APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY: Historical Development, Biblical Foundation, and Contemporary Claims

A Comprehensive Scholarly Study
August 2026

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most enduring theological disputes in Christianity concerns the nature and necessity of apostolic succession. For nearly two millennia, Christian denominations have divided sharply over whether the authority and legitimacy of the Church depends upon an unbroken line of episcopal ordinations reaching back to the apostles themselves, or whether such authority rests primarily in doctrinal fidelity to apostolic teaching as recorded in Scripture. This essay undertakes a comprehensive examination of this contested doctrine through three interconnected inquiries:

1. What was apostolic succession in the earliest church, and who were the disciples of the apostles?
2. Which Christian traditions claim apostolic succession today, and on what grounds?
3. Most critically, when Jesus declared to Peter that the Church would be built "on this rock" (Matthew 16:18), did he intend to establish an institutional succession of bishops, or was he employing figurative language with a different referent?

The question is far more than historical trivia. Modern ecclesiology—the doctrine of the church—stands fundamentally at stake. Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and certain other traditions assert that Christ established a visible, hierarchical church governed by bishops who possess sacramental authority deriving from apostolic ordination. Mainstream Protestant denominations, conversely, argue that apostolic continuity concerns doctrinal truth, not episcopal genealogy, and that no church's legitimacy can rest upon an unverifiable historical claim about ordination lines spanning two thousand years.

To address these questions responsibly, we must examine four dimensions of the evidence: the linguistic and exegetical evidence of Matthew 16:18 as read against the Greek critical text (NA28/UBS5), the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers and early Church Fathers, the historical development of episcopal succession claims, and the contemporary theological positions that different Christian traditions defend.

II. DEFINITION AND DOCTRINAL FOUNDATION OF APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

Apostolic succession denotes the theological claim that the Christian Church maintains unbroken continuity with the apostolic foundation through an institutional mechanism—typically episcopal ordination. The Roman Catholic Church formally defines this doctrine as

"the visible and tangible transmission of ministerial authority from the apostles through an unbroken line of bishops" (Catechism of the Catholic Church, §1556–1576). This definition carries specific implications: only those ordained by bishops who themselves were ordained in this unbroken line possess valid sacramental authority.

Early Church Development

The doctrine as formalized by medieval Catholicism emerged gradually across the patristic period. The earliest evidence appears in the letters of Clement of Rome (c. 95 CE) and the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (c. 107 CE), which begin to articulate a threefold ministry (bishop, presbyter, deacon) as the normative structure for church governance. Clement's 1 Clement 42–44 draws a direct parallel between the apostles' appointment and the bishops' role: "The apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the apostles are from Christ. Both therefore came of the will of God in the appointed order."

Yet this early attestation differs markedly from later, more rigid formulations. Clement emphasizes the transmission of doctrine and teaching authority, not necessarily a sacramental power transmitted through hands.

By the late second century, Irenaeus of Lyons (c. 180 CE) had articulated a more systematic defense of apostolic succession, chiefly as a criterion for distinguishing orthodox from heretical teaching. In Against Heresies III.3, Irenaeus frames apostolic succession as proof of doctrinal purity: "It is possible, then, for everyone in every church, who may wish to know the truth, to contemplate the tradition of the apostles which has been made known to us throughout the whole world." For Irenaeus, apostolic succession functioned primarily as an empirical check against doctrinal deviation. The unbroken sequence of bishops in major sees (Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem) proved that their teaching aligned with what the apostles had taught, thereby refuting the secret, esoteric interpretations claimed by Gnostic heretics.

III. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS: DISCIPLES OF THE APOSTLES

The Apostolic Fathers comprise a defined group of early Christian writers who flourished at the close of the first century and the beginning of the second century. Unlike the Church Fathers proper (Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen), the Apostolic Fathers were believed to have enjoyed direct contact with the apostles or their immediate successors. Scholars debate the precise membership of this group, but consensus includes Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, and the authors of the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas.

Clement of Rome (fl. c. 90–98 CE)

Clement is identified as the third or fourth bishop of Rome by the late second-century church historians (Tertullian, Jerome, Eusebius), and a tradition preserved in Jerome's *Illustrious Men* claims he was ordained by the Apostle Peter himself, though this remains unverifiable. He authored 1 Clement (also called the Letter to the Corinthians), a mid-90s CE epistle addressing factional disputes in Corinth. The letter contains the earliest extra-canonical testimony to apostolic succession language, and Clement invokes it to resolve ecclesiastical conflict.

However, his concern is fundamentally about preserving sound doctrine and institutional order, not about sacramental powers.

Ignatius of Antioch (c. 35–107 CE)

Ignatius served as bishop of Antioch and was martyred in Rome during the reign of Trajan (c. 107 CE). Eusebius of Caesarea identifies him as "the second successor of Peter in the See of Antioch" (Church History III.36), though early tradition disputes his ordination by Peter. His seven extant epistles (to Ephesus, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphia, Smyrna, and Polycarp) provide invaluable testimony to early second-century ecclesiology. Ignatius emphasizes the authority of the bishop as necessary for church unity and proper worship, and tradition indicates he may have known the Apostle John, whose thought appears reflected in Ignatius's Johannine-flavored theology.

In his Letter to the Smyrnaeans 8, Ignatius writes: "See that you all follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as you would the apostles; and reverence the deacons as being the institution of God. Let no man do anything connected with the Church without the bishop." This passage demonstrates Ignatius's high regard for episcopal authority, but it is addressed to a local church about local governance, not about a hierarchical structure spanning Christendom or about ordination conferring sacramental power.

Polycarp of Smyrna (c. 69–155 CE)

Polycarp is perhaps the most firmly connected to apostolic witness. Irenaeus explicitly testifies that "Polycarp himself was instructed by apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ…and he died in the fifty-sixth year of his bishopric, at an advanced age, having always taught the things which he learned from the apostles" (Against Heresies III.3.4). Contemporary scholarship generally accepts that Polycarp was indeed a disciple of the Apostle John. His Epistle to the Philippians (c. 110–130 CE) addresses doctrinal and moral concerns but contains little about succession mechanics. The Martyrdom of Polycarp (mid-second century), an account of his death during Roman persecution, portrays him as a pillar of orthodoxy but emphasizes his fidelity to teaching, not sacramental authority.

The Didache (The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)

Rediscovered in 1883, the Didache is a Syrian church order manual dated variously from pre-70 CE to early second century. It provides practical guidance on baptism, fasting, prayer, and the Eucharist, along with instructions about receiving apostles and prophets. Notably, the Didache does not presume a formal three-tiered hierarchy (bishop, presbyter, deacon) throughout the church; it addresses locales where prophets and traveling apostles held authority alongside incipient local leaders. This diversity suggests that in some regions, the monarchical episcopate (one bishop per city) developed slowly and unevenly, not as an apostolic institution uniformly transmitted.

IV. MATTHEW 16:18 AND THE PETROS/PETRA QUESTION: EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS

The passage that has generated more theological ink than perhaps any other relevant to apostolic succession is Matthew 16:17–19. A careful exegetical examination requires attending to the original Greek, the Aramaic likely underlying Jesus's speech, and the immediate context.

The Greek Text and the Petros/Petra Distinction

Matthew 16:18 in the NA28/UBS5 critical Greek text reads:

> κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν

("And I tell you that you are Peter [Πέτρος], and on this rock [πέτρα] I will build my church."—NIV)

One of the most-contested features of this verse is the apparent distinction between Πέτρος (Petros—masculine singular, nominative) applied to Simon and πέτρα (petra—feminine singular, dative) in the phrase "on this rock." For centuries, Protestant exegetes have argued that the two words carry different meanings: Petros denotes a small stone or pebble, while petra denotes a large, immovable rock mass. On this reading, the wordplay suggests that Jesus is not building his church on Peter the person but on something else—either Jesus himself as the rock, or Peter's confession of faith.

This exegetical move, however, rests on a grammatical and lexical assumption that modern scholarship has increasingly questioned. Contemporary Greek lexicography, informed by study of post-classical and Koine Greek papyri and inscriptions, has found no consistent semantic distinction between petros and petra in first-century usage. Both terms could denote rocks of any size. The distinction in Matthew 16:18 is not lexical but grammatical: Petros is masculine (required to rename a man), while petra is feminine. To avoid the awkward construction "I will build my church on Petros," which would be grammatically bizarre in Greek, Matthew uses the synonym petra, which is the standard term for "rock" in the sense of foundation material or bedrock.

The Aramaic Original

Jesus almost certainly spoke to his disciples in Aramaic, not Greek. In Aramaic, the word for rock is *kepha* (כיפא), a masculine noun. The Aramaic utterance would have been:

> "Atta Kepha, wa-al kepha hada ebneh qehalti."

("You are Kepha, and on this kepha I will build my church.")

In Aramaic, there is no grammatical necessity to shift words, and the parallelism is absolute: kepha applied to Simon parallels kepha as the foundation. Matthew, writing for a Greek-speaking audience unfamiliar with Aramaic, necessarily translated kepha into Greek but was constrained by gender requirements for a proper name. He rendered Simon's name as Petros (masculine) but rendered the foundation-rock as petra (feminine) because petra had become the standard Greek term for rock foundations by his time. The divergence is not Matthew's way of signaling a semantic distinction; it is an artifact of translation from Aramaic to Greek.

Context: Peter's Confession

Matthew 16:17 supplies crucial context: "Jesus replied, 'Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by flesh and blood, but by my Father in heaven'" (NIV). Jesus has just asked his disciples who they say he is. Peter has confessed: "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God" (v. 16). Jesus pronounces Peter blessed for this confession and for the divine source of his knowledge. This blessing is the immediate antecedent to the saying about the rock.

A contextual reading makes clear that Peter's blessing is tied directly to his confession. Jesus has not said, "You will be the foundation of my church" but rather frames Peter's affirmation as divinely given insight. The saying about the rock immediately follows. To suggest that Matthew then intends to shift the referent of "rock" away from Peter (whom Jesus has just addressed and blessed) to Jesus himself or to Peter's confession divorced from Peter's person would require an abrupt and contextually undermotivated reversal.

The Keys and Binding and Loosing (Matthew 16:19)

Matthew 16:19 continues: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven" (NIV). The imagery of keys alludes to Isaiah 22:22, where the key to the House of David is given to Eliakim as a symbol of governmental authority. In Jewish thought, "binding and loosing" referred to the authority to interpret Torah and declare what is permitted or forbidden in Jewish practice.

However, several critical observations complicate a reading that grants Peter unique, permanent jurisdictional authority:

First, Matthew 18:18 employs nearly identical language: "Truly I tell you, whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." Here, Jesus addresses the entire assembled community (μαθηταί—disciples), not Peter alone, suggesting that binding and loosing authority was not uniquely Peter's but belonged to the whole congregation.

Second, the phrase "keys of the kingdom of heaven" in Matthew pertains to access to the kingdom through proclamation of the gospel, not necessarily to institutional governance. Peter's role, on this reading, is to be the foremost proclaimer and shepherd of the believing community, not an institutional monarch whose authority transmits to successors in perpetuity.

V. EARLY CHURCH PATRISTIC EVIDENCE FOR SUCCESSION

Beyond the Apostolic Fathers, the Church Fathers of the second and third centuries provide testimony to how succession was understood. The evidence is more nuanced than confessional interpretations often allow.

Tertullian of Carthage (c. 160–225 CE)

Tertullian's *Prescription Against Heretics* (c. 200 CE) is frequently cited by Catholic apologists as evidence for apostolic succession. In Chapter 32, Tertullian challenges heretics: "Let them produce the original records of their churches; let them unfold the roll of their bishops, running down in due succession from the beginning." This passage does indeed suggest that by 200 CE, a list of episcopal succession was considered an important criterion for legitimacy.

However, Tertullian's concern was specifically doctrinal: he wanted heretics to show that their teaching was continuous with apostolic doctrine, not that their bishops possessed valid sacramental authority. The Greek term he invokes is *paradosis* (tradition/transmission), which for Tertullian means the transmission of *teaching*, not of sacramental power per se. Moreover, Tertullian was a rigorist who came to doubt the efficacy of sacraments administered by morally compromised clergy—a position inconsistent with a doctrine of sacramental validity depending solely on unbroken ordination lines.

Cyprian of Carthage (c. 200–258 CE)

Cyprian, writing in the mid-third century during schisms over episcopal authority, emphasizes the centrality of the bishop to valid church life and sacraments. Yet even Cyprian does not articulate a doctrine of sacramental validity dependent on a specific ordination genealogy. His argument is rather that the church is where the bishop is, and the bishop embodies apostolic authority through his *cathedra* (teaching seat). Cyprian does defend episcopal primacy and suggests Rome's bishop had some pre-eminence, yet he never concedes that Rome's primacy is jurisdictional over all churches, and he resists Rome's interventions in African ecclesiastical matters.

Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260–339 CE)

Eusebius, the first great church historian, compiled lists of bishops for the major sees in his *Church History*. His intention was to demonstrate the continuity of orthodox teaching across the churches: if a bishop's predecessor and successor taught the same doctrine, Eusebius could argue that heretics, whose teaching diverged from this continuum, could not claim apostolic authority. Eusebius's lists, however, are incomplete and sometimes contradictory—a fact that undermines claims about absolutely unbroken succession. Moreover, Eusebius himself was reluctant to grant Rome exclusive or supreme authority; he viewed Rome's bishop as one among the great metropolitan bishops, not a universal monarch.

Summary: The Patristic Position

The patristic evidence attests that by the mid-second century, Christian communities were beginning to organize under bishops and to view apostolic succession as important. However, the succession they emphasized was *doctrinal*—the faithful transmission of apostolic teaching—rather than a sacramental grace believed to inhere in ordination itself. The Church Fathers understood apostolic succession to mean that the faith taught in their day was the same faith the apostles taught, not that bishops possessed mystical authority derived from a magic touch passing through ordination.

VI. CONTEMPORARY CLAIMS TO APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION AND THEIR JUSTIFICATION

Today, five major Christian traditions formally claim apostolic succession.

Roman Catholic Church

The Roman Catholic Church defines apostolic succession as an unbroken chain of episcopal ordination from the Apostle Peter through popes and bishops to the present. The Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC §1556–1576) states: "Just as the office of Peter belongs to the structure of the living Church, the office of the apostles belongs to the structure of the Church and remains present in the office of bishops." Rome's argument rests on three pillars:

1. Peter's primacy in Matthew 16:18
2. Peter's ministry in Rome (on the basis of tradition and second-century evidence)
3. The unbroken papal succession in Rome from Peter to John Paul II to Francis

Modern Catholic scholars (e.g., Austin Flannery, *New Catholic Encyclopedia*) acknowledge that the historical evidence for Peter's presence in Rome is circumstantial and that the earliest papal lists contain gaps and contradictions, yet maintain that the living tradition of the Church vindicates the doctrine's truth.

Eastern Orthodox Church

Orthodox Christianity also claims apostolic succession but distributes it among the autocephalous (self-governing) orthodox churches. Rather than locating authority uniquely in Rome, Orthodoxy views apostolic succession as preserved in the collective witness of the five patriarchs (or later, after the schism, in the Eastern patriarchs) and the entire episcopate. An Orthodox bishop is apostolic insofar as he is part of the communion of bishops maintaining apostolic faith and practice. Importantly, Orthodox theology recognizes that Rome's bishops stood in apostolic succession until the schism of 1054; Rome did not *lose* its apostolic succession, but Rome fell out of communion with Orthodoxy by introducing doctrinal and ecclesiological innovations (papal supremacy, filioque, etc.).

Oriental Orthodox Churches

These churches, which separated from the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451 CE) over Christological disputes, also claim apostolic succession through their patriarchs. They trace their lineage to apostolic sees (Alexandria/Mark, Jerusalem/James, Antioch/Peter), though they split from the mainstream due to disagreements over dogma, not over succession claims.

Anglican Communion

The Church of England and its worldwide Anglican Communion claim what they term "historic episcopate"—an unbroken succession of bishops from medieval England through the present. This claim is disputed by both Catholics and Orthodox, who argue that the break at the Reformation severed the succession (Catholics argue this; Orthodox may be more flexible). Anglicans maintain that their bishops were ordained by bishops who stood in historical succession, and they consequently believe their orders and sacraments valid. However, the 1896

papal bull *Apostolicae Curae* declared Anglican orders null and void from a Catholic perspective.

Some Lutheran and Methodist Churches

A minority of Lutheran churches (notably the Church of Sweden) and some Methodist churches have attempted to recover or maintain historic episcopate, arguing that bishops constitute a beneficial (not necessary) feature of church order.

The Justification Question

Are these claims historically justified? The short answer is: not entirely, and not in the rigid forms sometimes asserted. Several facts are reasonably established:

1. By the mid-second century, Christian communities organized under bishops.
2. The major churches (Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem) maintained lists of their bishops and valued them as links to apostolic times.
3. The fathers viewed apostolic succession as important for doctrinal legitimacy.

However, several caveats apply:

1. The earliest church lists (Eusebius, Jerome, Hippolytus) are incomplete and sometimes contradictory
2. The theological interpretation of succession as sacramental transmission (not merely doctrinal continuity) developed gradually, reaching full elaboration only in the medieval period
3. The claim that an unbroken ordination line can be verified across 2000 years strains credibility given the gaps and ambiguities in early records
4. Even if bishops can be linked historically, this does not settle whether Christ intended such an institutional structure

---

VII. CRITICAL ASSESSMENT: IS MATTHEW 16:18 ABOUT INSTITUTIONAL SUCCESSION?

Having examined the evidence exegetically and historically, we now return to the central interpretive question: When Jesus declares “on this rock I will build my church,” is he establishing an institution to be governed by a succession of bishops, or does the saying mean something other?

Linguistic Findings

The petros/petra wordplay does not, upon careful analysis, require interpretation as a distinction between Peter and some other foundation. The Aramaic kepha/kepha makes the parallelism plain, and Matthew’s use of Petros (for the name) and petra (for the foundation material) reflects grammatical necessity, not semantic intent to exclude Peter from the foundation role.

Contextual Findings

Matthew 16:18 does not, in its immediate context, speak of institutional succession at all. Jesus promises to build his church and grants Peter the keys (presumably leadership authority). But the text does not say, "I will instruct you to ordain other bishops, who will ordain others in a continuous line to the end of time." A reader who encountered Matthew 16:18 without presuppositions about church government would understand Jesus to be granting Peter a leadership role, not establishing an administrative mechanism for transmitting that role to future generations.

Historical Development

The doctrine of apostolic succession as formally articulated by the medieval Catholic Church—specifically, the belief that sacramental validity depends on an unbroken chain of episcopal ordination—is not explicitly taught in Matthew 16:18 or in any other single New Testament passage. Rather, this doctrine developed over several centuries as Christian communities organized around bishops and sought to legitimate them by appeal to apostolic appointment. This historical development is not disqualifying; doctrines often develop over time. However, it does mean that Matthew 16:18 alone does not bear the weight the doctrine places upon it.

Alternative Interpretations

The exegetical evidence does not exclude, and in some respects favors, alternative readings of Matthew 16:18:

1. **Peter as Foundational Witness**: Jesus establishes Peter (along with the other apostles, cf. Matthew 18:18; Ephesians 2:20; 1 Corinthians 3:11) as a living stone in the foundation of the church. His primacy is personal and non-transmissible; other believers are built on the same foundation of apostolic faith, but do not inherit Peter's unique role.

2. **Peter's Confession as Foundation**: Jesus builds his church on the truth that Peter confessed—that Jesus is "the Messiah, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16). Peter is the first to articulate this, and his confession becomes paradigmatic. The foundation is not Peter the man but Peter's insight into Christ's identity, which all believers are called to share.

3. **Jesus Himself as the Rock**: Although Jesus is not explicitly named as petra in Matthew 16:18, he is called "the stone the builders rejected" (Matthew 21:42, citing Psalm 118:22) and is compared to a rock foundation in 1 Corinthians 3:11 and Ephesians 2:20. One could argue that Peter serves as a vice-regent or steward of the church, but the ultimate rock on which the church stands is Jesus himself.

Each of these interpretations honors the text's claim that Peter receives authority (the keys, binding and loosing) while stopping short of reading into Matthew 16:18 a doctrine of institutional succession that the text itself does not express.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Apostolic succession emerged as an important concept in early Christianity by the mid-second century. The Apostolic Fathers—Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna—and later Church Fathers valued the succession of bishops as evidence that apostolic faith was being preserved. However, the succession they championed was fundamentally doctrinal: it meant that the teaching of the church remained faithful to what the apostles had taught.

The developed Catholic and Orthodox doctrine—that sacramental validity depends on an unbroken line of ordinations from apostolic times—crystallized gradually over centuries and reached its most elaborate form in medieval Catholicism. This doctrine is not directly deducible from New Testament sources, including Matthew 16:18.

Matthew 16:18, when examined linguistically and contextually, grants Peter a role of leadership and authority but does not establish an institutional mechanism for transmitting that authority to successors. The petros/petra distinction, long cited by Protestants to deny Peter's foundational role, does not withstand scrutiny; it reflects translation requirements, not a semantic distinction. However, the text also does not explicitly establish episcopal succession, and the saying is consistent with Peter's unique, non-transmissible apostolic authority.

In sum:

- Matthew 16:18 most plausibly refers to Peter as a foundational figure, granting him leadership authority. Whether this authority transmits to successors is not addressed in the text.
- Apostolic succession was valued in early Christianity but as doctrinal continuity, not primarily as sacramental power inherited through ordination lines.
- The historical evidence for an absolutely unbroken episcopal succession is incomplete and ambiguous; claims to such succession strain the limits of verifiable history.
- Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican claims to apostolic succession reflect genuine historical connections to the medieval and early modern churches, but these connections do not settle the theological question of whether such succession is necessary for a church to be truly apostolic.
- The most theologically defensible position is that apostolicity is grounded in fidelity to apostolic teaching as witnessed in Scripture, not in an institutional lineage that cannot be definitively established.

This conclusion does not deny the value of episcopal leadership or the importance of church order. It acknowledges that bishops have an important role in preserving doctrine and maintaining visible unity. However, it suggests that the leap from valuing bishops to requiring succession through a specific ordination lineage for sacramental validity—and further, to claiming that Matthew 16:18 establishes this requirement—exceeds what the textual and historical evidence warrants.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, Gregg R. “What Does ‘This Rock’ Refer to in Matthew 16:18?” *The Gospel Coalition*, January 16, 2020. https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/what-does-this-rock-refer-to-matthew-1618/

Cullman, Oscar. “Petros and Petra.” In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 6, 95–112. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Church History*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Irenaeus of Lyons. *Against Heresies*. Translated by Alexander Roberts and William Rambaut. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 1. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1885.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Lake, Kirsopp (ed. and trans.). *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912–1913.

Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Nestle-Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

The Holy Bible, *New International Version* (NIV). Grand Rapids: Biblica, 2011.

Tertullian. *Prescription Against Heretics*. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1885.