

Isomorphic and Allomorphic Models of Character Naming in Russian And Uzbek Folk Tales

Jalilova A.A.

Lecturer, Gulistan State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 12 February 2026; **Accepted:** 08 March 2026; **Published:** 31 March 2026

Abstract: The article examines the structural features of character naming in Russian and Uzbek folk tales from a comparative-typological perspective. The purpose of the study is to identify isomorphic and allomorphic models of anthroponymic nomination in the two folklore traditions. The analysis shows that in both fairy-tale traditions a personal name may function independently or be combined with social-status, professional, characterizing, kinship, and other components. Isomorphism is manifested primarily at the level of general principles of character identification, whereas allomorphic features are revealed in the order of components, their morphological and word-formational structure, as well as in the degree of integration of an additional characteristic into the structure of the name.

Keywords: Anthroponym, folklore anthroponym, folk tale, anthroponymic nomination, structural model, isomorphism, allomorphism, Russian folk tales, Uzbek folk tales.

Introduction: A proper name occupies a special place in the language system because it performs not only the function of individualizing an object but is also capable of accumulating a considerable amount of linguistic, social, and cultural information. In onomastic studies, the name is regarded as an element of a special nominative system whose structure and functioning are determined by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors [1; 2]. A particular field of onomastics is the study of proper names functioning in folklore texts. Unlike the real anthroponymicon, where the main function of a name is to identify a specific person, in a folk tale the naming of a character is governed simultaneously by nominative and artistic principles. A name may indicate the hero's origin, social status, profession, kinship relations, or external and internal qualities. As a result, fairy-tale nomination often represents a structurally complex formation. Russian folklore anthroponymy is characterized by a considerable variety of ways of naming characters. Studies of the structural models of Russian fairy-tale anthroponyms show that, alongside simple personal

names, multicomponent units combining a proper name with titular, social, characterizing, and genealogical elements are widely used [4]. Uzbek anthroponymy also constitutes a developed system that includes personal names, nicknames, honorifics, and socially marked forms of nomination. E. A. Begmatov examines Uzbek anthroponymy in terms of its nominative-motivational, lexical-semantic, grammatical, and word-formational features [3]. Studies of anthroponyms in Uzbek folk tales confirm the structural and semantic diversity of character names [5]. Despite the considerable number of works on Russian and Uzbek onomastics, comparison of the structural organization of character names in Russian and Uzbek fairy-tale traditions remains less developed than the study of their semantics, functions, or linguocultural content. Meanwhile, the use of a unified classification model makes it possible to identify not only the general principles of fairy-tale nomination but also the specific structural differences between two languages belonging to different systems. The present study employs the concepts of isomorphism and

allomorphy. Isomorphic models are understood as naming models that display fundamental structural correspondence in Russian and Uzbek fairy-tale traditions. Allomorphic models, or individual ways of their realization, are those that demonstrate differences in composition, order, morphological form, or methods of combining components.

METHODS

The research material consisted of anthroponymic units extracted from the texts of Russian and Uzbek folk tales. The material was selected according to whether a particular unit performed the function of stable character identification. The study included not only personal names in the narrow sense but also compound nominations combining a proper name with an additional characterizing component. Such an approach requires distinguishing anthroponymic nomination from free contextual characterization. For example, an attribute used by the narrator only once to describe a hero is not regarded as a structural part of the name. If, however, a combination is regularly reproduced to identify a character, it is classified as a stable anthroponymic unit.

The following methods were used in the analysis: the descriptive method, for identifying and systematizing anthroponymic units; the structural method, for determining the number and sequence of nomination components; component analysis, for establishing the function of each element; and contextual analysis, for distinguishing stable nomination from free characterization.

RESULTS

The analysis of the material shows that Russian and Uzbek fairy-tale anthroponymy display both structurally similar and differing ways of organizing a character's name. In Russian and Uzbek tales, the N + S model is productive: Ivan Tsarevich, Marya Tsarevna; Ziyod botir, Bektemir botir, Qilich botir. In the Russian material, the second component mainly denotes dynastic status, whereas the Uzbek botir characterizes the hero through courage and heroic qualities. Thus, structural isomorphism is observed here alongside a semantic difference between the components. A representative example is the comparison Nikita Kozhemyaka – Mahmud yamoqchi. Both nominations correspond to the N + Prof model, in which a

professional characteristic becomes a stable means of individualizing the hero. Despite the structural similarity, a word-formational difference is evident: the Uzbek component yamoqchi is formed by means of the productive suffix -chi. The Uzbek material also contains the N + Soc model, for example Nurilla boyvachcha, where the second component indicates the character's social position. No exact structural-semantic correspondence to this model was identified in the Russian fairy-tale material; therefore, partial isomorphism can be discussed here. Uzbek anthroponymy also contains the S + N model, for example Malikai Husnobod. Unlike the Russian structure Ivan Tsarevich (N + S), the status component here precedes the proper name. This makes it possible to speak of positional allomorphy. The comparison shows that the most pronounced isomorphism is observed in the N + S and N + Prof models. Allomorphy is manifested in the order of components, methods of word formation, and the degree to which social, genealogical, or characterizing information is incorporated into the structure of the name.

DISCUSSION

The results obtained show that a structural comparison of anthroponyms in Russian and Uzbek folk tales cannot be reduced to a search for direct lexical equivalents. It is considerably more productive to identify a common nominative mechanism that receives its own formal expression in different languages. The first level of similarity is associated with the universal need to individualize a fairy-tale hero. In both traditions, a personal name is often insufficient, and therefore an additional component is attached to it. Such a component may denote status, profession, social position, a characteristic, or another identifying feature. For this reason, the models Ivan Tsarevich and Ziyod botir may be regarded as structurally isomorphic despite the absence of complete semantic identity between the words tsarevich and botir. In both cases, a stable component is added to the personal name, distinguishing the hero's position within the fairy-tale system of characters. An even more consistent parallelism is represented by the pair Nikita Kozhemyaka – Mahmud yamoqchi. Here, both the structure and the nominative motivation coincide: professional activity becomes a means of

individualizing the character. The differences emerge at the level of the internal word-formational resources of Russian and Uzbek. This observation makes it possible to clarify the nature of the relationship between isomorphism and allomorphy. They do not necessarily constitute mutually exclusive categories. The same unit may display isomorphism at one level and allomorphy at another. For example, a model may coincide in the number of components while differing in their morphological structure or semantic specialization. Kinship and genealogical information is also significant in Uzbek fairy-tale material; however, it more often retains greater syntactic independence and does not always become a permanent part of the anthroponym. This makes it possible to regard the degree of grammaticalization of a genealogical feature within the name as one of the important parameters of cross-linguistic difference.

CONCLUSION

The comparative study conducted makes it possible to draw the following conclusions. First, the anthroponymic systems of Russian and Uzbek folk tales are characterized by considerable structural diversity. In addition to simple personal names, both traditions employ multicomponent nominations containing social-status, professional, characterizing, kinship, and honorific elements. Second, the isomorphism of Russian and Uzbek fairy-tale anthroponymy is manifested primarily at the level of general principles of name construction. The most representative example is the N + Prof model, represented by the nominations Nikita Kozhemyaka and Mahmud yamoqchi. Third, the N + S model also has broad typological correspondences. Russian nominations such as Ivan Tsarevich and Uzbek nominations such as Ziyod botir display a similar structural principle but differ in the semantic nature of the second component. Fourth, the allomorphy of the two systems is manifested not only in the presence or absence of particular models but also in the ways they are realized linguistically. The differences concern the order of components, their word-formational structure, the degree of structural independence, and the nature of their connection with the anthroponymic core.

REFERENCES

1. Afanasyev, A. N. Russian Folk Tales: in 3 vols. / ed. prepared by L. G. Barag, N. V. Novikov; executive eds. E. V. Pomerantseva, K. V. Chistov. Moscow: Nauka, 1984–1985.
2. Begmatov, E. A. Anthroponymy of the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: Fan, 2013. 264 p.
3. Podolskaya, N. V. Dictionary of Russian Onomastic Terminology / executive ed. A. V. Superanskaya. 2nd ed., revised and enlarged. Moscow: Nauka, 1988. 187 p.
4. Superanskaya, A. V. General Theory of the Proper Name. 3rd ed., revised. Moscow: URSS, 2009. 365 p.
5. Tereshchenko, A. V. Structural Models of Folklore and Historical Anthroponyms: Based on Russian Folk Tales and Archival Documents // Bulletin of Tomsk State Pedagogical University. 2016. Issue 7 (172). pp. 101–106.
6. Qilichev B. E., Kholmukhamedov B. F., Zaripov B. P., Rahmatullaev Sh. N. Anthroponyms in Uzbek Folk Tales: Problem with Content and Frequency // Thematics Journal of Education. 2021. Vol. 6.