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Abstract
This article explores two translation models circling around the key issue “equivalence” in translation studies. They are the Jerome Model and the Horace Model. They differentiate from each other in the aspects of the translating priorities and purposes, etc. Moreover, through illustrative examples, the article points out there are intrinsic relationship between the two models, but also build up a bridge between source language culture and target language culture.
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INTRODUCTION
Translating is a complex process involving a variety of factors, and the first key point in translation studies is the standard of a piece of good translation, and this is usually centered upon the idea “faithfulness” or how we can attain “equivalence” between the original text and the reproduced one.

Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere proposed (2001) three translation models: the Jerome Model, the Horace Model and the Schleiermacher Model. The first one emphasizes on the word-for-word translation or being faithful to the source text. The second one takes the customers or readers as the most important factors, thus a translator ought to negotiate between the two languages. The second one carries the first one further by suggesting the reservation of original cultural elements of the source language for the purpose of adding exotic flavor to the translation. In this comparison, the first two really encounter with each other, because they are in opposite directions, regarding the issue of “faithfulness”. Further comparative analysis is needed to be done before we can apply them appropriately in translating practices.

The Jerome Model originated from Saint Jerome, dated back to the fifth BC and prevalent in the West up until the nineteenth century. In the beginning, it was targeted at the Bible translation and emphasized “faithful to the text” (Liao, 2000, p.4), “stick to the word-for-word translation” (Liao, 2000, p.4), and elevated faithfulness to the central position, to the exclusion of many other factors. With the help of a dictionary, it sought for the equivalence between meaning and form, though we know today that the absolute equivalence could not be realized in translating practice, but it enjoyed a monumental significance. If we re-examine it in its historical background, we can get an idea why St. Jerome advocated “faithful to the text” and “word-for-word translation”.

There are three reasons: (a) the Bible was the voice of God, thus no translator dare raise a challenge to His ultimate authority; (b) The capability of rendering the Bible into different languages was bestowed upon the translators by God; (c) The Bible was first translated from Hebrew to Greek, then to Latin, then to English, in this process, the Western society paid homage to it through the facility of translations, therefore, the only way to keep coherence of the meanings of God was to follow every
word exactly. The enlightenment we can get from St.
Jerome Model is that the options of translation methods
must be adapted to specific historical background and the
ideological dominance.

The other one is the Horace Model, which is
associated with the name of the Roman poet Horace
(65BC-8BC). Although it predated the Jerome model, it
had been overshadowed by it for about fourteen centuries.
Influenced by Cicero, Horace insisted on the flexibility
of translation, against the word-for-word translation. He
advocated that translation should be done based on the
idea of “sense for sense”. Furthermore, he suggested
that when necessary, a translator can create new coined
words or import foreign words to his translation to enrich
the target language and enhance the effectiveness of the
translated works to target language readers.

According to Horace, A ‘fidus’ translator/interpreter
was one who could be used, who got the job done on time
and to the satisfaction of both parties. To do so, he had to
negotiate between two clients and two languages (Bassnett
& Lefevere, 2001, p.5). Later on, the idea of Horace’s
translation methodology—it is not proper for a translator
to render the text word-for-word into target language
is always used by translators to attack word for word

1. THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE
JEROME MODEL AND THE HORACE
MODEL

The two models differentiate from each other in two
main aspects: the purpose of translation and the priority
a translator chooses while using the two models
respectively. The Jerome Model functions as the religious
tool based on a society dominated by a certain ideology,
therefore, a translator need stay faithful to every word
of God, for the original message must not be misinterpreted,
in contrast, the Horace model is orientated towards the
customers, or in a broad sense, the readers, therefore, a
translator need fulfill customers’ requirements, provided
that he can still rightly translate the original message into
the target language, but not stick to every word exactly.

The absolute equivalence was not only the ultimate
goal sought by St. Jerome, but also many early Chinese
translators in their translating of Buddhist Scriptures.
As early as in the Eastern Han Dynasty Zhi Qian (支
谦) pointed out in 《法句经序》, “佛言，依其义不用
其饰，取其法不以严。其传经着，当令其晓，勿式
厥义,是则为善” emphasizing the conveyance of the
original meaning and expressiveness of the translation.
Dao An (道安) of the Eastern Jin also warned translators
on guard against 五失本（five ways of losing the original
essence in translation）in 《摩诃钵罗若波罗蜜经钞序》
(Chen, 1992). The “five losses” in improper translation
he mentioned are: (a) unnecessary reversion of word
order, (b) added description (which does not exist in the
original), (c) cutting of repeated wording (necessary as
religious scriptures for prayers), (d) omission of repetition
of certain conclusive message; (e) cutting of contents
repeated as introduction to a new topic (Chen, 2005, p.5).
We can see the requirements for translators are nearly the
same as the Jerome Model.

To some extent, the Jerome Model is applicable in
translation practices, because in each language, there is
a core vocabulary standing for the most common things
of the world, or people’s actions or ideas. For example,
there are in English and Chinese basically corresponding
words such as sun (太阳), moon (月亮), sky (天空),
mountain (山), river (河流), animal (动物), walk (行走),
etc. So in theory there should be no difficulties to find
“corresponding” words between English and Chinese,
at least for words referring to concrete objects. But, as
a matter of fact, many words in English do not have
exactly corresponding words in Chinese or vice versa.
For example, there are words like ox (公牛, 黄牛), cow (母
牛, 奶牛), buffalo (水牛) and yak (牦牛) in English, but
there is no word in English corresponding to the Chinese
superordinate word, though there is an adjective
“bovine” in English basically corresponding to the
Chinese adjective 牛的. Such lexical gaps between English
and Chinese often give rise to difficulties in translation,
thus the Jerome Model is always being challenged.

As translators find so many difficulties in adopting
the Jerome Model, due to the great disparity between
two languages, then they need think about the absolute
faithfulness to the text or word-for-word translation
impossible in many ways, and re-adjust the standard of
equivalence.

The Horace Model suggests that translators find the
touchstone in orienting the translation towards the needs
of readers or customers, because the actual purpose of
translation, the target readership, and the demand of the
designator of translation, etc., may all affect the standard
of translation required. There are two terms concerning
this point, one is domestication, first raised by Lawrence
means a translation strategy for a transparent, fluent style
in order to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text for
readers of the translation. Opposed to domestication is the
term foreignization (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2005, p.79)
or alienation, which aims at a translation deliberately
breaking target conventions by retaining some foreignness
or exotic flavor of the original.

Domestication can be regarded as the product of the
Horace Model, taking into consideration of the need,
while foreignization as the production of the Jerome
Model. The two most famous English translations of Hong
Lou Meng (《红楼梦》) can be thought to have followed
the two opposite principles. David Hawkes intended to
make his translation The story of the Stone, easier for
native English speakers, so he made many emendations, thus his translation is more of domestication, while the translation A Dream of Red Mansions by Yang Hsien-yi (杨宪益) and Gladys Yang (戴乃迭) follows the principle of foreignization in order to introduce to the West not only the story but also Chinese culture. There is a poem by a character named Shi Xiangyun (史湘云), translated on the basis of two principles, in another word, different models.

### 2. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE JEROME MODEL AND THE HORACE MODEL

"Equivalence" is the yardstick judging good or bad translations. The Jerome Model sticks to "absolute equivalence", but as a matter of fact, "absolute equivalence" only remains an ideal. How can we re-define "equivalence" concerns the effectiveness of our translating works. The Horace Model, though seems to be a bit far away from the standard of equivalence "faithfulness to text", it paves a new path for us to find equivalence through translating works sense for sense. Some examples are cited to illustrate how we combine the Jerome Model and the Horace Model to keep the original form of the source language as well as adding some necessary changes to it, in order to get sound translations.

#### A: Beauty, strength, youth, are flowers but fading seen;
Duty, faith, love, are roots, and ever green.

(From a sonnet by George Peele)

#### B: Duty, faith, love, are roots, and ever green.

(Translated by Yang Hsien-yi and Gladys Yang)

The Chinese version is a good one because the translator uses the Jerome Model to keep the sentence structure similar to the original one, therefore, creating a couple of sentences in the format of Antithesis, but the translator changes the word class of some words in the original in order to make the version sound smooth and natural in Chinese, for example, by changing "fading green" into verb phrase “终将衰尽” and “ever green” into “万古长青”.

#### C: Beauty, strength, youth, are flowers but fading seen;
Duty, faith, love, are roots, and ever green.

(From a sonnet by George Peele)

The translator notices that "关" and "还" constructs "rhyme", so he or she tries to keep this form (using the Jerome Model) to create a rhyme pattern in English version “wall” and “all”. But we can still see some words have been omitted by the translator, for example, “万里长征”, because readers can get the reference from contextual clues. The necessary omission can be regarded as the application of the Horace Model.
We have noticed that the parallel structure “顶悲 剧，顶痛苦，顶热烈，顶没有法子办” in the original version, but it is difficult to create the similar structure in target version, because in the original Chinese version, the four constituents of the parallel structure are all verbal phrases. But the translator seeks for the formal equivalence (the Jerome Model) and finds out a clever way by using four “most” to construct a similar structure by changing the verbal phrases into adjective phrases.

The translator wants to retain the formal equivalence (the Jerome Model) to the fullest extent, but because of the differences between two languages, he can partly stick to the formal equivalence by choosing words with the initial letter “s” to reinforce the sorrowful effect of the original version- one seeks in vain.

CONCLUSION
By comparison, we have known that the Jerome Model, targeted at the Bible translation for ideological purposes, emphasizes “faithful to the text”, “stick to the word-for-word translation”, while the Horace Model goes against “word-for word ” translation, and puts priority on the needs of readers or customers, trying to negotiate between two languages. The two popular trends in contemporary translation studies- foreignization and domestication can be regarded as following the Jerome Model and the Horace Model respectively, as we can find the most telling example from the comparative study of two versions of Hong Long Meng by Yang-Hsien Yi & Gladys Yang and David Hawkes.

Though the Jerome Model and the Horace Model seem to be at two extremes, there is an intrinsic link between them. St. Jerome raises the standard of “absolute equivalence” which can be regarded as the ideal for all translators. But translating practices tell us “absolute equivalence” cannot be achieved, so the problem is how we can re-define the term “equivalence”. Definitely, all translators bear the task of finding the equivalence between SL and TL, otherwise, translating practices all come in vain, in this regard, the Horace Model solves the problem by requiring us to attain “equivalence” by negotiating between the languages, thus, when we translate an article, we need not follow word by word, when necessary, we can import some new terms to enrich the target language cultures as we can find their application in the translation of some articles with rhetorical methods: antithesis, rhyme, repetition, etc..
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