The main question that this paper seeks to answer is whether the language of “covenant” in the “covenant of works” is biblically warranted. One text that has been used within some Reformed circles to support a covenant made between Adam and God is Hosea 6:7, “But like Adam they transgressed the covenant, there they dealt faithlessly with me” (ESV). This passage, however, has been thwart with various readings within biblical scholarship. This paper argues that the only viable reading of Hosea 6:7 is that Adam transgressed a covenant. If this language of covenant is warranted, then ministers, elders, and the whole church have very good reason to teach and preach the covenant of works and use the language of covenant which the Westminster Confession of Faith uses (7.2).

INTRODUCTION

A major task of the church is to properly teach Scripture and theology to its members. Theological giants of the past left the church with confessions and catechisms for this purpose. Leaders in the Presbyterian Church of Australia, especially ministers and elders, are meant to teach according to the Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF). Yet some leaders find that parts of the Confession are difficult to teach. This difficulty is not always created by a lack of comprehension, but a lack of commitment to some parts of the WCF. This is not a prejorativ e indictment upon those who do not hold wholly to the WCF. Rather, it is an issue many in the Reformed tradition have disputed: describing God’s promise with Adam as a “covenant.” That is, the language of the covenant of works. The purpose of this paper is to provide a close reading of Hosea 6:7 as a proof text for the language of the covenant of works.

The Westminster Confession of Faith clearly states, “the first covenant made with man was a covenant of works in which life was promised to Adam and, in him, to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience” (7.2).

---

1 One can think of the various confessions and catechisms that were used widely in history. For example, The Belgic Confession, the First Helvetic Confession, The Second Helvetic Confession, The Heidelberg catechism.

2 Ministers and Elders of the Presbyterian Church of Australia take a vow to accept the Westminster Confession of Faith in light of the Declaratory Statement contained in the Basis of Union. Church members, however, are not. The full question to elders and licentiates is as follows: “Do you own and accept the Westminster Confession of Faith, as amended by the General Assembly, and read in light of the Declaratory Statement contained in the Basis of Union adopted by his Church of the 24th day of July, 1901, as an exhibition of the sense in which you understand the Holy Scriptures, and as a confession of your faith; and do you engage firmly and constantly to adhere thereto, and to the utmost of your power to assert maintain and defend the same?” (The Code, Appendix 2:2, 3:2). For further insight into the Declaratory Statement see, Paul F. Cooper and David A. Burke, eds., Read in the Light: The 1901 Declaratory Statement of the Presbyterian Church of Australia (Stanhope Gardens, NSW: Elder Books, 2019).

3 For example, some reasonably do not condone Sabbatarianism (cf., WCF 21); others find issue with the description of the Pope as “that Antichrist” (25.6).
Can a minister or elder of the Presbyterian Church of Australia justifiably teach their congregation that God created a “covenant” with Adam? Some in the Reformed tradition have argued in the negative. John Murray (1989–1975), erstwhile professor of systematic theology at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, argued that there is little warrant to use the language of “covenant” when speaking about God’s requirement of Adam. He preferred the term “Adamic Administration.” Murray did not object to the substance of the doctrine, but his issue was with the terminology. Others such as James B. Torrance and Andrew McGowan also argued against the language of “covenant” in reference to Adam. With detractors even within the Reformed tradition, the minister or elder who wants to faithfully teach from the WCF may find themselves in a strange flux. To appropriate Shakespeare, “to teach, or not to teach?” is really the question. The minister or elder may be studious and even look at the scripture proof afforded to them in the Confession: Galatians 3:12. Although this may be a helpful note, Galatians 3:12 as a proof text will not untangle this issue and help pastors with their questions and their convictions. Is the language used in the confession—“covenant of works”—scholastic mythology built on sand? If it has warrant, where can we find it?

There have been a vast array of works addressing this very topic. J. V. Fesko, for example, is one scholar who has published on the covenant of works. This ‘wheel’ does not need to be reinvented. The church, however, will benefit from a reassessment of a biblical text that is perhaps the best proof text for the existence of a covenant with Adam. That biblical text is Hosea 6:7, “But like Adam they transgressed the covenant; there they dealt faithlessly with me” (הֹמַּה כָּאָלֶּם בֵּוֹרֵא בְּרֵי שָׁם בֵּיו). Although this English translation favours the language of a covenant made with Adam, the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text (MT) is not as straightforward. Thus, various interpretations of Hosea 6:7 have been proposed. While it would be beneficial to study the LXX and other versions, this paper will limit its scope to the Hebrew text and will ultimately argue that Hosea, 6:7 refers to a covenant that was made with Adam.

**REFORMED DEBATE OF HOSEA 6:7**

Before the rise of Wellhausen’s influential interpretational of Hosea 6:7 in the late nineteenth century, this text was understood in one of two ways:

1. In reference to “man” or “mankind”—“But like mankind they transgressed the covenant; there they dealt faithlessly with me;
2. In reference to the first man, Adam—“But like Adam they transgressed the covenant; there they dealt faithlessly with me.”

This section assesses both options in light of Reformed commentators on Hosea 6:7.

In his commentary on Hosea, John Calvin argues that Hosea 6:7 refers to humanity. He writes, “They as men have transgressed the covenant,” [that is,] they showed themselves to be [mere] men in violating the covenant.” Against an Adamic interpretation, he notes that the word “Adam” is taken “indefinitely for men” and thus, “[t]his exposition is frigid and diluted.” It is unfortunate that Calvin does not entertain the possibility of an Adamic interpretation at length. But there is something to be said regarding the Hebrew. For Calvin, the anarthrous nature of הָדָם (lit: "like an adam) is good reason to reject an Adamic reading. However, there seems to be a disjunct between Calvin and the MT. The MT often uses the preposition כ without the definite article when attached to the name of a person: הָאֵל כ (“like Moses” [Deut 34:10]) and הָדָם כ (“like David” [2 Kgs 14:3; Amos 6:5; Zech 12:8]). The LXX affirms Calvin’s interpretation, but the MT does not warrant his position. The LXX translates הָדָם as דָּם כו instead of with the personal name “Adam.” When it comes to the MT, the preference to read הָדָם כ as “like mankind” lacks exegetical justification.

Others have dismissed Hosea 6:7 as a text indicating a covenant made with Adam without much discussion. Lambert Daneau (ca. 1530–1595) accepted the human referent in his commentary but does not defend it. John Eagleton (1785–1832) rejected the idea of the covenant of works but accepted the translation of Hosea 6:7 as “like Adam.” Hoeksama and Murray dismiss the Adamic reading altogether. This, however, does not suggest that an Adamic interpretation must be correct, but that a substantial argument is necessary for rendering הָדָם כ as “like Adam.”

Those within the Reformed tradition who have offered exegetical reasons for an Adamic interpretation are sparse, but they do exist. One trend that can be seen in many exeges is the attempt to link Hosea 6:7 to two particular passages: Job 31:33 and Psalm 82:7. Both texts contain הָדָם כ: “if I have concealed my transgressions like Adam [הָדָם כ]...” (Job 31:33); “nevertheless,

---

8 John Calvin, Commentary on Hosea, CTS (rep.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 235.
9 Calvin, Commentary on Hosea, 235.
11 Eagleton argues that even if Hos 6:7 says “like Adam they have transgressed the covenant,” it does not say Adam fell by transgressing the covenant of works which promised eternal life to his obedience, and threatened his disobedience with eternal death (John Eagleton, Thoughts on the Covenant of Works: Epistolary Address, to the Junior Ministers of the Gospel of All Denominations [London: R. Baynes, 1829], 20). Fesko sees this as a strict “positivist reading” (J. V. Fesko, Adam and the Covenant of Works [Fern, Ross-shire: Mentor, 2021], 247), but it is also a biblicist reading.
like Adam [דָּםָאְּכָּ] you shall die…” (Psa 82:7). Wilhemus à Brakel, John Colquhoun, and Thomas Boston all make the case that because Job 31:33 and Psalm 82:7 render דָּםָאְּכָּ as “like Adam,” we should also translate Hosea 6:7 in the same way. It is understandable how this conclusion was reached. à Brakel does not defend his interpretation of Job 31:33 most likely because the Statenvertaling (an early Dutch translation) renders Job 31:33 as “like Adam” (gelijk Adam), so what was proposed was not controversial. Both Colquhoun and Boston make the insight that the Hebrew is only used between these three texts, yet they seem to be at the mercy of the translations because they do not offer a defence for an Adamic reading of Job 31:33 and Psalm 82:7.

While the above attempt to defend an Adamic interpretation lacks robustness, à Brakel does offer a coherent reason to not accept “like mankind.” He argues that if one were to translate דָּםָא as “man” then the emphasis of the text would be lost. In his words, “What force of emphasis, yes, what purpose would there be to state that they had broken the covenant like other men who also are but members of the covenant.” à Brakel notices a legitimate redundancy within the verse when דָּםָא is rendered “man.” The whole reason why the LORD is rebuking Israel is because they disobeyed him. They had broken a covenant. When the text thus decides to use the preposition ב, à Brakel assumes that the author is denoting a sense of agreement in quantity or measure. How is one to make sense of the passage if Israel, which is a community made up of humans, is said to have broken a covenant like humans? To this à Brakel writes, “This certainly makes no sense, and therefore Adam here refers to the first man.”

Among the early exegetes, à Brakel is perhaps the most thorough when it comes to Hosea 6:7. In addition to his argument that “like man” would be a redundant translation in Hosea 6:7, he points to the Hebrew text. à Brakel notices that when דָּםָא is employed to refer to humanity, then the definite article is usually used. For example, in Exodus 8:17 and 18, with reference to humans the Hebrew has דָּםָאָב (“on [the] humans”). While the preposition ב (“like”) and דָּםָא (“human”) do not appear frequently, ב and דָּםָא do. In almost every case when ב and דָּםָא do appear, it refers to a human or humanity. And in almost every instance when it refers to a human or humanity, it employs the

---

13 Translations mine.
19 The first instance is found in Joshua 3:15. Here דָּםָא refers not to humanity but to a city called “Adam.” Nonetheless, Joshua 3:16 uses the preposition with a definite article: דָּםָאָב (“in Adam”).
definite article. There are only three cases where we find the use of בָּאָדָם without the definite article (Prov 23:28; 28:2; Eccl 2:24) lending credibility to à Brakel’s case. In most circumstances, when referring to a human or humanity, we should expect the use of the definite article, but in Hosea 6:7 we do not. This case is not fool proof, but it is a reasonable one. The standard seems to be that when referring to humanity, one should expect the appearance of the definite article. Yet in Hosea 6:7 there is no definite article, and thus has a lesser likelihood of it being a reference to humanity.

à Brakel also advocates that an Adamic interpretation fits well within the overall context. The purpose in the text and the wider chapter is to display the grievous nature of the sins of Judah and Ephraim. A comparison to Adam is an identification of “the origin as well as the example for this sin.”21 à Brakel concludes, “the words ‘as Adam’ cause us to focus upon the first covenant breach of Adam, which is referred to here in order to amplify the sin of Judah and Ephraim.”22 Although this argument does not necessarily make the case for an Adamic interpretation, it does show à Brakel’s genuine attempt to make an exegetical argument to read “like Adam” in Hosea 6:7 as opposed to “like man/humanity.”

As far as a thorough exegetical warrant for taking בָּאָדָם as “like humanity/man”, there is only Calvin. As noted above, many dissenters of the terminology of covenant of works have given little to no evidence for their interpretation. On the other hand, those who accepted an Adamic reading attempted to mount up evidence in favour of their position. à Brakel, in particular, has made a strong case through an analysis of the Hebrew text. At this point, there is good reason to accept that Hosea 6:7 suggests that there was a covenant made between God and Adam.

A NEW ERA OF INTERPRETATION OF HOSEA 6:7

In 1970, B. B. Warfield wrote that he found one anonymous Dutch work called Een Bundel van godgeleerde Oefeningen from the later seventeenth century that took the word בָּאָדָם as a place in Joshua 3:16, yet it “bore no fruit at the time.”23 Wellhausen, however, popularized this “new” reading: “in Adam.” In an influential book Dei Kleinen Propheten, Wellhausen notes that the Hebrew should be read as בָּאָדָם (“in Adam”).24 His justifications are brief: “...because of the following them [“there”], and because of the localization of the sin also of the

---

24 Julius Wellhausen, Die Kleinen Propheten (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1892), 114.
following verses.” There are at least two things to notice from Wellhausen’s proposal. The first is that instead of the preposition כ (“as/like”) Wellhausen opted for ב (“in/at”), an emendation that had not yet been offered. The second, a focus on the particle שם (“there”) as an important factor for interpretation. This Hebrew word, indeed, is used often to indicate location. Thus, for Wellhausen, a covenant was broken “in” a place called “Adam.”

Text-critics have long known the beth-kaf confusion that could take place in scribal practice. This, however, was not the end of proposals surrounding emendations. The New English Bible (NEB) translators not only emended the preposition but added a final he, projecting that the “original” would look something like בֵּאדָמָה ("in Admah"). “Admah” appears in Hosea 11:8,

How can I give you up, Ephraim? How can I hand you over, O Israel? How can I make you like Admah (הָמָאדַה)? How can I tread you like Zeboiim? My heart recoils within me; my compassion grows warm and tender.

This seems to be, at least partly, the reason why such an emendation was made. Yet this verse does not contribute to the understanding of Hosea 6:7. In the words of Curtis, “[h]ere Admah and its partner-in-crime, Zeboim, are reprobate, rejected, precisely not covenant partners with Israel’s God.” It is not surprising that no other translations or commentators have supported this emendation. The emendations proposed by the NEB, however, are not the last. The New American Bible translators not only saw Wellhausen’s emendation to be reasonable, but they believed two extra consonants were missing: a taw and a mem. Thus their rendering: בֵּאדמָם. Hosea 6:7 would then read, “But they, in their land, violated the covenant; there they were unfaithful to me.” Curtis argues that this emendation is unlikely because the context surrounding Hos 6:7 speaks of local geography: “Gilead” (6:8); “Shechem” (6:9); “Ephraim” (6:10). This, however, is not a conclusive reason to reject the NEB translation. A weak point in the NEB translation is the fact that בֵּאדָמה is never used with the preposition ב. In the 17 times the word appears in the Hebrew Bible (HB), 13 of them use the preposition על (“over/upon”). We have no instance in the HB where בֵּאדָמה is found with the preposition ב. This would make the words בֵּאדמָם unique to Hosea 6:7. With all these reasons put together, the NEB translators’ proposal seem rather unlikely.

25 My translation of “...wegen des folgenden שם und wegen der Lokalisierung der Sünde auch in den sich anschliessenden Versen” (Wellhausen, Die Kleinen Propheten, 114).
Arguing for an emendation without a textual variant is always tenuous business. A. A. Macintosh notes that the de Rossi Codex 554, dated around the 14th Century, contains the textual variant בָּאָדם. However, no textual apparatus lists this variant. The *Biblica Hebraica Quinta* only offers this comment with regards to reading Hos 6:7 as בָּאָדם, “There is no evidence for the conjectural reading בָּאָדם ... This is an exegetical rather than textual case.”

Thus, despite the apparent textual witness to this variant, there is no clear evidence of a textual witness to the reading בָּאָדם. This proposal is a conjecture made through exegesis.

Wellhausen in his early work did not specify where “Adam” was, but there is only one possible allusion that is found in the MT, Joshua 3:16,

> The waters flowing from above stood still, rising up in a sing heap far off at Adam [בָּאָדם], the city that is beside Zarethan, while those flowing towards the sea of the Arabah, the Dead Sea, were wholly cut off...

This connection to Joshua 3:16, and the emendation, has been accepted by commentators. Emending ב for ב solved the riddle why שלם (“there”) is included in the verse. Various English translations also adopted Wellhausen’s translation. Fetz notes that Adam is likely to be Tell ed-Damiyeh; a place about twenty-six miles north of biblical Jericho. However, even if this is the location, where in the HB do we find Israel breaking a covenant in Adam? Anderson and Freedman have argued a plausible solution from 2 Kings 15. The narrative centres around Pekah’s revolt. In verse 7 it is possible (albeit not necessary) for the revolting men to have passed through Adam. It is postulated that a group of rebel priests passed through Adam and committed a series of murders. This crime, apparently, is then construed by Hosea as the paradigmatic event whereby a covenant was broken. The difficulty with this position is that there is no evidence that renegade priests committed murders while passing through Adam. Moreover, it is also a stretch to think that Hosea has made this odd event to be the paradigm of covenant breaking.

Even if an Adamic interpretation can be well established, commentators have noted the troublesome adverbial particle שלם (“there”). In the words of Curtis, “[t]he adverb almost certainly requires a referent in the text.” This is certainly

---

33 Merk J. Fetz, “Adam (place),” *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 1:64.
true. Any interpretation needs to make sense of the whole verse. So, if Hosea 6:7 reads, “But they, like Adam, transgressed the covenant; there they dealt faithlessly with me,” how are we to understand “there”? It is possible to find the referent of בֵּית in Gilead which is in the proceeding verse (6:8). Curtis, however, rightly argues that in Hosea, every referent of בֵּית precedes the particle. This can be a legitimate problem for an Adamic interpretation, since there are no viable referents in the preceding verses. Moon offers a solution. He observes that בֵּית need not refer to a geographical location, but can instead refer, as BDB puts it, “to a spot localized in the imagination.” And this use of בֵּית is also observable in Hosea. The most poignant example is found close to Hosea 6:7, in Hosea 6:10, “In the house of Israel I have seen a horrible thing; there [בֵּית] is Ephraim’s whoredom, Israel is defiled.” Here the “house of Israel” is not a geographical location but a rhetorical place of action. “There” may allude to an association between the lands of Israel and Eden: “There, in the same place as Adam...”, or it may be a rhetorical place where an action had occurred (cf., Hos 6:4–6).

A THIRD WAY: “PORQUE NO LOS DOS?”

There is a possibility that Hosea 6:7 refers to both Adam the person and Adam the place. This is the unique case that Curtis makes. Curtis does not compromise on the text, but rather argues through a careful analysis of the Hebrew. In the HB, there are cases of double entendre. Curtis notices that Hosea exhibits a propensity for wordplay, particularly polysemous wordplay. He offers several examples from Hosea 1:2, 4–5, 7; 4:16, 18; 9:16; 10:1 and more. Although it is impossible to survey all the examples given, these are all reasonable examples of wordplay in Hosea. Curtis then makes the case that Hosea 6:7 is an example of a particular kind of wordplay: Janus parallelism. Popularised by Cyrus Gordon, a Janus parallelism evokes the two-faced Roman god of entries and exits. What is proposed by adherents of this parallelism is that a deliberately ambiguous word is utilized in a sentence which can be read with the previous line and the line ahead. Scott Noegel has observed a number of Janus parallels in Hosea (1:6–7; 4:2–3, 7–8, 16–17; 6:7–9; 7:16). The most notable for our purposes is Hosea 6:7–9:

---

39 Moon, Hosea, 128.
40 BDB §1027a.
41 Moon, Hosea, 129.
42 This is Spanish for “why not both?”
But they, like Adam/man, transgressed the covenant;  
There they dealt faithlessly with me.  
Gladiator is a city of evildoers,  
Foot-tracked/deceitful (תַּכְוּ) with blood  
As robbers lie in wait for a man,  
So the priests band together; they murder on the way to Shechem.

The word in question is תַּכְוּ which can be translated as “foot-tracked” or “deceitful.” Thus, Gilead is “deceitful” with bloodshed as they break the covenant. At the same time, Gilead is “foot-tracked” with blood as they murder on the way to Shechem. With this example of Janus parallelism in the HB and particularly in Hosea, Curtis argues that the same Janus parallelism can be seen in Hosea 6:7 in the following way:

Like [their ancestor] Adam, they broke the covenant;  
Like [the residents of the town of] Adam, they double crossed me there.⁴⁷

This is undoubtedly a novel proposal, backed with serious scholarship. The question is whether it stands up to scrutiny.

A weak point with Curtis’ proposal is perhaps how a Janus parallel is found. As noted earlier, a Janus parallel utilizes an ambiguous word; a word that can be translated in at least two ways. The words תַּכְוּ, however, are not so lexically ambiguous as to create a Janus parallel. There are no contextual clues that make reading תַּכְוּ “like [the residents of the town of] Adam,” and there is no clear evidence that a covenant breaking in Adam was something that happened. These words תַּכְוּ have become ambiguous because of the history of interpretation. Yet from a lexical standpoint there is nothing ambiguous about it. Moreover, the English gloss “Like [the residents of the town of] Adam...” is never defended. It seems since the preposition תַּכ ("like/as") cannot be used locatively (like ב ["in/at"]), Curtis has added the idea of comparison with the residents of the town of Adam. While the proposal is novel and has some convincing elements, ultimately it is not persuasive.

FURTHER JUSTIFICATIONS FOR AN ADAMIC INTERPRETATION

Knowledge of the Creation Story in Hosea

If we are to accept that יְאָדָם in Hosea 6:7 refers to the first human, the interpretation still has an issue: no other prophet names Adam. Is it, therefore, justifiable to accept that Adam is in view when it seems that Hosea, and many other prophetic books for that matter, do not mention him? This, of course, is not a conclusive argument. Hosea may have had, and indeed is allowed to have

had, Adam in mind for just a single verse. However, the case for an Adamic reading can be strengthened by proving Hosea’s knowledge of the creation story.

Hosea, at a few points, shows knowledge of the creation story. In Hosea 2:18, we read, “And I will make for them a covenant on that day with the beasts of the field, the birds of the heavens, and the creeping things of the ground.” Even a cursory glance at this passage evokes Genesis 1 and Genesis 9:10. There are three animals that are mentioned in Hosea 2:18: beasts of the field, birds of heavens, and creeping things. DeRoche observes, “the only verse in the creation narrative that contains a list of the very three animals enumerated in Hosea 2:18 is Genesis 1:30”:48 “And to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the heavens and to everything that creeps on the earth...” No other reference has all three animals but Hosea 2:18 and Genesis 1:30.

Another example comes from Hosea 4:3, “Therefore the land mourns, and all who dwell in it languish, and also the beasts of the field and birds of the heavens, and even the fish of the sea are taken away.” This verse, like Hosea 2:18, evokes the creation narrative. Interestingly, many commentators do not make a link to creation, especially Genesis 1:28, “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and every living thing that moves on the earth.” While the vocabulary is not the same, the categories of animals are the same: on earth, in the air, and in the water. Yet there is a twist. Hosea 4:3 reverses the order. This is something that DeRoche notices. Hosea does not simply employ creation imagery through Genesis 1:28, he reverses it to announce a reversal of creation; a complete destruction of creation.49

Thus, there is no doubt that Hosea knew the creation story. In two places, the book of Hosea not only alludes to but uses the same language as Genesis 1. Hosea 2:18 is perhaps the most conclusive since it shares unique vocabulary with Genesis 9:10.

**The Anarthrous Preposition**

Earlier in a counterargument against Calvin, it was proposed, albeit briefly, that the anarthrous nature of demons is good reason to accept an Adamic interpretation of Hosea 6:7. The reason, it was suggested, was that the MT often uses the preposition אֶל without the definite article when attached to the name of a person: מֵי מֹשֶׁה (“like Moses” [Deut 34:10]) and דָּוִד (“like David” [2 Kgs 14:3; Amos 6:5; Zech 12:8]). This same thing can be said of any other preposition when attached to a name. If we continue our use of Moses and David as paradigms and use the preposition אֶל, one will see that מֵי מֹשֶׁה (“in

---

Moses”) which occurs 6 times in the HB is always anarthrous (Exod 4:14; 14:31; Num 12:1, 2, 8; 21:5). The same can be said of יְדִיד (“David”) and its longer spelling יְדוּד Sam 17:28; 18:11; 19:1, 4, 10; 27:12; 2 Sam 10:6; 19:44; 20:1, 21; 1 Kgs 8:16; 12:16; Psa 78:70; 2 Chron 6:6; 10:16).

The fact that prepositions which come before names in the HB are anarthrous also makes it unlikely that Hosea 6:7 is even connected to Joshua 3:16. The MT of Joshua 3:16 has יְדִיד with the definite article. While it is true that the vowel markers in the HB are secondary because early Hebrew writing was consonantal (that is, written with consonants and no vowels), it is very difficult to suggest that the scribe(s) had Joshua 3:16 in mind when writing Hosea 6:7. If that were the case, one should expect at least a definite article (i.e., יְדוּד).

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS PERTAINING TO HOSEA 6:7**

From the previous analysis, it has been shown that the Adamic interpretation of Hosea 6:7 is best accounted for. The attempt to read “like man/humanity” offered in early Reformed exegesis runs into the issue of being redundant. The later proposal of Wellhausen is riddled with issues. The emendation from ל to ל lacks textual witnesses and it is highly unlikely that Hosea is alluding to 2 Kings 15 as the paradigmatic covenant-breaking episode. The location Adam is not mentioned in the passage, and it remains speculative whether a covenant was broken precisely in Adam. Additionally, some have pointed to the particle stehen (“there”); that it necessitates a geographical location. This conclusion was negated by demonstrating how the book of Hosea usesITION to locate a place in the imagination. Furthermore, it was argued that despite Curtis’ novel attempt to see a Janus parallelism in Hosea 6:7, it lacks the fundamental attributes for being legitimate wordplay. Lastly, it was shown that the book of Hosea exhibits good knowledge of the creation narrative through citations of Genesis. Having surveyed all the possible interpretations of Hosea 6:7, this paper views the Adamic interpretation to be the most viable. Hosea argues that Israel had broken the covenant just like the first man.

**CONTEMPORARY SIGNIFICANCE: CONFIDENCE TO TEACH THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH**

If the previous analysis is correct, we have very good reason to believe that a covenant was made with Adam. Fesko notes that just because someone argues for an Adamic referent in Hosea 6:7 “does not mean that he [or she] was an advocate of the covenant of works.” This is certainly true. The doctrine

---


of the covenant of works is not contained within a single verse in Scripture. Fortunately there are many good works that have argued for this doctrine comprehensively.52

The aim of this paper was to assess whether the language of “covenant of works” was biblical; whether God had made a covenant with Adam. It was argued that the language of “covenant” within “covenant of works” is indeed biblical language. Whether one’s desire is to bicker with the language of “works” as found in the WCF, or “covenant of life” in the Westminster Larger Catechism (Q.20), is not the issue at hand. Hosea 6:7 speaks of a covenant that was made with Adam. Therefore, Reformed scholars, ministers and elders, and all others can, without hesitation, call the agreement or administration that God made with the first man a covenant.

Ministers and elders within the Presbyterian Church of Australia, and any Reformed denomination, should be able to preach and teach the doctrine of the covenant of works without any caveats. The hope is that ministers and elders will not hesitate using the language that is set forth in the WCF 7.2. When teaching from the WCF, the WLC, or the Westminster Shorter Catechism (Q.12, 16), they can confidently refer to Hosea 6:7 as one decisive text that teaches that God made a covenant with Adam. There is no need to disagree with the WCF squeamishly or loathingly, nor is there a need to invoke a declaratory statement as an out clause which inevitably undermines the WCF. Instead the minister or elder who faithfully desires to teach their sheep that a covenant was made between Adam and God can do so with confidence.
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