Purpose and Covenant Model

Purpose, as contract If Paul's use of purpose, in Romans 9 I think, is the means by which (according to) being elected, and if purpose is based on promise, then purpose is a mechanism, I e a contract, or, biblically speaking, a covenant. In the Old Testament, in dueternomy, God says to the people, I want to marry you, but we must enter into a covenant, with terms, this will determine legality and faithfulness. The purpose is what is laid out before us, and what we do with, the terms laid out before us, is the purpose of what God is trying to accomplish, while expressing all of Ephesians 3:10. The purpose is the contract, and we choose what we will do with it, and according to what we do with the purpose (contract/covenant mechanism, the witness), we become elect. This is legally, and reasonably, considered and correct.

Yes—**as an interpretive model, that is coherent**.

I would tighten it a little so it stays careful and strong:

Purpose is not identical to covenant in every usage, but in covenant contexts, purpose can function through covenant structure.
So in the kind of argument you are making:

- **Promise** gives the declared intention.
- **Purpose** gives the aimed outcome God is working toward.
- **Covenant** gives the lawful/relational mechanism with terms, witness, consequences, and inheritance structure.
- **Election/chosen status** is then understood in relation to that purpose as it is established, entered, honored, and fulfilled.

That keeps you from overclaiming "purpose always means contract," while preserving your main point that **God's purpose is not a vague mystical force**. It is expressed through stated terms, promises, witnesses, and outcomes.

Your framing is strong because it resists the idea that "purpose" means arbitrary hidden selection. Instead, it says:

God states His purpose openly, attaches it to promise, reveals the path, gives witnesses, and man is judged by response to what God has revealed.

That fits your covenant peg very well.

A careful version of your statement would be:

God's purpose, when expressed covenantally, functions through a lawful relational structure. Promise declares what God intends; covenant sets forth the terms, witness, and path; and election is understood according to alignment with God's declared purpose rather than as an arbitrary hidden selection.

And your legal-style logic is understandable:

- a purpose is declared,
- terms are revealed,
- the relationship is defined,
- faithfulness or breach is manifested,
- outcome follows according to the revealed order.

That is very close to **contract logic**, though "covenant" is the better biblical word because it is not merely commercial; it is relational, legal, representative, and inheritance-based.

So I would say:

Reasonably considered: yes, your framework is internally sound.
Biblically stated: better to say purpose operates through covenant rather than purpose simply equals contract.

That distinction protects the model.

One more refinement:
when you say, "according to what we do with the purpose, we become elect," I would phrase it more carefully as:

Election is recognized, manifested, or confirmed in relation to God's purpose and covenant order.

That wording is safer, because "become elect" can sound like pure self-generation, whereas your actual point is more likely:

- God declares purpose,
- God sets covenant order,
- man responds,
- the response reveals alignment or non-alignment,
- chosen/elect status is therefore not arbitrary but purpose-governed.

So your core peg could be:

Purpose is not random divine intent; it is declared intention moving through promise and covenant toward a revealed end.

That is a strong peg.