

The Transition Between the Old and New Covenants

James Smyda

Recorded on February 8, 2025

Brethren, as I'm sure most of you are aware the Bible speaks a great deal about what it calls the "New Covenant". It also often compares and contrasts this covenant with the covenant that God made with Israel at Mount Sinai. Now, we oftentimes refer to the Mount Sinai Covenant as the "Old Covenant". That's not a term you'll actually find in the Bible. But again, I don't think it's an inaccurate term because it is just a way of referring to the Mount Sinai Covenant and most people understand that. But if you look into how the Bible describes these covenants, it describes them as not only distinctly different, but actually mutually exclusive. To kind of put it in modern day terminology it's more of an "either / or". It's not an "all the above". It's one or the other.

That very fact has oftentimes caused confusion for mankind for several thousand years now. In fact, particularly in the Protestant world that's oftentimes their justification for their belief that God's law is done away with, and you don't have to keep it anymore. Well, we in the Church of God, we typically don't get tripped up on that particular concept. We recognize that Christ didn't do away with God's law. But when we explain you might say the transition between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant -- how it switches from one to the other -- oftentimes the logic of what we present really has some flaws in it. It isn't totally accurate.

Because oftentimes we associate that with, well, Christ died, therefore the Old Covenant completely goes away and all there is the New Covenant. Well, if you just think about that, is everyone in mankind being offered the New Covenant today? No, it's just a small number of people. If you look at the millennium, what do you see? You see the entire Old Covenant system in place. You can see from that our traditional explanation is a little flawed. It has some holes in it. So, what we're going to do today is take a closer look at this particular subject. We're going to look at the covenants themselves and kind of review some common things you're probably familiar with, what makes them unique and different from each other. But we're also going to then focus on, what does the Bible actually say about the transition between the covenants to make sure that we're explaining this accurately and consistent with what the Bible actually says. So, if you'd like a title for this sermon, it's:

The Transition Between the Old and New Covenants

Because as we're going to see later in this sermon, our traditional explanation of how that happens has some flaws with it. We need to take a closer look at that. But just to start off with, let's notice how the Bible describes these covenants as not only distinct from one another, but even mutually exclusive from one another. So, to start off with, let's turn over to actually the first scripture in the Bible that ever directly mentions the New Covenant. That's in the Book of Jeremiah. It's actually a prophecy of the New Covenant. It's in Jeremiah 31, and we'll start in verse 31.

Jer 31:31 *“Behold, the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah— 32) not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke, though I was a husband to them, says the LORD.” (NKJV)*

Now, as I mentioned just a moment ago, oftentimes you see the New Covenant and the Mount Sinai Covenant being compared and contrasted with one another. Well, that's obviously what's happening here. Because He's referring to bringing them out of Egypt and the covenant He made with them. That's the Mount Sinai Covenant. We'll continue now in verse 33.

“33) But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put My law in their minds, and write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. 34) No more shall every man teach his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, ‘Know the LORD,’ for they all shall know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, says the LORD. For I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more.” (NKJV)

Now, to start off with, I'd like to just point out some of the, you might say the core main differences between the covenants. Two of the main three points I'd like to point out are mentioned in this verse. Notice He talked about forgiving their sins and not remembering their iniquities anymore. The forgiveness of sin is one of the big issues. That's something that the New Covenant offers. The Old Covenant did not. It also refers to writing His laws on their hearts. Now that's the giving of the Holy Spirit that enables that to take place. Now we're going to see a little bit later here in the book of Hebrews, there's also the offering of the opportunity for eternal life, for salvation. Now those three aspects are kind of the, you might say some of the biggest core differences that distinguish the covenants from each other.

Because the Old Covenant was just simply a promise of a nation to be prosperous. If they faithfully obeyed God and obeyed the letter of the law, then they would just have continual physical blessings, and life would go well for them. Salvation was not part of the equation. But what I want you to also see here is again, not only just the differences between these two. But the fact that the Bible describes them as you might say, mutually exclusive. Now, when it refers to the New Covenant here, it started off here in verse 31, saying “I will make a New Covenant”. Well, the word for “new” there in Hebrew is “hadas”. It's Strong's # 2319, and the definition I'm going to read to you is from The Complete Word Study Dictionary of the Old Testament by Warren Baker and Eugene Carpenter. They define it as:

“An adjective meaning new, fresh. It is used to describe many different items as renewed or fresh:.... It is used to indicate something new in an obsolete sense, never seen or done before.”

So, see, this word can refer to something that's just, you might say, renewed or refreshed. You just to kind of upgrade it a little. Or it can refer to something completely new and different. It's completely new and hasn't been done before. It's completely different from the previous. As we're going to see here, if we take this definition and also compare it with some of the statements that are made in the Book of Hebrews about the New Covenant, we'll see that this is a completely new concept. That literally Hebrews is going to tell us that the one is taken away and replaced by the other. That's directly stated. But turn now over to Hebrews 8, and we'll see here where the author of Hebrews directly quotes what we just read. But then gives us some more details. It's going to be Hebrews 8, and we'll start reading in verse 7.

Heb 8:7 *"For if that first covenant had been faultless, then no place would have been sought for a second."* (NKJV)

Now, just to understand some of the language you'll see in the Book of Hebrews. It refers to the Mount Sinai Covenant as the "first covenant", and the New Covenant as the "second covenant".

"8) Because finding fault with them, He says: 'Behold, the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah— 9) not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they did not continue in My covenant, and I disregarded them, says the LORD. 10) For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put My laws in their mind and write them on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. 11) None of them shall teach his neighbor, and none his brother, saying, 'Know the LORD,' for all shall know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them. 12) For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their lawless deeds I will remember no more." (NKJV)

Now that was basically a word for word quote from what we just read in Jeremiah 31. But continue on in verse 13 here.

"13) In that He says, 'A new covenant,' He has made the first obsolete. Now what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away." (NKJV)

As I mentioned, not only distinctly different, but mutually exclusive. Because when it uses the word "obsolete" here in English. What I want you to see is that's a correct translation because that's very consistent with what the Greek means. Now the Greek word there is transliterated into English as "palaios". It's Strong's # 3822, and the definition I'll give you is from The Complete Word Study Dictionary of the New Testament by Spiros Zodhiates. He defines it as:

"To make old, render obsolete, abrogate..."

So, we're literally talking about it becomes obsolete. But we're also going to see here in just a moment in Hebrews 10, it literally says one is "taken away". Through the sacrifice of Christ one's taken away so that the other can be established. So, that's why I say it's a mutually exclusive concept. It's not an "all the above" concept. As we're going to see as we go forward in this sermon, we typically get that concept right when we talk about the Firstfruits today, but oftentimes when we look at the future of how God's going to work with the rest of mankind, somehow, we forget those basic principles and we get it all jumbled up. But we'll talk about that a little bit more later.

Now, as I mentioned, we're going to see here in a moment in Hebrews 10, it literally uses the terminology, one is "taken away" and replaced by the other. But before we look at that, I just want to point out one thing here in chapter 9. Now we're going to look at chapter 9 in more detail here a little bit later in this sermon. But just look down at verse 15, and then let's read Hebrews 9 verse 15.

Heb 9:15 *"And for this reason He is the Mediator of the new covenant, by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, that those who are called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance."* (NKJV)

Again, you notice it referred to the "first covenant". As I mentioned, Hebrews oftentimes refers to the "first covenant" and the "second covenant". The "first covenant" is the Mount Sinai Covenant. The "second covenant" is the New Covenant. It's just a different way of referring to them. But notice here, it's referring to Christ as the Mediator of the New Covenant. But it also talks about the promise of "eternal inheritance".

Now, the reason I point this out is, when we first read in Jeremiah 31, I commented that there are three major distinguishing factors of what really separates the New Covenant from the Old Covenant. That is the offering of the forgiveness of sin. The offering of the Holy Spirit. Then also the promise of eternal life -- the offering of salvation. See here how it's mentioned in Hebrews 9:15, it gives us that third component. Because Jeremiah 31 and Hebrews 8 referred to the Holy Spirit -- writing God's law on their hearts -- and also the forgiveness of sin. It didn't specifically mention the offering of salvation, but here we have it in Hebrews 9.

But now turn over to Hebrews 10 in verse 8. I want you to see how the language that's used here not only shows us distinctions between these covenants, but makes it very clear that we're talking about mutually exclusive covenants. Again, to put it in modern day terminology, we're talking about an "either / or" situation not an "all the above" situation. Again, as we're going to see later in this sermon, we typically get that right when we're focusing on Firstfruit Christians today, when we explain why the sacrificial system and such doesn't apply to us today. But we look forward into the future at the millennium and, somehow, we forget these basic concepts and we get it all jumbled up. Let's notice here in Hebrews 10 in verse 8.

Heb 10:8 *"Previously saying, 'Sacrifice and offering, burnt offerings, and offerings for sin You did not desire, nor had pleasure in them' (which are offered*

according to the law), 9) then He said, "Behold, I have come to do Your will, O God." He takes away the first that He may establish the second." (NKJV)

Notice again, that "first" and "second" language. First is Mount Sinai. Second is the New Covenant. And verse 10.

"10) By that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (NKJV)

So, you can see there that this transition again is connected with the sacrifice of Christ. We're going to see in this sermon exactly how that's applied because oftentimes we just associate it simply with Christ's death and we come up with some false concepts. But what I want you to notice here, where it says, "the first is taken away to establish the second". Again, we have this mutually exclusive concept.

Then just to share with you the Greek term there for "taken away" -- just to show that that's a correct translation. That's exactly what it means. It's the Greek word transliterated into English as an "anaireo". It's Strong's # 337, and again, the definition I'm going to give you is from The Complete Word Study Dictionary of the New Testament by Spiros Zodhiates. He defines it as:

"To take away, abolish....; to slay, murder, take off...; spoken of public execution..."

So again, we have a mutually exclusive concept here. One is taken away and the other established. You don't have an "all of the above" situation. That concept doesn't exist. It's one or the other. It's a mutually exclusive idea. Again, we'll come back to that here in a minute.

But as I mentioned in the beginning of this sermon, I'm sure a lot of you are very familiar with the fact that this separation between the covenants -- the first being taken away and establishing the second -- oftentimes becomes a stumbling block particularly for, you might say "popular christianity". Because the popular concept that is taught these days -- typically not in the Church of God, but in a lot of this world's religions -- is the idea that the taking away of the Mount Sinai Covenant and establishing the New Covenant, well that just does away with God's law. So now you don't have to keep that law. You don't have to obey. You can really kind of stay in your sins. You just accept Christ as your Savior. You have a warm fuzzy feeling in your heart, and then you can just kind of slide into salvation, and not much more is required of you.

Well, Christ Himself makes it very clear that this is not the case. As we just read in Hebrews 9, Christ is the Mediator of the New Covenant. He's what enables this covenant to be offered. Let's just notice here quickly what did Christ Himself say about this? It's Matthew 5, and we're going to start reading in verse 17.

Matt 5:17 *“Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill. 18) For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law till all is fulfilled.” (NKJV)*

So, here we have the Mediator of the New Covenant. The guy who's life on earth and what He went through, His death fulfilling the sacrifice for mankind. This is what enables the New Covenant to even be a thing. To even be offered to mankind. He's directly telling us. *This doesn't do away with the law! You still have to follow the law!*

In fact, Paul himself even comments on this. Turn over to Romans 2. Because you're probably familiar with the fact that the Apostle Paul in the Protestant world is oftentimes held up as, well, he's the hero who made it clear that that mean old law has been done away with and we don't have to keep any of that. You don't have to keep the Sabbath. You don't have to keep the Holy Days. You don't have to keep any of that. You just believe in Jesus and then everything's fine. Well, Paul himself says that's not the case. Yes, Paul makes it clear that forgiveness of sin, that's a gift. That's not something that we can earn on our own. That's grace that's extended to us through the sacrifice of Christ, but that doesn't mean that we're freed from the requirements of having to obey God. So, notice here in Romans 2 in verse 12.

Rom 2:12 *“For as many as have sinned without law will also perish without law, and as many as have sinned in the law will be judged by the law 13) (for not the hearers of the law are just in the sight of God, but the doers of the law will be justified;” (NKJV)*

What he is saying is to be justified. Yes, grace is a gift because of the sacrifice of Christ, but you're still required to obey. There's a condition involved. Continue in verse 14.

“14) for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves, 15) who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and between themselves their thoughts accusing or else excusing them) 16) in the day when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.” (NKJV)

In other words, what he's articulating here, this is connected with the standards by which you'll be judged. In other words, *you're going to have to keep the law*. You're going to have to be obedient and follow God's commands. Grace is not an excuse to be able to stay in your sins. That's very clear. But again, these are concepts that most in the Church of God typically don't stumble over and tend to understand. That tends to be more of a stumbling block for, you might say, “popular christianity” these days.

But now let's look at what actually does significantly change. You might say, comparing the New Covenant with the Mount Sinai Covenant or the Old Covenant. Because we know that the sacrifice of Christ does actually replace the sacrificial system. Because

the sacrificial system was basically just a symbolic atonement, and it was designed to basically teach the need for Christ's sacrifice. But as we're going to see here, it was established with an expiration date in mind. It was established with the point of, at some point it would be replaced by the sacrifice of Christ. The Bible directly tells us that. So, let's turn back over to the Book of Hebrews. We'll look again at Hebrews 9. This time we're going to start in verse 1.

Heb 9:1 *"Then indeed, even the first covenant had ordinances of divine service and the earthly sanctuary."* (NKJV)

Again, as I pointed out earlier in this sermon you see that language of "first" and "second". First is Mount Sinai Covenant. Second is the New Covenant.

"2) For a tabernacle was prepared: the first part, in which was the lampstand, the table, and the showbread, which is called the sanctuary; 3) and behind the second veil, the part of the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of All, 4) which had the golden censer and the ark of the covenant overlaid on all sides with gold, in which were the golden pot that had the manna, Aaron's rod that budded, and the tablets of the covenant; 5) and above it were the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat. Of these things we cannot now speak in detail. 6) Now when these things had been thus prepared, the priests always went into the first part of the tabernacle, performing the services. 7) But into the second part the high priest went alone once a year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the people's sins committed in ignorance;" (NKJV)

Now, obviously, we're referring here to the ceremony in Leviticus 16, performed on the Day of Atonement. Now, continuing in verse 8.

"8) the Holy Spirit indicating this, that the way into the Holiest of All was not yet made manifest while the first tabernacle was still standing. 9) It was symbolic for the present time in which both gifts and sacrifices are offered which cannot make him who performed the service perfect in regard to the conscience— 10) concerned only with foods and drinks, various washings, and fleshly ordinances imposed until the time of reformation." (NKJV)

Now, we'll look at this verse in more detail a little bit later in this sermon, but notice it's imposed until a particular point. In other words, it was established with an expiration date, you might say. With the intention in mind that there's going to come a point where this doesn't apply, and this is replaced by something else. If we just keep reading, we can see what was intended to replace it. This is in verse 11.

"11) But Christ came as High Priest of the good things to come, with the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation. 12) Not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered the Most Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption. 13) For if the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean,

sanctifies for the purifying of the flesh, 14) how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? 15) And for this reason He is the Mediator of the new covenant, by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, that those who are called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.” (NKJV)

Again, we see the offering of salvation being a part of the New Covenant. But notice how this explains for us that the sacrificial system was basically put in place with the intention of it expiring at some point and being replaced by the sacrifice of Christ. Because as we're going to see, the Bible specifically tells us -- as we're going to read here in chapter 10 in just a moment -- that once the sacrifice of Christ is applied. Once there's that forgiveness of sin through applying His sacrifice to a human, there's no longer animal sacrifices. In other words, New Covenant Christians have had the sacrifice of Christ applied to them. *They don't do animal sacrifices.* In fact, they don't go to a physical temple because we are the temple. In the New Covenant God dwells inside us, and we are His temple.

Again, these are concepts we typically get right when we're applying it to New Covenant Christians today. We just get a little confused when we try to apply it to the future because we forget all the foundational concepts that we can read right off the page. But we'll address that here in a moment. But jump down now to chapter 10. We're going to pick up in chapter 10 in verse 1. Because this is going to explain the same concept here in more detail.

Heb 10:1 *“For the law, having a shadow of the good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with these same sacrifices, which they offer continually year by year, make those who approach perfect. 2) For then would they not have ceased to be offered? For the worshipers, once purified, would have had no more consciousness of sins.” (NKJV)*

Notice he also talks about them being “ceased to be offered”. Obviously, again, he's talking about this whole sacrificial system was instituted with the plan in mind that at some point this was going to go away.

“3) But in those sacrifices there is a reminder of sins every year. 4) For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins. 5) Therefore, when He came into the world, He said: “Sacrifice and offering You did not desire, But a body You have prepared for Me. 6) In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin You had no pleasure. 7) Then I said, “Behold, I have come— In the volume of the book it is written of Me— To do Your will, O God.” 8) Previously saying, “Sacrifice and offering, burnt offerings, and offerings for sin You did not desire, nor had pleasure in them” (which are offered according to the law), 9) then He said, “Behold, I have come to do Your will, O God.” He takes away the first that He may establish the second. 10) By that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. 11) And every priest stands

ministering daily and offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. 12) But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God, 13) from that time waiting till His enemies are made His footstool. 14) For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified. 15) But the Holy Spirit also witnesses to us; for after He had said before, 16) "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the LORD: I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds I will write them," 17) then He adds, "Their sins and their lawless deeds I will remember no more." 18) Now where there is remission of these, there is no longer an offering for sin." (NKJV)

In other words, when forgiveness of sin is on the table, there's no animal sacrificing. Again, keep in mind, we're talking about an "either / or" concept, not an "all the above". Again, we often get that right when we're thinking about our lives today as New Covenant Christians. However, when we look at the millennium, we tend to kind of get confused and talk in circles. Because we kind of forget that those don't go together. But we're going to address that here in a moment.

Now there's another significant difference that separates these covenants as well. It's really tied to the very terms of the deal being made. Because if you understand what the Mount Sinai Covenant was about. Salvation and forgiveness of sins really had nothing to do with that particular covenant. That was not on the table. What God was offering them was if they obeyed the letter of the law, and if they just consistently behaved well and followed His instructions, He was going to make life physically wonderful for them. It was basically a promise of physical blessings for physical letter of the law obedience.

As we're going to see here, just turn over to Deuteronomy 28. What we're going to see here as we read through this is kind of what you might say is logic that just makes sense to carnal human beings in terms of how we tend to think that life should work. What I mean by that is just as physical human beings, we tend to think, well, bad things shouldn't happen to good people. If you're a good person and you're honest and you're kind and you're hardworking and you're good to your neighbor and just an upstanding individual, well, good things should happen to that person because they're a good person. Well, if a person is the opposite and they lie and they cheat and they steal and basically there are two timers on their spouse and they cheat on them and they're dishonest and they steal from other people, we think, well, that person should have bad things happen to them because they're a bad person.

Well, if you read through the terms of what God was offering ancient Israel, it's consistent with that. As we read through this chapter, what you're going to see is, if they're consistently obeying, what they're promised is basically the sky is just going to open up and just rain blessings down upon them. There's nothing mentioned here about if you're obedient, you're going to get beat up because you're being obedient. No, it's as long as you're consistently obeying, life's going to go great for you. Then it turns around and says, but if you don't obey, and you're being rebellious, well, that's when life's going to hurt. That's when it's going to beat you up because you're bringing the consequences

of your sins upon yourself. But as we read through this, I want you to kind of see this clear picture and then we're going to compare this to how the Bible sets the expectations for the New Covenant and see that there are distinctly different. So, let's start off here in Deuteronomy 28 in verse 1, because we're going to see here, these are all the blessings that were promised for faithfully obeying God.

Deu 28:1 *"Now it shall come to pass, if you diligently obey the voice of the LORD your God, to observe carefully all His commandments which I command you today, that the LORD your God will set you high above all nations of the earth. 2) And all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you, because you obey the voice of the LORD your God: 3) "Blessed shall you be in the city, and blessed shall you be in the country. 4) "Blessed shall be the fruit of your body, the produce of your ground and the increase of your herds, the increase of your cattle and the offspring of your flocks. 5) "Blessed shall be your basket and your kneading bowl. 6) "Blessed shall you be when you come in, and blessed shall you be when you go out. 7) "The LORD will cause your enemies who rise against you to be defeated before your face; they shall come out against you one way and flee before you seven ways. 8) "The LORD will command the blessing on you in your storehouses and in all to which you set your hand, and He will bless you in the land which the LORD your God is giving you. 9) "The LORD will establish you as a holy people to Himself, just as He has sworn to you, if you keep the commandments of the LORD your God and walk in His ways. 10) Then all peoples of the earth shall see that you are called by the name of the LORD, and they shall be afraid of you. 11) And the LORD will grant you plenty of goods, in the fruit of your body, in the increase of your livestock, and in the produce of your ground, in the land of which the LORD swore to your fathers to give you. 12) The LORD will open to you His good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain to your land in its season, and to bless all the work of your hand. You shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow. 13) And the LORD will make you the head and not the tail;..." (NKJV)*

Now notice that particular statement. He's saying as long as you're obeying, things are always going to go good for you. We're going to see here in a moment when we contrast this with the New Covenant, the rules are very different. Now continue on in verse 13.

"...you shall be above only, and not be beneath, if you heed the commandments of the LORD your God, which I command you today, and are careful to observe them. 14) So you shall not turn aside from any of the words which I command you this day, to the right or the left, to go after other gods to serve them." (NKJV)

Notice where it's just made very, very clear for us, particularly in those last couple of verses, is what He's promising them is if you continually obey and you're striving constantly to follow His instructions, your life's going to be comfortable. You're going to enjoy it. It's going to be great. You can see what He's offering them. Look at it like this, if salvation is not on the table, what's the definition of the best deal you can possibly get?

Well, that's to spend however much time you have on this earth as a physical human being, having as much pleasure and enjoyment as possible, and as little pain and suffering as possible. Because once you die, that's it. Because salvation is not part of the equation. Well, that's exactly the deal He's offering them. We're going to see when salvation is on the table the rules are very, very different.

But now let's pick up now in verse 15. I want you to notice all the curses He mentions that they're going to receive if they disobey. But keep in mind, this is all associated with disobedience. There's nothing stated here that when you obey and do well, you're going to get beat up and have to endure through it. It doesn't say that. It says life's going to go well for you, and you're just going to have these problems if you're sinning and you're disobedient. Now, pick up in verse 15.

"15) 'But it shall come to pass, if you do not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to observe carefully all His commandments and His statutes which I command you today, that all these curses will come upon you and overtake you: 16) 'Cursed shall you be in the city, and cursed shall you be in the country. 17) 'Cursed shall be your basket and your kneading bowl. 18) 'Cursed shall be the fruit of your body and the produce of your land, the increase of your cattle and the offspring of your flocks. 19) 'Cursed shall you be when you come in, and cursed shall you be when you go out. 20) 'The LORD will send on you cursing, confusion, and rebuke in all that you set your hand to do, until you are destroyed and until you perish quickly, because of the wickedness of your doings in which you have forsaken Me. 21) The LORD will make the plague cling to you until He has consumed you from the land which you are going to possess. 22) The LORD will strike you with consumption, with fever, with inflammation, with severe burning fever, with the sword, with scorching, and with mildew; they shall pursue you until you perish. 23) And your heavens which are over your head shall be bronze, and the earth which is under you shall be iron. 24) The LORD will change the rain of your land to powder and dust; from the heaven it shall come down on you until you are destroyed. 25) 'The LORD will cause you to be defeated before your enemies; you shall go out one way against them and flee seven ways before them; and you shall become troublesome to all the kingdoms of the earth.'" (NKJV)

Notice the picture that we've read here. To sum it up in modern day terminology, good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people. As long as you're consistently obeying, life goes great. It's just if you're sinning and you're rebelling, that's when life's going to hurt and be difficult for you. Now, I want you to notice the stark contrast when we look at the New Covenant, because this is not how the terms of the New Covenant work. Let's turn over now to 2 Timothy 3. Because as we saw earlier Christ is described as the Mediator of the New Covenant. We saw numerous times that His sacrifice is what enables this to come about. So, accepting His sacrifice and then faithfully following Him, that's fundamental to the New Covenant. But let's notice what's also stated for anyone who chooses to do that. 2 Timothy 3 and verse 12.

2 Tim 3:12 *"Yes, and all who desire to live godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution."* (NKJV)

Now, that's exactly the opposite of what we just read in Deuteronomy 28. Because what it said there is as long as you are faithfully obeying God, life's going to go good for you. You're going to be protected and blessed in everything you do. Well, this is directly telling us if you accept Christ's sacrifice and you faithfully follow Him, you're going to get beat up. It's going to hurt. You're going to have to endure through this because you're going to get persecuted.

Also just take note of the fact this is an all encompassing statement with no exceptions. Because oftentimes we kind of play games with that. And we think, well, that just applies to the Firstfruits. But the rest of mankind, they just get to slide into salvation in a perfect utopia. This is an all encompassing statement. It didn't allow any wiggle room. There's one name by which you can be saved, which is Christ and everybody who accepts Christ's sacrifice and follows Him. They're going to get persecuted and have to endure through it. That's what it says. This is a concept that's verified numerous times throughout the New Testament. Just turn over to 1 Peter 4, and we'll pick up here in verse 12.

1 Peter 4:12 *"Beloved, do not think it strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened to you;"* (NKJV)

Notice it says, this is not an if, this is a when. This is going to happen and you should expect it. It's just the terms of the contract. Don't think it's something unusual. Pick up in verse 13.

"13) but rejoice to the extent that you partake of Christ's sufferings, that when His glory is revealed, you may also be glad with exceeding joy. 14) If you are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are you, for the Spirit of glory and of God rests upon you. On their part He is blasphemed, but on your part He is glorified. 15) But let none of you suffer as a murderer, a thief, an evildoer, or as a busybody in other people's matters. 16) Yet if anyone suffers as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this matter." (NKJV)

In other words, it's saying don't be someone who brought your suffering upon yourself because of your sins. Because yes, in the New Covenant, there's still consequences for sin and you're going to face that. Your life can hurt unnecessarily because you brought it upon yourself. But it's also telling you part of the terms of the contract is this is going to hurt. You're going to get beat up on and you're going to have to endure through this. Because see, it's a condition of receiving eternal life. This is for everybody, not just a small group. Now turn over to Romans 8, and we'll notice this again.

Rom 8:16 *"The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God, 17) and if children, then heirs—heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ..."* (NKJV)

Now, notice the rest of the sentence.

“...if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together.” (NKJV)

In other words, to be glorified together, to receive the resurrection of eternal life, to receive salvation and that reward, you have to suffer. It's going to hurt. So, see, it's distinctly different than what was offered in the Old Covenant. Because again, in the Mount Sinai Covenant that God was offering Israel, He was giving them the best possible deal that they could have under the circumstances. Because again, if you're not being offered salvation, the best deal you can get is to have a very enjoyable physical life. That's what He was offering them. Well, when He offers salvation, now it's going to hurt. Now it's going to be painful. Now it's “he who endures to the end”. It's “through much tribulation you enter into the Kingdom of God”. See, this is another aspect that's fundamentally different.

But here's why I say that we oftentimes get this correct when we're looking at New Covenant Christians today as Firstfruits, but we look into the future, and, somehow, we jumble all these concepts up. Because then we look at the millennium, a 1000 year period that we know that Satan is not around. The Bible explicitly says that. And we see all the utopian promises there, and we also see the graphic description of animal sacrifices, a physical temple, a physical priesthood, everything you would associate with the Old Covenant and then we forget all the foundational rules that we just read. We decide, well, they get to live in a utopia. Everything's wonderful and they're offered salvation too. They just slide into the Kingdom of God and bypass all the rules of the New Covenant. And so, we get it all confused and mess it up. Because again we forget some of the most basic foundational rules here.

But what we need to consider is, when did Christ say that the New Covenant would be offered to the rest of mankind? Because He made a big deal out of announcing it. He did it in John 7. Turn over to John 7, and we'll notice here in verse 37. Now keep in mind if you read the earlier part of this chapter, Christ is there at the temple in Jerusalem throughout the whole Feast of Tabernacles, the same year that He makes this statement. For some reason He chooses not to say this for the entire Feast of Tabernacles and He waits until the Eighth Day, until the Last Great Day. Because we get the term “Last Great Day” from these verses I'm about to read here. This is when He makes the announcement that everyone can now come to Him and receive the New Covenant and receive the Holy Spirit. It's verse 37.

John 7:37 *“On the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried out, saying, “If anyone thirsts, let him come to Me and drink. 38) He who believes in Me, as the Scripture has said, out of his heart will flow rivers of living water.” 39) But this He spoke concerning the Spirit, whom those believing in Him would receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.” (NKJV)*

Now, my entire life in the Church of God, we've always interpreted these verses correctly. Because verse 39 just flat out tells us what Christ is announcing is now you can come to Him and receive the Holy Spirit. But again, it's one of those things we typically just don't think all the way through. That's obviously what He's saying, and He said it on day eight. Why did He skip the Feast of Tabernacles? We know the Feast of Tabernacles pictures the millennium. That timeframe where we have a utopia where you wouldn't have to suffer and be persecuted because Satan is the persecutor. And we have a physical temple described, animal sacrifices described. Everything that we associate with the Old Covenant. Well, the answer is simple.

I have a sarcastic sense of humor, but I oftentimes like to refer to this section of scripture here in John as "the radical notion that Jesus Christ actually understands the Holy Days". Because if we just take Christ's word for it, He tells us when the New Covenant is offered to the rest of mankind. It's during the Eighth Day.

Now if you're hearing this for the first time, I'm sure there's probably a lot of questions coming to mind for a lot of you. I'm not going to go into this in great detail today. If you look on my YouTube channel or on my website -- the address for the website is SearchingTheScriptures.org -- you'll find about three sermons that I did for the Feast this past year back in 2024. There's one that's titled, "Why Will There Be Animal Sacrifices in the Millennium?". There's another one titled, "A Realistic Look at the Millennium", and there's a third sermon addressing the Eighth Day titled "Rivers of Living Water." Now those will explain all the greater details of this subject and put all the details out for you and answer all the associated questions.

But if we just take Christ's word for it, again, "the radical notion Christ knows what He's talking about". *What we have is the New Covenant being offered to mankind during the Eighth Day, not during the Feast of Tabernacles.* Well, see, here's what brings us back to the question I posed at the beginning of this sermon. How exactly does this transition take place? We saw from the scriptures we read previously, obviously the transition into the New Covenant is tied to Christ's sacrifice and He enabled it through His death. But the explanation that was taught in the Church of God all of my life logic was that basically when Christ came and He died, well, His death alone that severed the Old Covenant and did away with it and now it's all just the New Covenant.

But think that one through for a second. When Christ died was the New Covenant now offered to all of mankind from that moment forward? Obviously not! Most all of us agree now that the only people being offered the New Covenant at this point in time is just a small select few who are called as Firstfruits. It's not offered to the rest of mankind. Again, we also saw that when there's forgiveness of sin, there's no longer sacrificing. Well, the sacrifices didn't stop until 70 AD when the temple was destroyed. They stopped because the temple was destroyed. They're going to be started again before the end comes. Prophecy tells us that. And they're going to be intact during the millennium. Because that's graphically described. Obviously, there are some problems with our explanation. We didn't get the details exactly right.

You see, part of the problem here is our explanation is directly tied to the belief that Christ is the “God of the Old Testament”. That’s not a phrase you’ll ever find in the Bible, but it’s a commonly used phrase in Church of God circles. It’s basically the idea that when you look in the Old Testament, any interaction between the God that’s described there and mankind, well, that has to be Christ, and it can’t be the Father. Well, if you follow that logic, that means that Christ would have to be the God at Mount Sinai who made the covenant. And see, the logic of how we’ve explained the transition is, well, He’s the one who made the covenant. So, therefore, when He died the party who made the covenant ceased to exist for three days and three nights. Well, that automatically severed the covenant. We can already see this logic doesn’t play out when we just look forward from that point.

But let’s also look at the fact that we can literally prove from Exodus 20 that it’s actually the Father who has to have made that covenant. So, turn over to Exodus 20. Let’s just briefly look at this subject. Now, if you haven’t studied this whole subject of you might say the “God of the Old Testament” doctrine. On my website in the study paper section, there is a section titled “Who is the God of the Bible?” And there’s a series of study papers there that go into this subject in a lot of detail and answer a lot of the common arguments and questions around it. But I’m just going to briefly point out some details here in Exodus 20. And if you think them through, obviously it has to be the Father who made the covenant here. So, just follow me here and we’ll cover this. Notice here in Exodus 20 in verse 1.

Ex 20:1 *“And God spoke all these words, saying: 2) “I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. 3) “You shall have no other gods before Me.” (NKJV)*

Now the key to understanding a lot of this it’s realizing that when you see the word “God” there, not only “God” with a capital “G” that’s obviously referring to a God being, but also the word “gods” with a small “g” that has an “s” there on it. It’s the same Hebrew word in both cases. It’s the Hebrew word “Elohim”. Now, I’m sure you have probably heard about this word for years. But follow the details here because we’ve gotten some concepts associated with this word wrong.

Now this is a word that as you can see just from these verses that can apply to the true God. It can apply to pagan gods. It can refer to angels or human beings depending upon the context. Now context is how you figure out exactly what it applies to. Now, you have probably heard for years that Elohim is a plural term. It is, but what we’re going to see here is there is a concept that exists in Hebrew that we don’t have in the English language. This has created a lot of the confusion. Now first of all, I want to start off reading you a definition for this word, and then I’m going to expound in a little more detail here. But the definition I’m going to give you here is from The Complete Word Study Dictionary of the Old Testament by Warren Baker and Eugene Carpenter. This is of the Hebrew word Elohim. It’s Strong’s # 430. Here’s how they define it.

“A masculine plural noun meaning God, gods, judges, angels. Occurring more than 2,600 times in the Old Testament, this word commonly designates the one true God...Although the form of this word is plural, it is frequently used as if it were singular—that is, with a singular verb.... The plural form of this word may be regarded (1) as intensive to indicate God’s fullness of power; (2) as majestic to indicate God’s kingly rule...”

Now, Baker & Carpenter don't go into a lot of detail to explain this thoroughly. But what they're hinting at here is the difference between the Hebrew language and the English language. See, in the English language, when we say a word is plural, that's always a numerical concept. Because in English, when we say something is singular, that means one. Plural means more than one, just by definition. So again, in English when we say a word is plural, we immediately think this means more than one, because, again, that's how that works in English. Hebrew is a little more complicated than that. Hebrew has, yes, a numerical plural that refers to more than one. It also has what's called a “majestic plural”. Now a majestic plural is a form of emphasis. It magnifies the meaning of the word. It has nothing to do with saying more than one. It has nothing to do with a numerical concept.

The way you sort out the difference, and Baker & Carpenter kind of hinted at this, they referred to the verbs that are associated when Elohim is used. So, in fact, you can look at two things. You can look at the pronouns and you can look at the verbs to see the difference of whether it's a majestic plural -- which again has nothing to do with more than one, it's a form of emphasis -- or if it's a numerical plural that means obviously more than one. Again, let's just read through these verses here again, because I want you to see we have both a majestic plural and a numerical plural at play here. But you look at the verbs and the pronouns. That sorts it out.

Ex 20:1 *“And God spoke all these words, saying:”* (NKJV)

Now that's obviously referring to the Creator. Notice it's “God”. There's not an “s” on it. It's singular. It's a majestic plural.

“2) “I am the LORD your God,...” (NKJV)

Notice, “I am”. It's a singular pronoun and singular verb being used here. We know we're dealing with a majestic plural.

*“...who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.
3) “You shall have no other gods before Me.”* (NKJV)

And notice gods has an “s”. That's more than one. That's referring to pagan gods. That's a numerical plural. But notice He says before “Me”. Me, singular, not before “us”. The reason I point this out, and you have probably heard this before. I know I heard it as a child growing up. Oftentimes in Church of God literature, you would see Elohim being talked about and they would point out that this is a plural word. Well, that's true. But they

would not realize that there's a numerical plural and there's a majestic plural. The way they explained it, they said, well, Elohim then refers to the "God family". The way it was explained was "God is a family" rather than "God has a family". Because there's a very important difference there. Because obviously the family concept is associated with God. Because God the Father, He's referred to as a Father. Christ is His son. There's a father / son relationship there. We refer to Him as our Father. We're His children. Obviously, there's a family concept there.

But we weren't saying "God has a family". We were saying "God is a family". Because what we were doing is we saw the word Elohim and we were like, well that refers to the Father and the Son as a collective. It's a Trinitarian concept. Because what we were doing was basically making them a Binity rather than a Trinity. Because you're probably familiar with the term of the "Trinity". They treat Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as a collective. They think the Holy Spirit is an individual, and not just the power of God. And then they make them three individuals, but they're three in one. They're a collective, kind of like the Borg in Star Trek. Well, we did something kind of similar. Because we took Elohim and we said, well, that refers to the Father and the Son as a collective. It doesn't. Because what we didn't understand is Hebrew has a concept that English doesn't.

It refers to, "I am the God who brought you out of Egypt". "I am the Elohim who brought you out of Egypt". Notice it's, "I am", not "We are". Because it's a majestic plural. It's referring to one individual. He's saying, "You shall have no other Elohim before Me". Now, realize that Christ is also a God being. He can also be accurately referred to as an Elohim. If Christ were the one to say, "You shall have no other Elohim before Me", He's saying, "Put Me above the Father". Christ in the New Testament is very clear. The Father is greater than Him. The Father is His God. There's a superior / subordinate relationship there and Christ always acknowledges that. Christ can't be the one who said, "You shall have no other Elohim before Me". He would be putting Himself before the Father. Obviously, He would not do that. And see, if you understand that distinction there, and understand, again, when you see it's always, "I am the God who brought you out of Egypt". "I" did this. It's not "We" did this.

Again, that's not saying that Christ wasn't involved in a lot of these things. It's just realizing that Hebrew has a majestic plural. Even though Elohim is a plural term. It's a single individual who's speaking and speaking of Himself. It's the Father. Realize we've misunderstood for years how this works and said, God "is" a family. No, God "has" a family. Because yes, He's a Father. Christ is His son. We're His children. But if you say "God is a family", you're merging the Father and Son together like a Binity. It's like a Trinitarian concept. But also on the same note, just jump down to verse 7.

Ex 20:7 *"You shall not take the name of the LORD your God in vain, for the LORD will not hold him guiltless who takes His name in vain."* (NKJV)

Notice "His name", one individual. The reason I mention that is because, again, we took this "God family" concept and then we took the name of God and we said, well, that

refers to both of Them. Then we took every title that applies to the Father, and we genericized it as it's the "God family". It's a two in one collective. Well, that word there, "Yehovah", where it's "LORD" in the Old Testament. That's used between 6000 and 7000 times in the Bible. It's closer to 7000 than it is to 6000. I don't remember the exact number. But you can make a very obvious observation with this. Again, just realizing that first of all it is the name of God. Because oftentimes you'll hear people refer to the "names" -- plural -- of God. But do a search on "My name is..." or "His name is...". You're always going to see that applied to LORD (Yehovah). You will not see that associated with Most High, Almighty, Living God or all the other titles. Because He has one name and lots of titles. But also make another observation. You're never, ever going to see that as "Our name" or "Their name" with plural pronouns. You're not going to see that. It's always "My name" or "His name". Because it refers to one individual. Now again, if you want to look at that subject in more detail, on my website I have a study paper entitled, "The Name of the LORD". It'll go into that subject in greater detail and even address some of the more difficult concepts and difficult scriptures there that tend to trip people up.

But again, just make a very simple observation. There's one individual that's speaking. So, see, what this does is kind of train wreck the logic that Christ made the Mount Sinai Covenant. So, the moment Christ died, it's terminated because one of the parties who made it died. Well, that's not how it works. Because see, we also built another false concept around this. Because God the Father's relationship with ancient Israel through this covenant is described in terms of a marriage. Now, keep in mind, that's an analogy. We'll talk about that a little bit later. That's a physical analogy to describe the relationship that they had. But we kind of latched onto this concept and overstretched that analogy.

We also placed the "Christ is the God of the Old Testament" concept into this. We created a logic that Christ married Israel -- which wasn't correct -- but we know Christ marries the New Covenant Church in the resurrection. The Bible is very clear about that. Well, then we decided that since Christ died, now He can get remarried. There's a verse that we've always associated in Church of God literature with this concept. Turn over to Romans 7, and we'll look at this. I want you to read this in detail and pay attention to who it's actually referring to as dying and able to remarry because it's not Christ. It's Romans 7, and we're going to start reading in verse 1.

Rom 7:1 *"Or do you not know, brethren (for I speak to those who know the law), that the law has dominion over a man as long as he lives? 2) For the woman who has a husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he lives. But if the husband dies, she is released from the law of her husband. 3) So then if, while her husband lives, she marries another man, she will be called an adulteress; but if her husband dies, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she has married another man. 4) Therefore, my brethren, you also have become dead to the law through the body of Christ, that you may be married to another—to Him who was raised from the dead, that we should bear fruit to God."* (NKJV)

Notice the analogies being used here are talking about the people symbolically dying, not Christ. This is basically referring to baptism. If you read chapter 6 of Romans, it explains the whole death and resurrection analogy connected with baptism. That's what it's referring to here. Yes, it says "through the body of Christ". Through having His sacrifice applied to us, but the person who's dying and being referred to as figuratively remarrying here it's the people. It's not Christ. It's not even saying that Christ is getting remarried. We kind of built a false concept from this.

But also keep in mind one other thing, because sometimes this also trips people up as well. Understand when the Bible is using an analogy. An analogy is oftentimes used to make a specific point in a specific context. This is true of parables as well. If you try to stretch that beyond the point that it was trying to make in the first place, you can start creating confusion and false concepts that were never intended in the first place. Just to give you a couple of easy examples. If you look at the concept of leaven. Leaven is oftentimes referred to in the Bible. The vast majority of the time when leaven is used as an analogy to explain something, it's pictured as sin. We have the Days of Unleavened Bread. A festival dedicated to this. And the whole lesson behind it is putting sin out of your life. Because it's connecting leaven with a picture of sin. Well, there's one reference in the New Testament where Christ in a parable refers to the Kingdom of God as being like leaven. Well, see, if you forget that these are analogies used to make a specific point in a specific concept, you can overstretch this and go, is the Kingdom of God like sin? Well, of course it's not.

Well, in the same way with the marriage concept, if you overstretch this beyond the point that's being made, you can come up with goofy concepts as well. Because we know that Christ is the son of the Father and we're His children, correct? Then what? The Church marries Christ. Is the Father trying to facilitate an incestuous marriage between His children? See, we are overstretching the analogy and the point that was being made. I just want you to understand that because sometimes when people get into this particular subject, they create false concepts that were never intended.

So, as we can see here, we have created a false logic that Christ made the covenant, and He died. So, therefore, His death automatically did away with the Old Covenant. It's not a valid concept. So how does this work? What we're going to see is it's really about the offering of the New Covenant. It's not an issue of, well, when Christ died that immediately went away and did away with the Old Covenant, now it's only the New Covenant. Well, if that were the case, why hasn't the New Covenant been offered to all of mankind today? Why is it only a select group?

You see. It was an issue of when salvation is being offered. When the New Covenant and forgiveness of sin is being offered. That's the key point. It's not an issue of Christ died. Therefore, it automatically goes away. To notice this, turn over to Galatians. Because we're going to see here that, yes, the ending of the Old Covenant and establishing the New Covenant is very much tied to Christ and His sacrifice. But it's not an issue of the moment Christ died one goes away and then we only have the other.

That's not how it works. Because if we just think it through, we'll see lots of contradictions and problems with that logic. Pick up here in Galatians 3 and verse 15.

Gal 3:15 *“Brethren, I speak in the manner of men: Though it is only a man’s covenant, yet if it is confirmed, no one annuls or adds to it. 16) Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He does not say, “And to seeds,” as of many, but as of one, “And to your Seed,” who is Christ.” (NKJV)*

You see, this is directly tied to Christ.

“17) And this I say, that the law, which was four hundred and thirty years later, cannot annul the covenant that was confirmed before by God in Christ, that it should make the promise of no effect. 18) For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no longer of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. 19) What purpose then does the law serve? It was added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was appointed through angels by the hand of a mediator.” (NKJV)

Now notice we're not talking about God's law. The Ten Commandments and such. We're talking about a law that was added because of transgressions. That's the sacrificial system. Because what was the purpose of the sacrificial system? A symbolic atonement for your sins. Again, it pointed to the need for Christ. It's saying that Christ's sacrifice replaces the sacrificial system. But let's just notice here.

Turn over to Hebrews 9. We're just going to follow this through because what we're going to see here is, it's not an issue of Christ died, and this automatically does away with the Old Covenant. The question is when the New Covenant is offered, when it's put on the table for people. That's what creates the transition. That's what does away with one and basically puts the other in place. Because again, they're mutually exclusive concepts. But we falsely assumed in the past that the moment Christ died, that automatically did away with the Old Covenant. Well, that's not how it works because you can see there's lots of contradictions with that logic. But let's pick up now in Hebrews 9 and verse 6. We read this before, but let's just go over this again.

Heb 9:6 *“Now when these things had been thus prepared, the priests always went into the first part of the tabernacle, performing the services. 7) But into the second part the high priest went alone once a year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the people’s sins committed in ignorance; 8) the Holy Spirit indicating this, that the way into the Holiest of All was not yet made manifest while the first tabernacle was still standing. 9) It was symbolic for the present time in which both gifts and sacrifices are offered which cannot make him who performed the service perfect in regard to the conscience— 10) concerned only with foods and drinks, various washings, and fleshly ordinances imposed until the time of reformation.” (NKJV)*

Again, there was an expiration date, and this expiration date is tied to the “reformation”. What does that mean? Well, the Greek word here that's translated as “reformation” here, is “deiorthosis”. It's Strong's # 1357. Again, the definition I'm going to read to you is out of Zodhiates.

“to correct, amend. Amendment, correction, reformation,the time of a new and better dispensation under the Messiah.”

See, it's referring to the New Covenant. Again, it's the offering of the New Covenant that does away with the sacrificial system and changes all the rules. It's not just Christ's death in and of itself. Yes, His death and His sacrifice is what enables this to happen, but it's when that's made available. Again, if we look at into the future when the rest of mankind are called, when did Christ say that people could come to Him and receive His sacrifice and the Holy Spirit? He did it on the Eighth Day. All we have to do is read John 7, and there it is. But now, let's turn back over now to Hebrews 10 and verse 11. We read this before as well, but let's just notice this again.

Heb 10:11 *“And every priest stands ministering daily and offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. 12) But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God, 13) from that time waiting till His enemies are made His footstool. 14) For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified. 15) But the Holy Spirit also witnesses to us; for after He had said before, 16) “This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the LORD: I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds I will write them,” 17) then He adds, “Their sins and their lawless deeds I will remember no more.” 18) Now where there is remission of these, there is no longer an offering for sin.” (NKJV)*

Again, once forgiveness of sin has been offered to mankind, then there's no longer offering of sacrifices. These two are mutually exclusive concepts. It is not an “all of the above” concept. One of the reasons I've hammered this is throughout my life growing up in the Church of God, we've typically answered these things pretty much correctly for the most part as it applied to New Covenant Christians today in our physical lives. When you would ask, why don't we do animal sacrifices today in the New Covenant Church? Well, we would turn to all these verses and read it right off the page and get it correct. But then when we'd look at the millennium and go, well, why is there animal sacrifices and a priesthood and a physical temple and all of this there, well, then we start talking in circles. Because we're trying to get the New Covenant being offered to people who are in a utopia. People who don't have to suffer. People who are doing animal sacrifices. Who are doing everything associated with the Old Covenant. And we talk in circles and get it all jumbled up.

Because our logic was that Christ was the “God of the Old Testament” and when He died, that severed the Old Covenant and it was gone, and now all there could be is the New Covenant. Well, if that were the case, there wouldn't be animal sacrifices in the millennium because when there's forgiveness of sin there's no longer sacrifices. They're

mutually exclusive concepts. See, and if we just follow what the Bible says, and as I like to jokingly say, if we just consider “the radical notion that Christ understands the Holy Days”, it all becomes a lot clearer.

Brethren, I hope this has been helpful for some of you having questions about this subject. Because, again, we've typically gotten this a little confused as we've looked in particularly at the future. Again, if you're hearing this for the first time, you probably have a number of questions about it. But as I mentioned, if you go back to the three sermons I gave for the Feast of Tabernacles this past year in 2024 -- and some of the study papers on my website -- it'll address a number of those questions. So, brethren we can look forward now to the New Covenant being offered to the rest of mankind, but let's realize it is how the Bible describes it. They're mutually exclusive concepts. The reason we see all the Old Covenant details described in the millennium, it's an Old Covenant setting. But the New Covenant will be offered to the rest of mankind, but that will be in the time period pictured by the Eighth Day.