



CARM.ORG - Christian Discussion Forums > RELIGIONS > Jehovah's Witnesses
How can Jesus be worshiped if only a "god"?

Welcome, tkkclark.
You last visited: 1 Hour Ago at 06:19 AM
Instant Messages: Unread 0, Total 0.

User CP FAQ **Donate** Members List Calendar New Posts Search ▾ Quick Links ▾ Log Out



Page 9 of 26 << First < 5 6 7 8 **9** 10 11 12 13 19 > Last >> ▾

Thread Tools ▾ Search this Thread ▾ Rating: ★★★★★ ▾ Display Modes ▾

08-27-2006

#161

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Alberta, Canada
Gender: ♂
Posts: 1,005
57 Reputation Points



Paul distinguishes between the Father as the primary source (ex hou) of the all things and the Son as the intermediate agent as here (di' hou)."

I don't understand Greek , but I will research more on the subject.

When the Bible says that God created the heaven and the earth in Genesis, why didn't it say that God created the heavens and the earth through His Son? Also it would mean that God needed help creating right? The only way this would make sense is that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are all the one God.



08-27-2006

#162

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Allan 747**
Paul distinguishes between the Father as the primary source (ex hou) of the all things and the Son as the intermediate agent as here (di' hou)."

I don't understand Greek , but I will research more on the subject.

When the Bible says that God created the heaven and the earth in Genesis, why didn't it say that God created the heavens and the earth through His Son? Also it would mean that God needed help creating right? The only way this would make sense is that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are all the one God.

Genesis doesn't tell us how he did it, it only tells us that he did it. It would not mean that he needed help, but that he wanted his Son to have some role out of his own love for that son. It makes perfect sense without them being one God, and in fact the notion of them being such is not Biblical anyway!



08-27-2006

#163

mondo

501-1000 Posts



Quote:

Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 816
 13 Reputation Points

Originally Posted by **Allan 747**

*[John 1:3](#) **All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.***

Is Jesus a thing? Thats what WT would have you believe.

God is a "thing" too, but technically it doesn't say "thing" in the text. That is added to make it read better in English. It just says "all" in Greek.



08-27-2006

#164

dumotel

Member

Join Date: May 2006
 Posts: 481
 18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

Genesis doesn't tell us how he did it, it only tells us that he did it. It would not mean that he needed help, but that he wanted his Son to have some role out of his own love for that son. It makes perfect sense without them being one God, and in fact the notion of them being such is not Biblical anyway!

Sorry for butting in with perhaps a seemingly shallow contribution, but the notion of more than one real god isn't biblical either.

Even when I hypothesise for understanding's sake, that the Word was A god, it still leads me back to the Word being God. Why? Because "the Word was with God" shows co-existence from all time. There's nothing to suggest to me that the Word came after God. Either the Word was God, or no god at all. I genuinely, sincerely can't bring myself to accept the 'a god' translation meaning another god (whether mighty or not), since Jehovah Himself says there's no other (true god) before or after Him. I have really tried very hard to understand the JW doctrine. I had nothing to lose but all to gain from trying to understand, and I'm still trying, but failing miserably at each attempt.

Du

- Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. **1 John 4:1**



08-27-2006

#165

katierussell

Member

Join Date: May 2006
 Posts: 1,481
 16 Reputation Points

Yes, I did respond albiet to the first one you gave [Matthew 19:6](#). It was enough to show me you still did not have any grasp what is the grammar and sentence structure of [John 1:1c](#) and why theos can be indefinite. Go read my showing you why your [Matthew 19:6](#) did not parallel [John 1:1c](#). This is which I wrote:

Quote:

Lets take the first one you offer to begin with.

Unfortunately Tim theos is indeed nominative but it is preceded by the Greek article. It is articular. This is not what we have at [John 1:1c](#) where

theos is anarthrous, without the article. Also at [Matthew 19:6](#) theos is the subject not the predicate whereas theos of [John 1:1c](#) is in the predicate.

So when you cited [Matthew 19:6](#) you could hardly have got another peice of Greek that was more different!

Everyone watching you Tim would have grasped that theos of [John 1:1c](#) was a singular anarthrous predicate nominative preceding the verb. You were told that over and over again. But now you say when you give us all nouns before a verb that "but now you want more than that, a perfect match." No, I have never moved ground and wanted "more."! You simply can't get it can you! It has always been the case that the basis for the indefinite rendering of [John 1:1c](#) is because its being a singular anarthrous predicate theos preceding the verb(as well as its context of course). Just admit Tim that what you thought of as "more" was already on the table.

And as for Robert not being "here"! He has visited the board many times since I posted a rebutal of his and he has seemingly not wished to reply. His choice but it means his mistakes have not been acknowledged or my post rebutted.

Last edited by katierussell : 08-27-2006 at 03:07 AM.



08-27-2006

#166

Allan 747

Inactive

Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Alberta, Canada
Gender:
Posts: 1,005
 57 Reputation Points



Good point Du; You are right there is nothing that suggest that the Word was created.



08-27-2006

#167

katierussell

Member

Join Date: May 2006
Posts: 1,481
 16 Reputation Points



First, I would have thought you would have realized a made a typo and meant "Bible"!
Second, though you may well have read several Bible translations you are still reading translations and I bet all of them produced by those of the same theological persuasions, trinitarians. The NWT is not the only one to consider theos of [John 1;1c](#) as indefinite. Its good you look at the original Greek at times. Yes, many JW's do some deep research into translational issues such as we are discussing here re [John 1:1](#). But when you say "But honestly when talk of the third participate verb subjugated from the particle predivative subverb and such comes up my brain hurts, and I made good grades in english in school" then why look at the original Greek? What do you see there but cases, subjects, predicates, anarthrous and articular nouns etc? Just looking at the Greek will not tell you what grammatical rules there are in the Greek.
Yet I agree with you when you write: " I don't think God made the Bible so complex you had to have a PhD in ancient languages to understand his word." This is why context plays an important part in deciding how to understand a scripture. In [John 1;1c](#) we are told that the Word was "with God." This "God" is undoubtedly the God of the OT, Jehovah. The Word was with Jehovah, not that the Word was Jehovah. Then we are told that the Word was "theos." If this means the Word was "God" it would make the Word the God who he was said to be "with." But any honest person should be able to admit that a being with

another being is not going to be that being as well. But as John wrote in terms of theos, a word that means either God or god, then the second is is demanded lest we have the Word the God he is with, and lest we read our pre-conceptions about God into John's 1st century writing which says absolutely nothing here of three persons making up one God.



08-27-2006

#168

[dumotel](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006
Posts: 481
18 Reputation Points



Hello Katie!

If it's of any worth, just letting you know that I had no preconceptions before my relatively recent undertaking of understanding the Bible. I never really bothered to ever think about what 'position' Jesus held in relation to the Father. Before I actually read the Bible, and looking in retrospect, I actually believed pretty much what you do; i.e that God is the Father, and Jesus the Son; that the Son was not God. I never discussed or delved or even wondered about anything. It was just in my mind that Jesus was someone *really* special and holy etc because He is God's son, nothing else. As for what I thought the Word was, I actually didn't think about it at all. I just thought the Bible was nice to have in the house, as lame as that is. Any quoted scripture I came across by chance in everyday life (not much at all), I brushed off as technical details that religious nuts involved themselves with.

After I finally opened the Bible to read it, and not just dust the cover as I did every so often, I discovered amazing things. The triune God hit me in the face like a ton of bricks. To show you my ignorance/innocence whatever you want to call it, I didn't even know about this triune God business. I of course had heard of the Trinity, being Father, Son, Holy Spirit, but I *didn't* know it meant a triune God. I just thought it was 2 persons and God's force/energy (the Holy Spirit) that were supposed to be considered holy. That's it! That's all the baggage I had when I started reading the Bible. I had no specific doctrine to question, I had nothing. The days I used to go to church as a kid, I never paid attention because the service was in biblical Greek and so it might as well have been Chinese for me. My church attendance (limited to say the least) had no effect on me as far as the Trinity goes. All I knew was there's God, there's His Son, and a Holy Spirit that I knew came from God. I knew God sent His Son to die for us, but embarassing as it is to admit, that's pretty much all I knew.

The reason I'm telling you all this, is so that you don't think any trinitarian belief I share is based on an indoctrinated preconception.

sincerely,

Du



- Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. **1 John 4:1**



08-27-2006

#169


[Toejamken](#)

Junior Member



Join Date: Jul 2006
 Location: NW Florida
 Posts: 89
 ■ 16 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell** 
There are good grounds for the "a god" translation. You must judge those grounds not on who or who not rejects them. You must judge the reasons for it or against it. Don't get caught up in this 'qualification's' thing.

Hi Katie,

There are no good grounds for the "a god" translation. I reject that statement based on the fact it would contradict what has been previously written and understood in the Old Testament. Jesus Christ cannot be "a god" because of what is written in [Isaiah 43:10,11](#): "Before Me there was no God formed, And there will be none after Me. I, even I, am the LORD, And there is no savior besides Me." This passage clearly excludes the possibility of the "a god" translation. Other verses also reinforce the impossibility of the "a god" translation:

"See now that I, I am He, And there is no god besides Me." ([Deuteronomy 32:39](#); See also: [Isaiah 42:8](#); 44:6,7,8,24; 45:5,14,21,22; 46:9)

I'm no Greek scholar, but I understand the importance of qualifications when it comes to the ability to translate from one language into another. If I was an ambassador to Saudi Arabia, I wouldn't want an amateur in Arabic translating for me. Would you choose to fly in an aircraft if the pilot wasn't qualified? Would you want an unqualified guide in a country where you didn't speak the native tongue? You are energetically trying to interject the JW translation among commentary from experts who say the "a god" translation has no merit. You may be well read on the subject matter, but unless you have the qualifications you're not a translator.

DR. PHILIP B. HARNER of Heidelberg College: "The verb preceding an anarthrous predicate, would probably mean that the LOGOS was 'a god' or a divine being of some kind, belonging to the general category of THEOS but a distinct being from HO THEOS. In the form the John actually uses, the word THEOS is placed at the beginning for emphasis [thus ruling out the 'a god' translation]."

(from Grieshaber, Erich, and Jean Grieshaber. "Mistranslations," *Redi-Answers on Jehovah's Witness Doctrine*. Blue Letter Bible. 1 Jul 2002. 27 Aug 2006. < <http://blueletterbible.org/study/cul...d/rajwd24.html> >)

The order in which the phrase is constructed rules out the "a god" translation. So "ruling out" means there are no "good grounds" for the "a god" translation. This is based on the reasons of qualified experts (not only Harner) of which none are members of the Watchtower.

"For not even the Father judges anyone, but He has given all judgment to the Son, so that all will honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent Him. Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears My word, and believes Him who sent Me, has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed out of death into life."

Jesus died for me, and I would not know love apart from His sacrifice.

Ken



08-27-2006

#170

[Toejamken](#)



Junior Member

Join Date: Jul 2006
Location: NW Florida
Posts: 89
■ 16 Reputation Points

Hello Mondo,

quote:

It would not mean that he needed help, but that he wanted his Son to have some role out of his own love for that son.

My response:

Your statement is an opinion, and I don't see it as being Biblical either. In [Isaiah 44:24](#) we read:

I, the LORD, am the maker of all things,
Stretching out the heavens by Myself
And spreading out the earth all alone,

If Yahweh did it by Himself and all alone, [John 1:1](#) obviously means more than what those of the Watchtower teach.

We also read in [Isaiah 43:10-11](#):

Before Me there was no God formed,
And there will be none after Me.
I, even I, am the LORD,
And there is no savior besides Me.

The "a god" translation is excluded by this statement.

According to [John 1:1](#) the Word has existed before "the beginning." [Isaiah 43:10](#) reinforces that He is without beginning and not a creation. Compare:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,"

"Before Me there was no God formed, And there will be none after Me."

Jesus is the way, the truth, the life, and the only way to God.

Ken



08-27-2006

#171

[Toejamken](#)

Junior Member

Join Date: Jul 2006
Location: NW Florida
Posts: 89
■ 16 Reputation Points



Hi Katie,

Quote:

If this means the Word was "God" it would make the Word the God who he was said to be "with." But any honest person should be able to admit that a being with another being is not going to be that being as well. But as John wrote in terms of theos, a word that means either God or god, then the second is is demanded lest we have the Word the God he is with, and lest we read our pre-conceptions about God into John's 1st century writing which says absolutely nothing here of three persons making up one God.

My response:

The Word of God overrules your reasoning. Jesus Christ cannot be "a god" because of what is written in [Isaiah 43:10-11](#) : "Before Me there was no God formed, And there will be none after Me. I, even I, am the LORD, And there is no savior besides Me." This passage clearly excludes the possibility of the "a god" translation. Other verses also reinforce the impossibility of the "a god"

translation:

"See now that I, I am He, And there is no god besides Me." ([Deuteronomy 32:39](#); See also: [Isaiah 42:8](#); 44:6,7,8,24; 45:5,14,21,22; 46:9)

This passage also excludes the possibility of the Word being created.

Ken

Last edited by Toejamken : 08-27-2006 at 06:16 AM. Reason: separate my response from Katie's quote



08-27-2006

#172

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006
Posts: 1,481
16 Reputation Points



No, you simply misunderstand Is.43:10-11. There Jehovah is saying there are no gods that are independant from him. In truth the gods of the surrounding nations are a unreality. But the "Word" being "a god" in [John 1:1](#) is not a god that is independant from Jehovah nor is his godship an unreality. Hence, one can not use Is.43:10 against a translation that is both grammatically and contextually the best translation.



08-27-2006

#173

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006
Posts: 1,481
16 Reputation Points



You are wrong to assert there are no good grounds for the "a god" translation. Grammatically there are excellent reasons why it is the best. There are in fact no grammatical 'rules' that can deny such a translation. And of course the context is against the "was God" translation.
As for Is.43:10 I have already responded to your citing this against the "a god" translation. You have simply misunderstood it, and [John 1:1c](#), and ripped it out of it's context.
Once again, we see that you are caught up with qualifications and credentials. The "a god" translation is not based on "amateurish" grounds but on verifiable grammatical grounds.
You next quote Harner. What he says is OK, but I see nothing there in that quote that shows that a singular predicate nominative preceding the verb can not be indefinite! As there are other PNVs that have been translated indefinitely, then it may well be John placed the PN before the verb for emphasis but I do not see how that means it then can not be indefinite also! As I said, the word order John used certainly does not "rule out" the "a god" translation any more than in other places where the exact word order occurs rules those out as being indefinite. The NWT 1984 Reference Edition cites some examples and then how they have been translated. They have been translated with the English indefinite article. I have no idea who put "thus ruling out" in your above quote but whoever did has obviously misled you. And I do believe that Harner argued against the anathrous theos of [John 1;1c](#) as definite. But as the translation of "and the Word was God" is a definite translation of theos then you have successfully quoted a scholar who is against understanding it to say "and the Word was God." 😊



08-27-2006

#174

[dumotel](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006



Katie,

Posts: 481
18 Reputation Points

No gods independent of Jehovah? I can only see Jehovah saying there are no other gods, period. That makes all other gods, regardless of who they are, or how they came to be worshipped, false gods. For example, Satan is the god of the present system of things; but does this make Satan a true god? Does Jehovah recognise Satan as another real god, or just as a creature who has mustered some kind of ruling and subsequent worship?

Either the Word has true godship or the Word doesn't. The only way that the Word can have true godship, and for this godship to harmonise with the Bible's monotheistic teaching, is by the Word sharing the godship with Jehovah.

You said it yourself Katie, the Word is not a god independent of Jehovah. Hence, I keep coming back to the Bible's strict monotheistic teaching. If the Word is a god, the Word can only be a part of what constitutes the one true God. Any other way promotes polytheism.

Unless it tires you out, I'm genuinely willing to listen to as many explanations as possible and consider them. So far however, I've seen nothing compelling enough to sway me. Of course you are not obligated to keep trying to convince me that my understanding is flawed, but do know that I am genuine in my attempts to understand you, just in case I actually do find I've been wrong. I hope that makes sense. If not.. perhaps I'll write better in the morning.

Du

- Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. **1 John 4:1**



08-27-2006

#175

tkkclark

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Mondo, good to see you back!

Otherwise (i.e. completely undirected at Mondo, but addressed generically to all)...

If the "a god" translation is as grammatically proper/demanded as the WTS and JWs have insisted right here on this thread, why is it no credible Greek/NT scholar agrees with the NWT? I once read through a loooooooooooooong list of quotations from scholars specifically and vehemently condemning the NWT of [John 1:1](#), including quotations from the very scholars the WTS quotes to support their "a god" position.

I don't know Greek so I depend on authorities who do know Greek. These scholars uniformly state that the "a god" translation is abominable. If the "a god" position is at all credible, why the lack of scholarly support?

Mayhap a conspiracy?

snort

You can babble on about prevarable whatchamacallits all you want, but as for my grasping what you're saying...Well, you might as well try dilligently explaining the laws of physics to a three-toed sloth. No idea what you're talking

about, no interest in trying to figure out what in the world you're talking about (sorry, but my study time is limited to an entirely different subject at the moment). But I betcha those Greek scholars have heard of your prevarable whatchamacallits and they **still** uniformly disagree with your "a god" interpretation. Please note I said interpretation, **not** translation.

As for [John 1:1](#)...What about [John 1:1a](#)? John's deliberate use of the imperfect *eimi* is quite indicative, denoting the continual existence of the Word before the beginning. No matter where you put the beginning, the Word was already there. John doesn't apply the form (tense?) of *eimi* that has a starting point, *egeneto* (sp?) to the Word until 1:14, I think, (when the Word became flesh) but always use this *egeneto* in reference to created things (John himself, the world, etc). Very deliberate usage. John is also alluding to [Gen 1:1](#), In the beginning, God created...John's prologue speaks of creation as does the start of Genesis. Same subject matter (creation), same words (at least in the LXX) that John chooses to start his Gospel...

[John 1:1a](#) tells us what kind of God John thought the Word was -- an eternal one, one that existed -- continually existed -- before the beginning, no matter where you place that beginning. If the Word continually existed before the beginning (creation), then the Word is no part of the creation. So the Word is eternal and uncreated -- and as such, hardly a secondary god. Only Yahweh is eternal and uncreated. Therefore, the Word is God, with the big 'G,' even before you get to 1:1c.

Also, and this one **is** directed at mondo, wasn't Origen eventually excommunicated for his unorthodox/heretical views?



08-27-2006

#176

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006

Posts: 1,481

16 Reputation Points



Yes, Jehovah says no other gods but in a context where he is referring to the gods of the nations surrounding Israel which gods were independant from Jehovah. This does not mean that *Jehovah* has not created creatures that he himself recognizes as "gods" and that are dependant on him. He has, the angels. The angels are not false gods they are true gods for they have superhuman natures and reflect the nature of the One true God. In the very same place, Is 43:10, 11, Jehovah says there are no saviors but he. But this does not mean that *Jehovah* has not himself raised up saviors for Israel and can be called as such. He did and they are called saviors. But there are no saviors independant from Jehovah for Israel. So, from this one can see that Is 43:10 can not be used against a grammatically and contextually valid translation of the Greek of [John 1:1c](#). Yes, when one does that one is ripping Is. 43:10-11 out of it's context.

Yes, the Word's being "a god" mean that his godship is true for his being "a god" is because he has been made such by God and his godship is dependant on God but still limited and qualified. The bible's monotheism allows for others other than the one true God to be gods for these ones, such as the angels, are gods because they share the nature of God and reflect his power. Polytheism is not only the recognition of more than one god but the worship of more than one god. The Word being "a god" does not mean he is worshipped as God, nor even as "a god." So the translation of [John 1;1c](#) as "and the Word was a god" is not polytheistic but in accord with the Bible's monotheism which allows others not God to be gods but not independant from God and hence not to be worshipped as one should only God.

I hope this explains why Is 43:10-11 should not be used, or really, misused, against a grammatically and contextually valid translation of [John 1:1c](#) and why

the charge of polytheism against the "a god" translation only comes from a misunderstanding of true biblical monotheism.



08-27-2006

#177

[katierussell](#)

Member

Join Date: May 2006
Posts: 1,481
16 Reputation Points



And the guy even cites "Colwell"! What more need to be said? Except he is not up to date with his Greek! 😊



08-27-2006

#178

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



KR, I went rounds with mondo over the meaning of true in [John 17:3](#), the only true God, some time back. If I remember correctly, Mondo cited Vincent and Origen (unless I'm mistaken, the ex-coummunicated ANF) as his only support for the archetypal definition of *alethinous*. Every (other?) authority, i.e. the **VAST** majority defines *alethinous* in the true vs false sense.

There is only one true God.



08-27-2006

#179

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [dumotel](#)

Sorry for butting in with perhaps a seemingly shallow contribution, but the notion of more than one real god isn't biblical either.

Even when I hypothesise for understanding's sake, that the Word was A god, it still leads me back to the Word being God. Why? Because "the Word was with God" shows co-existence from all time. There's nothing to suggest to me that the Word came after God. Either the Word was God, or no god at all. I genuinely, sincerely can't bring myself to accept the 'a god' translation meaning another god (whether mighty or not), since Jehovah Himself says there's no other (true god) before or after Him. I have really tried very hard to understand the JW doctrine. I had nothing to lose but all to gain from trying to understand, and I'm still trying, but failing miserably at each attempt.

Du

It doesn't show coexistence for all time. That is an interpretation, which is possible, but not demanded by the text.



08-27-2006


#180

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Quote:

Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 816
 13 Reputation Points

Originally Posted by **Toejamken** 

Hello Mondo,

quote:

It would not mean that he needed help, but that he wanted his Son to have some role out of his own love for that son.

My response:

Your statement is an opinion, and I don't see it as being Biblical either. In [Isaiah 44:24](#) we read:

*I, the LORD, am the maker of all things,
 Stretching out the heavens by Myself
 And spreading out the earth all alone,*

If Yahweh did it by Himself and all alone, [John 1:1](#) obviously means more than what those of the Watchtower teach.

Yahweh did it alone because he is the source of it all. We all know full well that he used his existing creation to bring about creation. He used gravity, he used various gasses, etc. In context that text is addressing the fact that he did the creating and not idol gods that do not exist.

Quote:

We also read in [Isaiah 43:10-11](#):

Before Me there was no God formed,
 And there will be none after Me.
 I, even I, am the LORD,
 And there is no savior besides Me.

The "a god" translation is excluded by this statement.

According to [John 1:1](#) the Word has existed before "the beginning." [Isaiah 43:10](#) reinforces that He is without beginning and not a creation.

Compare:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,"

"Before Me there was no God formed, And there will be none after Me."

Jesus is the way, the truth, the life, and the only way to God.

Ken

[Isaiah 43:10](#) does nothing but tell us that God is eternal. There is no such thing as "before God" and there is no such thing as "after God" so nothing ever was created before him or after him.



 Post Reply

Page 9 of 26 [« First](#) [<](#) [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [8](#) **9** [10](#) [11](#) [12](#) [13](#) [19](#) [>](#) [Last »](#)

[« Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread »](#)

Quick Reply



Please click one of the Quick Reply icons in the posts above to activate Quick Reply.

Options

Quote message in reply?

Post Quick Reply

Go Advanced

Posting Rules

- You **may** post new threads
- You **may** post replies
- You **may not** post attachments
- You **may** edit your posts

vB_code is **On**
 Smilies are **On**
 [IMG] code is **On**
 HTML code is **Off**

All times are GMT -4. The time now is 07:35 AM.
 As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,354,647, Page Views Today: 22,354,647

-- Default Style

[Contact Us](#) - [Christian Discussion Forums](#) - [Archive](#) - [To](#)

Powered by vBulletin® Version 3.6.7
 Copyright ©2000 - 2007, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.
 copyright CARM 2006,2007
 Get Weather for any City, State, Zipcode, or Country:

Fast Forecast