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ABSTRACT
This article critically reviews the international works that situate Charles Dickens from a global perspective. The current ‘global’ turn in Dickens’s scholarship and in Victorian literary and cultural studies in general led to a heated debate among scholars and researchers on why there is no complete, comprehensive global study on Dickens. Scholars also disagree on whether systematic or non-systematic methodologies are efficient in the completion of what became known as the Global Dickens Project in the late 1960’s. In this paper, I will refer to the scholarly attempts that aimed to bring Dickens to world audiences. Special attention will be given to the challenges and gaps as far as methodology is concerned, suggesting, in the end, a more effective and productive methodology for systematic scholars.
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1. Introduction
It is important to note that works on the globalization of Dickens are few. One early and significant work is conducted by Ada Blanche Nisbet. In “Global Dickens” (2009), John O. Jordan, the former director of the Dickens Project at the University of California, Santa Cruz, gives an account of Nisbet’s work and explains why it was incomplete. In the late 1960s, Nisbet hoped to complete a work on Dickens titled Charles Dickens: International Guide to Study and Research, which was regarded, said Jordan, as ‘the most important research and reference tool in Dickens studies for many years to come’ (p. 1211). According to Nisbet, this project will evaluate and analyze the autobiographies, criticism, adaptations, and locations of Dickens’s novels. The project also aimed to find the influence of Dickens on international creative writers. Nisbet invited many scholars to write about the relationship between Dickens and their own literature and cultures. What we can notice is the existence of one contribution only about Dickens in Egypt. This is because Nisbet’s network with Arab and Muslim writers whose interest is Dickens is very limited.

Nisbet hoped that her project would prove Dickens’s global reputation in the end. Nisbet was in the vanguard of finding Dickens’s history and circulation in America and Britain, while the task of many international scholars was to examine the circulation, criticism, and translations of Dickens in world languages. In Nisbet’s own words, she described these international essays as “very exciting indeed, opening up materials in other languages the Anglo-American club has never heard about” (Jordan, 2009, p. 1211). Nisbet’s project was divided into two volumes. The first volume dealt with Dickens in America and England, i.e., Dickens in English, and the second volume, which included twenty-three essays, examined Dickens in other languages, including his translation into Arabic. Jordan writes in his essay that “Dickens in Arabic includes discussion of the Arabic translation of Dickens’s novels as well as critical commentary in both Arabic and English by scholars in the Arab world” (p. 1213). Nisbet’s Egypt contributor, Nur Sherif, published her contribution entitled Dickens in Arabic, which focuses only on some critical reviews and Arabic translations of Dickens in Egypt individually in 1974.
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2. Nisbet’s Personal Issues
Although Nisbet hoped to publish the guide in 1970 to coincide with the centenary of Dickens’s death, the work was unfinished due to Nisbet’s illness in mid-1980 and death in 1994 (Jordan, 2009). In addition to health issues, Nisbet’s hopes to tell the story of Dickens in Europe were overambitious. Moreover, some contributors were hard to find, especially in India. Other contributions proved to be very slow in arriving. In April 1981, Nisbet wrote to her contributors:

In my desperate effort to keep up with the flood of books and articles on Mr. D. written in English, I have had little time for correspondence – a situation I trust all of you will understand. You will probably not hear from me again in the months to come unless you have a specific problem you write to me about [...] My friends. (Jordan, 2009, p. 1214)

After Nisbet’s letter in 1981, many contributors were frustrated at the slow pace of the project’s completion. Some contributors decided to withdraw from the project. Some others, including Sherif, have published their essays independently.

Nisbet’s over ambitions, health problems, and difficulties in finding contributors are not the only reasons why her international guide to Dickens remained incomplete. According to Jordan, one important reason is that Nisbet did not make the most of technology. Jordan claims that “It is sometimes painful to examine the flimsy air letters exchanged at great intervals between Professor Nisbet and her far-flung contributors” (Jordan, 2009, pp. 1214–1215). Correspondences via air letters proved to be very slow. Jordan added that the emergence of the aeroplane did not speed up the letters enough between Nisbet and her contributors. Therefore, Nisbet’s international bibliography of Dickens was ‘a casualty of the postal system’ (p. 1215). I strongly agree with Jordan that the use of technology would have accelerated the pace of correspondence between Nisbet and her contributors. Technology, as I will show in the last section of the article, would help contributors track the historical dissemination of Dickens’s works in libraries and archives. It can also help them find the influence of Dickens on their literature in less time and cost possible.

Nisbet’s archive contains almost nothing about Dickens’s reception in Africa. There is some information about Dickens in the Middle East, Egypt in particular, as previously mentioned, but nothing relevant to the Middle East or sub-Saharan Africa – though perhaps a little on translation into Afrikaans. The critical reception of Dickens in Egypt, especially during the 1920s and 1930s, was minimal. Egyptians were more interested in the translation of Dickens than in criticism. Sherif (1974) maintains that it is not “until much later in the century that there appears a small number of critical essays analysing his [Dickens] technique as a novelist” (p. 25). A few essays on Dickens were published in some Egyptian periodicals, such as Rushdi Mikhail Al-Sisi’s “Dickens and H. G. Wells,” published in Al-Resala in 1934. In this article, Dickens was compared to Wells, and after comparison, Al-Sisi argues that the former has a lasting worldwide reputation because his humour and melodrama made him sound like an artist. The criticism that can be said about this essay is that Al-Sisi was unable to support his argument as his analysis was based on one work only, which is A Tale of Two Cities (pp. 27–28). According to Al-Sisi, what contributed to Dickens’s greatness are his humanitarianism, imagination, and humour.

In the 1940s and 1950s, a revival in Dickens’s criticism was witnessed in Egypt. Some of the critical essays include Ezzat Arafa’s “Charles Dickens: The Genius and Characteristics of his Art,” published in a magazine known as Al-Resala in 1943, and Mubarak Ibrahim’s “The Quarrel between Dickens and Thackeray,” published in 1949 in a magazine called Al-Thaqafa. According to Sherif, if we add these essays to the articles, the abridgements and Arabic translations of Dickens during the 1920s and 1930s, “it will become clear that the Arabic reader’s knowledge of Dickens was beginning to extend beyond A Tale of Two Cities” (Sherif, 2009, p. 28). In 1952, Al-Thaqafa published Mobarek Ibrahim’s article entitled “Walter Scott and Charles Dickens.” This essay shows that Dickens is a great satirist. In 1958, a magazine known as Al-Adab published “Dickens’s Critics,” whose contributor remained unknown. The unknown writer has shown “The variety of interests, from the viewpoint of both form and content, that each has discovered in his works [Dickens’s works]. This essay may help the Arabic reader to realize the wealth that lies hidden in Dickens’s novels, which he will find rewarding if he gives them the attention they deserve” (p. 30). This essay and the last two articles demonstrate the twentieth-century Egyptian appreciation of Dickens. They reveal that the personal, literary, technical, and artistic features of Dickens’s works are at the core of his early reception in Egypt, especially during the twentieth-century. Although it is right that the essays contributed to extending the knowledge of Arab readers of Dickens, the articles can be criticized for being less critical.

It was not until the twenty-first century that Arab critics from Egypt, Palestine, and Jordan started to write commentaries about the Arabic translations of Dickens. From the 1970s to the 2000s, three major critical works on Dickens were published. These include Sherif’s Dickens in Arabic 1912–1970 (1974), Faysal Mikdadi’s “David Copperfield in Arabic,” published in The Dickensian in 1979, and Fatima Muhaidat’s PhD thesis and subsequent book A Tale of Two Cities in Arabic in 2005 (Jordan, 2009, pp. 1216–1217). These contributions focus primarily on the history of Dickens’ Arabic translations and briefly explain the appeal of Dickens’s works to
Arab educators and translators. They left a considerable gap in scholarship about the globalization of Dickens in northern Africa, the Middle East (except Egypt, Lebanon, and Jordan), and Asian Muslim countries.

The academic reception of Dickens in Arabic began in Egypt when *A Tale of Two Cities* was used in many schools after it was translated into Arabic (Sherif, 1974, p. 32). As a result, many students often choose to write their dissertations on the analysis of Dickens’s novels. In 1956, Ahmad Kamel Metwali finished an MA thesis entitled *The Theme of Poverty in the Works of Charles Dickens* at the University of Wales. At Manchester University in 1961, Metwali completed a PhD thesis under the title *Charles Dickens as a Social Critic*. Zeineb M. Raafat completed an MA thesis titled *Melodrama in Charles Dickens’s Writings* in 1962 at the University of Wales. These dissertations demonstrate that Egyptian students were primarily interested in the thematic, social, and melodramatic aspects of Dickens’s novels. The criticism that can be made about these dissertations is that they are only about Dickens’s fiction. They did not investigate the relationship between Dickens’s writings and Islamic literature and cultures. They also did not examine the use of Dickens’s novels in Egyptian school curricula and how this contributed to the increase of his popularity, especially among educators and students. These dissertations remained unpublished and did not contribute to the foundation of a branch of research on Dickens, neither in Egypt nor in the Muslim world.

**2.1 Hollington and Jordan’s Anglo-centric Contributions**

*The Reception of Dickens in Europe*, edited by Hollington in 2013, confirms the growing awareness of Dickens as a global writer, particularly in Europe. Dickens “has ‘spoken to,’ and been heard not only by people living in some small offshore islands in northwest Europe but by people of different races, cultures and languages everywhere” (p. 1). Hollington adds to Jordan’s explanation of why Nisbet’s guide, which inspired his project on Dickens in Europe, was not published. This is mainly because one main manuscript—the contribution to the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* was lost in a taxi when Nisbet visited Cambridge (p. 1). Cambridge is, therefore, at the centre of Dickens’s global story. As a member of the Cambridge Dickens Fellowship during the period of 2016 and 2017, I noticed during the monthly scholarly meetings at Wolfson College that there was an absence of works on Dickens and the world. The fellowship did not encourage the restoration of what had been lost by Nisbet. After Nisbet’s death in 1994, her letters and archives were neglected (p. 2).

Nisbet’s brother Bob states in an interview with Hollington in 2007 that he gave the archives and letters of Nisbet to the Dickens Project at California Santa Cruz University. Bob hoped that “Other scholars might eventually bring the results of her labour to some kind of fruition and that Santa Cruz was the place where this was most likely to happen” (Hollington, 2013, p. 2). The archives, which Bob Nisbet left at the Dickens Project, initially aroused little scholarly interest for two main reasons. First, scholars doubted the existence of archives on Dickens in Europe. Second, there was a continuing Anglo-centric view of Dickens. In his three weeks’ stay in California, Hollington claims that he was the first scholar in twenty-five years to examine the content of Nisbet’s archives. This proves that there was less scholarly interest in the archives, though the global reception and influence of Dickens seem today to be a growing subject of interest since the centenary of Dickens’s death in 1970.

In a volume of essays published in *Global Dickens*, Jordan and Perera (2012) emphasize the need to consider Dickens a global author. *Global Dickens* focuses on the influence, reception, and travelogue works of Dickens outside the English world. Jordan and Perera write that the contributors to the volume came from different cultures and geographical locations (Jordan and Perera, Introduction). *Global Dickens* consists of four parts. The first part examines Dickens’s reception in many countries, such as Russia, Australia, China, Japan, Spain, and France. The last three parts examine the intertextuality and impact of Dickens on some world writers as well as the travelogue of Dickens’s writings, arguing that he is an international traveller (p. Introduction). Similar to Hollington’s *The Reception of Charles Dickens in Europe*, *Global Dickens* fails to cover the globalization of Dickens all over the world. Although it teases out the intertextual parallels and relations between Dickens and colonial African authors, including Wole Soyinka and Ngugi wa Thiong’o, *Global Dickens* makes no reference to writers in northern Africa. It also did not show how *All the Year Round* and *Household Words* can be used to increase Dickens’s editorial effect and appeal, especially through their representation of nineteenth-century Arab and Islamic culture and history. As in Nisbet’s international guide, *Global Dickens* contains no contribution to the globalization of Dickens in the Arab and Muslim world.

**3. The Limitation of the Systematic Approach**

Another issue why global Dickens’s projects are never complete is due to the systematic approach. Juliet John, the Head of the Department of English at Royal Holloway University, is doubtful about the value of Jordan’s systematic approach in the completion of the global Dickens project. John argues in her article “Global Dickens: A Response to John Jordan,” published in 2012, that “if global literary studies have taught us anything, it is that bibliographical projects such as Nisbet’s will never be complete” (p. 502). John argues that scholars, including Jordan, had better “avoid any wholesale study of the same because of the impossibility of reaching any ‘systematic’ and watertight conclusions” (p. 503). Any systematic documentation and scholarly collaboration on Dickens’s influence on world literature and culture would take hundreds of years. John asserts that mass culture, such as British Council celebrations and film festivals, plays a crucial role in the promotion of Dickens. One of the key events, appreciated by John,
is the Council’s global Read-a-Thon, which included many Arab countries, such as Syria, Lebanon, UAE, Kuwait, Morocco, Oman, and Palestine. I agree with John that the systematic approach is time consuming. Moreover, the Read-a-Thon and many film festivals show how Dickens crossed borders, especially into unfamiliar places that were not covered yet in systematic global Dickens’s projects. The conferences organized by the British Council coinciding with Dickens’s 200 anniversary show the influence of Dickens had on world literature, societies, politics, and cultures. However, the British Council should not only celebrate Dickens using social media but rather organize adaptations, screenings, and local readings of Dickens’s novels.

4. The Limitation of Methodology

Although technology hindered Nisbet from achieving better results and accelerating the pace of her project, technology in global Dickens research is thought to be fruitless. In her ‘Response to John Jordan,’ John (2012) rejects Jordan’s call for using technology in systematic projects to complete Dickens’s globalization. John states that technology during Dickens’s period was relatively little used:

The relative lack of information technology in the 19th century means that records about Dickens’s reception, sales, and circulation are, even in Britain and America – the most evolved markets for all things Dickensian – partial and incomplete, as Robert L. Patten’s seminal work Charles Dickens and his Publishers (1978) attests. (p. 503)

Although technology is widespread today, John is still doubtful about its advantages. Jordan’s calling for the use of information technology is also seen as confusing because facts show that Jordan and Nisbet relied heavily on printed texts and archives. I will believe that setting up an online platform either by the British Council, Dickens Societies and Fellowships would enable international readers, researchers, academics, and scholars write about how they discovered Dickens, what it is in Dickens’s works that appeals to them, and to what extent Dickens impacted their imagination and literature. Then, the findings will be edited and published in a larger scale volume of essays than that of Jordan and Nirshan.

Another criticism of Jordan’s article is that it presented Nisbet as the first one to think about Dickens’s long history in the European languages. In fact, George Ford’s Dickens and His Readers (1955) drew connections between Dickens’s literature and Europe (Hollington, 2013, p. 2). The translation and reception of Dickens in some European nations is also problematic. Shortly before his death, Dickens was not well received in Germany. Despite its popularity in the Anglophone world, Our Mutual Friend was not known in Germany, and to the date when Hollington and many leading critics and translators started writing The Reception of Dickens in Europe in 2007, it had still not been translated into German, Czech or Bulgarian (Hollington, 2013). After Dickens’s death in 1870, many critics saw Dickens as one of the founding fathers of realism. Richard Ford appreciated Oliver Twist in his review of the novel in 1839 because of its ability to “open up a new world unknown to thousands bred and born in the same city” depicting “the mother-wit, the low humour of the lower classes, their Sanscrit, their hitherto unknown tongue” (p. 3). In some European countries, Dickens was highly appreciated by European children, who enjoyed his works because of their entertainment value. Many European writers and admirers, including Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, were influenced by Dickens. Despite its usefulness, The Reception of Dickens in Europe fails to track the global status of the whole European continent. Countries that were covered include Germany, Russia, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium and the Netherlands. The book fails to cover the whole European continent.

Dickens’s continuing popularity can be attributed to the circulation of his works worldwide. One influential work is Regenia Gagnier’s article entitled “The Global Circulation of Charles Dickens’s Novels,” published in 2013. Gagnier seems to be less interested in the appreciation and originality of Dickens but rather in Dickens’s transmission, use, revoicing, and transculturation. Gagnier writes that several aspects of Dickens’s novels are appealing to international readers and critics, particularly dialect and social criticism. Gagnier (2013) writes:

When we consider the role of Dickens in cultural translation and transculturation, he has ‘meant’ both migration and settlement, class warfare, revolution, critique of neo-colonial ideological state apparatuses, care of orphans/children, critique of capitalism, socialism, gender and domestic relations, sociology and psychology of crime and deprivation, Christian solutions to social divisions and suffering, dialect, and the vernaculars of the street. (p. 82)

Gagnier maintains here that Dickens’s social criticism, language, and ideology contributed to the appeal and affection in which he is held across the world. The numerous factors that also helped to increase the circulation and popularity of Dickens include international conferences, museums, fellowships, and public consumption, such as Old Curiosity Shoppe, Dickens Inns, Artful Dodger Pubs, and so forth (Gagnier, 2013). Works that are published to date on global Dickens tend to focus on the reception and circulation of Dickens’s novels. However, more work is needed to assess the cultural transformations that resulted from reading
and watching the adaptations of cinema as well as the role of Dickens in changing the sociocultural and political formations of societies where Dickens is in the canon.

As stated earlier in the article, many works on global Dickens encountered several challenges in methodology. This article responds to Dickens’s scholars who have conflicting views on the usefulness of technology, empiricism, and textual analysis in the completion of global Dickens projects. The preposition and use of methodology stem from its usefulness and consideration of the research nature rather than due to its tradition. Patrick McNeil and Steve Chapman (2005) argue that the nature of research determines the choice of research method. Others claim that what affects the choice of methodology is the aims of the research undertaken (Opoku, Vian, & Julius, 2016). Global Dickens projects had better follow a qualitative research approach, including online research method, empiricism, and textual analysis.

The use of the online method corresponds with Dickens’s interest in modern technologies. In Charles Dickens in Cyberspace: The Afterlife of the Nineteenth Century in Postmodern Culture (2003), Jay Clayton claims that if we are able to think of an English Victorian novelist who would sit before a computer, use the World Wide Web, click on various databases, make an electronic calendar and send emails to several correspondents, that would be Dickens. Clayton writes that “More than any other writer of the nineteenth century, Dickens would have been fascinated by the Internet. Throughout his long career, he exhibited a passion for new technology and eagerly exploited every innovation in the communications and transportation networks of his day” (p. 3). Dickens wrote admiringly about the railway, the steam engine, the London Post Office, and the telegraph. Dickens was a believer in the new forms of advertising in his journals, such as by inventing serials. Clayton declares that “if Dickens did not invent a publishing technology, he was invariably what is known in computer circles as an early adopter” (p. 4). According to Clayton, the phrase “Conducted by Dickens,” which headed All the Year Round and Household Words, serves today as an information outlet that is very similar to a corporate home page (p. 4).

Works that suggest the use of technological sources include Jordan and Perera’s Global Dickens, which attributes the global circulation of Dickens to new technologies. These take various forms, such as films, videos, radios, and the internet, which “make him available in forms unimaginable a century ago” (Jordan and Perera, 2012, p. xx). In “Global Dickens” (2009), Jordan calls for more use of technology when he asserts:

> The availability of new technologies and the growing interest in the globalization of literary studies and the global circulation of literary texts have no doubt contributed to such research. New paradigms, new theoretical approaches, new models of what constitutes the national and the literary – especially in the fields of book history and postcolonial studies – have altered the meaning of the term ‘Dickens’ for purposes of scholarly analysis. (p. 1215)

Technology can help researchers access library catalogues and archives showing the dissemination of Dickens’s novels. Technology also enables the discovery of a whole database that reveals Dickens’ theatrical and cinematic adaptations in various cinemas and theatres.

In the pre-computer era, literary linguistics used manual analysis. When computers spread widely, different web applications appeared. In order to bring novelty to the analysis of Dickens’s language, the University of Birmingham introduced a web application known as CLiC. This online platform helps corpus linguists gain new insights into the creation of meanings in Dickens’s literary texts (Mahlberg et al., 2016, p. 435). Users of the CLiC application insert the concept, such as a theme or a character, and the application automatically finds the results.

CLiC contributes to the scholarly debate regarding tracking characterization in Dickens’s fiction using technology. It also helps in bringing Dickens’s literature into digital and computational linguistics. Many researchers involved in testing CLiC declare:

> We have found that using CLiC to explore readerly effects in Dickens has led to a more exceptional integrative approach than we had expected. An initial presumption was that we would be able to use corpus linguistic tools and methods in order to test cognitive poetic claims about texture and then validate, reject, or revise those claims, and then produce a more productive, more complex, and more compelling account of the interaction of textual patterns and readerly effects than had previously been possible. (Mahlberg et al., 2016, p. 456)

The use of CLiC opens new channels of research using web applications to enrich the debate about validating and rejecting some claims related to the novels and their themes and characterizations. CLiC supports the analysis of discourse in narrative fiction. Researchers used to access Dickens’s journalism manually in libraries. They used to travel hundreds and thousands of miles coming to London’s Senate House Library in order to access archives of these journals if they were stocked on shelves. One main problem
that most researchers face when accessing these journals is that they cannot borrow them (Drew, 2012). Due to these difficulties, the University of Buckingham liaised with Archive.org and made open online access to All the Year Round and Household Words in 2006. Dickens Journals Online helps researchers across the world to read and download journal items with just one click. Dickens Journals Online (DJO) shows Dickens’s vision of crossing the border and his hope to bring his journalism to world readers.

Technology also enables researchers to collect data. Technology plays a significant role in advancing the pace of human, social, and scientific research. It has an impact not only on data collection but also on the identification of the problem, the review of the literature, and the identification of the population (Sappleton, 2013). Nathalie Sappleton states that “Online social networking tools like Facebook and Twitter can also help a researcher identify the problem areas for possible research” (p. 4). This statement evinces that researchers often use social media to circulate their preliminary ideas and get more responses and acquaintances from within the research circle. Dickens societies and fellowships in the UK and the USA have Twitter and Facebook pages where individuals communicate their research projects and ideas, find a research population among participants, and extend networking within the research community. Technology offers efficient tools for collecting data. For example, Skype and email interviews, which Sappleton argues reach wider participants in less time and cost, can be used to find Dickens’s impact on writers who cannot be reached face to face.

The empirical research method is useful in the examination of the circulation of Dickens’s novels. Jordan appreciates the empirical research of Priya Joshi in Another Country: Colonialism, Culture, and the English Novel in India (2002). Jordan contends that Joshi’s empirical research helped her identify the archives and library holdings of English writings in India. Jordan claims that this methodology would “open avenues of research that scholars of book history will want to follow in other parts of the world” (Jordan, 2009, p. 1217). Like Joshi, Abdelrezzaq Ghafsi’s thesis on the globalization of Charles Dickens in Algerian literature and culture (2020) involves an empirical observation where Ghafsi traced and examined the dates and locations of Dickens’s novels that existed in Algeria during the colonial period. The dates when Dickens’s works were introduced to Algeria were established in different ways: first, the publication date of the library catalogue itself; second, the stamps placed on the novels; third, the bibliographical guides and records; and lastly, the library online guides. It could be, therefore, said that the empirical research in Guelma, Tiemcen, and Algiers helped in validating the online archives and catalogues, which were obtained from Gallica, and in identifying the journal reviews of Dickens which also existed in Algeria in the colonial era. Impiricism not only helped find the circulation of Dickens in Algeria since the late nineteenth century but also helped understand the politics surrounding dissemination. A good example is when Ghafsi discovered that some of the novels by Dickens, such as The Pickwick Papers and Bleak House, were burned by the French shortly before they left Algeria in June 1962.

Along with online and empirical research methods, textual analysis is a valuable method. According to Jordan, “Dickens is also a text, a commodity, a discourse, and a piece of international cultural capital” (Jordan, 2009, p. 1215). Lisa M. Given (2008) states that textual analysis examines the structure and meaning of texts and helps sociologists and historians understand their socio-cultural context. Textual analysis as a method has different models of analysis: narrative, structural, genre, discourse, and content analysis. The main questions that the textual analysis addresses are: Who is the author? Who is the audience? What are the themes? and so on. In Textual Analysis, Alan McKee (2003) defines textual analysis as a way of understanding how human beings make sense of the world. According to McKee, “When we perform textual analysis on a text, we make an educated guess at some of the likely interpretations that might be made of that text” (p. 1).

The reason for using textual analysis in global Dickens studies, I believe, is because researchers are concerned with interpretation, such as what appeals in Dickens’s works for world readers. It is also a useful tool for finding the intertextual parallels between Dickens and his literati. Analysing the narratives of world culture in Dickens’s journalism also helped identify many themes and characters that are deemed worthy by readers of Dickens’s world. Yet, one question raised is whether textual analysis alone is enough to explain Dickens’s international reputation. Interdisciplinary research often involves various approaches and methods because the truth is not one (McKee, 2003). This justifies very well the use of online and empirical methods along with textual analysis because researchers are not only aiming at analysing texts but rather examining how they crossed world boundaries, how they were used in cultural and educational contexts, and how they affected world readers.

In Susan Sontag’s essay “Against Interpretation,” she defines textual analysis as an interpretive process that involves understanding and restating the phenomenon (Iser, 1980). Here, Sontag emphasizes the importance of textual interpretation. Along with the gift of interpretation, textual analysis, Given (2008) writes, increases “understanding of the construction of textual meaning,” provides “rich discussion of presentational and structural specifics,” and enables researchers to be self-reflexive (p. 865).

5. Conclusion
Global Dickens’s projects failed to come up with an international wholesale study on the reception of Dickens mainly due to personal reasons such as illness, death, overambition, lack of contributions, absence of technology, especially during Nisbet’s life,
the systematic approach, the problematisation of reception and translation such as in some European countries. This article suggests going beyond the Anglo-centric systematic approach, which focuses mainly on conventional topics related to originality, into seeing Dickens’s works as cultural products that had better circulate using museums, international book fairs, British Council’s anniversary and bicentenary events, fellowships, and societies. Also, Dickens’s systematic scholars had better consider changing methodology. Triangulation of methodology, including textual analysis, technology, and empiricism, will invite scholars from other disciplines, such as literary critics, academics, archivists, and IT experts, to contribute to the ongoing Global Dickens’s projects. Dickens is always a novelist who enjoys mass readership.
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