

Literary Translation From Deconstructionist Perspective—The Novel *Spicy Pickled Cabbage*

QU Jiaocheng, LIU Xiaozheng
Changchun University, Changchun, China

This paper, using deconstructionist translation theory as a framework and combining the translation practice of dialects and colloquialisms in the novel *Spicy Pickled Cabbage*, explores the translatability of regional languages in literary translation. First, it elucidates Derrida's concept of "différance" and Robert Escarpit's theory of "creative treason". Based on this, it analyzes the characteristic demonstrated when applying "creative treason" under the guidance of deconstructionist translation theory to the translation of Chinese rural dialects. From the two dimensions of cultural cognition and linguistic form, it deeply analyzes the phenomena of cultural information retention, transformation, and loss in the translation of dialects and colloquialisms. The analysis demonstrates that when translating Chinese rural literary dialects under the framework of deconstructionist theory, there is a tendency to "preserve cultural heterogeneity and distinctive figurative imagery". This paper aims to provide theoretical reference and practical inspiration for the translation of Chinese rural literary dialects, promoting the effective dissemination and interpretation of Chinese regional culture internationally.

Keywords: deconstructionism, dialects and colloquialisms, cross-cultural translation

Introduction

The essence of literary translation is far more than a simple code conversion; it is a complex practice that transcends linguistic boundaries and negotiates cultural differences. In this process, dialects and proverbs, which carry profound regional cultural heritage, constitute the core elements of the local and national characteristics of literary texts, and their translation has therefore become a key point and challenge in cross-cultural transmission. This paper, based on Derrida's theory of "différance", focuses on the dialect-to-English translation of the novel *Spicy Pickled Cabbage*. Through an analysis of dialect translation cases, it systematically explores the following core questions: From a deconstructionist perspective, what are the limits of dialect translatability? How can translators achieve cross-cultural translation through "creative treason"? The essence of translation is not a complete equivalent transmission of the source language, but rather the construction of a new paradigm of cross-cultural understanding through the production and negotiation of differences, providing deeper insights into the international dissemination and reception of Chinese regional literature.

Acknowledgements: This paper is supported by the Department of Education of Jilin Province entitled "Research on Multimodal Discourse Construction and Education Mechanism in College Foreign Language Classrooms From the Perspective of Ideological and Political Education" (Fund No. JJKH20260333SK).

QU Jiaocheng, postgraduate student, Foreign Languages College, Changchun University, Changchun, China.

LIU Xiaozheng (Corresponding author), M.A., associate professor, Foreign Languages College, Changchun University, Changchun, China.

Core Principles of Deconstructionist Translation

Deconstructionist translation theory emerged in the 1960s, based on Jacques Derrida's deconstructionist philosophy. Traditional translation theory adheres to the principle that "Translators should be faithful to the original work", placing the original text and the translation, the author and the translator, in opposition, and assigning the original text and the author a central position. However, deconstructionist translation theory completely reverses this relationship. This theory argues that the vitality of the original text depends on the translation; without the translation, the original text cannot exist. The definition of the text itself is determined by the translation, not the original. As Derrida stated, "Translated text writes us, not we the translated text" (Edwin, 1993, p. 145). Consequently, the translator is no longer an invisible, passive imitator but becomes a creative subject, equal in status to the author. Therefore, the translator is no longer an invisible, passive imitator, but a creator with subjectivity, equal to the author. Through the deconstruction and reconstruction of the original text, the translator can uncover its deeper meaning, thereby enriching and extending the meaning of the original text in the translation.

Derrida's Concept of "Différance"

Deconstructionist translation theory emphasizes the openness and uncertainty of textual meaning. Derrida believed that deconstructionism is closely related to translation, and he proposed the concept of "différance" to address the elusive phenomena in the translation process. In his essay "Margins of Philosophy", Derrida (1982) defined "différance" in two ways: "to differ" and "to delay", the former referring to spatial imitation and the latter to temporal concepts. He pointed out that "in the limits to which it is possible or at least appears possible, translation practices the difference between signified and signifier" (p. 21). For linguistics and translation studies, the fixed and unchanging relationships between signified and signifier, language and speech, can no longer remain unchanged; translation must confront difference and resistance.

"Creative Treason" and Literary Translation

French literary sociologist Robert Escarpit coined the term "creative treason", stating that "translation is always a kind of creative treason". Xie Tianzhen (2003) applies the term "creative treason" to the field of translation studies, pointing out that creative treason is an indispensable factor in literary translation. Creative treason is not unique to literary translation. In fact, it is a fundamental law of literary dissemination and reception. We can even say that without creative treason, there would be no dissemination and reception of literature (pp. 140-141). From a linguistic perspective, the meaning of language itself is constantly flowing and changing, which provides space for creative interpretation in translation and fundamentally determines that creative treason is inevitable in the translation process. Such translations are not deviations from the original text; the translator incorporates their own cultural background, aesthetic concepts, and personal style, thus giving the translation unique value.

In conclusion, deconstructionist translation theory affirms creative treason in translation, emphasizing the translator's subjective initiative and the diversity of translation results. This also provides us with new ideas for translating literary works—experimenting with "creative treason" against dialects in translation under the guidance of deconstructionist translation theory.

The Translatability of Dialects and Colloquialisms From a Deconstructionist Perspective: A Case Study of the Novel *Spicy Pickled Cabbage*

Introduction to the Source Text of the Novel *Spicy Pickled Cabbage*

The short novel *Spicy Pickled Cabbage*, included in the collection short novels in *Jilin Literature Writings*.

Focusing on the life difficulties of an ordinary family in Northeast China, it tells the story of a laid-off husband and his wife who takes on the family's livelihood, and their reconciliation after experiencing conflicts. The most distinctive linguistic feature of this story is its extensive use of northeastern dialect and colloquialisms. The use of dialects not only fits the dialogues and psychological descriptions of ordinary people, becoming a key vehicle for shaping character images, but also deeply carries the cultural connotations, life experiences, and language expression habits of Northeast China, highlighting rich regional cultural characteristics. It also provides typical linguistic samples for cross-cultural translation research of dialects in local literature. Different countries possess distinct regional cultures, and this localized cultural ecology is known as regional culture. Literature is primarily linguistic, and "language cannot exist apart from culture" (Sapir, 1985, p. 186). Therefore, language is essentially a cultural phenomenon, a condensation and sedimentation of national culture, knowledge, and thought. Thus, dialects can embody the characteristics of regional culture.

This paper selects this text as the research object mainly because the northeastern dialect colloquialisms in the text cover a variety of types, including reference to everyday objects, expression of daily behavior, description of emotions and psychology, cultural metaphors and rhetoric, and the playful use of social discourse. Moreover, they are rooted in the local cultural cognition and social context of Northeast China, forming a stark difference from the English language system and cultural background. This can directly reflect the translatability and untranslatability of local dialects in cross-cultural translation. The translation examples selected below are all chosen from the aforementioned dialect types. They not only fit the linguistic characteristics of the texts, but also correspond to the translation difficulties in the dimensions of cultural cognition and linguistic form. Through the deconstruction and analysis of these examples, we can clearly explore the specific application path of the "creative treason" strategy from a deconstructionist perspective in the translation of local dialects. They can also provide a practical reference paradigm for the cross-cultural translation of similar local literary dialects. The typicality and diversity of the corpus make the theoretical discussion of dialect translation more practical.

The Translatability of Dialects in Cross-Cultural Translation

The essence of translation is to promote communication and interaction between languages and cultures. Different countries possess distinct regional cultures, and this localized cultural ecology is known as regional culture. Language, as a crucial carrier of culture, embodies the connotations and characteristics of regional culture. In the field of cross-cultural translation, the translation of dialects has always been a topic of great interest.

Assessing the translatability of dialects from a deconstructionist perspective, we can examine it from the dimensions of cultural cognition and linguistic form. Dialect translatability often stems from the commonalities in cognition across different cultures; while untranslatability is largely rooted in the unique conceptual systems or distinctive linguistic forms of a culture. Translatable dialects often point to shared life experiences and cognitive patterns across different cultures. This kind of expressions typically describes specific scenes, universal emotions, or basic principles in daily life, and their semantics are relatively direct and clear. During the translation process, translators can find corresponding expressions in English through appropriate translation strategies, thus preserving the original meaning relatively well. Untranslatable dialects, on the other hand, exhibit distinct cultural specificity. That kind of expressions is deeply rooted in specific regional cultures, carrying unique historical traditions, folk customs, and values, thus forming distinctive cultural connotations. At the same time, they are also unique in their linguistic form, often adopting local expressions, rhetorical devices, or linguistic structures. It is precisely this uniqueness of cultural connotations and particularity of linguistic forms that make such

dialectal expressions hard to find fully equivalent expressions in English, thus resulting in the loss of cultural information during translation and making it difficult for English-speaking readers to comprehend.

The following section will select different types of dialect and colloquial translation cases from the text, and explore the translatability and untranslatability of local dialects in cross-cultural translation from the two dimensions of cultural cognition and linguistic form. At the same time, it will combine deconstructionist translation theory to specifically analyze the practical application path and effect of the “creative treason” strategy in dialect translation.

Example of the Translatable Dialectal Proverbs

Example 1

ST: 她跟李昌浩说想在贸易商场内兑一个床子，再把菜窖翻修一下，用水泥和石头砌上。

TT: She explained to Li Changhao that she wanted to rent a stall in the market, and renovate the vegetable cellar with cement and stones.

This example demonstrates how cross-cultural translation can be achieved through “Creative Treason”. At the level of cultural cognition, “兑一个床子” is a typical Northeastern Chinese dialect expression in which “床子” specifically refers to a market stall, and “兑” in this context carries the complex meaning of “renting” or “purchasing”. This expression exhibits distinct colloquial characteristics and regional flavor. Rather than adhering to a literal phonetic translation, such as “chuangzi”, the translator engaged in creative treason by selecting “rent a stall” from the English lexicon as a substitute for the original phrase. This decision was grounded in the translator’s interpretation and reconstruction of the core commercial logic. Although the translation sacrifices the dialect-specific nuances of “兑” and the colloquial nature of “床子”, it preserves the essence of the commercial activity. The rendition “rent a stall” has a dual effect: On one hand, it diminishes the regional cultural color of the source text; on the other hand, it serves as a form of supplementation—English readers, through the universally recognizable commercial activity denoted by “rent a stall”, successfully activate the cognitive schema of “acquiring a stall in the market”. As a result, through “différance”, the meaning regenerates in the new cultural context. Therefore, this seemingly “disloyal” translation, through “Creative Treason”, readily accepts its “Différance” of meaning and successfully allows the text to gain “afterlife” in different culture environments.

Example 2

ST: 明淑正在扫地上的一点煤面子。

TT: Mingshu was sweeping up coal dust.

This example demonstrates the translatability resulting from the commonality of material experience. At the level of cultural cognition, “煤面子” in the original text refers to the fine powder resulting from coal combustion or crushing—a concrete material form. At the level of linguistic form, “煤面子” serves as a vivid colloquial expression in northern dialects for “coal dust”. In Western contexts, coal has a long history as a fuel, and “coal dust” is a commonly recognized byproduct of coal usage. Readers familiar with coal-related practices possess an intuitive understanding of the fine powder produced after coal burning, as the referent is clearly defined and corresponds directly to an equivalent conceptual term in the target language. Therefore, “coal dust” effectively conveys the core material attribute of “煤面子” without requiring additional explanation, achieving cross-cultural understanding through material reference. When linguistic symbols point to shared human material experiences, accurate transmission of meaning can be accomplished without excessive elaboration.

Example 3

ST: 这要是在我们那儿玩一百元一炮的，今晚你这点运气够你半辈子花的了。

TT: If we played for 100 yuan a round back home, with your luck tonight, you'd have enough to last you half a lifetime.

This example demonstrates the translatability brought about by shared behavioral experience.

At the cultural-cognitive level, “一炮” in the original text is a colloquial term for “a round/game”, referring to a complete session of gambling activity. As a social behavior that exists universally across cultures, its basic unit of measurement has a clearly corresponding cognitive concept in English-speaking cultures. Foreign readers have an intuitive understanding of the behavioral pattern of “playing a game with a certain amount of money as a stake”, and can grasp the core behavioral logic without needing to know the origin of the specific term “炮”. At the linguistic-formal level, “一炮” is an oral expression in Northeast Chinese dialect referring to a round of gambling. Although the translation adopts the common English measure word “a round” discards the dialectal specificity, it accurately conveys the core semantic meaning—“a complete process of gambling”. When linguistic signs point to shared human behavioral experiences, target language readers can clearly understand the betting rules through “100 yuan a round” and thereby grasp the logical outcome of “you'd have enough to last you half a lifetime”, achieving cross-cultural cognition without requiring additional cultural annotations.

Based on the preceding examples, the translatability of dialects and proverbs is the result of the synergistic effect of cultural commonality and deconstructionist “creative treason”. The translatability of local dialects exhibits hierarchical and relative characteristics. From a hierarchical perspective, the degree of connection between a dialect and shared human experience directly determines its translatability: the closer the connection, the higher the translatability and the less translation loss. Dialects with separable core semantics but unique cultural imagery require “creative treason” to achieve semantic transmission, inevitably resulting in the loss of regional cultural color and linguistic characteristics. From a relative perspective, existing translatable cases are all the result of translators' trade-offs between cultural preservation and cross-cultural understanding; even if the core semantics are translated, the regional linguistic flavor of the original text is difficult to fully reproduce. Dialects deeply rooted in local culture, with weak connections to shared human cognition, and possessing unique linguistic forms, face significant obstacles in cross-cultural translation, easily resulting in substantial cultural information loss, and may even exhibit obvious untranslatability.

Example of the Untranslatable Dialectal Proverbs

Example 4

ST: 明淑心里明白，李昌浩用这种方式来发泄，说不准他没输那么多，是故意回来同她找碴儿，她想，他闹够了也就好了。

TT: Mingshu knew that Li Changhao was venting in this way. Perhaps he didn't lose that much and was deliberately picking a fight with her. She thought that once he had vented enough, he would feel better.

This example illustrates the collapse of the multidimensionality of culturally specific behaviors and relational concepts in translation. At the level of cultural cognition, the original phrase “找碴儿” carries a dual meaning: first, deliberate provocation; second, taking out one's anger on others due to personal frustration. “好了” encapsulates the triple expectations of the behavior ending, emotional calm, and easing of tension within a single word. At the level of linguistic form, both are highly context-dependent polysemous colloquial words.

The translated phrase “picking a fight” only conveys the first layer of meaning, neglecting the causal logic of “taking out one’s anger on others after losing money”. The translated phrase “feel better” focuses solely on the psychological level, simplifying multidimensional cultural and psychological concepts into a single-dimensional behavior in the target language. Admittedly, a polysemous word cannot find a completely corresponding polysemous word in another language. Therefore, when translating such a polysemous word, one often has to choose only one meaning, meaning one can only find a word in the target language that contains that meaning to translate the polysemous word. In this way, the polysemous word becomes a single meaning, which is equivalent to not translating the polysemous word completely and flawlessly, thus creating untranslatability. Translation can never exhaust the full meaning of the original text; the translated text is inevitably an “addition” and “alteration” of the original. This unavoidable “meaning collapse” is a manifestation of “deferred difference”—meaning is delayed and differentiated in the process of conversion, revealing the structural limitations of translation in conveying complex cultural psychology. “Feel better” is a natural expression in English, but it negates the “heterogeneity” of the original. The domestication treatment of the word “好” obscures the uniqueness of East Asian family conflict resolution methods. The cultural logic behind “好” is the female’s forbearance towards the male in the family, reflecting the social background of gender power in East Asia. If a creatively rebellious translation strategy is adopted, “好了” can be translated as “things would settle down” or “peace would return”, retaining the imagery of “relationship repair”. This effort to preserve heterogeneity is the true practice of deconstructionist translation theory—it refuses to reduce translation to cultural adaptation, but rather opens up possibilities for cross-cultural dialogue through the presentation of differences.

Example 5

ST: 明淑后悔早应把钱拿到自己手里, 她一直以为, 这钱是家里的救命钱, 李昌浩不至于犯浑。

TT: She had always thought that this money was the family’s lifeline and that Li Changhao wouldn’t be so foolish.

This example demonstrates the inherent untranslatability of complex concepts of emotion and ethics. At the level of cultural cognition, the complex concept of “犯浑”, which combines emotional impulse and ethical indiscretion, undergoes a profound semantic reconstruction when translated as “be so foolish”. The translation “be so foolish” only refers to the psychological state of “foolishness”, stripping away the ethical criticism of “ignorance” and the regional characteristics of the dialect. In this example, “犯浑” retains only the singular referent of “foolish”. The action of “犯” is abstracted into a “state” in the translation, reflecting the language system’s forced reconstruction of meaning, losing the slang’s vulgarity and emotional intensity. Simplifying the dialect-specific ethical judgment into a universal psychological description, this domestication strategy actually follows the cognitive paradigm of the target culture. From a deconstructionist perspective, this translation exposes power relations in cultural transmission. By transforming the culturally specific concept of “犯浑” into the universally understood “foolish” in English, this approach eliminates the heterogeneity of the source culture. A more rebellious and creative strategy, such as transliterating “fanhun” and supplementing it with cultural annotations, may create reading barriers but can preserve space for cultural differences. This approach does not aim for perfect equivalence but rather makes the target language reader aware of the irreducibility of the cultural essence by highlighting its untranslatability.

Example 6

ST: 李昌浩拿出一副虎死不倒威的架势, 但底气明显不足。

TT: He attempted to feign bravado, yet his lack of confidence was palpable.

This example highlights the complete loss of cultural allusions and totemic imagery in translation. The idiom “虎死不倒威”, literally meaning “a tiger retains its majesty even after death”, metaphorically represents “a person who, though out of power, tries to maintain a facade of authority”, implying satire of “bluffing”. Its cultural archetype originates from the totem worship of the tiger and the collective perception of it as the “king of animals”. While the translated “feign bravado” accurately conveys the basic meaning of “bluffing”, it compresses the rich cultural imagery into a single psychological description. This simplification directly weakens the rhetorical effectiveness of the original text. The image of the tiger in the idiom not only enhances the satirical effect but also implicitly criticizes masculinity—using the fall of the king of beasts to highlight the character’s destitution. The translation completely eliminates this cultural metaphor, making the character appear flat without specific cultural reference. The chain of signifiers breaks here; the rich cultural imagery and satirical scenes in the source language are compressed into a thin psychological description in the target language, and multidimensional meaning collapses into a single dimension. A creative translation, such as “like a fallen tiger still pretending majesty”, requires more interpretive effort from the reader but preserves the core cultural imagery. It constructs a new cultural dialogue space in the target language, allowing the symbolic meaning of “tiger” to be reborn in a cross-cultural context.

Furthermore, the original “架势” refers to outward posture, implying “deliberate performance”. The translation “attempted to feign” emphasizes psychological motivation, losing the physical description. In this example, the concrete, perceptible physical expression is transformed into an abstract description of psychological motivation, compressing the multi-dimensional meaning of the source language into a single psychological description. This transformation leads to a loss of meaning: Firstly, it weakens the intuitiveness of the character portrayal, making Li Changhao’s specific expressions vague; secondly, it dissolves the Chinese culture of conveying social identity through body language. Translating “架势” as “struck a pose of...” or “assumed the manner of...”, while still not a perfect match, at least preserves its physical and performative dimensions. The current choice of translation methods reflects a prioritization of the target language readers’ acceptance habits. While this domestication strategy enhances readability, it inevitably weakens the cultural specificity constructed by the original text through bodily narratives. Venuti argues that “translation is the process by which the translator, based on understanding, replaces the chain of signifiers in the source text with the chain of signifiers in the target language”. Although the translation of culturally loaded words inevitably involves the rupture of the “chain of signifiers”, we can consider adopting a deconstructionist foreignization translation strategy, moving from linguistic differences to cultural differences, and preserving cultural differences in the target language through translation.

Example 7

ST: 你就当扶贫了，陪我们玩一会儿，你不玩不是搅局吗。

TT: Just treat it as doing a good deed. Play with us for a while. If you don’t play, you’ll spoil the fun.

This example demonstrates the failure of puns generated by the playful use of political discourse in translation. At the cultural level, the humor and irony of “扶贫” in this context stem from the playful appropriation of a serious political term, relying on readers’ shared knowledge of specific socio-cultural backgrounds. The original “扶贫” is a political and economic term, but here it is used playfully to denote “providing economic assistance”. The translation “doing a good deed” only takes the literal meaning of “doing good deeds”, completely eliminating the humor and irony created by the appropriation of political terminology. The speaker’s cynical and absurd sense of glorifying gambling as “charity” is weakened into ordinary persuasion. This makes it difficult for target language readers to perceive the humorous rhetoric of “using a big word for a small thing” in Chinese, thus

completely losing the original's subtle irony and contemporary relevance. The original phrase “搅局” means “to disrupt the game”, implying “deliberate sabotage”. While translating it as “spoil the fun” retains the basic meaning, it weakens the confrontational connotation of “deliberate sabotage”, thus diminishing the subtle sense of coercion and moral blackmail in the dialogue and reducing its tension. The translator's choice of “doing a good deed” over the political metaphor of “poverty alleviation” represents a compromise between cultural preservation and reader acceptance. In fact, through “creative treason”, “扶贫” could be translated as “think of it as poverty alleviation”, with an explanation of its ironic usage. While this might increase reading difficulty, it preserves space for cultural differences. From a deconstructionist perspective, the translator reconstructs a text in the target language that is both related to and different from the original through strategies such as selection, omission, and rewriting. This “unfaithful” translation is precisely where the value of deconstructionism lies; it reveals the limitations of language, but also through the exposure of differences, opens new paths for cross-cultural understanding.

The Characteristics of “Différance” and “Creative Treason” in Translating Chinese Rural Literary Dialects

Guided by deconstructionist translation theory, the application of “creative treason” in translating Chinese rural literary dialects exhibits a significant characteristic—a tendency to systematically preserve elements of cultural heterogeneity, especially imagery rich in cultural metaphors. This stems from both the deconstructionist translation perspective's understanding of “difference” and the inherent cultural burden of Chinese rural literary dialects themselves. Through a systematic analysis of a series of cases in the novel *Spicy Pickled Cabbage*, we can gain a deeper understanding of the specific manifestations of this particularity from the following dimensions.

Explicit Retention of Cultural Imagery

In conventional translation practice, when faced with dialectal expressions rich in cultural imagery, translators often tend to adopt a “functional equivalence” strategy, replacing them with semantically similar but imagery-different expressions in the target language. While this domestication ensures reading fluency, it leads to the systematic dissolution of the source language's cultural imagery. However, “creative treason” guided by deconstructionist translation theory presents a completely different approach—translators intentionally preserve the core cultural imagery of the source language, even if it means requiring readers to exert more interpretive effort. Taking the idiom “虎死不倒威” as an example, conventional translations like “feign bravado” convey the basic meaning of “bluffing”, but completely dissolve the core cultural imagery of “tiger”. Creative treason from a deconstructionist perspective, however, advocates preserving the symbolic imagery of “tiger”, such as “like a fallen tiger still pretending majesty”. The uniqueness of this translation method lies in preserving the imagery of the source language, thus maintaining a channel for target language readers to enter the cognitive model of Chinese cultural ecology—readers need to understand the unique expressions of “majesty”, “decency”, and “bluffing” in Chinese culture through the image of “a tiger maintaining its majesty even after death”. Thirdly, this preservation of imagery itself is an acknowledgment and respect for cultural differences; it refuses to assimilate differences but rather serves as the starting point for cultural dialogue.

Foreignization Translation of Culture-Loaded Terms

Dialects and proverbs, as unique carriers of regional culture, contain rich cultural connotations and national wisdom, vividly embodying Chinese culture. The “creative treason” guided by deconstructionist translation theory is unique in that the translator does not passively accept the inevitable loss of meaning but rather achieves

equality between the two parties in cultural exchange through creative strategies. Taking the translation of “犯浑” as an example, the conventional translation “be so foolish” simplifies it to a single psychological state description, dissolving the inherent ethical critique and the unique emotional intensity of the dialect. Creative treason from a deconstructionist perspective might adopt a strategy of Foreignization, such as transliterating it as “fanhun” and supplementing it with necessary annotations. The uniqueness of this approach lies in preserving the heterogeneity of the source language concept, making the target language reader aware that “there exists a unique concept of Chinese cultural behavior that cannot be completely covered by ‘foolish’”. The translation here is not the end point of meaning, but rather the starting point for its dissemination—it stimulates the reader’s perception and curiosity about cultural differences in the target language, opening up possibilities for deeper cross-cultural understanding.

Conclusion

From a deconstructionist translation perspective, the translatability and untranslatability of dialects and colloquialisms are essentially inevitable consequences of linguistic and cultural differences. The linguistic characteristics of different languages are difficult to overcome, and cultural connotations such as regional customs and gender roles cannot be fully transformed. Derrida argued that through translation, we can achieve a deeper and more accurate understanding of the differences between languages and their specific modes of expression. This means that the different semantic, syntactic, and phonetic modes of expression in various languages should not be hidden during translation but should be expressed in the new text. Genuine cultural dialogue should dare to retain heterogeneous elements and confront the potential power inequalities that may arise in cultural transmission. The “creative treason” guided by deconstructionist translation theory is most profoundly characterized by its pursuit of equality in cultural dialogue, opposing the one-way model of viewing translation as “cultural export”. Translation practice from a deconstructionist perspective acknowledges the irreducibility of cultural differences and accepts the loss and variation of meaning during translation, but simultaneously provides target language readers with opportunities to enter the cognitive patterns of Chinese culture by preserving heterogeneous elements of the source language culture. This kind of translation is not about making Chinese culture understandable to Western readers, but rather inviting them to explore the expressions and ways of thinking within Chinese culture. In summary, when translating Chinese rural literature and dialects using “creative treason” under the guidance of deconstructionist translation theory, there is a tendency to preserve cultural heterogeneity. That is, when translating dialectal proverbs with cultural metaphors, more of the imagery of the metaphor is retained, thus allowing for the preservation of imaginative space within the heterogeneous culture. Cultural differences are not obstacles to be overcome, but rather valuable resources for dialogue. Translation, as the “afterlife” of the original work, has value in “spreading” differences, allowing local proverbs to achieve meaning regeneration and reconstruction in the target language. By adopting deconstructionist translation and “creative treason”, and using a “deferred difference” strategy for untranslatable dialects, the cultural distortion caused by forced domestication is avoided, thus completing cross-cultural dialogue within the tension between “translatable” and “untranslatable”.

References

- Bao, H. N. (2007). A cultural perspective on translation: An analysis of cultural factors in the limits of translatability. *Journal of Changshu Institute of Technology*, 20(9), 6-10.
- Cai, Q. L., & Zhang, L. (2023). The manifestation of regional cultural differences in English translation. *Teaching Reference of Middle School Geography*, 52(20), 88-89.

- Derrida, J. (1982). *Positions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edwin, G. (1993) *Contemporary translation theories*. Routledge.
- Escarpit, R. (1971). *Sociology of literature*. London: Cass.
- Fu, Q. Y. (2019). An exploration of the untranslatability of literary works from the perspective of deconstructionist translation. *Journal of Northeast Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 69(2), 55-60.
- Fu, X. M. (2014). On the innovation and limitations of Venuti's translation theory. *Shanghai Journal of Translators*, 29(3), 75-77.
- Gentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary translation theories*. London: Routledge.
- Hu, D. P., & Wei, J. (2010). Translating "Creative treason": A deep faithfulness. *Journal of Hunan Agricultural University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 11(1), 82-86.
- Huang, Z. L. (2012). Dialect translation conversion mechanism. *Journal of Beijing Institute of Technology (Social Sciences Edition)*, 14(2), 144-147+151.
- Jiang, T. (2012). Terminology chain: The genesis of Venuti translation studies. *Foreign Languages (Journal of Shanghai International Studies University)*, 35(1), 54-61.
- Li, Y. X. (2024). Some thoughts on the English translation research of Chinese rural literature—Taking "A Study on the English Translation of Rurality in Modern and Contemporary Chinese Novels" as an example. *Foreign Languages and Translation*, 31(2), 32-36.
- Liu, J. P. (1997). Deconstructionist view of translation. *Foreign Languages (Journal of Shanghai International Studies University)*, 20(2), 52-55.
- Ma, F. H. (2003). Creative treason in literary translation from the translator's perspective. *Journal of Jiangsu University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 5(3), 107-109.
- Peng, G. Z. (2008). Derrida's "Heterodoxy" deconstructionist view of translation and its theoretical implications. *Journal of Hubei University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 35(6), 116-119.
- Qin, X. L. (2016). Rethinking Derrida's view of translation. *Frontiers of Literary Theory*, 13(2), 70-90.
- Sapir, E. (1985). *Selected essays*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Wang, N. (2009a). Deconstruction, postcolonialism and cultural translation: A study of Venuti's translation theory. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, 31(4), 51-56.
- Wang, N. (2009b). The cultural turn in translation studies: The advancement of deconstructionism. *Journal of Tsinghua University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 24(6), 127-139+160.
- Wang, X. L. (2013). On the creative treason in the English translation of "The Grasshopper" from the perspective of deconstructionist translation. *Foreign Languages and Literature*, 29(S1), 135-138.
- Xie, T. Z. (2003). *Translation studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Yang, S. Z., & Shi, H. M. (2025). A study on the adaptation path of Chinese literature translation. *Chinese Translation*, 46(4), 114-121.