

Presentation date: January, 2023, **Date of acceptance:** March, 2023, **Publication date:** May, 2023

33

THE DIFFICULTIES OF LEARNING RUSSIAN LANGUAGE ON THE EXAMPLE OF STUDYING THE CONFLICTOGENIC POTENTIAL OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

LAS DIFICULTADES DE APRENDER EL LENGUAJE RUSO EN EL EJEMPLO DEL ESTUDIO DEL POTENCIAL CONFLICTOGENICO DE LAS UNIDADES FRASEOLOGICAS

Liudmila Babina¹

E-mail: ludmila-babina@yandex.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1205-1075>

¹ Derzhavin Tambov State University, Russia.

Suggested citation (APA, seventh edition)

Babina, L. (2023). The difficulties of learning russian language on the example of studying the conflictogenic potential of phraseological units. *Revista Conrado*, 19(92), 290-296.

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the conflictogenic potential of the Russian phraseological units (PUs) by identifying the PUs with a negative connotation, which can convey a negative attitude towards other participants in communication and can be used as a verbal insult, provoking the development of an existing conflict. The author identifies the lexical categories that make up such PUs. The phraseological units, that make up the lexical categories “intellectual abilities”, “character”, are analyzed by describing the cognitive models that determine their creation. It is revealed that PUs of the category “intellectual abilities” are created according to metaphonymic, metaphoric and metonymic cognitive models, PUs of the category “character” - according to metaphoric cognitive models. The article shows that not only PUs with a negative connotation have a certain conflictogenic potential, since in some contexts the positive connotation of PUs can be neutralized, and PUs with a neutral connotation can take on a negative connotation.

Keywords:

Phraseological units, Russian language, conflictogenic potential, cognitive models, functioning.

RESUMEN

El artículo trata sobre el potencial conflictivo de las unidades fraseológicas (UP) rusas al identificar las UP con connotación negativa, que pueden transmitir una actitud negativa hacia otros participantes en la comunicación y pueden usarse como un insulto verbal, provocando el desarrollo de una ya existente. conflicto. El autor identifica las categorías léxicas que componen dichas UP. Las unidades fraseológicas que componen las categorías léxicas “habilidades intelectuales”, “carácter”, se analizan describiendo los modelos cognitivos que determinan su creación. Se revela que las PU de la categoría “habilidades intelectuales” se crean de acuerdo con modelos cognitivos metafonímicos, metafóricos y metonímicos, las PU de la categoría “carácter” - de acuerdo con modelos cognitivos metafónicos. El artículo muestra que no solo las PU con connotación negativa tienen cierto potencial conflictivo, ya que en algunos contextos la connotación positiva de las PU puede neutralizarse, y las PU con connotación neutra pueden adquirir una connotación negativa.

Palabras clave:

Unidades fraseológicas, lengua rusa, potencial conflictivo, modelos cognitivos, funcionamiento.

INTRODUCTION

The interaction of people, unfortunately, is impossible without contradictions and even clashes that arise in almost all spheres of human life, therefore the concept of “conflict” is used in various fields of knowledge in which conflict is studied from certain angles: a definition of conflict and a conflict situation is proposed, types of conflicts, their causes, ways of overcoming and many other problems.

By now, the conflict has received sufficient understanding in the works of linguists. Turning to the analysis of the conflict, they note that the beginning of the conflict requires a communicative contact of at least two participants whose behavior is determined by a complex of both external (social) and internal (psychological) factors, which can be considered as the first parameter characterizing the causes and nature of the conflict. When considering the conflict from a psychological perspective, the emphasis is placed on the personal properties of an individual, according to which the choice of personality behavior is made. However, it is important to take into account social factors that also determine the behavior of an individual, since they create conditions for the manifestation of certain personality traits. The second parameter can be language and speech, which are also correlated as phenomena of external and internal order. The language, being common to speakers of the same language, creates conditions for understanding those who communicate, while speech is individual, unique, and represents a process in which there is a place for creative use of language resources. Both language and speech are characterized by properties that contribute to the ambiguous interpretation of a speech message (for example, lexical and grammatical ambiguity, homonymy, dynamism, variability, and others). This, in turn, can “lead to misunderstanding, undesirable emotional effects, tension in speech communication, which are signals of speech conflict” (Tretyakova, 2009). According to the researchers, conflict communication is largely due to the wrong choice of language means aimed at the communication partner, the speaker’s inability to adequately convey the content of the message so as to meet the expectations of the interlocutor, etc.

The correct selection of language means in the process of intercultural communication is especially important, the success of which is due to the effective conceptual interaction of communication participants (Boldyrev, 2022). In this regard, one of the tasks of studying conflict-free language communication is to identify potentially conflicting language means, which include PUs that allow not only to interpret reality figuratively, but also to convey emotions in the process of communication.

PUs are able to reflect the collective knowledge of a nation, its social experience, historical development, culture, traditions, and beliefs, therefore they invariably arouse the interest of researchers who consider different facets of this linguistic phenomenon: structure, meaning, motivation, evolution and many others.

Within the framework of cognitively oriented studies, PUs are analyzed in order to understand how individual and collective mentality, ideology and culture are reflected in language. On the one hand, attention is paid to the analysis of PUs as a means of reflecting the worldview of a certain people. For example, Gutiérrez Rubio (2018), tries to identify the peculiarities of the conceptualization of the passing of time for men and women as reflected in Spanish phraseology. He comes to the conclusion that although the conceptualization of the passing of time is based on the spatial metaphor of TIME IS SPACE, the notion of the passing of time is conceptualized in two different ways for women and men through the prism of PUs. According to Spanish idioms, the life of men can be represented as a line on which two opposite, isolated periods are distinguished – incomplete childhood and full maturity. Women’s conceptualization of the passing of time is more like a continuous line that becomes a “forked” path shortly after women leave childhood behind, which is determined by whether *“they find a husband, being able to fulfill their main task in life as mothers and homemakers, or they do not, ending up alone and useless to society.”* (p. 13).

On the other hand, scientists, investigating how the attitude of a certain people to the surrounding world is transmitted through PUs, and how, on the contrary, society identifies its national consciousness through PUs, serving as a kind of “mirror” in which a special vision of the world is reflected, are trying to understand how the phraseology of one language correlates with the phraseology of other languages. Goshkheteliani (2013), conducting a study on the material of PUs with somaticisms in Georgian and English, shows that many phraseological units are universal in meaning and have equivalents in other languages. This indicates a certain universality of the phraseological worldview and the interpenetration of images of different cultures, including due to the existence of close cultural ties between peoples. For example, Hudcovičová’s article analyzes the lexical and grammatical structure of idioms borrowed into English from the French language, reveals the degree of influence of the French language on the English language in the diachronic aspect (Hudcovičová, 2020).

At the same time, PUs are considered as original linguistic signs that reveal the cultural characteristics and creativity of a nation, which is characterized by its

own way of thinking, its behavior and value system. For example, Zinovieva & Alyoshin (2015), consider Russian and Swedish PUs, characterizing the manner of human speech. The authors conclude that the lack of an equivalent of the Russian PU in the Swedish language is not due to the difference in the system of etalon images (for example, in both languages, a person's verbose loud speech is compared to objects making loud noises), but to the fact that in different linguistic cultures different features of etalon images come into focus, which is determined by the established tradition (for example, the common comparison etalon – a parrot in Russian serves to characterize a person repeating the same thing, and in Swedish – a chatterbox).

PUs perform an emotional and evaluative function, since they express people's worldview, their imaginative vision of the world. PUs transmitting a negative connotation often prevail over PUs transmitting a positive connotation, which is noted in the above-mentioned articles, as well as in the article by Szerszunowicz (2012), in which evaluative connotations of English and Italian idioms containing anthroponyms are analyzed in order to determine the means of evaluation implemented in PUs and to represent the typology of interlanguage equivalents of the PUs units under consideration. One of the explanations for this phenomenon is that it is typical for a person to indicate a deviation from the norm, which is evaluated negatively, while the norm is taken for granted. Since the use of PUs is one of the components of intercultural dialogue, allowing the participant of communication to express his/her vision of the world, attitude to other people, to make communication creative, it is important to be able to use PUs correctly. When using PUs, it is necessary to take into account, among other things, their conflictogenic potential, determined by the presence of negative connotations in PUs, and also to understand that even the positive connotation inherent in a PU can be neutralized in a certain context. It is important to take this into account so that situations leading to misunderstanding or even conflict do not arise in the process of intercultural interaction.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of this article is to consider the conflictogenic potential of Russian PUs, which must be taken into account in the process of intercultural communication. Achieving this goal involves solving the following tasks: 1) identification of Russian PUs with negative connotations that characterize a person, the use of which in communication indicates a complex relationship between communication participants, and the use as a verbal insult can provoke the development of a conflict situation; 2) description of contexts in which the positive connotation of PUs is neutralized, and the neutral

connotation changes into a negative one. The article also analyzes the cognitive models by which the considered language units are created, defines some lexical categories, the components of which are language units with negative connotations.

METHODOLOGY

The research uses methods of conceptual and definitional analysis, cognitive modeling, elements of etymological analysis, contextual analysis. In the implementation of cognitive modeling, the author relies on the works by Lakoff & Johnson (2003); Goossens (2003); Radden (2018); and Ruiz de Mendoza (2020).

The practical significance of the work is determined by the fact that its results may be useful in the study of lexicology of the Russian language, Russian as a foreign language.

DEVELOPMENT

The study has shown that Russian PUs with negative connotations can belong to the lexical categories of "appearance", "intellectual ability", "character", "behaviour" and "status". These language units are created according to a number of cognitive models, making it possible to convey a disapproving or condescending attitude of those who use them to those people who are characterized by these units. Often, the use of the PUS in direct address to the interlocutor contributes to the development of conflict, which indicates their conflictogenic potential. Let us turn to the analysis of PUs of two lexical categories: "intellectual ability" and "character".

The lexical category "**intellectual ability**" includes the PUs naming a person of low intellectual ability, which are formed according to metaphonymic, metaphoric and metonymic cognitive models.

Metaphonymic cognitive models.

HUMAN BEING ← PLANT and PART - WHOLE: golová elóvaja "(pl. not used) colloq., a stupid, dumb person" (Larionova, 2014, p. 113), dubóvaja golová (bashká) "(pl. not used). colloq., a dumb, stupid person" (Larionova, 2014, p. 149), etc. Spruce and oak are hard woods, difficult to process. In a figurative meaning it means that a person who has a "spruce or oak head" is difficult to learn new things.

(1) - *Dura, **dubovaja golova!** -- serdito progovoril Matvej: -- ne mogla uzh vo-vremja domoj ego zaluchit'!*

- *Ty umen! -- voskliknula zadetaja za zhivoe Praskov'ja. -- Prihodil by da zaluchal. On tam po kabakam shljaetsja, a ja tut vse dogljadi da pospej /-* Stupid, **blockhead!**

- Matvey said angrily, "You couldn't have got him home in time, could you?"

- You are clever! -- Praskovia exclaimed, "You should have come and taken him home. You're out there in the pubs, and I'm here to keep an eye on him."

In example (1) the speaker, along with the PU, uses a synonymous word *dura* "a stupid woman" (<https://dic.academic.ru>), thus offending his female interlocutor and provoking conflicting communication.

HUMAN BEING ← ARTEFACT and PART - WHOLE: *golová sadóvaja* "(pl. not used). colloq., disapproving, an unimaginative, inattentive person" (Larionova, 2014, p. 115), *mjakinnaja golova* "colloq. a stupid person" (<https://phraseology.academic.ru>), *tolokónnyj lob* "a dumb, stupid person" (Larionova, 2014, p. 419), *mednyj lob* "scornful, a stupid and senselessly stubborn person" (<https://rusphraseology-dict.slovaronline.com>), etc.

When understanding the first PU, we should bear in mind that in the olden days, a garden scarecrow with a cabbage or pumpkin instead of a head, or sometimes an empty pot, was called *golová sadóvaja*. To understand the second PU, you need to know that chaff is the waste that remains after the threshing and cleaning of cereal grains and some other crops, a person with *mjakinnaja golova* has a head instead of brains filled with something extraneous. Knowledge of history is required to understand the third PU, namely that *tolokno* in Russia was called flour, but not ordinary flour, and that which was obtained by grinding with a pounder (most often from oats). It turns out that *tolokónnyj lob* is a forehead stuffed with flour.

(2) — *Jeto chto za fil'kina gramota? Vy chto, golova sado-vaja, podpisivaete? — sprosil on menja.*

— *Vy v teatral'nyh delah nichego ne ponimaete, stalo byt', i ne govorite! — rasserdilsja i ja /-* What kind of a piece of paper is this? Are you **a cabbagehead** signing it? - he asked me.

- You don't know anything about the theatre, so don't tell me! - I, too, got angry!

In example (2), addressing the interlocutor using the PU *golová sadóvaja* causes irritation and a negative reaction of the latter.

HUMAN BEING ← ANIMAL and PART - WHOLE: *kurinye mozgi, ptich'i mozgi* "limited, shallow, weak mind".

Metaphoric cognitive models.

HUMAN BEING ← ARTIFACT: *dubina stoerósovaja* "(pl. not used). often used as an appeal to a person, colloq., a fool, a stupid man" (PDMRL, 2014, p. 148), *pen' berezovyj*

"colloq., scornful, fool, mutt, dumbass" (<https://phraseology.academic.ru>), *pen' s glazami* "a stupid man", *churka negovorjashhaja, churka s glazami, churka s ushami* "a stupid man".

(3) *Hrapov ustanovil ego: — Stoj ty, dubina stoerosovaja! Nu, chego ty melesh'? Net, izmuchilsja ja s tobój sovsem. Ty hot' pozhalet by ... — Ty chto — shutish' ili smeesh'sja? — I ne dumaju shutit' ili smejat'sja, tem bolee nad tobój, moja dorogaja. — Chto zhe znachit — vyzovu doktora?*

I, ne zhelaja zatrudnjat' sebja bol'she, on obratilsja ko mne:

— *A nu-ka, smazh' emu razok po kartochke. Da po-nas-tojashhemu, smotri! /Khrapov stopped him: "Stop, you stupid bastard! What are you talking about? No, I've had enough of you. You should at least be sorry... - Are you joking or laughing? - I don't think I'm joking or laughing, especially not at you, my dear. - What do you mean by "call a doctor"?"*

He didn't want to make it any more difficult, so he turned to me:

- Slap him in the face. Truly, look!/
/

In example (3) the speaker uses the PU to convey his anger at the fact that his efforts have been wasted. He is quite aggressive, trying to convince another participant of the communication to take active actions of a negative nature.

HUMAN BEING ← HUMAN BEING: *otpetyj durak* "a hopelessly stupid, incorrigibly stupid person", in the PU a foolish person is likened to a dead person over whom a funeral rite has been performed.

The metonymic cognitive model PART - WHOLE: *dur'ja golova* "(pl. not used). colloq., a fool, a foolish man", *golova [ij] dva uha* "colloq., disapproving, an unintelligent person, not distinguished by intelligence". When comprehending the second PU, it is necessary to take into account that the emphasis is on the presence of external signs of the human head in the absence of content.

(4) — *Zdorovo u vas delo postavleno! — On okidyvaet menja nasmeshlivo-prenebrezhitel'nyim vzgljadom. — Jeh, golova — dva uha! Nu kakoe zh ot tebja mozhet byt' so-dejstvie?.. Zakuriv, on vyhodit iz zemljanki, no skoro vozvrashhaetsja i, potiraja ruki, dovol'nyj, soobshhaet: — Jeh, i nochka budet — kak na zakaz!.. /— You have a great job! He gives me a mocking, dismissive look. — Eh, a **head — two ears!** Well, what kind of assistance can there be from you?.. Having lit a cigarette, he leaves the dugout, but soon returns and, rubbing his hands, happy, reports: — Eh, and the night will be — as to order!*

In example (4), a mock-dismissive attitude towards one of the communication participants is conveyed with the help of the PU.

The lexical category “character” consists of PUs with negative connotations, which are formed according to metaphoric cognitive models. It should be mentioned that it is often quite difficult to unambiguously classify PUs either to the lexical category “character” or to the lexical category “behaviour”, as a person’s mental properties determine his/her behaviour.

Metaphoric cognitive models.

HUMAN BEING ← ANIMAL: *mókraya kúrica* “(pl. not used). colloq., disapproving, sometimes scornful, a characterless person” (Larionova, 2014, p. 216), *gad polzuchij* “abusive, a wicked, nasty person” (Fedorov, 2008).

(5) *U vysshego jeshelona byli lichnye prichiny ne lju-bit’ Hrushheva. <...> Obrashhajas’ k tovarishham po prezidiumu CK, v vyrazhenijah ne stesnjalsja: — Durak, bezdel’nik, lentjaj, grjaznaja muha, mokraja kurica, der’mo... /The upper echelon had personal reasons not to like Khrushchev. <...> Addressing his comrades on the Presidium of the Central Committee, he did not hesitate in expressions: — A fool, a loafer, a lazy, dirty man, a **characterless person**, shit .../*

In example (5) the PU *mókraya kúrica*, used in combination with other words and expressions with negative connotations, conveys the indignation and contemptuous attitude of one of the communicators towards his subordinates. The coarse language is used by the speaker for his own emotional discharge, which is disapproved by his subordinates, who do not directly express their attitude towards their superior’s behaviour.

HUMAN BEING ← HUMAN BEING: *rýcar’ na chas* “boorish, a weak-willed person, incapable of a long struggle for noble goals” (Larionova, 2014, p. 358), *babaskvernavka* “obsolete, abusive, a characteristic of an indecisive, unreliable person” (Fedorov, 2008). It is interesting to note that the source of the first expression is the title of N.A. Nekrasov’s poem “Knight for an Hour”, which reflects the inner hesitation of a man who believes that he could not bring any significant benefit to people.

HUMAN BEING ← PLANT: *staryj hren* “abusive expression about an evil, harmful old man”, an elderly man is compared to a gnarled horseradish root, wrinkled like an old man’s skin, which by the age of 3 is gaining acidity.

HUMAN BEING ← ARTEFACT: *staraja perechnica* “colloq., low, a grumpy old woman” (<https://dic.academic.ru>), the sarcasticness and wickedness of an old woman

corresponds to the sharpness of pepper. The PU, as well as the above-mentioned one, conveys the idea not only of the character, but also of the external qualities of the person.

As the analysis shows, the conflictogenic potential of the considered PUs is realized by the participants of communication and is consciously used, in almost all cases causing dissatisfaction and negative reaction of their interlocutors.

However, it is not only the PUs with negative connotations that have a conflictogenic potential. It is necessary to carefully use the PUs describing people and take into account the following points so that there is no misunderstanding in the process of intercultural communication:

1) Some of PUs, being polysemous, have a positive connotation in one meaning and a negative connotation in another one. For example, *agnec Bozhij* “1) a clean, pure, meek person who meets all the religious commandments (jokingly); 2) a person who only pretends to be a lamb (ironically)”.

(6) *A v Tuluze ja sbezhal, kogda uslyshal, kak s vami razgovarivaet Al’bert Romual’dovich. — Mne dostavilo udovol’sstvie pozlit’ byvshego bossa. Pust’ pobesitsja. — Nu da, ponjatnoe Ty nichego ne znaesh’ i chist, kak agnec bozhij. Kto tebe zaplatil, merzavec? Nazovi summu, i ja dam bol’she. U tebja net ni odnogo shansa uji /And in Toulouse I ran away when I heard Albert Romualdovich talking to you. — It gave me pleasure to annoy the former boss. Let him get mad. — Well, yes, of course You don’t know anything and are as pure as **the lamb of God**. Who paid you, you bastard? Name the amount and I’ll give you more. You don’t have a single chance to leave.*

In example (6) the PU *agnec bozhij* is used in its second meaning to convey the negative attitude, even aggression, of one of the communicators towards the person who is characterized by the PU in the comparative construction and later called a bastard.

2) in some contexts, the positive connotation of PU can be neutralized:

- because of the ironic use of PU. For example, *vol’naja ptica* “colloq., express., a free, independent person” (<https://dic.academic.ru>).

(7) *Prijatelej svoih Ivan smeshil uzhasno objazatel’nost’ju jetoj i otvetstvennost’ju. Dendi, k pen’kam ego, neispravim. Tak vyjasnilos’, chto prijatelej u Ivana mnogo, a druga-to i net. No vot Ivan **vol’naja ptica**. Rabotat’ ne hočet, zhit’ tozhe. Hočet vkusno est’, valjat’sja na tjoplom pesochke i zabyvat’sja v krugovorote grjoz. Nu i budu tak zhit’ / Ivan*

made his friends laugh terribly with this commitment and responsibility. Dandy, to his stumps, is incorrigible. So, it turned out that Ivan had many pals, but no friend. But Ivan is a **free bird**. He doesn't want to work; he doesn't want to live. He wants to eat good food, lie on a warm sand and forget himself in a cycle of dreams. Well, I'll live like that.

In example (7), the PU *vol'naja ptica* is used with sad irony, since we are talking about a hero who does not want to work, does not want to be beholden to someone, but wants to live for his pleasure, his dreams.

- due to the simultaneous realization of the figurative and direct meanings of one of the words of PU, leading to the destruction of the metaphorical image on which the metaphor is built. For example, *shirokaja natura* "colloq., express., the man is not petty, open, generous in all his manifestations".

(8) — *Mozhno u vas perenochevat'?*

— *Strannyj vopros! — rasserdilsja starik. — V gostinice net ni dushi. Vybiraite ljuboj nomer. S al'kovom ili bez al'kova. Esli u vas shirokaja natura, to mozheteh zhit' odin v dvuh nomerah. Ili v treh. I pri jetom sovershenno besplatno. Gratis!* /- Can I sleep here tonight?

- What a strange question! - the old man got angry. - There is not a soul in the inn. You may choose any room. With or without an alcove. If you are a **generous spirit**, you may have two rooms to yourself. Or three. And it's completely free. Gratis!

In example (8), the PU is used in such a way that the figurative meaning "not constrained in the manifestation, in the detection of something, in a big way" and the direct meaning of the adjective *shirokaja* "having a large extension, covering a large space" are played out.

- because of the ambiguous interpretation of PU. For example, *zolotye ruki* "express., a master, skilled in his craft".

(9) *Vmeste s tem pansionat — polnocennaja usad'ba, s nebol'shim svinarnikom, dajushhim na kuhnju neskol'ko tonn horoshego mjasa, s parnikami, so shvejnymi masterskimi, s klumbami i gazonami, za odnim, osobenno krasivym, revnostno sledit baba Katja (zolotye ruki, dvenadcat' sudimostej po karmannym delam)* /At the same time, the boarding house is a full-fledged farmstead, with a small pigsty providing several tons of good meat for the kitchen, with greenhouses, with sewing workshops, with flowerbeds and lawns, one, especially beautiful, is jealously looked after by Baba Katya (**golden hands**, twelve convictions for pickpocketing).

In example (9), the PU *zolotye ruki* can be attributed both to the linguistic means by which the character's ability to

handle plants is described, and the skills of theft, which causes irony.

- due to the use of PU in a negative construction, which leads to the denial of the presence of the quality or property that is transmitted by PU. For example, *semi pjadej vo Ibu* "a very intelligent, highly capable person".

(10) *Ili, vozmozhno, russoistskij tip — estestvennoe, ne isporchennoe knizhnoj kul'turoj sushhestvo; ladnyj da skladnyj, foto-i telegenichnyj, odnako posredstvenno obrazovannyj i voobshhe ne semi pjadej vo Ibu paren', u kotorogo, pozhaluj, luchshe, chem u prochih, poluchalos' skalit' zuby da po-derevenski aplodirovat' v otvet na aplodismenty; inymi slovami, «takoj sebe odin iz Sharikovyh jetogo mira — dvornjaga»? /Or, perhaps, the Russophile type - a natural, unspoilt by bookish culture; a well-built, photogenic and telegenic, but mediocredly educated and generally not a genius guy, who was perhaps better than the others at baring his teeth and clapping back applause in a village way; in other words, "one of the Sharikovs of this world - a mongrel"?*

In example (10), the presence of outstanding qualities in the person in question is denied, and the author's ironic attitude is generally read.

- because of the use of female-descriptive PU in relation to men. For example, *carevna nesmejana* "folk, about a quiet, modest woman".

(11) *Teper' oni dazhe raskaivalis', chto kogda-to vosprepjatstvovali ego zhenit'be: mozhet byt', hot' jeto kak-to obereglo by ego ot liha, — no chto bylo nynche govorit'? Tezkin sidel na divane, kak carevna-nesmejana, i na lice u nego bylo krasnorechivo napisano: chto volja, chto nevolja... / Now they even repented that they had once prevented his marriage: maybe, at least, it would have somehow protected him from evil-but what was there to say today? Tezkin was sitting on the sofa like a **princess-not laughing**, and on his face, it was eloquently written: what is will, what is bondage.*

In example (11) the behaviour of the male character is compared to that of a girl, which allows the ironic attitude of the author to be conveyed.

3) PUs with neutral connotations can acquire negative meanings, since the qualities and properties described by them can be evaluated negatively in some situations, as evidenced by the example below. Let's illustrate what has been said with the help of PU *belaja kost'*.

Belaja kost' "a privileged person who comes from a noble family, a nobleman, an aristocrat" (Larionova, 2014, p. 17).

(12) — *odnovremenko s nej drugaja. — I da i net! — usmehnulsja Egor i kriknul vdrug gromko i zlobno: — Burzhuazija... belaja kost'!* Dumaete, chto raz baby, tak na vas i upravny net?.. A, sukiny docheri!.. I on, vyhvativ obojmu, stal zakladyvat' ee v magazinuju korobku /- at the same time

as the other one. - And yes and no! - Yegor grinned and shouted suddenly loudly and angrily: “Bourgeoisie... **blue blood!** Do you think that just because you’re women, you can’t be dealt with...? You sons of bitches!... And he took out a clip and started to put it in the magazine box.

In example (12), the PU *belaja kost’* loses its neutral connotation as it is used by a person who feels class hatred, which is also conveyed by the PU *sukiny docheri*. *Sukina dochka* “colloq., obsolete, abusive, about a woman who arouses anger, resentment”.

The conducted research allows us to conclude that PUs with negative connotations may constitute such lexical categories as “intellectual abilities” and “character”. PUs of the lexical category “intellectual abilities” are created according to metaphonymic models, metaphoric models (HUMAN BEING ← ARTEFACT, HUMAN BEING ← HUMAN BEING) and the metonymic model PART - WHOLE. The metaphoric models HUMAN BEING ← PLANT, HUMAN BEING ← ARTEFACT, HUMAN BEING ← ANIMAL, as well as the metonymic model PART - WHOLE are used within the metaphonymic models. Several metaphoric models (HUMAN BEING ← ANIMAL, HUMAN BEING ← HUMAN BEING, HUMAN BEING ← ARTEFACT, HUMAN BEING ← PLANT) are used to create PUs of the lexical category “character”.

CONCLUSIONS

In the study, the PUs of these categories have a conflictogenic potential, as their use serves as a sign of an incipient conflict between the participants of communication or allows conveying the speaker’s negative attitude towards his/her interlocutor when the conflict has already flared up. Teaching foreign students the Russian language, it is necessary to give an idea that the lexical categories “intellectual abilities”, “character” include such PUs with a conflictogenic potential, the use of which is desirable to avoid.

In addition, it should be taken into account that even PUs with positive connotations have a certain conflictogenic potential, functioning in certain contexts in which they acquire an ironic overtones. It is also important to remember that the connotation of a PU depends on the meaning in which it is used, about the ability of PUs with neutral connotations to convey negative connotations due to the fact that the qualities of a person designated by them can be evaluated both positively and negatively.

The research is financially supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant (project No. N° 22-18-00067, <https://rscf.ru/project/22-18-00067/>).

REFERENCES

- Boldyrev, N.N. (2022). Conceptual interaction as a factor of conflict-free language communication. *Cognitive studies of language*, 3(50), 31-36.
- Fedorov, A.I. (2008). *Phraseological Dictionary of The Russian Language*. <https://rus-phraseology-dict.slovaonline.com>
- Goossens, L. (2003). Metaphonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. In, R. Dirven y R. Porings (eds.). *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. (pp. 349-377). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goshkheteliani, I. (2013). Idioms in Cross-cultural Communication. *Research on Phraseology Across Continents*, 2, 19-36.
- Gutiérrez Rubio, E. (2018). Conceptualization and representation of the passing of time in Spanish phraseology: A gender study. *Topics in Linguistics*, 19(1), 1-17.
- Hudcovičová, M. (2020). French idioms borrowed into the English language. *Linguistic, Literary and Didactic Colloquium*, 9, 10-21.
- Larionova, Yu.A. (2014). *Phraseological Dictionary of The Modern Russian Language (PDMRL)*. Adelant.
- Radden, G. (2018). Molly married money: Cognitive Foundations of Language Structure and Use. In K. U. Panther and G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought*. (pp. 161-182). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ruiz De Mendoza Ibáñez, F.J. (2020). Understanding figures of speech: Dependency relations and organizational patterns. *Language & Communication*, 71, 16-38.
- Szerszunowicz, J. (2012). On the Evaluative Connotations of Anthroponymic Idioms in a Contrastive Perspective (Based on English and Italian). Białostockie Archiwum Językowe. NR12. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku. https://www.academia.edu/20283778/On_the_Evaluative_Connotations_of_Anthroponymic_Idioms_in_a_Contrastive_Perspective_Based_on_English_and_Italian
- Tretyakova, V.S. (2009). *Speech communication: harmony and conflict*. Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University.
- Zinovieva, E., & Alyoshin, A. (2015). Russian and Swedish stable comparisons characterizing the manner of human speech. *Linguo-cultural research on phraseology*, 3, 485-500.