

UDC 811.161.2'373.21

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2025-40.9>

TO THE ORIGIN OF THE OIKONYMS *FUN(N)A, DEMERDZHI, LUCHISTOYE*

Alexander V. Ivanenko

PhD in Philology, Research Associate
at the Department of History of Ukrainian Language and Onomastics
Institute of Ukrainian Language
of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,
Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: skifetym@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6553-4909>

SUMMARY

The article examines the origin and semantic and typological connections of three names of one of the ancient settlements of the Tauride Peninsula – Fun(n)a, Demerdzhi, Luchistoye (the current name of the village). The historical and cultural realities against which the oikonyms emerged and functioned are also briefly described. Based on the analysis of one of the Crimean legends, the semantic spectrum of the Greek Latinism φοῦρνος, which was used in the Crimea, is expanded.

Keywords: *etymology, reconstruction, prototype, oikonym, oronym.*

Introduction. The aims of this article are: 1) to give an etymological explanation of three names of one ancient Crimean settlement – *Fun(n)a, Demerdzhi, Luchistoye*; 2) to clarify the typological links between these oikonyms. Such aims reflect the trends in the contemporary linguistics and consequently the stated scientific problem is **relevant**.

The **material** for the article served as historical and statistical documents of the 14th–20th centuries, fictitious names of the settlement at different stages of its existence, as well as one of the Crimean legends reflecting the folk interpretation of the historical name of the modern village of Luchistoye – *Fun(n)a*.

The used **methods**: etymological and comparative-historical, internal reconstruction method.

Material of analysis and results

The story of the Taurian **Fun(n)a** (later *Demerdzhi*, now *Luchistoe*) represents that rare case when the data of archaeology, linguistics and folkloristics (sic!) are in full agreement. Given the fact that there are various versions of the origin of the toponym *Fun(n)a* in the literature – Indo-Aryan, Iranian, Greek-Latin and, finally, Gothic – to assess the degree of probability of each of them it is necessary to give a brief overview of historical and archaeological data.

Thus, according to historians, the remains of two Neolithic settlements, a Bronze Age settlement, and three Taurian burial grounds were discovered near the Luchistoye village. In the VI–VII centuries there was a settlement of *Funy* on the site of the present village. From the thirteenth century – *Demerdzhi* (ІМС Крим, 1974: 238).

In the vicinity of the village, objects of the Late Scythian culture (whose carriers are called Tauro-Scythians in ancient monuments) were found, approximately dated between the second and third centuries BC and the first and second (the main massif), and less often – the third and fourth centuries AD (Lysenko A. V., Masyakin V. V., Mordvintseva V. I. «Grave No. 1 of the necropolis of the Roman time Luchistoe-2 (Southern Crimea)». *History and archaeology of Crimea*. Vol. II. The volume of collected papers dedicated to memory of Alexander Evgenyevich Puzdrovsky [ed. by V. V. Maiko]. 2015, pp. 304–321).

In the context of further research, we note the following important (and in our case, decisive) historical circumstances.

1. Around the third century, the Alans were firmly established in the south-east of Taurica, and under the pressure of the Huns they were forced to migrate to the south-west, and already at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries their burials were found in the area of the modern village of Luchistoi (Khrapunov I. N. Alans. “From Cimmerians to Krymchaks (peoples of Crimea from ancient times to the end of the XVIII century)”. 2004, pp. 88–90). On the other hand, the Goths appeared here in South-Western Crimea around the middle of the III century. Due to the mixing of representatives of both ethnic groups in this region, the culture of the late IV – first half of the V centuries,

numerous burials of which were found near the present-day Luchistoye, is usually qualified as Alano-Gothic or Gotho-Alanian (Aibabin A. I., Khairedinova E. A. “The burial ground near the village of Luchistoe. Volume II. Excavations 1984, 1986, 1991, 1993–1995”. 2014, p. 8). In general, the archaeological material is dated to the IV–XII centuries.

Further it should be mentioned that nowadays there are three known settlements in the outskirts of Luchistoye – Demerdzhi I, Demerdzhi II and *Funa*. The first two are dated X–XIII centuries. On the territory of Demerdzhi I settlement there were found a settlement and ruins of two churches (one of them with a pogost). It is not excluded that one of the churches was connected with the name of the *Virgin Mary*, because in the following legend about the ‘mountain smith’ *Funna* (in it we find, among other things, the explanation of this name) a girl named Maria is mentioned. Later, in the XIII century, a fortification – a castle, known from monuments as *Funna*, appeared (Myts V. L. “Fortifications of the Taurica X–XV centuries”. Kiev, 1991, pp. 150–151; “Legends of the Crimea” [ed. G. Taran]. 1961, pp. 106–107).

2. At the end of the IX century, the Crimean fortresses again came under Byzantine rule, and by the end of the X century in the territory between Kherson and the Kerch Strait, the centuries-long assimilation process of the formation of the Crimean people, which absorbed Alanian, Gothic, Roma and Bulgar components, was completed. The unifying component in this case was Christianity and Byzantine culture. In this case, the inhabitants of the *Klimate*s (in the IX–X centuries the term gr. (τὰ κλίματα referred to the lands between Kherson and Bosphorus (now Kerch). – *A.I.*) knew Greek, and some of them had Greek or Alanian names (Aybabin A.I. “Ethnic History of Early Byzantine Crimea”. 1999, pp. 227, 229).

Besides, as early as in the fourteenth century both Alans and Goths were mentioned among the inhabitants of Taurica, and in the fifteenth century the fact of naming the mixed population of Mountainous Taurica Gotoalans is recorded. Also in the middle of the XVI century in Crimea there were Goths who did not know their own language and Greeks who knew Gothic. Gothic could act both as a language of family and inter-ethnic communication (Op. cit., 230).

These are, in brief, the historical data necessary for a consistent explanation of the first name of the modern village of *Luchistoye*.

The first records of the settlement in historical documents date back to the end of the XIV century.

≈ 1360 The name of the village first appears in the Genoese treasury lists of Caffa (*cartolfri della Masseria*), where Fonna is mentioned among the settlements belonging to the captaincy of Gothia ([https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Лучистое_\(Крым\)](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Лучистое_(Крым))).

1381 + MCCCCLXXXI [1381. – A.I.] ...

+ Die XVIII marcii

Abranus de Gentille bancherius debet nobis pro Gorgibey Baxas de racione Manolli proti pro cazallis

Fonna de XXXX asperos I DCL ...

Item XXVII aprilis pro Costo Damodi propto Ialito in racione cazallis Ialite in XXXX asperos IX D... (Džanov A. V. «Kazaliyas of Soldaya and Gothia according to Books Massarii Kaffa». 2017, pp. 322).

1384 ... о приходѣ ... *Фуны* и Аланіи («Antoninus, archimandrite. Ancient acts of the Patriarchate of Constantinople relating to the Novorossiysk region» *ZOOID*. 1867. V. 6, p. 460).

1520 *Demürcü* (Öztürk 122).

1542 *Demürcü* (Öztürk 122).

1652 селении *Демурджи* (in *Джизіє дефтера Лива-и Кефе* (Османских налоговых ведомостях) ([https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Лучистое_\(Крым\)](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Лучистое_(Крым)))).

1680 Селение *Демурджи* принадлежит к [кадылыку] Сугдак (“Ottoman Landholding Registry of Southern Crimea of 1680s”: 3, 65).

1778 *Фуны (Демурджи)* (according to Metropolitan Ignatios) ([https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Лучистое_\(Крым\)](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Лучистое_(Крым))).

1783 «деревня» *Темурджи* Судакскаго кадылыка Кефинскаго каймаканства (see: «Chamber description of the Crimea in 1784. Continued: Statement of what exactly are the kaimakanstvos in the Crimean peninsula, who exactly in which kaimakan consists, how many kadyliks are in each kaimakanstvo, and in any kadylik how many villages. December 17th day of 1783». *Bulletin of Tavricheskaya scientific archival commission*. 1888. № 6, p. 57).

1794 при д. *Деймерджи* (Лашков, 1897: 27).

1864 *Демерджи*, д. каз. тат. of Yalta district at the Demerdzhi-Uzen' river at the foot of the Yaila Mountains (see: "List of populated places of the Russian Empire, compiled and published by the Central Statistical Committee of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. 41. Tavricheskaya governorate". 1865, p. 92).

1887 *Демерджи* of Yalta district, Alushta vol. (see: "Memorable book of Tavricheskaya governorate for 1889". Simferopol, p. 12).

1902 *Демерджи* of Yalta district, Alushta vol. ("Memorable book of Tavricheskaya governorate for 1889". Simferopol, p. 134).

21. VIII. 1945 р. *Демерджи* is renamed to *Лучистое* ("Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR of 21 August 1945 'On renaming village councils and settlements of the Crimean region'". *Administrative-territorial transformations in the Crimea. 1783–1998* / Reference book. 1999. Appendix 19, p. 399).

The origin of the first name of the settlement – *Fun(n)a* and sub. – is connected with the name of the mountain of the same name, at the foot of which the old settlement was located. In the Crimean legend about this mountain-smith, we find both its description and explanation (albeit in fictionalised form) of its name, sounding as *Funna*. In the abridged retelling of the legend sounds like this:

When the nomads who invaded the Crimea spread across the steppes and mountains in a lava flow, the cinders, smoke and stench followed them. And the further they advanced into the interior of the peninsula, the greater the need for weapons they felt – because the inhabitants of Taurica did not want to submit to them, having killed many ferocious invaders.

And the invaders reached the mountain called *Funna* – Smoky. A column of smouldering fire rose from its top, and it was always bright around this mountain. At the foot of the mountain in the village lived craftsmen famous for their blacksmith's art. People lit the first horn in these places from the fire from the top of this mountain ("Legends of the Crimea", p. 103).

And the commanders of the conquerors decided to set up a forge in this mountain, for there was no better forge for the weapons forging. And there was a big and terrible man among them who set up a gigantic forge on the top of the mountain. All day long this mountain rattled and smoked, the flames danced and the clanging and ringing of hammers was heard. And since then the invaders have had many weapons ("Legends of the Crimea", pp. 104–105).

The area around *Funna* was drying up: the rivers were getting shallow, the gardens were withering and the grapes had ceased to give birth. Many people were led away by the invaders to the mountain to forge weapons. They killed many people there and committed many atrocities. They burned the elders who came to ask the blacksmith to leave the mountain. The blacksmith also killed a girl

named Maria, who came to ask the blacksmith for the same thing. And when, in the end, the mountain's cup of patience was overflowing, it trembled, breathed fire, and the smithy collapsed with the blacksmith and his friends into the fiery pit of the mountain.

Since then *Funna* calmed down, there was no fire above its peak and its old name – *Smoky* – was forgotten. But people remembered everything that had happened and gave the mountain a new name – *Demerdzhi* (*Blacksmith*) (see: “Legends of the Crimea”, pp. 104–105).

The following circumstances are important for analysing the legend.

1) the legend was created not earlier than the middle of the XIII century - the time of the Mongol-Tatars' invasion of Taurica, and most likely – much later, as the legend says that the invaders advanced slowly into the interior of the peninsula. The estimated time of the legend's creation is the first half to the middle of the XV century (between 1421 and 1459), when the castle of Funa was burnt down and rebuilt again in 1459. The second time it was destroyed by the Ottomans in 1475 (Myts V. L. “Fortifications of the Taurica X–XV centuries”. Kiev, 1991, p. 151);

2) the authors of the first version of the legend were Christians. Judging by linguistic data – Crimean Goths and Greeks who professed Orthodoxy (on their religion see: Kizilov M. B., Masyakin V. V. “Goths”. *From Cimmerians to Krymchaks (peoples of Crimea from ancient times to the end of the XVIII century)*. 2004, p. 71). The fact that the legend was created by the pre-Turkic population of Taurica is evident from the beginning of the legend, in which the hordes of nomadic invaders are characterised negatively: ‘They were stocky, long-armed, their faces were round, their eyes were small, and their gaze was fierce’ (see: “Legends of the Crimea”, p. 103). Further, near the end of the legend, among the blacksmith's atrocities, he mentions the murder of a girl with a typical Christian name – *Maria* (Ibid., pp. 106–107).

A Greek trace can be traced in one of the episodes of the legend (the comparison of Mount Funa with a blacksmith's mine).

Later this legend underwent some adaptation in the Turkic cultural environment, as evidenced by the use of the Crimean Tatar oronym *Demerdzhi* in its text.

In connection with the etymologisation of the earliest documented variant of the name – *Fun(n)a* – it is important to pay attention to the nature of the geographical object bearing it. In the case of *Fun(n)a-Demirdzhi*, it is a mountain, which at a certain stage could have been volcanically active.

At least one more case of such activity in Taurica is reflected in the legend about the so-called castle of dishonour (on the outskirts of Partenit), which was destroyed as a result of a volcanic eruption: ‘Not far from the Karabag rock, the ground opened up, from where a huge flame appeared, accompanied by millions of stone nuclei, which, most of them falling on the castle of dishonour, with a terrifying roar, fell into the abyss of the sea’ (Kondaraki V. H. “Legends of the Crimea”. 1883, pp. 57–58).

As can be seen from the text, the legend analysed by us contains quite enough information to explain all three – *Funa*, *Demerdzhi* and *Luchistoye* – names of the village. In any case, the descriptions of the mountain set a clear vector of etymological searches.

The given considerations we will try to confirm the following theoretical calculations.

I. Oikonym *Fun(n)a* etc. – transonymisation according to the model ‘oronym > oikonym’, and therefore all the variants of oikonyms noted in the sources may go back to the corresponding forms of oronyms. Therefore, it is further necessary to attribute these variants in connection with one or another language. It is possible to clarify the changes / fluctuations in the internal form of the oikonym only by considering similar processes in the internal form of the deriving oronym, whence the need for etymologising the oronym.

II. Oronym *Fun(n)a*. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct the pre-Gothic history of the name: the settlement located in the outskirts of modern Luchistoye is not mentioned in the records of ancient and early medieval authors about Taurica. In any case, we have not met any names that are etymologically related or at least somewhat consonant with the toponym *Fun(n)a*. Nor have we met any toponyms with typologically similar internal form.

And only on the basis of the fact that the Gothic name *Fun(n)a* was later partially calcified on the Turkic ground as *Demerdzhi*, we

can assume that the Gothic toponym may be a calc from an earlier non-Germanic (Indo-Aryan = Sindo-Meotian, Taurian; Scythian or Sarmato-Alanian) name.

In this connection, it is appropriate to cite the versions we encountered in the work of A. K. Shaposhnikov.

1. Chronologically, the earliest layer of vocabulary is Indo-Aryan. Accordingly, the origins of the oronym can be considered in the context of the etymologies given in A. K. Shaposhnikov's dictionary:

a) the place name *Funa* is a Sarmatian-Alan adaptation of Sindo-Meot. **pauna*- 'purifying (fire)', cf. Sanskr. *pauna*-, *puna*- 'the same'. Initial *f*- is considered as a means of adaptation in Sarmatian-Alan dialects (Shaposhnikov A. K. "Dictionary of the most ancient onomastics of the Taurian Peninsula". *Toponymy of Crimea*. 2011: Collection of articles [comp. by Yu. A. Belyaev]. 2011, pp. 418);

b) the place name *Funa* is a re-formation (of a feminine noun to *-a*) of the Tauro-Gothic. *fon* (N. sing.), *funins*, *funin* (Gen. sing., Dat. sing.) 'fire' (Shaposhnikov. Ibid.).

The original meaning may be close to the semantics of barbarism *demirdzhi* 'iron smith', and therefore a search in this semantic field (*furna*) is promising. The place name refers to the ruins of the medieval fortress of *Demirdzhi* (now *Luchystoye*) and Mount *Demirdzhi*. The creators of the place name are not precisely identified (Shaposhnikov. Ibid.).

These versions seem to us to be the closest to the historical linguistic situation.

Also in the quoted dictionary of A. K. Shaposhnikov there are two more versions of the genesis of the *Fun(n)a* name, which in a certain way correlate with the historical realities set out in the legend about the origin of the toponym discussed below:

c) the toponym *Funa* is a distortion of the Greek (< Latin) τὸ φοῦμο, ὁ φοῦμος 'soot, grime' (Shaposhnikov. Ibid.);

d) toponym *Funa* – spoilage (loss of *-r-*) and re-forming of the feminine noun with *-a* (Latinism) φοῦρνονς 'furnace, firebox' < Latin *furnus* 'smelting furnace' (Vitruvius), cf. Greek toponyms *Furna*, *Furni* (island, channel) (Shaposhnikov. Ibid.).

All versions given by A. K. Shaposhnikov require, in our opinion, a close consistent consideration, as well as some corrections.

The Indo-Aryan (Taurian) name of the mountain, assumed by A. K. Shaposhnikov, must have sounded as **pauna-* with the approximate meaning **‘fiery’*. Whether this mountain had some sacred status in connection with the Sanskr. *pauna-*, *puna-* ‘purifying’, cited by the researcher, for which cognates with the meaning ‘fire’ from other Indo-European languages are indicated (Monier Williams, 1899: 633, 640), it is difficult to say.

Due to the fact that the legend, among other things, notes an episode with the burning of the elders who came to ask the terrible blacksmith to leave the mountain, it is not excluded that in pre-Christian times the mountain (during the periods of its volcanic calm) could have been used for ritual executions or sacrifices. The legends about them could be reflected in the local legend. However, this is only our conjecture.

Also we cannot ignore A. K. Shaposhnikov’s remarks about the nature of the initial *f-* in the forms of oikonym recorded by the sources. Indeed, the transition *-p- > -f-* is typical for the languages of the Iranian group: not only for Sarmatian or Alanian, but also for Scythian.

We can only assume that in the dialects of the local Iranian population there could exist a geographical term **funa-* with some ‘fire’ meaning. The following Ossetian material (but with a different expander) can serve as a basis for such an assumption: sf. Osset. *fūgæ / fogæ* ‘rhododendron’, possibly derived from **paṇaka* ‘fire’ in case the name of the plant formerly meant ‘fuel’, cf. Sanskr. *pāvaka-* ‘fire’, from which a number of plant names are formed. Further, the Ossetian word goes back to Iranian. **paṇ-* : **pāṇ-* : **pū-* and then to I.-E. **peu-* : **peuā-* : **pu-*, **pū-* ‘to clean, purify, sift’ (“Etymological dictionary of the Iranian languages”. V. 6, pp. 254–255). But unfortunately, in the ancient and early medieval sources known to us, the name of the settlement or mountain **Funa-* is not mentioned.

Later, with the arrival of the Goths in South-Western Taurica, **the Gothic name of the mountain** appears. It is this name, starting from the XIV century, that is reflected in medieval documents.

It is quite natural and logical to assume that the Gothic name, to a greater or lesser extent, calques some earlier name – for example, Sindo-Meot. **Pauna-* or East-Iran. **Funa*. However, it is

impossible to prove this assumption – due to the absence of earlier written evidence.

However, in any case, the forms of oikonym attested in medieval monuments (see above) are quite satisfactorily explained in connection with such Gothic vocabulary as: Goth. *fōn*, gen. *funins*; *funisks* ‘fiery’ < *fon* (Uhlenbeck, 1900: 47, 52), cf. forms gen. sing. *funnis*, dat. sing. *funnin* < *fun* (*fūn*?) < *fōn* ‘fire’ (Balg, 1887–1889: 101). Gothic *fōn*, together with Eng. *fire*, O.-H.-G. *fiur*, O.-Fris. *fīor* (cf. Gr. *πῦρ* ‘fire’, Lat. *pūrus* ‘pure’), goes back to Germ. **fūr-* / **fewur-* ‘fire’ and further to IE **pe-or-* / **peh-r-* ‘fire, to burn; to purify by fire’ [-*n-* in Goth. *fōn*, O.-Isl. *funi* ‘fire’, as in O.-Prus. *panno* ‘fire’ etc., characterises the form of the indirect cases of the IE **pe-or-* / **peh-r-*, belonging to the Indo-European heteroclitlic declension in *-r/-n-* (see: Levitsky V. V. “Etymological dictionary of Germanic languages”. Vinnitsa, 2010. V. 1, pp. 199).

Accordingly, for the Gothic oikonyms (and their formative oronym), we propose a reconstruction of the feminine, singular ***Fun(n)a**.

The original intended oronym could look like ***Funnis Fairguni** ‘fire mountain’, where *funnis* is a form of gen. sing.

In the context of reconstruction of a potentially possible onym word combination it is important to note the following syntactic feature of the Gothic language: there is no firm word order in it. And although ‘the definition expressed by the genitive possessive tends to postposition: *sunus gudis* ‘son of God’, *sunus mans* ‘son of man’, but *barne barna* ‘children’s children’ (Guhman M. M. “The Gothic Language”. 1958, pp. 216). In our case, however, we should speak not of the genitive of possessivity, but of the genitive of relativity. However, this fact does not fundamentally change anything.

The choice of Goth. **fairguni** as the second component of the supposed original form of the oronym is due to the character of the geographical object itself.

1. Mount *Funna* is a part of one of the three mountain ranges stretching along the southern coast of the Tauride Peninsula. Therefore, the use of Gothic *fairguni* as a designation of ‘mountain

range' (Lehmann, 1986: 104) is quite appropriate in this case. Moreover, it turns out that in Taurica of the Gothic time this word could be a used geographical term.

2. In the legend quoted above, it is said that the mountain rattled all day long, with the clanging and ringing of hammers (see: "Legends of the Crimea", p. 104). The sounds made by the mountain, which shows volcanic activity, became a detail of the legend, which is well explained by the semantics of the Gothic oronym **Fairguni*. The Gothic oronym is a full structural-etymological analogue of the name of the Lithuanian thunder deity, cf. Lith. *perkūnas* 'thunder god; thunder', O.-Prus. *Percunis* 'thunder' (Lehmann, 1986: 105; Orel, 2003: 99).

As for the form of the oikonym **Fonna* noted in the sources, it may be either a reflection of the phonetic transition **-u-** > **-o-** noted in Germanic languages from the end of the 14th century, or the result of inaccurate transmission of the Germanic form by the author of the Latin-language economic document.

As for **the Greek-Latin etymology** of the oronym *Fun(n)a*, the versions cited by A. K. Shaposhnikov do not seem to be completely groundless, although they cannot be accepted as an explanation of the forms like *Fonna*, *Funa* and others mentioned in the sources.

Another thing is that among the Greek inhabitants of Crimean Gothia both the mountain and the settlement (approximately from the IX–X centuries) could be characterised with the help of a borrowed from Latin Gr. *φούρνος* 'oven, hearth' = Lat. *furnus* 'baking oven', 'melting oven' (Liddel, Scott, 1996: 1952; "Latin-Russian Dictionary" by I. H. Dvoretzky. 1976, p. 447). Judging from the text of the legend, in which the fire and *smoke mountain* is compared to a *forge*, the Greek *φούρνος* in Mountainous Taurica also had the meaning 'forge'.

Unfortunately, the name *Furna* and sub. for the Crimean mountain (as well as for the settlement) is not recorded in the historical sources available to us today, and the only argument in favour of its existence can only be the mentioned *comparison of the mountain with a horn*. However, it is impossible to ignore this legendary evidence.

III. Oikonym Demerdzhi. We believe that the ‘blacksmith’ internal form of the Turkic microtoponym (and, accordingly, oikonym) *Demerdzhi* – from C.-Tat. *demirci* ‘forge’ (Бушаков, 2003: 101) – was predetermined precisely by the comparison of the mountain with a mountain, which goes back to the Gr. *φοῦρνος ‘horn’. Thus, *Demerdzhi* is a partial Turkic calque from the earlier Gothic **Fun(n)a*, the name of the mountain near which the settlement was originally located.

IV. Oikonim Luchistoe. Oikonim is motivated by the onimised adjective of Russ. *лучистый*, *-oe* on the cognition of the mountain *Demerdzhi*, the top of which is brightly visible on sunny days. The motives for naming the village *Demerdzhi* to *Luchistoe* are also found in the quoted legend about the mountain-smith: ‘Demerdzhi is the most beautiful mountain in the Crimea ... How many hours a day has, so many times its colour changes. It is as if a rainbow shimmers on its slopes’ (see: “Legends of the Crimea”, p. 102).

Conclusions. Thus, summarising the above, it should be stated that the first two oikonyms recorded in the monuments – **Fun(n)a** and **Demerdzhi** – are typologically close in semantic terms and, in fact, the later Turkic name of the mountain (and, accordingly, of the settlement) calques (not to the full extent) the earlier Gothic toponyms.

Such partial typological parallelism in the internal form of the names *Fun(n)a* and *Demerdzhi* is a rather typical case (in particular, for the toponymy of Crimea). This happens when one dominant ethnos in a region is replaced by another – a foreign culture and language.

To put it simply, in this case there is a partial translation of the oikonym, when only the most important, so to say, the general idea, remains in the internal form of the new name from the old name: cf. the earlier name Scyth. Ἀρδάβδα ‘devotee of the seven gods’ and the later name of the same settlement – Gr. Θεοδοσία ‘giving to the god’.

However, despite the absence of a complete set of historical data about the settlement of interest to us, it seems that the genesis of the first documented name – *Fun(n)a* – and the history of the later names of the present-day settlement of Luchistoe are gradually becoming clearer.

REFERENCES

Balg G. H. (1887–1889). *A comparative glossary of the Gothic language. With special reference to English and German*. Wisconsin ; N. Y. ; London, England ; Halle, Germany : Max Niemeyer.

Bushakov V. A. (2003). *Lexichnyi sklad istoricheskoi toponymii Krymu* [Vocabulary of the historical toponymy of Crimea]. Kyiv : [b. v.] [in Ukrainian].

IMS Krym (1974). *Istoriya mist i sil Ukrainskoi RSR. Krymska oblast* [History of Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR. Crimean Region]. Kyiv : URE AN USSR [in Ukrainian].

Lashkov F. (1897). *Sbornik dokumentov po istorii krymsko-tatarskogo zemlevladieniya* (Okonchanie) [Collection of documents on the history of Crimean Tatar land ownership (Ending)]. ITUAK. № 26, pp. 24–154.

Lehmann W. P. (1986). *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden : Brill.

Liddel H. G., Scott R. (1996). *A Greek-English Lexicon* compiled by Henry George Liddel and Robert Scott, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars. With a revised Supplement. Oxford : The Clarendon Press.

Monier Williams M. (1899). *A Sanskrit-English dictionary: Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to Cognate Indo-European languages*. Oxford : The Clarendon Press. (2008 revision).

Orel V. (2003). *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden ; Boston : Brill.

Uhlenbeck C. C. (1900). *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache*. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Amsterdam : Johannes Müller.

ДО ПОХОДЖЕННЯ ОЙКОНІМІВ ФУН(Н)А, ДЕМЕРДЖІ, ЛУЧИСТЕ

Олександр В. Іваненко

кандидат філологічних наук, науковий співробітник
відділу історії української мови та ономастики
Інституту української мови Національної академії наук України,
Київ, Україна
e-mail: skifetym@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6553-4909>

АНОТАЦІЯ

У статті розглянуто походження та семантико-типологічні зв'язки трьох назв одного з давніх поселень Таврійського півострова – Fun(n)a, Demerdzhi, Luchistoye (сучасна назва села). Також стисло схарактеризовано історико-культурні реалії, на тлі яких виникали та функціонували ойконіми. На підставі аналізу однієї з кримських легенд розширено семантичний спектр грецького латинізма φοῦρνος, який вживався на території Криму.

Ключові слова: етимологія, реконструкція, прототип, ойконім, оронім.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Бушаков В. А. Лексичний склад історичної топонімії Криму. Київ, 2003. 317 с.

ІМС Крим: Історія міст і сіл української РСР. Кримська область. Київ : Голов. ред. УРЕ АН УРСР, 1974. 833 с.

Лашков Ф. Сборник документов по истории крымско-татарского землевладения (Окончание). ИТУАК. 1897. № 26. С. 24–154.

Balg G. H. A comparative glossary of the Gothic language. With special reference to English and German. Wisconsin ; N. Y. ; London, England ; Halle, Germany : Max Niemeyer, 1887–1889. 667 p.

Lehmann W.P. A Gothic Etymological Dictionary. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Liddell H. G., Scott R. *A Greek-English Lexicon* compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars. With a revised Supplement. Oxford : The Clarendon Press, 1996. 2448 p.

Monier Williams M. A Sanskrit-English dictionary: Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to Cognate Indo-European languages. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899 (2008 revision).

Orel V. A Handbook of Germanic Etymology. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2003. 683 p.

Uhlenbeck C. C. Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Amsterdam : Johannes Müller. 1900. 179 S.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 11.06.2025