an important key to our Lord’s prophecies, and a decisive justification for those who, like myself, firmly hold that *the coming of the Lord* is in many places to be identified, primarily, with that overthrow.

**42.]** A citation from *the same Psalm of triumph from which the multitudes had taken their Hosannas.* This verse is quoted with the same signification in Acts iv. 11: 1 Pet. ii. 6,7, where also the cognate passage lsa. xxvii. 16 is quoted, as in Rom. ix. 33. The builders answer to the husbandmen, and the addition is made in this changed similitude to shew them *that though they might reject and kill the Son, yet He would be victorious in the end.*

**the head of the corner]** The *corner-stone* binds together both walls of the building ; so Christ unites Jews and Gentiles in Himself. See the comparison beautifully followed into detail, Eph. ii. 20—22.

On **maryellous in our eyes,** compare Acts iv. 13, 14.

**43.]** Our Lord here returns to the parable, and more plainly than ever before announces to them their rejection by God. The *vineyard* is now *the kingdom of God.* The **nation** here spoken of is not the Gentiles in general, but *the Church of the truly Faithful,*—the *“holy nation, peculiar people”* of 1 Pet. ii. 9: see Acts xv. 14,

**44.]** A reference to Isa. viii. 14, 15, and Dan. ii. 44, and *a plain identification of the stone there mentioned with that in* Ps. cxviii. The stone is *the whole kingdom and power of the Messiah summed up in Himself.*

**he that hath fallen... .]** he that *takes offence, that makes it a stone of stumbling,* (or perhaps, he that *is superimposed on it,* as a stone in the building: but not so probably, as the *breaking* would want due interpretation,) **shall be broken:** see Luke ii. 34: but **on whomsoever,** as its enemy, *it shall come in vengeance,* as prophesied in Daniel, **it shall dash him in pieces.** Meyer maintains that the meaning of the word is not this, but literally *‘ shall winnow him,’* throw him off as chaff. But the confusion thus occasioned in the parable is quite unnecessary. The result of winnowing is complete separation and dashing away of the worthless part: and it is surely far better to understand this *result* as the work of the falling of the stone, than to apply the words to a part of the operation for which the *falling of a stone* is so singularly unsuited.

**45, 46.] {45}** All three Evangelists have this addition. St. Mark besides says *“and they left him and went their way,”* answering to our ch. xxii. 22. Supposing St. Mark’s insertion of these words to be in the precise place, we have the following parable spoken *to the people and disciples:* see below.

**CHAP. XXII. 1—14.]** PARABLE OF THE MARRIAGE OF THE KING’S SON. Peculiar to Matthew. A parable resembling this in several particulars occurs in Luke xiv. 15—24, yet we must not hastily set it down as the same. Many circumstances are entirely different: the locality and occasion of delivery different, and in both cases stated with precision. And the difference in the style of the parables is correspondent to the two periods of their utterance. That in Luke is delivered earlier in our Lord’s ministry, when the enmity of the Pharisees had yet not fully manifested itself: the refusal of the guests is more courteous, their only penalty, *exclusion ;*—here they *maltreat the servants,* and are *utterly destroyed.* This binds the parable in close connexion with that