

# UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham  
Research at Birmingham

## Before and After:

Mitchell, Rebecca; Jones, Anna Maria

### *License:*

None: All rights reserved

### *Document Version*

Early version, also known as pre-print

### *Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Mitchell, R & Jones, AM 2016, Before and After: Punch, Steampunk, and Victorian Graphic Narrativity. in *Drawing on the Victorians: The Palimpsest of Victorian and Neo-Victorian Graphic Texts*. Series in Victorian Studies, Ohio University Press.

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

Eligibility for repository: Checked on 21/4/2016

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## <A>Chapter Eight

### <A> Before and After: *Punch*, Steampunk, and Victorian Graphic Narrativity

<B>Rebecca N. Mitchell

When asked by an interviewer to define “what exactly is steampunk,” Paul Di Filippo—termed the “Steampunk Godfather” in a special issue of *Neo-Victorian Studies* dedicated to the genre—did not exactly provide a definition. He began instead by noting a distinction: “I adore steampunk fiction. I’m not so much into the material aspects of the genre: clothes or artefacts.”<sup>1</sup> Privileging of fiction is not uncommon in steampunk scholarship, or in neo-Victorian studies more broadly. Yet representations of clothes and artefacts are among the most recognizable indicators of steampunk in one genre of fiction: the graphic text, in which the visual milieu is inseparable from theme, plot, or other literary conventions. Even as the intersection of the textual and the visual or material remains underexplored, scholars are increasingly attuned to the extra-literary manifestations of steampunk, treating it, for example, as a subculture or as a mode of creative production.<sup>2</sup> Many studies foreground the ambivalence of the aesthetic that, by definition, embraces anachronism and a past that includes ideologies and reanimates technologies long since outdated.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps because of steampunk’s willingness to engage that past, scholars have traced the ways that steampunk works or practices lay bare or, to use a word often invoked in the discussion of the movement, negotiate the social tensions of the Victorian era as well as the corresponding tensions of the contemporary moment of production. Brigid Cherry and Maria Mellins argue that steampunk undertakes “complex negotiations of modernity and identity,” “articulates complex discourses concerning gender and class,” and “[illustrates] the ways in which ‘punk’ has become a highly contested and problematic label, for a set of lifestyle and identity factors which appropriate a quasi-nostalgic look to an imagined (and idealized) past.”<sup>4</sup> Margaret Rose argues that steampunk texts “do not undermine the idea of the reality of the past but instead explore the intersections and limitations of the various

textual ways in which we access it.”<sup>5</sup> And Christine Ferguson suggests that steampunks must mediate the politics of a practice that “simultaneously requires and de-realizes a verifiable Victorian past,” so that they may “visually quote the Victorian period without seeming to slavishly repeat and emulate its clichéd ideological significations.”<sup>6</sup>

This line of inquiry owes much to Fredric Jameson’s and Linda Hutcheon’s articulations of the relationship of the postmodern to history; it is a theoretical foundation that cannot, perhaps, be ignored, but also one that encourages a backward-looking critical approach to steampunk, asking what such postmodern phenomena can tell us about our received notions of the past.<sup>7</sup> Further, positioning a meta-textual or meta-imagistic postmodern in contradistinction to what comes before, encourages a monolithic understanding of the Victorian past as being singular, stable, and unreflective. To be sure, this practice has been critiqued in literary studies for some time.<sup>8</sup> Yet many analyses of steampunk continue to rely on a static notion of the Victorian, perhaps because the nature of steampunk itself is still being debated by its practitioners: these debates tend to focus on defining which contemporary practices should count as steampunk, while questions of which past practices, styles, or ideas should count as Victorian remains relatively untroubled.<sup>9</sup> Suggesting a productive movement away from this bind, Ferguson notes that steampunk subcultures complicate Jameson’s “well-known diagnosis of postmodern cultural production.”<sup>10</sup> She counters that steampunk practices are based “on questions of epistemology, on how we establish, frame, and fix the period visual tropes rendered up for appropriation.”<sup>11</sup> This chapter asks similar questions in relation to the Victorian era: did Victorian graphic artists “establish, frame, and fix” the visual tropes that we now appropriate, and if so, how? How do we know, or think we know, what a “verifiable Victorian past” looks like, so that we might “visually quote it”? When did these images—which steampunks must now negotiate—become “clichéd ideological significations”?

Literary antecedents to steampunk narratives have been traced to proto-science fiction, dystopian/utopian narratives, and early counterfactual stories,<sup>12</sup> in which social and natural histories are contested, if not outright rejected. Literary scholars have in recent years recognized that Victorian fiction depends heavily on optative, counterfactual, and proleptic modes, on accounting for what might have been or what is yet to be.<sup>13</sup> What is less explored is the extent to which these modes are reflected in Victorian graphic productions. Some strategies for effecting visual temporal shifts were based in the reanimation of past aesthetic paradigms—such as, for example, the revivalist iconography that defined the neo-medieval,<sup>14</sup> Pre-Raphaelite, and Arts and Crafts movements—whose production methods or visual vocabulary stand in stark contrast to the conventional trappings of the day, from fashion and furniture to printing processes. Other visual strategies, though, shirk direct revivalism, and are intended not to challenge or subvert the status quo, but rather to document it.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, some of the very techniques that steampunk works use to subvert normative Victorian iconography or ideology were, in fact, codified in the popular Victorian illustrated periodical.

To explore Victorian pictorial negotiations of their own history, I turn to one exemplary Victorian work heavily invested in representing, celebrating, and commenting upon the passage of time: the Diamond Jubilee issue of *Punch*, which deploys a number of iconographic modes not only to codify the “Victorian,” but also, and perhaps more importantly, to parse sub-periods and sub-movements, making distinctions within the Victorian. In some images, historical personages from different time periods comingle; in another, a Victorian moment is reset in a different historical period;<sup>16</sup> and, in a visual trope repeatedly deployed to great effect, image pairs are used to create a before-and-after or then-and-now topos, offering a condensed form of graphic narrative that

renders seismic social shifts in two simple frames. These varying image modes represent a range of strategies used in the late nineteenth century to consolidate the past as an identifiable group of signs.

In what follows, I will take up cartoons in the 1897 Diamond Jubilee issue of *Punch* as examples of images that visually historicize nineteenth-century Britain culture, before considering the way some neo-Victorian texts employ the visual language codified by that practice. There is the risk here of falling into what Joseph Bristow terms a “cybernetic loop,” an endless recursion in which analysis reveals that neo-Victorian works simply repeat a mode of creation or reflection long ago perfected by the Victorians themselves.<sup>17</sup> Being mindful of that risk, I wish to focus expressly on the consolidation of visual markers of period (and their attending ideologies), as they are made readable through temporal contrast. I do not wish to suggest that these examples are necessarily representative of all Victorian iconography; rather, I hold up these iconographic modes to demonstrate that the Victorian historicization or periodization of images was a self-conscious, intentional project, the relative success of which can be seen in the steampunk adoption of the same visual vocabulary. After a brief primer on the chronological image form and its early applications, I consider *Punch*'s tour de force Diamond Jubilee issue. I then turn to two steampunk comics set in the British fin de siècle, concurrent with the *Punch* issue: Grant Morrison and Steve Yeowell's *Sebastian O* (1993), an edgy 3-issue series centering on a group of decadent Aesthetes,<sup>18</sup> and Alan Moore and Kevin O'Neill's *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen* (1999–2003), which also takes 1890s London as a setting for the adventures of a team of corruption-fighting misfits drawn from various literary texts.

<B>Picturing Time

That historical narrative can be depicted visually is practically uncontested, though accounts vary as to how exactly narrative or time is inscribed or suggested in pictures. Writing in 1988, Wendy Steiner noted that “the narrative of pictures is virtually a nontopic for art historians,”<sup>19</sup> having been established by Lessing’s notion of the “pregnant moment,” a scene depicted whose visual markers suggest the events that immediately preceded and followed.<sup>20</sup> Sachererell Sitwell adopted a nearly identical formulation in his influential study *Narrative Pictures*, wherein he describes “the painting of anecdote” as depicting “the chosen moment in some related incident, and looking more closely into its details we must see hints or suggests of the before and after of the story.”<sup>21</sup> Steiner troubles this model by suggesting that “the discreteness of temporal events is not enough to create the equivalent of literary narrativity.”<sup>22</sup> Instead, she insists that visual narrative requires the repetition of figures with discernable difference: “We know that we are looking at narrative painting because we see the subject repeated, and because reality only repeats in time.”<sup>23</sup> Since Steiner’s intervention, others have tackled the issue of the narrative potential of the image, but fundamental questions—such as “Can a Single Still Picture Tell a Story?”—remain open for debate.<sup>24</sup> Whether in a single frame or in repeated images, with repetition comes the introduction of difference, and in the hiatus between the two comes the interpretive gesture.<sup>25</sup>

As any two images with repeated characters or icons may open up similar possibilities for narrative certainty or—conversely—narrative polysemy, the interpretation of consecutive images is of especial concern to comics theorists. Thierry Groensteen raises the question of the narrative capability of the single image in his field-defining *System of Comics*, where he suggests that narrative depends upon “the triad composed of the panel that is currently being read, the panel that precedes it, and the panel that immediately follows it.”<sup>26</sup> Later, he refines his definition to focus upon development, writing that the “defining quality of a narrative” “is that it necessarily includes a

beginning and an end,” and requires “an element of development of the action, of evolution of the initial state A to state B.”<sup>27</sup> Moreover, Groensteen argues that within the context of a comic, “the hiatus between two consecutive images, in a sequential narrative, can be programmed so that all readers will necessarily reconstruct the virtual content of the narrative ellipsis in exactly the same way.”<sup>28</sup> In Scott McCloud’s telling, it is this predictably interpretable sequencing of images that defines the comic form: comics are “juxtaposed pictorial and other images in deliberate sequence, intended to convey information and/or to produce an aesthetic response in the viewer.”<sup>29</sup> The idea that “all readers” will understand visual or narrative ellipses in “exactly the same way” or that a graphic text can be written to “produce an aesthetic response in the viewer” depends on the supposition that the reading audience will be familiar with the conventions of the form.

British fin-de-siècle readers would indeed have been well-versed in reading the conventions of graphic narrative forms. As late as 1904 a *Punch* cartoon adapted the first engraving from Hogarth’s *Industry and Idleness* (1747)<sup>30</sup> as the basis for satire, suggesting that the graphic narrative sequence was still part of a shared cultural tradition and required no explanation.<sup>31</sup> Central to that moral lesson of Hogarth’s pair of apprentices is the vast gulf between their different states—which grow further apart as the series progresses—thus communicating to the viewer the ultimate effects of good versus bad behavior, the ostensible result of a series of decisions. There are, though, (at least) two ways of moving through the sequence of images: one can track the idle apprentice’s development (plates 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11) and the industrious apprentice’s development (plates 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12) chronologically, or one can follow the precedent of the first plate and compare the pair at each stage of their development (plates 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 6 and 7, etc.). If the first approach emphasizes the passage of time between each of the images in either apprentice’s life, the second

approach emphasizes the temporal simultaneity of the complementary succeeding images in the series: the apprentices are industrious and idle, respectively though concurrently.

When taken together, the plates in the Hogarth series inscribes a narrative, but the first image depicts contrasting figures, and while the many visual symbols (and Hogarthian captions) might suggest much about the young men's backgrounds, personalities, and habits, they do not quite suggest the events preceding the scene. This kind of paired image—that of simultaneous contrast—was frequently exploited by *Punch* and other illustrated magazines through the dual-panel cartoon, and because the format derives meaning from contrast, it is perhaps not surprising that gender differences were a central theme. A throwaway gag from a January 1856 issue of *Punch* offers one example (see fig. 8.1): the dual-paneled frame juxtaposes the “Highland Officer in the Crimea, according to the Romantic Ideas of Sentimental Young Ladies” on the left with the same man, “according to the Actual Fact” on the right.<sup>32</sup> The passage of time is neither implied nor necessary to the cartoon's meaning, as the punch-line requires only contrast. In this case, the caption tethers the punch-line to gender difference, exposing the gulf between idealized expectations (the “romantic ideas” of “sentimental” girls) and the harsher realities of masculine experience.<sup>33</sup> In cases such as these, the pictorial “hiatus”—to use Groensteen's term—represents synchronous difference but not necessarily the passage of time between the images. Another form of split panel image, however, does expressly depend upon the passage of time and on repetition with difference: the before-and-after image.

**{insert fig. 8.1 around here}**

The development of the before-and-after trope largely coincides with the history of photography. Both were quickly conscribed for promotional or prescriptive uses. In these pairs, the



hiatus does, by definition, suggest not only the passage of time, but also an intervening event: the transformative moment on which the “after” hinges. For a viewer to grasp the nature of that event, visual clues must be provided, and/or the audience must be relied upon to respond with generally consistent interpretations. With good reason, much of the analysis of these kind of images tends to focus on the ideological undercurrents that shape the viewer’s interpolations of the hiatus event. As Seth Koven has ably described, in the 1870s, Dr. Thomas Barnardo used widely engraved and reprinted before-and-after photographs of London street waifs to raise funding for his homes for indigent children by showing the extraordinary change rendered by his intervention. The dirty, ragged street-child was turned, as if by magic, into a clean, industrious worker (see fig. 8.2).<sup>34</sup> These pairings are, to use Lessing’s term, pregnant with implied counterfactuals: were it not for Barnardo’s presence, these girls or boys would be left on the street, with little hope for change. Barnardo was neither the first nor the only to apply the inherent didacticism of the before-and-after image to advertise ideology; it was “standard practice for charities at this time.”<sup>35</sup> Other applications of the trope foregrounded the value of objects, and if ideological prejudices were engaged, so much the better. Advertisers were quick to recognize this potential, and the inscription of various ideologies are easily readable in Victorian ads.<sup>36</sup> Thomas Richards, for example, describes a before-during-after sequence of photographs showing an infant transforming from malnourished to healthy, used to advertise Mellin’s food for infants: “the three photographs progress from contraction to composure, from lower-class poverty to middle-class satisfaction.”<sup>37</sup> Following Richards, Anne McClintock’s analysis of Pears’ Soap ads demonstrated that when coupled with suggestive imagery, nationalistic jingoism could be exploited to sell something as banal as soap, which could in turn reinforce that imperialist ideology.<sup>38</sup> Because the intervening events or changes taking place in the hiatus between the before and the after are merely implied, the collective unconscious can be conscribed or manipulated to the image creator’s end.

{insert fig. 8.2 around here}

## <B>A Reign in Retrospect: *Punch's* Diamond Jubilee

That collective unconscious is certainly shaped by shared experience, a fact put to excellent use by *Punch* in its celebratory issues. For the fiftieth anniversary of Victoria's coronation in 1887, *Punch* published a special three-volume series, *Mr. Punch's Victorian Era*, which reviewed the entire run of the weekly satirical magazine. Having started publication in 1841, only four years after the start of Victoria's reign, *Punch's* ascendancy was nearly synchronous with that of the monarch's rule. These volumes reviewed work already printed in *Punch*, reprinting cartoons along with helpful commentary to job readers' memories, offering necessary context for the socio-political moments that the cartoons satirized. The effect was of a scrapbook of memories. Subtitled "An Illustrated Chronicle of Fifty Years of the Reign of Her Majesty the Queen from the Contemporary Pages of 'Punch,'" the collection was clearly intended to provide an overview, charting the course between the past and the reader's present.<sup>39</sup> Whereas the 1887 volumes traced the chronological threads linking then and now, the June 19, 1897, Diamond Jubilee issue took a different approach. This number is notable because it is composed almost entirely of illustrations, with relatively little accompanying text, offering a veritable catalog of modes to visualize history (or historicize images). Further, nearly each of these modes complicates the accounts of narrativity in both Lessing's description of paintings and Groensteen and McCloud's analysis of comic structure. Some of the images elide temporal distinctions by depicting characters who are historically out-of-time, sharing the same space and the same moment. In other images, the passage of time is foregrounded explicitly and the differences between the start of Victoria's reign and the then-present day shown to be stark, and not necessarily for narrative ends. Meaning in these images is based in counterfactual synchronicity or drastic asynchronicity, or it is derived from the codification of imagery aligned with

various moments in Victoria's reign: the *Punch* issue, in other words, functions as a key to the meaning of date-specific imagery.

Setting the laudatory tone that would continue throughout, on the opening page, Victoria is pictured on throne, in her present age, surrounded by the "Great Queens of History," including Catherine of Russia, Isabella of Spain, Elizabeth I, Phillipa, Cleopatra, Sheba, Maria Theresa of Austria, and Queen Anne. The accompanying poem describes the scene as "strangest of all dreamland's scenes,"<sup>40</sup> and one might be tempted to dismiss the vignette as just a "dreamland" gallery of famous faces, with no intended connection to any real place or time. In the issue's first full-page cartoon, though, the importance—and the sheer duration—of the Jubilee period (1837–1897) is foregrounded in both image and caption. An allegorical figure for fashion oversees a swirling parade of men and women in "Madame la Mode Reviews a Few of Her Vagaries During the Last Sixty Years" (see fig. 8.3). Here, the "vagaries" of fashion are readily readable (or would have been to contemporary viewers), as the width of skirt, style of hair and bonnet and of whiskers and hat, represent the major trends of the previous six decades; yet the figures dance arm in arm, clearly sharing the same moment on the page. Other images of blurred periodicity include "Design for a Parliamentary Car for the Queen's Procession," featuring "A Combined Assembly of Distinguished Members of Both Houses during Her Majesty's Reign."<sup>41</sup> As in the case of Madame La Mode's parade of fashion, the celebratory impact of the image is due to the comingling of figures who would have otherwise never shared the *same* page of *Punch*: the greater the temporal disparity in the figures presented, the greater the impact of "Her Majesty's Reign." Another iteration of this kind of ahistorical scene finds Mr. Punch overseeing a "reception of notable histrions" from Victoria's reign.<sup>42</sup> Again, the scene's visual impact is due to the crush of people, whose varied attire and appearance, amplified because some of the actors are in period costume, suggest the breadth and

range of the queen's reach. A more democratic version of comingled past and present is featured in the final cartoon of the issue, the two-page "A Diamond Jubilee Dream of Victorian Derby Days," which depicts a crowd scene at the derby with a cross section of Victorians from the across the century. If these images playfully disrupt historical veracity or the limits of realist depiction, they also suggest that the present is always informed by the past, its actors always in conversation with those that have gone before.

**{insert fig. 8.3 around here}**

Another group of featured cartoons performs a very different function from the counterfactuals or comingled group depictions: the issue also contains a striking number of paired past-and-present images depicting contrasts between the time that Victoria ascended the throne and the then-present day. Rather than emphasizing continuity or range, these images insist upon articulating difference, often emphasizing change in easily readable terms. These paired images appear in various formats: in some, a single frame encloses two images; in others separate panels are juxtaposed side-by-side, and other pairs are split, separated across pages. With varied formats and a notable lack of captions, the volume's editors and illustrators appear to have been confident that readers would have no trouble making meaning of the image pairs. Many of the split images address aspects women's changing gender roles, some more overtly than others. On a page featuring a grid of four images (see fig. 8.4), the bottom pair depicts, as its caption suggests, the life of "The Journalist – Then" and "The Journalist – Now." The change privileged in the image and the caption is the journalist's move from "Fleet Prison" to "Fleet Street," from poverty and shame to relative comfort and respectability. A less obvious shift is the position of the journalist's family: in the background of the "Then" frame lurk the shadowy figures of a child and its mother, whose saintliness is suggested by the halo-like lines that surround her head. In the "Fleet Street" image, the

family is no longer present, though the improvement of circumstance attending the journalist suggests that his wife and child's absence from the work site implies their greater comfort and security: they are at home.

**{insert fig. 8.4 around here}**

While mother and child are relegated to the background in the “Journalist” cartoons, the top pair, captioned simply “1837” and “1897,” takes the family as its subject. In the “1837” frame, a young family enjoys a walk in the countryside. A man, in mustache and sideburns, top-hat and walking stick, is depicted in profile; directly behind him is a woman (presumably his wife), attired in a wide bonnet and an ornate dress with shawl. She holds the hand of a young girl—in a light dress with dark sash, and carrying her own bonnet in her hand—and adjacent to the man is a young boy, back to the viewer, in a sailor suit waving a flag at a horse-drawn carriage that has recently passed by. A winding country lane leads into the distance, towards a snug church, the steeple of which is plainly visible. It is a scene of familial pastoral.

The companion “1897” cartoon provides a suggestive contrast, and with no caption to indicate the artist's intended message, one must draw conclusions from the elements of the scene that have changed. The country idyll of 1837 has been entirely replaced. What was a country road is now a more urban scene, or at least a village scene, with what appear to be paved, fence-lined streets. The undulating, grass-covered ground of “1837” is expressed in multi-directional short hatchings; in “1897,” the road beneath the bicycles is rendered in a series of unidirectional lines, suggesting movement and speed. In the “1897” image, the mustachioed man wears a Norfolk suit and boots, his top-hat replaced by a high bowler and—in perhaps the most startling intervention—his walking stick replaced by a bicycle. Indeed, both man and woman are riding bicycles in “1897.”

In place of her highly detailed dress and shawl are a simple blouse and solid skirt. Her wasp-waisted silhouette marks a change from the 1837 moment, and the leg-of-mutton sleeves and high neckline keep her more covered than the deep décolleté of the earlier dress: it is the style of the New Woman, as demarcated in numerous *Punch* cartoons in the previous decade. She is, moreover, mobile, employing the same mode of transportation as the man, and even wearing a collar and bow-tie that decidedly borrow from masculine dress.

In another pointed contrast, the woman, whose gaze in “1837” had been directed at her daughter, faces the viewer directly, even as the man is still shown in profile. Not only is the positioning more direct and more active, it calls attention to a major omission: in “1897” no children appear in the frame. The only other figure in the scene is a second young woman, also on a bicycle, riding in the opposite direction in the background, suggesting not only that mobile women were becoming more common, but that their options for movement were also increasing. While in “1837” the wife does not face her husband, she is depicted in his shadow, slightly beneath his, and there is no suggestion that she will part from the route that he and their children are pursuing. In “1897,” conversely, though both man and woman are still close to each other, she is now at the same level within the frame, and the fact that their bicycles are heading in opposite directions suggests that as time progresses, they will simply (and quickly, thanks to the speed of the bicycle) get further and further apart. In fact, in the absence of children, there is nothing to suggest that the man and woman pictured have any relation to each other whatsoever, other than the “1897” image’s propinquity to the “1837” image.<sup>45</sup>

Taken together, this pair not only illustrates gendered symbols, it helps to ossify them. Readable signs include clothing and hairstyles, but the importance of contextual markers—both within the single frame and in relation to the paired image—becomes clear when we consider that

“Madame La Mode” also displayed changing fashions. In the “1837–1897” cartoon, the shift of environment from rural to urban is significant, but the presence of the bicycle and the absence of a family are even more telling. By eliding any intermediary scenes, the staggering difference between the two moments is emphasized, and with it the enormity of changes that occurred in the seemingly interminable reign of the Queen. These changes were punctuated by a number of events that would have been immediately familiar to *Punch*’s readers in 1897: the Married Women’s Property Acts of 1870 and 1882, the establishment of Newnham and Girton colleges, the development of the bicycle, and the New Woman debates, to name only a few. Instantly readable differences in fashion and trappings thus become aligned not merely with the decade in which they were popular, but also with the range of social changes which led to the “1897” frame. This is not to say that old values did not linger, but rather that these graphic consolidations helped to label traditional or conservative values *as* old. As noted, if the “1897” image was viewed on its own, it might not be understood as a critique of the expanding role of women in the social sphere and the changes wrought by that changing role in the home. Yet when set next to an image of an idyllic family from “sixty years hence,” the resulting hiatus becomes freighted with meaning: the woman’s clothing and bicycle have displaced the family, and difference has displaced the unity that had existed.

In light of this context of shifting roles, many of the other image pairs from the issue take on new valences of meaning; even in the pairs that do not feature women explicitly, the “after” frames suggest a world in which men are hemmed in or thwarted. In “Past and Present, A Sportsman’s Diary,” hunters on horsebacks and their dogs jump over wooden fences, taking “a splendid line” over stream and dale in 1837. In the 1897 frame, the horses pull up short, faced with barbed wire fence, and the caption informs that “several hounds [were] killed on the railway.”<sup>44</sup> One single panel cartoon features an older man, a younger man, and a dog in a muzzle. “Just think of it, my boy,” the

elder man says, “In those days we had no electric light, no x rays, no cinematograph, no—.” The younger man interjects: “Muzzling Order.”<sup>45</sup> If the 1837 man can marvel at the technological innovations that benefit the younger generations, the younger man (and perhaps his dog) seems to long for a time when laws did not constrain.

The meaning accumulated by the cartoons in the issue suggests wistfulness for times that were simpler, slower, and unchallenged by upstart women or the lower classes. To reinforce the message of the images, a recurring series of three mini-dialogues or plays, each under the title “Extremes Meet: Or, Some Victorian Contrasts,” underscores the temporal and social dissonance pictured in the then-and-now cartoons. The second features a “Street boy, early Victorian” and “Street boy, late Victorian,” both portrayed as ignorant and with heavy accents, but the “Late Victorian Boy” extolls his compulsory “heddication.”<sup>46</sup> In the third play, a “Miss Flora” (early Victorian), Miss Bloomer (mid-Victorian), and Miss Latchkey (New Woman) compare notes on men’s reactions to their clothing. Miss Latchkey insists, “I ignore man’s very existence—except as a comrade and rival, to be met and crushed in the struggle for existence.”<sup>47</sup> Such textual pieces buttress the visual suggestions of the issue’s cartoons, making clear not only that the Latchkey kind of woman aims to “crush” men, but that she represents an extreme deviation from other kinds of earlier Victorian women. Taken as a whole, the Diamond Jubilee issue demonstrates ways that nineteenth-century artists defined and deployed iconography to codify an array of ideas and ideals associated with passing times. And the artists and writers of *Punch* seem to be fully conscious of their role in the process: one telling pair of cartoons contrasts the clothing of the “Early Du Maurier Crinoline Period, 1860” with the “Charles Keenesque Croquet Period, 1866,” aligning dates not only with particular styles, but with the cartoonists who captured those styles for the magazine.<sup>48</sup>

<B>Neo-Victorian Applications



Suzanne Barber and Matt Hale have argued that steampunk depends upon the simultaneous negotiation of “multiple temporalities” and multiple nexus events to dictate their counterfactual plots.<sup>49</sup> In order for the chronological elision to be readable—in order for readers to recognize that characters sharing a page or a frame derive from asynchronous sources—steampunk graphic texts use a visual vocabulary that is chronologically marked. Because twentieth- and twenty-first century readers cannot be counted on to grasp subtle differences in nineteenth-century clothing or context, the distilled iconography of works such as *Punch* (those “clichéd ideological significations”) are used instead. Grant Morrison and Steve Yeowell’s proto-steampunk comics series *Sebastian O*, issued originally in three monthly instalments in 1993, employs these visual tropes effectively.<sup>50</sup> Replete with allusions to the literature and illustrations of the decadent 1890s, particularly the works of Oscar Wilde, *Sebastian O* earns its steampunk bona fides by introducing anachronistic technologies into fin-de-siècle London, where the dandy-cum-action hero Sebastian must thwart the plans of his nemesis Lord Lavender, who hopes to rule England. Such a coup d’état would be possible because Queen Victoria has died, replaced by a computer-generated video image, an ur-Big Brother.

Within this world, clothing and décor are visual signifiers that draw on the ideological undercurrents that dictated the interpretation of the *Punch* Jubilee cartoons. One couple’s characterization depends almost entirely upon those signifiers: George Harker is introduced while shooting game with a trusty setter, wearing a version of a hunting suit with knee breeches and spats while holding a gun (see fig. 8.5). Joining George in the hunting party is a woman, identified only as Phoebe, seated behind on the grass. She holds a parasol and wears a bonnet and pink gown with a massively full skirt, spread in all its glory on the ground. The clothing communicates George’s hypermasculinity (hunting suit) and Phoebe’s hyperfemininity (enormous crinoline), though the styles are not chronologically coterminous.<sup>51</sup> Insisting on historical accuracy in steampunk is a non-starter,

but in this case it is not the historical inaccuracy, but rather the discordant pairing that is telling: the woman's exaggerated skirt and bonnet are appropriate to the mid-1850s, while Harker's suit typifies a later era. Phoebe, in other words, would have been at home in the "1837" *Punch* cartoon, not the "1897" one. *Sebastian O* includes at least one other female character who is dressed in typical 1890s fashion—contemporary with the ostensible setting of the comic—in a narrow skirt and cuirass bodice, suggesting that Phoebe's dress is not an accidental or unintentional anachronism. Her voluminous skirt appears markedly dated, even within the context of the story, and intentionally so. Phoebe is represented throughout her narrative arc as supplicant, most frequently sitting at George's feet, eyes averted. In both clothing and action, then, Phoebe seems to be a throwback, reanimating the outmoded gender roles of the 1850s, a regression signaled by her dress and amplified by the temporal contrast between her attire and George's. At the fin de siècle, the hunting suit with knee breeches came to represent a traditional masculinity at least in part because it was invoked as the polar opposite of the attire of the caricatured, foppish Aesthete that Du Maurier made famous in the pages of *Punch* and that features throughout *Sebastian O*.<sup>52</sup> By pulling together the Angel in the House figure of the 1850s with the archetypally masculine British man of the 1890s, the resultant pair—George and Phoebe—appear overdetermined in their heteronormativity.

**{insert fig. 8.5 around here}**

As it happens, a heteronormative reading turns out to be misplaced. In the third and final issue of *Sebastian O*, which opens with a vignette of George smoking a pipe in a wing chair in front of a roaring fire and Phoebe on the ground again in her billowing skirt, George is revealed to be a woman. The nature and extent of *Sebastian O*'s investment in transgressive politics is unclear, and George and Phoebe are ambivalent sexual radicals, at best. Aside from their gender, their relationship seems to conform to the most entrenched stereotypes of the high Victorian roles of

husband and wife. A scene in which they explain their relationship to outsiders does not help clarify the comic's ideological intentions: when a group of policemen approach George and Phoebe's home, where Sebastian O is hiding, George dismisses them with a warning: "We suffer from tribadism, a disease of women, a nymphomania of the senses. . . . Despite the shame and horror of it, we cannot stop ourselves, officer. Your men are free to enter, but we cannot guarantee that they will not carry the contagion back to their wives and loved ones" (see fig. 8.6).<sup>53</sup> On the one hand, she cleverly plays into the policemen's homophobia to facilitate Sebastian's escape. On the other hand, by framing same-sex desire as a contagion, the comic references its early 1990s subtext of AIDS-fueled hysteria in a way that may be read as a self-conscious critique but may also be read as a problematic reanimation of Victorian stereotypes. In terms of *Sebastian O's* plot, the revelation of George's subversive gender performance packs a greater punch because it had been shrouded in fashion that visually signified heteronormativity.

**{insert fig. 8.6 around here}**

Similarly ambivalent—or ambiguous—motivations are evident in Alan Moore's *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*, which is often vaunted for its provocative mixing of figures from different literary worlds and set in different times.<sup>54</sup> As I have argued, this ostensibly postmodern mixing was in fact handily used by the Victorians. As significant as the chronological blending is Moore's revision of the well-known plots of some of the characters that the story appropriates from other novels. Mina Murray (of Stoker's *Dracula*) leads the league after having divorced Jonathan Harker.<sup>55</sup> While the sartorial detail in *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen* is limited when compared to that in *Sebastian O*, it still depends upon the same visual vocabulary established in the fin de siècle. With a wasp-waisted silhouette, leg-of-mutton sleeves, sensible flat-brimmed straw hat, and ever-present

neck-scarf that echoes the ties and cravats of the men that surround her (see fig. 8.7), Mina's dress marks her as a New Woman, as does her smoking.

**{insert fig. 8.7 around here}**

Markers of fashion combine with stylistic illustration choices to reinforce the dating of the story and, at times, to highlight the temporal dissonance of the characters. In one of the first images of the first volume of the *League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*, Mina's silhouette is graphically cast in black and yellow, recalling Aubrey Beardsley's striking covers for the *Yellow Book* (1894–97). Mina's style, though, is expressly not Aesthetic—others in the comic take that role, with Hawley Griffin adorning his invisible body in quilted lapel smoking robes that denote Oscar Wilde's Sarony photographs or, again, Du Maurier's Aesthetic parodies. Within the pages of the issues, Mina's New Woman attire matches her New Woman behavior: newly divorced, willing and able to lead men, and delighted to spurn social codes. Curiously, however, the covers of the first volume of the *League of Extraordinary Gentlemen* depict Mina in clothing (and in positions) that differ from her representation within. On the cover of the comic's first issue, Mina's face appears in a close-cropped portrait in the center of the page, with a caption noting "Lady 'With Past' Kept Peculiar Company"; in a small frame to the left, she appears bare-breasted, being assaulted, with a caption "An affront to womanhood in foreign parts": if her character within the comic resists gender norms, the cover seems to embrace them, emphasizing her sensational "past" and promising sexual assault within. While one could argue that the cluttered cover of the first issue is self-consciously critiquing hyperbolically sensationalist Victorian advertising, it is also depending on that same sensationalism to attract a readership to a new work. The second issue again mimics Victorian advertising by featuring the comic's main characters *à la* cigarette cards. Emphasizing the literary and temporal mash-up that was the comic's central innovation, each picture/card is dated, and the dates are

conspicuously asynchronous: despite appearing in the comic together, Miss Mina Murray is captioned 1897 (the year that Stoker's *Dracula* was published), while Auguste Dupin is dated 1841 (the year the character appeared in E. A. Poe's "The Murders in the Rue Morgue"), and other characters are dated according to the publication date of their original appearance. While Mina's picture is tagged "1897," her dress is not visible, and thus not visibly datable. The only woman on the cover, with her hair in a prim bun and with a conspicuously bare neck and décolletage, Mina shows no trace of the physical prowess or leadership that she possesses within the story. It is not until the cover of the fifth issue (of six in the first volume), in fact, that she appears in the same late-90s dress that she wears in the issue. And when the first volume was published in an omnibus trade edition (2002), the cover again emphasized Mina's conventional femininity by setting her against a backdrop featuring the male characters and a picture gallery of men's portraits, and by depicting her in a dress that hews closer to mid-Victorian than fin-de-siècle standards, including a dramatically full, crinolined skirt and fussy lace details (see fig. 8.8). Only her barely-visible cigarette and facial expression suggest her New Woman character. Even as these covers signal "Victorian" to readers, they demonstrate that the "vagaries" of "Madame la Mode" can be manipulated to communicate relative levels of convention or subversion. Whereas the more comfortably conforming images of Mina on the cover might appeal to readers who fetishize an early-Victorian incarnation of femininity, those images can be displaced, or at least overwritten by the more transgressive signifiers within.

**{insert fig. 8.8 around here}**

Even, then, as these steampunk comics depend on a diffuse set of images and styles to communicate a generic Victorian-ness, closer examination demonstrates that more specific markers of Victorian movements or trends are employed as a shorthand for character traits. Phoebe's

massive crinoline represents a host of traits aligned with the domesticated woman of the mid-nineteenth century: docility, submission, and wifely duty. Mina's New Woman attire denotes her independence, unconventionality, and rejection of marriage. These stereotypes, I argue, were not twentieth-century inventions, the reductive condensation of complex nineteenth-century realities. Rather, they were the result of ongoing pictorial negotiations by Victorians, who sought ways to represent visually the passage of time and its attendant changes. Invested in representing the varying incarnations of the Victorian era, the Diamond Jubilee issue of *Punch* functions as a concordance of these types, distinguishing between "then" and "now," "past" and "present" in visual terms that were mapped—sometimes explicitly and sometimes implicitly—onto the social trends or sensibilities that were concomitant with the period's readable signifiers of clothing and style.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lisa Yaszek, "Democratising the Past to Improve the Future: An Interview with Steampunk Godfather Paul Di Filippo," *Neo-Victorian Studies* 3, no. 1(2010): 190. Yaszek writes, "Critically acclaimed science fiction author Paul Di Filippo is regularly recognised as a founding figure in the neo-Victorian aesthetic movement known as steampunk. His 1995 short story collection, *The Steampunk Trilogy*, has been credited with giving this movement its name." "Democratising the Past," 189

<sup>2</sup> For examples of analyses of steampunk as literature, see Jay Clayton, *Dickens in Cyberspace: The Afterlife of the Nineteenth Century in Postmodern Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); and Margaret Rose, "Extraordinary Pasts: Steampunk as a Mode of Historical Representation," *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 20, no. 3 (January 2009): 319–33. On steampunk as subculture, see Christine Ferguson, "Surface Tensions: Steampunk, Subculture, and the Ideology of Style," *Neo-Victorian Studies* 4, no. 2 (2011): 66–90; and Brigid Cherry and Maria Mellins, "Negotiating the Punk in

---

Steampunk: Subculture, Fashion, and Performance Identity,” *Punk & Post-Punk* 1, no. 1 (September 2011): 5–25. On steampunk as mode of artistic production, see Karen Christians, “Steampunk: Future Past,” *Metalsmith* 31, no. 3 (August 2011): 18–19; and Jake von Slatt, “The Steampunk Workshop,” accessed 4 March 2014, [www.steampunkworkshop.com](http://www.steampunkworkshop.com).

<sup>3</sup> This tendency is evident even in the titles of many studies: Christians’s “Steampunk: Future Past,” Heidi Weig’s “‘Rebuilding Yesterday to Ensure our Tomorrow’: An Overview of Steampunk Aesthetics and Literature” (*Inklings: Jahrbuch Für Literatur Und Ästhetik* 30 [2012]: 135–50), and Jason Jones’s “Betrayed by Time: Steampunk & the Neo-Victorian in Alan Moore’s *Lost Girls* and *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*,” (*Neo-Victorian Studies* 3, no. 1 [2010]: 99–126), among others..

<sup>4</sup> Mellins and Cherry, “Negotiating the Punk,” 7.

<sup>5</sup> M. Rose, “Extraordinary Pasts,” 322.

<sup>6</sup> Ferguson, “Surface Tensions,” 72.

<sup>7</sup> See Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991) and Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge, 1988) and *The Politics of Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge, 1989). For example, Rachel A. Bower and Brian Croxall write, “Through its own instability, enacted via nonlinear temporality and blended surfaced, steampunk reminds us of the instability and constructedness of our concepts of periodisation and historical distance.” “Introduction: Industrial Evolution,” *Neo-Victorian Studies* 3, no. 1 (2010): 1–45.

---

<sup>8</sup> One of the first, and still most important texts to address this question is John Kucich and Dianne F. Sadoff's edited collection *Victorian Afterlife: Postmodern Culture Rewrites the Nineteenth Century*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000). In a review of that collection, Simon Joyce elegantly articulates the competing theoretical approaches detailed in the collection: "we either look skeptically at postmodernist claims to liberation, exposing the ways that any attempt at periodization or retroaction inevitably produces a warped and politically serviceable version of the past; or we take pleasure in the available opportunities for intertextual connection that such a project opens up, as 'politically progressive, [. . .] offering effective strategies for the fashioning of political positions, values, and subjectivities' (xxv). Heads you're with Fredric Jameson, tails with Michel Foucault." "Review of *Victorian Afterlife: Postmodern Culture Rewrites the Nineteenth Century*," *Victorian Studies* 44, no. 3 (Spring 2002): 556.

<sup>9</sup> See Jess Nevins, "It's Time to Rethink Steampunk," *io9*, posted 27 January 2012, accessed 5 March 2014, <http://io9.com/5879231/its-time-to-rethink-steampunk>.

<sup>10</sup> Ferguson also demonstrates that some of the problems of the "alternative historiography of New Historicism" can be revived in steampunk texts. Christine Ferguson, "Victoria-Arcana and the Misogynistic Poetics of Resistance in Iain Sinclair's *White Chappell Scarlet Tracings* and Alan Moore's *From Hell*," *LIT: Literature, Interpretation, Theory* 20, no. 1–2 (2009): 46.

<sup>11</sup> Ferguson, "Surface Tensions," 81.

<sup>12</sup> These categories are contested. In addition to works like E. A. Abbott's *Flatland* (1884) and Walter Besant's *Inner House* (1888), steampunk forbears might include Benjamin Disraeli's *The Wondrous Tale of Alroy* (1833) or Nathaniel Hawthorne's *P's Correspondence* (1845). See Jess Nevins for a more



---

comprehensive introduction to the genesis of the term and the genre. “Introduction: The 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Roots of Steampunk,” in *Steampunk*, ed. Ann VanderMeer and Joe R. Lansdale (San Francisco: Tachyon, 2008): 3–12.

<sup>13</sup> For perspectives on the Victorians’ relationship with what might have been and what might be, see, for example, Andrew H. Miller. “‘A Case of Metaphysics’: Counterfactuals, Realism, *Great Expectations*.” *ELH* 79, no. 3 (2012): 773–96; Kelly J. Mays, “Looking Backward, Looking Forward: The Victorians in the Rearview Mirror of Future History,” *Victorian Studies* 53, no. 3 (Spring 2011): 445–56; and Jesse Rosenthal. “The Large Novel and the Law of Large Numbers; or, Why George Eliot Hates Gambling,” *ELH* 77, no. 3 (2010): 777–811.

<sup>14</sup> cf. Linda Hughes, “Prefiguring Future Pasts,” in this collection 000–000.

<sup>15</sup> Mary Elizabeth Leighton and Lisa Surridge’s suggestion that illustrations of serialized fiction “may be proleptic (anticipating plot events to follow) or analeptic (referring to previous plot events) and may represent the personal or the grand historical narrative” is applicable to non-fictional narratives as well. “Making History: Text and Image in Harriet Martineau’s Historiettes,” in *Reading Victorian Literature, 1855–1875: Spoils of the Lumber Room*, ed. Paul Goldman and Simon Cooke (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 142.

<sup>16</sup> In E[dward]. T. Reed’s “A Prehistoric Jubilee,” the Jubilee procession is staged among dinosaurs and cavemen in a style that anticipates *The Flintstones*. *Punch* 19 June 1897, 311.

<sup>17</sup> Joseph Bristow, “Whether ‘Victorian’ Poetry: A Genre and its Period,” *Victorian Poetry* 42, no. 1 (2004): 82.

---

<sup>18</sup> The three-issue series was published by Vertigo, an imprint of DC comics designed for anyone “who enjoys alternative music, foreign and independent films, or other entertainment outside the mainstream.” Art Young, “On the Ledge,” in *Sebastian O*, by Grant Morrison and Steven Yeowell 1 (May 1993): 28.

<sup>19</sup> Wendy Steiner, *Pictures of Romance: Form Against Context in Painting and Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 8.

<sup>20</sup> Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Laocoon: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*, trans. E. C. Beasley (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1853), 132.

<sup>21</sup> Sacheverell Sitwell, *Narrative Pictures: A Survey of English Genre and its Painters*, (1936; London: Batsford, 1969), 1.

<sup>22</sup> Steiner, *Pictures of Romance*, 14

<sup>23</sup> Steiner, *Pictures of Romance*, 18

<sup>24</sup> Klaus Speidel, “Can a Single Still Picture Tell a Story?: Definitions of Narrative and the Alleged Problem of Time with Single Still Pictures,” *Diegesis* 2, no. 1 (2013): 173–294. Speidel offers a helpful review of developments in visual narratology since Steiner’s work.

<sup>25</sup> One foundational Victorian example of such interpretation is John Ruskin’s reaction to Augustus Egg’s triptych *Past and Present*, first shown at the Royal Academy of 1858. In his review of the paintings, Ruskin first noted that “several mistakes have been made in the interpretation” of the triptych and then asserts that he will “give the true reading of it” before offering a summary of the narrative he envisions. Ruskin attests both to the certainty that a singular implied narrative is

---

readable in images (“true reading”) and that such image sequences are nevertheless open to misreading (“several mistakes” in “interpretation”). John Ruskin, *Notes on Some of the Principal Pictures Exhibited in the Rooms of the Royal Academy*, vol. 5 (London: Smith, Elder, 1855) 26.

<sup>26</sup> Thierry Groensteen, *The System of Comics*, trans. Bart Beaty and Nick Nguyen (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2007), 111.

<sup>27</sup> Thierry Groensteen, *Comics and Narration*, trans. Ann Miller (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2013), 23.

<sup>28</sup> Groensteen, *Comics and Narration*, 29.

<sup>29</sup> Scott McCloud, *Understanding Comics: The Invisible Art* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 9.

<sup>30</sup> For Hogarth’s image, see fig. 1.3 in Brian Maidment’s “The Explicated Image: Graphic “Texts” in Early Victorian Print Culture.”

<sup>31</sup> “Practice and Precept,” *Punch*, 2 November 1904, 302. See Brian Maidment’s “The Explicated Image: Graphic ‘Texts’ in Early Victorian Culture” in this collection for a discussion of Hogarth’s impact on British graphic narratives.

<sup>32</sup> “Highland Officer in the Crimea,” *Punch* 12 January 1856, 20.

<sup>33</sup> With a different caption, the same image pair could be read in a wholly different register. If, for example, instead of describing the kilted officer on the left as a product of the sentimental imagination of women, the label read “Highland Officer in the Crimea, as imagined by young men before enlisting,” the cartoon could be understood as a much sharper critique of the miseries of war.

---

<sup>34</sup> Koven demonstrates that the “before” shots, through their depiction of children with exposed flesh, often fetishized and sexualized the children’s poverty. *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004). See also Lindsay Smith, “The shoe-black to the crossing sweeper: Victorian street Arabs and photography,” in *The Politics of Focus: Women, Children, and Nineteenth-century Photography* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 111-32.

<sup>35</sup> Clare Rose, *Making, Selling, and Wearing Boys’ Clothes in Late-Victorian England* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2010), 45. John Hannavy writes that missionaries seized upon photography and lantern slide shows were used as tools for education and to encourage evangelical zeal: “Publicity, support and fundraising for their missions in Europe were furthered by juxtaposed, staged photographs of naked and dirty, clothed and orderly ‘natives’ before and after conversion.” *Encyclopedia of Nineteenth-Century Photography* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 117.

<sup>36</sup> Advances in color lithography made mass production of color advertising cards fiscally viable, and a vast array of these cards used before and after images to suggest the improvements in health, wealth, attractiveness, made possible through the application or use of the product advertised Ben Crane documents a host of American versions of the before–and–after trade cards, many of which involve trick folds or pull-outs to effect the desired change. See *The Before and After Trade Card* (Schoharie, NY: Ephemera Society of America, 1995).

<sup>37</sup> Thomas Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England: Advertising and Spectacle, 1851–1914* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991), 189.

---

<sup>38</sup> Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 222.

<sup>39</sup> Text was added to give readers context for the cartoons, many of which were topical and political. In the preface of the third and final volume, editor E. J. Milliken writes that “the Chronicle has been compiled mainly with a view to linking and elucidating the illustrations.” “Preface,” in *Mr. Punch’s Victorian Era: An Illustrated Chronicle of Fifty Years of the Reign of Her Majesty the Queen*, vol. 3 (London: Bradbury, Agnew, & Co., 1888), n.p.

<sup>40</sup> “Great Queens of History,” *Punch*, 19 June 1897, 289.

<sup>41</sup> Edward T. Reed, “Design for a Parliamentary Car for the Queen’s Procession,” *Punch*, 19 June 1897, 294.

<sup>42</sup> “Thalia and Melpomene, Assisted by Mr. Punch, Hold a Reception of Notable Histrions of the Past Sixty Years,” *Punch*, 19 June 1897, 299.

<sup>43</sup> The pairing thus challenges Wendy Steiner’s requirement of repeated subjects to encourage narrative reading.

<sup>44</sup> George Denholm Armour, “Past and Present, A Sportsman’s Diary,” *Punch*, 19 June 1897, 297.

<sup>45</sup> “Just think of it,” *Punch*, 19 June 1897, 312. Muzzling orders to contain rabies could be issued under the “Dogs Act 1871,” much to the consternation of many owners.

<sup>46</sup> “Extremes Meet: Or, Some Victorian Contrasts, II,” *Punch*, 19 June 1897, 308.

<sup>47</sup> “Extremes Meet: Or, Some Victorian Contrasts, III,” *Punch*, 19 June 1897, 310.

---

<sup>48</sup> “Charles Keenesque Croquet Period,” and Leonard Raven-Hill, “Early Du Maurier Crinoline Period,” *Punch* 19 June 1897, 312.

<sup>49</sup> Suzanne Barber and Matt Hale, “Enacting the Never-Was: Upcycling the Past, Present, and Future in Steampunk,” in *Steaming into a Victorian Future: A Steampunk Anthology*, ed. Julie Anne Taddeo and Cynthia Miller (Plymouth, UK: Scarecrow Press, 2013), 167.

<sup>50</sup> See Joseph Good, “‘God Save the Queen, for Someone Must!’: *Sebastian O* and the Steampunk Aesthetic,” *Neo-Victorian Studies* 3, no. 1 (2010): 208–15.

<sup>51</sup> Shu-chuan Yan writes that “crinolines, beauty, and femininity were conflated in *Punch*.” “‘Politics and Petticoats’: Fashioning the Nation in *Punch* Magazine, 1840s–1880s,” *Fashion Theory* 15, no. 3 (September 2011): 353.

<sup>52</sup> See the discussion of figure I.4 in the introduction to this volume, pp. 000–000.

<sup>53</sup> Grant Morrison and Steve Yeowell, *Sebastian O* (New York: D.C. Comics, 1993), 3.7.

<sup>54</sup> See, for example, Phillip Wegner, “Alan Moore, ‘Secondary Literacy,’ and the Modernism of the Graphic Novel,” *ImageText* 5, no. 3 (2010): n.p.

<sup>55</sup> Alan Moore and Kevin O’Neill, *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen, Volume 1* (La Jolla, CA: American’s Best Comics, 2002). Jason B. Jones writes that the comic thus “firmly corrects the fateful decision [in *Dracula*] to exclude Mina from the vampire-hunters’ planning.”