



**MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF
CONFECTIONERY PRODUCT NAMES**

Kholova Shahnoza Shukhrat qizi

Bukhara State University

*Independent Researcher, Department of Uzbek Linguistics
and Journalism*

E-mail: shahnozakhlovash@gmail.com

Phone: +998 97 080 58 57

Orcid: [https://orcid.org/0009-](https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6599-0871)

0005-6599-0871

ARTICLE INFO:

Received: 16.09.2026

Revised: 17.09.2026

Accepted: 18.09.2026

KEY WORDS:

*pragmatonym,
morphological structure,
affixation, compound
word, word
combination, izafet,
category of possession,
productivity.*

ABSTRACT

The article analyses the morphological structure of confectionery product names in the Uzbek language. On the basis of the collected linguistic material, these names are classified by structure into simple, derived, compound, and phrasal types, and the word-formation mechanism and degree of productivity of each are established. The paper also addresses the restrictions in the grammatical categories of number and possession that are characteristic of pragmatonyms, as well as the morphological assimilation features of borrowed names. The findings show that the most productive nominative model of confectionery pragmatonyms is formed on the basis of a syntactic phrase.

INTRODUCTION

In order to give a full account of the linguistic nature of an onomastic unit — including the pragmatonym — it must be analysed not only from a semantic or nominative standpoint but also from the perspective of its morphological structure. The form in which a name is realised as a linguistic unit — whether as a simple word, a derived word, a compound word, or a word combination — determines its formation history, its degree of productivity, and its grammatical behaviour.

In Uzbek linguistics, the problems of word formation and morphology have been thoroughly elaborated in academic grammars and in the works of such scholars as A.N. Kononov and A. Hojiyev; the application of these theoretical foundations to the material of confectionery pragmatonyms in particular, however, has not yet been the subject of a dedicated study. The aim



of the present article is to classify the names of confectionery products in the Uzbek language according to their morphological structural types, to reveal the formation mechanism of each type, and to identify the pragmatonym-specific restrictions in their grammatical features.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research material comprised confectionery names collected from the explanatory dictionaries of the Uzbek language, from the product labels of confectionery enterprises, and from colloquial speech. The following methods were employed in the analysis: morphemic analysis — to segment a name into its constituent parts (stem, affix); structural-derivational analysis — to establish the formation model; and the comparative method — to contrast the grammatical behaviour of ordinary appellatives with that of pragmatonyms. The number and type of units (stem, affix, word) in the morphological composition of a name were adopted as the criterion of classification.

RESULTS

The structural-morphological analysis made it possible to divide confectionery names into four principal types.

1. Names with a simple (stem) structure. This type comprises names that are morphemically indivisible and consist of a single stem: holva, novvot, parvarda, tort, keks, vafli, zefir. The majority of such names are borrowings; although they may possess a complex structure in the source language (parvarda, for example, being a Persian participial form), in the recipient language — Uzbek — this internal division is no longer perceived, and the word is apprehended as an integral, indivisible stem. In linguistics this phenomenon is termed the demotivation of the borrowed word (the blurring of its internal form), and it frequently proceeds in parallel with the transition to a simple structure.

2. Names with a derived (affixal) structure. Names of this type are formed by the addition of a word-forming affix to a stem. The most productive affix in confectionery lexis is the adjective-forming suffix -li, which attaches to a noun stem and forms an adjective with the meaning “containing X”: asalli, sutli, shokoladli, yong‘oqli, kunjutli. The high productivity of this affix is no accident: as an open word-formation model it permits the creation of an unlimited number of new names on the basis of any new component of composition, and it has therefore become the most convenient nominative device on an industrial scale. A second, considerably less productive model is the diminutive-hypocoristic affix -ak: in the word pashmak this affix is joined to the Persian stem pashm (“wool”) and produces the meaning “little tuft of wool”. The rarity of this affix testifies to its limited derivational potential within confectionery terminology.

3. Names with a compound (composite) structure. This type is of particular interest, since it lies on the border between syntax and morphology. The name holvaytar was historically the Tajik izafet phrase halvoi tar (“moist halva”); over time, however, the boundary between the two components was effaced, and the phrase turned into a single morphological whole — a



compound word. In linguistics this process is called lexicalisation, and it is a striking instance of a syntactic unit becoming a morphological one: whereas “halvoi tar” still consists of two independent words, “holvaytar” has already acquired the status of a lexical unit as a single word and can no longer freely interchange with another word.

4. Names in the form of a word combination (syntactic). This is the most frequently attested and most productive type in the collected material, being formed from the combination of two independent words. Within it two distinct grammatical models must be distinguished. The first is the attributive phrase (a phrase without izafet and without a possessive suffix): in names such as soch holva, gardish holva, tog‘ holva, sutli shokolad, the modifier precedes the head word, and the head word takes no suffix. The second is the genitive (relational) phrase: in names such as Qo‘qon holvasi, Samarqand holvasi, Buxoro parvardasi, the head word takes the possessive suffix -si/-i, which grammatically expresses the relation of “belonging, specificity” between the toponym and the product. This distinction between the two models is not merely stylistic but rests on a deep grammatical basis: in the first model the modifier denotes a permanent, internal feature of the product (its shape, its composition), whereas in the second the modifier denotes an external, possessive-locative relation of the product (that to which it belongs) — and it is precisely this semantic difference that grammatically governs the presence or absence of the possessive affix.

Restrictions in the grammatical categories of number and possession. Onomastic theory notes that proper names, pragmatonyms among them, exhibit a distinctive restriction in the grammatical category of number: as a rule they tend to be used in the singular, since they name a single, individual denotatum. In the material of confectionery pragmatonyms this rule is put to the test in an interesting way: although the name “Zefir” or “Marvarid” is perceived in the singular as a trademark, in usages of the type “I bought two ‘Zefir’ from the shop” or “The Zefirs were very tasty” the name assumes the plural form. This is not a purely grammatical phenomenon but a morphological indicator of the process of deonymisation: the pragmatonym draws closer to an appellative that denotes a class of countable, pluralisable objects. A.V. Superanskaya has shown that the appellativisation of a proper name is reflected in its grammatical behaviour — in particular, in its beginning to accept such categories as the plural and the article.

The morphological assimilation of borrowed names. Names borrowed from European languages and from Russian, such as tort, keks, pryanik, vafli, have submitted fully to the grammatical system of the Uzbek language: they freely accept case (tortni, tortga, tortda), possessive (tortim, tortingiz), and plural (tortlar) suffixes without any restriction whatsoever. This demonstrates that they are fully assimilated in phonetic and morphological terms — that is, that they function within the morphological system of the Uzbek language not as “alien” words but as fully-fledged native units.

DISCUSSION



The ratio of the four structural types shows that the most productive model in confectionery nomination is naming on the basis of the word combination. The reason for this is readily understood: a single word (simple or derived) can encode only one feature, whereas a phrase, by virtue of its two independent components, makes it possible to express two kinds of information at once (for example, composition and shape, or region and product type). I.V. Kryukova has likewise emphasised that the informational capacity of advertising names is bound up with the complexity of their structure.

The grammatical difference between attributive and genitive phrases, for its part, proves to be a morphological echo of a semantic-motivational distinction: when the namer designates a product on the basis of its “external shape”, he has recourse to a phrase without a possessive suffix, whereas when he designates it on the basis of its “place of origin”, he turns to a phrase with a possessive suffix. This observation once again confirms the intimate connection between morphology and nominative semantics, and shows that the grammatical form may itself carry indirect information about the motive of the nomination.

The observation concerning the use of pragmatonyms in the plural is of practical significance: it may serve as an objective grammatical criterion for determining when a name is functioning as a pure trademark (singular, individual) and when it is already functioning as a name generalised and appellativised in popular speech (plural, a class-name).

CONCLUSION

The morphological analysis of the names of Uzbek confectionery products has shown that they fall into four structural types — simple, derived, compound, and phrasal — and that among these the model based on the word combination is the most productive. The grammatical differentiation between attributive and genitive phrases reflects a semantic-motivational distinction, while the distinctive behaviour of pragmatonyms in the grammatical category of number makes it possible to trace morphologically their shift from the onomastic into the appellative field. The conclusions obtained may serve as a foundation for a deeper study of confectionery pragmatonymy at the meeting point of morphology and onomastics.

REFERENCES

1. Blinova O.I. Motivologiya i eyo aspekty [Motivology and Its Aspects]. – Tomsk: Tomsk University Press, 2007.
2. Vinogradov V.V. Russkiy yazyk (Grammaticheskoye ucheniye o slove) [The Russian Language (A Grammatical Study of the Word)]. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1972. – 614 p.
3. Kononov A.N. Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka [A Grammar of the Modern Uzbek Literary Language]. – Moscow–Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences Press, 1960. – 446 p.



4. Kryukova I.V. Reklamnoye imya: ot izobreteniya do pretsedentnosti [The Advertising Name: From Invention to Precedent]. – Volgograd: Peremena, 2004. – 288 p.
5. Ne'matov H., Rasulov R. O'zbek tili sistem leksikologiyasi asoslari [Foundations of the Systemic Lexicology of the Uzbek Language]. – Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1995. – 128 p.
6. Podolskaya N.V. Slovar russkoy onomasticheskoy terminologii [A Dictionary of Russian Onomastic Terminology]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1988. – 192 p.
7. Rahmatullaev Sh. O'zbek tilining izohli etimologik lug'ati [An Explanatory Etymological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. – Tashkent: Universitet, 2000–2009. In 2 vols.
8. Sayfullaeva R. et al. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili [The Modern Uzbek Literary Language]. – Tashkent, 2009.
9. Superanskaya A.V. Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo [A General Theory of the Proper Name]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1973. – 366 p.
10. Tikhonov A.N. Slovoobrazovatelnyy slovar russkogo yazyka: v 2 t. [A Word-Formation Dictionary of the Russian Language: in 2 vols.]. – Moscow: Russkiy yazyk, 1985.
11. Ulukhanov I.S. Slovoobrazovatel'naya semantika v russkom yazyke [Word-Formation Semantics in the Russian Language]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1977. – 256 p.
12. Shoabdurahmonov Sh. et al. O'zbek tili grammatikasi. I tom. Morfologiya [A Grammar of the Uzbek Language. Vol. I. Morphology]