

National And Cultural Conditioning Of Incorporation In Russian And Uzbek

 Marina A. Kim

Denau Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy, Uzbekistan

Received: 25 November 2025; **Accepted:** 17 December 2025; **Published:** 21 January 2026

Abstract: The article examines incorporation as a word-formation and morphosyntactic mechanism reflecting national and cultural patterns of conceptualization in Russian and Uzbek. Based on a comparative analysis of culturally marked incorporating constructions, the study identifies differences in dominant referential domains, conceptual metaphors, and productive word-formation models. It is shown that in Russian incorporation is primarily oriented toward technical, professional, and terminological nomination, while its evaluative function is limited. In Uzbek, by contrast, incorporation is characterized by somatic, functional, and spatial conceptualization, demonstrating a somatocentric and culturally specific organization of linguistic experience.

Keywords: Incorporation, word formation, national and cultural specificity, conceptualization, Russian language, Uzbek language, linguistic economy.

Introduction: Incorporation as a word-formation and morphosyntactic mechanism functions not only as a means of structural compression but also as a linguistic device reflecting culturally significant modes of conceptualizing reality. As noted by Kim (2025), incorporation appears at first glance to be a simple phenomenon, namely the combination of words into a single word, yet in practice it proves to be highly complex and multifaceted. Within linguistics, where every word and every morpheme constitutes a fundamental unit of the language system, incorporation represents a refined interaction of elements, each contributing its specific meaning while forming an integrated semantic structure.

The national and cultural specificity of incorporating constructions manifests itself at several interrelated levels: in the choice of referential domains subject to incorporation, in the dominant conceptual metaphors underlying these constructions, in their axiological load, and in the system of productive word-formation models. A comparative analysis of Russian and Uzbek makes it possible to identify systematic differences in cultural priorities encoded through incorporation.

At the level of referential domains, incorporation tends

to concentrate in areas that possess increased conceptual relevance for a given linguistic community (Lakoff, Johnson 1980). In Russian, one of the most representative domains is technical and industrial vocabulary. Incorporating constructions such as «водопровод», «газопровод», «нефтепровод», «электроснабжение», «теплоснабжение», «паровоз», «тепловоз», «самолёт», «ледокол» function as terminologically precise and semantically neutral nominations.

Structurally, these units are predominantly formed according to the models $N + V \rightarrow N$ (for example, «водопровод» проводить воду, «теплоснабжение» снабжать теплом) and $N + N \rightarrow N$ (for example, «самолётостроение» строительство самолётов). The meaning of the whole is usually transparently derived from the meanings of its components, which indicates a low degree of idiomatization and a strong orientation toward logical and analytical categorization. Expressive or evaluative components are generally absent in such nominations.

Against this background, a contrasting group is formed by poetic occasional incorporations, primarily associated with the works of Vladimir Mayakovsky: «громадье», «многопудье», «адище»,

«сердцелюдый», «крикогубый», «непроходимолесый», «лазоревосинесквозное», «верблюдокорабледраконьи». In these formations, incorporation performs a fundamentally different function. Rather than facilitating linguistic economy, it serves as a tool of artistic experimentation, producing hyperbolic, synesthetic, and deliberately complex images. The semantics of such constructions cannot be reduced to the sum of their components and emerges through the intentional violation of conventional combinatorial constraints.

Another culturally significant domain of Russian incorporation consists of agentive nominations denoting persons by occupation or activity: «водовоз», «землекоп», «лесоруб», «рыболов», «зверолов», «хлебороб», «водолаз». These formations realize the productive model $N + V \rightarrow N$ and encode a stable association between social identity and labor. Incorporation in this case functions as a compact means of fixing a socially relevant role.

A smaller but revealing group comprises evaluative incorporations such as «кровопийца», «душегуб», «мироед», «словоблуд». In these cases, physical actions are metaphorically reinterpreted as social vices, and incorporation serves as a means of moral condemnation. Nevertheless, despite the presence of such formations, the evaluative function remains peripheral in comparison with the dominant nominative and terminological functions of incorporation in Russian.

In Uzbek, the distribution of incorporating constructions across culturally marked domains reveals a different pattern. The most representative domain is the somatic sphere. Both lexical incorporations and phraseologized constructions with somatic components constitute the largest group: «oyoqiyim», «qo'lqop», «boshkiyim», «ko'zoynak», «yurakdard», as well as expressions such as «ko'z-yummoq», «yurak-ezmoq», «ko'ngil-ochmoq», and «bosh-ko'tarmoq». In these constructions, body parts and bodily actions function as a universal source of nomination for both concrete objects and abstract emotional or social states.

This regularity points to a pronounced somatocentric orientation of the Uzbek conceptual system, in which the body functions as the primary mediator between physical and abstract experience. An important feature of these constructions is their high degree of semantic motivation: speakers generally recognize the connection between the literal bodily action and the figurative meaning. At the same time, the interpretation of such meanings requires culturally specific knowledge of conventional somatic

metaphors.

The second significant domain is represented by the productive model $N + -xona$: «kutubxona», «choyxona», «oshxona», «mehmonxona», «kasalxona». The suffix $-xona$ functions as a word-formation element with stable semantics denoting a place intended for a particular purpose and is easily extended to new realities (internetxona, kompyuterxona). Beyond its lexical function, this model reflects a culturally specific way of conceptualizing social space through functional categorization. The lexeme choyxona denotes not merely a place for drinking tea but a stable social institution associated with communal interaction, which has no direct counterpart in Russian culture.

Another culturally marked model is the pattern $N + -iston$, realized both in toponyms (O'zbekiston, Qozog'iston) and in metaphorical formations such as jahliston and mozoriston, where abstract social states are conceptualized as spatially organized "countries". Such constructions are characteristic of early twentieth-century educational and reformist discourse and perform an ideological function through spatial metaphor.

Agricultural vocabulary (paxtachilik, chorvachilik, bog'dorchilik) reflects the traditional agrarian orientation of Uzbek culture, in which activity is conceptualized as a socially significant and institutionally sustained practice. Izafet constructions such as temiryo'l and yer-suv are characterized by high semantic transparency and a preference for functionally clear nominations without expressive coloring.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that in Russian incorporation primarily serves terminological and professional nomination, while expressive and evaluative functions remain secondary. In Uzbek, incorporation is oriented toward bodily, functional, and spatial conceptualization, with evaluative meanings largely absent. These differences reflect contrasting cultural orientations: a rational-analytical and partially axiologized perspective in Russian, and a somatocentric, functionally structured worldview in Uzbek.

Thus, incorporation emerges as a universal mechanism of linguistic compression that simultaneously functions as a cultural marker, revealing dominant modes of conceptualization and national and cultural priorities characteristic of each linguistic community.

REFERENCES

1. Kim, Marina A., Ostanov, Rashid Erkinzhonovich. Problema lingvisticheskogo opredeleniya termina

“inkorporatsiya”. Russkii yazyk i literatura v sovremennom mire, 2025, no. 1. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/problema-lingvisticheskogo-opredeleniya-termina-inkorporatsiya> (accessed 18 January 2026).

2. Murav'eva, Irina A. Tipologiya inkorporatsii. Doctoral dissertation in Philology. Moscow, 2004. 286 p.
3. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 242 p.
4. Mithun, M. Incorporation. In: Morphologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 916–928.
5. Sapir, E. The problem of noun incorporation in American languages. American Anthropologist, 1911, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 250–282. DOI: 10.1525/aa.1911.13.2.02a00060.