

# **“All the Prophets Testify”: Hosea 2:2-15**

Midweek Bible Study – 2026 July 29

Rev. Dr. Jayson S. Galler, Pastor, Pilgrim Lutheran Church, Kilgore, TX

<https://www.pilgrimlc.org/bible-studies/prophets>

Invocation & Opening Prayer

Follow-up to last class: pace, depth, other comments or questions?

Outline (the following is from *TLSB* p.1428; we are listing the major divisions and will expand/collapse them as we proceed through them [we previously noted possible alternate explanations for the arrangement, such as *CSSB* p.1351, and *God’s Word for Today*, p.3]):

- I. Superscription (1:1)
- II. Hosea’s Personal Issues as Prophecies (1:2-3:5)
  - A. Names of Hosea and Gomer’s Children Presage Israel’s Judgment (1:2-9)
  - B. Great Reversal of the Curse (1:10-2:1)
  - C. Divorce Proceedings with New Betrothal and Marriage (2:2-15)**
  - D. Images of Great Reversal (2:16-23)
  - E. A Second (?) Marriage to Gomer (3:1-5)
- III. Various Oracles (4:1-14:9)

Note that Hosea 2:14-20 is the Old Testament Reading for *Lutheran Service Book’s* Three-Year Lectionary Series B’s Eighth Sunday after the Epiphany of Our Lord and for its Proper 3 (for the Sunday that falls on May 24-28 of that same second year of the Three-Year cycle), both of which Sundays would not occur in the same Church Year, if either occurs in a Church Year at all. In both sets of Propers, the Hosea Reading is paired with the Gospel Reading of Mark 2:(13-17) 18-22, the optional account of Jesus’s calling Levi and the account of Jesus’s answering a question about fasting, in part by speaking about wedding guests fasting while the bridegroom is with them. (Despite also sharing the same appointed Introit, Psalm, and Verse, the two sets of Propers have different Collects, Graduals, and Epistle/Second Readings, apparently a result of the different seasons in which they occur.)

Divorce Proceedings with New Betrothal and Marriage (2:2-15):

Although referring to the Revised Standard Version text, Roehrs-Franzmann provides a summary of their view of Hosea 2:2-15 that may be a helpful overview for us before we discuss the passage’s individual verses and those verses’ various phrases: “Between the utter rejection of 1:2-9 and the *Yet* of 1:10 there lies an unanswered question: How can these things be? How can the doomed *children of harlotry* become *sons of the living God*? Ch. 2 answers that question, not in the sense that it ‘explains’ the mystery of the triumph of God’s love but in the sense that it shows how that inexplicably persistent love pursues its ends. Not one whit of the judgment is retracted; the adulterous wife who has played the harlot is to be rejected (2), degraded (3), *slain with thirst* (3), and *no pity* will be shown to the *children of harlotry* (4). But a series of three astonishing *therefore’s* (6, 9, 14) makes clear that the judgment visited upon spouse and children is not the blind fury of an outraged man; God’s judgment is disciplinary and restorative. God will block every way for the wayward wife except the way that leads her back to Him (6-8). He will take from her all the gifts in which

she wantonly luxuriated and forgot the Giver (9-13). And then (here the picture of the wife and the literal reality of Israel's history merge), when Israel has returned to the beggary of her beginnings in the wilderness, He will begin her history anew; He will *allure her* with the blessings of the covenant in the wilderness and return her, now restored to the fidelity of her *youth*, to the fruitful land of promise and give her a future and a hope. (14-15)" (*GWfT* and Golden somewhat similarly talk about God's law and Gospel, arguably both needed for the repentance that consists of contrition, sorrow over sin, and faith, trust that God will forgive sin for Jesus's sake.)

2:2 "*Plead with your mother, plead*: We have previously discussed the matter of where any "section" break might be placed. Golden for one says 2:1 and 2:2 are tied by their imperative forms, though there is a shift from promise to contention. In 1:11 the children of Judah and Israel were gathered, and in 2:1 brothers and sisters were how to address one another; in 2:2, they are told to plead with their mother. Keil-Delitzsch comments, "The close connection between the contents of the two sections is formally indicated by the simple, that just as the first section closed with a summons to appropriate the predicted salvation, so the section before us commences with a call to conversion." God continues to speak to His people in words that seem also to apply in at least some way to Hosea and Gomer and the children named Jezreel, Lo-ruhamah and Lo-ammi. Golden explains, "While 1:2b-9 focused on Hosea's family, attention now turns to Yahweh's family. As Hosea's family is a picture of Yahweh's, it can be challenging to distinguish between what describes Hosea's family and what describes Yahweh's. It is proper and fruitful to hear the prophet's words as describing both simultaneously." *TLSB* comments, "Metaphor of Hosea's marriage and family life is extended; Israel is identified as the Lord's unfaithful wife." Keil-Delitzsch points out that the mother that is the nation had no existence apart from the children that are the individuals in the nation; confer Golden, who comments, "Yahweh's wife and children are one and the same." (Note that we who believe can speak of the Church as our mother.) "Plead" repeated in this line is a second-person masculine plural imperative, as was "Say" in 2:1. The Hebrew verb *riyb* used in this verse can mean "strive" or "contend", either physically or with words, including conducting a legal case or suit (confer *TLSB*). Golden notes that the Hebrew preposition used indicates the contention is not bilateral but unilateral. Perhaps somewhat unclear are the precise implications of the "contending" in this case, though Roehrs-Franzmann comments, "the individual members of the people are to call the people as a body to repentance". Keil-Delitzsch refers to some individuals not as enslaved by the idolatry, as other individuals, and so who might benefit from God's warning and be converted (confer Laetsch, "the few remaining faithful children of God", but compare Kretzmann, who thinks all are guilty and will be punished). Should we think of confronting one another or our nation over our sin? (*GWfT* refers to Matthew 18:15-19 and our "rebuking members guilty of adultery, dishonesty, neglect of the means of grace, and the like".) How does a theocracy compare to a democracy on this point? What about our Church body?

—*for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband*—: *GWfT* says Israel's "unfaithfulness is personalized in Gomer, the faithless wife of Hosea." *TLSB* comments, "Because Israel has been as guilty of adultery as Gomer, the nation has thus proven itself wholly unworthy of a committed husband. However, the Lord remains faithful (cf 2Tm 2:13)." Again, unclear is whether Hosea is "divorcing" Gomer. Golden says, "Some understand

this to be a divorce declaration. That is not a universally accepted position”, and Golden goes on to cite Anderson and Freedman’s arguing that the threats of punishment indicate Hosea’s and Yahweh’s claims of continuing authority over their wives. *CSSB* comments, “The marriage was broken by unfaithfulness, but reconciliation, not divorce, was sought (cf vv.7-15).” Important is considering that God creates one-flesh unions in marriage that arguably last for eternity.

*that she put away her whoring from her face, and her adultery from between her breasts:* Presumably Israel’s false gods and/or the individual people’s temple prostitutes of those false gods are the mother’s “whoring” and “adultery” and her “face” and “breasts” are both figurative and literal indications of the intimacy of her sinful relationships.

Keil-Delitzsch comments, “The whoredom is attributed to the face, the adultery to the breasts, because it is in these parts of the body that the want of chastity on the part of a woman is openly manifested, and in order to depict more plainly the boldness and shamelessness with which Israel practiced idolatry.” Kretzmann says perhaps more explicitly, “Israel, in her shamelessness, was like a public harlot, who displays her profession in her bared breasts”. Laetsch refers to her eyes “glowing with the fire of impure love” and her breasts “gleaming with jewels”. Golden rejects the idea that Baal ornaments would have adorned the head and chest of his worshipers and instead sees “an example of the Hebraic delight in the physical body as God’s creation”, and Golden emphasizes that the contention is a call to repentance.

2:3 *I strip her naked and make her as in the day she was born:* regarding “strip her”, *CSSB* comments, “The husband supplied the wife’s clothing (see Ex 21:10; Eze 16:10), and here her unfaithfulness was exposed (see Jer 13:26; Eze 16:39).” Roehrs-Franzmann is perhaps more direct in referring to “public degradation as punishment for infidelity” with reference to Ezekiel 16:37-39. Regarding “naked”, *CSSB* comments, “As Israel was when the Lord ‘found’ her in Egypt—in slavery and with nothing (cf. Eze 16:4-8; Na 3:5)” (confer Kretzmann’s reference to Ezekiel 16:4). Keil-Delitzsch identifies in periods of Israel’s history the wife’s birth, courtship, and marriage. Presumably nakedness here is associated with the shame of sin. Golden rejects any suggestion that rape is inferred, and he suggests the “baring” might be more figurative, revealing his wife for what she is. We might think of the man and the woman who were created naked but did not feel shame until they sinned. We might also think of Job’s comment that he came from his mother’s womb naked and would return naked (Job 1:21, though how one “returns” to the womb is another matter).

*and make her like a wilderness, and make her like a parched land, and kill her with thirst:* while the ESV gives us three instances of the same English verb “make”, the Hebrew text has three different verbs, not to mention to other two different verbs used of the Lord’s potential action. *TLSB* comments, “The Lord warns with increasing severity that shame, desertion, and death will come if Israel refuses to repent. The graphic imagery employed here recalls Israel’s miserable status in Egypt and the desperate conditions she experienced during the wilderness wanderings of Exodus.” *TLSB* does not detail precisely how the imagery recalls those things, and we might think of God’s gracious provision of both water and food for Israel during the forty years in the wilderness, and we might compare and contrast the mention of the wilderness in 2:14. Indeed, Keil-Delitzsch comments, “There is hardly any need to say that these words do

not refer to the sojourn of Israel in the Arabian desert; for there the Lord fed His people with manna from heaven, and gave them water to drink out of the rock.”

2:4 *Upon her children also I will have no mercy*: Keil-Delitzsch suggests the construction continues the idea of “lest” from 2:3. “Her children” are presumably those being told to “plead” with “their mother” in 2:1. *GWfT* refers specifically to Hosea threatening “to cut off his love from Gomer’s children”. Golden mentions taking “mother” as Israel’s leadership and “children” as the people, but elsewhere Golden generally rejects such a distinction. The Hebrew translated “no mercy” is, as you might expect, *lo ruhamā*, the name of Gomer’s daughter. *TLSB* comments, “Though earnestly invited to a restored relationship in v 1, God’s children will yet be left without mercy if their rebellion continues.”

*Because they are children of whoredom*: Keil-Delitzsch notes that the children were begotten in whoredom and inherit the nature and conduct of their mother, and Keil-Delitzsch says that, while mother and children are in reality one, they are mentioned separately to emphasize the thread and guard against carnal security from people imagining that “inasmuch as they are free from the sin and guilt of the nation as a whole, they will also be exempted from the threatened punishment.” *TLSB* comments, “Just as husbands typically feel little obligation for children conceived in adultery, so also the Lord warns the tainted children of Israel that he may desert them.” *CSSB* contrasts “children of whoredom” with “children of the living God” in 1:10. *GWfT* discusses children’s suffering with their parents and children’s seeking to avoid responsibility for their own deeds by blaming their parents.

2:5 *For their mother has played the whore; she who conceived them has acted shamefully*: we should not take the English “played” as if Israel had not actually committed fornication, been a harlot, or committed adultery as the parallel line indicates. Kretzmann refers to “openly committing” shameless acts and “making no attempt” to hide bold practices.

*For she said, ‘I will go after my lovers, who give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, my oil and my drink.’*: regarding “go after”, *CSSB* comments, “The wife was chasing other men”. Regarding “lovers”, *CSSB* comments, “The reference is to Canaanite deities (such as Baal), whose worshipers hoped to gain agricultural fertility” (confer Golden, who notes the agreement of the plurals in both the lovers and the Baals). *TLSB* comments, “Israel acts as though its food and clothing come from the surrounding pagan nations. The people completely ignore the Lord’s generous provision. Consequently, Hosea warns that these sustaining gifts may be removed (vv 8-9).” *TLSB* refers to God’s miraculous provision during the exodus, which, it says the people ought to have remember, though seven-hundred years may have had passed. Though *CSSB* refers to “The agricultural staples of Palestine”, the provisions listed in this verse and treated in following verses arguably could be grouped as food, clothing (flax as linen or fiber for garments, as opposed to eating flaxseed; Golden cites King in distinguishing wool as pastoral and flax as agricultural), and religious offerings (confer drink as wine in what follows; Keil-Delitzsch combined the last pair, oil and drink, under the label of “the delicacies of life” [confer Kretzmann’s “enjoyments of life”]; Golden cites Macintosh’s putting the last pair under the heading of “beauty and health products”).

2:6 *Therefore I will hedge up her way with thorns and I will build a wall against her, so that she cannot find her paths:* Golden cites King in discussing “stone fences topped with thorny shrubs”. *GWfT* refers to St. Paul’s experience with a “thorn” in 2 Corinthians 12:7-10. *CSSB* comments, “Rather than punish Israel with death...the Lord would isolate her.” *TLSB* comments, “Before acting on His threat to kill Israel (v 3), the Lord acts to restrain her wickedness. By erecting a hedge, God means to block His people’s pursuit of Baal.” People sometimes think that the woman’s telling the serpent that she was not to touch the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil reflected a figurative “hedge” that the man had put around the tree.

2:7 *She shall pursue her lovers but not overtake them, and she shall seek them but shall not find them:* regarding “pursue”, *CSSB* notes that the word is “A cultic term in Hosea”. Keil-Delitzsch explains that the failure to overtake and find the lovers indicates the failure to be delivered from the calamity that the Lord sent. *TLSB* comments, “Sadly, Israel will end up frustrated within the protective maze of the restraining wall, since she will persist in the pursuit of other gods.”

*Then she shall say, ‘I will go and return to my first husband, for it was better for me then than now.’*: *CSSB* notes that the Hebrew translated “return” often means “repent”, though true repentance would be more than acting on one’s best interest; Roehrs-Franzmann refers to Luke 15:17-19 for the thought (the younger “prodigal” son deciding to go back to confess his sin to his father; confer Laetsch). *GWfT* refers to short-term outward resolves to return to God as unacceptable. Golden is similar, rejecting the idea of true repentance but rather identifying the attitude as seeing the Lord as a means to an end. *TLSB* comments, “Just as Hosea took Gomer (1:3), so the Lord would take back Israel.” *TLSB* continues, “This is remarkable since God’s Word allowed for divorce in cases of adultery (Dt 24:1-4)”, which statement arguably takes too much from that very specific piece of case law (as did the Jews of Jesus’s day), the provision was intended to put a limit on a practice that was happening, specifically a wife’s returning to her first husband after taking a second one (confer, for example, Golden’s discussion of a divorce’s upending the reconciliation that follows). Hosea’s taking Gomer, the Lord’s taking Israel back, and the Early Church’s reading of the relevant New Testament divorce passages would suggest that even in the cases of adultery reconciliation is the ideal and, if not, then legal separation without any “new” marriage. (This verse of Hosea is said to be alluded to or referenced by Revelation 17:16, about the horns and the beast’s hating the prostitute and making her desolate and naked, but perhaps Hosea 2:3 is meant.)

2:8 *And she did not know that it was I who gave her the grain, the wine, and the oil:* Golden notes that “know” is more than intellectual assent but also includes trust, what we might call faith. *TLSB* comments, “Despite Israel’s preposterous claims that her food and clothes came from other nations and gods (v 5), the Lord here sets the record straight, He is the source of Israel’s well-being.” Roehrs-Franzmann refers to grain, wine, and oil “as typical blessings of the covenant” with reference to Deuteronomy 7:13; 11:14; 28:51. Obviously, grain can be and is used for bread, wine can be and is drunk, and oil can be and is used for cooking, but, given the following pair of lines, food and clothes seem less in view than religious offerings.

*and who lavished on her silver and gold, which they used for Baal:* Baal was thought to guarantee dependable cycles of growing seasons. Keil-Delitzsch seems to link the crops

to the cash, and Kretzmann links the profitable friendship with the surrounding nations to the idolatry. *TLSB* comments, “Ironically, Israel was taking the gold and silver God lavished on her and offering them to images of Baal. The people were even fashioning these precious metals into idols (8:4; cf 1Ki 12:28-30).” Keil-Delitzsch mentions not only the preparation of idols but also the maintenance and extension of Baal worship. Golden with reference to Andersen and Freedman notes, “The foolishness of idolatry is displayed through the irony of Israel being ‘deluded into thinking that Baal is generous,’ since ‘his worshipers have to supply the metals to make him.’” Luther uses the verse as an occasion to talk about the popular belief in works righteousness. Keil-Delitzsch further points out how the first-fruits offerings at feasts mentioned in what follows were to remind the people of God’s providing the crops, and we might reflect on the downward cycle of forgetting that God provides blessings and refusing to make offerings.

2:9 *Therefore I will take back my grain in its time, and my wine in its season*: Unclear is whether the Lord through Hosea is still discussing warning of 2:3 and/or the hedge of 2:6 or has moved past a decision to execute judgment (though perhaps see 2:10). Perhaps we should think not so much as “taking back” what already had been given, as we likely should think of “cutting off” future supply (confer *CSSB*’s “withholding”). Golden notes the use of the Hebrew word for “turn, return, repent”. Oil was mentioned in 2:8 but is not mentioned here, though it would hardly be excepted. The seasons again may be a reference to Baal’s expected guarantee. Keil-Delitzsch refers to the time of harvest when the loss is felt more painfully (not surprisingly, confer Kretzmann).

*and I will take away my wool and my flax, which were to cover her nakedness*: Golden notes the use of the Hebrew word for “rescue, deliver” used ironically in this phrase. As in 2:5, wool and flax are arguably clothing, as here, and again nakedness is mentioned (confer 2:3 and the shame of 2:5).

2:10 *Now I will uncover her lewdness in the sight of her lovers, and no one shall rescue her out of my hand*: Golden suggests a shift from Yahweh’s stripping the land to His stripping the people. Regarding “uncover her lewdness”, *CSSB* says, “The unfaithful wife was exposed to public shame”. Kretzmann comments, “While the nations round about were looking on, partly in helpless idleness and partly in malicious joy, Israel was delivered to her punishment.” *TLSB* comments, “A return to the warning of v 3. Israel’s nakedness contrasts starkly with her boast that she is well-supplied by the gods of other nations (v 5). When God removes the fruitfulness of the land, the fertility god Baal will be useless to cover Israel.” Keil-Delitzsch says the mention “no one” cuts off all hope of averting the punishment. “Hand” can be a figure of speech for power and authority, and often it is used of God’s protection from enemies, though in this case the reference seems to be God’s judgment.

2:11 *And I will put an end to all her mirth, her feasts, her new moons, her Sabbaths, and all her appointed feasts*: we should remember that the Northern Kingdom’s worship was syncretistic/heterodox (confer 2:13’s mention of feast days for the Baals). *TLSB* comments, “The annual celebrations of Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Booths. The new moon celebrations were monthly; the Sabbath, weekly. Such weekly, monthly, and annual celebrations will come to an abrupt halt when God allows a pagan invader, the Assyrians, to take Israel in to exile.” Similar is *CSSB*, “In exile these joyous seasons would be only a memory.” Golden says the feasts cannot take place because the Lord has

taken the agricultural products that occasion the festivals. Keil-Delitzsch draws attention to the principle feast days commemorating the Lord's great acts of mercy towards His people; Kretzmann remarks, "the hypocritical evidence of a joy which was no longer real among the people". Laetsch says, "Israel regarded them merely as national holidays, occasions for social gatherings, for joyous merrymaking, for grossly carnal enjoyments and pleasures."

2:12 *And I will lay waste her vines and her fig trees*: in this passage vines have been mentioned implicitly by way of wine; figs have not been mentioned in this passage. Keil-Delitzsch refers to vine and fig-tree as "the choicest productions of the land" and so mentioned as "the representatives of the rich means of sustenance with which the Lord has blessed His people". In view of the foolish thought expressed in the following line, *TLSB* says, "God threatens to overthrow such folly by laying waste to Israel's vines and fig trees. Cf. Lv 26:22; Dt 11:13-17 for similar warnings." Compare the gift of vineyards in 2:15.

*of which she said, 'These are my wages, which my lovers have given me.'*: The "wages" are what Laetsch calls "the hire paid for a harlot". *TLSB* comments, "Israel foolishly considered the fertility of her land to be the result of her illicit relationship with Baal."

*I will make them a forest, and the beasts of the field shall devour them*: the direct object is presumably still the vineyards of grape vines and orchards of fig trees. In regards to "forest", *TLSB* comments, "A place of danger", there is also some connotation of the vineyards and orchards' being overgrown. Indeed, Keil-Delitzsch says that the carefully hedged and cultivated vineyards and fig-orchards are deprived of their hedges and cultivation and so turn into a forest so that the wild beasts are able to devour them. Laetsch adds the thought that the animals of the field will devour the vineyards and orchards since the people will be gone from the land. Golden says the wild beasts may be the Assyrian invaders.

2:13 *And I will punish her for the feast days of the Baals when she burned offerings to them*: *TLSB* comments, "Israel abandoned the Lord's festivals (v 11) and began offering sacrifices to Baal", though 2:11 does not say that Israel abandoned the Lord's festivals but that the Lord would put an end to her observance of the festivals, which *TLSB* associated with the future Assyrian invasion. Nevertheless, Keil-Delitzsch does say Israel was keeping the Lord's feasts in honor of the Baals. The plural "Baals" *TLSB* explains by "The abundance of individual shrines to Baal" (confer *CSSB* and Roehrs-Franzmann on 2:5, though compare Keil-Delitzsch, who thinks of a general term for the Canaanites' various idols). And, in regards to "burned offerings", *TLSB* comments, "Numerous places in the OT refer to Israel offering burnt sacrifices to Baal and Asherah" and then lists some of them.

*and adorned herself with her ring and jewelry*: Laetsch says the rings could be ear-rings or nose-rings but here "rings in general" (for the fingers?). Regarding the ring and jewelry, *TLSB* comments, "Israel continues to act as a harlot, dressing in finery to attract attention, pursuing Baal instead of her faithful Lord." Keil-Delitzsch seems to rule out a literal understanding and prefer a figurative understanding when saying, "There is no ground for thinking of the wearing of nose-rings and ornaments in honor of the idols", but perhaps compare Kretzmann. Of course, we wear our best when coming into the presence of the Lord for a completely different reason.

*and went after her lovers and forgot me, declares the Lord:* the going after the lovers was mentioned in 2:5. “Forgetting” the Lord is sometimes contrasted with “knowing” Him (we might say the continual knowing of “remembering” Him). The “declares the Lord” could be emphatic here, or it could indicate the end of the oracle of judgment and give reason for taking 2:14-15 with 2:16-23. For his part, Golden finds the change in verb tense and attribution to the Lord as both indicating the close of a section, not to mention the attribution’s emphasizing the certainty of the matter.

2:14 *Therefore, behold:* again there is a question where any “section” break might go (for example, the outline we are following continues the current section through 2:15, but the ESV puts a new subheading between 2:13 and 2:14). If the judgment of 2:2-13 should include some “Gospel” hope, then 2:14-15 does seem to be included, but 2:16 seems to be closely connected to the “change” described in 2:14-15 and so would seem to follow through to 2:23. For his part, Golden treats 2:14-15 apart from both what came before and what comes after, noting that its prominence rightly leads to setting it apart. Golden points out that “therefore” normally would begin a judgment oracle but here begins a salvation oracle, and Golden points out that “behold” directs attention to the surprising plans that follow.

*I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak tenderly to her:*

Keil-Delitzsch comments, “In ver. 14 the promise is introduced quite as abruptly as in ver. 1, that the Lord will lead back the rebellious nation step by step to conversion and reunion with Himself, the righteous God. *TLSB* comments, “God thus turns from threatening Israel to pursuing her winsomely”, though we might reflect on how we usually think that God moves from law to Gospel. Regarding “wilderness”, *TLSB* comments, “Recalls the exodus and a time when Baal had not intruded into the relationship of God and Israel,” though we might compare and contrast the mention of the wilderness in 2:3. Keil-Delitzsch refers to a figurative return to Egypt and exodus, with its teaching the people about their lack and His provision to meet it, awakening in them heartfelt faith and love. Regarding “tenderly”, *CSSB* comments, “Reassure, encourage, comfort (cf Ge 34:3; Ru 2:13; Isa 40:2). God continually shows love in the midst of judgment.” *TLSB* comments, “God speaks with the kindness of a loving spouse.” Golden refers to a “second honeymoon” after the reconciliation of confession and absolution.

2:15 *And there I will give her vineyards and make the Valley of Achor a door of hope:* compare and contrast the destruction of vineyards in 2:12. Keil-Delitzsch notes that the vineyards are the vineyards that formerly belonged to the faithful wife. Golden says the vineyards are a representative part for the whole of the land. Regarding “Valley of Achor”, *TLSB* comments, “Southwest of Jericho. God judged Israel here during the entry into the Promised Land (Jsh 7). Regarding “door of hope”, *TLSB* comments, “Achor means ‘trouble’; God ironically reverses the name of the valley by calling it a door of hope. This rhetorical move follows the transformation of Hosea’s children’s names (1:6, 8; 2:1) and anticipates the reversal of the way Israel will address the Lord in v 16.” Achan’s sin and the Lord’s expiating guilt are an important part of that background in Joshua.

*And there she shall answer as in the days of her youth, as at the time when she came out of the land of Egypt:* *TLSB* comments, “Recalls Israel’s acts of faithfulness, as when she

rejoiced to follow the Lord out of Egypt (Ex 15:1-21) and worshiped Him after entering Canaan (Jsh 4)” (confer Keil-Delitzsch).

What are you taking home from the prophecy considered tonight?

*TLSB’s Law and Gospel Application Note for Hosea 2:1-13* says, “God warns Israel that He will punish her for the idolatrous insistence that Baal will provide for her needs. At the same time, the Lord more earnestly urges Israel to repent and avoid judgment. Today, God warns us similarly through the preaching of His Law. He also unfailingly adds the promises of His Gospel, wherein grace and every blessing are assured.”

*TLSB’s Law and Gospel Application Note for Hosea 2:14-23* says, “Despite Israel’s complete disregard for the covenant, the Lord promises to renew His marriage with her. To this end, He will even marshal creation as His witness and servant. Though it pains us to admit it, our wealth often begins to lead us into the same failings as those of Israel in Hosea’s day, putting our trust in things rather than in the Lord. Fortunately for us, however, the God of Israel never weavers in His commitments. God’s Law continues to show us our sins and to make us want to be rid of them. Through Christ, all our waywardness and idolatry is forgiven, and a new all-inclusive covenant has been enacted.”

Next time, August 05, Hosea 2:16-23

Closing Prayer & Benediction