God, as “*Father, Son, and Holy Spirit:*” Matt. xxviii.  
 This name Jesus would inscribe on the conqueror.  
As the high priest carried on his mitre, graven “like  
the engraving of a signet, HOLINESS TO THE  
LORD,” so should the conqueror wear the name of the  
God whom he had devotedly served.  
 “The name of *my* God.”  
 Jesus, though He is addressing His servants, never  
forgets the subordinate place He now holds, as the  
servant of the Father. Four times in this verse He  
speaks of “my God.” This is especially beautiful here,  
as He is speaking in the character of the Son of David to  
whom the kingdom is promised. Antichrist comes in  
his own name, and blasphemes the true God. *Jesus  
reverently confesses the name of His Father as His  
Commissioner*, and as appointing Him Priest and King.  
 “And the name of the city of my God.”  
 Why should it not be a literal city? All that Barnes  
says against it is, “It is a departure from all proper  
laws of interpretation, to explain this *literally*, as if a  
city should be actually let down from heaven.” What  
proper law of interpretation this construction violates is  
left, as well it may be, in silence. The one proper law  
is, to take each statement literally, which is not absurd,  
or does not involve a contradiction. Is there anything  
absurd in the supposition of God’s letting down a city  
from above? Anything more absurd than in the casting down of a mountain, or a star from the sky? “And  
equally so [improper] to infer from this passage and the  
others of similar import in this book, that a city will be  
literally *reared* for the residence of the saints. If the  
passage proves anything on either of these points, it is  
that a *great and splendid city*, such as that described in  
ch. xxi., will *literally come down from heaven*.” Just so!  
“But who can believe that?” *A great many!* Almost  
as many as believe that God will create new heavens