



**ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКАЯ, ПРИКЛАДНАЯ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНАЯ
ЛИНГВИСТИКА/THEORETICAL, APPLIED AND COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.76.8> EDN: DXUNEC**REPETITION OF PREPOSITIONAL AND POSTPOSITIONAL ELEMENTS IN COORDINATED STRUCTURES
(BASED ON DATA FROM ITALIAN AND AZERBAIJANI)**

Research article

Вахрамова Г.М.^{1,*}¹ ORCID : 0000-0001-9808-0894;¹ Azerbaijan University of Languages, Baku, Azerbaijan

* Corresponding author (gunelf[at]mail.ru)

Abstract

This article presents a comparative analysis of the repetition and omission of prepositions and case markers (postpositions) in the coordinated structures in Azerbaijani and Italian. Azerbaijani, as an agglutinative language, encodes case relations through morphological suffixes, the repetition of which in coordinated constructions is grammatically obligatory. Italian, belonging to the inflectional-analytical language, expresses case relations by means of prepositions, where repetition is optional but serves the functions of emphasis, clarity, and structural symmetry. The results show that, despite the formal differences between the two systems, the primary function of repetition in coordinated constructions is the same in both languages: ensuring semantic transparency and discursive parallelism. Consequently, repetition should be viewed not only as a morphological or syntactic mechanism, but as a universal grammatical and discursive principle.

Keywords: Italian language, Azerbaijani language, prepositions, postpositions, case markers, coordination, typology.

**ПОВТОР ПРЕДЛОЖНЫХ И ПОСЛЕПОЗИЦИОННЫХ ЭЛЕМЕНТОВ В КООРДИНИРОВАННЫХ
СТРУКТУРАХ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ИТАЛЬЯНСКОГО И АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ)**

Научная статья

Байрамова Г.М.^{1,*}¹ ORCID : 0000-0001-9808-0894;¹ Азербайджанский университет языков, Баку, Азербайджан

* Корреспондирующий автор (gunelf[at]mail.ru)

Аннотация

В статье проводится сопоставительный анализ повторения и опущения предлогов и падежных показателей (послелогов) в координированных структурах азербайджанского и итальянского языков. Азербайджанский язык как агглютинативный выражает падежные отношения посредством морфологических суффиксов, повторение которых в координации является грамматически обязательным. Итальянский язык, относящийся к флективно-аналитическому типу, кодирует падежные отношения с помощью предлогов, где повторение не является обязательным, но выполняет функции акцентации, ясности и структурной симметрии. Полученные результаты показывают, что, несмотря на формальные различия между двумя системами, основная функция повторения в координированных конструкциях в обоих языках одинакова: обеспечение семантической прозрачности и дискурсивного параллелизма. Следовательно, повторение следует рассматривать не только как морфологический или синтаксический механизм, но как универсальный грамматический и дискурсивный принцип.

Ключевые слова: Итальянский язык, азербайджанский язык, предлоги, послелоги, падежные показатели, координация, типология.

Introduction

The comparative study of the morphosyntactic and syntactic systems of Azerbaijani and Italian, which belong to different language families and represent distinct morphological types, is of particular relevance for both typological and functional linguistics. While the case system of Azerbaijani and the prepositional system of Italian have been extensively examined in previous research, the mechanisms governing the repetition and omission of these elements in coordinated structures remain relatively underexplored.

The present study is based on the hypothesis that in both Azerbaijani and Italian, the repetition of case-marking devices in coordinated constructions should not be regarded solely as a formal grammatical phenomenon, but rather as a functional strategy contributing to discourse clarity and information structuring. Importantly, instead of assuming a strict universal principle, this paper approaches repetition as a typological tendency that may manifest differently across languages depending on their structural properties [6], [12].

In Azerbaijani, an agglutinative language, grammatical relations are expressed through morphological case suffixes, whose repetition in coordination is generally obligatory due to the morphological transparency and linear organization of the system. In contrast, in Italian, a fusional-analytic language, grammatical relations are encoded by prepositions, whose repetition is optional and conditioned by communicative, semantic, and stylistic factors, such as disambiguation, emphasis, and rhythmic or structural balance.



Despite these systemic differences, both languages appear to exhibit a comparable functional orientation, namely the tendency to preserve structural parallelism and semantic transparency in coordinated constructions. From this perspective, repetition can be interpreted as a discourse-motivated mechanism that enhances interpretability and reduces potential ambiguity [3], [8].

This approach is not only theoretically relevant for the study of the interaction between morphology, syntax, and discourse, but also has practical implications for translation studies, second language acquisition, and intercultural communication.

Theoretical Framework

Comparative studies of prepositional and postpositional systems occupy a central position in linguistic typology and functional grammar, as they represent alternative structural strategies for encoding grammatical relations and semantic roles [1], [2], [3], [10]. Typological research has consistently demonstrated that these systems correlate with broader structural parameters such as basic word order and morphological type. However, while traditional approaches have primarily focused on morphological form and syntactic distribution, the principles governing the repetition and omission of relational markers in coordinated constructions have received comparatively less systematic attention.

The present study argues that repetition in coordination cannot be explained solely in terms of morphological type. Rather, it should be interpreted as a **functionally motivated and typologically recurrent tendency**, associated with structural parallelism, informational transparency, and processing efficiency. From this perspective, repetition emerges as a strategy that enhances interpretability and facilitates the linear organization of complex syntactic structures.

Prepositions are characteristic of SVO-type fusional and analytic languages such as English, French, and Italian, where grammatical relations are expressed through independent function words preceding the noun (*a Roma, con l'amico, da casa*) [2], [4]. In contrast, postpositions and case suffixes dominate in SOV-type agglutinative languages such as Azerbaijani and Japanese, where grammatical relations are encoded through suffixal morphology attached directly to the noun (*məktəbə, evdə, evdən*). This typological distinction reflects a well-established correlation between word order and grammatical marking strategies [4].

This structural asymmetry has direct consequences for the realization of repetition in coordinated constructions. In Italian, the repetition of the preposition is optional and sensitive to discourse-pragmatic factors: *con Marco e Lucia* vs. *con Marco e con Lucia*. While both constructions are grammatically acceptable, the repeated form tends to reinforce structural symmetry and reduce potential ambiguity. In contrast, in Azerbaijani, the repetition of case suffixes is morphologically obligatory: *məktəbə və işə; evdən və ofisdən*. The omission of the suffix (*məktəbə və iş, evdən və ofis*) results in ungrammatical or structurally incomplete constructions.

This contrast suggests that, whereas in agglutinative systems repetition is a consequence of morphological encoding, in analytic systems it operates as a syntactic and discourse-level option. In both cases, however, repetition contributes to the explicit marking of relations between coordinated elements.

Modern Azerbaijani distinguishes six productive cases expressed through suffixes, with the nominative remaining formally unmarked [14]. Case suffixes function as obligatory grammatical markers encoding syntactic and semantic relations within the clause. In coordinated constructions, each conjunct must independently carry the relevant case marker (*məktəbə və işə* “to school and to work”; *evdən və ofisdən* “from home and from the office”), which reflects the tight morphological integration of case marking into the noun phrase structure.

In Italian, by contrast, grammatical relations are primarily expressed through prepositions (*a Roma, con l'amico, da casa*). In coordinated contexts, both repetition and omission are normatively acceptable: *con Marco e con Lucia* vs. *con Marco e Lucia*; *a Roma e a Milano* vs. *a Roma e Milano*. The choice between these variants depends on functional and discourse-related factors. Repetition tends to signal emphasis, disambiguation, and structural balance, whereas omission is associated with economy, informality, and rhythmic efficiency.

This interpretation is consistent with observations in Italian grammatical tradition, where prepositional usage is often described as sensitive to stylistic and communicative variation [9], [16], [17]. From this perspective, repetition in Italian should be understood not as a purely optional redundancy, but as a meaningful discourse strategy that interacts with syntactic structure.

Typological research has identified a number of cross-linguistically recurrent principles governing coordinated constructions. According to Haspelmath [3] and Stassen [18], coordination is typically shaped by factors such as structural parallelism, informational clarity, discourse coherence, and rhythmic balance. These factors contribute to processing efficiency and facilitate the interpretation of complex syntactic units.

The comparison of Azerbaijani and Italian suggests that these languages differ primarily in the formal realization of such tendencies. Azerbaijani encodes parallelism morphologically through obligatory suffix repetition, whereas Italian encodes it syntactically through optional prepositional repetition.

Rather than postulating a strict universal rule, it is more appropriate to interpret these patterns as reflecting a **strong typological tendency** toward the explicit marking of relations in coordinated structures. In this sense, repetition and omission can be viewed as alternative grammatical strategies shaped by the interaction of morphological structure, syntactic organization, and discourse-pragmatic constraints.

Prepositions in Coordinated Structures in Italian

In Italian, prepositions function as core syntactic devices for encoding grammatical relations that correspond to case functions in inflectional languages. Their behavior in coordinated constructions reflects not only formal syntactic organization but also discourse-related and communicative factors. The repetition or omission of prepositions should therefore be interpreted not as a purely formal alternation, but as a functionally motivated choice, contributing to clarity, emphasis, and processing efficiency.



Italian coordination allows two main structural patterns: repetition and omission of the preposition. The repetition pattern (*con Marco e con Lucia*) maintains full structural parallelism between conjuncts, whereas the omission pattern (*con Marco e Lucia*) involves a single preposition governing both coordinated elements. Both constructions are grammatically acceptable and widely attested in contemporary usage.

Additional examples further illustrate this alternation:

- *a Roma e a Milano* vs. *a Roma e Milano*
- *con gli amici e con i colleghi* vs. *con gli amici e i colleghi*
- *per il padre e per la madre* vs. *per il padre e la madre*

The repetition model reinforces structural symmetry and ensures explicit marking of grammatical relations, which becomes particularly relevant in more complex or potentially ambiguous constructions. By contrast, omission reduces formal redundancy and contributes to syntactic economy and phonological fluency.

Importantly, the choice between these patterns is not determined by strict grammatical rules, but rather by a combination of discourse conditions, syntactic complexity, and stylistic preferences [9], [17]. This suggests that prepositional behavior in coordination operates at the interface between syntax and discourse.

As noted by Roberto Zamparelli [19], prepositional repetition in Italian coordination fulfills several important grammatical and communicative functions.

First, repetition facilitates disambiguation by explicitly marking the grammatical relation of each conjunct. For example, in *a Marco e a Lucia*, the directional or dative relation is clearly associated with both referents, whereas in *a Marco e Lucia*, the interpretation may depend more heavily on contextual inference.

Second, repetition contributes to emphasis and contrast, particularly in constructions involving semantic opposition or rhetorical highlighting:

- *con i ricchi e con i poveri*
- *tra il passato e tra il presente*

In such cases, repetition reinforces the conceptual separation between the coordinated elements.

Third, repetition enhances rhythmic and structural balance, supporting phonological regularity and syntactic symmetry, especially in formal or carefully structured discourse. This function is frequently observed in written and rhetorical contexts.

Taken together, these observations indicate that repetition operates not merely as a formal device, but as a discourse-sensitive mechanism contributing to interpretability, coherence, and communicative precision.

Normative descriptions of Italian grammar recognize both repetition and omission as acceptable variants [9], [16]. However, their distribution is conditioned by stylistic and register-related factors.

Formal and written varieties tend to favor repetition:

- *con il rappresentante e con il cliente*
- *a Roma e a Milano*

In these contexts, explicit marking enhances clarity and reinforces structural parallelism. By contrast, informal and conversational usage more frequently favors omission:

- *con il rappresentante e il cliente*
- *a Roma e Milano*

This pattern reflects a tendency toward economy and fluency in spontaneous speech.

This flexibility illustrates the analytic character of Italian grammar, in which grammatical relations are expressed primarily through syntactic means rather than morphological marking. At the same time, it supports the view that Italian aligns with broader typological tendencies toward structural parallelism and informational clarity, while allowing variation in their formal realization depending on discourse and stylistic conditions.

Case Markers in Coordinated Structures in Azerbaijani

Modern Azerbaijani distinguishes six productive cases—nominative, dative, accusative, locative, ablative, and comitative—expressed through suffixes, with the nominative remaining formally unmarked [1], [14]. Typical examples include *məktəbə* (dative), *məktəbdən* (ablative), and *qardaşı ilə* (comitative). These suffixes function as integral components of the noun phrase and play a crucial role in encoding grammatical relations.

In coordinated constructions, each conjunct is required to independently carry the appropriate case marker:

- *məktəbə və işə getdim* (“I went to school and to work”)
- *evdə və ofisdə işləyir* (“He/She works at home and in the office”)
- *kitabı və dəftəri oxudu* (“He/She read the book and the notebook”)

By contrast, omission of the case marker in one of the conjuncts typically results in ungrammatical or structurally degraded forms:

- *məktəb və işə getdim*
- *evdə və ofis işləyir*

This pattern reflects the morphological autonomy of each coordinated element and the requirement that grammatical relations be explicitly encoded on each noun phrase. In this sense, coordination in Azerbaijani does not involve the sharing of a single case marker, but rather the parallel realization of identical morphological structures across conjuncts.

The obligatory repetition of case suffixes fulfills several essential grammatical and communicative functions.

First, it ensures semantic precision by explicitly marking the grammatical relation of each coordinated element, thereby minimizing the risk of ambiguity. Second, it guarantees grammatical stability, as each noun phrase remains morphologically complete and structurally independent. Third, it contributes to discourse coherence and processing clarity, since the repetition of identical markers reinforces structural parallelism and facilitates the linear interpretation of coordinated sequences.



From a functional perspective, this pattern can be interpreted as reflecting a broader typological tendency toward explicit marking in agglutinative systems. In such systems, grammatical relations are typically encoded in a transparent and segmentable manner, which favors the overt realization of markers in each conjunct.

Thus, repetition in Azerbaijani coordination is best understood as a morphologically grounded and functionally motivated constraint, rather than a context-dependent syntactic option.

In colloquial and informal speech, occasional omission or reduction of case suffixes may occur, often as a result of phonological simplification or processing economy. For example, reduced forms may be observed in rapid speech or dialectal variation. However, such instances are generally regarded as non-standard and are not accepted in formal or written usage.

Standard Azerbaijani requires explicit case marking on each conjunct, ensuring clarity, grammatical consistency, and structural transparency. From a descriptive standpoint, these non-normative patterns may be interpreted as performance-related variations rather than evidence of a systematic grammatical alternative.

This observation further supports the conclusion that repetition in Azerbaijani is primarily a structural and morphological requirement, in contrast to analytic languages such as Italian, where repetition remains optional and is largely conditioned by discourse and stylistic factors. At the same time, both systems can be seen as reflecting a shared typological tendency toward maintaining structural parallelism and interpretative clarity in coordinated constructions.

Conclusion

Despite their typological differences, Azerbaijani and Italian exhibit the same underlying functional orientation in coordinated constructions. Azerbaijani, as an agglutinative language, requires morphologically obligatory repetition of case suffixes, whereas Italian, as a fusional-analytic language, allows optional repetition of prepositions, conditioned by stylistic, discourse, and communicative factors. The fundamental distinction thus lies in grammatical obligation versus discourse-mediated choice, yet both systems aim to achieve similar communicative goals: semantic clarity, structural parallelism, and interpretive transparency.

From a typological perspective, Azerbaijani encodes grammatical relations morphologically, necessitating that each coordinated element independently carries its case marker. Italian, in contrast, encodes these relations syntactically through prepositions, whose repetition enhances clarity, emphasis, and structural symmetry but remains optional. Despite this formal divergence, both languages exhibit typologically recurrent tendencies toward explicit relational marking and parallel structural organization, in line with cross-linguistic observations in coordination studies [12], [18].

The comparative analysis yields several significant theoretical and functional conclusions:

1. Grammatical and discourse roles: Case markers in Azerbaijani and prepositions in Italian function not only as formal grammatical markers but also as discourse-level devices facilitating the interpretation of coordinated structures [3], [6]. In this respect, they contribute to the explicit encoding of relational links between conjuncts, guiding the hearer toward a coherent interpretation of syntactic and semantic dependencies within the coordinated domain.

2. Maintenance of parallelism and clarity: Repetition in both languages contributes to structural parallelism and semantic transparency, albeit realized through different formal means: morphological in Azerbaijani and syntactic in Italian. This parallelism enhances the perceptual salience and interpretability of coordinated structures, ensuring that relational dependencies are processed in a uniform and predictable manner, thereby facilitating both production and comprehension [11], [15].

3. Cross-linguistic tendencies: These patterns provide empirical support for the notion that functional tendencies toward explicit marking and parallelism operate across typologically diverse languages, beyond idiosyncratic grammatical rules [7], [8], [13]. From a functional-cognitive perspective, such tendencies reflect the general pressure toward semantic transparency and processing efficiency, whereby overt marking and structural symmetry facilitate the organization and interpretation of coordinated relations.

In sum, coordinated constructions reflect general cognitive, processing, and functional constraints, rather than language-specific formal conventions, supporting the claim that coordination is shaped by communicative efficiency and discourse considerations.

The analysis demonstrates that repetition in coordination should not be interpreted solely as a morphological or syntactic phenomenon. Rather, it constitutes a functionally motivated typological tendency, ensuring semantic precision, structural coherence, and communicative efficiency. The obligatory repetition in Azerbaijani and the optional, discourse-conditioned repetition in Italian are different formal realizations of the same functional principle.

This insight contributes to theoretical linguistics by clarifying the functional interface between morphology, syntax, and discourse, and has practical implications for applied linguistics, including:

- Translation studies: Understanding the structural and functional equivalence of grammatical systems is essential for accurate rendering of meaning.
- Second language acquisition: Awareness of typological constraints aids learners in mastering coordination patterns in both analytic and agglutinative languages.
- Intercultural communication: Explicit marking strategies in coordination inform strategies for clarity and disambiguation in multilingual contexts.

Overall, the study emphasizes that functional pressures—clarity, parallelism, and interpretive transparency—shape coordination across typologically distinct languages, demonstrating a robust interaction between formal grammatical systems and discourse-level strategies.

**Конфликт интересов**

Не указан.

Рецензия

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

Список литературы / References

1. Abbasov I. Mirzə Kazımbəyin “Türk-tatar dilinin ümumi qrammatikası”nın tərcümə, tədqiq və şərhı / I. Abbasov. — Bakı: Zərdabi LTD MMC, 2017.
2. Abbasov I. Pietro della Vallenin “La grammatika della lingua turca” (1620) əsərinin tərcümə, tədqiq və şərhı / I. Abbasov, G. Bayramova. — Bakı: Zərdabi Nəşr MMC, 2020.
3. Bybee J. Language, usage, and cognition / J. Bybee. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
4. Cinque G. The syntax of adjectives: A comparative study / G. Cinque. — Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.
5. Comrie B. Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology / B. Comrie. — Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.
6. Croft W. Typology and universals (2nd ed) / W. Croft. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
7. Dryer M.S. Order of adpositions and genitive / M.S. Dryer // The World Atlas of Language Structures Online / Ed. by M.S. Dryer, M. Haspelmath. — Max Planck Institute, 2013.
8. Givón T. Syntax: An introduction / T. Givón. — Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001. — Vol. 1.
9. Graffi G. La frase: L’analisi logica / G. Graffi. — Roma: Carocci, 2012.
10. Greenberg J.H. Universals of language / J.H. Greenberg. — Cambridge: MIT Press, 1963.
11. Halliday M.A.K. An introduction to functional grammar (2nd ed) / M.A.K. Halliday. — London: Edward Arnold, 1994.
12. Haspelmath M. Coordination / M. Haspelmath // Language typology and syntactic description / Ed. by T. Shopen. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. — Vol. 2. — P. 1–51.
13. Heine B. Cognitive foundations of grammar / B. Heine. — New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
14. Hüseynzadə M. Müasir Azərbaycan dili. III hissə: Morfologiya / M. Hüseynzadə. — Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, 2007.
15. Levelt W.J.M. Speaking: From intention to articulation / W.J.M. Levelt. — Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.
16. Serianni L. Italiano: Grammatica, sintassi, dubbi / L. Serianni. — Milano: Garzanti, 2011.
17. Simone R. Fondamenti di linguistica / R. Simone. — Roma & Bari: Laterza, 1990.
18. Stassen L. And-languages and with-languages / L. Stassen // Linguistic Typology. — 2000. — № 4 (1). — P. 1–54.
19. Zamparelli R. Coordination and linearization / R. Zamparelli // On the syntax of coordination / L. Cheng, N. Corver. — Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. — P. 47–85.

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Abbasov I. Mirzə Kazımbəyin “Türk-tatar dilinin ümumi qrammatikası”nın tərcümə, tədqiq və şərhı [Translation, study and commentary on “General Grammar of the Turkic-Tatar Language” by Mirza Kazimbey] / I. Abbasov. — Bakı: Zərdabi LTD MMC, 2017. [in Azerbaijani]
2. Abbasov I. Pietro della Vallenin “La grammatika della lingua turca” (1620) əsərinin tərcümə, tədqiq və şərhı [Translation, study and commentary on “La grammatica della lingua turca” (1620) by Pietro della Valle] / I. Abbasov, G. Bayramova. — Bakı: Zərdabi Nəşr MMC, 2020. [in Azerbaijani]
3. Bybee J. Language, usage, and cognition / J. Bybee. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
4. Cinque G. The syntax of adjectives: A comparative study / G. Cinque. — Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.
5. Comrie B. Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology / B. Comrie. — Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.
6. Croft W. Typology and universals (2nd ed) / W. Croft. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
7. Dryer M.S. Order of adpositions and genitive / M.S. Dryer // The World Atlas of Language Structures Online / Ed. by M.S. Dryer, M. Haspelmath. — Max Planck Institute, 2013.
8. Givón T. Syntax: An introduction / T. Givón. — Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001. — Vol. 1.
9. Graffi G. La frase: L’analisi logica [The Sentence: Logical Analysis] / G. Graffi. — Roma: Carocci, 2012. [in Italian]
10. Greenberg J.H. Universals of language / J.H. Greenberg. — Cambridge: MIT Press, 1963.
11. Halliday M.A.K. An introduction to functional grammar (2nd ed) / M.A.K. Halliday. — London: Edward Arnold, 1994.
12. Haspelmath M. Coordination / M. Haspelmath // Language typology and syntactic description / Ed. by T. Shopen. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. — Vol. 2. — P. 1–51.
13. Heine B. Cognitive foundations of grammar / B. Heine. — New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
14. Hüseynzadə M. Müasir Azərbaycan dili. III hissə: Morfologiya [Modern Azerbaijani language. Part III: Morphology] / M. Hüseynzadə. — Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, 2007. [in Azerbaijani]
15. Levelt W.J.M. Speaking: From intention to articulation / W.J.M. Levelt. — Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.
16. Serianni L. Italiano: Grammatica, sintassi, dubbi [Italian: Grammar, syntax, doubts] / L. Serianni. — Milano: Garzanti, 2011. [in Italian]



17. Simone R. *Fondamenti di linguistica* [Fundamentals of linguistics] / R. Simone. — Roma & Bari: Laterza, 1990. [in Italian]
18. Stassen L. *And-languages and with-languages* / L. Stassen // *Linguistic Typology*. — 2000. — № 4 (1). — P. 1–54.
19. Zamparelli R. *Coordination and linearization* / R. Zamparelli // *On the syntax of coordination* / L. Cheng, N. Corver. — Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. — P. 47–85.