

if it were the law of Moses alone that was in question the preacher would be doubtless right. But our freedom from the law of Moses has passed into a bondage to the law of convention. We have identified righteousness with *sittlichkeit*. For the written law we have substituted the unwritten law of "consuetudinary practice." For most people, Christian conduct is defined by conformity to the customary rule of give-and-take in social conduct. The new law may be less specific in detail; yet it is none the less acknowledged as a definition of moral obligation. But freedom from the law does not mean freedom from its demands but from its limitations. We are not exempted from its spirit but from its letter. We are free not to ignore it but to transcend it. "I came not to destroy but to fulfil." There is no limit to moral obligation; no standard set at which a man having reached he is able to say, "I have attained." There is a creative quality, a restless originality, in the released moral impulse which drives it to outdo its own best, to stretch out beyond its own highest achievements. It is not satisfied with loving neighbour; it presses on to the love of enemies. Christian morality has a starting-point but no terminus. It has a direction, but no goal in sight. Conversion is understood unless it is regarded as a release of this moral impulse, which may utterly reverse the former manner of life, but which will always be impatient to "exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees," and ever be true to itself through everything. Whether our legalism gather around a written code or unwritten convention, it obscures