

3-1-1932

## Studies in Hosea 1-3

Th.. Laetsch

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Laetsch, Th.. (1932) "Studies in Hosea 1-3," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 3 , Article 26.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol3/iss1/26>

This Homiletical Help is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

1518. *Appellatio ad Concilium.* — Diese Schrift ging aus am 28. November. Sie findet sich XV, 656 ff.

1518. „Auslegung und Deutung des heiligen Vaterunsers.“ — Dies ist Luthers erste Bearbeitung des Gebets des Herrn. Sie wurde von Johann Schneider (Agricola) besorgt. Sie findet sich nicht in der St. Louiser Ausgabe.

(Fortsetzung folgt.) P. C. R e c h m a n n.

---

## Studies in Hosea 1—3.

### Chapter 2, 14—23.

“I will allure her and bring her into the wilderness.” The loving Husband, His heart filled with love divine, leads His apostate wife into the wilderness. The selfsame God that punished her, vv. 3—13, is the God of love, who has loved her with an everlasting love. When she stands stripped of all her beauty and all her wealth, v. 3, destitute, despised, forsaken by her lovers, a miserable woman, not daring to raise her eyes for shame, then I will “speak comfortably unto her,” speak to her heart, so heavy, so sad.

“And I will give her her vineyards from thence.” From out of the desert shall her vineyards spring forth. The Gospel comfort, the sweet consoling voice of her Savior-Husband, will render the very desert to her a vineyard, a place of peace and joy and supreme satisfaction. Ps. 73, 25 f.; cf. Hab. 3, 17. 18. “And the valley of Achor for a door of hope.” The vale of Achor symbolized the punishment there meted out to Achan, Josh. 7, 25. 26. The very punishment of Israel shall be to her a door of hope. If He has kept His threats, if He has proved Himself Jehovah by sending this sorrow according to His word, then He will be my Jehovah in keeping His promise of undying love and grace. “And she shall sing there,” rather thither, שָׂמָּה, into the very wilderness shall she sing and shout, make even the howling wilderness resound with glad songs, “as in the days of her youth and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt,” Ex. 15. For then she was delivered out of the hands of those who sought her destruction by oppression and cruelty. Now she is being delivered from the adultery of her idolatry, reconciled, restored, to the Lord, her God.

“And it shall be at that day,” at that time, “saith the Lord, thou shalt call, My Husband! and thou shalt no more call Me, My Lord.” In the first half of the verse the word אָמַן is used absolutely, without an object, as in Gen. 45, 1; Lev. 13, 45; Ex. 34, 6; Judg. 7, 20. Gesenius-Buhl: “Worte mit lauter, affektvoller Stimme hervorbringen,” to utter words in a loud and impassioned voice. Overwhelmed by the grace and loving-kindness of her God, the Church calls, cries out, O my Husband! We are reminded of the words of



Scheffler: "Alas! that I so late have known Thee, Who art the Fairest and the Best," Hymn 349, st. 3. The entire hymn brings out beautifully the meaning of this cry of the Church, in which repentance, and shame, and joy, and hope, and love are strangely intermingled, O my Husband! "And no longer shalt thou call Me, My Lord." Such complete and perfect love will fill your heart that My relationship to you will no longer seem to you, and be designated by you, as that of a lord to his subject merely, God only lording it over you and you having no right and no recourse but to obey. No longer will your covenant relationship to God appear to you as a burdensome yoke, a state of bondage, slavery, from which you will seek every opportunity to escape in order to enjoy love and liberty, by playing the harlot and whoring after other gods. Ah, no! at that day I will appear to you in the true light; then you will know Me (cf. v. 22 b) that I am now and ever was, even though it did not seem so to you, and ever shall be Jehovah, your loving Husband. And then shall come to pass: V. 17. The word "for" is not found in the original. The two sentences are merely connected with *consecutivum* in order to introduce an intensifying consequence, "*eine steigende Konsequenz*," Koenig, *Theol. A. T.*, p. 155. After addressing Israel in v. 16, He proceeds again in self-consultation.

V. 17: "I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name." I will bring this about. As the entire conversion of Israel is the work of God's almighty grace, so *He* will remove every trace and vestige of idol-worship out of Israel. No more will the names of Baalim be heard out of thy mouth. No longer will you cry to Baalim, v. 17a. No, the names of Baalim, once so dear to you, once so frequently heard in all your assemblies, these names shall be removed out of your mouth, you will cease to call upon Baalim as your helper, your god; the very word Baalim shall no longer suggest to you a helper, a lord, a god, in whom to trust. Yea, so utterly shall all idolatrous love be removed from your heart, so completely shall affection and love to the only God fill your soul and mind, that the very memory of the name of Baal shall have passed away. Even if you hear and use the word Baal, this word shall not recall to your mind that idol whose name once upon a time it was; no, every trace of idol-worship shall be completely eradicated from hand and mouth and heart and memory. Possibly we have here one of those plays on words of which Hosea is so fond. In the same measure as the Lord will no longer be regarded by Israel as a *baal*, a stern lord, but rather as a loving husband, the worship of Baalim will be eradicated. No more is the Lord *baali*. Hence no more Baalim will be worshiped; but Jehovah, the loving Husband, will rule supreme in your hearts. The sense is not in the least altered by assuming such a play on words here.



We regard the prohibition of the use of the name *baali* to be exactly along the same lines as the similar prohibition of the names "master," "Rabbi," "father," Matt. 23, 8-10. One may call a man his master, father, etc., without transgressing this word of Jesus. Every child calls his parent *father*; a servant may call his superior *master*. It is not wrong to speak of Rabbi Wise, of Father Wyneken, Teacher Smith, Professor Craemer, Doctor Walther; see also 1 Cor. 4, 15. Again, one may refrain from using these terms and still sin against Matt. 23, 7-9, namely, if one makes not the Word of God, but the word of man his norm and rule, makes man his master, father, lord, in things divine, becomes guilty of *in verba magistri iurare*. So one may call God אֱלֹהֵי, my Lord, and please God thereby, while another may call God אִשְׁתִּי, my Husband, and be utterly disrespectful. Not so much the use of the word *Baal* as the spirit in which this word was used by Israel was displeasing to God and therefore forbidden.

The interpretation of vv. 16 and 17, as outlined above, is in the main that in which quite a number of commentators agree, with perhaps slight variations as to details. Jamiesson-Fausset-Brown: "Affection is the prominent idea in 'husband'; rule, in 'lord.'" The *Pulpit Commentary*: "A term of tender affection, not of stern authority. The title of 'My Husband' will take the place of 'My Lord.' . . . Rashi's comment favors, 1) thus: 'Ye shall serve Me out of love and not out of fear; *ishi* denoting marriage and youthful love; *baali* lordship and fear.'" Luther: "*Der Prophet . . . vergleicht den rechten Gottesdienst . . . mit der ehelichen Liebe, die Abgoetterei mit der Hurerei und dem Ehebruch; denn auch oben habe ich gesagt, dass Baal nicht allein ein Herr heisse, sondern auch ein Liebhaber, ein Buhle.*" (St. L. VI, 1146.) Hengstenberg says that this interpretation (which we shall designate as No. 1) commends itself because of its seeming depth; yet for various reasons he rejects it and adopts another interpretation (which we shall designate as No. 2), accepted with slight modifications by very many interpreters. Keil, *Weimarer Bibel, Pulpit Commentary*, Koenig, etc., offer it after No. 1. Agreeing in the interpretation of v. 17 with No. 1, the second interpretation refers the word אֱלֹהֵי, v. 16, to Baal, the idol of the Canaanites. Koenig states that v. 16 proves that Israel actually called Jehovah Baal and that this specific sin of identifying Baal with Jehovah, calling Jehovah Baal, shall cease. Practically all these commentaries agree in two points — that we have here a description of New Testament conditions in Old Testament phraseology and that God here prophesies simply that in the New Testament Church idol-worship and syncretism shall cease.

The question, then, is this: Do the words "Thou shalt call Me no more *baali*?" symbolize the change which Israel's conception of



God and her relation to Him was to undergo, or do they prohibit the use of the word Baal as a name for Jehovah? The commentators favoring Interpretation No. 2 point to the context as proving their view. Since the word  $\text{בַּיָּהוָה}$  throughout the entire book, in this second chapter, and even in the very next verse, refers without doubt to the idol Baal, it must, so they contend, refer also in v. 16 to the idol Baal.  $\text{בַּיָּהוָה}$  occurs only four times in Hosea besides in our present passage, the singular being used chap. 2, 8; the plural, 2, 13. 17; 13, 1.

We feel that this argument is not convincing. First, the fact that a word is generally used by a writer in a certain sense does not preclude the use of this word in a different sense by the same writer and in the same context. *E. g.*, the word *νόμος*, law, Rom. 2, 12 ff.; 3, 27. 28; sleep, 1 Thess. 5, 6. 10; righteousness, Rom. 3, 21. 22. 25. Secondly, the common use of a word should be retained only so long as the context does not oblige us to deviate from this use. Yet here the context obliges us to do that very thing, to accept *baal* not as the name of the idol, as it is usually used by Hosea, but in its original sense of lord, master, ruler, for two reasons.

1. In the entire context the specific sin of Israel is not once declared to be that of calling Jehovah Baal, but that of seeking other lovers since she had ceased to regard God as a loving husband, merely regarding Him as a harsh taskmaster. In other words, the different light in which Israel viewed Jehovah (no longer as a loving husband, but as a commanding lord) is stressed, not the use of the word Baal for God.

2. Interpretation No. 2 takes for granted that Israel actually called Jehovah Baal. Plausible as this may seem, especially if we consider the manifest syncretism of Hosea's time, it is merely an assumption which cannot be proved from the Scriptures. As far as the testimony of the Scriptures goes, we do not *know* whether Jehovah ever was called Baal. Koenig indeed is of a different opinion. He tells us (*Theol. A. T.*, 3d Ed., p. 154) that the term Baal was used to designate the true God of the legitimate religion of Israel. So also Gesenius-Buhl, *Woerterbuch*, 12th Ed., *sub baal*: "In the old times Jehovah was called Baal by the Israelites; cf. the proper names Ishbosheth, Eshbaal, — Eljadah, Bealjadah, — Gaaljah, — Jerrubbaal, Jerubbesheth, — Mephibosheth, Meribbaal." Similarly Nowack and others. Koenig's first reason is that "such a use was *possible*. Baal as *nomen appellativum* means 'possessor,' 'lord,' and especially '*Eheherr oder Ehegemahl*' (Gen. 20, 3b; Ex. 21, 3. 22; 2 Sam. 11, 26; *ish, Mann*, etc.), and the relation of God toward the nation of Israel was also regarded as a marriage (Ex. 34, 15 etc.)." However, the possibility that Jehovah be called Baal, even if conceded, does not prove that He actually was so called. Koenig continues: "This usage must be recognized as a fact. This is proved by the following circum-



stances: A) Even the composite name Bealjah (Jah is baal, lord) occurs as an Israelitish name, 1 Chron. 12, 5, and has not been changed by later authors, as Baaljadah, etc. B) Hoshea says: Chap. 2, 16. Therefore v. 16 expressly states that Jehovah had hitherto been designated by the nation of Israel by the expression Baal." We hold that B does not *prove* Koenig's contention, since Interpretation No. 1 is hermeneutically correct and does not accept this meaning of *baal*. Or let us say, Hos. 2, 16 cannot decide for either side in this question, since the meaning of *baal* there is the very point in dispute. As to Koenig's reason given under A, Koenig overlooks the fact that *baal* in Baaljah may be construed as a verb form and the name translated, "Jehovah rules." For this meaning of the verb *baal* see Is. 26, 13; 1 Chron. 4, 22. It need not be translated, "Jehovah is Baal." In the same verse, 1 Chron. 12, 5, occur similar verb formations: Shemarjahu, Jahu preserves; Shephatjahu, Jahu judges. Bealjah is formed exactly like these names, which are indisputably verb, not noun formations. — Baaljadah, David's son, 1 Chron. 14, 7, and Eshbaal, Saul's son, 1 Chron. 8, 33; 9, 39, may have been heathen names originally, taken over by Israelites without reference to their etymological meaning. Baaljadah (perhaps the original form preserved in the genealogical lists used by the chronicler) may have been changed by Bealjadah himself, because he did not want to bear the name of a heathen god, or by the writer of 2 Sam., who may have thought the name offensive, so that in both cases we would have here a protest against the divinity of Baal rather than an identification of Baal with Jehovah. (By the way, all the changes of *baal* in these names to another word are found exclusively in the books of Samuel.) The same applies to Saul's son Eshbaal, changed to Ishbosheth, 2 Sam. 2, 8 ff. Here, however, *bosheth* is substituted for *baal*, a custom quite general among the later Jews. This custom explains the frequency of the feminine article before Baal in the Septuagint, *bosheth* being fem. gen., Hos. 2, 8; 1 Sam. 7, 4, etc., and in the only reference to Baal in the New Testament, Rom. 11, 4. — Finally, Jerubbaal, Judg. 6, 32, "let Baal strive," changed into Jerubbesheth, 2 Sam. 11, 21, "let the shameful thing strive," and Meribbaal, 1 Chron. 8, 34, "striver against Baal," changed into Mephibosheth, 2 Sam. 9, 6, 10, far from furnishing evidence for the interchanging of Baal and Jehovah, prove the very opposite, the hatred of Israel for Baal. — Hence we hold that the argument for No. 2, based on the names, is far from convincing, proving rather the very opposite.

Since, therefore, Interpretation No. 2 is based on an assumption which cannot be proved, we prefer No. 1, which need not take recourse to such an assumption, but is based entirely on the text.

There is a third interpretation, which should not be overlooked. Jerome transcribes these verses as follows: "*Tantum odi, inquit*



*Deus, idolorum nomina, ut etiam id, quod bene dici potest, propter ambiguitatem et verbi similitudinem nequaquam dici velim*" (So much do I hate, says God, the names of idols that even what can be well spoken I will, because of the ambiguity and similarity of the word, in no wise have spoken). Similarly Matthew Henry: "It is probable that many good people had, accordingly, made use of the word *baali* in worshipping the God of Israel. When their wicked neighbors bowed the knee to Baal, they glorified in this, that God was their Baal; 'but,' says God, 'you shall call Me so no more, because I will have the very names of Baalim taken away.' . . . When calling God *ishi* will do as well, and signify as much, as *baali*, let that word be chosen rather lest by calling Him *baali* others should be put in mind of their *quondam* Baals." Concerning this interpretation, Luther says: "*Wie aber Hieronymus diese Stelle auslege, ist bekannt; denn Lyra sagt, dass auch die Auffassung des Juden Salomo christlicher sei.*" (St. L. VI, No. 2.)

This interpretation makes the use of the proper name of Baal or any other idol as the designation of the true God sinful, *nequaquam velim*. A number of considerations will show that this cannot be the intention of our text.

1) No. 3 bases its contention on the premise that the name of Baal had been used for Jehovah. This premise has been shown to be a mere assumption without Scriptural proof. The conclusion is no stronger than the premise.

2) Matthew Henry regards v. 17 as the reason for the prohibition of the use of the name of idols for God. We have shown that the relation of v. 17 to 16 is not that of cause and effect.

3) No. 3 assumes that the *proper* names of idols are here forbidden as designations of the true God. For surely even Jerome would not have gone so far as to say that any name given to idols was on that account ineligible as a designation for the true God.

Yet v. 17 does not speak of proper names of idols. We do not read: I will take out of her mouth the proper names of idols; nor, the names of idols; nor, the word Baalim; nor, the proper names of Baalim; nor, the proper name of Baalim; nor, the name of Baalim. What God did say is that He will remove the *names* (plural) of *Baalim*. The names which were given to Baalim, not merely Baal Peor, Baal Berit, Josh. 8, 33, Baal Zebub, 2 Kings 1, 2 ff. (given to distinguish the various Baalim, so that in this case *baal* seems rather a generic term than a *nomen proprium*), but the names as well whereby the Baalim were designated and honored and worshiped, as *baalim*, or lords, or divinities, or *elohim*, or superior beings, equal to Jehovah,—all these words and designations in so far as they are names of Baalim will He remove. In so far as they are not *names of Baalim*; in so far as they were applied, *e. g.*, to certain men who were called



baal, Is. 1, 3; Joel 1, 8; 2 Sam. 11, 26; *elohim*, Ps. 82, 1. 6; or in so far as they pertained to the true God, they were not to be removed out of the mouth; at least this passage does not state that.

4) In order to make any matter sinful, it must be forbidden in clear and unmistakable language. Interpretations No. 1, hermeneutically correct, and No. 2, held by many theologians of undoubted orthodoxy, do not prohibit such a use. Therefore it cannot be said that this use is clearly designated as sinful here. Whether such a use is always advisable and wise is quite a different question.

V. 18: "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field and with the fowls of heaven and with the creeping things of the ground, and I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth and will make them to lie down safely." The Lord is planning ways and means of proving to His Church His everlasting love. As He had called upon the animal world to destroy Israel's crop (cf. v. 9, 12b) and upon the enemies to break her power (chap. 1, 4. 5), so He will, for Israel's welfare, now make a covenant with the animals no more to harm their crops and will no more permit warfare to disturb her. In other words, peace and plenty shall be her portion instead of war and famine, a promise which finds its partial fulfilment in this life and its completion in the world to come. Here, as so often in Old Testament prophecy, time and eternity merge into one grand picture. The perfect peace and plenty of heaven will cause us to forget all trials of this life, however burdensome they may have seemed to us, Rom. 8, 18; 2 Cor. 4, 17.

While making His plans, the Lord turns once more to His Church, and out of the abundance of His loving heart His mouth speaks the sweetest words which human ears can hear, a declaration of unending love by the divine Bridegroom, a message which to this day fills our heart with joy and gratitude and love toward our God and Savior, who addresses these words to us also. Just listen: "And I will betroth thee unto Me forever." The Lord speaks here of a betrothal—the establishment, the beginning, of marriage. He accepts again His former wife; the covenant relation is reestablished, yet upon an entirely new basis. Hengstenberg aptly remarks: "It is great grace that the unfaithful wife is again accepted. According to the Law she might have been rejected forever. The only valid reason for severing the marriage existed—for years she had lived in adultery. But God's grace extends farther. The old condition is not only forgiven, it is forgotten. An entirely new relation begins, into which enters no suspicion and no bitterness on the one part, no sad memories on the other part, as is the case so often in similar human relations." "I will betroth thee unto Me forever." It is God that does the betrothing, accepts her as His bride, awakens in her heart true love. Jehovah betroths in eternity. The ravages of time shall not affect, no



passing age shall sever, not even death shall part, this union. It is as eternal as Jehovah and as unchanging as He, ever that same ardent, fervent, cordial love of the newly betrothed. "Yea, I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness and judgment." Righteousness was at the basis of the Old Testament covenant, a righteousness expressed in His holy Law as given on Sinai and symbolized by those two tablets of stone which were laid into the Ark of the Covenant, over which dwelt Jehovah between cherubim as if sitting on a throne established on righteousness. This was, alas, a righteousness which no man could fulfil, which called every man into judgment the inevitable outcome of which would be eternal damnation. The new covenant, the betrothal of God with His Church of the New Testament, is also based on righteousness, a righteousness of God's own making; a perfect righteousness, for it is a righteousness procured by Christ, the Messiah, the Lord, our Righteousness; a righteousness which satisfies the holiness and justice of God, for intimately connected with this righteousness on which the betrothal is founded, yea, forming, together with it, the basis of the betrothal, is judgment. The judgment of damnation which was to be pronounced upon all men, because they all sinned, was suspended for all men by Messiah, Is. 53, 4—8; 2 Cor. 5, 19 ff.; Rom. 5, 12 ff., the cancelation actually going into effect in the case of believers. By having this judgment executed upon Himself, He became our Righteousness; and on this righteousness and judgment is based the betrothal of God to His Church. Cf. Eph. 5, 25 ff. Consequently the essential righteousness of God was not violated by this betrothal. See also Rom. 3, 25, 26. Without this righteousness and judgment no betrothal would have been possible; but since Christ is our Righteousness, this betrothal, this covenant, is one based on "loving-kindness and mercies." חַסֵּד, the love of God toward the undeserving and unworthy, which assures us that in spite of our many shortcomings this betrothal shall not be annulled. רַחֲמִים, mercies, the yearning, pitying love of the parent toward the offspring, whose very misery and helplessness rouses pity and commiseration. Cf. Is. 49, 15; Ps. 103, 13. Grace and mercy, how often are these words used to describe the blessing of the New Testament covenant! Is. 54, 4—10; John 1, 14, 16, 17, etc. This betrothal will not place on the bride such burdensome yokes as the thousand and one ceremonies and rules and regulations which hedged in the Israelite at every step, making the Old Covenant a heavy burden, Acts 15, 15. Not the Law, but grace and mercy is the basis of the new betrothal, the sweet Gospel of redemption through judgment executed on Christ, of forgiveness of all our sins, Jer. 31, 31—34; Heb. 7, 22; 8, 6; 9, 15; 2 Cor. 3, 6—11, a much more agreeable covenant, granting far greater privileges, but at the same time higher responsibilities, and a greater measure of guilt should any one break this covenant of loving-kindness and mercies.



"I will even betroth thee unto Me in faithfulness." This betrothal is based on the truthfulness of God, who is not a man, that He should lie; neither the son of man, that He should repent. Hath He said, and shall He not do it? Hath He spoken, and shall He not make it good? Num. 23, 19. In and by His Word He announces His betrothal to His Church; His Word, which is truth, establishes this union, His faithful Word begetting and preserving faith and love in the hearts of men.

Three times the Lord announces His betrothal. One is reminded of the tripartite benediction, Num. 6, 24—26. Is it reading too much into the text if we say the Triune God is referred to here? The first clause refers to the everlasting Father; the second, to the Son, through judgment imposed on Himself the Author of our righteousness, of all grace and mercy; the third, to the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, who speaks to us and makes us partakers of this covenant through His Word of Truth.

"And thou shalt know the Lord." We shall know, enjoy, gratefully experience, Jehovah, His unchanging grace, His unending mercy, His never-failing compassion, His loving-kindness, which knows neither measure nor bounds. What a precious wedding-gift, far surpassing all the riches of this world: the knowledge of the Lord! To know Jehovah, that is life indeed, life eternal, Joh. 17, 3. Can God give more to His bride?

Vv. 21—23: "And it shall come to pass in that day, I will hear, saith the Lord, I will hear the heavens; and they shall hear the earth; and the earth shall hear the corn and the wine and the oil; and they shall hear Jezreel. And I will sow her unto Me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not My people, Thou art My people; and they shall say, Thou art my God."

The curse pronounced against apostate Israel shall be lifted. Jezreel shall no longer be rejected of God, his prayers unanswered. No; he shall pray and be heard. God's covenant extends not only to the animals, v. 18, but to heaven and earth, so that they no longer withhold their blessings from Israel, rather plead with each other and together plead with God that again the heavens may send their rain, and the rain fructify the earth, and the earth bring forth its products at their request, and these products willingly offer themselves to Jezreel at his request. Jezreel, once rejected, chap. 1, 4, 5, now restored to grace. For we read v. 23: "And I will sow her unto Me in the earth," again shall she grow and flourish like living seed sown by the living God (cp. Is. 61, 11); "and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not My people, Thou art My people; and they shall say, Thou art my God." Just as in the closing verses of chap. 1, so here the three names of



Gomer's children, symbolical of the fate of apostate Israel, are alluded to, to indicate that the curse has been lifted, the wrath of God has disappeared. Again, in New Testament times there shall be a great people of Israel, sown by God, having obtained mercy from Him, acknowledged by Him as His people, while they rejoice in Him who is indeed their God. Peace shall reign on earth again; for God in Christ reconciled the world unto Himself, magnifying His holy name, the Lord Jehovah of mercy and of truth. THEO. LAETSOH.

(To be continued.)

---

## The Personal Factor in Preaching.

---

There is only one eternal and unchanging truth in the world, and that truth is the Word of God. In words of surpassing beauty and power St. Peter writes: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, *which liveth and abideth forever*. For all flesh is as grass and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof fadeth away; but *the Word of the Lord endureth forever*," 1 Pet. 1, 23—25. Cp. John 17; Rom. 10. This is the Word which, as Peter states in concluding the chapter, "by the Gospel is preached unto you." To this preaching the Church of Christ and every church worthy of the name is committed. It means the constant repetition of the great motto of St. Paul's life: "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified," 1 Cor. 2, 2. It means the unequivocal stand against all falsifiers of the truth. "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed," Gal. 1, 9.

But while we stand committed to this unchanging principle, we are fully aware of the fact that changing conditions make constant adjustments of the form of presentation of the truth to new circumstances necessary. If this were not the case, all church confessions, all symbolical books, would be superfluous. The doctrine of the deity of Christ is clearly taught in both the Old Testament and the New; yet it was necessary, not absolutely, but relatively, to have not only the Apostolic Creed, but the Nicene and the *Symbolum Quicunque* as well. The various doctrines which were submerged between the sixth and the sixteenth centuries are all clearly taught in Scripture, yet it was necessary, again not absolutely, but relatively, to add the confessions of the era of the Reformation as they are now contained in the Book of Concord of the Lutheran Church. The arguments of these confessions meet the changed conditions and false applications of the entire medieval age. The inspiration of the Bible, the power of the Sacraments, the universal priesthood of all believers,