the vision to these below on earth: here  
the heaven, the house or palace of God  
[Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 6, xxix. 9], remains  
firmly shut to those on earth, but a door is  
opened, and the Seer is rapt in the Spirit  
through it. Henceforth usually he looks  
from the heaven down on the earth, seeing  
however both alike, and being present in  
either, as the localities of his various visions  
require): **and the former voice** (much confusion  
has been introduced here by rendering,  
as A. V., *“the first voice which,”* &c.,  
giving the idea that it means, *first after*  
the door was seen set open; whereas it  
is *the voice which I heard at first,* viz.  
in ch. i, 10) **which I heard** (at the  
beginning) **as of a trumpet speaking  
with me** (viz. ch. i. 10. This clause is  
not predicative, “*was* as...” as A.V.  
and Treg. The construction simply is—  
“behold, a door. . . and the voice . . .,”  
both clauses being dependent on “**behold**.”  
—The voice is not that of Christ, but of  
some undefined heavenly being or angel.  
As Düsterdieck observes, all we can say of  
it is that it is the *same voice* as that in  
ch. i. 10, which there, ver. 17, is followed  
by that of our Lord, not “*as of a  
trumpet*,” but “*as of many waters*,” as  
stated by anticipation in ver. 15), **saying,  
Come up hither** (viz. through the opened  
door), **and I will shew thee** (it is surprising  
how Stier can allege this **I will  
shew thee** as a proof that the Lord Himself  
only can be speaking: compare ch. xxi.  
9, 10, xxii. 8, 9, which latter place is decisive  
against him) **the things which must**  
(of prophetic necessity) **take place after  
these things** (so literally: viz., the things  
now present: as in ch. i. 19, but the  
*things* not being the same in the two  
cases. So that **after these things** has  
very much the general meaning given by  
the “*hereafter*” of the A. V.: this clause  
corresponds to “which are about to happen  
after these things” of ch. i. 19).

**2.] Immediately I was** (became) **in the  
Spirit** (i. e. I experienced a new accession  
of the Spirit’s powerful influence, which  
transported me thither: “I was in a trance  
of ecstasy:” see on ch. i. 10. It is hardly  
credible that any scholar should have proposed  
to understand “*there*” after **was**,  
“immediately I *was there* in the Spirit:”  
but this was done by Züllig, and has found  
an advocate in England in Dr. Maitland):  
**and, behold, a throne stood** (the A. V. “*was  
set*,” gives too much the idea that the  
*placing* of the throne formed part of the  
on: “*lay*” would be our best word, but  
we do not use it of any thing so lofty as a  
throne. I have therefore adopted **was  
there**, as best, indicating mere position)  
**in heaven, and upon the throne one sitting**(called henceforward throughout the book,  
**He that sitteth upon the throne**, and  
being the Eternal Father [not as Lyra,  
*the Three-One God;* for He that sitteth  
on the throne is distinguished in ch. vi. 16,  
vii. 10 from the Son, and in ver. 5 from the  
Holy Spirit]: see ch. vii. 10, xix. 4, where  
we read expressly “*to God that sitteth*  
*upon the throne.”* So that it is not for  
the reasons sometimes suggested, that the  
Name is not expressed: e. g. on account  
of the Jewish unwillingness to express the  
sacred Name: or, that the mind has no  
figure and the tongue no word by which  
to express it. The simple reason seems to  
be, as assigned by Hengstenberg and Düsterdieck,  
that St. John would describe  
simply that which he saw, *as* he saw it.  
For the same reason he does not name  
Christ expressly in the first vision, ch. i.  
13); **and he that sat** (no need to supply  
“*was:*” the nominatives are all correlative  
after **behold**) **like in appearance** (lit. “*in*  
*vision*,” “*in sight*,” as A. V. in the next  
clause) **to a jasper and sardine stone** (the  
**jasper** appears to have been a beautiful