

the best. Now that the second *δικαιοσύνης* is admitted to be an interpolation, it is clearly impossible. Some interpret "Law of righteousness" as equivalent to "righteousness which is of the law", an exegesis which Charles Hodge describes as "rather forced". Meyer's interpretation seems to me quite satisfactory. He says: "The justifying law is in both instances to be left without any more precise concrete definition, and to be regarded as the ideal the reality of which the Israelites strove by their legal conduct to experience in themselves (to possess), but did not obtain. The justifying law! this is the idea, which they pursued, but to the reality they remained strangers."

v.32. Paul answers the objection. Instead of indignantly repelling it, as in v.14, he accepts its statement as true, but asks "διὰ τί;" Wherefore did the mass of Israel fail to attain to justification? Because they were seeking it in the wrong way. In self-will they were trying to pile up merit before God, instead of humbly submitting in faith to the method of justification which He provided. ὡς, Winer (Grammar, p.617) says, "In Rom.9:32 ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, the expression ἐκ πίστεως denotes the objective standard; ὡς ἐξ ἔργων, the purely imaginary." In a footnote to Lange's commentary, Philip Schaff states, "The word 'as' transfers the matter to the sphere of subjective fancy, and expresses this: that the Jews imagined they were doing the works of the law, but did not really do them, according to the deeper sense and spirit in which the law should be apprehended. Comp. Isa.58:2; Phil.3:9". προσέκοψαν τῷ λίθῳ κ.τ.λ. This describes the result of their wrong method of διώκειν. The figure of the race course is still in mind. There are instances in Greek literature of chariot drivers,