

ANTHROPOGEOGRAPHICAL CONCEPT OF JOVAN CVIJIĆ AND CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC PROPOSITIONS IN THE STUDIES OF RURAL SETTLEMENTS

Antić Marija¹, Danica Đurkin¹, Budović Aljoša¹

Abstract: At the beginning of the XX century, along with the scientific foundation of anthropogeography, Jovan Cvijić developed an authentic anthropogeographical concept in the study of the settlements. The synthesis of anthropogeographic knowledge of rural settlements and the setting of complex theoretical and methodological tasks in this field gave innovative results that represent a significant heritage of Serbian anthropogeography. In this paper, the authors consider some questions that many scientists did, analysing scientific actuality of Cvijić's concept in the research of rural settlements - the importance of the traditional anthropogeographical concept in the contemporary studies of rural settlements and applicability of a wide spectrum of methodological principles of the Serbian anthropogeographical school (the method of direct observation in the field, genetic, geographic-comparative, typological method, the method of ethno-psychical profiles etc.). The analysis of the authenticity and integrity of Cvijić's theoretical and methodological principles in the anthropogeographical studies of rural settlements in the Balkan Peninsula confirms the validity of concept, methodology and indicators that were used, as well as the scientific actuality and quality of the traditional anthropogeographical concept. By introducing modern qualitative and quantitative methods, while some of the new ones are not fundamentally different from traditional ones (for example methods of factor and cluster analysis, on the one hand, and the typological and space analysis method, on the other), the traditional anthropogeographical concept has not lost its scientific importance, and great attention from different positions should be dedicated to modern research of rural settlements and rural areas.

Keywords: Jovan Cvijić; anthropogeographical concept; rural settlements; methodology

Introduction

The Serbian anthropogeographical school was founded and developed by Jovan Cvijić in the first quarter of the XX century. At the time of Cvijić's scientific engagement, together with his gifted contemporaries and followers (Vojislav Radovanović, Rista Nikolić, Atanasije Urošević, Jefto Dedijer, Tihomir Đorđević, Milisav Lutovac, Jovan Trifunovski, Branislav Bukurov etc.). Serbian anthropogeography has experienced its golden age and developed world-renowned authentic anthropogeographic concept. For that reason, the versatility and comprehensiveness of the scientific legacy, which Jovan Cvijić left behind,

¹ University of Belgrade, Faculty of Geography, Belgrade, Serbia
e-mail: geo2mara@yahoo.com

brought him the epithet of one of the most important and influential scientists of our area rightly from the end of the XIX and in the first half of the XX century.

At the very beginning of his career, Cvijić had clearly defined scientific views about problems of geography as a field of science. In his lecture *Današnje stanje geografske nauke* [*Today's State of Geographical Science*], when he was appointed as a professor of scientific geography and anthropogeography, in 1893, he emphasized that anthropogeography concerns the complicated organism of society and discusses one of the most difficult topics ever that attract human spirit: the influence of the entire nature on the human creations and the characteristics of people's spirit (Cvijić, 1893). Paying the respect to the works of Friedrich Ratzel, based on the inextricable relation between man and his natural environment, Cvijić also pointed out to the lack of his scientific opus which almost excludes man from human geography (Cvijić, 1991a). According to Mirko Grčić, one of the best experts in the works and creations of this talented scientist, "from the beginning of his scientific research, Cvijić noticed that the problem of anthropogeography is not in the subject, but in the method" (Grčić, 2004, p. 26). Cvijić noticed a methodological disadvantage in the anthropogeographical works of his contemporaries, who focused their attention primarily on forms of material culture (settlements, economy etc.) and introduced scientific topics that no one else did before — the metanastatic drifts, civilization zones, ethno-psychic types of population (Grčić, 2004).

In an extremely diverse and complex Cvijić's scientific opus it is difficult to distinguish one dominant field of anthropogeography. By leaving this time aside the analysis of the numerous anthropogenic problems of the Balkan Peninsula (migration of the population, cultural belts and ethno-psychic characteristics of the South Slavs etc.) in the works of Jovan Cvijić, this paper emphasized its special peculiarity and authenticity in the study of settlement complex, especially rural settlements.

Cvijić's scientific method in the study of settlements

The theoretical and methodological basis of Cvijić's anthropogeographic conception is contained in his work *Antropogeografski problemi Balkanskoga poluostrva* [*Anthropogeographic Problems of the Balkan Peninsula*] (Cvijić, 1902), where the main ideas were developed and the final form is presented in his famous work *Balkansko poluostrvo i južnoslovenske zemlje. Osnove antropogeografije* [*Balkan Peninsula and the South Slavic Lands. The basics of anthropogeography*] (Cvijić, 1922a). The following methodological principles are outlined: 1) the problems are examined; the material is collected; material for

which you don't know its purpose, should not be collected; 2) the aim of the research is to analyse and interpret anthropogeographical problems in way that various and complex causes can be highlighted, as in all problems concerning relations and mutual interactions between the whole nature and ethnic elements, human creations and human migrations; 3) the descriptions in anthropogeographical works should be overcome and the phenomena of the everyday life fully explained; 4) explanations and conclusions must be based on the existing factography; and 5) anthropogeographical and ethnographic phenomena should be related to the material (economic) basis (Carić, 1982).

The methodological plan for field research is set in *Uputstva za proučavanje sela u Srbiji i ostalim srpskim zemljama* [Guidelines for the study of villages in Serbia and other Serbian lands] (Cvijić, 1896). Until 1898, according to anthropogeographical specifics three more special guidelines were made (for Serbia, Old Serbia and Macedonia; Bosnia and Herzegovina), and after that also *Uputstva za ispitivanje naselja i psihičkih osobina* [Guidelines for the study of settlements and psychological traits] (Cvijić, 1911) and *Uputstva za ispitivanje porekla stanovništva i psihičkih osobina* [Guidelines for the study of the origins of the population and psychological traits] (Cvijić, 1922b). These mentioned Guidelines were the result of extensive and comprehensive field research, where all major anthropogeographical issues of the Balkan Peninsula were noticed and evaluated. In his first Guidelines, Cvijić grouped the questions in seven thematic units: 1. the location of the village, 2. the type of village, 3. the house, the yard and the garden, 4. second home settlements and other buildings situated in the mountain regions and valleys, 5. stories and interpretations about the names of villages, 6. the establishment of the villages, previous settlements and their traces and 7. occupation of the population.

The theoretical and methodological setting of the anthropogeographic study of the settlement through the development of mentioned Guidelines and their actuality and applicability in modern anthropogeography is understandable since "every question of the Guidelines has a certain task: to highlighted the anthropogeographic issues from all sides – to see their causes, both diverse and complex, as with all problems related to the interesting relationship and mutual influence between overall nature and the ethnic moments, as well as of human creation and human migrations" (Cvijić, 1991b, p. 20). Accordingly, the Guidelines provided the basis for the typological classification of the settlements, thus establishing the content basis of the system approach in the typological classification of the settlement.

Cvijić's anthropogeographic concept was created and developed according to his methods of field work, which explicitly perceived the importance of deep observation and originally collected material (Lutovac, 1982). The method of observation, as one of the oldest methods, gave authenticity to Serbian anthropogeographical research. This is reflected in the direct field observation (from house to house, from family to family, from settlement to settlement), which forms the basis of later *systemic processing of typological original anthropogeographic material*.

An important part of Cvijić's anthropogeographic studies of settlements is the use of a natural method and the general introduction of naturalistic views and elements, which was later contested by some authors considering this approach one of the main drawbacks of Cvijić's conception in the study of settlements. Namely, the important principle of his anthropogeographical views was certainly the understanding of the "organic connection of all aspects of life and their close relations with the geographic environment" (Grčić, 2004, p. 28), but this view certainly did not have the characteristics of geodeterministic perceptions, rather it was close to modern understanding of human ecology. The methodological principle of Cvijić's study of settlements provided a possibility to conceptualize anthropogeographical issues in a dialectic way, and to comprehend anthropogeographic objects, phenomena and processes as the result of mutual interactions of natural and social factors (Radovanović, 1957).

One of the most important methodological principles of traditional anthropogeography is the application of the *genetic method*, which most adequately interprets the genesis, development and transformation of settlements in the historical and genetic context and links their geographical and historical aspects (Radovanović, 1959). The study of the anthropogeographical complex in the historical-genetic framework enabled the synthesis and chronological connection of geographical and historical aspect. In this way, the authenticity of anthropogeography has been enriched, showing that historical problems can be solved by geographic method. Namely, without stepping outside of anthropogeographic framework, in a genetic context, historical data are exclusively used for the interactions of natural and social factors (Lutovac, 1982).

Sociological approach in Cvijić's anthropogeographic conception is defined by Čulibrk (1968) as a sociological direction of geography that sets sociological theories of settlements, migration, culture and psychical types of population. The sociological method of traditional anthropogeography also can be considered to be "the sociology of the Balkans and the Balkan people" (Čulibrk, 1968, p. 46)

that representing one of the cornerstones of Cvijić's anthropogeographical and ethnological school (Radovanović, 2003).

Typological method has a special value in traditional anthropogeographic studies and application in the study of rural and urban settlements. Its application allows generalization of the empirical data settlements on the basis of systemic-structural propositions, giving authenticity and integrity in methodological and research process which are the most explicitly reflected in typological classification of urban and rural settlements of the Balkan Peninsula according to various criteria — types of positions, physiognomic, genetic features and functional criteria (Martinović, 2016).

The application of *system principle* to the anthropogeographic process of settlement development (process of genesis, evolution and transformation of settlements) can be clearly established in the Cvijić's research and methodological procedure, which is also an important methodological standpoint of modern geography. As the most significant innovation in Cvijić's methodological concept, which was held until today, Grčić (2004) precisely implies the implementation of system approach in anthropogeographical-ethnographical process (genesis, evolution and transformation of the anthropogenic system), thus integrating all spheres of anthropogeography — geodemographic, geocultural, geoeconomic, geocological, geologicistic, geopolitical and geostrategic. The same author concludes that "classic paradigm of Cvijić's anthropogeographical school is quite close to modern paradigm... and a system principle in anthropogeography today gives a new meaning to the complex anthropogeographic synthesis" (Grčić, 2004, p. 46–47).

Anthropogeographic problems in the study of rural settlements in the works of Jovan Cvijić and their scientific validity

For anthropogeographic knowledge of rural settlements of the Balkan Peninsula, Jovan Cvijić provided works of capital significance. Works were related to formulation of a holistic, coherent, historical-geographically continuous and functional cognitive-theoretical framework, as well as in the study of genesis, evolution and transformation, morphological and physiognomic structure, population origin and migration flows, economic opportunities and economic orientation of settlements.

Cvijić's anthropogeographic concept in the study of rural settlements was primarily adapted to geographic environment where research was conducted, so the results of the exhaustive field research that he organized were extremely complex and innovative for that time (Daneš, 1927). Taking into consideration

the axiom that settlements are the most remarkable elements of the environment — cultural landscape, places where population is bonded to the territory, as well as bearers of functional organization, economic development and focus of geospatial transformation, Cvijić opened a new epoch in the survey of rural settlements of the Balkan Peninsula, paying attention to the all nations and cultural zones of the studied area (Tošić, 2017).

With his guidelines for the study of rural settlements and other results Cvijić created a scientific climate that, along with the improvement of methodological propositions and determination of complex anthropogeographic phenomena and processes on the basis of extensive field research, influenced the subsequent growth and synthesis of knowledge about anthropogeographic issues of rural settlements, which according to its theoretical and practical propositions occupy a prominent place in modern socio-geographical studies of rural areas.

The theoretical and methodological bases of anthropogeographic study of settlements contained in *Guidelines for the study of villages in Serbia and other Serbian lands* have great practical significance for the field research of rural areas. Since this approach allows the settlements to be considered as a basic unit for territorial (spatial) organizations of population, while respecting their dynamic and development under the influence of physical-geographical, socio-historical, economic and cultural opportunities, their actuality and applicability in modern anthropogeography is understandable. In this way it is possible to interpret their geographic position from the point of view of chronological and historical variability, whose value is determined by the natural, historical, cultural, ethnic and economic conditions that are embedded in the geographic environment. Through the interaction of natural-geographical, historical-cultural and socio-economic conditions it is possible to explain the process of genesis and development of morpho-physiognomic structure of settlements, as well as transformation of their internal structure, spatial development and boundaries. Beside typological classification of settlements, according to physiognomic configuration and homogeneity of the internal structure, these Guidelines provide the basis for the typological classification of settlements by local position, genetic and functional criteria. Territorial organization of settlements (permanent and temporary) and economic areas could be represented in cohesion with peculiarity socio-economic organization and demographic development in the geographical-historical context, where the spatial organization of settlement represent a relatively constant category of settlement system. In this way, it is possible to perceive genesis and development of anthropogeographic settlement system in correlation with the genetic-historical variability and hierarchy of its structure and organization. It is also important to emphasize that Guidelines

provide the basis for studying the issues of the origin of population, classification of their regional composition (native and immigrants) and organizations (family cooperatives), as well as the authenticity of monitoring migration flows and their ethnological, economic and social consequences in the structuring of anthropogeographic complex. Such a detailed “recording” of population origin based on the tradition of certain genera can be compared with the present method of “deep” research (case study) in socio-geographical research of migration and population origin (Antić, 2016).

As already emphasized, *typological method* and its application in the study of villages and *varoš* [towns], population migration, ethno-psychic traits and other, have a special value in traditional anthropogeographic studies. This methodological procedure enabled generalization of empirical data of villages based on system-structural regulations, which provide authenticity and completeness in methodology and research, which particularly can be seen in typological development of urban and rural settlements of the Balkan Peninsula. Application of typological method, whereby elements of the system approach are somewhat intuitively, explicitly and consistently respected, enabled to determine relatively homogeneous systems and subsystems of settlements with a pronounced organization of their spatial and hierarchical structure (Martinović, 2016).

After defining the seat of the settlement as “a place where settlement is located along with cultivated and economically utilized soil around it... which always has a geographical name” (Cvijić, 1969, p. 86). Cvijić first divided the settlements into three main types — *small settlements, villages [or rural] settlements, and varoš [or urban] settlements*. The last two groups have been singled out, according to the demographic size, as *large settlements* that feature *settling in groups*, while small settlements are characterized by *individual settling* (Cvijić, 1969). The positions and types of settlement that Cvijić determined are closely connected with geographical factors, cultural influences and ethnic predispositions of people (Radovanović, 1959).

The geographic position and development of rural settlements, unlike urban where “natural potential of spacious areas” are dominant, Cvijić emphasizes *local topographic characteristics* (fertile land, proximity to drinking water, favourable microclimate, simple communication etc.). Studying the topographic position of villages on the Balkan Peninsula, Cvijić concludes that settlements are formed at sites which provide the greatest economic potential, regardless the great varieties of their topographic position. These are the contact zones of various ecological and economical areas (*the “contact position of the village”*),

which have provided the basis for diversified rural economy (crop farming, livestock farming and forestry) and drinking water sources (Cvijić, 1991a).

According to the topographic position, Cvijić singled out two groups of settlements: 1) *villages at heights, located on the valley sides, hilly terrains and surfaces up to 1,600 m*, predominantly formed on cleared land, dispersed type, with agricultural areas in the village and the economic orientation to livestock; and 2) *villages in the valleys, ravines and the plains*, mainly compact with agricultural areas located outside the village. Considering the influence of the relief on the topographic position and geographical distribution of the village, Cvijić emphasized *the villages on morphological borders, villages on the terraces and alluvial fans, villages and summer pastures on the moraines and other glacial forms and villages in karst depressions* (Cvijić, 1991a).

With typological classification of rural settlements based on their genesis and physiognomy, Cvijić first distinguished two basic groups: 1) *villages of a dispersed type*, which are divided into hamlets (neighbourhoods, quarters, jamaats), separated from each other by agrarian and forest areas; and 2) *villages of a compact type*, with a dense concentration of housing and economic buildings with a garden plot. Cvijić explained occurrence of different physiognomic types of villages by the influence of relief, forest cover, different cultures and administrations. According to that, villages of a dispersed type are located mostly in mountainous and wooded areas, in the cultural zone of the patriarchal regime, while villages of compact type are mainly located in valleys and ravines and in the areas of Byzantine civilization, the Mediterranean-Roman culture and under the strong Turkish rule. At rural settlements of dispersed type Cvijić singles out the *Stari Vlah type*, from which by the further evolution the *Šumadija, Jasenica and Mačva types* developed, then *karst type* and *Ibar or jamaat type of villages*. The villages of a compact type by Cvijić can be divided into the following types — *Timok, Čitluk, Turkish-Oriental, Mediterranean type*, at which he singles out three special types (*Greco-Mediterranean, Dalmatian-Mediterranean and Kaštelan types*), as well as *transitional type of rural settlements*. By dividing the village of a transitional type of rural settlements, where it emphasizes the examples of *Čitluk type* which after liberation from the Turks and the feudal agrarian regime has been significantly transformed (in Timok, Mačva, Šumadija type etc.), Cvijić pointed out that the mentioned types of villages understands as changing structural categories that stand in close relation with the cultural, historical, genetic, demographic, functional and economic characteristics of the area.

Acceptance of the thesis on heterogeneity of rural areas and rural settlements influenced the general scholarly acceptance of the typological method as an important starting point in modern geographic research of their development. Unlike mentioned qualitative methods of traditional Serbian anthropogeography, in recent decades of quantitative approaches in the typological classification of rural settlements and rural areas has often been used. This time, it is important to outline that quantitative typologies, has an important lack of statistical observation of space, with problems of defining common criteria for measuring the diversification of rural areas. The above mentioned traditional methods of systematization, classification and typology, as well as the method of space analysis, similarly determine the functional types of rural settlements, so they can be related to modern methodological propositions. The key difference was driven by data collection and processing. While traditional qualitative methodological procedures involve extensive and detailed field research, systematic processing of the original material, and typological classification, that is determining certain types of rural settlements and rural areas, recent research is mainly based on the use of statistical data where the functional types of rural areas and rural settlements are being separated and defined (Martinović, 2014).

Traditional anthropogeographical studies have pointed to the complex structure and hierarchy of organization of rural settlements and rural areas, while respecting the relations between elements and phenomena, and the existence of a relationship between a number of variables that have influenced rural development (Sibinović, Antić, Šantić, & Ratkaj, 2016). The problems of transformation of rural settlements occupy a significant place in contemporary period, after long and intensive demographic, socio-economic, functional and cultural changes in rural areas, in conditions of growing social interest in concept of sustainable rural development (especially in underdeveloped, peripheral and devastated rural regions), where the development of a geospatial complex outside the boundaries of urban agglomerations is imposed as one of the vital issues (Martinović & Ratkaj, 2015). In addition, by analysing the concept and methodology of researching rural settlements from the aspect of the traditional anthropogeographical concept, we can “confirm” its scientific significance, so according to the modern research priorities of human geography, it should be paid with great attention.

Conclusion

The concept and methodology of anthropogeography has changed over time. Serbian anthropogeographical school has a significant role among the anthropogeographical schools in the world. In the Serbian anthropogeographic

school, the differentiation and specialization of anthropogeography in a series of independent geographical disciplines (Population geography, Geography of settlements, Economic and Political geography) and their further “splitting” into scientific disciplines and subdisciplines (Agrarian, Industrial, Geography of transport, Urban, Rural geography), segmented the anthropogeographical system, stripped away the originality of Serbian anthropogeography and brought a polycentrism in which the whole of object gradually was lost from sight (Wirth, 1979; Grčić, 2004). However, in spite of this, the contemporary (“modern”) anthropogeographical school did not lose the core of its integrative scientific essence, primarily thanks to the works of some authors (Radovanović M., Kostić M., Veljković A., Stamenković S., Grčić M. and others), who further elaborated the anthropogeographic concept in the field of human geography and showed that anthropogeographic facts of the past represent the facts of the present and the immediate future.

References

- Antić, M. (2016). *Antropogeografska proučavanja naselja Zaplanja*. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu — Geografski fakultet.
- Carić, N. (1982). Problematika gradskih i seoskih naselja u Cvijićevim delima i savremeni pogled na nju. U R. Lukić, M. Lutovac, D. Nedeljković & P. Stevanović (Ur.), *Naučno delo Jovana Cvijića*, Naučni skupovi Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, knj. XI (281–289). Beograd: SANU.
- Cvijić, J. (1893). Današnje stanje geografske nauke. Pristupno predavanje na Velikoj školi. *Nastavnik*, 4(3), 1–34. Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Srbije.
- Cvijić, J. (1896). *Uputstva za proučavanje sela u Srbiji i ostalim srpskim zemljama*. Beograd: Srpska Kraljevska državna štamparija.
- Cvijić, J. (1902). *Antropogeografski problem Balkanskoga poluostrva* (knj.4). Beograd: Etnografski zbornik.
- Cvijić, J. (1911). *Uputstva za ispitivanje naselja i psihičkih osobina*. Beograd: Nova štamparija „Davidović“.
- Cvijić, J. (1922a). *Balkansko poluostrvo i južnoslovenske zemlje. Osnove antropogeografije* (knj. 1). Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca.
- Cvijić, J. (1922b). *Uputstva za ispitivanje porekla stanovništva i psihičkih osobina*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Cvijić, J. (1969). *Opšta geografija — Antropogeografija*. Beograd: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika SR Srbije.

- Cvijić, J. (1991a). *Balkansko poluostrvo. Sabrana dela* (knj. 2). Drugo izdanje. Beograd: SANU, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Književne novine.
- Cvijić, J. (1991b). *Antropogeografski spisi. Sabrana dela* (knj. 4). (2. izd.). Beograd: SANU, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Književne novine.
- Ćulibrk, S. (1968). Jovan Cvijić kao sociolog. *Cvijićev zbornik SANU, Odeljenje prirodno-matematičkih nauka*, 43–52.
- Daneš, J. (1927). *Jovan Cvijić*. Posebna izdanja Geografskog društva (sv. 1). Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca.
- Grčić, M. (2004). Gnoseološki model antropogeografije prema koncepciji Jovana Cvijića i njegova naučna aktuelnost. *Demography*, 1, 25–48.
- Lutovac, M. (1982). Cvijićeve antropogeografske koncepcije. U R. Lukić, M. Lutovac, D. Nedeljković & P. Stevanović (Ur.), *Naučno delo Jovana Cvijića*, Naučni skupovi, knj. XI (221–222). Beograd: SANU.
- Martinović, M. (2014). Aktuelni problemi revitalizacije ruralnog prostora Srbije. U M. Grčić, D. Filipović & S. Dragičević (Ur.), *Zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa Geografsko obrazovanje, nauka i praksa: razvoj, stanje i perspective (57–62)*. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu — Geografski fakultet.
- Martinović, M., & Ratkaj, I. (2015). Sustainable Rural Development in Serbia: Towards a Quantitative Typology of Rural Areas. *Carpathian Journal of Earth and Environmental Sciences*, 10(3), 37–48.
- Martinović, M. (2016). Scientific significance of system approach in Cvijić's anthropogeographical studies of settlements. In V. Jović & A. Petrović (Eds), *150th Anniversary of Jovan Cvijić' Birth, Book 10 (II)* (539–550). Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Radovanović, V. (1957). Jovan Cvijić: iz perspective savremene naučne misli. *Glasnik etnografskog instituta Srpske akademije nauka*, 1–3.
- Radovanović, V. (1959). *Opšta antropogeografija*. Beograd: Građevinska knjiga.
- Radovanović, M. (2003). O naučnim osnovama Cvijićeve antropogeografsko-etnološke škole i njenom značaju za poznavanje etničkih procesa u srpskim zemljama. *Globus*, 28, 3–28.
- Sibinović, M., Antić, M., Šantić, D., & Ratkaj, I. (2016). *Ruralni prostor opštine Knjaževac — antropogeografske osnove razvoja*. Knjaževac: Narodna biblioteka „Njegoš“, Srpsko geografsko društvo.
- Tošić, D. (2017). Antropogeografski diskurs u istraživanjima seoskih naselja Branislava Kojića. U Z. Vuksanović-Macura, M. Drobnjaković, J. Todorić & A. Spalević (Ur.) *Branislav Kojić — prostor u selu, selo u prostoru* (90–91). Beograd: SANU, Geografski institut „Jovan Cvijić“.
- Wirth, E. (1979). *Theoretische Geographie*. Stuttgart: Teubner.