

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## The Doxology at the End of Romans.

PROF. BENJAMIN W. BACON.

NEW HAVEN.

AS is well known, there is great manuscript variation in the last two chapters of Romans, and a corresponding multiplicity of critical theories to account for it. The fact that two such intellectual giants as Lightfoot and Hort, both types of the most genuine conservatism, should have fully discussed the question from opposite sides, the one maintaining the original existence of a form of Romans prepared by the apostle himself shorter by nearly all the last two chapters, the other the unauthenticity of the last three verses, is sufficient to prove the seriousness of the problem. It might, indeed, suggest to those who have read the three characteristic essays republished from the *Journal of Philology* (ii., 1869, p. 264 sq., and iii., 1871, p. 51 sq., 193 sq.), in Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays* (1893, pp. 284-374), the futility of further effort. But as Lightfoot and Hort summed up and largely disposed of the ingenious theories of their predecessors, Schulz, Baur, Renan, *et al.*, so Lipsius, Sanday and Headlam, Zahn, to mention only the most important later contributors, have sifted Lightfoot and Hort. Whoever would be *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri* must then perforce repeat the process.

As the view I wish to present is in the main opposed to Sanday and Headlam, I may fairly adopt their statement of the MS. evidence, and so far as I can their conclusions from it. It is summed up under two heads on p. lxxxix. of the introduction to their *Commentary on Romans* (International Series).

(1) "The words ἐν Ῥώμῃ in 1<sup>7</sup>.<sup>15</sup> are omitted by the bilingual MS. G both in the Greek and Latin text (F is here defective). Moreover, the cursive 47 adds in the margin of vs.<sup>7</sup> τὸ ἐν Ῥώμῃ οὐτε ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει οὐτε ἐν τῷ ῥητῷ μνημονεύει."

Sanday and Headlam appear to me to be right in agreeing with Hort that Lightfoot's further evidence for this reading is untrustworthy, and further in maintaining against Hort that the evidence, slight as it is, demands some further explanation than "simple transcriptional accident." They suggest (p. xcvi.) that it may be due to the influence, direct or indirect, of Marcion's *Apostolicon*.

(2) "There is considerable variation in existing MSS. concerning the place of the doxology, 16<sup>25-27</sup>.

"*a.* In  $\aleph$  BCDE *minusc. pauc. codd. ap.* Orig.-lat., d e f, Vulg. Pesh. Boh. Aeth. Orig.-lat., Ambrstr. Pelagius, it occurs at the end of ch. 16, and there only.

"*b.* In L *minusc. plus quam 200, codd. ap.* Orig.-lat., Harcl., Chrys., Theodrt., Jo.-Damasc., it occurs at the end of ch. 14, and there only.

"*c.* In AP, 5, 17, Arm. codd., it is inserted in both places.

"*d.* In FG *codd. ap.* Hieron. (in Eph. 3<sup>b</sup>), g, Marcion (*vide infra*), it is entirely omitted," G and g leaving a blank space at the end of ch. 14. F leaves the blank after 16<sup>24</sup>, f supplying from the Vulg. D and Sedulius also attest the omission by transposing the Benediction, vs.<sup>20b</sup> to vs.<sup>24</sup>, manifestly because their archetype (Western) ended with vs.<sup>23</sup>. Thus, in substance, Sanday and Headlam.

The documentary evidence thus far seems to present almost a typical instance of the archetypal families distinguished by Westcott and Hort. The authorities under *c* represent the later, conflate texts, corresponding to the so-called Syrian, exclusively dependent upon the archetypes represented under *a*, *b*, and *d*. Of these, the reading *a* is supported by the "Neutral" and some of the most important Western MSS., besides others; *b* would perhaps be considered "Alexandrian," while *d* is supported by a Western group which, however small, is impossible to explain away.

Sanday and Headlam infer from it: "(i.) That the weight of good authority is in favor of placing this doxology at the end of the epistle, and there only. (ii.) That the variation in position—a variation which must be explained—is early, probably earlier than the time of Origen, although we can never have complete confidence in Rufinus's translation. (iii.) That the evidence for complete omission goes back to Marcion, and that very probably his excision of the words may have influenced the omission in Western authorities."

My dissent from the above conclusions is not affected by Zahn (*Einleitung*, 1897, § 22, n. 2), who maintains (p. 269 f.) on internal grounds that the doxology must be placed after 14<sup>23</sup>, and there only; for I agree with Sanday and Headlam that on internal grounds a separation of 15<sup>1-13</sup> from 14<sup>13-23</sup>, whether by the doxology or otherwise, is intolerable. My dissent is based primarily on the documentary evidence. A comparison of the data with §§ 240-242 of Westcott and Hort's edition of 1881, vol. ii., devoted to a discussion of "Western Non-interpolations," will show that we have here all the phenomena which point to one of those "exceptional instances of

the preservation of the original text in exclusively Western readings." It is true that our authors make the statement in the same connection (§ 240): "With a single peculiar exception (Mt. 27<sup>49</sup>) . . . the Western non-interpolations are confined to the last three chapters of St. Luke." But there is not a single characteristic in which the extremely early Western "non-interpolation" of Rom. 16<sup>25-27</sup> does not equal or surpass in evidential value that on which I.k. 22<sup>19, 20</sup> 24<sup>12, 40, 51b</sup> and similar passages are excluded from the text. The explanation which applies to these is equally applicable to Rom. 16<sup>25-27</sup>: "They are easily reconciled with the other phenomena if we suppose, first, that the text which became fixed at Alexandria, and in due time was partially adulterated by Alexandrian corruptions, was an offshoot from the text which we have called the neutral text, and which had parted company from the earliest special ancestry of the Western text at a yet earlier date; and, secondly, that the interpolations which give rise to the appearance of Western omissions took place in the interval, if not at the actual divergence, and thus stand in all non-Western texts, whether derived through Alexandria or not. . . . The purely documentary phenomena are compatible with the supposition that the Western and non-Western texts started respectively from a first and a second edition of the Gospels, both conceivably apostolic."

This is, of course, nothing else than the well-known theory suggested by Lightfoot for the phenomena of the Lucan writings, and now developed with amazing confidence by Blass. But Lightfoot also applied it to the doxology of Romans, although Professor Hort, in confining the occurrence of Western non-interpolations to the Gospels, would seem to have forgotten the conclusion he had reached ten years before in his reply to Lightfoot, viz., that the doxology, though genuine (*i.e.* Pauline), formed no part of the original epistle; in other words, is a true Western non-interpolation.

In this conclusion we are compelled to agree with him as against Sanday and Headlam, for an examination of their explanation of the omission in the Western archetype (the influence of Marcion) will show it to be quite inadequate.

But in order to do justice to the question, we must continue our synopsis of the documentary evidence:

(3) "There is very considerable evidence that Marcion omitted the whole [read a large part] of the last two chapters.

"*a.* Origen (interpr. Ruf.), x. 43, vol. vii., p. 453, ed. Lomm., writes: *Caput hoc Marcion, a quo Scripturae Evangelicae atque*

*Apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est: omne autem quod non est ex fide, peccatum est: usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est in his quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus, in nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus, hoc est: omne autem quod non est ex fide, peccatum est: statim coherens habetur: ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare. Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent."*

Sanday and Headlam rightly reject Hort's emendation of the passage to the form *et non solum hic sed et in eo loco*, etc., and his application of the words to the doxology alone, pointing out that the succeeding words, *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit*, would become quite meaningless. But Zahn's ample discussion of the passage (*op. cit.* § 22, n. 2) proves them wrong in their inference. However Hort's emendations may fare, the passage in either form could not mean that Marcion cut off the whole of ch. 15 and 16. This would have been much more simply expressed. On the contrary, Origen differentiates his treatment of the doxology, which he "removed entirely" (*penitus abstulit*), from his treatment of "all which followed the passage, 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin' (14<sup>25</sup>), to the end." This Marcion "cut to pieces" (*dissecuit*, not *deseccuit*), *i.e.* mutilated according to his well-known habit. Such a "cutting off" of the entire conclusion of the epistle is in fact in itself improbable. It cannot be supposed that it had escaped Marcion's attention that Paul is not accustomed to end his epistles in so abrupt a manner; nor that if he had before him a doctrinally unobjectionable genuine ending, or one which by a slight excision could be made so, he would not have retained it. Marcion's procedure was doubtless in accordance with his practice in the other Pauline epistles: *i.e.* he cut out phrases which for doctrinal reasons were obnoxious to him (as nearly all of 15<sup>1-13</sup> would be), especially vs.<sup>36</sup> 4. 8. 9-12. 25-28. 31b 16<sup>4</sup>. 7. 17-20<sup>(1)</sup>. But it does not appear that he had any adequate motive for rejecting the only passage which we positively know he did reject, *viz.*, the doxology. As to this, a stroke of the pen through the four words *διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν* would have fitted it exactly to his purpose in rounding out the mutilated end of the epistle. The mere fact that 16<sup>1-20</sup> contained little of use "for the definite dogmatic purpose he had in view" counts for nothing to prove omission, for he retained Philemon and the salutations of Ephesians and Colossians. Now, if we grant that Marcion had these chapters, as apparently we must,

the mere fact that he made extensive or frequent omissions from them has no significance either way.

His rejection of the doxology is rightly treated by Origen as a different matter. As to this we must conclude with Hort : " On the whole it is morally certain that the omission is his only as having been transmitted by him ; in other words, that it is a genuine ancient reading."

It remains therefore to add this evidence, more ancient even than Marcion, for the unauthenticity of the doxology to that still remaining to be enumerated.

(4) *a.* Tertullian (*Adv. Marc. v. 14*), quoting the words *tribunal Christi* (14<sup>10</sup>), states that they occur *in clausula* of the epistle ; but is perhaps referring only to Marcion's form thereof.

*b.* Marcion, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and probably Cyprian never quote from Rom. 15 or 16. This may be explained from their character, the same being true of 1 Cor. 16, but the fact has more weight in connection with

*c.* Certain systems of capitulations in MSS. of the Vulgate seem to imply the use of a form of the epistle dividing ch. 1-14 into fifty sections, the fiftieth containing 14<sup>13(15)-21</sup>. A fifty-first and last section contained the doxology, 16<sup>25-27</sup>. This is the system of Codex Amiatinus, and " seems to have prevailed very widely." Codex Fuldensis supplements an otherwise unknown system, which divided ch. 1-14 into twenty-three sections, by means of the Amiatine. Apparently the former extended no further than ch. 14, possibly to 14<sup>12</sup> only, in which case it was fragmentary, and has no independent significance. To make up the total of fifty-one sections required by his table of contents, the scribe took the last twenty-eight of the Amiatine system, although he thus duplicated ch. 9-14.

Hort's explanation of these phenomena, a dropping of the last two chapters from the Lectionaries as unsuited to public reading, and substitution of the doxology, followed by its adoption into the text, is felt by Sanday and Headlam to be inadequate. Even if supposable, it takes no account of the patristic evidence. With Sanday and Headlam we conclude that " No single argument in favor of the existence of the shorter recension may be strong, but the combination of reasons is too weighty to be explained away."

But the explanation of Gifford, followed by Sanday and Headlam, is also inadmissible. Mere *mutilations* of ch. 15, 16 by Marcion cannot have led to their omission from the Lectionaries, still less to a form of the text ending with 14<sup>23</sup>, with or without the doxology. The existence of such a recension remains therefore one of the

diplomatic probabilities requiring explanation, perhaps connected in its origin with the omission of ἐν Ῥώμῃ in 17.<sup>15</sup> by certain texts.

If we turn now to the internal evidence, it is at once apparent that a broad line of distinction must be drawn between the doxology and the rest of the two chapters in this respect, as well as in that of documentary attestation.

It is needless to repeat the refutation of a theory whose meagre support is fast dwindling to nothing, that of the spuriousness of ch. 15 f. If still maintained in any quarter, it is amply refuted in the few words (their own and their predecessors') devoted to the subject by Sanday and Headlam. It is enough to say that if ch. 15 were not there, the ingenuity of criticism would soon have discovered that precisely such an ending was lacking to the epistle. If, per contra, it had been discovered in the sands of Egypt, unknown, anonymous, and unclaimed, the proof of its having originally formed the authentic close of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans would have been deemed one of the most undeniable triumphs of critical skill. The interpolations discovered by Lipsius, devoid of external support, are based, even as to internal evidence, upon our ignorance rather than our knowledge. The internal evidence of ch. 15 is conclusive in its favor. Division between ch. 14 and 15 is purely arbitrary, and must have come about from some cause not yet explained at a time subsequent to the giving out of the letter.

This, of course, disposes at once of the direct testimony cited under (4) against the doxology. Indirectly the existence of this truncated form of the epistle accounts for the insertion of the doxology after 14<sup>23</sup>. Directly, its case is not affected.

The internal evidence of the doxology appears to me to point in the opposite direction. Not that its Pauline character and authorship are to me any less manifest than that of ch. 15, but that the impossibility of connecting it with the Epistle to the Romans is so clear. Undeniably it has a certain affinity with it, such as might be expected if written on the same occasion but to a different church. This subtle relation to the four greater epistles has been brought out by Hort, but did not obscure to his keen perception its much more vital relation to Ephesians. It is only to Sanday and Headlam that Hort's analysis seems to prove the doxology "not only a genuine work of St. Paul, but also an integral portion of the epistle." It seems to me that here their judgment of the internal is as erroneous as of the external evidence.

We have seen that the documentary evidence would characterize

Rom. 16<sup>25-27</sup> as a Western non-interpolation. Only strong internal evidence of its authenticity could counteract the showing. In point of fact it is very hard to believe it was ever framed by Paul for either of the positions to which the varying documentary evidence assigns it, and one or the other of which is alternately favored by the greatest conservative authorities of to-day. If with Zahn we place it after 14<sup>21</sup>, we produce an intolerable interruption of the course of thought which Sanday and Headlam so justly insist is continuous. If we append it to the postscript the position will be almost equally infelicitous. Doxologies are frequent in Paul, but do not occur without adequate occasion in the immediate context. In general it appears to be the mention of "the good and acceptable and perfect will of God," when his goodness, wisdom, and power stand revealed in their inexpressible greatness, that calls for these ejaculations: cf. 11<sup>33-36</sup> 2 Cor. 9<sup>15</sup> Gal. 1<sup>5</sup> Eph. 3<sup>20f.</sup> Phil. 4<sup>20</sup> 1 Tim. 1<sup>17</sup> 2 Tim. 4<sup>18</sup>. It is true that they more than once appropriately wind up the argument of Paul as a kind of splendid peroration, *e.g.* Rom. 11<sup>33-36</sup> Eph. 3<sup>20f.</sup> 1 Tim. 1<sup>17</sup>, and so naturally come often to stand at the close of a letter, as in Phil. 4<sup>20</sup> 2 Tim. 4<sup>18</sup>; but the doxology precedes in all cases the salutations and benediction, and in the nature of the case must do so. If Paul had really experienced such a rekindling of the emotions as Sanday and Headlam suppose, impelling him after completing the letter, and even after having added a few greetings in what they denominate a postscript, to reopen the principal subjects for a further expression of his emotions of praise, he would have had Tertius insert it somewhere in the body of the letter; not after 14<sup>21</sup>, to be sure, but in some such place as those already thus marked. At the very least he would have placed it before the benediction in vs. 30<sup>b</sup>, as in Phil. 4<sup>20</sup> 2 Tim. 4<sup>18</sup>. To cite the case of 2 Pt. 3<sup>18</sup> Jude 24<sup>f.</sup> for a similar doxology as the ending of an epistle is beside the mark, for here we have neither salutations nor benediction. Who can doubt that if they had been present they would have followed and not preceded the doxology? Clement of Rome combines benediction and doxology in one.

But it is not merely that the doxology is manifestly out of place in either position assigned to it in the MSS. It is quite impossible to allow it a position anywhere in Romans, least of all in a mere appendix to a postscript, because the subject of its thanksgiving, while not altogether foreign to Romans, is nowhere dwelt upon in this epistle in sufficient degree to make it intelligible to Paul's readers. There is one epistle of Paul, and only one, in connection with

which this grand doxology would be perfectly intelligible, viz., Ephesians. Substitute Rom. 16<sup>25-27</sup> for Eph. 3<sup>20f.</sup>, and its meaning and appropriateness would be apparent from 3<sup>5, 9-11</sup>, — not, indeed, I admit, to those who have been blinded to the true significance of this sublime epistle by the notion that “the mystery which from all ages hath been hid in God who created all things . . . the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus,” is merely the co-heirship of the Gentiles. Every student of the apocalyptic literature, and particularly of Paul’s relation to it, must see that the mystery vainly searched into, not only “in other generations by the sons of men,” but now revealed even “to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places” only through the church, is the mystery of the creative purpose. Angels have desired to look into it, but as God says to Enoch in Slavonic En. 24<sup>2</sup>: “I will tell thee now even from the first what things I created from the non-existent. . . . Not even to my angels have I told my secrets, nor have I informed them of their (own) origin.” But as Paul declares in the epistle which Ignatius rightly regarded as making the Ephesians *συμμύσται* with Paul in the mystery of the cosmic unity in Christ, in whom, by whom, and for whom all things were created, “it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit.” The mystery in which angels and men have from all ages been supremely interested, which in other generations the sons of men have vainly sought to know, hid from the wisest of this world, is the mystery of the universe, its origin and destiny. This is the secret of him who created it for his own inscrutable eternal purpose. If we would appreciate the exultation of Paul in the conviction that this mystery of God’s eternal purpose, which he purposed in Christ Jesus, hath now been revealed to us through the Spirit, we must compare the exultation of the contemporary or earlier *Assumptio Mosis* 1<sup>14-16</sup> in the conviction that Gen. 1<sup>27f.</sup>, interpreted as applying to the people of God, *i.e.* Israel, reveals the final cause of all things: “God hath created the world on behalf of his people. But he was not pleased to manifest this purpose of creation from the foundation of the world in order that the Gentiles might thereby be convicted, yea, to their own humiliation might by their arguments convict one another (*i.e.* their conflicting cosmologies demonstrate the Mosaic as alone revealed). Accordingly he designed and devised me” (Moses), etc.

Rom. 16<sup>25-27</sup> does not belong in the place of the passage it so strongly resembles in its opening clause, Eph. 3<sup>20f.</sup>; but to be intelligible it must have followed upon some such exposition of “the mystery

which from all ages hath been hid in God" as we find in Eph. 1-3, with the parallels in Colossians, and do not find elsewhere in the known writings of Paul, though passages which presuppose some such cosmology are not unknown even in the earlier epistles, e.g. 1 Cor. 2<sup>1-12</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> Rom. 8<sup>10-23</sup>. But it is only, as it were, the last corollary of the revelation, Paul's *special* insight into the mystery of the cosmic purpose of the Creator, — only the *historical* element of his "eternal purpose to sum up all things in Christ, whether things on earth or things in the heavens," only the union of Jew and Gentile in a redeemed people of God, which clearly appears in Romans. And this special share of Paul in "the mystery of Christ that hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit," has its own appropriate doxology in Rom. 11<sup>33-36</sup>. Now, it is the *cosmic* mystery of which Paul is speaking in 16<sup>25-27</sup>. "The revelation of the mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal" belongs to Pauline apocalypse, and demands something of the nature of Eph. 1-3 to make it appropriate, or, indeed, in the fullest sense intelligible. In letters addressed to the churches of proconsular Asia, or to intimate associates familiar with his cosmology, a doxology of this character would be natural; cf. Eph. 1<sup>3-14</sup> Ti. 1<sup>26</sup>. In a letter addressed to a strange church it could not stand alone and unexplained.

Our conclusion, which I cannot but feel has strong evidence, both external and internal, in its support, must be that the doxology Rom. 16<sup>25-27</sup> is a Pauline fragment, attached, when not altogether omitted, at the end of Romans. There having been in circulation early in the second century a shorter form of the epistle ending with 14<sup>23</sup>, it was in these texts appended there. In others which placed the benediction in vs.<sup>24</sup> it followed thereafter. In no case has it a better position than an irrelevant attachment at the end.

Of its original setting we can know, of course, but little. (1) It was probably written at the same time as Romans, not only from its textual connection with it, but because of the internal affinity; cf. *στηρίξαι* vs.<sup>25</sup> with Rom. 1<sup>11</sup>, but see also 1 Thess. 3<sup>2</sup> 13 2 Thess. 2<sup>17</sup> 3<sup>3</sup>; *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου* with Rom. 2<sup>16</sup>, but see also 2 Tim. 2<sup>8</sup>; *εἰς ὑπακοήν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* with Rom. 1<sup>5</sup>; *σοφῶ θεῶ* with Rom. 11<sup>33</sup>. (2) It was probably written to some church or churches in proconsular Asia in connection with some such exposition of Paul's cosmology as appears in Ephesians and Colossians. (3) It cannot originally have stood as a mere appendix, but is a fragment from the heart of some larger whole. This is not only apparent from its

nature as the appropriate crown of some exposition of the mystery of the eternal, hidden purpose of the loving Creator, but is required by the introductory  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ , a connective particle, and enables us in some degree to account for the anacoluthon at the end.

It was not a part of my purpose to discuss the theory of Schulz (1829), which regards Rom. 16<sup>1-20</sup>, or a part thereof, as a letter of commendation given to Phoebe in connection with the writing of Romans for delivery in Ephesus. It has the weight of such names as Weizsäcker, Lipsius, McGiffert, and even of such conservatives as B. Weiss and Farrar in its support, but against it the serious archaeological objections brought forward by Lightfoot and reproduced with others by Sanday and Headlam and Zahn. Almost every internal argument applicable to the disconnection of 16<sup>25-27</sup> from Romans and the connection of it with proconsular Asia would apply equally to vs. 17-20; but the absence of any external evidence — for the existence at an early date of a form of Romans containing only ch. 1-14 can hardly be called such — puts the two questions on a wholly different basis. If the letter of commendation of Phoebe originally belonged to an epistle intended for Ephesus, part of which was preserved along with Romans through the accident of having been dictated to the same scribe (Tertius) at the same sitting, the copyist in Corinth having transcribed a part of the former along with the latter, then the doxology may well be conceived as coming from the same, an Alexandrian survival similar to the extra-canonical fragments in Lk. 22-24. Such speculations are tempting, and in the instance before us have a peculiarly strong *prima facie* case in the merely internal evidence. A tracing up of all the clues will suggest an internal relation between Rom. 16<sup>17-27</sup>, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles (cf. *e.g.* Ti. 1<sup>2f.</sup> 2<sup>14</sup> 3<sup>3-7</sup>). But while such speculation is to be encouraged under strict canons rather than deprecated, the true procedure must certainly be first textual, afterwards the higher criticism. First establish, if possible, the existence of fragments from unknown letters of Paul on purely textual grounds; afterwards scrutinize the possibilities of similar survivals in 2 Cor. 6<sup>14</sup>-7<sup>1</sup> and 10<sup>1</sup>-13<sup>10</sup> Rom. 16<sup>1-20</sup> and the Pastoral Epistles. To prove the existence of one such survival has been the object of this paper.

---

[EDITORIAL NOTE. — This article was received before the publication of Professor Ryder's article on the authorship of Romans 15, 16, in vol. xvii. of the JOURNAL.]