

Learning Through Victorian Garbage: Disgust and Desire in an Interdisciplinary Capstone Course

Tamara Ketabgian

In Charles Dickens's *Our Mutual Friend*, London is for neither the faint of heart nor of stomach. The novel begins, appropriately enough, with a scene of scavenging and corpse-hunting on the Thames. As we soon learn, in this city “the accumulated scum of humanity seem[s] to be washed from higher grounds, like so much moral sewage,”¹ until it sinks into the river. For members of my class on “Victorian Garbage,” this passage alone has evoked a range of challenging and suggestive meanings. Who or what, my students often ask, performs the washing portrayed here? Does the “scum of humanity” refer to people or to the actual waste and ooze produced by them? While a cursory reading of *Our Mutual Friend* may suggest the latter, this waste still retains an ambivalent association with humans, serving as their material trace and extension. Here, I discuss my experience teaching a class that—so to speak—embraces scum. Designed as an interdisciplinary capstone seminar for juniors and

T. Ketabgian (✉)
Beloit College, Beloit, USA

seniors, “Victorian Garbage” explores the ideas of filth, disease, and contamination in urban nineteenth-century Britain and beyond.

GARBAGE AS TOPIC

Garbage may at first seem a strange topic for a Victorian studies course, but I have found it an exciting approach for imagining classes, categories, and concepts—ways of knowing and seeing that remain central both to the Victorians and to us today. In the words of anthropologist Mary Douglas, waste is “matter out of place”²; by definition, it challenges cultural, psychological, and conceptual boundaries. Indeed, it is impossible to study filth without considering that from which it is presumably excluded: purity, beauty, value, and godliness—all terms that Victorians endowed with specifically gendered and raced connotations. What did it mean to be dirty—and to be clean—in a culture riven by changing notions of urban life and industrial labor, of gender and sexuality, of colony and metropolis, and of social class and economic value? Turning to the raw detritus of London and to the fallen women and “human scum” sketched in the literature by Dickens and his contemporaries, my class examines dirt both literally and metaphorically. How, my students and I ask, do these works address the difficult conceptual problem of disgust? How do they envision the threats and attractions of all that is low? Along with the nineteenth-century novel, “Victorian Garbage” treats materials from a wide variety of fields: anthropology, sociology, psychoanalysis, the visual arts, urban planning, and public health. In turn, this expansive focus has attracted students from a broad range of majors. Since 2003, I have offered the class four times at Beloit College, a small liberal arts college in southern Wisconsin. My students have come from a variety of skill levels and perspectives, but they all pursued final capstone projects and presentations as a crucial component of their learning.

I have benefited from an unusual amount of freedom in my design of “Victorian Garbage.” Unrestricted by literary or historical coverage requirements, I devised the course as a culminating liberal arts seminar devoted to Victorian studies in the most hybrid sense. Paradoxical as it may seem, this English capstone seeks to show how English studies are, at bottom, an interdiscipline. “Victorian Garbage” urges students to read the novel itself as an encyclopedic, interdisciplinary text and to consider realist fiction’s shared origins with journalism, sociology, ethnography, and moral philosophy. Dickens’s *Our Mutual Friend* thus serves as an

ideal lens through which to understand evolving forms of knowledge and value in the nineteenth century—a period that gave rise to so many of the disciplinary categories that we employ today. As one of my students has observed, the resulting approach is “kind of like a landfill ... A whole bunch of topics packed into one class.”³

While its initial emphasis was literary, “Victorian Garbage” soon came to focus on alternate disciplinary theories of purity and contamination. More than a theme, the course’s topic—its hybrid mix of systems, classes, and categories—also forms its unifying method and approach. The class seeks to:

1. introduce students to the process of disciplinary formation in nineteenth-century Britain;
2. investigate garbage and abjection as an intellectual problem with wide-ranging cultural, political, philosophical, and representational implications;
3. expose students to lesser-known primary texts from the Victorian era, such as personal diaries, works of social investigation, and statistical, medical, and architectural documents;
4. explore how literature influenced and sometimes initiated many of the broader social and political movements of the period. By combining literary texts with works from other disciplines, this course seeks to provide a more dynamic account of modern cultural change;
5. offer students an opportunity to pursue—and to present to their peers—substantial individual research projects.⁴

As these goals suggest, learning through garbage should be a critical and integrative process, closely allied with the project of the liberal arts.

In my courses, I have long urged students to draw reflexive connections between the introspective world of fiction and broader social and historical developments. For them, waste is an ideal approach for linking concepts of public space and sanitation with the charmed circle of the middle-class family, home, and nation. What does the containment of sewage and cholera have in common with that famous (if sometimes tired) Victorian duality—the ideology of the separate spheres, with its domestic angels and tainted streetwalkers, its private virtue and public vice? As it happens, quite a lot! Occasionally, students are tempted to reduce these gender binaries to a rigid system, neglecting their fluid

role within a greater nexus of race, class, labor, sexuality, and spirituality. However, a more nuanced view of waste averts such easy stereotypes. By stressing the cultural and ideological work of keeping clean, “Victorian Garbage” both complicates and reinvigorates these binaries, which scholars such as Caroline Levine have recognized for their “crude,” “contradictory,” “but also sometimes operative” powers.⁵

GARBAGE IN PRACTICE

“Victorian Garbage” begins with a tour of several theoretical approaches toward waste, drawn from anthropology, philosophy, and psychoanalysis. After testing these conceptual frameworks with a quick preview of Dickens’s prose, we then turn to other class units: on myths of purity, the city as system, maps of infection, imagining empire, and *Our Mutual Friend*, which serves as the course’s interdisciplinary hub. The class’s second unit, “Fairy Tales,” explores ideologies of gender, class, and the separate spheres, as portrayed in mythic narratives of purity and fertility. Next, in “Tales of the City,” we examine the metropolis as a living being, an economic network, and a field of erotic relations, as treated in visual culture, in social and sanitary investigation, and in private diaries recounting cross-class liaisons. At this point, after more than a third of the semester, we address *Our Mutual Friend* in earnest, reading it slowly and deliberately, along with other period images and texts. Following Dickens’s novel, we then focus on “Mapping Infections” and “Imagining Empire,” which treat maps of London, cholera epidemics, and the global autobiography of Mary Seacole, a multiracial Jamaican nurse who worked in the Crimean War. All the while, students are continually writing and reflecting, whether through quick weekly assignments, brief summary presentations,⁶ or lengthier capstone projects that they research throughout the term and share during the final third of the semester.

In the course’s introductory section, we compare and evaluate different disciplinary methods toward garbage from Mary Douglas’s *Purity and Danger*, Julia Kristeva’s *Powers of Horror*, and William Ian Miller’s *Anatomy of Disgust*, which we pair with sketches from Dickens’s *Uncommercial Traveller*. These readings are among the most difficult and abstract of the course (particularly Kristeva), but, as I tell students, their critical frameworks will support lively open debate

for the remainder of the term. I excerpt the theory sparingly, provide definitions of challenging terms,⁷ and require completion of brief written summaries.

We begin with Douglas's classic work of structuralist anthropology, which addresses social class, taboo, cultural ambiguity, and people acting "out of place"⁸ and station. Treating dirt as a conceptual bridge between cultures, Douglas suggests that nothing is dirty "apart from a particular system of classification in which it does not fit."⁹ Through these "elaborate cosmologies,"¹⁰ we then read Dickens's sketch "Refreshments for Travellers," which satirizes the uncertain status of travelers shocked by the brusque service, disgusting food, and chaotic rail travel of a modern city in flux. In class exercises, my students and I ask: If dirt reveals something about symbolic systems for Douglas, what does it reveal about the symbolic system of Dickens's London? Dickens's narrator may insist he is "a Briton ... [and] never will be a slave,"¹¹ but his uneasy place in this world of upheaval—and its objects uneatable—evokes threats from above, below, and abroad.

Dickens's tale leads neatly to Miller, who defines disgust both as hierarchical relationship and an "aversive" moral judgement. Whereas Miller treats disgust as an emotional "claim to superiority,"¹² Kristeva stresses its gendered aspects, as an ambivalent response spurred by the feminine, the maternal, and the abject—that which is neither subject nor object. Allied with food loathing, bodily waste, and the corpse, the abject inspires awe, horror, repulsion, and repressed identification. Here, again, our class tests Miller's and Kristeva's methods through *The Uncommercial Traveller*,¹³ in sketches that describe particularly modern forms of haunting and taboo—pleasures and anxieties surrounding contamination, national and class identity, maternal authority, and even cannibalism in a world of restless social and physical mobility.

For their first short paper, students build on these conclusions, using examples from *The Uncommercial Traveller* to evaluate a concept of garbage or disgust proposed by one of our assigned theorists. The paper serves as both a bite-size engagement with theory and an accessible introduction to Dickens, encouraging interdisciplinary work while preparing for the greater demands of *Our Mutual Friend*. We end these exploratory approaches with a reflexive turn to Ruskin's critique of waste as a corrupting form of modern urban art, life, and imagination in "Fiction, Fair and Foul." Following Ruskin, we ask: What are the ethical

and aesthetic goals of portraying garbage, and when, if ever, is it proper to do so?

The response to Ruskin's critique lies in his own praise of a controversially abject work: J.M.W. Turner's oil painting *The Slave Ship*, a grim seascape of dead and dying slaves, thrown overboard by slavers who face the divine vengeance of a typhoon on the horizon. Mythically redeeming a scene of gruesome carnage, this painting turns our focus to the magical, ritual pursuit of purity—a course topic that we also examine in Ruskin's "King of the Golden River" and Rossetti's "Goblin Market," an especially subversive lesson on desire and the corrupting forces of the marketplace. Lively and accessible, these fairy tales illustrate the path to successful masculinity and femininity and, in turn, to moral and ecological renewal. They also expose the byzantine formal logic of separate spheres ideology, as canonized by Ruskin in his essay "Of Queen's Gardens." My students and I consider how, as purity rituals, these narratives cast light on the fairy-tale endings that ground both Dickens's fiction and domestic ideology as we know it today.

Cleaning rituals also highlight the complex intersecting identities behind the white middle-class Victorian household, as we learn through the private diaries and photographs of maid-of-all-work Hannah Cullwick and middle-class civil servant Arthur Munby. These texts recount Cullwick and Munby's secret marriage, their erotic role-playing, and their obsession with labor and dirt as transgressive forms of lowness and spiritual virtue. Since current editions are limited,¹⁴ the journals are best introduced by social historian Leonore Davidoff's classic essay and by video clips on domestic labor from PBS's *1900 House*.¹⁵ Blending gender, race, and class, these diaries treat the shifting relation between Munby as an idle, effeminate gentleman and Cullwick as a racialized and masculinized worker, darkened by dirt and even deliberately posing as a slave in blackface—an image students find particularly shocking. In small-group exercises, we use these documents to generate a working definition of the relation between dirt and value—a topic to which we return in *Our Mutual Friend*.

From Cullwick and Munby, we turn to Friedrich Engels's *Condition of the Working Class in England*, which reads the Victorian city as a system dominated not only by production and consumption but also by waste and excretion—the hidden, working-class complement to its industrial wealth. We compare Engels's sociological vision—and his corresponding revolutionary disgust—to other disciplinary approaches toward the

city: woodcut images of urban chaos and construction in *The Illustrated London News* and medical and statistical views of the city by sanitary reformer Edwin Chadwick. In the final weeks of class, we return to these sanitary geographies, both in John Snow's London cholera map (as treated in Steven Johnson's study *The Ghost Map*) and in Mary Seacole's *Wonderful Adventures*, which traces the imperial vectors of war, trade, and disease in a global counter-narrative to Florence Nightingale's sanitary reform at the Crimea.

At this juncture, our class begins *Our Mutual Friend*. We complete the novel in five to six weeks—roughly double the time that I would normally allot to it. In the novel's first chapter, we closely examine Gaffer and Lizzie Hexam's dirty work—their river scavenging—along with related ethnographic sketches from Henry Mayhew's *London Labour and the London Poor*. Why, we ask, does Dickens's narrator describe the Hexams' labor so opaquely and ambivalently? How does this portrait set the stage for *Our Mutual Friend*'s persistent focus on corrupting work? For this opening scene, the 1998 BBC film adaptation spurs helpful discussion of the novel's multidisciplinary texture and point of view.¹⁶ We consider how Dickens uses a blend of ethnographic, economic, and sociological language to portray both river dredgers and other recycling occupations—dustmen, old clothes sellers, taxidermists, and doll's dressmakers, to name only a few. This disciplinary language is specifically addressed in the second short paper for our class, through a targeted discourse and passage analysis of *Our Mutual Friend*.¹⁷ For, as we learn, Dickens's narrative is absolutely premised upon the recycling, redemption, and containment of garbage: The source of the tale's inherited Harmon fortune is dust (salvaged from urban households) and the root of its various mysteries is a recovered and revived corpse.¹⁸ The novel's entire economic food chain is a system of waste and transformation, where glittering middle-class banquets dine off the filth of the river, trading both socially and financially upon a drowned man and his "golden" dust mounds.¹⁹ Even the text's romantic plots rely upon acts of slumming and salvage—of tainted goods and people made magically "bright" again in the "Golden Bower" of domesticity.²⁰

With their massive array of occupations, the first two books of *Our Mutual Friend* are a wonderful resource for in-class exercises. Typically, I ask small groups of students to analyze and report on a particular industry or character in London's vast network of recycling, production, and consumption. Then, I ask these groups to work together on

the chalkboard and produce a conceptual diagram that synthesizes all of these relations. I photograph this diagram, share it, and, at future meetings, ask the class how they would revise and update its various social, economic, and metaphoric links. How do these relations shape different forms of social status and value? Sometimes I have tried to do too much at once with this model, with the unfortunate effect of overwhelming students. I therefore wait until later to invite class members to adapt their diagram to the actual physical geography of Victorian London, with the aid of several excellent online resources, including both historic maps of sites in *Our Mutual Friend* and current tagged Google maps.²¹

We revisit this conceptual model at the novel's end, where, in a short written assignment, students explore how they would remap *Our Mutual Friend*'s world of garbage and value. After what we now know, where should we locate value and waste in Dickens's London—and according to whose (or what) measure? How does this text redefine the relation between money and moral value—and between physical and human garbage? Returning to the chalkboard, we redraft our earlier diagram to reflect this novel's new moral geography of character and occupation, which so often finds virtue in the lowest of the low. *Our Mutual Friend*, however, also resists easy answers. I urge students to debate how this narrative still ends with its own mythic (and parodic) cleanup job: a final domestic sorting, revaluation, and devaluation of various characters to their respective marriage plots and scavenger carts.

While keeping students on task can be challenging, "Victorian Garbage" moves most smoothly when we read roughly 200 pages of *Our Mutual Friend* a week, with an occasional pause for other brief approaches and exercises, including the abstracts and annotated bibliographies required for the course's final capstone project. The topic of the project is relatively open: Students must explore a specific issue or problem surrounding garbage, the Victorians, or any combination of the two. I welcome not only traditional academic papers but also research projects that employ digital media or creative writing, use comparative approaches, or examine contemporary culture. This openness can sometimes overwhelm students, although I use conferences to help them narrow down their subjects and research plans. Class members receive additional feedback when they present their ongoing work during the later weeks of the term.

In recent years, "Victorian Garbage" has attracted increasing numbers of creative writers interested in crafting historical, steampunk, or

neo-Victorian fiction. For these creative projects, I have learned to require an accompanying critical essay, which encourages students to address their research more explicitly and analytically, while also providing me with a clearer critical rubric for assessment. Successful projects have run the gamut, ranging from fiction ironizing the Cullwick–Munby diaries, to readings of the TV series *Hoarders* and Victorian commodity fetishism, to a study of concepts of sisterhood in Rossetti’s poetry and charity reform work. Many of the most path-breaking projects have drawn from digitized periodicals, although access to these expensive resources is a continual struggle for smaller institutions like mine. Despite these challenges, however, I have been pleased by the enthusiasm and inventiveness of my students, whose projects speak to the continuing relevance of Victorian interdisciplinarity.

REFLECTION

Like *Our Mutual Friend* itself, “Victorian Garbage” is a loose, baggy monster—and is thus particularly hard to assess from an objective learning standpoint. Yet students have appreciated the course’s use of different disciplinary methods. Both in their course evaluations and more informally, they advise me to stress—very clearly—how and why the class differs from the pacing and emphasis of a usual literature course. As one student suggests, “I would explain what the course was and how it links different disciplines and really helps your brain think in a completely different way than usual.” Another writes, “It’s the perfect interdisciplinary course and, true to Beloit’s values, it’s as relevant outside of the classroom as it is inside.” A vocal minority of students have wanted the class to include more fiction and less theory and period nonfiction. At times I agree, but then I remember how, when I first offered the course, I muddled its interdisciplinary focus by assigning too many novels and did not provide students with enough time to research, share, and revise their capstone projects. Since then, I have noticed that the quality of writing and classroom engagement improves markedly when we read slowly, carefully, and with attention to different ways of knowing.

One of the particular attractions of “Victorian Garbage” is the rich perspective gained by teaching advanced class members from many disciplines outside of English. At Beloit, I am able to shape these enrollments carefully (often through personal interviews), but I realize this practice may be impossible at institutions serving greater numbers

of students or employing more rigid registration systems. Nonetheless, at many schools “Victorian Garbage” could still be offered as an upper-level honors college seminar or as a course in environmental studies or the medical humanities. Without its capstone project, its introductory theory, and its explicitly interdisciplinary focus, the class could also serve as a themed, intermediate Victorian literature class, perhaps by bookending *Our Mutual Friend* with Elizabeth Gaskell’s *Mary Barton* and Thomas Hardy’s *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*.

“Victorian Garbage” could expand in other directions as well. Since I first taught the course in 2003, scholarly resources on garbage, recycling, disgust, and abjection have exploded. Environmental studies is now a burgeoning field of study, providing students with an exciting range of theoretical approaches toward the Anthropocene, the posthuman, and object-oriented ontologies. In addition, the course could engage more closely with the intersection between urban mapping and digital humanities, with the racial politics of empire and ecology (which we treat briefly in Seacole’s *Adventures*), and with steampunk and neo-Victorian literature such as Michael Faber’s *The Crimson Petal and the White*. Yet, whatever direction one pursues with garbage, in the words of *Our Mutual Friend*’s taxidermist Mr. Venus, it is sure to provide a “general panoramic view”²²—of both the Victorian world and our own.

APPENDIX: FROM THE CLASSROOM

PAPER: Theory and Practice

Papers should be 4 pages in length. Quote *at least once* from Dickens and from a theorist read in class.

In his sketches for *The Uncommercial Traveller*, how does Dickens engage with concepts of garbage posed by a theorist we have read (Douglas, Kristeva, Miller, or Ruskin)?

NOTE: This topic is a broad “prompt” for more pointed and specific claims that students will define, pursue, and winnow. Students should be asked to generate topics of interest that they might pursue in their papers. Some suggestions:

- Order and disorder
- Spirituality and the sacred
- Ritual and daily practice
- The abject
- Phobia, anxiety, and/or the threat of contamination
- Production and consumption
- Social class/status
- Gender and/or sexuality
- Race and/or ethnicity
- Anthropology, ethnography, travel, journalism.

PAPER: Reading Our Mutual Friend

Papers should be 4 pages in length. Quote *at least once* from Dickens and from a theorist read in class or another text (see list below).

Compare and contrast the treatment of a common topic, problem, image, or metaphor in *Our Mutual Friend* and a text from another disciplinary (or proto-disciplinary) tradition.

The second text should be by one of the following authors: Cullwick/Munby/Davidoff (social history), Engels (sociology), Chadwick (public health), Mayhew (anthropology), Marx (philosophy/political economy), Patten (publication/media history), or an article presented by a student in class. Papers should carefully consider the use of language and other organizing conceptual, rhetorical, and/or disciplinary practices in the two texts. For instance: How do their attitudes and approaches resemble or vary from each other? How do they make arguments (rhetoric) and what counts as evidence? How do we know what we know (epistemology) and which defining concepts, structures, or categories (epistemes) help organize this information?

NOTE: As above, students should be asked to generate topics as points of departure that they might pursue in their papers. Some suggestions (in addition to ones listed above):

- Individual/collective psychology
- Urban/industrial culture
- Mapping: bodies, classes, spaces, empires (“reading the city”): central and marginal sites

- Realism and representation (descriptive and/or normative aims: what is vs. what should be)
- Qualitative and quantitative analysis
- Crowds, density, mixing, promiscuity, contiguity
- Domesticity: public and private spaces (separate spheres)
- Purity and corruption (literal and figurative)
- Recycling economies
- Sewers and rivers
- Food, hunger, cannibalism, predation, adulteration
- Narrative structure and technique: plot, suspense, description, narration, audience.

Final Capstone Projects and Presentations

Project Overview

Research projects may focus on texts discussed in class or on other texts and questions surrounding garbage, the Victorians, or any combination of the two. Students should devise specific topics. Students should be encouraged to undertake comparative projects (different cultures, different texts, different time periods, different media), explore interdisciplinary topics and questions, or complete projects involving digital media or creative writing.

- Scholarly papers should be at least 15 pages
- Digital media or creative writing projects should be accompanied by a substantive explanation (at least 6 pages) of how the work relates to the course theme, and should address relevant critical and scholarly sources, demonstrating that the project is grounded in research
- Projects should be preceded by an abstract, annotated bibliography, and oral presentation about the topic (see below)

Abstract and Annotated Bibliography

- The *Abstract* should be a one- to two-paragraph description of the topic, outlining tentative arguments, questions to be asked, approaches being taken, and evidence to be used
- The *Annotated Bibliography* should summarize at least four sources, offering one or two sentences that demonstrate the source's relevance to the project

- Electronic sources should be subject to editorial review and accessed through the library Web site (Wikipedia and personal Web sites are not normally appropriate sources)
- Personal conferences to discuss students' projects are strongly recommended.

Project Presentations

Oral presentations should be required in class as a means of helping students jump-start their writing and research. Presentations should be 10–15 minutes and serve as works in progress. These graded assignments should:

- Demonstrate that a student is already involved in researching and seriously thinking about a research topic
- Provide a tentative road map or abstract of the project
- Pose questions and issues that follow from the topic
- Engage classmates' assistance in shaping the final project
- Offer a useful sample of the work or works to be discussed or created
- Discuss how the topic relates to the greater focus of the course.

Presentations should be accompanied by a brief (1-page) handout including the abstract, a bibliography of relevant works, and helpful excerpts or images (if relevant).

NOTES

1. Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, p. 30.
2. Douglas, p. 44.
3. Levelling.
4. Ketabgian.
5. Levine.
6. During the first half of the term, these short student presentations (no more than five minutes) provide a helpful summary background to various historical and theoretical topics not addressed in readings or my own brief lectures.
7. To introduce students to Kristeva and abjection, I use Elizabeth Wright's entry on Kristeva from *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary* (Wright, "Julia Kristeva"), and Dino de Felluga's helpful web resource "Modules on Kristeva," now available in print in (Felluga, "Abject [Abjection]").

8. Douglas, p. 44.
9. Douglas, p. xvii.
10. Douglas, p. 6.
11. Dickens, "Uncommercial Traveller," p. 169.
12. Miller, p. 9.
13. We focus on the sketches "Travelling Abroad," "City of London Churches," and, if time permits, "Nurse's Stories."
14. The two editions are Cullwick, *Diaries of Hannah Cullwick* and Hudson, *Munby: Man of Two Worlds*.
15. I have found Davidoff's second-wave feminist essay to be the most accessible and concise introduction, despite its overly schematic framework and relative silence on race and empire (Davidoff, "Class and Gender"). Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather* fills this gap, although it is better suited for a short student presentation than as a class reading (McClintock, "'Massa' and Maids").
16. I highly recommend the BBC adaptation, which is complemented by an educational Web site developed in conjunction with the UCSC Dickens Project in 1989 and reedited in 2012. See The Dickens Project, "*Our Mutual Friend*." The Web site includes a massive bibliography of critical scholarship on *Our Mutual Friend*, as well as information on the novel's serialization, publication, MS plans, original advertisements, illustrations, reviews, and historical references, along with letters from Dickens during the novel's composition.
17. For this second paper, as well as the first, students generate their own topic threads in class. They may write the paper without finishing the novel in its entirety.
18. We encounter such corpses in the plot not only of John Harmon/John Rokesmith's mistaken identity but also of both Eugene Wrayburn and Rogue Riderhood, both of whom are retrieved and revived from the river. On these rebirths and their relation to the novel's various recycling economies and fortunes, see Gallagher, "The Bioeconomics of *Our Mutual Friend*."
19. Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, p. 138.
20. Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, pp. 757, 748.
21. Helpful period maps of *Our Mutual Friend* include: Dickens Project, "London in 1862," and Perdue, "Map of Dickens's London." As of this writing, two recent Google maps of *Our Mutual Friend* are Holdsworth, "London Literary Locations" and Biggins, "*Our Mutual Friend* Map." A more generally useful resource is "Locating London's Past," which does not focus on Dickens but provides a GIS interface between the 1863–1880 Ordnance Survey map and a current Google map ("Locating London's Past").
22. Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, p. 86.

WORKS CITED

- Biggins, Peter. "Our Mutual Friend Map." *CommunityWalk*. http://www.communitywalk.com/our_mutual_friend_map/map/396146.
- Cullwick, Hannah. *The Diaries of Hannah Cullwick, Victorian Maidservant*, edited by Liz Stanley. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1984.
- Davidoff, Leonore. "Class and Gender in Victorian England." In *Sex and Class in Women's History: Essays from Feminist Studies*, edited by Judith L. Newton, Mary P. Ryan, and Judith R. Walkowitz, 16–71. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.
- De Felluga, Dino. "Abject (Abjection)." *Critical Theory: The Key Concepts*, 3–5. London: Routledge, 2015.
- . "Modules on Kristeva: On the Abject." *Introductory Guide to Critical Theory*. Purdue University. <http://www.purdue.edu/guidetotheory/psychoanalysis/kristevaabject.html>.
- Dickens, Charles. *Our Mutual Friend*, edited by Adrian Poole. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997.
- . "The Uncommercial Traveller." In *Selected Short Fiction*, edited by Deborah A. Thomas, 1860. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- Dickens Project. "London in 1862: Places in *Our Mutual Friend*." University of California-Santa Cruz. <http://omf.ucsc.edu/london-1865/victorian-city/london-map.html>.
- . "*Our Mutual Friend*: The Scholarly Pages." University of California-Santa Cruz. <http://omf.ucsc.edu>.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge, 1966.
- Faber, Michael. *The Crimson Petal and the White*. London: Harvest, 2002.
- Gallagher, Catherine. "The Bioeconomics of *Our Mutual Friend*." In *The Body Economic: Life, Death, and Sensation in Political Economy and the Victorian Novel*, 86–117. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Holdsworth, Rachel. "London Literary Locations: *Our Mutual Friend*." *Londonist*, 21 June 2013. <http://londonist.com/2013/06/london-literary-locations-our-mutual-friend>.
- Holmes, Derek. *Munby: Man of Two Worlds: The Life and Diaries of Arthur J. Munby, 1828–1910*. London: Gambit, 1972.
- Ketabgian, Tamara. "Victorian Garbage: Course Syllabus," Beloit College, August 2011.
- Levelling, Katie. "Trash or Treasure." *Beloit College Magazine*, Spring 2010. https://magazine.beloit.edu/?story_id=241036&issue_id=240622.
- Levine, Caroline. "Strategic Formalism: Towards a New Method in Cultural Studies." *Victorian Studies* 48, no. 4 (2006): 627–30.
- "Locating London's Past." <http://www.locatinglondon.org/index.html>.

- McClintock, Anne. "'Massa' and Maids: Power and Desire in the Imperial Metropolis." In *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*, 77–131. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Miller, William Ian. "Darwin's Disgust." In *The Anatomy of Disgust*, 1–23. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Patten, Robert L., "The Composition, Publication, and Reception of *Our Mutual Friend*." In Dickens Project, *Our Mutual Friend: The Scholarly Pages*. University of California-Santa Cruz: <http://omf.ucsc.edu/publication/comp-and-pub.html>.
- Perdue, David. "Map of Dickens's London." http://charlesdickenspage.com/dickens_london_map.html.
- Wright, Elizabeth. "Julia Kristeva." In *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary*, 194–8. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Tamara Ketabgian is Professor of English at Beloit College. She is the author of *The Lives of Machines: The Industrial Imaginary in Victorian Literature and Culture* (University of Michigan Press, 2011), in addition to various articles and book chapters on nineteenth-century literature and science. Her research has received fellowship support from the American Philosophical Society and the American Council of Learned Societies. She is currently working on a book project entitled "Contrivance: Faith, Persuasion, and Technology in Victorian Scientific and Literary Culture," which explores fantasies of technological design and spiritual intelligence from Charles Babbage to the present.

Teaching Victorian Literature in the Twenty-First
Century

A Guide to Pedagogy

Cadwallader, J.; Mazzeno, L.W. (Eds.)

2017, XXV, 342 p. 9 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-58885-8