# Towards Formulating Some Theoretical Principles to Evaluate the Accuracy of Translating a Medieval Theological Text
## A Case Study of the Romanian Language*

W I L H E L M   T A U W I N K L

## Introduction

WITHIN THE research activity focusing on a certain specialised terminology and the possibilities to render it into contemporary Romanian[1], our initial question regards the possibility to sketch several theoretical principles guiding the evaluation of the accuracy of a translation. Though at the level of a "common sense" statement, assessing the accuracy or correctness of a translation may rely on "self-evident" arguments, a deeper reflection on this matter must take into account, as we shall later see, a whole range of questions whose answer goes beyond the ground of one single discipline. A philologist will be keen on the fluency of the translated text, whose aim is to have it flow as if it were written in the language it was translated into; a philosopher, on the other hand, will stress the importance of the terminological consistency all throughout, whereas a theologian will focus, among others, on the usage of a certain denominationally conditioned idiom and the specialised terminology developed throughout ages of doctrinal debates.

## Ways of Approaching the Evaluation of a Translation's Accuracy

FOR A more suggestive description of all the aspects involved in determining the accuracy of a translation, we shall take as a starting-point the presentation of two extreme cases of finding the equivalent of a piece of information from one communication system to another.

Several of the elements described in these two limit-situations variably occur in any process of translation; the examples offered below will help us make the necessary differences.

## The Extreme Case of Converting a Computer Programme from one Programming Language into Another

COMPUTER PROGRAMMING languages present particularities similar to those of human language, although the latter possesses functions impossible to apply in the case of machines. The purpose of a programming language is to convey instructions to a machine—in this case, to a computer, so that it performs certain operations having a particular result. The various programming languages developed throughout time have been created in order to be better adapted to the different requirements in creating computer programmes.

When the translation or conversion of one programme from one language into another is needed, the accuracy of the translation is easy to check: the translated programme must lead to the same results and its usage must be error-free.

It is nevertheless obvious that this manner of checking the validity of a translation in the case of human language can only function in the event of using a purely communicative discourse, leaving aside the other functions of the language. If a taxi-driver in a foreign country will take a tourist there where he asks him to, this proves that the translation of the tourist's desire has been correctly made.

However, in the case of other types of discourse, such as the religious or the theological ones, we cannot exclusively apply the criteria that are valid when translating computer programmes. Without necessarily agreeing with the neo-positivist rejection of the objective meaning of theological language, we have to be aware that, to a great extent, its statements cannot be experimentally verified, at least not in the way in which the correct functioning of the instructions in computer programming can be ascertained.

## The Extreme Case of Disconnectedness between the Translation and the Original

AT THE opposite end from the perfect equivalence between rendering a discourse in one language and in another, as is the case with converting computer programmes, one can find a translation that is in no relation whatsoever with the original. In what follows, we shall try to describe the (hypothetical) complex of circumstances wherein such a result could be verified.

Let us therefore imagine a state where corruption, illiteracy, bureaucracy and argyrocracy reach extreme limits and necessarily determine the entire activity and functioning of that particular society. In such a context, a publishing-house, whether

state-owned or private, decides on the publication of a translation on the exclusive ground of obtaining a direct or indirect profit. For instance, if a work has suddenly become an international best-seller, one could assume that it will enjoy the same popularity in our imaginary state. Another reason could be that some international organisations offer subsidies to those publishing-houses that participate in the implementation of certain programmes and policies.

In the process starting from the original in a foreign language and reaching the stage of selling its translation to the readers, the importance of the work of each and every factor will be judged according to the actual, direct contribution to the profit. According to this logic, the most important element in this process is the advertising agency; next to it, and less important in terms of the profit obtained, follow the distribution network, the printing shop, the editorial office and the translator. The latter, if we keep in mind that we find ourselves in a corrupt and illiterate society, might be employed based on nepotistic criteria, though he may not know the language to translate from; even in the opposite case, his work would be remunerated symbolically and he would be asked to submit his translation within a very short time.

In both cases, the translator could resort to a simple solution, either in order to mask his incompetence, or to reach a balance between his work and the payment received for it: by making use of the internet search engines and the "copy-paste" functions of the browser and the text processor, he could come up with a text of approximately the same dimension as that of the original, which he could then submit to the publishing-house as the translation of the required work. The text would be made up by stringing together, one next to the other, various materials, such as, newspaper articles and blog posts, possibly linked to the subject dealt with in the original writing.

The work will then be received by the editorial office, where the correctors will only have an eye for the grammatical accuracy of the "translated" text, then by the printing shop, for which the content of the book will be of no concern. Instead, the distribution network and the advertising agency will promote the book by incessantly referring to its international success.

The fact that a publishing-house is an economic enterprise will also be understood of an extreme manner, in such a way that the main purpose of the editorial activity will not be to publish books, but to make profit, by using the publication of books as a pretext. In this case, the pursued limit-ideal will be to get an impressive profit without in fact publishing anything. Taking into account the characteristics of the society we have imagined, we may assume that most of the people have no books or very few in their household and also that they experience great difficulties in reading and writing. The book however, will be sold and even successfully, as a result of its advertising, to persons who will use it as a decorative item in their offices or homes, or who need a fashionable gift for friends' birthdays.

In the unlikely event that a foreign publishing-house or the author that published the original text find out details about the quality of the published translation and manage to prove it, all that remains is the case of the legal implications of hypothetical claims to be compensated. The situation described above could not be consid-

ered abuse, since the publishing-house that published the translation has rightfully paid its copyright obligations.

Furthermore, if in the legal system of the imaginary country the explanatory dictionary of its language has no legal value, the publishing-house could at any moment defend itself by saying that according to its philosophy, a "translation" means the publication in the local language of a work for which it concluded a translation contract and paid its copyright.

Therefore, in such a limit-case, the meaning given to the notion of "translation" depends on the arbitrary decision of the one invoking it.

## The Impact of the Dissolution of the Word Meaning on the Translation

In the above imaginary example the very notion of "translation" reaches an extreme limit. In fact, the result of a translation can be understood, in practice, from several view-points, situated somewhere in-between the two extremes: from strictly reaching the same result (as in the case of converting computer programmes), to making up a text having a certain (vague) relation with an original text. Next, we have to ask ourselves to what extent a translation must take into account the current use of a terminology in everyday life, which often differs considerably from the definition offered by explanatory dictionaries. In Romanian we can speak at the moment about a phenomenon of dissolution at the level of word meaning.

We shall next illustrate, again as an example, a common phenomenon. In the Romanian explanatory dictionaries[2] the term "signature" is defined as "a person's name hand-written under the text of a document, letter etc." In Romania it is well-known the fact that, probably out of imitating the style of office-workers who have to sign heaps of documents on a daily basis and who come to change their signature into a minimalist logo, signing illegibly has turned into a habit. In most of the cases nowadays, the letters making up a person's name are no longer legible in a signature, or the signature is so graphically simplistic that it is difficult to relate it to the specific features of a particular person's handwriting. That is why, probably in order to avoid problems in case a handwriting analysis is necessary, the Romanian authorities or the notaries are lately requesting those who have to sign official documents to write down their full name legibly next to their (illegible) signature.

Thus, although according to the dictionaries, "signature" means "a person's name written by one's own hand," could it be that the fact that official documents may contain two separate columns, "signature" and "legibly hand-written full name," indicates that the meaning of the word "signature" has changed in Romanian? Or are we confronting ourselves with a language misuse, a wrong interpretation in practice of a specialised term which retains its meaning? This kind of "hermeneutical abuse"

is difficult to prove in reality, for what can be argued in front of someone who claims that an oblique line represents his own signature?

The answer to these questions is very useful in case we wish to make an accurate translation into Romanian. As such, how can one translate the idea of "signature," which occurs in a text written in a country where this notion is literally interpreted in practice, simply meaning "the legible writing of one's name by one's own hand"?

In the contrary case, if we translate a Romanian notarial document in a low-level language where the etymology is more present in the form of words, it is possible that the two columns may not be translated other than by one single word, which means both "signature" and "hand-written full name" (thus leading to the situation evoked in the anecdote below). Once again, in this case, the meaning of the term "signature" depends, in practice, on the arbitrary decision of the one using it.

Another side of the process described above is illustrated by an old anecdote showing a beginner's difficulties of translation: a schoolboy whose homework is to translate the sentence, *Cicero et Demosthenes duo clari oratores sunt*, finds in the dictionary, under *Cicero*, the explanation: "famous orator," and again under *Demosthenes*, "famous orator"; as such, he will translate the sentence as: "One famous orator and another famous orator make two famous orators". Here the explanation of a name takes the place of translation, a thing which can also occur in a real translation and not only in an anecdote. Some translators are seriously asking themselves whether words that have no longer a meaning for readers must be literally translated (it is the case of translating the ancient terms for money occurring in some editions of the Bible, trying to find their equivalents in modern currencies).

# The Tension between Finding
# the Equivalent of the Terminology and
# of the *Message* in Translating a Theological Text

CHANGES OF meaning in a word, even if the above examples show that they occur unexpectedly fast, are normal phenomena in the evolution of language. A classic statement from a linguistic standpoint notes that linguistic signs change as a result of several factors, resulting in a shift in the relationship between the signal and signification.[3]

Ferdinand de Saussure spoke at the same time about the mutability and the immutability of the linguistic sign, in the sense that language changes without its subjects being able to change it. The current use of Romanian becomes problematic for the activity of translation and the readers of translations, since arbitrariness is not only a characteristic of the language changes, choosing for a certain sign without consulting the readers,[4] but it has become, as we have seen in the above examples, a current practice on the part of the human subjects.

If we were to theoretically accept what happens in practice today, namely that speakers decide on the meaning of words, a translation that follows the example of the imaginary society (using newspaper articles and the computer "copy-paste" functions) could be considered as valid as one made by a researcher who strives to apply all the principles of the theory of translation in a balanced way.

## Characteristics of a "Good" Translation according to Thomas Aquinas

S INCE OUR particular interest here is the translation into Romanian of a medieval theological text, it would be useful at this moment to find out what the scholars of those times thought about the validity of a translation.

The XIIIth century too was partly debating about the same questions as those raised so far. A "good" translation, according to Thomas Aquinas, is characterised precisely by the ability to adapt the original message to the characteristics of the language it is translated into:

*ad officium boni translatoris pertinet ut ea quae sunt Catholicae fidei transferens, servet sententiam, mutet autem modum loquendi secundum proprietatem linguae in quam transfert. Apparet enim quod si ea quae litteraliter in Latino dicuntur, vulgariter exponantur, indecens erit expositio, si semper verbum ex verbo sumatur. Multo igitur magis quando ea quae in una lingua dicuntur, transferuntur in aliam, ita quod verbum sumatur ex verbo, non est mirum si aliqua dubietas relinquatur.[5]*

The above-quoted text refers especially to the translation of statements regarding the life of faith. It emphasizes the fact that *sententia* must be preserved, while adapting the *modus loquendi* to the *proprietas linguae*. Here *sententia* is synonymous with *sensus* and represents the "idea," "mind," possibly "meaning"; this must be retained, while adapting the "way of speaking" to the "peculiarity of the language". But how can one decide what pertains to the *sententia* and what belongs to the *modus loquendi* in a practical case? Before properly looking into this matter, we shall make a short digression into the broader frame of transposing the content of a message from one communication system to another.

## The Analogous Situation of Updating the Formulation of the Dogma

I N A different context, yet raising similar questions, ever since the 1960's there has been an ongoing discussion over the manner of presenting in the contemporary forms of expression — through *aggiornamento* — statements about the faith of the Church that had been formulated in other historical and cultural contexts. Pope John XXIII was asking, during the Vatican Council II, for an updat-

ing of the formulation of the dogma and its address to the faithful of his time in an intelligible way:

> *… oportet ut, quemadmodum cuncti sinceri rei christianae, catholicae, apostolicae fautores vehementer exoptant, eadem doctrina amplius et altius cognoscatur eaque plenius animi imbuantur atque formentur; oportet ut haec doctrina certa et immutabilis, cui fidele obsequium est praestandum, ea ratione pervestigetur et exponatur, quam tempora postulant nostra. Est enim aliud ipsum depositum Fidei, seu veritates, quae veneranda doctrina nostra continentur, aliud modus, quo eaedem enuntiantur, eodem tamen sensu eademque sententia.[6]*

We are not dealing, properly speaking, with translation here, but with the updating of a message in a new language. The reflections on this matter can however be useful when speaking about the translation of a text. If we are dealing with a medieval theological text, the problem of transposition into a different cultural context comes back again and again.

Although the demand expressed by John XXIII can be, in theory, easily accepted by any translator, its practical application is not free from difficulties. Already at the time it was formulated, it was commented upon as follows by an observer present at the Council:

> *The question of the border between unchanging substance and formulation is one of the most difficult and complex… It is useless to make a distinction between form and content if we cannot say what is the form and what is the content.[7]*

The matter was under discussion in the theology of the second half of the XXth century within the context of the growing awareness of the need to update the formulation of the dogma in a language accessible to the contemporary people. Cullmann's observation was further continued by bringing into discussion another problem, namely the fact that a content of ideas must be expressed in a form appropriate to it and that, on the other hand, the form of expression itself determines the content to a certain degree. We therefore arrive at the conclusion that the distinction between form and content becomes impossible. To reach a solution, one must keep the balance between the relation, on the one hand, between form and content (respectively, between form, meaning and expression), and, on the other hand, the distinction between them.[8]

Just as the reformulation of the same idea in another age asks for adapting it to the new circumstances, so also does a translation from one language into another require adapting it to the characteristics of the latter. When translating a medieval theological text into a modern language, such as Romanian, the undertaking becomes even more complex as it needs both a synchronic adaptation (from one language to another), and a diachronic one (taking into account the differences be-

tween the historical and cultural contexts). Still, the history of the form of expressing certain notions cannot be ignored when entering another age. Due to the terminological specialisation within the doctrinal debates at the time of the great Church Councils, it is often impossible to completely leave aside a certain formulation which was canonised as unfailingly expressing a certain theological idea.

## A Practical Example from Trinitarian Theology

RETURNING TO the actual problem of translation and to Thomas Aquinas' observation referring to it, we can ask ourselves how far the adaptation of the *modus loquendi* to the characteristics of the language can go. Aquinas was giving already an example taken over from the Trinitarian theology of Greek and Latin expression:

> *Dicitur enim apud Graecos recte et Catholice, quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sunt tres hypostases; apud Latinos autem non recte sonat, si quis dicat quod sunt tres substantiae, licet hypostasis idem sit apud Graecos quod substantia apud Latinos secundum proprietatem vocabuli. Nam apud Latinos substantia usitatius pro essentia accipi solet, quam tam nos quam Graeci unam in divinis confitemur. Propter quod, sicut Graeci dicunt tres hypostases, nos dicimus tres personas, ut etiam Augustinus docet in VII de Trinitate.*[9]

Thus, according to Aquinas, the translation *secundum proprietatem vocabuli*, "on a purely verbal basis," or *litteraliter*, is not always satisfactory and can dismiss the necessity to take heed of the broader frame of the *proprietas linguae*. In the above example, he notices that at the purely lexical level, the Latin equivalent of *hypostasis* is *substantia*; but the Latin philosophical terminology uses *substantia* in order to designate the essence, therefore a literal translation would be: "there are three essences in God," which is dogmatically unacceptable both for the Greek author who used *treis hypostaseis*, and for the reader of the Latin translation. That is why he welcomes the expression of the same idea in Latin by making use of the term *persona*.

To be honest, one can debate over the example Thomas Aquinas gives, since *stricto sensu*, the term *persona* cannot be the full equivalent of the Greek *hypostasis*. Even if in the Trinitarian theology it is correct to say both that "there are three hypostases in God," and that "there are three persons in God," it is debatable whether in this case *persona* represents, properly speaking, the translation of *hypostasis* or rather an interpretation. Bearing in mind the specialisation of *hypostasis* in the Christological and Trinitarian terminology, in fact what we find here is a fortunate contribution to complementing the terminology, so that the Latin translation by *persona* does not betray the original meaning, but brings a new shade of meaning.[10] The present situation is however a fortunate case and cannot be generalised. Furthermore, the above

case of equalling the terminology functions only within the Christological and Trinitarian theological sphere and cannot be transposed in all the fields of knowledge where such terms are used. Ignoring the necessity to adapt the translation to another language led in the past to often unfounded accusations of heresy.[11]

## Triggering the Same Effect
## as a Way of Checking the Translation of Religious Texts?

I F WE apply the system of finding the equivalent that expresses the same notion, for instance, to the colours of the rainbow, the result is interesting and easy to apply. It is known that the continuous spectrum of visible light is divided differently, in various languages, in areas circumscribed to the same designation of a colour. When translating from one language to another, finding the equivalent would be a simple matter, even if one particular language will use more words than another to express, for instance, the various shades of orange. By using different words, we get the same effect of describing one single colour.

Instead, in the field of theological texts, we can expect that establishing such equivalents may not be as readily available as the case of nature description. Nevertheless, there is a field of religious texts where the task of translation seems to come near that of converting computer programmes. In a contemporary reference work in the field of spirituality, the author states that in the case of spiritual literature, especially the mystical one,

> *the translation must not only transmit thoughts but as text and structure must have the same effect as the original: not the referential function but the poetics of the textual structure are primary, especially in the case of mystical texts. In addition, the spiritual process must be correctly reproduced.*[12]

Taking into account the fact that the effect of a spiritual text must be to offer insight into the internal event-character of a spiritual form, "right-up to the 'unsayable' of the mystical experience,"[13] in this particular case the translator of a mystical text should be himself a mystic, just as the translator of a poet should he himself be a poet. As in the case of the requirement formulated by Thomas Aquinas regarding the validity of a translation, the principle is easy to formulate and understand, yet difficult to apply in practice in each particular case.

# Towards Finding Solutions
# in the Case of a Romanian Translation

I**N WHAT** follows we shall bring into discussion what further difficulties than the ones already mentioned poses the translation of a theological (medieval) text into Romanian, taking into consideration two possible methods to ensure the accuracy and consistency of a translation.

One of them focuses on maintaining the link with an existing tradition of translation. In the case of a theological text, it is natural to first investigate the tradition of translating the Bible. Unfortunately, most of the Romanian translations of the Bible, even the contemporary ones, heavily depend on the solutions provided by the 1688 Bible in terms of terminology.[14] In the XVIIth century, the literary Romanian was still evolving and in many situations it did not yet possess the appropriate vocabulary to consistently translate the various terminological shades of meaning. For instance, the 1688 Bible, as most of the later ones up until the current editions of the Holy Synod of the Romanian Orthodox Church, translates by *chip* a whole range of terms for which Latin, for instance, has *aspectus, facies, figura*, *forma*, *idolum, imago, similitudo*, *simulacrum*, *statua, vultus*.[15] It is significant as well the fact that it was impossible to find a term in the Romanian inherited vocabulary, which led to the need to resort to the loan from the Hungarian *kép*.[16]

The other method of checking the accuracy of the translation would be to compare the definitions included in explanatory dictionaries and to choose the versions of translations that cover the best the range of meaning of the looked up terms. However, the explanatory dictionaries, especially the Romanian ones, do not always contain all the fields where the entered terms are used, and sometimes they do not exclude ambiguity: for instance, in the case of the Romanian neologisms for the Latin terms mentioned above, six of them (*aspect* [aspect], *faţă* [face], *figură* [figure], *formă* [form], *idol* [idol], *imagine* [image]) are defined in the dictionary as *chip* (or this term is listed among the synonyms), which would, at first sight, justify the traditional undifferentiated translation.

The situation would probably find a remedy in producing a Romanian dictionary of medieval studies, able to shed light on the less known specialised terminology in Romania and hopefully it could thus contribute to enriching and systematising the Romanian philosophical and theological vocabulary.

❑

# Notes

1. The author is currently involved in a post-doctoral research entitled "Particularities of Rendering into Romanian the Terminology of the Logos Incarnation in Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*," within "The Social-Humanistic Sciences in the Context of a

Globalised Evolution: Development and Implementation of Post-doctoral Studies and Research Programme" project, coordinated by the Centre of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy within the Faculty of History and Philosophy of the "Babeş-Bolyai" University in Cluj-Napoca, Romania.

2. Cf. Romanian Academy — The "Iorgu Iordan" Institute of Linguistics, *Dicţionarul explicativ al limbii române* [*The Romanian Explanatory Dictionary*], 2nd ed. (Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic, 1998), *s. v.*; *Noul dicţionar explicativ al limbii române* (Bucharest: Litera International, 2002), *s. v.*.

3. Cf. Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (Chicago (Illinois): Open Court Classics, 1988), 74–75.

4. Ibid.*,* 71 sq.

5. "It is, therefore, the task of the good translator, when translating material dealing with the Catholic faith, to preserve the meaning, but to adapt the mode of expression so that it is in harmony with the idiom of the language into which he is translating. For obviously, when anything spoken in a literary fashion in Latin is explained in common parlance, the explanation will be inept if it is simply word for word. All the more so, when anything expressed in one language is translated merely word for word into another, it will be no surprise if perplexity concerning the meaning of the original sometimes occurs": Thomas Aquinas, *Contra errores Graecorum*, I, *Prooemium.* English translation available on the internet only by Peter Damian Fehlner, re-edited and missing chapters supplied by Joseph Kenny, <http://dhspriory.org/thomas/ContraErrGraecorum.htm> retrieved 10.9.2011.

6. "What is needed is that this certain and immutable doctrine, to which the faithful owe obedience, be studied afresh and reformulated in contemporary terms. For this deposit of faith, or truths which are contained in our time-honored teaching is one thing; the manner in which these truths are set forth (with their meaning preserved intact) is something else": "Allocutio in sollemni Ss. Concilii inauguratione, die 11 octobris 1962," n. 6 [Address on the occasion of the solemn opening of the Most Holy Council (October 11, 1962)], in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (Rome) 54 (1962), 786–796, 791–792.

7. Oscar Cullmann, "Sind unsere Erwartungen erfüllt?," in: *Sind die Erwartungen erfüllt? Überlegungen nach dem Konzil*, ed. K. Rahner, O. Cullmann, H. Fries (Munich: Max Hueber, 1966), 35–66, here 40–41; apud Thomas Guarino, "Rosmini, Ratzinger, and Kuhn: Observation on a Note by the Doctrinal Congregation," in: *Theological Studies* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 2003): 64, 43–68, here 54.

8. Cf. Leo Scheffczyk, *Fundamentele dogmei. Introducere în dogmatică*, L. Scheffczyk, A. Ziegenaus, *Dogmatica catolică*, I (Jassy: Sapientia, 2010), 189–190 [original German edition: L. Scheffczyk, *Grudlagen des Dogmas. Einleitung in die Dogmatik*, L. Scheffczyk, A. Ziegenaus, *Katholische Dogmatik* 1 (Aachen: MM Verlag, 1997)].

9. "Among the Greeks it is said, correctly, and in a Catholic way, that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three *hypostases*. But with the Latins it does not sound right to say that there are three *substantiae*, even though on a purely verbal basis the term *hypostasis* in Greek means the same as the term *substantia* in Latin. The fact is, *substantia* in Latin is more frequently used to signify essence. And both we and the Greeks hold that in God there is but one essence. So where the Greeks speak of three *hypostases*, we Latins speak of three *personae*, as Augustine in the seventh book on the Trinity also teaches": Thomas Aquinas, *ibid*.

10. About the christological meaning of *hypostasis* and *persona* cf. Anton Ziegenaus, *Isus Cristos, Plinătatea mântuirii. Cristologie și soteriologie*, L. Scheffczyk, A. Ziegenaus, *Dogmatica catolică* [*Catholic Dogmatics*], IV (Jassy: Sapientia, 2010), 224–237 [original German edition: A. Ziegenaus, *Jesus Christus. Die Fülle des Heils. Christologie und Erlösungslehre*, L. Scheffczyk, A. Ziegenaus, *Katholische Dogmatik*, 4 (Aachen: MM Verlag, 2000)].
11. See in the history of the Church the christological debates that led to the emergence of the Monophysite and Nestorian movements (either the real ones or those labelled as such).
12. Kees Waaijman, *Spirituality. Forms, Foundations, Methods* (Leuven–Paris–Dudley: Massachusetts, 2002), Peeters, 411 (emphasis mine).
13. Cf. Ibid.
14. The statements on this theme are founded on personal observations—as yet unpublished —, gathered while working on the translation and commentary of the Gospels according to Matthew and Mark, as well as of the book of Revelation (which included comparison with other Romanian translations) within the *Monumenta Linguae Dacoromanorum — Biblia 1688* project, as well as within the *Biblia Sacra Vulgata — Translation and Commentary*, both within the "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Jassy, Romania.
15. See the various concordances of the Vulgate, also available online. For the rare occurrences in this list, see 2 *Chr* 15:16; *Ez* 1:5; 43:11; *Joel* 2:4; 1 *Cor* 7:31, *Phil* 2:6–7.
16. Cf. Alexandru Ciorănescu, *Dicționarul etimologic român* (Tenerife: Universidad de la Laguna, 1958–1966), *s. v.*

## Abstract
### Towards Formulating Some Theoretical Principles to Evaluate the Accuracy of Translating a Medieval Theological Text: A Case Study of the Romanian Language

The relation between a translation and the original work can vary from perfect equivalence (the case of converting a computer programme from one programming language to another) to the lack of any connection between the two (the imaginary case possible in certain circumstance described in the article). In the quest for criteria to assess the accuracy of a translation, the article analyses the possibility to apply the criteria suggested by Thomas Aquinas for evaluating the work of a good translator to the case of translating a medieval theological text into Romanian. Certain particularities of the Romanian tradition of translation and some linguistic phenomena recently noticed ask for specific solutions, analysed in the present study.

## Keywords
meaning ambiguity, Middle Ages, Romanian language, translation accuracy, Ferdinand de Saussure, Thomas Aquinas