

# Current Trends of Thought on Paul and the Gospel

## The 'new perspective on Paul' and related issues

---

The last 45 years or so have seen some new ideas emerging from Protestant scholars on aspects of Paul's understanding of the gospel as revealed in his letters. The term used to describe them is 'the new perspective on Paul' (NPP). These ideas have taken some time to percolate into the awareness of Christians at large—indeed, many still remain unaware of them. But their influence is growing rapidly.

Some of the ideas are not really new, having been held by certain wings of the church for centuries, but are now becoming mainstream. Others stem from more recent research into Koine Greek and the background of first-century Judaism from which Paul came.

This is an attempt to summarise the main ideas, which are now being recognised and discussed widely.

### Some key players

Many theologians have become involved, but three in particular have played a major role in forming and spreading these ideas:

- **E.P. Sanders.** In 1977 he produced a ground-breaking book entitled *Paul And Palestinian Judaism*. This examined the state of Judaism in Paul's day and how Paul's writings reflected it. He concluded that, since the Reformation, virtually all Protestant thinking on Paul's teaching has been conditioned, not by Paul's own Jewish background, but by religious conditions in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when the likes of Luther and Calvin reacted against the 'salvation by works' message of a corrupt RC Church.
- **James D.G. Dunn.** He contributed more work on Paul's thinking, and is best known for actually coining the phrase 'the new perspective on Paul' (in 1982). A huge number of other scholars have contributed to the debate, and they offer a wide variety of views, so there is in fact no such thing as a *single* 'new perspective on Paul'. But the phrase is still a useful way of identifying the broad trend of the new ideas.
- **N.T. Wright.** Formerly the Bishop of Durham, Wright is a NT scholar, a committed evangelical and a towering intellect whose writings have done much to bring the NPP within reach of ordinary Christians. He is a prolific author and a specialist in Pauline studies. He disagrees with both Sanders and Dunn on certain aspects of the subject and musters some convincing evidence for his conclusions.

### Some key concepts

A number of interrelated concepts come together to make up the NPP. Prominent among them are:

#### Christ/Messiah

These two words are of course transliterations of the Greek and Hebrew words for 'anointed one'. Many believers use 'Christ' in the naïve belief that it is Jesus' surname, a bit like 'Smith'. But even those of us who know that it means 'anointed one' often fail to associate that with the rich concept

of 'Messiah', which ties 'Christ' right into Israel's history and the identity of the nation's promised deliverer.

For that reason N.T. Wright in particular uses 'Christ' very sparingly, preferring to use 'the Messiah' instead, and he does this universally throughout his own translation of the NT. That way, he believes, it is easier for us to keep the NT revelation firmly anchored where it belongs: to the bedrock of OT promise that has worked itself out in the history of Israel.

### **The climax of Israel's story**

Many Christians have wrongly tended to separate Israel from the church. They have implied that, while God in OT days dealt with the nation of Israel, due to their failure he turned his attention to an alternative community, the church.

This is a serious error. God has never had a 'Plan B'. His one 'Plan A' purpose in calling Abraham and his descendants, the nation of Israel, was in order that the Jews might be 'a light to the Gentiles' and that, by this means, he might reach everyone and in due course put the whole world to rights—not just all human beings but the whole created order.

Paul constantly has the underlying OT narrative in mind in his writings. He insists that the fact that the Jews failed so signally in their mission did not throw God's plan off track. The Messiah, Jesus, proved to be *the* true Israelite, who embodied in himself everything that the nation had been called to be. His resurrection vindicated him as God's chosen one, through whom all who believe—Gentiles as well as Jews—can partake in the new age he had inaugurated.

According to Paul, Israel thus continues but has been *redefined*. The children of Abraham—or to use synonymous terms, 'Israel' or 'the people of God'—are now all who believe in Jesus, regardless of their ethnic background. In this way God has honoured his covenant with Abraham. This is the message of Paul's letter to the Romans, whose fundamental topic is 'Who are the people of God?'

### **The gospel**

The Greek term is *euangelion* (εὐαγγέλιον). It means 'good news' and was widely used in Paul's day, long before the Christian message came on the scene, to mean the good news that Caesar was Lord of the whole world, that the benefits of living under his rule were second to none, and that people needed to submit to him to secure those benefits. This 'good news' was always trumpeted on the emperor's birthday.

Christians took over the word and applied it to the risen Jesus. It was he, and not Caesar, they insisted, who was Lord of the whole world, and real life and success came from submission to him. It was before Christ, not Caesar, that every knee must bow.

Seen this way, the Christian message is more than a private affair concerned with how an individual may find God. It had a public dimension in that it boldly confronted the claims of Rome, and the church that proclaimed it thus came to be seen as a politically subversive movement threatening the very foundations of the Empire. It helps explain why many Christians were willing to die rather than sacrifice to the Emperor as a deity and say 'Caesar is Lord'.

In NT thinking the 'gospel' was not primarily a system of salvation, nor even the good news that there *is* a way of salvation available to all—though that was implied within it. It was fundamentally the proclamation that Jesus of Nazareth had been raised from the dead and had thereby been

shown to be Israel's promised Messiah. And since God's purpose through the Messiah had always been to reach every nation and to put the whole world to rights, the claim to be Israel's Messiah was simultaneously a claim to be the whole world's true Lord. Paul's 'gospel' was 'Jesus Christ (i.e. Jesus the Messiah) is Lord'.

The gospel was thus a call to submission, obedience and allegiance to him, and that finds expression in *faith* in him—what Paul calls 'the obedience of faith' (Rom 1:5), expressed in baptism.

### **The *ordo salutis***

Literally 'the order of salvation'. The Latin phrase means the chronological (or logical) order of events in the process by which a person comes to be finally saved.

The naming of the various stages has over the centuries become confused. Reformed Christians have tended to use 'justification' and 'conversion' to mean more or less the same thing: the step of turning away from sin and embracing Christ for salvation. The NPP questions this terminology, especially with regard to the term 'justification'. A key passage here is Paul's 'golden chain' with its five links:

**Romans 8:29–30** Those God **foreknew** he also **predestined** to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brothers and sisters.<sup>30</sup> And those he predestined, he also **called**; those he called, he also **justified**; those he justified, he also **glorified**.

Of these it is 'called' that Paul uses to indicate (to quote Wright) 'the effective call of the gospel, applied by the Spirit to the individual heart and life and resulting in a turning away from idolatry and sin and a lifelong turning to God in Christ in believing allegiance.'<sup>1</sup>

Two steps in Paul's chain *precede* this. The first is God's foreknowledge. The second is his predestination. 'Predestined', however, has become highly coloured by Reformed Christianity to mean, at a personal level, 'guaranteed to secure eternal life'. As Paul uses the term, by contrast, it is God's 'marking people out ahead of time', the mark being specifically stated to be likeness to his Son.

Then, *after* the call comes justification: 'those he called he also justified'. So justification—declaring someone to be 'righteous'—is something subsequent to, and different from, what we tend to call conversion.<sup>2</sup> 'Justification' and the related term 'righteous' are such key terms in the NPP that some comments need to be made on them specifically (see below).

### **Righteousness**

The Greek term—*dikaiosynē* (δικαιοσύνη)—has been commonly misunderstood, according to the NPP. Its meaning is in fact variable and determined by its context. Many English translations of the

---

<sup>1</sup> I did a quick search for the use of 'call' in Paul's letters where it could mean salvation and came up with 37 instances.

<sup>2</sup> And note that the final item is not, as many would expect, 'sanctification' but glorification: Paul regards all who have become Christians as already sanctified—1 Cor 6:10-11. As for glorification, 'Paul regards it as a fixed point that those who belong to the Messiah by faith and baptism already share his glorious life, his rule over the world, and that this rule, this glory, will one day be manifest.' (Wright).

NT, traditionally leaning on the Reformers' 16<sup>th</sup>-century interpretation, do little to dispel the confusion.

### *'The righteousness of God'*

This phrase occurs in, e.g., Rom 3:21. The Greek term is *dikaiosyne theou* (δικαιοσύνη θεου), literally 'the righteousness of God' (the 'righteousness' word reflects its Hebrew predecessor: *tsedaqah*). The phrase always means God's *own* righteousness, not—as virtually every English Bible renders it—the status that God's people have *from* him. There is, of course, such a thing as a righteous status that people enjoy, a gift of God, but this phrase is definitely not a description of it.

God's 'righteousness' indicates his *determination to be faithful to his covenant with Abraham*: in spite of Israel's waywardness and resulting exile, God has remained faithful to his commitment and has rescued her—through Christ—as he promised he would. He has 'done the *right* thing' by her. And he will pursue that covenant plan to its fulfilment in eventually liberating the whole creation from corruption, sin and death.

Contrary to Reformed views, God's righteousness is *not* synonymous with his salvation; it is the *reason why* he has saved his people. Wright notes: 'What God's righteousness never becomes, in the Jewish background which Paul is so richly summing up, is an attribute which is passed on to, reckoned to, or imputed to, his people. Nor does Paul treat it in this way.'

### *'The righteousness that comes from God'*

This is a different phrase: Greek *hē ek theou dikaiosynē* (ἡ ἐκ θεου δικαιοσύνη). It occurs in, e.g., Phil 3:9. It means literally 'the righteousness that comes *from* God' (as distinct from the righteousness that characterises God himself), and the phrase indicates the righteous status that we, as believers, enjoy as a gift from him.

God does indeed 'reckon' righteousness to us—but note that this righteousness is not the righteousness of God or of Christ somehow transferred to us, as traditional Protestantism has affirmed since the Reformation (see below).

### *'Righteous' or 'Just' or 'Justified'*

[Note these alternative English translations. The *dikaio*-group of words in Greek may equally be translated 'righteous/righteousness' or 'just/justice/justify'. There are not two distinct word-groups as in English.]

Greek *dikaios* (δικαιος). The background of this term (and the related ones) is the Jewish lawcourt, where a judge has before him a plaintiff and a defendant. He hears their case and settles it by pronouncing '*dikaios*' over one or the other. This is now the declared status of the vindicated party. It has nothing to do with some 'righteousness' of the judge being somehow transferred to that person. Nor does it mean 'to *make* righteous'. It means 'to *declare* righteous' as a legal status; this person is declared to be 'in the right'. A good English alternative would be 'vindicated'.

This status is what is 'reckoned' to the believer in, e.g., Rom 5:14-21. It is not God's or Christ's own righteousness that is somehow transferred. It is a new *status*: the believer now enjoys the status of

‘justified sinner’ and, by implication, ‘covenant member’ of God’s people.<sup>3</sup> It is accredited to those who are in Christ, that is, those who, having heard the gospel, respond with ‘the obedience of faith’. They become *bona fide* members of ‘the Israel of God’.

## Justification

Paul uses *dikaioō* (δικαιῶ), ‘to justify’, and its cognates *not* to describe the moment when, or the process by which, a person turns from idolatry, sin and death to God, Christ and life, but rather *the verdict that God pronounces consequent upon that event*.

‘Justify’ (or ‘vindicate’) isn’t a word that makes something happen or changes the way something is; it is a *declarative* word, declaring that something is the case. As we noted earlier, it is lawcourt terminology. Wright says: ‘When we talk of God’s vindication of someone we are talking about God’s declaration, which appears as a double thing to us but I suspect a single thing to Paul: the declaration (a) that someone is in the right (their sins having been forgiven through the death of Jesus) and (b) that this person is a member of the true covenant family, the family God originally promised to Abraham and has now created through Christ and the Spirit, the single family which consists equally of believing Jews and believing Gentiles.’

Note again that justification is *not* God’s bringing something about but his authoritative *declaration that something is the case*.

Wright again: ‘This vindication occurs twice. It occurs in the future on the basis of the entire life a person has led in the power of the Spirit – that is, it occurs on the basis of “works” in Paul’s redefined sense [see below for more on this]. And, near the heart of Paul’s theology, it occurs in the present *as an anticipation of that future verdict*, when someone, responding in believing obedience to the “call” of the gospel, believes that Jesus is Lord and that God raised him from the dead. This is the point about justification by faith – to revert to the familiar terminology: it is the *anticipation in the present* of the verdict which will be *reaffirmed in the future*. Justification is not “how someone becomes a Christian”. It is God’s declaration about the person who has just become a Christian. And, just as the final declaration will consist, not of words so much as of an event, namely, the resurrection of the person concerned into a glorious body like that of the risen Jesus, so the present declaration consists, not so much of words, though words there may be, but of an event, the event in which one dies with the Messiah and rises to new life with him, anticipating that final resurrection. In other words, baptism.’

This shift of emphasis is hard for most of us to come to terms with, not because it is erroneous, but because we have become so used to using the term ‘justification’ in a certain way—a way that the NPP has shown to be open to serious question.

Wright sees three factors emerging from this more accurate understanding of justification:

1. Paul’s doctrine of what is true of those who are in the Messiah does the job, within his scheme of thought, that the traditional Protestant emphasis on the imputation of Christ’s righteousness

---

<sup>3</sup> There is an intimate link between being declared righteous and being a member of God’s covenant people. For example, in Gen 17:11 God gave the practice of circumcision to Abraham as ‘a *sign* of the *covenant*’ between God and him. When Paul refers to this in Rom 4:11 he uses the phrase ‘he received circumcision as a *sign*, a seal of the *righteousness* [*dikaioῦnē*] that he had by faith...’ This ‘being in the right’ is thus the same thing as ‘membership in the covenant’.

did within that scheme. Jesus was vindicated by God as Messiah after his penal death; I am in the Messiah; therefore I too have died and been raised. According to Romans 6, when God looks at the baptised Christian he sees him or her in Christ. But Paul does not say that he sees us clothed with the earned merits of Christ. That would of course be the wrong meaning of 'righteous' or 'righteousness'. He sees us within the *vindication* of Christ, that is, as having died with Christ and risen again with him.

2. Justification, for Paul, is not (in Sanders's terminology) how one 'gets in' to God's people, but about God's declaration that someone *is* in. In other words, it is all about assurance. We are now and for ever part of the family to every member of which God says what he said to Jesus at his baptism: you are my beloved child, with you I am well pleased.
3. Justification is the original *ecumenical* doctrine. The first time we meet justification, that is, in Galatians 2, it is about people from different cultures and traditions sharing table-fellowship on the basis of nothing other than their shared faith in Jesus as Messiah and Lord. Once we relocate justification, moving it from the discussion of how people become Christians to the discussion of how we know that someone is a Christian, we have a powerful incentive to work together across denominational barriers.

### Final judgment according to works

The great battle-cry of the Reformation was 'justification by faith'. It reflected the wonder of the discovery that salvation was not, as the mediaeval Catholic Church taught, something earned by good works or acts of penance, but was a gift of God's pure grace, received with the empty hands of faith. We rightly continue to believe that without reservation.

In their understandable reaction against anything that smacks of 'works', however, Protestants have found difficulty with some of Paul's statements that seem to give at least some room for 'works' in the Ultimate Assize at Christ's return. Such statements are particularly embarrassing in Romans, the letter usually touted as a treatise on *sola gratia* (grace alone) and *sola fide* (by faith alone). But there Paul, speaking of the day of judgment, clearly says:

**Romans 2:6–10** God "will repay each person according to what they have done."<sup>7</sup> To those who by persistence in doing good seek glory, honour and immortality, he will give eternal life.<sup>8</sup> But for those who are self-seeking and who reject the truth and follow evil, there will be wrath and anger.<sup>9</sup> There will be trouble and distress for every human being who does evil: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile;<sup>10</sup> but glory, honour and peace for everyone who does good: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile.

See also 2 Cor 5:10. We should take Paul's words at face value and not shuffle uncomfortably and ignore them or try to fudge their meaning: God's final judgment will be in accordance with *the entirety of the life a person has led*—in accordance, in other words, with their works. Jesus himself taught along the same lines (e.g. Mat 16:27).

A balancing factor here, however, is important. As Wright observes: 'The "works" in accordance with which the Christian will be vindicated on the last day are not the unaided works of the self-help moralist. Nor are they the performance of the ethnically distinctive Jewish boundary-markers (sabbath, food-laws and circumcision). They are the things which show, rather, that one is in Christ; the things which are produced in one's life as a result of the Spirit's indwelling and operation.'

Interestingly, Paul himself, in 1 Thess 2:19-20 and Phil 2:16, has no problem with ‘boasting’ about what he has achieved and sees it as standing him in good stead on the day of judgment—because it is an effective sign that the Spirit of the living Christ has been at work in him.

### **Works of the law**

The Reformers understandably equated Paul’s phrase ‘works of the law’ with the kind of religion they saw in the corrupt Roman Catholic Church of their day. Subsequent generations of Protestants have maintained that view, unable to imagine that the phrase could mean anything different. They hold that Paul chastised the Jews for trying to earn their way into God’s favour by their good works. Thus when in Rom 10:3 he says that they ‘sought to establish their own’ righteousness he means that they were desperately trying to accumulate spiritual merit by their own moral efforts.

The NPP, however, detaching itself from the 16<sup>th</sup>-century mentality and examining the mindset of Second Temple Judaism, sees the ‘works of the law’ as something different. Its proponents maintain that the Jews in Paul’s day never in fact saw God’s favour as something they could earn by their good works. They universally recognised that God’s choice of them as a people was an act of his grace alone.

If this was the case, what did Paul mean in Rom 10:3? Wright describes how he thought it through: ‘Supposing, I thought, Paul meant “seeking to establish *their own* righteousness”, not in the sense of a *moral* status based on the *performance* of Torah and the consequent accumulation of a treasury of merit, but an *ethnic* status based on the *possession* of Torah as the sign of automatic covenant membership?’ On this view, “works of the law” are the works through which the Jew was defined over against the pagan: his pride was in the ‘badges’ of covenant membership like the Mosaic Law and circumcision (Rom 2:27).

Paul is at pains to show in Romans that reliance on these ‘badges’ is no guarantee of covenant membership. On the contrary, he insists, the Jews have for the most part shown themselves to be ungodly. Worst of all, they have rejected God’s revelation of Jesus, their Messiah, and have failed to put their faith in him, while many Gentiles, who never had the Jews’ ancient privileges, have been flocking to him and God has accepted them.

Israel has been redefined. Membership of the covenant community is by faith in the Messiah alone, just as it was for its founding father, Abraham, who believed God and found acceptance before the law was given and circumcision introduced. Reliance on the possession of Torah, circumcision and observing the food laws were the Jews’ vaunted ‘works of the law’, while Paul was at pains to show that the only ‘badge’ that now counted was faith in Jesus.

### **‘Faith’ and ‘Faithfulness’**

Greek *pistis* (πιστις), ‘faith’, and cognate words like *pisteuō* (πιστευω), ‘to have faith’, ‘to believe’.

Traditionally, Protestants have believed that Paul always used *pistis* to mean trust in Christ for salvation, as in Eph 2:8-9. But recent studies into the word and its background have concluded that it very often means *faithfulness*, in the sense of firm commitment in an inter-personal relationship.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Sometimes this is so obvious that most English versions render it ‘faithfulness’. For example, *pistis* is commonly translated that way in Rom 3:3.

Sometimes, especially in an unequal relationship like that of a slave to his master, *pistis* in its ‘faithfulness’ sense is a near-equivalent to ‘obedience’. This means that, whereas Protestants have traditionally seen ‘faith’ and ‘obedience’ as distinct from one another, and even incompatible, the two are in fact closely related, which helps to explain a phrase like the ‘obedience of faith’. What’s more, ‘faith’ with this connotation, far from ruling out any human effort, positively encourages it. While in no way undermining the traditionally-emphasised need for faith (in the sense of taking God at his word) for salvation, this view equally emphasises the fact that true faith will always issue in the kind of legitimate works implied in the NT’s ‘make every effort to...’ passages.

One phrase that includes this word has received particular attention in the NPP: *pistis Christou* (πιστις Χριστου), literally ‘the faith[fulness] of Christ’. Until recently most English versions of the NT have assumed it to mean the ‘faith *in* Christ’ exercised by other people and have translated it that way in passages like Romans 3:22; Galatians 2:16 and Philippians 3:9. But the weight of scholarship has now swung behind the conviction that Paul means by it ‘the *faithfulness* of Christ’, that is, the *faithfulness of the Messiah* to the purposes of God. Seeing it this way, Jesus is the true Israelite who succeeded in living God’s way when all the others failed, enabling God to remain true to his covenant.<sup>5</sup>

## Summary

- ‘Christ’ means ‘Messiah’—Israel’s promised deliverer and king. Using ‘Messiah’ helps us keep in mind that Jesus, who achieved that deliverance, was a Jew, fulfilling God’s promises to Abraham and achieving God’s goal of expanding ‘Israel’ to include believing Gentiles as well as believing Jews.
- We must never divorce Christ from his Jewish background or make him less than central to its definition. There has only ever been one Israel, one ‘people of God’. Christ came as the true Jew and the Messiah. In him God has redefined Israel, so that the badge of belonging is faith expressed in baptism, and it is available to all people everywhere, regardless of their ethnic origin.
- The ‘gospel’ is the good news that Jesus, through his death and resurrection, has become the Lord of all, and is a summons to obedience and allegiance to him. This was politically subversive in Paul’s day, and remains so today wherever totalitarian regimes rule.
- The term Paul uses for ‘become a Christian’ is ‘*called*’—the effective call of God by the Spirit. Those whom God calls he then ‘justifies’, that is, declares to have the legal status of ‘in the right’. This is his anticipation in the present of the verdict that he will declare over them in the future.
- God is righteous, that is, *faithful to his covenant* with Israel in spite of their disobedience. His righteousness is not something passed on to or imputed to his people.
- He does, however, declare to be ‘righteous’ or ‘in the right’ those who submit to Jesus as Lord, and accepts them as members of his covenant people. He thus ‘justifies’ them. To justify is ‘to declare righteous’. It is a term from the lawcourts meaning to ascribe to a person a legal status

---

<sup>5</sup> Some Bible versions translate the phrase this way. For example, the International Standard Version (ISV) of Rom 3:22 says, ‘...God’s righteousness through the *faithfulness* of Jesus the Messiah...’ The NET is similar, and the popular FaithLife Study Bible covers it in a note.

of being 'in the right'. It does not mean to transfer or impute to that person the righteousness of God or Christ.

- Those who are in Christ are enabled by the Spirit to live a good life and thus become increasingly like Jesus himself. God's ultimate judgment of them will be on the basis of the entirety of the life they have lived in seeking to please him. God brings this forward into the present by 'justifying' them (declaring them vindicated and 'in the right') *now* as they trust Jesus and submit to baptism.
- The 'works of the law' for which Paul chastised the Jews are not their alleged attempt to earn salvation by keeping the Mosaic law. They are their reliance on what they saw as the badges of covenant membership: circumcision and the keeping of Torah. Because of what the Messiah has achieved, the only valid badge now is faith, and it is available to people of any and every ethnic group.
- While faith is rightly viewed as taking God at his word, it also contains a strong element of *faithfulness*. The *pistis Christou* ('faith of Christ') was his faithfulness as Messiah to the purposes of God. For us, to have faith in him is also to be faithful to him, and that implies practical dedication to the task.

## Conclusion

The NPP touches other areas, but the above are probably the main ones. What are we to make of them?

If we take N.T. Wright as the best-known current exponent of some of these approaches we have every reason to be confident that we are on pretty safe ground. Wright has shown himself time and time again to be committed to the fundamentals of evangelical faith, and the tweaking of some of these represented by the above points in no way undermines that position. James Dunn, too, is broadly evangelical.<sup>6</sup>

Some Reformed teachers and writers have overreacted to the NPP—unhelpfully and prematurely, in my opinion. If you have stuck rigidly to a doctrinal system all your life, you are prone to see any challenge to it as a threat to your very *raison d'être* and to become unnecessarily defensive. One of the strong points of the Reformers, however, was their commitment to bring to Scripture an open-minded approach over against the fixed traditional view, and to go where their findings took them (*sola scriptura*). This is the very attitude that the likes of Wright have adopted. In looking freshly at Paul's writings in the light of newly-available insights into Greek and fresh background information about his era they have taken a further step towards understanding his meaning, and we have nothing to fear from it.

It will take some time for English translations of the NT to catch up and tweak some words and phrases. Until they do, the traditional renderings of phrases like *pistis Christou* will probably continue to shape readers' views.

---

<sup>6</sup> He contributed the two volumes on Romans to the *Word Biblical Commentary* series.

### **Recommended reading**

You will find a readable and comprehensive presentation of most of the above ideas in N.T. Wright's *Paul: Fresh Perspectives* (SPCK, 2005)—available in hard copy, Kindle edition, or for Logos Bible Software.

On the particular issue of 'justification' and its meaning see N.T. Wright's *Justification: God's Plan And Paul's Vision* (SPCK, 2009)—Wright's response to the critique by John Piper of his earlier work on the subject.

David Matthew July 2012