

On Dave Anderson's Post-Supersessionism

A Statement of Dave's Teaching and a Rebuttal from Scripture and Scholarship

The Elders of Littleton Bible Chapel have drafted this document in an effort to clarify Dave Anderson's statements made publicly from this pulpit regarding the theological framework he has labeled post-supersessionism. The elders hold additional concerns about other doctrinal shifts in Dave's teaching, which we have addressed and may continue to address in separate documents. This document is restricted to his teaching on this specific subject. We are aware that Dave has since published a number of documents seeking to further define his doctrinal positions. As Dave is no longer part of this body, those subsequent statements fall outside the scope of this document. Our concern here is with what was taught publicly from this pulpit and communicated among the elders and people of LBC while Dave served in that capacity. We offer these clarifications for the benefit of those in our congregation who heard that teaching, carry genuine questions about it, and have sought guidance from their elders.

Summary: What This Document Is About and Why It Matters

For those who may not have sufficient time or interest to interact with the entirety of this document, we begin with a brief summary which can be used to get a sense of the pertinent issues. This document addresses three specific theological problems that have emerged from Dave Anderson's public teaching at Littleton Bible Chapel, each documented from his own sermons. The body of the document provides LBC's historical and scriptural argument for each concern.

First: Dave teaches that Jewish believers in Christ remain permanently obligated to the Mosaic law.

In his own words: *"Jews are obligated to the Sabbath in ways that we're not"* (Exodus Sabbath sermon series), and from his published letter: *"If a Jewish rabbi came to faith in Christ tomorrow and asked me, 'Do I need to give up Sabbath, circumcision, and keeping kosher?' — my answer would be no."*

The New Testament requires the opposite conclusion. Hebrews 8:13 calls the Mosaic covenant obsolete. Galatians 3:24-25 describes the law as a guardian whose assignment ended when

Christ arrived: *"Now that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian."* Dave's framework keeps the guardian permanently on duty for Jewish believers. The New Testament dismisses him.

Second: Dave introduces a two-track covenant structure into the present-day church, what theologians call "Messianic bilateralism."

In plain terms, bilateralism is the claim that within the one body of Christ there exist two groups with different obligations before God: Jewish believers obligated to Torah, Gentile believers who are not. From the pulpit: *"The Jewish food laws are still in place, just not for the Gentiles"* (Romans 14:13-23 sermon), and *"There are different rules for Jews and Gentiles, it seems"* (Romans 14:13-23 sermon).

Ephesians 2:14-15 explicitly denounces this as a possible conclusion: Christ created *"one new man in place of the two"*. This refers to a new humanity defined not by ethnic origin but by union with Christ. A community with two differently-obligated groups is not the one new man Paul describes. It reconstructs the very division Christ died to abolish.

Third: Dave cites Michael Vlach as a supporting scholarly voice while arriving at conclusions Vlach explicitly rejects.

Michael Vlach, author of *Has the Church Replaced Israel?* (B&H Academic, 2010), states that the Mosaic covenant ended with Christ's death, explicitly refuses two-peoples language, and insists that Gentiles share *with* Israel rather than being incorporated *into* Israel. On all three of the questions most central to Dave's framework, Dave's own cited authority stands against him.

The Pastoral Consequence

These concerns bear directly on the most important question any believer asks: *on what terms do I stand before God?* Scripture's answer is unambiguous. Believers are clothed entirely in the righteousness of Christ, declared righteous by God's verdict, received by faith alone, with no ethnic qualifier attached. Jewish and Gentile believers stand on identical ground before the Father. Dave's newfound doctrinal positions fracture that ground and not merely by theological imprecision. It removes the only place a troubled conscience has to stand. That is why this document was necessary.

Part One: What Dave Actually Teaches — In His Own Words

As we shall show, Dave has given his theological position a precise label: **post-supersessionism**. We begin by pointing out that the label itself is not theologically innocent. When Dave calls himself post-supersessionist, he is not simply describing an affirmation that God is not finished with Israel, a conviction LBC already holds. He is adopting a label with a specific, institutionally

defined meaning that includes the rejection of Torah's obsolescence for Jewish believers. The label carries its content with it whether Dave intends it to or not. Understanding what he means by it based on the content of his public teaching, and what he does not mean, is essential before any rebuttal can be fair or effective.

The elders have shown elsewhere that much of Dave's shift in doctrine has been influenced by thought originating with the New Perspective on Paul. We wish here to point out that the term post-supersessionism did not originate with NPP thinkers. This notion originated not with Evangelical thinkers, but with liberal mainline Protestant scholars, who hold fundamentally different commitments to scripture, salvation and the finality of Christ. The primary scholar responsible for the origin of this doctrine is R. Kendall Soulen at Emory University, whose 1996 book launched the movement as a named theological program. The Society for Post-Supersessionist Theology, which owns the term's formal definition, explicitly includes in that definition the rejection of Torah's obsolescence for Jewish communal identity, which is precisely the bilateral Torah-obligation framework at the center of the elders' concerns. Dave's adoption of this label is therefore not a retreat from NPP categories toward more conservative ground. It is a move into a tradition that is in several respects more theologically radical than the NPP. While we won't ascribe all of post-supersessionist thought to Dave any more than we'll ascribe all of the NPP to Dave, we do hold him accountable to his use and origins of theological constructs that veer from our traditional teaching.

Where we agree:

As in all our papers regarding confusion sparked by Dave's teaching, we want to be as charitable as possible. That means beginning with and fully affirming the areas we agree. Dave rejects supersessionism and that is something we can affirm. Supersessionism is the view that the church has replaced Israel as the people of God, inheriting her promises and rendering her covenantally obsolete. LBC's doctrinal view of the future of Israel is a long held and still fully affirmed view and we are glad for it. He rightly states this from the pulpit:

*"The fancy name for this I refer to is called supersessionism. That's where the church absorbs all the promises that were made directly to Israel and sort of becomes Israel in a spiritual sense... I'm telling you, this might not sound like a big deal, but it really does change everything."
(Romans 11:1–10 sermon)*

"Ethnic Israel is still relevant. Ethnic Israel still has a future. Ethnic Israel has not been magically changed into the Gentile church and now called Israel." (Romans 11:1–10 sermon)

"God doesn't unknow the people he knows. He doesn't unlove the people he loves. He doesn't uncall the people he calls. He doesn't rescind the adoption." (Romans 11:1–10 sermon)

On these points the elders agree with Dave without reservation. LBC is a premillennial congregation and has been since its inception over 60 years ago. We believe Romans 11:29, that the gifts and calling of God are irrevocable. We believe ethnic Israel has a literal eschatological future. We believe the Messiah will return and reign from Jerusalem. We believe God is not finished with the Jewish people. These convictions are not in dispute.

What Dave's preaching is building and where the problems begin:

Dave's post-supersessionism is not merely a rebuttal to supersessionism. It builds a positive theological framework on the foundation of anti-supersessionism, and it is in that framework that the elders find serious and demonstrable error. We believe his framework rests on three interlocking claims we seek to examine carefully:

Claim One- "Messianic Bilateralism": One People, Two Callings

A careful review of Dave's sermon record reveals a sustained and consistent commitment to what theologians call **Messianic bilateralism**. This is a term that will be unfamiliar to most in our congregation and deserves precise definition before we examine its content.

Post-supersessionism, as described above, addresses an eschatological and hermeneutical question: what is the ongoing status of God's covenant with ethnic Israel? Messianic bilateralism addresses a different and more specific question: how do Jewish and Gentile believers relate to Torah within the present New Covenant community? It is primarily an ecclesiological position. Its concern is not with Israel's future but with how the church is structured now, and what covenant obligations Jewish believers carry in the present age.

The term did not originate in evangelical theology. It is a product of mainline Messianic Judaism, coined by Mark Kinzer in his 2005 book *Post-Missionary Messianic Judaism*, and it remains a contested position even within the Messianic Jewish world that produced it. In the context of LBC's historic doctrinal commitments it is more foreign still.

We note that Dave has at various points embraced and distanced himself from the various labels applied to his teaching, just as he has with the New Perspective on Paul. Our concern here is not with the labels he accepts or rejects. It is with the content of what he has taught publicly from this pulpit, which falls demonstrably within this framework regardless of what he calls it.

That content is this: Dave's argument is not the unremarkable observation that Jews and Gentiles have different histories and cultural backgrounds. It is the theological claim that within the one New Covenant community, Jewish and Gentile believers carry structurally different

covenant obligations before God, not merely different cultural expressions of the same faith, but different relationships to the law of Moses as a permanent and governing covenantal requirement. This is not a peripheral feature of Dave's teaching. It is its organizing principle.

The practical content of that claim is stated plainly in his sermons:

"The Jewish food laws are still in place, just not for the Gentiles." (Romans 14:13–23 sermon)

"Jews are obligated to the Sabbath in ways that we're not." (Exodus Sabbath sermon series)

"He's emphatically saying they do not need to give up their identity, these Jews." (Romans 14:1–12 sermon)

"There are different rules for Jews and Gentiles, it seems." (Romans 14:13–23 sermon)

The framework is not confined to those passages, though even these would be enough. It appears as the assumption underneath his entire reading of Acts 15, his Exodus Sabbath series, and his Romans 9–14.

In Acts 15 he states it with directness:

"Salvation is homogenous. It's the same for Jew and Gentile. There is no distinction in salvation on the day of judgment. But distinctions remain. Roles still remain. Israel still retains a unique role among the nations." (Acts 15 sermon)

And similar statements in sermons, revealing the two-track logic very clearly:

"The gifts are irrevocable...and of all the gifts to Israel, the Law is at the top of the pile."

"The Law... is part of the irrevocable gifting and calling of Israel." (Acts 15 sermon)

"Paul's a Torah observant Jew to the very end. This is huge. He doesn't require this of the Gentiles. He does seem to require it of the Jewish Christians." (Romans 14:1–12 sermon)

"Paul has one rule in his churches... if you've got the marks of circumcision, you don't remove it. If you don't have the marks of circumcision, don't seek to get it. Stay as you are, Jews and Gentiles." (Romans 14:1–12 sermon)

And explicitly, from one of his published letters:

"If a Jewish rabbi came to faith in Christ tomorrow and asked me, 'Do I need to give up Sabbath, circumcision, and keeping kosher?' — my answer would be no."

A pastoral note is necessary here because the elders might also affirm a version of an interaction with a Jewish rabbi wondering about his continued observation of the law. We would not demand that a newly believing Jewish man or woman immediately and abruptly set

aside practices woven into the fabric of their life and identity. The conscience is formed gradually, and the Spirit works with patience. Romans 14 makes clear that the strong are to bear with the weak, not to demand immediate conformity, but to receive them fully while giving the gospel time to do its clarifying work. A Jewish believer who continues observing Sabbath or dietary laws in the early months and years of their faith is not in error, they are in process, and they deserve the same grace every new believer deserves as their understanding of what Christ has accomplished grows deeper. But accommodation, as we might describe it, is not what Dave's framework is getting at.

What we are objecting to is categorically different. Dave's framework does not describe a pastoral accommodation for the newly believing, it describes a permanent theological structure in which Torah observance is a *covenantal obligation* for Jewish believers, not a transitional practice for the immature. When Dave says a Jewish rabbi who comes to faith in Christ should not give up Sabbath, circumcision, or keeping kosher, he is not making a pastoral concession for a tender conscience. He is making a doctrinal claim about what the New Covenant *requires* of Jewish believers, for their entire lives, simply because they are Jewish. This is the claim of "Messianic Bilateralism", and this is Dave's claim. For adherents, the Jew must permanently and structurally, have a lifelong commitment to Torah observation. The difference between those two things is the difference between a pastor wisely shepherding a new believer and a teacher restructuring the covenant.

The elders want to be precise about where the error lies because Dave is correct about one thing and wrong about another and conflating the two is a danger here.

He is correct that Jewish and Gentile believers have different histories, different cultural inheritances, and different roles in God's eschatological (future kingdom) purposes. LBC affirms this. The nations and Israel will be distinguishable in the coming kingdom, and we do not require Jewish believers to abandon their cultural identity or pretend their Jewishness is irrelevant to their story anymore than we would require this of any other human ethnic group.

Where Dave differs from LBC's historical teaching, demonstrably and with great consequence, is the claim that those differences constitute *differentiated covenant obligations in the present New Covenant age*. The moment Sabbath, circumcision, and dietary laws become things a Jewish believer in Christ is still *obligated* to observe is the moment the New Covenant has been fractured into two tracks. A New Covenant with two tracks is not the New Covenant the New Testament describes.

Galatians 3:28 states the present reality without qualification: "*There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.*" Paul is not describing an eschatological hope here. He is describing what is true now, in

Christ, for all who belong to him. The oneness is not future. It is the present ground on which every believer stands.

Ephesians 2:15 is even more precise: Christ abolished the law of commandments expressed in ordinances *"that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two."* One new man. Not one new man with two different sets of legal obligations depending on his ethnic origin. One. The unity Paul describes is not a unity of salvation outcome with ongoing distinction of covenant obligation. It is a unity of identity, standing, and relationship to the law. **It is vital to recognize that Paul is defining a new humanity that did not exist before the cross and exists now only in him.**

Dave's bilateral framework, requires reading "one new man" as "one new community containing two differently obligated groups." The text does not permit that reading. And a congregation formed by that reading will, over time, find itself unable to answer the question every believer eventually asks: *on what terms do I stand before God?* LBC's clear historical teaching on this topic has always answered this question with the clean, objective, ethnically unqualified answer the gospel provides.

Claim Two – Differentiated Torah:

The Jerusalem Council of Acts 15 is Dave's governing paradigm. Based on his preaching, the Council's ruling establishes a permanent two-track framework: Jewish believers live under Torah as their covenantal inheritance; Gentile believers observe only the four apostolic prohibitions. From the pulpit:

"The Jerusalem Council actually prevents both errors... We go too far if we assume that none of the law applies... But there is another error to avoid — the Hebrew Roots movement... assumes all of the law still applies equally." (Acts 15 sermon)

"The law of commandments expressed in the ordinances that excluded Gentiles has been abolished. The dividing wall is gone. But it's going too far to suggest that the Law itself has been abolished." (Acts 15 sermon)

Claim Three — Christianity as a Subset of Israel:

Dave consistently frames the church not as a new entity but as an expansion of Israel's covenantal family. Gentiles are grafted *into* Israel's story and identity. From the pulpit:

"The church is not a separate entity from Israel, but if anything, a subset of Israel." (Romans 9:1–5 sermon)

"Non-Jews don't become Jews, but do they become Jewish?" (Romans 14:1–12 sermon)

That last question, *do they become Jewish?* Is left to be answered rhetorically but reveals what Dave's theology has concluded.

Pastoral Concerns:

Before we go further, we take a moment here to discuss the pastoral and counseling implications of Dave's doctrine.

LBC, along with the The Association of Certified Biblical Counselors have long observed that a believer's functional understanding of the atonement, that is, what they actually believe at the level of conscience and daily life, about what Christ's death accomplished directly governs the health of their sanctification. When a believer operates under any framework that attaches ongoing legal obligation to their standing before God, the inevitable psychological and spiritual effect is a conscience that measures rather than rests. Instead of asking *"what has Christ done?"* one is tempted to ask *"have I done enough?"*, and that question, once internalized, produces either pride when the answer feels satisfactory or despair when it does not. Neither conclusion is biblical sanctification. Both are the predictable fruit of a law-burdened conscience.

This concern is not theoretical for LBC. We are now a congregation exposed to extensive teaching that Jewish identity carries ongoing covenantal weight, that Torah obligations remain in force for some believers, and that faithfulness and allegiance are the expected response woven into the fabric of grace itself. The elders are deeply concerned this will produce people who are functionally oriented toward performance rather than toward the finished work of Christ as the sole ground of their acceptance. Biblical counselors consistently find that the most entrenched patterns of either spiritual pride or chronic spiritual despair trace back not to personal weakness but to a deficient understanding of what the atonement actually secured. Doctrine and the health of the soul are not separate concerns, and these are not mere intellectual acrobatics. Right doctrine, leads to right thinking and right thinking is the foundational heart of sanctification. For that reason, we labor further.

Part Two: Where we disagree with Dave - Four Decisive Problems

Problem One: The Mosaic Covenant Ended at the Cross

Dave's entire bilateral framework depends on an ongoing Torah vocation for Jewish believers. But the New Testament is explicit that the Mosaic covenant, **including its identity markers**, ended with Christ's death and the establishment of the New Covenant.

Hebrews 7:12 states the principle with precision: *"For when there is a change in the priesthood, there is necessarily a change in the law also."* The Levitical priesthood has been replaced by the eternal priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchizedek. Therefore, the law governing that priesthood, the entire Mosaic administration, has changed with it. Hebrews 8:13 makes the conclusion explicit: *"In speaking of a new covenant, he makes the first one obsolete. And what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away."*

The author of Hebrews is not speaking to Gentiles about Gentile obligations. He is writing to Jewish believers. These are people with the strongest possible cultural and religious attachment to the Mosaic covenant, and he is telling them that covenant is obsolete. Not spiritually enriched. Not continued under new management. Obsolete.

Dave's framework requires that Jewish believers in Christ retain Sabbath, circumcision, and dietary laws as ongoing covenantal obligations. The author of Hebrews requires the opposite. The Mosaic covenant has not been abolished in the sense of being declared evil, this is a strawman argument. Instead, it has been fulfilled and therefore superseded by the better covenant, the better priesthood, the better sacrifice it was always pointing toward.

Galatians 3:23-25 makes the same argument in Paul's language: *"Before faith came, we were held captive under the law, imprisoned until the coming faith would be revealed. So then, the law was our guardian until Christ came, in order that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian."*

Paul's word, (*paidagogos*), 'guardian' describes the household servant whose role was to escort the child to school until the child came of age. The escort's role was real, necessary, and temporary. When the child matured, the escort went home. His job was finished.

Dave's framework keeps the escort on duty permanently, but only for Jewish believers. Hebrews and Galatians both make that impossible to sustain exegetically.

Problem Two: The One New Man Is Not Bilateral

Dave's most quoted text for his framework is Ephesians 2, the breaking down of the dividing wall between Jew and Gentile. But Paul's actual argument in that passage is the most direct rebuttal of the bilateral framework available in the New Testament.

Ephesians 2:14-15 reads: *"For he himself is our peace, who has made us both one and has broken down in his flesh the dividing wall of hostility by abolishing the law of commandments expressed in ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace."*

Paul says Christ abolished (*katargeō*), rendered inoperative, brought to nothing, the law of commandments expressed in ordinances. This is not a reference to the moral law. It is the Mosaic covenant's specific commandments and ordinances, exactly the identity markers Dave says Jewish believers must retain. And Paul says Christ abolished them in order to create *one new man in place of the two*. Not two men with shared salvation but differentiated obligations. One new man. In place of the two.

Dave reads this passage as destroying the wall while preserving the distinction. The wall is gone; the bilateral difference remains. But Paul's wording doesn't allow this result. Note that the passage clearly teaches that the purpose of creating a new man is the result of abolishing the ordinances themselves. The one new man is the consequence of the abolition. You cannot have the one new man while simultaneously maintaining that one half of him lives under covenant obligations the other half does not.

Problem Three: Acts 15 Does Not Establish a Permanent Bilateral Framework

Dave's use of Acts 15 as the governing paradigm for his bilateral ecclesiology requires a reading of that chapter that the text does not support. The Jerusalem Council made a ruling, a real, authoritative, apostolic ruling. But what did it actually decide?

The Council's question, as Dave himself correctly identifies, was: *do Gentile believers need to become Jewish in order to be saved and to belong?* The answer was an unambiguous no. The four apostolic prohibitions were given to Gentiles, not as a permanent two-track covenant framework but as minimum requirements for table fellowship in a mixed Jewish-Gentile community at a specific moment in redemptive history when Jewish believers were still meeting in synagogues.

The Council did not address the question Dave wants it to answer: *do Jewish believers retain ongoing Torah obligations in the New Covenant age?* That question never came before the Council. The silence is not permission. As Michael Vlach, Dave's own cited authority, notes in his treatment of Acts 15: *"the passage establishes that Gentiles should NOT be coerced into Judaism. It does not establish that Jewish believers remain permanently under Mosaic obligation as a covenantal calling."*

Furthermore, Paul's own conduct provides the correct interpretive framework for Jewish practice in the New Covenant age. Dave cites Paul's circumcision of Timothy and his Nazirite vow in Acts 21 as evidence of ongoing Jewish covenantal obligation. But Paul himself provides the interpretive key in 1 Corinthians 9:20: *"To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews."* The phrase *as a Jew* is Paul's own language. He did not say *I remained a Jew* or *I fulfilled my Jewish covenantal calling*. He said he became *as a Jew*, what we might call missiological flexibility, not covenantal obligation.

Problem Four: Michael Vlach Does Not Support Dave's Conclusions

The elders affirm the value of serious theological scholarship and commend its careful use in the formation of doctrinal conviction. We raise no objection to the engagement with academic sources. We do, however, hold that intellectual honesty requires a teacher to represent his sources accurately. That is, acknowledging where a scholar's conclusions diverge from his own rather than citing that scholar's authority in support of positions he explicitly does not hold. It is on that standard of honest representation that the following concern is raised.

This point requires explicit treatment because Dave has cited Dr. Vlach as a scholar whose work informs and supports his framework. The elders address that citation because Vlach's actual positions on the three questions most central to Dave's bilateral framework stand against Dave's conclusions.

On the Mosaic covenant, Vlach is explicitly in agreement with LBC's historical position: *"The Mosaic Covenant was a temporary and conditional covenant given to Israel at Mount Sinai. The era of the Mosaic Covenant ended with Jesus' death and the establishment of the New Covenant."* – Michael Vlach *He Will Reign Forever: A Biblical Theology of the Kingdom of God* (Silverton, OR: Lampion Press, 2017). Here, Vlach cites Hebrews 7:12 directly: *"When the priesthood is changed, of necessity there takes place a change of law also."* This is the opposite of Dave's position that Jewish believers retain Sabbath, circumcision, and dietary laws as ongoing covenant obligations.

On the bilateral community, Vlach deliberately avoids Dave's framework. In his treatment of Romans 9-11, Vlach explicitly draws readers attention to the fact that he *"avoids using any language that might sound as if there are two peoples of God, Israel and the Church,"* stating instead that *"Jesus's church encompasses both believing Israelites and Gentiles."* – Michael Vlach *He will Reign Forever* (2017). Dave's "Messianic bilateralism" is precisely the language and framework Vlach clearly refuses.

On Gentile identity, Vlach draws the line that Dave crosses: *"Gentiles are brought near to Israel's covenants, promises, hope, and God but they do not become Israel; they share with Israel. Nothing is said about Gentiles becoming Jews or part of Israel."* – Michael Vlach, *Has the Church Replaced Israel? A Theological Evaluation* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010). Dave's framework, reinforced by his recommendation of Liebengood's *Reading 1 Peter After Supersessionism*, moves Gentiles into "Israelhood". Vlach says explicitly: they share *with* Israel. They do not enter *into* Israel.

The conclusion is unavoidable: Dave cites Vlach as a supporting voice while arriving at positions Vlach explicitly rejects. The elders are not claiming Vlach is the final authority on these questions. But a teacher who invokes a scholar's authority while departing from that scholar's

conclusions at three of the most critical points owes the congregation a clearer account of where he actually stands and why.

Part Three: Conclusion

Finally, the elders want to be clear about what we do and do not affirm based on the historic teaching and doctrinal commitments of LBC.

What we affirm:

God's covenant with ethnic Israel is irrevocable. Israel has a future. The Messiah will return and reign literally from Jerusalem. The nations will stream to Zion. Israel and the nations will co-exist in the Messianic kingdom with distinct and complementary vocations. The church has not replaced Israel. Anti-Semitism is incompatible with the gospel. These are convictions LBC holds and has always held.

What we reject:

We reject any notion of a two track, two peoples program for the children of God. No believer, Jewish or Gentile, is Torah obligated as Dave's framework asserts. Further, the distinction between Israel and the nations is primarily eschatological (future oriented) it describes what will be true in the coming kingdom, not present and ecclesiological, it does not describe differentiated covenant obligations within the present New Covenant community. In the present age, all believers, **Jew and Gentile**, stand before God on identical ground, governed by the same Spirit, under the same New Covenant, in the same one new man that Christ created when he abolished the ordinances that separated them.

To that end, a Jewish rabbi who comes to faith in Christ has not graduated from Sinai into a parallel track of the same covenant. He has arrived, as all true Christ followers have, at the one to whom Sinai was always pointing. The escort from Galatians 3:23-25 has brought him home. His job is finished.