” which he felt were “commonly put into the hands of youth, as if for the express purpose of reconciling them to vice and crime.” In contrast, Hawthorne aspired with his version of a “new literature for the young” to reinvest children’s reading with precisely the kind of imagination and fancy that Goodrich considered to be potentially detrimental. The project he envisioned for himself and Longfellow—a collection of fairy tales tentatively called “The Boys’ Wonder-Horn,” after the German folk collection *Des Knabens Wunderhorn* (1805–1808)—never came to fruition (evidently not for lack of enthusiasm on Hawthorne’s part). Nevertheless, Hawthorne achieved his own “revolution” in children’s literature with the “gothicized” classical myths of *A Wonder Book* and *Tanglewood Tales*, a project he described to James T. Fields (7 April 1851) in distinctly un-Goodrichian terms: “It shall not be exclusively Fairy tales, but intermixed with stories of real life, and classic
myths modernized and made funny, and all sorts of tom-foolery—"The Child’s Budget of Miscellaneous Nonsense" (XVI: 417).

The very subject matter of *A Wonder Book* is “revolutionary” in the context of nineteenth-century American children’s literature, for fantasy remained rare in the juvenile literature of the United States long after it had become well established in Britain. Indeed, many literary historians place Hawthorne at the beginning of the tradition of the American literary fairy tale.53 As Hawthorne intimates in his letter to Fields, however, it is the “intermixing” of fairy tales, myth, and “stories of real life” that is most remarkable about *A Wonder Book*. Earlier, in *Grandfather’s Chair*, Hawthorne had injected a trace of the fantastic into otherwise factual chapters of Massachusetts history, as the chair itself descended through time, witnessing, in almost human fashion, the scenes and events Grandfather describes. Indeed, in the final sequence, “Grandfather’s Dream,” Hawthorne brings the chair to life and endows it with the power of speech—although Grandfather scrupulously separates fact from fable, “warning the children that they must not mistake this story for a true one” (VI: 205).54 In *A Wonder Book* and *Tanglewood Tales*, the categories of fantasy and reality become blurred, as Hawthorne catapults the myths of ancient Greece into contemporary New England and invests them with a characteristic blend of romance and detail drawn from real life. His strategy, as he explains in the Preface to *A Wonder Book*, is “to clothe [the fables] with . . . [the] garniture of manners and sentiment, and to imbue [them] with . . . [the] morality” of the present age (VII: 3). In the Preface to *The House of the Seven Gables* (published less than two months before he began *A Wonder Book*), Hawthorne had cautioned the writer of a romance “to mingle the Marvellous rather as a slight, delicate, and evanescent flavor, than as any portion of the actual substance of the dish offered to the Public,” adding, “He can hardly be said, however, to commit a literary crime, even if he disregard this caution” (II: 1). In *A Wonder Book* and *Tanglewood Tales*, the proportions shift as he begins with a tale that is essentially “Marvellous” and proceeds to ground it firmly in a real-world context, which, in consequence, takes on a fantastic quality of its own. Thus, in the preamble to “The Golden Touch,” Hawthorne accounts for the inspiration of Eustace Bright, a student at Williams College, in narrating the story of King Midas: “It had come into his mind, as he lay looking upward into the depths of a tree, and observing how the touch of Autumn had transmuted every one of its green leaves into what resembled the purest gold. And this change, which we have all of us witnessed, is as
wonderful as anything that Eustace told about, in the story of Midas” (VII: 39). Similarly, Eustace presents the outlines of each myth in a factual manner but freely acknowledges embellishing them with creations of his own imagination. In the introduction to “The Golden Touch,” for example, he begins: “Once upon a time, there lived a very rich man, and a king besides, whose name was Midas; and he had a little daughter, whom nobody but myself ever heard of, and whose name I either never knew, or have entirely forgotten. So, because I love odd names for little girls, I choose to call her Marygold” (VII: 40). Even Eustace’s auditors, the little children whom he regales with the romanticized myths, take on a fantastic quality, as Hawthorne endows them with names that “might better suit a group of fairies than a company of earthly children” (VII: 6).

The characterization of both the sprite-like children who comprise Eustace’s fictional audience and the children within the stories further illustrates the extent to which Hawthorne had transcended the constraints of the earlier biographical and historical texts. Within the contexts of their narrative frames, both Grandfather’s Chair and Biographical Stories for Children are addressed to stereotyped sets of children (Laurence, Charley, Clara, and Alice in the former; Edward, George, and Emily in the latter), and both collections contain stories that reinforce traditional gender roles or critique those who deviate from them. The life of Queen Christina, for example, is, according to Hawthorne, “chiefly profitable as showing the evil effects of a wrong education, which caused this daughter of a King to be both useless and unhappy” (VI: 275). Thus Hawthorne describes the basis of this “wrongful education”:

[King Gustavus] determined to educate her exactly as if she had been a boy, and to teach her all the knowledge needful to the ruler of a kingdom, and the commander of an army.

But Gustavus should have remembered that Providence had created her to be a woman, and that it was not for him to make a man of her. (VI: 277)

The tale concludes with the moral that “Happy are the little girls of America, who are brought up quietly and tenderly, at the domestic hearth, and thus become gentle and delicate women! May none of them ever lose the loveliness of their sex, by receiving such an education as that of Queen Christina!” (VI: 283).

In the mythological tales, by contrast, Hawthorne not only dispenses with such overt didacticism but portrays childish whimsy and naughtiness as natural and even preferable to a more mannered and artificial state of childhood. Indeed, in “The Paradise of Children,” Hawthorne’s version of
“Pandora’s Box,” his description of an untroubled prelapsarian world in which “the children never quarrelled among themselves; neither had they any crying-fits; nor, since time first began, had a single one of these little mortals ever gone apart into a corner, and sulked!” (VII: 66) strains uneasily against his depiction of Pandora, who spends her time quarreling with Epimetheus and brooding over the forbidden contents of the box. Moreover, in A Wonder Book and, to a lesser degree, Tanglewood Tales, which lacks the elaborate frame of the earlier volume, Hawthorne abandons the customary audience of conventional boys and girls in favor of a playful, rambunctious, occasionally querulous assortment of youngsters called by the whimsically Shakespearean gender-ambiguous names of Primrose, Periwinkle, Sweet Fern, Dandelion, Blue Eye, Clover, Huckleberry, Cowslip, Squash Blossom, Milkweed, Plantain, and Butter-cup. Both the avoidance of stereotypical boy and girl characters and the positive portrayal of childhood mischievousness in A Wonder Book and Tanglewood Tales are unusual in the juvenile literature of the mid-nineteenth century, representing not only an important artistic innovation on Hawthorne’s part (one that recalls the characterization of Pearl in The Scarlet Letter), but a concurrent development in the course of juvenile literature, as fictionalized children became less angelic, less idealized, and less constrained by traditional social roles.

Part of the reason for Hawthorne’s success both in depicting and in appealing to children in his books of myth is a heightened sensitivity to children’s literary preferences, borne, inevitably, of his role as a parent. The self-consciousness with which he differentiates between his audience of children and that of adults becomes evident midway through A Wonder Book, when Primrose informs Eustace that Mr. and Mrs. Pringle wish to hear one of his stories. Although rather pleased “at the opportunity of proving to Mr. Pringle what an excellent faculty he had in modernizing the myths of ancient times” (VII: 88), Eustace is aware that what pleases the children might find less favor with their parents. After Mr. Pringle turns to him “in a way that made him feel how uncombed and unbrushed he was, and how uncombed and unbrushed, likewise, were his mind and thoughts.” Eustace informs him, “You are not exactly the auditor I should have chosen, Sir... for fantasies of this nature” (VII: 89). His plea, before beginning the tale of “The Three Golden Apples,” to “be kind enough to remember, that I am addressing myself to the imagination and sympathies of the children, not to your own” (VII: 89) reflects both the clear separation Hawthorne observes between literary fare for children and adults and his
determination to cater directly to the preferences of the young. Eustace’s reference to “the admirable nonsense that I put into these stories, out of my own head, and which makes the great charm of the matter for children” (VII: 88) unmistakeably identifies the nature of these preferences. By the time he wrote *A Wonder Book*, Hawthorne was a father of three young children, had acquired considerable first-hand experience with youngsters, and was therefore qualified to speak with some authority about their literary tastes, as evidenced by his confident assertion earlier in the volume that “it is a truth, as regards children, that a story seen is often to deepen its mark in their interest, not merely by two or three, but by numberless repetitions” (VII: 8). Earlier, in the Preface to *Grandfather’s Chair*, Hawthorne had evinced a degree of uncertainty about his “ponderous tome” (VI: 5), confessing that “The author’s great doubt is, whether he has succeeded in writing a book which will be readable by the class for whom he intends it. To make a lively and entertaining narrative for children, with such unchangeable material as is presented by the sombre, stern, and rigid characteristics of the Puritans and their descendants, is quite as difficult an attempt, as to manufacture delicate playthings out of the granite rocks on which New England is founded” (VI: 6). A decade later, Hawthorne expressed a similar awareness that, in restyling Classical myths, he was again working with recalcitrant literary material. But the diffidence of the earlier work gave way to a newfound aplomb as Hawthorne wrote in a letter to James T. Fields: “I shall aim at substituting a tone in some degree Gothic or romantic, or any such tone as may best please myself, instead of the classic coldness, which is as repellent as the touch of marble” (XVI: 436). This confidence in his ability to assess and accommodate the tastes of his juvenile audience, underscored by his assertion that “The book, if it comes out of my mind as I see it now, ought to have pretty wide success amongst young people” (XVI: 437), resounds in the opening of *A Wonder Book*, where Hawthorne, in marked counterpoint to the Preface of *Grandfather’s Chair*, announces that “The author has long been of opinion, that many of the classical myths were capable of being rendered into very capital reading for children” (VII: 3).

Hawthorne’s assurance that he had succeeded at last in capturing a receptive juvenile readership was not misplaced. He received many complimentary letters from children following the release of *A Wonder Book*, and both that collection and its sequel were well reviewed by the press. An anonymous writer in *Graham’s Magazine* effectively summed up Hawthorne’s achievement when he contrasted his most recent juvenile
productions with the kind of routine, unimaginative writing for children that was so prevalent at mid-century (and, indeed, of the kind Hawthorne had "perpetrated" a decade earlier): "It is almost needless to say that all these stories [Tanglewood Tales] evince the felicity and transforming power of genius, and are to be rigidly distinguished from ordinary books for children. They have nothing of the book-making, hack-writing, soul-lacking character of job work, but are true products of imagination—of the literary artist as discriminated from the literary artisan." Of the writing of these mythological tales, Hawthorne confessed, "it has been really a task fit for hot weather, and one of the most agreeable, of a literary kind, which he [the author] ever undertook" (VII: 4). That he found artistic satisfaction in them is evident in a statement he made to Washington Irving (16 July 1852), another literary artist whose retellings of European tales were avidly read by children: "I sent you 'The Wonder Book,' because, being meant for children, it seemed to reach a higher point, in its own way, than anything that I had written for grown people" (XVI: 570). The apparent paradox of reaching a "higher point" through writing for children is resolved in the Preface to A Wonder Book, where Hawthorne explains:

the Author has not always thought it necessary to write downward, in order to meet the comprehension of children. He has generally suffered the theme to soar, whenever such was its tendency, and when he himself was buoyant enough to follow without an effort. Children possess an unestimated sensibility to whatever is deep or high, in imagination or feeling, so long as it is simple, likewise. It is only the artificial and the complex that bewilder them. (VII: 4)

In 1838, Hawthorne had written to Longfellow with respect to their proposed collaboration of children's stories: "Seriously, I think that a very pleasant and peculiar kind of reputation may be acquired in this way—we will twine for ourselves a wreath of tender shoots and dewy buds, instead of such withered and dusty leaves as other people crown themselves with" (XV: 266–67). Four years later, he had affirmed in the Preface to Biographical Stories, that "in point of the reputation to be aimed at, juvenile literature is as well worth cultivating as any other. The writer, if he succeed in pleasing his little readers, may hope to be remembered by them till their own old age—a far longer period of literary existence than is generally attained, by those who seek immortality from the judgments of full grown men" (VI: 214). To Horace Mann, Elizabeth Peabody conveyed Hawthorne's avowal "that were he embarked in this undertaking he should
feel as if he had a right to live—he desired no higher vocation—he considered it the highest.⁶² Fifteen years later, after Hawthorne had finally succeeded in this “undertaking,” he declared in a letter to R. H. Stoddard⁶³ (dated 16 March 1853) that the six myths of Tanglewood Tales are “fully equal, in their way, to Mother Goose,” adding, “I never did anything else so well as these old baby-stories” (XVI: 649). Although critics have generally admired Tanglewood Tales less than its predecessor, A Wonder Book, there is sufficient evidence both within the tales and in their reception history to justify Hawthorne’s unprecedented expression of satisfaction. Indeed, in terms of aesthetic quality and the value ascribed by author, readers, and critics, the span between Biographical Stories and A Wonder Book epitomizes Hawthorne’s growth, as a writer for children, from “book-making, hack-writing, soul-lacking” producer of literary “job work” and other “iniquities” to the kind of “literary artist” who “evince[s] the felicity and transforming power of genius.”

The gradual shift from pedagogy and didacticism to entertainment and amusement in children’s literature, and from juvenile history and geography to fantasy and other forms of highly-wrought imaginative fiction, occurred as a result of a number of factors, including the secularization of American culture, which helped broaden the horizons of children’s literature beyond moral tales and Sunday School reading, and the increasing purchasing power of children, which empowered children to vote with their pocket money—within the parameters of parental means and approval.⁶⁴ In addition, the stiffening competition among publishers of juvenile literature acted as a catalyst on the marketing of children’s books, which became increasingly aggressive in its efforts to vie for the attention of young readers.⁶⁵ Goodrich, writing in 1856, may have had in mind the new breed of literature conceived and marketed to appeal directly to the young when he urged his readers to “go to such a juvenile bookstore as that of C. S. Francis, in Broadway, New York, and behold the teeming shelves—comprising almost every topic within the range of human knowledge, treated in a manner to please the young mind, by the use of every attraction of style and every art of embellishment—and let him remember that nineteen twentieths of these works have come into existence within the last thirty years.”⁶⁶ One can imagine Goodrich and his contemporaries gazing in wonder upon the “teeming shelves” of the children’s bookstore in much the manner of Little Annie gazing with astonished eyes upon the riches of the confectioner’s shop. For readers today, it is enough to marvel that in 1856 the publishing trade had evolved
to the point that there were such specialized establishments as "juvenile bookstores." In any event, that by mid-century American children were eager for fanciful works such as *A Wonder Book* and *Tanglewood Tales* is indicated in a letter from Ticknor & Fields to their English agent, Thomas Delf, on 19 December 1849, in which Fields wrote: "We wish we had an £100 of Cundall's Juveniles & as much more of other kinds—the rage is for 'Eng Juveniles'—& very few to be had." In the 1840s, the London firm of Joseph Cundall (1841–1852), which specialized in high-quality children's books, was publishing fairy tales, legends, nursery rhymes, ballads, folktales, and other kinds of imaginative story books. These scintillating volumes, embodying just the kind of "tom-foolery" Hawthorne intimated to Fields with respect to *A Wonder Book*, could hardly have failed to attract the multitudes of American children who were "deeply read in Peter Parley's tomes." Hawthorne's timely abandonment of the "book-making, hack-writing, soul-lacking" job of writing Parley-type historical tales in favor of the fantastic stories he blithely characterized as "The Child's Budget of Miscellaneous Nonsense" thus happily coincided with the recognition—and indulgence—of the growing literary appetite of American children who shared an "increasing love for fairy tales" with the diminutive heroine of "Little Annie's Ramble."
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3 Andrew Preston Peabody, writing for the Christian Examiner, wrote, “There is hardly anything in the volume, which pleases us more than ‘Little Annie’s Ramble,’ which is a mere sketch, simple, natural, full of child-like feeling, of a child’s stroll with her friend through the gay streets of the town, by the print-shops and the toy-shops, through all the little worlds of gorgeous sights, which arrest infancy’s lingering steps on its earliest walks” (quoted in J. Donald Crowley, ed. Hawthorne: The Critical Heritage [New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970]. 65). In his précis in the North American Review, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow exclaimed, “What minute delicacy of touch, and womanly knowledge of a child’s mind and character, are perceptible in ‘Little Annie’s Ramble’” (Ibid., 82). Evert A. Duyckinck cited the tale in full in an essay in the Democratic Review, explaining, “It is so cheerful a sketch and so full of pleasant imagery that we give it entire to the reader without apology” (Ibid., 99). In general, early reviewers, who encountered the tale for the first time in Twice-told Tales, did not identify “Little Annie’s Ramble” as a children’s story.
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5 In the version of the sketch that appeared in Youth’s Keepsake, Annie was versed in “Robin Carver’s tomes.” Just prior to the publication of “Little Annie’s Ramble,” Robin Carver had published several volumes of juvenile non-fiction, including Stories About Boston, and Its Neighborhood (1833), Stories of Poland (1833), Anecdotes of Natural History (1833), History of Boston (1834), and The Book of Sports (1834). Hawthorne inserted the allusion to Peter Parley when he was revising the text for Twice-told Tales. See J. Donald Crowley, “Editorial Emendations in the Copy-Text,” Twice-told Tales, The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1972). IX: 586.

6 The Juvenile Miscellany: For the Instruction and Amusement of Youth was published in Boston from September 1826 to March 1836. Lydia Maria Child, who founded the magazine, served as editor until 1834, when public hostility toward her “An Appeal in Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans” forced her to resign. (Significantly, Child had already fallen out of favor by the time Hawthorne’s endorsement of the Juvenile Miscellany appeared in “Little Annie’s Ramble.”) Sarah J. Hale (who went on to edit Godby’s Lady’s Book) succeeded Child as editor. The magazine included historical sketches and dramas,

7 These two aspects of Hawthorne's writing for children mirror the broad development of juvenile literature in the United States. As Daniel Roselle explains, "... when there came to America the two interlocking lines of historical development in children's books—the morally didactic and the romantically fanciful—there was a tendency in the beginning to stress the former at the expense of the latter" (Samuel Griswold Goodrich, Creator of Peter Parley: A Study of His Life and Work [Albany: State University of New York Press, 1968], 59).

8 According to Pearce, True Stories from History and Biography "represents Hawthorne's attempts to write for an established juvenile market in an established juvenile genre," while "A Wonder-Book and Tanglewood Tales are products of his flourishing self-confidence after the success of The Scarlet Letter in 1850" (VI: 287).


11 Pearce, 288.

12 This period also coincides with Hawthorne's marriage to Sophia Peabody in July 1842 and his growing concerns with "how I am to earn my bread." See Edwin Haviland Miller, Salem Is My Dwelling Place: A Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991), 238.
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Roselle, 63; Gilkes, 105; Goodrich, II: 281. This strategy of commissioning freelance authors to write books from outlines was later implemented by publishers of dime novels and children's series books (including, most famously, the Stratemeyer Syndicate).

Hawthorne also served Goodrich in the capacity of editor of the American Magazine of Useful and Entertaining Knowledge from January through June 1836, editing the March–August issues. The arrangement soured when the promised salary failed to materialize and the Bewick Co., which published the magazine (and of which Goodrich was a member), went bankrupt. In the words of Wayne Allen Jones, “Goodrich lured Hawthorne aboard a sinking ship and persuaded him to become its pilot” (“The Hawthorne-Goodrich Relationship,” 118). On 15 February 1836, Hawthorne wrote to his sister Louisa of his obviously strained relationship with his employer: “My mind is pretty much made up about this Goodrich. He is a good-natured sort of man enough; but rather an unscrupulous one in money matters, and not particularly trustworthy in anything . . . . He made the best bargain with me he could, and a hard bargain too. This world is as full of rogues as Beelzebub [the family cat] is of fleas” (XV: 236). More than twenty years later, Hawthorne’s feelings toward Goodrich had softened somewhat, although he retained the sense that Goodrich had manipulated and exploited him. On 13 August 1857, he wrote to his sister-in-law Elizabeth Peabody, “As for Goodrich, I have rather a kindly feeling towards him, and he himself is a not unkindly man, in spite of his propensity to feed and fatten himself on better brains...
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48 Goodrich, Recollections, I:166. English translations of Charles Perrault’s fairy tales were available in the United States as early as 1785.
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58 Clearly, the myths permitted a license in their retelling which the history of New England did not. While he balked at sanitizing one of the bloodiest episodes of early American history for his young readers (resulting in Alice’s torrent of tears), Hawthorne blithely informed Fields of his intention, in A Wonder Book, to “purge out all the old heathen wickedness, and put in a moral wherever practicable” (XVI: 437).

59 Pearce, 309.


This reviewer may be picking up on an increasing tendency in publishing to differentiate textbooks from other kinds of books for children, as pedagogical works came to be “rigidly distinguished” from juvenile literature designed primarily to amuse rather than to instruct.

62 Peabody, 200.

63 Richard Henry Stoddard (1825–1903) was a poet, critic, and editor. A “protegé” of Hawthorne’s, he patterned his Adventures in Fairy-Land (1853) after A Wonder Book. See Mark I. West, ed., Before Oz: Juvenile Fantasy Stories from

See Avery and Anne Scott MacLeod, A Moral Tale: Children's Fiction and American Culture (Hamden, Conn.: Anchor Books, 1975).

See, for example, Raymond L. Kilgour, Lee & Shepard: Publishers for the People (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1965).


Although C. S. Francis did not publish juvenile books exclusively, children's books were his forte. He published several series for children, including his Juvenile Classics (one of the earliest of the large, numbered publisher's series for children in the United States) and Library of Instructive Amusement. Two earlier American booksellers who operated specialized children's bookstores were Samuel Wood (1760-1844), whose Juvenile Bookstore at 357 Pearl Street, New York had opened by 1815, and Mahlon Day (1790-1854), whose New Juvenile Bookstore, also on Pearl Street, was open from 1820 to 1845. See Harry B. Weiss, Samuel Wood & Sons. Early New York Publishers of Children's Books (New York: New York Public Library, 1942) and Mahlon Day, Early New York, Bookseller and Publisher of Children's Books (New York: New York Public Library, 1941). I am indebted to Cornelia King and Laura Wasowicz for the information in this paragraph.

Quoted in Pearce, 295. As Marjorie N. Allen observes, "The English fantasy imports created a market in America for books that directly appealed to children and opened the door for American authors who preferred storytelling to moralizing" (100 Years of Children's Books in America, Decade by Decade [New York: Facts on File, 1996], 7).


Van Tassel has argued that "Hidden behind his reference to Peter Parley... is [Hawthorne's] disillusioned knowledge that Annie's reading taste, shaped by men like Goodrich, rejected his serious work and demanded fiction that women and children could safely enjoy, innocuous pieces such as this very sketch, 23
published in household magazines and children's annuals" (172). While Van Tassel's reading is consistent with the nature of the literary apprenticeship Hawthorne served under Goodrich, as I have suggested, the growing interest in fairy tales and other imaginative stories on the part of Little Annie and her contemporaries ultimately helped establish the market for the juvenile "classics" Hawthorne went on to author in the 1850s. This trajectory of Hawthorne's career (in distinct counterpoint to that of his adult fiction) thus auspiciously accorded with the broader development of American literature. With respect to his writing for adults, Nina Baym observes that Hawthorne did not "foresee the evolution of both popular and critical taste away from the gothic, romantic, and historical toward the domestic, realistic, and contemporary" (17).