God when she is actually seeing and loving God face-to-face in the beatific vision, Aquinas thus will not separate what it means to live “according to reason” with the pursuit of the vision of God.

Johnson then examined two examples from Aquinas: on lying and on the vice against nature. Since Aquinas’s theological anthropology dictates that for humans to act in the image of God requires them to act according to their intellectual natures, Aquinas concludes that lying and the vice against nature are sinful because they are violations of human reason and, as such, must result in the infliction of self-damage.

Lisa Cahill followed with an appreciative response, but challenged Johnson on two points. First, Cahill argued that Johnson's account of what it is to act according to nature (one’s intellectual nature?) was not sufficiently specified, and second, that Johnson's appropriation of Aquinas's analysis of the vice against nature did not sufficiently appropriate the development of Church teaching on the goods of marriage and sexuality.

At this point discussion opened to the floor, and the questions directed towards Johnson and Cahill included further discussion of the issue of the historical evolution of the notion of “nature,” to what extent the moral theologian has to be attuned to such historical developments, and the limits of such development. There was also considerable discussion of how moral theologians might critically appropriate work in various sciences. Participants in the discussion period included Jack Bonsor, Lawrence Dewan, Benedict Guevin, Edwin Lisson, and Norbert Rigali. All who wished were able to raise questions and make comments, contributing to a spirited and engaging discussion.
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couples are more likely to “drift” from church as compared to those who become “investors” in the experience of the church; (3) 43.8% of respondents who began as interchurch at the time of engagement became same church couples; (4) predictors of divorce are correlated with a complex of factors including lack of spousal communication, a lack of joint activities, and differences in religious beliefs.

Philippe Thibodeau addressed the pastoral response to interchurch couples by insisting upon a careful definition of terms. He identified authentically interchurch couples as a distinct, but highly significant subset of the population which Lawler’s study has named collectively as “interchurch.” Thibodeau employed the *koinonia* ecclesiology and sacramental nature of interchurch marriages in speaking of a particular vocation for this subset, who practice a “double belonging” in the churches of both spouses. He asked for theologians to provide words to describe their experience, which challenges the static ecclesiological paradigms typically employed in response to such families’ pastoral needs. He cited the chronic need in pastoral care for guidelines which apply the *koinonia* ecclesiology to eucharistic theology. The German bishops’ January 1997 strong pastoral statement on eucharistic hospitality and an analogous January 1998 statement by the South African bishops were cited by Thibodeau as signs of hope for such progress.

Margaret O’Gara highlighted aspects of ecclesiology of communion as foundational for thinking about interchurch marriage: (1) Vatican II’s (*Lumen gentium*) use of the word *subsistit* to teach that the one Church of Christ extends beyond the visible boundaries of the Roman Catholic Church; (2) Vatican II’s description of the family as “domestic church,” and its reaffirmation by Pope John Paul II in *Familiaris Consortio* and in the Ecumenical Statement of the German Bishops’ Conference to the Working Group of Christian Churches in Nürnberg. She identified the latter statement’s emphasis upon the underlying principles for eucharistic sharing that are seen from a particular theological perspective in the case of interchurch marriage partners who enjoy a special role as “builders of unity.”

O’Gara suggested two other ideas to expand our theological foundations for understanding interchurch marriage. First, the idea of the “gift exchange,” as outlined in her own book, *The Ecumenical Gift Exchange*. She cited Vatican II and Pope John Paul II’s use of this terminology in *Ut Unum Sint* and *Orientale Lumen* in the sense that diversity or differences should be seen as a richness rather than a threat. She identified interchurch families, regularly experiencing the *ethos* of each church community (hymns, preaching styles, ethical agendas, theological emphases, ministerial skills) as a means of reception of new gifts from one community to another. Their children, she added, can further the reception of these gifts if they can be saved from alienation and discouragement over the pain of the continuing divisions in the church. Her second suggestion borrowed from Jean-Marie Tillard’s emphasis upon the nuptial blessings at weddings, through which married couples are given the commission to teach
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(forming their children by the gospel, as examples of Christian life, and as witnesses to others) in a special way. She mused over the realization that the non-Catholic partners in interchurch marriages should be understood to have a kind of teaching responsibility in the Roman Catholic Church.

Discussion included: attention to the fact that 12% of children in Lawler’s study claim “interchurch” identity; the real but imperfect ecclesial communion such couples and their children enjoy; the problem of reciprocity in eucharistic sharing; and the integrity of sacrament vis-à-vis questions of governance, which mitigate communion ecclesiology.
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Topic: The Canadian Experience: Challenges and Contradictions for the Church
Moderator: Ellen M. Leonard, University of St. Michael’s College, Toronto
Presenters: Carolyn Sharp, Redactrice en chef, Relations, Montréal
Jacoba H. Kuikman, University of Regina, Saskatchewan
Ellen M. Leonard, University of St. Michael’s College, Toronto

The panel reflected on the Canadian Church as a distinct local church in communion with the Church in Rome and with other local churches under the leadership of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, noting that there are two language groups in the conference: francophone and anglophone. These are distinct in history, language, and culture. It then considered three regions as local churches, illustrative of the great diversity which characterizes the Canadian reality.

Carolyn Sharp described the context of the Church in Quebec which has changed dramatically during the past forty years, from a tightly woven francophone Catholic society to a religiously tolerant pluralistic society in which nominal catholicism continues to define the overwhelming majority of Quebecers. She indicated that the Quebec episcopacy is centered around an accompaniment model. Theology is based in theology departments of state-funded public universities. Quebec theologians are isolated from their North American counterparts, interacting more with francophone European theologians. Sharp considers modernity and liberation to be the principal axes of Quebec theology. She sees feminist theology and praxis arising from the nexus of modernizing and liberationist concerns. Sharp presented the church in Quebec as progressive in its response to the Quiet Revolution and to Vatican II, but noted the skepticism of the younger generations who consider the church to be irrelevant to their lived experience.