

much wider area than the tiny Roman province of Judea: just who are the “kings” (plural) who had hitherto reigned over the territory in question? And was there wholesale acknowledgement of Jesus as the Lamb of God, as verse 16 describes, in A.D. 70? Surely not; the very opposite was true, and the events of A.D. 70 were designed not to convert what was left of Judah’s commonwealth but to destroy it. Doubtless there are parallels between A.D. 70 and the overthrow of pagan Rome, as each dispensation was judged by God and came to an end. But I think that closer attention to the detail will tell us which one is being described in Revelation 6.

Brother Alleyne asks for a direct answer to the question, If the similar phrases of Matthew 24 and Revelation 6 are not describing the same events, then “why are those allusions there?”. The answer I offer is this: because they are describing *similar* events—it is as simple as that.

Revelation is characterised by literally hundreds of quotations and allusions from the Old Testament, and very many of them are given new and unexpected applications by the Lord Jesus. So, whilst examining similarly phrased passages of God’s Word is undoubtedly a basic tool of Bible interpretation, there is often much more involved in comparing Scripture with Scripture.

Jeremy Thomas  
Sale

### Israel’s dwelling safely

Brother Whittaker’s analysis of Israel’s dwelling safely ([Dec. 2001, p. 464](#)) is very interesting. He seems to be correct when he points out that, for Gentiles who are outside the covenants of promise, *betach* is translated ‘careless’, involving being caught off-guard, whereas for Israel it is usually translated ‘in safety’ or ‘safely’.

We must note, however, that in Leviticus 26:5,6 Israel is offered safety on the condition that they keep God’s commandments. We know that from A.D. 70 onwards Israel was placed right outside God’s loving protection, and have faced over the years such things as the Inquisition and the Holocaust, the outworking of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. They are having a very hazardous time today, with danger in every corner.

Ezekiel 38 and 39 are about God’s final punishment on Israel for their wayward behaviour over the past 2,000 years. In their present situation the nation of Israel is without Divine protection,

as they are living in their own self-confidence, like the Gentiles who know not God, and are living outside the covenants of promise. Thus Ezekiel 38:11 would be best rendered, “I will go to them that are at rest, that dwell carelessly [*betach*], all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates”, and similarly verses 8 and 14.

Those who survive the catastrophe described in Ezekiel 38 and 39 will recognise Christ as their Messiah when he shows them his hands (Zech. 13:6). Once they do this they will again come under Divine protection and will dwell safely. But at this time Israel are living as the Gentiles do, carelessly, without Divine protection.

Keith Worthington  
Pinetown, South Africa

### The meaning of God’s Name

I would like to comment on some of the points made by Brother Mark Vincent concerning the Name of God in his series on Exodus. I agree with the point he made concerning addressing God as ‘Father’ rather than ‘Yahweh’ (Jan. 2002, p. 14). God is our Father by adoption, and the pattern laid down by the Lord Jesus, “Our Father Which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name”, shows how we can address God as our Father whilst giving due reverence to His Name.

However, I would not agree with him when he says concerning Exodus 3:14: “it is quite legitimate to translate the Hebrew as either ‘I am’ or ‘I will be’” (Aug. 2001, p. 307). Whilst acknowledging that Brother Vincent does not rule out a future application, I would argue that the Scriptural evidence points to the future tense as being the only right way to translate these words.

In verse 12 the same Hebrew translated “I am” in verse 14 is found, but here it is translated “I will be”. In verse 12 God was saying how He would be with Moses when he went into Egypt. As this was to be in the future, God said, “I will be with thee”. It would be expected that the AV would also use the future tense for the other occurrences of this word in this passage. However, the AV translators chose to translate it in the present tense in verse 14. The RV recognises this inconsistency, and suggests in a footnote, among other variations that use the present tense, “I will be that I will be” as a translation.

The same Hebrew translated “I am” in Exodus 3:14, *ehyeh*, is found in 2 Samuel 7:14, “I will be his father”. This is quoted in Hebrews: “I will