

The Female Lamb Without Defect

Description

The Female Lamb Without Defect

A study related to the SDA
Sabbath School Lesson for 2021, 3rd Quarter

Rest In Christ

Week 11

by [Mary Zebrowski](#)

Edited by [Trent Wilde](#)

This week's lesson is entitled, "Longing for More," and discusses the significance of "types" in the bible. A "type," as the quarterly points out, can serve as an example, a lesson, a parallel for a truth God wants to teach us about. Monday's lesson is entitled, "Rituals and Sacrifices," and discusses the Old Testament symbols pointing to New Testament truths. Sabbath School Quarterly Lesson, Monday, September 6, 2021

Monday's lesson has us read the instructions for the sin offering for unintentional sin in Leviticus 4:32-35. It reads,

³² "If someone brings a lamb as their sin offering, they are to bring a female without defect. ³³ They are to lay their hand on its head and slaughter it for a sin offering at the place where the burnt offering is slaughtered. ³⁴ Then the priest shall take some of the blood of the sin offering with his finger and put it on the horns of the altar of burnt offering and pour out the rest of the blood at the base of the altar. ³⁵ They shall remove all the fat, just as the fat is removed from the lamb of the fellowship offering, and the priest shall burn it on the altar on top of the food offerings presented to the Lord. In this way the priest will make atonement for them for the sin they have committed, and they will be forgiven.

As the lesson points out, this offering was a sin offering for a common Israelite not the congregation at large or a priest or a ruler. It was for a circumstantial or special occasion when someone had committed a sin unintentionally. The sacrificial animal prescribed here was a spotless female lamb. Other special sin offerings, or offerings that were made when other certain circumstances arose, were he-goats, bullocks, female goats, pigeons, turtledoves, and in one instance only, a male lamb, that being for the case of leprosy. (See Leviticus 14:10-20).

Now we know that Jesus was referred to as the "Lamb of God." (John 1:29,36) But since all the animals we just mentioned were also means of atonement for sin, why didn't John call Jesus "the she-goat" of God? Or "the ram of God"? Or "the pigeon of God"?

Leviticus gives very detailed instructions for all the offerings both for specific sacrifices for individuals and groups with various reasons to offer a sacrifice, and regular sacrifices which were sacrifices made at regular intervals daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly.

For example, the daily burnt offering for the congregation was specified to be done using a spotless male lamb. This happened twice each day — at the third and ninth hours. These sacrifices always included a meal and drink offering. The daily sacrifices of the male lamb should have had the effect of keeping the horrible results of sin — death (as echoed in Romans 6:23) — fresh in the minds of the people on a continual basis, and this continual reminder of the horrible result of sin should have helped to keep the people of the congregation from sinning.

To call Jesus — the Lamb of God — is to use the sacrificial lamb as a type, or picture, of Jesus. In other words, it is drawing a parallel, or comparison, between Jesus and the lamb. And they truly are comparable. Both were innocent, not deserving death. And just like the Israelites could have and should have seen the terrible results of sin each time they saw or smelled the sacrifice of the daily lamb, and this should have caused them to stop sinning — just so, we can and should see the terrible results of sin in the murder of Jesus, and this should cause us to stop sinning. If we daily spend time remembering the life and death of Jesus, As Ellen White admonished (Desire of Ages, 83.4), we can be kept from sinning by remembering that sin is never worth it — it destroys not only the sinner but the innocent — even Jesus himself. If we sin today, we are living by the same corrupt principles as those who killed Jesus, and our sin will have just as terrible results if we don't stop it. If we sin, we side with Jesus' — murderers against him, rather than siding with Jesus on the platform of righteousness and truth.

But back to the different types of animal sacrifices. Reading Leviticus reveals that there were all sorts of sacrifices for a whole variety of circumstances.

We've already seen that there are real parallels between Jesus and the daily burnt offering, and there are also parallels between him and the male lamb offered in the case of leprosy, but would it really make sense to say that Jesus is the antitype for every animal in the sacrificial system? Sometimes people make statements along these lines as though it is a complete explanation — the animal sacrifices represent Jesus — full stop. But given that there were so many different sacrifices, it really doesn't make sense to say they all represent Jesus. And actually, as Adventists, we know they don't. Many Christians look at the two goats on the day of atonement and are satisfied to say they both represent Jesus, but as Adventists, we recognize that both animals suffered different fates and that it really doesn't make sense to say that the same person is represented by both goats. Instead, we've always seen the goat that is offered as a sin offering as representing Jesus, while we see as the scapegoat as representing Satan. Clearly then, it would not make sense to say that Jesus is represented by every animal in the sacrificial system — full stop.

Now, it might be easy to assume that only Jesus sacrificed himself for our salvation, and in one sense that's true, but in another sense, the Father did as well.

2 Corinthians 5:19 says — that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation. • See also John 3:16, — For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. • Every parent knows how huge a sacrifice it would be to give up their child. God did this for us. That is quite a sacrifice, as we all would agree!

Interestingly, Ellen White also said that it was not only Jesus who gave himself for the sins of the world. She said,

— The Godhead was stirred with pity for the race, and the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit gave Themselves to the working out of the plan of redemption. • Ellen White, Counsels on

Health, p. 222

So, is it possible that the other members of the Godhead could also be typified in the sacrificial service if all of them gave themselves for our salvation?

If Satan can be typified in the sacrificial system, then I think we'd have to acknowledge that it's possible for members of the Godhead besides Jesus to be represented in it as well. In fact, it's not just possible; it's quite plausible! If we are to see the plan of salvation in the sacrificial system and if the whole Godhead is involved in the plan of salvation, then it would only make sense to see each member represented by various sacrifices. Consider the replacement sacrifice God provided for Abraham to use in place of his son, Isaac. Abraham was expecting a lamb (Genesis 22:8), but God provided a ram, the father of a lamb (Genesis 22:13). This fittingly pictures the Father's sacrifice for us in giving up his son, not just the sacrifice of the Son in giving himself.

Let's again consider the sacrifice in Leviticus 4:32-35. This sacrifice for the sin of an individual common person was to be a female lamb, specifically. Why a female lamb?

When it comes to types, we tend to have a limited group of stories and sacrifices we are familiar with. We know that we can draw parallels between the male lamb without defect and Jesus Christ. We can draw parallels between God the Father and the ram, the father of a lamb, in Genesis 22. We can even see parallels between Abraham and God the Father, and Isaac and God's Son Jesus. But have we ever considered who the parallel for Sarah would be? And how about a parallel for the sin offering of the female lamb? Should we just ignore the gender of these animals used in various sacrifices when it is so clearly specified? Would that be a consistent approach to studying the bible?

Well, I think we all would agree that we should be consistent in our study of scripture. If we are not going to be consistent, then why study? It is only through consistency that we are able to come to meaningful conclusions.

So, what truth might Sarah parallel? The apostle Paul actually uses Sarah as a type in Galatians 4, starting in verse 22. It reads,

22 For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman, the other by a freewoman. **23** But he *who was* of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh, and he of the freewoman through promise, **24** which things are symbolic.

For these are the two covenants: the one from Mount Sinai which gives birth to bondage, which is Hagar's **25** for this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children **26** but the Jerusalem above is free, which is the mother of us all. **27**

28 Now we, brethren, as Isaac *was*, are children of promise. **29** But, as he who was born according to the flesh then persecuted ****him who was born according to the Spirit,**** even so *it is* now. **30** Nevertheless what does the Scripture say? **Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.** **31** So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman but of the free.

Wow, so here Isaac is used as a symbol for those who are set to inherit the promise **27** those who are born of the Spirit. Isaac was born of Sarah **27** the freewoman. And verse 31 parallels this with us saying that we are to be born of the freewoman, or born of the Spirit, as it says in verse 29. Clearly, Sarah here is being used as

a symbol for the Holy Spirit!

Jesus also uses the female gender to speak about the Holy Spirit.

In John chapter 3, Jesus and Nicodemus have a conversation about what it means to be "born again." Jesus says,

"Most assuredly, I say to you, unless one is born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Nicodemus said to Him, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?"

Jesus answered, "Most assuredly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." John 3: 3-5

Jesus then goes on to talk more about being "born of the Spirit." Obviously, since males cannot give birth, Jesus is here speaking of the Holy Spirit as a female. Even though Nicodemus didn't understand what being born again was really about, he at least caught on to Jesus's image of a mother giving birth, as you can see from his question, "Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?"

So again, we see in scripture the Holy Spirit being presented as a mother. And while this might seem new and even shocking to us, it wouldn't have been to Jesus and his earliest followers since they spoke Semitic languages like Aramaic and Hebrew and in those languages, "Spirit" is feminine yes, even in the Hebrew Bible.

So, is it possible that the female lamb could be a type for the Holy Spirit? Has the Spirit not also left heaven to live among us after Jesus ascended into heaven? (John 16:7) Isn't this a sacrifice? And is not the Spirit also an intercessor for us along with Jesus? Romans 8:26 reads,

²⁶ Likewise the Spirit also helps in our weaknesses. For we do not know what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit Himself makes intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.

Now you may be thinking, why does the English translation here use a masculine pronoun "Himself" to refer to the word "Spirit"? This is a good question. Of course, this is an English translation of a Greek text. In Greek, the pronoun is "autos" which is neuter gender and can be translated as "he," "she," or "it," depending on context. The reason why the masculine gender is often used for "the Spirit" in English translations of the Greek is actually because the Latin word for "Spirit," "spiritus," is masculine and Latin was the predominant language for Scripture in Western Christianity for centuries. But of course, Church history centuries after Paul isn't the thing to use to decide how to translate Paul. The Greek word for "Spirit," "pneuma," is also neuter and can be understood as masculine, feminine, or neuter again depending on context. And the fact is, we have the context of Paul's own writings that show that he thought of the Spirit in feminine terms, as we saw from Galatians, and we know that Jesus and his followers in general also viewed the Spirit as feminine as we saw from John 3 and as [we have evidenced in other videos](#). So while the grammatical aspects of these words allow for three gender possibilities masculine, feminine, or neuter, the doctrinal context along with the Semitic language context, favors translating it as feminine. But our main point in quoting this verse isn't the translation we just thought we should address it so you aren't left wondering. The point we are making here though is that the Spirit is an intercessor, which is a priestly duty, just like Jesus is said to be our intercessor in the same chapter of

Romans (See Romans 8:34).

The Spirit has given up her life in heaven to be here with us as an intercessor — just like Jesus is our intercessor in heaven — sacrificing herself, her life, much like a mother does for her children. She is here to guide us into all truth (John 16:13). She is here, giving her all as a living sacrifice, to help us overcome sin in our lives.

Who is the anti-type for the female lamb without defect, the specified sin offering in Leviticus 4:32? With all considered, the weight of evidence seems irresistibly in favor of it being the Holy Spirit! Again—if we are to see the plan of salvation in the sacrificial system, we have to acknowledge that female sacrifices play a role. And if the whole Godhead is involved in the plan of salvation — then we should at least consider that the female sacrifices might represent a female member of the Godhead. And when we see, as we have, that the Scriptures present the Holy Spirit as a female, and that she sacrifices herself for us just as the Father and the Son do, then it becomes hard to deny that she is indeed comparable to a female sacrifice — just as much as Jesus and the Father are to male sacrifices.

For a deeper study on this topic, please see our studies [in this website](#), and on our YouTube channel, — [Branch Davidian SDA](#) —