their doom. The same is strikingly set  
before us in the history of Jonah’s preaching at Nineveh.

**24,** and **22.**] These  
verses are connected with those respectively  
preceding them thus:—‘If these mighty  
works had been done in Tyre and Sidon—  
in Sodom—they would have, &c.;, but,  
since no such opportunity was afforded  
*them*, and *ye*, Bethsaida, Chorazin, and  
Capernaum, have had and rejected such,  
it shall be more tolerable, &c.’ And as to  
the saying of our Lord, ‘If more warnings  
had been given they would have repented,’  
—it is not for the infidel to say, ‘Why  
then were not more given?’ because  
every act of God for the rescue of a sinner  
from his doom is purely and entirely of  
free and undeserved grace, and the proportion of such means of escape dealt out to men is ruled by the counsel of His will  
who is holy, just, and true, and willeth not  
the death of the sinner; but whose ways  
are past our finding out. We know enough  
when we know that all are inexcusable,  
having (see Rom. i. ii.) the witness of God  
in their consciences; and *our* only feeling  
should be overflowing thankfulness, when  
we find ourselves in possession of the light  
of the glorious Gospel, of which so many  
are deprived.

That the reference here  
is to the *last great day* of judgment is evident, by the whole being spoken of in the future. Had our Lord been speaking of  
the *outward* judgment on the rebellious  
cities, the future might have been used of  
*them*, but could not of Sodom, which was  
already destroyed.

**This shall be more  
tolerable** is one of those mysterious hints  
at the future dealings of God, into which  
we can penetrate no further than the  
actual words of our Lord reveal, nor say  
to what difference exactly they point in  
the relative states of those who are compared. See also Luke xii. 47, 48.

**25.**] This is certainly a continuation of  
the foregoing discourse; and the **answered**, which seems to have nothing to  
refer to, does in reality refer to the words  
which have immediately preceded. The  
**at that time** is not *chronological*, but  
gives additional solemnity to what follows.  
There may have been a slight break in  
the discourse; the older interpreters, and  
others, insert the return of the Apostles:  
but I do not see any necessity for it.  
The whole ascription of praise is an *answer*:  
an answer to the mysterious dispensations  
of God’s Providence above recounted. With regard to the arrangement in Luke, see note on Luke x. 21.

**I thank thee**]  
Not merely, ‘*I praise Thee,*’ but in the  
force of the Greek word, **I confess to Thee**,  
‘*I recognize the justice of Thy doings;*’  
viz. in the words **Even so, Father**, &c.  
Stier remarks that this is the *first public  
mention* by our Lord of His Father; the  
words in ch. x. 32, 33 having been addressed to the twelve (but see John ii. 16).  
We have two more instances of such a  
public address to His Father, John xi. 41;  
xii, 28; and again Luke xxiii. 34. It is  
to be observed that He does not address  
the Father as *His* Lord, but as Lord *of  
heaven and earth*: as *He who worketh all  
thinge after the counsel of His will*, Eph. i. 11.

**hast hid....hast revealed**]  
more properly, **didst hide**, and **didst reveal**, in the deeper and spiritual sense of  
the words; the time pointed at being  
that in the far past, when the divine  
decrees as to such hiding and revealing  
were purposed. See 1 Cor. ii. 9–12.

**these things**, *these mysterious arrangements*, by which the sinner is condemned  
in his pride and unbelief, the humble and  
childlike saved, and God justified when He  
saves and condemns. These are ‘*revealed*’  
to those who can in a simple and teachable  
spirit, as *babes*, obey the invitation in vv.  
28–30, but ‘*hidden*’ from the wise and  
clever of this world, who attempt their  
solution by the inadequate instrumentality  
of the mere human understanding. See  
1 Cor. i, 26–31.

**27.**] In one other