

# In Search of the Source Version of Su Manshu's *Can Shehui*:

An Intertextual Study

Chiang Yung-chieh\*

Abstract

Su Manshu (蘇曼殊, 1884-1918) was known for his foreign language abilities. The source version of his 1903 newspaper serial *Can Shehui* (慘社會), which was reprinted separately as *Can Shijie* (慘世界) in 1904, has sparked many critical conjectures: some claim it was translated directly from Victor Hugo's (1802-1885) original *Les Misérables*, some believe it was rendered from an English version, and still some speculate it was based on a Japanese text. These judgments are mostly based on the biographical, historical or linguistic information of Su. While each is convincing in its own reasoning, the answer to the question has remained inconclusive. Besides, although *Can Shijie* is a revised and

---

\* Chiang Yung-chieh was a part-time assistant professor at National Taiwan University, National Taiwan Normal University, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, and Soochow University at the time of submission of the paper.

supplementary version of *Can Shehui*, the former entails the disputed issue of translatorship for the additional three-odd chapters, and thus should be dealt with in a separate paper. Focused on *Can Shehui* only, the present paper attempts to trace the source of the Chinese translation by conducting an interlingual, intertextual comparison. After juxtaposing the Chinese text with possible Japanese, English and French versions and examining their relationships, this paper contrives to establish that *Can Shehui* is rendered from an English version, most probably from Charles E. Wilbour's (1833-1896) translation.

Keywords: Victor Hugo, *Les Misérables*, *Can Shehui*, *Can Shijie*, Su Manshu

# 蘇曼殊《慘社會》的底本研究

強 勇 傑

摘 要

蘇曼殊（1884-1918）的外語能力頗負盛名，其1903年的報紙連載譯文《慘社會》（後於1904年發行的單行本改爲《慘世界》）所根據的底本語言爲何，在學界有諸多揣測，主張譯自雨果（Victor Hugo，1802-1885）的法文原著、英譯本、或日譯本的學者皆有。這些說法，多以蘇氏的語言背景或當時的歷史脈絡爲判斷依據，雖然各有道理，但至今尚無定論。另外，雖然《慘世界》是根據《慘社會》修訂增補而成，但因《慘世界》涉及最後三餘章的譯者爭議，需另外爲文處理，故本文僅以《慘社會》爲研究對象，爲解決其底本的爭議，本文進行跨語言、跨文本的比較，將中譯本與可能的日文、英文、法文版本交叉比對，釐清彼此傳承關係，最後確定蘇氏的《慘社會》是譯自英文，很可能是威爾伯（Charles E. Wilbour，1833-1896）的版本。

關鍵詞：雨果、悲慘世界、慘社會、慘世界、蘇曼殊



## In Search of the Source Version of Su Manshu's *Can Shehui*:

An Intertextual Study

Chiang Yung-chieh

Victor Hugo's (1802-1885) novel *Les Misérables* was first introduced to China by Su Manshu (蘇曼殊, 1884-1918) through translation. Like so many other translated texts in China at the time, Su's Chinese version did not necessarily adopt the original work as the basis of rendition, and like so many of his contemporaries, Su only offered information of the original author in his translation but did not specify what source he used as his master copy. In the daily newspaper where the serialized rendition appeared, the authorship information in the first installment only revealed that it was written by Hugo and translated by Su Zigu (蘇子毅, one of the pen names of Su Manshu) in China.<sup>1</sup> While this note is clear about the author of the original work, it remains unknown which text, the original French or any other version, was used by Su Manshu for translation.

In tracing the source from which Su Manshu translated his Chinese *Les Misérables*, critics have mostly resorted to the biographical, historical

---

<sup>1</sup> The original Chinese phrasing is: 「法國大文豪囂俄著；中國蘇子毅譯。」

or linguistic background of the translator for speculation, but no agreed-upon conclusion has been reached yet. This paper seeks to solve the long unsettled mystery by making intertextual comparisons to derive the most likely source text for the Chinese translator. To delimit the focus of my paper, I would like to draw attention to another issue that needs to be addressed first here: while they may be well aware that the process of formation of the Chinese text entails a supplementary transformation with the possibility of two translators and thus two (or more) different sources, most critics choose to ignore the differentiation between Su's different Chinese versions in proposing their surmises about the source text they deem most probable. To clarify this problem, a brief review of the development of Su's translation is necessary.

Originally titled *Can Shehui*<sup>2</sup> (慘社會), Su Manshu's vernacular translation of *Les Misérables* was first serialized every other day in *Guomin Riribao*<sup>3</sup> (國民日日報) in Shanghai (上海) in 1903, from the eighth of October to the first of December, when the roman-feuilleton stopped in the middle of the eleventh chapter as a result of the termination of the newspaper. In 1904, a separate of an enlarged fourteen chapters was published by Jingjin (鏡今) Bookstore in Shanghai. The title of this offprint was changed to *Can Shijie*<sup>4</sup> (慘世界), and the authorship, or translatorship, was also modified to include Chen Duxiu (陳獨秀, 1879-1942) in Su's undertaking. In 1921, Taidong (泰東) Bookstore,

---

<sup>2</sup> Literally, "The Miserable Society."

<sup>3</sup> "The China National Gazette." In his introductory work on Su Manshu, Liu Wu-chi (柳無忌) refers to *Guomin Riribao* as *National People's Daily*, a good semantic translation probably done by Liu himself. See Wu-chi Liu, *Su Manshu* (New York: Twayne, 1972), 32-35. However, the daily already offered its own English title as "The China National Gazette" on the head page of each edition. Accordingly, the English title offered by the daily is adopted here.

<sup>4</sup> Literally, "The Miserable World."

also in Shanghai, published a memorial reprint of the work with the title altered to *Beican Shijie*<sup>5</sup> (悲慘世界) and the authorship restored to Su Manshu alone. The content, however, was proved by Qian Xuanton (錢玄同, 1887-1939) to be identical to that of the 1904 edition.<sup>6</sup> In 1925, when Taidong Bookstore issued a second print, the name of the novel was shifted back to *Can Shijie*, from whence no titular variation has occurred.

The evolution described above can be summed up in two ways. In terms of title, we have *Can Shehui* for the unfinished serialized version, *Can Shijie* for the 1904 Jingjin edition and the 1925 Taidong reprint, and *Beican Shijie* for the 1921 Taidong republication. As far as content is concerned, except for the incomplete serialized one, all the other editions are of the same version. Thus there are actually two versions of Su Manshu's Chinese *Les Misérables*. For ease of identification, throughout the present paper I shall use *Can Shehui* for the uncompleted eleven-chaptered newspaper serial and *Can Shijie* for the subsequent expanded reprints of fourteen chapters. When critics talk about Su's Chinese translation of *Les Misérables*, they usually refer to the fourteen-chaptered version of *Can Shijie*. However, the distinction of *Can Shehui* and *Can Shijie* has left one particular question unanswered: Does the inclusion of Chen Duxiu in the authorship of the 1904 offprint suggest that the supplemented three-odd chapters of *Can Shijie* were translated by Chen? If Chen was a co-translator, the source text he referred to for translation might probably be different from that used by Su, owing to the difference in their respective linguistic background. Since answers to this disputed question have been inconclusive, in the present paper my source-tracing will be limited to *Can Shehui* only, and the issues related to the last three-

---

<sup>5</sup> Literally, "The Sad, Miserable World."

<sup>6</sup> 劉心皇：《蘇曼殊大師新傳》（臺北：東大出版社，1984年），頁208。

odd chapters of *Can Shijie* shall be dealt with in a separate paper.

The problems involved in tracking down the source of Su Manshu's Chinese *Les Misérables* are rather complicated. Su's multicultural background and multilingual faculty, the existence of several English and Japanese translations of *Les Misérables* before Su's version came out, his supposed exposure to known translations of the French novel in different languages in his time, and his tendency to translate freely to the extent of making large-scale changes to the original story—these factors seem to lend plausibility to many speculations and make it difficult to decide which text was the source of Su's Chinese rendition. In the following sections, attempts will be made to explore into the different aspects of the topic concerning the source text on which Su based his rendition of *Can Shehui*.

## I. Probable Language Sources: Inconclusive Critical Conjectures

The source from which Su Manshu translated his Chinese *Les Misérables* has remained a mystery. Su's multilingual capability makes the issue of source-tracing a rather complex one. Because of his cross-cultural background and acquired education, Su's linguistic abilities are known to embrace Chinese, Japanese, English, Sanskrit, and French—a multilingualism which distinguished him as a rare language genius among his contemporaries. Of the five languages he was capable of, the first two are doubtless his mother tongues, for they were developed very early in his childhood through his exposure to the native environments and continued to be improved through later education. By contrast, English, Sanskrit, and French are his secondary languages, learned through deliberate effort in



non-native conditions from teenage on.

Considered along with temporal factors, the linguistic advantages in Su's case mean that all versions of *Les Misérables* which were published in any of the five languages before the first appearance of Su's *Can Shehui* in 1903 are possible sources Su might have availed himself of. By the time Su began to serialize his translation in the newspaper, there had been no known *Les Misérables* in Chinese or Sanskrit, but there had existed several complete and abridged translations in English as well as many partial translations in Japanese, not to mention the French original. Hence, Chinese and Sanskrit can be ruled out from our consideration, leaving us with the remaining three languages which deserve closer scrutiny. If Su's command of Japanese, English and French was good enough for rendition, then all the English and Japanese versions which antedated the advent of Su's translation, as well as the French original, were possible sources which Su might have drawn on.

So far, critical conjectures on Su's source of translation are all based on such biographical, historical or linguistic information and yield different results, but no critics have attempted to solve the controversy once and for all by getting to the bottom of it. There are those who speculate Su's source being Japanese. For example, based on her observation of the phenomenon that many writers and translators in late-Qing China, such as Liang Qichao (梁啟超, 1873-1929), Bao Tianxiao (包天笑, 1876-1973), Wu Jianren (吳趸人, 1866-1910), Lu Xun (魯迅, 1881-1936), and Su Manshu, either had the experience of studying in Japan or had the practice of translating from Japanese, Chen Hung-shu (陳宏淑) ventures a guess by stating that Su's Chinese *Les Misérables* may well be derived from Japanese version of *Aamujou* (噫無情)

by Kuroiwa Ruikou (黑岩淚香).<sup>7</sup> Such a guess is biographically, historically, and linguistically oriented. However, its justifiability does not preempt or preclude other likelihoods. Liu Wu-chi offers a wider range of probability, speculating that Su's Chinese rendering of *Les Misérables* is "probably from English or Japanese considering his language skills at the time."<sup>8</sup> Though also linguistically oriented, Liu's conclusion does not totally agree with Chen's. The likelihood of English is also pointed out in a recent study by Wang Xiaoyuan (王曉元). Exploring the various critical speculations on Su's levels of proficiency in the languages he was capable of, Wang also narrows down the possibilities to Japanese and English, but he takes one step forward to conclude that English is the most likely medium through which Su did his Chinese rendition because Chen Guochuan's (陳國權) reply, confirmed and forwarded by Luo Xiaoming's (羅孝明), to Liu Yazhi's (柳亞子, 1887-1958) question about Su's command of Japanese bears out the fact that Su's grasp of the Japanese language falls only on the basic level of daily conversation.<sup>9</sup> Still, Liu Yazhi, father of Liu Wu-chi, holds a different viewpoint from his son and believes that Su Manshu worked his translation from French.<sup>10</sup> Since Liu Yazhi was a close friend of Su Manshu and the most important contributor to the first compilation of Su's complete works, his opinion cannot be ignored but should be taken

---

<sup>7</sup> 陳宏淑：〈譯者的操縱：從 *Cuore* 到《馨兒就學記》〉，《編譯論叢》第3卷第1期（2010年3月），頁63。

<sup>8</sup> Wu-chi Liu, *Su Man-shu* (New York: Twayne, 1972), 34.

<sup>9</sup> 王曉元：《翻譯話語與意識形態：中國1895-1911年文學翻譯研究》（上海：上海外語教育出版社，2010年），頁139-142；柳亞子：〈蘇曼殊研究的三個階段——《蘇曼殊文集》序〉，收於馬以君主編：《蘇曼殊文集》第2冊（廣州：花城出版社，1991年），頁21。

<sup>10</sup> 柳亞子：〈蘇和尚雜談〉，收於柳亞子主編：《蘇曼殊全集》第5冊（北京：中國書店，1985年），頁208。

into serious consideration. His belief in Su's French competence is echoed by Ding Fu-sheng (丁富生), who, besides confirming Su's Japanese and English abilities, cites some evidence to demonstrate how high-level Su's French calibre is and then argues that Su could translate from any of the three languages without difficulty, though there is no knowing which one is his source.<sup>11</sup> Ding's argument functions to sum up the probabilities we are facing about the source language on which Su based his Chinese translation.

Since Japanese, English, and French are all possible sources for Su Manshu's translation, and the reasons offered by supporters for each language are all very convincing, my study has to resort to more substantial evidence to sort out the issue. Although my approach is linguistic in nature like most of the predecessors who studied Su's Chinese *Les Misérables*, my study goes one step further in conducting a close reading of related textual material for more definite clues. In the search for an origin here, this paper seeks to juxtapose Su's text with versions in Japanese, English, and French to sort out their relationships through macroscopic and microscopic comparison. Here comes the question of which texts in these languages are supposed to be the right candidates for intertextual comparison. Evidently, to put Su's translation side by side with all the Japanese and English versions that precede it in time, together with the French original, would be spatially uneconomical and too distracting for the comparisons to be presented clearly. A more feasible approach is to break the screening process into two stages: The first stage features intralingual screening, by which this paper filters out impossible candidate texts in each single language, leaving only the most

---

<sup>11</sup> 丁富生：〈蘇曼殊：《慘世界》的譯作者〉，《南通大學學報（社會科學版）》第22卷第3期（2006年5月），頁67。

probable one(s) for further comparison; in the second stage, an interlingual comparison is conducted where the chosen versions in the four languages (French, English, Japanese, and Chinese) are set against each other for closer comparative scrutiny. The two-staged screening enables my study to focus on the most probable texts which might inspire Su's translation.

In the next few sections, possible versions in the four languages shall be discussed, the most probable one(s) in each language shall be singled out, and then further intertextual comparison between the selected texts shall be conducted. A note should be given first about the French language sources. Besides the complete text of the original French *Les Misérables*, there were also abridged versions in French, some of which I find to be likely sources. Because the truncated texts discussed here in my study happened to be meant primarily for English readers who were interested in learning French or studying French literature, they will be placed together with other English abridgments for comparison and contrast under the section of English versions. This leaves the French original standing all by itself, making the section for French versions unnecessary. Therefore, the following divisions will go without a French section.

## II. Intralingual Screening: Probable English Versions

There existed both complete translations and partial renditions of the French novel in English before the emergence of the Chinese versions. Among them, six widely circulated ones are worthy of attention: they are translated respectively by Charles E. Wilbour (1862), Lascelles Wraxall (1862), Alexander Dimitry and A. F. [better known as the Richmond translation] (1863), Isabel F. Hapgood (1887), William Walton et al. (1894), and Sara E. Wiltse (1897). Three of them, by Wilbour, Hapgood,

and William Walton et al., are complete translations, whereas the others are partial ones. In addition, there are two abridged French versions which are intended for English readers: they are edited by H. C. O. Huss (1892) and F. C. de Sumichrast (1896) respectively. Now a further, more specific screening is to be made among these texts. Whether a text is a complete or abridged version, it qualifies for candidacy in my final intertextual comparison if it is released before Su's translating in 1903 and if it covers Book Two of Volume One of the original story, i.e., the part treated by Su Manshu in his Chinese rendition. In temporal terms, all the versions enumerated above are possible sources because they all predated Su's translation. Thus it is necessary to examine their content one by one. To be sure, the full-length translations respectively by Charles E. Wilbour, Isabel F. Hapgood, and William Walton et al. are certainly eligible texts for further intertextual scrutiny.

As to the partial translations, my research shall begin by inspecting how Wraxall's version handles the Second Book of Volume One. Of the original thirteen chapters in the Book, Wraxall preserves all of them except the Eighth Chapter. Since this particular chapter is also ignored by the Chinese translator, Wraxall's text has a full coverage of the segment presented in the Chinese version and so is qualified for further cross-textual juxtaposition.

The Richmond translation also prunes away the entire Eighth Chapter, making its Second Book one chapter less than the original thirteen chapters. It is already known that this deletion is shared by the Chinese translator, so it does not deprive the Richmond version of candidacy for Su Manshu's possible source. In the twelve chapters that remain in the Richmond's Book Two, some long passages of the original are found missing. For example, in Chapter Two of the original, there is a

description of a book on Duty which Bishop Myriel was working on. This Confederate version by Professor Dimitry and A. F. does mention this fact, but omits the more detailed account of the contents of the book. In the same chapter, the portrayal of Mademoiselle Baptistine and Madame Magloire which sets the two figures in sharp contrast is also obliterated by the translators of the Richmond version. Nevertheless, these passages are digressions from the plot, and the Chinese translator also turns a blind eye to them in his plot-oriented rendering. Even though “the war-time paper shortage resulted in longer and longer omissions,”<sup>12</sup> what was left out is mainly in the latter volumes of the novel, affecting little, if any, of the front part of the story where Book Two of the First Volume is situated. The Confederate text’s complete covering of the part treated by Su, together with the remarkable fact that it is essentially a nearly identical copy of Wilbour’s meticulous translation, makes it qualify as another source worth comparing and contrasting with the Chinese translation.

Sara E. Wiltse’s edition, a condensed text from Hapgood’s full-text translation, coincides with Wraxall’s version and the Richmond translation in reducing the thirteen chapters to twelve in Book Two of the original by leaving out Chapter Eight altogether. This does not nullify its possibility as a source for the Chinese rendition. However, within the preserved chapters in the Wiltse’s excerpt, there are some omissions which are not shared by the Chinese translator. Two examples are available here. For the purpose of contrast and illumination, Wiltse’s prototypical text, i.e., Hapgood’s version, is included in the citations.

---

<sup>12</sup> Olin H. Moore, “Some Translations of *Les Misérables*,” *Modern Language Notes* 74-3 (1959): 246.

English (Sara E. Wiltse)	Chinese (Su Manshu) <sup>13</sup>
<p>The sweat, the heat, the journey on foot, the dust, added I know not what sordid quality to this dilapidated whole. His hair was closely cut, yet bristling, for it had begun to grow a little, and did not seem to have been cut for some time.</p> <p>[No one knew him. He was evidently only a chance passer-by. Whence came he? From the south; from the seashore, perhaps, for he made his entrance into D— by the same street which, seven months previously, had witnessed the passage of the Emperor Napoleon on his way from Cannes to Paris.] This man must have been walking all day. He seemed very much fatigued. ... (Hapgood, I: 56; Wiltse, 40)</p>	<p>進得城來，神色疲倦，大汗滿臉，一見就知道他一定是遠遊的客人了。但是他究竟從什麼地方來的呢？暫且不表。<sup>14</sup>(113)</p>

A preliminary note is to be made: The bracketed text in Wiltse's quote is present in Hapgood's version but deleted by Wiltse in her excerpted edition. The removed sentences include the speculation on where the stranger came from and the allusive mention of Napoleon's previous route of journey. The Chinese text here shows a rather different depiction, an instance of the translator's inventive retelling of the original story. What is remarkable here is that Su's text contains the

<sup>13</sup> All the Chinese passages of *Can Shehui* in this section are quoted from [法] Victor Hugo 著，蘇曼殊譯：《慘世界》，收於文公直主編：《曼殊大師全集》（臺南：德華出版社，1976年）。

<sup>14</sup> "In town, he looked very fatigued and was sweating all over his face. A mere glance enabled one to know that he must have travelled here from far away. But where did he come from? Let's drop this subject for the time being."

---

interrogative “但是他究竟從什麼地方來的呢，”<sup>15</sup> which brings to mind the corresponding question “Whence came he?” in Hapgood’s unabridged rendition. Contrastively, Wiltse’s condensed text does not raise any similar question. This suggests that Su’s translation is not based on Wiltse’s truncated version. Indeed, a closer examination on the texts concerned displays other proofs against the lineage between Wiltse and Su. A decisive piece of evidence is available in the following passage:

---

<sup>15</sup> “But where did he come from?”



English (Sara E. Wiltse)	Chinese (Su Manshu)
<p>One of the men seated at the table, however, was a fishmonger who [, before entering the public house of the Rue de Chaffaut,] had been to stable his horse at Labarre's. It chanced that he had that very morning encountered this unprepossessing stranger on the road [between Bras d'Asse and—I have forgotten the name. I think it was Escoublon]. Now, when he met him, the man, who then seemed already extremely weary, had requested him to take him on his crupper; to which the fishmonger had made no reply except by redoubling his gait. This fishmonger had been a member half an hour previously of the group which surrounded Jacquin Labarre, and had himself related his disagreeable encounter of the morning to the people at the Cross of Colbas. From where he sat he made an imperceptible sign to the tavern-keeper. The tavern-keeper went to him. They exchanged a few words in a low tone. The man had again become absorbed in his reflections. (Hapgood, I: 60-61; Wiltse, 45-46)</p>	<p>……同坐的有一位漁夫，自從這日早晨，就在路上遇過華賤一次。待到華賤在苦巴館被逼的時候，他在馬房裡繫馬。隨後他也就來到這盧茶福店裡，卻又看見華賤來了，不覺吃了一驚，尋思道：「我卻忘記在什麼地方遇過這古怪的東西，莫非是在愛士可弗論麼？不料現在又碰著他，看他這種疲倦的神氣，好不討人厭。」想著，便兇狠狠地對華賤渾身上下打量了一回，又令華賤坐在他背後。自己急忙立起身來，逕自開門去了。不多一會，便急回來，將華賤的來歷，一一告訴了這客寓裡管事的，還低聲說了些別的話。<sup>16</sup> (117)</p>

<sup>16</sup> “... Also in the tavern was a fisherman who had encountered Jean Valjean on the road that morning. When Jean Valjean was declined by the host at La Croix de Colbas, the fisherman was there in the stable putting up his horse. Then he came to the tavern in the Rue de Chaffaut and was surprised to find Jean Valjean also arriving. He thought to himself, “I forget where I came across this weird guy. Can it be Escoublon? What a coincidence to see him here again! His look of weariness in pride is really repulsive.” At the same time, he looked him from head to toe in an unfriendly manner, and turning his back on him, stood up in a hurry and went out the door. Not long after, he returned and revealed Jean Valjean's background to the host of the inn. He also said some other things in a low voice.”

Here again, the bracketed texts, present in Hapgood's original translation, are deleted in Wiltse's bowdlerization. Although there are some differences in description between Su's text and the two English versions, what is noteworthy here is that the place name "Escoublon," which is erased in Wiltse's edition, is treated in the Chinese as "愛士可弗論," a phonetic transliteration of "Escoublon." If Su Manshu had modeled his translation on the Wiltse extract, he could not have come up with such a proper name on his own. Therefore, Wiltse's version can be excluded from consideration in the present quest for the source of Su Manshu's Chinese translation.

The English versions having all been addressed, it is time now to examine the two English-reader-oriented French shortened texts. H. C. O. Huss's version excerpts only Book Two of Volume One of the French novel, which is the exact same part that is selected by Su Manshu for his Chinese manipulative translation. Thus Huss's text is also eligible for further consideration. However, since its text is identical to Hugo's original, my subsequent intertextual juxtapositions will present Hugo's text as representative of Huss's content.

F. C. de Sumichrast's version presents the Second Book of Volume One in a bowdlerized form, just like what Su Manshu does with his rendition, but the two are shortened in different ways. Unlike the chapter-faithful arrangement in the condensed version in French, the fourteen chapters in Su's translation do not follow the original chapter division, though the order of plot narrated by the French author is generally preserved in the Chinese text. In terms of the detailedness with which they present the original plot in this particular book, the two versions vary with different parts of the story. At some sections, the Sumichrast condensation offers more details to the plot than Su's translation. For example, the

description of Jean Valjean's appearance in the town of Digne includes the following account in the excerpted version in French:

English (F. C. de Sumichrast)	Chinese (Su Manshu)
<p>Personne ne le connaissait. Ce n'était évidemment qu'un passant. D'où venait-il? Du midi. Des bords de la mer peut-être. Car il faisait son entrée dans Digne par la même rue qui sept mois auparavant avait vu passer l'empereur Napoléon allant de Cannes à Paris. Cet homme avait dû marcher tout le jour. Il paraissait très fatigué.<sup>17</sup>(18)</p>	<p>進得城來，神色疲倦，大汗滿臉，一見就知道他一定是遠遊的客人了。但是他究竟從什麼地方來的呢？暫且不表。<sup>18</sup> (113)</p>

A comparison between the two versions reveals that the French text contains more details than the Chinese. Some narrative differences aside, the Chinese text does not mention the Napoleon part which the French text does. Notwithstanding, the larger-scale abridgment in some parts of the Chinese text does not preclude the possibility that they may have been trimmed from those in the Sumichrast extract. What invalidates the possibility is found in reverse situations, where Sumichrast's text omits more than Su's version. In the following paragraphs, evidence will be offered in this regard.

Besides the parts where the Chinese text is more condensed than the

---

<sup>17</sup> “No one knew him. He was evidently only a chance passer-by. Whence came he? From the south; from the seashore, perhaps, for he made his entrance into D-by the same street which, seven months previously, had witnessed the passage of the Emperor Napoleon on his way from Cannes to Paris. This man must have been walking all day. He seemed very much fatigued.” (Hapgood: I 56)

<sup>18</sup> “In town, he looked very fatigued and was sweating all over his face. A mere glance enabled one to know that he must have travelled here from far away. But where did he come from? Let's drop this subject for the time being.”

French, Su's rendition sometimes covers more of the original plot than Sumichrast's excerpt. For instance, Chapter Four of the original book narrates the table chitchat between Jean Valjean and the bishop about the former's destination and the latter's past experience there. While Su's Sixth Chapter touches upon quite some part of the particular plot in the original chapter, Sumichrast's text omits the entire chapter, leaving only the chapter title "Détails sur les fromageries de Pontarlier."<sup>19</sup> In addition, the Sixth Chapter in the French original relates Jean Valjean's background, his theft, his imprisonment, his escape attempts, and his lengthening of jail terms. The Sumichrast edition summarizes the entire passage in brackets and combines it with the next chapter which reflects on Jean Valjean's misdeeds and society's evils. The succinct summary reduces the long chapter to a few bracketed sentences:

[Jean Valjean, à vingt-neuf ans, a volé un pain pour donner à manger aux enfants de sa soeur. Arrêté et reconnu coupable, il est condamné au bagne. Envoyé à Toulon il y devient le numéro 24601. Quatre tentatives d'évasion échouent et entraînent chaque fois un prolongement de la peine à subir. Entré au bagne en 1796, il est libéré en 1815.]<sup>20</sup> (Sumichrast, 33)

Compared with the succinctness of the Sumichrast summary, Su Manshu's version in the counterpart section presents a lot more detailed account of

<sup>19</sup> "Some Account of the Dairies of Pontarlier." The English translation of the chapter title follows Charles E. Wilbour's 1862 translation of *Les Misérables*.

<sup>20</sup> "[At the age of twenty-nine, Jean Valjean stole a loaf of bread in order to feed his sister's children. Arrested and found guilty, he was committed to prison. After he was sent to Toulon, he became Number 24601 there. Four escape attempts failed and each entailed a lengthening of his suffering in prison. He entered the jailhouse in 1796 and was released in 1815.]"

the plot. Each event mentioned in the above summary is elaborated and developed more fully in Chapters Seven, Eight and Thirteen in Su's textual arrangement. For example, how the protagonist made a living by doing odd jobs and how much he earned prior to his act of theft are depicted unsparingly by Su but completely scissored by Sumichrast.

An even more seriously truncated section in the Sumichrast text involves Chapters Eight to Eleven. The four chapters are summed up in one single sentence in the French abridgment: "Jean Valjean se réveille, vole l'argenterie de l'évêque et s'enfuit."<sup>21</sup> In contrast, the Chinese translator treats the said section with much more elaboration. The process of silverware-pilfering and the hero's inner struggles during the act are given reasonable development in the Chinese rendition. The examples given above, which demonstrate the Chinese text's treatment of some part of plot found absent in the Sumichrast version, prove that this French-language extract of *Les Misérables* cannot have been the source of Su's Chinese translation.

So far in the previous discussion of several English and French versions of *Les Misérables*, some texts have been marked impossible as the source of Su Manshu's Chinese translation. What are left for further examination, besides the original French text, are: Charles E. Wilbour's 1862 American version, Lascelles Wraxall's 1862 British edition, the 1863 Confederate translation at Richmond, Isabel F. Hapgood's 1887 text in English, William Walton et al.'s 1894 joint rendition, and Huss's 1892 French abridgment. Of the six possibilities, the 1892 French text is a duplicate extract from the original French novel, i.e., without altering a

---

<sup>21</sup> "Jean Valjean woke up, stole the bishop's silverware, and ran away." See F. C. de Sumichrast, ed., *Les Misérables*: Abridged, with Introduction and Notes. By Victor Hugo (Boston: Ginn, 1896), 36.

word, so it will be treated as one with the French original in the subsequent intertextual comparisons. This leaves us with five English versions eligible for further interlingual comparison with other language versions.

### III. Intralingual Screening: Probable Japanese Sources

In the last decades of the nineteenth century when Hugo began to capture the imagination of the Japanese literati, *Les Misérables* was commonly known as *Aishi*<sup>22</sup> (哀史) in the literary circles in Japan,<sup>23</sup> and some fragments of *Les Misérables* were rendered into Japanese. However, none of the Japanese translations did bear the heading of *Aishi* or “レ・ミゼラブル” (the phonetic transliteration of the original French title), as it later came to be known. Rather, they were usually retitled according to the episodes chosen for rendition, such as Hara Houitsuan’s (原抱一庵, 1866-1904) “ABC Kumiai” (ABC 組合)<sup>24</sup> and “Jean Valjean” (ジャンバルジャン). In other words, *Aishi* is a Japanese proper name, rather than the title of a version of translation in Japanese, for the original French novel. The appearance of Kuroiwa Ruikou’s relatively more complete rendition from 1902 on gave the story a new Japanese title as *Aamujou*.

According to the renowned Japanese literary scholar and translator Yanagida Izumi (柳田泉), Hugo’s works were not introduced to the literary circles of Japan until after 1883, though his fame had reached

<sup>22</sup> Literally, “A Miserable History.”

<sup>23</sup> For example, in his preface to “Fantine no Moto” in 1888, Morita Shiken (森田思軒) referred to *Les Misérables* as *Aishi* (“Fantine no Moto” 44). In 1892, Hara Houitsuan (原抱一庵) also mentioned *Aishi* as the original of his excerpted translation about the story of Jean Valjean (“Jean Valjean” 379).

<sup>24</sup> Literally, “ABC Society.”

Japan several years before.<sup>25</sup> However, Hugo became all the rage in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century in Japan, and Japanese translations of Hugo grew significantly in number during this period. As Kudo Takamasa (工藤貴正) points out, Hugo and Jules Verne (1828-1905) were two highly translated writers during the Meiji reign, and from 1884 to 1906 there were 30 translations of Hugo and 41 renditions of Verne.<sup>26</sup> In another essay, Kudo modifies his statistics and states that during the said period Hugo's Japanese translations were numbered at 31, including those published independently and those initially serialized in newspapers or magazines.<sup>27</sup>

From the information provided by Kudo can be known that before Su Manshu's Chinese *Les Misérables* was published in 1903, Japan had witnessed quite a few translations of Hugo's works, starting from 1884. It is therefore crucial to inquire how many of them were rendered from *Les Misérables* during the twenty years of Hugo's growing popularity on Japan's literary stage. In this respect, the collected material published by the Ozorasha (大空社) Bookstore turns out to be of enormous help. Edited by Kawato Michiaki (川戸道昭) and Sakakibara Takanori (榊原貴教), the collection presents many important Japanese translations of Hugo's works during the Meiji era. A chronology enclosed as appendix to this compilation lists Hugo's works in Japanese translation from 1884 to 1909, including independent publications and serialized ones. The period covered in the listed table coincides with the time when what is known as

---

<sup>25</sup> qtd. in [日] 工藤貴正著, 勵儲譯: 〈從本世紀初西歐文學的譯介看當時的中日文學交流〉, 《魯迅研究月刊》1997年第3期(1997年3月), 頁55。

<sup>26</sup> [日] 工藤貴正著, 趙靜譯: 〈魯迅早期三部譯作的翻譯意圖〉, 《魯迅研究月刊》1995年第1期(1995年1月), 頁38。

<sup>27</sup> [日] 工藤貴正著, 勵儲譯: 〈從本世紀初西歐文學的譯介看當時的中日文學交流〉, 頁55。

“the Hugo craze” happened in Japan. More importantly, this list offers a vital clue to the possible Japanese sources for Su’s Chinese translation—that is, if he translated from Japanese. From the table can be gathered that the illustriousness of *Les Misérables* did not escape the Japanese literary circles, which produced quite a few translations based on the novel, though there were as yet no complete Japanese renderings of the French novel. After screening out those translations which came later than Su Manshu’s and those which treat different parts of the French story, my research has three texts emerging as possible sources for Su: Hara Houitsuan’s “Jean Valjean” and “Mizu Mei Hen” (「水、冥」篇),<sup>28</sup> and Kuroiwa Ruikou’s *Aamujou*.

“Mizu Mei Hen” is translated from Chapter Eight of the Second Book in Volume One of the French novel, the part which is omitted in Su Manshu’s Chinese translation, and “Jean Valjean” embraces the whole content of “Mizu Mei Hen.” Hence, the Japanese chapter of waters and shadow has nothing to do with the Chinese rendition, so it can be ruled out first.

“Jean Valjean” covers Chapters One, Six, Seven, and Eight of Book Two in Volume One of the French novel. Significant is the fact that Hara changes the flashback fashion of the original narration to one in chronological order. The flashback part in the original, from Chapters Six to Eight, which relates what happened before Jean Valjean’s release from prison, is presented first by the translator, with some portion of the Seventh Chapter and the entire Ninth Chapter skipped. After finishing the Eighth Chapter, the translator returns to the beginning chapter of the book about Jean Valjean’s appearance in Digne. This way, the story is

---

<sup>28</sup> Literally, “‘Waters and Shadow’ Chapter.”



recounted chronologically in the Japanese translation. However, as the first chapter ends with the kind woman's advice to the stranger to try knocking on the bishop's door, the Japanese narration does not go on to Chapter Two but jumps beyond Book Two of the novel back to the previous book, excerpting first a passage from Chapter Four of the First Book and then another passage from the Second Chapter of the same book. In other words, Hara's translation leaves untreated Chapters Two to Five and Nine to Thirteen of Book Two, totally nine out of thirteen chapters, in the French novel—a large-scale omission unshared by the Chinese text.

The mere fact that Su Manshu's Chinese translation includes some chapters of the original story which are absent in Hara's version is evidence enough to show that Hara's text is not likely to be Su's source of inspiration. To be more precise, of the nine chapters left out of rendition by Hara, as many as eight chapters—Chapters Two to Five and Ten to Thirteen—constitute the principle axis of the story line and are seriously treated by Su Manshu in his translation. Besides, the chronological order of narration in Hara's text is quite distinct from the technique of flashback adopted in Su's text. This structural discrepancy also suggests the same conclusion. Finally, my judgment is further strengthened by some textual proofs in the passages that are handled by both translators. Suffice it to exhibit here just one salient example of such evidence. The innkeeper of La Croix de Colbas is named Jacquin in the original story. However, the Japanese text does not translate the name but simply refers to the keeper of the inn as “客舎はたごやの主人あるじ.”<sup>29</sup> In the Chinese text, by contrast, the tavern-

---

<sup>29</sup> Literally, “host of the inn.” See [法] Hugo 著, [日] 原抱一庵譯: 〈ジャンバルジャン〉, 收於川戸道昭、榊原貴教主編: 《明治翻譯文学全集: 新聞誌編 24 (ユゴー集 I)》(東京: 大空社, 1996年), 頁 395。

keeper is specifically called “紮昆,”<sup>30</sup> apparently a phonetic transcription of “Jacquin” in the source.<sup>31</sup> Su cannot have translated from Hara’s Japanese version if the Japanese text offers no information whatsoever of the innkeeper’s name. Therefore, structurally or textually, Hara’s “Jean Valjean” is by no means Su’s source of rendition.

After exclusion of Hara’s versions, the only Japanese translation left for consideration is *Aamujou* by Kuroiwa Ruikou, known as a prolific writer and translator in Meiji Japan. The longest Japanese version of *Les Misérables* so far at the time, *Aamujou* was serialized in 150 installments from October 8, 1902 to August 22, 1903 in *Yorozu Chouhou* (萬朝報). In 1906, the translation was published separately in book form by Husoudou (扶桑堂), with a total of 152 chapters in two volumes, the first 78 chapters in Volume One and the other chapters in the Second Volume. The reprinted book version, rather than the newspaper serials, is adopted when its content is referred to or cited in the present dissertation. Kuroiwa’s practice of free translation in the manner of story-retelling is shared by Su Manshu. This easily arouses the curiosity as to whether Su’s unrestrained translation was a result of translating from the Japanese text. Besides, the previously mentioned fact that both versions begin the story from Book Two of Volume One of the original adds to the suspicion that they are strongly related. Moreover, the part of plot selected by Su for rendition is also covered by the Japanese version, in Kuroiwa’s Chapters One to Eleven. Finally, there is a piece of circumstantial evidence that easily leads to the same judgment. The period of *Aamujou*’s serialization in the newspaper concurred with Su Manshu’s stay in Japan.

<sup>30</sup> Romanized as “Zhakun” in the Pinyin system.

<sup>31</sup> [法] Hugo 著，蘇曼殊譯：《慘世界》，收於文公直主編：《曼殊大師全集》，頁114。

After studying for five years in the eastern island nation, Su left Japan, embarking on a mail liner called Hakuaimaru (博愛丸) from the port city of Yokohama (橫濱), and returned to Shanghai in early September, 1903. The time required for the sea voyage between Yokohama and Shanghai can be estimated at less than ten days, an estimate based on the experience of a group of Chinese students studying medicine in Japan who also started their home-bound trip from Yokohama by taking Hakuaimaru on November 19 and arrived in Shanghai on November 26 to perform their rescue action.<sup>32</sup> This rough calculation allows one to draw the conclusion that to reach Shanghai in early September Su must have left Japan at the end of August, 1903, that is, well after the serialized publishing of *Aamujou* was completed. In other words, Su's sojourn in Japan witnessed the gradual unfolding of a Japanese *Les Misérables* on the Japanese newspaper. Greatly interested in arts and literatures of the world, Su cannot have ignored the fame of Kuroiwa and Hugo in Japan, nor can he have missed the event of the Japanese translation of one of Hugo's major works. The appearance of Su's own rendition of the same novel, in just a little over a month after his return to China and notably on the anniversary of the initiation of Kuroiwa's serial, seems to point to the probability that Su's translation was inspired by Japanese versions, and that particularly by Kuroiwa's. All in all, these observations justify the inclusion of Kuroiwa's version for further comparison and contrast with versions in other

---

<sup>32</sup> See 池子華：〈辛亥革命中留日醫學生的救護行動〉，《徐州師範大學學報（哲學社會科學版）》第30卷第2期（2004年3月），頁27。In addition, Lu Xun's navigation between China and Japan is also a piece of supporting evidence, though his trip is in the reverse direction. In 1902, he left Nanjing 南京 on a steamship on March 24, passing by Shanghai on the way, and arrived at Yokohama on April 4. See 鮑昌、邱文治：《魯迅年譜：1881-1936》第1冊（天津：天津人民出版社，1979年），頁33。

languages.

#### IV. Intralingual Screening: Versions of Su Manshu's *Can Shehui*

As has been mentioned at the beginning of the present paper, there are two versions of Su Manshu's Chinese *Les Misérables*: the uncompleted eleven-chaptered newspaper serial of *Can Shehui* and the expanded fourteen-chaptered reprint of *Can Shijie*. Since the authorship of the three-odd additional chapters in *Can Shijie* has remained an unsettled question, my source-tracing of Su Manshu's rendition here is targeted on *Can Shehui* only. As for the specific text to be used, the original text that appeared on *Guomin Riribao* is preferred to the first eleven chapters of the later enlarged reprint, for it was subjected to relatively fewer redactions and transformations and would thus betray comparatively more clues to its ancestry. However, a fatal disadvantage in employing the serialized *Can Shehui* for further juxtapositions and comparisons is that no complete copy of it can be found so far, as has been pointed out by Chen Wanxiong (陳萬雄).<sup>33</sup> The majority of the original serialized version on the newspaper has been lost, and so far it cannot be retrieved in full. What is accessible now about the newspaper version consists of the part serialized from October 8 to October 18, 1903 only, which presents Chapters One and Two, and an unfinished Chapter Three. This means that as many as eight chapters of the newspaper version are missing. Consequently, for the full content of the first eleven chapters of *Can Shehui*, the present thesis

<sup>33</sup> 陳萬雄：〈談雨果《悲慘世界》最早的中譯本〉，《抖擻》1979年第31期，頁10。Also qtd. In 王曉元：《翻譯話語與意識形態：中國1895-1911年文學翻譯研究》（上海：上海外語教育出版社，2010年），頁125。

cannot but rely on the version of *Can Shijie*. Then ensues the question of how different the two versions are from each other as far as the first eleven chapters are concerned. In this regard, the question can be boiled down to two aspects: characterization and verbal style.

In one of his essays on Su Manshu, Liu Yazhi elaborates on the distinctions between the two versions in characterization. According to his observation, aside from some minor differences such as the shift of the protagonist's name from “華賤”<sup>34</sup> in *Can Shehui* to “金華賤”<sup>35</sup> in *Can Shijie* and the conversion of Myriel's title from “和尚”<sup>36</sup> in *Can Shehui* to “孟主教”<sup>37</sup> in *Can Shijie*, the major disparity between the two texts consists in the characterization of Myriel: in *Can Shehui* he is portrayed as a hypocritical and avaricious monk, quite unlike the figure in Hugo's original story, but in *Can Shijie* he is changed back to Hugo's benevolent and charitable clergyman, though the editor did not see to it that all the necessary textual adjustments were made in accordance with his intended characterization, resulting in inconsistency in the portrayal of the bishop's character in *Can Shijie*.<sup>38</sup> The reasons for this intentional transformation are not my concern here. What is at issue is that the distortion of the religious character, done purposely and creatively by Su Manshu, will not affect the results of my source-tracing, for its juxtaposition with other interlingual versions would surely betray or even underscore the fact that it belongs to the translator's concoction, a deviation from Hugo's original

---

<sup>34</sup> A transliteration of “Valjean”

<sup>35</sup> A transliteration of “Jean Valjean”

<sup>36</sup> “Monk”

<sup>37</sup> “Bishop Mong,” Mong being a transliteration derived partly from the name “Myriel”

<sup>38</sup> 柳亞子：〈慘社會與慘世界〉，收於柳亞子主編：《蘇曼殊全集》第4冊（北京：中國書店，1985年），頁423-430。

as well as all the other versions, which unanimously depict the bishop as a positive figure instead of the negative one under Su Manshu's hand. Similarly, comparison of the inconsistent character of Bishop Myriel in *Can Shijie* with other versions of different languages would also evoke an awareness on my part that the inconsistency is due to translatorial or editorial revisions rather than to strict adherence to its foreign model, and so my source-tracing would not be misled by this discrepancy. Therefore, as far as characterization is concerned, to use the text of *Can Shijie* in place of *Can Shehui* will not cause any problem to my tracing of the source of Su's Chinese rendition.

In terms of verbal style, it is known that when the newspaper version was later separately reprinted with an expanded content, not only had the final three-odd chapters been appended, but the first eleven chapters had also undergone some editing. What concerns me here is whether the later revision drifts too far apart from its predecessor to direct my interlingual comparison straight. In other words, if the editing and revising in *Can Shijie* is done on a large scale with major changes, making the two versions significantly distinct, then we cannot rely on just the offprinted text, but have to cross-examine both versions when we are trying to track down their sources. On the contrary, if no remarkable disparities are found between them, the fourteen-chaptered version will be adopted for further comparison.

The question still remains that we have only less than the first three chapters of *Can Shehui* at hand, and that the examination of the editorial shifts from *Can Shehui* to *Can Shijie* in the first eleven chapters will be limited to the initial two-odd chapters only. Precisely speaking, the text from the second paragraph of Chapter Seven to the middle of Chapter Thirteen in *Can Shijie* constitutes the digression which is not based on

the French story but is made up by the Chinese translator. Since the digressive part has little, if any, to do with translation, its irrelevant text will not be used for the intertextually comparative analyses in my study. Thus what concerns my source-tracing lies actually in the first six chapters plus the first paragraph of the Seventh Chapter. The less than three initial chapters available to us occupy about half of the text in the first six-odd chapters, for Chapters Three to Six are short chapters compared with the first two chapters which are considerably longer. In order to continue with the research, the present thesis has to infer the general editorial patterns from the limited resources that can be obtained. Hence, in what follows, the texts from Chapter One to middle Chapter Three in *Can Shehui* and *Can Shijie* will be compared to see what transformations result from the editorial process. It is presumed that the editorial patterns derived from the first half of the six-odd-chaptered text also apply to the other half which is missing.

Through textual comparison, my study is able to identify different types of editing as *Can Shehui* morphed into *Can Shijie*. Numerous as they are, the textual revisions are mostly done on the minor phrasal level without resulting in any significant semantic shift or any change in the plot, except for the prominent characterization of Myriel. That is, the contents of the two versions are basically the same, so the revisions are insignificant and can be ignored, making the first eleven chapters of *Can Shijie* qualify both as a replacement for *Can Shehui* and as a candidate for further comparison. In what follows, demonstrations will be made to this effect. Formal differences such as paragraphing and punctuating, being insubstantial, are excluded from my comparative analysis.

The results of my comparison show different types of alterations done by the editor. For analytical convenience, the cited passages that follow

will be arranged in tabular juxtaposition. Revisions of a similar type are put in the same table, and each specific example is tagged with a number for later reference.

In the first place, some of the colloquial expressions in *Can Shehui* are rephrased to become more formally written ones in *Can Shijie*. Here are some examples:

no	<i>Can Shehui</i> <sup>39</sup>	<i>Can Shijie</i> <sup>40</sup>
1	此人年紀約四十六、七歲，身子不高不矮…… <sup>41</sup> (341)	此人年紀約莫四十六、七歲，身量不高不矮…… <sup>42</sup> (113)
2	他……就和和氣氣的脫下帽子，向那坐在門旁的憲兵行禮。 <sup>43</sup> (340)	他……就和顏悅色的脫下帽子，向那坐在門旁的憲兵行禮。 <sup>44</sup> (113)
3	歇息了一會兒，又將背上的行李放下，當做枕頭。 <sup>45</sup> (421)	歇息片時，又將背上的行李放下，當做枕頭。 <sup>46</sup> (120)

In the above instances, “約莫”<sup>47</sup> is synonymous with “約,” so is “身量”<sup>48</sup>

<sup>39</sup> All the passages of *Can Shehui* in this section are quoted with added emphases from [法] Victor Hugo 著，蘇曼殊譯：《慘社會》，收於吳相湘主編：《國民日日報》（臺北：臺灣學生書局，1965年），頁340-341、360-361、380-381、400-401、420-421、440-441.

<sup>40</sup> All the passages of *Can Shijie* in this section are quoted with added emphases from [法] Victor Hugo 著，蘇曼殊譯：《慘世界》，收於文公直主編：《曼殊大師全集》，頁113-184.

<sup>41</sup> “This man was about forty-six or forty-seven years old, with a medium stature.”

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> “He ... took of his cap gently and saluted the gendarme who was sitting at the entrance.”

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> “He rested for a while, and then put down the knapsack which he used as a pillow.”

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> “about”

<sup>48</sup> “stature”



with “身子,” “和顏悅色”<sup>49</sup> with “和和氣氣,” and “片時”<sup>50</sup> with “一會兒.” In each pair of synonyms, the rephrasing is directed toward a more formal style to replace the original colloquialism. However, changes of this kind do not alter the textual meaning at all.

There are also some editorial modifications that show personal preference in diction without transforming the meaning or style of the earlier version. Consider the following passages:

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
4	客人重復把大皮袋收在懷裡，氣忿忿的拿著行李，用力放在門邊下…… <sup>51</sup> (341)	此人重復把大皮袋收在懷裡，氣忿忿的拿著行李，用力放在門邊下…… <sup>52</sup> (114)

The passages narrate what Jean Valjean did after entering the inn of Cross of Colbas. To refer to Jean Valjean as “客人”<sup>53</sup> or “此人”<sup>54</sup> makes no virtual difference here in the context, for they are just narrative variations that can be used interchangeably.

Another type of rephrasing consists in making the narration more vivid while retaining the same sense. Compare the usage of different verbs in the following passages:

<sup>49</sup> “gently”

<sup>50</sup> “for a while”

<sup>51</sup> “The guest again held the big leather bag in his chest under his coat before he sullenly put his knapsack down hard on the ground at the door.”

<sup>52</sup> “The man again held the big leather bag in his chest under his coat before he sullenly put his knapsack down hard on the ground at the door.”

<sup>53</sup> “the guest”

<sup>54</sup> “this man” or “the person”

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
5	忽然間有一管事的人，名叫做扎昆的，跑將過來，在袋裡 <b>拿</b> 一枝鉛筆…… <sup>55</sup> (341)	忽然見有一管事的人，名叫做扎昆的，跑將過來，在袋裡 <b>摸出</b> 一枝鉛筆…… <sup>56</sup> (114)

The excerpts above delineate how Jacquin Labarre, the host of the inn, took a pencil from his pocket. In the two versions, the verbs “拿” and “摸出” both bear the meaning of “taking out,” but the latter sounds more graphic because it conveys an extra sense of “fumbling” which is absent in the former. This additional message serves only to add relish to the passage, but it does not change its basic semantic value.

At some points, the editing is targeted on Westernized Chinese in the former version. Here are two examples:

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
6	那憲兵也並不還答， <b>並且</b> 睜開眼睛，留神看了他一看。 <sup>57</sup> (340)	那憲兵也並不還答， <b>還</b> 睜開著眼，留神看了他一回。 <sup>58</sup> (113)
7	店主人猛然聽得開門的聲音，瞥見來了一個新客人， <b>他</b> 並不轉眼瞧他一瞧…… <sup>59</sup> (340)	店主人猛然聽得開門的聲音，瞥見來了一個新客人， <b>也</b> 並不轉眼望他一下…… <sup>60</sup> (114)

<sup>55</sup> “Suddenly the host of the inn, named Jacquin, ran over here and took out a pencil from his bag.”

<sup>56</sup> “Suddenly the host of the inn, named Jacquin, ran over here and took out a pencil after fumbling in his bag.”

<sup>57</sup> “The gendarme did not respond. He just opened his eyes wide and stared attentively at him for a while.”

<sup>58</sup> “The gendarme did not respond. He simply opened his eyes wide and stared attentively at him for a while.”

<sup>59</sup> “At the sound of the door suddenly opening, the host of the inn knew it was a new guest from the corner of his eye, but he did not bother to turn his head to look at him.”

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

The passages of no. 6 describe how the gendarme at the gate of the town-hall responded to Jean Valjean's salute. Three verb phrases are used here to illustrate the response: “並不還答,”<sup>61</sup> “睜開眼睛,”<sup>62</sup> and “留神看了他一看.”<sup>63</sup> Chinese syntax does not require any conjunction here, so the use of “並且”<sup>64</sup> in this part of *Can Shehui* is redundant. Such redundancy is frequently caused by translation or imitation of the grammatical concept of “and,” “but,” and so on in Western languages,<sup>65</sup> though it is not clear whether Su's application of this style resulted from his rendition or from his exposure to such writing. The replacement of “並且” with “還”<sup>66</sup> in the revised version erases the awkward foreign construction and makes the sentence smoother in Chinese reading.

The no. 7 passages show the indifference of the keeper of the inn to the entrance of a guest. The three predicates of “猛然聽得開門的聲音,”<sup>67</sup> “瞥見來了一個新客人,”<sup>68</sup> and “並不轉眼瞧他一瞧”<sup>69</sup> share the same subject “店主人.”<sup>70</sup> The pronoun “他”<sup>71</sup> in the earlier text is superfluous, for pronouns are used very sparingly, usually when absolutely necessary for clarification, in Chinese, quite unlike the much

---

<sup>61</sup> “did not respond”

<sup>62</sup> “opened his eyes”

<sup>63</sup> “stared attentively at him for a while”

<sup>64</sup> “and”

<sup>65</sup> 余光中：《分水嶺上：余光中評論文集》（臺北：純文學出版社，1981年），頁137-138。The Westernized Chinese was not limited to rendition of Western works but could be found in creative writing in Chinese as more and more Chinese writers were exposed to such a style of writing introduced to Chinese through translation.

<sup>66</sup> similar to “but” and “even”

<sup>67</sup> “at the sound of the door suddenly opening”

<sup>68</sup> “knew it was a new guest from the corner of his eye”

<sup>69</sup> “did not bother to turn his head to look at him”

<sup>70</sup> “the innkeeper”

<sup>71</sup> “he”

wider usage of pronouns in Western languages. The new version crosses out the Westernized “他” and substitutes “也”<sup>72</sup> for it, rendering the sentence more traditionally Chinese. The two cases of re-sinicization of Westernized construction in Chinese function to beautify the text rather than modify the sense.

The editor sometimes modifies the previous version in consideration of sentence patterning. The following is an example:

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
8	只見他……還沒有走到二百步，在街上泉場裡痛飲了兩次。 <sup>73</sup> (340)	只見他還沒走到二百步，便在街上泉桶裡痛飲了兩次。 <sup>74</sup> (113)

The passage in the earlier version adopts a sentence pattern of “還沒，”<sup>75</sup> and such a structure is usually coupled with a subsequent conjunction “便” or “就” in Chinese, forming a construction similar to the pattern “barely ... when” in English. However, the conjunction is missing in the first version, so that the sentence reads a little awkwardly, just like how the sentence will sound in English if the word “when” is omitted in the “barely ... when” structure. In the revised passage, the addition of “便” to the pattern perfects the structure and renders fluent the Chinese sentence, which is roughly equivalent to the English pattern “He had barely walked two hundred steps when he drank voraciously from the fountains in the street twice.” Certainly, the perfection of the sentence structure does not affect the content.

<sup>72</sup> “still” or “even”

<sup>73</sup> “He had barely walked two hundred steps when he drank voraciously from the fountains in the street twice.”

<sup>74</sup> “barely”

<sup>75</sup> “barely”

In addition, some syntactic peculiarities found in *Can Shehui* are corrected in *Can Shijie*. One example is as follows:

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
9	行不多時，來到一所客寓門前。抬頭一看，上寫到館名苦巴，迺太尼算是這城中有名的一個客寓。 <sup>76</sup> (340)	行不多時，來到一所客寓門前。抬頭一看，上寫著「苦巴館」，迺是太尼城中有名的一個客寓。 <sup>77</sup> (113)

The earlier text of “迺太尼算是這城中”<sup>78</sup> contains some misplaced words, making the sentence anomalous in Chinese. What was originally meant is obviously “迺算是這太尼城中”<sup>79</sup> and the mistake might have occurred during the printing process. The later version not only corrects the anomaly, but also turns “迺算是” into “迺是,” making the resultant phrase “迺是太尼城中”<sup>80</sup> sound more certain about the reputation of the tavern. To be sure, the correction and revision do not result in semantic shift in the least.

Aside from eccentric expressions, the first version of Chinese *Les Misérables* also carries some typos, which are easily distinguishable. A couple of examples are provided here:

<sup>76</sup> “Before long he found himself in front of a tavern. He turned up his head and saw a sign displaying ‘La Croix de Colbas,’ a famous inn in the town of Digne.”

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> literally “is Digne can be said to be in the town”

<sup>79</sup> “can be said to be in the town of Digne”

<sup>80</sup> “is in the town of Digne”

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
10	卻說這座太尼城，本原來在嶺上頭，也就 <b>有</b> 有些招風…… <sup>81</sup> (341)	卻說這座太尼城，原來建在嶺上，也就 <b>有</b> 些招風…… <sup>82</sup> (114)
11	世上人的嘴是 <b>狠</b> 消薄的，那時 <b>到</b> 不好看哩。 <sup>83</sup> (381)	世上人的嘴是 <b>很</b> 輕薄的，那時 <b>倒</b> 不好看。 <sup>84</sup> (116)

In the no. 10 passages, an unwanted character “有” somehow slips into the phrase “有些”<sup>85</sup> in the first version. In the passages of no. 11, “狠” and “到” are wrong characters for “很”<sup>86</sup> and “倒”<sup>87</sup> respectively. Of course, in both cases, the rectifications in the revised text do not alter the meaning.

Since the Chinese version of *Les Misérables* is rendered in the form of *zhanghui xiaoshuo* (章回小說), some modifications in the revised version are aimed at endowing the text with more elements of this particular type of novel. Let us examine the following example:

---

<sup>81</sup> “The town of Digne, having been built on the mountain range, was rather windy.”

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> “People in the world liked to wag their bitter tongues. It would be humiliating to be subjected to them.”

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> “somewhat”

<sup>86</sup> “very”

<sup>87</sup> “then”

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
12	一見就知道他一定是遠遊的客人了。但是他究竟從什麼地方來的呢？ <sup>88</sup> (340)	一見就知道他一定是遠遊的客人了。但是他究竟從什麼地方來的呢？ <b>暫且不表</b> 。 <sup>89</sup> (113)

In the earlier passage, the narrator puts a question “但是他究竟從什麼地方來的呢”<sup>90</sup> and goes on with the narrative without answering the question. In contrast, the revised text appends a phrase “暫且不表”<sup>91</sup>. This attached phrase is a set expression employed typically in a *zhanghui* novel to keep the interested reader in suspense. This is a technical alteration which strengthens the suspension effect without changing the semantic content.

On certain spots, the narrative sequence in the first version is switched around in the revision. The beginning of the Chinese texts offers a salient instance:

---

<sup>88</sup> “A mere glance enabled one to know that he must have travelled here from far away. But where did he come from?”

<sup>89</sup> “A mere glance enabled one to know that he must have travelled here from far away. But where did he come from? Let’s drop this subject for the time being.”

<sup>90</sup> “but where did he come from?”

<sup>91</sup> “let’s drop this subject for the time being”

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
13	卻說一日天色將晚，四望無涯。一人隨那寒風落葉，一片淒慘的聲音，走進法國太尼城裡。這時候乃是西曆一千八百十五年十月初旬，將交冬令，天氣寒冷。 <sup>92</sup> (341)	話說西曆一千八百十五年十月初旬，一日天色將晚，四望無涯。一人隨那寒風落葉，一片淒慘的聲音，走進法國太尼城裡。這時候將交冬令，天氣寒冷。 <sup>93</sup> (113)

The newspaper version starts with an unspecified “一日”<sup>94</sup> and then provides the specific day as “西曆一千八百十五年十月初旬”<sup>95</sup> after introducing the protagonist. In the later updated edition, the story points out the specific day at the very beginning and proceeds with narration of the coming event. Both kinds of narration are acceptable in Chinese, though each one serves a somewhat different purpose. The different arrangements in narrative order result in slightly different dramatic effects, but the information imparted in the above passages remains the same.

Sometimes the old sequence of description is rearranged in the new version not for the purpose of bringing about different effects, as in the previous instance, but because the old narration is not organized enough. The following is a case in point.

<sup>92</sup> “It happened that one day at dusk, a man walked from the boundless fields into the town of Digne in France, accompanied by cold winds, fallen leaves, and bleak, saddening sound. It was early October of 1815 on the Western calendar. The winter was approaching, and the weather was chilly.”

<sup>93</sup> “It happened in early October of 1815 on the Western calendar. One day at dusk, a man walked from the boundless fields into the town of Digne in France, accompanied by cold winds, fallen leaves, and bleak, saddening sound. Now the winter was approaching, and the weather was chilly.”

<sup>94</sup> “one day”

<sup>95</sup> “in early October of 1815”



no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
14	只見他那時候渴極了，有幾個小孩子跟在他的後面，還沒有走到二百步，在街上泉場裡痛飲了兩次。 <sup>96</sup> (340)	只見當時有幾個童子，看見是遠來的生人，就跟在他的後面。只見他還沒走到二百步，便在街上泉桶裡痛飲了兩次。 <sup>97</sup> (113)

The above extracts contain three major messages: the hero's thirst, his drinking from a fountain, and his being followed by some children. In *Can Shehui*, the narrator first mentions the hero's thirst, then adds the information of the protagonist's being followed by some children, and then resumes talk about the hero's quenching his thirst by drinking from the fountain after walking for some distance. This somewhat rambling description is rewritten in *Can Shijie*, which narrates several children following the hero first, and then recounts the hero's thirst-quenching act. The rearranged narration makes for a more logical flow of descriptive development, and the messages conveyed in the earlier version are not compromised.

The editing process also entails some additions, like the following examples:

<sup>96</sup> "Apparently he was extremely thirsty. Some children were following in his wake. He had barely walked two hundred steps when he drank voraciously from the fountains in the street twice."

<sup>97</sup> "Some children, seeing that the stranger must have come from far away, were following in his wake. He had barely walked two hundred steps when he drank voraciously from the fountains in the street twice."

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
15	……管事的人又對著這用人的耳邊唧唧咕咕的說了一會。那用人就一直跑到衙門裡去了。 <sup>98</sup> (341)	……並對著那用人的耳邊唧唧咕咕地說了一會。那用人點了點頭，便一直跑到衙門裡去了。 <sup>99</sup> (114)
16	正想解那衣衫鈕子睡下，耳邊忽聽得一種兇惡聲音。 <sup>100</sup> (421)	正想解衣睡下，耳邊忽聽得一種兇惡聲音，呱呱的叫來。 <sup>101</sup> (120)
17	一天到晚，跑了好幾十里，我實在不能再走了…… <sup>102</sup> (421)	一天到晚，跑了幾十里，粒米也不曾吃過。我實在不能再走了…… <sup>103</sup> (119)

The no. 15 passages describe how the host of the inn whispered something in the ears of a servant, who then ran out to the yamen. The revised edition adds a phrase to indicate the servant “點了點頭”<sup>104</sup> to the host before rushing to the yamen. In the no. 16 case, while the earlier text shows that the protagonist was about to take off his clothes to sleep when he heard a fierce, growling noise, the later revision characterizes the noise by an additional expression of “呱呱的叫來”<sup>105</sup>. In the passages of no. 17, the

<sup>98</sup> “The innkeeper whispered something into the servant’s ear. Then the servant ran all the way to the yamen.”

<sup>99</sup> “[The innkeeper] whispered something into the servant’s ear. The servant nodded before running out to the yamen.”

<sup>100</sup> “He was just about to unbutton his coat before sleep when he heard a ferocious sound.”

<sup>101</sup> “He was just about to unbutton his coat before sleep when he heard a ferocious sound bowwowing nearer and nearer.”

<sup>102</sup> “I have covered scores of leagues on foot from morning till evening, and I simply can’t walk on.”

<sup>103</sup> “I have covered scores of leagues on foot from morning till evening without even eating a grain of rice, and I simply can’t walk on.”

<sup>104</sup> “nodded”

<sup>105</sup> “bowwowing nearer and nearer”

protagonist said to the owner of a house that he had travelled for scores of leagues from morning till night and that he was too tired to walk on. The revised text tries to underscore the hero's energy exhaustion by adding the clause “粒米也不會吃過”<sup>106</sup> before the hero's articulation of fatigue. These additions are evidently made to enhance the contextual messages and enrich the illustrative flavors. The general information of the passage remains unchanged with these embellishments.

Besides additions, the editor also makes some reductions, two of which can be cited for illustration:

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
18	同坐的有一位漁夫……急忙立起身來，逕自開門去了。 <sup>107</sup> (381) 話說那漁夫去了不多一會，便急回來，將華賤的來歷，一一告訴了這客寓裡管事的…… <sup>108</sup> (401)	同坐的有一位漁夫……急忙立起身來，逕自開門去了。不多一會，便急回來，將華賤的來歷，一一告訴了這客寓裡管事的…… <sup>109</sup> (117)
19	卻說這太尼城，因為一千八百十五年有宗教的戰爭，所以到了現在，環城四面還有圍牆。 <sup>110</sup> (441)	卻說這太尼城，因為以前經過兵亂，所以到了現在，環城四面還有圍牆。 <sup>111</sup> (121)

<sup>106</sup> “without even eating a grain of rice”

<sup>107</sup> “Also in the tavern was a fisherman who stood up in a hurry and went out the door.”

<sup>108</sup> “It so happened that not long after he left, the fisherman hastened back and revealed Jean Valjean's background to the host of the inn.”

<sup>109</sup> “Also in the tavern was a fisherman ... who stood up in a hurry and went out the door. Not long after, he hastened back and revealed Jean Valjean's background to the host of the inn.”

<sup>110</sup> “The town of Digne, having seen wars of religion in 1815, was protected by walls on four sides.”

<sup>111</sup> “The town of Digne, having been torn by wars, was protected by walls on four sides.”

The no. 18 instance reveals an intriguing phenomenon caused by the distinction between serializing and separate printing. The excerpts narrate how a fisherman walked out the door upon seeing Jean Valjean and returned with information of Jean's background which he disclosed to the innkeeper. Probably because of space limitation, the newspaper version breaks the passage in two so that they appear in different editions of the paper, but the division of text does not make the fragments fall into different chapters of the novel. The October 12, 1903 edition ends with “逕自開門去了,”<sup>112</sup> and the October 14 edition continues with an inaugural clause “話說那漁夫去了不多一會,”<sup>113</sup> which is intended to help the reader pick up the threads of the story in the last issue. Hence, the introductory phrase is necessitated by serialization. However, no consideration of this kind is necessary when the story is printed whole in a volume, particularly when the broken parts constitute a cohesive chain of action. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that by leaving out the introductory sentence the later revision manages to describe the series of the fisherman's movement sequentially and in a tightly packed manner. Again, this adjustment does not alter the semantics of the passage.

Case no. 19 traces the walling of Digne to the religious wars of 1815. The specific mention of “一千八百十五年有宗教的戰爭”<sup>114</sup> in the earlier text is simplified to become “以前經過兵亂”<sup>115</sup> in the later revision. The simplification may be ascribed to the editor's consideration that religious warfare, unknown in Chinese history, is next to unthinkable to Chinese readers. Whether this conjecture is valid or not, the loss of

---

<sup>112</sup> “walked out the door”

<sup>113</sup> “not long after the fisherman left”

<sup>114</sup> “not long after the fisherman left”

<sup>115</sup> “having seen wars of religion in 1815”

information in the new version is relatively minor, and the main message of war is preserved.

Still another act of editing involves correction of mistakes which may result from misuse or misinterpretation in the first version. In a passage that depicts Jean Valjean's looks, the two versions of Chinese *Les Misérables* use different adjectives.

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
20	臉上雖是瘦弱，卻很有些英氣…… <sup>116</sup> (340-41)	臉上雖是瘦弱，卻很有些兇氣…… <sup>117</sup> (113)

The earlier version says that Jean Valjean's face is characterized by some quality of “英氣，”<sup>118</sup> whereas the revision turns the positive adjective into the negative “兇氣。”<sup>119</sup> Judging from the context, where the townspeople of Digne were appalled by the appearance of Jean Valjean the ex-convict, the latter choice of words seems more appropriate. What is at issue here is whether this semantic change will affect the results of my further intertextual comparison. For this reason, a check on the texts concerned becomes imperative, and it is found, after the inspection is performed, that the depictions of “英氣” and “兇氣” are both invented by the translator. The absence of such descriptions, at least not on the literal level, in the other texts selected for comparison means that the textual discrepancies caused by no. 20 editing are irrelevant to my search for Su's source.

My last example of the editorial traces has to do with the editor's consideration of social practices. Consider the following example:

---

<sup>116</sup> “His face, thin and feeble, was characterized by a sort of heroic spirit.”

<sup>117</sup> “His face, thin and feeble, was characterized by a sort of ferocity.”

<sup>118</sup> “heroic spirit”

<sup>119</sup> “ferocity”

no	<i>Can Shehui</i>	<i>Can Shijie</i>
21	華賤便道：「先生，求你寬恕我來得唐突。 <b>我現在把錢給你買</b> 一點飯菜吃，還求你把那花園拐角下的小房子借我睡一夜。不曉得可不可以呢？」 <sup>120</sup> (401)	華賤便道：「先生，求你寬恕我來得唐突。請你給點飯菜我吃，還求將花園拐角下的小房子給我歇宿一夜， <b>明日走時一發算錢給你</b> 。不曉得可能俯允嗎？」 <sup>121</sup> (119)

The passages narrate how Jean Valjean implored a man of the house to offer him food and shelter in exchange of money. The first version uses the expression “我現在把錢給你買一點飯菜吃，”<sup>122</sup> which denotes that the guest offers to pay in advance. The message of offering money is relocated in the narrative sequence and rephrased as “明日走時一發算錢給你”<sup>123</sup> in the new version. Thus the prepaid mode of supplication in the old text becomes a “pay later” one in the revision. The editor may have had in mind the social customs in China when he made the change, for it was rather rare for a host in China to accept payment first before actually providing food and accommodation. Anyway, the semantic shift caused by the editing necessitates an investigation on the texts concerned, and it is noted that although payment is an important message here, the timing of payment, varied in the two Chinese editions, is not described in the other versions chosen for comparison. It does not matter when the payment is to be made in the Chinese texts, for it is impertinent to the present source

<sup>120</sup> “Jean Valjean said, ‘Monsieur, I beg your pardon. I’m now offering my money to buy some food from you, and I’m begging you to allow me to sleep in the shed at the corner of your garden for the night? Could you, please?’”

<sup>121</sup> “Jean Valjean said, ‘Monsieur, I beg your pardon. Could you give me some food to eat, and the shed at the corner of your garden to sleep in for the night? I will pay you tomorrow when I’m leaving. Could you, please?’”

<sup>122</sup> “I’m now offering my money to buy some food from you.”

<sup>123</sup> “I will pay you tomorrow when I am leaving.”

study.

In the preceding paragraphs, I have listed fourteen types of modification with a total of twenty-one examples to illustrate the editorial process from *Can Shehui* to *Can Shijie*. Before making my decision as to whether they result in significant changes, I need to put my finger on my judgment criteria, which are conditioned by Su Manshu's strategy of translation. As is typical of the translation practice of his time, Su's rendition of *Les Misérables* involves a lot of omissions, additions, and alterations, quite unlike the fidelity orientation of the English versions. Su's point lies not in taking care of every word, phrase, clause, or sentence in the original, but in propagandizing his own agenda through appropriating the stories and ideas of the French novelist. For this very reason, my comparison of Su's translation with its likely sources will be concentrated first and foremost on the level of plot and structure, aided secondarily by clues from diction or syntax when the different texts manifest the same plot elements. Therefore, when I make the initial comparison between *Can Shehui* and *Can Shijie* to see if they vary significantly, my primary concern is with those elements that result in plot change, and my secondary attention is on radical semantic shifts. Any modification that does not affect the plot or entails replacement with synonymous or similar semantics will be considered minor and negligible.

With this assessment standard in mind, we may proceed to see to what extent Su's two versions differ from each other. Except for cases no. 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, all the examples show that the later editing done to the first version of Chinese *Les Misérables* does not alter the semantic value. That is, the content remains unchanged after the editing procedure. Even where semantic transformation takes place, the plot is not altered. Cases no. 15 to 17 witness the addition of a phrase which

serves to intensify its contextual message rather than cause informational deviations. In the no. 19 case, the primary message of war is preserved even though its cause (religion) and time (1815) are omitted. In the instance of no. 20, the rectification fits more reasonably to the context and, being a piece of characterization added by the translator, proves unrelated to my intertextual comparison. Lastly, the semantic change in the no. 21 example does not eliminate from the context the topic of payment which is all that counts regardless of when the payment is to be made. All in all, the differences analyzed above between *Can Shehui* and *Can Shijie* are only minor ones. Since the focus of my comparison between Su's translation and its probable sources is more on the elements of plot than on the linguistic subtleties, all the variations detected between Su's two texts can be ignored as my research proceeds with next source-tracing steps. Since what is analyzed in the above instances generally exhibits common and typical patterns of editing, it may be assumed that the same editorial patterns would most likely be identified if the missing text of *Can Shehui* were recovered, especially when the same editor of Chen Duxiu was in charge of finalizing the entire *Can Shijie*. In other words, the above conclusion about the initial two-odd chapters of the two Chinese variants may be justifiably applied to the missing chapters of *Can Shehui*. Therefore, the completed fourteen-chaptered *Can Shijie* can be selected as the Chinese basis for subsequent comparison.

## V. Interlingual Screening: the Chinese Text versus French, English and Japanese *Les Misérables*

In the previous sections, eight texts from the four languages in question are singled out, and they are Hugo's French original (embracing



the whole of Huss's 1892 abridged version), English versions of *Les Misérables* by Charles E. Wilbour, Lascelles Wraxall, Alexander Dimitry and A. F. (the Richmond translation), Isabel F. Hapgood, and William Walton et al. respectively, Kuroiwa Ruikou's Japanese *Aamujou*, and Su Manshu's Chinese *Can Shijie*. Now it is time to subject them to intertextual comparison and contrast.

My strategy of comparison is oriented primarily to plot and secondarily to nuanced linguistic subtleties. In practice, my comparison is conducted first from a macro perspective and then in a micro manner. The macroscopic comparison deals with the structures of narration in the different texts concerned—that is, how the plot elements are presented, in what sequence they are arranged, and what not. In the microscopic comparison, my study compares the individual plot elements to sort out the relationships between the different versions. When different texts show common plot elements, my research shall get down to the minute linguistic details, such as choice of words, phrases and syntax, to see if they reveal nuanced distinction. The two levels of comparison and contrast serve to inform my judgment about the most probable source of Su's translation.

As mentioned earlier, Su Manshu's Chinese rendition of the French novel handles only the Second Book ("La chute") of Volume I ("Fantine") out of the forty-eight books in five volumes in the original. In the original French work, the major plot line of Book Two starts from Jean Valjean's entrance in the town of Digne, through his recurrent rejections by the townspeople, his kind reception by Bishop Myriel, his abuse of the bishop's beneficence, to his disappearance from Digne. Interspersed in the story line are some digressions and flashbacks, including reflections on the evils of society and some information of the hero's background, his theft and imprisonment.

Structurally speaking, in the total of thirteen chapters in this book, the first five chapters are narrated in chronological order, beginning in medias res from the protagonist's appearance in Digne, through his constant rejections and frustrations in seeking food and shelter there, to his falling asleep in the bishop's house. The Sixth Chapter opens with a single-sentence paragraph purporting that Jean Valjean woke up in the middle of the night. From the second paragraph of this chapter on, the narrative flashes back to some accounts of the hero's background and history, including his desperate act of theft, his imprisonment and the elongation of his term of punishment as a result of his four escape attempts. The Seventh Chapter digresses to reflect on the correlation between crimes of individuals and crimes of society and also on the ill impacts of the punitive systems on a good-natured person. Chapter Eight extends the digression by comparing the socially disadvantaged to a drowning man who hopelessly struggles to survive in the billowy sea. The Ninth Chapter, also a digression, describes the exploitation of labor Jean Valjean suffers in jail and the unfair treatment he receives in payment of wages after his release from the prison house. The Tenth Chapter picks up what was left off in the first paragraph of Chapter Six and continues the chronological narration until the end of the Thirteenth Chapter which concludes Book Two, with episodes inclusive of the protagonist's larceny of the bishop's silverware, his capture by the gendarmes, his condonation by the more than magnanimous bishop, his robbery of Petit Gervais's coin, and his final remorse.

The above chapter descriptions of the Second Book of the original novel can be summed up by differentiating the plot line from the digressions. The principle axis of the story starts from Chapter One onward, breaks at the first paragraph of the Sixth Chapter, resumes

from Chapter Ten, and then follows through to the end of the Thirteenth Chapter. The digressive part comprises the majority of Chapter Six and the whole of Chapters Seven to Nine. This differentiation will prove useful in my later comparison and analysis.

A close rendering of the French work, the five English versions have the exact same narrative structure.

Now we shall look at the Chinese version first before examining the Japanese one. Despite the fact that Su's text contains numerous omissions, additions, and inventions, the sequence of the episodic elements in Su's text is in perfect match with that in the French original. The thirteen chapters in the French text are rearranged in Su's translation in fourteen chapters of the zhanghui novel form. In Su's text, the first six chapters concur with the first five chapters of the French original: the same episodes and the same sequence of events. As the French text starts digressing with the second paragraph of Chapter Six after a single sentence describing Jean Valjean's wakening in the first paragraph, the Chinese translation also drifts into digression from the second paragraph of Chapter Seven onward after the first paragraph's brief mention of the dormancy of Jean Valjean and the bishop's family. The deviating part of the Chinese version, from early Chapter Seven to middle Chapter Thirteen, consists of another story line, about the adventures of Ming Nande (明男德), which is invented by the translator. The two plot lines cross each other as Ming Nande learns of Jean Valjean's arrest and decides to rescue him from prison. Subtly woven into the invented plot are sporadic descriptions of Jean Valjean's background, his theft of bread, his imprisonment, his lengthening of jail time, and his subjection to cruel abuse. Su's fabricated digression ends with the failure of Ming Nande's attempt to assassinate Napoleon in the middle of the Thirteenth Chapter, and then the story

reverts to the major story line, i.e., the scene in the bishop's abode, where Jean Valjean awoke at two o'clock after some hours of repose. The portion from the latter half of Chapter Thirteen to the end of Chapter Fourteen in the translation echoes Chapters Ten to Thirteen in the French novel, recounting Jean Valjean's waking in the night, his running away with the bishop's silverware, his capture by the policemen, his obtaining forgiveness from the bishop, his pillage of Petit Gervais, and his ultimate regrets. In a nutshell, except the part of the text which deals with the narrator's reflections on the hero's situation in relation to society at large, all the main episodic elements of plot in the original work are retained and followed in the same order in the Chinese translation, albeit in a condensed and rephrased manner.

Kuroiwa Ruikou's *Aamujou* begins, like Su's Chinese rendition, from the Second Book of Volume One of the French novel, and the first eleven chapters of the Japanese text as a whole correspond to the content of the Second Book, i.e., the part treated by Su Manshu. Generally speaking, Kuroiwa's version follows the narrative order of the French novel for the most part. However, four exceptions are prominent. To begin with, the Japanese text initiates the First Chapter with a brief introduction to the town of Digne, a piece of information that is absent in the corresponding portions in the original and in Su's version alike. Second, where the original story proceeds to Chapter Two describing Bishop Myriel's activity before dinner, the Japanese version inserts a passage to give some accounts of the bishop's status and background and his acts of benevolence in the past. This interpolation is taken from Book One of Volume One of the original novel, and is absent here in the counterparts in the French and Chinese texts. Moreover, Kuroiwa's version differs from the French and the Chinese in the process of interactions between Jean Valjean and the

bishop's family. The entry of the culprit in the bishop's house and their conversation at the dinner table are depicted in Chapters Three and Four of the original story. The part of the dialogue where the bishop inquires about Jean Valjean's suffering and then warns him against harboring hatred for past inflictions is moved by the Japanese translator from Chapter Three to Chapter Four of the original division so that the episodic sequence is changed. Specifically, the scene at the table in the French novel includes the following interactions and topics of conversation in sequential order:

1. Jean Valjean's offering to reveal his name and hometown to the bishop (Chapter Three)
2. the bishop's inquiry about Jean Valjean's suffering (Chapter Three)
3. the serving of food by the female servant (Chapter Three)
4. the presentation of six pieces of silverware on the table (Chapter Three)
5. Jean Valjean's expressing that the wagoners live better than the bishop (Chapter Four)
6. talk about Jean Valjean's destination, the bishop's past experience there, and the bishop's relatives there (Chapter Four)

While the French and Chinese texts follow the listed order, the Japanese version relocates the bishop's inquiry about his guest's suffering (no. 2 in the above sequence) to somewhere between the talk about wagoners (no. 5) and the chat about the hero's destination (no. 6).

There is one last outstanding difference in the Japanese text's presentation of events. Whereas in the original story, the digressive parts, arranged from the Sixth to Ninth Chapters providing some information about Jean Valjean's family background, theft, imprisonment, and maltreatment, are followed by descriptions in Chapters Ten to Thirteen of Jean Valjean's waking in the dead of night and his subsequent acts

of stealing, the Japanese translator postpones the digression until Jean Valjean has entered the bishop's room in preparation for stealing the silverware. In other words, the French and Chinese digression occurs before Jean Valjean decides to steal the silverware, while the Japanese digression is inserted in the act of stealing.

Through the above macroscopic, structural comparison of the eight texts of *Les Misérables*, the present thesis finds that in terms of narrative structure the Chinese text agrees with the French and the English but differs somewhat from the Japanese in certain points. Here it is necessary to take another look at the four conspicuous structural differences analyzed above in order to judge how possible it is for the Japanese version to be Su's source. The first two differences involve the respective insertions of introductions to a place and a character, i.e., Digne and Bishop Myriel. The absence of such insertions in the Chinese version is not sufficient proof that the Japanese version is not the Chinese translator's source, for it is Su's tendency to delete and rewrite, especially in a context where the information of Digne and Bishop Myriel is only trivial to the plot line. And then there are the last two differences, which have to do with rearrangement of narrative sequence. Can it be that based on the Japanese text, Su reorganized the topics of the table conversation in an order that was more to his liking, and so is the case with the placement of the digressive part? This possibility cannot be denied. However, the fact that Su's deviation from the Japanese text entails his concurrent conformity to the French original seems to greatly compromise the Japanese's possibility and point to another better likelihood—that Su did not base his translation on the Japanese version.

The above analysis is directed in terms of probability. Though of the three language sources Kuroiwa's text is the least likely one Su might

have drawn on, my study cannot exclude the Japanese version altogether for certain. To make my judgment more decisive will require more substantial and powerful evidence from the texts, and this leads me to the second stage of comparison: a microcosmic comparison which involves juxtaposition of the different texts to sort out their relationships.

In my micro-perspective research, I find numerous instances which serve to argue against the Japanese translation. In most cases, the Chinese plot is presented similarly to the French and English ones, but shows some evident differences from the Japanese. To present all of such examples, however, would be impractical and make little sense. In what follows, only some selected cases, i.e., the ones which are found representative, will be given to show how the different versions are related. For ease of reading, comparing and referring, the instances will be numbered, and all the cited texts will be put in tables.

**Example 1:** The first example has to do with the presentation of time. At the onset of Book Two, the time of action is given respectively as follows:

French (Victor Hugo)	English (Charles E. Wilbour)
Dans les premiers jours du mois d' octobre 1815, une heure environ avant le coucher du soleil. ... (I: 93)	An hour before sunset, on the evening of a day in the beginning of October, 1815. ... (51)

English (Lascelles Wraxall)	English (Alexander Dimitry and A. F.)
At the beginning of October, 1815, and about an hour before sunset . ... (I: 55)	An hour before sunset, on the evening of a day in the beginning of October, 1815. ... (I: 44)

English (Isabel F. Hapgood)	English (William Walton et al.)
Early in the month of October, 1815, about an hour before sunset, ... (I: 55)	At the beginning of October, 1815, and about an hour before sunset . ... (XI: 123)

Japanese (Kuroiwa Ruikou)	Chinese (Su Manshu) <sup>124</sup>
<p>……千八百十五年<small>ねん</small>三月一日、彼の怪<small>か くわい</small>  <small>ゆうなぼれおん</small>雄拿翁がエルバの孤島<small>ことう</small>を脱出<small>ぬけいだ</small>してカン  (Cannes) の港<small>みなと</small>に上陸<small>じやうりく</small>し、巴里<small>ぼりー</small>の都<small>みやこ</small>を指<small>さ</small>  して上つたとき、二日目<small>にふか</small>に一泊<small>ぼく</small>した所<small>ところ</small>  てある……</p> <p>……</p> <p>いま <small>それ</small>今は其より七ヶ月<small>のち</small>の後<small>おな</small>、同じ年<small>とし</small>の十  月<small>はじめ</small>の初<small>あるひ</small>、或日<small>ゆふがた</small>の夕方……<sup>125</sup> (I: 1-2)</p>	<p>話説西曆一千八百十五年  十月初旬、一日天色將  晚……<sup>126</sup> (113)</p>

In the French, English and Chinese versions, the temporal information of the event that is about to be narrated is offered directly and clearly as the evening of a day in early October in 1815. By contrast, Kuroiwa's Japanese translation indicates the time in a relatively roundabout manner. The text first introduces the town of Digne as the place where Napoleon spent the night on March 1, 1815 on his way from Elba to Paris. The

<sup>124</sup> All the Chinese passages of *Can Shijie* in this section are quoted from [法] Victor Hugo 著，蘇曼殊譯：《慘世界》，收於文公直主編：《曼殊大師全集》，頁 113-184.

<sup>125</sup> The Japanese passage is translated into English as follows:

“... This is the place where the hero Napoleon spent the second night as he landed on the shore of Cannes on March 1, 1815, and proceeded on his way to Paris after escaping from the isolated island of Elba.

...

Now, seven months later, on an evening in early October of the same year. ...”

<sup>126</sup> “It happened that in early October of 1815 on the Western calendar, on the evening of this particular day. ...”



time of March 1, 1815 here refers to an event about Napoleon that happened sometime prior to the appearance of Jean Valjean in the town of Digne. The Japanese narrator uses this time about Napoleon as a point of reference and, after a couple of paragraphs, brings in Jean Valjean's emergence in relation to this particular point in time. The reference to Napoleon here in this context is peculiar to the Japanese version and not found in the corresponding parts in the other texts. So here the Japanese mode of temporal narration is vastly distinct from the French, English, and Chinese ones which are similar to each other. This suggests that the Japanese version is the least likely source for Su's Chinese translation.

**Example 2:** The description of Jean Valjean's entry into the town of Digne involves another passage worth comparing:

French (Victor Hugo)	English (Charles E. Wilbour)
Il fallait qu'il eût bien soif, car des enfants qui le suivaient le virent encore s'arrêter, et boire, deux cents pas plus loin, à la fontaine de la place du marché. (I: 94)	He must have been very thirsty, for some children who followed him, saw him stop not two hundred steps further on and drink again at the fountain in the market-place. (51)

English (Lascelles Wraxall)	English (Alexander Dimitry and A. F.)
He must have been very thirsty, for the children that followed him saw him stop and drink again at the fountain on the market-place. (I: 55)	He must have been very thirsty, for some children who followed him, saw him stop not two hundred steps further on and drink again at the fountain in the market-place. (I: 44)

English (Isabel F. Hapgood)	English (William Walton et al.)
He must have been very thirsty: for the children who followed him saw him stop again for a drink, two hundred paces further on, at the fountain in the market-place. (I: 56)	He must have been very thirsty, for the children that followed him saw him stop and drink again at the fountain on the market-place. (XI: 124)

Japanese (Kuroiwa Ruikou)	Chinese (Su Manshu)
<small>まち いりぐち あせ ふ ふき むど</small> 町の入口で、汗を拭き拭き井戸 <small>みづ くみあ の また ちやう</small> の水を汲上げて呑み、又一二丁 <small>ゆ まちなか むど みづ の</small> 行きて町中の井戸で水を呑ん だ…… <sup>127</sup> (I: 2)	只見當時有幾個童子，看見是遠來的生人，就跟在他的後面。只見他還沒走到二百步，便在街上泉桶裡痛飲了兩次。 <sup>128</sup> (113)

Here some plot elements are worthy of notice. Regarding the way the hero quenched his thirst, the French, English and Chinese versions say that his drinking source was fountain water, but according to the Japanese text it was water from a well that he drank. Since wells were very common as a source of drinking water in both Japan and China in the nineteenth century, it is quite unlikely that the Chinese translator could have deliberately turned the well water in the Japanese into the fountain water in the Chinese if he had translated from Japanese. Then, about the interval of the protagonist's thirst-slaking acts, the French, English and Chinese texts, excepting the versions by Wraxall and Walton et al., use "step" or "pace" as a unit of measurement and specify less than two hundred steps or paces as the interval of the action. Contrastively, the Japanese unit of measurement is "丁",<sup>127</sup> or "lane or block," and the distance offered is one

<sup>127</sup> "At the entrance to the town, wiping his sweat he drew water from a well and drank it. One or two blocks later, he drank again from a well in the town. ..."

or two blocks farther. Apart from that, the Japanese text is the only one of the eight that does not mention the part where the protagonist was followed by some children. All these instances show the Chinese text's similarity to the French and the English and its concurrent departure from the Japanese. If Su had referred to the Japanese text as his major source, he could not have modified the Japanese plot elements and invented his own version that coincides with the French and English versions. This also indicates that Japanese is less likely than French and English to be Su's source of translation.<sup>128</sup>

Regarding the five English texts, the Richmond translation copies Wilbour without altering a word, and the version by Walton et al. is a replicate of Wraxall's rendition. While the plot offered by the five texts, as well as the original French, is similar on the whole, Wraxall and Walton et al. distinguish themselves by omitting the description about the interval of two hundred steps altogether. Since the Chinese text contains this description, the probability of the versions by Wraxall and by Walton et al. to be Su's source is reduced enormously.

**Example 3:** Another example is the scene at a peasant's house at which the main character paused in his aimless wanderings after his repeated rejections by the taverns in the town. Following his brief peek into the house, Jean Valjean decided to knock and beg for shelter and food. The process from his action to the response in the house is presented as follows:

---

<sup>128</sup> "Several children who saw the stranger, obviously coming from afar, followed behind. In less than two hundred steps, he voraciously drank twice from the bucket of spring water (or fountain water) in the street."

French (Victor Hugo)	English (Charles E. Wilbour)
<p>Il frappa au carreau un petit coup très faible.</p> <p>On n'entendit pas.</p> <p>Il frappa un second coup.</p> <p>Il entendit la femme qui disait: -Mon homme, il me semble qu'on frappe.</p> <p>-Non, répondit le mari.</p> <p>Il frappa un troisième coup.</p> <p>Le mari se leva, prit la lampe, et alla à la porte qu'il ouvrit. (I: 102-03)</p>	<p>He rapped faintly on the window.</p> <p>No one heard him.</p> <p>He rapped a second time.</p> <p>He heard the woman say, "Husband, I think I hear some one rap."</p> <p>"No," replied the husband.</p> <p>He rapped a third time. The husband got up, took the lamp, and opened the door. (56)</p>

English (Lascelles Wraxall)	English (Alexander Dimitry and A. F.)
<p>... He tapped very slightly on a window pane, but was not heard; he tapped a second time, and he heard the woman say, "Husband, I fancy I can hear some one knocking."</p> <p>"No," the husband answered.</p> <p>He tapped a third time. The husband rose, took the lamp, and walked to the front door. (I: 60)</p>	<p>He rapped faintly on the window.</p> <p>No one heard him.</p> <p>He rapped a second time.</p> <p>He heard the woman say, "Husband, I think I hear some one rap."</p> <p>"No," replied the husband.</p> <p>He rapped a third time. The husband got up, took the lamp, and opened the door. (I: 48-49)</p>

English (Isabel F. Hapgood)	English (William Walton et al.)
<p>He tapped on the pane with a very small and feeble knock.</p> <p>They did not hear him.</p> <p>He tapped again.</p> <p>He heard the woman say, "It seems to me, husband, that some one is knocking."</p> <p>"No," replied the husband.</p> <p>He tapped a third time.</p> <p>The husband rose, took the lamp, and went to the door, which he opened. (I: 62)</p>	<p>He tapped very slightly on a window-pane, but was not heard.</p> <p>He tapped a second time.</p> <p>He heard the woman say, "Husband, I fancy I can hear someone knocking."</p> <p>"No," the husband answered.</p> <p>He tapped a third time.</p> <p>The husband rose, took the lamp, and walked to the front door, which he opened. (XI: 135)</p>

Japanese (Kuroiwa Ruikou)	Chinese (Su Manshu)
<p>こゝ 茲ならばと たびごと ちかよつ と たゞ          いた、二度叩いて三度目に主人          が窓まで立て来て『何方』と問          ふた……<sup>129</sup> (I: 9)</p>	<p>〔華賤〕輕輕地將窗戶敲了幾下，哪曉得也靜悄悄的竟沒有一人答應。又用力再敲幾下，只聽得那婦人道：「我的夫呀，我聽得好像有人敲門的聲音哩。」那男子道：「哪來的話？」華賤又把窗戶敲了幾下，那男子聽真了，便起身拿了燈來開門。<sup>130</sup></p> <p>(119)</p>

<sup>129</sup> "So the traveller stepped forward and knocked on the door. He knocked again. At the third knock, the man of the house walked to the window and asked, 'Who is it?'"

<sup>130</sup> "[Jean Valjean] tapped on the window lightly, but not a sound of response came from the house. He gave some more taps with more force, and heard the woman say, 'My husband, I seem to hear someone knock on the door.' The man replied, 'Impossible.' Jean Valjean knocked once again on the window. The man heard it. He got up to take the lamp and opened the door."

Here two spots of diversity in plot elements can be detected. The first is about the way the traveller attracted the attention of those in the house. In the French, English and Chinese versions, the protagonist achieved his purpose by tapping on the window, whereas in the Japanese text it is “戸<sup>と</sup>,” or the “door,” not the window, that the hero was knocking. Moreover, all the quoted passages delineate three rounds of knocking in the process, but at the interval between the second and the third, there is a description about the wife’s reaction and the husband’s denial in the French, English and Chinese texts. The Japanese translation is the only one that does not contain this husband-wife exchange but goes straight to the husband’s response of walking over to the window after the third knocking. This proves once again that Kuroiwa’s Japanese version is not likely to be Su’s source.

As to the French and English texts, all of them specifically narrate that the husband went and opened the door after he heard the third round of knocking, with the exception of Wraxall’s version, which states merely that the husband “walked to the front door,” with the sense of opening the door implied but not explicit on the surface value. The Chinese rendition “起身拿了燈來開門,” explicitly showing the husband’s door-opening act, is less in accord with Wraxall’s version than with the French original and the other English versions. In this light, Wraxall’s probability as the source of the Chinese version decreases to some degree.

**Example 4:** The dialogue that occurred as the innkeeper of La Croix de Colbas tried to dismiss Jean Valjean from the premises also betrays some resemblance and dissimilarity between the eight texts of *Les Misérables*:

French (Victor Hugo)	English (Charles E. Wilbour)
<p>-Monsieur, dit-il, je ne puis vous recevoir.</p> <p>L'homme se dressa à demi sur son séant.</p> <p>-Comment! Avez-vous peur que je ne paye pas? Voulez-vous que je paye d'avance? J'ai de l'argent, vous dis-je.</p> <p>-Ce n'est pas cela.</p> <p>-Quoi donc?</p> <p>-Vous avez de l'argent. . .</p> <p>-Oui, dit l'homme.</p> <p>-Et moi, dit l'hôte, je n'ai pas de chambre.</p> <p>L'homme reprit tranquillement: Mettez-moi à l'écurie.</p> <p>-Je ne puis.</p> <p>-Pourquoi?</p> <p>-Les chevaux prennent toute la place.</p> <p>-Eh bien, répartit l'homme, un coin dans le grenier. Une botte de paille. Nous verrons cela après dîner.</p> <p>-Je ne puis vous donner à dîner. (I: 97)</p>	<p>"Monsieur," said he, "I cannot receive you."</p> <p>The traveller half rose from his seat.</p> <p>"Why? Are you afraid I shall not pay you, or do you want me to pay in advance? I have money, I tell you."</p> <p>"It is not that."</p> <p>"What then?"</p> <p>"You have money-"</p> <p>"Yes," said the man.</p> <p>"And I," said the host; "I have no room."</p> <p>"Well, put me in the stable," quietly replied the man.</p> <p>"I cannot."</p> <p>"Why?"</p> <p>"Because the horses take all the room."</p> <p>"Well," responded the man, "a corner in the garret; a truss of straw: we will see about that after dinner."</p> <p>"I cannot give you any dinner." (53)</p>

English (Lascelles Wraxall)	English (Alexander Dimitry and A. F.)
<p>“I cannot make room for you, sir,” he said.</p> <p>The man half turned on his stool.</p> <p>“What do you mean? Are you afraid I shall bilk you? Do you want me to pay you in advance? I have money, I tell you.”</p> <p>“It is not that.”</p> <p>“What is it, then?”</p> <p>“You have money.”</p> <p>“Yes,” said the man.</p> <p>“But I have not a spare bedroom.”</p> <p>The man continued quietly: “Put me in the stables.”</p> <p>“I cannot.”</p> <p>“Why?”</p> <p>“The horses take up all the room.”</p> <p>“Well,” the man continued, “a corner in the loft and a truss of straw: we will see to that after supper.”</p> <p>“I cannot give you any supper.”</p> <p>(I: 57)</p>	<p>“Sir,” said he, “I cannot receive you.”</p> <p>The traveller half rose from his seat.</p> <p>“Why? Are you afraid I shall not pay you, or do you want me to pay in advance? I have the money, I tell you.”</p> <p>“It is not that.”</p> <p>“What then?”</p> <p>“You have money-”</p> <p>“Yes,” said the man.</p> <p>“And I,” said the host; “I have no room.”</p> <p>“Well, put me in the stable,” quietly replied the man.</p> <p>“I cannot.”</p> <p>“Why?”</p> <p>“Because the horses take all the room.”</p> <p>“Well,” responded the man, “a corner in the garret; a truss of straw; we will see about that after dinner.”</p> <p>“I cannot give you any dinner.”</p> <p>(I: 46)</p>



English (Isabel F. Hapgood)	English (William Walton et al.)
<p>“I cannot receive you, sir,” said he.</p> <p>The man half rose.</p> <p>“What! Are you afraid that I will not pay you? Do you want me to pay you in advance? I have money, I tell you.”</p> <p>“It is not that.”</p> <p>“What then?”</p> <p>“You have money-”</p> <p>“Yes,” said the man.</p> <p>“And I,” said the host, “have no room.”</p> <p>The man resumed tranquilly, “Put me in the stable.”</p> <p>“I cannot.”</p> <p>“Why?”</p> <p>“The horses take up all the space.”</p> <p>“Very well!” retorted the man; “a corner of the loft then, a truss of straw. We will see about that after dinner.”</p> <p>“I cannot give you any dinner.”</p> <p>(I: 58)</p>	<p>“Monsieur,” said he, “I cannot receive you.”</p> <p>The man half rose on his stool.</p> <p>“How? Are you afraid I shall not pay you? Do you want me to pay you in advance? I have money, I tell you.”</p> <p>“It is not that.”</p> <p>“What is it, then?”</p> <p>“You have money.” ...</p> <p>“Yes,” said the man.</p> <p>“But I have not a spare bedroom.”</p> <p>The man continued quietly: “Put me in the stables.”</p> <p>“I cannot.”</p> <p>“Why?”</p> <p>“The horses take up all the room.”</p> <p>“Well,” the man continued, “a corner in the loft; a truss of straw; we will see to that after dinner.”</p> <p>“I cannot give you any dinner.”</p> <p>(XI: 128)</p>

Japanese (Kuroiwa Ruikou)	Chinese (Su Manshu)
<p>〔主人〕『どうも貴方をお留め申す譯に行きません』全く打て變たと云ふ者だ、客は半分顔を揚げ『エ、何だと、騙られるとでも思ふのか、では先拂に仕やう、金は持て居る斷ツたのに』主人『イ、エ、室の空た所が有りませんゆゑ』客は未だ失望せぬ、最と靜に『室が無ければ馬屋で好(よ)い』主人『馬屋は馬が一ぱいです』客『では何の様な隅ツこでも構はぬ、藁さへあれば敷て寝るから、先ア兎も角も食事を濟ませてからの相談にしやう』主人『食事もお生憎様です』……<sup>131</sup> (I: 4)</p>	<p>……〔店主人〕「我卻不能留你住在這裡。」此人忙立起身來問道：「你怕我欠你的賬嗎？若是要先交錢我這裡還有點銀子。你不知道嗎？」店主人說道：「哪裡是為著這些事體。」此人道：「那麼是為著什麼事？」店主人道：「你是有銀子。」此人道：「不錯。」店主人又道：「怎奈我沒有房子留你。」此人急忙介面道：「就是在貴寓馬房裡住下，也不打緊。」店主人道：「那也不能。」此人道：「這是什麼緣故？」店主人道：「我的馬已經住滿。」此人道：「也好。那邊還有一間擱東西的房子，我們等吃了飯再商量吧。」店主人道：「有什麼人供你的飯吃？」<sup>132</sup> (114-115)</p>

<sup>131</sup> “[The host said] ‘I can’t receive you here.’ This attitude was in stark contrast with the kind attention a while ago. The traveller half raised his head and replied, ‘Hey, what are you talking about? Are you afraid I’d cheat you? If so, let me pay you first.’ The host explained, ‘No, not that. There is no room available.’ The traveller was not discouraged. In a temperate tone he said, ‘If there is no room, a place in the stable will do.’ The host insisted, ‘The horses take up all the space.’ The traveller: ‘Then, any corner of the house is all right. Just give me some straw to sleep on. Anyway, let me have dinner first and then we’ll discuss the matter.’ The host rejected, ‘Food is not available, either.’”

<sup>132</sup> The Chinese passage is translated into English as follows:

“... [The host said] ‘I cannot let you live here.’

The man rose up immediately and asked, ‘Are you afraid I don’t pay? If you want me to pay in advance, I have some money with me. Don’t you know that?’

In the exchange of conversation between host and guest, the Chinese is similar to the French and the English in the process of going back and forth between the two parties involved. The Japanese text, by contrast, shortens the process of verbal exchange to a considerable extent. The multiple interchange passage—"It is not that. / What then? / You have money. / Yes. / And I have no room."-is abbreviated by the Japanese translator to become the single straightforward explanation "No, not that. There is no room available." And the dual exchange—"Put me in the stable / I cannot. / Why? / Because the horses take all the room."-is simplified in the Japanese version as a single back-and-forth "A place in the stable will do. / The horses take up all the space." These abridgments greatly dilute the host's hesitation, in the face of the guest pressing for specificity, to reveal the truth behind his decision to expel the guest. The condensed form of dialogue in the Japanese text cannot have inspired the Chinese translator with the more detailed and vivid rendition in Chinese which is, so to speak, in concert with the French and English texts.

Also here in the cited passages, another interesting comparison is worth making. When the host explained to the guest that there was no room available, the latter's response "put me in the stable" is made in a manner that is expressed respectively as "tranquillement" in French, "quietly" in Wilbour, Wraxall, the Richmond, and Walton et al.,

---

The host said, 'It is not that.' The man pressed, 'What then?' The host went on, 'You have money.' The man answered, 'Yes.'

The host continued, 'But I have no room for you.' The man quickly replied, 'It's all right for me to sleep in the stable.' The host refused, 'That won't do, either.' The man demanded, 'How come?' The host explained, 'The horses take up all the space.' The man pressed on, 'All right. There is still that storeroom over there. Let's talk about this after dinner.' The host said, 'Who do you think you'll get your food from?'"

“tranquilly” in Hapgood, and “急忙” in Chinese. The semantic deviation of the Chinese from the French and the English is intriguing here and lends occasion for a suspicion of misinterpretation on the translator’s part. For a Chinese translator to base his translation on the French original, it is rather unlikely that he will take the word “tranquillement” wrongly, nor is it likely that Hapgood’s “tranquilly,” a word not easily mistaken, would be misconstrued to mean “急忙,”<sup>133</sup> if the translator adopted Hapgood as his original. By contrast, if a translator models his rendition on the other English versions, the word “quietly” may be inadvertently misread as “quickly” owing to the similar spelling contour of the two words, which easily explains the resultant rendition of “急忙” in Chinese. Can this be the reason why Su Manshu deviates from the original? If so, then the French original and Hapgood’s version are less likely sources for Su Manshu than the other English translations. Notwithstanding, the above suspicion will fall into a dismissible wild guess if no other supporting evidence is present. After all, the Chinese text’s difference from the French and the English here may also be explained away by an act of alteration done on purpose by the translator.

The relationships of the Chinese with the French and the English become increasingly clear as more instances are found pointing to the similar likelihood. Suffice it to quote two more passages for illustration.

**Example 5:** In the bishop’s house, the hero’s wonder at the bishop’s kindness in receiving him is expressed, at a certain point, as follows.

---

<sup>133</sup> “hurriedly” or “quickly”

French (Victor Hugo)	English (Charles E. Wilbour)
—Vrai? quoi? vous me gardez? vous ne me chassez pas! un forçat! Vous m'appellez monsieur! vous ne me tutoyez pas! Va-t-en, chien! qu'on me dit toujours. ... (I: 117)	“True? What! You will keep me? you won't drive me away? a convict! You call me Monsieur and don't say 'Get out, dog!' as everybody else does. ...” (64)

English (Lascelles Wraxall)	English (Alexander Dimitry and A. F.)
“Is it true? You will let me stay, you will not turn me out, a convict? You call me 'sir,' you do not 'thou' me. 'Get out, dog,' that is what is always said to me; ...” (I: 67)	“True? What! You will keep me? you won't drive me away? a convict! You call me Sir and don't say 'Get out, dog!' as everybody else does. ...” (I: 54)

English (Isabel F. Hapgood)	English (William Walton et al.)
“Really? What! You will keep me? You do not drive me forth? A convict! You call me sir! You do not address me as thou? 'Get out of here, you dog!' is what people always say to me. ...” (I: 71)	“Is it true? what? you will let me stay, you will not turn me out, a convict? You call me monsieur, you do not 'thou' me. 'Get out, dog,' that is what is always said to me; ...” (XI: 153)

Japanese (Kuroiwa Ruikou)	Chinese (Su Manshu)
<p>『エ、泊<small>とめ</small>て呉<small>く</small>れる、エ、本統<small>ほんとう</small>、  エ、何<small>なん</small>と仰<small>おつしや</small>有<small>わたく</small>つた、私<small>わたく</small>しをエ追<small>おひ</small>  拂<small>はら</small>ひもせず<small>ぜんくわもの</small>に、前科者<small>ぜんくわもの</small>を、貴君<small>きくん</small>  など<small>あなた</small>と貴方<small>だれ</small>は、誰<small>こ</small>でも此<small>の</small>野猫<small>のねこ</small>  めなど<small>い</small>と云<small>ひ</small>ますのに……』<sup>134</sup></p> <p>(I: 18)</p>	<p>「你真留我嗎？不趕我嗎？你爲  什麼稱呼我做先生，卻不叫我做  狗，趕出去，和別的人那一樣說  法呢？……」<sup>135</sup> (125)</p>

The abusive term by which the hero is addressed is a “dog” in the French, English and Chinese versions, but in the Japanese text the derogatory name becomes “野猫,” literally a “wildcat,” which is connotative of a “homeless rascal”-another piece of evidence to exclude the Japanese translation as a source for Su’s Chinese rendition. What is even more worthy of note here is how the French phrase “vous ne me tutoyez pas”<sup>136</sup> is treated in the English translations. In Wilbour’s and the Richmond texts the French differentiation between “vous” and “tu” is ignored and left untranslated. Contrastively, Wraxall, Hapgood, and Walton et al. drew on the English distinction between “you” and “thou” to make it a parallel to the French and came up with “you do not ‘thou’ me” (Wraxall; Walton et al.) or “you do not address me as thou” (Hapgood). The fact that Su leaves the French distinction out of translation, a distinction that would have been expressible in vernacular Chinese had the translator been conscious of the

<sup>134</sup> “Ah, you will keep me? Really? What did you say? You didn’t throw me out? I am an ex-convict, and you address me as Monsieur! Everybody else calls me a damned wildcat. ...”

<sup>135</sup> “You will really keep me? You don’t throw me out? Why do you call me Monsieur, and not ‘dog, get out,’ as everybody else does? ...”

<sup>136</sup> Literally, “you don’t address me in the second person singular ‘tu.’” The use of second person singular “tu” here conveys an unpleasantly too-familiar attitude that is disrespectful or even insulting.

original differentiation, seems to indicate that Wilbour and the Richmond are more likely sources for Su than the French original and the other English versions.

**Example 6:** Also in favor of Wilbour's and the Richmond texts is the passage about the dog's kennel cited as follows.

French (Victor Hugo)	English (Charles E. Wilbour)
<p>À la lueur du jour expirant, l'étranger aperçut dans un des jardins qui bordent la rue une sorte de hutte qui lui parut maçonnée en mottes de gazon. ... et elle ressemblait à ces constructions que les cantonniers se bâtissent au bord des routes. ... Il se coucha à plat ventre et se glissa dans la hutte. Il y faisait chaud, et il y trouva un assez bon lit de paille. (I: 104-105)</p>	<p>... by the light of the expiring day the stranger perceived in one of the gardens which fronted the street a kind of hut which seemed to be made of turf ... [I]t resembled, in its construction, the shanties which the road-labourers put up for their temporary accommodation. ... He got down and crawled into the hut. It was warm there and he found a good bed of straw. (57-58)</p>

English (Lascelles Wraxall)	English (Alexander Dimitry and A. F.)
<p>By the light of the expiring day the stranger noticed in one of the gardens a sort of hut which seemed to him to be made of sod or turf. ... [The hut] resembled the tenements which road-menders construct by the side of the highway. ... [H]e lay down on his stomach and crawled into the hut; it was warm, and he found a rather good straw litter in it. (I: 61)</p>	<p>... by the light of the expiring day the stranger perceived in one of the gardens which fronted the street a kind of hut which seemed to be made of turf ... [I]t resembled, in its construction, the shanties which the road-labourers put up for their temporary accommodation. ... He got down and crawled into the hut. It was warm there and he found a good bed of straw. (I: 50)</p>

English (Isabel F. Hapgood)	English (William Walton et al.)
By the light of the expiring day the stranger perceived, in one of the gardens which bordered the street, a sort of hut, which seemed to him to be built of sods. ... [I]t resembled those buildings which road-laborers construct for themselves along the roads. ... He threw himself flat on his face, and crawled into the hut. It was warm there, and he found a tolerably good bed of straw. (I: 63-64)	By the light of the expiring day the stranger noticed in one of the gardens a sort of hut which seemed to him to be made of sods of turf. ... [The hut] resembled the tenements which road-menders construct by the side of the highway. ... He lay down on his stomach and crawled into the hut; it was warm, and he found a rather good straw litter in it. (XI: 137-138)

Japanese (Kuroiwa Ruikou)	Chinese (Su Manshu)
<p> <small>すこ</small> <small>ゆ</small> <small>あるいへ</small> <small>には</small> <small>ひく</small> <small>か</small>  <small>り</small> <small>ご</small> <small>や</small> <small>やう</small> <small>もの</small> <small>あ</small> <small>た</small> <small>ぶん</small>  <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>た</small> <small>な</small> <small>に</small> <small>だうぐ</small> <small>い</small> <small>お</small>  <small>た</small> <small>め</small> <small>つくつ</small> <small>あ</small> <small>の</small> <small>だ</small> <small>らう</small> <small>け</small>  <small>れ</small> <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>も</small> <small>ぐ</small> <small>こん</small> <small>せ</small> <small>な</small> <small>ふ</small> <small>くろ</small>  <small>が</small> <small>じ</small> <small>や</small> <small>ま</small> <small>な</small> <small>む</small> <small>な</small> <small>ほ</small>  <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> </p> <p> <small>す</small> <small>こ</small> <small>し</small> <small>ゆ</small> <small>く</small> <small>と</small> <small>ある</small> <small>い</small> <small>へ</small> <small>に</small> <small>は</small> <small>ひ</small> <small>く</small> <small>か</small>  <small>り</small> <small>ご</small> <small>や</small> <small>やう</small> <small>もの</small> <small>あ</small> <small>た</small> <small>ぶん</small>  <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>た</small> <small>な</small> <small>に</small> <small>だうぐ</small> <small>い</small> <small>お</small>  <small>た</small> <small>め</small> <small>つくつ</small> <small>あ</small> <small>の</small> <small>だ</small> <small>らう</small> <small>け</small>  <small>れ</small> <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>も</small> <small>ぐ</small> <small>こん</small> <small>せ</small> <small>な</small> <small>ふ</small> <small>くろ</small>  <small>が</small> <small>じ</small> <small>や</small> <small>ま</small> <small>な</small> <small>む</small> <small>な</small> <small>ほ</small>  <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> </p> <p> <small>す</small> <small>こ</small> <small>し</small> <small>ゆ</small> <small>く</small> <small>と</small> <small>ある</small> <small>い</small> <small>へ</small> <small>に</small> <small>は</small> <small>ひ</small> <small>く</small> <small>か</small>  <small>り</small> <small>ご</small> <small>や</small> <small>やう</small> <small>もの</small> <small>あ</small> <small>た</small> <small>ぶん</small>  <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>た</small> <small>な</small> <small>に</small> <small>だうぐ</small> <small>い</small> <small>お</small>  <small>た</small> <small>め</small> <small>つくつ</small> <small>あ</small> <small>の</small> <small>だ</small> <small>らう</small> <small>け</small>  <small>れ</small> <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>も</small> <small>ぐ</small> <small>こん</small> <small>せ</small> <small>な</small> <small>ふ</small> <small>くろ</small>  <small>が</small> <small>じ</small> <small>や</small> <small>ま</small> <small>な</small> <small>む</small> <small>な</small> <small>ほ</small>  <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> </p>	<p> <small>す</small> <small>こ</small> <small>し</small> <small>ゆ</small> <small>く</small> <small>と</small> <small>ある</small> <small>い</small> <small>へ</small> <small>に</small> <small>は</small> <small>ひ</small> <small>く</small> <small>か</small>  <small>り</small> <small>ご</small> <small>や</small> <small>やう</small> <small>もの</small> <small>あ</small> <small>た</small> <small>ぶん</small>  <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>た</small> <small>な</small> <small>に</small> <small>だうぐ</small> <small>い</small> <small>お</small>  <small>た</small> <small>め</small> <small>つくつ</small> <small>あ</small> <small>の</small> <small>だ</small> <small>らう</small> <small>け</small>  <small>れ</small> <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>も</small> <small>ぐ</small> <small>こん</small> <small>せ</small> <small>な</small> <small>ふ</small> <small>くろ</small>  <small>が</small> <small>じ</small> <small>や</small> <small>ま</small> <small>な</small> <small>む</small> <small>な</small> <small>ほ</small>  <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> </p> <p> <small>す</small> <small>こ</small> <small>し</small> <small>ゆ</small> <small>く</small> <small>と</small> <small>ある</small> <small>い</small> <small>へ</small> <small>に</small> <small>は</small> <small>ひ</small> <small>く</small> <small>か</small>  <small>り</small> <small>ご</small> <small>や</small> <small>やう</small> <small>もの</small> <small>あ</small> <small>た</small> <small>ぶん</small>  <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>た</small> <small>な</small> <small>に</small> <small>だうぐ</small> <small>い</small> <small>お</small>  <small>た</small> <small>め</small> <small>つくつ</small> <small>あ</small> <small>の</small> <small>だ</small> <small>らう</small> <small>け</small>  <small>れ</small> <small>ど</small> <small>か</small> <small>も</small> <small>ぐ</small> <small>こん</small> <small>せ</small> <small>な</small> <small>ふ</small> <small>くろ</small>  <small>が</small> <small>じ</small> <small>や</small> <small>ま</small> <small>な</small> <small>む</small> <small>な</small> <small>ほ</small>  <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> <small>お</small> <small>ろ</small> </p>

<sup>137</sup> “A little distance further, he saw in someone’s garden a cabin which was probably set up by construction workers to store tools and implements. ... He tried to get into it nevertheless, but was hampered by the knapsack on his back, so he turned around and put down his knapsack.”

<sup>138</sup> “In his drowsiness he saw in a garden which fronted the street a cabin made of clay and turf. ... He thought to himself, ‘This is definitely built by road travellers as a makeshift shelter.’ ... He got down immediately and crawled into it. The cabin was very warm, and he found a bed of straw there.”



Except the Japanese version, which depicts the action differently,<sup>139</sup> all the cited texts share a similar delineation. So the Japanese text is excluded from the present discussion. What deserves special attention here is that some of the phrasings of the Chinese text seem to reveal a specific lineage. In the first place, the Chinese “街前花園裡” specifies the location of the supposed hut, which is in fact a dog kennel. Let us compare the Chinese phrase with its counterparts in the Western texts. We have in the Western versions:

“dans un des jardins qui bordent la rue” (Hugo)

“in one of the gardens which fronted the street” (Wilbour; the Richmond)

“in one of the gardens” (Wraxall; Walton et al.)

“in one of the gardens which bordered the street” (Hapgood)

Here, Hugo and Hapgood both adopt the verb “border”<sup>140</sup> to indicate the garden's position in relation to the street. Wraxall's and Walton et al.'s texts do not mention the street, so the two versions are ruled out here. Wilbour and the Richmond use the verb “front” in place of “border.” The concept of “border” here, if understood in Chinese, would have been something like “沿著” or “旁邊,” and so forth. A Chinese translator would have probably phrased his translation as “街旁花園裡,” or something like that. It is intriguing that instead of “街旁花園” Su Manshu

---

<sup>139</sup> In the Japanese text, the kennel is mistaken by Jean Valjean as a storeroom for tools, not the temporary shelter which it was thought to be in the other versions. Besides, the Japanese text contains an account of the knapsack forming an impediment to the hero's entry into the hut—a description which is absent in the other versions.

<sup>140</sup> Here the French “bordent” and the English “bordered” share the same infinitive “border.”

came up with “街前花園,” an apparent reflection of Wilbour and the Richmond’s “gardens which fronted the street.” This instance suggests a close affinity between the Chinese text and the versions by Wilbour and Dimitry and A. F.

What is more, as to the presumed function of the hut, we have in the Chinese text “過路的行人所做，預備一時過往用的，” which has the following counterparts in juxtaposition:

“les cantonniers se bâtissent au bord des routes” (Hugo)

“the road-labourers put up for their temporary accommodation”  
(Wilbour; the Richmond)

“road-menders construct by the side of the highway” (Wraxall;  
Walton et al.)

“road-laborers construct for themselves along the roads”  
(Hapgood)

Here attention is drawn to the adverbial structure at the end of each version. The French phrase “au bord des routes” is synonymously rephrased as “by the side of the highway” by Wraxall and Walton et al. and “along the roads” by Hapgood respectively. Wilbour’s and the Richmond’s versions are made conspicuous here by their departing from the original with a phrase emphasizing instead the purpose “for their temporary accommodation.” The Chinese text “預備一時過往用的”<sup>141</sup> clearly echoes the interpretation offered by Wilbour and the Richmond—another proof of the kinship relationship between Wilbour and the Richmond’s

<sup>141</sup> The original expression in the serialized *Can Shehui* is “預備過來過往用的” (Wu Xiangxiang 421). Though phrased somewhat differently from the later reprinted version, it still brings into relief the purpose, rather than the position, of the hut. Therefore, edited or not, the Chinese text here shows an approximation to the versions by Wilbour and the Richmond.

English texts and Su's Chinese rendition.

In sum, all of the above six examples argue against the Japanese version, so Kuroiwa's text can be safely ruled out as a possible source for the Chinese translation. As for the other versions, we have three instances against the French original (Examples 4, 5, 6), four against Wraxall (Examples 2, 3, 5, 6), three against Hapgood (Examples 4, 5, 6), and three against Walton et al. (Examples 2, 5, 6). Though the cases against them are made with varying degrees of plausibility, the convincingness of each individual argument is given more force as other pieces of evidence turn out to illustrate the same effect. Precisely because several examples conspire to strengthen the arguments made in each individual case, it is advisable to exclude the French original, Wraxall, Hapgood, and Walton et al. from consideration regarding the probable source for Su Manshu. The exclusion of the French original entails the concurrent elimination of Huss's 1892 abridgment because the two texts are identical.

So now we are left with only two probabilities: Wilbour's version and the Richmond translation. To decide between the two, this paper would like to resort to the perspective of genealogy for illumination. The Richmond translation was produced with a view to correcting Wilbour's errors in the treatment of some French idioms and phrases, but corrections aside, it nearly duplicated Wilbour's text wholesale, as exemplified by the quoted passages in the six instances provided above. Its increasing dependence on Wilbour as the translation progressed is also observed by Moore.<sup>142</sup> Thus it is by no means an exaggeration to say that the Richmond translation is based on Wilbour's text. The genealogy in the particular case of Wilbour versus the Richmond draws attention to the intriguing fact that

---

<sup>142</sup> Olin H. Moore, "Some Translations of *Les Misérables*," *Modern Language Notes* 74-3 (1959): 246.

the Richmond rendition achieves its candidacy as one of the most probable sources for Su's Chinese version through its reproducing Wilbour's text. For this very reason, in the present interlingual intertextual comparisons, verification of the one inevitably entails the simultaneous confirmation of the other. It is not clear which copy of the English versions Su had at hand when he did his rendition, but no matter which was adopted, it is always Wilbour's in essence and in substance. Even if Su based his translation on the Richmond text, it is still arguable that Su translated from Wilbour. After all, the concern of the present paper is to identify the source, rather than the original copy, of Su's Chinese *Les Misérables*.

So far I have demonstrated that Wilbour's version is the most probable source for Su's Chinese translation of *Les Misérables*. However, there is one problematic point to be addressed before my inquiry comes to a conclusion. The town of "Digne" is presented as "D-" throughout the English versions concerned, but in the Chinese text we have for its translation "太尼," which is a phonetic transliteration of "Digne." This betrays that the Chinese translator knew the full spelling for "D-." If Wilbour's text had been Su's only source, Su would have had no way of knowing what "D-" stands for. For Su to be able to know what "D-" represents and come up with the translation of "太尼" would require some knowledge outside of Wilbour's text. In other words, in addition to Wilbour's text, Su must have had referred to other material, whether it be Huss's French abridgment, which gives the full name unambiguously, or Kuroiwa's Japanese text, which presents the transliteration of Digne as "ダイン" followed by a parenthetical remark offering its original spelling, or some other resources of various kinds.

Despite the existence of other sources for the Chinese translator, the proofs I have found in favor of Wilbour's version are too numerous

and forceful to be dismissed as mere coincidence. The single peculiar exception in the case of “Digne” serves not so much to invalidate my conclusion as to enrich my findings. Diverse guesses could be ventured here. It may suggest that Su had known the town of Digne from other sources before he actually undertook to do the translating based on Wilbour’s text. It is also possible that not until he encountered “D-” in rendering an English *Les Misérables* did Su begin to check its original spelling in other reference material. Whatever the possibilities are and whichever source or sources the Chinese translator might resort to for rendition of “D-” are of little importance here. What is significant and noteworthy is the undeniable conclusion, drawn and confirmed from the textual evidence I have exhibited and the genealogy I have traced, that during the act of translating there is only one major and primary text for Su’s reference and that text is most probably Charles E. Wilbour’s English *Les Misérables*.

## Bibliography

- [日] 川戸道昭、榊原貴教主編：《明治翻訳文学全集：新聞雑誌編 24（ユゴー集I）》，東京：大空社，1996年。
- [日] 川戸道昭、榊原貴教主編：《明治翻訳文学全集：新聞雑誌編 25（ユゴー集II）》，東京：大空社，1998年。
- [日] 工藤貴正著，趙靜譯：〈魯迅早期三部譯作的翻譯意圖〉，《魯迅研究月刊》1995年第1期，1995年1月，頁38-43。
- [日] 工藤貴正著，勵儲譯：〈從本世紀初西歐文學的譯介看當時的中日文學交流〉，《魯迅研究月刊》1997年第3期，1997年3月，頁54-61。
- [法] Victor Hugo 著，[日] 原抱一庵譯：《ABC 組合》，東京：内外出版社，1902年。
- [法] Victor Hugo 著，[日] 黒岩淚香譯：《噫無情》東京：扶桑堂，1906年，第1冊、第2冊。
- [法] Victor Hugo 著，蘇曼殊譯：《慘社會》，收於吳相湘主編：《國民日日報》，臺北：臺灣學生書局，1965年，頁340-341、360-361、380-381、400-401、420-421、440-441。
- [法] Victor Hugo 著，蘇曼殊譯：《慘世界》，收於文公直主編：《曼殊大師全集》，臺南：德華出版社，1976年，頁113-184。
- [法] Victor Hugo 著，[日] 原抱一庵譯：〈ジャンバルジャン〉，收於[日] 川戸道昭、榊原貴教主編：《明治翻訳文学全集：新聞雑誌編24（ユゴー集I）》，東京：大空社，1996年，頁379-412。
- [法] Victor Hugo 著，[日] 原抱一庵譯：〈「水、冥」篇〉，收於[日] 川戸道昭、榊原貴教主編：《明治翻訳文学全集：新聞雑誌編25（ユゴー集II）》，東京：大空社，1998年，頁119-122。

- [法] Victor Hugo 著, [日] 原抱一庵譯:〈ABC 組合〉, 收於 [日] 川戶道昭、榊原貴教主編:《明治翻譯文學全集: 新聞雜誌編 25 (ユゴー集 II)》, 東京: 大空社, 1998 年, 頁 60-96。
- 丁富生:〈蘇曼殊:《慘世界》的譯作者〉,《南通大學學報(社會科學版)》第 22 卷第 3 期, 2006 年 5 月, 頁 65-69。
- 王曉元:《翻譯話語與意識形態: 中國 1895-1911 年文學翻譯研究》, 上海: 上海外語教育出版社, 2010 年。
- 池子華:〈辛亥革命中留日醫學生的救護行動〉,《徐州師範大學學報(哲學社會科學版)》第 30 卷第 2 期, 2004 年 3 月, 頁 27-28、33。
- 余光中:《分水嶺上: 余光中評論文集》, 臺北: 純文學出版社, 1981 年。
- 柳亞子:〈慘社會與慘世界〉, 收於柳亞子主編:《蘇曼殊全集》第 4 冊, 北京: 中國書店, 1985 年, 頁 422-431。
- 柳亞子:〈蘇和尚雜談〉, 收於柳亞子主編:《蘇曼殊全集》第 5 冊, 北京: 中國書店, 1985 年, 頁 130-231。
- 柳亞子:〈蘇曼殊研究的三個階段——《蘇曼殊文集》序〉, 收於馬以君主編:《蘇曼殊文集》第 2 冊, 廣州: 花城出版社, 1991 年, 頁 3-25。
- 陳宏淑:〈譯者的操縱: 從 *Cuore* 到《馨兒就學記》〉,《編譯論叢》第 3 卷第 1 期, 2010 年 3 月, 頁 41-68。
- 陳萬雄:〈談雨果《悲慘世界》最早的中譯本〉,《抖擻》1979 年第 31 期, 頁 10-14。
- 劉心皇:《蘇曼殊大師新傳》, 臺北: 東大出版社, 1984 年。
- 鮑昌、邱文治:《魯迅年譜: 1881-1936》第 1 冊, 天津: 天津人民出版社, 1979 年。
- Dimitry, Alexander, and A. F., trans. *Les Misérables (The Wretched): A New Translation, Revised*. By Victor Hugo. 5 vols. Richmond,

- Virginia: West and Johnston, 1863.
- Hapgood, Isabel F., trans. *Les Misérables*. By Victor Hugo. 5 vols. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1887.
- Hugo, Victor. *Les Misérables*. Paris: Pagnerre, 1862. 5 vols. New York: W. R. Jenkins, 1887.
- Huss, H. C. O., ed. *La Chute: From Victor Hugo's Les Misérables*. By Victor Hugo. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1892.
- Liu, Wu-chi (柳無忌). *Su Man-shu*. Twayne's World Authors Series: A Survey of the World's Literature. New York: Twayne, 1972.
- Moore, Olin H. "Some Translations of *Les Misérables*." *Modern Language Notes* 74-3 (1959): 240-246.
- Sumichrast, F. C. de, ed. *Les Misérables: Abridged, with Introduction and Notes*. By Victor Hugo. Boston: Ginn, 1896.
- Walton, William, J. Carroll Beckwith, M. Jules Gray, and M. Edouard Jolivet, trans. *Les Misérables*. Vols. 11-20 of *The Novels, Complete and Unabridged of Victor Hugo*. By Victor Hugo. 28 vols. Philadelphia: G. Barrie, c1894.
- Wilbour, Charles E., trans. *Les Misérables*. By Victor Hugo. New York: Carleton Publishing Company, 1862. New York: Modern Library, 1931.
- Wiltse, Sara Eliza, ed. *The Story of Jean Valjean: From Victor Hugo's Les Misérables*. Boston: Ginn, 1897.
- Wraxall, Lascelles, trans. *Les Misérables*. By Victor Hugo. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1862. 2 vols. New York: International Book, c1880.