

What is NEW about the New Covenant?

Does the New Covenant mean the end of Israel or mean that the Church represents a NEW fulfillment of the prophecies given to Israel? Jeremiah gave a prophecy he called the New Covenant revealing something wonderful that God had planned for the two houses of Israel, namely, the northern kingdom of Israel and the southern kingdom of Judah. It is part of God's plan to reunite and restore the separated northern and southern kingdoms of Israel. God would make another NEW covenant with all of Israel.

“Behold, days are coming,” declares the Lord, “when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke, although I was a husband to them,” declares the Lord. “But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days,” declares the Lord, “I will put My law within them, and on their heart I will write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And they shall not teach again, each man his neighbor and each man his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord,’ for they shall all know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them,” declares the Lord, “for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more.”

Jeremiah 31:31-34

This NEW covenant would be like the previous covenants made with Moses and the children of Israel but have a NEW place where the Law of God would be written. It would have some very familiar OLD elements as well.

When the children of Israel left Egypt it was all about “knowing the Lord.” Many think that God was just delivering Israel from Egyptian bondage. The Scriptures teach that God took His time pouring out judgments upon the Egyptians and their gods because He had another purpose. It wasn't just to free the Israelites, God was revealing His Nature. He wanted Pharaoh, the Egyptians, and the Israelites to “know the Lord.” Even more so, God wants us all to know Him. Therefore, it is not surprising that when God proposes a NEW covenant, it is for this same purpose. God is continuing to manifest Himself to Israel and all mankind. This is the very purpose of the New Covenant besides the forgiveness of sin and salvation.

However, the Christian world has laid claim to this prophecy and covenant, putting forth a much different purpose. How is it that Jeremiah's prophecy has made its way into what we understand as Christianity today? How is it, for example, that the Gentile church claims this covenant instead of the two houses of Israel? Why do Christians who claim this covenant say that the Law of God (the Torah) is not written on their hearts but instead, has grown old and disappeared?

Not all Christians agree with that view, but the general understanding of Christianity is that the Messiah came and changed everything. Instead of Israel being God's focus, it is now the church (made up of Gentiles). Instead of the Law (Torah) being the primary teaching of God, the New Testament has now taken its place. Even Evangelical Christians, those who support Israel, still think that the New Covenant brought about the now present church—in place of Israel.

Did Jeremiah prophesy this? Where in Jeremiah's words did he say this NEW covenant would change God's great plan of redemption and salvation for the whole world? According to Jeremiah, God purposed it for Israel. He said it would include His previous commandments. The purpose was for everyone to know the Lord, and it would result in forgiveness of sin. So, what's so NEW about the

New Covenant? This has been God's purpose from the beginning. He created Israel as a prophecy to the fathers with the ultimate goal of blessing all the families of the earth.

So far so good, but where is the prophecy to establish the church in this New Covenant? Where is the prophecy in the New Covenant to make the Law, the priesthood, and the temple service go away or diminish? Maybe we should read more of Jeremiah and see what else he says regarding the New Covenant.

Thus says the Lord, who gives the sun for light by day, and the fixed order of the moon and the stars for light by night, who stirs up the sea so that its waves roar; the Lord of hosts is His name: "If this fixed order departs from before Me," declares the Lord, "Then the offspring of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me forever." Thus says the Lord, "If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out below, then I will also cast off all the offspring of Israel for all that they have done," declares the Lord.

Jeremiah 31:35-37

God declares that if the sun, moon, and stars all change their orbits, then YES, Israel would cease to be a nation before Him. He goes further. If all of the heavens can be measured, then YES, God would cast off Israel for their mistakes before Him. God is making profound statements to emphasize that Israel has not ceased to be nor has God cast them off as a result of the New Covenant. Instead, God planned to use the New Covenant to revitalize and restore all of Israel and bring them even closer to the Lord, even forgiving their sins.

Yet, is this what is taught about the New Covenant? No. The church teaches something completely different. Exactly what does the church teach about the New Covenant?

To answer that, you have to go the New Testament where the teaching of the New Covenant is specifically addressed. According to the book of Hebrews, the New Covenant came because the previous covenants of God had faults.

For if that first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no occasion sought for a second.

Hebrews 8:7

Consider that for a moment. God gave covenants to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and David before bringing the Messiah to usher in the New Covenant. What were the faults of the previous agreements between God and men?

God's covenant with Adam dealt with how sin had separated us from God. That was the original problem and why we need to be born of the Spirit of God again since we are now made in the image of Adam. What was faulty about the covenant made with Adam?

God judged the whole world by means of the flood, although Noah found grace and was delivered by the ark. God promised him that He would not judge the world by water again. What was faulty about that covenant?

God then formed a friendship with Abraham to bring about a people that would serve Him. The sons of Israel were fathered by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. God's covenant was with Abraham and his

descendants. What were the faults of that covenant?

When the sons of Israel became numerous, the Lord did as He promised to Abraham and sent Moses to lead the children of Israel out of Egypt and back to the Promised Land. The NATION of Israel came forth, and God gave them a covenant and written commandments to guide them into being a free people. Maybe we are getting there. What was faulty about that covenant?

When God raised up David to be King over Israel, God made a covenant with him concerning the Son of David (the Messiah) and the establishment of Jerusalem as the city of the King. Everything has been moving along fine. What is faulty in all of these covenants?

Yes, it is true that all along the way, these men and the children of Israel misbehaved and made mistakes. In particular, after King Solomon, the nation split when Jeroboam led the tribe of Ephraim in a revolt against the House of David and the tribe of Judah. As a result, ten northern tribes, known as the house of Israel, separated themselves from the house of Judah, which was comprised of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. This was the setting for Jeremiah's New Covenant prophecy. Jeremiah prophesied extensively, as did many other prophets, that restoration would eventually come.

The writer of Hebrews says that the coming of the New Covenant was because of the faults of the previous covenants made with Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, the children of Israel, and King David.

For finding fault with them, He says, "Behold, days are coming, says the Lord, when I will effect a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not like the covenant which I made with their fathers on the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; for they did not continue in My covenant, and I did not care for them, says the Lord. 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 into their minds, and I will write them upon their hearts. And I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And they shall not teach everyone his fellow citizen, and everyone his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' for all shall know Me, from the least to the greatest of them. For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and I will remember their sins no more."

Hebrews 8:8-12

This is where the writer of Hebrews quotes Jeremiah's prophecy of the New Covenant; however, there are some slight differences in his quotation compared to the Hebrew Scriptures.

In the Hebrew Scriptures of Jeremiah it reads, "My covenant which they broke, although I was a husband to them." Whereas, the writer of the book of Hebrews says, "for they did not continue in My covenant, and I did not care for them." The difference is subtle.

The Hebrew text of the prophecy of Jeremiah contrasts the children of Israel breaking the covenant while God remained a faithful husband to a disobedient bride, whereas the text given by the writer of Hebrews shows no contrast. He makes a clear condemnation by God against Israel.

Why is the quotation in the book of Hebrews different from the actual Hebrew Scriptures given in Jeremiah? The answer is somewhat complex, but it stems primarily from the fact that the writer of Hebrews is not quoting from the Hebrew text of Jeremiah. He is quoting from the Greek text, the Septuagint, a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Furthermore, the English text we are reading from in the book of Hebrews is translated from the Greek text. Multiple translations have resulted in word

changes and nuances of the original text. But we will set that aside for the moment.

The writer of Hebrews is arguing that the whole purpose of God giving the New Covenant is based on the faults of the previous covenants, and the New Covenant is to bring about something very different as a replacement of the previous covenants. God has always been in the business of revealing His nature more and more as time has gone on. In fact, God has prophesied further that another covenant, the Covenant of Peace, will be given after the New Covenant.

For this is like the days of Noah to Me, when I swore that the waters of Noah would not flood the earth again; so I have sworn that I will not be angry with you Nor will I rebuke you. For the mountains may be removed and the hills may shake, but My loving kindness will not be removed from you, And My covenant of peace will not be shaken, says the Lord who has compassion on you.

Isaiah 54:9-10

I will make a covenant of peace with them; it will be an everlasting covenant with them. And I will place them and multiply them, and will set My sanctuary in their midst forever.

Ezekiel 37:26

Do these verses mean that we and the New Covenant are inherently at “fault” because God has planned another covenant? Is that the reason another covenant called the “Covenant of Peace” is prophesied to be in the Messianic Age? Of course not. The writer of Hebrews gives this other purpose for the New Covenant completely apart from what Jeremiah has prophesied. He is attempting to justify complete changes to God’s plan. This is the root justification for the church to replace Israel.

By the way, maybe you didn’t know this, but this author has serious problems with the veracity of the book of Hebrews. It disturbs me greatly that the writer of Hebrews quotes and uses Hebrew terms and words but substitutes Greek definitions and concepts to interpret them. Therefore, I don’t give the book of Hebrews the same weight of Scripture as the rest of the writings of Moses, the Prophets, or the Apostles. The book of Hebrews is a theological argument that I disagree with on the basis of the other Scriptures. If you would like to examine more evidence on this point, please refer to my previous teaching on the “Paradigm of Hebrews.”

Back to the arguments put forth by the writer of Hebrews (the central teaching of the church concerning the New Covenant) ...

When He said, “new,” [A new covenant] He has made the first obsolete. But whatever is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to disappear.

Hebrews 8:13

In the original Greek of the book of Hebrews, the bracketed phrase “a new covenant” is not there. English translators put that there to explain what they thought the writer of Hebrews intended. But if you just take the writer of Hebrews at his word, he argues that the single word “new” means that all previous covenants made between God and man are now obsolete and that obsolete means they are “growing old” and “ready to disappear.”

The word “new” when used elsewhere in the New Testament does not mean “new” as in “never happened” or “never existed previously.” Take, for example, the Messiah’s teaching of the NEW commandment to love one another. That commandment does not mean that all of the other previous

commandments of the Lord are now made “obsolete” or “growing old” and “ready to disappear.” As the Apostle John teaches later, loving one another is really an old commandment, but because it had not been obeyed, it seems NEW to the brethren.

Beloved, I am not writing a new commandment to you, but an old commandment which you have had from the beginning; the old commandment is the word which you have heard. On the other hand, I am writing a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passing away, and the true light is already shining.

I John 2:7-8

The Hebrew word “new” means renewed or made fresh again. For example, the “new” moon is not a completely new heavenly body; it is the same moon on a new cycle. This is the meaning of “new” used by Jeremiah in prophesying the New Covenant.

From a general point of view, the word “new” is a relative term. Give it a little time and the “new” thing of yesterday will be “old.” In fact, if you think about it, the “old covenant” the writer of Hebrews was referring to was about 1500 years old in his day. Today, the “new” covenant is more than 2000 years old to us. “New” and “old” are relative terms. They do not inherently make anything “obsolete.” They represent an appearance of something in the sequence of many appearances. The only way that “new” makes anything obsolete is if the definition is intended to “replace” something. This is really what the writer of Hebrews is trying to do: replace the previous covenants, replace the Law, replace the priests, and replace Jerusalem.

I find it fascinating that the writer of Hebrews quotes an extensive passage of Scripture from Jeremiah but makes his entire teaching on the one, single word: “NEW.” He has made a NEW definition for the word “new” because Jeremiah does not prophesy the obsolescence of the Law or the previous covenants made with our fathers. Jeremiah says instead that God will write His commandments on our hearts so everyone would know the Lord. That does not make the Law go away; that makes the Law even stronger. There is no discussion whatsoever about the cessation of anything or the replacement of anything.

If you believe that the book of Hebrews is Holy Scripture along with the other Scriptures such as Moses and the Prophets, then we have a serious problem, because the writer of Hebrews has definitely changed the purpose and meaning of Jeremiah’s prophecy of the New Covenant.

Now do you see how the church came to their conclusions about Israel and the Law? The book of Hebrews is the Biblical source for establishing the church over Israel, the New Testament over the Law, and a host of other replacement teachings.

Simply said, the book of Hebrews lays the groundwork for the church to do a NEW thing separate from Israel, the previous covenants, and the Scriptures. This is why the writer of Hebrews immediately argues for changes in the regulations for divine worship (the temple service) and a NEW TESTAMENT over the past Scriptures. He argues that the veil in the temple and the Law were foreshadowing the NEW thing (the church) that would come.

The Holy Spirit is signifying this, that the way into the holy place has not yet been disclosed, while the outer tabernacle is still standing,

Hebrews 9:8

For the Law, since it has only a shadow of the good things to come and not the very form of things,
Hebrews 10:1a

This is simply not true. The writer of Hebrews has forced an erring interpretation by misusing and misdefining the elements of the temple and the purpose of the Law. It is true that Torah prophecies tell of the Messiah and His redemption; however, the Law does not hint, nor prophesy, that the Law or any covenant would be obsolete. In fact, the Law and Prophets argue that point to the contrary.

By the way, there was a belief among the Sadducees that the Messiah would be so great that He would render the Law of none effect. This was a major difference between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Yahshua weighed in on this when He said the He had not come to abolish the Law and the Prophets. That did not stop the writer of Hebrews from attempting to re-define what the Messiah was really doing.

The writer of Hebrews quotes a second time from Jeremiah's prophecy to make another point against the Law.

And the Holy Spirit also bears witness to us; for after saying, "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the Lord: I will put My laws upon their heart, and upon their mind I will write them," He then says, "And their sins and their lawless deeds I will remember no more." Now where there is forgiveness of these things, there is no longer any offering for sin.

Hebrews 10:15-18

Now he writes that this is the understanding of the Holy Spirit as opposed to the Holy Spirit that guided Jeremiah to give his prophecy to begin with. Does the Holy Spirit do that? Does the Holy Spirit inspire a prophet to say one thing and then change the meaning when it comes to fulfillment later on? I don't think so, that is the typical work of a false teacher—giving attribution to God, but saying something else.

After quoting Jeremiah again, the writer says that since we are to receive forgiveness in the New Covenant "there is no longer any offering for sin." I agree that the sacrifice of the Messiah is the "Lamb of God offering that takes away the sin of the world," as was prophesied by Moses and the Prophets, but it doesn't mean Yahshua's sacrifice is obsolete. How does this take away the worship of God in the temple, the Law, or the previous covenants? God has kept His promise to bring us salvation and forgiveness through the offering of His Son. How does God's promise being fulfilled do away with the Law and the covenant? It doesn't.

Even the Apostle Paul makes this point. The Law and the promises of God (accepted by faith) do not negate each other; they establish each other.

Do we then nullify the Law through faith? May it never be! On the contrary, we establish the Law.

Romans 3:31

Why is the writer of Hebrews trying to say that the New Covenant has brought about forgiveness of sin and "there is no longer any offering for sin?" To make the Law and the Levitical priesthood go away. Let me address that immediately. In the first century, many people believed that Yahshua was the Lamb

of God offering for their sins. Today, we still believe that the Lamb of God offering is viable and just as real as it was in their day. Today, people still come to salvation from that same offering for sin. There is still an offering for sin to this day. In fact, Yahshua's sacrifice as the Lamb of God is eternal. It will never go away.

This is part of the reason why Jeremiah, still talking about the New Covenant prophecy, also says this:

“Behold, days are coming,” declares the Lord, “when I will fulfill the good word which I have spoken concerning the house of Israel and the house of Judah. In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous Branch of David to spring forth; and He shall execute justice and righteousness on the earth. In those days Judah shall be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell in safety; and this is the name by which she shall be called: ‘the Lord is our righteousness.’ For thus says the Lord, ‘David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel; and the Levitical priests shall never lack a man before Me to offer burnt offerings, to burn grain offerings, and to prepare sacrifices continually.’”

Jeremiah 33:14-18

Jeremiah is talking about when the New Covenant takes effect. The “good word” is about God giving the two houses of Israel a NEW Covenant. He says that the Messiah will be a part of the New Covenant—“the good word.” He says that many people will be saved and that the Lord will be called “our righteousness,” which is definitely the name of our Messiah! Then he says something utterly incredible. He says that the Messiah's throne will be eternal; the Messiah will sit forever on the throne of David in Jerusalem.

Jeremiah goes further... He also says that the Levitical priests will also make offerings and “prepare sacrifices continually.”

The writer of Hebrews has given the exact opposite interpretation of the prophet Jeremiah. He argues that the Levitical priesthood is being replaced by the Messiah.

Now if perfection was through the Levitical priesthood (for on the basis of it the people received the Law), what further need was there for another priest to arise according to the order of Melchizedek, and not be designated according to the order of Aaron? For when the priesthood is changed, of necessity there takes place a change of law also.

Hebrews 7:11-12

Maybe the writer of Hebrews should have read Jeremiah a little bit further to see what the “good word” of Jeremiah was all about, but he probably couldn't read further. You see, the second half of Jeremiah chapter 33 is not in the Greek Septuagint. It doesn't have Jeremiah 33:14-26 in it.

If Jeremiah had read the book of Hebrews and the argument against the Levites and the Law, he would have argued against it using these very Scriptures. His argument would have sounded something like this:

And the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying, “Thus says the Lord, ‘If you can break My covenant for the day, and My covenant for the night, so that day and night will not be at their appointed time, then My covenant may also be broken with David My servant that he shall not have a son to reign on his throne, and with the Levitical priests, My ministers. As the host of

heaven cannot be counted, and the sand of the sea cannot be measured, so I will multiply the descendants of David My servant and the Levites who minister to Me.’”

Jeremiah 33:19-22

Listen to what Jeremiah just said. The previous covenants made with Israel prior to the New Covenant will never be broken, rendered obsolete, nor grow old. This promise includes the New Covenant. But Jeremiah is not finished on this subject. Somehow, the Lord told Jeremiah that one day a group of people would believe that God had rejected Israel and the covenant made with them, so he prophesied to this point specifically. Jeremiah actually raises the very argument of the church today.

And the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying, “Have you not observed what this people have spoken, saying, ‘The two families which the Lord chose, He has rejected them?’ Thus they despise My people, no longer are they as a nation in their sight. Thus says the Lord, ‘If My covenant for day and night stand not, and the fixed patterns of heaven and earth I have not established, then I would reject the descendants of Jacob and David My servant, not taking from his descendants rulers over the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But I will restore their fortunes and will have mercy on them.’”

Jeremiah 33:23-26

Churchmen for years have said that Israel (the two houses) was despised by the Lord and cast away into the nations as punishment, no longer to be a nation. They concluded that God has done a NEW thing with mankind through the New Covenant. On the contrary, Jeremiah says the opposite to this very argument. He asserts that the heavens and the order of day and night must go away before the covenant with Israel can go away. He goes further and states clearly that God will restore their fortunes and will have mercy on them (both houses of Israel).

We will set aside the book of Hebrews now and see how churchmen try to use other arguments in the New Testament for the New Covenant. Specifically let us refer to the Apostle Paul. Interestingly enough, Judaism does not believe that Yahshua of Nazareth started Christianity. They claim that the Apostle Paul started it because churchmen quote extensively from the Apostle Paul’s writings. From the Christian side, I have actually heard preachers, confronted with the words of Yahshua contrasting their interpretation of Paul, actually say, “I will stick with Paul.” For some reason, churchmen think that Paul was smarter than Yahshua when it comes to understanding the New Covenant. This is really ironic because it is the Apostle Paul who explained best how the New Covenant was personally inaugurated by the Messiah.

In the same way He took the cup also, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in My blood; do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.”

I Corinthians 11:25

Paul explains how the Messiah used the elements of the Passover Seder dinner to initiate the New Covenant. It was at the ancient Passover in Egypt with the blood of the lamb on their door posts that God passed over the first born of Israel, thus freeing all of Israel. The Messiah, the Lamb of God, explained how His life (blood) would cause them to be passed from death to life by the forgiveness of sin. Thus, they would be delivered and not be slaves to sin any longer.

The traditional Seder has the elements of matzah (unleavened bread), bitter herbs, and four cups of wine. The commandment to teach our children the story of deliverance is observed by using two cups

before the meal and two after. The third cup, the one right after the supper, is called the Cup of Redemption. The bread eaten with it is the best part of the Matzah called the Afikoman. Yahshua used this cup and bread to inaugurate the New Covenant.

Just like Jeremiah said, God made this New Covenant not by declaring His word from the mountain with tablets of stone, but with a memorial meal of remembering the covenant made with Israel in a NEW way. The Messiah came to make it possible for all men to know the Lord and to offer forgiveness of their sins.

In no way can anyone interpret that the Messiah was doing away with Israel or the memorial meal of Passover. In truth of fact, the Messiah was filling the understanding of the Passover even more full.

Paul later emphasizes this very point to the Corinthians by comparing the gift of the Messiah, the Spirit of the Lord in the New Covenant, with the previous teaching of the Jewish leaders without the Messiah or the Holy Spirit.

...who also made us adequate as servants of a new covenant, not of the letter, but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.

II Corinthians 3:6

Paul had many conflicts with his previous Pharisaic brethren. In fact, there was an on-going protracted conflict between his previous teachers of the Law and his teaching of the New Covenant and the “good word” of the Messiah. Paul drew reference to the veil in the temple, where in accordance with the instructions in the old covenant, the Jewish teachers (rabbis) were outside the veil and only the high priest could enter the Holy of Holies. Yet, the Messiah, as the High Priest of our faith, has by His sacrifice removed the veil and led us before the very mercy seat of God.

But their [Pharisees and Sadducees] minds were hardened; for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remains unlifted, because it is removed in Christ.

II Corinthians 3:14

The book of Galatians, in particular, was a very strong part of the conflict with the Pharisees. The Pharisees could not see how the Messiah fit into the grand scheme of God’s plan through the Torah. Paul, on the other hand, spoke of events prior to the giving of the Law and the covenant God made with Abraham, to show how faith–believing in the promises of God–took precedence to the Law. Apparently, the Pharisees tried to argue that the giving of the Law changed the promises and covenant given to Abraham. Paul argued the matter this way:

What I am saying is this: the Law, which came four hundred and thirty years later, does not invalidate a covenant previously ratified by God, so as to nullify the promise.

Galatians 3:17

This is an emphatic point about how God has been revealing His Nature. Paul has argued that the giving of the Law and establishing the covenant with Moses and the children of Israel did not in any way invalidate the previous promise of the Messiah (faith) and the covenant with Abraham.

The logic of Paul is in direct contrast to the writer of Hebrews and churchmen who argue for the New Covenant to make the previous covenants obsolete. Simply said, faith in the Messiah and giving of the

New Covenant did not invalidate the previous covenants made with Moses and the children of Israel that were ratified by God.

Paul's real argument is that previous covenants are the very foundation of any following covenants; therefore, the Law is essential to properly receive and understand the New Covenant. If you didn't have a previous covenant made by God with the fathers (the two tablets) then the New Covenant of writing the commandments on the tablets of the heart could not be compared with it.

It turns out that the Apostle Paul agrees with Jeremiah. The covenants with Israel will not be broken. The Apostle Paul is also opposed to the writer of the book of Hebrews when the word "NEW" is taught to make the previous covenants obsolete.

Where does that leave us? The church today has been built on the premise that the New Covenant authenticated the very institution of the church. It didn't. Churchmen today believe that they best represent the work of the Messiah and the fulfillment of the prophecies of the New Covenant. They don't. They believe that the NEW Testament, another term exclusive to the church fathers, is the authoritative written word of God for them, to the harm and diminishment of Moses and the Prophets. It isn't.

The New Covenant is about restoring the two houses of Israel and gathering all peoples who want to know the Lord and have the forgiveness of their sins. The Messiah has not fully completed this. He inaugurated this covenant at the Passover with His disciples, yet there is still a day coming when no one will say to another "know the Lord." For in the day that the New Covenant is fulfilled, every man will "know the Lord."

The New Covenant does not make anything obsolete; it makes the previous covenants NEW for us. It is like we humorously say, "If the Old Covenant seems NEW to you and the New Covenant seems OLD to you, you might just be Messianic."

YAVOH, He is Coming is a monthly newsletter published as an outreach ministry of [Lion and Lamb Ministries](#)

The ministry is a non-profit organization with an end time prophetic message in a Messianic Jewish context.

Subscription to *YAVOH, He is Coming* is without cost and supported only by donation.

Permission is granted to reprint any article in *YAVOH, He is Coming* with attribution given to *YAVOH, He is Coming*.

Editor - Monte Judah