

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1046 – November 14, 2010

The Messianic Link To Old Testament Justice

We're going to review a little about this third event in Christ's life. What we're talking about is the Death of the King and we're making a point that every term in the Scripture, whether it's Christ died for our sins, or anything else is meant to be understood in context. Maybe you've been around Bible teaching circles and you hear people say "a text taken out of its context is not a proof text but a pretext." That's a very important principle to remember; you'll hear people say oh, I don't believe the Bible, you can read anything into the Bible. Yes, there have been idiots that read the Bible, but do you ever write a letter or e-mail to somebody? Well, yea, I've done that. Do you expect twenty people at the other end to have twenty different opinions about what you wrote? No you don't. If you really thought that you'd never write anybody. If writing and speaking was so hopelessly fouled up that the person on the other end couldn't get the meaning, you wouldn't write a letter, and you wouldn't type an e-mail. So by doing it everyday you're disproving the claim that you can get anything out of the Bible. Sure, an idiot can, but if we take it in context then no, you can't. Context, context, context.

With the Death of the King we want to understand it in context. And the background context for understanding the cross is summed up in one word, and that's justice. What is biblical justice all about? We said basically, if you look at the Scriptures and you look at the history of the Bible, keeping in mind that as we go through this frame of reference, you start out with Creation, the Fall, the Flood and the Noahic Covenant. You go through all these historical events, each one shedding light on these great truths. That's the context historically so that when the Lord Jesus Christ dies, He's given the human race thousands of years of preparatory truths to understand what happened on that cross. The cross did not happen in isolation from OT history. Therefore we want to make sure we have a biblical idea of justice.

We also, and this is a trick that I use a lot, when you start studying these things, and it's sad that in our schools and in our preparation of Christian young people, we don't give them the basic tools of thinking the great ideas, because education really involves, maybe ten to fifteen great ideas and that's about all, it's just combinations and permutations of these great ideas. One of the ideas you hear about all over the place is justice. Everybody is talking about justice. Maybe instead of talking about justice on this issue or justice in the women's rights, or justice in racial issues, or justice in a business deal, or political situations, instead of just going into these discussions, maybe we ought to say whoa, hold it. Hold it, cut! What are we talking about when we use the word "justice?" If I know that, then I can start thinking more clearly about what the problem is.

One of the conclusions we came to last time was this: that in the Bible, in contrast to human speculation, justice is derivative of God's attribute of holiness. God has His attributes. He's sovereign, He's righteous, He's just, He loves, He's omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent, immutable, eternal, lots of other attributes. That's who God is, that's what He was before the universe came into being. All this pre-existed our universe. And one of the things God is is holiness; I'm using the word "holiness" to encompass righteousness and justice. When the Bible speaks of holiness it's always in the context of justice and righteousness. So the two together are wrapped up into this package called holiness. Ultimately it's God's attribute of holiness from which all this derives. God's holiness is the source of justice in several ways. It's the source of justice in that when my conscience feels violated and I feel like something unjust is being done to me, that comes about because I am created in whose image? You're created in whose image? God's image. So there's something built into our souls that kind of intuitively senses when there's justice and when there's not justice. It's part of our design. Where did we get that from? It's an image of Him. So on the created level, the human conscience is a finite replica, a creaturely version of God's justice and righteousness. That's why it bothers us, because it reminds us we don't fit, ultimately morally and ethically with Him, we're at odds with Him, and we get our thing called conscience going.

Justice Scripturally does not come..., here's where I'm going to give some negatives, because the Bible is always set over against the culture. You have

to know this, you can't just think you know what the Bible says, you want to know what the Bible doesn't say. The Bible denies that justice is ultimately determined by man. Practically that means that justice ultimately is not defined by what happens in the Legislature. What segment of our government meets together part of the year to write and publish laws? The Legislature. Justice is not generated in the Legislature. We're stepping on toes here, now there's some tension in the air. What do you mean justice isn't made in the Legislature? How dare you assert that, I'm a legislator, I've been here ten years, I've given my time, my money, my effort, and you're telling me I don't create justice down here, what am I doing here if I'm not doing that? You're writing laws that you hope approximate justice, but you're not determining justice; you're trying to approximate God's justice, but you're not making the standard. We have to deny that. The Legislature, Washington, DC, those are not the sources of justice; they are only the sources of attempts for man to approximate God's justice, *attempts*. They're not the standard, they approximate God's standard.

Practically, where do we go from there? What's the immediate conclusion to this, what does this kind of reasoning lead us to? Let's suppose we don't believe that God is the source of justice and we accept the fact that man is the source of justice. What would you do in 1933 in Germany when the German legislators turned over the absolute power of the Third Reich to Adolph Hitler, and you hold that man creates justice? But now you don't like what you see. How do you respond to the atrocities of the Third Reich? Can you say it's wrong when you've just said that man defines right and wrong? The answer is when the Nazi's come to your doorstep and take your little retarded kid away to kill him because that kind of child pollutes and contaminates the genes for the Nordic race, you can say I don't like it, you can say it pains me, it grieves me, I don't like this but you can't say it's wrong. How can you say it's wrong? You can only say it's wrong if there's a standard that was independent of the absolute power of Adolph Hitler. Do you see?

At the end of World War II there was a famous trial of the Nazi leaders. I think every Christian should be aware of this chapter of history; it's called the Nuremberg Trials. At Nuremberg the issue was how can we prosecute Nazi atrocities? If you were a Nazi and you were a member of the S.S. what would be your defense at Nuremberg? Does anybody know what the Nazi's used as their legal defense; their lawyer sat right down and said it, "I

followed orders.” You know, “I followed the order.” How do you prosecute somebody then, how can you say that the guy shouldn’t have followed the order? That was the dilemma that all men faced at Nuremberg. In the middle of that trial, each country had given several justices. We gave a guy by the name of Robert Jackson. Jackson was discussing this matter, and as the justices struggled with this, there’s no such thing as international law, I mean, who writes that? So how do we prosecute the S.S. troops for their atrocities? Well, we don’t like it. But that’s not the issue in the trial, whether you like it, the issue is what was wrong, what was the injustice? So Jackson said the standard that we use must be above the *transient* and the *provincial*. It’s a very famous statement; he used these words. If we are to accuse the SS it cannot be by a standard that is transient and provincial. What did he mean by that? What would be a transient standard? One that went out of style; it was popular over here for a while, and then it we decided we didn’t like it that way so we changed it. So it can’t be a transient, changing standard. Nor can it be provincial. What did he mean by that? That it’s true for the Germans but not for the Spanish. It’s got to extend beyond provincial boundaries. And what they were searching for was some international standard that stood above all nations; it’s where the idea of international law and the UN really got going.

Okay, the point we’re illustrating here is that the standard which is ultimately above the transient and the provincial is God. The world is trying desperately to mimic and find a God replacement for justice and their answer has been international law; a body of law that trumps our Constitution and the Charter’s of other nations, for example with something like *The Earth Charter*. The question is how are they going to get there? How do they get people to go along with it? We know the where they want to get to, one international body of law, how are we going to get there? What’s the discussion now? The environment. How can they use the environment? The environment is unique because it doesn’t stop at national boundaries, the environment is the whole earth. So if we have a problem with the environment then the solution to the problem transcends national boundaries and therefore we’ve got to solve this problem and the easiest way to do it is to formulate international policies that stand in authority over national policies, and through this we will issue in a new world order, complete with an international body of law that overcomes the transient and provincial but which doesn’t have to submit to the standards of God. And that is precisely

what is ultimately described in the Books of Daniel and Revelation. The world system is trending toward a one world system that is sourced in man. But even when it all comes together and the whole thing is on the threshold of appearing attainable it will all come crashing down. So that's the attempt of man, the ultimate attempt to replace God and the Bible as the source of justice with man. I think we've said enough to see that man is not the source of justice, God is and man, when he legislates, can only attempt to approximate justice.

We went to Psalm 51 to point this is out. When David confesses his sin, it's a famous statement, and when we confess our sins, there's a lesson here that's very practical in the Christian life. If we're not clear on this issue of justice, we're going to have a real hard time confessing our sins to God. He'll accept our confession, I'm not saying He doesn't accept it, but I'm just saying that it's not really right to confess sin when on your mind the only reason you're confessing it is, "I embarrassed my fellow Christians, or I did this to somebody that I love." That's true, all of those things are true, but that's not what needs to happen when we confess our sins, because in Ps 51:4 David says "Against Thee and Thee only have I sinned." Is David denying that he hurt Uriah? Is he denying that he hurt Bathsheba? He's not denying that, but he says at the point I confess my sin to God, I have to see it as a sin against Him because He's the standard, not Uriah, not Bathsheba. God is the standard, I've violated Him and so I have to get that dealt with. That's how this justice plays a role, just in ordinary, everyday Christian living. That's the first thing we know about God's justice.

Then last time we also went to something else. We said that another feature of God's justice is that when you see justice in the Mosaic Law Code for all of society, justice calls for restitution. Exodus 22 gives ten to fifteen illustrations of this in the criminal law code of the time. It's interesting that in the law codes of Israel there's no mention of jail... no mention of jail! If you take a concordance the only time you see prisons mentioned in Scripture are two famous examples; famous men of the Bible that were in jail. Paul comes to mind, but in the OT, Joseph and Daniel. Where were they imprisoned? In both cases it was outside of Israel, in pagan nations. You say how did they control crime in Israel without jails? Exod 22 tells one way they controlled it: they required the criminal to pay double, triple and sometimes quadruple damages to the victim. You say suppose the guy said no, I'm not going to do

it. They killed him: capital punishment. That was rebellion against the authorities. Sorry. They sort of had a permanent solution to that problem.

The criminal law code had a way of coping with these things, but it didn't imprison people and treat them like animals in a cage, so they could get a graduate degree in criminology and do a better job next time, which is what we do. We have a very silly system. Suppose somebody robs somebody; let's say they rob you of \$10,000-\$20,000, really hurtful, damage your house or car or something. How does society solve that problem? Does the criminal ever pay you back? No, you never get a dollar out of the criminal. What happens? We send them to jail; we'll throw away the keys. You know what you don't throw away? The tax bill to finance three meals a day for the next ten years or however long he's in jail. So now look what we've done. Now we've got \$10,000-\$20,000 original damage over here, we've got \$40,000 a year times ten years, \$400,000 in taxpayer money. So what have we done to the damage? We haven't resolved the damage and now we impose another burden on all of society to pay for the next ten years.

What else do we do that's so brilliant? Now the insurance rates go up because the insurance company has to pay this, so now all of us pay again; we're paying to the insurance company, we're paying to the jails, we're paying the lawyers, they didn't do that in Exod 22. The Bible isn't quite as primitive as we think. We can learn a lot from the law codes in the word of God. God isn't stupid, and we ought to think about how He set up a society. He wasn't naïve, He knows man and He knows how to handle man. Maybe we can learn something from Him. So the second thing is that justice in the Bible means restitution is made and there is restoration.

The third thing we learned last time which transitions into our lesson today, the third thing is that in the case of our sin, what is the restitution for sin? What's the source of the restitution? Last week we looked at Gen 3, the first animal to be slaughtered, and slaughtering of animals is a modern issue, the animal rights movement. And there are some things about PETA and the animal rights movement that are absolutely weird, silly and stupid, but they are reacting against some things that are true. They don't like to see animals slaughtered and there's a reason for that. Animals have a soul, it's not in the image of God, but they do have a soul and that's why we have pets, that's why we can bond with animals, and to see them die horrible deaths can pain

us. That's why the Bible is very humane toward animals. There's a sensitivity toward animals.

In Gen 3:21, God "made garments of skin for Adam and his wife," how do you get skin except by killing an animal? Here's the first blood sacrifice. So God says, Adam and Eve, you've sinned, you've ruined the life that I gave you; that life is now cursed. You owe Me. But how do they pay? They can't, because they don't have any assets. So where's the source of the restitution? God, God makes the payment. And this lead to a practice that God kept in motion for century after century after century of time throughout the Scripture, and that is animal sacrifice. Let's think about why He did this.

The first thing to notice is that the animals are giving their life for man. There's a substitution of sorts in which the animal life is traded for man's life. There's a substitutionary aspect to this. That's Gen 3:21 and the whole thing. Why are animals picked instead of plants? Cain thought he could come to God with plants. Abel thought he could come to God with blood sacrifice of animals. What's the difference between plant and animal in creation account? *Nephesh*, the Hebrew word for "life" is true only of animals, not of plants. Adam and Eve could eat plants before the Fall and that did not cause the death of the plant, the plant didn't die in the *nephesh* sense. Plants and animals are distinguished. So animals, because of the *nephesh*, are used as medium so that Adam and Eve start to learn that for their *nephesh* other *nephesh* have to be substituted. Jesus Christ wasn't around, the incarnation hadn't happened yet, so this is preparatory to the incarnation. Animals have *nephesh*, plants do not, animals therefore are selected to give their *nephesh* for human *nephesh*.

Then what happens is that the animals are close enough to man, animals are analogous to us in that we feel, they feel, and when we have to kill them in animal sacrifice, we have to cause pain. The problem today is, because we're not living in rural America any more, we don't see the slaughter of animals. It's all neatly packaged in the supermarket shelf. But we don't see the pain that we caused. In order to get meat you have to kill something. That causes the animal pain. So something has to die in order that we can survive. We won't get into it today, but that's the lesson of Gen 9 of why there's a meat diet after the Flood and not before the Flood, etc. Now through the animal sacrifices we learn century after century the nature of God's restitutionary

justice is substitutionary. We learn that there has to be something that's alive, it can't be plants. We see the analogous nature of animals and the horror and the suffering it causes.

What is another illustration in the OT that God used to communicate to us the pain that is caused by sacrificial death and came very close to human sacrifice? An event in Genesis, Abraham and Isaac. That's the passage of Scripture, if you take a concordance and check out and look up this term that's used of the Lord Jesus Christ, remember one of the titles of Jesus is "the only begotten," *monogenes*. Do you know where that term first occurs? God says to Abraham, take your *monogenes*, take your "only begotten son" and slit his throat for Me. So in that scene of Abraham and Isaac, God comes yet closer. See, each step God reveals more and more of the nature of restitution. They didn't consciously think of it in terms of, perhaps coming to a head in a human Messiah at the time, but man was being led to this end.

That's why the Bible distinguishes the religion of Cain from the religion of Abel in the book of Hebrews, and the religion of Cain in the book of Jude. The way of Cain is the way of getting around bloody sacrifice, its bloodless religion. That is not saying that animism... a lot of tribes in primitive areas practice animism where they have sacrifice, the Aztecs and the Incas ruined their civilization because they used human sacrifices, cut out the heart right there on a big slab of stone. But behind all that blood and gore was a truth that they had once learned from father Noah, that if you want to approach God, and get on right terms with God's justice, there's got to be restitution and it's got to come from outside you. So it's got to come from animals or man. In paganism they slipped over the line and began to slaughter their babies, they began to slaughter slaves, they finally began to slaughter people in their families, and you had a bloody religion that was an apostate religion. On the other hand, if you go the green way of plants and you avoid this issue of blood sacrifice, and atonement for sin, then you are not dealing with God's justice.

Another passage of the OT that shows this is what happened when Israel was freed from Egypt? What was the climactic moment that is commemorated to this day by Orthodox Jewish families, all across the world? The Passover. What did they put over the door? Blood. A lamb had to be sacrificed. It wasn't plants. So now we have the lamb, we're specifying the kinds of animals. Certain kinds of animals are picked out as sacrifices. Why is that? Because

zoologically there's something about sheep that God wants us to see. There's something about that animal and killing that particular animal and the way it dies that teaches us about the cross of Christ. The way that animal dies sets you up for a whole series of truths about the death of Christ on the cross that you just don't get from any other zoological behavior.

So He ordains this strange practice of blood atonement, blood atonement, blood atonement. Years ago, when the gospel was preached in a much more direct fashion, the liberals thirty or forty years ago used to make fun of the fundamentalists. If you were a fundamentalist and you had a liberal friend in your home they'd say I don't believe in your bloody religion. They took pride in setting themselves apart that we have a higher ethic than you people and your bloody religion. So this is a tension point over the whole concept of justice.

We want to move on to the Messiah and how we start in the Bible discussion, in the progress of revelation, to link the Messiah in. So we have Messiah; He comes and He has something, all the details aren't quite clear, but Messiah is going to somehow be linked with substitutionary blood atonement. They couldn't see how the Messiah linked into the picture until they understood the necessity of substitutionary blood atonement. This lesson had to be learned first; it took a long time to learn this, the whole OT sacrificial system. Then after we learn that God's justice demands restitution for my sin, and I don't like this, I mean, the idea of having to kill an animal must have created the thought in people's minds, look at the consequences of my sin. When I sin against a holy God, look at what it takes to restore fellowship, look at the damage done here. Then the Messiah becomes linked into that. This is progress in a step-by-step learning process about how God is going to resolve man's problem.

We want to look at passages where the blood atonement and the Messiah come together. I've already said that the Passover was one of these. Turn to Gen 3:15, just above the passage where God killed the animal, God already revealed the first truth about Messiah. There's a term for this if you read a serious commentator, there's a Latin word that's used, "*protevangelium*," the first—"proto" gospel pronouncement and its Gen 3:15. That's the *protevangelium*. "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed," notice the different wounds that are made, "he shall

bruise you on the head,” that’s a death wound, “and you shall bruise him on the heel,” that’s not a death wound, that he will recover from.

Two things about that verse, notice in the third clause of Gen 3:15 there’s a word there that should have... *should have* grabbed the attention of every Jewish reader, or every reader of the Bible, that’s the word “seed.” It’s the word for sperm. What is unusual about the word usage in Gen 3:15? It belongs to a woman. Women don’t have sperm. Why is that word associated with a woman? The text doesn’t say, but it’s very odd. Something is not right. We read this, we get so used to it, we just go through it 35 mph and don’t even read the signs. But there’s something strange about that statement, and it’s deliberately put in there by the Holy Spirit hoping that somebody is going to read that and say hey, what does this mean, the sperm of the woman? What’s going on here? Of course we know looking back what that is, that’s a reference to the virgin birth. The woman will have a seed; it was the Holy Spirit that brought about the conception.

Her seed shall “bruise you on the head, and you will bruise him on the heel,” talking to Satan. In mythology this truth was partially remembered in a famous Greek myth. Remember what the myth was? Somebody whose heel his mother held when he was a baby and it gave him immunity from all parts except his heel, we call that in the expression of the English language, the Achilles heel, because Achilles was held by his mother and dipped and the only place that wasn’t dipped was the place where she held him, by the heel, that was his vulnerable point. That’s probably a mythological distortion of this truth in Gen 3:15.

So the Messiah in the context is spoken of, He’s her seed. The virgin birth is hinted at, how the seed would come into the world and the Messiah is to engage in a battle with Satan and be wounded. It’s not explicitly in context linked yet. Verse 15 and verse 21 aren’t linked together yet, but that’s the first thing. So let’s watch the progress. There are four or five of these links that go on between the Messiah that I’m going to point out.

The first one is in Gen 3, let’s go to the second one, which we’ve already talked about, that’s the Passover. Jesus Christ, the night before He was betrayed, He took bread, and He took the wine. Jesus Christ celebrated the Passover, and He did so because in effect He was acting out the Passover to

show His linkage. We'll get into that in a little bit. Exodus 12 is the second link between the Messiah and the substitutionary atonement.

The third link is that every major Biblical covenant in the Scripture, EVERY covenant in the Scripture is inaugurated by a blood sacrifice, starting with the Noahic Covenant. Noah made a sacrifice, Abraham had a sacrifice, the Mosaic Covenant was installed by sacrifice, and what was the covenant which was the focus into the future? The New Covenant, and when the Lord Jesus Christ, in the middle of the first communion, what did He say, as He held up the cup? This is the blood of the New Covenant; so as the Lord Jesus Christ installed the covenant that night, twenty-four hours later He would pay with His blood, with His life, the sacrifice of the New Covenant. It all fits together. He was doing nothing that hadn't already been done in the OT.

A fourth link, Isa 53, this is the most controversial passage to Jewish people in the Scripture. This has been a crux, a source of argumentation, for centuries, and a very famous portion of the OT. Knowledgeable Jews will react, I say knowledgeable Jews because there are many Jewish people today who know less about the Bible than Gentiles, but Jews that are knowledgeable about the Scripture are very sensitive to this passage. In Isaiah 53:2, "For He grew up before Him like a tender shoot, and like a root out of parched ground; He has no stately form or majesty that we should look upon Him. Nor appearance that we should be attracted to Him." By the way, this is the most elaborate portrait in the Scripture of the physical appearance of Jesus Christ. This is the closest we ever come. Here it says that if you saw the Lord Jesus Christ, not the hippie that's painted in the artistry, but if you saw the real Jesus you would not think of Him as a particularly outstanding person, very plain looking, "nor appearance that we should be attracted to Him." He wasn't that super attractive physically.

Verse 3, "He was despised and forsaken of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and like one from whom men hide their face. He was despised, and we did not esteem Him. ⁴Surely our griefs He Himself bore, and our sorrows He carried," watch verse 4 and 5, because this is what really causes grief to Jewish people who are knowledgeable of the Scriptures who are not Messianic Jews. "Surely our griefs He Himself bore, and our sorrows He carried, yet we ourselves esteemed Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. ⁵But He was pierced through for our transgressions," watch it right

there, do you see what's happening in Isaiah 53 that's exciting? Isaiah 53 links the Messiah to a substitutionary death. It's right here. What does it say, "He was pierced through for *our transgressions*, He was crushed for *our iniquities*; the chastening for *our well-being* fell upon Him, and by His scourging we are healed. ⁶All of us like sheep have gone astray, each of us has turned to his own way; but the LORD" look at this one, "the LORD has caused the iniquity *of us all to fall on Him.*"

Isaiah 53 is a central passage about the work of the Lord Jesus Christ. How do unbelieving Jews handle this? Before Christianity the universal interpretation of this by the Jewish community was that this was the Messiah, no doubt. Then after Jesus came and the Christian Jews began to say see, right there, there's Jesus, then they said well gee, let's take another look at this one. So things got greasy then, the interpretation of Isa 53 came to be well, we think that's the nation Israel there. That shift in interpretation came about in the Middle Ages when the rabbis got tired of dealing with these Christian's claiming Jesus fulfilled this. So finally they said, that's it, we've had enough of this, we have to come up with an answer to this so they said, ten centuries later, this refers to the nation Israel suffering, not the Messiah. "Some Gentile Christian scholars, however, insist that first-century Jews did not recognize any vicarious suffering of the Messiah in this passage." They say they just didn't recognize it. "These scholars are opposed by most Hebrew Christian scholars, who claim the contrary. Dr. Fruchtenbaum, for example, notes" and here's some evidences for you, I searched these out so those of you who like to capture little evidences, here's a few for you. Dr. Fruchtenbaum, "notes that the Zohar, written about A.D. 110," that's after the death of Christ, "preserves an old first-century Jewish interpretation of Isaiah 53:4," and this is what the Zohar says, quote, "Were it not that [Messiah] had thus lighted [sickness, pain, chastisement] off Israel and taken them upon himself, there had been no man able to bear Israel's chastisement for transgression of the law.' Surely, there is the element of vicarious or substitutionary Messianic suffering in this non-Christian Jewish first-century tradition. Furthermore, Fruchtenbaum points out, this interpretative tradition of Isa 53 continued in Jewish circles well into the Christian era, occurring in remarkable places such as the Yom Kippur Musaf Prayer written around the seventh century A.D." now we're up to the seventh century A.D., and here's what the prayer says, "Messiah our Righteousness is departed from us. ... He hath borne the yoke of our iniquities, and our

transgressions.... He beareth our sins... that he may find pardon for our iniquities.' The allusion to Isaiah 53 is unmistakable.”

What we've said today is out of this core of justice that we've learned in the Scripture, then we moved to the animal sacrifice that was a revelatory preparation for understanding the death of Christ, then the Messiah prophetically was linked into the substitutionary blood atonement four ways, by the Protoevangelium of Gen 3:15, the sperm of the woman, by the Passover, Gen 12, by the covenant sacrifices. Every covenant has a founding sacrifice, what's happening on the cross, a founding sacrifice for the new covenant, and finally Isaiah 53, the suffering servant, the traditional interpretation of which links the Messiah in explicitly as the substitutionary blood atonement for our sins.

Next week we're going to deal with the crucifixion narratives and we're going to cite certain things that maybe you haven't seen, hopefully most of us have, but there may be some who are newer to the Scripture who haven't noticed particular ways that the Bible reports the death to have occurred. There's a strange thing in this. So we'll work with that next week.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010