



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 12 of 26    « First < 2 8 9 10 11 **12** 13 14 15 16 22 > Last » ▾

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

08-27-2006

#221

**truffy**

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Posts: 1,593  
27 Reputation Points

Quote:

And when you ask: "If Jesus received a positive proskuneo from His followers, wouldn't you want to be more positive with Him?" you assume I give less "positive" proskuneo than his followers!

Than his followers? I assume you mean in the Bible? If you read the whole Bible from start to finish, you will see Jesus is God. You only want your favorite contextual verses that mean so much to you. Why not take the rest? I still didn't get your answer for those weird words, Katie, I guess it will take the next 5 or 6 posts to get them. Why not answer them now? I need a rest, Katie, see you in a while.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#222

**katierussell**

Member

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

I have, of course, read the Bible from "start to finish" and I do not see that Jesus is "God"(but I thought you think that three person are "God"??) but only the Father is, God the Father being the expression Paul uses often....never "God the Son." 😊 Have a nice rest Tim.



08-27-2006

#223

**mondo**

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark** ▾

*So your answer is to slam around a blanket "they're all biased" accusation?*

*Ah, I see conspiracy theories are alive and well in modern America.*

**All** NT scholars know the "God" translation of [John 1:1c](#) is wrong, but

*they insistently and vehemently deny the "a god" translation offered by the NWT committee is even possible -- because to do so might damage the doctrine of the Trinity.*

*Riiiiiiiiiiiiight.*

*That powdered sugar on donuts will effect your verility, too.*

*And again, NT scholars uniformly disagree with you. Even the ones the NWT quotes to try to bolster their position disagrees.*

Actually, many of them nowadays recognize that "a god" is grammatically fine, but they reject it on theological grounds. (i.e. Daniel Wallace)

Quote:

So you say. Three times, in three sentences. And yet not once in those sentences do you offer a single sliver of support for your much-proclaimed argument that mine is "fallacious."

Saying it ain't so doesn't prove it ain't so.

To support my position, first up, James White:

How about A. T. Robertson?

Marvin Vincent:

Albert Barnes:

Want more?

Post away, but it isn't doing you any good. The imperfect of EIMI also functions as what is known as an aoristic imperfect, which is an aorist in the form of the imperfect because there is no aoristic form.



08-27-2006

#224

[steider2003](#)

Member

Join Date: Jun 2006

Posts: 699

22 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katie russell](#)

*John did not "create" another god! John knew that the term theos can be used/applied to others not the one true god, God. He rightly applied it for the "Word" who was "with" the "God" of the OT. John then still accepted there was one "God" and he was not saying that the Word was a "false god" either anymore than the angels of God are and God's word applies the term elohim, gods, to them. So you have simply not grasped what the*

*term can signify and how it can be used.  
 Yes, JW's believe in "one God." Whenever that expression occurs it never ever refers to a triune being, a triune God and never ever refers to the Son, Jesus Christ but only the Father. Yes, JW's believe in "many gods" for the bible tells us the angels of God are "gods" and that the Word is "a god." But you I think believe in a pagan inspired anti-scriptural triune God where each person is "God" but there are not three Gods.....whatever! 😊*

[1 Corinthians 8:5-6](#) Many things in heaven and on earth are called gods and lords, but **none** of them really are gods or lords.

If Jesus isn't God then he is no god at all.

[John 1:1](#) NWT added the word "a" but, [John 1:18](#) contains theos twice, without "the" either time. According to Watchtower assumptions, we would expect to translate both as "god" or "a god." Instead, the New World Translation says "God" the first time and "god" the second time. The context overrules their rule.



08-27-2006

#225

**Allan 747**

Inactive

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



I can see why you would not be able to understand the trinity when you believe in a multitude of gods. Trinitarians don't believe in 3 separate Gods , we believe in 3 separate persons who make up the one God.

08-27-2006

#226

**tkkclark**

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006  
 Posts: 275  
 18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** *Actually, many of them nowadays recognize that "a god" is grammatically fine, but they reject it on theological grounds. (i.e. Daniel Wallace)*

I'd be very interested in seeing a quote from Daniel Wallace -- in context, of course -- in which he states the translation of 1:1c "and the Word was a god" is "fine," grammatically or otherwise.

Any other NT scholar, for that matter.

Quote:

Post away, but it isn't doing you any good. The imperfect of EIMI also functions as what is known as an aoristic imperfect, which is an aorist in the form of the imperfect because there is no aoristic form.

Again, so you say. The above quotations very much indicate otherwise and those quotations are only a small snapshot of the many, many authorities I could quote on the matter.

Would you care to provide supports for your position?



08-27-2006

#227

## Allan 747

Inactive

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



mondo what tense does "a god" have according to WT scholars?

08-27-2006

#228

## Ongyo no Kiheiji

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006  
 Posts: 2,280  
 18 Reputation Points



To add to what Katierussel has stated, here is what the Dead Sea Scrolls give as to an insight of the early Jewish belief about Angels.

"Praise him, divine spirits, praising for ever and ever the firmament of the highest heavens, all...and its wall, all its structure, its shape. The spirits of the holy of holies, the living 'gods', the spirits of eternal holiness above all the holy ones...The divine spirits surround the dwelling of the King of truth and righteousness; all its walls" (Vermes 226 [4Q403 I i, 30-46]).

"The figures of the 'gods' shall praise him, the most holy spirits...of glory; the floor of the marvelous innermost chambers, the spirits of the eternal gods, all...figures of the innermost chambers of the King, the spiritual works of the marvelous firmament are purified with salt, spirits of knowledge, truth and righteousness in holy of holies, forms of the living 'gods,' forms of the illuminating spirits. All their works of art are marvelously linked, many-coloured spirits, artistic figures of the 'gods,' engraved all around their glorious bricks of splendour and majesty. All their works of art are living 'gods,' and their artistic figures are holy angels. From beneath the marvelous inner most chambers comes a sound of quiet silence: the 'gods' bless..."(Vermes 228 [4Q405 19ABCD]).

The author here describes the Most Holy chamber of the Temple. In this chamber was where the Ark of the Covenant was kept. This is where Jehovah dwelled symbolically. Everything in the Most Holy was made of the finest gold. The Bible tells us that the Temple was ornamented with pictures of angels ([1 Kings 6:27-32](#)). Therefore, this description of the "gods" ministering to the Almighty fits perfectly with the Bible. The curtain that separated the Holy from the Most Holy even has pictures of angels ("gods") woven into it ([2 Chron. 3:14](#)).

"The 'gods' praise him when they take up their station, and all the spirits of the clear firmament rejoice in his glory...when the gods of knowledge enter by the doors of glory, and when the holy angels depart the realm, the entrance doors and the gates of exit proclaim the glory of the King...the fear of the King of 'gods' is awe-inspiring to all the 'gods,' and they undertake all his commissions by virtue of his true order" (Vermes 229 [4Q405 23i]).

The War Rule says that "the host of warring 'gods' gird themselves for the Day of Revenge" (1QMXV, Vermes 121). We also find in the fragment titled by Vermes as The Song of Michael and the Just (4Q491 fr. II, Ma) an incomplete sentence that says that there is "a throne of strength in the congregation of 'gods' so that not a single king of old shall sit on it, neither shall their noble men...(Vermes 126). The one called Michael is also held as saying "I am reckoned with the 'gods' and my dwelling place is in the congregation of holiness" and "for I am reckoned with the 'gods,' and my glory is with the sons of the King" (Vermes 126).

As D.S. Russell writes: "There is ample evidence to show that [the OT]

conception of monotheism was held in conjunction with a belief in a spiritual world peopled with supernatural and superhuman beings who, in some ways, shared the nature, though not the being, of God" ( \_The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic\_ P. 235). Compare this with the proskuneo of the angel who visits Joshua ([Joshua 5:14](#); cf. [Genesis 18:2](#); [Numbers 22:16](#)). If one wishes to, he or she can conclude that certain Israelites worshipped another 'god' (or other 'gods') as well, since the Bible calls angels 'gods' .



08-27-2006

#229

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [tkkclark](#)

*I'd be very interested in seeing a quote from Daniel Wallace -- in context, of course -- in which he states the translation of 1:1c "and the Word was a god" is "fine," grammatically or otherwise.*

*Any other NT scholar, for that matter.*

Wallace in his grammar dismisses it primarily on theological grounds, but he also cites Dixon's study, which IMO, is not reliable, because it depends upon Dixon's own interpretation of each text. He also doesn't understand all of the reasons that an indefinite rendering is argued for, which is seen in the strawman reply that he makes (arguing for it to be because it merely lacks the article). He does not disallow the translation completely though. So maybe Wallace was not the best example, but one cannot help but observe that Wallace heavily mixes theology in with his grammatical discussion, contaminating his position from the get go.

Vine is particularly interesting, for he says "To translate it literally, 'a god was the Word,' is entirely misleading." He calls it "misleading," but he does observe it to be "literally" translated that way.

Quote:

Again, so you say. The above quotations very much indicate otherwise and those quotations are only a small snapshot of the many, many authorities I could quote on the matter.

Would you care to provide supports for your position?

Gladly. Mr. A.T. Robertson himself (as you quoted him as a reference):

"They are sometimes called 'aoristic' imperfects... The same root was used for both forms, as only one form exists and it is hard to tell which tense the form is... We see this difficulty in hn, efhn, elegon, etc., particularly in verbs of saying, commanding, etc.... Hence we need not insist that hn (jo. 1:1) is strictly durative always (imperfect). It may be sometimes actually aorist also. So as to efn (Mt. 4:7); elegon (mk. 4:21, 24, 26, 30, etc.), etc." [Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Grammar). (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.), 882-3.]



08-27-2006

#230

### mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Allan 747**  
*mondo what tense does "a god" have according to WT scholars?*

Nouns don't have tenses! Verbs do!



08-27-2006

#231

### Allan 747

Inactive

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

Thats why I didn't do to well in english. 😞 Ok, all I know is that Wt changed the tense of [John 1:1](#) in order to make it agree with their theology. mondo is this the case?



08-27-2006

#232

### mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Allan 747**  
*Thats why I didn't do to well in english. 😞 Ok, all I know is that Wt changed the tense of [John 1:1](#) in order to make it agree with their theology. mondo is this the case?*

No, there was no tense change in [John 1:1](#). The same verb used in the NWT "was" is used in every Bible I've ever seen, except for paraphrases.



08-27-2006

#233

### mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark**  
*I'd be very interested in seeing a quote from Daniel Wallace -- in context, of course -- in which he states the translation of 1:1c "and the Word was a god" is "fine," grammatically or otherwise.*  
  
*Any other NT scholar, for that matter.*

Here is another for you:

"According, from the point of view of grammar alone,[theos en ho logos]could be rendered "the Word was a god."-Murray Harris, Jesus As God, 1992, pp.60.



08-27-2006

#234

## AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006  
 Location: Columbus, OH  
 Gender: ♀  
 Posts: 2,682  
 56 Reputation Points

Quote:

He, as God's "Word," would have been mightier and had more authority than any other spirit creature so would have been a god over them but not of course the god that they would worship but they would obey.

But scripture says he is over everything, that everything belongs to him. It also says that everyone in heaven and earth will kneel at the sound of his name. What am I missing? I can't accept that everything is his and was created by him, for him, that he died for my sins to reconcile me to live with him forever. Yet he is not worthy of my worship & praise, even though the bible says so? I am only to consider him 'a god', on the level of Satan? Satan is called the 'god of this world', yet he is no god - HE is an angel. So any god, apart from Jehovah God, can't be a true god. So we always have the dilemma with the 'a god' theory. There can't be more than one God. All others are false gods.

Quote:

In respects to humans he also would have a been a god as the angels from our perspective are such and the OT calls them gods.

I would never consider an angel god. And throughout scripture, any angel that was mistaken to be god refused worship.

Quote:

As to [John 1:3](#), that translation has "All things were made **by** him." Firstly, "all things" might be restricted to the physical material universe for the "beginning" may well be referencing [Genesis 1:1](#) and there the "beginning" was not to the spirit heavens and those who exist there but to this universe only. So this would not mean that the Word was uncreated himself. Secondly the word "by" in "All thing were made by.." is the word *dia* and this indicates that the Word is not the ultimate agent in creation but the intermeditary that *another* used. Obviously this another being God, God the Father. Hence, a better translation would be "all things came into existence *through* him." Compare [1 Cor 8:6](#) for who is the ultimate agent(the source of creation and hence the Creator) and the intermediate agent. See also [Revelation 4:8-11](#) for who is the Creator. This one here is made seperate and distinct from the "Lamb" who comes to this one later on. Hence the "Lamb" Jesus, is not this Creator, not the Creator.

I see it this way, throughout scripture Jehovah declares that he is the beginning (& the end). So, in John the Word was with the FATHER in the beginning; eternally - no beginning & no end. This is further confirmed in scripture:

[Rev 1:8](#) & [Rev 21:6](#) Almighty God (who is to come in v.8) is Alpha & Omega  
[22:13](#) Jesus is Alpha & Omega  
[Isaiah 44:6](#) & [48:12](#) Jehovah is First & Last  
[Rev 22:13](#) Jesus is First & Last beginning & end

Both Jehovah and Jesus are spoken of as having laid the foundations of the heavens and earth. I can't find any evidence that seperates them in the way you say. In everything and in everyway they work in harmony with each other.

Thanks for sharing your view with me Katie. Have a great day.

Until the end of our testing we cannot take for granted our being saved; **and therefore when someone asks, "Brother, are you saved?" we do not give**

**a categorically affirmative reply, but qualify our answer, "Thus far, yes!"**w52 7/1 p391 [See 1Jo 4 truth](#)



08-27-2006

#235

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006  
Location: Columbus, OH  
Gender: ♀  
Posts: 2,682  
56 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [katierussell](#)

*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.*

So is Jehovah's intention in every verse where he affirms that he is the only true God the same as what you say here?

I agree with you that the Word is not independant from the Father, they work in harmony along with the Holy Spirit. Not seperate, but one unit.

[John 1:1](#) may be grammatically correct according to some of the scholars, but, they certainly do not agree with the WT. That is why those scholars that were used by the WT to show endorsement for their translation have demanded that that WT stop using their names. None of them agree that 'a god' is contextually correct. and you are quite aware of that, as you told me that the scholars you quoted do NOT agree with the NWT rendering.

Until the end of our testing we cannot take for granted our being saved; **and therefore when someone asks, "Brother, are you saved?" we do not give a categorically affirmative reply, but qualify our answer, "Thus far, yes!"**w52 7/1 p391 [See 1Jo 4 truth](#)



08-27-2006

#236

### truffy

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Posts: 1,593  
27 Reputation Points

Quote:

Quote:  
Originally Posted by truffy  
I didn't say Coptic is a region...I said the manuscripts you are referring to came from Northern Egypt, the Sahidic Coptic manuscripts were written and came from there, the same region as Judas Iscariot's Gospel manuscript was written and found.

you said...

And so you want to discredit it on those grounds? You smell of complete and total desperation.

*Actually Sahidic Coptic language is in the southern Egypt region, my mistake. Judas Iscariot's manuscript was in another Coptic language in Codex form. If you would rather trust another Greek form of scripture other than Septuagint, then go right ahead. I would stick to the original Greek texts which truly displays the awesome power of Jesus.*

Quote:

Quote:

You avoided my question...did you learn this Greek negative for Jesus when in the Baptist Seminary, or was it when you were first influenced by WatchTower literature?

you said...

Greek is neither positive or negative for anybody. It is a language that communicates, just like English. Now, what is said by a language can be positive or negative, but I am not saying anything negative for Jesus, I'm simply not stating things falsely as most people here do.

*The Greek you used is negative for Jesus. Once again you did not answer my question...did you learn this Greek negative for Jesus when in the Baptist Seminary, or was it when you were first influenced by WatchTower literature?*

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#237

**mondo**

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

*The Greek you used is negative for Jesus. Once again you did not answer my question...did you learn this Greek negative for Jesus when in the Baptist Seminary, or was it when you were first influenced by WatchTower literature?*

The question is not valid, because it is based upon a false premise, which is that the Greek I use is negative for Jesus. It is not, but what I show when explaining that Greek is negative for your theology.



08-27-2006

#238

**truffy**

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Posts: 1,593  
27 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **katierussell**

*John did not "create" another god! John knew that the term theos can be used/applied to others not the one true god, God. He rightly applied it for the "Word" who was "with" the "God" of the OT. John then still accepted there was one "God" and he was not saying that the Word was a "false god" either anymore than the angels of God are and God's word applies the term elohim, gods, to them. So you have simply not grasped what the term can signify and how it can be used.*

*Yes, JW's believe in "one God." Whenever that expression occurs it never ever refers to a triune being, a triune God and never ever refers to the Son, Jesus Christ but only the Father. Yes, JW's believe in "many gods" for the bible tells us the angels of God are "gods" and that the Word is "a god." But you I think believe in a pagan inspired anti-scriptural triune God where each person is "God" but there are not three Gods.....whatever! 😊*

If JW's believe there is only one God then how can there be another god besides God? If you claim Jesus as a savior and call him a god, you are making Him into another god, and making Jesus into a god is putting Him into a level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world. If this is what your Jehovah wants, then your Jehovah is definitely not My God, because I know My God would never want to put Jesus who is also My God down to a lower deity, and I know Satan would love to see this happen. So where is your common sense in this matter? Can't you see the logic of what Satan wants versus what God wants?

Tim 😊😊😊



08-27-2006

#239

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [truffy](#)

*If JW's believe there is only one God then how can there be another god besides God? If you claim Jesus as a savior and call him a god, you are making Him into another god, and making Jesus into a god is putting Him into a level playing field with Satan who is a god of this world. If this is what your Jehovah wants, then your Jehovah is definitely not My God, because I know My God would never want to put Jesus who is also My God down to a lower deity, and I know Satan would love to see this happen. So where is your common sense in this matter? Can't you see the logic of what Satan wants versus what God wants?*

Truffy,

It is for the same reason that Paul can teach that Jesus Christ is our "one Lord," and yet when the apostle John spoke to one of the 24 elders, he had no problem addressing him with the words "my Lord."



08-27-2006

#240

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)

*Wallace in his grammar dismisses it primarily on theological grounds, but he also cites Dixon's study, which IMO, is not reliable, because it depends upon Dixon's own interpretation of each text. He also doesn't understand all of the reasons that an indefinite rendering is argued for, which is seen in the strawman reply that he makes (arguing for it to be because it merely lacks the article). He does not disallow the translation completely though. So maybe Wallace was not the best example, but one cannot help but observe that Wallace heavily mixes theology in with his grammatical discussion, contaminating his position from the get go.*

*Vine is particularly interesting, for he says "To translate it literally, 'a god was the Word,' is entirely misleading." He calls it "misleading," but he does observe it to be "literally" translated that way.*

Yeah....So...?

Quoting the Greek word order, as though reading from an interlinear, is **not** the

same as reading in proper English. Let's read the context of your quote:

Quote:

...it is usual to employ the article with a proper name, when mentioned a second time. There are, of course, exceptions to this, as when the absence of the article serves to lay stress upon, or give precision to, the character or nature of what is expressed in the noun. A notable instance of this is in [John 1:1](#), "and the Word was God"; here a double stress is on *theos*, by the absence of the article and by the emphatic position. To translate it literally, "a god was the Word," is entirely misleading. Moreover, that "the Word" is the subject of the sentence exemplifies the rule that the subject is to be determined by its having the article when the predicate is anarthrous (without the article). (Vine's, entry for God)

As for Wallace, I don't have his Greek grammar. Which is why I was interested in a quotation.

Quote:

Gladly. Mr. A.T. Robertson himself (as you quoted him as a reference):

"They are sometimes called 'aoristic' imperfects... The same root was used for both forms, as only one form exists and it is hard to tell which tense the form is... We see this difficulty in *hn*, *efhn*, *elegon*, etc., particularly in verbs of saying, commanding, etc.... Hence we need not insist that *hn* (jo. 1:1) is strictly durative always (imperfect). It may be sometimes actually aorist also. So as to *efn* (Mt. 4:7); *elegen* (mk. 4:21, 24, 26, 30, etc.), etc." [Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Grammar). (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.), 882-3.]

Thank you. Now, would you mind removing the triple dots and quoting it at me again? Pardon, but you, so I believe, selectively quoted Vine above, citing only that which supports your theology -- out of its intended context. I mean, seriously. What you quoted had nothing to do with whether it should be "a god" or "God," but was an analysis of word order in that clause, in that *theos* comes first because it's in the emphatic position. It's not a comment on "a god" vs "God" at all.

Yet, you quoted Vine as though what Vine said in regard to emphasis and word order somehow supported your position.

Pardon me if I don't particularly trust your quotations at the moment.



Post Reply

Page 12 of 26 « First < 2 8 9 10 11 **12** 13 14 15 16 22 > Last »

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

Quick Reply

Message:

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 07:36 AM.  
As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,354,664, Page Views Today: 22,354,664

-- 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