

OpenTheo

#40 Do I have to agree with St. Paul?

July 15, 2020



Ask NT Wright Anything - Premier

Tom answers listener questions on the life of the Apostle Paul, whether he wrote all the letters attributed to him, and whether contemporary Christians need to agree with all the views he gives.

* Support the show and receive NT Wright's brand new E-book '12 Answers to questions about the Bible, Life and Faith' <https://resources.premier.org.uk/supportntwright/>

* For bonus content, the newsletter, prize draws and to ask a question sign up at www.askntwright.com

* For a free e-book on Acts 15 by Tom visit www.ntwrightonline.org/askntwright

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

Transcript

[MUSIC] >> The Ask NT Wright Anything podcast.

[MUSIC] >> Hello and welcome to the show. I'm Justin Briley, Theology and apologetics editor for Premiere.

And of course, the program is brought to you in partnership with SBCK and NT Right Online. We're going to be hearing another program that I recorded with Tom in pre-locked down conditions so we're together in person. It's on the Apostle Paul and yes, we've done this before, but there are so many questions around his life and ministry that we thought it was worth bringing a few more out of the many questions we receive from week to week and we're going to be hearing Tom's responses to those.

If you would like to ask a question, that's the whole premise of this podcast. You can ask questions of Tom Wright about anything you like really and we try and put them together thematically for different shows over the course of the year. Well, feel free to do that and you can do it by simply subscribing to the newsletter.

That way you get the link which gives you the ability to send questions in. So ask NTRight.com is the place to go. Now, Tom has of course had to cancel a number of speaking engagements and tours as so many people have because of the lockdown and coronavirus.

It has provided a fruitful time actually for writing. He's even managed to write a book on the pandemic itself, God and the pandemic. I highly recommend that to you.

And of course, he's actually been doing lots of interviews and lectures and things from his Oxford study via Zoom, including actually I saw a recent live stream with Francis Collins of BioLogos. Francis Collins is of course a well-known geneticist and Christian scientist who has been leading the fight against COVID-19 in the USA as the director of the National Institute of Health. I had the privilege of sitting down with Francis himself recently on addition of my other show Unbelievable to talk to him about that, about his life faith and he was recently the recipient of the Templeton Prize as well.

You can also read that interview with Francis in the latest edition of Premier Christianity magazine. But yes, Francis and Tom did a sort of duet as part of that. They're both, as you'll know if you're a regular listener of this show, keen guitar players and they actually created a song called Genesis.

It's a riff on the Beatles song yesterday and they actually performed that together over Zoom, which was great fun. I'll see if I can actually bring the audio from that. BioLogos are happy for me to air that on.

I'll only ask Enthi right anything podcast. I'll put it out in the future edition of the show. If you do enjoy this show then why not subscribe to the newsletter? It'll give you all the access to the bonus content and of course the ability to ask a question yourself.

Access to prize draws as well and so much more besides. So if you want to do that just go online to askentiright.com. That's the website and if you'd like to support the show as well financially that is most, most welcome and we'll even send you an exclusive show e-book too. If you do that 12 questions answered by Tom on live faith in Scripture.

So lots of reasons to do that again. Askentiright.com right now though. Time to leap into today's edition of the show.

Welcome back to the programme. It's great joy to be joined again by Tom Wright who is the author of many books including of course the best-selling book Paul a Biography which came out. We were trying to work this out before we started recording Tom but we about two years ago now early 2018.

It was early 2020, yes I think. We've got questions on the Apostle Paul. We've done that before but there are so many things that people ask about this that it's time to revisit it.

An area of expertise for you of course and so I think we'll dive straight in if that's alright Tom. Now first question from Daniel in Lemington Spa says there are often questions raised about the authorship of various parts of the New Testament. For instance which of Paul's letters did Paul actually write? How important are those types of questions? In other words does it actually matter if Paul didn't write some of the letters he's purported to have written? Yeah it's a good question and over the last two or three hundred years people have raised that question again and again in relation to different parts of the Pauline corpus.

Interestingly I mean there were some in the middle of the 19th century, various skeptical German scholars who said that Paul didn't write any of those letters. So actually what do we mean by the word Paul? If we don't have any letters from him especially if Acts was written as a fiction later on are we sure there even was a Paul? And people have come right back from that to say no it makes far more sense historically to think there really was a Paul and he really did go around and he really did write letters. Then it becomes a question of two things of style and content and people have said well the style of these letters is very different than the style of those letters.

So these look like the real Paul let's take Romans and Galatians and then you move to Ephesians and Colossians and some people say it's written in a very different style and then other people say and the contents different too because in Romans and Galatians he's saying that what matters is justification by faith and in Ephesians and Colossians it's much more about being in Christ and at that point I and many others I should say hold up our hands and say hang on who says that these are incompatible with one another. In fact when you look at Galatians there's a lot about being in Christ there and it's welded together with justification by faith. In Romans Paul expounds it a bit differently but it's all one letter and it's all coming together.

And actually the biggest stylistic difference in the whole Pauline corpus and I speak as one who's translated the whole thing is between one and two Corinthians and that's explicable because in one Corinthians he's quite cheerful it's a bit of a knock about one thing you've asked me these questions and here are these issues and we go through them and we nail the issues and we put it all to bed and there we are. In two Corinthians he's fighting his way back from a terrible horrible time which we would describe almost as a nervous breakdown and you can feel it in the sentence structure that it's coming out all jerky and awkward and difficult and he's been through really hell on wheels and back again. And so when we look at the style I want to say Paul writes in various different styles and it's very difficult to say we now know that Paul looks like this and therefore that can't be him.

The one letter that I really find each time I read through Paul and I read through Paul in Greek usually probably once or twice a year, each time I hit first Timothy I think oh this really sounds and feels very different like the rest. And there are various clues for that.

The way he uses certain key phrases just aren't the same as the way he uses them elsewhere.

At the same time I'm aware a generation ago John Robinson wrote a book called Redating the New Testament when he said you know as a bishop and as a theologian and as a preacher and pastor I write letters to the clergy, I write books, I write learned articles, it all comes out differently each time. Why shouldn't somebody like Paul who was nothing if not a brilliant mind write in quite a different register? So the real issues then come down to theology and it used to be said very emphatically Ephesians and Colossians let alone the pastoral letters that Timothy's and Titus. This must be later than Paul but actually all it takes is a very slight shift to perception of what Paul is all about and they all come back in.

So the real question is how do we understand the centre of what Paul was talking about? So I want to say let's keep the questions on the table because it's always worth asking and I'm not phased by asking those questions. I mean if it could be shown proven more or less that at least some of the letters are written in Paul's name but weren't written by him perhaps some sort of community trying to yes to channel Paul is that going to be a problem given that they do claim to be all the Bible? I mean then people get into the debate about how widespread was the phenomenon of pseudonymous authorship of people writing in somebody else's name and it's possible that sometimes in the ancient world somebody gives a scribe the task of writing up a letter and says I need to write so and so I want to say this and this and this and this could you draft it for me and they can write it but with the bullet points they write it in their own way that's possible. I don't think we have very good first century evidence that that sort of thing was widespread or that somebody writing in somebody else's name wouldn't have been perceived as a bit odd there are debates about that some people say no that was perfectly common I'm not convinced about that so it would raise the questions.

Of course how would you prove it there have been studies done on the stoichiometric analysis you put into a computer and see and part of the problem is that the sample is too small to get any solid generalizations. I mean his name comes up quite frequently on this podcast but Bart M and wrote a book a while ago now called Forged. Oh yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah.

It's very issue of letters in the New Testament being passed off that he believes were not written by Paul. Right. Right.

And he kind of trumpeted that as a big problem for the New Testament. That basically this document that's supposed to have this you know divine authority is nevertheless basically got forgeries in it. Right right.

I mean do you just say that way. But the word forgery is a very modern word and would have modern connotations in the ancient world I'm not sure it would really work that

way. As I say I've lived with these letters day and night for most of my adult life and the older I get as I say I still do get puzzled by first Timothy but that may be just my problem and I don't want to project it onto Paul.

I think if all we had of the pastures was second Timothy there wouldn't be a problem and I am quite convinced as was my teacher George Cadd the Defusions and Colossians are thoroughly Pauline. It really is a matter of how you understand his whole theological position. Let's go to another question on Paul.

John in Pittsburgh says big fan of the show I've always enjoyed your works Tom. I have a question I feel a little silly asking but I fundamentally have a problem with the idea of Paul. It seems odd that Jesus trained and then charged the twelve apostles to go out and spread the word but just after his death and resurrection he appeared before this completely unrelated fellow and imbued him with authority to the point where he's teaching playing an outsized role in our understanding of Jesus at least compared to that of the apostles.

Why not in this Paul prior to his death and resurrection instead of just after? To put it bluntly why should I believe Paul? That's a great question. And I mean I hear what's being said there it does seem odd. At the general level there are many theological questions which people ask in terms of if I were God would I have arranged it like that and the answer was sorry mate you're not and just get used to it and that God's world is full of oddities of things that we wouldn't have done like that.

Fortunately God is God and not us. Who ever thought of a God coming down and getting himself grooves? Well that too. I mean in retrospect one can sometimes see some of the reasons why certain things are wrong.

It's very interesting that Paul himself faced with a question of why has this happened like this intrudes the word perhaps when he's writing to Philemon about Anisimus. It's perhaps this is why he was parted from you for a while so you can have him back. In other words I'm not going to say this was absolutely what God was up to but though it seemed very odd when he arrived and I happened to know you and O'Dere how we're going to sort this out maybe there is a purpose to it.

And so I want to say perhaps with a big P for the perhaps that what God was doing was emphasizing the radicalness of the new thing that was happening by taking somebody who was a ferociously zealous Phariseic Jew and Jesus appearing to him and the risen Jesus in such a way that he had no choice but to say okay I see right because only somebody who had come through that would be able to do and be the things that he had to do and be. And of course there is an ongoing curious apparent tension between Paul and the Jerusalem Apostles which we see in Galatians which we see in 2 Corinthians and they're working it out. They have to live with that and that too I think perhaps is part of the point that church unity is never straightforward and that we have to live with the fact

that there's some people there who seem to be teaching some weird stuff we just don't get it.

How on earth do we maintain unity across that and Paul kind of embodies that question in himself. But I think it's particularly the great joke of it is that when God wants to convert the Gentiles he takes a zealous Phariseeic Jew and says right this is your job. How does that work? But has a sense of humour.

But it's all part of the extraordinary apocalypse the radical unveiling of something radically new which is nevertheless the fulfilment of what was promised and Paul embodies all of that. Another really interesting question here from an anonymous person in Kent. Says is it okay to disagree with Paul? Many people seem to be trying to reinterpret him to make him more palatable to today's sensibilities.

Isn't it just easier and more honest to say Paul was a man of his time. That was then this is now how should we apply kingdom or gospel values now and accept that it might need to look different today. If Paul were around today how would he apply and live out his discipleship.

If he were writing letters to today's churches I suspect his instruction might be very different. Two thousand years of different. Trajectory hermeneutics you might want to say what exactly that means.

Attempts to project this kind of thinking forward. So yeah is it okay to disagree with Paul and just accept he was a man of his time and if he was doing the same thing now he might be issuing different sorts of instructions to Christian. Yes there are different sorts of differences.

And I think the first thing Paul would say is that the great turnaround in history has happened with the death and resurrection of Jesus. There is no other turnaround until Jesus comes again and restores all things. There is no other similar transformative moment and he Paul is at the cutting edge of the beginning of this new post-death and resurrection and ascension in the spirit moment.

And therefore he himself wouldn't expect that until Jesus comes again there would be any basic change because the basic things he's talking about are being genuine humans at last. And that's not going to change because being genuine humans means bearing God's image into the world and reflecting God's image into the world is going to mean what it meant in scripture and in the teaching of Jesus and particularly in and through the death and resurrection of Jesus, the dealing with evil and the launching of new creation. I think Paul himself would say that's not going to change but then when he gets to some of the specifics, I mean trivially when Paul wants to go to Rome he goes by boat we would probably take a 747.

Are there other things like that in terms of ethics? I think Paul would say actually know that what Paul is doing is working out in the rich varied culture of Antioch, in Syria, of Ephesus in Western Turkey, of Athens and Corinth in southern Greece and ultimately of Rome and on beyond, working out the basic issues of what it means to be human, of what it means to be a community of renewed humans, neither June or Greek slave nor free male nor female, that's again not going to change. The problem is not that we need to change it but that we need to catch up with the vision which Paul actually had. I'd love to talk to Anonymous Incant about which differences he or she thinks.

Typically, if I can bring up two examples, one is the way Paul talks in certain passages about women apparently and their role and we've sort of talked about that ourselves on another edition of this podcast and you've come to the position that you don't think necessarily actually Paul was forbidding women. So to some extent that matter settled for you in that way. Obviously the other big tin of worms is sexuality and what Paul says about that and presumably that's an area where you don't think Paul would necessarily revise his opinions today in light of modern same-sex partnerships and stuff.

Well I mean there were ancient same-sex partnerships as well but that's a whole other issue. Paul in Corinth, Paul in Ephesus, Paul in different parts of the Roman world, life is very much lived in public. Paul knew about more sorts of things that were going on and were accessible.

It's not that Paul was leading a sheltered life and we now know more than he did on that. Just like Shakespeare knew a huge amount of stuff and yet he was 200 years before the Enlightenment. How did that happen? Well the answer is that actually some stuff doesn't change with the calendar.

Deep human insight and so on wisdom continues. There are passages like 1 Corinthians 11 where Paul uses a particular argument for why women should wear head coverings. When leading in worship, I mean that's really important.

He assumes that they're leading in worship and that they should look like women when they're doing so. The particular arguments he advances as to why they should wear head coverings is a puzzle to me as to many people and I've looked at some of the contemporary theories and some of them may be right about that this may have been more of a dialogue where he's quoting things that the church was saying and responding to them. I am agnostic about that at the moment but in terms of the actual conclusions as to what Christians should believe, how they should behave and particularly how the church should be as a community, I think he would say you haven't even caught up with me yet so don't try and get ahead of me until you've caught up and that's a real challenge.

I suppose it's always a case of as wise readers of scripture to know what trying to work out I think the problem is is what's culturally something that is addressing and what's

kind of has ongoing impact. So, when Paul follows the household codes regarding slaves and masters and so on, well that's not necessarily an endorsement of modern day slavery or something like that. But this is a very big kind of word in itself of course but the culture of masters and slaves is often quite different from what we think because we are so attuned to the slavery of the 18th century which was basically white on black etc although there was black on black slavery going on in Africa etc.

But in the ancient world anybody could be a slave to have nothing whatever to do with race or background or upbringing all you had to do was lose a battle and you might if you were lucky to be alive you might well be enslaved for the rest of your life and Paul's rules about slaves are more like what we would have today as codes for employers and employees and okay slavery was the way it was practiced was a wicked institution but Paul is humanizing it and putting time bombs beside it in the better to find them and etc. And the problem about saying well something's a culturally conditioned it's actually it's all culturally. It's a question of justification by faith.

From straight out of the first century Jewish culture do we then put it to one side we say no actually we have to understand it in its culture in order then to see what it might mean for us today. So it's not as easy as oh well that was then this is now ethics don't change with the calendar and theology doesn't change with it. The only change with the calendar is when Jesus Christ died and rose again and poured out his spirit on his followers.

Literally changed our calendars and they are well exactly and that's very easy. The Ask Anti-Write Anything podcast is brought to you by Premier in partnership with SBCK and Anti-Write Online. And Anti-Write Online are offering a new free ebook from Tom from hypocrisy to compromise to faithfulness it's the story of Acts 15 and explores how the early church transitioned from a predominantly Jewish messianic movement into something new that the world had never seen.

Learn the story behind this pivotal moment in church history with this new free ebook from Tom Wright get it now at anti-write.org/askanti-write that's anti-write.org/askanti-write. Another interesting question here from Penny who's in upstate New York and also mentions that they're an online student with anti-write online. Of course we do this podcast in partnership with interesting on this when Paul, known as Saul at the time, was going about participating in the death of Christians were his actions and illegal act with legal punishment under Roman law. I didn't find an answer to this in your autobiography.

I think that was the slip of the typewriter. It's funny people often add the prefix auto to biography without realizing what they just did. I hope it isn't an autobiography.

I have no intention of being in that kind of language. I know that you almost feel like Paul's mind inside out but not maybe quite enough to call it an auto-moggy. My fear is

that he might end my mind inside out.

That would be really worrying. No, I think it's a very interesting question. My sense is that Paul's persecution of Christians takes place within a Jewish context, within a synagogue community or within the larger world around Jerusalem and that area where the Jewish rule of the high priest, etc., would be running.

Paul gets authority from the high priest. He doesn't get authority from the Roman governor because this is basically an inner Jewish disciplinary activity. In the same way when Paul himself goes to synagogue as a Christian apostle and talks about Jesus.

They say, "You're blaspheming. We have to punish you." He gets the 40 lashes minus one. The local synagogue authority doesn't have to get authority from the Roman magistrates in Galatia or whatever it is to do that.

This is an inner synagogue business. I think Paul is acting within the enclosed world of the Jews and the Romans would say, "Get on, do it yourself." Like Galileo says in Corinth in Acts 18, when the Jewish authorities bring Paul before the tribunal and say, "This man is teaching us to worship God in the legal ways." And Galileo says, "This is a matter, an inside matter for you Jews," sorted out. It raises all kinds of interesting questions for me at the same time, which is obviously we know Paul was obviously repentant and bitterly regretted the way he treated, followed the Christ up to his conversion.

But he never, in a sense, after that point, faced legal consequences if you look for it. Whereas today, if someone had imprisoned and even murdered Christians and then had some kind of conversion experience and admitted to what they'd done, they would face some kind of legal sanction, regardless of whether they went on to have some great ministry as well. I think, I mean, then it's a question of how does this work within the Jewish world at the time? And just as we look back on the 16th century and see heretics being burnt at the stake, there, and this was very seriously justified by very serious devout and apparently, in other words, in other ways, wise people.

I mean, think of Thomas Moore, for example, completely justifying burning heretics at the stake because this was a very dangerous disease like cutting out a cancer. We have to deal with this. And if we don't, we are complicit in their wickedness ourselves.

And in the same way, there would have been many, particularly among the more zealous Jews of Paul's day in zeal is precisely, you need to purge the iniquity from Israel. I think of some of the Old Testament stories about a daythron and people. And in the Pentateuch about people who do this must be cut off from among their people, that you're in danger of catching a fell disease here as a community and we've got to deal with it.

So I don't think the question of public law would have entered into it. That's interesting. Here's another interesting one about Paul's personality, Ryan in Kitchener, Ontario.

So do you see Paul as having traits of what we call asperges or autism today? If he was alive today, your picture of him in Paul's biography makes me think he'd be considered autistic or ASD. That's an interesting question. You've had any ideas? Well, of course, he's sharing that perception with the Roman magistrates who is trying Paul in Acts 26 and Paul is actually addressing King Agrippa who is there, one of the Herod family, and it is putting him on the spot and saying, "Now, Agrippa, you believe the prophets, don't you?" Agrippa is going to say, "Yes, because he wants to be a good Jewish." And he says, "I know you believe the prophets, so therefore you believe in resurrection, don't you?" And at which point the Roman magistrates yells out, "Paul, you're mad.

You've been studying too long. It's turned your head." He says, "No, actually, I'm not mad. Agrippa knows I'm speaking sober truth." But depending on your culture, different things that people might quite reasonably do might appear mad.

About 10 or a dozen years ago, somebody from the New Statesman was sent to interview me as well as Bishop of Durham, and they had to come and do an interview with me. The chap in the interview said that a friend of his from a different denomination from my own, hearing he was coming to interview me, had said, "He's mad, you know." So, well, that's nice. And the New Statesman interview was, I think, rather disappointed that I seem quite normal.

I mean, not that we're equating asperges or anything with madness, but the point being that the personality... A personality... I think it might... Well, I think... The interpreted in different ways, in different cultures. Yes, I say in the biography, Paul would have been a very high maintenance friend. And we do things like Myers-Briggs patterns, we do things like the Enneagram, we have ways of lining people up and saying... And Paul was relentless.

There's no questions. Intense and relentless. Does that mean he had asperges or something? I really don't know.

Because he was also a high functioning individual who could not only write about love, the greatest of these is love, but from all that we see, for instance, in First Thessalonians, was a person of utter personal generosity who would weep with people, who would pray with people, who when he had to leave, they would weep because they loved him so much. And I think he was a full-on human being in a way which we rather restrained Westerners are a bit embarrassed about being. And I don't think he had a particular syndrome.

I think he was just a very vividly alive person. Another question that is an interesting historical one, Annette in South Africa. Having read simply Jesus and Paul of biography and others, I'm intrigued by the relationship between Jesus and Paul and wonder if Paul the Pharisee studying in Jerusalem, probably at the time Jesus was there, ever would have encountered Jesus in person.

What are your speculations on this? I have wondered that too. There is absolutely no evidence that there's any such meaning that did take place. Some people have said in the past that when Paul says in Galatians, "He loved me and gave himself for me," we should hook that up with the story of the rich young ruler in Mark 10 when it says Jesus looked at him and loved him and he went away sorrowful.

That is fairly speculative. Extremely speculative. And it's the kind of speculation on which, as C.S.L. has said in different contexts, no one would risk tensionings in ordinary life.

He wouldn't lay bets on that. But though Jerusalem was quite a small, tight-packed city, it's perfectly possible that Jesus and his followers might be in one place and that Saul of Tarsus. And there were different movements, there were people coming and going.

So though it's physically possible, historically possible, we have no evidence for exposing it to anyone. Is it likely at least that Saul, as was, would have heard about this person making waves, drawing large crowds and so on? That is highly probable because it was a great renewal movement. There were other renewal movements.

And the Pharisees, and Saul was nothing if not a Pharisee, were anxious about this because they too were a renewal movement. And it's as though you start this great political party and you're going strong and then here's somebody else doing a very similar thing. Do they share our objectives? What's going on? Do we approve of them? So I think there may well have been some tension there.

But again, no sign of an actual personal meeting until the road to Damascus. Indeed. And Donald in Conroe, Texas, said it's accepted by many that Mark wrote his gospel under Peter.

When it comes to the actual content, I don't doubt this. However, considering Mark was also a companion of Paul, do you see a connection between the actual message or intent of Mark's gospel and the Pauline message of the kingdom as described in your book, Paul, a biography? Yeah, I think there's a lot of toing and froing between a lot of early Christians, a lot of the work that's been done, say, on the gospels recently, well, over the last generation, has indicated that the gospels were for all Christians and that there was a lot of traveling in the first century. The good Roman road system and Christians pop up here and there, the same people in Ephesus and then back in Rome and in Corinth.

And they're taking documents around with them. And there's every reason to suppose that as the gospels are written, that this was going on all the time. The problem comes when people imagine that the gospels are about the kingdom of God and that Paul is talking about something else, namely Jesus and how to get to heaven or something, it's really not like that they're all talking about the kingdom of God as being inaugurated by Jesus and established through his death and resurrection.

Paul, of course, focuses on the death and resurrection, but they are the death and resurrection which established Jesus as the King, the Lord of the world, which is where the whole kingdom of God message was going. So really, there is a very easy confluence between the two. Of course, Paul is not in his letters telling us the whole story of Jesus' life as Mark or whoever it does or part of it.

But I'm assuming that Paul knew a great deal about Jesus' life, but for him, that was all summarized in what his death and resurrection achieved. I mean, I suppose when Paul's traveling and writing and establishing churches for a certain period of that, the history of Jesus, the stories are being passed on in an oral way. And then, but being written down Mark, at least within Paul's lifetime, yes.

I always say to my students that if you read the textbooks, they will say that Mark is written in the late '60s and Matthew and Luke and John thereafter. We actually don't know that. There is no hard evidence for saying any of that.

They might all have been written, as early as 50 AD. I don't think they were, but they might have been. They might all be not written until 85.

I don't think they're that late, but they could be. Because the crucial bit of evidence about where are they in relation to the fall of Jerusalem in AD 17 is much more ambiguous than people have usually made out. And as well, there was some prejudices in the last century or two about saying, well, they should have really been living by faith in just waiting for the law to return.

They shouldn't have been writing history. And so this must represent a failure of nerve after the first generation. That is complete rubbish.

That's simply not how they thought. And they're not writing history in the sense of nostalgic jotting about how it was way back when. They're telling the story of how God's age-old purposes for Israel and the world came to their climax in Jesus in order to launch this new movement.

And you could tell that story in 35 AD, or you could tell it in 95, and you still want to do it. And Paul will be right there in the middle of it. Good stuff.

I hope that's helped with some of the questions that have come in on the Apostle Paul. I'm sure we'll return to that in due course. There were lots more questions about Paul that I could have reached for in the mailbag.

But do make sure to get us your questions as well, whatever they're on. We try to keep mixing up the themes from podcast episode to episode. And we do try to tackle as many different things as we can.

And next time it'll be something completely different. So do come back again for next

time. And for the moment, thank you very much.

Thank you. Good to be with you. Thanks for being with me, Justin Brierley, for this week's edition of the show.

We'll be back in a fortnight's time for another edition in which we'll be asking more of your questions to Tom. You'd like to make sure that your question is in with a chance of being asked in a future edition of the show. Simply get subscribed over at askenturite.com. And even if you don't have a question to ask, if you do that, you'll get access to the newsletter, to all the bonus content and more besides.

So thanks for listening today and we'll see you next time. Somebody refers to it as an autobiography, which is kind of funny. Penny an upset New York.

I did not find the answers. You're autobiography on Paul. But you know him so well, it probably feels a bit like that.

Was people sometimes accused me of this? You know, when you describe Paul's view, it seems as if it's your view as well. I thought that was the part of the point. 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.