

BIBLE READING PROGRAM — SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

**The Throne of Britain:
Its Biblical Origin and Future**

The greatest and most enduring dynasty in world history is showing signs of passing. But will it? To understand the future of the British royal family, we must examine how the monarchy began—and why.

©2003 United Church of God, *an International Association*

by Tom Robinson

The year 2002 marks the 50th year in the reign of Queen Elizabeth II—her Golden Jubilee—a milestone reached by only five previous British monarchs. Sadly, a pall was cast over the festivities by the death of the Queen’s sister, Princess Margaret, followed shortly afterward by the death of the Queen’s mother, who was also named Elizabeth.

The royal family has certainly experienced its share of tragedy over the past several years. Adultery, divorce, scandal, serious health problems. And, of course, who can forget the farewell to “England’s rose,” Princess Diana? Besides these, the House of Windsor has also had to face questions regarding the role and legitimacy of the monarchy itself.

As the United Kingdom wrestles with issues of national sovereignty and the preservation of its culture and national traditions in the face of calls for greater participation in the European Union, the throne of Britain has been the subject of ongoing debate.

One of country’s premier magazines, *The Economist*, has even called for abolishing the monarchy, calling it an institution of “baseless deference” (Oct. 22, 1994, p. 15; see Appendix 1: “Scrapping the Monarchy?”) Yet is it truly *baseless*? We will learn the answer to that question as we examine the matter—and from a rather surprising source.

“This sceptered isle”

The Economist did concede that “if the British people *want* a monarchy, they should *have* a monarchy” (p. 15). And despite its problems, most in the United Kingdom do still want their monarchy. Many reflect with pride and nostalgia on “this throne of kings, this sceptered isle, this earth of majesty” (Shakespeare, *Richard II*, Act 2, Scene 1)—recalling names like Queen Victoria, King James, Henry VIII, Robert the Bruce, Richard the Lionhearted, William the Conqueror and King Arthur. For some, this reflection on the monarchy stretches even farther back into the mists of time, all the way to its traditional founder Brutus, reputedly of the royal house of Troy—the famed city of Homer’s classical epic, *The Iliad*.

Around A.D. 1139, English chronicler Geoffrey of Monmouth fancifully recounted the story of Brutus (Celtic *Brwt*) from earlier sources in his *History of the Kings of Britain*. Though discounted as myth by most historians today, notice the incredible future that was foretold for the descendants of this ancient Trojan in a dream: “Brutus, beyond the setting of the sun, past the realms of Gaul [now France], there lies an island in the sea, once occupied by giants. Now it is empty and ready for your folk. Down the years this will prove an abode suited to you and to your people; and for your descendants it will be a second Troy. A race of kings will be born there from your stock and the round circle of the whole earth will be subject to them” (translated by Lewis Thorpe, 1966).

Remarkably, Geoffrey set down these words before Britain was even remotely a world power. Perhaps it was just a case of wishful thinking on his part—yet the words do seem rather prophetic. For in the 1800s, Queen Victoria, called the Empress of India, came to reign over the largest empire in the history of the world, encompassing “a quarter of the land mass of the earth, and a third of its population” (James Morris, *Heaven’s Command: An Imperial Progress*, 1973, p. 539).

Today, though, it seems that despite multiple nations still looking to Queen Elizabeth as their head of state, the British throne's glory days are over, particularly with more and more calls heard for its abolishment. But what really lies ahead for the monarchy? For the answer we must look back nearly 4,000 years—to a past even more amazing than the account of Brutus, and filled with far more certain prophecies. For as astounding as it may seem, the past and future of the British monarchy are found within the pages of the Holy Bible.

The scepter promise

Our story begins with the righteous patriarch Abraham, who, around 1900 B.C., trekked from Mesopotamia all the way to Canaan, which is now the land of Israel. In reward for his faithful obedience to God, the Almighty promised fantastic national blessings for his posterity and that through a particular descendant of his the entire world would be blessed (Genesis 12:1-3; 22:16-18). God further promised that *kings* would come from him and his wife Sarah (17:6, 16).

This is widely understood to mean that a line of kings would spring from them, culminating in the Messiah—Jesus Christ—who would bring salvation for the whole world. These promises, both of ethnic lineage and of grace, were confirmed to Abraham's son Isaac (Genesis 26:3-5).

Later, around 1750 B.C., God promised essentially the same thing to Isaac's son Jacob (Genesis 28:10-19). A few decades afterward, God informed him, "A nation and a company of nations shall proceed from you, and kings shall come from your body" (35:11). By this time, Jacob, renamed Israel, had fathered 12 sons—each to be the progenitor of one of the 12 tribes of Israel. Through his son Joseph—and Joseph's two sons Ephraim and Manasseh—would continue the birthright promise of national greatness (Genesis 48; 49:22-26).

We also see this in 1 Chronicles 5:1-2 in the New Revised Standard Version: "The sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel. (He was the firstborn, but because he defiled his father's bed his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph son of Israel, so that he [Reuben] is not enrolled in the genealogy according to the birthright; though Judah became prominent among his brothers and a ruler ["the chief ruler," King James Version] came from him, yet the birthright belonged to Joseph)."

Thus, while Joseph received the birthright, to Jacob's son Judah, father of the Jews, went the promise of a kingly line leading to the Messiah. Just before Jacob died around 1670 B.C., he prophesied: "Judah is a lion's whelp . . . The scepter [ruler's staff] shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh comes [*Shiloh* meaning "Peaceable One," "Peacemaker" or "To Whom It (the Scepter) Belongs"—thus a reference to the Messiah]; and to Him shall be the obedience of the people" (Genesis 49:9-10). It is probably because of this prophecy that the lion, the "king of beasts," became the heraldic emblem of Judah.

Some 30 years before this prophecy was given, around 1700 B.C., a strange event had occurred in the family of Judah, when Tamar bore him twin sons. During the delivery, a *hand* of one of the twins came out first, around which the midwife tied a scarlet thread to identify the firstborn—who was customarily preeminent when it came to inheritance rights (Genesis 38:27-28). But the baby pulled his hand back in and his *brother* came out first.

The midwife exclaimed: "How did *you* break through? This breach [or breaking out] be upon you!" (verse 29). In other words, "You are to be identified with this from now on." And to ensure it the child was named Perez (or Pharez), meaning "Breach." Then the baby with the scarlet thread on his hand was born—and he was named Zerah (or Zarah), meaning "Rising" or "Appearing," perhaps because his hand had appeared first (verse 30).

This surely seems a rather odd occurrence to record in the Bible if it were to have no further significance. The implication is perhaps that Perez, who forced himself into the firstborn position, would need to eventually be reconciled with Zerah. And we will later see that this appears to have actually happened.

In any event, since Perez was the firstborn, the right of inheritance went to him—although Zerah, with the scarlet thread, would seem to have some claim in this. So which one received the scepter? Neither did—personally that is. Indeed, Judah himself had not received it either. For it wasn't until much later in the time of Moses and the Exodus—around 1445 B.C.—that Israel became a true nation with a ruling king. But even then that king wasn't of the tribe of Judah.

The throne of the Lord

The king at the time of the Exodus and for the next nearly 400 years was the Rock of Israel, the Eternal God Himself—in fact, the preincarnate Word, Jesus Christ (compare Deuteronomy 32:4; 1 Corinthians 10:4; John 1:1-3, 14; 17:5; and to learn more, request our free booklet *Who Is God?*).

Though ruling through His chosen “judges”—from Moses and Joshua all the way to Samuel—God in the person of Christ sat on the throne of Israel (compare Judges 8:22-23). Samuel described this period as the time “when the LORD your God was your king” (1 Samuel 12:12). That’s why, when the Israelites told Samuel around 1050 B.C. that they wanted a human king like the nations around them, the Lord told him, “They have not rejected you, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them” (8:7).

So God then gave them a physical monarch—though surprisingly not of the tribe of Judah. Rather, King Saul was from the tribe of Benjamin.

It is interesting to note that unlike other ancient rulers, the king of Israel was not an absolute despot. God had Samuel anoint Saul “commander” (9:16; 10:1) or “captain” (KJV) over His people. This Hebrew term *nagiyd* used here could be rendered in English as viceroy or governor-general—the stand-in for the *real* monarch. In fact, the very act of anointing a ruler in the ancient world implied a vassal relationship. It is later explained that Israel’s king “sat on the throne of the LORD,” essentially reigning as king *for* Him (1 Chronicles 29:23; 2 Chronicles 9:6-8).

Also quite different than in other realms was the fact that in other countries, kings made law and were thus above it. But in Israel, God’s prophet explained “the rights and duties of the kingship” (1 Samuel 10:25, NRSV). The ruler was *subject* to the law (compare Deuteronomy 17:14-20). Essentially, the Almighty set up a constitutional limited monarchy—in which He would send prophets as His representatives to the king to give him his “report card.” Tragically, Saul failed and God removed him from office by bringing about his death.

Then, around 1010 B.C., *more than 650 years after* the scepter prophecy had been given to Judah, God at last did raise up a man from that tribe, of the preeminent branch of Perez, to be king: “I have found David . . . a man after My own heart, who will do all My will” (Acts 13:22).

The Davidic covenant

David, though he made mistakes, was a deeply converted man who followed God with his whole heart. So God told him he would make him a “house” (2 Samuel 7:11)—that is, a royal dynasty. It was to be an enduring dynasty through his son Solomon: “And I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever” (verse 13). If Solomon disobeyed God, he would be punished (verse 14). “But My mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I removed from before you. And your house and your kingdom shall be established forever before you. Your throne shall be established forever” (verse 15-16; compare 23:1, 5; 1 Chronicles 22:9-10; 28:4-5).

Yet this requires some clarification, particularly the statement about Solomon’s dynasty enduring forever. The Hebrew word translated “forever” here, *olam*, does not always carry this meaning. Occasionally it means unending as long as certain conditions apply (compare Exodus 21:6; Jonah 2:6). Recorded elsewhere, there were definite conditions attached to the endurance of Solomon’s throne. Notice 1 Chronicles 28: “Moreover, I will establish his kingdom forever, *if he is steadfast to observe My commandments and judgments*” (verse 7). God later reiterated this condition to Solomon himself (2 Chronicles 7:17-18; compare verses 19-22).

So if he lived in disobedience to God, the promise of an unending Solomonic dynasty would be rendered null and void. Sadly, this would come to pass, as Solomon’s heart was eventually turned to following other gods (see 1 Kings 11:4).

What, then, of 2 Samuel 7:14-15, where God said he wouldn’t remove His mercy from Solomon as He did with Saul? It must simply have meant that, in the event of Solomon’s disobedience, God would not bring about his death to end his reign, as happened with Saul. Instead, Solomon would be allowed to live out his days with his kingdom intact for the sake of David—and indeed this is what happened (compare 1 Kings 11:12). Nevertheless, Solomon violated the conditions that would have guaranteed him a perpetual dynasty. So while nothing forbade his descendants from reigning until well into the future, God was not obligated to ensure their continuance upon the throne.

On the other hand, God's promise to David in 2 Samuel 7:15-16—that David's own kingdom and throne would be established forever—still stands. For God did obligate Himself to this course no matter what Solomon did. Notice His confirmation of this tremendous pledge in the book of Psalms: "I have made a covenant with My chosen, I have sworn to My servant David: 'Your seed I will establish forever, and build up your throne *to all generations*'" (89:3-4). So from then on, David would have a descendant sitting on a continuing throne in every generation!

God further proclaimed: "Also I will make him My firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth. My mercy I will keep for him forever, and My covenant shall stand firm with him. His seed also I will make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven . . . My covenant I will not break, nor alter the word that has gone out of My lips. Once I have sworn by My holiness; I will not lie to David: His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before Me; it shall be established forever like the moon, even like the faithful witness in the sky" (verses 27-29, 34-37).

And in Jeremiah 33:19: "Thus says the LORD: 'If you can break My covenant with the day and My covenant with the night, so that there will not be day and night in their season, then My covenant may also be broken with David My servant, so that he shall not have a son [that is, a descendant] to reign on his throne.'"

Here, then, was an unbreakable promise of an unbreakable dynasty—a dynasty preeminent above all others! But what happened to that dynasty? And where is it today?

Fall of Israel and Judah

Because of Solomon's disobedience, God split the nation into two kingdoms following his death in about 930 B.C. (1 Kings 11–12). The tribes of Judah and Benjamin in the south (with many from Levi)—as the kingdom of Judah—continued under the throne of David, beginning with Solomon's son Rehoboam.

The northern 10 tribes, however—as the kingdom of Israel—went through a number of different dynasties. And because of the northern kingdom's continual idolatry, God finally had its people taken into captivity around 733 and 722 B.C. by the Assyrians, who resettled the 10 tribes in what is now northern Iraq and Iran (2 Kings 15, 17). Subsequently, as centuries passed, the 10 tribes were seemingly lost.

Around 20 years after Israel's final fall, the nation of Judah, following repeated cycles of idolatry and reformation, was invaded by Assyria as well, reducing Judah "to a shadow of its former self, at least two thirds of the population perishing or being carried away captive" ("Judah," *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, 1980, Vol. 2, p. 825). Thus, a great number of Jews, Benjamites and Levites were also taken away to join the Israelite captivity.

God gave the remnant of Judah another century to prove its loyalty and devotion to Him. Yet sadly, despite witnessing Israel's captivity and experiencing its own bitter taste of it, Judah lapsed into idolatrous rebellion again (see Jeremiah 3:10-11). So God sent the rest of the nation of Judah into captivity as well—this time by the hands of the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar II (ca. 604 to 586 B.C.).

The Davidic line had continued all the way to this point, with Zedekiah now reigning over Judah. But according to Jeremiah, the Babylonian forces took the Jewish king to Nebuchadnezzar, who—after killing Zedekiah's sons in front of his face and slaying "all the nobles of Judah" to ensure that no heir to the throne remained—put out Zedekiah's eyes and threw him in a dungeon in Babylon, where he eventually died (39:1-7; 52:1-11).

There was, it should be noted, a former king of the Solomonic line *still alive* in the dungeons of Babylon. In fact this man, Jeconiah—also called Coniah or Jehoiachin—was restored to honor 37 years into the Jewish captivity (2 Kings 25:27-30). He was even given the title "king" along with numerous other captive, vassal rulers. When the Persian conquerors of Babylon later permitted a contingent of Jews to return to their homeland, Jeconiah's grandson Zerubbabel was made *governor*—but not *king*—of Judea.

To dispel any notion that this line could have been the means whereby God preserved the Davidic dynasty, it must be pointed out that God had earlier decreed that no descendant of Jeconiah would ever sit on the throne of David, ruling over Judah (Jeremiah 22:24, 30). And none ever did. In fact, while a minority of the Jewish captives did return to the Holy Land following the Babylonian captivity, the Jewish throne was never reestablished there at all.

What, then, of God's promises that David's dynasty would never end?

The coming of the Messiah

Beyond the messianic reference in the scepter prophecy (Genesis 49:10), God gave many other prophecies about the Messiah in Scripture. He was to be of the line of David, ruling on David's throne (see Isaiah 9:6-9). And Jesus Christ, as the Messiah, was to fulfill these prophecies, as God was to "give Him the throne of His father David" (Luke 1:31-33). Indeed, Jesus was physically descended—through His mother Mary—from David's son Nathan (Romans 1:3; Luke 3:23, 30-33, Heli of that lineage being the father of Mary and father-in-law of her husband Joseph).

Mary's husband Joseph was himself of the Solomonic line of Jeconiah, and Jesus was reckoned as his son, signifying Jesus' adoption by him (Matthew 1:1-16; compare Luke 2:48). This adoption could perhaps have given Jesus a legal claim to the throne. Yet remarkably, if He had been the *actual* son of Joseph, descent from Jeconiah would have barred Him from inheriting David's throne. But Jesus was *not* Joseph's son—He was the Son of God the Father through miraculous conception in the womb of Mary when she was yet a betrothed virgin. And through Mary, Jesus was descended from David by a different family line, as mentioned.

Furthermore, Christ, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah" (Revelation 5:5), is both "the Root and the Offspring of David" (3:16). That is, beyond being David's descendant, Jesus was also the *ancestor* of David, as the Eternal God who created Adam—the father of all mankind (Luke 3:38; compare Ephesians 3:9). Moreover, the preincarnate Jesus was Israel's first King. The Davidic throne was actually, as we've seen, the throne of the *Lord*. And since Jesus *is* the Lord, the throne ultimately remained His to take back.

Many will hail these facts as proof that God's promises to David have been fulfilled in Christ's coming as David's descendant. Yet if so, it still doesn't explain why there wasn't a reigning king of David's line for more than 500 years between Zedekiah and Jesus. David's throne was supposed to be occupied in "all generations." And yet it would appear that there wasn't even a Davidic throne or kingship in existence for all that time. How did Christ inherit a throne that didn't exist?

The truth of the matter is that Jesus did not sit on David's throne when He came in the flesh—nor has He at anytime since. In a parable, Christ portrays Himself as a nobleman who "went to a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return" (Luke 19:12)—that is, He went to heaven to receive the Kingdom of God and has not yet returned to rule over it. Jesus is presently sitting with the Father on *His* throne in heaven (Revelation 3:21; Hebrews 12:2). But since Christ's rule over all nations from Jerusalem (see Jeremiah 3:17) has not yet begun, does that mean more than 2,500 years have gone by without a descendant of David reigning as king? Has God broken His word after all?

One important factor often overlooked about the scepter prophecy in Genesis 49:10 is that it shows Judah still having a ruling monarch, waiting for the Messiah to take over, "in the last days" (verse 1). Therefore, since Jesus has not yet returned in power and glory, there must be a monarch of Jewish descent reigning somewhere on the earth during this generation. In fact, that monarch must be of the line of David, occupying a throne that has continued through *all generations since* David. Otherwise, the Bible is unreliable.

To build and to plant

The obvious question now is: Did the Davidic dynasty come to an end with the death of Zedekiah and his sons—or did it somehow survive? In searching for an answer, we begin with the prophet Jeremiah, to whom God had given a mysterious commission: "See, today I appoint you over nations and over kingdoms, to pluck up and to pull down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant" (Jeremiah 1:10, NRSV). Oddly enough, even though Judah was the only nation or kingdom in the Promised Land at this time, notice that Jeremiah was set over "nations" and "kingdoms"—plural.

Setting that fact aside for now, based on Jeremiah's life after the prophecy was given it is easy to ascertain what God meant by plucking up, pulling down, destroying and overthrowing. This great prophet repeatedly warned the Jews to repent of their disobedience—but they scorned him. So God used him to pronounce judgment on the nation: the people and the kings of David's line would be overthrown in the Babylonian conquest and uprooted—to Babylon. But did *all of them* go there?

The latter part of the prophet's commission yet remained: "to build and to plant." But what did this involve? From Jeremiah 45:4 we can see that building and planting in this context originally entailed God's planting His people in the land and building a kingdom of them there—now to be pulled up and destroyed. So the commission would seem to involve planting people in another place in order to establish a kingdom elsewhere. But did this have anything to do with the house of David?

Intriguingly, Jeremiah did prophesy regarding David's dynasty, as we have already seen and will soon see more of. And a prophecy from Ezekiel will answer the question of who was to be planted—and where. Yet first note this amazing fact: Following the carrying away of Judah's people, a remnant left in the land included the "king's daughters" (41:10)—who were evidently young girls since their father Zedekiah was only 32 when he died (compare 2 Chronicles 36:11).

But could the royal line continue through a daughter? According to Israel's law of inheritance, the answer would certainly appear to be yes (compare Numbers 27:1-11)—though Nebuchadnezzar may not have realized this initially. (In fact, if kingship could not pass through a woman then it could not have passed through Mary to Jesus Christ.)

What, then, happened to the remnant? Against God's commands (Jeremiah 42:1-19), they fled from the Babylonian invaders to Egypt to seek the protection of Pharaoh Hophra. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* explains: "Apries . . . Hebrew Hophra (d. 567 B.C.), fourth king (reigned 589-570 B.C.) of the 26th dynasty of Egypt; he succeeded his father Psamtik II. Apries failed to help his ally King Zedekiah of Judah against Babylon, but after the fall of Jerusalem he received many Jewish refugees into Egypt" ("Apries," *Micropaedia*, 1985, Vol. 1., p. 496).

According to the Bible, the Jewish remnant took with them "men, women, children, the king's daughters and . . . Jeremiah the prophet and Baruch"—the last name referring to Jeremiah's secretary or scribe (Jeremiah 43:6). The majority of these, according to God, would die by sword or famine (42:15-16). But a few would escape and some would return (44:12-14, 28). We know that Baruch and Jeremiah, who did not go to Egypt by choice, survived (compare 45:2-5). And, as we will see, so did at least one of the king's daughters.

Asylum in Egypt

The Jewish remnant journeyed into Egypt "as far as Tahpanhes" (43:7)—to "Pharaoh's house" there (verse 9). Notice this from the famous British pioneer archaeologist and Egyptologist Flinders Petrie, who discovered the site in 1886: "Tahpanhes was an important garrison, and as the Jews fled there it must have been close to the frontier. It is thus clear that it was the Greek Daphnae, the modern Tell Defneh, which is on the road to Palestine . . .

"Of this," he continues, "an echo comes across the long ages; the fortress mound is known as Qasr Bint el Yehudi, the palace of the Jew's daughter. It is named *Qasr*, as a palace, not *Qala*, a fortress. It is not named *Tell* Bint el Yehudi, as it would be if were called so after it were a ruinous heap. Qasr is a name which shows its descent from the time of . . . habitation for nobility and not merely for troops. So through the long ages of Greek and Roman and Arab there has come down the memory of the royal residence for the king's daughters from the wreck of Jerusalem" (*Egypt and Israel*, 1911, pp. 85-86; see also "Daphne," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th ed., Vol. 7, p. 48).

Yet there certainly were many troops there as well. Petrie states: "Psamtik [Pharaoh Psammetichus I, founder of Egypt's 26th dynasty of which Hophra was the fourth king] guarded the frontiers of Egypt with three strong garrisons, placing the Ionian and Carian mercenaries especially at the Pelusian Daphnae . . . in the northeast, from which quarter the most formidable enemies were likely to appear" (p. 40).

These were Greek forces primarily from the west coast of Asia Minor (modern Turkey). "Ionian" and "Carian" primarily designated the Greek city of Miletus there: "Within Egypt itself, normally hostile to any foreign settlement, the Greeks gained a foothold . . . About 650 [B.C.] the Milesians [from Miletus] opened a 'factory,' or trading post, at Naucratis on the Canopic branch of the Nile. Pharaoh Psamtik I tolerated them because they made good mercenaries, while their commerce provided rich prey for his collectors of customs revenues" (Will Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, Vol. 2: *The Life of Greece*, 1966, p. 173).

Miletus will factor greatly in pursuing this whole subject to its conclusion. Suffice it to say for now that many of these "Greek" forces in Egypt were not so unrelated to the Jews taking refuge with them. There was evidently a kinship going way back. The ancient Greeks had often referred to

themselves as Danaans—a name evidently derived from the Israelite tribe of Dan (see Appendix 2: “Were the Greeks Israelites?”).

Indeed, a number of the Greek mercenaries employed in Egyptian service were probably Israelites whose ancestors had earlier settled in Greece and neighboring lands. And here they were—guarding the remnant of the Davidic royal family under orders of the Egyptian pharaoh!

Yet this arrangement was not to last. “The Greeks continued to play a prominent role during the reigns of Psammeticus II and Apries (the Pharaoh Hophra of Jeremiah). Under the latter, however, a national movement among the Egyptians led to a revolt [ca. 570 B.C.] against the [Egyptian] king and the Greek element, with the result that the throne passed to the general Amasis (Ahmosis II), who withdrew the Greeks from Daphnai” (*Chamber’s Encyclopedia*, 1959, Vol. 5)—evidently expelling many of them whom he considered loyal to Hophra.

Adding to the need for expulsion was the fact that although Ahmose confined the remaining Greek mercenaries near his capital, making many of them part of a royal guard, “an element within Egyptian culture . . . resisted this; and the presence of foreigners in Egypt, both as invaders and settlers, led to the rise of a nationalism” that wanted the foreigners out (“Egypt,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Macropaedia, Vol. 18, 1985, p. 165; “Ahmose II,” *Micropaedia*, Vol. 1, p. 168).

It was now about 16 years after the fall of Jerusalem, and up to this point things had apparently gone rather well in Egypt for those who had fled there. But God had warned of the calamity to befall Hophra (Jeremiah 44:30). And He had warned the Jewish remnant seeking refuge in Egypt that they would be consumed there (verse 27). Clearly, then, the turn of events was from Him. The Egyptians drove many of the Greco-Israelite mercenaries from the country. And most of the Jewish remnant was probably slaughtered around this time, if not in the uprising then probably in Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion of Egypt two years later in 568 B.C., which laid waste most of the Nile valley.

Based on God’s prophecies, a few evidently made it back to Judah (verse 28). But what about Jeremiah, Baruch and the king’s daughters? Where did they go? The book of Jeremiah doesn’t actually tell us, although it contains some hints.

To be planted in Israel

The very fact that Jeremiah was outside the country in the company of the king’s daughters, the only apparent successors to the Davidic throne, with a commission “to build and to plant” should give us pause. This was no mere coincidence—especially when we consider the unbreakable covenant God had made with David.

God had even said that if the Jewish remnant stayed in Judah as He told them to, He would have used Jeremiah to replant and build up the kingdom right where they were (Jeremiah 42:10). But, as we’ve seen, they instead went to Egypt—where God had explicitly said not to go.

So now that they were being driven out of Egypt, where would Jeremiah go at this time with the king’s daughters? They weren’t supposed to be where they were. And indeed, it is quite possible that they had already left Egypt even prior to Hophra’s death. In either case, to where did they travel?

No longer would God rebuild the kingdom in *Judah*—as the people had violated the terms of this offer by fleeing to Egypt.

Moreover, Judah or any *other* land under Babylonian dominion would seem a highly unlikely choice. If Nebuchadnezzar had not known about the king’s daughters before, he certainly did now. News undoubtedly reached him of their being placed under special guard and care by his enemy, Pharaoh Hophra. And even Jeremiah himself, who had previously been accorded favor by the Babylonian invaders of Jerusalem, would now be mistakenly perceived as an accomplice of Hophra.

Furthermore, we know the throne was not replanted in Judah because the Bible gives us information about the Jewish homeland during the time of the captivity. And when the captives later return from Babylon, it is obvious that there is no Jewish king reigning over anyone there. Thus, while Jeremiah and the royal daughters may have briefly passed through Judah at this time, they did not resettle there.

So did they hide out in a cave in obscurity for the rest of their lives? Or, more reasonably, did they settle down somewhere with their important status acknowledged by others? And if so, was it somewhere that the prophet could fulfill his commission?

Jeremiah himself provides us with a powerful clue. He had earlier prophesied that from his time forward, David would “never lack a man [i.e., a person] to sit on the throne of the house of Israel” (Jeremiah 33:17). This verse is crucial to understanding the whole subject. Read it again. Notice—it

does not say Judah, but rather the *house of Israel*, which had gone into captivity around 150 years before. So from Jeremiah's time on, David would never lack a descendant to reign over, again, not Judah but Israel. Incidentally, those who see this as just a prophecy of Christ's future reign should realize that it then speaks of "rulers" from David's line (verse 26)—not just a singular "Ruler." What this is telling us is that the throne of David had to somehow be transferred to Israel at the time of Jeremiah!

Through the prophet Ezekiel, contemporary with Jeremiah, God fills in more details. Prior to Jerusalem's fall, he posed a riddle to the house of Israel (Ezekiel 17:2)—again, not Judah—which He afterward explained. "A great eagle . . . came to Lebanon and took from the cedar the highest branch" (verse 3). Meaning: "The king of Babylon went to Jerusalem and took its kings and princes" (verse 12). Then: "He cropped off the top of his young twigs" (verse 4, KJV). Meaning: "And he took of the king's offspring" (verse 13).

Having explained these symbols, God, through Ezekiel, gave the following clear parable: "I will take also [a sprig, NRSV] of the highest branches [Zedekiah and princes] of the high cedar [Judah] and set it out. I will crop off from the topmost of its young twigs [Zedekiah's children] a tender one [female], and will *plant* it on a high and prominent mountain [a great kingdom]. On the mountain height [top of the kingdom—the throne] of *Israel* [not Judah!] I will plant it; and it will bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a majestic cedar. Under it will dwell birds of every sort [all manner of peoples] . . . And all the trees of the field [nations of the earth] shall know that I, the LORD, have brought down the high tree [Judah] and exalted the low tree [Israel]" (vv. 22-24).

Here, then, is what the latter part of Jeremiah's commission was all about. Remarkably, he must have been responsible for transplanting the throne of David *to Israel* by taking a daughter of King Zedekiah to the 10 lost tribes. Yet where did the Israelites live at this time?

The Tuatha de Danaan

In our free brochure, *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy*, we explain how a centuries-long migration was taking the 10 tribes from the areas of their Assyrian captivity to northwest Europe (be sure to request a copy if you haven't already).

But it should be noted that there was some Israelite migration prior to the Assyrian captivity. The Danites, mariners in their own right and later more so with the Phoenicians, sailed far and wide over the seas. As we've seen, some settled in Greece and became known as the Danaans (again, see Appendix 2: "Were the Greeks Israelites?").

Interestingly, all early histories of *Ireland* mention the arrival there of people from Greece called the Tuatha de Danaan. While some today equate them with ancient demigods or mythical fairy folk, they were definitely a genuinely historical people. The word *tuath* simply means "tribe." Notice: "Old Irish 'tuath,' Welsh 'tud' (people, country), Breton 'tud' (people) and Gaulish 'teuta' (tribe) all come from Common Celtic towta, from the Indo-European word teuta (tribe)" (Dennis King, *Focal an Lae: The Word of the Day in Irish*, on-line at www.lincolnu.edu/~focal/backinst/focal114.htm). Tuatha de Danaan is thus the tribe of Danaan.

The Annals of Ireland report: "The Dan'ans were a highly civilized people, well skilled in architecture and other arts from their long residence in Greece, and their intercourse with the Phoenicians. Their first appearance in Ireland was 1200 B.C., or 85 years after the great victory of Deborah."

The Tuatha de Danaan, then, must be synonymous with the Danaans of Greece and thus the Israelite tribe of Dan. This is not at all farfetched. Indeed, it is widely accepted that the Phoenicians established trading outposts or colonies as far away as the British Isles: "The Phoenicians are believed to have played an important part in spreading the early bronze culture by their trade in tin, which their ships brought to the eastern Mediterranean from Great Britain and Spain at least as early as 1100 BC" ("Industries, Extraction and Processing," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Macropaedia, Vol.21, 1985, p. 424).

Yet what many often fail to realize is that the ancient maritime power designated as "Phoenicia" was actually an alliance between the city-states of Tyre and Sidon and the nation of Israel—in which Israel was the senior partner. The *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* says: "In the time of Solomon, Phoenicians, accompanied by Hebrews, reached as far as England . . . England was therefore known to the Israelites and they may have sought a refuge there after the fall of their kingdom" (Vol. 1, p. 316).

King Solomon, we are told in Scripture, “had a fleet of ships of Tarshish at sea with the fleet of Hiram [the Phoenician king of Tyre]” (1 Kings 10:22, NRSV). Tarshish was an ancient port of southern Spain, also known as Tartessus. It was evidently named after Tarshish, the son of Javan (Genesis 10:4)—Javan (or Yavan) being the name for *Greece* in the Old Testament. As an early Ionian Greek settlement, it was actually an Israelite-Phoenician colony.

Lands of Iberia

The land of Spain and Portugal, it should be mentioned, is also known as the Iberian Peninsula. Notes *Microsoft Encarta*: “Iberia, ancient name for both the Iberian Peninsula and the country lying between the Greater Caucasus and Armenia, approximately coextensive with present-day Georgia [which is south of Russia]” (“Iberia,” 1994). The *Encyclopedia of Religions* states: “The Iberes of the Caucasus were Georgians . . . In Sicily the Iberes were on the west . . . Spain was Iberia . . . [And the Roman historian] Tacitus speaks of Iberes in the west of England [in Cornwall], who may have come from Spain” (1964, Vol. 2, p. 259).

Why would Iberia be the name of places and people so far removed from each other? It is probably because the Israelites—the *Hebrews*—migrated through both Spain and the Caucasus and also went to Britain! *Iber* is almost identical with the name of Abraham’s ancestor Eber or Heber, father of the Hebrews (Genesis 11:15-16).

Furthermore, the name *Hebrew* appears to have taken on an added meaning. *McClintock & Strong’s Encyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature* adds that the word came to mean “one of the other side, i.e. . . . immigrant” (Vol. 4, p. 128). Bible translator Ferrar Fenton noted that in 1 Samuel 4:6, “*Eberim*, if translated, means ‘Colonists’—a fit term to be used by the Philistines of the Israelites, who were really Colonists in Palestine.” And it would be a fit term for Israelite colonists in other lands to apply to *themselves*.

Considering the Hebrew migration through Spain, the name of the River Ebro there would appear to be of the same origin. And the same may go for Ireland—or at least one of its earlier names. The word Ireland derives from Eire-land—Eire being the nation’s Gaelic name. Traditionally, Ireland is also called Erin. The Romans called it Hibernia or Ivernia.

Harvard professor Barry Fell wrote: “One of the ancient names of Ireland is *Ibheriu*, pronounced as *Iveriu*, a fact that suggests the word is derived from a still-earlier pronunciation, *Iberiu*. Now this is very interesting, for the Gaelic histories assert that the ancestors of the Gaels came to Ireland from Iberia, the old name of Spain. Could *Iberiu* be the same as *Iberia*, the name of the older homeland having been transferred to the younger? Many people, including some linguists, think this may well be the case” (*America B.C.: Ancient Settlers in the New World*, 1976, p. 43). The connection between *Iveriu* and *Hebrew* is even stronger when we realize that the Hebrew word for “Hebrew” is actually pronounced *Ivri*.

However, it should be noted that while *Iber* is a likely root for *Iberiu* and the Roman names Hibernia and Ivernia, it is possible that the particular names Erin and Eire derived from another source, as we will later see. In any case, there is still a strong identification with the Iberians of Spain.

Let us, then, consider the influx into Ireland of people from the Iberian Peninsula. Northwest Spain is called Galacia, apparently after the Gaels. Likewise, Portugal may mean “Port of the Gaels.”

Thomas Moore, in *The History of Ireland*, states: “In process of time, the Tuatha-de-Danaan [in Ireland] were themselves dispossessed of their sway; a successful invasion from the coast of Spain having put an end to the Danaanian dynasty, and transferred the scepter into the hands of that Milesian or Scotic race, which through so long a series of succeeding ages, supplied Ireland with her kings. This celebrated colony, though coming directly from Spain, was originally, we are told, of Scythic race” (1837, Vol. 1, p. 61).

This is truly remarkable for, as proved in our publication *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy*, the Gaels (or Celts) and Scythians were, by and large, Israelites—just like the Danaans. And apparently the ensuing conflict between the Milesians and Danaans in Ireland subsided rather quickly when it was realized that both sides were related peoples.

Who were the Milesians?

Note that the Scythians from Spain were known as Milesians—a name replete throughout the Irish annals. Peter Berresford Ellis, one of the foremost Celtic scholars now writing, states in his 2002 book *Erin's Blood Royal: The Gaelic Noble Dynasties of Ireland*: “The indigenous Gaelic aristocracy of Ireland is, without doubt, the most ancient in Europe . . . The Irish royal houses have genealogies . . . tracing their descent, generation by generation, from the sons of Golamh, otherwise known as Milesius or Mile Easpain (soldier of Spain), who, according to tradition, invaded Ireland at the end of the second millennium B.C. [a time frame which is problematic, as we will see]. He is regarded as the progenitor of the Gaels” (p. 3).

Ellis thus sees the name Milesius as deriving from a root that means “soldier,” as the Latin *miles*, the origin of our word military. Yet as we saw earlier, the term Milesian is normally used to designate the people of Miletus in western Asia Minor (now western Turkey). We should look more into the background of this important Aegean city-state to see if there could be a connection.

According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, “The Greek city traced its foundation to Neleus and his followers from Pylos” (“Miletus,” 1985, Vol. 8, p. 125). “The Mycenaean kingdom of Pylos was conquered by Neleus, and thereafter was ruled by his youngest son, Nestor” (“Pylos,” *Baedeker Greece*, 1995, p. 417). The city of Pylos was located on the southwest coast of Greece on the Ionian Sea (“Pylos,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 9, p. 820). Ionian Greeks from this area colonized throughout the Mediterranean.

Historian Will Durant explains in his acclaimed work, *The Story of Civilization*: “There is nothing more vital in the history of the Greeks than their rapid spread throughout the Mediterranean . . . The migration followed five main lines—Aeolian, Ionian, Dorian, Euxine, Italian . . . The second line [the Ionian line] took its start in the Peloponnesus [southern Greece], whence thousands of Mycenaeans and Achaeans [whom Homer identified with the Danaans] fled . . .

“Some of them settled in Attica [the region of Athens], some in Euboea [the large island northeast of Athens]; many of them moved out into the Cyclades [islands of the Aegean Sea between Greece and Turkey], ventured across the Aegean, and established in western Asia Minor [Turkey] the twelve cities of the Ionian Dodecapolis [including Miletus] . . . The fifth line moved westward to what the Greeks called the Ionian Isles, thence across to Italy and Sicily, and finally to Gaul [France] and Spain . . .

“One by one these colonies took form, until Greece was no longer the narrow peninsula of Homeric days, but a strangely loose association of independent cities scattered from Africa to Thrace [in northern Greece] and from Gibraltar [in southern Spain] to the eastern end of the Black Sea” (Vol. 2, pp. 127-129).

So it should perhaps not really surprise us that we would find the name Milesians in both ancient Turkey and even Spain since these were undoubtedly related people. This becomes even more likely when we realize the scope of influence of Miletus itself. Durant reports: “Miletus, southernmost of the Ionian Twelve, was in the sixth century [B.C.] the richest city in the Greek world. The site had been inhabited by Carians from Minoan days [more on the Cretan Minoans in a moment]; and when, about 1000 B.C., the Ionians came there from Attica [the region of Athens], they found the old Aegean culture [of nearby ancient Troy] . . . waiting to serve as the advanced starting point of their civilization . . .

“Taking a lesson from the Phoenicians and gradually bettering their instruction, Ionian merchants established colonies as trading posts in Egypt, Italy, the Propontis [Sea of Marmara between Istanbul and the site of ancient Troy], and the Euxine [Black Sea]. Miletus alone had *eighty such colonies*, sixty of them in the north” (pp. 134-135, emphasis added).

Surely, then, the Milesians of Spain were from Miletus or any of its many colonies. But who *were* these people? They came, we have seen, from Mycenaean Greece, which was heavily Danite (once again see Appendix 2: “Were the Greeks Israelites?”). Yet Danites, it should be realized, were not the only Israelites in southern Greece.

Indeed, as amazing as it sounds, it can be shown that many inhabitants of Mycenaean Greece—and of ancient Troy—were of the tribe of Judah, which seems to have migrated through Crete. Indeed, it appears that these Jews were ruled by kings descended from Judah’s son Zerah, of the scarlet thread. From this descent emerged two main royal Zarhite lines—the Trojan royal house, from which most of European royalty is surprisingly descended, and the royal house of Athens, which became the royal line of Miletus (see Appendix 3: “Aegean Royal Lines From Zerah”).

Milesius or Miledh, the father of Ireland's Milesian dynasty from Spain—also called Golamh or Gathelus—is referred to as either the son of Nel (also Niul or Neolus) or the son of Cecrops, the founder of Athens in Greek mythology. This is, in fact, proof positive that Ireland's traditional histories link *its* Milesians to those of the Aegean. For besides the mention of Cecrops, we have already seen that the Milesians of Asia Minor traced their descent from Neleus, the ruler of Mycenaean Pylos on the Ionian Sea (who, as with other Mycenaean rulers, was likely of Jewish descent). So Milesius was probably not the actual name of the founder of the Milesian dynasty in Ireland. Rather, the name Milesius or Miledh itself meant Milesian (one from Miletus). Thus, it most likely did not just mean “soldier.”

Likewise, the name Golamh and its variants are not personal names. Rather, they simply denote nationality, coming from the same origin as Gaul and Gael. As explained in our booklet *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy*, these names denote wandering Israelites—as did the term Scythian (“Linguistic Links: What’s in a Name?,” p. 30). Interestingly, as noted elsewhere in this publication, Milesius was said to descend from the king of Scythia, one Feinius Farsaidh. But this may not be an actual personal name either. “Feinius appears to be the same word as Feni, a name for Ireland’s earliest Celtic inhabitants” (Ellis, p. 228). These were probably the Phoenicians—many of whom were Israelites.

Continuing on, the high kings of Ireland “claimed their descent from the two sons of Milesius, Eremon and Eber Fionn, who were progenitors of the Gaels in Ireland and who divided Ireland between them—Eremon ruling in the north and Eber Fionn in the south” (p. 5). Again, these may not have been personal names. We will later look at the meaning of Eremon or Heremon, which *may* have been a real name or at least a title. But Eber Fionn or Eber Finn may simply denote “Hebrew Phoenician.” Whatever the case, the most likely conclusion regarding the identity of the Milesian invaders of Ireland is that they were Israelites—yet not just any Israelites, but Zarhite Jewish royalty from Miletus.

The people of the Red Hand

The Trojans were forced out of the Aegean region through a series of national conflicts—one of which is presented to us in the famous Trojan War of Homer’s *Iliad*, which occurred around 1200 B.C. Some refugees seem to have migrated north into Europe via the Black Sea. Others from Troy migrated south to the area of Miletus (see Roberta Harris, *The World of the Bible*, 1995, map on p. 63). And still other Trojans appear to have traveled west—even all the way to Spain and France, some of them eventually migrating to Britain (see Appendix 5: “Brutus and the Covenant Land”). And we know that Milesians also migrated to Spain from the Eastern Mediterranean at a later time—ending up in Ireland.

It is amazing that two royal lines from Zerah—the Trojan dynasty and the Athenian-Milesian dynasty—both passed through the Iberian Peninsula. Arriving here, these settlers may have sailed up the Ebro River and, upon its banks, founded the city of Saragossa—which some have identified as Hebrew *Zerah-gaza*, meaning “stronghold of Zerah.”

Strengthening the identification with Zerah is the fact that the Milesians rulers who assumed the Irish throne were known as the people of the “Red Hand.” In fact, the Red Hand appears even today on the official flag of Northern Ireland and on the coats of arms of many Irish and Scottish clans.

This “ancient regional emblem [is known as] the blood-red right hand of Ulster” (Idrisyn Evans, *The Observer’s Book of Flags*, 1959, 1975, p. 28)—Ulster being the northern province of Ireland through which the high kingship was later transferred to Scotland.

An old story explains the origin of Ulster’s heraldic symbol this way: “A quarrel arose between Eremon and Eber over the right to rule all Ireland and it continued through their descendants. Eremon and Eber, so legend has it, originally made a wager on which of them would reach Ireland first. Realizing that Eber was about to reach the shore before him, Eremon is said to have cut off his hand and thrown it onto the shore, claiming to have won the bet. Thereafter the O’Neill kings [of Eremon’s line, named after the Milesian ancestor Niul and a later king in this line named Niall] adopted a symbol of a Red Hand. But a hand reaching forth is a symbol of kingship, and the severed hand is a fanciful tale” (Ellis p. 228).

Yes, it makes for interesting storytelling—and *would* account for the *blood*-red hand. Yet it should be obvious that this event did not really happen—or at least did not happen this way. No ruling chieftain would have cut off his own hand to win a race unless he were insane—in which case

he would likely have been deposed. If there is any truth in the story at all, we should recognize that instead of tossing his own hand ashore, Eremon had the *emblem* of the blood-red hand that represented him set up on shore before his competitor's arrival—and possibly before his *own* arrival. Of course, this requires that Eremon already possessed the symbol of the blood-red hand before any supposed contest.

Thus, the Red Hand must have had an older origin. This becomes even more intriguing when we consider another factor in the history of the Red Hand. It is reported that Ulster's emblem prior to the division of Ireland in 1920, when most of Ulster became the British state of Northern Ireland, was a blood-red hand circled by a scarlet cord.

Consider: A hand red with blood—perhaps the blood of *birth*—encircled by a scarlet cord. Surely this is no mere coincidence! According to a Northern Irish newspaper, “one tradition has it . . . that the Red Hand goes back to biblical time; when the twin sons were being born to Judah” (David Hume, “Did a Lost Tribe of Israel Land at Carrickfergus?,” *Larne Times*, Dec. 24, 1986). Indeed, the scarlet thread tied around Zerah's hand would seem rather likely to be the origin of this emblem.

Scholar Peter Ellis, however, sees hints for the origins of the Ulster emblem in various Indo-European words for king. “The terminology is related—the Irish *Ri(gh)* compared to the Gaelish Celtic *Rix*, the Latin *Rex* and the Sanskrit *Rajan* (Hindi = *raj*). Certainly the English king from the Gothic *kunnings* has no relationship, but a surprising harking back to the concept appears in the English words ‘rich’ and ‘reach.’ The ancient Indo-European concept was that a king *reached* forth his hand to protect his people. Also in Old Irish, for example, *rige* was not only the concept for kingship but also the word for the act of reaching . . . The Uí Neill's ancient symbol of the Red Hand doubtless stems from this concept” (p. 25). Yet could it not be that the very idea of one reaching forth for kingship came from the story of Zerah reaching forth from the womb—especially considering that Israelites under Zarhite leaders were scattered across, and had a major influence over, the entire Indo-European geographical region?

Regarding the story of Zerah, the *Larne Times* article continues: “The Red Hand of Ulster is thus claimed in some circles to be symbolic of this event, and also considered symbolic is the fact that the ancient Knights of Ulster were the most distinguished in the history of the island. They were known as the Knights of the Red Branch.” Ellis says: “There are several orders of elite warrior corps mentioned in the sagas and chronicles of ancient Ireland. Perhaps the best known were the Ulster Red Branch Knights, or the *Craobh Radh*. They emerge in the Ulster Cycle of myths, especially in the famous epic *Tain Bo Cualigne* (Cattle Raid of Cooley), which has been compared with the Greek *Iliad*. Its date of origin is uncertain. Scholars have identified it as having been handed down in oral form probably from the La Tene period, from about 500 B.C.” (p. 338). Indeed, when viewed in conjunction with the Red Hand, might not the Red Branch represent the Zerah branch of Judah's family?

This, then, provides us with even more reason to believe that the Milesian royal line of Ireland originated with Judah's son Zerah.

Only one place to go

We now have a plausible explanation as to how God's promise of the scepter being retained by Judah was fulfilled—through the line of Zerah. Judah's Zarhite heirs, through Trojan and Milesian descent, would reign over the nations of Europe—particularly over Israel in the British Isles, as the high kingly line of Ireland would eventually be transferred to Scotland and later to England.

Yet this still does not answer the question of how God would fulfill the specific promises to David, who was descended from Perez, does it? But if we think carefully on the matter, we can see that it really does. For remember Jeremiah and his company? At last mention, we wondered where he would go next with the king's daughters, yet knew that he was to transfer the throne of Judah to Israel.

In one sense there were many options as to where to go since the bulk of the northern 10 tribes were now scattered from east of the Caspian Sea all the way into eastern Europe, pressing westward—while a sizeable vanguard of Israel had already colonized western Europe. Yet for a God who foretold the future—and would reveal it to his servants the prophets, including Jeremiah (see Amos 3:8)—there was really only *one* place to go. Of course, this assertion requires some explanation.

It was earlier shown from Scripture that the birthright promises of national greatness went to the sons of the patriarch Joseph—Ephraim and Manasseh. Our booklet *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy* proves that Manasseh is now America and that Ephraim today is the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and those of British descent in other former British colonies. The heyday of Ephraim’s national greatness came during the British Empire—as mentioned earlier, the largest empire in the history of the world.

David’s descendants, as we’ve seen, were to rule over Israel and become the “highest of the kings of the earth” (Psalm 89:27). God further said of David’s dynasty, “I will set his hand [or authority] also in the sea” (verse 25). This is very much like the unofficial anthem of the British people: “When Britain first at Heaven’s command, arose from out of the azure main; this was the charter of the land, and guardian angels sang this strain: Rule, Britannia. Britannia, rule the waves . . .” Indeed, no nation has ruled the sea—nor the land for that matter—as has Great Britain. Clearly, the monarchy of David must be one and the same with the monarchy of Britain.

Following the primary line of descent of the British throne *back* to the time of Jeremiah leads us to Ireland. God, of course, knew that the Irish royal line of Jeremiah’s day would eventually become the British monarchy. Logically, then, that is where He would have directed the steps of Jeremiah with at least one of Zedekiah’s daughters in tow—to marry her into the royal line of Zerach and thereby perpetuate the throne of David.

Three overturns

But couldn’t the throne have been transferred elsewhere for a long time before being transferred to the British Isles? The indirect answer from prophecy seems to be no.

In Ezekiel 21:26-27, God declared that Zedekiah was to “remove the diadem and take off the crown: This shall not be the same [a change or transfer was occurring]; exalt him that is low [the Zarhite ruler in Israel] and abase him that is high [Zedekiah of the line of Perez]. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it [the crown, that is, the throne]; and it shall be no more [overturned] until HE come whose right it is; and I will give it HIM [Christ]” (KJV).

Notice that the final “overturned” was added in brackets for the sake of clarity. Some see this verse as a prophecy of the *overthrow* of the crown—that it would “be no more” (meaning *no longer exist*) until Christ came to claim it. Yet this cannot be the meaning of this prophecy or God would be breaking His unbreakable promise to David of an unbreakable dynasty. So the overturning must refer to removing the throne from one nation and raising it up in another. And the mentioning of overturn three times would certainly seem to be saying that such overturning would occur three times—that three times the throne would be transferred to another nation and that it wouldn’t be transferred again until Jesus Christ’s coming in power and glory to take it over.

When was the last time another country’s monarchy was transplanted into the throne’s present location in England? The answer is 1603, when King James VI of Scotland became King James I of Great Britain (the one who commissioned the King James Bible). This is obviously the last overturn to have taken place. Because of it, today’s British monarchs are of Scottish royal descent.

Prior to that, was another country’s throne ever transplanted into *Scotland*? Yes. The throne of the Scoti (as the Irish were anciently called) was moved from Ireland into southwest Scotland in the late fifth century—their kingdom of Dalriada in that area, centered at Iona (a name perhaps related to Ionia of Greece), eventually growing to envelop what is now Scotland. This was clearly the previous overturn—which is why Scotland’s monarchy, which became Britain’s monarchy, was actually Irish.

Now since these were the last two overturns of three, there can only have been one other—the first. And that first overturn had to have been the transfer of the throne *from* Judah. Thus it should be clear that this transfer must have been from Judah *to Ireland*. Had the throne been transferred from Judah to some other country before *later* being reestablished in Ireland, that would add a fourth overturn—when Scripture appears to allow for only three. By simple deduction, the three overturns must have been: 1) Judah to Ireland; 2) Ireland to Scotland; 3) Scotland to England.

It should be mentioned, though, that in the first overturn it is possible that the daughter of Zedekiah married into the Milesian Zerach line in Spain or elsewhere around the time it was *in the process of* assuming control over Ireland. This would not be adding another overturn from Spain to Ireland, as it would all be part of the same overturn. Whether or not this happened, however, is dependent on exactly when the Milesians from Spain took over Ireland, which is not entirely clear.

They may have already become established in Ireland before Jeremiah's journey—though perhaps still maintaining control over part of Spain when he arrived. Again, however, it is possible that Zedekiah's daughter and Jeremiah actually accompanied the Milesians in their invasion of Ireland from Spain.

Ollam Fodhla and company

Irish tradition lends support to what happened. Let's continue in the *Larne Times* article quoted earlier: "Many centuries ago three people arrived on the shore at what is today Carrickfergus [Northern Ireland]. It was around 582 B.C. [no doubt a rough date but essentially after Babylon destroyed Jerusalem], and the three were an aged man called Ollam Fodhla (the Lawgiver), his secretary, and a beautiful princess called Tamar. With them they brought a large, rough stone" (more on this stone later).

According to Charles O'Connor of Belanagare's notes (1826) on *The Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters*: "Ollam Fola is celebrated in ancient history as a sage and legislator, eminent for learning, wisdom and excellent institutions; and his historic fame has been recognized by placing his medallion in *basso rilievo* [bass relief] with those of Moses, and other great legislators, in the interior of the dome of the Four Courts in Dublin" (p. 227).

Irish historian Thomas Moore says that of the storied figures of the early "dim period of Irish history . . . the Royal Sage, Ollamh Fodhla, is almost the only one who, from the strong light of tradition thrown round him, stands out as being of historical substance and truth. It would serve to illustrate the nature and extent of the evidence with which the world is sometimes satisfied, to collect together the various celebrated names which are received as authentic, on the strength of tradition alone; and few, perhaps, could claim a more virtual title to this privilege than the great legislator of the Irish, Ollamh Fodhla" (p. 86).

Ollam Fodhla's laws bear striking similarity to the Ten Commandments and other Hebrew statutes. Interestingly, *Ollam* can be read in the Hebrew language as "ancient" or "secret" (James Strong, "Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary," *Abingdon's Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, Strong's No. 5769; *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon*, Logos Software, Nos. 5769, 5956)—perhaps indicating a possessor of secret knowledge (Milner, p. 12). *Fodhla* or *Fola* can be understood in Hebrew to mean "wonderful" (*Enhanced Strong's Lexicon*, Strong's Hebrew No. 6381) or in Celtic as "revealer" (Milner, p. 12). All of these meanings considered together seem to indicate a Hebrew prophet. In Old Gaelic, *ollamh* designated "the highest qualification of learning and [is] now the modern Irish word for professor" (Ellis, p. 4). It appears that Ollam Fodhla founded a royal school or university within the national palace—referred to in the Chronicles of Eri as *Mur Olamain*, perhaps translatable as "House of the Prophets."

The individual mentioned above as Ollam's secretary is sometimes referred to as Simon Breck, Brach or Berach (a biblical name meaning "bless" or "kneel," Strong's Hebrew Nos. 1263, 1288)—though there is dispute over his being contemporary with Ollam. And Tamar is also a biblical name (denoting three women in Scripture, all in the lineage of David), which means "palm" in Hebrew (Nos. 8558, 8559). The Tamar of Ireland is also at times, it appears, referred to in Irish histories and poems as Tea (Hebrew "wanderer," No. 8582) and Tephi (Hebrew "timbrel," No. 8596—or a Hebrew variant meaning "a diminutive of affection, or . . . the beauty and fragrance of fruit," Milner, p. 19). Yet many argue that these are different women far removed in time.

"Who exactly were these people?" asks Pat Gerber, a lecturer at Glasgow University. "Is it merely the desire to make connections that suggests links where there is nothing more than coincidence?" (*Stone of Destiny*, 1997, p. 47).

"According to some religious scholars," says the *Larne Times* article just quoted, "the aged man who landed at Carrick many centuries ago was the Prophet Jeremiah." And there is a strong tradition in Ireland to support this notion. That would seem to make Simon Breck Jeremiah's scribe Baruch (*Berekh* in Palaeo-Hebrew), who perhaps was also named Simeon. In any case, both names are certainly Hebrew.

And Tamar or Tea-Tephi would be Zedekiah's daughter. As the same article further reports, the tradition also states, "Princess Tamar married the High King of Ireland and . . . all the kings of Ireland and Scotland are descended from their royal line." Says Gerber, "Teamhair is the Irish for her name—mutated, through usage, to 'Tara'"—the name of the ancient seat of the high kings of Ireland just northwest of Dublin (Gerber, p. 49). Yet it should be mentioned that some believe the name Tara

is derived from the Hebrew *Torah*, or “law”—Tara being the seat of the Law perhaps brought by Jeremiah.

Notice this from one of the Irish chronicles: “Soon after this conquest made by the sons of Miletus their kinsmen and friendes, they divided the whole kingdome among themselves in manner as followeth. But first, before they landed on this land, Tea, the . . . wife of Heremon, desired one request of her said husband and kinsmen, which they accordingly granted, which was, that the place she should most like of in the kingdom, should be, for ever after, the principal seat of her posterity to dwell in; and upon their landing she chose Leitrim, which is since that time called Tara, and which she caused to be called Tea-mur—the house, palace, or town of Tephi” (*Annals of Clonmacnoise*, Conell MacGeoghegan translation, 1627, p. 27).

The name of the high king she married is sometimes given as Heremon, Eremon, Erimionn or something similar and sometimes as Eochaidh—the latter being not a name but simply the word for “prince.”

Questions over who’s who

Yet it must be admitted that none of this is certain. Indeed, even though there appear to be many more similarities between Jeremiah and Ollam Fodhla, Ollam appears in the Irish king lists as a *king* and sometimes as one who reigned centuries before Jeremiah. Simon Brach is *also* listed as a king—sometimes as the son of the king of Spain—who doesn’t always fit in time. Neither seems to always fit chronologically with Heremon. And the names Tea, Tephi and Tamar don’t always seem to refer to the same person.

However, while many obvious and important facts may be sifted from the Irish histories and various clan pedigrees, there is much reason to doubt their accuracy with respect to dating specific rulers—or, more accurately, to the dating scheme the chroniclers adopted—particularly since they are not all in agreement. It seems the various records and traditions the chroniclers drew on were in somewhat of a jumble, and compiling them involved going through them and trying to put things in order. The records themselves may have been somewhat reliable. (We just don’t know as they are now lost.) But the way they were put together is clearly problematic.

For instance, the compilers evidently placed dynasties in succession that were actually overlapping and contemporary—thus stretching the beginning of the Milesian kings back to an impossibly early date of 1700 B.C. (It is impossible because the Milesians arrived after the Israelite Danaans or Danites. And, in 1700 B.C., Jacob’s family, still small, had not even yet gone down into Egypt. There was, as yet, no *tribe* of Dan. Indeed, that was when Joseph was sold into Egyptian slavery and Perez and Zerah were only just born.)

Additionally, it seems that in at least one instance where an ancient source of the Irish chronicles appears to have contained a Hebrew sentence, the compilers mistakenly reckoned the Hebrew words as the names of rulers (see Milner, p. 11 footnote). Furthermore, multiple individuals seem to have become conflated into one at times—or, in other cases, different aspects of the same person have been distributed among multiple people.

That all being so, it seems entirely possible that Ollam Fodhla can be chronologically aligned to be Jeremiah in the 500s B.C. Thomas Moore quoted Charles O’Conor’s *Dissertations on the History of Ireland* (1766, sec. 4) as showing that Ollam Fodhla held sway in Ireland around 600 B.C.—though Moore believed the royal sage lived much later.

Regarding a tradition that Jeremiah is buried on Devenish Isle in Lough Erne near Enniskillen in Northern Ireland, a local publication states: “The Jeremiah stories are not local [they come from other parts of Ireland and thus do not constitute wishful thinking on the part of area residents], and are not found in the annals [under the name Jeremiah that is], where Cessair, Noah’s grand-daughter, and other Old Testament characters figure. There are two versions of the Jeremiah story.

“Jeremiah, a priest of the house of Aaron, fled from Jerusalem upon its destruction by the King of Babylon, taking with him his daughter Hamutal, widow of King Josiah, and her two daughters [a common error since Hamutal’s father was *also* named Jeremiah but of *Libnah*, whereas the prophet Jeremiah was from *Anathoth*] and some national treasures from the Temple. The most important of these was the Lia Fail, or Stone of Destiny, Jacob’s stone.

“The boat was shipwrecked off the coast of Ireland, but the company managed to make its way to the hill-seat of the last Tuatha De Danaan kings of the tribes of Dan. An Irish jingle is taken as evidence for this legend; the Finn in question is dated 600 B.C., the time of Jeremiah: *Finn McCool*

went to school / With the prophet Jeremiah. So Finn learned the Law from Jeremiah, and his successor, the Milesian king, called the hill Torah (the Law) or Tara. Jeremiah's body is said to have been conveyed all the way to Devenish island for a king's burial . . .

"Another version of the story makes Jeremiah flee to Ireland with Tea Tephi, eldest daughter of Zedekiah, in the ships of the Danites. Again, his grave and the Lia Fail are said to be on Devenish" (Mary Rogers, *Prospect of Fermanagh*, 1982, pp. 30-31). However, some say he—or rather Ollam Fodhla—is buried near Tara. This could be another result of the confusion of various identities of the period.

In any case, the dating of 600 B.C., or actually shortly afterward in the 500s, is quite reasonable. Indeed, a strong case can be made that the Milesian invasion did not commence until about this time—a critical factor in considering when Ollam Fodhla came on the scene, since he flourished during the Milesian period (see Appendix 6: "Dating the Milesian Arrival in Ireland").

Sorting out identities

If Ollam Fodhla was indeed Jeremiah, his identification as a king is fairly easy to reconcile. It could have resulted from his appearing to be the father or grandfather of the eastern princess he brought with him—or, even more likely, confusion over his being a great lawgiver. Says Gerber in *Stone of Destiny*, "Ollam Fodhla was the first king to hold the Fes, or Parliament of Tara, and the first to ordain district chiefs in Ireland" (p. 50).

Remember that in Israel the prophet was God's representative to the king. And in ancient Ireland, "an *ollamh* was treated as of princely rank. An *ollamh* of law and poetry was even considered the equal of a king at the court; he, or she, for both were equal under the law, could speak even before the king at a council and give advice" (Ellis, p. 337). If Jeremiah wielded this kind of authority in Ireland, the general populace may well have thought him a king. Notice again Jeremiah's commission from God: "See, today I appoint you *over* nations and *over* kingdoms . . ." (1:10, NRSV). It appears, then, that he was to exercise considerable authority. An interesting consideration in this regard is that *The History of Ancient Caledonia*—an 1897 Scottish publication that is reputedly the transcribing by author John MacLaren of a much older source—repeatedly refers to Ireland as "Jeremy's Land."

Consider also that the king himself may have referred to the prophet as "my father" out of respect, just as was done in ancient Israel (see 2 Kings 2:12; 6:21). This, too, could have made Jeremiah appear a king. In fact, Gede, one name given for the king at the time, is referred to in an old poem as the son of Ollam Fodhla. And there may be yet another reason for the confusion, which we'll see in a moment.

It also appears that Simon Brach could be chronologically aligned with Ollam Fodhla—if they are listed in sections that should actually overlap. The reckoning of Brach as a king, it should be noted, may have been a mistake. In the Bible, Baruch is called the son of Neriah. Yet, consider what a linguistics textbook says: "Sound changes . . . [such as] 'r becomes l' . . . are 'natural' sound changes often found in the world's languages" (Victoria Fromkin and Robert Rodman, *An Introduction to Language, Fourth Edition*, 1988, p. 318). Perhaps Neriah was read as Nelia. So Baruch may have inadvertently been reckoned as the son or descendant of Neleus, forefather of the Milesian dynasty.

Simon Breck was also said to be a descendant of Gathelus. As this name is an eponym for the Goidels or Gaels, it really means that Breck was a Gael (an Israelite). But because Gathelus, or Gede, was considered as an actual name of the founder of the Milesian dynasty, Simon Breck was made to be his descendant, even though he probably wasn't—and *certainly* wasn't if he were Baruch.

Of course, it is possible that Baruch was actually exalted to some high position in Ireland. God had told him not to seek greatness—that his reward would be his life wherever he went (Jeremiah 45:5). But perhaps once he stopped *seeking* greatness, God finally rewarded him with some measure of it in his later years. He could have been made a noble over a small dominion, similar to Caleb in the Promised Land (see Joshua 14:13-14)—and this might have been confused with being a king. Or perhaps he was one of the district chiefs ordained by Ollam Fodhla. He may even have been considered an actual lesser king subject to Ireland's high king.

It is interesting that he is described as the son of the king of Spain, considering that Jeremiah's party evidently came through Milesian Spain. Brach being a prince of Spain could have been a misunderstanding resulting from his having come to Ireland directly *from* there along with confusion about his father's name—and perhaps he was mistaken as the son of the regal-appearing Jeremiah,

particularly if he ever referred to Jeremiah as “my father.” If Jeremiah was Ollam Fodhla, we can perhaps see how Baruch was later considered his descendant.

There is further confusion over the identity of Heremon or Eremon. He is often said to be the son of Milesius but is sometimes identified as Milesius himself. Furthermore, there is, as mentioned, a Gede or Ghede who seems to be synonymous with Heremon. It is sometimes stated that Heremon had a *son* named Heremon. This name, a Hebrew derivative that may have meant something like “highest” (see Milner, p. 11 footnote), could have become a title for the Irish high king—similar to Eochaidh being a general term for prince. Thus, no matter what the actual name of the king at the time of Jeremiah, he may have been referred to both as Eochaidh and Heremon. Tea is reputed to have married Gede “the Heremon” by some accounts.

There is another possibility regarding the name Heremon that is rather astounding to contemplate. For the Hebrew derivation just mentioned is reckoned from the root *ruwm*, meaning “high . . . lofty . . . exalted” (*Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon*, No. 7311). And this root forms the name of a well-known Hebrew name—Jeremiah! His name, broken down as Yerem-Yah, is understood to mean “Exalted by the Eternal” or “Appointed by the Eternal” (No. 3414). In Greek his name is Ieremias. In Spanish his name is pronounced Heremias. With the Celtic augmentative suffix, this would become Heremion or Heremon.

So it just may be that Jeremiah’s name appears in the Irish annals after all—and that his name became confused with his contemporaries. If so, then Heremon was not actually the name of the husband of Zedekiah’s daughter—although it could have been the name of their *son*. For as important as Jeremiah was, it would not be at all surprising to find that others, particularly in the royal family, were named after him. In any event, it is interesting to consider that, as one source has put it, “Heremon and Ollam Fola are mingled together in hopeless confusion” (Matthew Kelly, 1848, translation notes accompanying John Lynch’s *Cambrensis Eversus*, 1662).

If Heremon or Eremon is the Irish form of Jeremiah, this could give us another possible origin of the name Eire or Ire-land. Indeed, it could explain why Ireland has been called Jeremy’s Land. For *Ireland* would actually *mean* “Jeremiah’s Land”—the land of Jeremiah! Yet it must still be kept in mind that the name Heremon became attached to the first Milesian king of Ireland, whether or not that was his actual name.

Tea-Tephi or Scota?

Concerning the names Tea, Tephi and Tamar, while they may refer to the same person at the time of Jeremiah, it is also possible that they do not. In favor is the fact that these names are sometimes linked together in old Irish poems. Moreover, these appellations, meaning what they did in Hebrew, could possibly have been applied to a Hebrew princess accompanying Jeremiah even if they were not her actual names—stories about her, then, may have confused her with other women. Also in favor is that if the other names mentioned were aligned with Jeremiah, she would fall into place as well.

And there is another possible explanation regarding her identity. One of the primary Irish chronicles, *The Annals of the Kings of Ireland by the Four Masters*, mentions “Tea, daughter of Lughaidh, son of Itha, whom Eremhon married in Spain” (1636, Vol. 1, p. 31). At first glance, this would seem to rule out her being the daughter of Zedekiah. However, *Lughaidh* may not refer to an actual person. The Irish are referred to as the “race of Lughaidh” and Ireland as “the land of Lughaidh”—“one of the many arbitrary bardic names for Ireland” (*Annals of the Four Masters*, Vol. 6, appendix).

Lughaidh in old Gaelic could mean “House of God”—broken down as *Logh*, “God,” and *aidhe*, “house, habitation, fortress” (Edward O’Reilly, *An Irish-English Dictionary*, 1821, 1864). “House of God” (Hebrew *Beth-El*) may have been a designation for David’s dynasty or even for the “large, rough stone” reportedly brought by Jeremiah (see Appendix 7: “The Stone of Destiny”). The word Lughaidh may also come from *lugh* or *lughadh*, meaning “oath”—apparently because it invokes God (O’Reilly, note by editor John O’Donovan, p. 671; N. MacLeod and D. Dewar, *A Dictionary of the Gaelic Language*, 1831, 1909)—and could be related to God’s oath to David.

The name *Itha* or *Ith* may mean “crown,” as does the related Welsh *yd* (O’Reilly). *Ith*, coming from Spain, is said to be the son of *Breoghan* in some accounts, but this may simply be because the Milesian line of kings came to Ireland from *Brigantium* (modern Corunna near Santiago de Compostella) on the northwest coast of Spain. Indeed, Tea is in at least one old poem called Temor

of Bregia. Brega or Breagh, it should be noted, was the immediate territory of Tara in ancient Ireland, named after the Celtic tribe known as the Brigantes (or vice versa). The Brigantes were located in southeast Ireland by the Roman geographer Ptolemy around 150 A.D. He also mentioned them as being one of the Celtic tribes in Britain at that time, as other sources also attest (see www.roman-britain.org/tribes/brigantes.htm). Some now believe that they derived their name from the Celtic goddess Brigid. Indeed, it could be that she is simply a later deification of Tea, combined with features of other pagan goddesses. According to some scholars, the name Brigid “comes from the Old Irish *brigante*, meaning ‘the exalted one’” (*In Search of Ancient Ireland*, Program 2: “Saints,” PBS Home Video, 2002). This title could conceivably correspond to the modern “highness” for a royal personage. In any event, it is certainly possible that the name Brigantes or Brega originally came from Brigantium in northwest Spain—all perhaps relating to a royal title.

Thus, “Tea, daughter of Lughaidh, son of Itha, son of Breoghan” could conceivably be read as “Tea, daughter of the House of God [or oath], child of the crown, child of Brigantium [or child of royalty].” This would well describe a Jewish princess of David’s line who came to Ireland by way of the Iberian Peninsula.

On the other hand, it may be that Lughaidh and Ith were actual people and that this Tea was not Zedekiah’s daughter. Perhaps, instead, Lughaidh was synonymous with the earlier mentioned Gathelus who supposedly married a “pharaoh’s daughter” named Scota in the Irish and Scottish histories. *She* may well have been Zedekiah’s daughter, as some contend. Gathelus and Scota, in certain accounts, never made it to Ireland. And in this scenario, Tea-Tephi, *their* daughter, would have been the *granddaughter* of Zedekiah. If so, this would still have fulfilled God’s promise that David would have a descendant ruling in “all generations”—as long as the overturn of the throne from Judah to Ireland was accomplished before the generation alive at Jerusalem’s fall passed away.

However, there are problems with the above explanation, chief of which is that Gathelus and Scota’s *son*, one of *several* sons, is said to have become king—not their daughter (incidentally this too still fits with God’s promise to David). Yet most of their sons are reported to have died—leaving the youngest, Heremon, to rule. But perhaps Heremon was actually not their son. It could be that he was their *son-in-law*, married to their daughter Tea-Tephi.

Then again, it could just as well be that this is all wrong, that there was no intervening generation in the transfer of the throne to Ireland, and that Tea-Tephi was the same as Scota. Others believe Scota was the *sister* of Tea (as Jeremiah escorted the king’s “daughters”—plural). And still others argue that Gathelus and Scota can’t be linked with Zedekiah in any fashion since they supposedly long predated Zedekiah and Jeremiah (see Appendix 8: “Gathelus, Scota and the Exodus”).

Standing on God’s Word

The point in going through all this is threefold: To show that 1) there are myriad problems in pinning down exactly what happened in the transfer of the throne from Judah to Ireland and in specifically identifying those involved; but that 2) be that as it may, problems in identification do not negate the possibility that Jeremiah saw to it that Zedekiah’s daughter married into the Milesian line that ruled or would rule Ireland. And 3) the fact that the information available to us can fit any number of workable scenarios actually strengthens the likelihood that Jeremiah did carry out his commission in the way we are generally postulating that he must have according to Scripture.

Pat Gerber, the University of Glasgow lecturer cited earlier, remains unconvinced of any links at all between Ireland and the line of David. But notice what she says: “No serious historian would dare to suggest that Zedekiah’s daughter Tea could have married the Irish King Eochaid the Heremon. And yet—it is not impossible . . .” (p. 50).

She goes on to say: “Dare we link Simon Brech with Jeremiah’s scribe Baruch, connect Tara with the Princess Tea who had passed through Egypt as the guest of Pharaoh on her flight from Nebuchadnezzar, the sole survivor of David’s line? Could she have been given the eponymous name ‘Scota’ by later writers because she wed Eochaid the Heremon, became Queen of the ‘Scots’ as the Irish were then known, and mother to a royal Irish-Scottish dynasty? Probably not—but because none of this is either provable or disprovable as yet, we are free to dream” (p. 50).

However, in general this is surely no dream. For much more is actually provable than what she and others give credit to—particularly in Scripture. Indeed, there is much information in even the Irish annals that fit the facts we definitely know. Yet these are certainly murky waters as we’ve seen, and the links we draw may well be dream and conjecture at times.

Whatever we do, we must be careful not to treat the chronicles of Ireland or those of other nations as Scripture too—expecting them to be infallible. On the contrary, they may contain major blunders and even be all mixed up as we've seen. Some of Ireland's history derives from bardic oral traditions. It is just not reasonable to place too much stock in everything they have to say.

Yet it should encourage us that, in sifting the information, it can be reconciled with the general understanding we have. And what understanding is that? In this case—based on scriptures explaining Jeremiah's commission and extrapolating backward from clearly fulfilled Bible prophecy regarding the identity of Israel today—that Jeremiah must have gone to Ireland, that he took one of Zedekiah's daughters at least part of the way, and that she must have married into what was or what became the Irish royal line (either in Ireland itself or in Spain or somewhere else in the process of transferring the throne to Ireland).

It frankly doesn't matter if this fact is nowhere accounted for in the Irish annals. Of course, we would expect it to be—and it seems likely that it *was*, based on what we've seen. But perhaps Jeremiah and the Hebrew princess are not mentioned as being in Ireland at all. Perhaps her marriage into the throne of Ireland was accomplished with little or no fanfare at all. No matter.

The important thing to realize is that the prophet *was* there—and that Zedekiah's daughter *did* marry into the Milesian royal line. Otherwise Jeremiah went to a great deal of trouble for no reason at all. Moreover, *God said* through Ezekiel that it *would* be done—and He used the same language as that in Ezekiel's prophecy to describe Jeremiah's commission. We may safely assume then—if we believe God—that Jeremiah completed the transfer of the Davidic throne from Judah to Israel. And if we accept the prophecy about the three overturns as valid, then Jeremiah must have secured the marriage of Zedekiah's daughter into the royal lineage of Irish kings.

Our proof rests on God's Word and verifiable history. We must accept these sure facts as a solid foundation. Irish traditions and fragmentary historical details can then be viewed in this light—and that indeed does seem to fill in some interesting and supportive details.

We may repeat the words of F.R.A. Glover, who wrote at length about this subject in the 19th century: "I have . . . no desire to encumber my hypothesis, with any argument, as to whether the Ollam Fodhla of Irish Tradition is, or is not a mistake for Jeremiah the Prophet. I feel that the case of the presence of the illustrious Seer in Ireland is made out on other grounds; that, indeed, he *must* have been the transporter of the Stone [of Destiny], the conductor of 'the King's Daughters' and the planter of the Standard of Judah, in Ireland. I was satisfied of this, long before I heard a word of the Legend, of his having been Instructor to the great warrior Finn McCoyne, or even of the existence of this Ollam Fola" (*England, the Remnant of Judah, and the Israel of Ephraim*, 1861).

Other sources and a caution

Yet Glover nevertheless made a strong case for the identification of Ollam Fodhla as Jeremiah. His work is available on-line (www.abcog.org/glover.htm)—as are many other articles and publications on this whole subject of the transfer of the throne of David to the British Isles. Another is *Judah's Sceptre and Joseph's Birthright* by J.H. Allen, first published in 1902 (www.giveshare.org/israel/judah).

One major source, already cited, is *The Royal House of Britain: an Enduring Dynasty* by W.M.H. Milner. First published in 1902, this book has gone through numerous reprintings. It is available to order from The Covenant Publishing Co., Ltd., in London (www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm). For a more recent work, see *The Throne of David* by Peter Salemi (on-line at www.britishisrael.ca/David.htm). Please bear in mind that the recommendation of outside sources for further study is not an endorsement of everything contained within those sources.

For those interested in the Irish king lists and annals, many of them are now available over the Internet (see www.magoo.com/hugh/irishkings.html and related links). However, it should be noted up front that, as already mentioned, these are rather confused records. And they do not contain all the information available on the various characters that have been mentioned. Some material is derived from the various clan pedigrees of Ireland and Scotland—as well as traditional rhymes, poems, songs and stories, some of which have been passed down by word of mouth.

Furthermore, a word of caution is in order regarding such material and, frankly, many other aspects of this study. The apostle Paul said that Christians should not "give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which cause disputes rather than godly edification which is in faith" (1 Timothy 1:4). This doesn't mean we're to have nothing to do with genealogies—for they are found throughout

Scripture and God expects us to study the entirety of His Word (2 Timothy 3:16). Instead, Paul means, in part at least, that such items should not constitute a major focus of our studies. Indeed, we should not let such matters consume our time to the exclusion of more important spiritual issues.

We should be even more cautious when it comes to genealogies and histories outside the Bible, which are debatable. While they can be interesting and enlightening, they can also become a drain on our spiritual energies if we spend inordinate amounts of time in researching them.

The real goal in our current study should be to get the basic gist of what happened—to see that the incredible prophetic promises God gave to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Judah and David have been kept. There are a number of key elements here that are obvious and solidly biblical—and we must stand firm on these despite attempts of others to belittle them.

Indeed, God through Paul commanded that we “not despise prophecies” (1 Thessalonians 5:20). For seeing God’s guiding hand in history will inspire faith in His Word—which is of great value. The minutiae of details, on the other hand—particularly those from outside the Bible—can take our focus away from what’s important if we aren’t careful.

This is certainly not meant to discourage interesting and potentially fruitful research. Rather, it is simply a reminder for us all to make sure to maintain the right balance and focus in any of our studies.

More links to David

Besides what we’ve already seen, there are *other* corroborating factors connecting the line of David with Ireland. Three miles north of Tara is an area known as Dowd’s Town. Dowd is a Hebrew name. In English we write it as David, but the Hebrew pronunciation of David is *Duwd* or *Dowd*. So right next to ancient Tara, where the line of David was established, is a town designated as the settlement of David.

Furthermore, going back to the *Larne Times* article: “When Jeremiah’s party arrived at Carrick that day many centuries ago they found themselves among kith and kin of the scattered people of Israel . . . Those who believe the tribes of Israel traveled to the British Isles also cite the use in Ulster of a six-pointed star . . . being a symbol of the royal line of David.”

This truly is remarkable. Earlier it was mentioned that the flag of Northern Ireland had the “blood-red right hand of Ulster” upon it. What was *not* mentioned is that this red hand appears in the center of a *six-pointed star*. The star is said to represent the six counties of Ulster. Yet it is the very “Star of David”—the symbol of the Jews. Is it mere coincidence that the Red Hand of Zerah is symbolically fused with the Star of David? And atop that star on the flag is the royal crown. This seems too much to be coincidence. Indeed, it appears to be further evidence that the royal line of David married into the Milesian royal line of Zerah.

Furthermore, the *Larne Times* article says, “Jeremiah may have brought King David’s harp with him.” The harp has long been the national emblem of Ireland. David himself, the “sweet psalmist of Israel” (2 Samuel 23:1), was a “skillful player on the harp” (1 Samuel 16:16-17)—and it is entirely possible that the harp became a symbol of his dynasty.

In 1581, Vincenzo Galilei, musician and father of the famous astronomer Galileo, published a book in which he stated regarding the harp: “This most ancient instrument was brought to us from Ireland where such are most excellently worked and in great number; the inhabitants of the said island have made this their art during the many centuries they have lived there and, moreover, it is a special undertaking of the kingdom; and they paint and engrave it in their public and private buildings and on their hill; stating as their reason for doing so that *they have descended from the royal prophet David*” (*Dialogo della Musica Antica*). Of course, this would apply more to the royal family than to the Irish as a whole—who, of primarily Danaan heritage, are mostly Danite.

Today, the harp of Ireland—the harp of David—appears on the flag of the Irish Republic and on the British royal coat of arms. Surprisingly, British royal heraldry seems to have much to tell us regarding the identity of Britain and its enduring dynasty (see Appendix 9: “The Lion and the Unicorn”).

With all the evidence at our disposal, we may confidently assert that Jeremiah came to Ireland. Traveling with him was at least one of Zedekiah’s daughters. She, of the line of David, married into the Irish royal line of Zerah. Thus at last was the breach between the Perez and Zerah branches of Judah healed! And from their union would spring a dynasty continuing unbroken through the kings of Ireland, later of Scotland, and later still of all Great Britain.

Curiously, it appears that almost all of these kings were crowned upon the same “large, rough stone” mentioned earlier—which may well have been brought to Ireland by Jeremiah, as tradition maintains. Indeed, of that stone there is quite a tale to tell (again, see Appendix 7: “The Stone of Destiny”). In any case, from the time that Jeremiah arrived, the succession of Irish, Scottish and British monarchs were all members of the same dynasty—the dynasty of David.

Eternal destiny

Now we can see why the British royal family rose under Queen Victoria to the heights of world prestige and preeminence. Why it continues to hold a special place in the hearts of all manner of people the world over. And why, of all royal families, it is still the first one that comes to mind.

Through the incredible purpose and power of the Great God, Queen Elizabeth II sits on the throne of King David—in fact, the throne of the Lord! And though she reigns over the foremost tribe of modern *Israel*, the Josephite tribe of *Ephraim*, the lion on the royal coat of arms is the lion of *Judah*. Elizabeth, Charles, Andrew, William and Harry—ethnically they’re all Jews! How truly remarkable this is. It’s not particularly surprising when a nationality maintains a line of rulers of its own ethnicity—but the Ephraimite British continue on with Jewish rulers!

Even more amazingly, all the intermarrying with the other royal families of Europe has not diminished that fact—for most of *them* have been of Jewish descent as well, through *Zerah* (see Appendix 10: “The Family of Odin”). Indeed, many of them are apparently even of *Davidic* descent (see Appendix 11: “Joseph of Arimathea and the Line of Nathan”). Intermarriage with the nobility has also been primarily within the tribe of *Judah* (see Appendix 13: “The Nobility—Also Jewish”). Only Almighty God could have planned all this and brought it to pass.

Returning to where we began, is the British monarchy really in danger of passing away? Does the question even need to be asked at this point? Consider that David’s dynasty has continued unbroken for 3,000 years—and that it was promised almost 1,000 years before that. God has gone to great lengths to ensure the continuance of this throne—and to safeguard the inviolability of His promises. Do we now suppose he would let a few advocates of republicanism thwart Him from keeping His word?

We should realize, in closing, that there *have* been at least three interregnums during David’s dynasty, where his descendant was not actually ruling. One happened when the evil queen Athaliah usurped the throne of *Judah* for about six years (2 Chronicles 22-23). Another has constituted much of this publication—the time between Zedekiah being deposed and the rule of the Davidic line being reestablished in Ireland. And the third occurred when King Charles I was beheaded in 1649. For 11 years, Oliver Cromwell’s Commonwealth ruled until the throne was restored under Charles’ son, Charles II, who had been living outside the country in France.

While these vacancies might seem to violate God’s promises to David, such temporary gaps, as mentioned earlier, were actually well within the scope of God’s specific promise that David would have a descendant sitting on his throne in “all generations.” Therefore, such a minor gap in the occupation of the throne can occur at any time. But we may rest assured: If the monarchy disappears tomorrow, a generation will not pass before it is restored.

It seems entirely possible that a brief interregnum is yet future. For while the refrain of the anthem “Rule Britannia” ends with “. . . Britons never, never shall be slaves,” that just isn’t so. Both America and Britain will go into national captivity and slavery just as ancient *Israel* and *Judah* did (request or download *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy* to learn more). And when that happens, the monarchy may very well be interrupted. But by no means will it be lost.

For a short time later, the rightful Heir to the throne, Jesus Christ, will appear on the scene and stand in Jerusalem. At long last, the throne of the Lord will be taken back from corruptible human beings by the Lord Himself. “And the government will be upon His shoulder . . . Of the increase of His government and peace there will be no end, upon the throne of David and over His kingdom, to order it and establish it with judgment and justice from that time forward, even forever” (Isaiah 9:6-7).

Amazingly, Jesus will share this wonderful throne of David with His perfected followers (Revelation 3:21; 2:26-28). Indeed, David himself will be resurrected from the dead in glory to reign with Christ upon the throne—assigned by Christ to rule over a regathered *Israel*. God says:

“Foreigners shall no more enslave them. But they shall serve the LORD their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up for them” (Jeremiah 30:8-9; see Ezekiel 37:24-28).

There will be multiple literal thrones for the saints (compare Matthew 19:28; Revelation 20:4). But, in a sense, these thrones will all be part or extensions of the *same* throne (3:21). For the Holy City of God, the dwelling place of Jesus and all the saints, will itself be the throne from which they rule: “At that time Jerusalem shall be called the Throne of the LORD, and all the nations shall be gathered to it, to the name of the LORD, to Jerusalem. No more shall they follow the dictates of their evil hearts” (Jeremiah 3:17).

Thus, the throne will have been overturned one last time—returned to its rightful place upon Mount Zion in the City of David, never to be moved again. And the throne of Israel will then become the throne of the whole earth. As shocking as it may seem, this is the awesome destiny of the throne of Great Britain! As the throne of Jesus Christ and His saints, it will endure forever.

God will also pour out His Spirit on the physical house of David (see Zechariah 12:7–13:1), so that its members may ultimately be saved and glorified as well. Indeed, this is the destiny that awaits all of mankind—whoever will accept God’s grace and humbly submit to His way of life. May we all be ever so thankful for the intricate and incredible plan that God is working out—and for the absolute certainty of His incredible promises.

©2003 United Church of God, *an International Association*