



Chinese Translation of Emily Dickinson's Poetry: A Data-based Comparison of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's Translated Versions

Jianxin Zhou^{1*}

¹School of Foreign Languages, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510641, China

Corresponding Author Email: wo777277@sohu.com | Tel: +86 13760886661

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i6.2680>

APA Citation: Zhou, J. (2026). Chinese Translation of Emily Dickinson's Poetry: A Data-based Comparison of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's Translated Versions. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i6.2680>

Received:

15/06/2026

Accepted:

20/08/2025

Keywords:

Data-based Analysis, Emily Dickinson's Poems Translation, Comparison, Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's Translated Versions

Abstract

Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's Chinese translations of poems of Emily Dickinson, a pioneer of modern English poetry, hold great importance for Emily Dickinson studies in China. This study selects 217 translated poems from each translated version respectively as research objects for a big-data analysis to reveal translation characteristics of the two translated versions. Drawing on corpora comprising 217 source texts and their corresponding translations by Jiang and Pu, the research employs the corpus analysis software AntConc 3.4.4 and the Chinese word segmentation system ICTCLAS to conduct a big-data comparative analysis, focusing on poetic form and vocabulary to identify characteristics of the two translated versions, especially in stanza division, line division, punctuation translation, and diction. The result shows that regarding poetic form—whether stanza division, line division, or punctuation arrangement—Pu's translation is more faithful to the source texts than Jiang's. In terms of diction, however, Jiang's translation proves more concise and flexible, whereas Pu's translation reads more smoothly and fluently, demonstrating an overall trend of strict adherence to the original texts. Given the fact that Jiang's translation is more favored by readers, it is evident that, at least in poetry translation, the popularity of a translation among readers does not necessarily correlate with its fidelity to the original.

Contribution/Originality: This study is the first empirical study and objective comparison and comment of feature of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's Chinese translation of Emily Dickinson's poetry, and will contribute to the development of Dickinson studies and popularization of Dickinson's poetry in China, in that it enhances Chinese scholars' and translator's understanding of Dickinson's poetry and helps Chinese readers to make better choice of Chinese translations of Dickinson's poetry.

1. Introduction

Emily Dickinson, a famous American poetess in the 19th century, wrote nearly 1800 poems during her lifetime. Her poems were translated into Chinese by scholars early before the Liberation of China (i.e. 1 Oct., 1949), as Yuan Shupai translated 5 Dickinson's poems in his *Modern American Poetry*, a translation book published in March 1949 (Zhou Jianxin, 2012: 50). However, it was not until the 1980s that the first book of Chinese translation of Dickinson's poems appeared, which is *The Selected Poems of Emily Dickinson*, translated by Jiang Feng (1929-2017) and was published in 1984 (Zhou Jianxin, 2011: 58).

So far, there have been 24 Chinese translations of Dickinson's poems. There have been some scholars who have studied and evaluated the relevant translations, for example, Hu

Qiuran, Zeng Yifeng, Zhou Jianxin, He Rundong and Niu Xiaoyan have respectively evaluated the translations by Yu Guangzhong, Yuan Shupai, Jiang Feng, Mu Yu and Zhou Jianxin (Hu Qiuran 2010; Zeng Yifeng 2012; Zhou Jianxin 2010; He Rundong 2004; Niu Xiaoyan 2011).

In 2004, Zhou Jianxin commented on 5 Chinese translations of Dickinson's poems translated respectively by Jiang Feng, Pu Long, Sun Liang, Wu Juntao and Wu Qiren, and Wang Jinhua (Zhou Jianxin, 2004). Then in 2011, he reviewed 11 Chinese translations of Dickinson's poems, including those translated by Zhang Yun, Mu Yu, Ma Yongbo, Dong Henxiu and Lai Weijie, and Li Huina (Zhou Jianxin, 2011). Among these Chinese translated versions, Jiang Feng's translation is the most influential with the largest number of reprints and the largest and long-term stable sales volumes (Zhou Jianxin, 2011: 60). The quality of Jiang Feng's translation has long been admired by most readers and researchers, as Liu Shoulun, a professor of Yunnan Normal University, put it in *The Study of Dickinson*, "Mr. Jiang's translation is the closest to the original style of Dickinson's poetry. It is simple, clean and beautiful, with rare superfluous words and misinterpretations." (Liu Shoulun, 2006: 360-1). Besides Jiang Feng, Pu Long also carries weight in translation of Dickinson's poems since he published the first and only complete translated version of 1775 Dickinson's poems, which was launched by Shanghai Translation Publishing House in 2014. This is a landmark achievement in Chinese translation of Dickinson's poems, and its influence can not be ignored. However, researches and comments on the characteristics of Pu Long's translation are still very few.

In view of the importance of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations in the field of Chinese translation of Dickinson's poems, this paper aims to employ big data analysis, with the aid of the software AntConc 4.3.3, to compare the two translations in terms of their formal features and lexical choices, thereby revealing the distinctive characteristics of both versions. This is intended to provide readers with a clearer understanding of these two Chinese translations and, more importantly, to address the following question: given that both are representative Chinese translations, why does Jiang Feng's version enjoy much wider popularity among readers than Pu Long's? It is believed that the findings of this study will shed light on the answer to this research question.

The specific research objects of this study are 217 original poems of Dickinson and their Chinese versions translated by Jiang Feng and Pu Long respectively. The original texts of the 217 poems are from Johnson's 1960 edition, *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson* (Johnson, 1960), on which both Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations are based. While Jiang Feng's Chinese translations of the 217 Dickinson's poems are taken from his book of selected translation of Emily Dickinson's poems, *Wild Nights, Wild Nights*, which was published by People's Literature Publishing House in 2008 (Jiang Feng, 2008), Pu Long's Chinese translations of the 217 Dickinson poems are selected from his book of translation of Emily Dickinson's poems, *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson* which was published by Shanghai Translation Publishing House in 2014 (Pu Long, 2014).

This paper firstly compares characteristics of the two Chinese translated versions in connecting with the original English poems in terms of form, specifically speaking, checking the correspondence between those translations and their original poems in terms of stanzas, lines and punctuation. And further on, this paper explores features of diction of the two translations through corpus analysis. The process is as follows: firstly, build corpora of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations separately and use the ICTCLAS, a Chinese-word segmentation system, to recognize words (always several characters as a Chinese word), split words and mark words with part-of-speech tagging; secondly, use corpus analysis software Antconc. 4.3.3 to calculate the total number of Chinese characters and words for further exploration, analyze and compare the features of words of the two translation corpora with different POS tagging, such as quantifiers, interjections and modal particles, prepositions and conjunctions, idioms and so on; and lastly, through those data analyses, conclude the characteristics of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations of Dickinson's poems in terms of form and diction.

2. Comparison of form

The main features of modern poetry in form include “blank space”, “line division” and “stanza division”, and poets often use visual separation of the form of poetry to achieve a certain purpose in poetic expression, such as semantic separation, jumping, association or continuity (Xue Xiao, 2010:50). Another way to make space break of poetry is the use of punctuation. Generally speaking, arrangement of form of a poem usually reflects careful consideration as well as repeated deliberation of the poet on diction and sentence making. Therefore, it is natural for poetry translator to strive to faithfully reproduce the original form of a poem and to convey the poetic flavor which the poet gives to the form.

2.1 Stanza division and line division

Stanza is of great significance to poetry. A poet often “makes the most cohesive verse lines into a stanza, giving the stanza independent status to achieve an emphasis on its meaning” and also hope that “readers may pay as much the same aesthetic attention to different stanzas as possible.” (Xue Xiao, 2010: 53) Therefore, in translation, translator should keep original appearance of the source text in order to preserve its original meaning. Dickinson’s nearly 1,800 poems are mostly short poems, of which many are of only one stanza, and some are divided into two, three, four, five or even more stanzas; and there are some stanzas which are composed of only one line, and some stanzas are composed of two, three or even more lines. For such irregular segmentation, translator needs to pay more attention to make the translation consistent with the original poem in stanza division and line division.

By comparing Jiang Feng’s and Pu Long’s translations with their 217 original poems in stanza division, one could see consistency and deviation between the translation and the originals (see Table 1). The statistics in Table 1 show that there are 18 poems of Jiang Feng’s translations that do not match the source texts in stanza number, accounting for 8.3% of the total 217 translations, while the number of Pu Long’s is 2, which is relatively low, accounting for no more than 1% of the total 217 translations. It can be seen that, compared with Jiang Feng, the corresponding ratio between translation and source text in stanza division for Pu Long’s translations is higher.

Table 1. Stanza deviation in Jiang Feng’s and Pu Long’s translations

Stanza deviation in Jiang’s translation																		
Sequence number of poems in Johnson’s edition	33	35	80	84	239	380	476	516	668	903	1263	1320	1379	1463	1508	1540	1587	1720
Number of stanza of original poems	1	1	2	1	3	8	6	3	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	2	1
Number of stanza of Jiang’s translation	2	3	1	2	2	7	7	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	3	4	1	2
Stanza deviation in Pu’s translation																		
Sequence number of poems in Johnson’s edition	637	1212																
Number of stanza of original poems	3	2																
Number of stanza of Pu’s translation	4	1																

In terms of division of verse lines, there are also deviations of Jiang’s and Pu’s translations from their original poems (see Table 2.). Table 2 shows that most of Pu Long’s translation maintains strict correspondence with original poems in the arrangement of verse lines, and only his translation of Poem 637 has one more line than its original text. Jiang Feng’s translation has slightly lower consistency in line numbers with its original text, with 5 examples of deviations. For instance, the translation of Poem 239 by Jiang Feng leaves out 4 lines (one stanza) of original text. While the translation of Poem 903 by Jiang Feng has 4 lines (one stanza) more than the original text in Johnson’s edition, and it’s found that this translation is actually a translation of the combination of Poem 80A and Poem 80B in Franklin’s edition.

Table 2. Line deviation in Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translation

Line deviation in Jiang's translation					
Sequence number of poems in Johnson's edition	31	239	376	903	1719
Number of line of original poem	9	12	11	4	4
Number of line of Jiang's translation	8	8	12	8	5
Line deviation in Pu's translation					
Sequence number of poems in Johnson's edition	637				
Number of lines of original poem	24				
Number of lines of Pu's translation	25				

It can be seen that in Jiang's translation there are 18 deviations in stanzas and 5 deviations in lines in comparing with that of the originals, while in Pu's translation there are only 2 deviations in stanzas and 1 deviation in lines. Overall speaking, both Jiang's translation and Pu's translation have few deviations in stanzas or in lines, keeping a high consistency with the original texts in form, but the consistency of Pu's translation is slightly higher.

2.2 Alteration of punctuation

As has been mentioned above, stanza division and line division are meaningful as well as signifying poetic pauses. However, in poetry, the written marks signifying poetic pause are mainly of two types: one is Punctuation; the other is Space. (Duan Caolin, 2001: 74) It's not hard to understand the significance of punctuation in poetry in that punctuation is not only a part of form and help to shape the form of a poem, but also contributes to the flow of poetic expression and the construction of poetic mood.

Emily Dickinson's punctuation always arouse great interest of readers and researchers, especially in her large amount of unconventional use of dash. When Johnson edited and published *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*, he attached great importance to consistency of printed version with Dickinson manuscript on dash, "Dickinson used dash as a musical device, and though some may be elongated end stops, any 'correction' would be gratuitous." (1960: 10-11) Jiang Feng also mentioned the special role of dash in Dickinson's poems: "Emily seldom used punctuation in her poems in the way people commonly used. She used tremendous short slashes instead of dashes to express poetic transition, leap, ellipsis, or merely signifying metrical ups and downs." (2008: 5) Apart from dash, Dickinson also uses other punctuation marks. Her poetry is characterized by free verse, and consequently she sometimes uses punctuation only within verse lines without any punctuation marks at the end of the line, yet in her poems, there are also many verse lines that end with dashes, commas, periods, question marks, or exclamation marks.

The punctuation marks in modern Chinese are originally introduced from Western languages, especially English, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and from which fully develop up to now. Therefore, punctuation system of Chinese and that of English share great similarities, so that only a few punctuations have diverse rules. So it is feasible for translators to maintain corresponding punctuation in their English-to-Chinese translation. In investigating the conformity of Jiang's and Pu's translation to original text in form, correspondence in punctuation marks becomes a concern of the author of this paper. Statistics of punctuation used in Jiang's translation, Pu's translation and the original texts are showed as in Table 3.

Table 3. Statistics of Punctuation used in original texts and in Jiang's & Pu's translation

Punctuation Items	Dash (——)	Comma (, /)	Period (. /)	Exclamation point (! / !)	Double quotation marks (“ ” / “ ”)	Question mark (? / ?)	Semicolon (; / ;)	Colon (: / :)	Enumeration comma (,)	Book title marks (《 》)
Numbers in original texts	2296	532	123	209	110	79	10	2	0	0
Numbers in Jiang's translation	1452	1297	153	183	108	77	12	8	12	1
Numbers in Pu's translation	2244	469	122	207	111	78	12	1	11	1

According to the statistics (see Table 3), the most frequently used punctuation marks in the 217 Dickinson's poems are dashes, which have a total of 2,296, with the average number of dashes used in each poem exceeding 10. The number of dashes used in Pu Long's translation is 2,244, which is close to the original texts. While in Jiang Feng's translation, the number is only 1452, which is far less than that of the original texts. The reason of this is that Jiang Feng has altered some original dashes into comma in his translation, as he has mentioned in the preface of his book of translation of Dickinson's poems, *Wild Nights, Wild Nights*, that is, "the translation retains original dashes only at the end of verse line, while those dashes within lines have been replaced by commas." (Jiang Feng, 2008: 5) This also explains, to some extent, why number of commas used in Jiang Feng's translation is much more than that in original texts.

According to statistics, 532 commas were used in the 217 original poems of Dickinson, with an average of only 3 commas per poem. And there are 87 poems that are without commas at all. In translation, Jiang Feng uses 1297 commas, with a big variation of 765 more than the originals; and Pu Long uses 469 commas, only 63 less than the originals. The author of this paper compares every comma used in Jiang's and Pu's translation with that in original texts, and obtains the number of addition and omission of commas in the two translations (see Table 4).

Table 4. Comma addition and omission in Jiang's and Pu's translations

Alteration of comma Translation version	Number of comma addition	Number of comma omission	Total alterations of comma
Jiang's translation	931	166	1097
Pu's translation	67	130	197

As can be seen from table 4, both Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations have commas added to the original text or omitted from the original text. This phenomenon is especially obvious in Jiang Feng's translation, the number of alteration amounting to 1097. While in Pu Long's translation, the alteration of commas is much less, only 197. It can be seen that the number of commas in Jiang Feng's translation reflected in Table 3 is 765 more than the original texts, and that in Pu Long's translation is 63 less than the original texts, which are the result of adding and omitting the commas in the translation.

Statistics of table 3 and table 4 show that regarding comma translation, Pu Long is more faithful to original texts, with much fewer alterations of commas than Jiang Feng. Jiang Feng's large deviation from original texts in comma translation, especially his addition of large number of commas, is not only due to his alteration of original dashes within lines into commas, but also his addition of commas within or at the end of verse lines where there are originally no commas at all. The reasons of his changes in punctuation translation could be that, firstly, changing the dashes within or at the end of original verse lines in order to make his Chinese translated version conform to habitual Chinese expression and make it more fluent to for readers to read; secondly, adding commas to signify pause where translator thinks is necessary in his translated version; thirdly, adding commas at the end of verse lines where there is originally no commas to highlight a pause in reading. While Jiang Feng, on the other hand, also occasionally omits original commas in his translation. his comma ellipsis in translation occurs mainly in the following two cases: omitting the commas within verse lines, and omitting the

commas at the end of verse lines. For free verse like that of Dickinson's, line division itself may result in distinct rhythmical pauses and truncation of meaning flow, therefore, adding or omitting commas at the end of verse lines in translation should generally have no significant effect on poetic expression.

As compared with Jiang Feng, Pu Long translates punctuation more faithfully to original texts. There are very few changes of punctuation in Pu Long's translation, the small percentage of dashes and comma changes in his translation are mostly necessary during interlingual translation. Except for comma and dash, other punctuation marks in Pu Long's translation remain commonly the same as they are in the original texts. It is worth noting that the number of commas omitted by Pu Long is more than the number of commas added. This is another obvious difference between the translation of Pu Long and Jiang Feng: Jiang Feng tends to increase the number of comma and create more pauses to ease the rhythm of poetry; while Pu Long tends to reduce the pause of the original text and thus tends to translate the original two or more groups of meanings into one long sentence.

In short, statistics show that, with regard to stanza division, line division, and punctuation, Pu Long's translation, as compared with Jiang Feng's translation, is more faithful to original texts. Yet this kind of loyalty does not necessarily entail warmly acclaim for readers and critics. On the one hand, a Chinese translation with so many dashes interspersed in or between verse lines is uncommon in Chinese poetry tradition, and Chinese readers may not be ready to accept it; on the other hand, readers may not be pleased to read long sentences in Pu Long's translation, as it could be more laborious than reading short sentences. And this could be an important reason why many readers and researchers now in China think, in their impressionistic evaluation, that Jiang Feng's translation is more concise and neat, and thus better.

3. Comparison of diction

Chinese is a pictographic and ideographic language with abundance synonyms. A concept or an idea may be expressed by use of one character, or by use of two characters(or even more characters) which make up a Chinese word. Therefore, in English to Chinese translation, an English word may sometimes be translated only into a Chinese character, sometimes it must be translated into a Chinese word(which combines two Chinese characters or more), and sometimes translation is just a choice among several Chinese synonyms. And that is one of the reasons why there are sometimes multiple Chinese translations for an English text. A translator's choice of words at lexical level, such as the word length (the number of Chinese characters), the bias of diction, and so on, will help to form his style of translation. Jiang Feng's translation and Pu Long's translation of the 217 poems differ in the number of Chinese characters and the application of several word types, with each has its own characteristics.

3.1 Number of characters

According to the statistics by authors of this paper, in translation of 217 Dickinson's poems, Jiang Feng uses altogether 22,351 Chinese characters, while Pu Long uses 23,024 Chinese characters, with 673 characters more than that in Jiang Feng's, accounting for 3.01%. That is to say, on average, every poem translated by Pu Long has 3.1 characters more than Jiang Feng's translation. On the whole, the number of characters Pu Long uses in his translation is slightly more than in Jiang Feng's translation, yet in regard to specific poem, when translating the same original poems, Pu Long sometimes uses more characters than Jiang Feng for one poem, while sometimes uses less characters than Jiang Feng for another poem, and sometimes both translators use same number of characters in translation of one same original poem. Table 5 shows number of translations in the two translated versions of the same original text with same and different number of characters.

Table 5. Number of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations with same and different number of characters

Jiang's translations with fewer number of characters than Pu's	Jiang's and Pu's translations with same number of characters	Jiang's translations with more number of characters than Pu's	Total
118	13	86	217

Table 5 displays the result of a comparison of each of Jiang's and Pu's translation of the same original text on the number of characters of each translation, and it reveals that, 118 translations by Jiang Feng have fewer characters, accounting for 54.38% of the total 217; and 86 translations by Pu Long have fewer characters, accounting for 39.63%; and there are 13 translations by both translators that have same number of characters. This statistics may help to verify the current evaluation of characteristics of Jiang's and Pu's translation of Dickinson's poems, "Comparing the two translations of Dickinson's poems, Jiang's is concise but a little bit rigid, while Pu's is smooth but lack of conciseness. Of course, this is but an overall evaluation." (Zhou Jianxin, 2004: 96)

3.2 Diction

In order to analyze features of diction of Jiang's and Pu's translations, authors of this paper use ICTCLAS, a Chinese-word segmentation software, to recognize words of the two translations and mark them with part-of-speech tagging, and then sort out a corpus of Jiang's translation of Dickinson's poems and a corpus of Pu's translation of Dickinson's poems. And then, Antconc. 3.4.4, a corpus analysis software, is used to analyze diction of the two translated versions.

Table 6. Statistics on diction of Jiang's and Pu's translations

Items Versions	Tokens	Word types	Token and type ratio
Jiang's translation	18689	4396	4.25
Pu's translation	19287	4785	4.03

Table 6 shows tokens (a word as a token) and word types of the two translations. It can be seen that the number of words (the tokens) of Pu Long's translation are slightly more than that of Jiang Feng's translation, as the same case as can be found in statistics of character number aforementioned. On the whole, no matter on character number or on word number, Pu's translations are slightly more than Jiang's translation. In addition, both of Jiang's translation and Pu's translation are based on the same 217 Dickinson's poems, yet Pu's translation has more word types than Jiang's translation, that means vocabulary used in Pu's translation is more abundant. The token and type ratio is an item to show exactly the richness of vocabulary of a corpus. It is the ratio of total word number and word types, and the lower the ratio, the richer the vocabulary. Since the token and types ratio of Pu's translation is lower, obviously, vocabulary in Pu's translation is more abundant.

A further comparison of similarities and differences between words used in the two translations is showed in Table 7. It is found that, roughly speaking, about half of words used in the two translations are the same, and the other half of words is different from each other.

Table 7. Number of co-occurrence words and non-co-occurrence words of Jiang's and Pu's translations

Items Versions	Word types	Co-occurrence words (ratio)	Non-co-occurrence word (ratio)
Jiang's translation	4396	2431 (55.3%)	1965 (44.7%)
Pu's translation	4785	2431 (50.8%)	2354 (49.2%)

Specifically speaking (see table 7), 55.3% of words in Jiang's translation occurs in Pu's translation as well, the other 44.7% of words are not existing in Pu's translation; while 50.8% of words of Pu's translation occurs in Jiang's translation, too, the other 49.2% of words are not existing in Jiang's translation. This may be attributed to the ambiguity and polysemy of poetry, as well as Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's different understanding of Dickinson's poems and their different habits of using word and constructing sentence while translating. For example, they have big differences in their use of numerals and quantifiers, modal particles and interjection, preposition and conjunction, and four-character idioms, etc.

3.2.1 Quantifiers

Numerals and quantifiers should not be ignored in English-Chinese translation. "Due to different habits of expression, numerals and quantifiers used in English and Chinese are different while describing a certain concept." (Xu Guolie, 1982: 27) When talking about the translation of numerals and quantifiers in English-Chinese translation, Xu Guolie illustrates that "To translate 'a word' into Chinese, different translators have different renderings with their own consideration of subtle factors. Translators must be discreet while translating numerals and quantifiers, as well as the singular and plural forms of nouns." (Xu Guolie, 1982: 27)

Table 8 displays two lists of quantifiers whose frequency ranks top 10 respectively in Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations. According to statistics made by authors of this paper, the total frequency of quantifiers in Jiang Feng's translation is 343, while that in Pu Long's translation is 384, with an increase of 11.95%. And the number of quantifiers used Jiang Feng's translation is 81, while that in Pu Long's translation is 98. Both the number and frequency of quantifiers in Pu Long's translation is obviously more than that in Jiang Feng's translation, because when translating Dickinson's singular noun phrase, "a/an+N", Pu Long tends to translate it word by word as "一+量词+名词"(one/a/an+ quantifier+ noun), while Jiang Feng mostly leaves out numerals and quantifiers and only retains the noun, and thus blur the quantitative characteristics of the noun.

Quantifiers may function as one of rhetorical devices in poetry, but mostly they are used to refer to quantity of something. There are only few quantifiers in English in the structure of "Numeral + Quantifier+ of+ Noun", mostly the noun phrase "Numeral +Noun" is used to express quantity of something. So in English-Chinese translation, quantifiers are often added by translator based on relevant semantics and context. In Jiang Feng's translation, one can see that he usually neglects the quantitative characteristics of some nouns in original texts, and so in his translation very often there are only translated nouns without any numerals and quantifiers as modifiers, thus making his translation apparently more concise, however, Pu Long, keeping fidelity principle of translation in mind, tries diligently to transmit the quantitative significance of the original noun in his translation as much as possible, in order to give original meaning full play in translation.

Table 8. Frequency and types of quantifiers in Jiang's and Pu's translations

/q (quantifiers)					
Jiang's translation			Pu's translation		
Total types:81	Total freq:343		Total types:98	Total freq:384	
Rank	Freq.	Words	Rank	Freq.	Words
1	37	个/q	1	34	个/q
2	27	只/q	2	28	只/q
3	24	种/q	3	27	种/q

/q (quantifiers)					
Jiang's translation			Pu's translation		
Total types:81		Total freq:343	Total types:98		Total freq:384
Rank	Freq.	Words	Rank	Freq.	Words
4	22	位/q	4	19	位/q
5	20	次/q	5	18	条/q
6	18	天/q	6	15	座/q
7	15	条/q	7	15	片/q
8	10	颗/q	8	14	天/q
9	9	座/q	9	12	颗/q
10	8	份/q	10	11	次/q

3.2.2 Modal particles and interjection

In oral communication, “modal particles and interjection can enhance the emotional colour of language expression, making it more vivid and individual.” (Shi Shuangwen, 2010: 103) Similarly, modal particles and interjection also play an important role in strengthening emotional intensity of poetic language. Generally speaking, modal particles and interjection take on three characteristics, firstly, they are relatively independent, and most of them do not serve as sentence elements; secondly, they remain considerably uncertain and always change with the context; thirdly, there exists a certain degree of discrepancy between their expressions in spoken and written language. (Shi Shuangwen, 2010: 103)

It is precisely the independency and uncertainty of modal particles and interjection that allow translators more choices in the process of their English-Chinese translation. This is probably one of the reasons of the obvious difference in modal particles and interjection between Jiang's translation and Pu's translation. Table 9 and Table 10 are statistics of modal particles and interjection in Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations. According to statistics, the frequency of modal particles and interjection in Jiang Feng's translation is higher than that of Pu long's translation. Based on this, one may say that Jiang Feng's translation retains more abundant and intense emotion.

For the choice of specific terms, there exists also big difference between Jiang's translation and Pu's translation(see Table 9&10). For example, Jiang Feng chooses to use such modal particles as “了”, “吧”, and “么” most frequently, with frequency of 23, 15 and 6 respectively, while in Pu's translation, their frequency is 5, 6 and 0. And Pu Long prefers to use modal particle “呀”, with 12 times, while Jiang Feng never used it in his translation. As for translation of interjection, Jiang Feng and Pu Long maintain big difference mainly because Jiang Feng chooses to use the word “哦” with the highest frequency in his translation, while Pu Long never use it in his translation.

Table 9. Frequency and types of modal particles in Jiang's and Pu's translations

/y(modal particles)					
Jiang's translation			Pu's translation		
Total types:7		Total freq:68	Total types:7		Total freq:46
Rank	Freq.	Words	Rank	Freq.	Words
1	23	了/y	1	19	啊/y
2	20	啊/y	2	12	呀/y
3	15	吧/y	3	6	吧/y
4	6	么/y	4	5	了/y
5	2	吗/y	5	2	矣/y
6	1	呢/y	6	1	呢/y
7	1	哩/y	7	1	啦/y

Table 10. Frequency and types of interjection in Jiang's and Pu's translations

/e(interjection)					
Jiang's translation			Pu's translation		
Total types:5		Total freq:20	Total types:8		Total freq:11
Rank	Freq.	Words	Rank	Freq.	Words
1	13	哦/e	1	3	啊/e
2	3	囉/e	2	2	喂/e
3	2	喂/e	3	1	呵/e
4	1	哎/e	4	1	哎/e
5	1	噓/e	5	1	哎呀/e
			6	1	嗨/e
			7	1	嗨哟/e
			8	1	噓/e

3.2.3 Preposition and conjunction

A preposition is a function word used to illustrate relationship between a word and another word, or between a word and a sentence. A conjunction is used to connect words to words, phrases to phrases or sentences to sentences, and to signify some kind of logical relation. Wang li (1900-1986), a Chinese linguist, once distinguished the difference of preposition and conjunction in Chinese and in English, "Chinese is a language full of parataxis, and the connected component is not a must, while English is a language full of hypotaxis, and the connection component is indispensable in most cases."(Wang Li, 1984: 487)

By examining frequency of preposition and conjunction in English-Chinese translation, Xia Yun studies the hypotaxis of the translated language and points out that "if the frequency of some functional component in Chinese translation is higher than usual, this would demonstrates its characteristic of high hypotaxis, which deviates from Chinese common traits of parataxis."(Xia Yun, 2013:105-6) Xia Yun also believes that "translation, as a cross-language communication, will inevitably be influenced by the original text. When translating English into Chinese, translator will consciously and unconsciously reproduce some of the hypotaxis features of English." (Xia Yun 113) Table 11 and 12 are statistics of frequency of top 10 preposition and conjunction in Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations. A comparison (see Table 11 & 12) of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations of Dickinson's poems reveals that preposition and conjunction used in Pu long's translation are more than that in Jiang Feng's translation. Accordingly, it could be said that, as compared with Jiang Feng's translation, Pu Long's translation unfolds stronger influence by original texts, which has a higher degree of characteristics of hypotaxis, with more complete language structure. And this helps to make Pu Long's translation apparently more smooth and fluent.

In terms of specific word choice, there also exists differences between the two translations. For example, the preposition "把" is used in high frequency both in Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations, with frequency of 71 times and 166 times respectively. But it is obvious that the frequency of "把" in Pu Long's translation is more than double the frequency in Jiang Feng's translation. The use of preposition "把" in a sentence does not generate any change in sentence elements, only causing a leap of the object forward to follow closely after the preposition "把". Compared with sentence of verb-object structure which there is no need to use "把", the sentence with "把" is not so concise and expressive. The fact that the frequency of preposition "把" in Jiang Feng's translation is far lower than that in Pu Long's translation explains why Jiang Feng's translation seems more concise and neat. Generally speaking, in Chinese, preposition "把" is more common in use in prose than in poetry. The high frequency of "把" in Pu Long's translation contributes to the characteristics of prose style of his translation.

Table 11. Frequency and types of preposition in Jiang's and Pu's translations

/p(preposition)					
Jiang's translation			Pu's translation		
Total types:45		Total freq:850	Total types:46		Total freq:943
Rank	Freq.	Words	Rank	Freq.	Words
1	257	在/p	1	232	在/p
2	71	把/p	2	166	把/p
3	66	像/p	3	52	对/p
4	42	为/p	4	41	因为/p
5	42	从/p	5	40	像/p
6	35	对/p	6	40	给/p
7	34	向/p	7	37	向/p
8	31	当/p	8	32	从/p
9	27	给/p	9	30	为/p
10	26	以/p	10	29	当/p

Table 12. Frequency and types of conjunction in Jiang's and Pu's translations

/c(conjunction)					
Jiang's translation			Pu's translation		
Total types:53		Total freq:466	Total types:61		Total freq:474
Rank	Freq.	Words	Rank	Freq.	Words
1	72	和/c	1	76	但/c
2	65	如果/c	2	51	如果/c
3	54	而/c	3	34	而/c
4	41	但是/c	4	31	和/c
5	35	然后/c	5	29	然后/c
6	19	或是/c	6	22	或者/c
7	13	只有/c	7	20	只有/c
8	12	于是/c	8	14	并/c
9	11	并/c	9	14	所以/c
10	9	所以/c	10	13	尽管/c

3.2.4 Four-character idioms

There is a kind of unique idiom in Chinese language, which is always composed of four characters with specific connotation. It is a language unit with same grammatical function as Chinese words. This kind of four-character idioms are short and concise, vivid and easy to understand. Whether four-character idiom is applicable in English-Chinese translation, different scholars hold up different attitudes. Feng Qinghua believes that "Four-character idiom may play significant role in English-Chinese translation" (Feng Qinghua, 1985: 55) While Chen Guohua opposes the abuse of four-character idiom in English-Chinese translation, and he holds that "'using four-character idiom prudently' still should be a principle in English-Chinese translation because novelty is an important quality for poetry. Not only the image but also the language should be novel. Although four-character idioms may help to make language concise and comprehensive and sometimes it has to be used for the sake of phonological effect, it is regarded as cliché. A poem full of clichés should not be seen as a good poem." (Chen Guohua, 1998: 86)

In English-Chinese translation, it is impossible not to use any idioms. Table 13 is a Statistics of some four-character idioms with high frequency in Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations. Table 13 reveals that both Jiang Feng and Pu Long use some four-character idioms in their translations, that is, 54 in Jiang's translation, and 107 in Pu's translation. The four-character idioms in Pu's translation is much as twice as those in Jiang's translation, which suggests Jiang's more cautious attitude toward using four-character idioms in translation. Roughly speaking, on average, Jiang Feng uses one four-character idiom in every four poems while Pu

uses one four-character idiom in every two poems. The use of four-character idiom in translation may render to Chinese readers a sense of familiarity, either reflecting an ingenious mastery of language or weakening the effect of defamiliarization and reducing freshness of the translation.

In addition, Jiang Feng and Pu Long use four-character idioms with great difference from each other. Of the four-character idioms Jiang Feng and Pu Long used in translation, there are only 10 idioms that they both use, they are as follows: 一如既往、不为所动、为时已晚、摇摆不定、自食其果、不知不觉、小心翼翼、引人注目、战战兢兢、趾高气扬. Among them, the former five idioms are translations for the same source text, while the latter five idioms for different source texts. That is to say, there are only five occasions that Jiang Feng and Pu Long translate the same source texts into the same four-character idioms. Thus it can be seen that the use of idioms in English-Chinese translation is free and changeable. For the same source text, one can choose to translate it into idiom with several options, or even can avoid it.

Table 13. Frequency and types of four-character idioms in Jiang's and Pu's translations

/i(idiom)					
Jiang's translation			Pu's translation		
Total types:50	Total freq:54		Total types:102	Total freq:107	
rank	Freq	word	rank	Freq	word
1	3	无能为力/i	1	2	不知不觉/i
2	2	娓娓动听/i	2	2	小心翼翼/i
3	2	不为所动/i	3	2	恰如其分/i
4	1	一丝一毫/i	4	2	无穷无尽/i
5	1	一丝不苟/i	5	2	不为所动/i

4. Conclusion

Through big data quantitative analysis, a comparison of Jiang Feng's and Pu Long's translations of 217 Dickinson's poems is carried out on respects of form and vocabulary. The analysis reveals that in poetic form, specifically, in stanza division, line division, and arrangement of punctuation, Pu Long's translation is more faithful to source text. In particular, there are more than 1000 alterations concerning with commas in Jiang's translation, while there are no more than 200 changes related to comma in Pu's translation. Jiang Feng tends to add more commas, which make his translation distinctive for juxtaposing of short phrases and sentences, while Pu Long prefers to omit more commas, which results in more longer sentences found in his translation.

At lexical level, the survey of use of character number, word number and various word classes reveals that, compared with Pu Long's translation, the total number of characters of Jiang's translation is less, and 54.38% of his 217 translated poems are with less characters than Pu's translation. On the whole, Jiang Feng's translation is more concise and neat, but the richness of its vocabulary is slightly lower than that of Pu Long's translation. In addition, Jiang Feng's translation has more modal particles and interjections, which makes its emotional expression more direct and intense, while Pu Long pays much more attention to the translation of numerals and quantifiers, thus making his translation more consistent with the source text. Furthermore, there are abundant preposition and interjection in Pu's translation, resulting in a higher hypotaxis and the characteristics of prose, which helps to make translation more smooth and fluent but not that concise and neat as Jiang's translation. What's more, both Jiang's and Pu's translation have a certain number of four-character idioms, but the cases of co-occurrence between the two translations are low, in another word, there are only 10 four-character idioms that both Jiang Feng and Pu Long use respectively in their translation. Jiang Feng seems to be more cautious in using four-character idiom in translation than Pu Long, as the frequency of

four-character idiom in his translation is only half the number than that in Pu Long's translation. That is to say, Pu Long uses four-character idioms more frequently, making his translation more familiar to Chinese reader, yet not as novel and fresh as Jiang Feng's translation. In a word, the comparative analysis at lexical level proves that Jiang's translation is more flexible while Pu's translation has the overall trend of adhering rigorously to source texts.

In conclusion, Jiang Feng's translation deviates more noticeably from the original in form, particularly through the addition of numerous commas, which gives the translation a stronger rhythmic quality; at the lexical level, his wording is more concise, and his expression of emotion is more vivid and intense, and these features may well be the key reasons why Jiang Feng's translation is more popular among readers. In contrast, although Pu Long's version is more faithful to the original in both form and vocabulary, it consequently takes on more of a prose-like flavor than poetic charm. Perhaps precisely for this reason, Pu Long's translation is not as favored by readers as Jiang Feng's. It thus becomes evident that the appreciation a poetic translation receives from readers bears no necessary relation to its fidelity to the original.

Works Cited

- Chen Guohua. "Wang Zuoliang's translation of Robert Burns' Poems." *Foreign Literature*, 2 (1998): 84-90.
- Dickinson, Emily. *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Ed. Thomas H. Johnson. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1960.
- Dickinson, Emily. *Wild Nights, Wild Nights: Selected Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Tr. Jiang Feng. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2008: 5.
- Dickinson, Emily. *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Tr. Pu Long. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2014.
- Duan Caolin. "The Written Marks for Poetic Pauses." *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 2 (2001): 74-75.
- Feng Qinghua. "Chinese Idioms in English-Chinese Translation." *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Language*, 2 (1985): 55-59.
- He Rundong. "Consideration of Dickinson's Poems Translation Based on Chinese Translation of *The Final Harvest*." *Journal of Leshan Normal University*, 19,1 (2004): 54-57.
- Hu Qiuran. "From Translating to Composing: Yu Guangzhong's Reception of Dickinson's Poetry." Ed. Zhao Minli. *Chinese Poetry Research*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 2010: 237-250.
- Liu Shoulun. *A Study of Dickinson*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2006, 360-361.
- Niu Xiaoyan. "Comments on Zhou Jianxin's Translation of Dickinson's Poetry." *Literature Education*, 12 (2011): 150.
- Shi Shuangwen. "Small words with Big Use: On the Use of Several Common Modal Particles and Interjections." *New Curriculum*, 8 (2010): 103-104.
- Wang Li. *Collected Works of Wang Li (I): The Theory of Chinese Grammar*. Jinan: Shandong Education Press, 1984.
- Xia Yun. "A Diachronic Study of Hypotactic Features in English-Chinese Translated Literature Texts." *Foreign Language Teaching and Researching*, 1 (2013): 105-116.
- Xu Guolie. "The Translation of Quantifiers Cannot be Neglected." *Chinese Translators Journal*, 5 (1982): 26-27, 37.

Chinese Translation of Emily Dickinson's Poetry

- Xue Xiao. "The Formation of "Speaking Module" in Modern Poetry: Leaving Blank, Dividing Lines and Dividing Stanzas." *Poetry Periodical*, 6 (2010): 50-53.
- Zeng Yifeng. "Translation and Introduction of Emily Dickinson by Yuan Shuipai." *East Journal of Translation*, 5 (2012): 24-29,79.
- Zhou Jianxin. "Comments on Five Translated Versions of Dickinson's Poems." *Journal of Zhengzhou University of Aeronautics*, 23,1 (2004): 95-98.
- Zhou Jianxin. "Jiang Feng and His Translation of Emily Dickinson's Poems". *Journal of North China Electric Power University(Social Sciences)*, 6 (2010):102-106.
- Zhou Jianxin. "Translation of Dickinson's Poems in China." *New Perspectives on World Literature*, 2 (2012): 50-52.
- Zhou Jianxin. "The Revelation of Sales of the Translations of Dickinson's Poems in the Last 30 Years in China." *View on Publishing*, 6 (2011): 58-60.
- Zhou Jianxin. "Comments on 11 Chinese Translated Versions of Dickinson's Poems." *Translations*, 1 (2011): 77-88.

Appendix

Table A. Sequence Number (SN) of the 217 Poems in Johnson's Edition

Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN	Poem	SN
1	1	21	79	41	191	61	274	81	373	101	440	121	480	141	644	161	766	181	1052	201	1549
2	2	22	80	42	249	62	276	82	374	102	441	122	609	142	650	162	767	182	1068	202	1551
3	9	23	84	43	4	63	277	83	376	103	444	123	530	143	663	163	769	183	1075	203	1583
4	12	24	99	44	192	64	285	84	380	104	445	124	540	144	666	164	779	184	1077	204	1587
5	21	25	100	45	248	65	288	85	381	105	448	125	543	145	668	165	781	185	1078	205	1599
6	23	26	101	46	206	66	298	86	384	106	449	126	544	146	683	166	782	186	1129	206	1618
7	25	27	107	47	213	67	302	87	386	107	450	127	549	147	903	167	839	187	1148	207	1619
8	31	28	108	48	214	68	304	88	387	108	461	128	563	148	623	168	840	188	1210	208	1670
9	33	29	111	49	215	69	305	89	391	109	463	129	566	149	686	169	842	189	1212	209	1719
10	34	30	113	50	217	70	311	90	392	110	467	130	568	150	690	170	846	190	1233	210	1720
11	35	31	115	51	221	71	303	91	394	111	470	131	569	151	692	171	861	191	1263	211	1725
12	40	32	126	52	223	72	326	92	399	112	476	132	579	152	709	172	875	192	1320	212	1732
13	41	33	131	53	239	73	315	93	413	113	478	133	580	153	712	173	883	193	1379	213	1754
14	47	34	153	54	241	74	316	94	421	114	494	134	585	154	717	174	919	194	1463	214	1755
15	49	35	165	55	250	75	318	95	425	115	497	135	608	155	718	175	939	195	1508	215	1760
16	67	36	173	56	251	76	324	96	429	116	498	136	620	156	723	176	976	196	1510	216	1774
17	70	37	179	57	254	77	333	97	433	117	502	137	631	157	738	177	986	197	1511	217	1775
18	72	38	181	58	255	78	356	98	328	118	511	138	632	158	741	178	997	198	1540		
19	76	39	182	59	258	79	357	99	432	119	516	139	637	159	744	179	1005	199	1545		
20	77	40	185	60	259	80	369	100	435	120	526	140	640	160	764	180	1041	200	1548		

Author Bio

Jianxin Zhou, Ph.D. is a professor of School of Foreign Languages, South China University of Technology, China, and once worked at Lancaster University, UK, as a professor and dean. He is a writer, translator and researcher whose research interests include Anglo-American poetry, comparison and translation of English and Chinese poetry, and pedagogy. Studying and translating Emily Dickinson's poetry is one of his enduring passions, and has produced fruitful research results in the past 30 years.