

in mourning. The Indians there, too, have disappeared. This book, if nothing else, places them back as a central part of the picture, and explains how it was with their help that Serra founded California.

ANTHONY LAPPIN

METHOD, MEANING AND REVELATION: THE MEANING AND FUNCTION OF REVELATION IN BERNARD LONERGAN'S *METHOD IN THEOLOGY* by Neil Ormerod, *University Press of America, New York, 2000. Pp. ix + 304, \$62.00 hbk, \$42.50pbk.*

In the 1990s, the young Australian theologian Neil Ormerod gave us two good books: *Introducing Contemporary Theologies* and *Grace & Disgrace*. This time, in *Method, Meaning and Revelation* he tackles the controverted notion of revelation and scrutinizes how Bernard Lonergan ties it with method and meaning.

With the help of Alasdair MacIntyre's idea of a tradition of rationality, he shows that Lonergan's understanding of revelation is parasitic on the Catholic tradition. In contrast to MacIntyre, however, he argues that far from ruling out Lonergan's turn to the human subject, the Catholic tradition demands it, inasmuch as it recognizes the duty of meeting modernity's challenge to faith. Lonergan simply builds on Thomas Aquinas as he unpacks the great medieval doctor's intellectual self-knowledge which undergirds his metaphysics. With Plato and Aristotle, Thomas went beyond the realm of common sense and was at ease in the realm of theory, where thinkers systematically interconnect aspects of the knowable. Furthermore, after Augustine, Thomas explored a third realm, which Lonergan calls interiority and for which the key category is meaning. Lonergan's contribution consists in offering a fuller account of interiority. This turn to the human subject is methodologically required if theologians are to situate their enterprise in regard to the human sciences and history, which essentially are studies of meaning.

The equivalent of MacIntyre's idea of a tradition of rationality is found in Lonergan's treatment of the carriers and functions of meaning. As carriers of meaning, the Jewish prophets and writers, Jesus himself and his disciples initiated and developed a habit of thinking—a Christian realism, as Lonergan calls it—which has endured to this day. Belief has increased the faithful's intellectual and affective capabilities. Accordingly revelation can be viewed as the entry of new meaning into human history. In its intrinsic association with value, such meaning is both cognitive and existential. Ormerod rightly recognizes that far from being objectivistic or subjectivistic, Lonergan's notion of revelation neither amounts to rationalism nor falls into fideism. The outer word (namely the manifestation of God in Christ) and the inner word (namely the light of the Holy Spirit) are complementary.

Ormerod explains the nature of the shifts that can be detected in Lonergan's writings, which must be seen as successive attempts to make sense of revelation. *Method in Theology* goes beyond *Insight* in its

differentiation of the kinds of meaning: intersubjective, artistic, symbolic, linguistic, incarnate, linguistic. The linguistic exercises the following functions: cognitive, efficient, constitutive, communicative. However, not utterly convincing are Ormerod's efforts at correlating the kinds of meaning with the levels of consciousness (p. 139) or with the functional specialties (p. 160). I wonder if each particular kind of meaning can be restricted to one level or to one specialty. Moreover, I do not recognize Lonergan's 'efficient' function of meaning in what Ormerod calls the 'effective, moral function' (141).

He rightly claims that Lonergan's account is more comprehensive and integrated than the theologies of revelation currently available. He contrasts Rahner, Pannenberg, Lindbeck and Schillebeeckx with Lonergan. He addresses the objections raised by some critics of Lonergan: Rahner, Lindbeck, Dulles, Kelly, Reynolds, Keefe and Mackey. In particular, he discusses in a helpful way the question of whether the author of *Method in Theology* sees or fails to see a correlation between the method itself and Christian revelation.

Ormerod successfully explicates the understanding of revelation which is latent in Lonergan's *Method in Theology*. He correctly indicates that the first key notion is 'special divine providence', retrieved from *Insight*, and that the second one is grace, treated in *Grace and Freedom*.

From a technical point of view, readers will note that almost all the page numbers of the 'Content' are inaccurate and that misspellings are not rare throughout the book. As regards the thinking quality displayed in this study, it is very clear and honest. Although intellectually demanding, it can serve, for theologically unsophisticated readers, as an introduction to central issues such as the role of experience, history and culture in revelation, as well as an expanded understanding of Christology and the Trinity. Ormerod's presentation of the several thinkers who disagree with Lonergan is always fair, respectful and detailed, with a knack for spotting their weak points. Furthermore, I have found impressive his knowledge of Lonergan's thought as expressed in *Method in Theology* and in articles prior and posterior to that important work. Finally, his command of the relevant secondary literature on Lonergan is remarkable.

LOUIS ROY

STUDIES IN PATRISTIC CHRISTOLOGY: Proceedings of the Third Maynooth Patristic Conference, ed. Thomas Finan and Vincent Twomey, October 1996 Four Courts Press, Dublin. 1998. Pp 245, £35.00 hbk.

This collection of Christological studies will prove valuable not only to patristic specialists but also to more general readers. As is appropriate in a collection of papers read before Irish audiences for the most part by Irish scholars, two have a specifically Irish subject-matter.

The first of these is Finbarr Clancy's '*Vive in Christo, ut Christus in te: The Christology of St Columbanus*'. The writings of this Irish monk,

598