

**Lusine Khachatryan<sup>1</sup>**

Associate Professor,  
Faculty of Oriental Studies,  
Yerevan State University

**BETWEEN VERNACULAR PRACTICE AND  
STANDARDIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE: MARINE ANIMAL  
TERMINOLOGY IN A NINETEENTH-CENTURY  
QUADRILINGUAL ARMENO-TURKISH DICTIONARY**

**DOI 10.46991/jos.2026.29.1.77**

*This article examines marine animal terminology in a nineteenth-century quadrilingual Armeno-Turkish medical dictionary (MS 10782, Matenadaran), with a focus on the processes through which scientific and vernacular knowledge were transmitted and adapted in a multilingual Ottoman context. Drawing on a series of lexicographic case studies, the study demonstrates that the terminology of marine species reflects a transitional stage between vernacular naming practices and emerging terminological standardization. The analysis shows that transcription functioned as a central mediating strategy, enabling the phonetic adaptation of Latin learned terms into Armenian-script Turkish (e.g., Mugil / Mujil, Cyprinus / Ch'ibrinus). However, transcription operated alongside other mechanisms, including semantic translation, metaphorical naming, functional classification through “umbrella terms,” and intralingual explanation. These strategies often resulted in taxonomic instability, cross-species equivalence, and the coexistence of multiple naming systems derived from Greek, Latin, Italian, and Turkic sources. The findings highlight the absence of strict one-to-one equivalence in nineteenth-century zoological terminology and demonstrate how knowledge was actively mediated through a combination of linguistic and conceptual strategies. A diachronic perspective further reveals that while some terms persisted into modern Turkish, others underwent semantic shift or disappeared, reflecting the gradual standardization of scientific vocabulary. By situating these processes within the broader framework of multilingual lexicographic practice, the article argues that Armeno-Turkish functioned as a crucial medium for the transmission, localization, and transformation of scientific knowledge in the Ottoman Empire.*

---

<sup>1</sup> E-mail: l.khachatryan@ysu.am, ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-.0009-4927-1577>.

**Keywords:** Armeno-Turkish; Armeno-Latin; ichthyonyms; marine terminology; transcription; multilingual lexicography; Ottoman Empire; translation strategies; terminological standardization

## Introduction

This article examines a group of fish names and other marine animal terms attested in a nineteenth-century Armeno-Turkish (Turkish written in Armenian script) within a quadrilingual handwritten medical dictionary Ms. 10782 stored at the Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, Matenadaran. Compiled from Latin and Italian (in Armenian script) into Armenian and Armeno-Turkish, this manuscript represents an important yet understudied source for the history of knowledge and historical concepts and multilingual knowledge transmission in the Ottoman Empire. The manuscript itself survives in an incomplete form: both its initial and final folios are missing, and the extant portion extends only up to the letter “S [ՄԷ].” It contains no colophon indicating the author, place, or exact date of composition. However, the presence of certain medicinal substances allows for a tentative dating to the second half of the nineteenth century, not earlier than 1857, the year in which bromine—and medicinal compounds derived from it—were first identified and patented<sup>2</sup>. Although the principal source languages of the dictionary are Latin and Italian, a small number of entries also draw on Arabic and Greek-derived forms<sup>3</sup>. For example, f. 033v records *hülāsa* (Arb.), alongside the Armenian equivalent «զուր» (zut ‘pure’), while f. 076v explicitly identifies *sblen* as a Greek word

<sup>2</sup> The therapeutic use of potassium bromide for convulsive disorders was introduced by Sir Charles Locock in 1857, providing a terminus post quem for the manuscript. “Sir Charles Locock and Potassium Bromide,” *PubMed*, National Institutes of Health, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22953325/>. The concurrent standardization of chemical treatments in European medicine, particularly within the French pharmaceutical tradition associated with Cadet de Gassicourt, further contextualizes the emergence of such terminology.

<sup>3</sup> Ms. 10782, f. 053r: *Hyoscyamus niger* (Lat.) *pan tohum* (Trk.), *bezr-i penç* (Arb.), Arm. «khupuk»; f. 035v: *terra Lemnia* (Lat.), Arm. «kaw knkel», alongside *fin-i makhtūm* (Arb.); f. 074r: *sakabenum / kummi sakabenum* (Lat.), *sekbenç* (Arb./Trk.); f. 074v: *santalum / santalinus* (Lat.), Arm. «sandal», Trk./Arb. *santal*; f. 076r: *spico salvatico* (It.), *ežārūn* (Arb.), a small evergreen plant; f. 076v: *sblenitide* (Gr.), ‘inflammation of the spleen’, rendered as Trk. *dalak ifūneti* or *tutuşması*.

meaning ‘spleen’, rendered in Turkish as *dalak*. While relatively limited in number, these instances are nevertheless significant, as they demonstrate that the lexicographic practice reflected in the manuscript was not confined to a strictly four-language model, but instead emerged from a broader, layered multilingual scholarly environment. The coexistence of Latin, Italian, Arabic, Greek, Armenian, and Ottoman Turkish elements within individual entries points to a non-linear process of terminological transmission shaped by overlapping lexical traditions rather than a single, direct chain of translation. The nineteenth century marks a crucial phase in the formation and systematization of scientific terminology. Multilingual dictionaries played a central role in this process by facilitating the transfer, adaptation, and localization of knowledge across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. In this framework, the Armeno-Turkish medical and biological vocabulary attested in the manuscript offers valuable evidence for both linguistic interaction and the circulation of scientific concepts within the Ottoman multilingual environment. In particular, it provides insight into the role of Armeno-Turkish as a medium through which specialized knowledge was transmitted, adapted, and integrated into local intellectual traditions. Studies on ichthyonyms and the naming of aquatic species have primarily focused on classical, Mediterranean, and modern vernacular traditions. Research on ancient Greek sources, particularly the works attributed to Aristotle and later authors, has demonstrated that pre-modern fish nomenclature was highly descriptive, context-dependent, and often lacked strict taxonomic stability (Ganias, Mezarli, and Voultziadou 2017)<sup>4</sup>. Byzantine and medieval sources further reveal the continuity and transformation of these naming systems, showing that ichthyonyms were transmitted across linguistic and cultural boundaries while undergoing semantic and phonetic adaptation (Chroné-Vakalopoulos 2008)<sup>5</sup>. Etymological studies of Greek and Latin fish names likewise emphasize that naming practices were not purely classificatory but interpretive, frequently reflecting perceived physical characteristics, habitat, or cultural

---

<sup>4</sup> Ganias/Mezarli/ Voultziadou (2017), 1038-1055.

<sup>5</sup> Chroné-Vakalopoulos, (2008), 123-157.

associations (Vergados 2021)<sup>6</sup>. In parallel, research in ethnoichthyology highlights the persistence of vernacular naming systems, where local communities maintain their own taxonomies that coexist with or diverge from scientific nomenclature (Svanberg and Locker 2020)<sup>7</sup>. Studies on language contact further demonstrate that fish names are particularly prone to borrowing and adaptation, especially in Mediterranean contexts characterized by intense linguistic interaction<sup>8</sup>. Within Turkic and Ottoman linguistic studies, fish names have also been examined as part of broader analyses of animal nomenclature. Besli's study of Old and Middle Turkic animal names includes a discussion of ichthyonyms, highlighting their etymological diversity and the coexistence of inherited and borrowed lexical layers<sup>9</sup>. Within the Armenian scholarly tradition, the work of Karekin Devejian is of particular importance. His comprehensive dictionary of fish names represents one of the earliest systematic attempts to document and classify ichthyonyms across multiple linguistic and cultural contexts, including Armenian, Ottoman Turkish, and European traditions. Devejian's work highlights the multilingual and layered nature of fish terminology and provides valuable evidence for the historical coexistence of scientific, vernacular, and borrowed naming systems. Despite these advances, relatively little attention has been paid to the mechanisms through which such terminology was transmitted, adapted, and integrated in multilingual Ottoman contexts. The present study addresses this gap by examining transcription as a mediating strategy in the transmission and localization of ichthyonyms within the above-mentioned lexicon. Through selected examples, the article analyzes how these terms were translated into Ottoman Turkish (in Armenian script), classified, and conceptually organized. It further seeks to determine the extent to which such terminology persisted in modern Turkish—both in colloquial and scientific usage—and to assess whether Latin scientific nomenclature had

---

<sup>6</sup> Vergados (2021), 179-212.

<sup>7</sup> Svanberg (2020), 3-29.

<sup>8</sup> D'Arcy (1928), 22-41.

<sup>9</sup> Besli (2010), 350.

achieved a stable and established presence in nineteenth-century Ottoman Turkish. More broadly, the study aims to situate these findings within the larger process of the standardization of biological terminology, particularly in the field of marine zoology.

### Lexicographic Study of Ichthyonyms and Marine Animal Terminology

The medical and related terminology attested in the dictionary can be provisionally grouped into several thematic categories, including body parts, diseases, remedies and medicinal substances, plants, minerals, animals (birds, insects, and marine species), as well as units of measurement. This thematic distribution provides a structural framework for analyzing the organization of medical vocabulary and facilitates a more systematic linguistic and historical interpretation of the material. In the nineteenth century, Latin—significantly enriched with Greek borrowings—had become firmly established as the principal language of medicine and the natural sciences in the European scholarly world<sup>10</sup>. In the Ottoman Empire, although new ideas and approaches associated with Western medicine had been known earlier, their systematic dissemination and application, as well as the introduction of corresponding terminology, became more pronounced from the late eighteenth century onward. On folio 001a<sup>11</sup> of the dictionary, the Armeno-Latin form *astakus marinus* and the Armeno-Italian *logusta* are recorded, with the Turkish equivalent given as *stakoz*, accompanied by the Armenian explanation “a kind of marine crustacean.” In modern Turkish, the form *istakoz* is preserved with the meaning “lobster.” The term is borrowed from Greek ἄστακός (*astakos*, “crab, lobster”)<sup>12</sup>. Phonologically, it is noteworthy that the initial vowel *a-* of the Greek form often undergoes modification in Armenian (either reduction or loss), whereas in Turkish, under the influence of vowel harmony, it becomes the initial vowel *ı-* (*istakoz*). On folio 003r, the

<sup>10</sup> Wermuth/Verplaetse (2019), 83-159.

<sup>11</sup> Matenadaran, Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, Ms 10782. Matenadaran.

<sup>12</sup> Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996); Beekes (2010); Ernout/Meillet (2001).

ichthyonym *arinka*, although presented as a Latin form, does not belong to classical Latin vocabulary. It is most likely a phonetic adaptation of **Aringa / Arenque (Italian/Spanish)**: These are the Romance language terms for herring. While they sound like "Arinka," they actually come from the **Germanic** root for the fish (*hering*) rather than the Latin word for grain. (scientific name *Clupea harengus*). The Armenian and Turkish equivalents are given respectively as *arīng*<sup>13</sup>- *dzukn* (from Italian *aringa*) and *ringa balığı*. The Turkish term *ringa balığı* corresponds to herring and is attested as a borrowing from Italian *aringa*, ultimately deriving from a Germanic root (*\*hering-*; cf. English *herring*, French *hareng*). The form is documented in Ottoman Turkish sources such as Ahmed Vefik Paşa's *Lehce-i 'Osmanī* (1876), where *ringa* is defined as a type of salted fish. Its presence in the dictionary thus reflects a stage of lexical borrowing mediated through European languages, most likely in the context of maritime and commercial exchange<sup>14</sup>. This example illustrates the mediation of scientific and vernacular terminology through Italian as an intermediary language in Ottoman lexical borrowing.

On folio 004v, the forms *ak'arnan* and *ak'arne* represent phonetic adaptations of the Latin taxonomic name *Acerina cernua* (*Gymnocephalus cernua*)<sup>15</sup>. Etymological evidence suggests that this ichthyonym derives from Late Latin *acernia*, itself of Greek origin and possibly rooted in a pre-Greek substrate. Over time, phonological and semantic developments produced a range of variants reflected in both scientific Latin and local vernaculars. Although the Turkish equivalent in the dictionary is given as *tekir balığı*, it should be emphasized that in modern taxonomy this name refers to *Mullus surmuletus* and does not correspond to *Acerina*. However, it is possible that in nineteenth-century lexicographic practice such terms were used in a broader or more approximate sense. No Armenian equivalent is provided; instead, a descriptive gloss appears: "a kind of marine fish of similar taste." This example illustrates the instability of

<sup>13</sup> Jahukyan (1978), 74.

<sup>14</sup> Nişanyan (2026); Ahmed Vefik Paşa (1876).

<sup>15</sup> Solopov (2008), 63–70.

nineteenth-century ichthyological terminology, where phonetic adaptation and approximate equivalence often replaced strict taxonomic accuracy, and vernacular naming practices diverged significantly from emerging scientific classification. On folio 007r, the form *Pastinaca marina* (modern *Dasyatis pastinaca*) represents a Latin ichthyonym corresponding to the modern classification of the stingray. The same concept is also expressed by the Greek *trygon*, used in antiquity for this species and later forming the basis of scientific nomenclature (*Trygon pastinaca*)<sup>16</sup>. The Latin *pastinaca* is polysemous, referring both to the parsnip plant and to this fish<sup>17</sup>. Thus, *Pastinaca marina* (“sea parsnip”) is synonymous with *trygon*, referring to a flat, disk-shaped ray. However, the Turkish equivalent given in the same entry is *trakonya* (weever fish), derived from Latin *Trachinus* (< Greek *trachys*, “rough”), referring to the fish’s spiny dorsal fin<sup>18</sup>. Although stingrays and weever fish are biologically distinct, they share a key feature—venomousness—which likely led to their conflation. This is also reflected in the Armenian gloss describing it simply as “a broad sea fish.” On folio 007v, the forms *passer levis* and *squamosus* correspond to Turkish *dil balığı* (“sole”) and *pisi balığı*. These reflect a mixed nomenclatural system characteristic of the nineteenth century: although Linnaean binomial taxonomy was already known, older descriptive Latin forms persisted<sup>19</sup>. The Turkish *pisi balığı* derives from Greek *ψήσσα* (*psēssa*), denoting flatfish (Pleuronectidae), and reflects the transmission of Greek ichthyological terminology into Ottoman Turkish<sup>20</sup>. Thus, different linguistic traditions converge on semantically related terms, illustrating a transitional stage in terminology. The dictionary’s translation of *Pholas* as “catfish” (*kedi balığı*) is zoologically inaccurate, since *Pholas* refers to a genus of marine bivalve mollusks. Such misidentifications likely reflect generalized perceptions of marine fauna or lexicographic imprecision. Later

---

<sup>16</sup> World Register of Marine Species (2026).

<sup>17</sup> Ernout/ Meillet (2001).

<sup>18</sup> Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996).

<sup>19</sup> Linnaeus (1758).

<sup>20</sup> Nişanyan (2026).

works, such as K. Deveciyan<sup>21</sup>, clearly distinguish mollusks from fish. The Latin terms *phoca* and *vitulus marinus* represent different layers of naming marine mammals. *Phoca*, though used in Latin, is of Greek origin (φώκη, “seal”)<sup>22</sup>, while *vitulus marinus* (“sea calf”) is a transparent metaphor based on appearance and behavior<sup>23</sup>. A similar metaphor exists in Turkish (*deniz danası*), though now obsolete, replaced by *fok*. Such naming reflects broader semantic fields and analogical thinking. A comparable metaphorical model appears in *Taenia* (f. 033v.-034r), meaning “ribbon” in Latin and used for parasitic worms<sup>24</sup>. However, the same term was historically applied to certain fish species (e.g., *Cepola macrophthalma*) due to their ribbon-like shape, illustrating how metaphor can lead to terminological overlap. The taxonym *Phocoena* (porpoise) derives from Greek *phōkaina*, related to *phōkē* (“seal”), reflecting perceived similarities among marine mammals<sup>25</sup>. In Turkish, this appears as *deniz domuzu* (“sea pig”). On folio 024v, multiple equivalents—*porcus marinus*, *pocena*, *turchino*, *rusmaris*—are grouped together, demonstrating a characteristic feature of nineteenth-century lexicography: the clustering of synonyms from different linguistic traditions to identify a single referent. On folio 022v, *polypus* (from Greek πολύπους, “many-footed”) refers to the octopus<sup>26</sup>. Armenian forms such as *igtabor* reflect medieval terminology influenced by Arabic (*uxtubut*) and Greek (*oktōpous*)<sup>27</sup>. Ottoman Turkish likewise displays variation: *ahtapot*, *polypos*, and *sekizayak*. This diversity reflects layered terminological influences<sup>28</sup>. The forms *Thunus/Thenis* (f. 037) represent adaptations of Latin *Thunnus* (< Greek θύννος), referring to tuna. *Belamis* corresponds to *Pelamis* (< Greek πήλαμις), linked to Turkish *palamut*<sup>29</sup>. These examples illustrate complex phonological and

<sup>21</sup> Deveciyan (1915), 310.

<sup>22</sup> Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996), s.v. “φώκη”.

<sup>23</sup> Lewis/ Short (1879), s.v. “phoca” and “vitulus”.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, s.v. “taenia”; Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996), s.v. “ταινία”.

<sup>25</sup> Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996), s.v. “φώκη” and “φώκαινα”.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, s.v. “πολύπους”.

<sup>27</sup> Acharian (1973), 172.

<sup>28</sup> Nişanyan (2026).

<sup>29</sup> Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996), s.v. “θύννος”, s.v. “πήλαμις”; Nişanyan (2026), s.v. “palamut”.

morphological transformations across Greek, Latin, Armenian, and Turkish. Similarly, *Trutta, troeta* (f. 039), and *fario* correspond to trout species (*Salmo trutta*), with Armenian *karmrakhayt dzuk* and Turkish *alabalık* as equivalents. Here, there is no confusion, but rather stable cross-linguistic equivalence. The term *lupus marinus* (“sea wolf”) appears as a calque in Armenian and Turkish (*deniz kurdu, balığı* (f. 046v.). In modern Turkish, however, the species is known as *levrek* (< Greek λάβρος). This illustrates the coexistence of calques and borrowings. The form *lucius* (*Esox lucius*, pike) appears in the manuscript as *luchius* (f. 046v.). The Armenian equivalent is given as «կրնկաձուկ» (*kʹrṅkadzuk*), which in modern usage is attested as a synonym of «գալլաձուկ» (*gailadzuk*, “wolf fish”), the standard Armenian designation for pike. While the Armenian term reflects a metaphor based on predatory behavior, the Turkish *turna balığı / turna balığı* (“crane fish”) is motivated by visual resemblance, referring to the fish’s elongated snout. These differing designations illustrate distinct naming principles—metaphorical predation in Armenian versus morphological analogy in Turkish

In nineteenth-century lexicographic practice, marine animals were often classified not according to strict biological criteria but based on observable features and practical functions. Thus, *Loligo* (squid) and *Sepia* (cuttlefish), both ink-producing mollusks, were grouped under the Ottoman Turkish term *mürekkep balığı* (“ink fish”)<sup>30</sup>. As seen in folio 047r, the entry lists Lat. *loligo / sepia*, Arm. *kaghamar dzuk*, and Turk. *mürekkep balığı*, reflecting an “umbrella term” rather than precise taxonomy. The Italian *gambero* (f. 048r *kampero*) denotes shrimp or prawn, reflecting similar terminological fluidity<sup>31</sup>. Armenian equivalents (*khachapar, khetcetin*) and Turkish forms (*yengeç, çağanoz*) show layered etymologies: Turkic (*yengeç*) and Greek (*tsaganos, τσαγανός*). These terms often reflect habitat or folk classification (e.g., *kum yengeçleri*)<sup>32</sup>. *Granchio* (f. 050v. [kranqio]) is the Italian word for “crab” and corresponds

<sup>30</sup> Anderson (2000), 603–633, Roper/Lu (1990).

<sup>31</sup> *Enciclopedia Italiana* (Accessed April 10, 2026); De Grave et al. (2009), 1–109.

<sup>32</sup> Nişanyan (2026), s.v. “yengeç”, s.v. “çağanoz”.

to the Armenian term «խէցզետիւն» (*khets'getin*). It is semantically and historically related to the Turkish equivalents *yengeç / lengeç / çağanoz*, which are likewise attested in the dictionary. Taken together, these examples illustrate how marine animal terminology across Italian, Armenian, and Turkish reflects a combination of semantic equivalence and etymological diversity. While the terms converge in meaning, their forms reveal layered borrowings and parallel naming traditions shaped by Mediterranean linguistic contact and folk classification. A comparable pattern is observed in the case of *Loligo* and *Sepia*, which, despite referring to distinct species, are grouped under a single functional category in Ottoman Turkish (*mürekkep balığı*), further demonstrating the prevalence of “umbrella terms” in pre-standardized zoological terminology.

*Mullus* (f. 060r: *mul(r)us*, [*tekir balığı*]) is the Latin scientific name for the genus commonly known as “goatfish.” In Turkish, this group is represented by terms such as *tekir*, attested in MS 10782, and *barbunya*. While these names are used in modern Turkish to denote related species within the Mullidae family, their usage in nineteenth-century lexicographic contexts may have been broader and less taxonomically precise, reflecting the fluidity of vernacular classification.

The form *Mujil* (f. 060r) represents a transcription of Latin *Mugil*, the genus name for the grey mullet. In Turkish, members of this family are generally referred to as *kefal*, a borrowing from Greek *kephalos* (κεφαλος, “head”). The term is also attested in the manuscript as «կեֆալ բարըրը» (*kefal balığı*). The Armenian equivalent «գլխածուկ» (*glkhadzuk*, “head fish”) appears to be a calque based on the same semantic motivation, illustrating parallel processes of translation and adaptation across languages.

The form *Ch'ibrinus* (Չիբրինուս f. 067v.) (*[suzan balığı]*; «է ձուկն ինչ գետը» e' dzukn inch' getoy —“a river fish”) appears to represent a phonetic adaptation of *Cyprinus*, the Latin genus name for carp, rather than *Citharinus*. The Turkish equivalent *suzan balığı* likely reflects a regional or non-standard variant of *sazan balığı*, the common Turkish term for carp (*Cyprinus carpio*). This suggests that the entry corresponds to freshwater

carp rather than to the African genus *Citharinus*. This example further illustrates how phonetic variation and vernacular usage could obscure precise taxonomic distinctions in nineteenth-century terminology.

A notable group of entries in the dictionary consists of cases in which no Turkish equivalent is provided, and the term is instead accompanied solely by an Armenian explanatory gloss (e.g., *Acus Aristotelis f. 005r*, *Bavus f. 008r*, *Berka f. 011v*, *Thinca f. 037r*, *Lavaretus f. 044r*, *Mithulus f. 059r*). In such instances, the compilers abandon direct lexical equivalence and resort to descriptive definition as a strategy of meaning transmission. These glosses typically characterize the referent in general terms—such as “a kind of marine fish” or “a freshwater fish”—without precise taxonomic identification. A similar but more elaborate strategy can be observed in entries such as *Bilole/Bilula*, where the term is not simply translated but expanded through a series of explanations, including Bibliography to specific remedies, uses, and even named authorities. Here, meaning is constructed cumulatively rather than through a single equivalent, transforming the entry into a micro-discursive unit of medical knowledge. Taken together, these cases demonstrate that transcription alone was not always sufficient to ensure comprehension. Instead, it was frequently supplemented by intralingual explanation in Armenian, which functioned as a complementary mechanism of translation. This reveals a multilayered process in which interlingual transfer (via transcription) and intralingual interpretation operate simultaneously. Such practices not only highlight the limits of terminological standardization in the nineteenth century but also show how knowledge was actively mediated, expanded, and adapted within a multilingual scholarly environment. In this respect, the manuscript reveals a hybrid translation system in which lexical transfer and explanatory discourse jointly produce meaning.

### **Patterns of Translation and Classification in Marine Terminology**

A general overview of the attested examples demonstrates that transcription played a central role as a strategy of translation and

terminological adaptation in the manuscript. In many cases, Latin scientific terms are transferred through phonetic adaptation into Armenian-script Turkish, as seen in forms such as *Mugil* / *Mujil* and *Cyprinus* / *Ch'ibrinus*. However, transcription is only one of several strategies. Semantic translation also plays a significant role, often relying on metaphor and analogy, as in *lupus marinus* / *deniz kurdu*, *vitulus marinus* / *deniz danası*, and *turna balığı*. These examples reflect perception-based naming rather than strict taxonomic classification. In other cases, distinct species are grouped under a single functional designation, forming so-called “umbrella terms.” For example, *Loligo* and *Sepia* are both rendered as *mürekkep balığı*, demonstrating a classificatory logic based on shared function (ink production) rather than biological distinction. The manuscript also exhibits frequent taxonomic instability, whereby different species are conflated or inaccurately matched across languages, as in *Pastinaca marina* / *trakonya*, *Pholas* / *keci balığı*, and *Acerina* / *tekir balığı*. Such examples highlight the absence of a fully standardized classificatory system. At the same time, the terminology reflects a layered linguistic structure shaped by borrowing across multiple languages, often mediated through intermediary forms. Examples such as *aringa* / *ringa* and *kefal* (of Greek origin) point to the broader Mediterranean contact zone in which these terms circulated. The methods of knowledge transfer in the dictionary are likewise diverse. In addition to interlingual transfer through transcription, intralingual explanation is frequently employed, particularly in cases where no established equivalent exists (e.g., *Bavus*, *Berka*, *Thinca*, *Lavaretus*, *Mithulus*). In such instances, transcription and explanation together form a hybrid system of meaning transmission. Finally, a diachronic perspective reveals that some terms persisted into modern usage, while others underwent semantic shift or disappeared. Terms such as *istakoz* and *kefal* have survived, whereas others, such as *tekir balığı*, have undergone semantic narrowing, and forms like *deniz danası* have largely fallen out of use. These patterns reflect the gradual process of terminological standardization.

## Conclusion

The analysis of marine animal terminology in MS 10782 demonstrates that nineteenth-century scientific vocabulary in the Ottoman context was neither fully standardized nor strictly taxonomic, but instead operated within a flexible, multilingual framework shaped by ongoing processes of translation, adaptation, and semantic negotiation. The dictionary reflects a transitional stage in which Linnaean classification coexisted with earlier descriptive, metaphorical, and function-based naming systems. The evidence shows that transcription played a central role in this process. Rather than serving as a purely mechanical device, it functioned as a mediating strategy that enabled the transmission, localization, and reinterpretation of scientific knowledge across linguistic boundaries. Through transcription, foreign terms were not only rendered accessible but also integrated into local lexical systems, sometimes preserving their original form, sometimes adapting to phonological norms, and sometimes coexisting with vernacular equivalents. At the same time, the terminology attested in the manuscript reveals a layered structure composed of Greek, Latin, Italian, Arabic, and Turkic elements, reflecting the broader linguistic ecology of the Mediterranean and Ottoman worlds. This multiplicity of sources, combined with the frequent use of synonym clusters and “umbrella terms,” highlights the absence of strict one-to-one equivalence and underscores the role of practical knowledge and perceptual categorization in the naming of marine species. In this context, MS 10782 should be understood not merely as a translation tool, but as an active site of knowledge production, where scientific, vernacular, and learned traditions intersect. By documenting the interaction between these systems, the manuscript provides valuable insight into the early stages of the standardization of biological terminology. More broadly, it demonstrates how multilingual lexicographic practices—particularly in Armenian-script Turkish—facilitated the circulation and transformation of scientific knowledge in the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire. In a multilingual Ottoman context, the transmission of scientific knowledge depended not on

direct equivalence alone, but on a dynamic interplay of transcription and explanatory strategies that together made specialized terminology intelligible and usable. Transcription alone did not translate knowledge—it worked together with explanation to make it meaningful.

**ԺՈՂՈՎՐԴԱԽՈՍԱԿՑԱԿԱՆ ԿԻՐԱՌՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԵՎ ԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ  
ՄԻՕՐԻՆԱԿԱՆԱՑՄԱՆ ՄԻՋԵՎ. ԾՈՎԱՅԻՆ ԿԵՆՂԱՆԻՆԵՐԻ  
ԵԶՐԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ 19-ՐԴ ԴԱՐԻ ՀԱՅՏԱՍԱՌ ԹՈՒՐԳԵՐԵՆ  
ՔԱՌԱՆԵԶՈՒ ԲԱՌԱՐԱՆՈՒՄ**

*Լուսինե Խաչատրյան<sup>33</sup>*

Սույն հոդվածում քննության են առնվում Մատենադարանի հմր. 10782 ձեռագիր հայատառ թուրքերեն քառալեզու բժշկական բառարանում (19-րդ դար) արձանագրված ծովային կենդանիների անվանումները: Ուսումնասիրության հիմնական նպատակն է պարզել, թե ինչպես էին գիտական ու ժողովրդական գիտելիքները փոխանցվում, հարմարեցվում և վերաիմաստավորվում Օսմանյան կայսրության բազմալեզու միջավայրում: Բառարանագրական նյութի վերլուծությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ ծովային կենդանիների եզրաբանության կազմավորման գործընթացը գտնվում էր անցումային փուլում՝ ժողովրդախոսակցական անվանակարգերի կիրառության և ձևավորվող գիտական միօրինականացման խաչմերուկում: Առանձին օրինակների հիման վրա պարզվում է, որ գիտելիքի փոխանցման հիմնական մեխանիզմներից մեկը տառադարձությունն էր, որի միջոցով լատիներեն գիտական անվանումները հայատառ տրանսկրիպցիայի միջոցով հնչունապես հարմարեցվել են թուրքերենին (օրինակ՝ *Mugil* → *Mujil*, *Cyprinus* → *Ch'ibrinus*): Միաժամանակ կիրառվել են նաև իմաստային թարգմանություններ, փոխաբերական անվանումներ, ընդհանրական դասակարգումներ և բացատրական ձևակերպումներ: Այս գործընթացների արդյունքում Օսմանյան թուրքիայի գիտական միջավայրում ձևավորվել էր տաքսոնոմիկ բազմազանություն, որտեղ կողք կողքի գոյակցում էին հունական, լատիական, իտալական և թյուրքական ծագման անվանումներ: Վերլուծությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ 19-րդ

<sup>33</sup> Լուսինե Խաչատրյանը ԵՊՀ արևելագիտության ֆակուլտետի թյուրքագիտության ամբիոնի դոցենտ է, բ.գ.թ., էլ. փոստ՝ l.khachatryan@ysu.am, ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4927-1577>

դարում խնդրո առարկա եզրաբանությունը դեռևս ամբողջովին ստանդարտացված չէր, իսկ պատմահամեմատական մոտեցումը թույլ է տալիս արձանագրել, թե որ բառերն են անփոփոխ հասել ժամանակակից թուրքերեն, որոնք են ենթարկվել իմաստային փոփոխությունների կամ դուրս մղվել բառապաշարային այս խմբից: Հոդվածում հիմնավորվում է նաև այն փաստարկը, որ հայատառ թուրքերենն առանցքային դեր է ունեցել Օսմանյան կայսրությունում գիտելիքի տարածման ու տեղայնացման գործում:

*Բանալի բառեր՝ հայատառ թուրքերեն, հայատառ լատիներեն, իլատիոնիսներ, ծովային տերմինաբանություն, տառադարձում, բազմալեզու բառարանագրություն, Օսմանյան կայսրություն, թարգմանական ռազմավարություններ, եզրաբանական միջոցինականացում:*

### Bibliography

1. Acharian, Hrachia. 1973. *Hayeren armatakan bararan* [Etymological dictionary of the Armenian language]. Vol. 2. Yerevan: Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
2. Anderson, F. E. 2000. "Phylogenetic Relationships among Loliginid Squids (Cephalopoda: Myopsida) Based on Analyses of Multiple Data Sets." *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 130, no. 4: 603–633.
3. Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.
4. Besli, Ertan. 2010. "Eski ve Orta Türkçe Hayvan İsimlerinin Etimolojisi." PhD diss., Istanbul University.
5. Chrone-Vakalopoulos, Maria. 2008. "Fishes and Other Aquatic Species in Byzantine Literature: Classification, Terminology and Scientific Names." *Byzantina Symmeikta* 18: 123–157.
6. Deveciyan, Karekin. 1915. *Pêche et Pêcheries en Turquie*. Constantinople: Imprimerie de l'Administration de la Dette Publique Ottomane.
7. Ernout, Alfred, and Antoine Meillet. 2001. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.

8. Ganiyas, Konstantinos, C. Mezarli, and E. Voultziadou. 2017. "Aristotle as an Ichthyologist: Exploring Aegean Fish Diversity 2,400 Years Ago." *Fish and Fisheries* 18, no. 6: 1038–1055.
9. Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani. 2026. "Treccani." Accessed May 3, 2026. <https://www.treccani.it>.
10. Jahukyan, Gevorg. 1978. *Hayren stugabanakan bararan* [Etymological dictionary of the Armenian language]. Yerevan: Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
11. Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. 1996. *A Greek–English Lexicon*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
12. Linnaeus, Carl. 1758. *Systema Naturae*. 10th ed. Stockholm.
13. Matenadaran (Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts). n.d. MS 10782.
14. National Institutes of Health. 2012. "Sir Charles Locock and Potassium Bromide." *PubMed*. Accessed May 3, 2026. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22953325/>.
15. Nişanyan, Sevan. 2026. *Nişanyan Sözlük: Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimolojisi*. Accessed April 14, 2026. <https://www.nisanyansozluk.com>.
16. Roper, C. F. E., and C. C. Lu. 1990. *Comparative Morphology and Function of Dermal Structures in Oceanic Squids*. Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology, no. 493. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
17. Solopov, V. A. 2008. "Etimologiya novolatinskogo ikhtionima Acerina ‘yorsh’" [The etymology of the Neo-Latin ichthyonym Acerina (‘ruffe’)]. *Schöle* 2: 63–70.
18. Svanberg, Ingvar, and Alison Locker. 2020. "Ethnoichthyology of Freshwater Fish in Europe." *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* 16, no. 1: 3–29.
19. Thompson, D’Arcy Wentworth. 1928. "On Egyptian Fish-Names Used by Greek Writers." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14, no. 1/2: 22–41.
20. Türk Dil Kurumu. 2026. *Türkçe Sözlük*. Accessed May 3, 2026. <https://sozluk.gov.tr>.

21. Vefik Paşa, Aḥmed. 1876. *Lehce-i 'Osmānī*. Istanbul: Maṭba‘a-yı ‘Āmire.
22. Vergados, Athanassios. 2021. "Etymological Explanations of Fish Names in Oppian’s *Halieutica*." In *Ancient and Medieval Greek Etymology*, 179–221. Leiden: Brill.
23. Wermuth, Maria-Cornelia, and Heidi Verplaetse. 2019. "Medical Terminology in the Western World: Current Situation." In *Handbook of Terminology*, Volume 2, edited by Abied Alsulaiman and Ahmed Allaithy, 83–115. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
24. World Register of Marine Species (WoRMS). 2026. *Dasyatis pastinaca* (Linnaeus, 1758). Accessed March 24, 2026. <https://www.marinespecies.org>.