

On the other side, Henrix looks to Pope Benedict XVI's response to Jacob Neusner where, reading the Sermon on the Mount together with the Prologue to John, the pope synthesizes language of Jesus as "God's living Torah." Henrix addresses some of the current lines of the subject, although I would also like to have seen here some of the recent scholarship by such Jewish researchers as Daniel Boyarin, who looks at first-century Jewish precedents for *Logos/Memra* theology, with its incarnational implications. A path to constructive dialogue might be found by recalling the Jewish roots of even these controversial Christian ideas.

The half century that produced *Nostra aetate* and *Dabru Emet* accomplished unprecedented things. But while such first steps were arguably clear ones to take, the next generation's steps may be less clear. Concluding essays by David Gordis, Peter Phan, and Celia Deutsch are bold in articulating concrete goals, and can provide readers with lively jumping-off points for dialogue and further collaboration.

Michael Anthony Novak
Saint Leo University, Saint Leo, FL

The Mystery and Agency of God: Divine Being and Action in the World. By Frank G. Kirkpatrick. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014, Pp. xvi + 163. \$39.

Philosophical theologian Kirkpatrick is interested in establishing "the primordially of God as an agent" (15) in contrast to an ontology of God. In more Scholastic terms, his interest is in the divine *agere* rather than the divine *esse*. To that end K. enlists a number of philosophers to explore notions of agency, agent, and action. K. senses divine agency being more and more excluded from scientific explanations of nature, thereby making God irrelevant.

The book is rich for those who want to know how to construe agency philosophically and then how one might proceed from there to understand divine agency in particular. K.'s foundation is laid with John Macmurray's conception of the self as agent. He then employs three other thinkers, Raymond Tallis, Edward Pols, and William Alston. The upshot of this philosophical approach, K. argues, is that we too readily think of acting or of being acted upon from our own narrow anthropomorphism and read God's actions in the same light.

If one approaches the question of divine agency with a need to plumb one's own religious tradition's doctrine on the issue, the book can leave one dissatisfied, especially if the agency of the Christian God, for example, is understood as trinitarian and significantly different from that of the Jewish or Muslim God. K.'s purview is of the three traditions together. Agents, whether divine or human, are personal, and K. fails to account for the question of divine agency in terms of the distinctiveness of how persons are understood in each tradition.

John C. Haughey, S.J.
Colombiere Jesuit Community, Baltimore