the former, *“soul and spirit,”* but as subordinate to them, and as used in a spiritual sense, not a corporeal: implying that both  
the *joints* and the *marrow* of the *soul* and  
of the *spirit* are pierced and divided by the  
*Word*. This I conceive is necessitated  
both by the wording of the original, and  
by the sense, which otherwise would degenerate into an anti-climax, if **joints and marrow** were to be understood of the body.  
The other views are, 1) That which regards  
the *dividing* as being a division of the *soul  
from the spirit, the joints from the marrow.*  
The objections to this are both psychological  
and contextual. It has been rightly urged  
[see especially Ebrard’s note here] that  
the soul and spirit cannot be said to be  
separated in any such sense as this [Œcumenins understands the taking away of the Holy Spirit from man’s soul to be  
meant]: and on the other hand the *joints*  
and *marrow* could not be thus said to be  
separated, having never been in contact  
with one another. 2) Many Commentators, who hold the division of soul from  
spirit, are not prepared to apply the same  
interpretation to the *“joints and marrow.”*  
3) Many understand *the dividing* to mean,  
not the act of division, but the *place where  
the division occurs:* where soul divides  
from spirit, and joints from marrow: i.e.  
to the innermost recesses of soul and body.  
The objection to this arises from its not  
satisfying the requirements of grammar in  
the original), **and a judger** (or, discerner)  
**of** (the) **thoughts and ideas** (this seems the  
nearest term to the Greek: not *“intents,”*  
as A.V.) **of the heart** (the inner and  
thinking and feeling part of man).

**13.] And there is not a creature** (the  
term embraces all created things, visible  
and invisible, compare Col. i. 16) **unseen  
in His presence** (first as to the possessive  
pronoun: to what does it refer? to *the  
word of God,* or to *God* Himself? The  
idea of its referring to *Christ* falls with  
the untenableness of the personal meaning  
of the *Word:* although some, abandoning  
that, yet hold it. Then of the two other,  
it seems much the more obvious to refer it  
to *God*, especially in the presence of *“the  
eyes of Him with whom we have to do”*  
below. Nor is there any harshness in  
this; from speaking of the uttered word  
of God, whose powers ave not its own but  
His, the transition to Himself, with whom  
that word is so nearly identified, is simple  
and obvious): **but** (nay, rather. . . i.e. so  
far from this, that...) **all things are  
naked and lying open** (the Greek word  
thus rendered is a very unusual and difficult  
one. Its intention seems to be to  
convey the idea of entire prostration and  
subjugation under the eye of God: so that  
the things of which this is said are not  
only naked, stripped of all covering and  
concealment,—but also laid prostrate in  
their exposure, before His eye. See the  
whole matter discussed in my Greek Test.  
It is one which can hardly be made intelligible to the mere English reader) **to His eyes** (for His eyes to see) **with whom we  
have to do** (there could not be a happier  
rendering than this of the A. V., expressing  
our whole concern and relation with God,  
One who is not to be trifled with, considering that His word is so powerful, and His eye so discerning. The ancients, withont,  
exception, confined this relation to one  
solemn particular of it, and rendered, *“to  
whom our account must be given.”* And  
many of the moderns also take this view.  
Others suppose it to mean, “concerning  
whom is our discourse”).

**14–16.]** *Hortatory conclusion of this  
second course of comparison* (see summary  
at ch. iii. 1); taking up again by anticipation that which is now to be followed out in detail, viz. *the High Priesthood of  
Jesus*. This point is regarded by many  
as the opening of the new portion of the  
Epistle: but on account of its hortatory  
and collective character, I prefer regarding  
it, with Ebrard, as the conclusion of the  
preceding: being of course at the same  
time transitional, as the close connexion  
of ch. v. 1 with our ver. 15 shews. It is  
much in the manner of the Writer, to