

Side note

The Urth list — 1 messages, 1 voices, 19 Feb 2002

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/2970>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

James Jordan — 19 Feb 2002, 22:09

For anyone else listening in:

Side note, from Dan'l to James: You wrote:

his voyage to horrible Green can be seen as Peter's journey to Rome, where he died -- though this is not in the New Testament, and protestants like me don't believe it happened, yet it is a central part of Wolfe's Roman Catholic committments.

I've never quite understood this, btw - most Protestants believe many things that aren't in the Bible (i.e., "Cannibalism and polygyny are wrong," "Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo," "The Gospel according to Matthew is divinely inspired, but the Gospel according to Thomas is not," etc.) - why do so many Protestants feel so strongly about rejecting this particular bit of historical trivia? I mean, it isn't as if this is in any material way the basis of the claims of the Papacy.

Sorry, I was very unclear. Most protestants DO believe Peter went to Rome and died there, interpreting "Babylon" in 1 Peter 5:13 as a code for Rome. "Protestants like me" (those who are of my ilk, and they are the minority) reject this because we believe the symbol "babylon" is pretty securely established in both OldTestament (when used symbolically) and NewTestament as Jerusalem-in-Rebellion. I believe Peter stayed in the Jerusalem area and died there. But none of this has anything to do with the Papacy one way or another, as you point out -- and I myself have no problem with a supreme bishop, provided that he agrees with ME!!! ;-)

Jim Jordan