

Discussion on Evangelization and Catechesis

- Evangelization is the telling of a story

Acts 17: “So Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, “Men of Athens, I see that you are very religious in all respects. For while I was passing through and examining the objects of your worship, I also found an altar with this inscription, ‘TO AN UNKNOWN GOD.’ Therefore, what you worship in ignorance, this I proclaim to you. **The God who made the world and everything that is in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made by hands; nor is He served by human hands, as though He needed anything, since He Himself gives to all people life and breath and all things; [THE STORY]**

- Catechesis is teaching someone about facets of our faith

From the bible:

Acts 8:26: We have heard what the deacon Philip did. He begins to evangelize the cities of Samaria. The Holy Spirit spurs Philip to approach a foreigner whose heart is open to God. Philip meets a high-level official of the queen of Ethiopia, an administrator of her treasure. After being in Jerusalem for worship, this man, a eunuch, is returning to his country. He is a proselyte Jew from Ethiopia. He is seated in a carriage, reading the scroll of the Prophet Isaiah, in particular the fourth verse of the “servant of the Lord”. Philip approaches the carriage and asks him: “Do you understand what you are reading?” (Acts 8:30). The Ethiopian responds: “How can I, unless some one guides me?” (8:31). This powerful man recognizes that he needs to be guided in order to understand the Word of God. He was the great banker, the finance minister. He had all the power of money but he knew that without the explanation, he could not understand.

Divine Mercy commentary spoke of evangelization and catechesis in that order
Baptism in Annapolis MD spoke of the newly baptized as preachers

Much of this is really a tale of evangelization and catechesis, their common goals and conflicts. What is the difference between evangelization and catechesis? I propose we look at St Paul and the issue of circumcision, the First Council of Jerusalem. (Acts 21:25)

The Christians in Galatia were listening to false teachers. These Judaizers were telling them that they must add the works of the law to faith in Jesus in order to be truly right with God (Galatians 2:4). Paul has rejected that teaching. Christ has set us free, Paul insists, by buying our way out of slavery to sin. That deal is done. We are justified before God (Galatians 3:25–29). To begin to follow the law of Moses in order to be justified by God is to miss the point of Christianity entirely. Paul has said repeatedly that it amounts to asking God to judge us by our works and not by Jesus' sinless life and death in our place. It makes us a slave to our inescapable sin.

Paul is speaking with James and the elders of the church in Jerusalem. He intends to update them on what he has been doing the last four years or so. His work included planting a church in Ephesus and building up mostly-Gentile churches all over the coast of the Aegean Sea. But a rumor has been floating around Jerusalem that Paul is teaching Jewish Christians they should not observe the Mosaic law. This is false, and Paul is willing to take the elders' suggestion—help four men complete a Jewish vow—to debunk the unhelpful gossip (Acts 21:18–24). “What has been sacrificed to idols” refers to the communal meals people have in pagan temples. To refrain means more than just not going out to dinner; during those meals people make business connections and show their fealty to their city. A person who doesn't sacrifice to the local god or goddess is seen as someone who doesn't care about their community. Without business contacts, a craftsman can suffer financially and find it difficult to provide for his family. It's a big sacrifice, but Paul supports it; false gods are demons, and Jesus-followers should have no part (1 Corinthians 10:14–22). This sounds like the friction between faith and government?

Due to the prohibition of eating an animal's blood, the Torah implies that an animal must be killed via exsanguination (slit throat with sharp knife), since animals which died naturally or were torn apart by other animals were absolutely prohibited. There is some human explanations of this. A hunter will never save the meat of an animal he wounded and chased down. The adrenaline released into the meat makes it taste bad. Also, all pathogens which are bad for humans in meat are carried by the blood stream. Blood, not drained, is stagnated or congealed in the veins. God was keeping his people safe just like no pork aka "Trich" or Trichinella.

Also, "if an animal dies of itself, it is not to be eaten. Deuteronomy 14:21" – (kept you from any sickness the animal may have had).

Paul urges that food sacrificed to idols is not to be eaten unless "unaware" – shows that Paul acknowledges that these laws are ceremonial only.

Long after sacrifices have ceased, the Jew will still, if possible, only eat what has been killed by a butcher of his own persuasion so confirming that the blood has been drained out. Meat so killed, which may be eaten without defilement, is known technically as Kosher...

The council forbids animals that have been strangled because such animals are not butchered correctly to ensure their blood is properly drained. There is debate today about whether Christians are still prohibited from eating blood because the law pre-dates the Mosaic law (Genesis 9:4) or if the restriction was lifted the same time other foods were (Acts 10:9–16). Either way, the council asks the Gentiles to refrain so the Jewish Christians will feel free to share meals.

"Sexual immorality" means any sex not between a husband and wife. There is no caveat for couples who are engaged, couples who "love each other very much," or pornographic situations. Such restrictions have always been in place, and remain; that they need to be repeated so often speaks to the powerful temptation of sex.

Now Paul reveals that it's even worse than that. To seek God's approval by following the law of Moses (catechesis alone) makes Christ's death for our sins worthless. More specifically, Paul says that **to "accept circumcision" makes Christ of no help to us.** This is a dire remark, and one that needs to be carefully understood.

Paul was saying that we need to believe in Christ as God and Savior. This is critical. The converse is useless – to know the law and have no connection to God will not save you. Protestants evangelize their followers. Each convert accepts Christ and believes in Him in their heart. This is what God desires. We cannot teach precepts and ignore the evangelization. However, the catechesis provides the framework to live your evangelized life through. You can become evangelized through the precepts(catechesis) as in time they will sink in and you will believe in Christ but maybe not or maybe your knowledge will not be enough to keep you with faith in Christ.

It seems to be a sticky story where evangelization and catechesis compete. The Eucharist and Mary are the separating line in both cases for the true faith. Generally, you would deny both to be a Protestant. If you accept both then you are likely a under-catechized catholic. But if you are catechized and not evangelized your persistence in the faith will be weak.

Is the baptism, confirmation and marriage prep lacking in evangelization at the expense of catechesis?

Born Again ??

Isn't this just evangelization. I could rephrase that to say "are you catechized only or are you evangelized?"

Too much pickle juice. Have joy that you will be in heaven. Yes, there is a God and there is a Savior and you will be there. This is what St Paul preached. No room for pickle juice if you are evangelized.

Kateri Tekakwitha was considered unfit for canonization because she was a "savage" – more simply just "not catechized" enough – re: evangelization and catechesis.

