

was born a king, he was of human nature and he was perfectly righteous.

Looking into the matter more closely, we find a remarkable passage in the Gospels, fitting in perfectly with the apostolic exposition, but without any reason being offered or any attention being drawn to the significance of the incident recorded. At the moment when Jesus died, "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom" (Mt. 27:51; Mk. 15:38; cf. Lk. 23:45). No comment is made; the bare fact is stated and nothing more is mentioned about it.

All readers know that when Solomon's temple was built it was on the basis that had been presented in the service of the tabernacle. The temple had its holy place and its veil. The temple erected in later years by Herod was on the same general pattern in the facilities it offered for worship. It is clear, then, that the rending of the veil at the moment of Christ's death exactly harmonised with the meaning stated in the letter to the Hebrews. He made a way into the most holy, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh. We can hardly suppose that an unbeliever would affirm that there was collusion between the two writers, and that the author of the Gospel record, having invented such an incident, left it for readers to see the hidden meaning.

The veil being rent from the top to the bottom is in itself significant. The top of the veil would be too high for human hands easily to reach. The rending was from above. It certainly seems that this incident is in the category of undesigned harmonies such as abound in Scripture.

We remember that in the book of Leviticus very particular instruction was given to the high priest regarding his entering the most holy on the great Day of Atonement. He was not to wear the ceremonial robe of glory and beauty. He had to wear special vestments of pure white linen. "These are holy garments", we read; "therefore shall he wash his flesh in water, and so put them on" (16:4). Then, with incense as a symbol of prayer, and with blood to be sprinkled seven times before the Lord, he moved aside the veil and entered the most holy place. In like manner Jesus washed his flesh in water at baptism. He was anointed with the Holy Spirit. He put on the garments of perfect righteousness, and through the rending of his flesh he made a way into the most holy.

A BELIEVER in the Bible feels to be on strong ground when an apostle leads the way in the interpretation of symbols. He is naturally interested to see the further significance of matters closely related to the explanation given, although the apostle does not mention them. Even an unbeliever, if he is a reasonable man, will recognise a certain obligation to examine these matters that have been handed down to us with such force of tradition. If he makes close examination he will assuredly perceive a succession of harmonies which challenge his scepticism. On the basis of the apostolic explanation, we may proceed step by step to other meanings which it would be increasingly difficult to dismiss as being fortuitous.



## Correspondence

*Comments on articles appearing in the magazine are always welcome, and should be addressed to the editor in whose section the article appears.*

### Who wrote Ecclesiastes?

In his article, "[Did Solomon write Ecclesiastes in repentance?](#)" (Mar. 2003, p. 73) Brother Dennis Elliott states that the authorship of Ecclesiastes has been called in question by some, but that internal evidence clearly shows that it was written by Solomon after he repented. One writer who called the authorship into question was the late Brother Harry Whittaker.<sup>1</sup> I have examined his analysis and found it to be sound, and have my own observations to add to the subject.

Firstly, the authorship of Ecclesiastes is traditionally attributed to Solomon, but it is *tradition*—to be specific, *Jewish tradition*. There is nothing wrong with accepting tradition provided it is rigorously examined against Scriptural evidence. There is no evidence that Solomon wrote Ecclesiastes; in fact the opposite is true.

The author of 1 Kings comments that Solomon "loved many strange women" (11:1). This

1. "Who wrote Ecclesiastes?", *Bible Studies*, p. 217.

is a classic example of what we read of in Genesis: “the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose” (6:2). These women led Solomon astray, and there is absolutely no evidence in Scripture of his repentance. In contrast, we are told explicitly about the repentance of King Manasseh. Why would Scripture omit such an important fact? The argument by omission is always a weak argument, for it is based on supposition.

I am convinced that the evidence points to King Uzziah as the author of Ecclesiastes, as argued by Brother Whittaker. The author of Ecclesiastes claims that he was king in Jerusalem, the past tense implying that he was no longer king at the time of writing. The only king who fits this scenario is Uzziah, who spent the latter part of his life in a lazar house, quarantined because of leprosy. The words of Ecclesiastes 7:2 fit these circumstances: “It is better to go to the house of mourning, than to go to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart”.

In 2 Chronicles 26, which summarises Uzziah’s reign, we are told how he “invented” war machines (v. 15). This word is very rare, but forms the prime root for the word “inventions” in Ecclesiastes 7:29: “God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions”.

Brother Whittaker provides another twenty-six points of contact between Ecclesiastes and what is recorded of King Uzziah, to which I refer the reader. To this I would add my own observations, formed after contemplating the psychology behind King Uzziah. He was an immensely successful king, both militarily and agriculturally. He obviously wanted to establish Judah as a regional power, and the land prospered and enjoyed peace under him. It is apparent that he modelled his reign on that of Solomon; see the description of his court in Ecclesiastes 2:7,8, which includes, following the RV, marrying concubines. He could truly say: “Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us” (1:10).

But it was not enough for him to be like Solomon; he wanted to be like David and sit before the ark. When he tried this he was struck down with leprosy. David had been asked to sit before the ark,\* but Uzziah was presumptuous, as he later recognised: “Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God” (5:1). Finally, Uzziah’s reflection on all his labour and his present condi-

tion is found in these words: “All his days also he eateth in darkness, and he hath much sorrow and wrath with his sickness” (v. 17). Uzziah had aspired to be greater than both Solomon and David, but he neglected to realise that both his forebears had failed. David was forgiven his sin; we do not know if this is the case with Solomon, nor do we know if he repented.

I also have some comments on the article, “[Who was the Pharaoh of the Exodus?](#)”, by Martin Cragg in the same issue (p. 97). The name Moses does indeed come from the Egyptian, as stated by the author, but I believe it was originally Meses, meaning ‘my son’, as in Rameses, meaning ‘the son of Ra’. Thus we read that, after Pharaoh’s daughter caused the infant Moses to be taken out of the Nile, “he became *her son*. And she called his name Meses [my son]; and she said, Because I drew him out of the water” (Ex. 2:10). She laid claim to him as her son because she rescued him.

God did the same with the nation of Israel, whom He called “My son” (4:23) when he drew the nation out of the water of the Red Sea. Jesus was also called out of Egypt: “Out of Egypt have I called *My son*” (Mt. 2:15). When he was baptized, God stated: “This is *My beloved Son*” (3:17). On the mount of transfiguration the disciples were instructed: “This is *My beloved Son*: hear him” (Lk. 9:35); and when they looked around Moses was no longer present. The point is that Jesus was the new Moses, come to lead a new Exodus. There are many other Scriptural passages that confirm that Moses means ‘my son’.

Paul Wjns  
Huddersfield

---

\* Is there any Scriptural evidence for this?—*T.B.*

### Froglie spirit in Australia

I read with interest Brother Nigel Bernard’s timely article: “A prime minister’s message in the light of Scripture” (Feb. 2003, p. 47). Similar circumstances have occurred in Australia also; and the article prompted me to revisit a newspaper clipping that I keep handy and which I draw on whenever the opportunity is right within the Brotherhood.

This particular news relates to the fiftieth anniversary of D-Day (6 June 1994) and, although now nine years on, is still remarkable in the light