

New Perspectives on Romans – How Right is Wright?

1. Why are we talking about this? (and who is David Field to be talking about it?)

2. Defining the task:

- a) not dealing with “the New Perspective”
 - there are several new perspectives – (what they have in common)
- b) not dealing with “Tom Wright’s thought”
 - (Jesus, resurrection, critical realism, preterism, women’s ordination, debt-cancellation etc)
 - but with his reading of Romans and understanding of justification

3. Channelling Tom Wright on Romans

The Story in the Background:

1. God intends “glory” – a cosmos reflecting his beauty ruled by an obedient, loving, praiseful, united humankind.
2. Adam’s sin messes this up – bringing condemnation / death.
3. God’s promise to Abraham is that through him the Adam-mess will be cleared up and the world will be restored.
4. This makes Israel an instrument for the restoration of the world. But Israel is also in Adam – corrupt and spiritually helpless.
5. So when Torah is given, even though it is good in itself, it woke sin and brought bondage, failure, and condemnation. Torah was good but Adamic-Israel under Torah was helpless and condemned.
6. So the situation is a corrupt, helpless, condemned and divided humankind needing a faithful Israel, sin dealt with, and a new covenant.
7. God has a “problem”. How can he keep his promise to Abraham and yet be just?
8. Jesus is the answer. He is
 - the new Adam – whose act of obedience deals with sin
 - the seed of Abraham – through whom the world would be blessed
 - the true Israel – who takes torah-condemnation in his death as a sin-offering, substitute
 - the true Israel – who is restored / justified in the resurrection
 - the one in whom the covenant is renewed so that the Abrahamic promise can now be fully realized
9. The Gospel tells this story and announces this Jesus and this only leaves the question of how people get in touch with / come to benefit from him.
10. And the answer is that in the call of the Gospel itself the Spirit gives spiritual life, creating the response of faith and incorporating sinners into Christ. (And, if you want justification included in the outline then this is where it comes: God declares that those who thus believe in Jesus and are “in Christ” have Jesus’s own legal standing, “righteous”, that is, that their sins are forgiven and they are part of resurrected Israel.) All who are thus restored “in Christ” are the new covenant true Israel, the children of Abraham and their resurrection will be renewal for the cosmos. The “glory” of 1. will be accomplished.

Romans expounds and applies that story to the Jew/Gentile Christian congregation(s) of Rome:

- to Jews who might be proud, might set up new barriers, might at the same time be mystified about the role of torah, about Israel’s spiritual helplessness, and wonder whether the Gospel signals the end for Israel
- to Gentiles who might be dismissive of Jewish Christians or ungrateful for Israel (in contrast to Galatians which addresses many of the same issues but in a letter to Gentiles who might be half-tempted to join those who are putting themselves back under flesh-curse-Adamic-Israel - see 4. and 5. above)

Picking up on moments from Romans

1.3-5
1.15-17
2.1-16
2.17-24
2.25-29
3.1-9
3.20-31
4
5.1-11
8.1-11
9-11
14-15

Overview of Romans

see “Climbing Mount Romans” at <http://www.davidpfield.com/other/Climbing-Mount-Romans.pdf>

Chapters 1-4

The first four chapters of Romans give an explanation of how, in the gospel of Jesus the Messiah, God’s righteousness (his consistency with his own justice and his faithfulness to his covenant) is revealed. Generic human, and pagan, and Jewish unrighteousness is exposed, God’s judgment described, and the helplessness and guilt of fallen humanity declared. God’s action in and through Jesus (in particular, through the faithfulness of Jesus as true Israel who rendered ultimate Obedience in his atoning-death) enables him to keep his promise to Abraham and thus, at one and the same time be consistent with his own justice and faithful to his covenant. Thus God brings into being a single Jew-Gentile family, a renewed covenant people, and these people are declared to be right with God not on the basis of human endeavour, Jewish privilege, or “works-of-*t Torah*” but purely through faith in Jesus. And looking back, this is seen to be God’s intention all along as revealed in his covenant with Abraham and Abraham’s own prefiguring of restored humanity.

Chapters 5-8

Chapters five to eight further explain God’s gospel accomplishment and revelation already described in the first four chapters. Showing that God’s people in Christ is the true humanity, these chapters set out the achievement of Jesus in such a way as implants in the worldview of the Gentile church the scriptural narrative through which they may discover their own place on the map of God’s purpose. God’s renewed covenant people is a Christ-people and no longer an Adam-people. These people, through Jesus’s messianic atoning death and the work of the Spirit have experienced a new exodus, have become the true *t Torah*-keepers (God’s redemptive-historical use of *t Torah* and the relationship of Adamic Israel to *t Torah* are explained along the way), and are now being led through the wilderness to the glory inheritance which is not just for them but for the whole cosmos. Salvation is assured.

Chapters 9-11

This, of course, raises (again) the question of Israel, the called and privileged people of God, the chosen instrument by which he intended to keep his promise to Abraham and thus restore the world. If God has accomplished the true exodus in the work of Jesus and the Spirit, what about the people of the original exodus? How can the gospel be a revelation of God’s faithfulness and justice if Israel is left out or rejected? Chapters nine to eleven address these questions, first demonstrating, by a retelling of the Israel story from Abraham through to Paul’s day, that God was sovereign in and through the hardness of heart and the misdirected zeal of Israel, using them to bring about his purpose which was a renewed covenant and a deeper and truer way of keeping *t Torah*. This deeper way of keeping *t Torah*, namely, obedient trust in and loyalty to Jesus was, of course, open to Jews and Gentiles alike. But just as, mysteriously, Messiah was rejected and then raised, so Paul is confident that Israel’s rejection will be matched and followed by resurrection as, over time, many (though not all) Jews come, by faith in Jesus, to be part of the true Israel reconfigured and redefined in Jesus.

Chapters 12-16

The last section of the letter, chapters twelve to sixteen, brings the announcement of the gospel and the exposition of redemptive history contained in the preceding eleven chapters down into the lives of the mainly Gentile congregations of Christians in Rome. Living as the people of the renewed covenant

will means worship, holiness, and unity, looking back to what God has done and forward to his worldwide purposes for the future. Christians learn to relate to each other and to outsiders in the light of the gospel and this means mutual love, as well as challenge to and gratitude for the civil authorities. In particular, justification on the basis of faith alone requires fellowship on the basis of faith alone – matters which previously divided Jews and Gentiles must do so no longer. God’s purpose of a worldwide people united in praise under Messiah’s rule is to be worked out in little congregations in Rome and, through Paul’s mission, far further afield too. Even the paragraphs of personal greetings illustrate and reinforce the Christian unity of God’s renewed covenant people.

Some great things about NTW on Romans:

- Key connections sometimes missed: 3 + 9-11; 2 + 8 + 10; 5 + 14; 1 + 15-16
- Intertextuality: a) context of OT quotes b) narrative substructures – 5-8 / 9-10
- Narrative reading for Torah / flesh / Israel showing their mysterious use in God’s plan
- Imperial context – law, justice, peace, Lord, salvation
- All the “Jew-Gentile” material *makes sense* in his reading
- Redemptive-historical – e.g. chapter 4 not an illustration; 10.1-13 as Deut 30 version
- Covenantal/corporate – Romans is more about God’s restorative purpose than about “how can I, a guilty individual, be saved?” though, God be praised, the second is answered by the first
- What “doing the law” means in the new covenant: 2.6-11 2.13-14 2.25-29 7.6 8.1-11 10.5-11 13.8

4. Tom Wright on justification – in his own words

(“The Shape of Justification” and “New Perspectives”)

1. It's best to begin at the end, with Paul's view of the *future*.
 - (a) The one true God will finally judge the whole world; on that day, some will be found guilty and others will be upheld (Rom. 2.1-16). God's vindication of these latter on the last day is his act of final 'justification' (Rom. 2.13). The word carries overtones of the lawcourt.
 - (b) But not only the lawcourt. Justification is part of Paul's picture of the family God promised (i.e. covenanted) to Abraham. When God, as judge, finds in favor of people on the last day, they are declared to be part of this family (Rom. 4; cf. Gal. 3). This is why lawcourt imagery is appropriate: the covenant was there, from Genesis onwards, so that through it God could deal with sin and death, could (in other words) put his creation to rights.
 - (c) This double declaration will take the form of an *event*. All God's people will receive resurrection bodies, to share the promised inheritance, the renewed creation (Rom. 8). This event, which from one point of view is their 'justification', is therefore from another their 'salvation': their rescue from the corruption of death, which for Paul is the result of sin. The final resurrection is the ultimate rescue which God promised from the beginning (Rom. 4).
2. Moving back from the *future* to the *past*, God's action in Jesus forms Paul's template for this final justification.
 - (a) Jesus has been faithful, obedient to God's saving purposes right up to death (Rom. 5.12-21; Phil. 2.6-9); God has now declared decisively that he is the Son of God, the Messiah, in whom Israel's destiny has been summed up (Rom. 1.3f.).
 - (b) Jesus' resurrection was, for Paul, the evidence that God really had dealt with sin on the cross (1 Cor. 15.12-19). In the death of Jesus God accomplished what had been promised to Abraham, and 'what the law could not do' (Rom. 8.3): for those who belong to the Messiah, there is 'no condemnation' (Rom. 8.1, 8.31-9).
 - (c) The event in which all this actually happened was, of course, the resurrection of the crucified Jesus.
3. Justification in the *present* is based on God's past accomplishment in Christ, and anticipates the future verdict. This present justification has exactly the same pattern.

- (a) God vindicates in the present, in advance of the last day, all those who believe in Jesus as Messiah and Lord (Rom. 3.21-31; 4.13-25; 10.9-13). The lawcourt language indicates what is meant. 'Justification' itself is not God's act of changing the heart or character of the person; that is what Paul means by the 'call', which comes through the word and the Spirit. 'Justification' has a specific, and narrower, reference: it is God's *declaration* that the person is now in the right, which confers on them the *status* 'righteous'. (We may note that, since 'righteous' here, within the lawcourt metaphor, refers to 'status', not 'character', we correctly say that God's declaration *makes* the person 'righteous', i.e. in good standing.)
- (b) This present declaration constitutes all believers as the single people, the one family, promised to Abraham (Gal. 2.14 - 3.29; Rom. 3.27 - 4.17), the people whose sins have been dealt with as part of the fulfilled promise of covenant renewal (Jer. 31.31-34). Membership in this family cannot be played off against forgiveness of sins: the two belong together.
- (c) The event in the present which corresponds to Jesus' death and resurrection in the past, and the resurrection of all believers in the future, is baptism into Christ (Gal. 3.26-9; Rom. 6.2-11). Baptism is not, as some have supposed, a 'work' which one 'performs' to earn God's favour. It is, for Paul, the sacrament of God's free grace. Paul can speak of those who have believed and been baptised as already 'saved', albeit 'in hope' (Rom. 8.24).

Among the remaining questions, three matters stand out at the moment.

The '**faith**' in question is faith in 'the God who raised Jesus from the dead'. It comes about through the announcement of God's word, the gospel, which works powerfully in the hearts of hearers, 'calling' them to believe, or indeed (as Paul often puts it) to 'obey' the gospel (Rom. 1.16f.; 1 Thess. 1.3f., 2.13; 2 Thess. 1.8). This faith looks backwards to what God has done in Christ, by means of his own obedient faithfulness to God's purpose (Rom. 5.19; Phil. 2.6), relying on that rather than on anything that is true of oneself. For Paul, this meant refusing to regard the badges of Jewish law-observance ('the works of the law') as the decisive factor (Phil. 3.2-11). And it looks forward to the final day: because this faith is the first sign of new God-given life, it is the appropriate anticipation of the final verdict, which is guaranteed by the same Spirit who inspired faith (2 Cor. 1.22; Phil. 1.6).

By '**the gospel**' Paul does *not* mean 'justification by faith' itself. He means the announcement that the crucified and risen Jesus is Lord. To believe this message, to give believing allegiance to Jesus as Messiah and Lord, is to be justified in the present by faith (whether or not one has even heard of justification by faith). Justification by faith itself is a second-order doctrine: to believe it is both to have *assurance* (believing that one will be vindicated on the last day [Rom. 5.1-5]) and to know that one belongs in the single family of God, called to share table-fellowship without distinction with all other believers (Gal. 2.11-21). But one is not justified by faith by believing in justification by faith (this, I think, is what Newman thought Protestants believed), but by believing in Jesus.

'**Justification**' is thus the *declaration* of God, the just judge, that someone is (a) in the right, that their sins are forgiven, and (b) a true member of the covenant family, the people belonging to Abraham. That is how the word works in Paul's writings. It doesn't describe *how* people *get in* to God's forgiven family; it *declares that they are in*. That may seem a small distinction, but in understanding what Paul is saying it is vital.

From "New Perspectives", p.258-59:

"My proposal has been, and still is, that Paul uses vindication language, that is, the *dikaioō* word group, when he is describing not the moment when, or the process by which, someone comes from idolatry, sin, and death to God, Christ, and life but, rather, the verdict that God pronounces [logically – see preceding paragraph] consequent upon this event 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 (his or her sins having been forgiven through the death of Jesus) and (b) that this person is a member of the true covenant family, the family that God originally promised to Abraham and has now created through Christ and the Spirit – the single family that consists equally of believing Jews and believing Gentiles. ... God's declaration of forgiveness and declaration of covenant membership are not ultimately two different things."

5. Relating this to the “traditional” doctrine of justification

a) things in common

Justification is ...

1. eschatological – about the last day judgment
2. forensic / declarative
3. entirely of God’s grace – not earned, deserved, or merited in any way
4. based on the completed work of Christ
5. immediately connected to regeneration (“call” in NTW; “effectual calling” in the Westminster Standards)
6. by faith alone
7. and altogether through union with Christ (related *both* to 5. and 6.)
8. co-ordinate with forgiveness of sins
9. one dimension of the “salvation” cluster (regeneration/call/adoption/definitive sanctification etc)
10. distinguishable from and yet *always* followed by a life of Spirit-worked grateful obedience to God’s law as expressed in the double love-command

b) differences

A couple of apparent differences:

1. NTW denies that justification is “entry-language”.

The caricature reaction runs, “in NTW, justification is something that happens after a person has been saved in which God looks around and decides who are his people and says that those who wear the faith-badge are his. Thus, we are left wondering a) how, in NTW’s view, a person gets saved? and b) since grace and faith are justification emphases and NTW separates justification from getting saved, then whether he really believes in salvation by grace through faith?”

In fact, of course, 5. a. 5-9 above show that this is only an apparent difference.

- a) NTW insists that “when God forgives sin or reckons someone within the covenant, these are functionally equivalent. They draw attention to different aspects of the same event.” (*NIB Romans*, 493).
- b) Ask a Westminster Standards man (*Confession* X.I-II; XI.I; XIV.I; *Shorter Catechism* QQ.30-32) whether, given
 1. that justification is a benefit received by those who have been effectually called
 2. and that justification “follows” effectual calling
 3. and that faith is the work of the Spirit, given in effectual calling

he really wants to assert that there is nothing in the salvation-cluster which logically and spiritually precedes justification? Does he think that justification is a factor of union with Christ or does it bring about union with Christ?

[NB. In spite of what I say above, NTW thinks that this is “the central point in the controversy between what I say about Paul and what the tradition, not least the Protestant tradition, has said.” (“New Perspectives” 256). I think this is a failure on NTW’s part to see how closely “effectual calling” in Westminster theology maps onto “call” in his own readings of Paul. His desire to state that justification is not a synonym for “conversion” or “salvation” but is God’s act of declaring who are his own has led him to overstate the identification of justification and “entry-moment, first-thing-that-happens movement from death-realm to life-realm” in the tradition.]

2. NTW strongly asserts future justification on the basis of works

In fact, this is simply a re-affirmation of the standard Reformed doctrine of judgment according to works in which the Spirit-produced good works of the believer are brought on judgment day as non-meritorious evidence that a person is united to Christ (NTW: “the things that show that one is in Christ” – “New Perspectives” 254) and thereby one whose sins have been forgiven and whose nature has been renewed. (More at <http://davidpfield.blogspot.com/2007/03/it-stinks.html>). Remember, too, that NTW stresses resurrection *as* justification so that “justification on the basis of works” even more closely relates to John 5, 2 Cor 5, Rom 14 and so on.

Some real differences:

The key question, of course, for each of these differences (after – “are these Scriptural?!”) is

“Does this *contradict* or *undermine* or *state in other words* or *refine* or *re-balance* or *develop* the traditional doctrine?”

In NTW’s view, justification, in Paul’s writing, is ...

1. especially related to the matter of identifying the children of Abraham / members of the covenant;
2. in view of 1., a teaching which supremely demonstrates the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise (in turn, God’s appointed means of dealing with the Adam problem – sin and death) to bring about a redeemed, restored and reunited humankind. NTW often states that the gospel was a “rival eschatology” in the sense of giving a unique and exclusive answer to the question, “how will God sort out the world’s mess given that means of blessing – Israel – is herself such a mess?”
3. in view of 1. and 2., a blessing of God with a strongly “sociological” or “ecclesiological” dimension (though, given incorporative messiahship, this cannot be divorced from the soteriological);
4. in view of 1. and 2. and 3., an importantly ecumenical doctrine insofar as it teaches that we sit down at table with those who are marked by faith in Jesus not just with those who are marked by agreement with us on the details of the doctrine of justification itself;
5. not especially about anti-moralism as such (though, according to NTW, of any and every thought of or effort to earn or merit or deserve or work God’s favour, Paul would say, “It stinks!” – NIB *Romans*, p.485; see also <http://davidpfield.blogspot.com/2007/03/it-stinks.html>);
 - When “old perspective” says “we are justified by faith alone and not on the basis of works” it means “God’s declaration (that the sinner who believes in Jesus has Jesus’s “righteous status” reckoned to him) is not earned through meritorious efforts of that sinner. Faith in Jesus is what counts, not “doing good”.”
 - When “new perspective” says “we are justified by faith alone and not on the basis of works” it means “God’s declaration (that the sinner who believes in Jesus has Jesus’s “righteous status” reckoned to him) is utterly unrelated to that sinner’s possession of torah or observance of particular “works of torah”. Faith in Jesus is what counts, not “being Jewish”.”
6. a glorious and inevitable consequence of the gospel rather than an essential part of the initial gospel announcement;

7. SO focussed upon union with Christ that “imputation” (in the sense of “reckon/consider”) is
 - a. an expression of the fact that, united to Jesus, a sinner has Jesus’s legal status reckoned as his rather than
 - b. a (logically) distinguishable event/moment in which a sinner has Jesus’s moral perfection (lifelong obedience and obedient death) accounted as his own

NTW does not believe that “imputation” in sense b. is to be found in Paul’s writings but would, of course, affirm “imputation” in sense a. (“What, then, about the “imputed righteousness”? This is fine as it stands; God does indeed “reckon righteousness” to those who believe.” “New Perspectives” 252). In doing so he is stating that union with Christ is the heart of Paul’s doctrine and that “imputation” is *one way of expressing what union with Christ achieves* rather than a separate something. (See “New Perspectives” 260-61);
8. closely related to ideas of covenant blessing, restoration after the curse, vindication, and – especially – resurrection. Thus Jesus’s justification was the vindication / not-guilty verdict / life / announcement of utter legal and covenantal approval (and personal delight) which God declared in his resurrection; our justification is that, in Christ, the legal status and covenantal approval rightly given to Christ in the resurrection is reckoned ours – and this itself is, for us, a “resurrection” in the present which will be confirmed/ re-promulgated (NTW’s word is “reaffirmed” – “New Perspectives” 260) and fully outworked in our future resurrection
9. of “political” (civilization-shaping) significance in that it is articulated in the language of “justice” and “peace” through a “lord of all”

6. What next?

- a) Care about levels of discourse: at a given moment we need to be clear about whether we are addressing the question of Paul’s teaching / use of language etc or discussing the “systematic” doctrine of justification as it has come to be expressed in particular confessional statements. If you hear the words, “You see that a person is justified by works and not by faith alone” coming out of my mouth you’d better be careful to find out whether I’m responding to the Westminster Confession or reading James 2 at the time
- b) When dealing with the systematic doctrine of justification, then we need to be clear about what are the non-negotiables of Biblical Christianity and determine (see 5.b. above) what, if anything, in a particular representation of Paul’s writings, *when translated from lexical and other exegetical discussions into a series of doctrinal propositions*, contradicts / undermines / refines / re-balances / develops our current understanding
- c) Recognition (while acknowledging the hermeneutical circle/spiral) that wider hermeneutical presuppositions / frameworks as well as theological temperament play an important part in one’s reaction to these readings. Generally speaking Wright’s emphases on union with Christ (federal headship, incorporative messiahship), redemptive-history, the Abrahamic promise, the covenantal shape of redemption, and the redefinition of Israel in Jesus are more likely to gain a sympathetic hearing from Reformed Christians. On the other hand, his opposition to one (popular) version of “imputation”, his advocacy of the ecumenical and political dimensions of justification, his view that the doctrine of justification is not itself part of the gospel announcement, and his conviction that justification is not – in Paul’s thinking – primarily about anti-moralism all sound alarm bells for conservatives.
- d) Specific historical, lexical and exegetical questions such as
 - how moralistic were second temple judaisms?
 - is “the righteousness of God” (thus phrased) always – in Paul – God’s own justice/covenant faithfulness?

- are the “works of the law” merit-earning good deeds or Jew-demarkating specific practices of torah?
- what’s going on in 2.6-11; 2.13-14; 2.25-29; 4.4-5; 7.7-25; 8.1-11; 10.4-11?

require detailed evaluation. It is important to discern how far a particular reading of Paul (we’ve been considering Wright’s) stands or falls with a particular historical, lexical, or exegetical proposal.

e) Attitude – patience, charity, alertness, Bible, Bible, Bible

NTW – frustration with “many conservative writers ... traditionalists” who fail “to do three things: first, to differentiate the quite separate types of New Perspective; second, to engage in the exegetical debates upon which the whole thing turns instead of simply repeating a Lutheran or similar line as though that settled matters; and third, to recognize that some of us at least are brothers in Christ who have come to the positions we hold not because of some liberal, modernist, or relativist agenda but as a result of prayerful and humble study of the text, which is and remains our sole authority.” (“New Perspectives”, 247)

f) Further study (both for NTW’s views of Romans/justification and for NPP):

1. Work through Tom Wright’s commentary on *Romans* (pp.393-770 of volume X of *The New Interpreter’s Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002).
2. Spend some hours on “The Paul Page” - <http://www.thepaulpage.com/> - which is a huge resource dealing with “The New Perspective” and both contains and lists a vast number of resources for further study from all points on the spectrum.

SOURCES:

All of these are by N T Wright. Full reference may be found on Wright’s “Publications List” at <http://www.ntwrightpage.com/PublicationsList.pdf>

Books:

1. *NIB Commentary on Romans*
2. *Paul for Everyone – Romans* (2 volumes)
3. *Fresh Perspectives*
4. *The Climax of the Covenant*
5. *What St Paul Really Said*
6. *The NT and the People of God*
7. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*

Lectures / articles:

1. “Romans and the Theology of Paul” - http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_Romans_Theology_Paul.pdf
2. “The law in Romans 2” - http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_Law_Romans2.pdf
3. “New Perspectives on Paul” - http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_New_Perspectives.htm - now available as chapter 11 of Bruce McCormack ed. *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges* (2006)
4. “The Shape of Justification” - <http://www.thepaulpage.com/Shape.html>
5. “Paul and Caesar: a new reading of Romans” - http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_Paul_Caesar_Romans.htm
6. “Paul’s gospel and Caesar’s empire” - <http://www.ctinquiry.org/publications/wright.htm>
7. “Coming home to St Paul” - http://www.westminster-abbey.org/event/lecture/archives/gore_2000.htm

Audio:

1. Romans in a Day – 3 lectures
http://www.calvin.edu/worship/idis/theology/ntwright_romans_part1.mp3
http://www.calvin.edu/worship/idis/theology/ntwright_romans_part2.mp3
http://www.calvin.edu/worship/idis/theology/ntwright_romans_part3.mp3
2. Further Thoughts on Romans 10 - Durham NT seminar –
<http://www.dur.ac.uk/kevin.bywater/Further%20Thoughts%20on%20Romans%2010.mp3>
3. Paul’s Perspective: The Apostle and his Theology - Lectures at the Auburn Avenue Pastors’ Conference 2005 - <http://www.auburnavenuemedia.org/>
4. Discussion with Jimmy Dunn about Paul’s theology - Durham NT seminar –
<http://www.dur.ac.uk/kevin.bywater/DunnWrightB.mp3>

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

