

God's Central Plan



Walt C. Kaiser, Ph.D.

*Experience: Distinguished Professor of Old Testament,
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary*

This is the New Testament promise God's central plan. The idea of the promise, we like to submit in these lectures, is one of the greatest unifying themes used by the biblical writers themselves to integrate the message and the deeds of the Old and the New Testaments. It will be our thesis that this theme of the promise runs through both the Old and New Testaments, and actually will serve at least as one of the good ways in which we can sort of pull them together. Now this brings up the whole question of, what do we mean by Old Testament or biblical theology?

Biblical theology is different than a systematic theology. In systematic theology we go through the Bible and sort of pick out a verse or verses, and they become sort of like flowers, like we would go through a garden and pick out flowers. So we have here a sort of series of flowers that we have picked, and then we make them into a bouquet, and it's our bouquet. Of course, they're biblical flowers – they do really represent verses. But the way in which we put them together is ours, and we've done this by the analogy of faith. The analogy of faith says that the whole Bible, being the product of God, we can now at the conclusion of it, go through the whole sweep of it and pick up all the verses on justification by faith, all the verses that deal with sanctification, and so forth, and then make them into a statement, a doctrine of systematic theology, or a doctrine of justification by faith, whatever the doctrine happens to be. That's systematic theology. Its organization is external to the Biblical text.

Biblical theology, however, by biblical theology we don't mean a theology that's just Biblical. The word has been used in that regard, but that's not what is intended as a discipline. As a discipline, biblical theology attempts to go through the Bible diachronically, that's d-i-a, which means through, and then chronos, diachronically, we go through, chronos meaning time. So through time, we are attempting to sort of see the various epochs and eras. And what is the sort of major emphasis for each

one of the epochs?

We sort of have a staircase kind of an effect built on a solid base and a platform, each one of which like a column rises higher and higher, as the same substance usually without too much jettison of material that is now antiquated because it has been, it was time-conditioned and fulfilled, continues to build. So the whole process of biblical theology is one in which we go through the Bible and try to set up the major teachings of each of the epochs, or eras of the Bible, which are admittedly arbitrary.

I, for example, use what I would call the pre patriarchal time of Genesis 1 through 11 as being my first one. Then I use the patriarchs, the fathers of their country, Genesis 12 through 50, where you have Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and some would include Joseph. But generally it's the three great patriarchs. And then the Mosaic time – during the time of Moses, and this would be everything from Exodus, say, through Numbers.

And then we have the time of before the monarchy, the pre-monarchical times. And this would be everything from Deuteronomy, and it would go up to the division of the kingdom, which would be in I Kings, Chapter 11. Excuse me, the pre-monarchy would go from Deuteronomy, take that back, up through, instead, up to the time of Saul, which would take us to the election in I Samuel, Chapter, say 10.

Then the monarchy, which would be the time of David, Saul, David and Solomon. And the monarchy is from that period from the middle of I Samuel all the way up to the division of the kingdom, I Kings, Chapter 11.

And then from the monarchy we want to go into the wisdom period, for here the spirit of God has stopped during the time of Solomon to give us a large section during the monarchy, which would be not only the royal Psalms of David, and other psalms that he has written, but also it would be the Books of Ecclesiastes, and Song of Psalms or Song of Solomon. It would be the Book of Proverbs, for example, the great wisdom literature of the Biblical text.

And then for each of the centuries as we move on through the prophets, the first being the 9th century, where we would have probably Joel and Obadiah out in front as being contemporaries almost of Elijah and Elisha.

And then the 8th century, where we would have the great group of Isaiah prophets, where we would also have Amos and Micah and Jonah and, let's see, we need in there Hosea. Hosea would be another one. Seventh century prophets are the Jeremiah group, which has, amongst others, Zephaniah and Habakkuk and Nahum.

And then the 6th century prophets, during the Exile, we would here have Daniel and Ezekiel. And then the 5th century, in the post-exilic, after the exile, and here we have Haggai, and Zechariah and Malachi, and probably I and II Chronicles come at this particular time, as well.

Well, basically then, we have walked through and we can use steps like this, each one of them forming a rough epoch of time. But yet no discipline has struggled more valiantly to fulfill its basic mission with more disappointing results than Old Testament biblical theology. Inherent in the very name of the discipline itself, is some kind of inner unity, Old Testament theology. We don't say Old Testament theologies, as if it were plural. We think that there is some kind of unity that binds it together.

And then we will speak of the biblical theology of both Old and New Testaments, too, as well. So how are we to do this? Well, to look at the literature, alas, it is very disappointing. For the main mood of the contemporary literature, both in our circles and out of our circles would be to stress pluralism. And it says that there is no way in which you are going to get such a mass of materials together to find any central motif, any unity, to sense any ongoing plan of God. Well, that's disappointing if that's so and I find that, at least provisionally, a very disappointing stance from which to begin. But, indeed, that's where most are at the present time.

So simply stated, the problem is this, does the Bible, and the Old Testament in particular, does the Old Testament provide a key for an orderly and progressive arrangement of subjects and themes, and teachings of the Old Testament? And here's the most crucial question of all, were the Old Testament writers consciously aware of such a key as they continued to add to the historical stream of revelation?

I think the answer to those two questions is extremely critical. I would like to answer the first question by saying, yes, there is a key. The key is to be found in the promised doctrine, the "promise" theme of the Old Testament. As a matter of fact, if you wish, so as not to get it into promise fulfillment terminology, maybe what we

should say is to use a hyphenated word, the promise plan of God. And then, to ask the question, were the Old Testament writers conscious of this, we answer also very positively, yes, they were.

And the great text that we think really backs that up is I Peter 1:8-12. I think you can take that whole thing there. But Peter is discussing so great a salvation that we have had. He can't believe it – so amazing is this gift of new life that Christ has given to all who believe. And he goes on to describe it, and he says this salvation is unbreakable, it's unrustable. Well, he doesn't use that word, but he really says that you just, it won't corrupt at all.

And now he says concerning which salvation, he makes sort of a transitional point there, in verse 10, concerning which salvation the prophets searched and inquired diligently. Ah hah, you say, there is it. They are scratching their heads, oh, yes, they are. That point is agreed. The prophets are scratching their heads. They are saying, oy vey! what is this about? They need to ask something but the point is, what are they scratching their heads over? Now before you jump too quickly, look at what the text says, for they were searching and inquiring diligently concerning what, or what manner of time. The Greek phrase here is very, very critical, eis tina e poion kairon, that is unto what, the word tina is what, or, a, what manner of time? In other words, we have a tautological statement here, unto time, that is, what time and what was the manner of time? So they wanted to know, what was the time? They didn't know what time these things would take place, and they didn't know what were the circumstances, what was the manner of time, poion, we generally translate as, what was the manner of the time, or what were the circumstances? We could use the word circumstances here just as well, too, of the time.

Well, the biblical writers wrote this and they said they didn't know the time, nor did they know the circumstances of the time. But they did know something else; for the text went on to say five things the prophets did know. It said that when they wrote concerning Messiah, concerning Christ, the word Christ there is Greek for Messiah, as you know. (1) So they wrote about Him. (2) And the text says that they wrote about His sufferings, so that they knew that He would come to suffer.

(3) The text says also they wrote about His glory. They knew that He would come triumphantly. (4) And fourthly, they knew the order. It was the glory that should follow.

(5) Fifthly, it says that they were prophesying these things, not only unto themselves, but the text says, they were also given for us, says Peter to the 1st century church. So in verse 12 it was revealed to them that they were not serving themselves, but you, when they spoke of the things that have now been told you, by those who have preached the Gospel to you by the Holy Spirit and from Heaven.

So we say then, these are five things that the prophets knew, five things the prophets knew. The prophets knew they were talking about Messiah. They knew they were talking about the fact that He had to suffer. They knew they were talking about His glory. They knew that it was a glory that should follow. They knew also, to some extent, that it involved the believing Church. This they knew. This they knew.

What they didn't know, there were two things, or basically one thing the prophets did not know. So make that in a separate category. The prophets did not know, and what was it that they did not know? They didn't know the time, or the circumstances, if you want to make a second point.

So that I think is what needs to be seen here with regard to the answer to the second question. Were these men aware of what they were doing, and did they see some unity to the whole thing? Yes, they did. They saw a unity focusing on the person of Christ, but not Christo-exclusive. It was Christocentric. It centered on Him, but it didn't mean the Christology was all that it was about – that when we have preached the Messiah we have preached the Old Testament. Oh, no. There are just loads of areas, once again, that the biblical text wants to give us reproof, and instruction, and correction and wants to make us wise unto salvation. So [there were] five things the prophets knew [and] two things that they did not know.

So, at any rate, it seems to me that the possibility then of locating such a structure is extremely important. We don't think we should impose a grid over the Bible – drop, as it were, a particular plan for organizing over top of the text. It would be better if one sprang from the text itself. And that's why it seems to me that such a procedure is to be preferred, if at all possible. And I think that following inductively through these sort of steps, as you please, through the various epochs as we have traced it here, beginning way back with Genesis 3:15 with the promise of the seed of the woman. There begins to develop here a content, which content

keeps enlarging and is repeated and repeated and repeated. The sheer repetition should have helped us to say, this is central, this is focal, this is the mete, this is the focus point for the whole of theology.

And I think that, that is better than our suggesting some modern divining rod, or water witching kind of thing, where we held out a stick, and we tried to see if the stick bent on a certain verse, and there we said, ah hah, there is a theological point there. As you know, that's not to be done. But at any rate, we have suggested all sorts of good things, like the holiness of God as a central point. Or the Lord, lordship, or knowledge of God, or communion with God, the rule of God, the kingdom of God, all these have been themes. They're good themes. But on the other hand, I want some indication that begins early, and that embraces all of the focus of scripture.

My suggestion and the burden of this lecture is going to be to show you that the central concept of scripture is one that begins quite early, and if we are to begin where the text begins, it would seem that it starts right away in Genesis, Chapter 3:15.

What then or how then shall be defining this word promise? Our English word promise comes directly from the Latin form, *p r o m i s s a*, meaning a declaration or an assurance made to another person; with respect to the future. So it's a declaration or an assurance. The promise from the Latin term, if we're using that particular expression, is that it is a word. So the promise of God begins with a declaration. It will be a word, or an assurance, and it is an assurance of both about what someone will be, or what someone will do. It will put its stress both on ontology; on being, and on deeds; on doing. It will have an activist side to it, too, as well, and what that person will be or do or will refrain from being or doing, so as to bring advantage or pleasure to the person's concern. And it usually is, and the promise stresses the advantage side, the pleasure side. It does not stress, in this regard, the judgment side, or aspect. I'll come back to that when we distinguish promise from a prophecy, for example. And that's why I think we should stay away from promise fulfillment kinds of themes. That is not what I am intending here at all.

So it begins with a declaration. In this case, it begins with a declaration by God. So the promise is God's word and God's assurance. That's how it starts. And it is God's promise or assurance made first to Eve in Genesis 3, then to Shem, or the

Shemites, which we now call the Semites, in Genesis 9, and then to the fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

So it's a word, first of all, to Eve, then to Shem, then to the patriarchs. And it's a word to them that, now in the famous statement which is going to be repeated over and over again in the tri-partite formula, three-part formula. This tri-partite formula is one that is repeated in the Bible some 50 times, in Old and New Testament.

The first part is I will be your God. That's the first assurance, or declaration, of the living God. I will be your God. The second part is, and you shall be my people, and you shall be my people. The phrase here, to be the people of God, my people, is going to be tremendously significant. Then, thirdly, and I will pup tent, I will dwell in the midst of you. I will shakan, I will tabernacle, I will dwell, watch that word, it's extremely important, I will dwell, not way off, but there is an imminent theology here as well as a transcendent theology. I will dwell in the midst of you. Dwell in the midst of you.

This begins in Genesis, in God's promise to Abraham, but it continues in Exodus where God adds a second part to it, I'll be your people. He told that to Abraham and to Jacob, I'll be your God. Then he adds in Exodus, Chapter 4, you shall be my people. As a matter of fact, you are my son, Israel is my son, Israel is my firstborn, Exodus 4:22-24. Israel is my firstborn. That becomes a technical term. Israel is my son. That becomes a technical term there. Israel is to be a kingdom of priests, a royal priesthood, in Exodus 19:5 and 6. And he continues this whole thing of what it means to be people, what it means to be my people. And then with the tabernacle theology, there comes, in Exodus 25, God dwelling, God tabernacling in the midst of them, with the shekinah glory, shakan, to dwell, and we have the whole concept of shekinah glory, the dwelling glory. God dwelling in the midst of men, and taking up His residence in the midst of men while also being the high and lofty God.

So that is the first assurance that God gives in this tri partite formula, and it begins there at that point. But it also includes the deeds of God, too, as well, His great action in history, His action on behalf of delivering a people out of bondage, the Exodus. His action as signaled in the Passover and in the Day of Atonement, which will be the great acts of substitution, which God Himself will provide through His son here in pictographic sample, picture

book form of what God is going to do in the final day.

So here you have deeds added to the words, and the assurance of this promise. So that's how it begins to build. So for formal definition now, then, we would say that the promise is the divine declaration or assurance made to Eve, Shem, and the patriarchs, and to the whole nation, that God would be their God, and that they would be His people, and that He would dwell in the midst of them. That's the divine assurance. That's the divine declaration.

But now there is something that is added that is even a greater surprise and that it that the text goes on to say here, and that through Israel's seed God would send the man of promise. This is the interesting thing that develops, that through this seed, and, by the way, we must retain the awkwardness of the word seed, or the word offspring, but not descendants. Why? Because what we need here at this point is a collective singular. We need something that is once; we'll refer to one, the representative person, offspring. We can use the word offspring for one. You can use the word offspring for many. You can use the word seed for one. You can use the word seed for many. But you can't use the word descendants for one. It's many, only.

So the translation descendants is inaccurate, and, as a matter of fact, it's false. You need here to understand the word, a collective singular, which exists in Hebrew, and in Greek, and in English at this point. There is a word, offspring, that I think meets the bill. But the others do not. So if you speak of children, or if you speak of descendants, I think you've missed the point. That's Paul's argument, too, in Galatians 3:16, where he didn't say seeds, which is many, but he said seed, which is one; and, furthermore, if we believe we are Abraham's seed, he says before he has finished that chapter. So you've got to meet the demands of what was in the text itself, like our word, deer, you can say one deer, or five deer. We don't say five deers.

It's specifically the uniqueness of this word, so that through this seed, God would send the man of promise. And that through this seed blessing would come to all peoples on the face of the earth. That also has to be included here. It is not only Christological that there would come the Messiah, but it is also missiological, that is there is mission here, and the mission is in your seed shall all the peoples of the earth be blessed. And in Genesis 12:3 that phrase refers to all of the 70 nations that have just been listed in Chapter 10. They are all the families of the earth. That is the phrase that he

used to signalize all of them. So he said, what I am doing here for you is not a chauvinistic sort of special deal, which I am making pets, but I am doing something for you so that by means of you all the nations of the face of the earth might be blessed. And so it is missions, too, as well.

So I take it here that these are the words that sort of summarize God's great plan. As a matter of fact, if I had to choose a verse, give me a verse for the promised plan, it would be Genesis 12:3, in your seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. I think that's Gospel, I think that's the organizing plan of the Bible. Albrechtsen writes in his book on the whole idea of revelation in history, he said, if I could accept Genesis 12:3 as being passive in form, I would see this as the whole plan of God. Well, it does happen to be passive in form. That's how Greek renders it, be blessed. Not as the RSV or some others render it, bless themselves. It is not as if the nations look around and say, not a bad deal, I think we'll bless ourselves. And so they bless themselves. That would be a reflexive concept, and there is a way to say that in Hebrew. But this is the niph'al form, and therefore passive is the very best, and I think the only way you can translate it.

And so, therefore, that phrase epitomizes for me the whole plan of God. He would bring a nation, and through the nation, he would bring one out of that nation who would be the means by which belief in him by all the nations would result in their salvation, the great blessing to all of mankind. So there is the central theme, it seems to me.

Now, in the Old Testament itself, there are just ordinary words that sort of encapsulate the pivotal promise of God. For example, the word to speak, or to say, could just as well be rendered 30 some times, and it is already in our Old Testament as the promise. But it is basically the verb to speak or to say.

There is actually a constellation of words in the Old Testament that we can refer to the promise as God's oath, as His Word. We can refer to the promise as the rest, the inheritance that God has given. We can refer to that promise as the kingdom that God has given to David, the throne, the dynasty, the house, in which it is there.

In other words, the promise of God is not just a kind of prediction in the Old Testament for which we look for New Testament fulfillment, as if it's promised fulfillment. It is a plan. It is

basically a plan, by which God was going to send the Messiah, and through the Messiah was going to bless all the nations upon the earth. But that's bare bones on the plan. The plan grows. It talks about missions as part of that plan. It talks about a concept of inheriting the land. It talks about the concept of fearing God, so that we might know how to conduct life as good fathers, fear of God to know how to be wise, to go to school, fear of God in order to know how to use leisure time, Book of Ecclesiastes, eat and drink and enjoy your paycheck, for this is the gift of God. Part of the whole promised plan of God includes mundane things like marriage relationship, and marital love, in the book of Song of Psalms and Song of Solomon, that's part of the plan of God. So it's much more embracive than what we had just seen as being sort of Christological, or being the doctrine of salvation, and how we could come to know the Savior.

But moving over into the New Testament, it is true the New Testament reflects on the Old Testament and uses the word "promise". That's where the word emerges for the first time. So, in a sense, I have waited until I have read the New Testament where I got my first idea of what the call is. But that's where it comes from. It comes from the New Testament itself. Fifty one times the noun occurs and the verb appears 11 times. But it appears, the word promise then, appears in every book except Matthew, Mark, John, James, Jude and Revelation – six books only that you do not have a reference to promise in the New Testament. Matthew, Mark and John, three of the Gospels, two synoptic, and the Johannine Gospel, Matthew, Mark and John, and then James, Jude and Revelation. Only six books that do not have a reference to the promise.

And the promise in these references can denote either the words, the form, that is the content of the words, or they can refer to the things themselves promised. So the promise may refer to the substance that is pointed to, or to just the verbal assurance before the substance comes.

Hebrews will make that distinction, that some of those received only the promises, but they had not yet received the substance, the reality, so that they, without us, they should not be made perfect. We who receive the substance, sort of where the perfection of what they got just in words. That's the writer of Hebrew making the word distinction I'm making here.

So since God's one promise plan has, as it were one plan, it also is used in the plural some 11 times because it refers to many specifications. There is an awful lot that goes into this promise plan. And what we can see in a promise plan? Well, it just gets too large to go down through all of them, but indeed, there is just a large sort of series of things that are promised. For example, the Resurrection of Jesus is part of the promise in Acts 13:23. From the offspring, from the seed of this man, according to the promise, God has brought to Israel a savior, Jesus, whom He raised from the dead. The whole theme there of the Resurrection. Or, going on in Acts 13:32, this is Paul's speech in Antioch of Pisidia, there he says, "And we preached [to] you the good news [of] the promise made to the fathers, that God has fulfilled this promise to our children in that He raised [up] Jesus" (from the dead). Again, the Resurrection is that promise.

But there is something else, too. The promise includes faith, and, for example, Romans 4:13 and 14, and 16 and 17, for the promise to Abraham and to his seed, that he would be heir of the world was, and then he goes on with his discussion, that he speaks for this reason, it is by faith that it might be in accordance with grace, in order that the promise may be certain to all the descendants, to all the seed. So again, the theme of the faith being the substance of it there, particularly.

And I take it that there is more to it, there is the seed Himself, that is, Jesus Christ is the center of this promise in order that Galatians 3:14 might be fulfilled, which says that the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles, so that we might receive the promise of the spirit and the promise, too, of Jesus Christ. There we can see the promise involves the Holy Spirit who is coming; it also involves the coming of Jesus Christ. Galatians 3, the rest of that chapter, verses 14 through 29, there are six references there to that particular theme.

There is also to be found hereto, as well, the theme of rest. In Hebrews 3:8, where indeed it speaks of 3:8 and 4:1, "therefore, let us fear (lest) [if], while a promise remains of entering his rest..." The inheritance that is spoken of in the Old Testament was both spiritual and physical; there was a land of Canaan that is the inheritance. There is an inheritance, too, which we enter by faith, which they didn't. Some of them got into the land, [the] physical inheritance, but didn't get into the spiritual inheritance – rest, as part of the promise of God.

And so it goes on and on, but you can see that the theme is very, very large. We can speak of it in just numerous kinds of cases. So I'm beginning to develop here a whole theme of 20 percent is about the promise to the nation Israel in the New Testament. About six percent is the promise of Christ's second coming. About sixteen percent is the promise of the resurrection from the dead. Eleven percent is the promise of Jesus as Messiah. Twenty percent is the promise of redemption from sin. Sixteen percent is the promise of the Gospel for the Gentiles, and another five percent is that the promise referred to the Gentiles, as such. Well, so it goes on. We can begin taking these 51 passages from the New Testament, and begin seeing some of the themes here that are marked out for us.

Well, the New Testament then, I think, uses this as their great way of emphasizing all that was found in the biblical text. I first got onto this through reading Willis J. Beecher's book, Willis J. Beecher's, "The Prophets and the Promise", the Stone Lectures for Princeton Seminary, 1904, I believe it was. And there he traced this out very beautifully. He there argued that it is a single promise. Paul said to Agrippa, in Acts 26:6-7, "now I stand to be judged for the hope of the promise." That's what this whole trial is about. I'm on trial for the hope of the promise made of God to our fathers, where unto our 12 tribe nation hopes to attain. So we hope to come to receive all that was spoken back there to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. That's what this trial is about.

So he put it as the substance of all that he was standing for. And yet it is not only a single promise the promise also is multiple, and so in Hebrews 11:39 he speaks there of having received the promises, because there are so many specifications to that one promise. And yet it is eternally operative and irrevocable. In Hebrews 6:13, for when God made the promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, he swore by himself, and then goes on to say in Hebrews 6:17 and 18, wherein God being minded to show more abundantly onto the heirs of the promise, the immutability of His counsel interposed with an oath that by two immutable things in which it's impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement. And so, Galatians 3:15 through 18, now to Abraham, where are the promises spoken and to his seed? The law does not disannul as to make the promise of none effect, but God granted the inheritance to Abraham by promise.

Well, the theme then, it seems to me, is very, very clear. What then are the four great unique points in the promise, peak points, as it were? I'd like to suggest that there are four great moments in

the promise, that sort of make these into four mountain peaks of understanding the whole Old Testament. Genesis 3:15 has got to be one of the great moments in the Old Testament, where there in the midst of a series of curses, judgment upon the woman, upon Eve, upon Adam, and upon the serpent, upon the ground and the soil, yet suddenly there breaks out sunshine, a ray of sunshine in the midst of all the clouds. And it's Genesis 3:15 where God suddenly interposes, "I, God, will put enmity". So God is going to put enmity, and we will see that it is between the serpent and between the woman, between the serpent's seed and her seed, but then surprise, surprise. The surprise is the woman will have a male descendant and that male descendant will crush the head of [the] serpent. And there is promise from the very beginning in the two sides of victory. A victory. And the victory is to be seen here in a male descendant.

I think that (that was pre Christian) was understood that way. As a matter of fact, even in the Greek translation of that, they broke the rules of agreement, thereby showing in the 3rd century BC., three centuries before Christ, that they understood this to be a male descendant who would indeed give a lethal blow to the head. A nip on the heel can be healed, but on the other hand, crushing a head is somewhat difficult to put back together again. And that's what's promised there.

The second great moment is Genesis 12:2 and 3; but there we have a great statement as well. It comes to the head in the finest statement of the Gospel, the finest statement of missions, the finest statement of the whole purpose plan of God, in your seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. It's the finest statement anywhere, and Paul enthuses when he hears it in Galatians 3:8. He said did you hear that? He said the Gospel, the good news, was pre announced. Abraham was pre evangelized. He uses the prefix "before," and then euaggelizomi, the word to evangelize. He was pre evangelized when he received this word, the Gospel, saying in your seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed. So it's in effect, it's as if God is handing out a basic law here and says to Abraham, God loves you and offers a wonderful plan for your life. So that was in Genesis 12:2 3.

But there is a third great moment, and that's in II Samuel 7, God's promise to David has got to be the other great moment. And

especially, in II Samuel 7:16-19, where God says, I will give to you a throne, a kingdom, and a dynasty. And he said, it will never, never collapse.

A lot of kings stay up late at night trying to think what's going to happen to their kingdom. Neb did. Nebuchadnezzar couldn't get to sleep. He had bad dreams and it just bothered him but God said, I'm going to give it to you, David. And David, when he heard this, and also, he said, David, about building that house, and you remember Nate said, yeah, I think it's a good idea. Well, I've talked to Nate about that, and thus saith the Lord. You shall not build the house. You understand? There is too much blood on your hands. But rather, I'll make a house out of you. How about that? Instead of you building a house for me, I'll make a dynasty, a house of David, out of you. And it will be forever, and your kid, he'll be mine. I'll adopt your son as my son, and I'll be daddy to him. I'll be father to him. And then goes on to quote in such a way that David understands that he is using the John 3:16 passages from Genesis, and Exodus, and Leviticus and Numbers. He is quoting the great promise statements there, of Genesis 3:15 and Genesis Chapter 12, and Genesis 18, and Genesis 22. And this blows his mind. David goes in and sits down before the Lord and he says I can't believe the whole thing. I can't believe it. Lord, who am I, and what is my family that you've done this for me? And if this were too small a thing, he was spoken for generations to come. And that this should be the wall for all of mankind. He can't believe it. By the way, neither can the translators. None of them get it right, none, none, there is not one. But it just simply says there in the text that he says, *vazot*, that this, the phrase here, this, and this, should be the Torah, or in the construct, *torat*, this should be the Torah *ha adam*, *ha adam*. And *adam* is Adam, or man, or mankind. So what he is saying there is that this should be the charter, this should be the law governing all of mankind.

And then, of course, there comes the last passage, and that would be Jeremiah 31, the great new covenant passage, Jeremiah 31:31-34. And that's the other great passage that is there.

So these are the four peak moments, Genesis 3:15, Genesis 12, II Samuel 7, and Jeremiah 31. Get to those great moments and you're at heartland. You're in the center of the great plan of God.