

# OpenTheo

## #11 Easter, the resurrection and thoughts on Jordan Peterson

April 9, 2019



### Ask NT Wright Anything - Premier

As Easter approaches Tom answers a variety of listener questions on the Biblical resurrection accounts, the nature of the resurrection body, why Jesus didn't stay with us, and also shares his thoughts on popular psychology professor Jordan B Peterson.

For prize draws, bonus content and to ask a question sign up at [www.askntwright.com](http://www.askntwright.com)

For podcast listener discounts on Tom's books [www.spckpublishing.co.uk/askntwright](http://www.spckpublishing.co.uk/askntwright)

Subscribe to the Ask NT Wright Anything podcast via PodBean, iTunes or RSS Feed

## Transcript

[Music] Premier Podcast.

[Music]

[Music] The Ask NT Wright Anything podcast.

[Music] Well hello there and welcome along to the program once more.

I'm Justin Briley, Premier's Apologetics and Theology Editor, sitting down on a regular basis with Tom Wright to ask him your questions. The show is brought to you by Premier in partnership with SBCK and NT Wright Online. Well as we approach Easter, today Tom's going to be tackling questions on the resurrection.

One of the subjects he's perhaps most famous for and towards the end of the show, he'll also be giving his thoughts on a rather well-known Canadian psychology professor. So look out for that. If you're a listener to this podcast, why not make yourself a subscriber to the newsletter as well? You get so much more that way.

Episodes, updates, you can ask a question for yourself. And of course, exclusive bonus video content, things like Tom answering questions on speaking in tongues and the

rapture. And of course, the competitions we run on a regular basis too.

We're going to be announcing winners from our latest prize draw of the Bible for everyone on the next edition of the program. So if you'd like to get yourself subscribed to the newsletter and all of the good things it brings your way, go to [askNTRight.com](http://askNTRight.com) and simply fill out the form and we'll be happy to add you in. And before we're joined by Tom, just a notice that we have a special Easter egg of our own right at the end of today's show, as Tom dusts down his guitar for another unplugged session.

Well, we're nearing Easter, Tom. And I'm sure Easter is obviously a time of great celebration for you. Where would you most likely find yourself this Easter? Oh, this Easter, God willing, I shall be in St Paul's Church in Hemersmith, where my son, Dorton Law, have been going for quite some time now.

And they've asked me if I will lead or speak at some of the services through Good Friday and then Easter itself. So it'll be the first time I've done that for some while, actually. I've kept rather a low profile in terms of Easter preaching for the last few years.

But it's a great church. Yes, I know it. It's a thriving church there in Hemersmith, isn't it? Well, we've got some questions about the resurrection, which of course is something you know a little bit about as well, having published a rather large book on the subject.

And we've also got questions actually on Jordan Peterson, which I'll explain the connection a little later. This is what I've been dying to ask you myself because I just read your commentary on the Gospel of Mark, the For Everyone commentary. And at the very end, you talk about the fact that we don't have the ending of Mark.

Well, we've got sort of these shorter long endings. It appears, as far as you can best see, that, I mean, what you say, as you nailed Colored to Mark and say, I don't think it was supposed to end this way. I think we have lost the ending.

Can you explain that? Yes. I mean, the best manuscripts have got of Mark's Gospel, the earliest manuscripts have got, end with chapter 16, verse 8, where the women, having seen the angels at the tomb, run away, and Mark says they said nothing to anyone because they were afraid. And in Greek it's famously F. or Buntogar.

They were afraid. And this is sort of, was it meant to end like that? It's extremely stark and abrupt. Now, some readers really like stark and abrupt.

And so they say, no, no, no, that's what it was meant to be. That's perfectly possible. However, Mark throughout the rest of the Gospel, particularly from the end of chapter 8 onwards, has had Jesus telling his disciples, "We're going up to Jerusalem.

The Son of Man is going to be handed over to the rulers who will beat him up and spit at him, etc." And they will kill him, and on the third day he'll be raised. And it's said again

and again and again and again. Then we get to Jerusalem, and lo and behold, he's handed over, and we don't get Jesus appearing from the Romans.

It feels as though Mark was intending to go there. The two endings that we've got look very clearly as though people in the probably third and fourth centuries have thought, "We can't have its job there. Let's cobble together something from the other Gospels and make an ending out of it." It is possible.

I toyed with this theory for some while, but I don't fully accept it now. It is possible that it was left deliberately open so that at that point when it was being read, you would have an eyewitness, "Now we happen to have here our brother Nathaniel, and he was there." So let's say what happened. Exactly.

There's sort of a stage direction. Now we'll on your eye. It's a nice idea, but I don't really believe that.

I think it's much more likely, is that with a scroll, and so the Gospels were among the early innovations for books, for codexes, codices, with an early scroll, the beginning and the ending of the scroll comes off. If you go to the Israel Museum and look at the Dead Sea Scrolls, almost all of them are short of the beginning and ending because that's where the wooden stick was, which would rot and pull away. And the beginning of Mark is very odd as well.

People don't always notice that because the opening phrase, "Arce to you, Evangelio, you years of Christ, which is the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," then it goes straight in as it is written in Isaiah the prophet, and then it quotes Malachi. And you think, "Excuse me, there's several odd things about this." Are we missing a little bit at the beginning as well then? I suspect that we're missing the beginning and the ending that Mark originally wrote, and that because you can't start a Gospel as it is written, Catholic or Galatia, somebody has put an elegant beginning, but they left the ending, but then other people filled it in. That doesn't bother me at all in terms of what Mark believed, what Mark said.

It's quite clear that Mark believes in Jesus' resurrection from all that I've said already. But one of the things we have to notice is that the fear of the women picks up that theme of fear from earlier in the Gospel. The woman with the issue of blood who comes in the crowd touches Jesus.

She is in fear and trembling when Jesus says, "Who touched me?" And there's a sense that these women in fear and trembling at the tomb are aware that something momentous is happening is not just that they're scared. And we assume that what it means, they said nothing to anyone, but they were afraid, means that then and there, within that next half hour, while they were dashing back into town. Because Mark wouldn't have much to write about if they hadn't told someone.

Well, yes, quite, quite, quite. But I think it seems to be a way of saying they didn't sort of saunter back into town and everybody they met, so that's what we just see. There was a sort of... Until they got back to the house.

I should have said actually who this question originates you with Thomas in Waughton v. And his specific question is how would you reconstruct the ending to Mark's Gospel? Well, I remember old Bishop Stephen Neal, who was a great New Testament scholar as well as a world missionary, etc. saying that Mark has been following... That Matthew has been following Mark quite closely, not totally, but quite closely up to that point. And that it may well be that the ending of Mark would have looked not totally unlike the ending of Matthew.

I'm not quite convinced of that because actually if you put Mark 16, 1 to 8 beside the equivalent bit from Matthew 28, there's lots of Greek words which actually aren't the same, even when the story is very similar. And Matthew has a more vivid account of the earthquake and so on. So I'm not quite convinced of that.

Clearly something about the appearing of Jesus, the promise that they'll see him in Galilee being repeated or whatever. But part of the point of the resurrection stories is that they carry this feeling that a new world has just begun. We're not sure we're ready for it.

I remember using the illustration of you're lying in bed early in the morning, still half asleep in pajamas on, and Sunday's a ring at the doorbell, and some very important visitor has just arrived, and you're not ready and helped, there's a sort of panic about it. It's as though the new creation has begun and we weren't ready. What are we going to do now? Just a bunch of interesting questions here.

Let's see how many we can get through about Jesus' resurrected form. Titus in Charlottesville asked this one. "I regularly debate non-Christians on my podcast, proselytise or apostasise." A little plug for you there, Titus.

"And one argument I major on is the resurrection. I'm wondering what a first century Jew would have concluded if he saw a vision of the resurrected Christ. Would he conclude that he was seeing a physically resurrected Christ on earth, or simply that he was seeing Christ in the intermediary state in heaven before the final resurrection?" And I suppose that sort of ties in a little bit with the nature of Paul's particular vision and so on.

Yes, it does. I mean, the empty tomb is really, really important, and this is why, because everybody in the ancient world knew perfectly well, anyone who thought about such things, that visions of recently dead people did happen from time to time. And I have, not first hand, but second hand close up evidence of this in my own family, and with a good personal friend with a very tragic thing where his daughter was the other side of the world, and she was murdered, and the first he knew was when she appeared to her

fiancé, who was a long way away, hundreds of miles away, in the room, fleetingly, and then disappeared again, and he had no idea what this was about, picked up the phone, and discovered she'd been killed.

And I mean, this happens. So some people, Dominic Crosson famously say, "Well, Christianity began with visions of a dead man, which is a lie, didn't it, began with appearances of a living man?" But so, appearances without empty tomb, that's what they would have concluded. And that's precisely what you see in Acts 23, when Paul puts the cat among the pigeons with the Pharisees and Sadducees, and saying, "I'm a Pharisee, it's about the resurrection, blah, blah, blah, blah." And the Pharisees, who have this belief that prior to the resurrection, people will exist either as quasi angels or spirits.

They say, "What if an angel or a spirit's bone to him?" And it answers exactly that question. But the empty tomb by itself without appearances would mean grave robbery. So only empty tomb plus appearances will do the trick of a physical resurrection.

And so, in terms of what people would assume in the first century Jewish context, if they had an appearance of the resurrected Christ, would it be very contingent on whether they would this empty tomb might exist? An appearance of somebody who then you have been crucified. Yes, yes. I mean, quite.

Had Jesus appeared to them three days, 30 days, whatever, after his crucifixion, but with the tomb still full, as it were, then this is a beautiful, strange thing, but these things happen. And they would not use the word resurrection. Resurrection is not about somebody going into a glorious angelic state.

Anastasis in Greek and its cognates and the equivalent in Hebrew Aramaic, they simply aren't about going to. This is one of the things that people don't understand, because when people today say, "I believe in the resurrection," often what they really mean is, "I believe in going to heaven when I die." That's simply not what the words may mean. More questions on the resurrection state of Jesus.

Mario in Croatia asked when Christ rose from the dead. He had a glorified body, sort of a new and eternal body, but the tomb was empty. It was also his old body, tortured, crucified, and murdered.

So I'm wondering, what does that mean to us and our bodies in the resurrection of the body in eternal life? Is there anything we can draw from the nature of Jesus' resurrection? Yes, I mean, it's very interesting, obviously, that in John particularly, there's great emphasis placed on the fact that Jesus is recognized by the mark of the nails and the spear thrust in his side. And Thomas says, "I'm not going to believe it unless I see them." And Jesus says, "Okay, be my guest. Here you are." But something about those wounds, which many, many generations of preachers and commentators have said, the reason that they are there is that these are the wounds that love has

born, and that is what is now exalted is the love that has born that.

And so people have speculated that maybe in the new creation, in our resurrection bodies, that the things that we have suffered out of love for others will be part of our glory, part of who we really are. We'll shine forth. That bullet someone took for another person, they might still bear the scar of that or whatever it might be.

This is what C. S. Lewis is getting at, and there's a little snippet in one of his post-mortem post-mortem pieces where he says, "Will there be books in the new creation?" And he says, "Well, yeah, but the only ones you'll have will be the ones you'll let people never go back." And then the question is, what about when people are scribbled in the margins of your books? And he says, "They will be transformed into wonderful illustrations and woodcuts and so on." The things that would most irritate you, if you allow them say, "Okay, this is how it is, they could be transformed." And I think because people from the second century onwards, Arneus, origin, knew perfectly well that we don't have to get the same molecules back. I mean, origin at the start of the third century knew perfectly well that the molecules in my hand, my body, my head are different molecules from what they were 10 years ago. We do a complete kit chain, roughly every 7 years.

They knew that in the ancient world more or less. So it's not a big deal to get the same stuff back. What counts as Paul says in 1st century, this 15, "God gives it a body.

God gives this me a new body." Now, I've always said to people, "If God wants to use such remains as there are, my bones in a coffin, I'm sure God would have fun doing that." No problem, but she doesn't need them. That's not going to be a problem reconstituting Tom Wright in his resurrected form.

[music] The Ask, Anti-Write Anything podcast is brought to you by Premier in partnership with SBCK and Anti-Write Online.

SBCK is Tom's UK publisher and they've created a special discount for podcast listeners on a selection of Tom's titles. So when you buy one, you get a second half price. There's a number of titles in the deal, including some of Tom's most popular books, Surprised by Hope, Simply Jesus and Simply Christian.

Get the Buy one, get one half price offer by going to this link, [sbckpublishing.co.uk/askntwrite](http://sbckpublishing.co.uk/askntwrite). That's [sbckpublishing.co.uk/askntwrite](http://sbckpublishing.co.uk/askntwrite)

[music] Wendy and Durham, why couldn't Jesus have remained on earth in his newly resurrected body as the first arise from the dead? Why did he have to leave? He could still have given the Holy Spirit to the believers. Yes, I think it's a pretty good question. It seems to me the idea that the ascension is a leaving while that is true, and in the farewell discourses they really are farewell.

I'm going away and the Spirit is going to come. There is a sense in that because the Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus, the Spirit makes Jesus present in a way which would be systematically confusing with our present perceptions. I think part of the problem has been in Western Christianity, though, this idea that with the ascension he's sort of saying goodbye and leaving us to get on with it.

So why were they so happy? Why did they go back to Jerusalem with joy? Why didn't they say, "Oh no, he's gone." And the answer is the end of Matthew 28, "I am with you always." And the sense of his continuing presence, which must have been a puzzle in the ten days between ascension and Pentecost, but then with the coming of the Holy Spirit, the Book of Acts is fascinating in oscillating between the presence of the Spirit and the presence of Christ. As indeed, as Paul, he talks about if Christ is in you, if the Spirit of Christ is in you. They're almost interchangeable.

Almost interchangeable. Paul is pretty sure footed. He knows what he's saying, but he does want to say Christ in you as well as the Spirit in you.

So it's almost like the people who say what a pity he had to die so young. You know, so much you could have done. But I think part of the point of the resurrection is the launching of the new creation and that the ascension is that Jesus is now in charge of the ongoing work of new creation, that heaven is not a long way away.

It is, as I've often said, the CEO's office. This is where the world is run from, and it's run by the energy of the Spirit. But the other thing about the ascension, one of my colleagues in St. Andrew's, David Moffat, who's an expert on the rest of the Hebrews, keeps on reminding us of this very helpfully, is that in the New Testament, what Jesus is doing at the moment is interceding on our behalf that he's not simply enjoying being in heaven with the Father and running well.

And waiting for everyone else to arrive. Right. Well, waiting for the time when he will make the new heavens and the earth.

But because we are constantly messing things up, and because the world is constantly in a mess, he is, as the hymn says, pleading his death. His death is once for all, but his intercession on the basis of his death is ongoing. Paul says that in Romans 8 that he's at the right hand of God and intercedes for us.

That's one of the great truths of Ascension Tide. So it seems to me that when we really get inside that, which the early Christians grasped almost effortlessly because they were soaked in the Psalms, and Psalm 110 says, he's at the right hand. Nate in Cambridge has a question that ties in quite neatly to that, which is simply where exactly is Jesus right now, like physically, bodily.

Presumably, his resurrected body must be someplace, but where? He says, this seems to

be of huge importance in terms of where I should point my imagination when I pray or think about him. This is really to do with how we conceive heaven and earth, and part of the great problem with so much modern Western thought is that we're basically implicit Epicureans. That is to say, we think of heaven as a long way away, if there are gods there, miles up in the sky, so people talk about whether your prayers go past the ceiling or whatever the earth is.

That's not the point. We have to learn to think with the conceptuality that the Jews would have focused on the temple, that when you're in the temple, it's not as if you're in heaven. You are in heaven.

This is where heaven and earth overlap, and with the Ascension, there is a bit of earth, the actual body of Jesus, which is more real than it was before, because it's now non-corruptible. It's not going to die or hurt or anything again. That body is now in heaven, but in order to say that, we have to rethink the meaning of the world.

That doesn't mean it's an far off place where we can't possibly access it. It doesn't mean it's in a far off place, and it doesn't mean it's in a place where a body would be inappropriate. I used to debate with my late friend Marcus Borg about this kind of thing, and when I would say, no Jesus body is in heaven, he would say, "Tom, I just can't imagine that." I would say, Mark, deal with your imagination.

You just got a platonic imagination, and it's a shame for you. There are other ways of construing heaven and earth. Very interesting.

You might want to try and deal with this some quickly. It's a part of the technical question. Grant in Canberra, Australia is asking, says in your book, "The Resurrection of the Son of God," you say that there is nothing improbable, and it makes good sense all round, that the guards at the tomb told their fellow soldiers, friends and family, that his disciples came by night and stole them while we were asleep.

But Grant has some problems with that. Given the guards were hardened Roman troops, why on earth would they, A, say nonsense, as the ancients were well aware that you're unconscious when asleep, so can't identify perpetrators of grave robbery? Secondly, tell a story that Galileo and peasants had made fools of them by stealing the body. In occupational terms, it's equivalent to Tom taking a bribe to admitting he doesn't know the text of John 3 16.

Thirdly, admitting to falling asleep at their post when that crime would almost inevitably seem them sentenced to death. So he's got some problems with that particular phrase in the Resurrection of the Son of God. Yes, I really should go back and have a look at it and see if I want to nuance that a bit.

But that story, of course, is in Matthew, and it's made very clear that these are on



Governor's orders and that there's money involved and that we'll sort it. You just tell them that and that'll be all right. We'll make it okay with the Governor.

So yes, the soldiers may have, I'm trying to think from Matthew's point of view, if you'd asked Matthew this because it's his problem rather than mine, as it were. I think Matthew would have said, yeah, there was plenty of money changing hands and the soldiers were quite happy to pocket the money and they didn't need to say very much. Just tell some people, oh, it must have been like this.

So the idea that, well, if they were asleep, how did they know who did it? Matthew here is responding to what was an early allegation that, oh, well, the body got stolen. Which, of course, is one of many allegations that people have made rather than face the actual story which the gospels are telling. Now, this one's a bit of a wildcard stuck in on the end of this podcast, but so many people have been in touch to ask about what you think of Jordan Peterson.

My only real connection with the resurrection topic is that I know that Jordan B. Peterson, who's become a very well known in the last year or two, a psychology professor who has packing out audiences best-selling books. He's been on my other show Unbelievable and seems to have captured a huge audience among young men, especially helping them to sort of find meaning and direction in life. And seems to have a lot of sympathy for Christianity.

He's sort of difficult to pin down to some extent exactly where he falls in terms of his own beliefs, but has been, as I understand it, been asked to look into the resurrection. And he said, well, it's something I'm going to devote a few years to trying to get to grips with and even possible possibilities, apparently, that your work is one of the things he's using to help him. So a couple of questions have come in here on that front.

I'll read them both. Julian in Canada, which is of course where Jordan Peterson hails from. Says, dear Tom, big fan of your work.

Your book, The Resurrection of the Son of God, has been revolutionary for my thinking as a Christian. I'm wondering what your general thoughts are on Jordan Peterson and the phenomenon. What parallels do you see between his and your own work? Do you have any criticisms of him? And Melanie in Pennsylvania asked, would you be interested in a conversation with Jordan Peterson about the resurrection? He's given himself three years to study it.

And apparently, the resurrection of the Son of God is one of the resources he is using. So firstly, have you heard of Jordan Peterson? Sure. My wife and I read his book on the Twelve Rules of Life about a year or so ago, and we both much enjoyed it.

Although it is a rambling book. His twelve rules, he states these rules and then goes all

around the houses, all sorts of anecdotes and highways and byways. And then finally you come back, oh, that's what this chapter is about.

I nearly forgotten. And I think several reviewers have said that sort of thing. So this isn't me being rude.

I think this is just how the book feels. At the same time, there's a lot of sort of combination of partly homespan, almost folk wisdom in the face of some of the follies of late modernity. And I think one of the reasons he's so popular is that he actually dares to say that the emperor has no clothes with some of the sillier things that in the postmodern world, some people are taking for granted.

I mean, I think that the great fuss happened in the University of Toronto when a directive went out about the professors should use a gender neutral pronoun rather than he or she would have a... I mean, the context of that was I think also that Canada was in the process of possibly passing legislation, which could criminalise the use of certain types of language and so on if you didn't use them. As I understand it, having spoken to him about it, Jordan Peterson said it's not that he has any issue with using the pronouns people, it's the forced, it's a criminalisation that he has. And I think that is a point where what one can broadly call a kind of postmodern liberal left has tipped over into forms of tyranny.

And if they say, "Oh, that's because people are so hurt and upset by the traditional things," Jordan Peterson would say, "Come on, get used to it. This is a tough world. We all have to figure stuff out and simply legislating things out.

It's like the whole business of no platforming speakers and so on. Your opinions are not welcome here and he would fight against that as I would." That's not to say that you invite people with utterly ridiculous shameful, horrible views at the same time within a very broad spectrum. I think the fact of him doing the Emperor Has No Clothes stuff is very welcome and people have welcomed it.

The trouble with that, the danger with that is that it can become a bit of a bandwagon of people who then want to push back and say, "Too bad for all that political correctness. We're going to go back to an old macho chauvinistic world or whatever." I don't think that's not how I hear Peterson. When I read his book, I then watched three or four YouTube videos.

There's a famous one where he was interviewed by one of our channel 4. Kathy Newman, yes, that went viral, yes. Right, right. Well, I saw that.

That was a revealing moment. But I suspect that he probably doesn't like being typecast in that way because I think there's much more going on there. And he clearly is on a journey and questioning himself.

In terms of conversation about the resurrection, I'm happy to talk to anyone about the resurrection any time. I mean, he and I have not met. We have not talked about.

Obviously, that is the big question. And my sense is that he's made a career out of coming from the far sort of central northwest of Canada way away from the big cities. Coming to the big city, looking around, like Martin Luther going to Rome saying, "Is this what it's all about? Now, come on.

Can we have some common sense here?" And that's a very healthier way of approaching things. And I would love to see that grow and blossom in something else. And the other side in which I think he's having really interesting conversations is with many of the big secular names.

So he's had these big sort of conversation debates with people like Sam Harris and others. And it's interesting to see he won't be pinned down on Christianity, the resurrection, so on. But he's not ruling it out by any sense.

True, true. And so, yeah, who knows? Well... That's great. Jordan, if you are listening, the table is set.

You're very welcome on my show to do something with that. That would be great fun. But it would be fun.

Anyway, there you go. We've gone all over the shop with that one. But it's been great to have you in.

A very happy Easter. Thank you. You too.

And we look forward to seeing you on the other side. Yes, probably. Probably sometime near to Pentecost or something.

Yes. But in any case, thanks for being with me today. Thank you.

[Music] Well, thank you for being with us on today's show. But don't go away just yet. Tom's pulling out the guitar again in a moment.

And if you want to see some exclusive video of Tom unplugged, then go to the video section on our website at [AskNTRight.com](http://AskNTRight.com). And you'll also be able to see his video response about Jordan B. Peterson there as well. Signing up at the website gets you access to bonus video content, the fortnightly newsletter, and means you get the link to ask the question yourself. We're always looking for fresh questions for this podcast.

So do go to [AskNTRight.com](http://AskNTRight.com) and get yourself subscribed.

[Music] Well, we've got to that fun, not too serious part of the podcast where Tom pulls out the guitar. It happens to me my guitar, actually, but Tom plays it for us.

Now, we all know some of the best-known songs from Sydney Carter. One more step along the world I go, Lord of the Dance and so on. In that sense, his songs have been sung in primary schools probably for decades now.

What I didn't realize until I came across a video of you online playing this particular song, that he obviously had quite a repertoire of different songs and poems as well. Tell us a little bit about how you first came across this one. Well, in the '60s, he was, as you say, writing things which then it was kind of flaky and exciting that one was allowed to play this sort of thing, which had Christian resonances and some people even bringing guitars into church.

I know that's now such a cliché and it's typical. The old '60s rock is still turning up grey head but still strumming away. So I'm very much aware of that and okay, the joke is on me there.

But in the '60s, this was hugely exciting. And when I was in a gap year, as we used to have between school and university, I was out in Canada and I was working in a lumber camp in British Columbia. And there was a folk club in Prince George, which was about 50 miles away from where the lumber camp was.

And it used to go in on the weekend. And I went one weekend and was chatting to people and they discovered that I played the guitar. Oh, come next week, do us a set.

So during that week working in the camp, how should I sort of nail my colours to the mast? And so I had all sorts of things from Dylan, Peter Paul and Mary, various Gordon Lightfoot. But I thought, actually I'll do a couple of Sydney Carter ones right up front, just to say, actually this is who I am. So right at the top of the first set, I played Lord of the Dance and then I played this Friday morning.

Let's hear it. Okay. It's self-explanatory, I think.

It was on a Friday morning that they took me from the cell and I saw they had a carpenter to crucify as well. You can blame it on to pilot. You can blame it on the Jews.

You can blame it on the devil, but it's God that I accuse. It's God they ought to crucify instead of you and me. I said to the carpenter, "Hanging on the tree." You can blame it on to Adam.

You can blame it on to Eve. You can blame it on the apple, but that I can't believe it was God that made the devil and the woman and the man. And there wouldn't be an apple if it wasn't in the plan.

It's God they ought to crucify instead of you and me. I said to the carpenter, "Hanging on the tree." Now, the Rabbis was a sinner and they let the Rabbis go. But you are being crucified for nothing here below.

And God is up in heaven and he doesn't do a thing with a million angels watching and they never move a wing. It's God they ought to crucify instead of you and me. I said to the carpenter, "Hanging on the tree." To hell with Jehovah to the carpenter, I said, "I wish that a carpenter had made the world instead." Goodbye and good luck to you.

Our ways they will divide. Remember me and your kingdom, the man you hung beside. It's God they ought to crucify instead of you and me.

I said to the carpenter, "Hanging on the tree." You've been listening to the Ask, Enty, Write, Anything podcast. Let other people know about this show by rating and reviewing it in your podcast provider. For more podcasts from Premier, visit [premier.org.uk/podcasts](http://premier.org.uk/podcasts). Very good.

Brilliant Word Smith. Oh, it's very good. Very clever.

Yeah.