

Whitworth Digital Commons
Whitworth University

English Faculty Scholarship

English

2015

George Lippard's *The Quaker City*: Disjointed Text, Dismembered Bodies, Regenerated Democracy

D. Berton Emerson

Whitworth University, dbemerson@whitworth.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.whitworth.edu/englishfaculty>



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

Recommended Citation

Emerson, D. Berton. "George Lippard's *The Quaker City*: Disjointed Text, Dismembered Bodies, Regenerated Democracy." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 70, no. 1, 2015, pp. 102-131. DOI: [10.1525/ncl.2015.70.1.102](https://doi.org/10.1525/ncl.2015.70.1.102).

This Peer Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at Whitworth University. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Whitworth University.

George Lippard's
The Quaker City:
Disjointed Text,
Dismembered Bodies,
Regenerated Democracy

D. BERTON EMERSON

IN a letter dated 18 February 1844, Edgar Allan Poe offered George Lippard some mixed feedback after reading the younger writer's first romance, *Ladye Annabel* (1842). "You seem," Poe wrote, "to have been in too desperate a hurry to give due attention to details." Despite its faulty prose, Poe proclaimed that "the work, as a whole, will be admitted . . . to be . . . indicative of *genius* in its author."¹ With Poe's blessing, Lippard printed the complete

Nineteenth-Century Literature, Vol. 70, No. 1, pp. 102–131, ISSN: 0891–9356, online ISSN: 1067–8352, © 2015 by The Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press website, at <http://www.ucpress.edu/journals/rights.htm>. DOI: 10.1525/ncl.2015.70.1.102.

This essay is part of a special issue on George Lippard's *The Quaker City*

¹ Edgar Allan Poe, letter to George Lippard, 18 February 1844, in *The Letters of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. John Ward Ostrom, 2 vols. (New York: Gordian Press, 1966), I, 242–43. Poe spent the rest of the letter assuring Lippard that the accrual of "personal enemies" should be credited as "stepping stones to your ambition." An Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship at the Library Company of Philadelphia and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania provided time and resources for completing this essay. I must thank Sari Altschuler, Christopher Looby, David Reynolds, Michael Winship, Paul Gilmore, James Green, Christopher Hunter, Derrick Spires, Stefanie Sobelle, and Aaron DeRosa for

letter—negative criticism included—on the back cover of his second novel, *Herbert Tracy* (1844).² Mixed reviews of this variety followed Lippard into the twentieth century. In a 1935 essay, Joseph Jackson breathed new life into the reputation of the once-popular but by-then-forgotten writer. Before praising Lippard's work, Jackson accounted for the same stylistic issues that had irked Poe: "We have it on the authority of one of his friends . . . that he never read his manuscript after penning it, and seldom took the trouble to glance at a proof." Providing some romantic explanations for Lippard's "carelessness," Jackson eventually confessed that few modern readers "could read with pleasure or satisfaction, any of Lippard's novels." He nevertheless judged Lippard worthy of study, for "he was the product of the world in which he lived." Amid the chaos of the 1840s, "the stage [was] set for the realist in fiction, [and] Lippard was the only writer to appear in that character."³

While readers today familiar with Lippard's literary oeuvre might question Jackson's characterization of the author as "realist," most should be unsurprised by these criticisms of Lippard's slapdash writing process. This especially seems the case when working through the rambunctious text of his most famous novel, *The Quaker City; or, The Monks of Monk Hall* (1844–45). Recent scholars might relish the text's formal and narrative incoherence, yet Lippard's compositional carelessness and editorial aversion in the creation of *The Quaker City* contain a richer story than previously told. Attending to Lippard's compositional process in conjunction with his distinctive publishing strategy (four paper-wrapped numbers appearing in the fall and early winter of 1844, and six more following in the late spring of 1845), this essay argues that *The Quaker City* is best understood when read more consistently with Lippard's own mid-production assessment: that he was producing two different

feedback on drafts of this essay. I am also grateful to Michael Cohen and the Americanist Research Colloquium at UCLA for the invitation to discuss parts of this work in progress.

² See George Lippard, *Herbert Tracy, A Romance of the Battle of Germantown* (Philadelphia, 1844), p. 167.

³ Joseph Jackson, "George Lippard: Misunderstood Man of Letters," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 59 (1935) 381, 383.

books, a novel and its sequel. While Lippard might have initially imagined his narrative as two discrete parts, the work defies even this formulation, for the last of the first four initial numbers contains clear signs of a shift to new thematic investments more fully developed in, yet ultimately unresolved by, the sequel. Recognizing this structural nuance helps us better parse the unruly narrative that exceeds and even contravenes the paratextual containers that Lippard—and later critics—would belatedly impose upon it. Thus, we more readily see the target of Lippard's social protest transition away from his retrospectively published agenda as it appears in the early numbers—the seduction of an innocent woman and the moral degradation of a community in which such a crime would be possible—to a broader complaint in the latter ones against the lack of democratic power and agency at the local level. In this transition the narrative discards an initial reliance upon national principles such as “Liberty of the Press” and symbols like Independence Hall that would provide remedy for the social, economic, and political wrongs on display in local Philadelphia. In their place, the sequel grapples with alternative political possibilities of a regenerated, localized democracy, a politics that shared the spirit of “city democracy” yet imagined possibilities beyond these labor-focused efforts.

After spending much of the twentieth century as a minor footnote, *The Quaker City* received renewed critical interest in the 1970s and 1980s. Scholars acknowledged (at times) its distinctive publication-in-parts, yet treated the novel as a total, unified whole when considering its cultural significance in relation to the canonical literature of its era.⁴ More recently, critics gauged the novel on its own merits as popular literature and for the cultural work it performed, but these readers too considered

⁴ Leslie Fiedler brought out the first twentieth-century edition, titling it *The Monks of Monk Hall* (New York: Odyssey Press, 1970) and providing an introduction that considered the text in relation to the works of other popular writers like Eugène Sue and G.W.M. Reynolds. In the following decade, critical readings that valued Lippard's popularity as a representative foil to more prominent canonical writers, especially Edgar Allan Poe, appeared in Larzer Ziff, *Literary Democracy: The Declaration of Cultural Independence in America* (New York: Viking, 1981); and David S. Reynolds, *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988).

Lippard's narrative as a singular text and situated it within a national context.⁵ These later assessments built off the valuable recovery work of scholars who have shown how a variety of popular generic fictions—the sentimental, the Gothic, the sensational—performed the cultural work of affectively and imaginatively tying individual readers to the nation as a community.⁶ Reputedly the most popular nineteenth-century novel prior to Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852), *The Quaker City* draws from all these types, making it a potpourri of generic elements that would conceivably prompt national identifications. Conversely, attending to the disrupted production of the text and Lippard's aversion to editorial revision, I argue that the novel's disjointedness more indelibly works against the fantasy of totality, cohesiveness, and imagined community, as it gradually discovers that national prescriptions fail to cure local ills. Regardless of Lippard's intentions, *The Quaker City* achieves this narratological feat through its unrevised, vernacular expression that not only refuses to fit neatly within the confines of a singular novel, but also resists critical attempts to be folded within a national narrative of consensus. This hardly seems the case in the first three numbers, when Lippard seeks a resuscitation of Revolutionary democratic ideals by recycling conventions of seduction novels along with diatribes against a libelous periodical press—two key threads used to tether print culture and individual bodies to national health in the early Republic.

⁵ For readings that assess the novel beyond its relationship to canonical literature, see Michael Denning, *Mechanic Accents: Dime Novels and Working-Class Culture in America* (London and New York: Verso, 1987); Dana D. Nelson, *National Manhood: Capitalist Citizenship and the Imagined Fraternity of White Men* (Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1998); Christopher Castiglia, *Interior States: Institutional Consciousness and the Inner Life of Democracy in the Antebellum United States* (Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 2008); and Samuel Otter, *Philadelphia Stories: America's Literature of Race and Freedom* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2010).

⁶ Examples include the sentimental novel's attempts to arouse a common sense of national feeling, as Jane Tompkins has claimed; the Gothic novel's sublimation of the darker elements of social experience into national identity, as Teresa Goddu has posited; and the sensational novel's capacity to steer national interests into imperialist ambitions, as Shelley Streeby has argued. See Jane P. Tompkins, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790–1860* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1985); Teresa A. Goddu, *Gothic America: Narrative, History, and Nation* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1997); and Shelley Streeby, *American Sensations: Class, Empire, and the Production of Popular Culture* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 2002).

The early numbers thus imply that reclaiming the radical democratic energy of the Revolutionary moment means dredging up cautionary tales to provoke more virtuous behavior. In the fourth number, an interlude of sorts that appeared just before a four-month hiatus in production, the narrative looks beyond these anachronistic conventions, showing initial signs of discarded faith in national remedies. What follows in Nos. 5 through 10 is an unfinished trial-and-error experiment with local solutions to systemic problems. Through what I am calling its “vernacular aesthetics,” the novelistic work-in-progress grapples with the pros and cons of local democratic action as antidote to the sociopolitical ills of Philadelphia in ways that national procedural mechanisms like Constitutional governance and mass-party politics had failed—and were continuing to fail—to achieve.

Lippard, as I will show, labored to cover over the details of his unedited compositional process and publication-in-parts, presumably for commercial reasons. At decade’s end, Lippard’s pro-labor anticapitalist politics would take on more coherent (albeit still unedited) shape when he came to run his own periodical, also named *The Quaker City*, from 1848 to 1850. As Shelley Streeby has shown, Lippard, in the curation of stories, letters to the editor, and reprints of important speeches, posed a powerful if complicated critique of U.S. liberal-capitalism and the politics that protected the interests of the privileged few. In this venture he came to esteem that the “solution . . . involve[d] world revolution, not the gradual refinement and perfection of U.S. democracy.”⁷ In the trajectory of Lippard’s career, then, *The Quaker City* offers a rough, imaginative draft of what would become his radical democratic politics. In his most famous novel, however, what we see is not the abstract idea of global revolution, but rather a more concrete, more localized, and arguably more democratic form of literary critique. Far from foreclosing the messy realm of democratic politics with a coherent master-narrative, the vernacular aesthetics of the novel, interlude, and sequel exceed the framework that Lippard’s expressed intentions and paratextual apparatuses sought to enclose.

⁷ Shelley Streeby, “Haunted Houses: George Lippard, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Middle-Class America,” *Criticism*, 38 (1996), 454.

This essay thus reconstructs the composition and publishing schedule of *The Quaker City* to highlight Lippard's shifting design. I then consider some historical developments—among these an aborted theatrical production that occurred between the composition of Nos. 3 and 4—that might have led to his changed course and how these played out in the numbers appearing before and after the four-month break. Turning to the narrative, I explore how the shifting trajectory between novel and sequel becomes most compelling in Lippard's treatment of printed texts/print culture and bodies/body politic, two entities frequently evoked in the cultivation and understanding of national (imagined) community. With print culture, early numbers exhume post-Revolutionary concerns with the potential of novel reading and slanderous print to corrupt national well-being. The latter numbers subsequently disclose a more nuanced critique of contemporary print culture, concluding with a notion of what print could do once it rejected national remedies and addressed the more contingent, ad hoc needs of localized democracy. As for bodies and the body politic, the early numbers figure the threat to women's bodies as the greatest risk to social and political well-being, much as an early U.S. novelist like William Hill Brown had posited in *The Power of Sympathy* (1789). Shuffling the seduction plots to the background and discarding faith in nation-scaled practices, the latter numbers of *The Quaker City* spotlight a different set of bodies, particularly those of the dismembered and haunting variety. These register a complaint against political power divested from material bodies in local spaces and rerouted to distant sites of national governance. Imaginatively working against the predominance of what Russ Castronovo has dubbed "necro-citizenship" in this era, *The Quaker City* thus brims with radical democratic energies.⁸



⁸ Castronovo locates this radical democratic practice in the "commitment to public debate, an insistence on grappling with material conditions, [and] a refusal to absorb embodied differences under consensus" (Russ Castronovo, *Necro-Citizenship: Death, Eroticism, and the Public Sphere in the Nineteenth-Century United States* [Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 2001], p. 3).

The two most recent editions of *The Quaker City* provide introductions by Leslie Fiedler (1970) and David S. Reynolds (1995), both focusing on the curious text and the cultural context in which it appeared. Fiedler never mentions the serialized publication yet boasts about its impressive sales numbers, stating that it “sold 60,000 copies in 1844, the year of publication, and was still being bought at a rate of 30,000 a year in 1854, the year of Lippard’s death.”⁹ Mentioning similar numbers, Reynolds’s account acknowledges the publication-in-parts: “The ten paper-covered installments of the novel appearing between the fall of 1844 and the spring of 1845 sold at a record-breaking pace. . . . When in May 1845 the whole expanded version appeared, . . . the publishers claimed that more than 60,000 copies had been sold within a year.”¹⁰ Such have been the most-cited narratives detailing the history of one of the earliest novels to capitalize on new publishing techniques and an emerging mass culture industry.

The composition and publication of *The Quaker City*, however, offer more intrigue than is related in these accounts celebrating its impressive sales and recognizing its publication-in-parts. Computing sales numbers was hardly an exact science during these early days of what later book historians have dubbed the “Industrial Book.”¹¹ Moreover, compared to more established firms like Philadelphia’s Carey & Hart or New York’s Harper & Brothers, those associated with the earliest publication(s) of *The Quaker City*—G. B. Zieber & Co., and Lippard himself—left few records behind. The source for these numbers is most likely Lippard himself, who proudly claimed high sales numbers in two prefaces to complete editions of *The Quaker City*, the first coming upon publication of the tenth and final part (as part of the “complete novel”), and the second appearing five years later when the novel came under the imprint of its third

⁹ Fiedler, “Introduction,” in *The Monks of Monk Hall*, p. vii.

¹⁰ David S. Reynolds, “Introduction,” in George Lippard, *The Quaker City; or, The Monks of Monk Hall: A Romance of Philadelphia Life, Mystery, and Crime*, ed. Reynolds (Amherst: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1995), p. xii; see p. vii.

¹¹ See *A History of the Book in America, Volume 3: The Industrial Book, 1840–1880*, ed. Scott E. Casper, Jeffrey D. Groves, Stephen W. Nissenbaum, and Michael Winship (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2007).

publisher, T. B. Peterson & Co. Both prefaces work retrospectively to convert the publication-in-parts into a singular event, arguably an expedient commercial tool. Yet these sales devices are also riddled with holes and ambiguities. Herein lies the first piece of evidence of *The Quaker City's* vernacular aesthetics working in contrast with Lippard's sales tactics—that is, in trying to market his serial as a unified novel, Lippard avoids the fact that it is not unified, nor was it unified in his mind as he produced it.

The first preface, titled “The Origin and Object of this Book” and dated 5 May 1845, discloses the following publishing details: “It was commenced on the 5th of September 1844, and published in ten numbers, with a success, almost without parallel in the annals of our literature. Since its first publication, near 40,000 numbers of the book have been sold. . . . I now present the work to the public in complete form, after nine editions in numbers, have met with rapid sale.”¹² Although acknowledging the serialized publication, the preface begs some questions with regards to the number 40,000. Did it mean forty thousand individual numbers sold? If so, how many readers had read all ten—or nine previously published—numbers, and thus the novel in its totality? And if readers had only read some numbers, what did that mean for the type of cultural work that *The Quaker City* performed? Whatever the answers, this preface cloaked potential incoherence of the book-in-parts under the coherence-making language of high sales. The 1849 edition also included this preface, but placed it after a new one that more succinctly treated the composition and publication of *The Quaker City* as a single event. In this new preface, titled “Preface to the Twenty-Seventh American Edition,” Lippard extolled the novel's impressive five-year run: “The Quaker City has been before the world nearly five years. It has passed through Twenty-Six Editions in America, each edition comprising from one to four thousand copies. It has been re-published

¹² George Lippard, *The Quaker City; or, The Monks of Monk-Hall: A Romance of Philadelphia Life, Mystery, and Crime* (Philadelphia: Published by the Author, 1845), p. 4. This edition, digitized and available on Google Books, features the same stereotype plates as the ten individual numbers and the rest of the nineteenth-century editions. Unless otherwise noted, subsequent quotations from the novel are from this edition and are quoted parenthetically in the text.

in London. It has been translated in Germany.”¹³ Lippard’s vague accounting creates more ambiguity, for sales could have numbered anywhere from 26,000 to 104,000 copies. Other than a brief admission that his scope had expanded upon his initial plans (a confession I take up momentarily), this preface bears no witness to the publication-in-parts.

Looking beyond the glare of these impressive (if ambiguous) numbers and investigating the details of serialization, we can begin to trace the distinctiveness of Lippard’s compositional and publishing strategies. We often consider these book-making acts in two separate registers, but with Lippard, the two were definitely intertwined and indicative of process—a shifting one at that—rather than product. A contract dated 31 March 1845 reveals that Zieber and Lippard had negotiated their contract at least two times prior, first on 4 September 1844 and again on 13 January 1845. In this third contract, Zieber and Lippard agreed to own the stereotype plates and the copyright jointly and to split the costs of publication as well as the profits from sales. Zieber also agreed to pay Lippard five dollars a week for three months.¹⁴ This arrangement allowed Lippard significant control over his publication schedule as the narrative began to twist and grow beyond its original cast.

The best evidence we have regarding the publishing schedule comes from the advertisements in local papers and the few extant parts. The first ad mentioning *The Quaker City* appeared on Saturday, 21 September 1844, in the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* and included the following proposal: “Next Saturday, the next number of the which is called the Quaker City, will appear, published in an octavo of 48 pages. . . . The other numbers will appear every other Saturday until the four numbers

¹³ George Lippard, *The Quaker City; or, The Monks of Monk-Hall: A Romance of Philadelphia Life, Mystery, and Crime*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson and Co., [1849], p. 1. Reynolds in the University of Massachusetts edition reprints a slightly altered version of this preface from an 1876 reissue by T. B. Peterson & Co., which removes specific sales numbers: “The Quaker City has passed through many Editions in America, as well as in London. It has also been translated and numerous editions of it have been published in Germany” (“Preface to this Edition,” in *Quaker City* [1995], p. 1).

¹⁴ Manuscript Agreement between George Lippard and G. B. Zieber & Co., 31 March 1845. (Joseph Jackson Papers: Box 1, Folder 11, Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

are complete.”¹⁵ When Zieber registered the copyright on 1 October, they had clearly missed the 28 September date and most likely published No. 1 a week later on 5 October. An advertisement in the *Public Ledger* on 8 October repeats this promise of four numbers.¹⁶ Advertisements for No. 2 first appeared on Saturday, 19 October.¹⁷ The earliest signs of No. 3, however, appeared nearly three weeks later, with a flurry of advertisements posted on 7, 9, and 13 November.¹⁸ Having built up demand with the first two parts, Lippard and Zieber perhaps held the third number longer than originally planned in order to capitalize on the attention brewing from a theatrical performance scheduled for 11 November. (This performance was canceled due to threats of riot.)¹⁹ Advertisements for No. 4 appeared nearly a month later on 7 December.

More than just missing on the targeted publication schedule, No. 4 deviated from precedent in a number of ways. It ran longer than the three previous installments, filling sixty-four pages as opposed to forty-eight. It was the first number to finish at a conventional chapter break rather than at a random spot—earlier numbers ended not only in the middle of a chapter, but also in mid-sentence. How readers responded to the first three issues concluding in mid-sentence is unclear, but this grammatical cliffhanger allegedly did little to quell interest in the developing story. Furthermore, if readers suspected No. 4 to conclude *The Quaker City*, as the September prospectus asserted, they discovered otherwise. The back wrapper featured a two-page advertisement for the author’s forthcoming romance, *Paul*

¹⁵ *Public Ledger*, 21 September 1844, p. 2.

¹⁶ *Public Ledger*, 8 October 1844, p. 2. On the publication dates, see Michael Winship, “In Search of Monk Hall: A Publishing History of George Lippard’s *The Quaker City*,” in this issue, p. 135.

¹⁷ *Public Ledger*, 19 October 1844, p. 2.

¹⁸ *Public Ledger*, 7, 9, and 13 November 1844, p. 2.

¹⁹ For the most commonly cited contemporary source detailing the scene of the theater riot, see Francis Courtney Wemyss, *Twenty-Six Years of the Life of an Actor and Manager* (New York: Burgess, Stringer, & Co., 1846). For a romanticized account of Lippard’s role in it, see John Bell Bouton, *The Life and Choice Writings of George Lippard* (New York: H. H. Randall, 1855). For a more recent account of the recently discovered playbill and the light it sheds on these events as well as the novel, see Sari Altschuler and Aaron M. Tobiason, “Playbill for George Lippard’s *The Quaker City*,” *PMLA*, 129 (2014), 267–73.

Ardenheim, along with this note in small print: "NOTE.—THIS REVELATION OF PHILADELPHIA LIFE, has so grown upon the Author's hands, that he finds it impossible to wind up the story under four additional numbers. These numbers will be published, at an early day, in a compact volume of 192 pages. This 'SEQUEL' to the 'QUAKER CITY,' will contain the very soul and spirit of the whole work."²⁰ Unlike the advertisement for *Paul Ardenheim*, which promises publication of the first issue on 1 January 1845, this Note more loosely promises publication of the "Sequel" to the "Quaker City" to occur "at an early day."

Readers would have to wait more than four months. On 24 March 1845, the *Public Ledger* advertised "THE SEQUEL AT LAST! – Will be published THURSDAY MORNING, March 27th, Sequel No. 1, to THE QUAKER CITY."²¹ Paper covers of this installment listed "Sequel No. 1" along the top line and included two new illustrations. When the next installment appeared two weeks later, the cover displayed the title "Sequel No. 2." Sometime after this wrapper was printed but before advertisements appeared, Zieber and Lippard apparently changed direction yet again, for the *Public Ledger* advertisement of 5 April proclaimed the sale of "No. 6 of the Quaker City, or the Monks of Monk Hall."²² After another one-month delay, advertisements and paper wrappers would match up from this point forward and appear rapidly—notices of No. 7 on 2 May, No. 8 on 9 May, No. 9 on 21 May. Amid this final push in May 1845, readers encountered one more change: from midway through No. 7 to the conclusion, printed pages shifted from double-column to single-column. On 30 May 1845, the following ad appeared in the *Public Ledger*: "THE PROSCRIBED BOOK! TENTH EDITION. THE QUAKER CITY; or MONKS OF MONK HALL is just issued, in one volume complete, or ten numbers complete, price \$1; single numbers, 12 ½ cents."²³ Finally readers could purchase the entire novel introduced by the recently

²⁰ [Anon.], *The Quaker City*, No. 4, p. ii.

²¹ *Public Ledger*, 24 March 1845, p. 2.

²² *Public Ledger*, 5 April 1845, p. 2. Winship cites a 4 April 1845 ad from the *Public Ledger* (see "In Search of Monk Hall," p. 140).

²³ *Public Ledger*, 30 May 1845, p. 2. Winship states that No. 10 first appeared on 24 May (see "In Search of Monk Hall," p. 141).

composed “Origin and Object of this Book” dated 5 May 1845, yet “single numbers” were still available. By this time Lippard had dropped the “novel-sequel” language; however, when subsequent two-volume editions appeared, they reused the stereotype plates from the original numbers and thus retained traces of the original plan, casting Volume I in the 206 pages that made up Nos. 1 through 4 and Volume II in the 288 pages of numbers making up the “sequel.”



I have reconstructed this publication schedule—the changes to and conflicting messages within advertisements along with discrepancies between proposals and finished productions—to underscore the evolving nature of what we typically construe as Lippard’s “novel.” The advertisements, the paper wrappers, the four-month break, the shift from double-column to single-column printing—all should force a pause in readings that attempt to treat this text as a unified whole, no matter the efforts of the belated prefatory materials. Beyond Lippard’s personal experience with the aborted theatrical production, a number of events might have spurred his change of direction. On the national level, the 1844 presidential election moved the expansionist and pro-tariff-reductionist James K. Polk into office.²⁴ The narrative betrays no evident concern with expansionist politics, but references to the high protectionist tariff crop up from time to time. Conflicts appearing closer to home came in the form of riots, particularly those in which Nativists targeted Irish Catholic immigrants in what became multi-day riots in both May and July 1844. In October, after the first two numbers of *The Quaker City* had appeared, Lewis Levin, who as editor of the anti-Catholic *Daily Sun* had been one of the foremost anti-Catholic agitators preceding and

²⁴ The politics of expansion and empire played key roles in Lippard’s writing in the latter part of the 1840s. See Shelley Streeby, *American Sensations: Class, Empire, and the Production of Popular Culture* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 2002). With the tariff, Polk promised to lower rates from the 40 percent level enacted in 1842. In 1846, the Walker Tariff would drop to 20 percent.

following the riots, was elected to Congress.²⁵ To what degree Lippard disfavored Levin's election is difficult to say, but we do see a shift in anti-Catholic rhetoric from novel to sequel. Early on, Monk Hall is cloaked in Catholic imagery, suggesting that Lippard harbored suspicions about the Catholic church in America; however, in the early stages of No. 5, his lampooning of anti-Catholic agitation from the execrable Reverend F.A.T. Pyne implies a much harsher take on those who foment this sort of divisive sentiment.

Whatever the motivation from historical events, the shift in focus from the first three numbers to the interlude of No. 4 and the six numbers making up the sequel is subtle yet telling. Nos. 1 through 3 focus tightly upon two interwoven triads: first, a seduction plot involving the innocent Mary Arlington, her seducer Gus Lorrimer, and her brother Byrnewood Arlington; and second, an adultery plot involving the social-climbing Dora Livingstone, her betrayed husband Albert Livingstone, and the con-man Algernon Fitz-Cowles. Both plots revolve around the concern detailed in the 1849 preface:

*That the seduction of a poor and innocent girl, is a deed altogether as criminal as murder. It is worse than the murder of the body, for it is the assassination of the soul. If the murderer deserves death by the gallows, then the assassin of chastity and maidenhood is worthy of death by the hands of any man, and in any place.*²⁶

This conceit plays out in Mary's fall from the emblem of pure innocence, with two figures providing relief. The first, Dora, is a former innocent who has suffered ruin, not from sexual seduction, but rather from temptations of social climbing. The second is long-haired Bess, a formerly virtuous woman but now a permanent resident of Monk Hall and Lorrimer's accomplice in Mary's seduction. The intersecting plots hold center stage in these early numbers covering the first night in which Lorrimer rapes Mary and Livingstone discovers Dora's adulterous affair.

²⁵ See Zachary M. Schrag, "Nativist Riots of 1844," in *The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia*, available online at <<http://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/>>. Accessed 8 August 2014.

²⁶ Lippard, *The Quaker City* (1849), p. 1 (italics in original).

In No. 4, the narrative moves into the next day and gradually expands its scope.²⁷ Among the many characters, scenes, and themes brought to life, none are more impressive than the reform of a character initially crafted as one of the corrupt Monks of Monk Hall, Luke Harvey. A recently discovered playbill of the canceled theatrical performance describes Luke as “a consummate Scoundrel, who betrays every-body under the guise of Friendship,” a description consistent with Luke’s relatively minor, supplemental role in Nos. 1 through 3.²⁸ In No. 4, however, Luke assumes a central if complex position as he peripatetically pops up all around Philadelphia: suffering a painful tooth extraction, trailing the suspected forger Gabriel Von Gelt through the streets, discovering Fitz-Cowles to be in league with Von Gelt, bantering with the Widow Smolby and Reverend F.A.T. Pyne over vice in the city, and disguising himself as Brick-Top to lure Von Gelt into a surefire arrest—all the while honoring his oath as a Monk of Monk Hall and keeping the police out of his fraternity’s house. His characterization as a “Scoundrel,” however, seems less apropos after a speech concerning “*Justice* in the Quaker City.” In this passionate diatribe, Luke uses concrete allusions to specific events in Philadelphia, the theatrical performance included, to critique the city’s injustice: “One day [Justice] stands grimly smiling while a mob fires a Church or sacks a Hall, the next, ha, ha, ha, it hurries from its impartial throne, and pastes its placards over the walls of a Theatre, stating . . . that THE TRUTH *must not be told in Philadelphia!*” (*Quaker City*, p. 174). Most likely composed after the composition and publication of Nos. 1, 2, and 3, the narrative clearly alludes to the burning of churches in

²⁷ The plot movement into Book the Second, set on “The Day after the Night” and titled “The Forger,” actually occurs with fifteen pages left in No. 3, the issue that appeared nearly concurrently with the canceled theatrical production. These fifteen pages follow the title by focusing on the figure of Fitz-Cowles at home with his servant Endymion; a revelation of the full extent of his con-artistry; his league with Buzby Poodle, editor of the *Daily Black Mail*; and the arrival of his creditors. In No. 4, the narrative opens with Fitz-Cowles duping his creditors and conspiring with Dora to bring about Livingstone’s death. This runs about twenty pages of the 64-page No. 4, but the final forty pages shift the focus from “The Forger” to a nearly exclusive tracking of Luke Harvey.

²⁸ Playbill, Chesnut Street Theatre, in Altschuler and Tobiason, “Playbill,” p. 271.

May 1844 and to the aborted theatrical production. Moreover, it suggests Lippard's shift in direction by signaling Luke's new role as moral compass and agent of law enforcement instead of the "Scoundrel" of the early numbers and the Playbill.

Beyond the transformation of Luke Harvey and his allusion to the canceled play, No. 4 includes a number of confluences between local and national cultures, importantly in a variety of vernacular expressions. The palavering Dr. McTourniquet confesses an inability to distinguish his horse from a prominent politician, both named Henry Clay: "seen my blood horse, Henry Clay? Splendid creature, capital action, glorious gait. Paid eight hundred for him. Make a good President; in favor of the Tariff; chivalrous fellow." When questioned by Livingstone, McTourniquet confesses, "Why the fact is, I'm such an admirer of the statesman, that whenever I begin with praising the horse I'm sure to slide into an expression of feeling with regard to the man" (*Quaker City*, p. 178). Later, when Livingstone and Luke try to convince Easy Larkspur to disguise himself and help them incriminate Fitz-Cowles and Von Gelt, Larkspur shares details of his past, and in the process jumbles up political policies of the pro-internal improvements, pro-tariff Whig party: "Two years ago, I was turned out of the Police. Since that time I've been perambulating the continent. Part of the time, as a Tuppygraphical engineer; I carried the chain on the railroad. Part of the time, I was engaged in the mercantile marine service: drove the horse on the canawl. I attributes the present depression of my funds to the cursed Whig tariff of '42" (pp. 181-82). On their own, McTourniquet's and Larkspur's confused references to national issues seem incidental moments of comic relief. But then Luke Harvey, now disguised as Brick-Top, begins spouting similar remarks about national politics with randomly exuberant (if meaningless) shouts of "Hurray for Tippeycanoe!" (p. 196). He peppers a pending robbery of the Widow Smolby with a wisecrack comment to Devil-Bug and Von Gelt, encouraging them: "Go up stairs boys, and Remove the Deposits! We're the rale Dimmycrats—we are!" (p. 199). As these vernacular-soaked allusions accrue, there seems a strong invocation of national presence entering to correct more than just the criminality that makes the rape of

Mary Arlington possible—that is, the invocation of national points of reference, even in jest, seems an anxious appeal to some higher power to cure Philadelphia of its ubiquitous vice. Unfortunately, the appeals offer no remedy: Luke’s trap fails to work, Smolby is brutally murdered by Devil-Bug, and the criminals get away. The solicitation of national devices fails to deliver the Justice that Luke’s speech so adamantly implores.

Readers waited four more months before learning that the “sequel” had finally appeared. Almost immediately, they discovered that appeals to national issues had been replaced. Shortly into No. 5, we see the first denouncement of overinvestments with problems coming from great distance at the expense of local issues when F.A.T. Pyne stirs up his Patent-Gospel audience to send a committee to take down the Pope of Rome. Lippard is clearly lampooning the anti-Catholic sentiment with an over-the-top narrative about shipwrecked sailors being captured by Vatican officials and then turned into sausages. But then enters an old man, who cites his credentials as a Revolutionary War veteran so that he may speak as “an American.” He asks, “Do we not want Missionaries in this our good city? . . . Are there no poor, no sick, no needy? . . . Are there no hideous moral sores to be examined and healed by the Missionary of Jesus in this our moral heart of Philadelphia”? (*Quaker City*, pp. 226–27). The veteran goes on to identify the various targets of reformers, from orphans and poverty to intemperance and mob violence, all in an effort to yoke the passions of the collective body into addressing the malfeasances located in their immediate vicinity. But Pyne’s congregants will not have it: “They silenced the old man with a hurricane of groans,” accuse him of being a Papist, and throw him out into the streets (p. 228). Having coerced the crowd into doing “benevolent work” in some far-off place, Pyne misdirects the attention of his public away from his (and his Monk Hall accomplices’) abuses of power and onto a site far removed from his locality. Lippard’s dramatization posits an obvious and heavy-handed critique of the hypocrisy of this spiritual leader. But it also highlights how easily attention can be taken away from the concrete actualities of suffering bodies in their local spaces, punctuating the missed opportunities for individuals to come

together and make collective decisions to improve quality of life in a democratic spirit. Implicitly, the narrative suggests this localized sense of democracy is precisely what is needed.

To say that Lippard's sequel developed a set of more radically democratic solutions to the local problems in Philadelphia ignores the reality that his editorial aversion made a coherent solution less than feasible. What we do know, however, is that Lippard took more than four months to bring out "Sequel No. 1" of *The Quaker City*, and evidence within these latter six numbers suggests that he was starting to work through the possibilities of new, more localized remedies to systemic problems, even as tidy solutions proved elusive. In his sole acknowledgment of a shifting design, Lippard admitted in the 1849 preface that as he "progressed in [his] task, other ideas were added to the original thought" and that he became "determined to write a book which should describe all the phases of a corrupt social system, as manifested in the city of Philadelphia."²⁹ To work through his depiction and evaluation of this corrupt social system, Lippard needed more time. What appears in the latter six numbers is evidence of a more radicalized if experimental approach to addressing local needs, and his most imaginative reforms would address two key constituencies of his sociopolitical milieu: print culture and the body politic.



As a periodical editor with literary aspirations, Lippard was a ready participant in a print culture that was increasingly dominated by those who aspired to reach national audiences to maximize commercial profits, best evidenced by his post-production prefaces. His commercial tactics, I have claimed, worked against the politics of *The Quaker City*, not only because print culture participants within the novel often appear as prime culprits for the fraudulence and crime in the city, but also in the broader scheme of print culture's role in an increasingly networked national community. As Lara Cohen has noted, in this moment when a robust American literary

²⁹ Lippard, *The Quaker City* (1849), p. 2.

culture had seemingly emerged, it was also unstintingly beset by charges of fraudulence. Paradoxically, such charges prompted the conditions in which there could be an authentic rendering in print, for “fraudulence holds out the possibility of authenticity, a binary opposition that replaces undeterminable claims of literary worth with the promise of clear-cut distinction.” Accordingly, Cohen writes, what emerged was “antebellum literary culture’s insistent attempts to locate authenticity and distinguish it from fraudulence.”³⁰ Lippard relentlessly pursued this fantasy of authenticity throughout his career, most notably in a series of columns titled “The Spermaceti Papers,” which satirically attacked the alleged fraudulence of prominent publisher George Graham and those associated with *Graham’s Magazine*.³¹ Lippard could hardly achieve some Archimedean point of leverage from which he could participate within print culture and still critique its flaws, but that did not stop him from taking numerous stabs at it. His attempts nevertheless play out poignantly, especially in the transition from novel to sequel.

The early parts of *The Quaker City* issue many complaints against printed books—primarily fictive works—as tools put to use in acts of seduction and moral degradation. Such complaints recycle warnings against novel reading in the early national era. In the 1790s, these concerns grew out of assumptions concerning the weaknesses of female sexuality—the key issue at stake in Lippard’s earliest conception of *The Quaker City*—and carried the weight of the young nation and its identity-forming citizenry.³²

³⁰ Lara Langer Cohen, *The Fabrication of American Literature: Fraudulence and Antebellum Print Culture* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), p. 16.

³¹ The nine-part series appeared in the summer of 1843 while Lippard worked as editor of *The Citizen Soldier*. Lippard’s contempt for those who were coming to dominate both the local and the national literary scene likely spurred him to find alternative publishing venues for *The Quaker City*, but they also betray a strange sense of jealousy and/or critique of an increasingly national brand (or at least the national as *sine qua non* of literary achievement).

³² As Elizabeth Barnes puts it: “To expose sympathetic young women to powerful stories of unbridled passion, deception, and broken honor was to invite tragedy not only for the individual family but for the new nation. . . . Just as women’s bodies in the early novel correlated to the health and innocence of the body politic, so, too, impressionable women readers represented a potentially seducible American citizenry” (Barnes, “Novels,” in *A History of the Book in America, Volume 2: An Extensive Republic*:

Lippard drew from these late-eighteenth-century sensibilities and staged them amid mid-nineteenth-century urban culture, presumably to educate and to reform. With Lorrimer's seduction of Mary, the narrative bestows romance books with much of the credit for enabling the Libertine to defile the emblem of innocence. Rationalizing the far-fetched events leading to her pending secret marriage with Lorrimer, Mary esteems her experience as both fantastic and yet believable: "All this is very strange—how like the stories we read in a book!" (*Quaker City*, p. 74). Mary's relationship to books merges early-national-era fears of seduction with the antebellum reading practices elucidated by Gillian Silverman: the capacity for books to spawn new forms of communion in the face of more limited interpersonal experience.³³ Although more culturally reputable in the 1840s, fictive books in Lippard's depiction still produce credulous women and pave the way for victimization.³⁴ Books help finish the job when, after the interrupted wedding, Lorrimer spins a new tale to finish off his conquest. In the process he relies upon the contents of a book—this one merging theatrical productions with printed romances by using a copy of Bulwer's play *Claude Mellnotte*—that "he had left upon the table, the story which he was about to tell. . . . it was his intention to wake her animal nature into full action" (*Quaker City*, p. 109). The intimacy prompted by books casts a spell, compromising Mary's individual will. Whether sowing the seeds of credulity in a young woman or serving as crucial supplement to a rape scene, books—and print culture more generally—are key accessories.

A related anxiety in the early Republic concerned the role of libelous material in the periodical press, and here again in

Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation, 1790–1840, ed. Robert A. Gross and Mary Kelley [Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2010], pp. 444–45).

³³ According to Silverman, "given the tremendous restrictions placed on face-to-face interactions in the nineteenth-century public sphere. . . . we might understand reading as providing an alternative route to intimacy" (Gillian Silverman, *Bodies and Books: Reading and the Fantasy of Communion in Nineteenth-Century America* [Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2012], p. 6).

³⁴ In a similar vein, Dora Livingstone explains her present behavior to Fitz-Cowles after he insinuates that her social climbing is ambitious and unbecoming: "Did you never read in books, that the first love of a strong minded woman, when divested from its proper source, turns to the gall and bitterness of worldly ambition?" (*Quaker City*, p. 160).

the early stages Lippard plays upon such fears with hopes that national rhetoric would provide correction. At the center of this critique are two representative types of contemporary periodical culture: Buzby Poodle, editor of a sensational penny paper named *The Daily Black Mail*, and Sylvester Petriken, editor of the sentimental *Ladies Western Hemisphere*. Early on, these two figures appear as the targets of Lippard's thinly veiled attacks on his personal enemies within the Philadelphia periodical scene, a practice he had seemingly exhausted a year earlier in "The Spermaceti Papers." Within the narrative Lippard holds these figures responsible for the proliferation of duplicity and ethical compromises of 1840s periodical culture. In his assessment of Poodle and Petriken, David Reynolds provides an apt distillation: "Poodle represents sensational reportage . . . in a manner anticipatory of tabloid journalism. Petriken represents the bourgeois world of trite morality, filling his magazine with saccharine poetry and tepid prose" ("Introduction," p. xxii). There is more, however, to Lippard's depiction of these two figures. First, Lippard pairs Poodle with Fitz-Cowles as counterfeiters and Petriken with Lorrimer as perpetrators of domestic crimes, both of which in the early national era had important implications on national health and virtuous citizenship. While this consistency helps unify the narrative to some degree, his treatment of these two figures—and print culture more broadly—changes significantly from novel to sequel. Early on, it seems Lippard is confident that a national prescription like "Liberty of the Press" can provide remedy for their misrepresentations in print. In the latter stages, national remedy seems ineffective, and the narrative sets about the task of finding more localized solutions.

Near the end of No. 3, the narrative stages a conversation between Poodle and Fitz-Cowles in which Poodle discloses the self-interest driving the salacious articles of his penny paper. He admits to making up stories in order to have slighted figures pay for retractions. Not always seeking monetary gain, he often uses his paper to facilitate other indulgences, most often to slander women who spurn his sexual advances. Lippard's rebuke of Poodle's unscrupulous practices becomes explicit when he turns to one of the nation's most cherished elements

as a viable referent of correction: “Oh, glorious Liberty of the Press, let us take the opportunity . . . [to] chaunt a psalm in your praise! Oh, glorious Press, what a comfort it must be to you, to think and feel in your inmost heart, that Buzby Poodle . . . is no reality, no fact; but a mere fictitious impersonation” (*Quaker City*, p. 140). In this sarcastic conceit, Lippard employs a national standard to lament the faults in this local instance of a penny-paper editor. Presumably, at this point, Lippard considered this an appropriate instrument to educate his readers and to arouse demands for a more virtuous press (much as the portrayal of seduction would entice more virtuous social behavior).

Subsequent moments in the sequel show less confidence in the reform potential of national rhetoric, most notably when Poodle and Petriken share the stage in No. 8—a clear implication that Poodle’s offensiveness and Petriken’s sentimentalism are two sides of the same coin.³⁵ The opening lines suggest otherwise, locating the conversation in the shadows of Independence Hall. As soon as this national symbol is evoked, however, the narrative reveals that this is a new era by making note of “giant trees, whose massive trunks had been young sixty years ago, when the Proclamation of Independence rang from the steps of the ancient Hall” (*Quaker City*, p. 361). The idealism aroused in that invocation seems long gone, as the narrative comments on the ways in which these two print culture criminals now thrive: “The one fattened on the garbage of the town; the other lived on stolen literature. . . . the one living on the Murder, Suicide and Bloodshed of the town, the other thriving on the fruits of various adroit literary robberies” (pp. 361–62). Subsequently, the two men gloat over related ambitions for the near-future. First, Petriken proclaims his pending status in language that appears almost presidential: “And so you see we’ll have a great Magazine! . . . To-morrow morning all the Intellects of the land meet at my office in order to talk the matter over. I, Sylvester J. Petriken will become the Focus of American Literature.”

³⁵ Poodle and Petriken briefly appear together in No. 2 when they attend the first bacchanalian feast in Monk-Hall, yet they have no direct interaction with one another until this moment in No. 8 (see *Quaker City*, pp. 48–52).

Poodle follows with similarly sweeping and prophetically laden language: “Won’t the name of Busby [*sic*] Poodle be known all over the country?” (p. 362). They shake hands, sealing their bond as future leaders of a nationalized print culture. Occurring in the shadows of the very site of nation founding, the unflattering portraits of these two figures clash sharply with the plausibly noble aspirations of those responsible for the “Proclamation of Independence.” Unlike the previous instance in No. 3, the narrative’s appeal to a national symbol seems powerless to make corrections, and the author does not step in to insist that they could.

In the concluding portion of No. 10, we see a representation of print that no longer appeals to national standards as social correctives and instead imagines a scene in which local oversight might make amends. Summing up the fallout of the primary events is a newspaper dated six months after the fact. Revealing the current conditions of several primary characters, an article curiously praises two figures that the narrative has taken great pains to condemn: F.A.T. Pyne, the anti-Catholic minister who also tried to drug and rape his adopted daughter Mabel, is initially praised as a “worthy and eminent divine”; and the counterfeit Algernon Fitz-Cowles is cleared of rumored ill-conduct “by an undeniable manifestation of public opinion” (*Quaker City*, p. 490). Readers would presumably be appalled by the injustice of these two getting away with their crimes. The narrative, though, corrects this injustice in two addenda in the same newspaper, which retract the praise of Fitz-Cowles and Pyne by stating that the former had just been arrested for forgery and the latter has been accused of “a most daring and atrocious act of perfidy . . . [against] the daughter of one of our wealthiest merchants [Livingstone]” (p. 491). The multiple reports apparently can coexist in the same paper. Such is the possibility of print to publicize a more just outcome, at least eventually. Moreover, Lippard valorizes the capacity of print to change its story, even in the pages of the same issue. Rather than deferring to a national standard to correct such a mistake, the narrative proffers a local retraction in nearly immediate time. In other words, the narrative no longer reckons the agents and instruments of print culture will be protected and rendered democratic by defaulting to a national standard like “Liberty

of the Press” or placing faith in the sacred site where the “Proclamation of Independence rang.” Only an honest, forthright, ad hoc action like the newspaper’s immediate retraction can do the democratic work of addressing the contingencies and exigencies of local life.



Even more ubiquitous than concerns with print culture are the frequent references to leftover bodies. At times they appear as carefully curated corpses, employed for medical education and experimentation. More frequently they are dismembered and carelessly strewn about in private spaces like the basements of Monk Hall. Most often, bodily remains appear as spectral presences that relentlessly haunt the living. For Dana Nelson, *The Quaker City’s* attention to bodies is a highly gendered operation, one that displaces the anxieties of white male fraternity in this historical moment—what she terms “national manhood”—upon the bodies and sexualities of women. This definitely seems to be the case with the seduction plots that dominate the first three numbers. As the narrative shifts from its previously avowed faith in national remedies, though, the increasing number of references to bodies-in-parts and spectral hauntings do more than register what Nelson describes as a collective “fear of dissolution . . . of a bounded nation, city, and manhood” (*National Manhood*, pp. 155–56). The revised focus from women’s bodies to more generalized bodies-in-parts, I argue, indexes the consequences of the predominance of abstracted national politics divested from material bodies; additionally, the numerous spectral bodies register a desire to reanimate the more radicalized and contingent form of democracy that was embraced by everyday people in the Revolutionary era. Thus the anxiety of white male patriarchy in the early numbers is rechanneled in the sequel into an alternative vision of materialized democracy that pushes back against what Russ Castronovo has characterized as “necro-citizenship.” Lodged within discrepancies between the materiality of bodies and the abstractions of citizenship, necro-citizenship registers the disjointed political subject produced by the U.S.

nation-state in the nineteenth century.³⁶ Specifically, in ways mirroring its shifting treatments of print culture, the narrative initially engages the symbolic realm of early national literature—an individual innocent woman symbolizes the danger to the body politic—yet moves to a more literalized attention to more systemic crimes against various kinds of bodies making up the local sociality.

In the early numbers, descriptions of women dwell on their tempting yet unguarded bodies. Mary has a beautiful face that lacks a “remarkable manifestation of thought, or mind, or intellect,” which seems a serious weakness when paired with her “well-developed bust, . . . slender waist, and the ripening proportions of her figure” (*Quaker City*, p. 16). Dora likewise cuts a dangerous figure: “her form was full, large and voluptuous. . . . swelling with the full ripeness of womanhood” (p. 117). While these women are displayed as objects that simultaneously prompt sexual desire and call for (national) oversight and protection, male bodies bear unhealthy marks as well. Lorrimer, after raping Mary, suffers from “an aberration of intellect” that leads to a semi-paralyzed state (p. 125). Fitz-Cowles sartorially supplements his counterfeiting activity with calf-enhancing boots and prosthetic hips to give “a voluptuous swell to the outline of [his] figure” (p. 133). Livingstone’s ailment is less visible: “for years the victim of a secret and insidious disease” that “ossifies the main arteries of the heart” (p. 157). Even Luke Harvey briefly suffers from a painful toothache before having it pulled (p. 167). As the abject underbelly of these more public figures, Devil-Bug’s ghastly body and single eye garner repeated references. While the female bodies suffer as objects of the narrative gaze, the physical ailments of male bodies register the failing health of the social body. While never explicitly calling

³⁶ For Castronovo, “dead bodies . . . imply a type of democratic subject produced in the nineteenth-century U.S. public sphere. Guaranteed formal equality and cultural autonomy, the citizen encounters politics as a near-death experience: he or she thus prefers privacy to public life, passivity to active engagement, and forgetting to memory” (*Necro-Citizenship*, p. 3). While these national forms dominate the cultural scene of the antebellum era, several writers—and I would add Lippard to Castronovo’s candidates—contested this anti-democratic ideology, which “suggest[s] how corpses, ghosts, suicides, and socially dead persons like slaves exert recalcitrant materialities that confound the story of citizenship as a completed category beyond politics” (*Necro-Citizenship*, p. 10).

for national symbols and slogans to redress these physical afflictions as we see in the depictions of print culture, Lippard's initial treatment relies upon the recycling of seduction tropes and compromised bodies with implicit hopes that a cautionary tale might produce a cure.

In the background of these early numbers appear few references to dismembered parts and spectral hauntings, yet they abound in the sequel.³⁷ In the transitional No. 4, bodies-in-parts appear more conspicuously, most notably when Livingstone visits Dr. McTourniquet's "Museum" to find a vengeful way to deal with his adulterous wife. The narrative creates atmosphere with details of jars containing "dead men in fragments, in great pieces and little, in all shapes and every form," including "a grisly skeleton, one hand placed . . . with the fingers stuck in the cavity of the nose, seemed performing the stale jest, common with the boys along the street" (*Quaker City*, pp. 179–80). Receiving no extra comment, the discourteous treatment of leftover body parts earns explicit rebuke in the sequel. In Ravoni's "Dissecting Room," the narrative lingers over tables on which "lay the remains of woman and child and a man. Here was a grisly trunk, there an arm, there a leg, and yonder a solitary hand" (p. 370). Medical students chatter profanely about the plausible histories of the bodies, often using them as macabre puppets to make obscene jokes in stilted, necrophilic, disturbing ways. McTourniquet delivers the ironically barbed moral corrective: "There my boy you see the respect paid by living dust to dead ashes!" (p. 372). A representative (if flawed) man like Byrnewood might avert his glance from the desecration of everyday bodies, but the narrative's increasing concern with their representation, along with its explicit rebuke, disperses the attention from the materially symbolic act against a single woman's body and looks more expansively upon offenses to all varieties of bodies.

More indelibly than these comments on bodies-in-parts are the repeated appearances of ghosts, victims of various types of violence who simply refuse to go away. The most haunted figure

³⁷ Two rare moments: Paul Western's ghost haunting Devil-Bug and Livingstone cutting off locks of hair from Dora and Fitz-Cowles (see *Quaker City*, pp. 90–92, 121).

is Devil-Bug, doorman of Monk Hall, who near the end of No. 4 laments, “Why can’t a feller kill his man or woman and have done with ’em?” (*Quaker City*, p. 205).³⁸ His haunts belabor him in both novel and sequel, and Devil-Bug’s psychic torture seems a logical consequence of his individual actions. Yet his experience with spectral hauntings takes on a whole new meaning in his dream occurring midway through the sequel. Cast one hundred years into the future, Devil-Bug witnesses an apocalyptic phantasmagoria depicting the final demise—or allegorically, the death of freedom—in Philadelphia. Accompanied by an unnamed ghost, Devil-Bug learns that on this day, “the lordlings of the Quaker City . . . tear down Independence Hall and raise a royal palace on its ruins!” (*Quaker City*, p. 316). Reduced to an empty sign of Revolutionary ideals, Independence Hall gives way to its antithesis, a royal palace that heralds inequality and repression. National symbols like a monument to George Washington have also been torn down and replaced with repressive state apparatuses, a jail and gallows. On the day preceding the crowning of the new monarch, Devil-Bug sees the resurrection of countless dead bodies that “mingled with the gay throngs of the side-walk,” yet they “beheld them not” (p. 318). Interspersed among the passive living bodies (i.e., the necro-citizens of Castrovano’s formulation), the dead proceed unnoticed. The next day brings the coronation of the king. Amid the great crowds, the dead suddenly become visible; the king is struck dead by the sight of a ghost, the city starts sinking into the earth, and the land convulses. As the scene closes, Devil-Bug witnesses the city reduced to ashes to the refrain of “WO UNTO SODOM” (p. 331).

The scene has understandably received frequent attention from literary critics.³⁹ Removed from the landscape, Devil-Bug

³⁸ Devil-Bug’s first murder, of Paul Western, occurred six years prior to the events of the novel, serving as his “pathway of crime, which it was his doom and his delight to tread” (*Quaker City*, p. 92). At the end of No. 4, Devil-Bug adds a second body to his cast of personal haunts when he slams the surprisingly feisty Widow Smolby against the andirons of the fireplace: “The brains of the old woman lay scattered over the hearth, and the body which Devil-Bug raised in the air, was a headless trunk, with the bleeding fragments of a face and skull, clinging to the quivering neck” (p. 205).

³⁹ Samuel Otter focuses on the spatial and architectural dimensions (see *Philadelphia Stories*, pp. 177–78). Christopher Castiglia reads it as a radically privatized queer sociality suddenly and violently merging with the public sphere (see *Interior States*, pp. 204–6).

sees what the living cannot: legions of dead bodies that register the invisible victims of nominal yet immaterialized democracy. With a scene depicting a total, inescapable finality in all-destructive terms, there seems little hope for regeneration. But interspersed within this apocalypse, we witness some key elements that underscore Lippard's shift of thinking from the nation to the local. First, nowhere in the dream do these events map onto the rest of the nation. Unlike the biblical destruction of Sodom, there is no other city like Gomorrah that is destroyed for its sins, much less any national or global doom. This is purely a local event. And while noting that national symbols have given way to signs of a reborn monarchical tyranny, it seems that the expansion of national imagery has created the conditions that brought an end to sociopolitical ideals born in the radicalism of the Revolution. This appears most evident when Devil-Bug meets an old antiquarian on the day of the king's crowning. The antiquarian presents Devil-Bug with a "relic of the past" that is now criminal contraband, "an old banner with thirteen crimson stripes, and twenty nine white stars, emblazoned on a blue field." When Devil-Bug gleefully identifies the relic as "the 'Merykin Flag,'" the antiquarian proceeds with the following eulogy: "That *was* the American Flag, I say! There is no America now. In yonder ruined Hall, America was born, she grew to vigorous youth, and bade fair to live to a good old age, but—alas! alas! She was massacred" (*Quaker City*, p. 327). Despite the appearance of a lamentation over the demise of the nation, Lippard's description of the flag with twenty-nine stars suggests otherwise. No. 7, the issue in which this dream appeared, was first advertised on 3 May 1845. Two months prior, on 3 March, the United States admitted Florida as the twenty-seventh state of the Union, the first new state since Michigan's admission in early 1837. The twenty-eighth state, Texas, joined in December 1845; a twenty-ninth star was added to the flag when Iowa entered in December 1846. Lippard's prognostication of the "death of freedom" inaugurated after the twenty-ninth star conceivably implies that an expanding

Dana Nelson reads its sexualized rhetoric as the hybrid social/sexual critique threatening the purity of the white male national citizenry (see *National Manhood*, p. 147).

nation was the primary source of the pending crisis. With greater investments in the nation, its expansion as well as its consolidation, the seeds for an anti-democratic counterrevolution were sown, all to the detriment, not of the nation, but of the city alone. All this occurs as ghostly bodies return to stake their claim on the political events of the moment.

Immediately after the dream, the narrative moves from the abstraction of the dream to a concrete instance that works through the need for a renewed commitment to local democratic action (well beyond the symbol-making trope of female seduction). An unemployed mechanic named John Davis personally seeks redress after losing all his money (\$600) following his bank's declaration of bankruptcy. Unable to find any help on the streets, Davis goes to the president of the bank, Job Joneson, with whom he shares some familiarity, having shingled his house the previous summer. Yet Davis receives no help, even after he sentimentally shares the news of his dying daughter. In fact, Joneson mocks him pitilessly, rebukes him for his failure to find work, refuses him even one dollar, and leaves abruptly to attend a Patent-Gospel meeting because "the Pope of Rome must be put down, and I must go an' help do it" (*Quaker City*, p. 344). Here Lippard evokes the earlier Patent-Gospel meeting in which the Revolutionary War veteran had been booted out of the hall after questioning the congregants' commitment to concerns occurring at a great remove at the expense of local needs. Unlike that episode, when the veteran is simply kicked out of the meeting, the narrative discloses much steeper consequences at this point: Davis proceeds to commit suicide, and Joneson falls dead the moment he comes upon Davis's corpse (pp. 347–49). With each passing moment that local action is bypassed by those in power who direct public attention to far-off issues, the stakes rise higher and higher. Davis's pitiful demise starkly demonstrates the missed opportunities for remedy at the local level. Such an obvious stab at the hypocrisy in the city demonstrates the challenges that any sort of people-based democratic politics might have, and these local illustrations—not national symbols—seem the best chance for remedy.

Following this episode, the narrative experiments with the mysterious Ravoni and the potential for world revolution under

his mystical sorcery. In spite of the emancipatory rhetoric, though, Ravoni is more demagogic than democratic, his magnetized followers described as fanatics who blindly follow his bidding. The narrative then returns to the original plots nominally to tie up loose ends, closing with a final scene of Byrnewood obsessing over a portrait of Lorrimer and Mary traumatically crying out her seducer's name (as Lorrimer's mother and sister strangely look on). Overshadowing the reimagining of newspaper and their potential for truth-production in the earlier portion of the conclusion, this final scene seems a regression from the radical imaginings of this sequence from Devil-Bug's dream to John Davis's suicide.

The importance we place on the completion of a coherent project concluded with a tidy denouement, though, should spur us to reassess the degree to which our critical practices continue to adopt the nation-form as default even as transnational scholarship endeavors to redraw sociopolitical boundaries. Overlooking the disjointed serial production of *The Quaker City* and assuming novelistic coherence follows a logic similar to that of nationalizing imperatives and a consensus-driven form of Constitutional management. Lippard seemingly discovered in the process of writing his novel that nation-oriented principles and symbols were not bringing about the changes that were needed in Philadelphia. The sequel at times suggests he had discovered that the nation and its cultural accoutrements were contributing to rather than correcting local problems, yet he also experimented with revolutions on a global scale. Solutions seem beyond Lippard's grasp, yet here is where the unrevised vernacular aesthetics of the novel and sequel register more radical ideas on contemporary democratic politics than the author himself might have imagined. Moving from the banal seduction and adultery plots to a broader assessment of the people in the city, the narrative provokes a more radical sort of response from its readers. Doing so in disjointed, often incoherent fashion posits a more contested literary space in which more radical democratic politics—then, now, and in the future—might be imagined.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

ABSTRACT

D. Berton Emerson, "George Lippard's *The Quaker City*: Disjointed Text, Dismembered Bodies, Regenerated Democracy" (pp. 102–131)

This essay argues that George Lippard's *The Quaker City* (1844–1845), originally published in ten separate numbers, is best understood when read more consistently with Lippard's own mid-production assessment: that he was producing two different books, a novel and its sequel. Doing so reveals that the target of Lippard's unruly social protest transitions away from a nation-framed story featuring the seduction of an innocent woman and the moral degradation of a community in which such a crime would be possible, to a broader complaint in the sequel against the lack of democratic power and agency at the local level. I start by reconstructing the disjointed composition and publication-in-parts schedule of *The Quaker City*, along with some historical developments that might have led to its changed course, in order to highlight Lippard's shifting design and the narrative's vernacular aesthetics. Turning to the narrative, I explore how the shifting trajectory between novel and sequel becomes most compelling in Lippard's treatment of printed texts/print culture and bodies/body politic, two entities frequently evoked in the cultivation and understanding of national (imagined) community. In Lippard's imaginative revision, the sequel thus grapples with alternative political possibilities that discard faith in nation-scaled remedies and instead works through the complexities of a regenerated, localized democracy.

Keywords: George Lippard; *The Quaker City*; democracy; bodies; print culture