

January 2011

Christ's Sheep

DD. The Oneness of Christ and his Father. v.30

"I and my Father are one." John 10:30 - εγω και ο πατηρ εν εσμεν

1. *"I and my Father"* - εγω και ο πατηρ

This verse reaffirms the distinctiveness of the three persons of each member of the godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, yet shows that they are all one. The word "my" is not found in the original. Instead, we have *ho*, "the", "*I and the Father are one*". The word *kai* shows that they, Christ and the Father, are completely connected to one another.

The word *I, ego*, is used whenever one is referring to their own identity, their own soul, their own person in contrast to others. The verb *eimi*, the verb to be, ("*are*" in this passage), is used whenever one wants to denote something about his own existence.

2. *"Are one"* - εν εσμεν

Because the verb *eimi*, are, is in the first person plural, *we*, we know that we have a compound subject made up of Jesus Christ and the Father. "*I and the Father we are one*".

The use of the neuter singular *heis*, one, shows that they are not one in person, but one in essence, that which makes a thing what it is. *Whatever* the nature of deity is, whatever it is that makes deity deity, that is the essence of it. And Christ is stating that he and the Father have the same essence.

The word *heis, one*, doesn't refer to just a unitary one, such as one apple, one orange, etc., for it has different uses. It is one of three words that expresses the uniqueness of something, that something occurs only once, and that there is nothing like this thing.

God is one, God is unique, there is no one like him and no one he can be compared to. He is complete in his oneness and needs nothing. "*For who in the heaven can be compared unto the LORD? who among the sons of the mighty can be likened unto the LORD?*" Psalm 89:6

God is above all, more powerful than all, wiser than all, eternal, perfect and complete in himself, totally righteous, totally just, totally holy, totally pure, the ruler and creator of the universe and of all that has been made. Indeed God is unique. "*To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like?*" Isaiah 46:5

Now when Christ stated that he and the Father were one, the Jews knew exactly what he meant. They knew that he was stating that he was God and that's why they wanted to bring a charge of blasphemy against him and stone him! "*The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.*" John 10:33 Which he was and is. "*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God.*" John 1:1,2

EE. They tried to stone Christ. v.31

1. *“Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him.”* John 10:31 - εβαστασαν ουν παλιν λιθους οι ιουδαιοι ινα λιθασωσιν αυτον

The word again, *palin*, was used to denote an event that had taken place at least once before showing that the Jews had tried to stone him at least one other time and were attempting to do it again. The word to pick up is the aorist tense of *bastazo*, which looks at an action from a point in time, but with the emphasis on the results of that action. *Lithos* is the normal word for stones or rocks. And the verb lithazo is used with hina plus the subjunctive mood, which introduces a purpose clause. They picked up the stones for the purpose of killing Christ!

They were listening to him talking about his sheep, eternal life, etc., with total unbelief and complete skepticism, and **their listening to him was only for the purpose of trying to find something that he would say that they could get him on as a pretext for killing him**. So when he made the statement that he and the Father were one, then they had what they were looking for and then picked up the stones to try to stone him...again.

There are many evil things that man has done on earth since the fall of Adam and Eve, murder, rape, bestiality, blasphemy, etc., etc., but there is absolutely nothing that can compare to the monstrous act of men wanting to kill their Creator! And beyond that of people wanting to kill the true God of their nation! Here he is, their God and Creator walking in their midst and they hate him! *“All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.”* John 1:3

Jesus Christ was the One who led them out of Egypt. He was the pillar of fire by night and the pillar of cloud by day. *“And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.”* 1 Corinthians 10:4 And now here he is incarnated deity in human form so they can see him as he truly is; walking among them, talking to them, eating with them, drinking with them, teaching them, forgiving them, healing them, helping them and they hate him! Yet at the same time, they go back to their temple to say that they love their God! *“He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not.”* John 1:10,11

The reason why they hated Jesus Christ and wanted to kill him is because they hated truth! Christ is light and truth; he is the incarnate truth. When Christ entered into the world, as the light of life, he brought us grace and truth. *“For the law was given by Moses, but **grace and truth came by Jesus Christ**.”* John 1:17 And he not only brought us grace and truth from the Father on high, **he is grace and truth!** *“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) **full of grace and truth**.”* John 1:14

But these men hated the grace Christ brought into the world, because it was in opposition to their self righteous works of legalism manifested in their religiosity, all which proceeded from their arrogance. Christ's person, life and mission stood in opposition to everything they were and everything they were trying to do with their lives and religion. *“For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov’d.”* John 3:20 And the same thing is still going on today with all those who hate Christ and his grace and truth. They hate him; they hate the truth and they hate his grace because they are evil. *“And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.”* John 3:19

FF. Christ's claim to be the Son of God. v.32

1. “Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?” John 10:32 - απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους πολλα καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν εκ του πατρος μου δια ποιων αυτων εργων λιθαζετε με

In this passage, where it says, “Jesus answered them,”, the word is *apokrinomai*, which is used as a reply to a question, or to an act that has preceded, and is used to defend one's self, one's beliefs, convictions and actions by using doctrinal rationale.

The Jews were picking up stones to stone him, and so in reply to what they were doing, Christ asks them for which one of these miraculous acts that he had done were they going to stone him? To which the Jews replied that they were not going to stone him because of the good works that he had done, but because of blasphemy by him saying that he and the Father were one.

Now the word for “shewed” in v.32 is *deiknumi* and it meant to put something on display, to exhibit something, to point out something, to make something known, and it had the idea of proving a point by documentary evidence, or to prove something by a demonstration.

What this tells us that the miracles that they had seen him do, which were far more difficult than to just say that he was one with the Father, were the full documentary proof that he was who he said he was, that he had come from God, that he was one with God and that he was the Son of God! One can claim to have the authority and power from God to heal, to raise the dead, to forgive; one can say those words all day long. But if you want to have proof that your claims are valid, then there has to be a **demonstration** of those powers, which Christ did repeatedly.

“From my Father”, is *ek tou patros* and is the ablative of source telling us that these works, which he was doing in their sight, were ultimately from the source of the Father on high! He was the immediate source of these miracles, but God the Father was the ultimate source. **No one could do these things in the name of God, unless God had given him both the authority and the power to do them!**

The word **authority**, *exousia*, meant that one has the legal right to do something and this legal right has been granted to one by someone else higher than you in authority. Authority can never be arrogated to oneself, but must be handed down to you. God the Father granted his Son the the authority, the legal right to heal, judge, raise the dead, forgive, etc.. “And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All **power**, (*exousia* – authority), is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” Matthew 28:18

The Father also granted his Son the **power** to do these things. Power refers to the force necessary to accomplish what one has been authorized to do. “And they were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority (*exousia*) and **power** (*dunamis*) he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out.” Luke 4:36 “And it came to pass on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judaea, and Jerusalem: and the **power** (*dunamis*) of the Lord was present to heal them.” Luke 5:17

Authority is granted by a superior party to perform certain specified acts and one's power is limited to the performing of those acts. And we see that Christ gave his disciples the authority and power to do certain things. “Then he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.” Luke 9:1

GG. They denied Christ's deity. v.33

*“The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, **makest thyself God.**” - John 10:33 - απεκριθησαν αυτω οι ιουδαιοι λεγοντες περι καλου εργου ου λιθαζομεν σε αλλα περι βλασφημιας και οτι συ ανθρωπος ων ποιεις σεαυτον θεον*

Everyone in Israel knew that only *Yahweh* himself, or the One that he had **anointed**, (commissioned, appointed), could do these things. And not only was Christ's anointing by the Eternal One on high evident to all when he was baptized by John, where he was anointed, not by oil, but by the Holy Spirit coming down upon him, thus demonstrating that he had been anointed by God. But here Christ is doing all these miracles in the name of the Father, thus demonstrating again, over and over, that he had been given the authority and power by *Yahweh* to do these things, thus also demonstrating that he was one with God! *“And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.” John 1:33*

The word *peri* is used here to denote something around which an activity is taking place. We would say, concerning this matter. Which tells us that they kept focusing on his statement of being one with the Father and ignoring the miracles that he was doing. But which is easier, to **say** something, or to **do** something? For skeptics, actions speak louder than words. So his actions proved that his words were true, but **they simply didn't want to believe!** They kept going back in their minds to his statement of being one with the Father and totally disregarded any of his miracles.

And they knew what he was saying when he said he was one with God, that in the entire universe only he and the Father are unique, and that God was his Father; they knew that he was making himself equal with God and that he shared all the essence of deity himself and they totally rejected that concept. They completely refused to accept that a man could be God, *“that thou, being a man, **makest thyself God.**”!* Also, *“Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, **making himself equal with God.**” John 5:18*

Now maybe the whole idea was foreign to them, or maybe it would be something difficult to accept, but an objective person would be open to the idea of proving it! And the real proof in all this would be that he did what the Father does. Were his works of the quality that would be in keeping to the nature of the Father? And if he did them in the name of the Father.

Now when you go back to the idea of **invoking the name of a deity**, it meant that you were calling upon that deity to perform whatever it is that you asked that deity to do, or it meant that whatever it is you were doing that deity was involved in it. And if you asked the deity to do thus and so, and he didn't, then it would prove that he did not honor your request and actually had nothing to do with you. But if he did grant your request, then it meant he was with you.

Or, if you went out and **claimed** that a particular deity, *Yahweh* in this case as the God of Israel, had given you the **authority** to perform an act in his name and had also given you the **power** to do that act in his name, and you went out to heal and nothing happened, then it would be proof that he had not sent you, nor given you any authority or power. But if you went out healed people, and all the other things Christ was doing, in *Yahweh's* name, then it would be absolute proof that *Yahweh* backed you up 100%! And it also would prove that everything you claimed about your relationship with God was true!

HH. You are gods. v.34

“Jesus answered them, *Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are **gods**?*” - John 10:34 - απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους ουκ εστιν γεγραμμενον εν τω νομω υμων εγω ειπα **θεοι** εστε

Often *apokrinomai* is used in solemn or legal discourse, which is what we have here, where the Lord is not merely replying to a question, or a statement, but a very serious charge that they have levied against him. They have accused him of blasphemy and of making himself, a man, into god. So now he is going to reply to all this using the Scriptures.

Of all the serious crimes that one could commit in Israel idolatry and blasphemy were the worse, because they were directed at *Yahweh* personally. So when the Jews accused him of blasphemy and making himself equal with God these were very serious charges of a legal nature and his reply to them was of a legal nature as well.

It is true that his statement of, “*Is it not written in your law*”, is a question, but it's an erotesis where he is not waiting for an answer, but using a question to make a statement. They are accusing him of something using the Scriptures as their basis, so he's using the Scriptures as his legal argument to prove that he is not guilty of blasphemy or making himself into being god. Argument here is not to be taken in the sense of arguing, but one's legal reply to legal charges.

Now this is a very serious matter that they have accused him of, for in the eyes of the Law it carried the penalty of death by stoning. So we need to investigate this matter to see if it warranted the charges made against him and exactly what the situation was in the Scriptures that he referred to that he was going to use to refute these charges.

The proof he uses in John 10:34, “*Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are **gods**?*” is taken from Psalms 82:6, “*I have said, Ye are **gods**; and all of you are **children** of the most High.*” אֲנִי-אָמַרְתִּי, אֱלֹהִים אַתֶּם; וּבְנֵי עֲלִיּוֹן כְּלָכֶם

The first verse seems to set itself apart in the sense that *Yahweh* is addressing the *Els* in heaven saying to them, “*A Psalm of Asaph. God (Elohim) standeth in the congregation of the mighty (Els); he judgeth among the gods (Elohim).*” Psalms 82:1

Then it goes into verses two through seven where he addresses the assembly of the Israelites and this is what he says to them, “*Ye are **gods** (elohim); and all of you are children (sons) of the most High (Elyon).*” The word for **gods** here is *elohim* and the word for **children** is actually *sons*, *ben*, so we have, “*I, I have said, 'gods you are and all of you are sons of the Most High, (Elyon)'*”.

They accused him of blasphemy and making himself into god by saying that God was his father, so he comes back with what the Scriptures say about this and **says that in the Scriptures *Yahweh* himself declared that all of them were *gods* and all of them were the sons of God, or the Most high!**

When we come to the word gods, we need to see that *elohim* does not automatically refer to deity. The *el* word group, such as, *El, Eloah, Elohim, Elim, El-Elyon*, etc., brings out the idea of strength, power and might. The angels as *els* are powerful, and *Yahweh* is powerful. But the celestial beings, as powerful as they are, are not as powerful as *Yahweh*, who has all power.

The word for **sons**, *ben*, could be used to denote membership in a group, and it could refer to the idea that one had come from someone else, that is, it denoted that you were the product of his creation or procreation. So it is very accurate to call the angels, *Els*, celestial beings in heaven, the sons of God because *Yahweh* had created them.

Even Adam was called the son of God because God created him. "*Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of **Adam, which was the son of God.***" Luke 3:38 So, when Christ referred to himself as the Son of God, and to God as his Father, he was in keeping with what the Scriptures say, for it was the Father who had prepared a human body for him. "*Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, **but a body hast thou prepared me.***" Hebrews 10:5

Now the problem that the Jews had with Christ was him continually referring to himself as the Son of God and saying that God was his Father. He stated that he and the Father were one. "*I and my Father are one.*" John 10:30 He was saying that he and the Father were unique, which would stand to reason if God was his Father, which he was through his incarnation into this world through Mary. Before that he was the second member of the trinity.

They said that by him continually referring to God as his Father was making himself equal with God. "*Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also **that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.***" John 5:18

The hypocrisy was that they, **the Jews, were claiming the same thing! They were claiming that God was their father!** The very thing they were accusing Christ over in the matter of blasphemy they were saying the same thing themselves! "*Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; **we have one Father, even God.***" John 8:41

Calling God their father was not blasphemous. All of Israel referred to him as their father. The problem the Jews were having is that **Christ** was saying it! Their problem was they hated everything that Jesus Christ was saying period! It was only because they wanted to get him on some trumped up charge to could kill him, that they focused in on this statement he had made concerning God being his Father!

He refuted their bogus legal charges with their own Scriptures, and the fact that they themselves claimed God as their father was also brought out in this. The truth was they hated Jesus Christ. They hated what he stood for. They hated what he said. They hated him because he was the light and they were the darkness. They hated him because the Father had actually sent him, anointed him and granted him all power and authority. They hated him because he was the legal heir to the land and they wanted to kill him to steal his inheritance. **And they hated him because the devil was their real father!**

Christ was very explicit in bringing out the truth of who their real father was. He said it was the devil! "*Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.*" John 8:44

After his death, burial and ascension into heaven, he revealed another bombshell on that self righteous evil going on back down on the earth concerning the Jews and that was their synagogues were not the synagogues of the Lord, but Satan! "*I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.*" Revelation 2:9

“*I said, Ye are gods?*” - εγω ειπα **Θεοι** εστε. Now Christ did not state that he was God, even though he was God in the flesh. **He stated that he was the Son of God.** So on the first charge there was nothing in the Law that could be considered blasphemous for calling God your father, or calling yourself a son of God for everyone, including these Jews, did.

Now on the second charge, making yourself equal with God, or making yourself God, Christ shows that the precedence of referring to certain individuals in Israel as “*gods*” had already been set in the OT by none other than God himself. And this is going to be the proof of Christ's argument against the charge of blasphemy. **His legal argument concerning their first charge** was that, even they called God their father thereby making themselves sons of God. And **his second legal argument** was that God referred to them as “*gods*”. His proof text is Psalm 82:6, where we have God standing in the great assembly of Israel, among the chiefs of Israel who judged over Israel, and he stands in judgment over the judges stating that he gives judgment among the “*god*”s, (referring to them), and says, “*You are gods, you are all sons of the Most High*”.

Now here's Christ's argument against the false charge of blasphemy. If God called them all his sons, then it's perfectly proper and legitimate for Christ to call himself the Son of God and to say God his Father. And if this calling himself the Son of God makes himself equal with God, or that he is one with God, then that is also proper and legitimate for God has already called these men gods!

The context of Psalm 82 shows that these men were not faithfully carrying out their offices. They were to defend the poor and fatherless, to do justice to the afflicted and needy, to deliver the poor and needy, to rid *them* out of the hand of the wicked. Instead they were defending the unjust and showing partiality to the wicked!

These men were given the positions as judges in Israel and they held tremendous authority and power. Now the right over life and death and the administration of justice belonged solely to God, but he had delegated this authority and power to these men. And as his delegates and representatives they were to bear his “image” in these matters giving them the name of “*gods*”.

Now if the coming of God's commission upon them invested them with the name of “*gods*”, how much more so, by *a fortiori* argument can Jesus, who was set apart from eternity past for this task by the Father, refer to himself as the Son of God! If mere men in the OT be called “*god*”s by God and not be considered blasphemous, then how much more can Christ call himself the Son of God!

The only statement that Christ made was that he was God's Son and that they were both one, or unique. And he showed by OT proofs and by *a fortiori* argument, that not only did Israel consider God as its Father, and these men too, but God himself considered Israel as his son and these men in Psalm 82 as “*god*”s. So if this is true, and it is, there is no blasphemy for calling himself the Son of God.

You see, these men were legalists, but not truly legal minded. Law to them, God's Law, was not used as the basis for truth and justice, but as a vehicle to express their arrogance and hatred. But when they came to Christ, who was God's truth and the epitome of justice and mercy, they met their Master! They could not refute his wisdom. Legalists, then and now, care not for true justice, mercy, grace and the truth. They care only for their own self righteous agendas and they use religion as their base for power. They really don't care for the souls of the people under them. They lust to have the power over people, so they can exercise control over their lives and elevate themselves in society.

II. They were called gods. v.35

“If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;” - ει εκεινους ειπεν θεους προς ους ο λογος του θεου εγενετο και ου δυναται λυθηναι η γραφη.

“If he called **them** (*ekeinos*) gods”, where *ekeinos* is used to denote the remoter object and to refer to well known personalities. The reference here is to men who lived many years ago in Israel, who evidently presided as judges and rulers over Israel.

The word for **if** is in the first class condition, which means if it's true and it is true, so we have, if God referred to these men as gods and he did.

“Unto whom the word of God came”. The Word of God came to these men denotes God addressing them, apparently at their consecration to office, and by this word they were promoted to a new level of dignity taking on the idea of gods because of their role as judges and rulers.

“And the scripture cannot be broken”, and scripture is not **able** to be broken. The word for broken is *luo*, which means to be loosed, set apart destroyed, showing that all the Word of God is connected together in a perfect union and not one aspect, or one part of scripture can be loosed from the main body for that would be breaking the cohesiveness of the scriptures.

Now what he's telling these men regarding their charge of blasphemy, by way of *a fortiori* argument and the proof of the OT scriptures, in that God had already called men that he had appointed and commissioned to public office, “gods”, and sons of the Most High, so for them to continue on with their charge of blasphemy would make **them** guilty of breaking the scriptures, which can't be broken!

JJ. Sent by the Father. v.36

“Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?” John 10:36 - ον ο πατηρ ηγιασεν και απεστειλεν εις τον κοσμον υμεις λεγετε οτι βλασφημεις οτι ειπον υιος του θεου ειμι

“Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified,” or, “whom the Father sanctified”. If God called them gods and the sons of the Most High, what do you have to say of whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world?

Sanctification, to set apart, is a theme that runs throughout the entire Bible, both OT and NT. Even the word **saints** comes from *hagios*, those set apart by God. All of God's people have been set apart. **Phase one** sanctification is our being set apart by God from the world system and given to Christ as our Savior. **Phase two** sanctification is our growth in the Word and personal spiritual growth. And **Phase three** sanctification is our going to be with the Lord. All of God's people have been set apart by God, and out of that body of people, God sets apart certain men from the rest to serve him in a capacity that he has ordained.

There are three ideas found in sanctification. **One**, we are separated **from** something, someone, the world, etc., **two**, **unto** someone – God, and **three** for a **purpose** – to do the will of God. God being a holy God separated from all sin and evil must first set apart those he is going to use for his will.

So these OT men, that Christ is mentioning, were set apart by God to serve him as rulers and judges over his OT people and now Christ is asking what about the One that the Father has set apart for his own? If it's biblical for him to do it with **them**, then it's biblical for God to do it with **him**!

“And sent into the world,” uses the word *apostello*, which was the word that denoted the admiral of a fleet, apostolos, who was commissioned with the appropriate rank and authority and sent on a mission. And this is how Jesus Christ referred to himself. He said that he had been sent by the Father into the kosmos system for a specific purpose. Now if God had been setting apart men all along and sending them to Israel to do his will, **is it too much to ask for them to believe that God had sent him??**

And if they wanted verification of his claim that God had sent him, then all they had to do was look at his miracles that he had done in the name of the Father! They were proof enough in themselves to authenticate his claim that he had been sent by God!

“Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?” Why are you saying that I am blaspheming, because I said, I am God's Son? A good question! Why are they accusing him? There was no legal precedence for it. Even they, themselves, said that they were sons of God! They were accusing him, but saying the same thing themselves! So why this groundless and idiotic charge?

Maybe they had some warped thing going on in their minds. Certainly they were inspired by Satan. Or maybe it was because they just wanted to get something on him that would warrant death by stoning, which blasphemy would, and they thought the charge of claiming he was God's Son would come close enough to sounding like blasphemy. Which, of course, he disproved by his *a fortiori* argument and his use of OT documentation.

But these men weren't interested in the truth, they weren't interested in true justice, they weren't even interested in the Law! They only wanted to kill Jesus and were searching for some legal excuse to justify it. Look at how they treated Stephen. He only spoke the truth to them and it so enraged them that they stoned him to death! *“Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye.” Acts 7:51* *“When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth.”* *“And cast him out of the city, and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul.” Acts 7:54, 58*

It just shows how blind men can be concerning the truth, even when it is clearly laid out before them. Blind because of their sin. Blind because they love the darkness. Blind because of their willful pride. Blind because they don't want the truth! And here we see the blindness of these men and the hardness of their hearts manifested in their unbridled hatred of the Creator, whom they wanted to murder!

KK. His works prove his claim. v.37

“If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.” John 10:37 εἰ οὐ ποίω τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς μου μὴ πιστεύετε μοι

Anyone can say anything, but actions speak louder than words. Christ's works, that is, the miracles that he was doing in the name of the Father were his proof! They were the demonstration of his claim proving who he said he was. He's saying, if I'm not doing the works of my Father, then don't believe me! It's a simple concept. But if he is doing the works of the Father and in the Father's name, power and authority, then you better believe him.

LL. Believe his words, or believe his works! v.39

“But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.” John 10:39 - ει δε ποιω καν εμοι μη πιστευητε τοις εργοις πιστευσατε ινα γνωτε και πιστευσητε οτι εν εμοι ο πατηρ καγω εν αυτω.

But if I do them (the works), even though you do not believe me, believe the works, that you may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father.”

As we say out here, “the proof of the pudding is in the eating”. If one makes a claim to be a Christian, or as a Christian makes a claim to have a certain spiritual gift, there will be some sort of demonstrable proof to verify one's claim. Paul verified his claim to be an apostle by his ministry in the Church.

If one claims to be a **Christian**, (and only God really knows who belongs to him), then there should be some tell tell signs, such as, a love for Christ, a love for his Word, a love for other believers, a desire to please God and do his will, etc.. And if he is in a state of rebellion, then some sort of discipline.

If a man claims to have the spiritual gift of **evangelist**, then there should be a desire for seeing people saved, an ability to present the gospel clearly, or be involved in some activity centered around getting the gospel out to the unsaved; something related to evangelism.

If a man claims to have back then the gift of **prophecy**, then he should not only have a teaching ministry of God's Word, but is able to accurately prophecy what is going to occur and it does!

If a man claims to have the spiritual gift of **Pastor-Teacher**, then this will be clearly demonstrated by his ability to teach Bible doctrine. He will be able, and does, accurately and faithfully teach the doctrines of God's Word. It will be his burning desire to see that the Truth goes out and that the doctrines of the faith are preserved. Not only that, he will be protective of the local church that God has given to him against anyone who would harm the souls of the sheep that have been entrusted to him.

There are many people out there, male and female, that claim to have been sent by God, but the proof centers around the Word of God. Do they teach the truth? Do they accurately give a salvation message? Do they bring forth the concepts of grace, faith and truth? Do they love Christ and his Word more than anything on earth? Or are they in it for the money and glory?

Christ claimed to have been sent by God. He claimed that God was his Father. He said that he and the Father were one. He claimed that all authority and power to do the miracles that he was doing had been given to him by his Father in heaven. How else could he do them? So he's telling them, if you don't believe me, believe the miracles!

If someone had said that God gave him the power to heal and they walked up to someone, who was crippled, and said you are healed, rise up and walk away, and they did! And they did this over and over and in every area, even causing the dead to rise to life again. What could you make of that, but that God gave that man the power to heal! You see it took the power coming from God to heal that man, and if the one standing there making the claim that God had sent them to heal had not been sent by God, then God simply would not supply the power necessary to heal the person! But if that man was healed, then it was complete proof that the man standing there doing the healing, the Lord Jesus Christ, had been sent by God and was telling the truth about everything he said!

