



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

Post Reply

Page 23 of 26    << First    <    13    19    20    21    22    **23**    24    25    26    >

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

08-29-2006

#441

### Keith Courage

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jun 2006  
Posts: 2,109  
49 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**   
*You've not substantiated the case at all! I've soundly demonstrated otherwise.*

This is the second time you have disagreed with me when I actually **agree** with current Watchtower Society doctrine!!

**Former Member of the Jehovah's Witnesses (1991-2006).**  
**Soldier of the Cross, Defender of Christianity and the Gospel of Jesus Christ.**  
**"And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me." - Mat 10:38**



08-29-2006

#442

### mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Toejamken**   
*Hello Mondo,*  
*You can say my exegesis is inconsistent, but that doesn't mean it is true. You have chosen to reject my comments, and those of others which has affected your ability to comprehend what we write.*  
  
*Ken*

I demonstrated it, I didn't just claim it.



08-29-2006

#443

### Toejamken

Junior Member

Join Date: Jul 2006  
Location: NW Florida



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**   
*I demonstrated it, I didn't just claim it.*

Posts: 89  
16 Reputation Points

You seem to have a security problem because you're always patting yourself on the back saying you're right and someone else is wrong. That is only your opinion. Your tactics prove nothing.



08-29-2006

#444

**truffy**

Inactive



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

Here is a quote from the Jewish Study Bible that might make it easier to understand.

*"The Mighty God...ruler": This long sentence is the throne name of the royal child. Semitic names often consist of sentences that describe God; thus the name Isaiah in Hebrew means "The LORD saves"; Hezekiah, "The LORD strengthens"; in Akkadian, the name of the Babylonian king Merodach-baladan(Is 39:1) means "the god Marduk has provided a heir." These names do not describe that person who holds them but the god whom the parents worship. Similarly, the name given to the child in this v. does not describe that child or attribute divinity to him, contrary to classical Christian readings of this messianic verse."*

Not too many people come with the name Immanuel, YHWH Our Righteousness, the First and the Last, the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, Mighty God, Almighty God, Everlasting Father, the Good Shepherd, The Word, and **God**. So who are the ones left who carry those names.....Oh, its only Jesus left. Mondo, sorry, you lost.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-29-2006

#445

**AmazingGrace**

CARM Super Member



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

yes, thank you - that helped show me where you were coming from geez laweez And Jesus is all of those things to every Christian.

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



08-29-2006

#446

**mondo**

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Posts: 816  
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **truffy**

*Not too many people come with the name Immanuel, YHWH Our Righteousness, the First and the Last, the Alpha and the Omega, the*

*Beginning and the End, Mighty God, Almighty God, Everlasting Father, the Good Shepherd, The Word, and **God**. So who are the ones left who carry those names.....Oh, its only Jesus left. Mondo, sorry, you lost.*

ROTFL. Immanuel - [Isaiah 8](#). A name given to Isaiah's son! God - Jewish King. [Psalm 45](#).



08-29-2006

#447

[pestmanpat1](#)

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006

Posts: 1,119

15 Reputation Points



grace in all sincerity i am happy to use other translations as i have been doing.i would like you to research the hebrew"elohim"and tell me what it means.and wheather or not it is a title exclusive to jehovah?

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"



08-29-2006

#448

[truffy](#)

Inactive



Join Date: Jul 2006

Posts: 1,593

27 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)

*Well you are again showing your limited knowledge, for the article is used here because of the genitive pronoun MOU in direct address. One cannot make this expression in the nominative case without the article, and so it has no bearing on whether or not the article indicates the Almighty or not. If Jesus is "a god" and "a god to Thomas" than Thomas would have to say either QEE MOU or hO QEOS MOU. Not a big deal.*

I think you need a new course in Greek, this time from real scholars. Look up [Mark 15:34](#) "My God, My God...", [John 20:17](#) "My God". These examples come with pronoun mou in direct addresses, so if you can find some other ways of discrediting the God word down to a lower case, I'm all ears.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-29-2006

#449

### pestmanpat1

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006  
Posts: 1,119  
15 Reputation Points

this subject can be debated.not all scholars see it the same way however combined with the ovewhelming scriptual evidence of jesus own testimony regarding his father it is clear that jesus is not his father.as when he prayed to his father in heaven while he was on earth.he wasent praying to himself was he.he said to his father not my will but your will.2 people .if trinity is what jehovah wants us to believe why such mystery.

those against the jws acuse us of putting jesus up as a seperate god.

in john 1:1 there are many other translations that correctly translate the sense of the word god here.such as the word was divine.

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"



08-29-2006

#450

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **pestmanpat1** [▶](#)  
*grace in all sincerity i am happy to use other translations as i have been doing.i would like you to research the hebrew"elohim"and tell me what it means.and wheather or not it is a title exclusive to jehovah?*

So does that mean Jehovah is **not** God since apparently everyone in the OT is elohim? Discernment is key, context is key. You can have both if you cry out to Jesus for truth.

If you use other translations, how do you reconcile all the verses that show Jesus being God?

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](#)



08-29-2006

#451

### AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

23So that all men may give honor (reverence, homage) to the Son just as they give honor to the Father. [In fact] whoever does not honor the Son does not honor the Father, Who has sent Him.

Do you honor Jesus as you do the Father?

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](#)



08-29-2006

#452

[pestmanpat1](#)

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006  
Posts: 1,119  
15 Reputation Points



grace jehovah is jehovah and jesus is jesus.JEHOVAH IS THE ALMIGHTY ,THE FATHER AND JESUS IS HIS MIGHTY SON.you are trapped in your thinking when you insist on using the term "god as exclusive to the almighty.this is largley because most translations have removed the divine name thousands of times substituting it for God and lord.GO TO YOUR BIBLE PREFACE AND SEE WHAT IT SAYS ON THE DIVINE NAME.

AND GRACE WILL YOU LOOK UP THE WORD ELOHIM FOR ME PLEASE.

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"



08-29-2006

#453

[truffy](#)

Inactive



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



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)  
ROTFL. Immanuel - [Isaiah 8](#). A name given to Isaiah's son! God - Jewish King. [Psalm 45](#).

[Isaiah 8:3](#) the name is Maher Shalal Hash Baz, I can't find a name in [Psalm 45](#) other than God... 6 Your throne, O God, will last for ever and ever; a scepter of justice will be the scepter of your kingdom. 7 You love righteousness and hate wickedness; therefore God, your God, has set you above your companions by anointing you with the oil of joy. Is this the name you were seeking for? And the first name mentioned is four different words, not one name like Jesus' name which is God.

Tim 😊😊😊



08-29-2006

#454

[pestmanpat1](#)

Member

Join Date: Aug 2006  
Posts: 1,119  
15 Reputation Points



**wickapedia**The word "Trinity" comes from "Trinitas", a [Latin](#) abstract noun that most literally means "three-ness" (or "the property of occurring three at once"). Or, simply put, "three are one". The first recorded use of this Latin word was by [Tertullian](#) in about 200, to refer to Father, Son and Holy Spirit, or, in general, to any set of three things.(Theophilus to Autolyclus - 115-181 - introduced the word Trinity in his Book 2, chapter 15 on the creation of the 4th day). The [Greek](#) term used for the Christian Trinity, "Τριάς" (a set of three or the number three),[\[1\]](#) has given the English word *triad*. The [Sanskrit](#) words, "[Trimurti or Trinatha](#)," has a similar meaning, as has "Dreifaltigkeit" in [German](#), and many other words in other languages. The [New Testament](#) does not use the word "Τριάς" (Trinity), but only speaks of God (often called "the Father"), of Jesus Christ (often called "the Son"), and of the Holy Spirit, and of the relationships between them. The word "Trinity" began to be applied to them only in the course of later theological reflection. The [earliest Christians](#) were noted for their insistence on the existence of one true God, in contrast to the [polytheism](#) of the prevailing culture. While maintaining strict [monotheism](#), they believed also that the man Jesus Christ was at the same time something more than a man (a belief reflected, for instance, in the opening verses of the [Letter to the Hebrews](#), which describe him as the brightness of God's glory and bearing the express image of God's own being, and, yet more explicitly, in the prologue of the [Gospel](#) according to John) and

also with the implications of the presence and power of God that they believed was among them and that they referred to as the Holy Spirit. The [Epistle to the Colossians](#) even goes so far as to state that "in [Jesus] lives all the fullness of Deity bodily" ([Colossians 2:9](#)).

The importance for the first Christians of their faith in God, whom they called Father, in Jesus Christ, whom they saw as the Son of God, the Word of God (Gospel of John), King, Saviour (*Martyrdom of Polycarp*), Master (*First Apology of Justin Martyr*), and in the Holy Spirit is expressed in formulas that link all three together, such as those in the Gospel according to Matthew, the [Great Commission](#): "Go therefore 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](#)); and in the Second Letter of [St Paul](#) to the Corinthians: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all" ([2 Corinthians 13:14](#)).

**Conclusions about how best to explain the association of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit with the one God developed gradually and not without controversy.** Christians had to reconcile their belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ with their belief in the one-ness of God. In doing so, some stressed the one-ness to the point of considering Father, Jesus and Holy Spirit as merely three modes or roles in which God shows himself to mankind; others stressed the three-ness to the point of positing three divine beings, with only one of them supreme and God in the full sense. Only in the fourth century were the distinctness of the three and their unity brought together and expressed in mainline Christianity in a single doctrine of one essence and three persons. Some Christians still debate the differences found in the New Testament, where Christ declared "I and my Father are one," but also prayed on the cross, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani" (My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?), which is often explained that first sentence refers to Jesus' divine nature and the second one to his human nature; another explanation is that the prayer on the cross quotes [Psalm 22:1](#) in order to name the entire Psalm, interpreted as prophesying Jesus' crucifixion; most mainstream Christians take the view that the prayer comes from Jesus's anguish at being temporarily separated from the Trinity "mystic oneness" in order that he could take the punishment for sin on behalf of all mankind; and still others (not the mainstream view) say that it is a ridiculous notion that this man is yelling at himself that he is abandoning himself.

In 325, the [Council of Nicaea](#) adopted a term for the relationship between the Son and the Father that from then on was seen as the hallmark of orthodoxy; it declared that the Son is "of the same substance" ([ὁμοούσιος](#)) as the Father. This was further developed into the formula "three persons, one substance". The answer to the question "What is God?" indicates the one-ness of the divine nature, while the answer to the question "Who is God?" indicates the three-ness of "Father, Son and Holy Spirit." It is also worthy to note that this council was set up and organized by the Roman [Emperor Constantine I](#), who for years remained a Christian catechumen and was not baptized until near the end of his life. He was more interested in solidifying his empire under one religion rather than in taking sides in the debate between the [Arians](#) and the orthodox. Also the Pope of the time did not show up to this council, but instead sent delegates; as did many of the top clergy of the time. Furthermore, as the council went on less and less people attended.[\[citation needed\]](#)

**The Council of Nicaea was reluctant to adopt language not found in Scripture,** and ultimately did so only after Arius showed how all strictly biblical language could also be interpreted to support his belief, that there was a time before Jesus was created when he did not exist. In adopting non-biblical language, the council's intent was to preserve what they thought the Church had always believed, that Jesus is fully God, coeternal with God the Father and God the Holy Spirit.

**Historically, the lack of an explicit scriptural basis for the Trinity was viewed as a disquieting problem,[\[citation needed\]](#) and there is evidence indicating that one mediaeval Latin writer, while purporting to quote**

from the First Epistle of John, inserted a passage now known as the *Comma Johanneum* (1 John 5:7) which explicitly references the Trinity. It may have begun as a marginal note quoting a homily of [Cyprian](#) that was inadvertently taken into the main body of the text by a copyist.[1] The *Comma* found its way into several later copies, and was eventually back-translated into Greek and included in the third edition of the *Textus Receptus* which formed the basis of the [King James Version](#). [Erasmus](#), the compiler of the *Textus Receptus*, noticed that the passage was not found in any of the Greek manuscripts at his disposal and refused to include it until presented with an example containing it, which he rightly suspected was concocted after the fact.[2] [Isaac Newton](#), known mainly for his scientific and mathematical discoveries, noted that many ancient authorities failed to quote the *Comma* when it would have provided substantial support for their arguments, suggesting it was a later addition.[3] Modern [textual criticism](#) has since concurred with his findings; many modern translations now either omit the passage, or make it clear that it is not found in the early manuscripts.

500 billion years and still burning"think about that"



08-29-2006

#455

## secondbirth

CARM Super Member



Join Date: Jul 2006  
Location: NEW JERSEY  
Posts: 1,757  
41 Reputation Points



Yeah I Read It And There Is Diferent Views That Supports Trinity And Other Views That Dont. So Whats Your Point

08-29-2006

#456

## AmazingGrace

CARM Super Member



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

Quote:

Originally Posted by [pestmanpat1](#)  
*grace jehovah is jehovah and jesus is jesus.JEHOVAH IS THE ALMIGHTY ,THE FATHER AND JESUS IS HIS MIGHTY SON.you are trapped in your thinking when you insist on using the term "god as exclusive to the almighty.this is largley because most translations have removed the divine name thousands of times substituting it for God and lord.GO TO YOUR BIBLE PREFACE AND SEE WHAT IT SAYS ON THE DIVINE NAME.*  
*AND GRACE WILL YOU LOOK UP THE WORD ELOHIM FOR ME PLEASE.*

Pat, I just don't have the energy to talk with you anymore on the subject. You can't look at anything without WT goggles and until you ask Jesus to open your eyes, you will remain spiritually blind. I know, cause I was once like you. And now I have more of God than I ever thought possible. I have his presence. Do you have that? (That's rhetorical since I won't be conversing again)

God bless you and I'll keep you in my prayers.

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



08-29-2006

#457

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)  
You've repeated yourself here a lot.. but no substance.

I've cited quite a few sources in regards to 1:1a, mondo: RWP, VWS, Barnes, Gill, James White. You've (partially) quoted Robertson who says *en* doesn't always point to continued existence, and I answered with a quotation in which Robertson -- **the very same authority** -- stated that *en* used specifically in 1:1a **does** point to continued existence.

That was your **only** quote, mondo. You're only one.

So there's your **one** quote, that only allows for a general possibility (refuted by that same authority specifically of 1:1a).

Against my...I don't know how many quotes I posted.

A lot.

Not to mention the times I (tried, at least) to broach a discussion as to why *en* is widely accepted as pointing to continued existence in the context of 1:1a by scholars (i.e. *en arche*, *en* contrasted with *egeneto*, etc).

And the best you can say is "no substance"?

ROTFL

Quote:

You were the one trying to prove [John 1:1a](#) means something.

No trying whatsoever. I **did** prove it.

Quote:

I shot that down, showing it didn't prove it.

You shot down your strawman argument. Congratulations.

Now, would you mind addressing **my** arguments? **Any** of the arguments I've presented in regards to what in the context of 1:1a points to *en* as an imperfect denoting continued existence? For instance, I know for a fact you haven't said word one about *en arche*, at least not to me. Yet, for some bizarre reason, you think you shot me down???

Somebody call Unsolved Mysteries.

Quote:

Your burden of proof, and based upon the grammar, it has been demonstrated that all the quotes in the world will not prove it.

Mondo, I've been posting quote after quote from respected authorities who discuss *en* and why the context of 1:1a points to continued existence.

I've more than adequately covered my burden of proof.

You produced **one, solitary** support -- which was readily answered by a quote from the **same** authority who **explicitly supported my position**.

Frankly, your assertion that you somehow shot me down is utterly bizarre. I know I'm repeating that word and as a former English major, I hate word repetition if at all avoidable, but that's the only word I can think of that describes your behavior: bizarre.

Quote:

Vine still says "a god" is literal.

Thought you weren't going to talk to me about Vine any more.

\*snicker, snicker\*

Quote:

And as for [John 1:10](#), however you want to read it, he still came to be in the world and hence he HN in the world.

The authorities I cited disagree. They stated, *en* points to continued action in 1:10.

Quote:

Thus, no matter how you want to look at it, it is not eternal for the world is not eternal!

And yet another unsupported assertion from you.

Quote:

He had to come to be in it at some point, even if it was at the creation of it, thus an aorist sense is included.

And once again, you offer not a **single, solitary** support for your position.

What's funny is you say **I** lack substance.

Quote:

Anything else you wanna try me with? I'm waiting for a challenge here.

Swagger all you like, but your bizarre trumpeting as well as your proud (and baseless) boasting doesn't change the fact that you haven't answered most of my arguments, haven't refuted the one or two you did bother to answer (with little to no degree of depth)...

You are one piece of work, mondo. And no, that isn't a compliment.



08-29-2006

#458

## Toejamken

Junior Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

*If that is what Paul was saying, he would not have called them "many gods" for they are not gods, they are merely so-called. Paul clearly distinguished the two groups.*

We are at an impasse here. I disagree that Paul is distinguishing two groups here. The statement is vague, and Paul makes no mention of angels here. The most one could say is that he may be referring to angels. For me, my interpretations will be based on what is clear. Paul is writing about false gods.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

*Notice the following reference: "For even supposing there are (exist) gods so called ([2 Thessalonians 2. 4](#)), whether in heaven (as the sun, moon, and stars) or in earth (as deified kings, beasts, etc.), as there be (**a recognized fact**, [Deuteronomy 10.17](#); [Psalm 135.5](#); 136.2) **gods many and lords many.** **Angels and men in authority are termed gods in Scripture**, as exercising a divinely delegated power under God (compare [Exodus 22.9](#), with v.28; [Psalm 82.1, 6](#); [John 10.34,35](#))." [ Jamieson, Robert. Fausset, A.R. Brown, David. *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House), ] (emphasis added)*

There is no argument that men were given authority in the Bible, and there is no argument that angels have authority. I don't deny that men and angels are called gods. [Psalm 82:7](#) tells those men they are not really gods but will die like men. Are human beings gods? How many men do you know of who are truly gods? Men, though they might be called gods are obviously not really gods though they might have demanded worship or exercised authority like they were. How many verses are there which say that angels are gods? Do those verses say that men should relate to them as *Elohim* (gods)? Though they are called gods, we do not worship them. What is clear is that YHWH is *Elohim* to Israel. [Deuteronomy 6:4](#). The NT teaches that Christians will one day judge angels. [1 Corinthians 6:4](#).

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

*[1 Cor. 10:20](#) simply has no bearing on [1 Cor. 8:5](#). It is a completely different context*

The verse shows that Paul agrees with [Deuteronomy 32:17](#). You have chosen a vague statement in [1 Cor 8:5](#) ("For even if there are so-called gods whether in heaven or on earth, as indeed there are many gods and many lords") to support your beliefs. Men and angels may be called *elohim* but [Deuteronomy 6:4](#) clarifies *Elohim* really is YHWH.



08-29-2006


#459

## Toejamken

Junior Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **pestmanpat1**   
*grace jehovah is jehovah and jesus is jesus.JEHOVAH IS THE ALMIGHTY ,THE FATHER AND JESUS IS HIS MIGHTY SON.you are trapped in your thinking when you insist on using the term "god as exclusive to the almighty.this is largley because most translations have removed the divine name thousands of times substituting it for God and lord.GO TO YOUR BIBLE PREFACE AND SEE WHAT IT SAYS ON THE DIVINE NAME.*  
*AND GRACE WILL YOU LOOK UP THE WORD ELOHIM FOR ME PLEASE.*

Hello Pat,  
 The Bible also refers to Jesus as "YHWH our Righteousness" in [Jeremiah 23](#). Though the word is used of men and angels (quite sparingly and without any depth of explanation), the only true elohim in the OT is YHWH. This should be understood from reading [Deuteronomy 6:4](#). Grace is not trapped in her thinking. The Holy Spirit bears witness with our spirit that we are God's children ([Romans 8:16](#); see also 5:5). The letter of 1 John was written so that we could know that we have eternal life ([1 John 5:13](#), [1 John 3:24](#), [1 John 4:13](#)). Please read these verses. The WTBS excludes anyone outside the 144K of this Witness. They have robbed you and others of the birthright of every true Christian.  
 Ken



08-29-2006


#460

## Toejamken

Junior Member

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

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**   
*Here is a quote from the Jewish Study Bible that might make it easier to understand.*

*"The Mighty God...ruler": This long sentence is the throne name of the royal child. Semitic names often consist of sentences that describe God; thus the name Isaiah in Hebrew means "The LORD saves"; Hezekiah, "The LORD strengthens"; in Akkadian, the name of the Babylonian king Merodach-baladan(Is 39:1) means "the god Marduk has provided a heir." These names do not describe that person who holds them but the god whom the parents worship. Similarly, the name given to the child in this v. does not describe that child or attribute divinity to him, contrary to classical Christian readings of this messianic verse."*

Hello Mondo,  
 I'm amazed you are quoting those who reject Jesus as Messiah. It is no wonder they also reject His Divinity. Why are you rubbing shoulders with their conclusions?  
 Ken



 Post Reply

Page 23 of 26 [« First](#) [<](#) [13](#) [19](#) [20](#) [21](#) [22](#) **23** [24](#) [25](#) [26](#) [>](#) 

[« 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 07:47 AM.  
 As of July 6, 2006, Total Page Views: 22,355,058, Page Views Today: 22,355,058

-- 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