

The Goal of Human Life

I would like to begin class today by reading some stanzas of a hymn by John Dryden. It is actually an English versification of an ancient Latin hymn, “Come, Creator Spirit.” In Latin, that would be *And there is one reference to the seven-fold energy of the Holy Spirit here, an allusion to Isaiah 11:12 where the seven-fold powers of the Holy Spirit are set forth. Let us make this our prayer today.*

Creator Spirit by whose aid the world’s foundations first were laid, come visit every humble mind, come pour Thy joys on humankind. From sin and sorrow set us free and make Thy temples worthy Thee. Plenteous of grace, come from on high, rich in Thy seven-fold energy, make us eternal truth receive and practice all that we believe. Give us Thyself that we may see the Father and the Son by Thee. In the name of Jesus, Amen.

Let me begin with a summary of where we were right at the end of the last session. Christian ethics is the study of the way of life that conforms to the will of God as revealed in Christ and the holy Scriptures. I was making the point from Romans 12:2 that we refer everything to the will of God. That defines for us the good. We may reasonably define Christian ethics as the study of the way of life that conforms to the will of God as revealed in Christ and the holy Scriptures. Of course, our sure knowledge of Christ comes from the Scriptures themselves, but I still think it is necessary for us to highlight Christ as the embodiment of what human nature and morality are supposed to be. Later we will explore the example of Christ as the pattern of obedience for us. Christian ethics, then, is the study of the way of life that conforms to the will of God as revealed in Christ and the holy Scriptures. Of course, we need the illumination of the Holy Spirit in order to perform that study as well, to give us both knowledge and insight. So I add the clause “as illuminated by the Holy Spirit” to remind us of our dependency, especially in light of our sinful condition. We need the Spirit who indwells us to illumine our hearts and minds, to renew us after the image of Christ, and to enable us to apprehend those things that are for our benefit.

Tucked away on page 131 in H. Richard Niebuhr’s classic treatise, *Christ and Culture*, a book that has been continuously in print since 1951, Niebuhr writes, “The Christian, and any man, must answer the question about what he ought to do by answering a previous question. What is my purpose, my end?” I agree with that, and more importantly, so do the Westminster Divines, the authors of the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*. So our topic for this session is to begin to explore the goal of human life. Now, I mean, of course, the goal of human life from a Christian world and life view. So we are talking about human life as it was created to be and will be through the redemptive work of Christ. Alternatively, you can call this the goal of the Christian life, which I have done in my book. But I have come to prefer this in order to make the point that when we are articulating the Christian life, we are articulating the pattern of life that has been shown to us by the One who claims to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life. So this is a universal ethic in that it is offered to all. It is the way to live.

The first question and answer in the Shorter Catechism is famous. You will find it in *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* along with Shakespeare and all those other Englishmen. The question is “What is the chief end of man?” And the answer comes back: “Man’s chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever.” Now, hearing this as a sophomore in college, it rang true to me and it also helped me put things in perspective. It was the beginning of the development of a broader world and life view. Looking at things in terms of the glory of God and the goal of human life, to enjoy Him forever, gave me a helpful perspective. It got me interested in the Reformed faith, but it was not until I began to teach ethics that I began to ask myself, “Why does the catechism begin with that question?” The Heidelberg

Catechism does not begin that way, rather it begins, “What is your only comfort in life and in death?” and the wonderful answer is, “That I belong not to myself but to my faithful Savior,” and it goes on to expound the evangelical theology coming from the Reformation that makes that case. It is a wonderfully warm, personal, and devotional catechism.

The Shorter Catechism is more technical, more definitional, and it begins with this question of “the chief end.” We are so struck by the answer that we do not often pause to think, “Why does it begin that way? What does it mean when it says ‘chief end’?” Well, the Greek word for “end” is *telos*. It is also the word for “goal.” And what the catechism is doing is aligning itself with the classical teleological tradition in ethics. “Teleological” is derived from the Greek word *telos*. It is a goal-oriented ethic, and it sees the other parts of ethics as subordinate to the question of our chief end, or, as the larger catechism puts it, “the chief and highest end.”

The second question is “What rule has God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him?” and the answer comes back, “The Word of God, which is revealed in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only rule to direct us how to glorify and enjoy Him.” So the rule, the norm, the standard, is there, but it is subordinate to the goal. What the catechism presupposes in beginning with this goal is that there is some supreme purpose for human beings, some ultimate goal or *telos* that fulfills human nature—that there is some absolute value that gives meaning to the whole of life, that there is some supreme good that is intrinsically worthy and totally satisfying, some highest good, some supreme good, some greatest good that we ought to seek. So the catechism begins the way it does because it understands that we are purposeful beings. We are teleological animals, if we can put it that way. As moral agents, we choose our end. This end does not happen automatically. We, as moral agents created in the image of God, must choose this end. The catechism wants to know what we should aim at in life as a whole. Then the specific questions are subordinate to that. It wants to know what we should aim at in life as a whole, because that will determine our notions of what kind of persons we ought to be and what kind of standards we ought to practice. It is the goal that determines the person and standards, and it is the goal that sustains our commitment when the going gets tough.

Now, in the history of Western philosophy, this is the question of the *summum bonum*, as it came to be called, the highest good, the greatest good, or the supreme good. It represents what the Greeks simply called the best. What is the best thing to aim at in life, meaning what is that which satisfies and fulfills human nature? Although we associate this question of the highest good, the *summum bonum*, with the Western philosophical tradition, actually, the question is older than the Greeks. As you would expect, this is a human question. What is the goal of life? What is intrinsically worthy of human pursuit? What is it that will fulfill a human being and totally satisfy?

Here is a piece that was written in Akkadian. A number of Akkadian documents were discovered. This was written in around 1800 BC. This is from *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*, edited by James Pritchard. It is really worth having to show parallels with biblical materials. In this book the piece is called “A pessimistic dialogue between master and servant,” but I have also heard it called, “The Obliging Servant.” I kind of like that title better. Listen to what it says:

Servant, obey me.

Yes, my lord, yes.

Bring me at once the chariot. Hitch it up. I will ride to the palace.

Ride, my lord, ride. All your wishes will be realized for you. The king will be gracious to you.

No, servant, I shall not ride to the palace.

Do not ride, my lord, do not ride. He will send you to a far place, you will be captured, and night and day you will see trouble.
Servant, obey me.
Yes, my lord.
Bring me at once water for my hands and give it to me. I wish to dine.
Dine, my lord, dine. To dine regularly is the gladdening of the heart.
No, servant, I shall not dine.
Do not dine, my lord, do not dine. To be hungry and eat, to be thirsty and drink, comes upon every man. That is much too common for any significance.
Servant, obey me.
Yes, my lord, yes.
A woman will I love.
Yes, love, my lord, love. The man who loves a woman forgets pain and trouble.
No, servant, the woman I shall not love.
Do not love, my lord, do not love. Woman is an iron dagger, a sharp one, cuts a man's neck.
Servant, obey me.
Yes, my lord, yes.
I shall give food to our country.
Give it, my lord, give it. The man who gives food to his country, his barley remains his own, but his receipts from interest become immense.
No, servant, food to my country I shall not give.
Do not give, my lord, do not give. Giving is like loving. They will curse you. They will eat your barley and destroy you.
Servant, obey me.
Yes, my lord, yes.
I will do something helpful for my country.
Do it, my lord, do it. The man who does something helpful for his country, his helpful deed is placed in the bowl of Marduk.
No, servant, I will not do something helpful for my country.
Do it not, my lord, do it not. Climb the mounds of ancient ruins and look about. Look at the skulls of late and early men. Who among them is an evildoer? Who a public benefactor?
Servant, obey me.
Yes, my lord, yes.
Now, what is good? To break my neck, your neck and throw both in the river, that is good.

Well, you notice the servant does not say, "Do it, my lord, do it." He begins to be a little philosophical:

Who is tall enough to ascend to heaven? Who is broad enough to embrace the earth? We really do not know enough about things to take that drastic action.
No, servant, I shall kill you and send you ahead of me.
Would my lord wish to live even three days without me?

Now that was 1800 BC. That is just the time that God speaks to Abraham. "Fear not, Abraham, I am your shield and your exceeding great reward." In this dialogue the servant and master explore the whole of life, and they cannot find meaning in anything. There is an upside; there is a downside. Nothing finally satisfies in this life: not food, love, or even benevolence. It comes to nothing in the end, so why not suicide? That is the only serious philosophical question. Approaching everything without a transcendent orientation does not provide much hope. That is the human condition. We are going to die. But God says to Abraham, "Fear not, Abraham, I am your shield and your exceeding great reward." It

comes at the same time as the dialogue. God makes promises to Abraham, and Abraham believes them. Abraham looked for the city with foundations, whose builder and maker is God. God promised to be Abraham's reward, and Abraham believed in the Lord and it was reckoned to him for righteousness. That is Genesis 15, where the Lord comes to Abraham and says that. And that is the great annunciation of the Gospel. Paul says in Galatians that those words to Abraham were the Gospel. They promise eternal life, and Abraham knew that. They promise eternal life through the seed which was to come to provide us with His righteousness, in order that we might be accepted before God.

The narrative goes on with Abraham. We need to look at Genesis chapter 18 to pick up something that is particularly relevant to our question of ethics. In Genesis 18:17 God says, "Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do?" God is about to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah. "Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do, seeing that Abraham shall become a great and mighty nation and all the nations of the earth shall bless themselves by him? No, for I have chosen him that he may charge his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord by doing righteousness and justice," so that the Lord may bring to Abraham what He has promised him. It is in two parts. You get God's sovereignty in making this covenant with Abraham, which is certain to be fulfilled. Abraham believed the Lord; it was counted to him for righteousness. The Lord also elicits Abraham's responsible activity in teaching his children the way of the Lord in righteousness and justice, in order that all this may come about. It is a wonderful testimony about the goal of life and, subordinate to that goal, our walking in God's ways.

So for the biblical orientation, I think that we need to orient ourselves toward that view of teleological ethics. Now, there is a slight problem in terminology here that I will try to sort out. In recent discussions of ethics, there has been a tendency to dichotomize ethics into teleological ethics and deontological ethics. And these are said to be the two competing types of ethics. Deontological ethics is derived from the Greek word *deon*, which means duty. So either you have a goal-oriented ethic or you have a duty-oriented ethic. This is the classic debate between utilitarianism, which makes what is right dependent on consequences, or good—the greatest good for the greatest number—and Kantian ethics, Kantian formalism, which makes acts of right depend on certain formal characteristics that are intrinsic to the act itself. When some Christians hear that there is a dichotomy between teleological ethics and deontological ethics they tend automatically to opt for deontological ethics because they want to avoid any form of consequentialism, utilitarian ethics, or really, situation ethics. That is what situation ethics was; it was a supposedly Christian form of utilitarianism. And so many evangelical writers on ethics have agreed there is a dichotomy here and have opted for deontological ethics. Now, that is a mistake in terms of the classic view of teleological ethics, in which principles of intrinsic right and wrong were incorporated into the idea of the goal. You do not reach the goal just as a reward for acts that you do. The way to the reward, or the way to the goal, is a part of the process of development. I think that it is possible to go back to the classic view of teleological ethics and learn a lot from that. We need to get away from this polarization between goal and duty, as though we have to opt for a duty-oriented ethic. It makes much more biblical sense to view the standards, the norms that God has given, in this way. They are intrinsically right, but they are subordinate to the goal of human life which is expressed in the catechism: to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. I think we need to recover the authentic classical form of teleological ethics and not be dismissive because of this modern dichotomy that has developed. It is superficial in terms of the reality of what is going on. A biblical teleological ethic incorporates intrinsic principles of right and wrong, but it is still a goal-oriented ethic, and I find it very liberating when we look at that broader perspective. Then we see how the commandments really fit with God's purposes and design for human nature. We will learn more about that later on.

One reason I am zealous to recover the teleological tradition in ethics is because it can be traced to St. Augustine, particularly his celebrated saying from the opening chapter of the *Confessions*: "You have

made us for yourself, and our heart is restless until it comes to rest in you.” Augustine agrees with the analysis of human conduct in that the desire for happiness is a human given. But the highest good is not happiness itself. It is knowing and loving God. The problem with the Greeks is not that they did not ask the right question, “What will fulfill human nature and truly satisfy?” Rather they looked for it in all the wrong places. The good life, according to Augustine, consists in knowing and loving God.

Let me say a word about the term happiness. The English word “happiness” does not quite represent the Greek word that lies behind that, which is *eudemonia*. In Aristotle’s view, *eudemonia* was a combination of fulfillment and satisfaction that resulted from moral and intellectual excellence. So it is not just pleasure. *Eudemonia* is not the same as *hedone*, the other Greek word that is familiar to us, as in hedonism, or the pursuit of pleasure. Aristotle’s view is much more subtle than that. Contemporary ethicists tend to translate “happiness” rather as “flourishing” in order to get away from the poverty of the English word “happiness,” which leads to subjectivist interpretation. This is as intended by Aristotle, and, as a matter of fact, as intended by the phrase in the Declaration of Independence that our Creator has endowed us with “certain inalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” That sounds like an odd third companion to life and liberty, but what they mean is that which will truly fulfill human nature as an objective condition, rather than mere satisfaction. Augustine picks up on that theme. He finds fault with the Greeks for not looking to a transcendent ground for their happiness. Pagan philosophers erred not in seeking happiness, because God made us with this itch. Our heart is restless because of the human condition. God has made us with this itch for Him. The problem with the pagan philosophers was in trying to find happiness in themselves and in this life only, and the Christian message comes into that vacuum with the right answer. We do not have to deny that people looking for happiness are asking the right question. They in some way or other are trying to find the goal of human life. We have got good news. There is a way to the goal. We know what the goal is. It is finding our satisfaction and fulfillment in God’s plan for our lives, and that is possible through the work of Christ.

There are various ways in which the Scriptures present to us the goal of human life, that which will truly fulfill human nature and totally satisfy us. There is both an objective and a subjective aspect to it. It fulfills human nature, and what fulfills human nature is satisfying to us, so it is fulfillment with satisfaction that the biblical idea of the goal of human life resounds. The first way the Scriptures put the goal of human life and the most prominent way, one that is pervasive through the Scriptures, is that it is the glory of God. This theme is so prominent: “The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament show its handiwork,” and so do the Scriptures. Practically every page is dealing with the glory of God as the goal of human life. God’s plan according to Ephesians chapter 1 is to redeem a people for His glory. Or take the verse that I proposed as a text for this course, Philippians 1:9-11. Consider what Paul says in that prayer, “I pray that your love may abound.” He begins with love. Remember the context. Paul has talked about his love for the Philippians and his joy when he remembers them because of their fellowship in the Gospel. This is a love that is produced by God’s love. And he goes on about that, saying, “I have you in my heart. You are always in my prayers. I long for you with the affection that is in Christ Jesus. And I pray that your love”—he is talking about our love for one another in response to the love that God has given us. He touches the affections first. It is characteristic of Paul when he comes to ethics to begin from the inside out. “I pray that your love,” which is in response to the Gospel, “may abound.” And not just in any old way that you might think appropriate, but “I pray that your love may abound in knowledge and insight.”

Now, that double expression is important. Knowledge points us to objective standards that God has revealed. The second word, insight, is the grasp of those principles, those standards, those norms, existentially in our situation as they apply to the sometimes complex situations of life. The only way we

will grow in knowledge and insight is if we have an affinity for the content and application of Scriptures. Paul wants us to have the proper disposition. You cannot have biblical knowledge and sound ethical insight without something happening internally that enables you to perceive those. "...knowledge and insight in order that you may discern the things that really matter." Here is a rather difficult word. The King James version says, "the things that are excellent." It is "the things that are best" or "what is best" according to the NIV. It is one word in Greek, and it is only used in one other place, which is Romans 2 where it says to those who have the specially revealed law of God, "understand the things that really matter." So I think that it is hard to capture it in a single word, but I think it has to do with moral excellence. It is that sensitivity—that discerning application of Scripture—that flows from love that will enable us to live morally excellent lives. It will enable us to live not morally mediocre lives, but morally excellent lives.

What is the purpose of this? Well, the purpose is that we may be filled with the fruit of righteousness that comes through Jesus Christ. This is the fruit of our justification by faith. The only righteousness we have is the righteousness of Christ. Paul goes on to say later that his longing is to be clothed with the righteousness of Christ. Well, the righteousness of Christ produces fruit. Faith works itself out through love. So the faith by which we are joined to Christ and His righteousness is productive of fruit. And the goal of that fruit is that we may be to the praise and glory of God. And you see what Paul is doing here. He is giving us a mini-course in Christian ethics. Beginning with a disposition, you work through the principles of Scripture, the norms that are oriented toward moral excellence. The goal of the disposition and discernment that come from knowing and applying the Word of God is the fruit of righteousness, the goal of which is the praise and glory of God. That is the ultimate goal, that we reflect something of what God is. The goal is my being conformed to His moral excellence by bearing the fruit of righteousness. We image God. That is the goal: the glory and praise of God.

There are a great many other texts that can be recited in this respect. One that we tend to neglect is 2 Peter 1:3-4. Let us look at that. In 2 Peter 1:3-4 Peter writes that God's "divine power has given us everything we need for life and godliness, through our knowledge of him who called us by his own glory and goodness." There is a lot to unpack in that verse. But it is God's glory and goodness that places us where we are, with this power for everything we need for life and godliness, the all-sufficiency of God's grace for our lives and to fulfill His calling. Verse 4 continues, "Through these he has given us his very great and precious promises so that through him you may participate in the divine nature and escape the corruption in the world caused by evil desires, that you may participate in the divine nature, that you may have communion in the divine nature." Now, that goal of our redemption is a pretty awesome goal. The goal of our ethics is that we may participate in the divine nature, that we may share in the divine nature. The Eastern Churches made more of this than the Western Church. And I think that they have a point. They call this *theosis*. It is sometimes translated as "the divinization of human nature," and that sounds bad. But it is like what Mark Twain once said of Wagner's music: "It is better than it sounds." And the so-called deification of human nature is better than it sounds. It goes back to a phrase in Athanasius. Athanasius wrote a wonderful treatise on the incarnation toward the end of which he says, "God became human in order that we might become divine." Well, a lot has been made of that. That is the key text in the Eastern Church. Athanasius was writing in Greek, and he is respected both in the East and West. But the Eastern Church makes a lot of that and of the doctrine of *theosis* that comes from that. But it comes toward the end of the treatise, and it is not developed as a doctrine really in Athanasius. What is developed is our renewal in the image of God. The main thrust that Athanasius is concerned about is that Christ became incarnate in order to provide the sacrifice and the means by which we might be renewed in God's image. And so when he says, "God became man that we might become divine," he means that we might be restored to the image of God, that we might be renewed in

knowledge, holiness, and righteousness, and that we might glorify God. So I think that there is a way to appropriate what the Eastern Church has elaborated in this area and to make more of that text in 2 Peter.

There is an analysis of that text in John Sanderson's book *The Fruit of the Spirit*. Among Reformed writers on the glory of God, it is amazing in a way that there is not much written on this subject. We simply use it as a principle, but you do not find us often giving an exposition of it. The best exposition that I know of is that of Jonathan Edwards' dissertation, published after his death, on the reason God created the world. He addresses the question why did God create the world? What moved God, who is all-sufficient in Himself, to which nothing can be added, to create the world? And Edwards' idea was that it was an internal disposition of God to share His effulgence with the creature so that the creature would reflect back into God His glory. So our renewal in the image of God reflects back something of God's own nature. And this is a very useful thought, because it incorporates our interest into God's interest. According to Edwards, we do not have to choose between a theocentric and an anthropocentric view. God makes our fulfillment His concern in this way. In creating human beings in His image, God has decided to make the creature a reflection of His infinite knowledge. So as rational beings who are capable of receiving His Word, we are able to reflect the knowledge of God. Of course, because it is infinite, God's knowledge is beyond us, but still our knowledge is a reflection of God's infinite knowledge.

Also, in terms of our moral agent, we are created to reflect God's infinite holiness so that our renewal in the image of God, in knowledge and holiness, is this refulgence of God's glory back to Himself. And what is unusual to us is that Edwards includes God's infinite happiness. One of Edwards' sermons, which comes at the end of his exposition of 1 Corinthians 13, which is entitled *Fruits*, is called "Heaven is a World of Love." That does not sound like Edwards to most of us, because often when we think of him we think of his sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." But Edwards preached much more on the Gospel than he did the warning theme. The warning theme is there; it is necessary. But Edwards elaborated on the Gospel, and he understood that God is a joyful God. There is that verse in Zephaniah that says "He will rejoice over you with singing." God sings over His redeemed people, and His goal is to share the divine happiness, the divine joy. What is the fruit of the Spirit? "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy. . ." It is a very wonderful thing. We need to make more of it.

So the glory of God is our goal, and I think that this three-fold pattern is helpful. John Piper has taken part of the catechism answer and run with this. He says the catechism should really read "The chief end of man is to glorify God *by* enjoying him forever." And so he develops what he calls a Christian hedonism. I think it is a partial truth. It has been very powerful in people's lives because it is a neglected part of the truth. God has made us to glorify Him by enjoying Him. That is a part of what it means. A significant part of what it means to glorify God is to enjoy the things of this creation as His gifts. God has given us richly all things to enjoy. You do not get a hint of Christian asceticism in those kinds of statements. God wants us to be happy and joyful in Him, but I think it is a partial truth. I think we need the whole truth, which is that we glorify God by being conformed to His knowledge and His holiness, as well as His happiness. It is reductionistic to say we are created to glorify God by enjoying forever without these other parts. Take what is good from Piper. That is a very important thing, because it is a very liberating thing. Lots of Christians are dragged down in a kind of heaviness that is unbiblical, and the understanding that God has created us for happiness, really to share in His happiness and to reflect His happiness, is an important thing, although it is not the only thing.

Some years ago I heard Mitch Glazer of Jews for Jesus speak on Reformed missions to the Jews. And it was a Scottish church that had the first mission directly for evangelism of the Jews. He was explaining to us our history. Well, at one point he invited some of us to go down with him to Washington

University, which has a heavy Jewish concentration of students, to hand out broadsides. Well, I had not handed out tracts since I was in high school. I never liked it. But I decided to go down, so we put on Yeshua t-shirts, went down, and handed those out. Well, it led to some interesting exchanges. But in our debriefing at the end, Mitch told us about one exchange he had. One student handed the tract back and said, "I do not need this; I am a hedonist." And Mitch immediately said, "I have good news for you. I have been looking for a hedonist, because my God says, 'At my right hand, there are pleasures forevermore.'" He turned that question on its head. What is true happiness? What is true joy? I think that there is a point to that. Augustine was after this attempt to reorient ourselves so that we understand it in terms of reflecting God's happiness.

You might ask if the word *theosis* could be interpreted as progressive sanctification. As I understand it, yes it can. As I understand the context in Athanasius, he is talking about progressive sanctification, of which *theosis* is the goal. In other words, we progress toward that from one degree of glory to another. So he is talking about our renewal in the image of Christ, which comes to its fruition in the life to come. It is a good observation, that *theosis* is progressive sanctification. I think that it has to do with union with Christ and the working out of the implications of His union with us, Him in our lives. So that is exactly what it is.

You might wonder, with this dichotomy between deontological ethics and teleological ethics, if I am saying it is really both. And that is what I am saying. Teleological ethics, when the dichotomy is set up, is really talking about consequentialism. That is, what is right is determined by consequences for good, so the right thing to do is what will lead to the best consequences. Well, all sorts of things follow from that view. If good consequences can come from fetal experimentation, then you can conduct any kind of fetal experimentation, because the greatest good for the greatest number is to sacrifice some embryos in order that people may live longer or better. That is the new designation of teleological ethics, and we would raise a question with that of whether there are some intrinsic limits to what we may do in order to produce good consequences. And as a matter of justice, it is not permissible to sacrifice a human life for the sake of others. That is what I regard fetal experimentation as doing, sacrificing human life for others. There is, however, this older and more classical understanding of teleology which incorporates absolute principles of right and wrong within it. So I am saying we cut ourselves off from an important and really crucial strand of biblical truth when we buy into that dichotomy and say Christian ethics is not teleological, it is deontological. It is both. Explained on Christians' assumptions in the right way, we need both of those aspects. And I would say we need to subordinate the principles of right and wrong to the goal. In other words, God has given us His law in order to provide the direction in which we are renewed in the image of Christ for His glory. So the law serves the goal. And I think it is very helpful to understand that. Otherwise, we get focused on duty as an end in itself, and you can live that way, but it is not the most freeing way to live.