

distribution of wealth. This is unrealistic. The shareholder model dominates all aspects of modern capitalism, and we need to find a better way to deal with it. One aspect of the current manifestation of the shareholder model, which is only briefly mentioned, is the immense power of shareholders who usually come in the form of large institutions and pension funds. These institutional shareholders (and the many christians who work for them) are not about to give up their power for a common good model. But the shareholder model and the whole governance structure of the modern corporation are under pressure. The demise of Enron and WorldCom suggests that, although management teams were hired by shareholders to promote their interests, they ended up promoting management's interests. The area of corporate governance is one of the fundamental issues that christian social thought needs to explore. But none of this should be taken as a criticism of the authors. They are to be commended for producing a landmark book that begins the journey of christian engagement with the modern business corporation and wealth creation. I hope other scholars and practitioners will continue this engagement.

BEN ANDRADI

**THE MEETING OF RELIGIONS AND THE TRINITY** by Gavin D'Costa, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 2000. Pp. xi + 187 £13.95 pbk.

D'Costa divides this book into two principal sections. In the first he considers five thinkers who argue for a radically pluralist position with regard to the various world traditions. D'Costa sets out to show that in fact all these thinkers turn out to be quite exclusivist. One group representing the Christian and Jewish traditions, comprises Hick, Knitter and Cohn-Sherbok, whom D'Costa identifies as holding to the values of modernity, judging the value of all religious positions in so far as they conform to these. Within the Hindu tradition, Radhakrishnan, on the other hand, judges partly by means of Western modernity and partly according to Advaitic criteria, while the Dalai Lama turns out to appraise the value of all traditions, including Christianity, according to the values of his own Tibetan Buddhism. D'Costa intends to show that radical pluralism is unworkable, either because if truly applied it renders any judgment about truth or value illegitimate or, as in the examples he considers, he can detect an implicit exclusivism at work, which compromises the integrity of some or all religious traditions.

Instead, D'Costa argues that it is inevitable and hence legitimate that all evaluation of other religious traditions is done from within a tradition-specific stance. In the second part he thus works from an explicitly Trinitarian and Catholic perspective, and considers whether according to this we can say that other religious traditions are *per se* vehicles of salvation, taking for granted that Catholic teaching states that all individuals can be saved. Carefully working within the limits placed by the current thinking of the Magisterium he comes to the conclusion that there

is little evidence that a Catholic can say on the basis of official teaching that other traditions are independently salvific in themselves. Instead he outlines within the criteria of the same tradition a Trinitarian perspective in which the activity of the Holy Spirit is active in other religious traditions, but both relates this to the redemptive death of Christ and, in apparent contradiction of any openness, affirms the necessity of the church for salvation. D'Costa states: 'The Council documents do not try to reconcile these tensions, but there has been much speculation since the Council on this point. The main route for reconciling the tensions lies within the Conciliar teaching that wherever God is present, this is the presence of the Triune God; and it is this Triune God who is the foundation of the church. Hence one very important point follows from these Conciliar statements: the Holy Spirit's presence within other religions is both intrinsically trinitarian and ecclesiological. It is trinitarian in referring the Holy Spirit's activity to the Paschal mystery of Christ, and ecclesial in referring the Paschal event to the constitutive community-creating force it has, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit' (p.110).

Because of this, on the one hand, there is the rejection of a plurality of independent salvific structures in that the activity of the Spirit in other religions is thus not an activity which is unconnected to Christ or the church. On the other hand, this means for Christians that failure to be open to the Holy Spirit's activity in other traditions is a failure to appreciate fully the action of the Spirit of Christ in the church. Here he explores a richer significance of conciliar talk of other religions as a preparation for the Gospel: 'If the church is not attentive to the possibility of the Spirit within other religions, it will fail to be attentive to the Word of God that has been entrusted to it. In this sense, if one were to retain and utilize the category of fulfilment in a very careful sense, then it is not only the other religions that are fulfilled in (and in one sense, radically transformed) their *preparatio* being completed through Christianity, but also Christianity itself that is fulfilled in receiving the gift of God that the Other might bear, self-consciously or not' (p.114).

As an extension of this position, D'Costa considers the issue of the nature and legitimacy of interreligious prayer, taking prayer with Muslims as a test case. Once again, D'Costa keeps closely within the limits of magisterial teaching, here exploring interreligious prayer within the categories of *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Rejecting any suggestion that public cultic prayer can be shared on the grounds that it involves identification with the tradition whose cult it is, he argues that other prayer is legitimate, when all prayer is seen as the activity of the Holy Spirit. Involvement in such prayer is not infidelity to one's own tradition, but involves the inevitable, but worthwhile, element of risk, struggle and vulnerability which is a mark of all genuine prayer. D'Costa's approach is very cautious and self-critical. It is surely important reading for Catholics wanting to think out interreligious dialogue in fidelity to the current state of Catholic teaching. By keeping firmly within the limits of what should count as an uncontroversial understanding of official Catholic teaching, his

account should also allay the suspicion among other Catholics about openness to other religious traditions, especially when such suspicion is based on an undiscerning reception of *Dominus Jesus*. Other Catholic thinkers may want to go further than D'Costa, but at least any Catholic should be able to go as far.

Perhaps one question to be posed about the book is whether it is necessary in so short a study to have both parts. Might it not just have been better to allow the Catholic position to stand as established within its own terms and explore it with confidence, without feeling the need to spend so much time on a defensive justification of the Catholic line by refuting pluralist positions? The first part of the book ends up being longer than the second, whereas the second part could have easily been expanded much more and to great benefit for Catholic readers.

MARTIN GANERI OP

**WHO WAS JESUS? A JEWISH-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE** edited by Craig Evans and Paul Copan, *Westminster John Knox Press, Harrow, 2001. Pp. 205, £15.99 pbk.*

This book grew out of a public discussion or debate between a Jew (Peter Zaas) and a Christian (William Lane Craig) on the question 'Who Was Jesus?', and contains the original texts of their presentations and discussion along with contributions from a number of invited scholars, both Jewish and Christian.

From the outset there is an interesting difference of perspective. For Craig, as for the title of the book, the question is who Jesus *was*, while Zaas asks who Jesus *is*, which is surely the relevant question for Christians. However, Craig and the other Christian contributors to the subsequent discussion concentrate in the main on the past, bringing evidence for the historicity of the gospels, of the resurrection, of the sayings of Jesus etc. They find it difficult to understand how, in the face of the weight of the evidence they bring, Zaas can simply say that Jews do not think about Jesus, and that the claims made about him by his followers are irrelevant to the religious life of a Jew. It is another Jew (Herbert Bassler) in a chapter entitled 'The Gospel Would Have Been Greek to Jews' who points out that 'events, in and of themselves, have no meaning beyond raw data and cannot be used to prove matters of faith. The Christian appeal to the Christ event cannot expect any privileged hearing except from the already-converted' (p.115). This point is conceded by Donald Hagner, who writes that 'the Gospels were written not as neutral historical documents but as theological documents designed to defend and promote the Christian faith. It is clear that they present *interpreted* history, and it must be admitted that sometimes the degree of interpretation is considerable' (p.48). But Hagner is also convinced that no Christian can answer the question 'Who Is Jesus?' without becoming 'an evangelist!' (p.57). For him, as for others, it is easy to underestimate the enormity for a Jew of the step from who the historical Jesus was to who Jesus is in Christian belief.