

CHAPTER 1

The Life of a Legend: The Making of “Luke”

If the Third Gospel were attributed to a person named Luke very soon after its publication, then it is reasonable to assume that the first audiences of this Gospel were already associating this document with the Luke known to be a participant in the Pauline mission.¹ This chapter attempts to trace the traditions regarding the identity of the writer; hence, the making of Luke.² Understanding something about these traditions associating “Luke” with these writings is a necessary prerequisite to considering the writer as a storyteller, interpreter, and evangelist.

Luke was, according to tradition, a physician and a friend of Paul, and he is described as a Gentile writing for a Gentile audience. He is also credited with writing the canonical Acts of the Apostles, the earliest account of the first followers of Jesus. The textual evidence suggests that these stories are very early, dating to as early as the second century. By the fourth century, these traditions were well enough established to be summarized by the historian Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* (312–324 C.E.):

Luke, being by birth one of the people of Antioch, by profession a physician, having been with Paul a good deal, and having associated intimately with the rest of the apostles, has left us examples of the art of curing souls that he obtained from them in two divinely inspired books,—the Gospel, which he testifies that he wrote out even as they delivered to him who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, all of whom [or all of which facts?] he says he had followed even from the beginning, and the Acts of the

Apostles, which he composed, receiving his information with his own eyes, no longer by hearsay. (3.4)

But how have these traditions withstood both the test of time and the critical eye of modern biblical scholarship? Before exploring the identity of the writer, we might begin by querying the extent of that which was written. In the opening lines of his Gospel, Luke offers his own explanation of why he began to write:

Since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed on to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, I too decided, after investigating everything carefully from the very first, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the truth concerning the things about which you have been instructed. (Luke 1:1–4)

The “events” to be described are, of course, the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Note that the Gospel writer does not count himself among the eyewitnesses to Jesus’ life. And he describes himself as only one of many who have set out to write Jesus’ story. The author dedicates his text to Theophilus, who is not mentioned again in Luke’s Gospel.

Theophilus’s name does appear once more in the New Testament, however—in the introduction to the book of Acts. This is our first clue regarding an assertion that is commonly made about the author of the Third Gospel: He is also responsible for writing Acts.

The book of Acts begins:

In the former treatise, Theophilus, I wrote about all that Jesus did and taught from the beginning until the day when he was taken up to heaven, after giving instructions through the Holy Spirit to the apostles whom he had chosen. (Acts 1:1–2)

The book of Acts is thus presented as the Third Gospel’s sequel. In it, Luke will continue to relate the events that transpired among the earliest Christians, from shortly after Jesus’ death until just before Paul’s.

The extrabiblical evidence that these two books are by the same hand dates as early as the last third of the second century, when both the Muratorian Canon (the earliest known list of writings deemed canonical by the church)³ and the early church father Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, identify Luke as the author of both the Third Gospel and the book of Acts.⁴

Of all the assertions traditionally made about Luke, this one has fared the best in modern scholarship. Today, however, the attribution of Luke and Acts to a single author is based primarily on shared literary and thematic elements.⁵ For example, both texts include travel narratives in which the hero—Jesus or Paul—journeys to Jerusalem and is arrested on false charges (Luke 9:51–19:28; Acts 19:21–21:36). The miracles performed by Peter and Paul in Acts mirror those of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke. All three figures heal lame men with the instructions: “Stand up and walk” (Acts 3:1–10, 14:8–11; Luke 5:17–26); and all three resurrect the dead, with Peter and Jesus employing the same command: “Get up” (Acts 9:36–40, 20:7–12; Luke 8:40–56).

In Luke, the Holy Spirit descends upon Jesus while he is at prayer before 40 days of “testing” and before he begins his public ministry (Luke 3:21–22). So it is in Acts, when the Holy Spirit falls upon his disciples on the Feast of Pentecost while they are at prayer after 40 days of instruction but before they begin their public ministry (Acts 2:1–4). Furthermore, the account of the first Christian martyr, Stephen, who is tried before the high priest and then stoned to death (Acts 6:8–15, 7:54–60), reflects the trial and death of Jesus (Luke 22–23). Jesus, at his trial, predicts that “the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God” (Luke 22:69); Stephen, standing before the high priest, exclaims that he “[sees] the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God” (Acts 7:56). When Jesus dies, he cries out: “Father, into your hands I commend my spirit” (Luke 23:46); Stephen makes a similar plea during his martyrdom: “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit” (Acts 7:59).

Luke and Acts also share an overarching geographical plan that has Jerusalem at its center.⁶ In Luke, events move toward Jerusalem, with the gospel beginning and ending in the temple. In Acts, Paul and others alternately journey outwards from Jerusalem (to Judea and Samaria, Asia Minor, Europe, and ultimately Rome) and back again (see Acts 12:25, 15:2, 18:22, 19:21, 20:16, 21:13, 25:1). Both books also see salvation history as falling into three periods: the period of Israel, the period of Jesus, and the period of the church. Both books demonstrate an interest in the same themes: Christology, the Holy Spirit, eschatology, and discipleship. Finally, both employ the same vocabulary and exhibit a strikingly similar writing style. Together, these features have led to a widespread consensus among scholars regarding the common authorship of Luke and Acts, underscored by the widespread use of the phrase “Luke-Acts” ever since it was coined by the American biblical scholar Henry Cadbury in 1927.⁷

The separation of Luke from Acts in the canon of Scripture is usually explained by the limitations of the scroll, the presumed medium of communication in the first-century Mediterranean world. Luke and Acts were simply too long to fit on one scroll, this theory goes, and thus were divided prior to “publication.”⁸ Or, some scholars have suggested, the two treatises may have been separated when they were taken into the canon (John’s Gospel now separating Luke from Acts), with Luke being subsumed under the rubric of the “four-fold gospel” and Acts serving as a bridge between the gospel collection and the letters. There is, of course, neither any manuscript evidence that these two documents were ever circulated as one nor any canonical list that in placing the texts together might provide a clue to a pre-canonical unified form.⁹ Still, it is reasonable to assume that the two writings came from the same hand, one (Acts) functioning as a sequel to the other (Luke). The next question, of course, is from whose hand?

The Gospel title—“εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν” (*euangelion kata Loukan*, the Gospel According to Luke)—appears at the end of the oldest extant manuscript of the Gospel of Luke, a papyrus known as P⁷⁵, now in the Bodmer Library in Geneva. But this fragmentary manuscript dates only to about 175 to 225 C.E., or 100 to 125 [100 to 150?] years after the Gospel is thought to have been written. The title probably reflects the oldest tradition, linking an author named Luke to the writing of the Third Gospel. Though the title does not specify Luke as a physician, since there were no other early Christians known to us by that name from the first century, this is a logical inference.

What else do we know about the author? In the prologue to the Gospel (Luke 1:1–4), the author seems to identify himself as a second-generation Christian relying on others’ eyewitness testimony. He cannot therefore be counted among the apostles. Furthermore, throughout the book of Acts, when describing Paul’s activities the narrator occasionally shifts from the third- to the first-person plural “we” (Acts 16:10–17, 20:5–15, 21:1–18, 27:1–28:16). For example, of Paul’s final trip to Jerusalem, he writes: “When we found a ship bound for Phoenicia, we went on board and set sail. We came in sight of Cyprus; and leaving it on our left, we sailed to Syria and landed at Tyre, because the ship was to unload its cargo there. We looked up the disciples and stayed there for seven days. Through the Spirit they told Paul not to go into Jerusalem” (Acts 21:2–4). While it is safe to say modern scholars are deeply divided regarding the significance of the “we” passages in Acts,¹⁰ there can be little debate that the early church took them to indicate the author of Acts (and Luke) was a companion of the Apostle Paul.

The church father Irenaeus was one of the first to interpret these "we" passages as evidence that Luke was a companion of Paul: "But that this Luke was inseparable from Paul and was his fellow-worker in the gospel he himself makes clear, not boasting of it, but compelled to do so by truth itself."¹¹ Refuting especially the followers of Marcion and Valentinus, Irenaeus argues on the basis of the common authorship of Luke and Acts that the veracity of the two works must stand or fall together. For Irenaeus, the book of Acts is the glue which holds together the two major portions of the New Testament, the "Gospel" and the "Apostle," as they were called by early Christian writers.

The book of Acts is not the only potential source of information about the relation between Paul and Luke, however. The name Luke appears three times in letters attributed to Paul. Unfortunately, this Luke is never identified as the Gospel writer. Of course, that has not stopped speculation, from the time of Irenaeus on.

In a letter to Philemon, a Christian living in Colossae in Asia Minor, Paul lists a man named Luke as one of his "fellow workers" (Phlm 24); and in an open letter to the Christian community of Colossae, the writer, identified as Paul, sends greetings from "Luke, the beloved physician" (Col 4:14). Finally, the author of the Pastoral Epistles, most likely one of Paul's followers who writes in Paul's voice, inserts these words in 2 Timothy: "Do your best to come to me soon, for Demas, in love with this present world, has deserted me and gone to Thessalonica; Crescens has gone to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. *Only Luke is with me* [emphasis added]. Get Mark and bring him with you, for he is useful in my ministry" (2 Tim 4:9–11). These scant references have augmented—or simply reflect—Luke's reputation as one of Paul's most faithful companions.

If Luke is the author of Luke and Acts, then it is a small move to claim that he was a physician, an identification suggested by Col 4:14. This, too, is repeated in the writings of Irenaeus and in the Muratorian Canon, and this point was picked up in the literature of the early and medieval church where it was asserted that in his writings, Luke the physician had provided "medicine for the soul." Jacobus de Varogine's comments in the *Golden Legend* are typical:

[Luke's] Gospel is replete with benefits; whence he that wrote it was a physician, to signify that he has set before us a most healthful medicine. This medicine is of three kinds. There is the medicine that cures diseases, namely penance, which cures all spiritual ills. There is the medicine which improves one's well-being, namely the observance of the counsels which makes man better and more perfect. There is the medicine which preserves one from sickness,

namely the avoidance of sinful occasions and of evil associations. And Luke shows us in his Gospel that the heavenly Physician set all these medicines before us.¹²

The view that Luke was a physician has received mixed reviews in recent scholarship. Late in the nineteenth century, Irish physician and scholar William K. Hobart searched the healing stories in Luke for what he believed were medical terms, such as “crippled,” “pregnant,” or “abscess,” or ordinary words used in a “medical” sense. From this “internal evidence” Hobart concluded that Luke and Acts were written by the same person, and that the writer was a medical man.¹³ But Henry Cadbury soon dismantled this argument by demonstrating that the terms on Hobart’s lists occur in the Septuagint, Josephus, Plutarch, and Lucian, all non-medical writings. Cadbury concluded, “The style of Luke bears no more evidence of medical training and interest than does the language of other writers who were not physicians.”¹⁴ In a tongue-in-cheek lexical note entitled “Luke and the Horse-Doctors,” Cadbury later showed that Luke’s vocabulary shows a remarkable similarity with the corpus of writings of ancient veterinarians!¹⁵ His refutation was so effective that he virtually eliminated this special pleading to a so-called medical vocabulary.¹⁶ His students used to jest that Cadbury earned his doctorate by taking Luke’s away. Still, we should not claim more for Cadbury’s evidence than does Cadbury himself. Cadbury is careful to say that the so-called medical language cannot be used to prove that the author of the Third Gospel was a physician, but neither, he asserts, should Cadbury’s own analysis be used to “prove” that he was not. Subsequent critical scholarship has often heard the first caveat but not the second.

The modern period has also witnessed a sharp attack on the traditional identification of Luke as a Gentile writing for a Gentile audience. This long-dominant view may have roots that reach back as far as the second century to an extrabiblical text, *Prologue to the Gospels*. This text, also known as the “*Anti-Marcionite Prologue*,” contained a description of Luke that church father Eusebius, among others, followed: “Luke was a Syrian of Antioch, by profession a physician, the disciple of the apostles, and later a follower of Paul.”¹⁷ In Luke’s day, Antioch was a prominent early Christian center. According to Acts 11:26, “It was in Antioch that the disciples were first called ‘Christians.’” All of Paul’s missionary journeys departed from and returned to this city. Connected to the view that Luke was not Jewish is the widely held assumption that Luke’s Gospel is the “Gentile Gospel,” written for a predominantly, if not exclusively, Gentile audience. It includes Simeon’s prophecy over

the infant Jesus that he would be a "light for revelation to the Gentiles" (Luke 2:32), the healing of the Gentile centurion's slave (Luke 7:1–10), and the commission by the risen Christ to the disciples to preach "forgiveness of sins to all nations" (Luke 24:47),¹⁸ all of which foreshadow the interest in the Gentile mission that occupies much of Acts.

Recently, however, a small but vocal minority has raised the possibility that Luke was in fact Jewish, or at least deeply interested in Judaism. They assume that the Luke referred to in Colossians was either a "God-fearer" with deep Jewish interests or not the same person as the author of the Gospel. This view also has ancient roots. In the fourth century, Bishop Epiphanius of Cyprus suggested that Luke was one of the 70 disciples sent out by Jesus (Luke 10) and was thus presumably Jewish.¹⁹

Some have assumed that if Luke were from such a well-known Greco-Roman city as Antioch, he must have been a Gentile. The first-century C.E. Jewish historian Flavius Josephus gives evidence that a Jew from Antioch could have been called an "Antiochene." Thus, even the tradition that Luke was from Antioch, an "Antiochene," does not preclude his being Jewish.²⁰ Antioch did have a Jewish community: Josephus notes that the first Seleucid king, Seleucus Nicator (c. 358–281 B.C.E.), who made Antioch his capital, granted the local Jews citizenship in gratitude for their having fought with the Greek armies.²¹ And according to John Chrysostom, who served as deacon of Antioch in the late fourth century C.E., the city had several synagogues. The archaeological evidence of the Jewish community is limited, however, to a small stone fragment of a menorah and a lead curse tablet referring to the biblical God Yahweh.

The narrative of Acts can also be read as supporting the view that Luke was a Jew or at least deeply interested in Judaism. Acts clearly presents the "Christian" movement as one Jewish sect among several. This perspective is shared by Christian, Jewish, and Roman characters in Acts, as well as the narrator himself: Twice, the Christian Paul in Acts makes the claim, "I am a Jew" (Acts 21:39, 22:3). Later in Acts, he states that he has "belonged to the strictest sect of our religion and lived as a Pharisee" (Acts 26:5, see also Acts 24:14). Tertullus, the Jewish advocate for the high priest before Felix, states: "We have, in fact, found this man a pestilent fellow, an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts 24:5). Further, the Jews in Rome say to Paul: "But we would like to hear from you what you think, for with regard to this sect we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (Acts 28:22). The Roman procurator Festus reports to King Agrippa about Paul: "His [Jewish] accusers . . . brought no charge in his case of such evils as I supposed, but they had certain points of dispute with him about their own superstition" (Acts 25:18–19).²² Finally, the

gospel narrator states: “But some believers [in Jesus] who belonged to the sect of the Pharisees stood up and said, ‘It is necessary for them to be circumcised and ordered to keep the law of Moses’” (Acts 15:5). Such evidence has led Lukan scholars like David Tiede to conclude that “the polemics, scriptural arguments, and ‘proofs’ which are rehearsed in Luke-Acts are part of an intra-family struggle [among Jews] that, in the wake of the destruction of the temple, is deteriorating into a fight over who is really the faithful ‘Israel.’”²³

Physician, Gentile or Jew, companion of Paul, writer of the Third Gospel and Acts: what one thinks about the identity of Luke rests in large part on one’s assessment of these traditions. Did the early church have information about the identity of the author of Luke and Acts that is no longer available to us? Or did someone looking to identify the otherwise anonymous author simply deduce Luke’s identity from the text of the New Testament?

Presumably the Gospel’s prologue, where the author seems to identify himself as a second-generation Christian, excludes identifying the author as an apostle (and thus making the choice of a “lesser” figure almost inevitable). The “we” sections in Acts demand someone who was a companion of Paul, and Luke the beloved physician emerges as a likely—though, importantly, not the only—candidate.

On the other hand, we must consider the stability of the tradition that identifies Luke as the author. Strictly speaking, the Third Gospel is an anonymous document, making no claims about its authorship. That all testimony agrees in identifying the author as a relatively obscure man named Luke is no trivial matter. Regardless of his identity, the author of Luke and Acts has left for us works that remain two of the most significant contributions by an early Christian to our understanding of the founder of Christianity and its first followers. In the pages that follow, we attempt to explore these writings in terms of Luke’s abilities as a storyteller in the context of ancient rhetoric, as an interpreter of pagan, Jewish, and Christian traditions, and as an evangelist whose stories of the elder brother (Luke 15) and Cornelius (Acts 10–11) serve as paradigms for the inclusion of Jews and Gentiles into the people of God. And so the life of this legend continues!

Notes

1. The title of this chapter echoes the work of R. Alan Culpepper, *John, Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), in which he collects the various traditions regarding the Apostle John

from the second century to the present. Students of the Lukan writings will also notice in the subtitle an allusion to *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1958; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999) by the American "doyen of Lukan studies," Henry Cadbury.

2. I am here concerned with the traditions regarding Luke the physician as the author of Luke and Acts. No less interesting, but surely less well known, are those later traditions that identify Luke first as a painter of icons (especially of the Virgin and Child) and later as the patron saint of the painters' guild. I have treated these traditions in the first chapter ("Luke: Physician, Painter, Patron Saint") in a work co-authored with Heidi J. Hornik, *Illuminating Luke: The Infancy Narrative in Italian Renaissance Painting* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 2003).

3. For arguments for a fourth century date for the fragments, see A. C. Sundberg, "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List," *HTR* 66 (1973): 1–41; for a response and defense of the traditional second-century dating, see Harry Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning* (GBS; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

4. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.14.1.

5. See esp. Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1974); I. Howard Marshall, "Acts and the 'Former Treatise,'" in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (ed. by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 163–82.

6. A feature noted by many, including Luke Timothy Johnson in *Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1991). See chapter 5 in this volume for another reading of the role of Jerusalem in the Lukan narratives.

7. See n. 1 on Cadbury. There have been challenges to the assertion of common authorship, largely on the grounds of vocabulary and style. Most notable is Albert C. Clark (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933], 394), who, after a detailed study of the syntax and style of Luke and Acts, concluded "that the differences between Lk. and Acts were of such a kind that they could not be the work of the same author." Wilfred L. Knox countered Clark's arguments in a carefully constructed rebuttal, however. Like Clark, Knox deals with the use of particles, prepositions, conjunctions, and other small parts of speech. Knox reasoned: "It may seem that to discuss such matters is to waste time over minute trivialities; but a man can be hanged for a fingerprint" (*The Acts of the Apostles* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948], 3; also 4–15, 100–109).

Other interesting linguistic dissimilarities between Luke and Acts have been more recently observed by Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Textual Connections in Acts* (SBLMS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), who incidentally is not primarily interested in the authorship question.

Modern scholars generally affirm the position of common authorship held by the early church, though the implications of that common authorship are not always clearly distinguished. See, e.g. Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo (*Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993]), who suggest that we must distinguish among various kinds of unity (e.g., narrative, generic, theological) when speaking of the unity of the Lukan writings and also allow for the possibility that some elements of discontinuity between the two writings might arise from time to time.

8. This argument is made, among others, by Donald Juell in *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983).

9. For more on the canonical shape of Luke and Acts, see Parsons and Pervo, "Introduction," *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*, 8–13.

10. See Vernon K. Robbins, "Prefaces in Greco-Roman biography and Luke-Acts," *PRSt* 6 (1979): 94–108; Susan Marie Praeder, "The Problem of First Person Narration in Acts," *NovT* 29 (1987): 193–218; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (New York: Paulist, 1989), 16–22.

11. Irenaeus, *Haer.*, 3.14.1.

12. Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend* (trans. Granger Ryan and Helmut Ripperger; New York: Longmans, Green, 1941), 626.

13. The quotation is taken from Hobart's cumbersome subtitle to *The Medical Language of St. Luke: A Proof from Internal Evidence that "The Gospel according to St. Luke" and "The Acts of the Apostles" Were Written by the Same Person, and that the Writer was a Medical Man* (1882; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1954). Hobart's thesis was supported by the eminent scholar Adolf von Harnack (*Luke the Physician* [trans. J. R. Wilkinson; New York: Putnam, 1909]).

14. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920), 50.

15. Cadbury, "Luke and the Horse-Doctors," *JBL* 52 (1933): 55–65.

16. That is not to say that defenders of the tradition no longer exist, only that appeals to medical terminology rarely appear in their arguments. See esp. Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981), 35–59; and *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist, 1989), 1–26. Fitzmyer offers a carefully and critically nuanced defense of the tradition: Luke the physician was an uncircumcised Semite and sometime companion of Paul.

17. The view that Luke as a Gentile does not rest solely on the tradition that he was an Antiochene, however. Rather, some accept Col 4:14 as identifying Luke as a Gentile. In the preceding verses of this letter, Paul lists a number of Jews who work with him: "Aristarchus my fellow prisoner greets you, as does Mark the cousin of Barnabas, concerning whom you have received instructions—if he comes to you, welcome him. And Jesus who is called Justus greets you. *These are the only ones of the circumcision among my co-workers for the kingdom of God, and they have been a comfort to me [emphasis added]*" (Col 4:10–11). Paul then goes on to list a handful of other workers who, many readers presume, must not be Jews, but "Greeks." He includes "Luke, the beloved physician" in this latter list (Col 4:14).

18. The Greek word ἔθνος (*ethnos*), like *goy* in Hebrew, can mean both "Gentile" and "nation" (a point often noted in discussions of Matt 28:16–20). In Luke 2:32 ἔθνος is translated as "Gentile" but the same word, which also occurs in Luke 24:47, is almost always translated as "nations." Although the Lukan Jesus clearly has Gentiles primarily in mind, Jews are not excluded: ". . . and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem."

19. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 51.110. A variant reading in the fifth-century manuscript Codex Bezae inserts the phrase: "And there was much rejoicing, and when we were gathered together" at the beginning of Acts 11:28, which makes this verse another "we" passage set in Antioch. This variant reading almost certainly derives from the tradition associating Luke with Antioch.

20. Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2:39.
21. Josephus, *Ant.* 12.119.
22. See also the letter of Claudius Lysas in Acts 24:29.
23. David Tiede, *Promise and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 7; see also Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).