

Introduction

Alright, everyone, as promised, we will be doing a little staff training with the hope of equipping you as a staff member in the youth ministry, but also as a Christian. And secondly, we will be doing these topical trainings in tandem with our topical teachings that will be taking place roughly every other month.

We wanted to not only inform you about the topics that we'll be covering, but also to prepare you for any conversations that you may have with students in small groups or otherwise.

Today's topical teaching, which I've been alluding to for the past month and a half, is secular expressive individualism. It's a mouthful of a phrase and I'll unpack it over the course of this training. But to start our time, I want to ask you all a question.

In your mind, what do you believe is one of the greatest threats as citizens of the modern era? What do you believe is one of the greatest threats to human flourishing? Or maybe more relevantly, what do you believe is one of the greatest threats to the church and specifically our youth group? In your handouts, I want you to write down what first comes to mind. Don't worry, I won't ask you to share it with anyone.

For some of us, maybe it's the threat of the soft totalitarian ideology of the left and the right, or maybe it's the heightened polarization of American politics, or the increasing censorship of religious freedom, or the rise in conspiracy theories and extremism, or abortion rights or identity politics, or the lionization or the vilification of public health guidelines. Or the abuses of technology.

And for others of us, maybe on a much smaller, less political, scale, what threatens everyday life is simply burn out. It's this overwhelming pressure to perform. Or the temptation to compete and outdo others. Maybe what disrupts everyday life is anxiety and depression. Or the nagging sense that we aren't measuring up to our true potential.

Or maybe it's the subliminal message that we find in Disney's *Frozen*. I'm not going to sing it, but it's probably going to get stuck in our heads for another two decades. I'm going to read a section of a very familiar song.

It's time to see what I can do

*To test the limits and break through
No right, no wrong, no rules for me
I'm free*

*Let it go, let it go
When I'll rise like the break of dawn
Let it go, let it go
That perfect girl is gone
Here I stand in the light of day
Let the storm rage on
The cold never bothered me anyway*

I mean, if you don't know this song by now, shame on you. I'm just kidding. But is the subliminal message of *Let It Go* the cause of secularism? Now, what if all of these things aren't actually the cause of secularism, but actually varying manifestations and symptoms of secularism?

What if the phenomena that we are experiencing today isn't just mere coincidences of social unrest here and there or the occasional cultural anxiety? What if the phenomena that we are seeing today has a common, underlying thread that connects all the phenomena together?

What many smarter people have suggested before me is that the current social unrest, cultural anxiety, and even daily pressures that we experience right now as citizens, Christians, and creatures of dust are caused by a fundamental way in which people see themselves *in relation* to God and others.

What many smarter people have suggested ahead of me is that secularism isn't caused by the current hot-button issues of our time. What they suggest is that the current hot-button issues of our time are merely symptoms of secularism. If we liken secularism to a tree, much like Paul Tripp's tree, what is happening in our culture today isn't the root of secularism, but really just the fruit of it. I'm inclined to agree with them.

Because when we peel back the many layers of secularism, the root of secularism is a radical redefinition and reconfiguration of the self as an autonomous individual disconnected from God and from others. When people start believing that they are their own, that they belong to no one other than themselves, that they owe it to no one, but

themselves, with no obligation to God or neighbor, it's not hard to see why modern society is where it is today.

If a 6th grader at the start of the school year was told every day that it was up to them to choose their own destiny, to pursue their own truth, to make a name for themselves, to live for no one except themselves, that there was no right or wrong, that they are free, what sort of theology and worldview would the 6th grader have by the end of the school year?

And so today, I want to peel back the layers of the 'self' and help us think a bit more theologically about it. I want to give a theological account of the 'self', so that we have a grammar to speak theologically about it, to help our youth students identify the secularism in their own hearts, and to also identify it in ourselves as well.

So as a way to guide our teaching, I want to frame the 'self' according to the doctrines of creation, the fall, and redemption. Just so you guys know, this training is *not* what I will be teaching the youth group this Friday. While there will be some overlap with this training and this Friday's teaching, today's training is mainly just for your information—it is intentionally a little heady because I want you guys to be aware of the sources that I'm using and interacting with.

But I hope that it won't be *so* heady that it's inaccessible. To prevent this from happening, I want to define some of the terms that I will be referencing over the course of this training, just so we're on the same page and so that you know what I'm talking about when I use certain terms.

Definitions

The modern self

The self is the way in which we understand our identity and how our identity relates to wider society, and how we understand happiness and flourishing within an intuitive framework established by society.

Age of authenticity

It is the understanding of life that each of us has his/her own way of realizing our humanity, and that it is important to find and live out one's own, as against surrendering to conformity with a model imposed on us from outside, by society, or the previous generation, or religious or political authority.

Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age*

Expressive individualism

The idea that each person has a unique core of feeling and intuition that should unfold or be expressed if individuality is to be realized.

Bellah, *The Habits of the Heart*

I'll unpack these definitions as we move through the training. But in order to fairly critique secular expressive individualism, we need to not only make a negative appraisal of it, but a positive one first. Which brings us to...

Framing the Self Within the Doctrine of Creation—I am not my own

Our discussion and assessment of the self must be set prior to the fall. In fact, the 'self' is set in the context of the Garden.

²⁶Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness..."

²⁷So God created man in his own image,
in the image of God he created him;
male and female he created them.

The very familiar story of creation is that God creates human beings *in his own image*. This is already very telling for us.

1. The self is vested with derivative authority and sovereignty

That God creates human beings *in his image* means that we are actually vested with sovereignty, albeit a derivative sovereignty. The 'self' is vested with limited autonomy. It is an autonomy that is given by God and constrained by God, but it is autonomy nonetheless. This autonomy is good because it is derivative of God's autonomy and sovereignty. God's sovereignty is an attribute that is communicated and distributed to his image bearers. It's the reason why human beings, not animals, are given the authority to rule over the creation as God's deputies.

So this authority and autonomy is good. It was untainted and undistorted. God *does* vest individualism to the 'self'. But even though we were given derivative authority, it never meant that we were supposed to be autonomous from God. The fact that our authority is

derivative demonstrates that we are always dependent upon God, not ourselves. Our derivative sovereignty was never meant to be disconnected and unmoored from the ultimate Sovereign. There is a givenness and dependency to our individualism.

2. The self is not self-made, but given

That we are created and begotten by God means that the 'self' is not self-made but given. The French political philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau opened the first chapter of his book *The Social Contract* with the line, "Man is born free and yet is universally enslaved."

But the creation of Adam and Eve demonstrates that man is not born free, but born utterly dependent on people. God didn't create man as a solitary being. From the beginning, male and female God created them. The creation of Adam and Eve *together* shows that human beings are socially dependent beings.

Contrary to Rousseau, man is not born free, but born utterly dependent on people. We are absolutely connected to other people. We are not self-made people. The theologian and former Duke seminary professor Stanley Hauerwas used to give his students a homework assignment over their school breaks, which I admittedly thought was weird but I think it serves the point.

When they go back home for winter or spring break and remember how difficult it was to live with their parents, he told his students to look at their belly buttons. I know, I know, it's kind of weird. But listen to what he says about it, "By noting that we are creatures, creations of mothers and fathers, the Decalogue tells us that we have life as a gift. We are begotten, not manufactured. Someone even changed our diapers, our first hint of what grace must be like. No wonder some of us despise our parents, for they are a visible, ever-present reminder that we were created, that the significance of our lives is not exclusively self-derived." Our existence is given, not self-produced.

We owe our very existence to others. The belly button, according to Stanley Hauerwas, has profound theological importance. It is our body's way of reminding that we are not self-made people. We are not separate islands, we are not merely rugged individuals. Instead, we are inevitably and necessarily bound together with others.

When we introduce ourselves to people that we meet for the very first time, we already reveal the givenness of our selves. We didn't choose our names, our parents gave it to us,

whether we like it or not. Even revealing something as mundane as “I like pizza” reveals a givenness to who we are, it reveals that we belong to a group that likes pizza as opposed to a group of people who don’t like pizza.

So from the account of creation, we find that the self is not completely autonomous from God or others—rather, according to Thomas Aquinas, the orientation of the self has always tended toward God and others. The ‘self’ is not an isolated individual; the self is marked by relatedness and interdependence.

3. The self is made for God

Just a second ago, I referred to Thomas’ explanation that the orientation of the self has always tended toward God and others. This is because the self always has a goal, a *teleology*. Because the self is created with purpose by God, it has a movement toward its proper and ultimate end, which is God himself.

According to Thomas again, all human beings by their God-given natures seek their own good. He writes that even “in things devoid of knowledge, everything naturally seeks to procure what is good for itself; as fire seeks to mount upwards. Consequently, both angel and man naturally seek their own good and perfect. This is to love self.”

What Thomas writes is helpful because the way that we need to frame the self for ourselves, for our kids in youth group, for our family, our coworkers, the unbelieving people in our lives, is that we are always seeking *something*. We are people who always seek our own highest good—this is true for non-Christians *and* Christians. Or to describe it in a more Lighthouse idiosyncratic way, we are all worshipers.

The philosopher Charles Taylor described this seeking perfectly with the word ‘fullness’. He describes that there is a melancholy of the self. He writes, “We all see our lives and/or the space wherein we live our lives, as having a moral/spiritual shape. Somewhere, in some activity, or condition, lies a fullness, a richness; that is in that place, life is fuller, richer, deeper, more worthwhile, more admirable, more what it *should* be.” As a philosopher who is Catholic, Taylor seems to be alluding that this fullness we seek can only be found in God.

Prior to the fall, this seeking was always ordered toward God. The self’s true happiness is to rest in God. Thomas writes again that all things, desiring their own perfection, desire

God himself. A more familiar way of saying it is in the words of Augustine's confessions where he says, "In yourself you rouse us, giving us delight in glorifying you, because you made us with yourself as our goal, and our heart is restless until it rests in you."

So the Augustinian/Thomistic view of the self is that it was simply made for God. self's ultimate happiness, or what we might call the proper love of self, is in loving God, which is the self's highest good. Anything that loves God less as a secondary good is an improper love of self.

In other words, there is a good and proper kind of self-love insofar as this love of self pursues God as its highest good. And there is a bad and improper kind of self-love when it loves God as a secondary good or loves something alternate to God. The doctrine of creation tells us why we are always seeking. We were made by God and *for* God.

And it's the reason why we see so much restlessness, so much yearning, so much longing, so much frustration when we talk with our students and coworkers. They want *something*. They chase *something*. They want to belong. They want to be loved. They want to be successful. The sense of belonging, beloved, and success, all equate to some sense of fullness.

So there is such a thing as self love, but not in the way that modern culture describes it. We all love ourselves in the Thomistic sense that we are always seeking our highest good. It's the reason why Jesus says that we are to treat others the way that we ourselves want to be treated.

But what regulates and prevents self-love from being distorted is love for God. Love for God regulates self-love because it centers love ultimately not on itself but ultimately on God and, from this love for God, generates love for others.

So framing the self within the doctrine of creation actually does a lot of conceptual heavy lifting for us. It reminds us that we are given freedom. God gives us latitude and freedom to act. It is not boundless freedom, but a freedom within limits. The doctrine of creation also reminds us that our identity as people as actually given, rather than made. And finally, the doctrine of creation tells us that the self naturally seeks its highest good, which is God himself.

And what the doctrine of creation actually does for our concept of the self is that frames what the self *ought* to be. It tells us that from the beginning of time, we are not our own, but that we belong to God. And our hearts are happiest, most content, and most full in him. But whereas the doctrine of creation happily reminds us that we are not our own, the doctrine of the fall tragically tells the story of how we sought to be our own.

Framing the Self Within the Doctrine of the Fall: I am my own

How did we get here? A Brief History Lesson

¹⁶ And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, “You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, ¹⁷but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die.”

Genesis 2:16–17

⁴ But the serpent said to the woman, “You will not surely die. ⁵For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” ⁶ So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate, and she also gave some to her husband who was with her, and he ate.

Genesis 3:4–6

What doctrine of the fall tells us is that because of sin, our derivative autonomy and limited freedom has been distorted and perverted to prefer what we want *independently* of what God wants. And because of sin, the self now seeks to override and rewrite the God-given script of what good and bad is. Rather than doing what God *freely* permits us to do, we would rather go out of bounds and do what God *expressly* permits us not to do.

In psychology, this is recognized as reactance, which is the theory that when something seems to threaten or eliminate our freedom of behavior, we react strongly with a drive to restore that perceived threat of freedom. I have a funny little comic to keep you guys awake.



But the problem is that God gave Adam and Eve the freedom to eat from *any* tree they wanted except for the tree of knowledge. But the serpent turned the logic around by describing it as a form of loss of freedom. But fundamentally, what enticed Eve was the specific lie that when they eat the fruit, they will be *like* God.

But the problem is that they were already like God. They were literally created by God and formed in *his* own image. The next closest thing was to be God. So the specific lie that enticed humanity wasn't deprivation, but total sovereignty. They wanted something *more* than just being like God—they wanted to be God, to make the rules, to define truth for themselves, and to do whatever they want.

So under the account of the fall, and under an Augustinian view of the fallen self, the self no longer naturally orders itself toward God, but toward itself. The self's fallen bent now curves inward. The self now loves itself more than it loves God. This is the fundamental problem of humanity. Secularism begins here—it's a life that actively runs from God.

The philosopher Isaiah Berlin describes this running from God, 'negative freedom'—freedom is freedom *from*. It's the right to be titillated, entertained, absorbed, honestly whatever you want, all on your own terms. We do more than transgress the boundaries; we seek to set and create the boundaries or remove the boundaries altogether.

*It's time to see what I can do
To test the limits and break through
No right, no wrong, no rules for me
I'm free*

The words of Frozen represent a clear shift with how we view our world. The philosopher Charles Taylor describes two different ways of thinking about the world, known as *mimesis* and *poiesis*. A *mimetic* view of the world sees the world as having a given order and a given meaning and that human beings find their meaning and purpose *within* that givenness. A *mimetic* view of the world sees the world fundamentally as something that is given.

So for example, we conformed to the natural order of the world. When the sun sets, we cease work. When the sun rises, we get up and make our coffee. There are obvious pros and cons of seeing the world this way.

A *poietic* view of the world, by contrast, sees the world as raw material which human beings create and make purpose and meaning out of. The raw material of the world is harvested by humans and we form and make it however we will.

And similarly, there are also pros and cons of seeing the world this way. Without a *poietic* view of the world there wouldn't be advancement in, for example, technology, where we can FaceTime people across the world or the development of medicine and other medical technology.

The *poietic* view of the world is the dominant way that we look at life and reality. We all live in a world that makes it possible for us to conceive of reality as something we can manipulate according to our own wills and desires, and not something that we necessarily need to conform ourselves to or passively accept.

A world that is *poietic* means that we make and manufacture ourselves. Human nature isn't something that is given, but something that is invented and reinvented. With the self now set in the doctrine of the fall, it's not hard to see why the culture is the way it is. In our Pelagian world, authenticity is realizing any sort of possibility on your own terms. It doesn't matter *what* you choose; what's important is *that* you choose. As modern people, we live as if we are our own—we belong to no one but ourselves.

The French sociologist Alain Ehrenberg writes this in his book *The Weariness of the Self*, “the modern political idea, that we are owners of ourselves...has widened to encompass all of aspects of existence. The sovereign man who is only like himself, who Nietzsche had imagined, has now become the norm.”

The Creed of the Modern Self

1. The highest good is individual freedom, happiness, self-definition, and self-expression.
2. Traditions, religions, received wisdom, regulations, and social ties that restrict individual freedom, happiness, self-definition, and self-expression must be reshaped, deconstructed, or destroyed.
3. The world will inevitably improve as the scope of individual freedom grows. Technology—in particular the internet—will motor this progression toward utopia.
4. The primary social ethic is tolerance of everyone’s self-defined quest for individual freedom and self-expression. Any deviation from this ethic of tolerance is dangerous and must not be tolerated. Therefore social justice is less about economic or class inequality, and more about issues of equality relating to individual identity, self-expression, and personal autonomy.
5. Humans are inherently good.
6. Large-scale structures and institutions are suspicious at best and evil at worst.
7. Forms of external authority are rejected and personal authenticity is lauded.

But the way that the doctrine of fall frames the self isn’t by way of more freedom, but actually slavery. Unmitigated freedom isn’t actually an unfettered blessing, but a crushing burden.

To be your own and belong to yourself means that the most fundamental truth about existence is that you are responsible for your existence and everything that it entails. It means that you yourself are responsible for living a life of purpose, of defining your own identity, of interpreting meaningful events, of choosing your values, and electing where you belong. And if you belong to yourself, then it means that you are the only one who can set limits on who you are and what you can do. No one else has the right to define you, to choose your journey in life, or as my Peloton instructor says, to choose your own fantasy.

This is the problem of getting exactly what we want. Which brings us to the malaise of the modern self. Let's go back to the 6th grader who was told every day as an encouragement that it was up to them to decide what they were going to be, that it was up to them to choose their destiny, to pursue their dreams. I mean, there's nothing wrong with those things. It'd be great to pursue your dream. But the way that it is encouraged isn't liberating, but crushing.

To be the master of your own fate and destiny is actually really, really crushing. If you were told all your life that it's all up to you to decide how you look, how intelligent you are, how you carry yourself, how well liked you are, what do you think will happen when you face opposition, failure, criticism, or difficulty from the very same people you are trying to prove yourself to?

If it's all up to you, and you inevitably fail, who do you have left to blame but yourself? What ends up happening is we become far more fragile, vulnerable, and anxious, because it means that we need to be even smarter, even more accomplished, even more successful, more beautiful, more everything. It makes us feel like we have to compete with others and be better than others. And that is the bargain that modern culture doesn't realize. When you live for yourself, you don't actually get more autonomy, you just get more slavery. Our culture doesn't have too high of a view of human freedom, but too low.

We are our own worst master. We are our own Sisyphus. But the crazy thing is that we give ourselves the stone. We keep rolling the stone that we lay upon ourselves.

The Malaise of the Modern Self

1. Finding and forging your own identity may be freeing at first, exciting even, but eventually it becomes really crushing. In a myriad of options, how do you know what's right? How do you know what's wrong?
 - a. Possibility doesn't actually become freeing, but ends up becoming enslaving. What you get isn't more freedom, but more slavery.
 - b. Additionally, the concept behind authenticity ends up becoming a guise for societal conformity. What's right for you ends up becoming what society deems is right.
 - c. "Choose your own adventure" sounds like self-actualization, but it's actually a call to obey society's dominant social norms. How do you know what's true to yourself? Being true to yourself is actually the call to being true to culture. So

- ironically, you're not actually following yourself, but really the dominant stance of modern culture.
- d. Self-actualization ends up becoming the fulfillment of what culture deems is acceptable and approvable. But this isn't self-actualization. It just becomes the actualization of cultural norms. And this sort of actualization becomes impossible, because since the values of our culture constantly change, actualization is as possible as hitting a moving target. The goal posts of what you must do and be constantly change.
 - e. The malaise of the modern self is that the modern secular project isn't just impossible, it's actually self-defeating.
2. Expressive individualism also tends to undermine commitment to the common good, because when one pursues the interest of themselves only, it creates a society that merely takes, rather than gives. The common good is reduced to "what can you do for me?" rather the question of "what can I do for you?"
- a. It makes our relationships competitive and adversarial
 - b. The problem with secular expressive individualism is that individualism is disconnected from community, so that the reference point of thinking about identity and your role in the world becomes self-oriented, rather than others-oriented

But the doctrine of the fall also reminds us that this construction of the modern self goes both ways. Sinful expression of individualism doesn't just plague one side, it plagues the other. In fact, according to Romans 3, it plagues everyone. We don't have the luxury of pointing fingers at the other camp. We don't have the luxury of saying to God, "God, I thank you that I am not like the other men." The doctrine of the fall prevents us from saying, "I thank you God, that I'm not like these people, or this other group of people." The doctrine of the fall makes us all recognize our complicity as expressive individualists. It's inescapable. As Professor Carl Trueman says, we are all expressive individualists now.

And once we realize that we're all complicit in this culture of expressive individualism, then it encourages our first move to be one of confession and repentance. It's important that as we talk about this topic of secular individualism that we recognize our own complicity in the sins of the culture as well. This is what prevents us from being hypocritical and Pharisaical witnesses of Jesus Christ.

Some of you might push against this and say that you're not an expressive individualist. But I'm inclined to think that we can't help be anything but in this world, because the outward expression of individualism is choice.

And we live in a world full of choices—some more important than others. And while we think that one particular group abuses their freedom of choice, I'm afraid the reality is that we all kind of do to varying degrees. We have the freedom to choose which church we want to go to, which denomination to be a part of. We have options now and we capitalize on those options. We can attend this church that's 30 minutes away from our local community simply because we can. This is no knock on any of you who do make that drive. But this choice *does* something to us. We can choose which church to attend because they preach the gospel *and* they have a counseling ministry, or because they have a children's program, or because we like their political affiliations more.

We may like to think that we like going to this church because it is *the* church with the truth, but if we're brutally honest with ourselves, often we choose which church we go to not *simply* because the gospel is preached there, but because of x, y, z factor. We will move and choose this church because we like the pastor, or the people. And I feel like this is a distinctly evangelical impulse.

We can go on and on with other examples, but the doctrine of the fall makes us reckon with the fact that we are contributors to expressive individualism rather than mere victims of it.

But, at the same time, expressive individualism isn't an unmitigated evil, as Carl Trueman points out. It is in many ways a significant improvement on that which it replaced. One of the aspects of our modern culture is the emphasis that it places on the inherent dignity of the individual. In older societies, a human's worth was determined by class and social hierarchy. So how we view the person today is significant compared to how people were viewed in older, hierarchal societies.

But the problem is with expressive individualism isn't its emphasis on the dignity of the individual value of every human being. This is what undergirded the fight against slavery in the 19th century and the civil rights movement in the 50s and 60s. The problem of expressive individualism is that has no ontological or ethical basis. It has no grounding in God.

Whereas the dignity of all human beings is derived from our being created in the image of God, how we ascribe dignity to all human beings becomes nebulous and hazy and arbitrary when God is dead. The worth of an individual becomes arbitrarily decided by society, not ontologically grounded by God. Identity isn't given, but again constructed. Again, it means that it's up to you to decide and prove your worth. There are so many implications of this.

The doctrine of the fall describes the self as something that always tends toward captivity, not liberty. When freedom is mere voluntariness, without further orientation toward God or others, then my choice is another means by which I'm just trying to look for satisfaction, or "fullness".

As long as we keep choosing to try to find satisfaction and fullness in finite, created things—whether it's beauty, power, success, meaningful friendships—we're going to be caught in a cycle where I'm more and more disappointed in those things *and* more and more dependent on those things. In choosing what we want without reference to God, then we actually forfeit our ability to choose. This is the self within the doctrine of the fall.

Framing the Self Within the Doctrine of Redemption—I am not my own, but belong to Jesus Christ.

If our fallen selves are enslaved, then the goal of redemption is to set the captive free. The doctrine of creation reminds us that the self will always choose its highest good. Before the fall, the unperverted self sought God as its highest good. Under the rubric of the fall, the self became perverted by sin and sought anything else other than God as its highest good. The doctrine of redemption through Jesus Christ frees and restores the self back to God. Herman Bavinck writes that grace is opposed not to nature, only to sin. The self is restored to seek God as its highest good.

³⁶ So if the Son sets you free, you will be free indeed.

John 8:36

In Jesus Christ, God has come to set the captive free. Grace is freedom. This is how Augustine describes this freedom in his *Confessions*.

“Oh, the twisted roads I walked! Woe to my outrageous soul, that hoped for something better if it withdrew from you! The soul rolls back and forth, onto its back, onto one side and then another, onto its stomach, but every surface is hard, and you’re the only rest. But look, you’re here, freeing us from our unhappy wandering, setting us firmly on your track, comforting us and saying, “Run the race, *I’ll carry you! I’ll carry you* clear to the end, and even at the end, I’ll carry you.”

This freedom that Jesus sets us free for is the happy confession that we are not our own, but belong to Jesus Christ. And because we also belong to Jesus Christ, we also belong to his family.

Belonging to Jesus Christ doesn’t just mean it’s you and Jesus. Belonging to Jesus Christ actually means belonging to a broader network of relationships called the church, the family that God created through Jesus Christ. In other words, to belong to Jesus Christ means that you belong to one another. We belong to one another. You are not your own fundamentally means that you are not alone.

What is your only comfort in life and in death?

That I am not my own, but belong—body and soul, in life and in death—to my faithful Savior, Jesus Christ.