In the matter of the New Covenant being offered during Acts, and accepted by a believing remnant, I have never had a problem. But then, I never held a mid-Acts understanding of the great dispensational change.

However, some that I have tried to teach the extent of the New Covenant have objected.

One objection is that the Old Covenant, acc. to Heb.8:13, is merely ready to vanish. What the text actually says is that it is “near disappearance”. Also, the 2 Cor.3 text uses verbs interestingly. In v.11 “which is done away” and “which remains” both use present participial forms of their verbs. “Is being done away” and “is remaining” are acceptable senses of these forms. The same applies to “which is abolished” (v.13) and “which is done away” (v.14) – the former is a present participle, the latter a present indicative – both can be rendered in the progressive English form “is being…”.

I once presented what I believe was the divine plan for Acts in the attached diagram.

Your point about Exo.19 opening on the very first Pentecost seems clearer to me now than it did when you first introduced the idea. Exo.4:27-5:1 condenses a bit of activity – Yahweh directed Aaron to come meet Moses at Sinai, where Moses explained all that Yahweh had shown him to do. With no great time (or words) being spent, we find Moses before Pharaoh explaining that Yahweh has directed, “Let my people go, so that they may hold a feast to me in the wilderness.” And repeated at 10:9. That appointment with Yahweh He declared to be a “feast”. Only later (23:14-19) is the full calendar of feasts detailed, but here “Weeks” is called “Firstfruits”, which contained both. Later 34:22 separates the two. Weeks or Firstfruits was a two-part celebration, just as Ingathering (NB *sunteleia* in LXX!) is one, but also three: Day of Atonement, Trumpets and Tents.

So this feast in the wilderness of Sinai represented a firstfruits offering to the Lord. And since there was no harvest in the desert, the antitype must have been meant – a first offering of men. This meaning was confirmed by this offering being made “WITH leaven”. Ditto the Pentecost of Acts 2 – a firstfruits offering of men was the heart of that feast too. That they should each be an inauguration of a covenant is one more cord that makes for a not-easily-broken rope.

Some of my pupils have objected that Jer.31 speaks of the Law written upon the heart. They just don’t see that happening during the Acts period. I think they may have idealized this heart-Law into a state of sinless perfection – part of the state of physical resurrection during the Millennium. And yet, our brother Paul said this very thing about righteous-acting Gentiles in Rom.2:15. By the way, that text seems to cover the subject of law-abiding Gentiles before the preaching of the gospel. I would propose that if the Law could be written in the heart under the terms of the Old Covenant, how much more readily under the New?

Some of the objection I hear is that until “ungodliness is turned away from Jacob” (Rom.11:26) the Law is not in their hearts. And that happens when “all Israel will be saved”, which they think did not happen during Acts. But Paul had previously DEFINED this term “all Israel” in Rom.9:6. In effect what he said was that they were the remnant. If it were otherwise, how could we explain Jesus’ own words about “sons of the kingdom” being cast into the outer darkness (double articles for emphasis) – disenfranchised from the kingdom?

These are a few of my thoughts, which I hope will add to yours in the explanation of the Covenants, Old and New.