

# “Thus It Is Written”: Redemptive History and Christ’s Resurrection on the Third Day

*Lee Tankersley*

## INTRODUCTION

Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead (Luke 24:46).

Jesus’ words in Luke 24:46 are not a source of controversy among those holding to the historic Christian faith. The resurrection of Jesus Christ on the third day is a central tenet of the gospel message. Thus, when Paul wrote to the Corinthians, reminding them of what was “of first importance,” he noted “that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures, that he was buried, *that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures*” (1 Cor 15:3-4).<sup>1</sup> Similarly, those constructing the Nicene Creed declared that “on the third day he rose again,

according to the Scriptures.” Simply put, those preaching the apostolic message in the history of the church have expressed no hesitation in affirming that Jesus rose from the dead on the third day *and* that this happened in

accordance with the Scriptures.

There has been much less of a consensus in the church, however, in affirming exactly what texts (or text) Jesus was referring to when he said “*it is written*, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead” (Luke 24:46). Some have suggested that it is unnecessarily reductionistic to assume Jesus had one text in mind.<sup>2</sup> Green, for example, argues that one “would be hard-pressed to locate specific texts that make these prognostications explicit” and thus concludes, “The point of Jesus’ words is not that such-and-such a verse has now come true, but that the truth to which all of the Scriptures point has now been realized!”<sup>3</sup>

There is no doubt truth in Green’s claim, and it would surely place unnecessary constraint on the interpreter to demand that one isolate a single text Jesus must have had in mind. With that said, however, if the Scriptures demand that the Christ be raised on the third day, then it is insufficient merely to make such a declaration without identifying the manner in which the Old Testament Scriptures mandate such a time-sensitive act as

---

LEE TANKERSLEY received his Ph.D. from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Dr. Tankersley is Pastor of Cornerstone Community Church in Jackson, Tennessee.

a third-day resurrection.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the goal of this article is to demonstrate the manner in which the Old Testament (through predictive patterns, types, and the development of redemptive history) prophesies that the Christ would be raised on the third day. Specifically, I will utilize Hosea 6:2 to illustrate the manner in which the Old Testament predicts a third-day resurrection.<sup>5</sup> By doing so, I am not suggesting that Hosea 6:2 is the only text that Jesus (or the New Testament writers) had in mind but am utilizing this text as a lens through which we can view the recurrent inter-textual patterns that predict not only that the Christ is raised but that the resurrection occur on the third day.

### **HOSEA 6:2 AND ITS CONTEXT**

Hosea's message of coming judgment for Israel's idolatry is pictured in his marriage to an unfaithful wife and the birth of children whose names declare that Israel will be judged mercilessly, for they are not the Lord's people.<sup>6</sup> This declaration of judgment is then illustrated graphically in 5:14 as the Lord is pictured as a lion that will tear the people and carry them off so that none can rescue them. Yet this is not the final word. In the verse which immediately follows this seemingly hopeless scene, the Lord holds out hope of forgiveness and restoration, declaring, "I will return again to my place, until they acknowledge their guilt and seek my face, and in their distress earnestly seek me" (Hos 5:15). If the people will turn from their idolatry, the Lord stands ready (and eager) to bring his wandering bride back to himself (Hos 2:14-3:5).

It is in this context that Hosea voices the cry of repentance Israel desperately needs to echo, as he declares in 6:1-3, "Come, let us return to the Lord; for he has torn us, that he may heal us; he has struck us down, and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him. Let us know; let us press on to know the Lord; his going out is sure as the dawn; he will come to us as the showers, as the spring rains that water the earth."<sup>7</sup> It is a state-

ment of hope, based in the Lord's steadfast love and faithfulness. However, this was a day Hosea did not see. Israel refused to turn from her ways, and the Lord finally brought forth his merciless judgment with the destruction of the Northern Kingdom at the hands of the Assyrians in 722 B.C. The Lord indeed tore his people and carried them away, awaiting a day when he would turn their hearts to himself.

### **IS HOSEA 6:2 PROPHETIC?**

There are a number of problems with seeing Hosea 6:2 as a text which fits the prophetic stream of Scripture calling for the Messiah to be raised on the third day. The first of these is that the text is not obviously prophetic. It is a far cry from other messianic prophecies like that of Isaiah 11:1-5 or Micah 5:2, which directly prophesy concerning the coming Messiah. Second, in the text, the object of the Lord's tearing and raising up on the third day is "us." That is, Hosea 6:2 speaks not of an individual but of a corporate people, Israel. Third, the phrase "after two days ... on the third day" does not appear to refer to a literal three day period but rather reflects the prophet's use of an  $x:x+1$  pattern to refer to "a set time" after which the Lord would restore his people to himself.<sup>8</sup> Finally, the hope of the people being "raised up" would seem to fit more with the restoration of the people back to their land after being exiled than to the literal resurrection of the Messiah from the dead. All of these elements combine to produce a pessimistic perspective on the notion that Hosea 6:2 predicts the resurrection of the Christ on the third day.

However, if we take these issues one-by-one, we will see that these obstacles are not insurmountable. First, it is too simplistic to rule that Hosea 6:2 is not a prophetic text because it does not fit the pattern of other prophetic texts like that of Micah 5:2, for example. Only a few chapters later in Hosea, the prophet writes in 11:1, "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son." On its surface, it is easy to make similar statements as those made against Hosea 6:2 not

being prophetic concerning the Messiah. Hosea 11:1 is not obviously and directly prophetic like some other texts. It too deals with Israel as a corporate people. And it seems to speak of a literal past exodus from the nation of Egypt rather than a future act brought about by a solitary figure. However, when Matthew writes of the child, Jesus, coming out of Egypt after the death of Herod, he writes, “This was to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet, ‘Out of Egypt I called my son’” (Matt 2:15), thus confirming that the text is indeed prophetic and was only fulfilled through the life and actions of Jesus. Therefore, we will now look briefly at why Matthew read Hosea 11:1 in this light, for this will shed light on why Hosea 6:2 may be read in a similar manner.

#### **HOSEA 11:1 AND RECURRING REDEMPTIVE PATTERNS**

In Hosea 11:1, the Lord speaks of his act of physically redeeming Israel out of Egypt. He recounts his kindness toward them in the early days, comparing his tender love for them to that of a father who feeds his son, teaches him to walk, and cares for him. However, he then notes that Israel is “bent on turning away from me” (Hos 11:7) and will face exile, as Assyria will be their king (11:5). Yet this will not be the end of the story. The Lord will one day draw his children back to himself. He will roar like a lion and his children will come trembling from all the places from which they have been driven, and he will return them to their homes (11:10-11). Thus, Hosea 11:1-11 reflects the tender-heartedness of the Lord as he both recounts his first deliverance of his son, Israel, to begin the section and speaks of a coming deliverance in the final verses of the section.

Even seen in this broader context, though, one may still charge that Hosea 11:1 does not necessarily seem to be a prophetic text concerning the Messiah but a mere reflection of God’s past work of salvation for his people. However, there are two elements that occur in this section of Hosea’s prophecy that fit within a recurring

pattern found in the redemptive storyline: sonship and a new exodus.

#### **SONSHIP**

The theme of sonship is established from the earliest pages of Scripture. After having noted that God created Adam in his own image and likeness (Gen 1:26-27), Moses writes, “When Adam had lived 130 years, he fathered a son in his own likeness, after his image, and named him Seth” (Gen 5:3). Therefore, by telling the reader that Adam fathered a son in his own image and likeness, it is difficult to avoid that the conclusion that Adam—having been created in God’s own image and likeness—is to God as Seth is to him, namely, his *son*.

But there is more than logical connecting of dots that drives this conclusion. Simply turning to the pages of the New Testament confirms Adam’s sonship, as Luke ends his genealogy of Jesus, writing, “the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God” (Luke 3:38). But Adam’s sonship is also entailed from the mere declaration that Adam was created in the image of God. In explaining the background of bearing the divine image, Gentry has noted,

The ancient Near Eastern and Canaanite cultural context is significant. In Egypt, from at least 1650 B.C. onwards, people perceived the king as the image of god because he was the son of god.... What is stressed is that the behavior of the king reflects the behavior of the god. The king as the image of god reflects the characteristics and essential notions of the god.<sup>9</sup>

That is to say, for one to be in the image of a god meant that one was understood to be a son of god, and to be a son of god meant that the image-bearer would reflect the behavior of his god. Therefore, with this background, Scripture’s declaration that Adam was created in God’s image was *already* telling the reader that which Luke confirms at the conclusion of Jesus’ genealogy, namely, that Adam was created as God’s son. And if Adam was God’s son, then Adam should have resembled and

reflected the behavior of God in the world.

The problem, however, is that we know that Adam did not reflect God in his behavior. He rebelled against his maker and went from being a worshiper of God to an accuser of God. Consequently, Adam forfeited the privileges of sonship to a reign of death so that all creation was subjected to futility and all those after him suffered condemnation before the God whose image we bear.

Yet God's plan was not thwarted by Adam's disobedience. As the biblical storyline unfolds, it becomes clear that God will indeed have a son who will reign over the earth. After calling Abraham to himself and multiplying his offspring, the Lord demanded of Pharaoh, "Let my *son* go that he may serve me" (Exod 4:23). Israel is thus given the role of Adam. They are to be God's son, reflecting and resembling their God in the world, and it is for this reason that the Lord declares in Hosea 11:1, "Out of Egypt I called my *son*." And as God's son, they are eventually brought into a land that "lay subdued before them," (Josh 18:1)—the very language given to Adam—and the land which they inherit is described in terms of Eden.<sup>10</sup> Sadly, like Adam, they also rebel against God and are driven from their land.

Israel's failure, however, does not bring God's plan to an end. In 2 Samuel 7:12-14, God promises David that he'll "raise up" another son, saying,

When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be to him a father, and *he shall be to me a son*.

Ultimately, it is only God the Son incarnate who is sufficient for this task. As the God-man, he lives in perfect obedience to his Father and is appointed (by his resurrection from the dead) to the position and role pre-figured in Adam and Israel and promised to David (Rom 1:3-4), as he

is given all authority (Matt 28:18) and reigns over the entire cosmos as the Son of God.<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, as the second and last Adam, true Israel, and obedient Son, he brings many sons to glory (Heb 2:10) so that one day all who trust in the crucified and resurrected Lord for salvation will reign alongside him as sons of God. Therefore, when Matthew cites the fulfillment of Hosea 2:15 occurring in Jesus' arrival from Egypt, it is in light of the reality that God's true "son" has now come to fulfill God's purposes and plans.

### **A NEW EXODUS**

But sonship is not the only theme found in Hosea 11:1-11. These verses also reveal the recurrent pattern of a coming new exodus. Hosea 11:1-11 not only begins with the Lord reflecting on the exodus as a past event but also ends with the Lord declaring a coming future exodus. After speaking of the Lord driving his people into exile, where Assyria will be their king, the Lord foretells that he will one day roar like a lion and "when he roars, his children shall come trembling from the west; they shall come trembling like birds from Egypt, and like doves from the land of Assyria, and I will return them to their homes" (11:10-11). The God who called them out of Egypt will indeed call them out of "Egypt" again. There is to be a new exodus.

But this "new exodus" theme is not found in Hosea alone but is a reoccurring prediction throughout the prophets. In Jeremiah 16:14-15, for example, the Lord declared,

Therefore, behold, the days are coming, declares the Lord, when it shall no longer be said, "As the Lord lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the land of Egypt," but "As the Lord lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the north country and out of all the countries where he had driven them." For I will bring them back to their own land that I gave to their fathers.

Thus, Jeremiah foretells of a day when the Lord will no longer be described by his action in the first

exodus, for there is another exodus coming which will eclipse the first. Similarly, Isaiah 38-55 and Ezekiel 36-48 predict a coming new exodus when Israel will be brought out of exile and restored to their land.

However, the restoration from exile should not be viewed as a mere promise to return Israel to their land. Rather, as Gentry rightly notes, there are two elements involved in the promise of a new exodus: physical return to the land and spiritual deliverance from their bondage to sin.<sup>12</sup> With specific reference to Isaiah 38-55, Gentry writes,

The promises of redemption are divided into two distinct events: release (42:18-43:21) and forgiveness (43:22-44:23). Release refers to bringing the people physically out of exile in Babylon and back to their own land; forgiveness entails dealing fully and finally with their sin and the broken covenant.... And corresponding to these two issues there are two distinct agents of redemption: Cyrus and the servant. The former will bring about the first task: physical return to the land of Israel (44:24-48:22); the latter will bring about the second task: the forgiveness of sins (49:1-53:12).<sup>13</sup>

The means by which Cyrus began the first element of deliverance was in his decree in 539 B.C., and the means by which the final element of deliverance takes place is through the actions of the servant (Isa 52:13-53:12). Yet the identity of the servant is complex. On the one hand, the servant is clearly Israel. Thus, the Lord declares in Isaiah 41:8-9, "But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the offspring of Abraham, my friend; you whom I took from the ends of the earth, and called from its farthest corners, saying to you, 'You are my servant.'" A few chapters later, though, we find the Lord again identifying the servant as Israel (49:3) only then to say that the servant's task is to bring back Israel (49:5-6). Therefore, one may conclude that the servant is both Israel and Israel's savior. But how can this be?

The answer is that Israel's Messiah serves as a representative for the entire nation. Going back to the discussion on Israel's identity as God's "son," it can also be noted that because Israel's king represented the whole of the nation, he could be spoken of as God's "son" in himself. For this reason, when Psalm 2 was read at the king's coronation, it would be spoken of him, "You are my Son; today I have begotten you" (Ps 2:7). Because Israel is God's son and the king represents the nation, so the king himself is God's son, for *he is Israel*. And because Jesus comes as the Messiah (and, thus, king and representative of Israel), he may rightly claim that he is the true vine (John 15:1), a label that was given to Israel (Isa 5). Thus, the hopes of Israel are fulfilled in the work of Israel's representative: the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>14</sup>

But how is it that the servant will deliver Israel from her sins? How will he "make many to be accounted righteous" (Isa 53:11) so that God's people are justified? The ultimate answer to this question is through the death and resurrection of the Christ. This is again why Jesus' arrival from Egypt is a fulfillment of Hosea 11:1. With his arrival comes the means by which the final act of the new exodus (the forgiveness of sins) will become a reality.

Yet here we must be more specific as to why the *resurrection* of Jesus is needed for the many to be accounted righteous. And the answer is that Jesus' resurrection from the dead is his justification, which is necessary in light of him bearing divine condemnation in death.

To make sense of this, we must understand the nature of Jesus' death as an act of penal substitution. That is, when Jesus died on the cross, he willingly bore the punishment, penalty, and judgment deserved by sinners in their place as their substitute and representative. This, of course, is foretold in the suffering servant text of Isaiah 53 wherein Isaiah declared that the servant "has born our griefs and carried our sorrows ... was wounded for our transgressions ... was crushed for our iniquities" (Isa 53:4-5). And it is clearly

picked up in the New Testament as well.

The book of Hebrews highlights Jesus' role as representative of his people (i.e., Israel who delivers Israel), showing that Jesus is a priest in the line of Melchizedek so that he might "act on behalf of men in relation to God, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Heb 5:1-9). Jesus' incarnation, then, is crucial so that he might "become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people" (Heb 2:17). Thus, by making propitiation for the people's sins, he turns away God's wrath from them.<sup>15</sup>

One key difference between Jesus and the former high priests, however, is that Jesus is both the priest making the sacrifice on behalf of God's people *and* the substitutionary sacrifice that is offered. Just as the lamb without blemish was slaughtered and its blood shed instead of the firstborn during the Passover, so Jesus offers "himself without blemish to God" (Heb 9:14). He appears "once for all at the end of the ages to put away sin by the sacrifice of *himself*" (Heb 9:26).

Therefore, though God's people were the objects of God's wrath because of their sin (Rom 1:18-3:20), Christ bore God's wrath and condemnation for sinners in his death on the cross. This reality is seen both in Jesus' struggle in the garden and in the nature of his death. Prior to the cross, Jesus prays in the garden, "Remove this cup from me. Yet not what I will, but what you will" (Mark 14:36). In light of the cup symbolizing God's wrath in Scripture, this is the clearest meaning of "cup" in this text.<sup>16</sup> Jesus anticipates going to the cross so that he might bear the condemnation of God's people—the wrath of God. Then, the cross itself pictures this same reality. He is handed over to die, cries out (asking why God has forsaken him), and the earth is shrouded in darkness—all signs that he is bearing God's wrath.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, when Jesus dies on the cross, he dies as the righteous Son of God, bearing divine condemnation for sinners.

The resurrection, then, must be understood against the backdrop of Christ dying as the con-

demned one on behalf of sinners. If Christ's death is the last "word" on that Friday, then it is a judicial declaration that Jesus is accursed of God. For Jesus to remain dead would be evidence that the one who appeared to be the perfectly obedient Son was something less than perfectly righteous. Moreover, since Jesus is the representative of his people so that what is true of him is true of them, if he remains under the condemnation of God then believers are condemned as well.<sup>18</sup> For this reason, Jesus must be justified, vindicated as the righteous Son, and this is precisely what happens in the resurrection.

The New Testament verifies this conclusion. The most straightforward confirmation is found in Paul's declaration in 1 Timothy 3:16 that Christ has been "justified by the Spirit,"<sup>19</sup> a reference to Christ's resurrection carried out through the agency of the Spirit.<sup>20</sup> But confirmation is also found in Romans 5:18.

In Romans 5:12-21 Paul highlights the parallel and contrast between the work of Adam and of Christ. Concerning Adam, Paul argues that Adam's sin brought about a legal sentence of condemnation for all in him (i.e., all humanity) that was manifested in a reign of death over the world (5:12, 14, 16-18, 21). Similarly, Paul argues that Christ's work of obedience brought about a legal sentence of justification for all in him (i.e., believers) that is manifested in eternal life (5:16-21). Specifically, Paul writes that Christ's "one act of righteousness leads to *justification resulting in life for all men*" (Rom 5:18).<sup>21</sup>

Therefore, if the reign of death over the world is evidence that a legal sentence of condemnation has fallen on humanity, then the reality of eternal life is evidence that a legal sentence of justification has come to the one who has life. Geerhardus Vos thus concluded, "Christ's resurrection was the *de facto* declaration of God in regard to his being just. His quickening bears in itself testimony of his justification."<sup>22</sup> That is, if Christ's death manifests that he bore divine condemnation, then the fact that he was made alive "bears in itself" evidence

that he has been justified. Indeed, the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the Father's visible attestation that he declares his Son righteous.

Moreover, since Christ is in representative union with his people, then believers should expect Christ's resurrection/justification to bring about their own justification. And this is precisely what one finds Paul stating in Romans 4:25. He writes that Jesus "was delivered up for our trespasses and raised for our justification." In the first half of the verse, he highlights Jesus' identification with believers in their condemnation—Christ pays the penalty for their sin. In the second half of the verse, he underscores the connection between Christ's resurrection and believers' justification. Jesus' resurrection bears a sentence of justification, and all believers are justified through their union with the resurrected Christ. *Christ* is raised, and (because he is in representative union with believers) it is for *our* justification.

Therefore, when Hosea prophesies of a coming new exodus, his prophecy contains two elements: a physical return to the land *and* deliverance from slavery and bondage to sin. And because Israel cannot free itself from the slavery and bondage to sin, the nation's hopes are in its representative—the Israel who will save Israel—the Christ. Moreover, since deliverance from the bondage and slavery to sin requires the death and resurrection of the Christ, then a prophecy concerning the new exodus for God's people is necessarily a prophecy concerning the death and resurrection of the Christ.

### **RETURNING TO HOSEA 6:2**

In light of these patterns developed in the redemptive storyline, the obstacles against Hosea 6:2 serving as a prophetic text have now largely disappeared. Though Hosea 6:2 speaks of the hopes of a corporate people Israel, we have seen that Israel's hopes are wrapped up in the work of their representative head. And though the text appears to hope for a day of national restoration in which they will return to their land and live before the Lord (*cf.* Ezek 37), we have seen that

the promise of restoration (or a new exodus) is a promise that includes the forgiveness of sins, which requires the death and resurrection of the Christ on behalf of his people. Finally, though the text does not prophesy in a direct manner like that of Micah 5:2, it does prophesy in an *indirect* manner by telling of events to come which not only are repeated throughout the redemptive storyline but which find their culmination in Christ.

Yet there is one more element which needs addressed: the third day. Again, in the text, Hosea declares, "Come, let us return to the Lord; for he has torn us, that he may heal us; he has struck us down, and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him" (Hos 6:1-2). Here we see the hope that God might bring about his redemptive act of causing the people to live before him "on the third day."

It can be tempting to move too quickly from this text to the third-day resurrection of the Christ, noting the language of Hosea's claim that "on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him." However, moving from the linguistic connections in Hosea 6:2 to the third-day resurrection of the Christ fails to ground the third-day element in a recurring pattern in the storyline of the Old Testament—a recurring pattern that is indeed present in the Old Testament storyline.

In showing the specifics of the third-day pattern in the Old Testament, I will draw on the helpful study by Michael Russell.<sup>23</sup> Russell notes that in the Old Testament, the numbers two, three, and four occur (in the Hebrew) 772, 605, and 456 times, respectively. This, he concludes, is to be expected, since smaller numbers are going to occur more frequently than larger ones. However, when one looks at the occurrence of "two days" (or the "second day"), "three days" (or the "third day"), and "four days" (or the "fourth day"), the frequency shifts considerably. While the second day and fourth day are mentioned fourteen and eight times, respectively, the third day is mentioned sixty-nine times in the Old Testament.<sup>24</sup>

The frequency of this occurrence alone is sufficient to draw the attention of the reader.

Russell then shows that the phrase “three days,” in its Old Testament usage, usually carries an idea of “sufficient time for certainty.”<sup>25</sup> And while it is unnecessary to repeat his findings in full, at least a portion deserves to be quoted at length. He writes,

For example, the three-day journey which the Israelites make before sacrificing in the wilderness is explicitly requested so as to be out of sight of the Egyptians (Exod 8:26-27). It represents sufficient time travelling to be certain that no Egyptians will be present. Also, in Joshua 2:16 and 22, three days in hiding is explicitly said to be sufficient for the two spies to be certain that their pursuers had gone.... When Laban moved Jacob’s flocks a three-day journey from his own flocks (Gen 30:36), it was implied that the distance was sufficient to be sure that the two men’s flocks would not interbreed and form more speckled offspring (which would then belong to Jacob). The reason Pharaoh waited three days to respond to the plague of darkness is not stated, but the feeling is that Pharaoh was now sure that the darkness would not subside without some kind of action (Exod 10:22). The Israelites began grumbling after three days of not finding water. The implication is that this time period was sufficient to be sure that they were in trouble (Exod 15:22). When three days passed after the treaty with the Gibeonites, the feeling of the narrative is that sufficient time had passed for the treaty to be firmly established, and thus binding (Josh 9:16).<sup>26</sup>

Meanwhile, his investigation reveals that the “third day” is typically not used to illustrate the same reality as “three days.” Rather, it serves to convey “a climactic reversal, usually involving a death, or the escape from likely death.”<sup>27</sup> This is seen, for example, in the Isaac narrative where “*On the third day* Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place from afar” (Gen 22:4), just prior to Isaac’s life being spared, or in the Joseph narrative where “*On the third day* Joseph said to [his brothers], ‘Do

this and you will live, for I fear God’” (Gen 42:18), after he had accused them of being spies.<sup>28</sup>

This pattern of “the third day” representing a climactic reversal, including escape from likely death, may be compared to the pattern in redemptive history of barren women bearing children, which culminates with the virgin-born Messiah. Ferguson notes,

In keeping with a long-established divine pattern emphasizing the monergistic activity of God in redemptive history, a “barren” woman is made fruitful (*cf.* Gen. 17:15-19; 18:9-14; Jdg. 13:1-24; 1 Sam. 1:1-20; Isa. 32:15). Indeed, here we meet the climactic illustration of this principle. When the Spirit comes to mark the dawning of the new messianic era, not merely a barren women, but a *virgin* woman, is with child (Isa 7:14; Mt. 1:23).<sup>29</sup>

We see a similar escalation of the third day pattern culminating in Christ.<sup>30</sup> Whereas the sacrifice of Isaac, for example, reveals a climactic reversal from likely death on the third day, this pattern culminates in the Christ being saved from *actual* death on the third day.<sup>31</sup>

Returning to Hosea 6:2, we see that this text may be placed within the divine pattern of a reversal from death to life “on the third day” which has been established in the redemptive storyline. Hosea has declared that judgment is coming. The people will be exiled. And indeed they were. Moreover, the exile is of such travesty that it is pictured in terms of death (*cf.* Ezek 37). Therefore, as Hosea looks for a climactic reversal from death to life (i.e., the new exodus) “on the third day,” he is placing his hopes for God’s dramatic intervention within the recurring pattern God himself has established in the Scriptures.

#### **CONCLUSION: “THUS IT IS WRITTEN”**

We are now in a place to put the pieces together. As Hosea looks forward to a day when the Lord will raise up his people in order that they may live

before him, he speaks of a coming new exodus. The new exodus, however, is not merely that of a physical return from exile but also includes a deliverance from their bondage to sin. This act of deliverance must be performed *by Israel for Israel* (Isa 49:5-6). Yet, the people are unable to save themselves. Therefore, their salvation must be achieved by the promised Son, the Messiah, who (as a representative of his people) is able to say, “I am Israel” (John 15:1) *and* save Israel. Moreover, saving his people from their sin requires his death (appeasing the Lord’s judgment against them) and his resurrection from death (whereby he and they—in union with him—are justified), the latter of which fits a pattern of reversal from death to life on the third day that is established in redemptive history. It is, then, these Old Testament patterns along the redemptive storyline that create an expectation for these predictive patterns to culminate in the work of Christ. And it is this reality that the Jesus himself (along with the New Testament writers) affirmed took place as he suffered divine judgment for his people in death and was raised on the third day, *as it is written*.

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>All Scripture quotations are from the English Standard Version (unless otherwise noted), and all emphases within Scripture quotations are added.

<sup>2</sup>For example, Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1894; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 857. See also Anthony C. Thisleton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1195, who makes a similar statement concerning 1 Corinthians 15:3-4.

<sup>3</sup>Green, *Luke*, 857.

<sup>4</sup>Goldsworthy notes, “Scholarly reserve and humility is one thing; loss of nerve in the implications of the New Testament’s teaching is another.” Graeme Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics: Foundations and*

*Principles of Evangelical Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006), 252.

<sup>5</sup>By “predicts” I do not mean to suggest that it is directly predicted but rather in an indirect and hidden manner which only becomes clear with the coming and work of Christ.

<sup>6</sup>As the Lord names Hosea’s children, he says, “‘Call his name Jezreel, for in just a little while I will punish the house of Jehu for the blood of Jezreel, and I will put an end to the kingdom of the house of Israel.’ ... ‘Call her name No Mercy, for I will no more have mercy on the house of Israel, to forgive them at all.’ ... ‘Call his name Not My People, for you are not my people, and I am not your God’” (Hos 1:4-9).

<sup>7</sup>The speaker and nature of these verses is dispute. The main options seem to be: (1) Hosea (as a model for the people) declaring a deep and heart-felt cry of repentance and trust in the faithfulness and promises of God, (2) the unrepentant people and its leaders who fail to see the weight of judgment and think the Lord can be easily persuaded to turn from judgment, or (3) the Lord himself, picturing for the people the kind of repentance he is looking for in 5:15. Certainly, any of these options (or another) is possible, but options 1 and 3 seem best to fit the context in light of the Lord’s predictions early in the book that he will one day turn the hearts of his people toward him (2:16-23; 3:4-5).

<sup>8</sup>Douglas Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah* (Word Biblical Commentary; Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 108.

<sup>9</sup>Peter J. Gentry, “Rethinking the ‘Sure Mercies of David’ in Isaiah 55:3,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 69 (2007): 284.

<sup>10</sup>G. K. Beale notes several places where Israel’s land is described in terms of Eden: Gen 13:10; Isa 51:3; Ezek 36:35; 47:12; Joel 2:3. G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 116.

<sup>11</sup>Christ’s appointment as son should not be confused with the heresy of adoptionism. Indeed, it is the pre-existent *Son* who is appointed to the role pre-figured in Adam and Israel—son of God. For more on this, see Lee Tankersley, “The Courtroom and the Created Order: How Penal Substitution Brings about New Creation” (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist

Theological Seminary, 2010), 203-18.

<sup>12</sup>Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 438.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 437-38.

<sup>14</sup>It should also be noted that those who truly make up “Israel” as God’s people (i.e., Abraham’s offspring and children of promise) are only those who are united with Abraham’s true and single offspring, Christ (Gal 3:15-29).

<sup>15</sup>Whether or not ἰλάσκεσθαι is understood to include the idea of propitiation (i.e., appeasing God’s wrath) in 2:17, one should affirm that the effect of Christ’s sacrifice was to turn away God’s wrath from his people. This is evident from the language of Heb 10:26-31, where if one turns from faith in the sacrifice of Christ as sufficient, what awaits him is “a fearful expectation of judgment, and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries ... punishment ... [and] vengeance.”

<sup>16</sup>See, for example, Ps 11:6; 75:8; Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15; Rev 14:10; 16:19.

<sup>17</sup>Bolt sums this up well, writing, “When God is the one handing people over, the expression has overtones of divine judgment (e.g. Ezek 39:23), sometimes explicitly paralleled with a reference to the wrath of God (Judg 2:14; Ps 78:61, cf. v. 59; Rom 1:18ff).... Interpreted by the biblical story, this darkness also becomes a sign of an event with great cosmic significance. It shows that Jesus is subject of the judgment of God. The Old Testament used darkness as an image for judgment, especially for the day of the Lord, or the day of judgment.... Before the final plague, when the angel of death moved throughout the land before that first Passover, when Israel was saved from slavery, darkness fell on the whole land for three days (Exod. 10:21-22). As a sign that the land was under the curse of God, people stumbled around in deep darkness, a darkness that could be felt.... Darkness at noon was a particular image used on several significant occasions to underline the severity of the judgment [see Jer 15:9; Deut 28:29, Job 5:14; Isa 59:10].... Jesus was mocked, again a concrete form of experiencing God’s wrath. He had previously spoken

of his coming death as a baptism, and as a cup to be drunk; both images refer to God’s wrath. Death itself is the manifestation of God’s wrath, especially death by crucifixion.... Jesus is forsaken, because, like the psalmist, his Father leaves him to endure this affliction rather than saving him out of it. He would not be forsaken if God chose to rescue him.” Peter G. Bolt, *The Cross from a Distance: Atonement in Mark’s Gospel* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 52-54, 126-33.

<sup>18</sup>This is why Paul can write in 1 Cor 15:17, “If Christ has not been raised ... you are still in your sins.”

<sup>19</sup>This reflects my own translation of ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι.

<sup>20</sup>See, for example, Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 280; William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, (Word Biblical Commentary; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 227; Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul’s Soteriology* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978; reprint, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1987], 119-22.

<sup>21</sup>This reflects my own translation of δικαίωσις ζωῆς

<sup>22</sup>Geerhardus Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930; reprint, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1994), 151.

<sup>23</sup>Michael Russell, “On the Third Day, According to the Scriptures,” *Reformed Theological Review* (2008): 1-17.

<sup>24</sup>By “the second day,” “the third day,” etc., I also mean to include “two days,” “three days,” etc. It should be noted that these findings by Russell exclude dates, such as “on the second day of the month.”

<sup>25</sup>Russell, “On the Third Day,” 8-9.

<sup>26</sup>He continues, “When the Philistines could not answer Samson’s riddle for three days, the time is sufficient to be sure of their failure. Thus they turn to desperate measures on the fourth day (Judg 14:14-15). In the narrative regarding Saul and the lost donkeys, three days is sufficient for Saul’s father to be worried for this son. His ‘lostness’ would now be seen as enduring (1 Sam 9:20, cf. 9:5). In the story of the lost Egyptian slave (1 Sam 30:12), the statement that the slave was abandoned ‘three days ago’ implies

that he has been permanently abandoned. In the story of Elijah's disappearance, three days is sufficient to imply that Elijah is permanently gone (2 Kgs 2:17). Ezra and his men wait for three days (Ezra 8:32) after they had arrived in Jerusalem. Having been fearful of 'enemies on the road' (8:22), the three days appear sufficient for confidence that they have not been followed. Later in the book of Ezra, Ezra sets three days for the people to assemble in Ezra 10:8-9. It is assumed that if the people have not assembled by that time, their absence is permanent." Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 10-11. Russell also employs a control here by comparing his findings with "next day" passages, and he finds that while nearly sixty-five percent of the "third day" passages have a death threat removed on that day, this is only present in eight percent of the "next day" texts. Ibid., 14.

<sup>28</sup>Russell provides a number of other examples. Ibid., 10-12.

<sup>29</sup>Sinclair B. Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 38.

<sup>30</sup>This development of a pattern escalating and culmi-

nating in Christ fits the description of typology provided by Wellum, who notes that types develop along intertextual patterns which escalate and culminate in Christ. Wellum adds, "This is why types are viewed as both *predictive* and *hidden*. They are *predictive* since God intends for them to anticipate Christ in a variety of ways. They are *hidden* not only due to their indirectness but also due to the fact that we come to know that they are types as God's redemptive plan unfolds and *later* texts pick up the recurring pattern." Wellum and Gentry, *Kingdom through Covenant*, 104-06.

<sup>31</sup>That Russell finds two divine patterns ("three days" and "third day") conveying two different realities may be helpful in explaining why Mark repeatedly notes that Jesus is raised "after three days" (see, for example, Mark 9:31; 10:34). Perhaps in a gospel where Jesus' dramatic actions consistently reveal his identity, his resurrection "after three days" (a sufficient time to prove he was dead) heightens Mark's message that this is the Christ who was raised from *death* to life.