not even where we might have expected it  
most, in the description of His relation to  
the Father, ch. i. init. Every where He is  
the SON of God, not His Word, And in  
ch. vi. 5, xi. 3, where he says the worlds  
were made by the Word of God, he uses  
not the Greek word *logos*, by which the  
Personal Word is always designated, but  
another word (*rhema*), by which He never is.  
*And in the passage itself:* for such  
adjectives as he here joins to *“the Word  
of God,”* as matter of emphatic predication, would hardly be used of the Personal Word: and, which to my mind is stronger  
evidence still, had these words applied to  
our Lord, we should not have had Him  
introduced immediately after, ver. 14, as  
*“Jesus the Son of God.”* But 2) some of  
the ancient, and the great mass of modern  
Commentators, have understood by the  
tern, *the revealed word of God*, in the  
law and in the gospel: or in the gospel  
alone, as contrasted with the former dispensation. And so even some of those  
who elsewhere in their writings have understood it of Christ. But neither does this interpretation seem to meet the requirements of the passage. The qualities here predicated of the *“Word”* do not appear  
to fit the mere written word: nor does the  
introduction of the written word suit the  
context. I should he rather disposed with  
Bleek to understand 3) *the spoken word of  
God,* the utterance of His power, by which,  
as in ch. xi. 3, He made the worlds,—by  
which His Son, as in ch. i, 3, upholds all  
things. This spoken word it was, which  
they of old were to hear and not harden  
their hearts: “To-day if ye hear his  
voice... .:” this spoken word, which  
interdicted them from entering into His  
rest—**“I sware in my wrath,** If they shall  
enter into my rest.” It seems then much  
more agreeable to the context, to understand this *utterance* of God, so nearly connected with God Himself, the *breath of  
his mouth:* and I would not at the same  
time shrink from the idea, that the Alexandrine form of expression respecting the *Word*, that semi-personification of it without absolutely giving it personal existence, was before the mind of the Writer  
Indeed, I do not see how it is possible to escape this inference) **is living** (not, *in contrast with the dead works of the law* [Ebrard], of which there is no question here: nor, *nourishing*, and able to preserve life: nor, *enduring:* but, as A.V., *quick*, i.e. having living power, in the same sense in which God Himself is so often called “the living God,” e.g. ch. x.  
31), **and active** (this *activity* is the very  
first quality and attribute of *life:* so that  
the predicates form a climax: *not only  
living, but energizing: not only energizing, but sharper, &c.: and not only that, but piercing, &c.: nor that only, but  
reaching even to the spirit, a discerner of  
the thoughts and ideas of the heart*), **and  
sharper than every two edged sword** (literally, two-*mouthed:* meaning, sharpened on both sides, both edge and back. The comparison of the word of God or of men to a sword is common in Scripture: see Ps. lvii. 4, lix. 7, lxiv. 3; Wisd. xviii. 15,16; Rev. i. 16; and above all, Eph. vi. 17. It has  
been questioned, whether the office here  
ascribed to the word of God is *punitive*, or  
merely *searching:* whether it regards the  
foes, or the servants of God. There seems  
no reason why we should separate the two.  
The same WORD, to which evidently by  
the succeeding clause is attributed the  
searching power, is powerful also to punish.  
The *knife* [the word commonly used for  
*sword* in the New Test. signified both] belongs to the surgeon, and to the judge: has its probing, as well as its smiting office), **and  
reaching through, even to dividing of soul  
and spirit, both joints and marrow** (there  
has been considerable diversity in the taking  
of these genitives. I have regarded them as  
follows: **soul** and **spirit** denote two separate  
departments of man’s being, each subordinate to the process indicated by dividing. The *Word* pierces to the dividing, not of  
the *soul from* the *spirit*, but of the *soul*  
itself and of the *spirit* itself: the former  
being the lower portion of man’s invisible  
part, which he has in common with the  
brutes; the latter the higher portion, receptive of the Spirit of God; *both which* are pierced and divided by the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God. Then passing on to **both joints and marrow**, I do  
not regard these terms as co-ordinate with