

PUBLIC VS PRIVATE: DIGRESSION OF EDWARD II'S ROYAL DISCOURSE

The article presents the analysis of the pragmalinguistic peculiarities of the digression of Edward II's royal discourse. The linguistic representations of notions of public and private as well as of Passion and Reason in the king's passionate speech are juxtaposed. With the help of speech act theory it is determined that the most prominent features of Edward's royal discourse are directives, expressives and commissives, whose semantic and syntactic content changes depending on the recipient of the message and the intention of the speaker. The article poses a question about the efficiency of a ruler who is overwhelmed with dangerous emotions and private matters and who because of this neglects his public duties and fails as a king. Because any literary text is a communicative situation and language is the means of expressing the characters' feelings, it became possible to make assumptions about Edward II's emotional state judging by his speech. The article also concentrates on the importance of language, which performs the role of the medium between the author of a text and a reader and allows a deeper insight into the analyzed text.

Key words: pragmatics; discourse; speech act theory; directives; expressives; commissives; dangerous emotions; passion.

The most popular and the latest Marlowe's play, *Edward II* is generally agreed to be his most mature work, which unites the features of history play, tragedy, and love story in one text [10, p. 307]. Inspired by Holinshed's Chronicle, *Edward II* presents «the comparatively unattractive reign of Edward II» from a new perspective [2, p. 54]. Due to the concentration on the relationship between the King and Gaveston the story gained a new life and aroused public interest to the events, which happened at the very beginning of the 14th century. The language and its means used masterfully to create the image of one of the most passionate men of Elizabethan theatre, also helped the author of the tragedy to transfer emotions the story evokes and make it appealing to the readership. It is language, which gives another life to historical personalities, who were buried in chronicles and who due to Marlowe's imagination were raised from the past and got their voice. Success and uniqueness of the play is also explained by the intimization of the story, which shifts the accent from Edward the ruler to Edward the human being, who is prone to passion and imperfections, inherent in human nature. Christine Edwards claims that Marlowe managed to create an «uncomfortable vision of reason and passion», which makes the play ambivalent and contro-versial. Both public duty and personal fulfillment become equally relevant in the play [4, p. 57]. Marlowe created the tragedy of human passion, which results in weakness and vulnerability, which monarchs are supposed to be free from.

The article deals with pragmalinguistic representations of emotions, which determine Edward's behavior and his speech, examines the interrelation between the structural,

semantic, and pragmatic components of the royal discourse and feelings of the passionate man, and investigates the confrontation of reason and passion which causes the digression of the king's utterances.

Bradbrook rightly pointed out that Edward II is the most passionate of Marlowe's characters [3, p. 154]. But the passion he is experiencing in the play is of two different natures. The first one is related to the affection for Gaveston, the second one shows his lust for power. Depending on what becomes the object of the discussion, Edward's discourse as well as speech tools he uses change. He is a dominant, strict and uncompromising ruler with his barons, an aggressive, indifferent and aloof husband in rare conversations with Isabella, but in dialogues with Gaveston he is a loving and caring man, who, because of the feelings, lets the favourite take over and becomes led by him («*What, Gaveston ! welcome ! — Kiss not my hand,/ Embrace me, Gaveston, as I do thee./ Why shouldst thou kneel? Knowest thou not who I am?/ Thy friend, thyself, another Gaveston! / Not Hylas was more mow'd of Hercules,/ Than thou hast been of me since thy exile*» (l.i.140–145).

Besides the emotional peculiarities of Edward II's utterances the vividness of the digression of royal discourse can be best illustrated with the help of speech act theory and syntactic structures. The most typical and frequently used feature of the king's lines— directives and their main structural representation imperatives — become one of the most eloquent for the analysis. Searle defines directives as the speaker's «attempts to get the hearer to do something», which semantically may be decoded in

«order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat, and also invite, permit, and advise» [7, p. 11]. In *Edward II* directives, first of all, help to create an image of an ardent ruler, who disregarding his duties uses reign to please his favourite. In the play on the syntactic level directives are represented mostly by imperatives, which, aside from their diverse semantics, primarily stand for power, authority, hierarchy and force. Edward II uses imperatives for many reasons, but in each case such syntactic structure reflects his believe in his legal right to rule, thus give orders. Although, vested with power, Edward II uses monarchical privileges not to govern the country, but for private matters.

What becomes vivid at the very beginning of the play is that Edward II has two modes of speech: sharpen and detached – for barons and Isabella, mild and pleasing – for Gaveston. Especially this distinction is reflected in directives, which, depending on the addressee of the utterance, are changed not only on the level of semantics, but also on the level of pragmatic function of the given speech. Talking to barons and Isabella, Edward II uses imperatives to demonstrate his power («*Throw off his golden mitre, rend his stole, / And in the channel christen him anew*» (I.i.187–188), «*Fawn not on me, French strumpet; get thee gone*» (I.iv.145), but in conversations with Gaveston imperatives display the king's caring and mentoring tone. They help to show how much Edward is ready to give to Gaveston and how much he means for the king («*No, spare his life, but seize upon his goods: / Be thou lord bishop and receive his rents, / And make him serve thee as thy chaplain: / I give him thee—here, use him as thou wilt*» (I.i.193–196). Moreover, in Edward's dialogues with peers imperatives perform the function of threat, order, or command, while pragmatic meaning of the same linguistic device in conversations with Gaveston suggests personal request, allowance, and invitation (I.i.141; I.i.161–162; I.i.166–170).

Edward also uses imperatives, as he names it himself, «to honour» Gaveston, to place him on the same level as he is on or even above himself («*Your grace doth well to place him by your side, / For nowhere else the new earl is so safe*» (I.iv.10–11). Gaveston, who is «*base and obscure*» (I.i.101), «*wicked*» (I.i.177), «*hateful*» (I.iv.33) and what is more «*villain... that hardly art a gentlemen by birth*» (I.iv.29) to barons, is «*sweet*» (I.i.161), «*dearest*» (I.iv.73, III.ii.2), «*poor*» friend (II.ii.218), and «*lovely Pierce*» (III.ii.8) to Edward II. The barons' hatred to Gaveston is enhanced by his low birth («*basely born*» (I.iv.402) and by «his foreign fashions and airs» [2, p. 53]. None of these bothers the king at all. To quiet barons and to please Gaveston Edward II gifts his favourite with numerous titles («*I here create thee Lord High Chamberlain, / Chief Secretary to the state and me, / Earl of Cornwall, King and Lord of Man*» (I.i.154–156).

In such situations Edward also uses his power to protect Gaveston from the baron's accusations and attacks. In conversation with Mortimer the king saying «*you shall know / What danger 'tis to stand against your king*» (I.i.96–97) uses a directive utterance to threaten the subordinate. And this is not an isolated instance. Later in the play Edward II threatens to kill Warwick for not obeying his will («*Stay, or ye shall die*» (I.iv.24), to stoop peers

for raising a riot against Gaveston («*I'll make the proudest of you stoop to him*» (I.iv.31) and to destroy the court for exiling his favourite («*If I be king, not one of them shall live*» (I.iv.105).

Christine Edwards calls the king's actions Marlowe's attempt to raise a debate about «the role of passion, and more specifically, the dangers it can present when combined with power» [4, p. 58]. From her point of view, in the play the author explores the problematic relationship between morbid passion and figures in authority. Moreover, according to the researcher, «by affirming Gaveston's power with titles and gifts, Edward reorders the power structure of the court according to his passions. Consequently, the first representation of passion in the play is not only vicelike, but dangerous to the nation» [4, p. 60]. Protecting the country from the disaster and performing their public duties, barons, who position themselves as rational and patriotic in the first part of the play, struggle with the king's affection and obsession over Gaveston. Though, numerous attempts to remind the king's of his duties (I.iv.39; I.iv.401–419; II.ii.6–10; II.ii.93) are waved by him («*Look to your own heads; his is sure enough*» (II.ii.92).

Carelessness in Edward's behavior, according to Tennov, is caused by «a general intensity of feelings that leaves other concerns in the background» [9, p. 23]. That is why personal matters become more important than the prosperity of the kingdom. This change in priorities is reflected in the language, used by Edward, where directives and imperatives are used not to rule the country, but to express the emotional state of the ruler. Imperatives become one of the most effective means for Edward to convey sadness, disappointment, grief, anger and misery to the audience. Imperatives are also the means of depicting king's stubbornness and readiness to sacrifice the kingdom in order to stay with Gaveston («*Ay, there it goes: but yet I will not yield: / Curse me, depose me, do the worst you can*» (I.iv.56). It is what Edwards calls the domination of passion over the reason, which according to Renaissance thought is an inverted hierarchy, in which «passions – including joy, hope, and love» are not «enchained by Reason», which due to the figure of Divine Grace is provided with the authority and wisdom to control extreme emotions [4, p. 53–54]. That is why in Act 1 Scene IV lines 65–72 Edward's selfish orders lack essential for the governing components – wisdom and the awareness of the public duty. Power becomes for Edward II the means to protect Gaveston and their relationship. That is why directive utterances do not perform their essential function: orders become the object of the private discourse rather than the public one, illustrating that in Edward's case reason is enchained by passion. Expressives become another linguistic device, which helps Marlowe to create the image of a passionate ruler. Searle defines expressives as a category of speech acts, which represents the speaker's psychological state and attitudes and with the help of the paradigm of such expressive verbs as «thank», «congratulate», «apologize», «condole», «deplore», and «welcome» signals the usage of more emotionally saturated utterances [7, p. 12]. Neal Norrick argues that the area of the application of expressives is much broader and suggests adding such

types of illocutionary acts as lamenting (which expresses the speaker's own misfortune), deploring (a highly emotional communicative act of censoring, in which the addressee is criticized for negative actions) and welcoming (when the speaker expresses positive feelings towards the arrival of the addressee) [5, p. 287–289]. Syntactically, expressives can be represented with the help of exclamatory sentences as well as with affirmatives. What defines an expressive utterance is its emotional content, which can be presented not only on the level of structure, but also on the level of semantics and intonation [1, p. 9].

Juan Antonio Prieto Pablos in his article «For the Love of Gaveston: *Edward II* and Audience Response in Elizabethan England» states that Edward's language is highly emotional. The researcher defines it as «a lamentative mode» of utterances, which suggests self-pitying and request for compassion [6, p. 141,143]. Following Norrick's typology of expressives, Edward's emotive utterances can be also classified according to their communicative function. Therefore alongside with lamentative utterances it is just to mention welcoming, deploring, congratulating and thanking modes of Edward's expressives.

From the very beginning of the play Edward's expressive language becomes vivid. The author uses the contrast between the deploring and welcoming modes to show how the king's discourse changes depending on the recipient of the message. In the first utterance pronounced by Edward he clearly defines his dissatisfaction with barons' action saying «*I am displeas'd*» (I.i.79). Furthermore his disappointment is conveyed with the help of the series of questions, whose function is not to get the answer but simply to emphasize the king's discontent and resentment (however, for Steane questions are the proves of Edward's insecurity and impotency [8, p. 220]) («*Will you not grant me this?*» (I.i.77), «*Beseems it thee to contradict thy king?/ Frownst thou thereat, aspiring Lancaster?*» (I.i.92- 93), «*Am I a king, and must be overrul'd?*» (I.i.135), «*What? Are you mov'd that Gaveston sits here?*» (I.iv.8), «*Meet you for this, proud overdaring peers?*» (I.iv.47). But his wrathful speech transforms into the gentle welcoming utterance when Gaveston steps out of his shelter («*What, Gaveston! welcome! – Kiss not my hand,/ Embrace me, Gaveston, as I do thee./ Why shouldst thou kneel? Knowest thou not who I am?/ Thy friend, thyself, another Gaveston!*» (I.i.140–143).

Edward's manner of speaking also changes when Queen Isabella becomes the addressee of his utterances. In conversations with her, as well as in dialogues with peers, the king comes through 3 stages: ignoring, acceptance and rejection, and the first and the last phases become the most emotional. Edward's language on the stage of ignoring («*Fawn not on me, French strumpet; get thee gone*» (I.iv.145), «*Away then; touch me not*» (I.iv.159), «*And witness heaven how dear thou art to me./ There weep: for til my Gaveston be repeal'd,/Assure thou com'st not in my sight*» (I.iv.167–169) proves Tennyson's assumptions about inability of a person, who is experiencing passionate love, to «react limerently to more than one person» [9, p. 24]. That is why Isabella's attempts to get his attention back irritate Edward so much. Moreover, Isabella is considered to be a threat for his relationship with Gaveston, who claims that the queen «robs» him of «his lord» (I.iv.161). And because the

king is blamed by the nobles for neglecting his monarchical duties, Isabella becomes a reminder for him of neglecting his marital duties too. That is why in his speech Edward makes so much effort to get rid of her presence in his relationship with Gaveston and the best option to do so becomes ignoring. As in the case with barons' reclamations, ignoring seems to be the shield, which protects the king and his favourite's relationship and provides them with some privacy.

Deploring mode of Edward's expressive utterances shifts into thanking one when he enters the second phase of the verbal interrelation with Isabella and peers. Acceptance is what Edward promises his wife in response to bringing Gaveston back from exile («*Once more receive my hand, and let this be/ A second marriage 'twixt thyself and me*» (I.iv.333–334). For letting Gaveston stay in the court barons are awarded as well (I.iv.44–47; I.iv.49–50; I.iv.339–342). There expressives are deployed with the help of imperatives, which are used to emphasize the intensity of Edward's feelings, his excitement and gratitude for bringing Gaveston back. The change is also vivid in the way Edward addresses his wife and subordinates: instead of «*French strumpet*» (I.iv.145) Isabella becomes «*fair queen*» (I.iv.326), Lancaster, earlier called «*aspiring*» (I.i.93) and «*high-minded*» (I.i.150), now is «*courageous*» (I.iv.339), «*the treacherous Mortimer*» (I.i.149) is addressed as «*Lord Mortimer of Chirke*» (I.iv.358). Edwards also expresses his emotional state explicitly, saying «*Repeal'd! the news is too sweet to be true*» (I.iv.322) and «*ne'er was my heart so light*» (I.iv.367).

The stage of rejection, which on the level of language is characterized by the lamenting mode, becomes the biggest part of Edward's expressive utterances and is mostly used in the last part of the play after Edward's imprisonment. Pragmatic function of such type of narration is in representing a speaker as the victim of a hearer's action, misfortune or external circumstances [5, p. 288–289]. Using such strategy in playwriting lets the author to engage the audience in the actions on the stage and establish emotional ties, based on pity or compassion. Instead of showing the character's suffering, the author turns it into a personal story by making the character speak for himself («*Happy were I: but now most miserable*» (I.iv.129). With the help of lamenting mode Marlowe manages to construct the image of a passionate ruler, who loses in the struggle between passion and reason (I.iv.304–309).

Prieto Pablos commenting on the basic linguistic resources in the king's lines, points out that «the use of questions and exclamatory sentences remarks Edward's loss of certainty about the reality and stresses the emotional modulation of his utterances respectively». The researcher also claims, that «the syntactic relocation of references to himself features Edward as the affected recipient of other people's action» [6 p. 143]. The image of a victim is also created by the exclamatory sentences like «*Treason, treason! where's the traitor?*» (II.ii.80), «*Yea, Spencer, traitors all*» (III.ii.103), «*Treacherous Warwick! Traitorous Mortimer!*» (III.ii.134). The use of the word with negative semantic meaning – «*treason*» and its derivatives – emphasizes that Edward blames peers for the circumstances he appears in and exculpates himself, representing the situation from the victim's point of view.

Linguistically he also excludes a possibility to be blamed for what is happening. Therefore, the lamentative mode of Edward's utterances emphasizes his over-whelming with dangerous emotions and preoccupation with private matters and his inability to think and behave reasonably, which is understood as his impotence and inefficiency as a king. As a ruler Edward II had to be tranquil and sensible, capable of making deliberate decisions, instead he is full of passions, therefore weak and useless for his country.

Another distinctive feature of the digression of Edward's royal discourse is the usage of commissives. According to Dorothy Tennov, commissives are typical for the speech of people who in their relationship with the beloved are coming through the stage of «intensification through adversity» [9, p. 24]. The researcher claims that any negative circumstances, threats or barriers are considered to be adversity, which instead of stopping a passionate lover and making him/her give up, intensifies his/her affection and forces them to desire the reunion with «the limerent object» even stronger. As the result a passionate lover shows the readiness to struggle for the relationships, which are threaten by the external circumstances.

In *Edward II* «intensification through adversity» on the verbal level is represented through commissive illocutionary acts, whose main pragmatic function is «to commit the speaker in varying degrees to some future course of action» [7, p. 11]. The meaning, which stands behind the commissives, signifies the speaker's intentions and is often encoded in promises, threats, refusals or vows. From the very beginning of the play the king, opposed to barons, expresses his readiness to struggle for the relationship with Gaveston («*In spite of them I'll have my will*» (I.i.77–78), «*I will have Gaveston*» (I.i.96), «*I will bandy with the barons and the earls, / And either die, or live with Gaveston*» (I.i.137–138), «*I pass not for their anger*» (I.iv.142). The meaning of protection in his messages in most cases is delivered to the audience through the means of threats, which show not only the king's power, but also his affection over Gaveston. The peers become the biggest obstacle the king has to overcome on his way to have «*some nook or corner left, to frolic with his dearest Gaveston*» (I.iv.72–73) and the best way to reach this goal is to threaten the nobles. It is interesting that the harder the peers try to get rid of Gaveston, the more efforts the king makes to keep him in the court and the more aggressive and emotionally saturated his utterances become.

Commissives also work as a tool for Edward to gain the barons and the queen's favour towards Gaveston. In conversation with Isabella the king promises her to fulfill any of her dreams if she helps him to bring his minion back («*For thee, fair queen, if thou lovest Gaveston; / I'll hang a golden tongue about thy neck, / Seeing thou hast pleaded with so good success*» (I.iv.326–328). The king is even ready to marry Isabella again in case of successful

negotiations with barons. However, commissives, which appear in Edward's conversations with Gaveston, are of different nature. In private dialogues they become verbal commitments, the statements of certainty of emotions, whose longevity is not measured by time («*Thy worth, sweet friend, is far above my gifts, / Therefore, to equal it, receive my heart; / If for these dignities thou be envied, / I'll give thee more*» (I.i.161–164). Such statements as «*I'll come to thee; my love shall ne'er decline*» (I.i.115) or «*we'll live in Tynemouth here*» (II.ii.219) perform the function of the declaration of support and standing by, which bear hopes for the future. Moreover commissives suggest the intimacy, which defines the king and Gaveston as one inseparable whole. Even pronouns «I», «you» and «he» in commissives get replaced by joining «we» («*We'll have a general tilt and tournament*» (I.iv.375), «*Spare for no cost; we will requite your love*» (I.iv.382), which shows that the king treats Gaveston as equal and want to share everything he has with him, which, of course, ruins the image of the proper ruler and illustrates Edward's preference for private not public.

The pragmalinguistic analysis of the digression of Edward II's royal discourse showed that on the level of structure the border between public and private is defined purely be the addressee of Edward's utterances and his communicative intentions. The register, the tone, the semantic content of the lines change from arrogant, cool, aggressive, and commanding to caring, protective, and friendly, depending on whether the king is talking to the barons and his wife or Gaveston. The king's preoccupation with private matters and complete abandonment of public duties are represented in directive, expressive, and commissive speech acts, which prevail in his discourse. Thus, directives, represented mostly by imperatives and meant to be used for governmental purposes, become the tool to achieve personal goals. The power the king is vested with is directed to give orders and commands, which do not improve the quality of the life of the country and the court, but please the king's favourite. Expressives, which are not usually typical for the royal discourse, become one of the most prominent features of Edward's speech. They illustrate how emotional and vulnerable the state of the king is and how Reason gives the way to Passion. Commissives, which on the linguistic level stand for the strong bond between Edward and Gaveston, display the depth of the king's emotions towards his favourite, and state the certainty of his affection. The vows, which appear in their conversations, declare support, standing by, and everlasting feelings. They are also used by the king to gain the barons' and the queen's favour towards the minion, and demonstrate how with the help of promises, threats, and refusals Marlowe, showing that passion is the dominant force in the king's decisions, constructs the image of a humanized and prone to emotions ruler and reveals the danger a passionate leader can cause to the nation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Source

1. Marlowe C. Edward II / C. Marlowe. – New York : Gordian Press, 1966. – 208 p.

Secondary Sources

1. Beijer F. The Syntax and Pragmatics of Exclamations and other Expressive/Emotional Utterances / F. Beijer. – Lung : Lung University, 2002. – 21 p.
2. Boas F.S. Shakespeare and His Predecessors / F. S. Boas. – London : John Murray, 1910. – 584 p.
3. Bradbrook M. C. Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy / M. C. Bradbrook. – New Delhi : Foundation Books, 1994. – 273 p.
4. Edwards C. «In No Respect Can Contraries be True»: Passion and Reason in Marlowe's Edward II / C. Edwards // *Cerae: An Australian Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*. – 2014. – № 1. – P. 53–74.
5. Norrick N. R. Expressive Illocutionary Acts / N. R. Norrick // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1978. – Vol. 2, № 3. – P. 277–291.
6. Prieto Pablos J. A. For the Love of Gaveston: Edward II and Audience Response in Elizabethan England / J. A. Prieto Pablos // *Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies*. – Sevilla : Universidad de Sevilla, 2014. – P. 131–147.
7. Searle J. A Classification of Illocutionary Acts / J. Searle // *Language in Society*. – 1976. – Vol. 5, № 1. – P. 1–23.
8. Steane J. B. Marlow: A Critical Study / J. B. Steane. – Cambridge : University Press, 1964. – 392 p.
9. Tennov D. Love and Limerence: The Experience of Being in Love / D. Tennov. – Langham : Scarborough House, 1999. – 340 p.
10. Tucker Brooke C. F. The Works of Christopher Marlowe / C. F. Tucker Brooke. – Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1910. – 684 p.

А. В. Єліссєва,

Ягеллонський університет, м. Краків, Польща

ДЕРЖАВНЕ І ОСОБИСТЕ: ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ КОРОЛІВСЬКОГО ДИСКУРСУ ЕДУАРДА ІІ

У статті розглянуто прагмалінгвістичні особливості трансформації королівського дискурсу Едуарда ІІ. Проаналізовано емоційне наповнення висловлювань та його репрезентація на лінгвістичному рівні. За допомогою теорії мовленнєвих актів інтерпретовано зв'язок між емоційним станом мовця та структурним, прагматичним та семантичним наповненням його висловлювань та доведено, що типовим для королівського дискурсу Едуарда ІІ є використання директивів, експресивів та комісивів, структурно-семантичне наповнення яких змінюється залежно від адресата повідомлення та мети адресанта. Встановлено, що під впливом «небезпечних емоцій», викликаних пристрасними почуттями до свого фаворита, інтенціональність мовця так само, як і засоби її вираження, змінюють своє основне прагматичне значення з загальнодержавного на особисте, доводячи не-ефективність Едуарда ІІ як правителя. У статті досліджується роль мови як головного інструмента для створення образу пристрасного героя та функціональність мовних структур для успішної комунікації між автором літературного твору та читачем.

Ключові слова: прагмалінгвістика; дискурс; теорія мовленнєвих актів; директиви; експресиви; комісиви; «небезпечні емоції».

А. В. Єліссєва,

Ягеллонський університет, Краків, Польща

ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ И ЛИЧНОЕ: ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ КОРОЛЕВСКОГО ДИСКУРСА ЭДУАРДА II

В статье рассмотрены прагмалингвистические особенности трансформации королевского дискурса Эдуарда II. Проанализировано эмоциональное наполнение высказываний и его репрезентация на лингвистическом уровне. С помощью теории речевых актов интерпретирована связь между эмоциональным состоянием говорящего и структурным, прагматическим и семантическим наполнением его высказываний, и установлено, что типичным для королевского дискурса Эдуарда II является использование директив, экспресивов и комисивов, структурно-семантическое наполнение которых меняется в зависимости от адресата сообщения и цели адресанта. Доказано, что под влиянием «опасных эмоций», вызванных страстными чувствами к своему фавориту, интенциональность говорящего, также как и средства ее выражения, меняет свое основное прагматическое значение с общегосударственного на личное, иллюстрируя неэффективность Эдуарда II как правителя. В статье исследуется роль языка как главного инструмента в создании образа страстного героя и функциональность языковых структур для успешной коммуникации между автором литературного произведения и читателем.

Ключевые слова: прагмалингвистика; дискурс; теория речевых актов; директивы; экспресивы; комисивы; «опасные эмоции».