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 ceruer of the thoughts is 'a discerner of the thoughts and 1,f0r-xv.24   
 and intents of the heart. ideas of the heart. 13 ™ Neither is mrs, sg   
 13 Neither is there any ny ereature that is not mani- Beta   
 creature that is not mani- there in his sight: but all things are TAs   
 fest in his sight: but ail naked ® and lying open unto the eyes » Jers.   
 things are naked and opened ith whom we have to do.   
 unto the eyes of him with of him Seeing then that we have °a oe.unt. 11.   
 whon we have to do. "4 See-   
 ing then that we have a   
   
 the former, “sox? and spirit,” but as sub- it seems much the more obvious to refer it   
 ordinate to them, and as used in a spiritual to God, especially in the presence of “the   
 sense, not a corporeal: implying that both eyes of Him with whom we have to do”   
 the joints and the marrow of the soul and below. Nor is there any harshness in   
 of spirit are pierced and divided by the this; from speaking of the uttered word   
 Word. This I conceive is necessitated of God, whose powers ave not its own but:   
 both by the wording of the original, and His, the transition to Himself, with whom   
 by the sense, which otherwise wonld de- that word is so nearly identified, simple   
 generate into an anti-climax, if joints and and obvious): but (nay, rather. . . i.e.   
 marrow were to be understood of the body. far from this, that...) all things aro   
 ‘The other views are, 1) That which regards naked and lying open (the Greck word   
 the dividing as being a division of the soul thus rendered is a very unusnal and diffi-   
 from the spirit, jointsfrom the marrow. cult one. Its intention seems to be to   
 “The objections tothisare both psychological convey the idea of entire prostration and   
 and contextual. It has been rightly urged subjugation nnder the eye of God: so that   
 [see especially Ebrard’s note here] that the things of which this is said are not   
 the soul and spirit cannot be said to be only naked, stripped of all covering and   
 separated in any such sense as this [@cu- voneealment,—but also laid prostrate in   
 menins understands the taking away of their exposnre, before His eye. See the   
 the Holy Spirit from man’s sont to be whole matter discussed in my Greek Test.   
 meant]: and on the other hand the joints It is one which can hardly be made intel-   
 and marrow could not be thns said to be ligible to the mere English reader) to His   
 separated, having never been in contact eyes (for His eyes to see) with whem we   
 with one another, 2) Many Commenta- have to do (there could not be a happi   
 tors, who hold the division of soul from rendering than this of the A. V.,   
 spirit, are not prepared to apply the same our whole concern and relation with God,   
 interpretation to the “joints and marrow.” One who is not to be trifled consider-   
 8) Many understand fhe diniding to mean, ing that His word is so powerful, and His   
 not the act of division, but the where eye so discerning. The ancients, withont,   
 the division oecurs: where soul divides exeeption, confined this relation to one   
 from spirit, and joints from marrow : i.e. solemn particular of it, and rendered, “fo   
 to the innermost recesses of soul body. whom our account must be given.” And   
 The objection to this arises from its not many of the moderns also take this view.   
 satisfying the requirements of grammar in Others snppose it to mean, “ concerning   
 the original), ala judger (or, discerner) whom is onr discourse”).   
 of (the) thoughts and ideas (this seems the 14—16.] Hortatory conclusion of this   
 nearest term tothe Greek : not “intents,” second course of comparison (see summary   
 as A. V.) of the heart (the inner and at ch. iii.1); up again by anticips   
 thinking and fecling part of man). tion that which is now to be followed ont   
 13.] And there is not a creature (the in detail, viz. the High Priesthood of   
 term embraces all created things, visible This point is regarded by many   
 and invisible, compare Col. i. 16) unseen as the opening of the new portion of the   
 in His presence (tirst as the possessive Epistle: bué on account of its hortatory   
 pronom: to what docs it refer? to the and collective I prefer regarding   
 word of God, or to God Himself? The it, with Ebrard, as the conclusion of the   
 idea of its referring to Christ falls with preceding: heing of course at the same   
 the untenableness of the personal meaning time transitional, as the close connexion   
 of the Word: although some, abandoning of ch. v. 1 with ver. 15 shews. It is   
 that, yet hold it. ‘Then of the two other, mneh in the manner of the Writer, to