

God said He would give Abraham and His descendants a certain land

How could God's land promise to Israel be unconditional, yet no longer valid today?

God gave ancient Israel the land

Joshua 21:43-45, 11:23, 23:14
1 Kings 4:21-24, 8:56
2 Samuel 8:3. Nehemiah 9:8, 22-25

But they lost it because they were not faithful to God

is 'unconditional' a Biblical view? Faithfulness was expected for...
acquiring the land Ex 23:20-22, Num 14:11-12, 22-24. Deut 1:34-36; 4:1-2; 6:17-19; 7:1-2, 12-13; 11:8-9, 22-23; Joshua 1:6-7
keeping the land Lev 18:24-28; 20:22-24; 56:14-17, 31-33; Deut 4:25-27; 6:10-15; 8:19-20; 11:16-17; 28:15, 36-37, 63-64; 29:24-28; Joshua 23:12-13, 15-16;
Returning to the land Deut 4:29-31; 30:1-5; Lev 26:40-42; 1 Kings 8:46-50; 1 Chron 6:36-39; 7:13-14 Jer 29:12-14; Eze 18:30-32; 33:11-16

Why would we then say the land promise was unconditional if there were conditions?

Was the Abrahamic Covenant Eternal + Mosaic was not?
Some verses cited for view that Abrahamic covenant was unconditional: (Gen 12:7, 15:18-21; 17:8)

Are we consistent?

Both are said to be 'eternal' covenants

the land promise, Circumcision, Levite priesthood, animal sacrifices, God's presence in a physical temple, are all said to be eternal. All are affirmed as fulfilled in Christ. They still exist, but are observed in a different way

Why is the land an exception if the New Covenant fulfillment is rest in Christ? (Matt 5:5; Rom 4:13-16; Gal 3:16, 29; Eph 1:10-14; Heb 11:8-10, 13-16; 12:22-24; Rev 21:1-3) There is land expansion, Abrahamic promise expanded to all in Christ, and fulfillments.

If 'eternal' Mosaic law was only eternal as long as ancient Israel was faithful, then so was the land equally limited

Not a jot or tittle of the law would pass away, until ...

God's Covenant Benefits
Salvation in Christ is free, but there are still conditions. The offer is not open forever. It's like a grandmother paying for your college might only happen if you actually go to a college. If you don't go, you don't get the money. You don't earn it by going to college. Likewise, ancient Israel did not take God up on the land offer after the Babylonian exile.
With the Old Covenant being obsolete, why do we expect a benefit to be given for a covenant that is not in place anymore? That's like not going to the college, the college closes down, and then getting mad at grandma for not giving the money.
Passages like Galatians 3:16-29, Romans 4:13, and Hebrews 11:13-16 interpret the land promise through Christ, suggesting: The "seed" (Christ) fulfills the promise in a way that transcends physical borders. The inheritance becomes the "world" or a "heavenly country," not just Canaan.

Faithfulness Required

Marriage

Marriage is a lifelong promise of faithfulness, but if one party breaks it, the obligation ends.

Similarly, God's covenant with ancient Israel was eternal if they remained faithful—they didn't. So, God's promises were eternal but conditional, and Israel's unfaithfulness released God from His obligations, just like infidelity in marriage

Does God make idle threats?

Or do we believe what God said? The old, apostate Jerusalem was destroyed, and from its ashes the New Jerusalem was born, which started with Jewish Christians, also likened to a woman giving birth (Matt 23:37-38; Gal 4:25-26; Rev 21:2; Isaiah 54:1-3; 66:7-9; Micah 4:10; 5:2-3;

God's threats not idle

(Lev 26:33; Deut 28:63-64;) -fulfilled in 722/587 BC and 70 AD. If God said He would do it, and He did, why would we disbelieve?

Therefore it is a mistake to confuse 'eternal' with 'unconditional'. Reframing 'eternal' as 'so long as they are faithful' instead of 'unconditional' more accurately fits the Biblical data.

The 'conditional'/'unconditional' contrasts made by modern theologians foreign to the Biblical text. All the covenants are full of conditions.

God promised to destroy Israel for unfaithfulness

Even though God initiated, by making the first move, faithfulness was required

If we say the Abrahamic covenant was unconditional, it is still clear that there were conditions to be in it.

Abraham had to do things (Gen 17:1-2, 9-11; 22:1-2, 17-18) For the New Covenant, Jesus had to do things.

In the Old Covenant, God gave Israel what they did not deserve, on account of Abraham's faithfulness.

In the New Covenant, it is Jesus' faithfulness that we benefit from.

all was fulfilled/accomplished

Matt 5:17-18 builds on top of Matt 1:22; 2:15-18; 23:3; 15:4; 14:16; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:14-15, 35; 17:10-12; 21:4-5; 26:54, 56; 24:34; 26:24; 27:9-10, 35. Jesus did fulfill all things spoken of Him; therefore a change in law was in order.

Hebrews affirms a change in the priesthood implies a change in the law. There was a change. Jesus is a priest of a different order than the Levite priesthood. Melchizedek (Hebrews 7:11-12)

So why is the land an exception to the fulfillments? Surely Jesus and His apostle Matthew are not wrong