

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

NOTE ON HOSEA vi. 1-3.

THERE seems to be an oversight on one point in Mr. Deane's excellent paper in the March number of this Magazine (p. 200). The passage, Hosea vi. 1-3 is taken as a prophecy, and as pre-figuring our Lord's resurrection. But surely these verses should be read, not as the words of the prophet himself, but as an expression of the superficial repentance of Ephraim, a repentance whose unstable nature is immediately afterwards declared by the prophet (verses 4-7).

The LXX. by inserting λέγοντες before verse 1, and thus connecting the passage with Chapter v. (followed, according to Mr. Drake, by the Chaldee and Syriac versions), were on the right track of interpretation, which has been lost sight of by most commentators, though not by Ewald or Dr. R. Williams. Compare Hosea viii. 2, where again the insincere self-defence of Israel interrupts the prophetic rebuke, "They cry unto me, My God, we know thee, we Israel."

The phrase "after two days,"¹ "on the third day," a common one for denoting a short indefinite period, was naturally taken as implying a reference to the Resurrection; with which however this passage as above understood has no connection. Nor need this conclusion be regretted, for under any rendering of the verses the reference was but a doubtful one; and here, as in so many other instances, the removal of an indefensible outwork only strengthens the central position.

P. LILLY.

Mr. Deane did not express himself quite clearly, I think. But he did not *intend* to pronounce any verdict on the true rendering of this passage, nor so much as to refer to the modern interpretations of it. All he meant was to affirm that *the Jews* read it as referring to the Resurrection, and that a general consensus of early Christian writers endorsed this view.

EDITOR.

¹ Exod. iv. 10; Deut. xix. 4; Josh. iii. 4; 1 Sam. iv. 7, xix. 7; 2 Sam. iii. 17; 2 Kings xiii. 5; 1 Chron. xi. 2; St. Luke xiii. 32; St. John ii. 19. The form of expression is hidden, in most of these passages, in the English Version, by the rendering "heretofore" or "in time past."