All Theses and Dissertations

2019-03-01

"Yup, So-Jeer"⬚: Interlanguage and Ruptured Translation in Charles Dickens's The Perils of Certain English Prisoners

Jacob Kurt Nielsen

Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

"Yup, So-Jeer": Interlanguage and Ruptured Translation in Charles Dickens's

The Perils of Certain English Prisoners

Jacob Kurt Nielsen

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Jamie Horrocks, Chair
Emron Lee Esplin
Evan R. Ward

Department of English

Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

"Yup, So-Jeer": Interlanguage and Ruptured Translation in Charles Dickens's
The Perils of Certain English Prisoners

Jacob Kurt Nielsen
Department of English, BYU
Master of Arts

Co-authored by Charles Dickens and Wilkie Collins, *The Perils of Certain English Prisoners* is a tale of linguistic subversion in colonial spaces. Christian George King—a native "Sambo" that betrays the English colonists on Silver Store to a marauding band of pirates—demonstrates a linguistic phenomenon that scholars call interlanguage, or a quasi-language that partially resembles both English and his native language. Because of its status as a language between languages, King's interlanguage disrupts the linguistic hierarchy of the tale by opening possibilities for miscommunication. To combat this underlying tension, the colonists must rely on translation—specifically, on the mistaken belief that all non-English languages, including an interlanguage, can be translated perfectly into English. Perfect translation grants colonial spaces a much-needed façade of unity and cohesion against what would otherwise be linguistic chaos. Yet the very notion that meaning can be perfectly translated is shattered by interlanguage's ability to cultivate both intimacy and resistance in the translator—intimacy, because the colonizers see enough of their own language in the learner to lull themselves into thinking that meaning is transparent; and resistance, because the foreign parts of the learner's speech that remain serve as a continual reminder of the unconquered tongue. While interlanguage is most apparent in King's speech, it is also present, in a unique way, in the construction and co-authorship of *The Perils* itself. Indeed, interlanguage proves a useful concept for thinking about any textual moment in which individual voices combine into a hybrid voice that cultivates the illusion of unity and cohesion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Yup, So-Jeer": Interlanguage and Ruptured Translation in Charles Dickens's *The Perils of Certain English Prisoners*

On 7 December 1857, *The Perils of Certain English Prisoners* was published in *Household Words*, becoming the fourth in a series of collaborative Christmas stories printed in Charles Dickens's periodical. Co-authored by Dickens and Wilkie Collins, *The Perils* emerged during a season of political and colonial upheaval in Britain and abroad. Inundated with reports of the horrific atrocities of the Indian Mutiny, readers and critics drew easy connections between *The Perils* and the events in Cawnpore (and, to a lesser extent, the 1853-56 Crimean War). One representative response comes from an anonymous critic writing for *The Saturday Review*. In commenting on the story, the critic avers that Dickens is "deeply impressed with the heroism of which India has been the scene, and he celebrates it cordially and warmly," but that for reasons of sensitivity, he "lays the scene of his story, not in India, but in Central America, and in the year 1744, instead of 1857" ("Christmas Number" 579). While another reviewer concedes that "the reader may, indeed, object . . . that there is no mention of India or the Crimea in [*The Perils*'s] pages, that its scenery belongs to a fable land, and that its characters and incidents are purely imaginary," he concludes that "the moral elements are the same in either case" ("Christmas Story" 4). Thus, as nineteenth-century readers interpreted Dickens's story, they found two tales: one corresponding to the words on the page, and one shaped by newspaper accounts of recent disasters in foreign lands. One might even conclude that it was owing to this, Dickens's decision to write in a way that allowed readers to translate *The Perils* into a story about Britain's imperial endeavors in India, that the story became yet another literary success for Dickens.

However, *The Perils* was not just Dickens's work, although many readers attributed it to his genius, creativity, and patriotism alone. As with all the Extra Christmas Numbers published in *Household Words*, *The Perils* was written collaboratively but did not explicitly make its

collaborative authorship known. *The Saturday Review*'s uncertainty is typical; the critic claims

that "whether the number which has just appeared is entirely from Mr. Dickens's pen, or whether

it is due in part—as one of our contemporaries stated—to Mr. Wilkie Collins, it deserves cordial

commendation on very high grounds" ("Christmas Number" 579). Eliding Collins's name

altogether, *The Times* similarly glosses over the collaborative nature of the tale, stating that "the

extra number of *Household Words* contains a story, the greater part of which is written by

Charles Dickens" ("Christmas Story" 4). While both reviewers admit the possibility of another

writer's involvement in the story's composition, they allow that writer's voice and contribution

to be subsumed under Dickens's authorial umbrella.[1] They reinforce this idea by referring to *The*

Perils throughout their pieces as having a single author, as though it could be attributed solely to

Dickens.

Both readings of *The Perils*—the one that reduces the story to a political allegory, and the

one that downplays its authorial collaboration—simplify the complexity of Dickens and

Collins's work. They remove ambiguity and replace it with well-known discourse, either that

surrounding a notable event (the Indian Mutiny) or that surrounding a notable voice (Charles

Dickens).[2] This serves to unify a somewhat odd and disjointed tale and implies that if readers

can identify these guiding discourses, then they will be able to interpret *The Perils* correctly, to

translate it into an understandable narrative. In short, the reviewers suggest that both interpretive

lenses will help readers obtain a "correct" reading of the text, the one that Dickens himself surely

---

[1] Glancy's analysis of Dickens's Christmas tales is common, as she focuses on how Dickens crafts "frameworks which would provide a unifying theme and structure for the numbers" (61). Little attention is given to Dickens's collaborators (only pointing out that they complicated Dickens's collaborative aspirations) (62). In *Unequal Partners*, Nayder recognizes a similar authorial hierarchy between Dickens and Collins, remarking how Dickens insisted "that the writings of his contributors appear anonymously" although "Collins increasingly felt the need to resist Dickens's authority and claim his work as his own" (2-3).
[2] Most modern criticism reads *The Perils* as a political allegory. For reference, see Moore, Colley, Ziegler, Tickell, and Nayder, "Class Consciousness."

intended. Yet the interplay of dominant and subservient voices as well as competing languages in *The Perils of Certain English Prisoners* challenges this conclusion.

In suppressing the dialogic nature of *The Perils*'s composition and interpretation, early critics mimic the suppression of fringe voices and languages that occurs within the text itself. Set in a fictional Central American colonial outpost, *The Perils* portrays a rigid linguistic hierarchy in which all those who do not speak fluent English are subordinated to those who can. Narrated by a British sailor named Gill Davis, the narrative tracks the story of British colonists who are betrayed by a "Sambo" [3] man named Christian George King to a nefarious and multilingual band of pirates (574).[4] Within the story, characters like the Central American Indians, "Sambos," and non-English-speaking pirates play subservient roles as servants, either to the British colonists or to the Portuguese pirate captain who has "a gift of speaking in any tongue he like[s]," including English (586). Dickens describes King's language as "barbarous," "clucking," and a "most violent hiccup," creating a racially-tinged dichotomy between foreign languages and English (586). Even Davis's voice is suppressed due to his illiteracy—his own narrative must be transcribed by a character named Marion Maryon, an educated woman who records Davis's oral account of the attack (573). On the story's surface, then, the eradication of polyvocality and the establishment of English eloquence is the key to obtaining tangible forms of power and stability on the fictional island of Silver-Store.

---

[3] According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word "Sambo" was used as a derogatory term for a black individual beginning in the early eighteenth century. The word derives from the Spanish word "zambo" which was simultaneously applied to American or Asian inhabitants of "mixed African and Indian or European blood" as well as "a kind of yellow monkey" (sambo, n.1). I use the term in conjunction with Christian George King because of its repeated use in *The Perils*.

[4] Dickens and Collins used a travelogue by Karl Ritter von Scherzer (published as Carl Scherzer) titled *Travels in the Free States of Central America: Nicaragua, Honduras, and San Salvador* (published in July 1857) as a source text for *The Perils*. There is strong evidence to suggest that Christian George King's character is based on Riverado Pelon, a "villainous" "Sambo" man that that Scherzer meets in Nicaragua (103). For more on Pelon, see *Travels* vol. 1, pp. 102-10.

Yet underneath the surface, *The Perils* also contains evidence that English's superiority is susceptible to subversion. Christian George King duplicitously submits himself to both the British colonists and the pirate captain throughout the course of *The Perils*, and his speech—which bears the marks of a linguistic phenomenon that scholars call interlanguage—reflects his duality. Interlanguage, a learner language first identified by Larry Selinker in 1972, is a "latent psychological structure" that second-language learners activate when they speak a new, target language (212). Scholars have found that it occurs when learners fail to master fully their target language and instead rely on "abstract" grammar and vocabulary to express meaning that they can only conceive of in their native language (Montrul 77-78).[5] When this happens, learners (Christian George King, in *The Perils*) resort to speaking a quasi-language, or interlanguage, that partially resembles both their target and native languages. Because of its status as a language between languages, King's interlanguage (a mix between English and an unknown native language) disrupts the linguistic hierarchy of the text by opening possibilities for miscommunication. The potential for subversion through miscommunication becomes a primary underlying linguistic tension in *The Perils*.

To combat this underlying tension, the colonists in the tale rely on translation—specifically, on the mistaken belief that all non-English languages, including an interlanguage, can be translated perfectly into English. The idea of perfect translation is essential to Dickens's story. As a form of colonial hermeneutics, perfect translation presupposes seamless communication between colonizer and subaltern, communication in which meaning is stable, consistent, and knowable.[6] Perfect translation also grants colonial spaces a much-needed façade

---

[5] By way of describing the essential structure of interlanguage, Selinker reacts to Noam Chomsky's theory that children possess an "innate knowledge of language" due to a universal grammar, proposing instead that adult learning of a second language must be different than a child's because adults do not have access to the same universal grammar structure (Tarone 10).

[6] Rangarajan recognizes the central role translation plays in colonial hermeneutics; however, she does admit that it is "both necessary as a bridge between radical difference and near impossible because of this difference" (4).

of unity and cohesion against what would otherwise be linguistic chaos. However, the deployment of interlanguage destabilizes translation's role as an ideological linchpin in the British colonial project. Because of interlanguage's equivocality, listeners must work to translate it, piecing the learner's meaning together word by word and sentence by sentence. Although the work of translation in this instance may not be as obvious as it is when one encounters a completely foreign tongue, it is still requisite for the most accurate transfer of meaning. Yet the very notion that meaning may be accurately transferred is shattered by interlanguage's ability to cultivate both intimacy and resistance—intimacy, because the colonizers see enough of their own language in the learner to lull themselves into thinking that meaning is transparent; and resistance, because the foreign parts of the learner's speech that remain serve as a continual reminder of the unconquered tongue.[7] Through this intimacy and resistance, interlanguage propagates the illusion of perfect translation while simultaneously showing it to be nothing more than an illusion. While the translation of interlanguage often goes unacknowledged in analyses of English colonial narratives, it can, like all acts of translation, destabilize the text by opening it up to linguistic subversion. For Padma Rangarajan, such subversion may even enact "the potential transformation of thought itself, as one culture encounter[s] another through language" (4). This fear of a "transformation of thought" fosters feelings of linguistic discomfort that permeate the text.

In addition, while interlanguage is most apparent in King's speech, it is also present, in a unique way, in the construction of *The Perils* itself. Indeed, interlanguage proves a useful concept for thinking about any textual moment in which individual voices combine into a hybrid voice that cultivates the illusion of unity and cohesion. All of Dickens's portmanteau Christmas

---

[7] Adjémian explains how interlanguage is "peculiar in being permeable" (qtd. in Tarone 11), meaning that it allows this hybrid fusion between a native language and a target language to occur.

stories—*The Perils* included—were presented as monological (oftentimes with a single author) and thus may be considered interlingual texts.[8] By seeing these stories as deploying a kind of authorial interlanguage, scholars can begin to break down the illusion of unity, pointing out moments when two voices resist or subvert each other and when they build off of one another to maintain textual stability. Literary interlingual instances also allow readers to see that there will be moments of implicit translation strewn throughout the text any time voices merge—moments that signal ideas in the text that are particularly tenuous and potentially subversive.

Translation and *The Perils*

Given that *The Perils* is an interlingual tale nestled within a larger interlingual structure, examining the story's structure facilitates a deeper understanding of how interlanguage functions within the text. While the story itself lacks unity and cohesion, *The Perils*'s publication format gives the impression that it is a seamless, unified text. Nowhere is this clearer than in the story's original print form. On the title page, after the story's title and a statement identifying it as the Extra Christmas Number of *Household Words*, readers find, in bolded and capitalized letters, the words: "CONDUCTED BY CHARLES DICKENS" (573). This same declaration of Dickens's authorial supervision is subsequently reprinted across the top of each two-page spread of the installment. With Dickens's name being the only one printed, the text is unified under his authorial reputation. Furthermore, while the front page of *The Perils* does indicate that the story will have three distinct chapters, all three parts are published side-by-side in the same number; thus, there is no gap of time or space separating the different sections for readers. According to

---

[8] Many scholars have considered the collaborative aspects of Dickens's Christmas stories, but none have yet provided a theoretical heuristic for conceptualizing the reduction of multiple voices in one. Gregory asks, "given his interest in what he called 'composite' writing, why is Dickens's collaborative work too rarely brought to the table, even while it offers so many attractive fusion dishes" (216)? Trodd calls the Collins/Dickens collaboration in *The Wreck of the Golden Mary* a "complex double operation" and "one of the most remarkable instances of literary collaboration" (202). Glancy, whose "Dickens and Christmas" article in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (1980) is one of the earliest to look at the frame tales, pays practically no attention to multiple voices.

Melissa Valiska Gregory, Dickens carefully structured his Extra Christmas Numbers this way; she claims that "each new annual number reveals Dickens's attempt to impose some sort of coherence" on the multi-voiced, collaboratively written stories, though he often failed or felt frustrated by his attempts to translate the individual chapters into the target language associated with the brand "Dickens" (220). Still, Dickens repeatedly averred that *The Perils* was to be thought of as "one story," a narrative with a single author and a single voice (Storey and Tillotson 8:482).

Nevertheless, Wilkie Collins's chapter in the middle of the novella, "The Prison in the Woods," challenges any attempt to see *The Perils* as a single, unified story. Addressing this irruption of a second authorial voice, Lillian Nayder notes that "Collins both complies with and resists" Dickens's portrayal of various elements in the story (103). While Nayder regards the overt differences between Dickens's and Collins's chapters—Collins's moments of resistance—as competitive and deliberate acts of subversion, Gregory looks at the differences with more equanimity. For Gregory, they become moments of "authorial negotiation" that create "intriguing tonal nuances" as well as the "weird internal friction[s]" that every reader of the story notices (216).[9]

Another way to see such moments of negotiation between authors in collaboration is as moments of ruptured translation.[10] To create a coherent narrative in a collaborative project, each author, of necessity, must metaphorically "translate" the plot, characters, tone, and authorial intentions of the other, incorporating these elements into his or her section of the story. In the

---

[9] Callanan similarly remarks how "the collaboration between the authors seems to have been genuine," although "Dickens probably exerted more control over the story than the idea of an equal partnership suggests" (82-83). She goes on to explain how "Dickens and Collins's authorial dynamic is mirrored in the narrative presentation of authorship" between Gill Davis and Marion Maryon (83).

[10] For my argument, the phrase "ruptured translation" encapsulates the disjointed process of negotiating literary "languages" of different authors in a collaborative project. Stone and Thompson propose a similar idea when they talk about collaborative "heterotexts," or texts that are "woven of varying strands of influence and agency, absorbing or incorporating differing subjectivities, and speaking in multiple voices" (19).

case of *The Perils*, Dickens's narrative must be translated by Collins to produce chapter two; Dickens must then translate Collins's narrative to finish the story in chapter three. Viewing it in this way helps readers see collaboration as conversational, with meaning negotiated or reconfigured back and forth between literary voices. Ruptured translation occurs when authorial intentions do not carry over from section to section—or when, in the words of Dickens himself, they cannot "be fitted together or got into the frame" (Storey and Tillotson 7:762). Following translational ruptures, collaborative texts become interlingual texts, or new, interstitial texts born from the unique merging of disparate authorial voices.

While there are many examples of ruptured translation in *The Perils*, one particularly evident illustration lies in the story's dramatic shifts in characterization. In Dickens's first chapter, "The Island of Silver-Store," Christian George King plays an outsized role in the narrative. Indeed, his treachery and duplicitousness lead to chaos and the disruption of British colonial life on Silver-Store. King betrays the colonists to the pirates and enables their successful attack on the British outpost. He consequently becomes the target of the colonists' ire to the extent that the narrator wishes "above all" to "put [King] out of the world" (582). Despite this large narrative role, King largely disappears from Collins's portion of the narrative. Suddenly, in "The Prison in the Woods," the focus of the colonists' antipathy switches from the treacherous Sambo to the Portuguese pirate captain, Pedro Mendez, or "The Don." King remains in the narrative; he follows the English prisoners as the pirates march them into the jungle and shows himself to be subservient to Don Pedro. But Collins shifts him into the background until readers almost forget his importance to the text. This importance reemerges when the narrative returns to Dickens in the final chapter, "Rafts on the River," in which King once again takes center stage. As the colonists escape on their rafts in this last section of the novella, the narrator Gill Davis imagines the oars making the sound "'Chris'en—George—King!' over and over again" (605),

reminding readers that the Sambo is still lurking in the text. The story then reaches its climax—not when the prisoners have triumphed over the pirates, but when King is killed and order is restored to Silver-Store.

Incidents in the text like the disappearance and reappearance of Christian George King represent moments of ruptured translation, foregrounding the text's interlingual nature. While scholarship rarely merges the concepts of interlanguage and translation, such a merger allows readers to see moments of textual hybridity as more important than mere rifts or gaps between authorial voices. In linguistic scholarship, researchers look for evidence of interlanguage in the verbal speech acts of second-language learners. They find, more than anything, that interlanguage is activated when learners try to express "new and difficult intellectual subject matter" in their target language (Selinker 215). During these interlingual moments, the learner reverts back to the "linguistic items, rules, and subsystems" of his or her native language and merges them with those of the target language (215). This new, grammatically-awkward interlanguage becomes an outward manifestation of underlying thoughts, ideas, and feelings that resist expression in a target language. Furthermore, this means of expression tends to fossilize, or remain permanent, "no matter . . . the age of the learner or the amount of explanation and instruction he [or she] receives in the [target language]" (215). Similarly, interlanguage is noticeable in literature when competing systems or discourses come to the fore, either in language itself, or in individual characters and settings. These moments signal that in some way, abstract concepts or "new and difficult intellectual subject[s]" are resisting perfect translation into a dominant discourse. It is imperative for readers to then look beneath the interlanguage, identify the subject matter that interlanguage masks, and ask why it resists translation.

Interlanguage also allows readers to examine the suppressed discourses that lie behind seemingly fringe languages and characters. By doing so, characters like Christian George King

achieve greater depth as readers recognize that his own interlanguage carries with it a potentially

subversive underlying discourse. Indeed, King shifts from being a transitory character in the

narrative to being one of the text's most important speakers. He reveals, in the end, the tenuous

status of translation as a tool of colonial stability because his simultaneous transparency and

resistance to the colonizers withstands easy delimitation. King's interlanguage, in fact, represents

the birth of a new form of power, one in which deep and complex meaning can resist complete

cooptation by a dominating discourse.

Interlanguage in *Household Words*

For Dickens, the practice of producing native characters who wield a threatening type of

interlanguage emerged long before the creation of Christian George King in 1857. Dickens and

his staff at *Household Words* portrayed indigenous people as speaking an interlanguage that

resisted translation. These texts foreground King's character, providing useful insight into how

King functions as an interlingual character in *The Perils*. One such text—perhaps the most

infamous—is an article titled "The Noble Savage," published on 11 June 1853 in *Household

Words*.[11] In this scathing indictment of native populations, Dickens's frustration largely centers

on his inability to understand native languages, a point he makes abundantly clear at the

beginning of the article:

> To come to the point at once, I beg to say that I have not the least belief in the Noble
>
> Savage. . . . I don't care what he calls me. I call him savage, and I call anything savage
>
> something highly desirable to be civilised off the face of the earth. I think a mere gent

---

[11] Dickens wrote this article in response to a "renewed public enthusiasm for the eighteenth-century concept of 'the noble savage', or a 'purer' moral nature to be found in dark-skinned races who had not been 'corrupted' by civilisation" (Slater 5). At the time, a group of African Zulus were put on display at the St. George's Gallery on Hyde Park Corner where they "performed scenes illustrative of daily life in their native environment enlivened with 'characteristic dances'" (Slater 5).

(which I take to be the lowest form of civilisation) better than a howling, whistling,

clucking, stamping, jumping, tearing savage. (337)

Linguistically, Dickens portrays the "Noble Savage" as "howling, whistling, clucking," and using the body to convey meaning. Apart from connoting animalistic or bestial behavior, Dickens's description concomitantly signals a rupture in translation—a rupture that generates extreme vitriol and discomfort. By admitting that he does not "care what [the Noble Savage] calls [him]," Dickens unearths his fear that indigenous people possess the linguistic power to prescribe meaning through naming. This realization unlocks the frightening reality that subalterns may hold subversive power within their language, a language that Dickens cannot understand.

Dickens's fear of native subversion is compounded by his observation that his fellow Europeans are blind to these dangerous realities. He bemoans his countrymen who express "regret" at the native's "disappearance" and remarks "how, even with evidence of [the native] before them, they will either be determined to believe, or will suffer themselves to be persuaded into believing, that [the native] is something which their five senses tell them he is not" (337). According to Dickens, all rational thought and sensory experience is jettisoned in favor of a romanticized belief regarding the cultural value of native populations. Living in this idealized world, the European incorrectly translates the "savage" into something "noble," instead of seeing the danger that Dickens observes behind every unfamiliar movement or utterance.

To combat his personal discomfort, Dickens strives to reassert a purer form of translation to stabilize meaning in the face of linguistic and epistemological uncertainty. He goes on to describe one "bushman" (or native from southwestern Africa) as screaming "Qu-u-u-u-aaa," a phrase that Dickens translates as probably "Bosjesman for something desperately insulting" (337). Here, he jokingly "interprets" an utterance that he does not understand, an action that

illuminates his discomfort in coexisting alongside a foreign discourse. His instinct is to paste something ridiculous over the unknown phrase—even knowing that it is ridiculous—because it attaches meaning to something that would otherwise be meaningless. Yet Dickens's translation is equivocal and cannot pass as a legitimate representation of meaning because he does not (and will not) understand the speaker's language.

In an attempt to make the natives' language more transparent to his English readers, Dickens crafts an imagined interlanguage in which he infuses native utterances with both English and foreign elements. While Dickens admits that his interlanguage is an act of "interpretings and imaginings," he feels a compulsion to imagine it anyway (338). Within this fictitious linguistic system, Dickens's native transforms from a "howling, whistling, [and] clucking" man into a "Witch Doctor" who proclaims, "I am the original physician to Nooker the Umtargartie. Yow yow yow! No connexion with any other establishment. Till till till! All other Umtargarties are feigned Umtargarties, Boroo Boroo!" (338). There are phrases throughout the shaman's speech that are undeniably clear in English: "I am the original physician . . . No connexion with any other establishment . . . All other Umtargarties are feigned." And yet, including utterances such as "yow yow yow," "till till till," and "boroo boroo" makes this an interlingual utterance—it merges English grammar, vocabulary, and structure with that of the shaman's (feigned) native language. What can be initially tossed aside as meaningless fillers suddenly take on a great amount of importance. Because interlanguage surfaces when complex or abstract meaning is being produced, Dickens's native could very well be hiding subversive thoughts beneath the foreign aspects of his speech—in this case, Dickens imagines the shaman as "looking out among the unfortunate faces for some unfortunate man who owes him a cow, or who has given him any small offence" and instantly killing the man who caused offence (338). Thus, although Dickens strives to facilitate the translation process by crafting a form of interlanguage, he simultaneously

litters native utterances with dark areas of potential signification that may heighten colonial anxiety.

Similar to Dickens, other members of the *Household Words* staff published articles in the months leading up to *The Perils*'s publication concerning second language learners and their inability to master English. For example, William Charles Milne published an article on 9 May 1857 titled "Canton-English" in which he juxtaposes a form of Chinese-English interlanguage with proper Queen's English. Milne describes it as a "jargon language" or "mixed result of Canton and English" that attempts to create "intercommunication" between the Chinese and the British (451). In one section of the article, he transcribes the conversation of an American and a Chinese man who are communicating with each other in "Canton-English." The following is the beginning of their dialogue: "Foreigner.—Chin-chinfookkee? Chinaman.—Belly well, belly well. Chin-chin: whafo my no hab seetaipan sot langim? F.—My wanchee wunpay soo belly soon. Sposefookkee too muchee pigeon: no can maykee" (452). Milne translates the dialogue to mean, "F.—How do you do John Chinaman? C.—Quite well, thank you, sir. How is it that I have not had the honour of seeing you for so long? F.—I want a pair of shoes soon. But I fear you are too busy to make them for me now" (452). While much more difficult to parse than the shaman's interlanguage in "The Noble Savage," readers can still see the deliberate mixture of English pronunciation, syntax, and vocabulary with that of an imagined version of Cantonese. Despite the potential usefulness of "Canton-English" as an intercommunicative language, Milne decries it as the "murdering of the English tongue" and a "mongrel dialect" that has "become fixed in its idioms, etymology, and definitions" (451).[12] Perhaps most interestingly, Milne disparagingly describes "Canton-English" speakers as believing "themselves up to the mark in pure English" by learning this form of interlanguage (452). The fear is that proper English will

---

[12] This is certainly an early recognition of speech fossilization.

soon be replaced by interlanguages that simultaneously embody transparency and foreignness. Milne's harsh critique of "Canton-English" and its speakers is worth noting, especially in light of his belief that interlanguage destroys English's purity and gives the speaker a false notion of equality with the British. Similar fears come to bear in the ways Christian George King in *The Perils* assumes an important role alongside the colonists on Silver-Store.

In Milne's and Dickens's articles, readers can see *Household Words* writers' attempts to establish linguistic stability and familiarize the unfamiliar through translation. These articles should be regarded as part of a history of linguistic ideology in Britain for, as Joseph Errington writes, translation does the "'ideological' work of devising images of people in zones of colonial contact" (5). In colonial writing, natives often morph into a representation of what the colonizers can conceptualize, bearing a faint resemblance of reality but lacking the intricacy that accompanies a more accurate representation. This allows *Household Words* writers like Alexander Henry Abercromby Hamilton and E. Townsend to portray all Indians in another article called "Indian Recruits and Indian English" as "those hundred and eighty millions who eat rice and worship idols" and, importantly, who speak "barbaric words" (321). The authors essentialize native speech to a "barbaric" language (with all its accompanying belief structures) in order to remove all spoken variability; all that is polyvocal and polymorphous becomes single and unified. This oversimplification shuffles people into "human hierarchies" in which natives are regarded as embodying a lesser form of existence, a shadow of Britain's humanity (Errington 5). Such hierarchies help pundits of the British Empire accomplish their goal of aspiring "toward a system of representation in which word is linked contiguously with reality" (Arteaga 20). Every action and word that is unfamiliar is translated into Britain's ideological system, forcing foreign utterances to be aligned with the colonizer's perceptions of reality.

Translation, however, always entails uncertainty. Even *Household Words*'s Hamilton and Townsend recognize the "nuisance" of being "pulled up in the middle of the most interesting narrative by some unintelligible word" and the fear of "stumbling blindly from one guess to another" (322). Translation creates a façade of complete knowledge, deceiving the colonizer by presenting an inaccurate or incomplete representation of what is. As long as there is room for error, there is room for chaos, rebellion, and subversion. Interlanguage is a physical manifestation of this. It is an untranslatable space where misconception may destroy the foundations of British identity at home and abroad. In *The Perils*, Christian George King embodies this interlingual space.

King, Interlanguage, and Translation

During his first verbal interaction with narrator Gill Davis, King speaks an interlanguage that stands in need of translation, immediately foreshadowing the difficulty of reconfiguring communication on Silver-Store. Even before Davis disembarks on the island, King rows out and jumps aboard the British ship "to pilot us in" (574). Later, as Davis is exploring the beach, King "comes a trotting along the sand, clucking, 'Yap [*sic*], So-Jeer!'" (576). Davis's response to this odd salutation is bewilderment, followed by an inexplicable anger; he has a "thundering good mind to let fly at [King] with my right. I certainly should have done it, but that it would have exposed me to reprimand" (576). Managing to suppress his sudden rage, Davis instead replies to King with a telling question: "What do you mean?" (576). Similar to Dickens's reaction to the "Umtargartie" in *Household Words*, Davis feels an immediate and visceral reaction to King. Certainly, some of the antipathy is grounded in King's animalistic behavior—his "trotting" automatically "others" him from Davis and the colonists. Yet the strangeness of King's physical movements is compounded for Davis by his inability to understand and conquer King's tongue. By admitting that he does not know what King means, Davis grants King the power to produce

meaning that exists outside of his control. It becomes imperative for Davis to then find ways to translate what King says and thereby suppress the meaning that King could potentially hide in his interlanguage.

Yet translation's fallibility becomes immediately apparent to both Davis and readers, cementing King's linguistic ambiguity and the colonists' inability to understand him. The first words that King speaks to Davis are "Yup, So-Jeer" (576). Initially, Davis takes these words and confidently translates them into something that his audience will understand; he claims that "Yup, So-Jeer" is "that Sambo Pilot's barbarous way of saying, Hallo, Soldier!" (576). However, subsequent encounters are not as easy to translate and extract meaning from. When King tries to express that the *Christopher Columbus* (Davis's ship) has sprouted a leak, he says, "Yup, So-Jeer . . . Bad job" (576). After Davis asks King for clarification, King responds by saying, "Ship Leakee" (576). Even after King clarifies, and despite the fact that "Leakee" would sound no different from "leaky" to Davis's ear, Davis makes sure he understands by asking, "Ship leaky?" (576). In this way, the novella contrasts ideal, perfect translation with the instability of potential mistranslation. Although the *Christopher Columbus* is sinking and Davis needs to act quickly, he is consumed with the need to ensure that he understands exactly what King is saying. Davis's clarifying questions betray his anxiety and signal an immediate rupture in the translation process.

This initial fissure in translation is continually exacerbated by the interlingual nature of King's utterances. Like other forms of interlanguage portrayed in *Household Words*, King's speech is composed of easily-understandable English phrases mixed with improper grammar and foreign interjections. For example, when the soldiers on Silver-Store are deciding whether or not to set off on their boats from the back of the island to surprise the pirates during their initial attack, King exclaims, "No, no, no! Told you so, ten time. No, no, no! All reef, all rock, all swim, all drown!" (580). While there are multiple grammatical missteps in this statement, the

most important is King's eliding of the pronoun "I." Instead of saying "*I* told you so, ten times" he says "Told you so," in effect removing himself from the statement and abstracting who the actual speaker is. When he does refer to himself, it is always done in third-person, such as when he says, "Yup, So-Jeer . . . Christian George King sar berry glad. Pirates all be blown a-pieces. Yup! Yup!" (580). King divorces himself from his speech, making it difficult for the colonists to know if the real Christian George King is speaking or whether it is a clever ruse that masks the real Christian George King. While King's interlanguage contains enough English to make his surface-level meaning understandable, the continual interjection of "Yup" leaves lingering doubts in the listener's mind, making him or her feel that there could be meaning lurking behind those interjections that they cannot understand. Thus, while King's interlanguage seems mostly transparent, it resists total cooptation through the translation process. With each new utterance, translation continues to rupture, causing doubt and anxiety to rise in colonists who crave stability and easy translation and who would like to believe that King is "very much attached to us all. Would die for us" (576).

In the face of these continual linguistic ruptures, Davis turns to outward manifestations of King's identity to piece together who he is and uncover any hidden meaning that remains entrenched in resistance. Initially, this quest for greater understanding is manifested in the colonists' concerted efforts to categorize and rename King, making him something they hope he will become, but are not sure he really is. The name "Christian George King" is a conglomeration of signifiers, presumably imposed on King by the British colonists on Silver-Store. By renaming King, the British attempt to translate him into an ideal British colonial subject. They domesticate King by imbuing him with symbols that have importance in Britain's world, including order, stability, and the hierarchy of religion and monarchy. Doing so allows the colonizers to pull King into their ontological universe and interpret his existence through the lens

of British values. They perform what Tejaswini Niranjana describes as a "strategy[y] of containment" by imagining King as "static and unchanging" or as "something that already exists"—all in an attempt to make him transparent, translatable, and controllable (3).

This renaming and categorizing impulse is also visible in the colonists' attempts to resolve the insecurity they feel about King's hybridized racial background. Maria Bachman argues that Dickens employs racially-tinged rhetoric throughout *The Perils* in an attempt to construct "the bodies of . . . foreign others as non-human, as fearful and threatening, precisely because they have gotten too close" (108). To combat this fear, the colonists impose a socially-constructed racial category on King. Upon seeing him for the first time, Davis identifies King as "one of those Sambo fellows" and immediately clarifies that the colonists "call those natives Sambos, when they are half-negro and half-Indian" (574). Like the name "Christian George King" itself, the categorization of King as a "Sambo" reduces the anxiety the colonists feel surrounding his hybridized race by defining him via a word they created themselves. Also like the name, this labeling moves King into an arbitrary racial hierarchy devised by the British to impose colonial order. Ultimately, the process of renaming gives the colonists the illusion that King fits nicely into their social, racial, religious, and political beliefs, easing lingering doubts that he could challenge solidified norms of behavior.

Naming and racially categorizing King brings the colonists on Silver-Store some comfort, but in King's actions, as in his interlanguage, readers find an existent duplicity that solidifies King's role as a potential threat. Throughout the novella, King's interlanguage is accompanied by exaggerated outpourings of physical emotion. He gives a "nod that looked as if it was jerked out of him by a most violent hiccup" (576), cries "English fashion" by "screw[ing] his black knuckles into his eyes, howl[ing] like a dog, and roll[ing] himself on his back on the sand" (576), and mimics drowning by "striking out . . . like a swimmer gone mad, . . . turning over on his

back on dry land, and spluttering himself to death, in a manner that made him quite an exhibition" (580). Davis has varied reactions to these demonstrations of uncontrollable emotion. Initially, he sees them merely as a function of King's barbarity—it is simply "the way with those savages" (576). For Davis, King's actions have little meaning because the overarching colonial discourse declares actions that cannot be easily understood to lack substance worthy of understanding. Yet at the same time, seeing King roll around on the sand elicits feelings of anger; Davis struggles to restrain himself from "kick[ing] him" (576). While he assumes that King's actions mean nothing important, readers can see a disparity between what King does (turning himself into "quite an exhibition" as he performs what he suggests are "English" actions) and what Davis thinks are wild and inexplicable (even punishable) gestures. These gestures suggest that King's adoption of an interlingual version of English is not concomitant with his adoption of British behaviors or values. His movements are an "exhibition" performed for the colonists, deliberate and purposeful. The performance aspect of them fulfills colonists' expectations of native behavior, allowing them to think King nothing more than a brute and certainly not capable of plotting against them or concealing anything from them.

Like his spoken interlanguage, then, King's physical movements offer a deceptively comforting transparency and familiarity that offsets his foreignness. Immediately after King demonstrates his "English" sorrow, Davis recounts how King aids him and his fellow colonists "at his own request" in saving the ship, going "at it with as good a will as any of the rest" (577). King's demonstration of loyalty and comradery in this instance helps him foster trust with Davis, who declares that King "rose in [his] good opinion, almost as fast as the water rose in the ship. Which was fast enough, and faster" (577). By performing simple actions that match how the British expect him to act, King assuages fears that he might be hiding potential subversion. This supposed loyalty, taken in conjunction with his emotional exhibitions, turn King's physical

movements into a viable source of information that the colonists mistranslate as subservience and simple-minded loyalty. They choose to see him as the least-threatening version of himself that he can be. As a result, Davis and the other colonists trust King despite evidence that continually calls his reliability into question.

Every act of translation strewn throughout *The Perils*, whether relating to spoken language, name, race, or behavior, is meant to bolster transparency and placate the potential resistance that interlanguage suggests. Eventually, however, interlanguage and interlingual characters like King refute the possibility of perfect translation and thus perfect understanding and perfect control. Posing a real threat to the English on Silver-Store, they stand in stark contrast to non-interlingual characters who seem like King in many ways (non-white, non-British, and operating outside the imperial realm of law and order) but who allow the myth of perfect translation to operate unchecked. Nowhere is the contrast clearer than in "The Don."

Unlike King, Captain Don Pedro and his pirate band unproblematically exist within the idealized colonial model of perfectly translatable discourse. As a result of the colonists' inability to interpret King's actions and motives as anything other than loyal, Davis and his fellows are left vulnerable to attack—an attack largely instigated by King, who is secretly in the service of Don Pedro. When the pirates invade Silver-Store with King's help, Davis remarks that the pirate band consists of "Malays . . . Dutch, Maltese, Greeks, Sambos, Negroes, and Convict Englishmen from the West India[n] Islands. . . . There were some Portuguese, too, and a few Spaniards" (584). Symbolically, the colonists' failure to translate correctly King's interlanguage unleashes an international hodgepodge of races, ethnicities, nationalities, and languages that seeks to tumble the British colonial project. However, it is quickly made clear that Don Pedro, the leader of this conglomerate, manages to keep the chaos in check and exact obedience from each member of the crew "as if he had been the greatest monarch in the world" (586). His power

is grounded in his ability to translate all languages. He has a "gift," says Davis, "of speaking in
any tongue he liked" (586). When the pirates take Silver-Store and transport the captive colonists
to the mainland, Davis notices how Don Pedro's "English rattled out of his crooked lips as fast as
if it was natural to them" (586). He is also seen speaking "a few words in his own, or in some
other foreign tongue" (588) and "communicating with the Indians" (593). Thus Don Pedro
becomes an omni-lingual figure who rules as a perfect intermediary between the disparate voices
that exist on the fringes of the British Empire. Unlike King with all his duplicitousness, Don
Pedro is extremely transparent because of his capacity to translate each language he encounters
and to understand perfectly what Davis can only guess at. He is a villain, but a villain who never
appears to the colonists as anything other than what he is.

Indeed, Don Pedro, in many ways, represents the ideal type of control that the colonists
strive for because of his ability to do what Davis cannot: understand Christian George King and
all the other inhabitants of Silver-Store. Davis remarks that "as for the Sambos, the Pirate
Captain knew them better than the English had known them at Silver-Store, and would have
nothing to do with them in any matter of importance" (595). Although it is never made explicitly
clear why or how Don Pedro knows the Sambos better than the English, he elicits complete
submission from them, even from Christian George King. This is particularly apparent when
Don Pedro drafts a ransom note (in English) after capturing the colonists:

> He pointed with the end of his cigar to one of the Sambos. The man was pulled forward,
> and set down on his knees with his shoulders rounded. The Pirate Captain laid the paper
> on them, and took a dip of ink—then suddenly turned up his snub-nose with a look of
> disgust, and, removing the paper again, took from his pocket a fine cambric handkerchief
> edged with lace, smelt at the scent on it, and afterwards laid it delicately over the
> Sambo's shoulders. . . . He began to write immediately. (586)

The pirate captain demonstrates both his authority and linguistic eloquence on the back of the Sambo. If the Sambo (epitomized in *The Perils* by King) represents interlingual instability, then the pirate captain conquers it by making the Sambo's body the table from which writing and English eloquence are made possible. Writing on translation in colonial spaces, Eric Cheyfitz notes how Western culture "conceives of power in terms of eloquence" (23). This eloquence allows the colonizer to control colonial discourse by "proving his [or her] absolute power, as a translator of both the body language and language proper of the slaves" (35). By translating on the back of the Sambo, Don Pedro essentially becomes the real colonizer of Silver-Store. He achieves the "absolute power" that the British colonists are never able to acquire on the island.

While the pirate captain manages to achieve absolute power through absolute eloquence, the colonists are unable to rectify the rupture in translation between themselves and Christian George King. As the English prisoners escape from Don Pedro by building rafts and floating down a river that runs near the palace, Captain Carton (a British soldier who aids the colonists in their escape) notices something in the trees, aims his "Spanish gun," and fires. Another officer named Captain Maryon yells "What is it?" In response, Captain Carton says, "It is a Traitor and a Spy . . . and I think the other name of the animal is Christian George King" (607). King is "shot through the heart" and "left hanging [on] the tree, all alone, with the red sun making a kind of a dead sunset on his black face" (607). Even after killing King, Captain Maryon fails to translate who or what he is in terms that the British can understand. For Maryon, King is not a "he" but an "it"—an untranslatable entity. Yet in describing him as a "traitor" and "spy," Maryon endows him with distinctly human qualities, a violator of British norms of loyalty to established order. If that is not confusing enough, King is also an "animal," reflecting Maryon's contradictory belief that the Sambo is subhuman. The story ends thus with a kind of lynching and without fully resolving any of the questions it raises surrounding effective communication in the colonies.

While Laura Callanan sees King's killing as a "scapegoat" for the colonists' real desire to destroy their fetish for the pirate captain, it may also be seen as a haphazard desire to eliminate King's pervasive interlanguage (77). Even though the British destroy the pirates, kill King, and regain their stolen treasure, interlanguage's neutralization fails. They silence it, but they fail to understand it. This leaves the future open to similar tension, betrayal, and subversion.

Implications

Exhausted with the process of drafting, editing, and publishing *The Perils*, Dickens wrote to Lavinia Watson on 7 December 1857 (the day of the story's publication), claiming that the work is "rather a remarkable production" and that it "will make a great noise" among a British public obsessed with colonial woes in foreign lands (Storey and Tillotson 8:487). Reflecting on his story, Dickens also made the following observation:

> It leaves me—as my Art always finds me and always leaves me—the most restless of created Beings. . . . I weary of rest, and have no satisfaction but in fatigue. Realities and idealities are always comparing themselves together before me, and I don't like the Realities except when they are unattainable—*then*, I like them of all things. . . . *There's* a state of mind for you, in 1857. (8:488)

The juxtaposition between realities and idealities inundates *The Perils*'s portrayal of interlanguage and translation. In Dickens's ideal world, the British would obtain the power to translate the minds, bodies, and souls of all colonial subjects into Englishness—a single, domineering colonial discourse. If foreign languages lose their subversive power, then Britain's colonial power will continue to infiltrate the globe, unchecked.

However, the interlingual nature of colonial spaces shatters the illusion that a single discourse can ultimately prevail. Silver-Store, the epitome of interlingual space, demonstrates this principle. Davis depicts the island as "partly South American and partly English . . . like a bit

of home that had got chipped off and had floated away to that spot, accommodating itself to circumstances as it drifted along" (575). Initially, Davis's description implies pre-existing colonial ownership—Britain has natural claim on the island and its resources because it is "a bit of home." Nevertheless, foreignness dilutes its familiarity the farther it floats away from the nexus of British influence. The process is particularly pernicious because of its gradualness (it "floated away") and because it retains components of home that add some measure of intimacy. Davis's observation that the "South American flag and the Union Jack" flew "from the same staff" on the island also suggests a threatening political and social merging between two disparate worlds (575). With foreign political power rooted in the island just as firmly as the British, Silver-Store becomes open to outside forces that could disrupt the Empire's desire for one-to-one signification in a world of perfect translation. Like King, Silver-Store is a volatile space that serves as a potential site of subversion—one of the grim realities that Dickens wishes to avoid.

For Dickens, the only way to combat the perils of interlingual spaces is to gradually reverse the process of hybridization, extracting goods and services the Empire needs from tumultuous spaces and transforming them into something that only serves the Empire's interests. In light of this, Davis describes Silver-Store's principal function as a transfer station, a small node in the large network of the Empire. The island

> had been given the name of Silver-Store. The reason of its being so called, was, that the English colony owned and worked a silver mine on the mainland, in Honduras, and used this island as a safe and convenient place to store silver in, until it was annually fetched away by the sloop. It was brought down from the mine to the coast on the backs of mules, attended by friendly Indians and guarded by white men; from thence it was conveyed to

Silver-Store, when the weather was fair, in the canoes of that country; from Silver-Store,

it was carried to Jamaica; . . . from Jamaica it went, of course, all over the world. (574)

The seamless penetration, extraction, and global dissemination of wealth depends on a synergy

between the dominant "white men" and the subservient but "friendly Indians." This synergy is

reflected in how the British adopt Honduran "mules" and "canoes" as methods of transportation,

making them essential to the Empire's commercial success. Just as verbal interlanguage

necessitates translation, interlingual spaces need to be translated in order to avoid the

destabilizing effects of hybridity. Silver-Store's status as small colonial node does not minimize

its function as an epicenter of exchange, where colonists translate the raw economic goods from

the foreign mainland into British property. By the time the translation process is complete, the

goods are shipped all over the world solely under the British banner. Even though the colonists

eventually outsmart the pirates and King and regain their treasure (and by extension their

economic enterprise), readers are left wondering whether the narrative's idealistic portrayal of

Britain's economic ingenuity will withstand further subversive attempts by similar interlingual

populations around the globe.

It is within this tenuous, interlingual space that Christian George King emerges as a

symbol of the Empire's susceptibility to subversion. The push-and-pull dynamic between King's

untranslatability, the colonists' failure to translate, and Don Pedro's portrayal as the ideal

translator makes *The Perils* a warning of what could happen when strict linguistic delineations

between colonizer and colonized are muddled. In recognizing interlanguage in British colonial

narratives and collaborative texts, readers can begin to see how a language-between-languages

complicates the negotiation of meaning and levels authorial, linguistic, and colonial hierarchies.

By setting meaning in motion through ruptures in translation, *The Perils* moves beyond a simple,

idealistic colonial allegory and becomes a very realistic portrayal of how ideas and power are

reconfigured in tenuous imperial spaces.

Works Cited

Arteaga, Alfred. "An Other Tongue." *An Other Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*, edited by Arteaga, Duke UP, 1994, pp. 9-33.

Bachman, Maria K. "Charles Dickens, Wilkie Collins, and the Perils of Imagined Others." *Fear, Loathing, and Victorian Xenophobia*, edited by Marlene Tromp, Bachman, and Heidi Kaufman, Ohio State UP, 2013, pp. 101-23.

Callanan, Laura. *Deciphering Race: White Anxiety, Racial Conflict, and the Turn to Fiction in Mid-Victorian English Prose*. Ohio State UP, 2005.

"Charles Dickens's Christmas Story." *The Times* [London], 24 Dec. 1857, p. 4. *The Times Digital Archive*, tinyurl.galegroup.com/tinyurl/8ywVqX. Accessed 1 Nov. 2018.

Cheyfitz, Eric. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from* The Tempest *to* Tarzan. U of Pennsylvania P, 1997.

"The Christmas Number of *Household Words*." *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, vol. 4, 26 Dec. 1857, pp. 579-80. *HathiTrust*, hdl.handle.net/2027/iau.31858016626396?urlappend=%3Bseq=501. Accessed 1 Nov. 2018.

Colley, Linda. *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600-1850*. Jonathan Cape, 2002.

[Dickens, Charles.] "The Noble Savage." *Household Words*, vol. 7, no. 168, 11 June 1853, pp. 337-39. *Dickens Journals Online*, www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-vii/page-337.html. Accessed 2 Apr. 2018.

[Dickens, Charles, and Wilkie Collins.] "The Perils of Certain English Prisoners, and their Treasure in Women, Children, Silver, and Jewels." *Household Words*, vol. 16, Extra Christmas Number, 7 Dec. 1857, pp. 537-608. *Dickens Journals Online*, www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-xvi/page-573.html. Accessed 4 Dec. 2017.

Errington, Joseph. *Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power*.

    Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Glancy, Ruth F. "Dickens and Christmas: His Framed-Tale Themes." *Nineteenth-Century*

    Fiction, vol. 35, no. 1, 1980, pp. 53-72. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2933479. Accessed

    18 Jul. 2018.

Gregory, Melissa Valiska. "Dickens's Collaborative Genres." *Dickens Studies Annual*, vol. 41,

    2010, pp. 215-36.

[Hamilton, Alexander Henry Abercromby, and E. Townsend.] "Indian Recruits and Indian

    English." *Household Words*, vol. 16, no. 393, 3 Oct. 1857, pp. 319-22. *Dickens Journals*

    Online, www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-xvi/page-319.html. Accessed 9 Apr.

    2018.

[Milne, William Charles.] "Canton-English." *Household Words*, vol. 15, no. 372, 9 May 1857,

    pp. 450-52. *Dickens Journals Online*, www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-

    xv/page-450.html. Accessed 2 Apr. 2018.

Montrul, Silvina. "Interlanguage, Transfer and Fossilization: Beyond Second-Language

    Acquisition." *Interlanguage: Forty Years Later*, edited by ZhaoHong Han and Elaine

    Tarone, John Benjamins, 2014, pp. 75-104.

Moore, Grace. *Dickens and Empire: Discourses of Class, Race and Colonialism in the Works of*

    Charles Dickens. Routledge, 2016.

Nayder, Lillian. "Class Consciousness and the Indian Mutiny in Dickens's 'The Perils of Certain

    English Prisoners.'" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1992, pp.

    689-705. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/450966. Accessed 1 Nov. 2017.

---. *Unequal Partners: Charles Dickens, Wilkie Collins, and Victorian Authorship*. Cornell UP,

    2002.

Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. U of California P, 1992.

Rangarajan, Padma. *Imperial Babel: Translation, Exoticism, and the Long Nineteenth Century*. U of Virginia P, 2014.

"Sambo, n. 1." *OED Online*, 2018, www.oed.com/view/Entry/170350. Accessed 4 Feb. 2019.

Scherzer, Carl. *Travels in the Free States of Central America: Nicaragua, Honduras, and San Salvador*. Vol. 1, Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1857.

Selinker, Larry. "Interlanguage." *International Review of Applied Linguistics and Language*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1972, pp. 209-31. *De Gruyter*, doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209. Accessed 4 Feb. 2019.

Slater, Michael. *Dickens's Journalism Volume III: 'Gone Astray' and Other Papers from Household Words, 1851-1859*. J.M. Dent/Orion Publishing Group, 1998. Rpt. in "The Noble Savage." *Dickens Journals Online*, http://www.djo.org.uk/indexes/articles/the-noble-savage.html. Accessed 4 Feb. 2019.

Stone, Marjorie, and Judith Thompson, editors. *Literary Couplings: Writing Couples, Collaborators, and the Construction of Authorship*. U of Wisconsin P, 2006.

Storey, Graham, and Kathleen Tillotson, editors. *The Letters of Charles Dickens*. Clarendon P, 1995. 12 vols.

Tarone, Elaine. "Enduring Questions from the Interlanguage Hypothesis." *Interlanguage: Forty Years Later*, edited by ZhaoHong Han and Tarone, John Benjamins, 2014, pp. 7-26.

Tickell, Alex. "*The Perils of Certain English Prisoners*: Charles Dickens, Wilkie Collins, and the Limits of Colonial Government." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 67, no. 4, 2013, pp. 457-89. *JSTOR*, doi:10.1525/ncl.2013.67.4.457. Accessed 1 Nov. 2017.

Trodd, Anthea. "Collaborating in Open Boats: Dickens, Collins, Franklin, and Bligh." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 42, no. 2, Winter 1999, pp. 201-25. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3829245. Accessed 2 Feb. 2019.

Ziegler, Garrett. "The Perils of Empire: Dickens, Collins and the Indian Mutiny." *Pirates and Mutineers of the Nineteenth Century: Swashbucklers and Swindlers*, edited by Grace Moore, Routledge, 2016, pp. 149-64.