

The “One Faith” of Ephesians 4:5

Dub McClish

Introduction

There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all. Eph 4:4–6

The “one faith” of Ephesians 4:5 is the fifth of seven unique entities mentioned in the context (vv. 4–6). The background of the naming of these seven entities is the plea that saints should walk worthily of their sanctified calling (v. 1) and should diligently seek to “keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (v. 3).¹ This list is apparently intended to lay down the standard by which the “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” was to be achieved and maintained. It is appropriate that the number of elements listed is seven, a number often indicating completeness or perfection in the Scriptures. This passage may be correctly thought of as God’s “platform” for unity and fellowship among His people, with each element serving as one of the “planks.”

If it is correct that this list of seven items is the expression of God’s terms of unity among His people, then it is immediately apparent that each of these terms must be carefully defined. If we do not understand the meaning of God’s conditions upon which unity must be built, we will err in the matter of those with whom we are to be united and to whom we should extend fellowship. Indeed, because of an incorrect definition of the meaning of “one faith,” some among us are now advocating unity and fellowship with those who have rejected some of God’s terms of unity.

What The “One Faith” Is Not

If we can determine what the “one faith” is not, it will help us to determine what it is.

The “One Faith” Is Not Subjective Faith

Many of the popular commentators opine that *faith* is used subjectively in this context (indeed, in practically every context of the New Testament). This would mean that the “one faith” refers to man’s belief and trust in Christ. Salmond expressed this view of *mia pistis*: “One faith, i. e, one belief having Him as its object; *pistis* having here its usual subjective sense of **saving trust**, not that which is believed, the Christian **doctrine** or **creed**.”² Eadie has a similar comment: “Faith does not signify creed, or truth believed, but it signifies confidence in the one Lord – faith, the subjective oneness of which is created and sustained by the unity of its object.”³

However, Lloyd-Jones' arguments against understanding "one faith" in a subjective sense are persuasive:

The learned commentators nearly all seem to be in trouble concerning the exact meaning of the expression.... There are those who feel that this "one faith" refers to our subjective faith, to that quality in us, which enables us to believe.... It seems to me that this is an impossible explanation of this statement, and for this good reason that in a sense it is already covered by the term, "one Lord." But there is a still more serious objection. The Apostle is endeavoring to give absolute proofs of believers' unity, so that whenever we are assailed by doubts we may have some certainty to sustain us. Now whenever we want to demonstrate or prove something, we must never appeal to that which is subjective, because the subjective is personal and cannot be defined. The subjective is no answer to an objective attack. But the Apostle is giving us objective proofs, something outside ourselves which we can apply to ourselves, and by which therefore we can test ourselves. So I argue that "one faith" cannot be considered subjectively, because to do so removes it from the category of an objective test.⁴

While *faith* is often (perhaps most often) used in a subjective sense in the New Testament, it is not so used in Ephesians 4:5.

The "One Faith" Is Not the "Principle" of Faith

Another explanation of "one faith" is put forth by Vincent: "The principle of faith; not that which is believed – the body of Christian doctrine, which does not promote unity."⁵ (If he speaks here of New Testament doctrine, he borders on blasphemy in blaming the Holy Spirit for religious division!) Wuest (who almost slavishly follows Vincent at times) parrots Vincent here: "Faith is not the Christian Faith as a system of doctrine and its respective responsibilities. It refers to the principle of faith by means of which all the saints enter into salvation."⁶ Lloyd-Jones argues at length that the "one faith" is "justifying faith," "justification by faith only," as "preached by the Protestant Fathers."⁷

Apparently, by "principle of faith" is meant "salvation by faith" as opposed to "salvation by works." Whiteside, in discussing another context, denies that the phrase, "principle of faith," even makes sense: "Much is said about the principle of faith.... Such an expression as the principle of faith conveys no idea to the mind."⁸ Whether or not this is a nonsensical expression, it is certain that Paul is not referring to "salvation by faith only," which is not only **not** taught by Paul or any other inspired writer, but which is **antagonistic** to the Scriptures (Mat. 7:21-23; Acts 3:22-23; Rom. 1:5; 2 The. 1:7-9; Heb. 5:8-9; Jam. 2:18-26; et al.). Does the "one faith" refer to the fact that we are saved by faith as opposed to works of our own righteousness? No, for had this been Paul's meaning, one would have expected him to say "one

salvation” rather than “one faith.” Further, the matter of salvation had already been covered in Paul’s reference to “one hope of your calling” (v. 4).

The “One Faith” Is Not the Atonement of Christ

To justify unity with other religious groups (especially the Independent Christian Church), some brethren have decided that the “one faith” refers only to Christ’s atoning work. The late W. Carl Ketcherside explained his view of what constituted the “one faith” as follows: “The faith relates to the life and death of Jesus.... The faith portrays what Jesus has done and will do for us, and we accept it.”⁹ Rubel Shelly agrees with Ketcherside in the following statement: “The one faith has nothing to do with our methods and procedures of doing God’s work; it has to do with the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus and our response to that once-for-all act of atonement.”¹⁰ Consider his further comments on the “one faith”: “One who denies any element of the one faith (i.e., the gospel message of redemption through the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ) has turned back from the truth....”¹¹

The early views of Ketcherside on what constitutes the “one faith” are unknown to the author, but those of Shelly are, as seen in the following statements:

Christ established only one church (Mat. 16:18) and revealed only one faith (Eph. 4:5). Those who discount that church and pervert that faith (as do theological liberals) are not Christian at all.... By virtue of the fact that men hear the **one faith**, which is the gospel of Christ (Rom. 1:16), they can believe on the **one father, one Lord and One Spirit**...¹²

It is obvious from these statements that in 1972 Shelly taught that the “one faith” was the whole Christian system, the Gospel of Christ, not merely the atonement, as he has taught at least since 1984. One is made to wonder why he changed. Sometime between 1972 and 1984 he came to the conclusion that there should be unity between the church of Christ and the Independent Christian Church and that the latter’s use of instruments in worship should not be a test of fellowship. Shelly avers that “only such items as pertain directly to the seven ones of Ephesians 4:4–6 are of such a nature as to qualify as issues of faith (i. e., doctrinal tests of fellowship).”¹³ In a 1985 speech to members of the Independent Christian Church he is also on record as saying,

I don’t draw the line at the instrument. I don’t think the Lord died over that. I’m not going to make that a test of my fellowship with you in Christ.... I refuse to be divisive over it. If I were in a congregation where the will of that congregation, the decision of the elders, was that the

instrument was going to be used next week, I wouldn't mount the pulpit and condemn them and divide the church.¹⁴

No wonder one of the Independent Christian Church members made the following observations (after Shelly's comments): "We talked about Carl Ketcherside. I am a great fan of his. Thirty years ago, he was saying the same thing you are saying."¹⁵

It becomes apparent that Shelly had to adopt some view of the "one faith" that does not relate it to our "methods and procedures of doing God's work," which would include how we worship God. Instrumental music is not authorized in the worship of God (which Shelly well knows), and if the "one faith" includes "methods and procedures of doing God's work," those who use the instrument would be in violation of the "one faith" and could not be granted fellowship! For sake of consistency with his new conviction that the instrument is not a barrier to fellowship, Shelly was forced to redefine the "one faith"!

In the same way, Ketcherside's definition of *one faith* conveniently makes room for his similar "Gospel/doctrine" dichotomy hobby. By this view only the "Gospel" (by his definition, of course—the plan of salvation in response to the atonement) establishes fellowship; "doctrine" (his definition again—matters of worship, work, and organization of the church, etc.) should have nothing to do with breaking or maintaining fellowship. It is not difficult to see how this "unity in diversity" position requires the definition Ketcherside has arbitrarily assigned to the "one faith." The unnamed member of the Independent Christian Church, quoted above, was right: Shelly was essentially teaching the same thing Ketcherside had taught thirty years earlier!

Did Paul merely refer to the atonement—to the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ—in the "one faith"? No, and for the following reasons:

First, in the listing of the seven "ones," "one Lord" and "one hope" had already been mentioned. Surely, if "one Lord" does not imply all elements of the atonement (the means by which Jesus was proved to be the "one Lord"), "one hope" does (our hope is the result of the death, burial, and resurrection of the "one Lord"). Thus, to say that "one faith" referred only to "the atonement" is to make Paul guilty of extreme superfluity and redundancy.

Second, in the immediate context Paul used *the faith* in such a way that it must mean much more than merely the atonement: "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith..." (Eph. 4:13). There is no indication that he is using *one faith* and *the faith* to mean two different things within the space of nine verses. Where there is no contextual indication or demand that a repeated term is being used in more than one sense **within a given context, sound**

hermeneutics requires a uniform understanding of terms. Whatever *the faith* (v. 13) may mean, it is certainly not a reference to the atonement!

Third, to limit *one faith* in Ephesians 4:5 solely to the atonement is not only out of harmony with the immediate contextual meaning of *the faith* (as noted above), but with the meaning of *the faith* throughout the New Testament, which will later be demonstrated.

Fourth, identification of the “one faith” with the atoning work of Christ seems to be peculiar to Ketcherside and Shelly (and presumably to those who share their dictum on “fellowship without endorsement,” “unity in diversity,” “big [F]—little [f] fellowship,” e.g., Leroy Garrett, et al.). No hint of this view has been discovered in any of the several other sources which have been researched. The fact that it is clearly an unusual view is not in itself a decisive reason to say it is incorrect, of course. However, when it is remembered (as earlier demonstrated) that this definition was **necessitated by doctrinal presuppositions relating to fellowship**, the definition becomes even more suspicious. We suspect that these men have let their desire determine their doctrine, rather than allowing the doctrine of Christ to govern their desires! While it is readily conceded that the “one faith” **includes** the atonement of our Lord, to say that it refers only to His atonement is arbitrary, and unjustifiable, and, in the final analysis, deadly.

What the “One Faith” Is

One does not study God’s Word very long without discovering that it uses *faith* in more than one sense. Often (as earlier noted) it is used in the subjective sense—that is, in reference to man’s act of believing and trusting in God and Christ and in the evidence God has provided for spiritual Truth. In fact, this is by far the most common usage of *faith* in the New Testament. Unquestionably, this sense of personal trust is used throughout Hebrews 11 during the discussion of many of the spiritual heroes and heroines of ancient times. Verse 6 expresses this meaning clearly: “And without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him” (cf. Heb. 11:1). Numerous other passages obviously employ *faith* in a subjective sense (e.g., Mat. 6:30; 9:22; Acts 3:16; 1 Cor. 15:15; et al.).

At least once *faith* is used in reference to one’s strong personal conviction of a matter as right or wrong: “But he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23).

Another frequent usage of *faith* in the New Testament is in an objective sense. When used this way it has reference to the whole body of Christian doctrine, the Gospel, the message of the New Testament, Christianity itself. One key to this usage of *faith* is that the definite article precedes it, indicating *the faith*: “And a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith” (Acts 6:7b). Christians are to “contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3). Although the English text does not fully reflect it, the grammatical construction in the Greek text in Galatians 3:23–26 is as follows (Note: Verse numbers are left in text for reader’s convenience in checking author’s comments after the quotation. The definite article as it appears in the Greek text is in brackets):

But before [the] faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the [correctly translated here] faith, which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that [the] faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through [the] faith in Christ Jesus.

Please observe:

1. In the first part of verse 23 the article is present before *faith* in the Greek text but not in the English translation (KJV or ASV).
2. In the second part of verse 23 the article is present before *faith* in the Greek text and in the English translation (KJV and ASV).
3. In verse 24 there is no article before *faith* in Greek text. However, sound hermeneutics (viz., contextual unity and consistency of definition within context) demands the same meaning for *faith* (i. e., “the faith,” the objective message of the Gospel), as in verses 23, 25–26.
4. As in (1) above, the article is present before *faith* in the Greek text, but not in the English translation (KJV or ASV). Given the preceding comments, Galatians 3:23–26 would read as follows if the definite article attached to *faith* in the Greek text were translated each time it appears:

But before the faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith, which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by [the] faith. But now that the faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through the faith in Christ Jesus.

It is unfortunate that the translators (for reasons unknown) **did not** translate three of the four definite articles in this passage. It is just as mysterious that they **did** translate one of the four articles (v. 23b – where is the consistency?). Their rendering leaves the distinct impression that Paul is speaking of one’s own personal, subjective faith throughout most of the passage. This author is convinced that just the opposite is true; this entire passage centers on faith used in an objective sense – “the faith.”

Another key to understanding when *faith* is being used in an objective sense (i. e., in reference to the Gospel) is the immediate context in which it is found. There are several places where *the faith* is so defined. In Acts 13 “the word of God” (vv. 5, 7), “the right ways of the Lord” (v. 10), and “the teaching [doctrine—KJV] of the Lord” (v. 12) are also called “the faith” (v. 8). *the faith* is equated with “the truth” and “the word of God” (1 Tim. 4:1, 3, 5).

In Galatians 1 Paul wrote in strong language about the Gospel, besides which there was none other, which some were perverting, and which alone must be preached and received (vv. 6–9). Later He referred to that same Gospel, which, as an apostle he preached, as “the faith of which he once made havoc” (v. 23). Jude’s bold exhortation that the Lord’s people must “contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints” is obviously an illustration of an objective usage of *faith* (Jude 3).

Upon several grounds we can confidently affirm that the “one faith” of Ephesians 4:5 is correctly understood in an objective sense. It therefore refers to the message of Christ, the body of doctrine in the New Testament, that which is to be believed and acted upon by men.

- **First**, the significance of the definite article when used with *faith* throughout the New Testament (i.e., “the faith”) is to singularize, peculiarize, and emphasize the uniqueness of the “faith” being discussed. Further, the definite article is a signal that *faith* is being used in an objective sense rather than in a subjective sense. How could Paul have referred to “one faith” without referring to that which he and other inspired writers consistently called “the faith”? *One faith* must equal *the faith*. As already demonstrated, *the faith* consistently refers to the objective message of the Gospel, the doctrine, the Word of Christ, the Truth in the New Testament, God’s one and only religion. Therefore, “one faith” refers to the same thing.
- **Second**, as earlier indicated, the immediate context refers to “the faith”: “Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ” (Eph. 4:13). *The faith* here cannot refer to man’s subjective faith, for they had already necessarily attained unto that in becoming Christians (Mark 16:16). Neither can it refer to “the atonement.” It is nonsense to make Paul say, “Till we all attain unto the unity of the atonement....” If one says that this refers to the unity Christians have in **believing** in the atonement, he expresses both an absurdity and a contradiction. While those addressed by Paul had already **in the past** all

believed in the atonement in the process of being saved, Paul was here pointing to something yet to be attained by them.

The unity of the faith in this passage does not refer to a spirit of oneness and harmony in the church. Rather, it refers to the completion of the written Word, by which the Ephesians (and all other Christians) would have the means of attaining complete knowledge of Christ and of becoming “fullgrown.” At the time Paul wrote to the Ephesians, the New Testament had not been completed in written form, and there was still the need for living apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers who were inspired by the Holy Spirit to teach infallibly (both orally and with the pen). Paul used all of the material between verses 6 and 13 (except for a parenthetical digression) reminding them of this very fact—God endowed men with such miraculous spiritual gifts that they might serve, perfect, and build up the church in its infancy. These men thus supernaturally endowed were given “till we all attain unto the unity of the faith,” that is, until they all had the perfected, completed Word of Christ available to them.

Ephesians 4:7–14 is closely parallel to 1 Corinthians 13:8–13 which refers to the coming of the completed Gospel message as “when that which is perfect is come” (v. 10). That the former passage teaches implicitly, the latter teaches explicitly: The miraculous spiritual gifts shall “cease” and “be done away” when the completed message of Truth was realized. It is beyond successful contradiction that *the faith* in Ephesians 4:13 means the Gospel, the Truth, the Word of God. There is nothing in the context to demand (or even to indicate) that Paul is using “one faith” (v. 5) to mean something different from “the faith” (v. 13). The “one faith” is simply the Gospel, the doctrine of Christ—“the faith.”

- **Third**, while numerous commentators argue that the “one faith” is man’s subjective belief (as earlier indicated), there are many respected expositors who understand the “one faith” to refer to an objective body of doctrine to be believed (i.e., the Word of God). While the voice of commentators is not final authority on any question, the reasoning of the following sources is worthy of notice: Findlay wrote: “We have one hope to work for; it is because we have **one faith** to live by. A common fellowship implies a common creed.”¹⁶ Clarke

commented: "One faith: One system of religion, proposing the same objects to the faith of all."¹⁷

- Lenski wrote at length on this point:

Some question whether *faith* is ever objective. We have found it so quite a number of times, it is then generally written with the article, "the faith." Here "one faith" is like "one hope." The list presents objective items, our basis of oneness is objective, must be so in order to be such a basis.... Hence *one faith* includes our personal believing, **but the stress is on the Christian faith as such, on what constitutes its substance.** This is one even as it centers on one Lord, one, whether you and I embrace it or not [emph. DM].¹⁸

Bultmann commented as follows:

The message itself, then, can be called *pistis* ["faith," DM] **For this reason, Paul can already use *pistis* in the sense of Christianity....** *Pistis* is also found for the preaching of faith at Acts 6:7, **and it is a principle in Ephesians 4:5....** The orthodox doctrine handed down by the Church is also *pistis* in Jude 3, 20; 2 Pet. 1:1 [emph. DM].¹⁹

While the sectarian terminology in some of the foregoing quotations is repugnant to faithful saints (e.g., "a common creed," "the orthodox doctrine handed down by the Church"), nonetheless, in principle these writers show a correct understanding of Paul's reference to the "one faith." The "one faith" is "the faith," the body of doctrine revealed to inspired men, which, when followed, constitutes Christianity, the religion of Christ.

Implications of the Fact That the "One Faith" Is the Doctrine of Christ

Having determined that Paul speaks of the Gospel—the one unified body of New Testament teaching—in his reference to "one faith," what are some implications of this fact?

- **First**, it is implied that there is a beautiful harmony and unanimity in the Gospel of Christ. The Word of God does not contradict itself. When the New Testament speaks of those things which uninspired, erroneous men or the devil and demons teach in religion, it generally speaks of "doctrines" (plural). Invariably, the inspired doctrine of Christ is characterized as "doctrine" (singular) emphasizing its internal harmony as a single entity. Paul taught the same things "everywhere in every church" (1 Cor. 4:17).
- **Second**, there can be no other religious message or doctrine that is pleasing to God besides the "one faith." All other "prophets" besides God's own inspired men are false prophets. All religious messages that are different from and other than the message of the Gospel of Christ are counterfeit. They are not the spiritual seed of God's Word (Luke 8:11), they were not planted by God, what they produce is not of God, and therefore, sooner or later, they "shall

be rooted up” by God (Mat. 15:13). There are just as many true spiritual messages and laws as there are true Gods, Lords, and Spirits – only one in each case!

- **Third**, since “the faith,” the doctrine of Christ, is one of seven elements upon which God’s people are to maintain unity and peace in Ephesians 4:3–6, there must be submission and adherence to the “one faith.” All who would be in fellowship with God and with one another (thus united) must be obedient to the doctrine of Christ. Unity, harmony, and agreement among men must be based upon the doctrine of Christ.

John wrote: “If we walk in the light, as he [God] is in the light, we have fellowship one with another...” (1 John 1:7). It is not too difficult to see that the one who walks in “the light” (God’s Truth) and thereby enjoys fellowship with others who walk therein is the same as the one who continues in the “one faith” and thereby enjoys unity and peace with others who do so. John further taught:

Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ [i.e., the ‘one faith’], hath not God: ...receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works (2 John 9).

“The light,” the “one faith,” the “doctrine of Christ” includes such things as the purpose of baptism, the action of baptism, the kind of music we employ in worship, when we observe the Lord’s supper, what the work of the church is, how the church does its work, identity of the church with the kingdom, Christ’s teaching on marriage, divorce, and remarriage and every other New Testament doctrine and Truth (Shelly, Ketcherside, et al., notwithstanding). It has already been demonstrated that Shelly once strongly advocated this very concept of Ephesians 4:5. Would any other application of this passage have ever occurred to him had he not first radically altered his concept of fellowship (or is it “Fellowship”?).

Conclusion

The correct comprehension of the phrase, “*there is...one faith*,” is crucial to one’s views on the subject of fellowship. If *one faith* refers to the Gospel or doctrine of Christ (as herein affirmed) then God’s people can have no fellowship (whether spelled with an “F” or an “f”) with those who practice things contrary to it (Eph. 5:11). This includes those who use instrumental music in worship, those who were immersed merely to “obey God” (without understanding or accepting the Scriptural purpose of baptism), those who believe they can observe the Lord’s supper when they choose, and such like. If *one faith* refers merely to the “atonement,” then there can hardly be any doctrinal barrier to fellowship. It seems that this is

precisely the aim of Ketcherside, Garrett, Shelly, and their “unity in diversity,” “fellowship everybody” crusade.

The following statement from our apostate brother, Rubel Shelly, serves well as an eloquent appeal to all (including Shelly himself!) who would pervert Ephesians 4:5. Obviously, he wrote these words several years ago before he strayed from the “one faith” and “went out from us” (1 John 2:19):

A number of preachers and teachers among us are advocating fellowship with members of the Conservative Christian Church [i. e., the Independent Christian Church, DM] and have indicated that they do not feel instrumental music to be a clear violation of the will of God but merely a matter of opinion.... To play instruments in Christian worship is to go beyond what Scripture authorizes and to commit sin. This is no mere matter of opinion or inconsequential difference of interpretation, for what is at stake is not so much the presence or absence of a piano in a church building but the far more fundamental matter of the authority of the Word of God. If Biblical authority can be set aside with regard to this issue, why must it be respected in any other?

Yes, instrumental music in worship is sinful and serves as a valid test of Christian fellowship. One cannot “walk in the light” of truth while refusing to respect Scriptural authority on this matter and therefore cannot be in fellowship with God or his faithful people in using instrumental music in worship (cf. 1 John 1:7).... Let us plead for and work toward unity in the truth. Let us not be diverted from that goal by liberalism’s ecumenical approach, **but contend for the one faith of the gospel (Jude 3) and the unity of believers which is brought about by a mutual submission to its absolute authority over our lives** [emph. DM].²⁰

Endnotes

1. All Scripture quotations are from the American Standard Version unless otherwise indicated.
2. S. D. F. Salmond, *The Expositor’s Greek Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1980), 3:322.
3. John Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*, ed. Ed. W. Young (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979), 2:275.
4. D. M. Lloyd-Jones, *Christian Unity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1980), pp. 107–108.
5. Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament* (McLean, VA: MacDonald Pub. Co., n.d.), 3:387.
6. Kenneth S. Wuest, *Ephesians and Colossians in the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954), p. 96.
7. Lloyd-Jones, pp. 109, 111.
8. Robertson L. Whiteside, *A New Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Saints at Rome* (Denton, TX: Inys Whiteside, 1955), p. 92.
9. W. Carl Ketcherside, *Mission Messenger* (October 1965).
10. Rubel Shelly, *I Just Want To Be a Christian* (Nashville, TN: 20th Century Christian, 1984), p. 82.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
12. Rubel Shelly, *Liberalism’s Threat to the Faith* (Memphis, TN: Simple Studies Pub. Co., 1972), pp. 7, 22.
13. Shelly, *I Just Want*, p. 91.
14. Rubel Shelly, Taped speech, quotation taken from transcription. (Hillsboro, OH: August 14, 1985).
15. *Ibid.*

16. G. G. Findlay, *The Expositor's Bible*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1982), 6:57.
17. Adam Clarke, *Clarke's Commentary* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1824), 3:2:451.
18. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Pub. House, 1961), p. 512.

Rudolf Bultmann, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. ed. and trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1980), 6:213.

19. Shelly, *Liberalism's Threat...*, pp. 59, 64, 22.

[**Note:** This MS was written for and delivered at the Sixteenth Annual Denton Lectures, Denton, TX, November 9–13, 1997. It was published in the lectureship book, *Studies in Ephesians*.]

Attribution: From *thescripturecache.com*; Dub McClish, owner and administrator.