brought him to his death at last: and the guilt of the death of the Lord abode upon them (ch. xxvii. 25). they repeatedly insulted and scourged the Apostles (see Acts iv. 3; v. 18, 40).

**7.]** The occurrence of this verse before the opening of the Feast to the Gentiles has perplexed some interpreters: but it is strictly exact : for although the Gospel was preached to the Gentiles forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, yet the final rejection of the Jews and the *substitution of the Gentiles* did not take till that event.

**his armies]** The Roman armies; a similar expression for the unconscious instruments of God’s anger is used Isa. x.5; xiii. 5: Jer.xxv.9: Joel ii. 25.

**their city]** no longer *His,* but *their city.* Compare *your house,* ch. xxiii. 38. Thi is a startling introduction of the *interpretation into the parable;* we knew not before that they had *a city.*

**8—10.]** {8} **On not worthy,** see Acts xiii. 46.

**were:** the past tense passes them by as done with. {9} **The highways** here spoken of are the places of resort at the meetings of streets, the squares, or confluences of ways. De Wette and Meyer are wrong in saying that they are not in the city, ‘for that was destroyed:’ it is not *the city of the murderers, but that in which the feast is supposed to be held,* which is spoken of: not jerusalem, but God’s world.

**{10} bad and good]** Both the open sinners and the morally good together. See ch. xiii. 47, where the net collects *of every kind.* Stier remarks, that we might expect, from ch. xxi. 31, to find the guest who by and by is expelled, *among the good.* Here, so to speak, the *first act* of the parable closes ; and here is the situation of the Church at this day ;—collected out of all the earth, and containing both bad and good.

**was filled** is emphatic.

**11, 12.]** {11}This second part of the parable is  
in direct reference to the word of prophecy, Zeph. i. 7, 8: *“The Lord hath prepared a sacrifice, he hath bid his guests.  
And it shall come to pass in the day of  
the Lord's sacrifice, that I will punish ....  
all such as are clothed with strange apparel.”* The coming of the King to see his  
guests is the final and separating Judgment of the Church, see ch. xxv. 19,—  
when that distinction shall be made, which  
God’s ministers have no power nor right to  
make in admissions into the visible Church.  
Yet as Trench remarks (Parables, p. 207),  
this coming of the King is not *exclusively*  
the final one, but every trying and sifting  
judgment adumbrates it in some measure.

With regard to the **wedding garment**, we must not, I think, make too  
much of the usually cited Oriental custom  
of presenting the guests with such garments at feasts. For (1) it is not distinctly  
proved that such a custom existed; the passages  
usually quoted (Gen. xiv. 22:  
Judg. xiv. 12: 2 Kings v. 22) are nothing to the purpose; 2 Kings x. 22  
shews that the worshippers of Baal were  
provided with vestments, and *at a feast:*  
and at the present day those who are  
admitted to the presence of Royalty in the  
East are clothed with a *caftan:* but all  
this does not make good the assumption:  
and (2) even granting it, it is not to be  
pressed, as being manifestly not the salient  
point of this part of the parable. The  
guest was bound to provide himself with  
this proper habit, out of respect to the  
feast and its Author: *how* this was to be  
provided, does not *here* appear, but does  
*elsewhere*. The garment is *the imputed*  
*and inherent righteousness of the Lord  
Jesus*, put on *symbolically* in Baptism  
(Gal. iii. 27), and *really* by a true and  
living faith (ib. ver. 26),—without which