

THE HYPOSTATIC UNION, KENOSIS, THE GREAT COMMISSION, AND PAUL

Question #1:

FIVE SERIOUS PROBLEMS THAT ARE KEEPING ME AWAY FROM CHRISTIANITY.

1. Problem of "Jesus is God" and "Jesus is the Creator".

There is no way for the Trinitarian Christians to reconcile John 1:1,14 , Colossians 2:9 and Hebrew 1:8 etc (which proclaim that Jesus is God) WITH Hosea 11:9/Malachi 3:6/Acts 2:22, John 17:3, John 20:17, John 14:28, John 14:1, Luke 6:12, Mark 10:18, Acts 3:13, Matthew 24:36 etc that dispute this claim.

Again, there is no way for the Non-trinitarian Christians like Jehovah Witnesses to reconcile John 1:3, 1st Corinthians 8:6 and Colossians 1:16 (which proclaim that all things were created THROUGH Jesus Christ) WITH Isaiah 44:24, 48:13, 45:12 and 66:2 which declare that God created the heavens and the earth ALL ALONE, BY HIMSELF, BY HIS OWN HANDS AND NOBODY WAS WITH HIM.

Response #1:

God is not Man. Jesus is BOTH God and Man. God did not change in His fundamental nature to become Man. Rather, He also took on the nature of Man so that in One Person God and Man are united.

Question #2:

2. Problem of "Jesus being sent ONLY to the Israelites

(check Matthew 15:24, 10:5-6, 19:28. Compare Matthew 28:19, Mark 16:15, Luke 24:47 and Acts 1:8 WITH Acts 10:1-28, 11:1-18,19, Galatians 2:7-9 and James 1:1).

Suppose you are being asked to distribute a packet of sweet to some children in your vicinity with an instruction to START WITH THE MALE CHILDREN BEFORE THE FEMALE. Now one of the female children approaches you for the collection of her own sweet. Please before God and man would you say; " I WAS ONLY ASKED TO GIVE THE MALE" ? Of course, you would not utter such kind of statement. You would definitely say "IT IS NOT YET TIME FOR THE FEMALE" or something similar to that .

Likewise, if it was already in the divine plan that JESUS AND HIS APOSTLES WOULD PREACH TO THE JEWS FIRST AND THEN LATER TO ALL THE GENTILES as the Christian scholars want us to believe, then Jesus' statement directed to that Canaanite woman in Matthew 15:24 should have been: IT IS NOT YET TIME FOR THE GENTILES or something similar in meaning rather than "I WAS SENT ONLY TO THE LOST SHEEP OF ISRAEL(Matthew 15:24 NIV)". Why did Jesus have to say such a statement if he was truly sent to the entire world to die for our salvation ?

Again, some of the Christian scholars opined that the reason why Jesus said he was sent ONLY to the Israelites was to TEST the faith of that Canaanite woman. But if this is the case, then Jesus would have committed an act of LYING by saying he was sent ONLY to the Israelites if TRULY he was sent to the entire world. So how could an esteemed and beloved prophet of God like Jesus have committed an act of LYING for something that is very trivial (just to test the faith of one woman) ? He could also have tested the faith of that woman WITHOUT LYING by simply say " It is not yet time for the Gentiles".

Therefore, no matter how you think about it; Matthew 15:24 will continue to be a problem for Christianity.

Response #2:

He was sent to Israel only because Israel was God's channel for blessing the whole world.

Question #3:

3. Problem of an innocent, righteous and beloved son who was placed under the CURSE of his own lovely and merciful father (Gal. 3:13, Deut. 21:23) in order for the father to forgive and ultimately save his sinful adopted children (i:e the Christians) from his punishment.

Of course, it is totally IRRATIONAL for an innocent, righteous and beloved SON of a compassionate, lovely and merciful FATHER to be under the CURSE of the same father !!!

The God of the Bible, the alleged father of Jesus Christ, has been described in the same Bible as being compassionate, lovely and merciful (See Psalm 78:38, 145:8-9, Luke 6:36, 1 John 4:8 etc).

Similarly, Christians also agree that Jesus must be an innocent, righteous and beloved son .

Therefore, in order to avoid the IRRATIONALITY of putting such an innocent, righteous and beloved son under the CURSE of such a compassionate, lovely and merciful father, we have to conclude that Jesus did not die on the cross.

Even Paul knew very well that it is IRRATIONAL to believe that Jesus was ACCURSED by God. This is the reason why he contradicts himself by saying as follows;

"Therefore, I want you to understand that no one speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus ACCURSED !" (1st Corinthians 12:3).

Yet the ONLY WAY for Jesus not to become "accursed" was for him NOT to die on the cross since it is clearly written in the the same Bible that ANYONE that is crucified is accursed by God (Deuteronomy 21:23, Galatians 3:13).

Response #3:

But it is not irrational for a father to work himself to the bone to feed his children and provide for them even at an age when they could do so for themselves. Nor is it irrational for able-bodied men to put their lives at risk for other people in war as soldiers.

The Lord Jesus was perfectly righteous and never did anything wrong. But on the Cross, He willingly took on the full weight of all human sin in His Body and became sin so that all of God's Anger against sin would be vented on Him. He did not personally deserve it but once He took our position, He made Himself fully deserving of it. That was His Ultimate Righteous Act - dying for those who do not deserve it.

Question #4:

4. Problem of "Jesus' private appearance to Paul on the road to Damascus" NOT BEING FORETOLD to the original apostles: (Compare Acts 22:6-9 WITH Matthew 24:23-28, Luke 10:18 . Compare Matthew 5:17-20, 23:1-3 With Romans 10:4, Colossians 2:14, Ephesians 2:15 and Galatians 3:23-25. Compare Genesis 17:9-14, Luke 2:21 With Galatians 5:2-4, Acts 23:12-14. Compare Acts 21:18-31 With Acts 26:1-8, 19-21, Romans 3:7. Compare Luke 12:1-2 with Acts 23:6. Compare 2 Corinthians 12:16 with Jeremiah 48:10)". Yet the same Paul wrote ALMOST HALF OF THE BOOKS that make up the New Testament . See the foundation upon which the edifice of Christianity is erected!

Response #4:

I'm not sure what this means exactly. I can't see the connection between your objections and the passages you provided. So, explain a little more.

Did Jesus need to tell His disciples that He would appear to Paul later? Why did He?

Was Paul disqualified in some way from writing Scripture? How was he?

Question #5:

5 . Problem of " the Bible and Christianity not being endorsed by God " ; the words "Bible" and "Christianity" are nowhere to be found inside the Bible. Yet an exclusive divine book and a true faith from God MUST have a unique name given to it by God Himself for identification and to distinguish it from all other false faiths that exist on the earth. Not the name given to it by the people as in the case with the "Bible" and "Christianity" . Even the word "Christian" found in the Bible was neither COINED by God nor Jesus; not even by original apostles of Jesus in Jerusalem. But by Paul and his colleagues ; people that never met Jesus during his earthly ministry (check Acts 11:26).

Response #5:

This one seems very frivolous to me. Until Jesus Christ was born, nobody knew that His Name would be Jesus although prophecies about His Coming began right at the beginning of human history.

"Bible" is just a term of convenience. You can say "Scripture" or "Scriptures" if you prefer. Those ones are in the Bible. As for "Christian", it too is a term of convenience. Before the mockery that eventually became the name, we were called disciples, followers of "this Way", brethren, children of God (as we still are called), saints, believers etc. We simply accepted a mockery and by so doing redefined it.

Obviously too, it wasn't Paul who coined the term. In fact, he never used it. It was unbelievers who called believers Christians first in Antioch. In fact, the actual term they used was "Chrestians". Its modern equivalent would be "Goody Two Shoes" "Holy-Holy" "Holier-than-thou" etc. It was a mockery for the moral behavior of Christians. In time, it was corrupted to Christians which meant "(members) of the House of Christ". Peter is the only believer in the Bible to use the term at all.

Question #6:

1. Hypostatic union loosely states;

"Within the person of Jesus Christ, there were two natures : Divine and Human" .

This is impossible. The person of Jesus Christ as proposed by Christian theism can not exist. The reason why is because within the person of Jesus Christ, there are two CONTRADICTORY natures. God is by definition perfect, omniscient, omnipresent, all-wise, eternal, omnipotent, etc. Humans are by definition imperfect, ignorant, limited, not all-wise, mortal, impotent, etc. These two contradictory natures CANNOT CO-EXIST in one person for one reason :

They are contradictory and violate the law of non-contradiction. For example, Does the person of Jesus know everything? If no, then he does not have the omniscient nature of God (Matthew 24:36). If yes then he does not have the ignorant nature of humans and he is not really human. Is the person of Jesus Christ perfect? If No, then he does not really have the God nature. If yes, then he does not really have the imperfect human nature (Ecclesiastes 7:20). Is the person of Jesus Christ all-powerful? If yes, then he is not really human (Mark 14:38). If no, then he does not really have the God nature (Psalms 115:3). You can not be both God And Human in one person.

Response #6:

You have the wrong conception of contradiction. Things are not contradictory unless they negate each other. When they do not, they are merely different. For example, light is different from darkness and contradicts it since where there is light, there can be no darkness. And if darkness prevails in a certain place, then there is no light there either. But green and blue are different and non-contradictory. Green is very clearly not blue. But green can be part of a color mix with blue without negating blue.

In the same vein, the human nature is incalculably inferior to the divine but it does not contradict it. The divine nature is simply infinitely greater than the human. This is why the Bible makes a very emphatic point about the great Sacrifice of God the Word in becoming human. It actually describes that as "voiding" Himself of His Divinity in Philippians 2:7. The Greek word translated there as "made Himself nothing" or "emptied Himself" is the one from which the theological term "Kenosis" was developed. It describes how in His First Advent, the Lord Jesus made Himself able to live like a true human without any of the advantages of His Deity. He did not cease even then to be Deity. He just never actually used that "part" of Himself until after He resurrected and was glorified and kenosis ended.

Another way to look at what He did is to imagine a King who changes out of his royal robes and divests himself of all symbols of his authority and dons the apparel of a peasant and goes to walk among the poor in his land. Unless he is recognized and permits it to be otherwise, he will be treated just like any other peasant. But he does not cease to be king. This is not a perfect parallel but it is close enough to help here.

In conclusion, there was no contradiction.

Question #7:

2. Jesus did not send his apostles to preach to the world. Follow the evidence below

" I was sent ONLY TO THE LOST SHEEP OF ISRAEL(Matthew 15:24)"

"Do not go among the Gentiles or enter any town of the Samaritans. Go rather to the LOST SHEEP OF ISRAEL(Matthew 10:5-6)"

"Truly I tell you, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the TWELVE TRIBES OF ISRAEL(Matthew 19:28)"

It is crystal clear from all these verses that Jesus and his apostles were sent ONLY to the Israelites i:e the Jews.

However, Christians usually proclaim that command of NOT preaching to the Gentiles was later cancelled and replaced by the new command of preaching to all the nations of the world just before Jesus ascended to heaven as the verse below indicate;

" Therefore go and make disciples of ALL NATIONS, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (Matthew 28:19)".

In this very verse, Jesus asked the apostles to carry out TWO great assignments;

1.To preach to all the nations of the world.

2.To baptize the people in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy spirit

But AFTER Jesus' departure, did apostles and the other disciples under their authority really act on these two commands ?

The following verses show that the apostles and the other disciples did not carry out the first command. In fact, they find it very difficult to visit the Gentiles talkless of preaching to them. See the evidence below;

Acts 10:28 NIV: Peter said to them (i.e some of the Gentiles that asked Peter to come): "You are well aware that it is AGAINST OUR LAW FOR A JEW TO ASSOCIATE WITH OR VISIT A GENTILE. But God has shown me that I should not call anyone impure or unclean".

Acts 11:2-3 NLT: "But when Peter arrived back in Jerusalem, THE JEWISH BELIEVERS CRITICIZED HIM; "YOU ENTERED THE HOME OF THE GENTILES AND EVEN ATE WITH THEM!"

The fact that other Jewish believers in Christ criticized Peter on his arrival back to Jerusalem ON THE SAME ISSUE OF VISITING AND ASSOCIATING WITH GENTILES help us to know that Peter knew what he was saying when he said "YOU ARE WELL AWARE THAT IT IS AGAINST OUR LAW FOR A JEW TO ASSOCIATE WITH OR VISIT A GENTILE. (Acts 10:28).

Acts 11:19 NKJV: "Now those who were scattered after the persecution that arose over Stephen traveled as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, PREACHING THE WORD TO NO ONE BUT THE JEWS ONLY".

Galatians 2:7-9 NLT: "Instead, they saw that God had given me(Paul) the responsibility of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, just as he had given Peter the responsibility of PREACHING TO THE JEWS. For the same God who worked through Peter as the APOSTLE TO THE JEWS also worked through me(Paul) as the apostle to the Gentiles. In fact, James, Peter, and John, who were known as pillars of the church, recognized the gift God had given me, and they accepted Barnabas and me as their co-workers. They encouraged us to keep preaching to the Gentiles, WHILE THEY CONTINUED THEIR WORKS WITH THE JEWS."

Have you now seen that original apostles of Jesus did NOT really act on the first command of preaching to all the nations. The work of christianizing the Gentiles was MAJORLY carried out by Paul and his colleagues; not by the original apostles of Jesus Christ who spent most of their time in Jerusalem.

Some Christians want to argue that the reason why Peter said:"YOU ARE WELL AWARE THAT IT IS AGAINST OUR LAW FOR A JEW TO ASSOCIATE WITH OR VISIT A GENTILE(Acts 10:28)" is because Peter and other apostles find it difficult to discard the Jewish custom of not associating and visiting the Gentiles. However,the fact that Peter responded positively to that VISION and departed with those gentiles on the following day (see Acts 10:29) is an evidence that he never find it difficult to discard this Jewish custom. Again, it is not possible for the apostles and disciples of Jesus to give PREFERENCE for mere Jewish custom OVER a great and important command from their Master.

What actually preventing them was the command of "NOT PREACHING TO THE GENTILES" in Matthew 10:5-6 and the fact that Jesus told them CATEGORICALLY that he was sent ONLY to the lost sheep of the house of Israel(Matthew15:24).

What about the second command of baptizing in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy spirit ?

Again, see the evidence against this command;

Then peter said to them, repent, and let everyone of you be baptized in the NAME OF JESUS CHRIST for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38).

For as yet He had fallen upon none of them. They had only been baptized in the NAME OF THE LORD JESUS (Acts 8:16).

So peter ordered them to be baptized in the NAME OF JESUS the Messiah. Then they asked him to stay there for three days (Acts 10:48).

If "Matthew 28:19" is true and Jesus did command his apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, then why would apostles go against this command and baptize only in Jesus name ?

As you can see, the original apostles of Jesus did NOT act on the two great commands contained in Matthew 28:19.

Do you know the reason why ?

Matthew 28:19 and other verses like it DID NOT EVER COME OUT from Jesus'mouth.

Response #7:

Depending on the quality of your next response, it is very likely that I will not respond any further on this thread because the above suggests very strongly to me that you are intent on being dishonest perhaps in order to swindle Christians out of their faith and I cannot see how I will be able to discuss amicably with you in that spirit.

First, it is perfectly obvious from your own comment that Jesus DID IN FACT send His apostles and disciples to the rest of the world.

Second, it is perfectly obvious that these apostles and disciples DID IN FACT go to the rest of the world. Whether they did so reluctantly or enthusiastically, they DID GO IN FACT. And, if they did not go, it would not have changed the fact that the Lord Jesus sent them thereby confirming that while He was sent to the Jews and so were they during His earthly ministry, the goal in the end was for what Israel had been offered to spread to all the world.

Third, Paul's work only means that he was more enthusiastic about the Lord Jesus's commands than all the others were. That can hardly be a fault on his part. Would that all of us were.

Fourth, in Jesus Christ Himself, the fullness of God dwells bodily, so that baptism into Jesus Christ is baptism into the Trinity as a whole. There was no contradiction between what Peter said and what the Lord Jesus commanded.

Fifth, it is entirely your own fabrication that Matthew 28:19 is not part of the Bible. Obviously, as demonstrated above, it very much is. Furthermore, from Abraham through all the generations of Israel, it was constantly emphasized that God would bless the whole world through Israel, so there is no reason at all to imagine that the Lord Jesus was not intending to save the whole world or to have the Gospel preached all over the world. In fact, in the incident in the house of Simon the Pharisee, He announced that the story of the woman who broke an expensive box of perfume for Him would be told wherever the Gospel is proclaimed throughout the world.

Question #8:

3. The case of soldiers risking their lives on the battle field in order to save the lives of others from THE ENEMY is TOTALLY DIFFERENT from the case of a father who insist that his only righteous and beloved son MUST BE ACCURSED before he can forgive and ultimately save his adopted children from his OWN punishment; NOT from the punishment of the ENEMY.

Even if the son voluntarily decided to take up the CURSE, the father has every right to reject the offer because

it is totally IRRATIONAL for an innocent, righteous and beloved SON of a compassionate, lovely and merciful FATHER to be under the CURSE of the same father !!!

The God of the Bible, the alleged father of Jesus Christ, has been described in the same Bible as being compassionate, lovely and merciful (See Psalm 78:38, 145:8-9, Luke 6:36, 1 John 4:8 etc).

Similarly, Christians also agree that Jesus must be an innocent, righteous and beloved son .

Therefore, in order to avoid the IRRATIONALITY of putting such an innocent, righteous and beloved son under the CURSE of such a compassionate, lovely and merciful father, the conclusion that "Jesus did NOT die on the cross for our sins" must be perfectly true.

Even Paul knew very well that it is IRRATIONAL to believe that Jesus was ACCURSED by God. This is the reason why he contradicts himself by saying as follows;

"Therefore I want you to understand that NO ONE speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus accursed !" (1st Corinthians 12:3)

Yet the ONLY WAY for Jesus not to become "accursed" by God was for him NOT to die on the cross since it is clearly written in the the same Bible that ANYONE that is crucified is accursed by God (Deuteronomy 21:23, Galatians 3:13).

Response #8:

First, you offer no reason for why it is more rational for able-bodied men to go into battle and risk their lives for other people some of whom would be incredibly ungrateful for the sacrifice than for the Lord Jesus to sacrifice Himself for the sins of the world. So, I see no reason to accept this nebulous difference you insist on.

Second, obviously, there was no insistence on the Father's Part. The Father told the Lord Jesus to lay down His Life only willingly and take it up in a similar manner.

Third, God's Love means that He must protect that which He loves. His Justice means that He must not let any wrong-doing go unpunished or any righteousness go unrewarded. His compassion and mercy mean that He pities the weak and delivers them. Therefore, these things are consistent with His Offer of His One and Only Son to die in our behalf so that we are not destroyed for our sin. If His Son was willing, then He was going to take all of our sin and become responsible for it so that He would suffer the full punishment for sin to deliver us who were too weak to deliver our own selves. And because of this righteous act, His Son too is raised from the dead and given all authority over all creation as well as the Church and all Millennial Believers as His Reward. Thus, God's Love, Justice, Compassion, Righteousness and Mercy are all fully served with none left wanting at all. The Lord Jesus was not made the Sacrifice against His Will. And He was not left suffering forever for our sins.

Question #9:

4. It is VERY IMPORTANT for Jesus to foretell his appearance to Paul on the road to Damascus to the original apostles . See the reason below;

Before his ascension to heaven, Jesus said to his apostles ;

"Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying; I am the Christ; and shall deceive many (Matthew 24:4-5)...“Then if anyone says here is Christ or there, DO NOT BELIEVE IT. For false christs and false prophets will appear and perform great signs and wonders to deceive, if possibly, even the elect. See, I have told you ahead of time. So if anyone tells you; Christ is out in the wilderness, do not go out; or Christ is in the inner rooms, DO NOT BELIEVE IT. For as lightning that comes from the east is visible even in the west, so will be the coming of the son of Man. Wherever there is a carcass, then the vultures will gather(Matthew 24:23-28)”.

In these verses, we are commanded by Jesus not to believe any account of a person who claims to have seen Jesus in a private manner prior to his universally-visible appearance to all . Jesus was telling us that his returning to earth again from heaven will be clear and unmistakable to everyone. Every eye from every point “east and west” will see him. The people would gather to see Jesus coming from the heaven just like vultures gather over the carcass. Hence, any private appearances of Jesus before this public appearance should be discarded .Therefore, if Jesus’ private appearance to Paul in form of “a great light falling from heaven” would be an exception to this great warning of not believing in private appearances of Christ, then Jesus should have foretold this exceptional event to the original apostles before he ascended to heaven. But Jesus did not foretell anything like that. Instead of pre-informing the original apostles that he would privately appear to someone like “LIGHTNING FROM HEAVEN” before his universally-visible appearance to all, Jesus only informed them as follows;“I saw Satan falling like LIGHTNING FROM HEAVEN (Luke10:18)”.See how all evidence is working seriously against Paul! But is it really reasonable to believe that it was Satan, and not Jesus, that revealed himself to Paul in form of lightning from heaven? Yes, it is not only reasonable but also probable because as at that time Paul was yet to repent from all the evil crimes he has committed against the true followers of Christ (Acts 9:1, 26:11). In fact, his spiritual condition was so bad(1st Timothy 1:13) for anyone to be sure that he possessed nothing of divine power and divine wisdom that could have protected him from such satanic delusion. If the great light that appear to Paul was true Jesus Christ, then one would expect Jesus to command him to repent immediately and secretly meet the original apostles of Jesus who were then living at Jerusalem. On the contrary, Paul even continued to boast and proclaimed that these original apostles of Jesus imparted nothing to him (Galatians 2:6).

Response #9:

Your argument is false simply because Matthew 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21 all teach that the Lord Jesus was answering an eschatological question. That is, He was prophesying about the last few (seven, in fact) years before His Return to rule the world. Of course, even Stephen saw a vision of the Lord Jesus after this and nobody accuses him of being a false Christ, false prophet, false teacher or false believer.

Paul, on the other hand, was the 12th apostle chosen by the Lord Jesus to replace Judas Iscariot. The vote cast by the disciples before the Holy Spirit was given to the Church at Pentecost was not sanctified by the Lord, so Matthias was never the replacement.

Paul was chosen by the same Lord Jesus Who handpicked each apostle. No other apostle was voted into the office of the apostle. This is why he was granted to see the glorified Lord Jesus in his turn.

Question #10:

1. Let me try to explain it again for the last time;

Yes blue and green are different but not contradictory. But God's nature and human nature are not only different but also contradictory. For example, it is very clear that human being is NOT omnipresent. But God is omnipresent (Jeremiah 23:23-24). Therefore, this very unlimited nature of God directly CONTRADICT the limited nature of human being. Hence, these two contradictory natures cannot CO-EXIST SIDE BY SIDE in one person; one has to vacate for the other to stay . And if the two natures were to BLEND with each other, then this will lead to CHANGE and yet God's nature cannot be changed (Malachi 3:6). For this very reason, it is IMPOSSIBLE for Jesus to be both human and God at the same time.

In fact, when Jesus was praying to the Father, he said; "And this is eternal life, that they may know You, the ONLY TRUE God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent (John 17:3)" . If Jesus himself was referring to another person (i:e the Father) as the "ONLY true God" , then how could Jesus be God ? If Jesus did not use the word "ONLY", then hopefully the Christians may still want to argue that Jesus is also God just like his Father. However, the phrase "ONLY TRUE God" used by Jesus in reference to the father alone implies that apart from the father all others are FAKE.

Response #10:

By your logic, since Green is NOT Blue, the two are contradictory. This is obviously wrong. The two are NOT each other but they do not contradict each other either.

The law of contradiction is that nothing can be both A and not-A. On this we are both agreed.

But the issue is what differences are contradictory and what differences are not. Using your example, the human nature is obviously NOT omnipresent but it certainly does exist in space and is able to change locations. Omnipresence only means existence in all locations at the same time. The difference then is not one of quality but one of degrees. Human nature is limited in ability to inhabit locations where the divine is not. This is not a contradiction.

Question #11:

2. I have given you sufficient evidence (Acts 10:28, 11:2-3, 19, Galatians 2:7-9, James 1:1, Acts 2:38, 8:16 and 10:48) to show that apostles of Jesus did NOT carry out the two great commands contained in Matthew 28:19. Now if you insist that this Matthew 28:19 actually came out from Jesus' mouth, then you have to believe that God has chosen the WRONG PEOPLE to be the apostles of Jesus; the apostles who neglected the commands from their master.

Response #11:

You lie, sir/madam. Even by your own admission, they DID preach to Gentiles albeit reluctantly according to you. Peter's story with Cornelius is one of the most famous in Acts of the Apostles. Phillip's with the Ethiopian eunuch is another. There is no doubt that the apostles and disciples were reluctant to preach to Gentiles because they did not really get that God had decreed that the whole world would be saved. But it is a flat-out lie that they did not preach to Gentiles. They most certainly did.

Question #12:

3. It is very RATIONAL both in the sight of God and men for some one to risk his own life in an attempt to save the lives of others from the harm of the ENEMY. However, if there is alternative and easier way you can take to save the lives of others from the harm of the ENEMY or from the harm of YOUR OWN SELF, then it is highly IRRATIONAL for such a person to risk his own life or the life of his close relative.

You wrote that Justice of God means that He must not let any wrong-doing go unpunished.

But an act of wrong-doing is not a "TANGIBLE SUBSTANCE" you can just transfer from one guilty person to another innocent person. It is absolutely INSEPERABLE from the person that committed the act. For example, there is NO WAY you can punish the act of fornication WITHOUT punishing

the fornicators. There is NO WAY you can punish the act of theft WITHOUT punishing the thieves. Therefore, if the act of wrong-doing must always be punished as you claim , then it is the very people which committed the act that must be punished; not an innocent and righteous person. See the evidence directly from God's mouth;

"The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself. But if a wicked man TURNS (i:e REPENTS) from all his sins which he has committed, keeps all My statutes, and does what is lawful and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die. NONE OF THE TRANSGRESSIONS which he has committed shall be remembered against him; Because of the RIGHTEOUSNESS which he has done, HE SHALL LIVE. Do I have any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?" says the Lord God, "and not that he should TURN FROM HIS WAYS AND LIVE ? (Ezekiel 18:20-23).

As you can see from above, "repentance from our sinful deeds and engaging in the act of righteousness " is what we need to be saved. This is the rational and alternative way that God has chosen to ensure our salvation. THERE IS NO NEED FOR an innocent and righteous son to fall under the CURSE of his own lovely and merciful father before we can be saved.

Response #12:

First, if going to war to risk dying for ungrateful strangers is rational, then so is willingly choosing to die for those you love to save them from the consequences of their actions if possible.

Second, sin is rebellion, or better put, treason against God. It made us God's Enemies. And God became our Enemy too. His Justice cannot permit creature rebellion to go unpunished. This is why Jesus is called our Mediator or Go-between in the Bible. He made peace between us and God by accepting responsibility for all of our sin and being punished for all of it.

Third, perhaps what you consider as God in your mind is a completely different thing from the actual meaning of the word. A true God is not limited in ability. The Bible says both that the Lord Jesus "bore our sins in His Body" and that He "was made sin" for us. It said also that God did not desire sacrifice or offerings; rather, He made a Body for the Lord Jesus with which He was to fulfill His Mission. I see no reason to imagine that God could not have made Him carry literally all our sins in His Body. However that was made possible we don't need to know. It is enough that the Bible says that He did.

If you insist on the intangibility of sin and the impossibility of transfer, I must ask how debt is transferable or cancellable seeing as it too is truly intangible. Documents do nothing more than state the fact of the transfer or elimination of debt. If they are tangible enough for you, then you have no reason to object to God's Own Spiritual reckoning of these things.

Question #13:

4. However, the fact that Paul contradicts true Jesus on many important issues is even enough to prove that the revelation he claimed to receive was from fake Jesus Christ. For example, God and Jesus forbid the believers from eating spiritually unclean foods and meat sacrificed to idols (Ezekiel 22:26, Revelation 2:14) but Paul wrote that there is nothing wrong in eating such things as long as you do not eat them in the presence of a weak believer (1st Corinthians 8:8-10, Colossians 2:16). Again, Jesus' statement in Matthew 24:24 and Matthew 7:21-23 implies that; performing great signs and wonders in Jesus' name are the things that would accompany the false Christs and the false prophets. Yet Paul declares that performing great signs and wonders in Jesus' name are the things that even commissioned him as true apostle of Jesus Christ (2nd Corinthians 12:12, Romans 15:19). Furthermore, Jesus said: **DO NOT THINK I CAME TO DESTROY THE LAW or the (way of the) PROPHETS. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill. For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law till all is fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. (Matthew 5:17-19).**

Yet Paul declares as follows: "Christ is the end of the Law (Romans 10:4).

But BEFORE faith came, we were KEPT UNDER GUARD BY THE LAW, kept for the faith which afterward would be revealed. Therefore, THE LAW WAS OUR TUTOR to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But AFTER faith has come, WE ARE NO LONGER UNDER A TUTOR (Galatians 3:23-25).

Again, despite the fact that circumcision is an everlasting covenant of God for the Jews i.e the Israelites (Genesis 17:9-14) and Jesus himself was also circumcised (Luke 2:21); yet Paul went ahead to write as follows: "Indeed, I Paul say to you that if you become circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing. And I testify again to EVERY MAN who become circumcised that he is a debtor to keep the whole law. You have become estranged (i.e. cut off) from Christ, you who attempt to be justified by the law; you have fallen from grace (Galatians 5:2-4)". The term "EVERY MAN" used by Paul in the verse quoted above is indisputable evidence that he condemned the act of circumcision for both Jews and Gentiles. If this is not the case, then the Jewish believers in the Jerusalem would not bound themselves with oath that they will never eat nor drink until they kill Paul (Acts 23:12-14). In fact, this single fact alone that Paul condemn the act of circumcision, an EVERLASTING

covenant of God, is another prove that “the great light from heaven” that appeared to Paul on his road to Damascus was a false Christ as already foretold by Jesus Christ during his earthly ministry.

Furthermore, Bible recorded that the number of Jesus apostles was somehow fixed to be twelve (Matthew 10:2-7, 19:28, Revelation 21:14). Therefore, when Judas Iscariot fell out and there was need for replacement and restoration of original twelve, then one would expect the divine plan to unfold in such a way that original apostles would be pre-informed by Jesus to exercise patience and wait till Paul repents. But instead of waiting for Paul, Matthias was chosen to replace Judas under the guidance of Holy Spirit (Acts 1:20-26). This proves again that apostleship of Paul was not even recognized in heaven. Yet Paul repeatedly called himself an apostle of true Jesus Christ at the beginning of most of his letters. The most astonishing part of Paul and his assertion of being among the apostle of Christ is that, unlike other writers, he almost never quotes Jesus in any of his letters. Yet this is expected from Paul if truly the light he saw falling from heaven was true Jesus Christ.

Paul was also caught lying red handed; he was accused of teaching all the Jews among the Gentiles to forsake circumcision and the Law of Moses (Acts 21:18-31). But instead of proving this accusation to be true or false when the King Agrippa asked him about that accusation, Paul now claimed that he was being accused for the hope of the promise made by God i.e. the resurrection of the dead (Acts 26:1-8) and for the fact that he advised people to repent and turn to God (Acts 26:19-21). There is nothing like “circumcision and the law of Moses” in the answers presented by Paul to the King. In fact, Paul himself admitted to be a liar when he said: “For if the truth of God has increased through MY LIE to His glory, why am I also still judged as a sinner (Romans 3:7)”.

Yet the same Paul wrote almost half of the books found in the New Testament. See the foundation upon which the edifice of Christianity is erected!

Response #13:

Paul NEVER contradicted Jesus Christ.

i. The Lord Jesus actually declared all foods clean when He said that everything that is eaten goes through the body and is eliminated but what comes out of the heart is really what defiles us.

ii. If we take that to be true, then every single apostle and evangelist and believer who did miracles in Acts of the Apostles was a false Christ and false prophet. That would include Peter and John. But we know that in Matthew 24, the Lord Jesus was referring to the Tribulation. In Matthew 7, the Lord Jesus was speaking of people who deceived themselves with make-believe miracles and sorcery. Clearly, the Lord Jesus gave the disciples power to perform miracles when He sent them out two by two and in groups multiple times. So, in no way can it be said that Paul was a false Christ

or false prophet just because he performed miracles. And he was exactly right that the stamp of his authority as a member of the Twelve was the miracles he did and the things he suffered.

iii. The Law was perfectly fulfilled by the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross. Therefore, it was removed by that Sacrifice just as the Lord Jesus pretty much said (:the Law would only pass away after it had been fulfilled). So, Paul was directly in line with the Lord Jesus.

iv. The Lord Jesus told the Samaritan woman that the time would come when the worship of God would be in spirit and in truth so that the religious system of the Jews including circumcision would become irrelevant to true worship of the true God. Paul was therefore agreeing with Christ again there.

v. There is absolutely no reason why the Lord would pre-inform the apostles of anything. There is no evidence that He informed any of them that there would be other apostles as He selected them in their own turn. It was neither their business nor in particular ours. Ours is to know that He has chosen and who He chose if He is pleased to tell us His Choice.

vi. On your comment on Matthias, read my last post again. The Spirit was given in chapter 2 and the vote occurred in chapter 1. Additionally, no apostle was ever elected except for Matthias. Each one was specifically chosen and personally called by the Lord Jesus just as Paul was.

vii. Paul quoted Jesus about the Communion when he was warning the Corinthians about the terrible judgment associated with receiving it unworthily.

viii. It is you who lie. Paul stated the real reason why he was being persecuted. It had far less to do with circumcision and the law since they arrested him fulfilling a vow according to the Law and helping some other men at his own expense to do the same than it had to do with his proclaiming the resurrection of Jesus Christ Whom the Jews hated with a violence.

ix. Paul never admitted to being a liar. He simply offered a hypothetical about an unbeliever who is trying to justify himself by claiming that God cannot condemn him if his sin only served to further God's Plans. You are an incredible liar, sir/madam.

My answers right now are quite rushed but I am confident that they are correct. I just wish I could make more time to actually give you harder ones. You are a very dishonest person. You clearly know what a Bible is and you can read it. Why then you pick and choose things in it and completely ignore others that do not serve your agenda can only be explained by an inveterate dishonesty that is determined to destroy faith in Jesus Christ by any means necessary.

Question #14:

Please I Need Trinitarians To Explain Hebrews 1:1-3 For Me:

Hebrews 1:1-3 New International Version (NIV)

1 In the past God spoke to our ancestors through the prophets at many times and in various ways, 2. but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, and through whom also he made the universe. 3. The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven. Hebrews 1:1-3 New International Version (NIV)

Response #14:

Hi. Your profile suggests that you are a Jehovah's Witness, so you are almost certainly just looking for an argument to prove that your position that Jesus Christ is not God is true.

I think that such a conversation would be a waste of time and energy, but in the event that you may be willing to consider that your position may be wrong, and also for the sake of other readers, I will answer you.

To begin, the three verses say that God the Father Who once communicated to human beings through human intermediaries called prophets has now given us His Last Word, so to speak, through His Son Who is such a perfect representation of Him as to seal up all His Communication to man.

When this Son of His had fulfilled His Mission to purify human beings from their sins, He was received back into Heaven to sit down at the Father's Right Hand.

Now, I would like to add a bit more of that chapter for useful context:

[6]And when He again brings the firstborn into the world, He says, "And let all the angels of God worship Him."

[7]And of the angels He says, "Who makes His angels winds, And His ministers a flame of fire."

[8]But of the Son He says, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, And the righteous scepter is the scepter of His kingdom."

[9]"You have loved righteousness and hated lawlessness; Therefore God, Your God, has anointed You With the oil of gladness above Your companions."

[10]And, "You, Lord, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, And the heavens are the works of Your hands;

[11]They will perish, but You remain; And they all will become old like a garment,

[12]And like a mantle You will roll them up; Like a garment they will also be changed. But You are the same, And Your years will not come to an end."

Hebrews 1:6-12 NASB

As you can see, the angels are commanded by the Father to worship the Son (v.6). Since only God must be worshipped, this is a clear Scriptural witness to the Deity of the Son.

You can also see that the Son is being contrasted with the angels here (vv.7-8), so that it makes no sense to think that He is or was ever one of them.

You should also note that from verses 8 to 12, God the Father Who is the Subject of Hebrews 1 is addressing the Son as God and speaking of His timelessness and eternity as well as His absolute superiority to all the created universe.

These things are only a drop in the bucket of staggering Scriptural evidence of the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ of Nazareth.

Question #15:

Hi. I would rather consider this as deliberations rather than arguments, and I don't think it's a waste of time to deliberate over an important issue as this. I know that our deliberations will make some to see the truth.

I'm a non-trinitarian and we believe, even as the Bible teaches that there is one God - YHWH and one lord (and son of God), who is the mediator between God and man - Jesus. At the heart of the trinity doctrine is the logic that the father and the son are ontologically divided ie. they are two separate and equal beings. None greater or less than each other, each said to be God.

Its clear that the text here in Hebrew 1:1-3 disagrees with the views of trinitarians.

Hebrews 1:1 Starts off with: "Long ago God spoke to our forefathers by means of the prophets on many occasions and in many ways. 2. Now at the end of these days he has spoken to us by means of a son..."

The God here is clearly the father, because it's talking about his son. And the God spoken of here is the one who spoke long ago on many occasions in many ways through the prophets and in these last days, we're talking about the father - Everytime you see God speaking, it's the father according to this text.

Verse 3 continues: He(the son) is the reflection of his (God's) glory and the exact representation of his very being...

According to verse 3, Jesus Christ is a representation (copy) of God's being, he is not of the same being. This is an irrefutable text, there are no grammatical problems, there are no semantic difficulties, really there's no other way to interpret this text.

God is not a representation (copy) of anyone's being, but there is someone who is a representation (copy) of his being - Jesus Christ.

Response #15:

You have free will, so you are free to call things whatever you want, even if that is not what they are, and to believe whatever you want, even if what you believe is not true. For these choices, there will be rewards and consequences from the Lord God, not from me.

First, the Bible does not teach what you claim. I already demonstrated that with Hebrews 1:8-12.

Second, the Doctrine of the Trinity does not hold that the Father and the Son are two separate **beings**, rather it holds that they are two separate **Persons** Who are **One in essence**. As One God then, neither is greater or less than the other.

As for Hebrews 1:1-3, if it is clear that that part of the Bible disagrees with the Doctrine of the Trinity, then your arguments will show how it does.

As for the notion that the God Who is being spoken of here is the Father, I don't see how we are in disagreement. I did say the very same thing. That the Father has always spoken through representatives, human and angelic, is borne out through all the Scriptures.

As for the Lord Jesus not being the Father (you yourself said that the Person being spoken of as God here is the Father), that is precisely what the Doctrine of the Trinity teaches. They are not the same Person. The Father is a separate Person from the Son, as I already said, and the Son is His Representative to us. This does not in any way mean that the Son is not God too. As you said, it only means that He is not the Father.

That is why I brought up the rest of the chapter. In verses 8-12, I can't begin to see how it is not clear that although the Son is not the Father, He is quite completely God just as the Father is too.

Question #16:

A lot of different interpretations of the trinity these days....But let's go with the version you've presented - The father and son are not two separate beings. They are the same being but separate persons.

I don't still understand why the Bible will imply 2 beings when talking about the father and son by saying: "He (son) is the exact representation of his (father) very being."

According to modern dictionaries every human creature is a human being because he exists. Every person is a being because he exists. The word "being" simply means "to be in existence." Based on this I cannot see how the son and the father can be 2 persons but one being.

This is my major objection to Trinitarianism. It depends on a distinction between "person" and "being" that is not articulated in Scripture.

Also i believe that one of the biggest problems with the orthodox doctrine of Christ is that it is unintelligible and results in a person who is both A and non-A at the same time.

We are told that the incarnate Christ was/is both "fully God" and "fully man". As one who is "fully God" he is said to be omniscient, all-powerful, and omnipresent, yet as one who is "fully man" he would have to be limited in knowledge, power, and location. To say that a person can have all of these attributes at the same time is not just to utter something unintelligible, it is to affirm that which would normally be considered impossible. The sentence "Jesus is all-knowing yet limited in knowledge" appears to have the same logical content as the sentence "Bob is a murderer who's never killed anyone" or "Joe is a football player who's never played football."

Non-Trinitarians such as myself and others don't necessarily reject the idea of believing in something that one might call "mysterious" but we have a problem believing in that which is logically impossible. Well, reason is part of the image of God that he stamped upon us to enable us

to determine what is true and what is not true, and I can't imagine why we'd discard that attribute when asking the most important question of all: Who/what is God?

Response #16:

"Trinity" is only a word we use to label a concept that you find when you read the Bible, it isn't some kind of ideological or philosophical construct that needs to be interpreted. In a sense, you can say that it is an interpretation of the Bible. So, when you say that there are "a lot of different interpretations of the trinity these days," you demonstrate a very poor understanding of the mechanics at play here.

As for what the Bible is implying, your own words are your answer. It is you who claim that the Bible implies something. It does not actually say any such thing. You are merely interpreting it that way. Whether your interpretation is accurate remains to be seen. As for the quote, as I already said, it is clear that Hebrews sees the Father and the Son as two separate Persons. It is also rather obvious that Hebrews reports that the Father regards the Son as God. And we know that God is One, not two, from elsewhere in the Bible. Therefore, we must conclude that Hebrews teaches that Father and Son, though separate Persons, are one God and, therefore, One in essence, since God is One.

As for your appeal to modern dictionaries, I'm not sure that any dictionary makes such an argument, but you are right about the fact that a human person is a single being alone. Multiple human persons do not become one being. That is common sense. But it is also common sense that human beings and other creatures are most certainly not God. For one thing, God is not "*a*" being. God is Being or Existence itself. That is what His Name YHVH or YHWH means. He is the "**IS**". Thus, He cannot be a multiple. He is the Infinite One. And in the One Infinite, there are Three Persons, according to the Bible. That there are multiple Persons Who are One in essence is obviously not in the experience of creatures, but that is not a logical problem. It is perfectly logical to expect God Who is Existence itself to be fundamentally different from the things which He caused to exist.

As for a Scriptural distinction between "person" and "being," rest assured that the Bible does teach both that there is one God and that there are multiple Persons Who are each God. I already showed you this in the Hebrews 1:8-12 reference. This is how the Scriptures teach this:

In Deuteronomy 6:4, the Scripture says:

[4]"Hear, O Israel! The Lord is our God, the Lord is one!

Deuteronomy 6:4 NASB

So, we know that there is only one God.

In John 20:17, the Scripture says:

[17]Jesus said to her, "Stop clinging to Me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to My brethren and say to them, 'I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God.'"

John 20:17 NASB

And in John 8:54, it also says:

[54]Jesus answered, "If I glorify Myself, My glory is nothing; it is My Father who glorifies Me, of whom you say, 'He is our God';

John 8:54 NASB

So, we know that the Father is God.

In Hebrews 1:6, 8-12, the Scripture says again:

[6]And when He again brings the firstborn into the world, He says, "And let all the angels of God worship Him."

[8]But of the Son He says, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, And the righteous scepter is the scepter of His kingdom."

[9]"You have loved righteousness and hated lawlessness; Therefore God, Your God, has anointed You With the oil of gladness above Your companions."

[10]And, "You, Lord, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, And the heavens are the works of Your hands;

[11]They will perish, but You remain; And they all will become old like a garment,

[12]And like a mantle You will roll them up; Like a garment they will also be changed. But You are the same, And Your years will not come to an end."

Hebrews 1:6,8-12 NASB

So, we know that the Son is God too.

And in 2 Corinthians 3:17, the Scriptures says as well:

[17]Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

2 Corinthians 3:17 NASB

Since the Greek word κύριος, which is translated "Lord" here, is used to translate the Tetragrammaton, that is, the Name YHVH/YHWH, in the New Testament, we know from here that the Holy Spirit is God too.

The logical conclusion then is that although there is One God alone, there are Three Persons identified as God in the Bible.

As to whether they are separate, the Scripture says:

[16]I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Helper, that He may be with you forever;

[17]that is the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it does not see Him or know Him, but you know Him because He abides with you and will be in you.

John 14:16-17 NASB

So, we know that the Scripture teaches that there are three separate Persons Who each are fully God in their Own Right but Who together are the One God.

This teaching is what is dubbed the Doctrine of the Trinity.

As for intelligibility, that is really not the Bible's problem. Those who submit to the Bible's authority come to understand it just fine. The problem is when one comes to the Bible to dictate to it what it may or may not say. That is actually the difference between me and you here. I go to the Bible to learn how to think and how things must be understood, but it seems obvious to me that you go to the Bible with a list of demands that it must meet so that it will be believed by you. It is intelligible to me that God is different from me, and from other creatures. I don't mind that. It doesn't bother, concern, or worry me. I'm happy being a lowly creature who is incapable of existing as God does. So, I accept the loftiness of His Existence as fundamentally different from mine, and I worship Him for it.

As for the law of non-contradiction, you misunderstand the issue of A and not-A. "Not-A" does not mean "anything apart from A." It is a philosophical construct used to say "opposite to A." That is, although blue is "not-green," in a colloquial manner of speaking, in philosophy, blue is not "not-green," because green is not opposite to blue. They are only different colors, not opposite phenomena or ideas. An example of an A/Not-A pair would be light/darkness. Another would be good/evil. Yet another would be be/not-be OR exists/does-not-exist.

So, the question is whether human nature is opposite to Divine nature. I think the answer is obviously no. The opposite of Omnipresence, the characteristic of being unlimited by space, for example, is not limitation by space. Localization of presence is a matter of degree, not contrast. The opposite of being able to exist everywhere at once is total absence from anywhere at all. That is, the opposite to Omnipresence is complete inexistence. Likewise, the opposite to Omniscience is not limited knowledge, it is total ignorance. And so on.

So, there is no contradiction between the Divine Nature and the Human. The human one is merely a far inferior one to the Divine one. Incidentally, that was the point of the Sacrifice of the Lord Jesus:

[3]Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind regard one another as more important than yourselves;

[4]do not merely look out for your own personal interests, but also for the interests of others.

[5]Have this attitude in yourselves which was also in Christ Jesus,

[6]who, ***although He existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped,***

[7]but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, and being made in the likeness of men.

[8]Being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross.

[9]For this reason also, God highly exalted Him, and bestowed on Him the name which is above every name,

[10]so that at the name of Jesus every knee will bow, of those who are in heaven and on earth and under the earth,

[11]and that every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Philippians 2:3-11 NASB

That is, the great God loved us enough to humble Himself and become a mere human like us so that He could suffer death - an ignobility to which He was never susceptible - for us so that we could be saved from eternal punishment for our sins. That is a huge deal. This is what Paul says here that we should try to model after. We are to love others enough to humble ourselves too to look out for them, just like the Lord Jesus did for us. Of course, none of us can hope to do what He did, but you get the idea.

In other words, to become Man does not negate Deity, but it would require the "voiding" or "emptying" of Deity that the Lord Jesus had to do to suffer for us. See verse 7 above. Because Deity is so much greater and so much better than Humanity, the Lord Jesus had to impose something theologically called ***kenosis*** upon Himself, or else He would never have been able to live like a human or die like one. In fact, the term is derived from the Greek that is translated "emptied" in verse 7 above.

So, this is not a contradiction like "Bob is a murderer who has never killed anyone." Rather it is of the same logical category as "The King dressed up like a peasant and went to live in a village as a poor farmer for a season." It is both possible and logical. The king would simply refuse to use his privileges and rights as a king in order to pull it off. Being a peasant for a while is not opposite to being the king, although obviously both are not the same.