the righteousness they sought?   Because they sought it in the
wrong way-- by works, instead of by faith..."   It is interesting
to note that Sanday, who does not accept this interpretation of
vv.30-31, nevertheless says,"Nowhere else in this Epistle, where
St.Paul uses the expression $\tau\acute{\iota}\ o\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\ \check{\epsilon}\rho o\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, does he give it an
immediate answer.   He follows it by a second question (as in
9:14); and this is not a mere accident.   It is a result of the
sense of deliberation contained in the previous words with which
a second question rather than a definite statement seems to harmonize."
The interpretation which he gives, and which many scholars accept,
that of understanding v.30-31 as being Paul's summary of the result
of the discussion so far, given in answer to the question $\tau\acute{\iota}\ o\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$
$\check{\epsilon}\rho o\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, besides being absolutely without precedent in Paul's use of
the words, which never introduce a summary or a conclusion, but
uniformly present a new element, given by way of objection, expressed
or implied, and which are always elsewhere followed by a second
question, leads moreover to the necessity of interpreting v.30 and
v.31 in devious ways, reading into the terms many thoughts which are
certainly not contained in their ordinary use.   Taking this as
the simple statement containing the objection, such difficulties
disappear. $\underline{o\tilde{\upsilon}\nu}$ refers to the preceding verse, with which the
objection connects itself very well, but it refers still more,
logically, to the theme of the entire section-- that of the failure
of the mass of the Israelites to be included among the recipients of
the blessings described in chapters 1 to 8.   Paul has laid down
the great principle of God's sovereignty in election, and has defended
it against the objection that it might impute unrighteousness to
God.   Now he takes up a different objection dealing with the