



I'm not robot



Continue

Non catholic christian word

The Home Faith is part of an ecumenical effort, and the Reconciliation Church calls non-Catholics by the name of Christianity. For example, it is true that despite [the obstacles of unity], all those justified by faith in baptism are integrated into Christ. Therefore, they have the right to be called Christians and are accepted as brothers by the children of the Catholic Church for good reason. Vatican II document, Unitatis Redintegratio, §3 (emphasis added). However, Catholics should not call heresy and divisiveness in the name of Christianity: it is contrary to the teachings of the Pope, doctors and fathers of the Church. It is unreasonable and the same reasonings go into the absurdity of calling everyone a sacred Catholic. It is contrary to human ubiquitous practices, using his natural wits and common sense, for example, a man calls a stealer, a thief; And it is contrary to the entire history of the Catholic Church when judging people, (viz., not according to church judges and presumptions in external forums, invincible or home, hidden goodwill. 1. The teachings of popes, fathers, and doctors do not call non-Catholics by the name of Christianity because they are not true followers of Christ. Pope Pius XII said this was clear, when he taught us: a Christian man must be Roman. We must recognize that the heir to the Apostolic Prince, the bishop of Rome, the vika of Christ on earth, is one of the governing Churches of Christ. Hinted at by Irish pilgrims on October 8, 1957 (emphasis added). Pope Leo XIII, when he wrote, made catholic teachings like this clear: as long as members lived in the body, it lived; separation, it lost its life. Therefore, as long as he lives in the text of the [Catholic] Church, he is a Christian. Separated from her, he is heresy . . . Encyclical Satis Recognition 5 (emphasis added). The doctor of the church, St. Peter Canisius, teaches the same thing, non-Catholics are not truly Christian; Q. Who is called a Christian? A. Jesus professes the doctrine of Christ in the Church. Thus, as a truly Christian, he thoroughly deprecates all sects and sects found outside the doctrine, and completely deprecates all peoples, such as Jews, Mohammeds, heretical sects and sects. Sum of Christian Doctrine, Pt.1, Q.1. St. Augustine, father and doctor of the Church clearly accept the distinction between heretics and Christians (i.e. Catholics). Because they are Christians and heretics. On the morals of the Catholic Church, ch. 33, ¶72 (emphasis added). St. Ciphrian, the father of the church, taught the same thing in his thesis on schismatics. To be a Christian in the same way that the devil often fakes himself in order to become a Christian. Thesis 14. Thus, it is clear from this pope, doctor and father that Catholics do not call non-Catholics by the name of Christianity. The response to the opposition that this Catholic teaching should be updated to accommodate our time may be that the teachings of the Church need to be updated, because many people of goodwill, now born in heretics or divisive churches? It is a very old situation where people are born with religious errors and (probably) do not carefully investigate those errors. In fact, this issue is as old as the Church himself. Not only has he often been born heretics since the beginning of the Catholic Church, but this situation is the same as all other non-pastors. Pagans and Jews are also doing their faults during the life of the Church. Therefore, we are not a new situation where the great doctors of the Church are unpredictable, we need to update the teachings of the Church, and we will be allowed to begin calling non-Catholic believers in the name of Christianity. 2. Calling non-Catholics in the name of Christianity, calling everyone a sacred Catholic all sin (not just heresy), is unreasonable for the same reason that it involves some element of ignorance. Should we call him a non-Catholic in the name of Christianity and give him the benefit of the doubt that he may have goodwill? We first talk about the ignorance of the fictional man, and then whether Catholics should call him Christian. Every sin contains an element of ignorance. As St. Thomas teaches: unbelievers are ignorant of things of faith, and they do not know or believe in themselves. The faithful, on the other hand, know them not by protest, but by the light of faith. Summa, Ila Ilae, Q.1, a.5 Ad 1. In a way, all sin involves an element of ignorance, for no one will commit any kind of sin if he fully understands the full consequences of his actions. But any transgression of sin requires knowledge in any way, and that particular act is wrong. Otherwise, the person will not be able to commit his or her sins. To avoid the conclusion that we know that certain non-Catholics can subjectively commit his mortal sins, we can assume that he is invincible. We may think that his full Catholic faith has never been explained to him, and therefore we may think that he cannot be overruled for rejecting true faith. God knows the heart of man. We don't really know every opportunity such a person (or doesn't have). His subjective transgressions For men (or at least it is known only to imperfect people). God is judging on grounds that may not appear to us. For example, we may appear ignorant (i.e., unforgivably) of the Catholic faith because we have good reason to think that faith has never been explained to him. However, however, but a man like Respect appears, and we do not know his insides. Perhaps a person commits a sin against reason (e.g. lies and theft). Because God rejected truth or justice based on natural law, he may have judged such a person to have rejected Catholicism. Once again, God will judge the person's internal forum (conscience). Men make mistakes by doing so. Therefore, in the last few paragraphs of this article, it is clear: 1) All sins contain some ignorance and this ignorance does not necessarily eliminate transgression; And that 2) a person can be wrong about someone else's internal transgressions. To be a Christian, not a Catholic, his ignorance is ignorant and incalculable. It is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. Thus, for a man who has not visibly/externally part of the Catholic Church, the only way he arrives in heaven is if he has a Catholic faith, grace, hope and charity in a truly, truly internally parted way, but if there are some errors that cause him through ignorance that he does not explicitly embrace the true Catholic Church. Therefore, if he is not Catholic, it is false to call someone a Christian (i.e., a true follower of Christ). It would be false to call someone Christian if he were outside the Visible Catholic Church if he were not truly a member of the Catholic Church, but because of his invincible, incalculable ignorance, he is not visibly part of the Church. If we call a person Christian based on The Catholicism in God, we will call Jews and pagans in the name of Christianity. Let's say we call Protestants christians by name. This means that they will not even know that they are members of the true Church, but that they will truly think they are part of the Catholic Church. If we call heretics (and schismatics) Christianity, for the same reason we should call all Jews and infidels in the name of Christianity. This same assumption will have consequences for calling all of us Catholics. Not only that, but because this same principle applies not only to the name Christianity, but also to catholics, people who are truly Christian (i.e., followers of Christ truly), Also Catholic. Thus, according to harmful and foolish conciliatory practices that blindly assume that all heresies (or schismatic) have perfect goodwill, we must call all heretics, Jews and infidels in the name of Catholicism. These same assumptions will have consequences for calling all of us saints. We cannot rule out that everyone is (internally) Catholic, and based on speculations like this, we cannot likewise rule out the possibility that they are Catholic as well as very saintly because we cannot rule out their goodwill, invincible ignorance and presumptive charity! Thus, if a person is consistent when applying the foolish conciliatory notion that we should call heretics (or schismatics) in the name of Christians, it leads us to the conclusion that we should also call everyone sacred Catholic, including rock music blowing, drug addiction, blasphemous lungs. We then see the absurdity of calling non-Catholics by name Christianity, because the same reasoning, which led to more absurdity we should call them all, even saintly Catholics. 3. Calling non-Catholic Christianity is contrary to a person's natural wits and common sense, for example, a person calls a stealer a thief. We refer to a man according to the outside world (what we see), not according to unknown presumptions that could theoretically be in it. It has never been the practice of a person to assume in an external forum (which is also reasonable) that a complete lack of assumptions (where men judge) inside (subjective) transgressions of everyone of their actions, simply because they may perhaps lack transgression in the internal forums of their conscience, which is by God alone. We don't say that Hitler was a good man, simply because we can't rule out the possibility that God will judge him as good because of his completely hidden (invincible) ignorance and (hypothetical) goodwill. Likewise, with Stalin, Attila Hun, Luther and all the remaining enemies of mankind. We assume they are good and blame-free and don't call them that way, but we can't completely rule out the possibility of hidden goodness, nor can we be positive that they're in hell. For this reason, by judging by our natural wits and common sense (as a man has always judged), we should not call heresy and division in the name of Christianity. 4. Catholic customs have always been to call heresy and schism by its name and not to call them Christians. Likewise, the Church judges in the same way that people do based on our natural wits. This is the only way people can judge in the Church. We call the outer division by this name, just as men call the outer thief. St. Thomas explained: [W] ith about the internal inclination of the person we consider In relation to divine judgment, the spiritual state is related to his external actions, and we consider the spiritual state of man in relation to the Church. Soma, Iaiæ, Q.184, a.4, Respondent. Because the name Christianity is used by Catholics or the Catholic Church, we can see that related to the outside, no non-Catholic should ever be called a Christian. Similarly, Pope Leo XIII explained: of state of mind and intent, the Church does not judge, as they are internal; But if they are obvious, she must judge them. Sado-Chan Curæ, ¶33. Therefore, the Church does not judge if someone is ignorant of the lawless before God, but if they are not Catholic in external forums, they judge and label a person. Pope St. Pius X was surprised that when judging modernists of this principle, we should put them in number among the enemies of the church, but if God alone excludes the inner tendencies of the judged soul, no one would be reasonably surprised that we should. Their way of speaking and their actions [objective criteria with one judge]. Indeed, you may not be the most malicious person in all of the Church's hit. Fassendi Dominica Gregis, ¶13 (bracket notes added). Again, when used by Catholics or the Catholic Church, no non-Catholic believer should ever be called a Christian, because the name Christianity is associated with external forums (i.e., what we can see and know). Pope Benedict XIV explains these same principles, in relation to the hypothetical case of heretical death for a doctrine he held in common with the Catholic Church. Pope Francis explains that if Heresy was a martyr in the eyes of God, even (hypothetically) ignorant of his heresy, the Church would never call him a martyr. Pope Benedict XIV cites St. Thomas Aquinas and follows, and the Church teaches more to judge heresies who do not have the gift of supernatural faith. De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione, Bk.III, ch.20, ¶3. Conclusion We cannot rule out that a certain person outside the visible church is holy, spotless, and able to go to heaven (which requires him to be a Catholic). However, the man is judged to be an outward forum, an act of condemnation. Therefore, Catholics should not call heresy and divisiveness in the name of Christianity: it is contrary to the teachings of the Pope, doctors and fathers of the Church to call any non-Catholic in the name of Christianity: It's unreasonable and the same (false) reasoning is the absurdity of calling Human beings are catholic saints: It is contrary to human ubiquitous practices, using his natural wits and common sense, (for example, a man calls a stealer, a thief); And it is contrary to the entire history of the Catholic Church when judging people, (viz., the Church is not judged in external forums, not according to presumption, invincible or home, hidden good faith.