I mistake not. The mount on which John was set  
was, I believe, the summit of the twelve foundations of  
the city. The city is twelve thousand furlongs in  
height, when the foundations are added to the amount.  
Suppose the foundations to take up three-fourths of the  
height; then John would be standing on a great and  
high mountain, at the best possible point of view to  
take in the various glories of the city.  
 Highly illustrative of this is Stanley’s notice of the  
earthly Jerusalem. “The situation of Jerusalem is in  
several respects singular amongst the cities of Palestine.  
Its elevation is remarkable: not indeed from its  
being on the summit of one of the numerous hills of  
Judea, like most of the towns and villages, but because  
it is on the edge of one of the highest table-lands of the  
country. Hebron indeed is higher still by some hundred  
feet, and from the south, accordingly, the approach  
to Jerusalem is by a slight descent. But from every  
other side the ascent is perpetual; and to the traveller  
approaching Jerusalem from the west or east, it must  
always have presented the appearance, *beyond any other  
capital of the known world, we may add, beyond any  
important city that has ever existed on the earth, of a  
mountain city;* breathing, as compared with the sultry  
plains of the Jordan, or of the coast, a mountain air:  
enthroned, as compared with Jericho or Damascus,  
Gaza or Tyre, on a mountain fastness” (*Sinai and  
Palestine*, p. 170).  
 This its elevation is increased just before the millennium  
by the great earthquake, while all the adjacent  
country is made a plain around it. Isa. ii.; Zech. xiv.  
Thus God gives intimations of His final purpose of  
making His city to be set on a lofty mountain. The  
nations and Israel sought for their worship “high  
places” as the fittest points. The Most High gives  
effect at last to this tendency of the human mind.