

## Sermon Transcript

03.22.2026

Hebrews 9:15-22

***\*\*\*This is a working manuscript and is not an exact transcription of the sermon. Actual audio content may differ slightly from these notes.\*\*\****

Hebrews 9:15-22

- Good morning. Please open to Hebrews 9. We'll be in vss. 15-22 this morning.
- As you turn there, I want to share a story from when I applied to seminary. This was back in the early 00s so online education wasn't much of a thing back then. I was already living in Dallas and was deeply involved in a church that I loved so I wanted to stay in the area and the only options I knew about at the time were Southwestern Baptist in Fort Worth and Dallas Theological in Dallas obviously.
- I toured both and resonated more with DTS given its better academic reputation and Southwestern's resistance to Reformed theology at the time.
- So I preferred DTS, but the cost was substantially higher and I had no idea how I would afford it.
- But I ended up applying to both and trusting the Lord to help me try to make the best decision possible.
- Well, that happened was SW lost literally every bit of paperwork I sent them, application, references, etc. It was as if I'd never applied. They called me up one day to follow up on my campus visit and asked if I had any questions about the school and that led to a really confusing conversation where they didn't know that I had already applied and I didn't know that they didn't know that. Well, anyway, I took all of that as a pretty clear sign.
- Had DTS lost my stuff, I don't know if I would have interpreted it the same way, but they didn't. They accepted me and that was that.
- But I still had no idea how I would pay for it because it was almost twice as much as SW. I don't generally recommend just taking on significant debt and trusting the Lord to figure it out, but that's kinda what I did and the Lord was faithful despite my naivete. And thankfully I graduated debt free 4 years later through a series of little providences.
- For example, my parents switched vehicles with me, taking over payments on my car and gave me my dad's old paid off truck so I wouldn't have that expense. And then one semester a roommate randomly gave me \$3K because he said he just wanted to invest in my future. Other times I was able to sell some stuff, until eventually I got hired at my church and they started helping with tuition.
- But my very first semester of seminary something happened that kind of set the trajectory of the Lord's provision, though it happened in an unfortunate way that involved the death of my grandmother.
- When she and my grandfather were both still alive they had told my mom and her siblings that they wanted each grandkid to inherit \$5K as part of their estate.
- So for years, we had known that we would one day inherit this money, but it wasn't ours and wouldn't be ours until both grandparents had passed.
- My grandfather died in 2001 and my grandmother a few years later, literally 2 months after I started seminary. And, sure enough, I got \$5K and that paid for that semester and the subsequent summer.
- And that serves as an illustration of the principle we see in the text today. For years I knew that I would get some money, but it obviously wasn't mine. I couldn't use it, couldn't access it,

couldn't touch it, it was promised, but inaccessible...at least until both grandparents passed away.

- Obviously, my point isn't to base your present financial decisions on the future death of a family member. I would have preferred my grandmother to live longer and I figured out another way to pay for that semester, but the illustration does provide an analogy for the idea we'll see this morning where a will and inheritance are only effective with the death of the one who makes it.
- How this analogy relates to Christ and the new covenant will be apparent as we move through the text so let's pray and then we'll dive in together.
- Self, others, me.
- Anyone know the first rule of real estate? Location.
- What about the first rule of hermeneutics? Also location, but we call it context.
- As has been said, a text without context is a pre-text for a prooftext.
- You can make the Bible say just about anything if you neglect the context. For instance, the bible explicitly says that there is no God. But that isn't a feather in the cap of atheists when you consider what comes immediately before that. The fool says in his heart there is no god.
- So context is crucial. And when it comes to context there are two main types to explore. We call them literary and historical context.
- So before we dive in to vss. 15-22, let's orient ourselves to the context.
- Let's start with historical context. What's going on historically that prompts the writer to write this book? Like all of the Bible, it isn't a systematic theology, its a contextual document, a situational letter, written to particular people dealing with particular issues. And we can piece that situation together to some degree by looking at what the author writes about the circumstances facing his audience.
- We can deduce that these are followers of Christ, we can also infer that they're Hebrew Christians based on how extensively he makes use of the OT and the various ways that he structures his argument. That's why this is called Hebrews, after all. So these are Hebrew Christians, Jews who had been converted from Mosaic Judaism to new covenant Christianity.
- And they're facing various forms of persecution as we read later in the book.
- Some have been imprisoned, some have had their possessions confiscated. It doesn't seem like persecution has advanced to martyrdom, but the temperature is rising.
- So as the temperature rises, so does the temptation. That temptation is apostasy, falling away. That's the great danger of the book. Since they're being persecuted by fellow Jews, the assumption is that if they would just recant, the pain will stop. We see that danger in places like Hebrews 2:1
  - *Therefore we must pay much closer attention to what we have heard, lest we drift away from it.* (Hebrews 2:1)
  - *Take care, brothers, lest there be in any of you an evil, unbelieving heart, leading you to fall away from the living God.* (Hebrews 3:12)
  - *Therefore, while the promise of entering his rest still stands, let us fear lest any of you should seem to have failed to reach it.* (Hebrews 4:1)
- And to bolster the faith of the readers to provide them with the engine and energy to resist the drift, the author compares and contrasts the old and new covenants, comparing the danger of facing the first century church to the danger faced by Israel in the wilderness.
- So the argument goes: why go back to what is inferior, what is weak and useless, what is indeed obsolete, when you already have what is infinitely better, superior, efficacious, and eternal?
- That's the argument. Christ is better. That's the subtle watermark on every page of the book.

- He's better than the entire Mosaic covenant as a whole, but also better than all of its various components. Better than the angels who spoke the word as seen in chapters 1 and 2, better than Moses who mediated it in chapter 3, better than the priests and sacrifices and tabernacle and so forth in chapters 7-10.
- In any and all ways, Christ is better, Christ is superior, Christ is greater.
- That's the message of Hebrews.
- And one of the main rhetorical tools that the author uses to make this point is called typology. It is called typology from the Greek typos meaning example or illustration or image.
- So throughout Hebrews, we've seen a number of types or pictures, that is God-ordained analogies between the old covenant and new covenant. The promised land, the Sabbath rest, Melchizedek, the Levitical priesthood, the tabernacle, these are all similar in some way to some new testament reality.
- Christ is like Melchizedek in that He's a priest king, king of peace & king of righteousness. He is like the Levitical priests in some ways. Like the Aaronic high priest in some ways. There is a genuine analogy.
- But every analogy falls apart at some point and new wine can't be put into old wineskins, so there is similarity, but also dissimilarity. There is correspondence, but also escalation.
- As an example of that, think of the rewards that are promised in the Mosaic covenant. What is the great hope of that covenant? What is Israel promised they will attain if they're faithful in the OT? Long life in the promised land. That's the good life in ancient Israel. That's the reward.
- Now, how does that compare to the new covenant? Well, the promise of long life has been eclipsed by a better promise. Not just long life, but eternal life. That's escalation. The new is better. And the promised land has been expanded to cover not just the tiny sliver of Israel, but indeed the righteous now inherit the entire earth.
- Again, expansion. God's promises aren't annulled or cancelled, but neither is there a direct one-to-one correspondence. God's promises expand when filtered through the new covenant.
- So over the past few weeks we've seen that typological lens focused on the tabernacle, the mobile temple in the wilderness.
- We've seen that the entire structure of the tabernacle, and the subsequent temple communicated God's inaccessibility. Remember how God's presence was partitioned off by a number of veils or curtains, and guarded by cherubim. Each aspect of the architecture signified how man's sins rendered God unapproachable.
- To get into the outer courtyard, you needed to be ceremonially clean. But even if you were clean, you couldn't come into the actual tent and the holy place unless you were a Levitical priest. And then Levitical priests were forbidden from entering the second section, the most holy place. In fact, even the high priest couldn't draw near to the most holy place except for once a year and then only through elaborate ritual.
- Not only that, but the blood of the sacrifices offered under the Mosaic covenant weren't actually efficient or sufficient. They couldn't actually atone. They functioned instead by anticipating and foreshadowing something. Human sin demands human blood so the animal sacrifices didn't actually atone, instead they signified or signaled or foreshadowed the future atonement that Christ would provide.
- So as long as that structure was in effect, as long as those sacrifices were offered. As long as the Mosaic covenant was in effect, the work was unfinished and God's presence was inaccessible.
- So that's the shadow, that's the type. That's the image that prefigures what we see in Christ which is that the Son of God has passed through the curtain, He has passed through the

shadow to the very substance of heaven itself. And he has offered better blood and purchased an eternal redemption, and purified not merely our bodies, but our souls, our consciences. That's the escalation. He has created not only a new covenant, but a better covenant as we'll read about today.

- Now, if you are a visitor, that's a whole lot. You might feel like you're drinking from a fire hydrant and I don't expect you to understand everything I just said, but I can assure you it will become a whole lot clearer if you go back and listen to the previous sermons because the book of Hebrews is building on itself so the more you listen, the more you'll understand.
- With that in mind, let's start in vs. 15.

***Therefore he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, since a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions committed under the first covenant. (Hebrews 9:15)***

- This isn't the first time that we've encountered reference to a new covenant. We first saw it explicitly mentioned in chapter 7:22
  - *This makes Jesus the guarantor of a better covenant. (Hebrews 7:22)*
- But we've seen throughout the book that the author will mention something in passing, but won't fully expound it at the time, only to eventually come back to it later. And sure enough that's what happens in chapter 7. He mentions a better covenant, but then doesn't really go into detail until the next chapter.
- We pick that language up again in chapter 8 vs. 6 which says:
  - *But as it is, Christ has obtained a ministry that is as much more excellent than the old as the covenant he mediates is better, since it is enacted on better promises. (Hebrews 8:6)*
- Notice the theme of supremacy. Better ministry, better covenant, better promises.
- If you recall, he then expositis what exactly is better about the new covenant by appealing to Jeremiah 31 and the promise of a new covenant that was not like the previous covenant, but was better for a few reasons.
- We mentioned three in particular:
  - First, it was written on the heart and not just stone. It involves a new heart, a new nature.
  - Second, it involves the entire covenant community. Unlike Israel, which was a mixed community of believing and unbelieving Jews, there is no such thing as an unbelieving Christian. To be a Christian is to be a believer. You aren't born into covenant with God, but rather reborn into relationship.
  - Third, it explicitly involved forgiveness of sins. Again, you could be a genuine member of Israel & not be forgiven of sin, but that isn't the case in the new covenant. If you're a member of the new covenant community, then you have, by definition, been forgiven.
  - For all of those reasons, the new covenant is better. In short, because the new covenant is efficacious, effective. The Mosaic covenant pointed to, but didn't actually promise salvation, but the new covenant comes on the basis of promise not law.
- So here in vs 15 the author is circling back to this and connecting Christ's superiority as a mediator to the fact that He has offered a sufficient once for all sacrifice in the previous verses. It is a better covenant because He has entered not only the holy place or even the most holy place, but the holiest of holy places, the heavenly holy place of which the tabernacle and temple were just types or symbols.
- And since His work is sufficient, it is efficacious, it is effective.

- He writes, so that those who are called may receive the promised inheritance.
- Now, to be called here means more than just the general gospel call. It refers to God's effective call. As Paul writes, those who are predestined are called and those called are justified and those justified are glorified.
- So, to be called in this sense is to be elect. And so all of the elect will receive the inheritance.
- And, again, that's different from the Mosaic covenant which was conditionally based on the law. If you obey, you will enter into your inheritance, that was the ethic of the law. Since many Israelites didn't obey, they didn't receive the inheritance. In fact, you could say that even those who did generally obey didn't receive the full inheritance. Look ahead to chapter 11:
  - *These all died in faith, not having received the things promised, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having acknowledged that they were strangers and exiles on the earth. (Hebrews 11:13)*
  - *And all these, though commended through their faith, did not receive what was promised, since God had provided something better for us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect. (Hebrews 11:39–40)*
- In fact, from a new covenant perspective, there is a sense in which you could say that Christ is the only legitimate heir. He is Israel par exemplar, the only perfectly faithful Israelite, and thus the one to whom all of the promises are ultimately addressed. Look at Galatians 3:16
  - *Now the promises were made to Abraham and to his offspring. It does not say, "And to offsprings," referring to many, but referring to one, "And to your offspring," who is Christ. (Galatians 3:16)*
- Jesus Christ is the ultimate Israelite. He is the one who was tempted in the wilderness and yet remained faithful, the one who perfectly fulfilled the law. So Christ is the only direct heir.
- You and I are co-heirs to the degree that we are in Christ. But He is the direct heir, the one to whom all of the promises are made.
- And because of His faithfulness, His active and passive righteousness, because He has entered once for all into the heavenly holy place and offered himself as a perfect, morally unblemished sacrifice, He has therefore established this new covenant and secured the inheritance that He shares with His brothers and sisters.
- Remember in chapter 2 that He has been made like His us in all respects so that He can call us brothers. Well, now in chapter 9 we see some of the significance of that in that Christ shares the inheritance with his siblings.
- By the way, notice that it's an eternal inheritance which corresponds to the eternal Spirit and eternal redemption we talked about last time. The old was temporal, the new is eternal...that's another reason for its supremacy.
- And He is able to do all of this because of His death.
- We'll see that fleshed out a bit more in the next verses, but first notice the phrase the transgressions committed under the first covenant. What's that mean?
- Well, as we've said before the Levitical and Aaronic sacrifices didn't actually atone, didn't actually satisfy, didn't propitiate. So that means that technically there was no redemption under the Old Covenant. But weren't OT saints redeemed?
- Of course. So how? Well, the blood of Christ was retroactively applied to them. The OT sacrifices themselves didn't atone, but they symbolically pointed forward to what would eventually atone.
- You may recall in 9:5 how we mentioned that the word translated mercy seat, hilasterion, only occurs one other time in the NT. That other time is in Romans 3 and it isn't translated as mercy seat, but as propitiation, the satisfaction of God's wrath.

- The connection between those two is that the mercy seat is where propitiation was supposed to occur. As the blood is applied, man's sin is expiated and God's wrath is satisfied or propitiated.
- But again, the mercy seat didn't actually accomplish that. It instead pointed forward symbolically to a future reality.
- And so we come to Romans 3 and read about this fulfillment in vss. 21-26
  - *But now the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from the law, although the Law and the Prophets bear witness to it— the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction: for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, and are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a propitiation [hilasterion] by his blood, to be received by faith. This was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins. It was to show his righteousness at the present time, so that he might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus.* (Romans 3:21–26)
- Notice, that in the OT God had to pass over sins since those sacrifices didn't actually atone. How could He just pass over sin?
- Many of you know that I've been studying Islam in depth for a seminar we're hosting this summer. Well, 1 of the many differences between Christianity & Islam regards forgiveness. In particular, there is no theology of atonement in Islam. Allah simply capriciously decides to forgive some sins. Its very arbitrary because in Islam Allah has no essential attributes which He must act in accordance with. But in Christian theology, capricious forgiveness is a problem because it calls into question God's justice. For God to just forgive without demanding payment for sin would be to undermine His character. That's why Paul writes about showing God's righteousness and that He might be just and the justifier.
- So how can God's decision to pass over sins committed under the 1<sup>st</sup> covenant not call into question His holiness or justice? Because of Christ. Because Christ's sacrifice is sufficient not only for all future sin, but also all previous sin. It is therefore applied retroactively to cover the past transgressions.
- BTW, I don't have time to dive deep into this, but that word used for transgressions is a strong word in the LXX that referred to sins that were even high-handed and deliberate egregious offenses. You may recall that earlier in Hebrews 9 we saw the phrase unintentional sin.
- In the OT, there were categories of sin & some were classified as unintentional sins of ignorance & others were more deliberate. The sacrificial system in general was for the former category whereas the punishment for more deliberate sin was excommunication or death.
- So another way that the new covenant is better, the sacrifice of Christ is better, is that it suffices even for those more egregious sins. The blood of Christ covers all sin and not merely some subcategory of lesser venial sins or something.
- Wish I had time to explore more, but we gotta move. Vss. 16-17.

***For where a will is involved, the death of the one who made it must be established. For a will takes effect only at death, since it is not in force as long as the one who made it is alive.***  
**(Hebrews 9:16–17)**

- To grasp the author's argument, you need to know something that doesn't come out clearly in English and that's a bit of wordplay.
- In classical Greek, the word diatheke normally refers to a will or a testament. But it was the word that translators used to translate the Heb covenant in the LXX. So that's why the OT is

called the OT. Because the common word for will or testament was used to translate the word for covenant. The new testament deals with the inauguration and culmination of the new covenant.

- As in my opening illustration, there is a difference between the making and fulfilling of a will. The will becomes effective only at the death of the one who made it.
- So the author is using the flexibility of the word translated as covenant here to make the point. The same way that a will only becomes effective at death, so does the covenant involve death.
- After all, in the old testament, various covenants were sealed by death. Think of the Abrahamic covenant and how he had to cut animals in pieces and God walked between the two pieces as a symbol that God Himself would bear the penalty if the covenant was broken.
- How do we know that the cutting of the animals symbolizes that the one who breaks the covenant should suffer that fate?
  - *And the men who transgressed my covenant and did not keep the terms of the covenant that they made before me, I will make them like the calf that they cut in two and passed between its parts— the officials of Judah, the officials of Jerusalem, the eunuchs, the priests, and all the people of the land who passed between the parts of the calf. And I will give them into the hand of their enemies and into the hand of those who seek their lives. Their dead bodies shall be food for the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth.* (Jeremiah 34:18–20)
- So death is associated with covenants to show the severity and gravity of the commitment.
- And in the Mosaic covenant, that covenant was sealed by means of sacrifice. The entire covenant was premised on death.
- And all of God's covenants with man were ultimately broken. Not from God's side. God was always faithful. But from man's side. And yet, rather than demanding that we bear the punishment of death, God Himself has born the burden.
- In fact, this is even a bit clearer in the Greek where the word established is literally the word for bear or carry. So the one who makes the will or the one who makes the covenant, bears the death that establishes the covenant. God pays what we owe.
- That's the good news of the gospel in short. Christ was exiled and rejected, betrayed and abandoned, beaten and crucified. The curses of the Adamic covenant and Noahic covenant and Abrahamic covenant and Mosaic covenant have fallen on Him for our sake.
- But the main point here is simply to show that death is necessary for the receiving of an inheritance. And so in God's divine wisdom, He has acted in such a way as to be the one who makes the covenant and bears the death that ratifies the covenant such that He can share the inheritance with us. Let's keep going. Vss. 18-20.

***Therefore not even the first covenant was inaugurated without blood. For when every commandment of the law had been declared by Moses to all the people, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people, saying, "This is the blood of the covenant that God commanded for you."*** (Hebrews 9:18–20)

- We've mentioned before that first covenant in Hebrews isn't literal. In reality, there were multiple covenants prior to the Mosaic covenant. There was a covenant with Abraham and with Noah and even with Adam in a sense. But in Hebrews he is concerned only with the Mosaic and new covenant so in that sense, the Mosaic is first.

- And that covenant was also inaugurated with blood. So he's moved from the overarching principle of covenants in general to the particular instantiation of the Mosaic covenant.
- And in doing so, he's moved from death in general to blood in particular.
- Why? Well, most of us don't associate blood with death. I know a few of you who are deathly afraid of needles, in fact a couple of our ostensibly manly men view needles as their kryptonite. But in general, our contact with blood isn't in the context of death.
- We give blood and cut ourselves shaving or otherwise bleed and, unless we're hemophiliacs, the bleeding stops long before death.
- But that's not how blood functioned in the sacrificial system. The blood there represented death.
- This reminds me, as most things do, of a scene from the Office where Dwight invents a product called Burger on the Go which is a device that allows one to obtain six hamburgers (or twelve sliders) from a horse without killing the animal.
- Well, that wasn't how sacrifices in the OT worked. They didn't just obtain a bit of blood from a bull and then let it go. The blood was obtained by slaughter. That blood signified death because blood represents life. Look at Leviticus 17:11
  - *For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it for you on the altar to make atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that makes atonement by the life.* (Leviticus 17:11)
- So that's how the author has moved seamlessly from talking about death to talking about blood because blood in the sacrificial system means death.
- With that in mind, let's look at the confirmation of the covenant in its old testament context since that is what the author is quoting.
- In Exodus 24 vs. 3 we read:
  - *Moses came and told the people all the words of the LORD and all the rules. And all the people answered with one voice and said, "All the words that the LORD has spoken we will do."* (Exodus 24:3)
- So Israel enters into covenant with YHWH.
- And then burnt offerings and peace offerings are sacrificed and then we read in vs. 8:
  - *And Moses took the blood and threw it on the people and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words."* (Exodus 24:8)
- At that point, the covenant is inaugurated.
- What about the water and wool and hyssop?
- Well, those were all used in various other ceremonies for cleansing and they fit with the general idea that the blood symbolized cleansing.
- Now, as we talked about last time, the cleansing that the blood signified was merely external. It purified the body, but not the soul, not the conscience. So, again, we see that Christ's blood is better. It penetrates to the true root of the stain of sin and doesn't merely deal with the surface.
- In other words, the cleansing of the Mosaic system was superficial, while Christ's sacrifice is substantial. The old was shadow, the new is substance.
- Let's keep going. Vss. 21-22.

***And in the same way he sprinkled with the blood both the tent and all the vessels used in worship. Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins. (Hebrews 9:21–22)***

- Earlier we read from Exodus 24 and the confirmation of the covenant. If you read the whole passage, a word that might stand out is all. The phrase all of the words of the Lord is mentioned multiple times, then you also have references to all the rules, all the people, and all that the Lord has spoken.
- Then here in Hebrews we have all of the vessels. This particular ritual isn't mentioned in Exodus 24, but it does relate to the day of atonement and other sacrifices that we see later in the text.
- The Old Testament never explicitly refers to the tabernacle itself being sprinkled with blood, but we do read that blood was sprinkled on the altar, on the garments of the high priests, before the tent of meeting, before the veil of the sanctuary, on the mercy seat once a year, and later the doorposts of the temple. So the author is just painting with a broad brush here, once again conflating various rituals in order to give a more wide-ranging picture of the Mosaic covenant as a whole.
- The point is to show the comprehensive nature of the sprinkling since without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness.
- And, again, that shows the tragedy and irony of the Mosaic covenant. All that blood and no actual atonement. Everything was sprinkled but nothing was actually cleaned. It's like when a kid takes a bath and plays around in the water for a bit but never actually uses shampoo or soap. Their whole body may be wet, but wet doesn't mean clean.
- So the whole tabernacle may have been sprinkled, but that doesn't mean it was actually clean.
- Now, that doesn't mean that the sacrifices were useless, just that their use was typological. It may not have been actually clean, but it was symbolically clean. In other words, the sacrifices weren't effective in themselves, but they are effective as a lens by which to better understand and appreciate the superior sacrifice of Christ.
- And they also function to show the severity of sin. We've done this exercise before, but imagine living in ancient Israel. Imagine the sounds of sacrifice, the bleating of sheep, the lowing of cattle. And the sight of blood and animal carcasses. And the smell of blood and burnt flesh lingering in the air.
- Each and every day, there was sacrifice. And then even more on the annual day of atonement. In fact, there were over 1000 annual sacrifices, but that was just what was corporate. That didn't even include sacrifices for your own individual sin. There might literally have been hundreds of thousands of sacrifices each year. Each dove or goat or sheep or bull slaughtered because of your sin.
- That's why Hebrews 10:3 says:
  - *But in these sacrifices there is a reminder of sins every year.* (Hebrews 10:3)
- Not only did the sacrifices not actually pay the penalty for your sin, they just subjectively reminded you of that sin. They showed what you deserved, what you earned, what you merited.
- The sights and smells and sounds functioned as a perpetual token of your idolatry. That aroma of death represented the fact that you weren't clean, weren't perfect, that things were unfinished and incomplete.
- Because you suppressed the truth in unrighteousness, you worshiped and served creation rather than the creator.
- Without the shedding of blood, without death, there was no forgiveness because the wages of sin is death. So you would kill animal after animal, but the blood of bulls and goats could never atone, so the work was never finished.
- Human sin needs human blood.

- And so what's better about the new covenant? God has shed human blood, unblemished blood, blameless blood, perfect blood, blood which purifies and perfects not only the earthly tabernacle, but the heavenly holy places.
- Better blood shed by a better priest in a better tabernacle inaugurating a better covenant built on better promises. Christ is better.
- What the law and the Levites and the Aaronic priesthood could not do, God has done through Christ. We'll see that in depth next week. For now, let's pray.

### **Communion**

- Fence table
- As you know, communion was originally instituted by Christ during Passover and Passover within ancient Israel was distinct from the Day of Atonement sacrifice, but like Yom Kippur it involved sacrifice. A Passover lamb was sacrificed and its blood spread on the doorway as a sign reminding Israel of release from Egypt and God's work of delivering the people from slavery.
- And there was a sense in which that was finished. They were after all fully delivered from Egypt since Egypt was basically destroyed by means of the plagues and the Red Sea and yet Passover itself was typological for a greater liberation, liberation from a foe far more powerful than Pharaoh.
- So the Scriptures speak of Christ as our Passover lamb. But, again, unlike the OT shadow, Christ's fulfillment is ultimate and final. He is the true and new and better Passover.
- And that's what this meal signifies. Each time we partake, we do so cognizant of the fact that we have been redeemed from slavery, not to Egypt, but to sin, to Satan, to ourselves and our flesh.
- So in this meal, there is a certain power as we are reminded of God's power and promises to us.
- So this morning as we partake together, I want us to consider how this meal serves as nourishment to your fight with sin. How this meal symbolizes the fact that you are no longer enslaved to lust or pride or greed or anger or whatever.
- Yes, we still struggle with the residue of the flesh, but we are no longer imprisoned and enslaved to our flesh. We've been set free from not only the penalty of sin, but also its power.
- And this meal also looks forward to the day when we will even be set free from its presence, when we partake together of the wedding supper of the lamb.
- So take a few seconds, confess and repent and we'll partake together.
- On the night...