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For the exceptional combination of imagination, scholarly precision and literary skill with which he has recovered and illuminated the beliefs of ordinary people in early modern Europe.

Carlo Ginzburg, Professor at the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, is one of the most original and influential historians of our time. He has ranged very widely in his scholarly work, and he has also written in a more abstract manner about questions of historical method, but his main and major contributions have all been made as an historian of early modern Europe.

Professor Ginzburg’s oeuvre is impressively large and various, and includes six major works on early modern European social, cultural and intellectual history. His scholarship displays at the same time an exceptional coherence of subject-matter and approach. One topic in which he has been interested throughout his career has been the explanation and appraisal of witchcraft beliefs and practices. This concern was first reflected in *I benandanti* (1966; *The Night Battles*, 1983), and it recurs in *Storia notturna* (1989; *Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches’ Sabbath*, 1991). More generally, he has always been interested in recovering the beliefs and attitudes of ordinary people whose lives and outlook would otherwise be unknown. It was this concern that gave rise to his most celebrated book, *Il formaggio e i vermi* (1976; *The Cheese and the Worms*, 1980), in which he succeeded in reconstructing, from Inquisitorial records, the entire world-view of Menocchio, a sixteenth-century miller. A pioneering work of micro-history, *Il formaggio e i vermi* remains one of the most successful and widely-imitated examples of the genre.

More recently Professor Ginzburg has turned his attention to the high culture of early modern Europe. He has written in *Indagini su Piero* (1981; *The Enigma of Piero*, 1985) about the iconography of Piero della Francesca, and in *No Island is an Island* (2000) about four moments in English literature in which the interpretation of a classic text – one being Thomas More’s *Utopia* – is shown to turn on an understanding of its international context. At the same time, Pro-
Professor Ginzburg has continued to contrast the elite culture of the early modern period with the more everyday beliefs on which he initially concentrated. Another thread binding his books together is the urge to show how elite and popular cultures reciprocally relate to each other.

As well as being a highly imaginative and productive historian, Professor Ginzburg has been a methodological innovator of wide influence. He has written about the nature of historical evidence in *Miti emblemi spie* (1986; *Clues, Myths and the Historical Method*, 1989), and about the idea of historical proof in *History, Rhetoric and Proof* (1999). He has also reflected in his historical works on the nature of his own practice, highlighting in particular the importance of the connections between social anthropology and cultural history.

The impact of Professor Ginzburg’s scholarship has been immense. His book on Menocchio, everywhere recognised as a classic, is available in twenty-five languages, while his book on myths and clues has been translated almost as widely. Professor Ginzburg’s intellectual energies and intensity of commitment remain undimmed, and more books will no doubt follow, but his achievement to date is already sufficient to make him not merely a worthy but a highly distinguished recipient of the Balzan Prize.
Prizewinner’s Acceptance Speech
Rome, Palazzo del Quirinale – 19 November 2010

Mr. President,
Members of the Balzan Foundation,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am deeply honoured by the prestigious prize that I have been awarded. At this moment, I feel the need to thank all of those who have helped me, through their friendship and affection, their criticism, and what they have taught me. To my family and my friends, I extend my appreciation: to those who are here and those who no longer are. Here, on this public occasion, I want to remember those from whom I have learned a great deal.

Apart from my research work, teaching has been my profession, or better, an important aspect of my profession. I have often found myself saying that I like teaching, but that I like learning better. I consider learning to be one of the great joys of life. I have had the good fortune of learning from very diverse people who were full of extraordinary qualities. If I look back, I am moved by their generosity and their human and intellectual diversity. I think of Goya’s wonderful drawing depicting an old man with a white beard, slowly moving forward with two canes; above him are written two words: *Aun aprendo*, I still learn, I’m still learning. Goya was thinking of himself, and when I look at that old man, I see myself in him. One never stops learning. I have learned outside school, unpredictably and in unpredictable circumstances; and I have also learned in school, from elementary school onwards, until recently, when I formally stopped teaching: because, as one knows, teachers learn from their students, and vice versa. What I am saying is obvious, because everyone learns (*homo sapiens* is not the animal that knows, but rather, is the animal that knows how to learn). But in evoking the idea of learning, it is not obvious to remember all of this today, on such a solemn occasion, when in so many countries, starting with the one where I am a citizen, the schools have become a fragile, threatened institution – due in the first instance to the short-sightedness of the political class, but also to the absolutely inadequate reaction of public opinion. I have spoken of short-sightedness, but I realize that I have used an improper term. Of course, cutting investment destined for education, in a world where education is (and will be even more so) the most precious resource for the development of
society, is a short-sighted gesture that goes against the interests of the country, and – let’s say it without any pretense – that condemns it to certain decadence in the future. Nevertheless, this reasoning is insufficient and should be rejected, because what it really does is to implicitly accept the so often taken for granted idea that education and the transmission of knowledge are goods that are subject to the laws of the market, to the mechanism of supply and demand. So I should correct myself: it is not a question of short-sightedness, or in any event, not only of short-sightedness. This is an assault (because we are talking about a direct attack here) on public education. Is this malizia or matta bestialitate, malice or brute bestiality? readers of Dante will ask. Perhaps both – who knows?

My generation was fortunate to be involved in the extraordinary technology that has transformed how knowledge is attained and handed down: namely the internet. Some have said that the internet is a tool of democracy. Taken literally, this statement is false. One needs to add: it is a tool of potential democracy. The internet’s motto can be summed up in the paradoxical and politically incorrect words that Jesus pronounced: “For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance” (Matthew, XIII, 12). In surfing the internet, in order to pick out pearls from trash, one must already have had access to knowledge – access that is normally (here I am speaking of personal experience) associated with social privilege. The internet, which could potentially be a tool that would lessen cultural disparities, in the short term, actually widens them.

Schools need the internet, of course; but, in order to be used to its full potential (let’s be realistic: to one millionth of its capacity), the internet needs public schools that really do teach. In the course of my life, I have had the good fortune of attending schools and universities, in Italy and outside Italy, meeting extraordinary scholars who were all – without exception – extraordinary teachers as well. If I had not met them, I would be another person today, and I cannot even imagine what I would have become. I will name a few: Delio Cantimori, Arsenio Frugoni, Augusto Campana, Arnaldo Momigliano, Gianfranco Contini, Carlo Dionisotti, Ernst Gombrich and Lawrence Stone. Then, those from outside university lecture halls: Felice Balbo, Vittorio Foa, Sebastiano Timpanaro and Cesare Garboli. I have cited only the names of scholars who have passed away. To the living, and to those who are near and very dear to me, I pronounce my gratitude once more.

Carlo Ginzburg
Some Queries Addressed to Myself

by Carlo Ginzburg

A panoramic synthesis of his career, realized on the occasion of the 2010 Awards Ceremony in Rome

1. I am deeply honoured by the prestigious prize that has been awarded to me. I thank the jury and in particular, Quentin Skinner for his generous words, and especially for mentioning the coherence in the subjects and approach which are detectable in my research. I feel flattered – but then I immediately hear the voice of the devil’s advocate (a voice which accompanies me, like a basso continuo): “You dealt with witches and Piero della Francesca, with a miller put on trial by the Inquisition and with questions of method: where is the unity in all this? What is the thread that ties such strikingly heterogeneous themes together?”.

It is an insidious objection, because it hides an invitation to teleology: a vice that everyone – especially historians – ought to beware of. To go back and search for an underlying theme in a research trajectory that has gone on for over fifty years is possible, of course – but on the condition of tacitly eliminating chance, unawareness, the alternatives that were rejected or simply ignored as they gradually emerged. In order not to fall into the trap that the devil’s advocate is setting for me, I will avoid the running thread metaphor and will try to use a different one.

2. On 12 July 1934, Walter Benjamin, in exile in Denmark, where he took refuge after escaping from the Nazis, wrote in his diary:

Yesterday, after a game of chess, Brecht said: So, if Korsch comes [Karl Korsch, the Marxist theorist], we will have to think up a new game for him. A game where the positions are not always the same: where the function of every piece changes after it has stood in the same square for a while: it should either become stronger or weaker. This way the game doesn’t develop, it stays the same for too long.1

Brecht wanted to change the rules of chess so that they would be closer to reality, which is in perpetual movement. I will reformulate his proposal by applying it (with an eye to *Il cavallo e la torre* [The Horse and the Tower] by Vittorio Foa) to an infinitesimal fragment of reality: a research itinerary which is the one I have followed. I will try to describe it as a game of chess in which the pieces, instead of being arranged at the beginning, are introduced as the game goes on. The game commenced one day in the autumn of 1959. I was twenty. I was in the library of the Scuola Normale di Pisa, where I had been studying for two years. All of a sudden I decided three things: that I wanted to be a historian; that I wanted to study witchcraft trials; that what I wanted to study was not the persecution of witchcraft, but the victims of persecution – the women and men accused of being witches and sorcerers. This nebulous project, formulated with great conviction and in the most complete ignorance imaginable, would not have been born without the powerful impression aroused by my reading Antonio Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks*, Carlo Levi’s *Christ stopped at Eboli* and Ernesto de Martino’s *Il mondo magico* (The Magic World). But there was another element, which I did not realize until many years later: in the emotional identification with the victims of persecution, and in the impulse to study them, there was an unconscious projection of my Jewish identity, which the persecution had reinforced.2

3. At the end of the 1950s, beliefs and practices linked to witchcraft were themes reserved for anthropologists. Scholars of European history tended to be concerned with the so-called witch hunts (a theme that in any event was considered marginal). The situation was in part to change shortly thereafter. In 1977 Arnaldo Momigliano wrote that “the most pervasive characteristic” of the fifteen years between 1961 and 1976 was perhaps “the attention to oppressed and/or minority groups within more advanced civilizations: women, children, slaves, men of colour, or more simply heretics, farmers and workers”.3 Momigliano observed that in the course of those fifteen years, anthropologists or ethnographers had acquired “unprecedented prestige” from historians. However,

---


he did not dwell on an obstacle that the historians who wanted to study “oppressed and/or minority groups within more advanced civilizations” had been forced to come to terms with. In any society, power relationships condition access to documentation, and its characteristics. The voices of those who belong to those oppressed and/or minority groups are usually filtered down to us by extraneous, if not hostile figures: chroniclers, notaries, bureaucrats, judges and so on. In the case of the witch trials that I wanted to study, the psychological and cultural violence used by judges, at times accompanied by torture, tended to distort the voices of the accused men and women in a pre-established direction. (It is not a matter of chance that the political trials carried out in the course of the twentieth century have often been defined, polemically, as “witch hunts”). How can this obstacle be overcome?

This was the situation that I could reasonably have expected, and that I in fact encountered in the first years of my explorations in the lay and ecclesiastical archives in Italy, where Delio Cantimori directed me. Then I had a stroke of luck: “by pure chance, or” as Carlo Dionisotti once wrote “by the norm that governs research on the unknown”, I discovered the witch trials held by the Inquisition in Friuli in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries against the benandanti (literally, “those who go doing good”).4 The inquisitors repeatedly asked the meaning of this incomprehensible word from the men and women who said they were, in fact, “benandanti”. This was invariably the answer: since they had been born wrapped in a caul, they were forced to fight in spirit against witches and sorcerers four times a year for the fertility of the fields. For the inquisitors these were either absurdities or lies: in their eyes, the benandanti were obviously witches and sorcerers. But in order for this identification to become reality, it took fifty years. Harassed by the questions and threats of the inquisitors, the benandanti incorporated the traits of the model that had been shown to them (or better, forced upon them) little by little: and the detailed descriptions of the battles they fought in spirit for the fertility of the fields, armed with fennel branches, left room for the more or less stereotyped image of the witches’ sabbath.5

---


The difference between the expectations of the inquisitors and the answers of the benandanti indicated that the latter emerged from a deep stratum of peasant culture – whence the exceptional value of that Friulian evidence. The attempt to grasp the voices of the victims of persecution was crowned (I thought) by initial success, which opened unexplored terrain. In retrospect, I am led to think that all of my research sprang from that first book, even if it happened in an unpredictable, and above all non-linear way. (That is why I am fond of the metaphor of chess: in the course of the game, the different pieces are moved on the chess board according to their own logic, obeying specific rules; but there is only one game).

4. To try to reconstruct the beliefs and attitudes of the accused through the distorted trials and the expectations of the judges seemed, and was indeed, paradoxical. All my problems sprang from that preliminary choice. I had to learn to read between the lines, to gather the tiniest clues, to find ripples under the surface of the text that signalled the presence of profound tensions, that could not be reduced to stereotype. Without realising it, I was trying to work on archival documents by applying the lessons of hermeneutics carried out on literary texts that I had learned from Leo Spitzer, Erich Auerbach and Gianfranco Contini. The impulse to reflect on method (today I would say: to sterilize the tools of analysis) emerged from concrete research – even if at a certain point I gave in to the temptation to suggest a genealogy and a justification of the method I identified with and was practising. But when I published that paper – Spie (Clues) – my research in the Udine Archbishopric Archive had already taken another direction.

In the preface to I benandanti (1966 – translated as The Night Battles) I had written: “This Friulian testimony reveals a continuous criss-crossing of trends enduring for decades and even centuries, and of individual, private, and frequently wholly unconscious, reactions. It is apparently impossible to make history from such reactions, and yet without them, the history of ‘collective mentalities’ becomes nothing more than a series of disembodied and abstract tendencies and forces”.6 Today, in this distantiation from the Annales of the second generation (from which I also learned a great deal) I read a potential opening towards a further reduction of scale: research concentrated on a single

---
individual. But this further move needed time. At the beginning of the 1960s, going through the 18th century index of the first thousand Inquisition trials preserved in the Udine Archbishopric Archive, I had fallen upon a summary, condensed in a few lines, of two trials against a peasant, guilty of maintaining that the world was born from rotten matter. That peasant was the miller Domenico Scandella, called Menocchio. But seven years went by before I decided to take up his case, and another seven, understandably, before *The Cheese and the Worms*, the book dedicated to him, was published. In that hesitation, and even more in the polemical, aggressive and at the same time defensive tone of my introduction, I experience again the element of risk that the success of that book cancelled out. To dedicate a book – not a footnote or a paper – but a book, to a sixteenth century miller was at the time (not anymore today, I guess) anything but an obvious choice.

5. I have spoken about “reduction of scale”: a typical term of microhistory, the historiographic current introduced by a group of Italian historians who coalesced around the journal *Quaderni storici* in the second half of the 1970s. I, too, was part of that group; and both *The Cheese and the Worms* and the essay *Spie* (Clues) have been often connected to microhistory, or at least to one of its versions. Labels do not interest me, but the impulse that generated microhistory does. I am convinced that the reduction of scale in observation (not of the object of investigation, let’s be clear about this) is a precious cognitive tool. As Marcel Mauss writes, one intensely studied case can be the starting point for a generalization. I would add: yes, above all if it is an anomalous case, because anomaly implies the norm (whereas the opposite is not true). And I would go on by distinguishing between the generalization of answers and the generalization of questions. It seems to me that the potential wealth of case studies is mainly linked to the latter.

*The Cheese and the Worms* is a book that was born in the atmosphere of the political and social struggles in Italy in the 1970s, but it has continued to live

---

thanks to readers born in other places and periods of time. Its unexpected success is first of all to be attributed to the extraordinary personality of Menocchio, the protagonist of the book. His challenge of the political and religious authorities, nourished by a culture born of the interaction between oral and written culture, was capable of reaching individuals who were far from his world – and, I might add, from mine. Among those who reacted – often in an understandably polemical way – there were also professional historians. If I am not mistaken, the book has shown the unexpected complexity that is hidden behind expressions historians often take for granted: from “popular classes” to “peasants”, from “learning to read and write” to “reading”. More generally speaking, the book rebutted once and for all the thesis that had been formulated by an authoritative historian, according to whom the less privileged classes of Europe of the early modern era were only accessible through statistics.11

6. I mentioned generalizations which start from one case. After the publication of The Cheese and the Worms I decided to develop a hypothesis that seemed to strongly emerge from the case of Menocchio: the circularity between élite and subaltern cultures (to use Gramsci’s term). An attempt in this direction led me to the traces of a Jewish convert, Costantino Saccardino, tried by the Holy Office, first in Venice and then in Bologna, and ultimately burnt at the stake in 1621 because he was involved in a conspiracy that smacked of heresy. Since a copy of the Venetian trial had been sent to Rome, I assumed that it might have been preserved in the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (at the time inaccessible). This led me to write a letter to Pope Wojtyla, in which I asked for the archive to be opened to scholars. From the Pope’s secretary, I received a reply that took note (perhaps with a touch of benevolent irony) of my enthusiasm for research, but informed me that the Saccardino trial was untraceable – probably destroyed. Twenty years later, as prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal Ratzinger spoke at the conference that was held in 1998 at this Accademia dei Lincei to celebrate the opening of the archives of the Holy Office in Rome as decided by Pope Wojtyla. On that occasion Ratzinger read an excerpt from my letter, stating that it was the scholar who had defined himself as “born Jewish and atheist” to “inspire a moment of reflection that constituted the contemporary history of the opening of the

11 Il formaggio e i vermi, introduction, p. XIX (the reference is to François Furet).
Archives”. A generous, too generous acknowledgement. But in the meantime, my research had taken a different direction.

7. Once more I will use the model of the chess board, because it is compatible with zig-zagging, non-rectilinear movement, and nonetheless is conditioned by an initial opening move – which in my case, was related to the benandanti. Once again, there was a chance discovery: a trial, published in a journal of Baltic history, against an old werewolf named Thiess, which I came across before sending the final version of the manuscript of The Night Battles to the publisher. The trial, which took place in Jürgensburg (today’s Zaube) around the end of the seventeenth century, was altogether anomalous: Thiess stated that, since he was born with a caul, he had to go “to the end of the sea” three times a year with the other werewolves to fight against the devils to ensure the fertility of the fields. The analogies with the benandanti were evident, but they required comparative research that I did not feel capable of doing; in the preface, I stated that I had not “dealt with the question of the relationship which undoubtedly must exist between benandanti and shamans” – a statement that was both audacious and prudent. Before I decided to commit myself to this task almost twenty years elapsed. I started to collect a great deal of material, without understanding what I was doing; but before long, I stopped, and threw myself into a completely different kind of project – research on Piero della Francesca, which I condensed in a small book entitled Indagini su Piero (1981; translated as The Enigma of Piero).

I realize that the itinerary that I am describing seems to be dominated by caprice, if not by frivolity. Actually, a few years later, I realized that my seeming diversion towards Piero della Francesca was obscurely trying to reckon with the main obstacle I had been facing in an entirely different domain, in my attempt to insert the case of the benandanti into a comparative perspective. This obstacle can be connected to two terms: morphology and history, and how they relate to each other. In my research on a group of works by Piero, I examined non-stylistic data linked to iconography and to patronage, thus constructing a pictorial itinerary and a chronology that I compared with the one that had been proposed authoritatively on the basis of stylistic data. Behind this experiment, born of an old passion of mine for Piero and for painting, lay the pages of Rob-

---

erto Longhi on Palma il Vecchio in the Precisioni on the Galleria Borghese, and the book by Federico Zeri on the Master of the Barberini Panels, Two Paintings, Philology and a Name.\textsuperscript{14} From them I had learned that a configuration of formal data trace out the itinerary, often imperfectly known, of a stylistic personality that might correspond to a recorded individual name. Likewise, I thought, a configuration made up of myths morphologically similar to the one centred on the benandanti must be related to specific historical connections – unless those morphological affinities lead back to human nature.

I struggled over this alternative and its implications (which I will not talk about here) for over fifteen years. The book that I finally wrote – Storia notturna. Una decifrazione del sabba (1989, translated as Ecstasies. Deciphering the Witches Sabbath) – inserts the beliefs of the benandanti into a much larger picture based on evidence that covers a span of millennia, collected by demonologists, bishops, anthropologists, folklorists across the Eurasian continent. Unlike the evidence on the benandanti, these documents almost never give the names of the actors. In the abovementioned paper on the characteristics of historiography in the fifteen years from 1961 to 1976, Momigliano had referred to the “spread of a-chronic structuralist interpretations in addition to the traditional diachronic historiography”.\textsuperscript{15} From this intellectual climate descends the prolonged dialogue with structuralism (a version of the dialogue with the devil’s advocate), which inspired the project for Ecstasies: to put an anonymous, a-chronic morphology at the service of history, in order to make conjectures about buried historical connections.

8. “The sources must be read between the lines (\textit{in controluce})” Arsenio Frugoni used to say in his lessons at Pisa. I think that these words vaccinated me against naive positivism. I could not have imagined that one day those same words would have helped me to reject the neo-skeptic positions of those who upheld the impossibility of tracing a rigorous distinction between historical and fictional narratives. I was involved in this discussion for twenty years, in large part coinciding with the period I taught at UCLA. Among the papers that I dedicated to this theme, there is one entitled Le voci dell’altro (Alien Voices)


\footnote{15 A. Momigliano, “Linee”, p. 377.}
that analyzes a page from a book by the Jesuit Charles Le Gobien, the *Histoire des îles Mariannes*, which appeared in the year 1700: a harangue pronounced by the indigenous chief Hurao exhorting his people to revolt against the Spanish invaders. A close reading of the text shows that the harangue cleverly reworks, as one might predict, a series of classical citations: first and foremost, the speech delivered by the indigenous chief Calgacus in Tacitus’ *Agricola*, denouncing the misdeeds of the Roman Empire. Hurao’s harangue is the fruit of the imagination – but not completely.\(^\text{16}\) Among the accusations that he makes against the Europeans, there is that of having brought to the Marianne Islands flies and other insects that did not exist there before. In a footnote, Le Gobien mocks the passage, calling it absurd: a residue incrusted on the smooth, rhetorically impeccable surface of Hurao’s harangue.

The trials against the benandanti are a formally dialogical document, articulated in questions and answers. In the *Histoire des îles Mariannes*, the dialogical dimension suddenly flares up in a passage in Le Gobien’s footnote. But the hermeneutic strategy that I used in the two cases is essentially the same: to grasp the tensions and dissonances within a text. In the second, the author looks at what he just wrote without understanding it. From that note at the bottom of the page, there creeps in, as if through a crack, something uncontrolled: an extraneous voice, a fragment of that extra-textual reality that the neo-skeptics present as unattainable.

9. No text is immune to cracks: not even the poem that a supreme artificer has controlled down to the last detail. Even in the *Commedia* there is a blind spot, an element of the reality that Dante’s conscious “I” did not manage to master. But to talk about this research in progress would be premature.\(^\text{17}\) The game is still on.

---


Research Project – Abstract

A Comparative Approach to Religions
A Historical Perspective - from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries

He will dedicate the second half of his Balzan Prize to a three year research programme where he intends to scrutinize the emergence of a comparative approach to religions. This will involve a number of young scholars.

The Research Project will go back to the 1500s, exploring the emergence of a comparative approach to religions, focusing on the connection between antiquarianism and early ethnology, in the framework of European colonial expansion. It is envisaged that a series of analytical studies will emanate from this research.

The launch of the project will be constituted by a number of essays by Carlo Ginzburg which have been recently published or are to be published in the near future: Ancora sui riti cinesi: documenti vecchi e nuovi, in A dieci anni dall’apertura dell’Archivio della Congregazione per la dottrina della fede: storia e archivi dell’Inquisizione (Roma, 21-23 febbraio 2008), Rome 2011, pp.131-144; Provincializing the World: Europeans, Indians, Jews (1704), “Postcolonial Studies”, vol. 14. 2 (2011), pp. 135-150; Machiavelli e gli antiquari. Researchers will also take account of the questions raised in the following works: A New Science. The Discovery of Religion in the Age of Reason, Guy Stroumsa, Harvard University Press, 2010; Ancient History and the Antiquarian, Arnaldo Momigliano, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute, 1950; Prospettiva 1967 della storia greca, Arnaldo Momigliano, Rivista Storica Italiana 80, 1969.

Positions for two researchers will be advertised internationally and it is expected that the positions will be filled by the end of December 2011. They will be supported by scholarships of one year duration. Two workshops and an international conference will also be organized. It is expected that the papers from the international conference will later be published.
Biographical and bibliographical data
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Among his most important works we would mention:
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- *Un dialogo*, (with Vittorio Foa) Feltrinelli 2003