

**FROM BRAND NAMES TO EVERYDAY WORDS. GENERICIZATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGE USE.****Alijonova Madina Xamidjon kizi**Faculty of Teaching Methods of English Philology and  
Translation Studies, ADCHTI

Teacher of the Department of Integrated Course of English Language Teaching

Tel. number: 998931082312

Email: mshoxobiddinova@bk.ru.

**Abstract.** This article examines the linguistic phenomenon of genericization, in which brand names evolve into common nouns or verbs through widespread everyday use. Focusing on a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek, the study explores how social practices, technological development, and consumer culture contribute to lexical change in both languages. Well-known examples such as **Google** and **Xerox** in English, and **Tefal** and **Xerox** in Uzbek, illustrate how brand dominance and communicative efficiency encourage speakers to adopt trademarked names as general terms. Drawing on established linguistic scholarship, the article demonstrates that genericization is not a deviation from linguistic norms but a natural outcome of language adaptation. Despite differences in cultural context and stylistic conventions, English and Uzbek display similar mechanisms of lexical innovation driven by frequency of use and social acceptance. The findings highlight the dynamic relationship between language and society and emphasize the role of everyday communication in shaping vocabulary across languages.

**Key words:** Genericization, Deonym, generic trademark, semantic broadening, verbalization, communization. Xerox, goggle, everyday life, Tefal, usage, comparative.

**Introduction**

Language evolves in close connection with social change, technological progress, and consumer culture. One of the most noticeable linguistic phenomena reflecting this interaction is genericization—the process by which a brand name becomes a commonly used word referring to an entire category of products or actions. While genericization is often discussed in the context of English, it is equally present and influential in Uzbek. A comparative examination of this phenomenon reveals striking similarities in how speakers of both languages adapt vocabulary to everyday communicative needs.

Genericization can also be used in different terms. For example the term can be seen as *Deonym*, *Generic trademark*, *semantic broadening*. However most of them can be defined as the same.

**Literature review.**

There are numerous of scholars who has done different researches about the Genericization for example; Shafiulla, B. (2010). *Genericization of Trademarks: Brand Name becomes Generic Name - A Challenge for Brand Managers*. In this article, the author writes the process of Genericization and the factors that influence to the brand name to turn into generic trademark. The writer argues that when a brand becomes extremely popular and widely used by the public, people start using the brand name as the product itself. Sometimes brand names may become as the noun or verb. The next article is by Simonson, I. (1994). *An empirical investigation of the meaning and measurement of genericness*. Simonson in his work pays mostly attention to the consumers understanding of brand names. In his research, he examines how the public utilizes brand names in daily life. James A. Heilpern, William G. Eggington, Earl Kjar Brown, and Zachary D. Smith, *Going Generic: A Linguistics Approach to Genericide in Trademark Law*, 50

BYU L. Rev. 81 (2024). The writer discusses how trademarks are used in a context as well as how the meaning of the brand name change in a context.

### Methods.

In this article there has been used several methods as Comparative analysis, where the data are compared in two languages. Descriptive analysis this method analyses structure of English word groups.

### Understanding Genericization

In linguistic terms, genericization occurs when a proper noun, originally protected as a trademark, loses its exclusive association with a specific brand and begins to function as a common noun or verb. According to David Crystal (2003), this process reflects the natural tendency of language users to prioritize efficiency and familiarity over formal accuracy. When a product becomes widespread and culturally dominant, its name often replaces longer or less familiar descriptive terms.

Scholars such as Trask (1996) emphasize that genericization is not a result of linguistic decay but rather a sign of lexical productivity. It demonstrates how speakers actively shape language to suit practical communication. This phenomenon is especially visible in societies undergoing rapid technological and economic transformation, where new objects and services enter daily life faster than standardized terminology can develop.

### Genericization in English: A Global Pattern

English provides some of the most well-documented examples of genericization. The verb “**to google**”, for instance, is now universally understood to mean searching for information online, regardless of the search engine used. Linguistically, this represents a shift from a brand name to a fully functional verb, complete with grammatical flexibility (**googled, googling**). Crystal (2019) notes that such transformations highlight the openness of English to lexical innovation. Another classic example is “**Xerox**”, which for decades has been used as a synonym for photocopying. Even when photocopiers are produced by other manufacturers, speakers often continue to use the term. Similar cases include “**Photoshop**” for digital image editing, “**Zoom**” for online meetings, and “**Jeep**” for off-road vehicles. In each case, the brand name becomes cognitively associated with the function rather than the company. The word **Escalator** is also the brand name that is now commonly used for all staircase products.

From a stylistic perspective, most style guides still recommend avoiding genericized trademarks in formal writing. However, their persistent use in journalism, advertising, and spoken discourse suggests that they have become deeply embedded in linguistic practice. As Bauer (2007) argues, once a word gains widespread social acceptance, prescriptive rules struggle to eliminate it.

### Genericization in Uzbek: Local Context, Similar Mechanisms

Although Uzbek has a different linguistic history and structure from English, the mechanisms of genericization function in remarkably similar ways. A widely recognized example is the use of “**Tefal**” to refer to an electric kettle. While the standard Uzbek term **elektr choynak** exists, everyday communication often favors the brand name due to its brevity and recognizability. This reflects what Aitchison (2012) describes as the principle of economy in language use, where speakers prefer shorter and more efficient expressions. Similarly, the word “**Xerox**” is commonly used in Uzbek as both a noun and a verb (**ksereks qilish**), meaning to make a photocopy.

This usage mirrors Russian linguistic influence, where brand-based verbs are also widespread, but it has become fully integrated into Uzbek colloquial speech. Other examples include “Pampers” for diapers and “Colgate” for toothpaste, regardless of the actual manufacturer.

An important characteristic of Uzbek genericization is its strong association with spoken and informal contexts. In official documents, academic writing, and formal media, standard lexical forms are usually preferred. However, newspapers and popular journalism increasingly incorporate these genericized terms to sound more accessible and relatable to readers, demonstrating the gradual normalization of such vocabulary.

### **Comparative Analysis: English and Uzbek.**

When comparing English and Uzbek, several shared patterns emerge. First, in both languages, genericization is driven primarily by social usage rather than institutional approval. Speakers adopt brand names because they are familiar, memorable, and efficient. Second, the process is closely linked to technological innovation, particularly in areas such as digital communication, household appliances, and office equipment.

However, differences also exist. English, as a global lingua franca, often spreads genericized terms internationally, influencing other languages. Uzbek genericization, by contrast, tends to be more locally grounded, shaped by regional consumer habits and historical language contact. Additionally, English shows a greater tolerance for genericized terms in semi-formal writing, while Uzbek maintains a clearer stylistic boundary between colloquial and standard usage.

Despite these differences, both languages illustrate what Labov (2001) identifies as the social nature of linguistic change. Language evolves not through rules imposed from above, but through repeated patterns of everyday interaction.

### **Conclusion.**

Genericization in English and Uzbek illustrates a universal linguistic process shaped by culture, technology, and daily communication needs. Although the two languages differ in structure and history, speakers of both employ brand names as practical linguistic tools. These words serve as shortcuts that reflect shared social experiences and collective habits.

From a broader perspective, genericization reminds us that language is not merely a system of rules, but a living reflection of how people interact with the world around them. For journalists, educators, and linguists alike, understanding this phenomenon offers valuable insight into the dynamic relationship between language and society.

### **References.**

1. Aitchison, J. (2012). *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* Cambridge University Press.
2. Bauer, L. (2007). *The Linguistics Student’s Handbook*. Edinburgh University Press.
3. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Crystal, D. (2019). *The Stories of English*. Penguin.
5. Labov, W. (2001). *Principles of Linguistic Change*. Blackwell.
6. Trask, R. L. (1996). *A Dictionary of Phonetics and Phonology*. Routledge.