

**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](http://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 Eremon 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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://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*

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

©2002 United Church of God, an International Association

### APPENDICES

---

#### Appendix 1: Scrapping the Monarchy?

The shocking death of Princess Diana in 1997 brought a great deal of attention to bear on Great Britain's royal family—much of it negative. Many complaints came forward about the Civil List, the sum granted by Parliament to meet the House of Windsor's official expenses—which was “set at £8.9 million a year, but other royal income, including the Queen's travel allowance, raises the cost to the taxpayer to about £50 million a year” (*The Telegraph*, Sept. 14, 1997).

Also at issue has been the degree of public access to royal palaces. Of course, the events of Sept. 11, 2001, have done much to silence such concerns. But there is still discontent over the level of communication between the royal family and the British people.

Prime Minister Tony Blair has advocated the monarchy paying for itself. But that's a far cry from the reform sought by many in his party, who want a republic. In 1997, the British *Telegraph* explained that “many of his Cabinet colleagues have previously made controversial comments about the Royal Family, including Ron Davies, the Welsh Secretary, who said Prince Charles was not fit to be king, and John Prescott, the Deputy Prime Minister, who has declared himself to be in favour of abolishing the monarchy.”

The same newspaper cited another source as saying that “the logic of New Labour—especially the abolition of hereditary peers—could lead even Blair supporters to call for the scrapping of the monarchy.”

*The Sunday Times* of London, reporting on a survey it conducted with a major British polling firm, said that “the royals must modernise to survive—a majority (58%) do not believe the monarchy will exist in its present form in 30 years' time” (Sept. 14, 1997). Charles himself favors change, though he “warns that ‘we must not throw the baby out with the bathwater’ by destroying all that is good about the monarchy.”

But is the monarchy truly a *good* thing? In 1994, one of the most respected British magazines in the world, *The Economist*, editorialized that “the monarchy's time has passed . . . the only powerful argument against abolition is that it is not worth the trouble” (Oct. 22, p. 15).

Criticizing it as “an unelected institution, redolent of authority and selected by accident of birth,” the magazine labeled the monarchy “the antithesis of . . . democracy, liberty, reward for achievement rather than inheritance. Surrounded as it is by privilege and patronage . . . it is also a symbol of aristocracy, of feudal honors, of baseless deference.” Yet it is certainly *not* baseless, as the substance of this publication reveals.

The royal family's popularity has risen in the past few years, though not to the level of decades past. Many remain unhappy with the amount of tax money going to support the monarchy. Yet according to a December 2001 poll by *The Observer*, 75 percent of the British people want the monarchy to continue—with 55 percent believing the successor to the throne should be Prince Charles ([www.guardian.co.uk/monarchy/story/0,2763,625864,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/monarchy/story/0,2763,625864,00.html)). In fact, most (59%) believe he should be allowed to marry Camilla Parker Bowles, but they don't want her to become queen.

Perhaps the most interesting results were the answers to the question “How much longer do you think the monarchy will last?” The responses were: “Only until the Queen dies or abdicates 8%; For another 10 years or less after the Queen dies or abdicates 11%; More than 10 but less than 20 years

9%; More than 20 but less than 50 years 15%; More than 50 but less than 100 years 9%; At least 100 years 34%; Don't know 14%.” Thus, the majority believe that the monarchy will be gone within 100 years.

The surprising truth is that the monarchy will not only last more than 100 years, but more than 1,000 and even 10,000 years. Indeed, the monarchy that rules over Great Britain, as this publication proves, will endure forever and ever.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 2: Were the Greeks Israelites?

Hecataeus of Abdera, a Greek historian of the fourth century B.C., “tells us that the Egyptians, formerly being troubled by calamities [in context, assumedly the 10 plagues at the time of the Exodus] in order that the divine wrath might be averted, expelled all the aliens [i.e., Israelites] gathered together in Egypt. Of these, some under their leaders Danaus and Cadmus, migrated into Greece; others into other regions, the greater part into Syria [i.e., the whole eastern Mediterranean, including the land of Israel]. Their leader is said to have been Moses, a man renowned for wisdom and courage, founder and legislator of the state” (cited by C.W. Muller, *Fragmenta Historicum Graecorum*, 1883, Vol. 2, p. 385).

In confirmation of the Israelite identity of these people, Diodorus of Sicily, a historian of the first century B.C., states: “They say also that those who set forth with Danaus, likewise from Egypt, settled what is practically the oldest city of Greece, Argos, and that the nations of the Colchi in Pontus and that of the Jews, which lies between Arabia and Syria, were founded as colonies by certain emigrants from their country [i.e., Egypt]; and this is the reason why it is a long-established institution among these peoples to circumcise their male children . . . the custom having been brought over from Egypt. Even the Athenians, they say, are colonists from Sais in [the Nile Delta of] Egypt” (Book 1, sec. 28, 1-5).

Whether or not Danaus and Cadmus were actual people is difficult to ascertain. Danaus was supposedly the head of the “Danae” under whom Argos flourished. And Cadmus was considered by the Greeks of Thebes to have founded their city (Will Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, Vol. 2: *The Life of Greece*, pp. 40, 72). Yet these may have simply been the Israelite tribal names Dan and Gad. (Such a possibility should be considered since the *-us* endings are Latinized Greek suffixes. Cadmus would actually be Cadm—perhaps *Gadim* in Hebrew, meaning Gadites.)

Indeed, the famed Greek poet Homer often used the term Danaans for the Greeks. For this name, or variants such as Danai or Danoi, is what they called themselves. Dr. Robert Latham, a respected ethnologist of the 19th century, made the connection, writing: “Neither do I think that the eponymus [eponym or ancestral name] of the Argive Danai [i.e., Greeks of Argos] was other than that of the Israelite tribe of Dan; only we are so used to confining ourselves to the soil of Palestine in our consideration of the history of the Israelites that we . . . ignore the share they may have taken in the ordinary history of the world . . . Yet with the Danai and the tribe of Dan this is the case, and no one connects them” (*Ethnology of Europe*, 1852, p. 137).

Yet more scholars since *have* connected them (see Cyrus Gordon, *Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations*, 1966; Allen Jones, *Bronze Age Civilization: The Philistines and the Danites*, 1975; “Danaans and Danites: Were the Hebrews Greek?,” *Biblical Archaeology Review*, June 1976; “Against the Tide: An Interview with Maverick Scholar Cyrus Gordon,” *Biblical Archaeology Review*, Nov.-Dec. 2000, pp. 52-63).

And the connection had even been made by the people in question themselves at one time. The first-century Jewish historian Josephus recorded the contents of a letter sent to the Jews of the Holy Land a few centuries earlier by the king of the Lacedaemonians (the Spartans of southern Greece):

“Areus king of the Lacedaemonians, to Onias [the Jewish high priest], sendeth greeting; we have met with a certain writing, whereby we have discovered that both the Jews and the Lacedaemonians are of one stock, and are derived from the kindred of Abraham. It is but just, therefore, that you, who are our brethren, should send to us about any of your concerns as you please. We will also do the same thing, and esteem your concerns as our own; and will look upon our concerns as in common with yours. Demoteles, who brings you this letter, will bring your answer back to us. This letter is foursquare: and the seal is an eagle, with a dragon [a serpent] in its claws” (Book 12, chap. 4, sec. 10).

This was the heraldic emblem of the tribe of Dan (“Flag,” *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, p. 405), apparently derived in part from Jacob’s prophecy: “Dan shall be a serpent by the way, a viper by the path” (Genesis 49:17). The four main standards surrounding God’s tabernacle in the wilderness, those of Ephraim, Judah, Reuben and Dan (see Numbers 2), are widely believed to have carried the emblems of a bull, a lion, a man and an eagle respectively—parallel to the four living creatures surrounding God’s throne in heaven (Revelation 4:7) and the faces of the angelic cherubim (Ezekiel 1:10).

Later, another Jewish high priest, Jonathan, wrote back to the Spartans in affirmation “concerning the kindred that was between us and you . . . because we were well satisfied about it from the sacred writings . . . It is a long time since this relation of ours to you hath been renewed, and when we, upon holy and festival days, offer sacrifices to God, we pray to Him for your preservation and victory” (Book 13, chap. 5, sec. 1).

Indeed, the “sacred writings” do address this matter indirectly. For by the time of the Israelite judge Deborah around 1200 B.C., the tribe of Dan had become a seafaring people, sailing on ships (Judges 5:17). They were no doubt later the preeminent sailors of Solomon’s fleet, which plied distant waters with the Phoenicians (see 1 Kings 9:26-28; 10:22; 2 Chronicles 8:18; 9:21). And notice this from Ezekiel: “Dan also and Javan [or Yavan, i.e., the Old Testament Hebrew word for the Greeks, see *Smith’s Bible Dictionary*] going to and fro [as mariners] occupied in thy fairs” (27:19, KJV). So a close relationship still existed between Dan and the Greeks.

It should be noted that not all of the Greeks were Israelites. Indeed, the word translated *Greece* in the Old Testament is, as mentioned, Yavan, who was one of the sons of Noah’s son Japheth (see Genesis 10:2).

Says scholar Cyrus Gordon: “Noah’s son Shem is the ancestor of the Semites. Japheth [another son of Noah] is connected with the Greeks. Now look at Genesis 9:27: ‘May God enlarge Japheth, and let him dwell in the tents of the Shem.’ The Greeks will dwell in the tents of the Semites. In other words the [Aegean] area was Semitic before it became Indo-European” (*Biblical Archaeology Review*, Nov.-Dec. 2000, p. 61).

When the New Testament uses the term Greeks, it is clearly referring to gentiles—non-Israelites. Of course, this is mainly because all people who weren’t Israelite were considered “Greek”—the Greek language and culture having been spread throughout the known world. Furthermore, by the time the New Testament was written, most of the Danaans of Greece and nearby lands had migrated elsewhere.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 3: Aegean Royal Lines From Zerah

We have seen elsewhere in this publication that many people of ancient Greece and western Turkey were of the Israelite tribe of Dan (see Appendix 2: “Were the Greeks Israelites?”). But the Danites did not constitute the only Israelite tribe in the ancient Aegean. There were also many Jews there, an important link in the subject we are examining.

### “Mount Judah”

Discovered at the location considered to have been ancient Pylos—the Milesian point of origin—were “hundreds of inscribed clay tablets baked hard by the fire that destroyed the palace [there]. The tablets are inscribed in the so-called Linear B script found earlier in the palace at Knossos in Crete, as well as . . . in excavations at Mycenae” (“Pylos,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, p. 820).

This is a reference to one of two very similar Minoan scripts found in Crete—Linear A and B. Linear B turned out to be an early form of Greek, while Linear A has been the subject of controversy. The late Cyrus Gordon, acclaimed for his translation of Ugaritic, the language of Canaan, is not so respected for his decipherment of Linear A—as he claimed it is Semitic or Hebraic, which modern scholarship has not been quick to embrace. Nevertheless, there is much to support his conclusions (see Gary Rendsburg, “Is Linear A Semitic?,” *Biblical Archaeology Review*, Nov.-Dec. 2000, pp. 60-61).

Though Linear B is Greek, it is interesting to note that it used essentially the same syllabic system as that used in Crete to write what was probably Hebrew. And the Minoan civilization of Crete was closely related to the Mycenaean civilization of southern Greece. This provides yet another link between the Israelites and ancient Greeks.

Moreover, the first-century Roman historian Tacitus wrote: “Some say that the *Jews* were fugitives from the island of Crete, who settled on the nearest coast of Africa about the time when Saturn was driven from his throne by the power of Jupiter [an apparent blending of myth with fact]. Evidence of this is sought in the name. There is a famous mountain in Crete called Ida; the neighboring tribe, the Idaei, came to be called Judaei by a barbarous [i.e., non-Greco-Roman] lengthening of the national name” (Tacitus, *The Histories*, Book 5, sec. 2, *Great Books of the Western World*, 1952, Vol. 15). So it would appear that the tribe of *Judah* was represented in the early Israelite immigration into Greece.

Surprisingly, there was another Mount Ida “in northwestern Asia Minor, near the site of ancient Troy” (“Ida,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1985, Vol. 6, p. 238). A publication by the Christian Israel Foundation notes that “perhaps the most striking evidence of an Israelitish migratory settlement in Cretan Mycenae is to be found in [renowned pioneer archaeologist] Sir Arthur Evans’ monumental work, ‘Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult,’ in which it is established that Hebrew rituals were observed there . . . This culture moved to Asia Minor, where, behind Troy, we again find a Mount Ida (Judah), and where, as in Miletus, survived the belief in the Cretan royal descent” (*The Link*, June 1989, p. 261). We will come back to this notion shortly.

Regarding the Trojans, one author writes: “Later Greek myths indicate that they came from the same source as the Mycenaean, but moved farther north to cross into Asia Minor at the Bosphorus, the strait between the Sea of Marmara and the Black Sea in Russia. They then migrated into what is now Turkey. Finally a branch under Ilus founded Troy under the name ‘Ilium’—hence Homer’s *Iliad* (I.G. Edmonds, *The Mysteries of Homer’s Greeks*, 1981, pp. 71-72). The name Troy, according to Greek tradition, came from Ilus’ father Tros.

Quoting a reputedly much older source, a Scottish publication from 1897 mentions Israelites in northwest Asia Minor around the time of the Exodus who were in alliance with the Greeks: “The Hebrews then built an altar to the Lord . . . [thanking Him for their deliverance from] the Egyptians. The king of Greece visited their camps with his Hebrew servant, telling them to build a city and fortify themselves against their enemies . . . [They then] commenced to build the city of Troy” (John MacLaren, *The History of Ancient Caledonia*, p. 4). Shocking though it seems, this may well be what happened.

## The royal house of Troy

The traditional founder of Troy's famed royal house was Dardanus, a few generations prior to Tros and Ilus: "Dardanus, in Greek legend, the son of Zeus and the Pleiad Electra, mythical founder of Dardania on the Hellespont [the nearby strait separating Dardania from Hellas or Greece now called the Dardanelles]. He was the ancestor of the Dardans of the Troad [the region surrounding Troy] . . .

"According to tradition . . . Dardanus fled from Arcadia [in the middle of Mycenaean Greece] across the sea to Samothrace [a northern Aegean island]. When that island was visited by a flood, he crossed over to the Troad . . . Being hospitably received by Teucer (ruler of Phrygia), he married Teucer's daughter Bateia and became the founder of the royal house of Troy" ("Dardanus," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, 1985, Vol. 3, p. 884).

In his acclaimed *Story of Civilization*, historian Will Durant writes: "Who were the Trojans? An Egyptian papyrus mentions certain 'Dardenui' as among the allies of the Hittites at the battle of Kadesh (1287 [B.C.]); it is likely that these were the ancestors of the 'Dardenoi' who in Homer's terminology are one with the Trojans. Probably these Dardani were of Balkan [Greek] origin, crossed the Hellespont in the sixteenth century [B.C., though the 15th is perhaps more likely] . . . Herodotus [Greek "father of history" of the fifth century B.C.], however, identified the Trojans with the Teucrians [note the eponymous King Teucer already mentioned], and the Teucrians, according to [the first-century-B.C. Greco-Roman geographer] Strabo, were Cretans who settled in the Troad, perhaps after the fall of Cnossus. Both Crete and the Troad had a sacred Mt. Ida" (Vol.2: *The Life of Greece*, 1966, p. 35).

This is all becoming much clearer. Again, these people were evidently Israelites—most likely Judahites or Jews. Indeed, even many of the Mycenaean royal houses of southern Greece appear to have sprung from the royal lineage of Crete, which seems to have been Jewish.

It is interesting to consider that, according to Homer, the shields of the Greek leaders in the Trojan War were decorated with heraldic eagles and lions. These were the Israelite tribal emblems of Dan and Judah respectively. The lion also appeared on the shields of the Trojans.

This is made all the more compelling by the following quote from *Biblical Archaeologist* magazine: "Lions, we may remark, are not frequent in Greece" (March 1996, p. 17). And yet over the "Lion Gate" of Mycenae, an ancient relief of two very large lions flanking a pillar still greets tourists. Virtually the same emblem later appeared across the Aegean in Phrygia in western Turkey—on the rock-cut tomb of Arslantas ("Lion Stone") near Afyon. Perhaps this was due to the symbol being carried by Mycenaean royalty, which was later evidently transferred to Miletus—the Milesians then influencing neighboring Phrygia. Is it possible that in these emblems we are seeing the lion of Judah?

Added to the intriguing possibility is this fact from a Harvard travel publication: "The excavated site of ancient Mycenae extends over a large tract of rough terrain tucked between Mt. Agios Elias to the north and Mt. Zara to the south" (*Let's Go Greece & Turkey*, 1998, p. 146, emphasis added). In fact the royal palace sits right at the base of Mount Zara. *Could* Mycenaean royalty have been descended from Judah's son Zerah or Zarah—the child of the scarlet thread?

## Zerah and the line of Dardanus

Before answering that, we should first take another look at *Trojan* royalty. When all factors available to us are considered, it would seem that the founder of Troy's ruling dynasty is not so mythical after all.

Sir William Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* notes that the first-century Jewish historian Flavius Josephus used Dardanus as the Greek form of a biblical name: "Darda . . . Joseph.[us] Dardanos; Darda . . ." (1863, Vol. 1, p. 397). Darda, or Dara, is listed in Scripture as a son of Judah's son Zerah—the same Zerah who had received the scarlet thread upon his wrist in Genesis 38. "The sons of Zerah were Zimri, Ethan, Heman, Calcol, and Dara—five of them in all" (1 Chronicles 2:6). In 1 Kings 4:31, he is called Darda: "For [Solomon] was wiser than all men—than Ethan the Ezrahite [i.e.,

Zerahite or Zarhite], and Heman, Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol; and his fame was in all the surrounding nations.”

Yet how could some of these men be sons of Mahol if they were sons of Zerah? A clue occurs in the title of Psalm 89, which gives the author as Ethan the Ezrahite—who obviously lived after David since the psalm speaks of God’s covenant with David and even of later transgression by David’s successors. Therefore, it would appear that the “sons” of Zerah in 1 Chronicles 2:6 must actually mean the *descendants* of Zerah—which is common usage of the word “sons” in the Bible. And “five of them in all” must mean that among the extended “family of the Zarhites” (Numbers 26:20), there were five who were spoken of together as having a great reputation for wisdom and accomplishment. That Solomon is noted to have outclassed them speaks volumes about *them* as well. They were undoubtedly internationally famous people who had carried out great exploits.

That the five, including Darda, are not immediate sons of Zerah takes care of a potential discrepancy in this whole identification, since Greek tradition mentions a brother of Dardanus named Jasius or Iasion, who was either killed by Dardanus or struck by lightning (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, p. 884). If the five sons of Zerah are *descendants* of Zerah, this matter is easily resolved.

It is also interesting to note that while the genealogy of the Perez branch of Judah’s family is given in great detail for many generations in Scripture, the genealogical record of Zerah’s family is what you see above—that’s it except for a named son of Ethan (1 Chronicles 2:8) and the infamous Achan of Joshua’s day being listed along with his father and grandfather (verse 7; Joshua 7:17-18, 24).

This lack of information perhaps suggests that most of Zerah’s descendants were no longer present with the main body of the nation. Perhaps they became upset with their secondary status behind Perez, believing it unfair because of the incident with the scarlet thread and Perez’s breach. Whatever the reason, they appear to have migrated elsewhere.

Yet could the biblical Darda truly be the founder of Troy? What of Dardanus’ descent from the Greek god Zeus? A number of royal genealogies based on Homer describe the descent of Trojan royalty as follows: Cronus (or Kronos) – Zeus – Dardanus – Erichthonius – Tros – Ilus – Laomedon – Priam (the king of Troy at the time of the Trojan War in Homer’s *Iliad*). While this lineage might appear entirely mythical, it should be realized that some ancient myths about the “gods” were actually rooted in stories about real people. In fact, many pagan religions began, in part, as ancestor and hero worship (see Thomas Bulfinch, *Bulfinch’s Mythology*, “Stories of God’s and Heroes,” chap. 25: “Origin of Mythology,” 1855, 1979).

With that in mind, it is rather surprising to discover what the ancient Phoenician historian Sanchuniathon (or Sanchoniatho)—who is believed to have lived around the 1200s B.C. (though some put him a few centuries later)—had to say about the identity of Cronus. But first it should be recognized that all material from Sanchuniathon “is derived from the works of Philo of Byblos (flourished AD 100), who claimed to have translated his *Phoenicia* from the original text. The authenticity of that claim has been questioned, but excavations at Ras Shamra (ancient Ugarit) in Syria in 1929 revealed Phoenician documents supporting much of Sanchuniathon’s information on Phoenician mythology and religious beliefs” (“Sanchuniathon,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1985, Vol. 10, p. 404).

The writings of Sanchuniathon, as we have them, mention the Greek “Kronos, whom the Phoenicians call *Israel* . . . He circumcised himself, and forced his allies to do the same” (I.P. Cory, *Ancient Fragments*, 1828). Israel, as earlier stated, was the new name given to the biblical patriarch Jacob. And the Phoenician historian further explained that this Kronos or Israel had a special son named *Jehud* or *Yehud*. This is simply a shortened form of the Hebrew *Yehudah*, that is, Judah: “. . . evidence of the extent of Judah [later in the fifth century B.C.] are the seal impressions on storage jars . . . on which appear the name ‘Yehud’ in various forms” (Yohanan Aharoni and Michael Avi-Yonah, *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*, 1977, p. 109).

Since the primary son of the Greek Cronus (Roman Saturn) was Zeus (Roman Jupiter), then Jehud would be the same as Zeus. Indeed, the word Zeus (Zhe-ut) may actually *derive* from Yehud—as the Roman Jupiter or Iupiter appears to derive from the Greek Zeus-pater or Zheut-pater (*pater* meaning “father”). Of course, a great deal of Babylonian paganism was overlaid onto these historical characters, creating the false gods of Greek and Roman mythology (see Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 1916, 1959).

Thus, stripped of mythological embellishment, Dardanus son of Zeus son of Kronos is Darda son of Judah son of Israel. Actually, Darda was the grandson, great-grandson or later descendant of Judah—as the word “son” can be interpreted. In any case, Darda was, in fact, a descendant of Judah through the line of Zerah.

Incredibly, an examination of the genealogies of the royal families of Europe shows that nearly all of them trace their lineage back to the house of Troy (see James Anderson, *Royal Genealogies or the Genealogical Tables of Emperors, Kings, and Princes, from Adam to These Times*, 1736; W.M.H. Milner, *The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty*, 1902). Thus, the scepter did indeed remain with Judah as prophesied. For from the line of Perez came the royal house of David, while from the Zerah line came the royal house of Troy. Yet Troy’s wasn’t the only royal line from Zerah.

## The founder of Athens

The Mycenaean house of Atreus also traced its lineage to Zeus (i.e., Judah). And considering the Mount Zara rising above Mycenae, it would seem that this royal line, like that of Troy, sprang from Zerah. Indeed, remember that the Zarhite Dardanus actually came from this area of Greece. Thus it would appear that the Jewish Cretan royal family, evidently of Zerah, was split—with one line going to northwest Turkey and the other going to Mycenaean Greece. Yet they were fused back together when Dardanus married Teucer’s daughter and founded Troy.

How, then, does all of this relate to the Milesians? This publication elsewhere explains that the father of Ireland’s Milesian dynasty from Spain is sometimes given as Miledh, Golamh or Gathelus. He is often called the son of Nel (also Niul or Neolus)—surely the Neleus from whom the Milesians of Asia Minor traced their descent. But Gathelus is sometimes referred to as the son of Cecrops, the founder of Athens in Greek mythology.

So which was it? Was Gathelus the son of Neleus or Cecrops? If “son” is understood to mean descendant, which it almost certainly does here, then he could be the son of both. As noted elsewhere in this publication, Will Durant stated that the Ionians came to Miletus *from Attica*, the region of Athens (pp.127-129).

The Mycenaean Greeks also traced themselves back to “Achaean and Ion, who begot the Achaean and Ionian tribes, which, after many wanderings, peopled respectively the Peloponnesus [southern Greece] and Attica [the region of Athens]. One of Ion’s descendants, Cecrops, with the [supposed] help of the goddess Athena, founded . . . the city that was named after her, Athens. It was he, said the story, that gave civilization to Attica, instituted marriage, abolished bloody sacrifices, and taught his subjects to worship the Olympian gods—Zeus and Athena above the rest” (Durant, pp. 39-40).

This is likely a corrupted account of something that actually happened. We’ve already seen Zeus identified with Judah. And Athena may have been named after Athens rather than the other way around. Furthermore, as she was the goddess of wisdom, perhaps Cecrops simply promoted the celebration of wisdom and this was later interpreted as promoting the worship of a goddess. Then again, he may have been thoroughly pagan—we just don’t know.

Intriguingly, while much has been made of Dardanus (and rightly so), some students of this subject have identified Cecrops as one of the other sons of Zerah—Calcol or Chalcol. This might at first appear to be a rather tenuous connection. But there is some evidence to support it.

Consider that of the two scriptural mentions of Calcol and Darda (apparently called the sons of Mahol in the latter), Calcol is mentioned first both times—apparently as the eldest or most prominent. This would seem to indicate that, between the two, the primary royal line from Zerah should be through Calcol. Yet that is rather surprising when we consider Darda as the founder of the royal house of Troy. For what could be more prominent than that? Perhaps, the answer would seem to be, the founder of the royal house of early Athens—a lineage that also seems to have become the dynasty of Miletus and other kingdoms (eventually including Ireland).

Regarding Mahol, some see a relation to the name Miletus. The name Mahol can be rendered in Hebrew as *Machol*, which means “dance” or, literally, “to move in a circle.” This name does seem similar to the promontory just north of Miletus—“Mycale, the central meeting place of all Ionia” (p. 242). It was here that the Ionian cities of Asia Minor would gather for meetings and to celebrate

their great festival of song and dance, the Panionium (p. 151). While both Calcol and Darda appear in Scripture to have descended from someone named Mahol or to have been cryptically referred to as “the sons of dance,” there is no way to know whether or not “Mahol” is related to Mycale or Miletus.

It is also possible that the word *mahol* or *machol* as here applied was actually imported from Greece—that it was the Hebrew transliteration of the Greek word *megale*, meaning “great.” Thus, Calcol and Darda would be the “sons of greatness.”

This would lend further credence to Calcol’s identification with the founder of Athens. Of course, there is yet more to go on anyway, not least of which is the fact that on the large island of Euboea right next to Athens, settled by Athenians, was a region called Chalcis (see Appendix 4: “The Colchis Connection”).

Furthermore, since there is compelling evidence that Ireland’s Milesian rulers descended from Zerah as this publication elsewhere shows, the first of the Milesian rulers springing from Cecrops would seem to require the Athenian founder to have been a Zarhite too. Because of that, and Calcol’s preeminence above Troy’s founder Darda, it is not unreasonable to identify Calcol with Cecrops—despite how incredible that may sound.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 4: The Colchis Connection

Besides Cecrops of Athens, some have identified Zerah's descendant Calcol or Chalcol with the land of Colchis, a "nearly triangular region at the eastern end of the Black Sea south of the Caucasus, in the western part of the modern [former] Georgian S.S.R." ("Colchis," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, 1985, Vol. 3, p. 443). This location makes it contiguous with ancient Iberia—the land of the Hebrews!

Continuing on: "In Greek mythology Colchis was the home of Medea [daughter of King Aetes and possessor of the famous golden fleece] and the destination of [Jason and] the Argonauts [sailors of Argos of the Danaoi, who were likely Danites], a land of fabulous wealth and the domain of sorcery" (p. 443)—which any land of superior technological ability and perhaps prophets (be they true or false) might seem.

First-century-B.C. historian Diodorus of Sicily has identified Argos and Colchis with the Israelites who emigrated from Egypt—and relates the same origin for Athens (see Appendix 2: "Were the Greeks Israelites?").

Yet Colchis is far removed from Athens. Is it possible to identify Calcol or Chalcol as Cecrops of Athens and still relate his name to the people of Colchis? First of all, it should be noted that *Calchas* was a name used in Mycenaean Greece, as it was the name of a priest who told the Greek king Agamenmon at the time of the Trojan War to sacrifice his daughter. So this name *could* have been another name of Cecrops, who lived earlier. Still, if it was, how might this name have been transferred to the land of Colchis, which was far to the northeast of Athens—across the Aegean and Black Seas? To the *immediate* northeast of Athens lies the great island of Euboea whose great central territory was known as Chalcis. Says historian Will Durant, "Its coastal plains were rich enough to lure Ionians from Attica in the days of the Dorian invasion [ca. 1100 B.C.]" (*The Story of Civilization*, Vol. 2, p. 106). So Athenians migrated here.

Going on: "Neighboring deposits of copper and iron and banks of murex shells gave Chalcis its wealth and its name [*chalcum* meaning copper in Greek]; for a time it was the chief center of metallurgical industry in Greece, making unrivaled swords and excellent vases of bronze" (p. 106). Yet is it not possible that the naming should be understood in reverse? That the Greek word for copper was actually derived from the region of Chalcis? And that Chalcis derived its name from the Athenian migrants descended from Chalcol?

It was evidently here that the Milesians sprang from around 1000 B.C. (see Appendix 3: "Aegean Royal Lines From Zerah.") But the Athenian Chalcians followed another migration pattern as well. We later find them on the Macedonian coast in northern Greece: "Greeks, mostly from Chalcis and Eretria [just south of Chalcis on Euboea], conquered and named the three-fingered peninsula of Chalcidice" (p. 157). East of here, on the Bosphorus Straits leading up into the Black Sea, where now sits the Asian side of Istanbul, was established ancient Chalcedon—which was also a colony of Miletus (p. 156). Then, passing into the Black Sea and traveling further east along the length of its southern shore we eventually come to Colchis. So there is a likely migratory pattern linking these areas after all.

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* further states, "Historically, Colchis was colonized by Milesian Greeks to whom the Colchians supplied gold, slaves, agricultural produce, and shipbuilding material" (p. 443). Thus, the ancient Athenians, Colchians and Milesians would seem to be inextricably bound together. Calcol, Chalcol, Chalcis and Colchis—these names seem too similar to be a matter of coincidence given all the facts we know about them.

Yet there is some confusion: "The ethnic composition of the Colchians, who were described by Herodotus as black Egyptians, is unclear" (p. 443). Kristin Romey, assistant managing editor of *Archaeology* magazine, writes: "What about Herodotus' idea of the Colchians' Egyptian origin? [Local excavations director Amiran] Kakhidze dismissed the question with a wave of his hand. 'He was probably drinking too much wine when he wrote that,' volunteered a bystander" ("Land of the Golden Fleece," *Archaeology*, March-April 2001, p. 35).

Of course, Herodotus may have been reporting fact. But perhaps he wrote after the Israelites in this region had sailed or trekked away. We should bear in mind that in earlier centuries, during the reign of Solomon, the nations of Israel, Canaanite Phoenicia and Egypt were in a very close

alliance—sailing and colonizing together. So it is likely that Israelites would not have been the only ones in this region. Yet prior to their emigration, they must have been prominent. Of course, it is also possible that Herodotus had simply heard the same origin for the Colchians that Diodorus of Sicily later reported—that is, migrants from Egypt related to the Jews of Palestine.

Could King Aetes of Colchis, then, have been a descendant of Calcol? It is certainly possible. If so it is remarkable that the Israelites later taken into Assyrian captivity found their way to this same land. The Assyrians deported the Israelites to northern Mesopotamia. Their population overflowed into Armenia just to the north. Soon they made their way next door to Iberia and Colchis.

The Colchian city of “Vani was founded in the eighth century B.C., a century during which Colchis witnessed a population explosion, most likely caused [it is supposed] by significant innovations in iron production” (Romey, p. 30). We may instead venture to guess that the population explosion was due to the influx of Israelites from Armenia at this time.

Perhaps the Israelites in this region accepted the rule of the Zarhite Colchian king. And, migrating from this region into Europe—journeying up the rivers that emptied into the Black Sea—they may have remained under the line of Zerah. In fact, this appears to be another way the royal line of Zerah was transferred into Europe—even the Trojan line (see Appendix 10: “The Family of Odin”)—besides the routes through Spain, the *other* Iberia.

However, it should be noted that the Zerah line may have become blended with a Davidic line in the course of these migrations. Consider the great Armenian city of Ani. “Ani’s ancient Armenian rulers (who claimed descent from David and Solomon) reigned over an area covering most of northeastern Turkey and modern Armenia” (*Archaeology Odyssey*, Sept.–Oct. 2002, p. 18). There were many Jews among the Israelite migrants after a large part of Judah was taken captive by the Assyrians as well, and it is entirely possible that some of these Jews were descendants of David. (We do know that the line of rulers could not have descended from Jeconiah, who was later taken into Babylonian captivity, because of the restriction God had placed on his descendants.)

It should also be noted that some of the Iberians in Spain could perhaps have come from the Colchian Iberia, including royalty. Irish historian Thomas Moore mentions “the Celto-Scythae, who founded part of the mixed people of Spain, having come originally from the neighbourhood of the Euxine [Black] Sea and therefore combining in themselves all the peculiarities attributed to the Milesian colony, of being at once Scythic, Oriental [i.e., Middle Eastern], and direct from Spain” (*The History of Ireland*, 1837, Vol. 1, p. 73).

In any event, it is worth noting that we are not confined to a single line of descent to account for the presence of the Zerah branch of Judah’s family—and perhaps even the Perez branch through David—among the royalty of Europe.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 5: Brutus and the Covenant Land

One king of Trojan descent of whom we have record was mentioned at the outset of this publication—Brutus or Brwt, the first king of Britain, from whom Britain is understood to have derived its name. Notice the following from an old British history published in 1661:

“In the time of King Edward I [1272-1307]. At Lincolne, where [was] held a Parliament, after much diligent search of antiquities . . . letters were sent to the Pope of Rome, sealed with an hundred seals and witnesses . . . wherein is declared and justified that in the time of Hely [Eli] and Samuel the Prophet [that is, ca. 1100 B.C.], Brutus a Trojan landed here, and by his own name called the Country Britannia, before named Albion” (Percy Enderbie, *Cambria Triumphans, or Britain in Its Perfect Luster*).

The account goes on to describe how the nation was divided between his sons into three parts—Loegria, Albania and Cambria (later known as England, Scotland and Wales respectively). This was likely derived in part from the record set down by Geoffrey of Monmouth in the 1100s in his *History of the Kings of Britain*, which many scholars now prefer to dismiss as fiction. (It may be downloaded from [www.yorku.ca/inpar/geoffrey\\_thompson.pdf](http://www.yorku.ca/inpar/geoffrey_thompson.pdf).) However, Geoffrey claims that he was translating from a much older source in the early British language. And there is evidence to support his claim and work (see Mike Gascoigne, “Why All the Fuss About Geoffrey?,” on-line at [www.write-on.co.uk/history/geoffrey.htm](http://www.write-on.co.uk/history/geoffrey.htm) and Bill Cooper, “The Kings of the Ancient Britons: A Chronology,” on-line at [www.biblebelievers.org.au/nation08.htm](http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/nation08.htm)).

Furthermore, 300 years before Geoffrey the Welsh monk Nennius had *also* recorded the coming of Brutus in his *History of the Britons* (on-line at [users.ev1.net/~theweb/Nennius.htm](http://users.ev1.net/~theweb/Nennius.htm))—explaining him to be descended from Aeneas of the Trojan royal house, the same Aeneas from whom the early Roman emperors claimed descent, and how Brutus subdued Spain and journeyed through Gaul before arriving in Britain. Indeed, others had recorded elements of this tale as well. And there was much tradition surrounding it, such as Brutus coming upon other Trojan colonies in Spain and Gaul and persuading them to join him in his journey north.

Tradition further states that Brutus and his entourage arrived in Devon in southwest England, sailing up the River Dart past modern Dartmouth—putting in 12 miles inland from Torbay at what is now Totnes, a town of ancient pedigree. The Brutus Stone in Fore Street there still marks the spot where he is supposed to have stepped ashore. Is it conceivable that the River Dart, along with the surrounding countryside of Dartmoor, was actually named after the heir of Darda, founder of the house of Troy? The Dart might seem to have been named after the Celtic tribe of Durotriges who lived in the area, although perhaps the reverse is true—they being named after the river and countryside, which itself was named after Darda.

Brutus is further credited with the founding of London as Trinovantum or New Troy (see Gascoigne, “The Trojan City of London,” on-line at [www.write-on.co.uk/history/trojan\\_london.htm](http://www.write-on.co.uk/history/trojan_london.htm)). One author comments: “No longer need the story be regarded as fabulous, that Brutus the Trojan, the grandson of Aeneas (the hero of Virgil’s great epic), gave the name of Caer Troia, Troynovant or New Troy, to London. In site and surroundings . . . there seems to have been considerable resemblance between the historic Troy on the Scamander and New Troy on the Thames. On the plains of Troy today may be seen numerous conical mounds rising from out of the lagoons and swamps that environed the citadel hill of Hissarlik [the modern site of ancient Troy in northwest Turkey], akin to those that dominate the marshes, round about the Caer and Porth of London, in prehistoric times” (E.O. Gordon, *Prehistoric London: Its Mounds and Circles*, 1946, p. 83).

Modern history identifies the Trinovantes as an ancient Celtic tribe dwelling not far to the north of London at the time of the Roman conquest of Britain. Julius Caesar mentioned them in his writings. They may have derived their name from Brutus’ capital. According to Bede’s *History of the English Church and People*, completed in 731, “the strong city of Trinovantum and its commander Androgius surrendered to Caesar” (Book 1, chap. 2, translated by Leo Sherley-Price, 1955).

Not surprisingly, the majority of scholars today reject the story of Brutus as having any bearing on the etymology of the name Britain. According to them, the Britons are named after one of the two major branches of the early Celts in the British Isles. One branch was that of the Goidelic Celts,

from whom the Gaels of Ireland and Scotland trace their ancestry. The other was that of the Brythonic or Brittonic Celts, from whom the peoples of Wales and Brittany are descended.

But could not the Brythonic Celts have been named after Brwt or Brutus? After all, the word *Brython* or *Brwth-ayn*, from which Britain came, is simply *Brwt* (pronounced *Brutt* or *Britt*) with the Celtic augmentative or plural suffix. As the Celtic language very likely developed out of the ancient Hebrew language (the Celts being descendants of the Israelites), we might wonder what *Brit* means in Hebrew. Stunningly, this is how to pronounce the Hebrew word for “covenant.” The Israelites were the *people of the covenant* (compare Exodus 19:5). The word *b’rit* (or *berith*) could be made part of a name—as it is in that of the false god Baal-Berith (see Judges 8:33; 9:4). Britain, then, would essentially mean place or land of the covenant—or, perhaps, of the covenant people. Indeed, the term “covenant people” in Hebrew would be *Brit-am*, which is rather close to Britain.

It is entirely possible, of course, that Brutus himself was given the Hebrew name Brit (later Latinized as Brutus). After all, he was of Jewish descent through the house of Troy. So he could have received a Hebrew name. Of course it is also possible that he was historically nameless—referred to simply as king of the Brwt, a name that was then applied to him personally.

However it happened, it is remarkable that a name meaning “covenant” in Hebrew came to refer to a nation of Israelite descent. Indeed, Britain—primarily descended from Joseph’s son Ephraim—is the *leading nation* of Israel (see our booklet *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy*). Perhaps it is only a coincidence that the English word “British” can be broken down in Hebrew as “covenant man” (*ish* being a familiar suffix in English meaning “pertaining to” but a word meaning “man” in Hebrew). Or perhaps it is no coincidence at all.

Quite interesting in this regard is a statement in an audio study course called *An Invitation to Hebrew* in its section on the “Vocabulary of Jewish Life.” After the teacher confirms that “covenant in Hebrew is . . . *b’rit*,” he mentions its occurrence in the term “*b’nai b’rit*, the children of the covenant” and in referring to “the USA, which is called, in Hebrew, *Artzot Ha-Brit*, the lands of the covenant” (Mordecai Kamrat, Spoken Arts, Inc., 1960).

This is all rather astonishing. For both the United States and Britain are indeed the lands of the covenant—the lands God promised to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob by covenant. For help in studying this subject in greater detail, request or download your free copy of *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy*.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 6: Dating the Milesian Arrival in Ireland

In the transfer of the Davidic throne from Judah to Ireland, a princess of the house of David married a man of Milesian royal lineage who either was or soon became the king of Ireland—or whose child with the Davidic princess sat on the Irish throne. We can be confident that this marriage took place at the time of the prophet Jeremiah, who—sometimes identified with the ancient Irish historical figure Ollam Fodhla—evidently supervised the transplanting of the monarchy.

How can we know this happened in Jeremiah's day? Certainly by scriptural indications—but also by understanding, from historical clues, approximately what time the Milesians invaded Ireland. For the transfer of the Davidic throne had to have taken place either after Milesian rule over Ireland commenced or shortly before—the latter case meaning that the Milesian takeover of Ireland was actually *part of the process* of transferring the Davidic throne.

Unfortunately, the dating of the Milesian arrival in Ireland is an area of broad dispute. But there are factors that should help us in forming a reasonable answer. It is shown elsewhere in this publication that the Milesian or Scotie invaders took control of the island nation *from the Tuatha de Danaan*—a fact generally stipulated.

Further, an Irish source has been quoted placing the first appearance of the Danaans in Ireland around 1200 B.C., shortly after the time of Deborah the prophetess. No doubt colonization continued through the period of the Israel-Phoenician alliance in the days of David and Solomon (ca. 1000 B.C.) and even beyond then.

Some place the Milesian takeover of Ireland in David's day or before. But there are problems with this idea. Irish historian Geoffrey Keating, in his *History of Ireland from the Earliest Period to the English Invasion*, says, "The Danaans were a people of great learning and wealth; they left Greece after a battle with the Assyrians and went to Ireland; and also to Danmark, and called it 'Danmares,' Dan's country" (Vol. 1, 1866, pp. 195-199). This is most likely referring to the time of Assyria's invasions of Israel in the 700s B.C.

Now the Danaans' migration described here was evidently not their first into Ireland. Rather, these went to settle with the numbers of their tribe who already inhabited the Emerald Isle. But this later settlement most likely took place while the Danaans still ruled in Ireland. It seems highly improbable that this influx followed the establishment of the Milesians over the Danaans. Thus the Milesian arrival in Ireland, in all likelihood, postdated Israel's Assyrian conquest—placing it *after* the 700s B.C. This would require Ollam Fodhla to have flourished after this time as well. Therefore, the chronologies dating him to between 1100 and 800 B.C. are shown to most likely be in error.

And notice what the *Lebor Gabala Erenn*, or *Book of Invasions of Ireland*, says about the Milesian arrival: "The Tuatha de Danaan did not suffer them to come to land there, for they had not held a parley with them . . . They encircled Ireland three times, till Thursday, so far as the day of the week, on the day before the Calendes of May, the 17th day of the moon: Anno Mundi 3500" (compiled ca. 1150, Rescension of Michael O'Cleirigh, 1620s, translated by R.A. Stewart Macalister, 1938, Vol. 1, p. 122). Anno Mundi means "Year of the World," considered from the time of Adam's creation, which medieval clerics reckoned at shortly before 4000 B.C. Thus, this source puts the Milesian arrival shortly before 500 B.C.

In confirmation of all this is recent historical testimony. Author John Bardon writes in *A History of Ulster*: "Archaeological enquiry does not show evidence of formidable invasion [because there was no cultural break—the inhabitants and invaders both being Israelites]; rather there was a steady infiltration from Britain and the European mainland over the centuries. The first Celtic speakers [and Celtic, it can be shown, is derived from Hebrew] may have come as early as 1000 B.C. and in greater numbers from about 500 B.C. and, equipped with iron weapons and advancing on horseback, they brought the native peoples under subjugation" (1992, p. 9).

The earlier wave of Hebrew immigrants would be the Danaans, from 1200 to 700 B.C. The later wave would be the Milesians from the mid-500s on. Notice what was happening at this time in the Aegean according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*:

"During the 7th century [600s B.C.], Miletus came into conflict with the neighboring state of Lydia and probably acknowledged Lydian overlordship in the mid-6th century. In the latter part of the sixth century, it came under Persian rule, along with other Greek cities of Anatolia [i.e., Asia

Minor or Turkey]. About 499 BC the Milesians led the Ionian revolt that marked the beginning of the Greco-Persian Wars. The city was stormed and sacked by the Persians in 494. After the Persian defeat by the Greeks (479), Miletus joined the Athenian dominated Delian League; but by the mid-5th century it was weakened and impoverished by internal divisions and in 442 was defeated in war by neighboring Samos” (“Miletus,” Vol. 8, p. 125).

This turmoil was evidently the impetus behind major westward migration. Will Durant states: “Near the beginning of the sixth century the Phocaeans of Ionia [Phocaea was the northernmost Milesian city of the Ionian Twelve in Asia Minor] landed on the southern shore of France, founded Massalia (Marseilles), and carried Greek products up the Rhone and its branches . . . Westward they ventured into Spain and built the towns of Rhodae (Rosas), Emporium (Ampurias), Hemeroscopium, and Maenaca (near Malaga). The Greeks in Spain flourished for a while by exploiting the silver mines of Tartessus [Tarshish in southern Spain]; but in 535 the Carthaginians [Phoenicians of Northwest Africa] and Etruscans [Italians] combined their forces to destroy the Phocaeon [Milesian] fleet, and from that time Greek power in the western Mediterranean waned” (p. 169).

The mid- to late sixth century B.C., then, would seem to be the period that the Milesians were being driven to Spain and beyond Spain into Ireland. This was soon after the fall of Jerusalem (586 B.C.), which means the prophet Jeremiah could conceivably have been among the Milesians when they first arrived in Ireland.

Some place the Milesian arrival in Spain and Ireland nearly 1,000 years earlier—around the time of the Exodus—based upon the stories surrounding the traditional Irish ancestors Gathelus and Scota. However, even besides the obvious mistake of making the Milesian arrival predate that of the Danaan’s, that chronological framework is clearly in error for numerous reasons (see Appendix 8: “Gathelus, Scota and the Exodus”).

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 7: The Stone of Destiny

In November 1996, after 700 years beneath the coronation chair in Westminster Abbey in London, a sandstone block known as the Stone of Scone or Stone of Destiny was returned to Scotland “to the skirl of pipes, toasts of whiskey and a school holiday” (*The Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 16, 1996). In early medieval times, Scottish kings had been crowned upon this stone at Scone (pronounced *skoon*) near modern Perth until 1296, when the English king Edward I took it to London—thereafter to be the seat of the kings of England. Eventually, the Scottish dynasty itself would follow the stone, being transferred to London.

What was so special about this chunk of rock, which now sits in Edinburgh Castle? Before its removal from the coronation chair at Westminster, a sign nearby identified it as “Jacob’s Pillow Stone.” The following explanation appeared in the official guidebook:

“Coronation Chair—the Coronation Chair was made for Edward I to enclose the famous Stone of Scone, which he seized in 1296 and brought from Scotland to the Abbey . . . Legends abound concerning this mysterious object and tradition identifies this stone with the one upon which Jacob rested his head at Bethel—‘And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillows, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil on the top of it’ (Genesis 28:18). Jacob’s sons carried it to Egypt and from thence it passed to Spain with King Gathelus, son of Cecrops, the builder of Athens.

“About 700 BC it appears in Ireland, whither it was carried by the Spanish king’s son Simon Brech, on his invasion of that island. There it was placed upon the sacred Hill of Tara, and called ‘Lia-Fail,’ the ‘fatal’ stone [i.e., stone of fate], or ‘stone of destiny’ . . . Fergus Mor MacEirc (d. 501?), the founder of the Scottish monarchy, and one of the Blood Royal of Ireland, received it in [the area of Iona in southwest] Scotland, and Kenneth MacAlpin (d. 846) finally deposited it in the Monastery of Scone (846)” (*Westminster Abbey Official Guide*, 1994, pp. 46-47).

A newer Scottish guidebook, though its authors consider all of this mythical fancy, further relates: “A song about the Stone was composed in England, probably shortly after the death of Edward I in 1307. In this it is stated that Scota, Pharaoh’s daughter, brought the stone directly from Egypt to Scotland, to a place close to Scone. Twenty years later William de Rishanger offered further elaboration when he wrote that [Scottish King] John Balliol sat on ‘the royal stone which Jacob placed under his head when he was going from Beersheba to Haran’” (David Breeze and Graeme Munro, *The Stone of Destiny: Symbol of Nationhood*, 1997, p. 16).

This is an astonishing tale. Might there be any truth in it? We should start with a closer look at what the Bible has to say.

### Jacob’s pillow—and pillar

God had promised the Hebrew patriarch Abraham that through his descendants would come great nations and kings. The same promise was reaffirmed to his son Isaac and then to Isaac’s son Jacob. While Jacob slept on the ground in Canaan, he dreamed of a ladder extending to heaven with angels ascending and descending on it (Genesis 28:10-12).

According to John Rogerson’s *Atlas of the Bible*: “A vivid description of the site of Bethel, and of the remarkable stones to the north of the village that may underlie the dream, has been provided by the American scholar J.P. Peters in 1904: ‘You are far above Jerusalem, which is visible away to the south. You look over a succession of hills and then across the huge, deep cleft of the Jordan valley to Gilead and Moab beyond . . . just here, occurs a freak of nature so singular that it is difficult to convince oneself that nature and not man is the author. Huge stones seem to be piled one upon another to make columns nine or ten feet or more in height . . . Whoever stands on the hillside above Bethel, especially toward evening, understands with a new understanding the fascinating story of Jacob’s flight when night overtook him near Bethel, and there on the height, which was so much nearer to heaven than all the country round about him, he saw the ‘ladder’” (1985, p. 153).

Above the ladder was God, telling him that his descendants would be great colonizers—spreading far abroad across the face of the earth (verses 13-14). God then said, “Behold, I am with you and will keep you wherever you go, and will bring you back to this land; for I will not leave you until I have

done what I have spoken to you” (verse 15). While this applied to Jacob personally, it also seemed to be a promise to Jacob’s descendants, relative to their colonizing abroad over the earth. Eventually, they would return to the Land of Promise.

When Jacob awoke, He exclaimed: “How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven!” The Great God of the universe, he realized, had been there with him where he slept.

Then, in an event that would have great significance in time to come if the later accounts are true, “Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillows, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. And he called the name of that place Bethel [or Beth-El]”—that is, literally, House of God (verses 18-19, KJV). In Jacob’s dream, it was by this stone, apparently the base of the ladder, that God’s angels stepped out into the world at large to carry out His will.

“Then Jacob made a vow, saying, ‘If God will be with me, and keep me in this way . . . so that I come back to my father’s house in peace, then the LORD shall be my God. And this stone which I have set as a pillar shall be God’s house . . .’” (verses 20-22).

Decades later, God indeed did bring Jacob back. Now renamed Israel, meaning “Prevailer with God,” he returned to Bethel, where God informed him, “A nation and a company of nations shall proceed from you, and kings shall come from your body” (35:11). Then he anointed the pillar stone again and once more called the place Bethel (verses 14-15).

## The shepherd stone

This stone surely must have some significance to feature so prominently in Genesis. It is interesting that the promise of a line of kings is concomitant with mention of it—and that the stone is anointed just as the kings later will be.

Of course, the ultimate anointed figure in Scripture is the Messiah, Jesus Christ. Indeed, the word “messiah” is the English form of the Hebrew *mashiach*, which means “anointed.” The *Greek* word for “anointed” is *christos*—that is, Christ. When those of Jesus’ day referred to Him as “Jesus Christ,” they were effectively saying “King Jesus.” He is the coming King of Kings who will receive the throne of Israel from the line of David.

In Daniel 2, we are told of a prophetic dream in which a stone “cut out without hands” strikes and shatters an image representing the succession of gentile empires ruling this world—and then grows into a great mountain filling the whole earth (verses 34-35). That stone ending man’s wayward civilization and growing into the worldwide mountain represents the setting up the Kingdom of God over all nations (verses 44-45).

The stone itself is obviously the Messiah, Jesus Christ, who is often portrayed as a stone or rock (see 1 Corinthians 10:4; Psalm 18:2; Matthew 16:18; Romans 9:33; Ephesians 2:20; 1 Peter 2:6-8). Regarding *Jacob’s* dream, then, the angels of God go out into the world of man and return to heaven via Christ—that is, by His command.

In delivering a prophecy about the descendants of Joseph, Jacob said, “From there is the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel” (Genesis 49:24). The New Revised Standard Version says, “the Shepherd, the Rock of Israel.” This would seem to be a reference to Jesus Christ, the Chief Shepherd (compare 1 Peter 5:3) and, as we’ve seen, the spiritual Rock. And perhaps the prophecy does refer to Him on one level. Yet Jesus did not come from Joseph—neither by ethnic descent nor by territorial origin. “For it is evident that our Lord arose from *Judah*” (Hebrews 7:14). And in the end He will come from heaven, not from Joseph’s land.

So to what was Jacob’s prophecy primarily referring? What the New King James Version renders as “the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel” should perhaps actually be translated “the shepherd stone of Israel.” The Ferrar Fention Translation has “Israel’s guardian stone.” This would fit the anointed stone of Jacob at Bethel because Bethel was located in what became the territory of Ephraim, one of the two tribes of Joseph. Thus, it seems that Jacob’s prophecy primarily concerned the anointed Bethel stone. But this stone was clearly a physical type of the ultimate, true anointed stone—Jesus the Messiah.

## Symbol of monarchy

Concerning Bethel, we should remember that Jacob gave that name, meaning “God’s House,” to not just the place where the stone lay but also to the stone itself. Consider, furthermore, that the prophet Nathan later told David, “Also the LORD tells you that He will make you a *house*” (2 Samuel 7:11)—by which he meant a royal dynasty (verses 12-29). Yet, as elsewhere explained, Israel’s kings “sat on the throne of the LORD” (1 Chronicles 29:23; 2 Chronicles 9:6-8). Thus, David’s dynasty was not just his *own* house—it was also *God’s* house, Hebrew *Bethel*. So perhaps the anointed Bethel stone came to symbolize the monarchy.

We should also consider that Jacob set the Bethel stone as a “pillar”—a *matsebah* or standing stone. A pillar conveys the idea of a structural support. Indeed, pillars were often seen as upholding the heavens. Jesus Christ, the ultimate pillar, “sustains the universe with his word of power” (Hebrews 1:3, Moffatt Translation). The Church of God, of which Jesus is the “chief cornerstone” (Ephesians 2:20), is the “house of God . . . the pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Timothy 3:15). Indeed, all of God’s saints are anointed pillar stones who will one day inherit David’s throne along with the ultimate anointed pillar stone Jesus Christ (see 1 John 2:27; 1 Peter 2:4-5; Revelation 3:12, 21). This is the glorious future of the Davidic monarchy.

It is interesting that the Stone of Scone has been used as a coronation stone for untold centuries. Do we find any parallel in Scripture? Yes! Notice the details of the crowning of Judah’s King Joash of the line of David at the temple of God in Jerusalem around 835 B.C.: “And he [Jehoiada the priest] brought out the king’s son [Joash], put the crown on him, and gave him the Testimony; they made him king and anointed him, and they clapped their hands and said, ‘Long live the king!’ Now when [the usurper queen] Athaliah heard the noise of the escorts and the people, she came to the people in the temple of the LORD. When she looked, there was the king, *standing by a pillar according to custom*; and the leaders and the trumpeters were by the king” (2 Kings 11:12-14).

According to 2 Chronicles 23:13, he “stood by *his* pillar”—evidently not one personally owned by him before but one that was “his” because it was the pillar of the Davidic dynasty of which he was the current representative. Similarly, around 621 B.C., another Davidic king, Josiah, “stood by a pillar and made a covenant before the LORD, to follow the LORD and to keep His commandments and his testimonies and statutes . . .” (2 Kings 23:3).

The Hebrew in these passages is even more interesting, for it literally says the king stood *upon* the pillar (see *Adam Clarke’s Commentary*, 1967, note on 2 Kings 11:14; E.W. Bullinger, *The Companion Bible*, 1990, note on 23:3). And, as stated, this was the common custom for anointing the Davidic kings. Today’s British monarchs are crowned *upon* the Stone of Scone, though *sitting* upon it.

But was Judah’s coronation pillar stone the same stone that Jacob anointed at Bethel? There would not seem to be any other stone that would merit such a role in the crowning of the Davidic kings. Yet we should ask: Is there any evidence that Jacob or his descendants took this stone from Bethel?

## Leading the march?

Since Jacob reckoned the stone as “God’s house,” it is quite likely that he would have wanted the stone *with* him—not in some idolatrous sense but simply as a symbolic keepsake of his covenant with God and God’s promises to Him. And since Jacob did not dwell at Bethel, he would have to have removed it from there to keep it with him and his family. He knew that God was not a mere local deity and that God’s House was essentially wherever God’s *people* were. Indeed, just as God’s house in the New Testament is His Church, His house in the Old Testament was the whole house of Israel—the nation in covenant with Him beginning with its forefathers—and the later ruling house of David.

Now, did Jacob have the “shepherd stone” with him in Egypt when he mentioned it in the prophecy related earlier? Did those of the Old Testament “church in the wilderness” (Acts 7:38, KJV) have it with them when they *left* Egypt? In 1 Corinthians 10:4, the apostle Paul says, “They drank from the spiritual rock that accompanied them, and that rock was Christ” (NIV). God was referred to as the Rock in Moses’ day (Deuteronomy 32:4). And as Paul explained, the Rock—the

God—the people knew at that time was the one who became Jesus Christ. He dwelt with the people in the pillar of cloud and fire (Exodus 13:21), by which He led and shepherded them.

The preincarnate Jesus Christ—the Shepherd in the pillar—was the *spiritual* Rock or Stone that accompanied Israel. But is it not possible that there was also a *physical* pillar stone that accompanied the people—an earthly type of the true Pillar Stone who led them? That such an earthly type existed is certain—it was Jacob’s anointed Bethel stone. The question is whether the stone was with Israel at this time or not. Yet surely it must have been—or how could it have served as a type at all? How could it have been considered a shepherding stone if it was far away from the flock?

Indeed, some believe that when God in the person of Christ said He would stand “on *the* rock” at Horeb or Mount Sinai, causing water to miraculously flow from it upon Moses striking it for the people to drink (Exodus 17:6), He was referring to the stone of Jacob. The same is believed of “the rock” out of which water was made to flow at Kadesh (Numbers 20:7-13). Though we can’t be sure, this is not out of the question because in both places a particular rock is meant yet not identified. Moreover, since the stone of Bethel was a physical type of the *spiritual* Rock from which the people drank in an ultimate sense, this would fit quite well. Indeed, how appropriate in the first instance that the divine King of Israel at the time would be standing upon the pillar stone.

In any case, it would certainly appear that the stone of God’s house was *with* God’s house in the wilderness. And consider further: To be a shepherding stone, Jacob’s pillar must have been placed in front of the moving camp of Israel to lead the way—just as the pillar of cloud and fire went before. And Numbers 2 reveals that the *tribe* who led the march in Israel’s wilderness travels was Judah! It seems likely, therefore, that in the vanguard of Israel, where the standard of Judah, with its heraldic lion, went before the people, the Bethel stone was right there also. This, then, may be how the stone came to be associated with Judah—even though it was from the territory that would be allotted to Joseph’s descendants.

It would certainly appear that Jacob’s pillar, an important symbol of anointed kingship, came to be used by the Davidic kings of Judah as the coronation pillar stone mentioned in Scripture.

## Baetylus stones

More evidence of the stone being taken from Bethel by Jacob and then linked with Judah comes from what might at first blush seem an unlikely source—Greek history and mythology. However, many of the ancient Greeks were Israelite, as explained in Appendix 2 and elsewhere in this publication. Indeed, the rulers of ancient Greece, as explained in Appendix 3, traced their lineage to the god Zeus (Jupiter) and his father Cronus (Saturn)—and writings attributed to the ancient Phoenician historian Sanchuniathon mention “Kronos, whom the Phoenicians call Israel,” that is, Jacob, and his son “Jehud” or Judah, parallel with Zeus (see Appendix 3: “Aegean Royal Lines From Zerah”).

There is a convoluted tale in Greek mythology about Cronus swallowing his children to prevent their future rebellion. He didn’t swallow Zeus because Rhea, the children’s mother, wrapped a stone in swaddling clothes as a substitute for Zeus, which Cronus swallowed instead. Zeus, who had been hidden on the isle of Crete, later forced Cronus to cough up all the children and the stone. The account is certainly fictitious and even absurd. Yet there is perhaps a grain of truth to be found in it. For the stone swallowed by Cronus (or Jacob), which represented Zeus (or Judah), was referred to by the Greeks as *baetylus*.

Notice this from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: “Baetylus, also spelled baetulus, in Greek religion, a sacred stone or pillar; the word is of Semitic origin (*-bethel*). Numerous holy, or fetish, stones existed in antiquity, generally attached to the cult of some particular god and looked upon as his abiding place or symbol” (“Baetylus,” 1985, Vol. 1, p. 789). This does not mean that Jacob followed a pagan practice. Rather, pagan practice has always counterfeited elements of the true religion—and the use of Bethel pillar stones in paganism is a clear corruption of what Jacob did.

Indeed, this may be the origin of the Minoan pillar cult on Crete. As mentioned in Appendix 3, over the “Lion Gate” of Greek Mycenae appears a relief in which two seated lions face each other with their forelegs standing on the base of a pillar. And in a later emblem across the Aegean in Phrygia, upon the tomb of Arslantas (“Lion Stone”), the same picture appears, except that the pillar

is clearly a pillar *stone*. Thus what may be “lions of Judah” are portrayed as balanced upon the base of the important pillar stone.

Again, it is remarkable to find the Greeks referring to sacred stones by the name of Baetyl or Bethel. Continuing in the *Britannica*: “The most famous example is the holy stone of Delphi [in Greece], the omphalos (“navel” [of the world]), that reposed in the Temple of Apollo and marked the exact center of the universe. A second stone at Delphi was said to have been the one that the Titan Cronus swallowed; it was thought to be Zeus himself in his symbolic, or baetylic, form” (p. 789).

Citing the second-century Greek traveler and geographer Pausanias (*Description of Greece*, Book 10, sec. 24:5), mythologist Robert Graves stated: “Zeus himself set up at Delphi the stone which Cronus had disgorged. It is still there, constantly anointed with oil, and strands of unwoven wool are offered upon it” (*The Greek Myths: Complete Edition*, 1955, 1992, p. 41). Again, we see here a corruption of Jacob’s practice.

Distilling the story to its more realistic elements, what are we left with? Israel “swallowed” the Bethel stone—perhaps indicating that Jacob took it onto his person, carrying it away with him (or possibly that Israel, meaning Jacob’s family, brought it among themselves). The pillar stone came to represent Judah, who was to receive anointed kingship and rule over the rest of Israel. Judah—that is, some of the *tribe* of Judah—dwelt for some time in Crete before passing into Greece and other Aegean areas. And the stone was later disgorged from Israel—Israel in this case representing the Israelite homeland. Thus, the stone went elsewhere.

## To be with Joseph’s descendants

Yet if Jacob’s stone truly did leave the area, where did it go? It appears that it eventually ended up with the Jews of Zerah’s line who had passed through Crete and Greece. Remember, Jacob said, “From there [that is, from Joseph] is the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel” (Genesis 49:24). We’ve seen that the stone did come from territory in Canaan that would later be Joseph’s. However, it must be realized that Jacob was giving a prophecy of the “last days” (verse 1). The part regarding Joseph (verses 22-26) mentions him as a “fruitful bough” whose “branches run over the wall” (verse 22).

This ties back to God’s promise given at Bethel that Jacob’s descendants would overspread the bounds of Canaan and colonize abroad over the face of the earth (Genesis 28:14). Indeed, it was upon receiving this promise that Jacob anointed the stone the first time (verse 18). How interesting that in the context of Joseph’s descendants becoming the greatest colonizers of Israel—coming to possess the choicest areas of the earth—Jacob should again mention the stone.

God had promised to be with Jacob wherever He went and to bring Him back to the Promised Land. This is likewise true of Jacob’s descendants. God has been with them wherever they have gone, as Jacob prophesied particularly of Joseph (49:24-25). And He will eventually conduct all of Israel back to the Promised Land, as many prophecies show. Moreover, the shepherd stone appears to figure prominently in this course of events (verse 24). It appears that it was to be with Joseph’s descendants in their colonial days.

Indeed, since this is an end-time prophecy, it seems that verse 24 should actually be rendered, “From there [Joseph’s land in the last days] will come the shepherd stone of Israel”—that is, it will come back to the Promised Land from there.

But where is *there*? As this publication and our booklet *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy* explains, Ephraim, the leading tribe of Joseph, is today Great Britain and the British-descended nations of the Commonwealth. This would seem to imply that the stone would be possessed by the British monarchy prior to Christ’s return. That makes complete sense when we consider that, as made clear in this publication, the British monarchy is in fact a continuation of the Jewish monarchy of David—fused with the royal line of Zerah that came through the Aegean area.

Westminster Abbey, the coronation church of the British monarchs, is the only place on earth where kings and queens are still consecrated with sacred oil, known as chrism (anointing). This practice, according to the PBS video series *In Search of Ancient Ireland*, “began in Ireland. Even in pre-Christian times, kings were never above the law. [With that background] the Irish church had been the first to introduce the ordination of kings, a simple and revolutionary idea spread to Europe by Irish scholars. Kings were now God’s anointed—ruling according to God’s law” (Program 3:

“Warlords,” 2002). Of course, the Irish tradition itself surely had a much earlier origin—as this was the tradition of the ancient kings of Israel and Judah. Indeed, on the large west stained-glass window of Westminster appear every one of the 12 sons of Jacob by name along with Moses holding the Ten Commandments and Aaron the high priest.

How amazing it is, then, to discover that the British throne is also closely associated with a particular stone, the coronation stone known as the Stone of Destiny or Jacob’s pillow stone—which is traced back to Scone in Scotland (having been brought from Iona in western Scotland) and then back to Ireland before that (see Appendix 9: “The Lion and the Unicorn”), where it was known at Tara as the Lia-Fail. This is the same route followed by the monarchy itself. Yet could the stone that now sits in Edinburgh Castle have come from the Promised Land?

## The sandstone block in Scotland

According to biblical archaeologist E. Raymond Capt, a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and author of several books on British-Israelism: “One of the most significant facts about the Coronation Stone is that no similar rock formation exists in the British Isles. Professor [Charles A.L.] Totten, the eminent professor of Science at Yale University [in the late 1800s and early 1900s], after making a thorough examination of the Stone made the following statement: ‘The analysis of the stone shows that there are absolutely no quarries in Scone or Iona where-from a block so constituted could possibly have come, nor yet from Tara.’

“Professor [Edward] Odlum, a geologist (and Professor of Theology at an Ontario University [in the early 1900s]), also made microscopic examinations of the Coronation Stone, comparing it to similar stone from Scotland (including Iona and the quarries of Ireland) and found them dissimilar” (*Jacob’s Pillar: A Biblical Historical Study*, 1977, p. 58, available to order at [www.artisanpublishers.com](http://www.artisanpublishers.com)).

Yet according to the recent Scottish guidebook quoted earlier, the 336-pound Stone of Destiny “is formed from a coarse-grained pinkish-buff sandstone . . . This stone is found in Perthshire and Angus, indeed within a few miles of Scone. It would be entirely possible therefore for the Stone to have been quarried near to Scone and for it not to have been brought there from elsewhere. Deposits of this type of rock are found everywhere in Scotland but not in sufficiently large deposits to allow the quarrying of such a substantial block” (Breeze and Munro, p. 42).

Of course, we should realize that this information comes from those whose aim is to dispel what they consider to be myth. There is a very strong historical tradition that the stone came to Scone from Ireland through western Scotland, where the above source admits it could not have been quarried. For this and other reasons, some, including University of Glasgow lecturer Pat Gerber in her 1997 book *Stone of Destiny*, believe the stone that sat at Westminster for 700 years and was recently returned to Scotland was not really the Scottish coronation stone. That is, they believe the stone that went to England with Edward was a fake quarried at Scone and that the real coronation stone, brought from Iona or elsewhere in western Scotland, was hidden upon Edward’s invasion. Yet this seems rather unlikely, as the Scottish guidebook explains:

“That the Stone returned to Scotland in 1996 is certainly the one removed in 1296 is beyond serious doubt. There will, however, probably always be speculation as to whether Edward I took the ‘real’ Stone of Scone south in 1296. It has been argued that the Abbot of Scone would have been likely to have hidden the Stone following Edward’s invasion of Scotland. Yet, Edward was able to lay hands on the crown, sceptre and ring and the Black Rood of St Margaret, all of which could have been more easily secreted away.

“If the real Stone had been hidden, it is almost inconceivable that it would not have been produced for the coronation of [Scottish king] Robert the Bruce only ten years later, in 1306, especially since Bishop Wishart of Glasgow was able to produce appropriate robes and vestments for the occasion and even a banner bearing the arms of the last king. Right up to the end of his reign Bruce was keen to secure the return of the Stone to Scotland. Finally, at least one of Edward’s officers, as well as the Bishop of Durham, had been present at the [earlier Scottish] inauguration of King John [Balliol] and could presumably have verified that the Stone taken by Edward was genuine” (Breeze and Munro, p. 23).

As for medieval testimonies that the Stone of Destiny was marble when the coronation stone is calcareous sandstone, this may simply be due to the fact that marble denotes *calcareous* limestone susceptible to polish—or perhaps any calcareous stone. (Calcareous means resembling calcite or calcium carbonate, especially in hardness, or containing calcium carbonate as a cement to hold the rock together.) Notes the Scottish guidebook: “We should not place too much credence in the statement that the Stone was marble: as late as 1874 it was described as limestone, when it is clearly sandstone” (p. 46).

## Is Bethel a possible origin?

Let us suppose, then, that the current Stone of Destiny was indeed the one upon which Scottish kings were crowned. Let us further suppose that, although it could conceivably have been quarried at Scone, it in fact had a much richer heritage behind it—that it came from western Scotland and then Tara in Ireland before that, as tradition attested. If that is so, we should consider that it could not have been quarried from these locations. So from where, then, would it have come?

Again, we ask the question: Could the stone that now sits in Edinburgh Castle have come from the Promised Land, as tradition maintains? There is certainly sandstone scattered throughout the land of Israel. Yet the area of Bethel is predominantly limestone. The nearest area that is predominantly reddish sandstone lies about 20 miles east in Jordan.

However, notice E. Raymond Capt’s report on the findings of the Toronto university professor of the early 1900s: “Professor Odlum became tremendously interested in the Stone. He was intrigued with the idea that perhaps its source could be found in Palestine, as suggested by the ancient records of Ireland. Determined to make the search, and after several weeks of unsuccessful exploration, Odlum discovered a stratum of sandstone near the Red Sea at Bethel, geologically the same as the Coronation Stone” (p. 58).

After relating the circumstances of the discovery in Odlum’s words, Capt further reports: “A microscopic test of the sample Bethel stone matched perfectly with the same test made of the Coronation Stone.” However, Odlum was prevented by the Archbishop of Canterbury from taking a small piece of the coronation stone to submit to chemical analysis (p. 58).

It would seem, then, that Britain’s coronation stone *could* have come from Bethel. In fact, even if no such rock stratum exists around Bethel, the stone could *still* have come from there. For the stone that Jacob anointed at Bethel might not have been a natural feature of the landscape. Rather, God could have specially placed it there. While this seems unlikely, it is certainly not preposterous—particularly considering the stone’s apparent later importance and its typological representation of Christ, the stone from heaven cut out without hands. Or, considering that Bethel had previously been a town named Luz (Genesis 28:19)—apparently no longer inhabited in Jacob’s time—it is possible that Jacob used an old building stone that had been brought there from elsewhere by the former inhabitants. Perhaps, in another parallel with Christ (see Psalm 118:22; Matthew 21:42; 1 Peter 2:7), it was “the stone which the builders rejected”—discarded outside of town—that became “the chief cornerstone,” as it later appears to have been the coronation stone at the temple. There is just no way to be sure either way.

What we *can* say is that, considering the whole matter of where the throne of David is today and the traditions surrounding the Stone of Destiny, it is no stretch to assume that the coronation stone of Great Britain *was* the Lia-Fail of Ireland, that it was the actual stone upon which the Davidic monarchs of Judah were crowned, and that this stone was the very one anointed by Jacob at Bethel. In fact, it seems rather likely that they are all one and the same.

## Did Jeremiah bring it with him?

How, then, would the stone have come to Ireland?

We have seen elsewhere in this publication that the monarchy was transferred to Ireland under the auspices of the prophet Jeremiah. Since the coronation stone of Judah’s kings, very likely the Bethel stone of Jacob, was a clear symbol of the monarchy, can we not imagine that, in fulfilling his commission, he would have taken that symbolic stone with him? Indeed, it is quite reasonable to suppose that he would have—particularly when tradition links him to the stone.

Says W.M.H. Milner regarding the stone's arrival in Ireland, which he places at the time of Jeremiah: "The *Chronicles of Eri* tell the story—the 'Story of the Lia Fail.' In its early days it was carried about by the priests on the march, in the wilderness. Later, it was borne by sea from East to West—to the extremity of the world of land to the sun's going.' Its bearers had resolved, at starting, to 'move on the face of the waters in search of their brethren.' Shipwrecked on the coast of Ireland, they yet 'came safe with Lia Fail,' understanding that *In what land this messenger shall stay, a chief of Iber still shall bear the sway.*

"[Later] Eochaid (in close connection with Ollam Fola [whom many identify as Jeremiah]) 'sent a car [a carriage or litter] for Lia Fail' (which had, apparently, been some time in the country) 'and he was placed thereon.' The Story of the Stone was then repeated by his order. 'And Erimionn was seated on Lia Fail,' and the crown was placed upon his head, and the mantle on his shoulders, and 'all clapped and shouted.' And the name of that place, from that day forward, was called Tara" (*The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty*, 1902, 1964, p. 16). This, as we can see, is quite similar to the coronations of ancient Judah.

In this context, it is interesting to consider the woman Tea, "daughter of Lughaidh," who married the high king of Ireland, as stated elsewhere in this publication. It is there pointed out that Lughaidh, which became a general term for Ireland, may not have been the actual name of a person. Rather, it can perhaps be broken down into *Logh-aidhe*, which would mean "God's House"—identical to Bethel. Perhaps it was the stone that gave the name to Ireland—or perhaps the name of the stone was applied to David's dynasty, which then transferred over to Ireland. In any case, this would seem to lend support to the conclusions already drawn.

Yet there is still much to sort out here regarding other players in the story of the stone's transfer. We saw mention earlier of King Gathelus, the son of Cecrops of Athens, and of Scota, a "pharaoh's daughter"—both of whom are said to have traveled with the stone. In fact, a number of accounts put the transfer of the stone to Ireland at the time of the Exodus. Who, then, *are* these people? How do *they* fit in the story? And how do we square the timeline with Jeremiah? For the answer to these questions, see Appendix 8: "Gathelus, Scota and the Exodus."

## Looking to the future

When all the evidence is brought to bear, there is strong reason to believe that the British coronation stone, the Stone of Destiny, is indeed Jacob's pillar stone, which sat at the base of the visionary ladder to heaven and came to designate the house of God. Its story was carried into foreign lands by migrating Israelites, where it was corrupted into the baetylus of Greek religion. Anointed by Jacob, the stone was later used to crown the rulers of the house of David in ancient times—and it appears to still be the stone used to crown the rulers of David's house today.

And now the stone has been returned to Scotland. Some see this as proof that it cannot legitimately represent the British throne, which is in London. And yet, as part of the Scottish regalia, the stone belongs to Scotland's royal family, which is *Britain's* royal family. "We are informed as the Stone comes back to Scotland on loan, it belongs to the Crown . . . The Scottish Office replied politely to a letter from Robbie the Pict; the Stone remains the property of the Crown and, while it would be housed in Scotland, it would be taken back to Westminster for future coronations" (Gerber, pp. 154, 163).

We see this also in the ceremony in which the stone was set with Scotland's crown jewels in Edinburgh. "Placed on a crimson dais in the Great Hall at the top of the Castle, surrounded by ropes and tassels, the stone was attended by two bearskinned scarlet-jacketed soldiers and a small proportion of the 800 guests who had turned up. Prince Andrew [Queen Elizabeth's son] alias the Earl of Inverness [Northern Scotland] handed over the Stone officially to the Commissioners of the Regalia, and to a kilted Michael Forsyth [Scottish secretary of state], Keeper of the Great Seal, who had to promise to return it to Westminster when required" (p. 172).

Thus, the Stone of Destiny remains the coronation stone of the British monarchy—the monarchy of King David. But is it truly the same stone upon which the ancient kings of Judah were crowned? It seems likely that it is. Of course, there is no way to be certain.

Yet even if it isn't, it would appear that the actual stone must be somewhere in the British Isles. For besides the very strong traditions that it came to Ireland and then Scotland, we have Jacob's

prophecy, which seems to state that the stone representing the Jewish monarchy was to be located with the people of Joseph at the height of their power in the end time. Then again, perhaps it didn't actually need to be the same stone. Perhaps what was passed down was the *tradition* of anointing a stone to represent the anointed monarchy—and not the stone itself.

The prophecy would then indicate that it is the *Jewish monarchy* that would be with Joseph in Britain in the end time—as it surely is. And the monarchy, along with the stone representing it—be it the actual one from Bethel or one in its anointed tradition—will *remain* with Joseph until the true and ultimate anointed Shepherd Stone from heaven, Jesus Christ, returns to smash the kingdoms of this world and set up His rule over all nations. May all of us stand upon *that* Stone, upon *that* Rock—the Rock of our salvation—and by God's grace reign *with* Him forever.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 8: Gathelus, Scota and the Exodus

It has been reported in various sources that the Stone of Destiny, upon which the kings of Ireland, Scotland and Britain have been crowned, was brought to Ireland from Egypt by a certain King Gathelus, son of Cecrops the founder of Athens, and a daughter of Pharaoh called Scota (see Appendix 7: “The Stone of Destiny”). We should examine this in greater detail—particularly their connection to the time of Moses and the Exodus.

### The Irish and Scottish accounts

One recent source, quoting Victorian professor William Skene, gives details from a late medieval Scottish historian: “Hector Boece wrote the *Scotorum Historiae* in 1537, in which Gaythelus, a Greek, the son either of the Athenian Cecrops or the Argive Neolus, went to Egypt at the time of the Exodus, where he married Scota, the daughter of Pharaoh, and after the destruction of the Egyptian army in the Red Sea, fled with her by the Mediterranean till he arrived in Portingall [Portugal], where he landed, and founded a kingdom at Brigantium, now Compostella [which is actually on the northwest coast of Spain, some miles north of modern Portugal]. Here he reigned in the marble chair [i.e., calcareous stone seat], which was the ‘*lapis fatalis cathedrae instar,*’ or fatal stone like a chair [i.e., the stone of fate as the seat of a throne], and wherever it was found portended kingdom to the Scots . . . Simon Breck, a descendant of Gathelus, brought the chair from Spain to Ireland, and was crowned in it as King of Ireland” (Pat Gerber, *Stone of Destiny*, 1997, p. 31).

Irish historian Geoffrey Keating mentions a Miledh of Scythia as ancestor of the Milesians—Scythia here apparently denoting lands colonized by Greeks of Miletus—who came and settled in Egypt with the permission of a Pharaoh Nectonibus. This Miledh, who is also apparently referred to as Gaedal (evidently the Gathelus mentioned by Boece), is said to have fought battles for Egypt against the Ethiopians: “In these he was so successful that his fame and renown spread through all nations, whereupon Pharaoh gave him one of his own daughters to wife. This lady was called Scota . . . She bore her husband two sons in Egypt” (*History of Ireland from the Earliest Period to the English Invasion*, 1857, pp. 176-177).

Boece has Gathelus winning “a great victory for Pharo against the Moris,” that is, the Moors of North Africa (*The Chronicles of Scotland*, 1537, Vol. 1, translated by John Bellenden, 1551).

Another version of the story goes like this: “One of the most memorable chapters in the history of the Celtic race deals with Niul, youngest son of Fenius Farsa, King of Scythia. Niul was reputed to have mastered all of the languages of the then-known world. The fame of his learning and wisdom spread worldwide, and King Forond [probably a corruption of Pharaoh], the first-styled ‘Pharaoh Cingris’ of Egypt, invited him to Egypt to instruct Egyptian youth in the sciences. The King gave Niul a large fiefdom on the Red Sea, and gave him, also, his daughter, Scota, in marriage” (*The MacGeoghegan Family Society Newsletter*, May 3, 1990).

But, according to the account related by Keating, Miledh, again seemingly the same as Gathelus, befriended Moses and the Israelites. “Pharaoh Intur [supposed son of Nectonibus] and the Egyptians, in time, remembered their old grudge to the descendants of Niul and the family of Gaedal [Gathelus], namely their resentment for the friendship the latter had formed with the children of Israel. They, then, made war upon the Gaels, who were thereby compelled to exile themselves from Egypt” (1866, pp. 153-156).

A song or poem from 1307, mentioned in Appendix 7, states: “In Egypt Moses preached to the people. Scota, Pharaoh’s daughter, listened well, for he said in the spirit, ‘Whoso will possess this stone [the Stone of Destiny], shall be the conqueror of a very far-off land.’ Gaidelon [again, Gathelus] and Scota brought this stone, when they passed from the land of Egypt to Scotland, not far from Scone, when they arrived. They named the land Scotland from Scota’s name. After Scota’s death her husband took no other wife, but made his dwelling in the land of Galloway [southwest Scotland but earliest version in French has Galway, which is western Ireland]. From his own name he gave Galloway [or Galway] its name. Thus it appears that Scotland and Galloway are derived from their names” (quoted by Gerber, pp. 33-34).

After leaving Egypt, Keating's history has Miledh and his family making a rather long journey, settling for a while in France and later in Spain. The eighth-century monk Nennius says in his British history that Gathelus' wandering lasted 42 years, after which he lived for a long time in Spain. Keating then has Miledh dying before Scota, contrary to the song above, and Scota accompanying her sons to Ireland. Yet five of her eight sons were killed in a storm-related shipwreck upon their arrival and she herself was supposedly killed in a battle that ensued with the native Irish (Seumus MacManus, *The Story of the Irish Race*, 1949, p. 10). Yet the stone made it safely. And by some accounts, Scota's son is identified with Eremon, the first king of the Scots or Milesians in Ireland.

## Serious chronological problems

Some, relying on the above information, date the transfer of the Stone of Destiny to Ireland to the time of the Exodus, around 1445 B.C. Yet there are obvious problems with this chronology. First of all, if these events took place around the Exodus, it would place the Milesian arrival in Ireland before the Danaan arrival there—when it clearly came afterward. Indeed, it seems rather clear that the Milesian arrival in Ireland should be dated to around the sixth century B.C., the time of Jeremiah (see Appendix 6: “Dating the Milesian Arrival in Ireland”).

Secondly, if Jacob's stone were carried to Ireland at the time of the Exodus, then it would never have been associated with the later Davidic dynasty in the Promised Land. It would never have served as a coronation stone for the house of David. Adherents of this position might answer that the stone came to represent the royal succession of Zerah through the Milesians. Yet Jesus Christ, the antitypical Stone, was of the line of Perez and David, not Zerah. Strange, then, that the coronation pillar of David's line—which we know from Scripture existed (see Appendix 7: “The Stone of Destiny”)—would pass into oblivion while the stone of Zerah persists. It seems much more likely that the stone that went to Ireland was the stone of David's house—and yet David himself did not reign until 400 years after the Exodus.

Thirdly, there is clear proof that the aforementioned Irish and Scottish records are not completely trustworthy in relating what happened. The Egyptian pharaoh of Moses' day is referred to as Nectanebo. Yet while there were indeed *two* pharaohs by this name, notice when they reigned: “Nectanebo, also called Nekhtnebf, or Nekhtnebef . . . Nectanebo I, first king (reigned 380-363 BC) of the 30th dynasty of Egypt . . . Nectanebo II, third and last king (reigned 360-343 BC) of the 30th dynasty of Egypt” (“Nectanebo,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, p. 578). That's about 1,100 years after the Exodus.

So the Irish and Scottish historical information would appear to be rather convoluted. But perhaps there are elements of truth here that can help us in unraveling what actually happened—and when.

Right up front, we should consider that if Gathelus and Scota lived at the time of Nectanebo I or II, they could have had nothing to do with the transfer of the Davidic throne. For much longer than a generation would have passed since the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.—meaning God's promise that David would have a descendant reigning in “all generations” would have failed, which it surely did not.

It is within the realm of *possibility* that Jeremiah could have left the Stone of Destiny in Egypt to later be transported by Gathelus and Scota to Ireland 200 years later. But why would the prophet have brought it only to leave it? And why would Gathelus and Scota have later taken it up—or had anything to do with it for that matter? The original explanation was a prophecy Moses delivered to them. Yet Gathelus and Scota, if they existed, almost certainly did not live in Moses' day.

Frankly, there are many possibilities that are just not worth considering—and Jeremiah dropping off the stone in Egypt to be picked up by others two centuries later would seem to be one of them. We would do better to realize that if Gathelus and Scota were actual people, they did not live at the time of either Nectanebo.

Yet if that's true, why might later historians of Ireland have linked Nectanebo with Gathelus and Scota? Regarding the reign of Nectanebo I, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states: “A powerful army, gathered by a previous king, Achoris (reigned 393-380 BC), and largely composed of Greek mercenaries, was entrusted by Nectanebo to the Athenian Chabrias” (p. 578). Perhaps Chabrias of Athens was confused with Cecrops, the *founder* of Athens, who figures in the Irish traditions as the father of Gathelus.

Perhaps the confusion also resulted from the presence of a large Greek mercenary force in Egypt at the time. Yet, as we have elsewhere seen, Greek mercenaries were in Egypt at an *earlier* time as well—at the time of Jeremiah. Indeed, if we venture to date Gathelus and Scota at the time of Jeremiah, then much of the story appears to more easily slide into place.

### **Closing in on the right time**

We have seen elsewhere that Pharaoh Psamtik I (reigned 664-610 B.C.), founder of Egypt's 26th dynasty, allowed Greeks of Miletus (many of whom were actually Israelites) to establish a colony in the Nile Delta around 650 B.C., enlisting many of them as mercenaries in the Egyptian army. This origin (Miletus or one of its 80 colonies) would explain why Gathelus is also called Miledh—this being not a name but a nationality.

He is referred to as the son of Nel, Niul or Neolus (and sometimes Niul himself) as well as the son of Cecrops of Athens. As explained elsewhere, this most likely means that he was the *descendant* of both of these men. The Milesians of Miletus, it has also been explained, traced their lineage to Neleus of Pylos. (Gathelus himself being called Niul would be like the later Irish name O'Neill—borne by those descended from Neill or Niul.) And the Athenian royal family of Cecrops, who seems to have been the biblical Calcol (a descendant of Judah through Zerah), appears to have been transferred to Miletus.

Incredibly, the fifth-century-B.C. Greek historian Herodotus reported that the Milesian arrival in Egypt was caused by a fluke of bad weather that nevertheless fulfilled a prophecy given to Psamtik about bronze warriors coming to help him (Book 2: *Euterpe*, sec. 152, translated by George Rawlinson, *Great Books of the Western World*, 1952). While we can't place stock in pagan oracles (though God has at times spoken through false prophets—compare the episode with Balaam, Numbers 22–24), God was almost surely involved in bringing the Zarhite Milesians to Egypt, especially considering the role they appear to have played in the transfer of the Davidic throne to Ireland, as we will see.

Getting back to the leading characters in these events, it is sometimes supposed that Niul and Gathelus (or Golamh or Gallam, as his name is also given) were two separate individuals far removed in time—who each happened to marry a Scota, daughter of Pharaoh. That, however, is unreasonable in the extreme. Clearly, there was only one Scota from Egypt if there was one at all—and, if the names Niul and Gathelus denote actual people, they are thus one and the same.

Yet Gathelus was probably not this man's actual name. Also given as Golamh, Gallam, Gaidelon, Gaedal, and Gede (a.k.a. Heremon), this name, as mentioned elsewhere in this publication, is an eponym for the Goidels, Gaels, Gauls or even Celts. 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). Indeed, Scythian, as other sources show, may even have denoted wanderers into the sundown—the west. No surprise then that this particular Gathelus or Miledh was also referred to as a Scythian. Indeed, the same name could perhaps have applied to *any* of the Israelites dwelling in Egypt.

And yet there was surely an actual person behind these stories who was clearly special, being of royal lineage—we, again, just don't know his actual name. (For purposes of this publication, therefore, he will continue to be referred to by the eponyms already mentioned.)

### **Reconciling with known history**

Regarding the Scythians, it is interesting to find that there was a 28-year period about this time during which, according to Herodotus, the Scythians were “masters of Asia” (Book 1: *Clio*, secs. 103-106)—Asia meaning Medo-Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine and Asia Minor. Herodotus describes Pharaoh Psamtik pleading with the Scythians at Egypt's frontier with Philistia not to invade his country (sec. 105). The 28 years have not been exactly pinpointed in time but, as is widely acknowledged, they must have been in the late 600s B.C. Thus, Greek settlers from Asia Minor during this period, particularly those who were ethnically related to the Scythian overlords, would have been considered Scythians. And Scythian was a Greek name for the Israelites.

Are there any more parallels from history? As we've seen, Niul, or Gathelus, is said to have mastered language and taught the youth of Egypt. With that in mind, notice this from Herodotus: "To the Ionians and Carians [i.e., Milesians] who had lent him their assistance Psammetichus . . . made good all the splendid promises by which he had gained their support; and further, he entrusted to their care certain Egyptian children whom they were to teach the language of the Greeks. These children, thus instructed, became the parents of the entire class of interpreters in Egypt" (Book 2: *Euterpe*, sec. 154).

And there is more to harmonize accounts. Take, for example, Gathelus fighting for Egypt against the Ethiopians. Can that fit historically? It is interesting to find that Milesian settlement and mercenary involvement continued through a succession of pharaohs. Psamtik's son was the famous Pharaoh Necho of the Bible during the reign of Josiah of Judah. And Necho's son was Pharaoh Psamtik II, "king (595-589 BC) of the 26th dynasty of Egypt, who conducted an important expedition against the kingdom of Cush [Ethiopia], Egypt's southern neighbor.

"The Greek historian Herodotus, writing in the 5th century BC, refers briefly to an Ethiopian war of Psamtik, an expedition that contemporary records prove to have been of great importance. Perhaps suspecting a Cushite threat to Egypt, Psamtik sent a large force against it. The army consisted of native Egyptians led by Ahmose, who later became pharaoh, *and mercenaries (Greeks, Phoenicians, and Jews) led by another general.*

"A contemporary stela from Thebes dates the venture to the third year of his reign [592] and refers to a great defeat that was inflicted on a Cushite force . . . Greek participants in the expedition left graffiti on the colossuses at Abu Simbel, the temple of Ramses II, claiming to have advanced beyond Kerkis . . . near the Fifth Cataract of the Nile, which stood well within the Cushite Kingdom" ("Psamtik II," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, Vol. 9, p. 756, emphasis added).

This, then, lends credence to the Irish histories—that is, they apparently contain many correct facts but have them in the wrong chronological setting. Placed in the *right* setting, the recorded events make far more sense.

## Misidentifications

What are we to make of Scota, daughter of Pharaoh who was given in marriage to Gathelus? As with Gathelus, Scota was probably not her real name. This eponym denotes the mother of the Scots, which was another name for the Milesians who came to Ireland from Spain. Indeed, the word Scot shares the same origin with the word Scythian (Greek *Skuth*), a word that originally denoted a descendant of Isaac but came to mean wanderer. It is interesting that the name of the Irish princess Tea, believed to have been the daughter of Zedekiah, meant "wanderer" in Hebrew.

But was Scota a Scythian princess, and thus an Israelite? She is referred to as the daughter of Pharaoh. Yet Egyptian rulers almost never gave their daughters in marriage to foreigners—and doing so would have made it a huge event, of which we see nothing in history. Again, we must consider the time frame and what was happening. Psamtik II reigned for only a short time, dying soon after the Ethiopian campaign in 589 B.C. His son Apries, called Hophra in the Bible, then became pharaoh. It was during Hophra's reign that Jerusalem fell and Jeremiah accompanied the daughters of King Zedekiah of Judah to Egypt. Hophra, as we've elsewhere seen, provided them refuge at a palace in Daphne—the ruins of which were still referred to as the "palace of the Jew's daughter" as late as the 1800s—under guard of the Milesian mercenaries.

There are three obvious ways in which the daughter of Zedekiah could have been reckoned as the daughter of Pharaoh: 1) Hophra may have actually adopted her, which would not be at all surprising considering the fact that her father, Hophra's ally, was dead and she and her sister or sisters (we don't know how many there were) were the remaining heirs of the Jewish throne. 2) She may have been cared for and treated *as if* a daughter by Hophra even though she was not one in fact. Or 3) later Irish historians may have seen or heard her described as a princess who came from Egypt and concluded she was a pharaoh's daughter—an understandable mistake.

Hophra (Hebrew *Chophra*) may be the Pharaoh Cingris or Chencris of Irish tradition. However this name from Irish records could perhaps denote any pharaoh. *Cenchr*is was the Greek word for the kestrel or falcon, which represented the falcon-headed god Horus. And the Egyptians believed all living pharaohs to actually *be* Horus.

What about Hector Boece of Scotland's statement that Gathelus won a military victory for the pharaoh against the Moors? This seems rather problematic since there *were no Moors* at the time. "The word derives from Mauri, first used by the Romans to denote the inhabitants of the Roman province of Mauretania, comprising the western portion of modern Algeria and the northeastern portion of modern Morocco" ("Moor," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, Vol. 8, p. 301). This could, of course, have been a mistake made over the course of centuries of information transmission—perhaps the aforementioned victory over Ethiopia was meant instead.

However, there is another possibility. A while after the fall of Jerusalem, Pharaoh Hophra, or Apries, "took the Phoenician port of Sidon" ("Apries," Vol. 1, p. 496). Some Sidonians may have then migrated to the Phoenician Mediterranean port of Carthage in northwest Africa. "During the long years of Phoenician decline, Carthage was strengthened by a constant stream of refugees, people who fled their troubled home cities [such as Tyre and Sidon] and sailed west to the new colony" (*TimeFrame 1500-600 BC: Barbarian Tides*, Time-Life Books, 1987, p. 112). Thus, Hophra took a city whose surviving citizens then or later migrated to Northwest Africa—territory that was eventually associated with the Moors. In fact, Hophra later launched a failed attack on Cyrene in Libya to the west, which may also have factored into the confusion.

## Mosaic references

Next, we must address the issue of Gathelus befriending Moses and the Israelites. This is clearly a chronological mistake. Yet he probably did befriend the Israelites—the Jews—whom he and the Milesians were guarding. And we should not be too quick to dismiss all mentions of Moses. In referring to the Torah or Law, the Jews often used the name of its author, Moses—as in, "According to Moses, this is what should be done," etc.

Gathelus is said to have been healed of a snakebite by Moses. This could be complete falsehood or perhaps it means that he was healed when he became an adherent of the Mosaic religion as laid down in the Torah. (If he was truly bitten and then healed by a specific person, the person was likely Jeremiah.)

Here we also have an explanation for this particular part of the song quoted earlier: "In Egypt Moses preached to the people. Scota, Pharaoh's daughter, listened well, for he said in the spirit, 'Whoso will possess this stone [the Stone of Destiny], shall be the conqueror of a very far-off land.'" Scota's listening well to Moses may simply mean that she heeded what Moses wrote in Scripture—which was preached to her by the priest and prophet Jeremiah.

Did Moses write down anything like what is mentioned here? In essence yes—when he recorded an end-time prophecy of Jacob about the tribes of Joseph in Genesis 49: "Joseph is a fruitful bough by a well; his branches run over the wall. The archers have bitterly grieved him, shot at him and hated him. But his bow remained in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the Mighty God of Jacob (from there is the Shepherd, the Stone [or the shepherd stone] of Israel), by the God of your father who will help you, and by the Almighty who will bless you" (verses 23-25).

God's strengthening of Joseph's hands for military victory and expansion appears related here to the possession of the stone. No doubt Jeremiah would have explained the importance of the stone, including this prophecy, to those royal family members who became its bearers with him.

Speaking of Moses, we might wonder how Irish and Scottish history came to associate these events with the time of the Exodus, which occurred almost 1,000 years earlier. "In 1866 Joseph Robertson of Register House, Edinburgh, enumerated a few facts he had gleaned from Scottish chronicles, written at various periods from the tenth century . . . Robertson explained how 'events which may have really happened are frequently misplaced and transferred to a wrong epoch, very often owing their misplacement to a wish to build up the fame of some favourite hero, by attributing to him the merit of every important action of several different periods. Scottish history abounds with such misplacement'" (Gerber, p. 29, 35).

Consider that medieval chroniclers had mistakenly arranged the king lists of Ireland in such a way that stretched the beginning of the Milesian dynasty back to around 1700 B.C.—nearly 1,200 years before it appears to have actually begun. Seeing in their ancient records and traditions that Gathelus and Scota, the founders of the Milesian dynasty, came from Egypt amid some turmoil, these chroniclers, who were Roman Catholic monks, decided to connect the departure of the illustrious

ancestral figures to the greatest event in the biblical history of Egypt—as it seemed to generally fit their time frame (even though it was still around 250 years out of sync).

The word “exodus,” we should bear in mind, was simply the Greek word for exit or departure—*leaving*. Thus, Gathelus and Scota had made an “exodus” from Egypt. And this apparently occurred in the midst of calamity and upheaval. “Apries’ [i.e., Hophra’s] army was . . . defeated in Libya when it attacked the Greek colony at Cyrene; this led to an army mutiny and to civil war in the [Nile] delta. A new Saite king, Ahmoses (Amasis), usurped the throne” (“Egypt,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Macropaedia, p. 164).

Though Ahmose (II, reigned 570-526 B.C.) wanted to continue to use the Milesian forces as mercenaries, he no doubt expelled some whom he considered loyal to Hophra. Furthermore, an anti-foreign nationalism rose up among the Egyptian populace at this time (p. 165). As explained elsewhere in this publication, God had promised that most of the Jews who fled to Egypt following Jerusalem’s fall would be killed or die of starvation (Jeremiah 42:15-16). And that very likely happened around this time. (The mention of Pharaoh Intur in the Irish records may be simple confusion with the uprising of Inaros, which occurred shortly after Ahmose’s reign.)

## Reasonable conclusions

Thus, it seems rather likely that Gathelus and Scota, though not their real names, were actual people. Gathelus was a Milesian leader who was apparently of the royal line of Zerah, son of Judah. And Scota was evidently the daughter of King Zedekiah. They left Egypt with the Stone of Destiny. And, it is reasonable to conclude, the prophet Jeremiah went with them. They all finally ended up in Spain or Portugal, from where we see Simon Brec (elsewhere identified with Jeremiah’s secretary Baruch) taking the stone to Ireland. (This is further evidence of when Simon Brec lived.)

Since the names Scota and Tea both seem to indicate a wanderer, and both are reckoned to have been the daughter of Zedekiah, it is possible that they are one and the same. Yet it is also possible that Scota was confused with another Tea who was actually the daughter of a person named Lughaidh, especially if this daughter were named after her. However, as explained elsewhere, Lughaidh may not have been an actual person—as this name, apparently meaning “God’s House” or “Oath,” could have simply applied to the Davidic dynasty.

In the traditions laid out here, Scota herself never actually sits on the throne of Ireland as Tea does—but her son Heremon does. This would be within the limits of God’s promise to David of a continuing dynasty as long as her son assumed the Irish throne before a generation had passed since the fall of Jerusalem. Indeed, God’s promise would actually seem to allow a lot of time for the throne to be transferred—a lifetime from the fall of Jerusalem, which could have been a century or so.

However, it was surely accomplished in less time than that. We should consider the age of Jeremiah. Since he was a “youth” when his ministry began in the 13th year of Josiah’s reign around 626 B.C. (Jeremiah 1:1-2, 6), we assume him to have been about 17. He would thus have been 58 at the fall of Jerusalem in 586 and 74 at the time of Hophra’s overthrow in Egypt around 570.

Nennius, we earlier saw, said that Gathelus wandered for 42 years before settling in Spain or Portugal, living there for seven more years, as others record, before the throne was finally transferred to Ireland a few years after that. Yet this would make Jeremiah 126 when he first arrived in Ireland. And consider that Jeremiah is said to have been Ollam Fodhla, who is reputed to have reigned 40 years.

Clearly we have problems here. It is likely that the figure of 42 years is just wrong or is reckoned from the wrong starting point. Ollam Fodhla reigning for 40 years may actually refer to Jeremiah living 40 years from the fall of Jerusalem or from the expulsion from Egypt, which would place his death at either age 98 or 114—neither of which is unreasonable for an ancient prophet of God. It is also possible that since Ollam Fodhla was often confused with the ruling high king referred to as Heremon, the 40 years should be applied to the king who was contemporary with Jeremiah and not to Jeremiah himself.

Considering known historical events, it could be that the Milesian settlement of Ireland did not commence until around 535 B.C., when the Carthaginians and Etruscans destroyed the Phocaeen (Milesian) fleet in the Western Mediterranean (see Appendix 6: “Dating the Milesian Arrival in Ireland”). Jeremiah would then have been 99. Invigorated by the power of God to carry out his

commission, he may well have lived several years after that in Ireland, establishing there the throne of David (through either the son of Gathelus and Scota or through Scota herself) and directing many of the Israelites to return to the ways of God.

Of course, Scota by this time would have been in her 50s—so it may be that the story of the beautiful young princess Tea-Tephi applied to what had transpired in Egypt or, as already postulated, to another young woman from Milesian Spain who may also have been of royal lineage. Yet it is also possible that Jeremiah and the Milesians arrived much earlier in Ireland—when Scota was still young.

In any case, while there is certainly confusion over exactly what happened, the gist of the story is sound. Jeremiah saw to it that a princess of the royal line of David married a man of the Milesian royal line of Zerah. The prophet guided the transfer of the monarchy of David from the land of Judah to Ireland—accompanied by the coronation stone of David's house—the Stone of Destiny. And from the union of the two royals sprang the kings of Ireland, then Scotland, and later of all Britain.

What an amazing history God has worked out.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 9: The Lion and the Unicorn

Britain's heraldic imagery takes on great significance in light of the true biblical identity of the British people and their royal family. As our booklet *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy* proves, the British-descended nations of the world are the recipients of the birthright blessings of national greatness promised to Jacob or Israel (see Genesis 35:11; 48-49; 1 Chronicles 5:1-2).

Joseph's eldest son Manasseh was to become a great single nation—and certainly has done so through his descendants, the majority of the people of the United States. Joseph's younger son Ephraim, on the other hand, was to become even greater—a multiplicity of nations. This prophecy has been fulfilled through the British Empire and the multiple British-descended states of the Commonwealth that have followed. Indeed, Britain (Ephraim) in its heyday ruled over a greater percentage of the earth and its peoples than any nation in history. Ephraim, as the greater tribe, has been the foremost representative of Joseph. Indeed, while Manasseh is referred to by name in Revelation 7:6, in the same context Ephraim is actually called Joseph (verse 8).

Yet while the birthright blessings were promised to the descendants of Joseph, the line of kings leading to the ultimate King, Jesus the Messiah, went to the tribe of Judah (Genesis 49:8-12; 1 Chronicles 5:1-2). To Judah, as elsewhere explained, were born the twin sons Perez and Zerah. Though Perez was born first, Zerah's hand had actually come out first and had been marked with a scarlet thread. Through Zerah came many of the royal lines of Europe—particularly those of the various tribes of Israel. Yet it was through Perez that the primary line of royalty would come—King David and later Jesus. Today's British royal family is actually a union of the royal houses of David (of Perez) and Zerah.

### Heraldic imagery

Jacob and Moses both delivered prophecies from God about the future of the various tribes of Israel. It was primarily from the imagery in these prophecies that the tribal emblems of Israel were derived. These emblems would later be displayed on the standards or early flags of the tribes, mentioned in Numbers 2 (see also "Flag," *Jewish Encyclopedia*).

With that in mind, notice what Moses said of Joseph: "His glory is like a firstborn bull, and his horns [weapons] are like the horns of a wild ox" (Deuteronomy 33:17). Where the New King James Version has "a wild ox," the earlier King James had "unicorns." Certainly a bovine animal was intended—tying back to the "bull" in the earlier part of the verse.

Indeed, the medieval unicorn idea is believed by some to have been inspired by the Arabian oryx. Viewed from the side, particularly from a distance, these animals appear to have a single long horn. And sometimes they actually have only one. Consider also that unicorns, though portrayed with horse faces, have antelope hooves and long, lion-like tails—as oryx also have. The bull or unicorn thus became the symbol of Joseph—particularly of Ephraim.

Of Judah, God said through Jacob: "Judah, you are he whom your brothers shall praise; your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies; your father's children shall bow down before you. Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, you have gone up. He bows down, he lies down as a lion; and as a lion, who shall rouse him? The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . ." (Genesis 49:8-10). As is widely understood, the lion became the tribal emblem of Judah—and we see it here directly connected to kingship. This was fitting, of course, since the lion is known as the "king of beasts"—and from Judah was to come the king of Israel, David, and ultimately the King of Kings, Jesus Christ. Jesus is even referred to as "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David" (Revelation 5:5).

Indeed, the lion, as the emblem of Judah, was the symbol of the house of David. Notice how David's son Solomon utilized this imagery to represent the greatest dynasty on earth: "The king made a great throne of ivory, and overlaid it with pure gold. The throne had six steps, with a footstool of gold, which were fastened to the throne [and the top of the throne was round at the back]; there were armrests on either side of the place of the seat, and two lions stood beside the armrests. Twelve lions stood there, one on each side of the six steps; nothing like this had been made for any other kingdom" (2 Chronicles 9:17-19; insert from 1 Kings 10:18-20).

Amazingly, though the birthright blessings of power and greatness were to go to Joseph, these blessings would, as God foretold, eventually be made to serve the kingly line of Judah. For at the height of Ephraim's (that is, Britain's) power, Britain was subject to the royal line of David. Even a number of the presidents of the United States have come from that same lineage. No wonder, then, that God portrays Israel's end-time national power in terms of a lion (Micah 5:8-9).

And notice this incredible prophecy of Israel that God caused the pagan prophet Balaam to utter: "God brought him forth out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of a *unicorn*: he shall eat up the nations his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows. He couched, he lay down as a *lion*, and as a great lion: who shall stir him up? Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee" (Numbers 24:8-9, KJV, emphasis added). Thus, we again see the lion and the unicorn—symbols of the scepter tribe of Judah and the birthright tribe of Joseph respectively. And the last sentence was a repetition of the birthright blessing given to Jacob (see Genesis 27:29).

## Coat of arms of many colors

Now, where is all of this leading us? To the British royal coat of arms, in which all these and other symbols converge. In this blazon, the crest, which sits above the heraldic shield, consists of a helmet bearing the regal crown, atop which strides a crowned lion. Flanking the shield are the shield supporters—another lion along with a unicorn! The rampant lion (risen on one foot to strike), said to be the golden lion of England, has a crown upon its head while the rampant unicorn, a symbol from Scottish heraldry, has a lesser crown around its neck.

One source explains: "King James VI of Scotland succeeded Elizabeth I when she died childless in 1603, effectively uniting Scotland and England beneath one rule. The Scottish Royal Arms had up to that point used two unicorns as shield supporters. The English Arms had used a variety of supporters, but most frequently had included a lion. In a tactful gesture then, he placed a lion upon the left of the new Arms, and a unicorn upon the right.

"This was a potent bit of symbolism, for both the lion and the unicorn had long been thought to be deadly enemies: both regarded as king of the beasts, the unicorn rules through harmony while the lion rules through might, It came to symbolise a reconciliation between the Scottish unicorn and the English lion that the two should share the rule" ([www.sterlingtimes.org/memorable\\_images14.htm](http://www.sterlingtimes.org/memorable_images14.htm)). Of course, it should be mentioned that the lion—the rampant *red* lion—was the primary symbol of Scotland. Certainly, none of this detracts from the likely biblical origins of these symbols. For Scotland and England are *both* Ephraim (represented by a bull or unicorn)—and are both ruled over by the Judahite house of David (represented by a lion).

Returning to the coat of arms, between the lion and unicorn is a garter around the central shield said to represent the Order of the Garter, an ancient order of knighthood of which the British monarch is sovereign. On the garter appear the Old French words, "*Honi soit qui mal y pense*," which means, "Evil to him who thinks evil"—toward Britain that is. Is this not nearly the same as "cursed is he that curseth thee" in Numbers 24, a promise given in the same context as the lion and unicorn in Scripture? Surely this is no mere coincidence.

Beneath the shield and animals appears the motto of the sovereign, "*Dieu et mon droit*," meaning, "God and my right," that is, the right of kingly succession (as David's line has by God's promise) or right of birth—the *birthright* (of which Ephraim is the foremost recipient). This was the military password chosen by King Richard I in 1198, but its origins may go even further back. In any event, it would seem to be more than happenstance that such is the royal motto of Britain.

And there is more. Upon the shield of the arms appear the golden passant lions of England—passant meaning walking with farther forepaw raised. Actually, these lions are considered to be running across the shield in a crouched position—stalking prey and attacking. Says one source: "Lions have appeared in our Royal Arms since the introduction of Heraldry. It is said that Henry II's arms originally consisted of two lions, and that he added a third on marriage [in 1152]" (Patrick Montague-Smith, *The Royal Line of Succession*, Pitkin, 1968, p. 2).

The two lions had been the emblem of William the Conqueror prior to 1066 (Jiri Louda and Michael Maclagan, *Heraldry of the Royal Families of Europe*, 1981, p. 16). William was apparently of the Jewish line of Zerach (see Appendix 10: "The Family of Odin"), and may even have been of

Davidic lineage (see Appendix 11: “Joseph of Arimathea and the Line of Nathan”). The two golden lions could perhaps be reminiscent of the gilded lions upon the sides of Solomon’s throne.

That brings up a related matter. When William’s descendant Edward I took the Stone of Destiny from Scotland in 1296, he “ordered his goldsmith to make a fair bronze chair to contain it . . . The coronation chair, which still stands in Westminster Abbey today, has been used in almost all English coronations since that of Edward II in 1307. We are told that it was made by Walter of Durham in 1299 . . . [who] was paid . . . for the carving and painting of two wooden leopards [“leo-pard” being the medieval term for a running as opposed to rampant *lion*]—kings of England during that period liked being shown with their feet resting on leopards [i.e., lions], perhaps to model their throne on descriptions of King Solomon’s which had ‘two lions standing by the stays’” (Pat Gerber, *Stone of Destiny*, 1997, p. 105).

But, it should be pointed out, “in spite of Edward Plantagenet’s original order for a bronze chair, none of the research so far carried out by historians and scientists has revealed a single trace of bronze in the chair . . . Indeed, recent research is suggesting strongly that in fact Edward’s men took the very chair [in Scotland] which contained the Stone, perhaps to be a model for the proposed bronze throne, and later, when it was safely at Westminster, had it gilded in the English fashion” (p. 106, 112). This means the lions of Edward’s chair were probably part of the throne design in Scotland—if not the very same lions.

## Other contributions

Again, the lion was and remains the primary symbol of Scotland. The rampant red lion adorns the Scottish flag, and it too appears on the shield of the British royal coat of arms. Information about its origin has been passed down. It came with the transfer of the Davidic monarchy from Ireland to Scotland around A.D. 500: “How that Eastern Tropical Beast, a Lion, came to be the Blazon of a Country lying so far West as Scotland, and in the Icy North, the following extract from [Edmund] Campion’s *Historie of Ireland* [1571], p. 32 in [Edmund] Spencer’s Publication [*A Vewe of the Present State of Irelande*, 1597], will declare:

“First therefore came from Ireland Fergusius, the Son of Ferchardus; a man very famous for his skill in blazoning of armes. Himselfe bore the Red Lyon, rampant in a Golden Field (John Major [*Historia Majoris Britanniae*, 1521], lib. 2, cap. 1). There was in Ireland a monument of marble [that is, of stone—the Stone of Destiny], fashioned like a throne; and . . . because he deemed the finding thereof to be ominous to some kingdome, he brought it along with him and layde it up in the country for a Jewell. This marble Fergusius obtained towards the prospering of his voyage, and in Scotland he left it, which they used many years after, in Coronation of their kings at Scone.’

“Thus, it will be seen, that the Lion of Scotland was, in reality, the Lion of Ireland: and, as the Lion is no more an Irish than a Scottish wild beast, it is evidently an importation to that Country from the East: further, as having been associated, as is seen above, by Fergus with the National and Family Stone, it is clear that he must have considered it equally as the Family and National Standard” (F.R.A. Glover, *England, the Remnant of Judah, and the Israel of Ephraim*, 1861).

Why a *red* lion? Again, Scotland’s monarchs originally came from Northern Ireland—that is, from Ulster, which also used the symbol of the Red Hand and the Red Branch. It is explained elsewhere in this publication that these likely originated with the descendants of Zerah, who was identified in Scripture by the scarlet cord upon his hand. Since the Zarhites were of the tribe of Judah, they would likely have used the lion emblem—but perhaps colored it red to represent the scarlet cord (the symbol of their denied primacy).

It is also interesting to consider that the top of the back of the British coronation chair looks like the top of a Star of David. Perhaps a fuller representation of the star actually appeared on the throne in Scotland. As mentioned elsewhere, the six-pointed Star of David was another symbol of Ulster, which still appears on the flag of Northern Ireland, the Red Hand displayed within it.

Returning once again to the British royal coat of arms, its shield does display a universally acknowledged symbol of Ireland—in fact, the national emblem of Ireland, which appears on the flag of the Republic of Ireland, the Irish harp. As also mentioned elsewhere, the astronomer Galileo’s father wrote a book in 1581 in which he explained that the Irish attachment to the harp was traced

by the Irish themselves to their descent—or, rather, their ancient *monarchy's* descent—from King David the harpist.

Thus, upon the British royal blazon appear to be the lion and crown of Judah, the harp of David, the golden lion of Solomon, the red lion of Zerah, the unicorn of Joseph, the promised blessing of enemies cursed, the birthright of Israel and acknowledgment of God as the one who has orchestrated it all. What incredible convergence in a single image! While these things don't of and by themselves constitute proof of the biblical origin of the British people and their royal family, they certainly help to confirm what we have elsewhere proven to be the case. Certainly, Britain is Ephraim and the British royal family is of the Jewish royal line of Zerah in union with the royal house of David.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 10: The Family of Odin

The various royal houses of English history—the Saxons, Danes, Normans, Tudors, Stuarts, Plantagenets, Hanoverians, Saxe-Coburgs, all lines blended and fused with Scottish royalty to form the modern House of Windsor—trace their bloodlines back to a common ancestor. Indeed, the various monarchs of Europe, as attested to in the medieval Viking sagas and histories, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and pedigree after pedigree of every European royal lineage, are all traced back to the same person. To the Germans he was known as Votan. To the Anglo-Saxons Woden. To the Norse and other Scandinavians, he was known by the name by which he is still commonly referred to today—Odin.

Yet Odin is, of course, the chief *god* of the Teutonic pantheon known as the Aesir, who lived at the supposedly mythical Valhalla (“Hall of the Chosen”) in Asgard—considered the Norse version of “heaven.” So, as we might expect, modern scholarship usually dismisses the notion outright. But what are we to make of it?

### Thor hunts for Odin

Notice a Reuters News Agency report from Nov. 30, 2001: “The Viking god Odin may have been a real king who lived in what is now southern Russia 2,000 years ago, Norwegian explorer Thor Heyerdahl said in a controversial new book on Thursday. In *The Hunt for Odin*, Heyerdahl says his archaeological digs by the Sea of Azov in Russia backed evidence in 13th century sagas written by Snorre Sturlason that Odin was more than a myth.

“Heyerdahl, who won worldwide acclaim with his 1947 voyage across the Pacific on the Kon-Tiki balsa raft, said Odin was a king who lived around Azov before being driven out by the Romans and taking his followers to Sweden. Ancient metal belt holders, rings and armbands dating from 100-200 AD found in excavations around the mouth of the Don River were almost identical to Viking equivalents found in Gotland, Sweden, some 800 years later, he said. ‘Snorre didn’t sit down and dream this all up,’ Heyerdahl told a news conference to launch his latest book with co-author Per Lillestrom. ‘In ancient times, people treated Gods and Kings as one and the same thing.’ Snorre’s stories about Odin, viewed as the king of the gods in Norse mythology, portrayed him as fighting battles. By contrast, Snorre treated Thor, the god of thunder, as a mythical hammer-wielding figure riding through the air. And he said that many of the place names in Snorre’s sagas matched the ancient Greek names for places around the Sea of Azov, such as Tanais.”

Indeed, Heyerdahl has gone even farther. He has identified the region east of Azov and the Black Sea as Asgard. He sees also a connection of the Aesir or Aser with Azerbaijan, just south of the Caucasus Mountains, where the people call themselves Azeri. “Heyerdahl first began forming this hypothesis after visiting Gobustan, an ancient cave dwelling found 30 miles west of Baku [in Azerbaijan], which is famous for its rock carvings. The sketches of sickle-shaped boats carved into these rocks closely resemble rock carvings found in his own native Norway” (“Scandinavian Ancestry: Tracing Roots to Azerbaijan,” *Azerbaijan International*, Summer 2000, on-line at [www.azer.com/aiweb/categories/magazine/82\\_folder/82\\_articles/82\\_heyerdahl.html](http://www.azer.com/aiweb/categories/magazine/82_folder/82_articles/82_heyerdahl.html)).

Heyerdahl states: “I’m personally convinced that Snorre recorded oral history rather than a concocted myth, and I think it’s time to look for the land that my Scandinavian ancestors came from and not merely where they subsequently went on their Viking raids and explorations. They certainly did not come out from under the glaciers when the ice-age ended so they must have immigrated from the south. Since their physical type is referred to as Caucasian and their very own descendant preserved an itinerary from south of the Caucasus and north of Turkey, I suspect that the present Azeri people and the Aser of the Norse sagas have common roots and that my ancestry originated there” (“The Azerbaijan Connection: Challenging Euro-centric Theories of Migration,” *Azerbaijan International*, Spring 1995, on-line at [www.azer.com/aiweb/categories/magazine/31\\_folder/31\\_articles/31\\_thorazerconn.html](http://www.azer.com/aiweb/categories/magazine/31_folder/31_articles/31_thorazerconn.html)).

Yet it should be pointed out that Heyerdahl is not the first one to put forward such ideas. Indeed, as he mentions, it is rather clear that much of Snorri Sturluson’s Icelandic *Edda* is a genuinely historical account. You may read it yourself. It is available on-line along with other medieval Norse

sagas and poems at [www.heathenry.org/lore](http://www.heathenry.org/lore). The two primarily relevant sources are the prologue of Snorri's *Edda*, also called the *Prose Edda*, and his *Heimskringla* (*The Chronicles of the Kings of Norway*), particularly the "Saga of the Ynglings." Based on these and other accounts, many have drawn conclusions similar to Heyerdahl's—and have for quite some time.

In 1902 W.M.H. Milner wrote in his book *The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty*: "The traditions of our Scandinavian forefathers tell of a great conqueror, the hero king of Asgard—Odin. He was so heroic a king, and so great a conqueror, that the superstition or reverence of after ages made a god of him . . . He led our forefathers across Europe. Asgard has been variously located in Armenia or on the Dniepr. In either case, his victorious march traversed Russia, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden" (pp. 31-32).

Milner cites other sources as well: "[Paul] Du Chaillu's *Viking Age* [1889], pp. 51-68, gives the evidence for the migration of 'Odin.' His historical identity is established by [Daniel] Haigh at pp. 120-140 of his *Conquest of Britain [by the Saxons, 1861]*. In Sharon Turner's [monumental work of historiography] *History of the Anglo-Saxons* [1805, 1823], Vol. i, pp. 124, 430, 450, the human existence of Odin is proved in detail" (p. 32, footnote). Based on genealogical tables, Odin can be dated to the second or third centuries: "The date of Odin is given at p. 733 of Anderson's *Royal Genealogies* as A.D. 256 to 300. On p. 140 of Haigh's *Conquest of Britain by the Saxons* a careful collation of all the Saxon genealogies makes Odin born in the 'latter half of the third' century. Sharon Turner, at pp. 430, 450, of the first volume of his *History*, makes the date of Odin A.D. 270, 297, 285, or 220. A.D. 250 is a reasonable average" (p. 32, footnote).

## When and who?

Heyerdahl, however, would put him a little earlier: "Snorre says: 'At that time when Odin lived, the Romans were conquering far and wide in the region. When Odin learned that they were coming towards the land of Asers, he decided that it was best for him to take his priests, chiefs and some of his people and move to the Northern part of Europe.' The Romans are human beings, they are from this planet, they are not mythical figures.

"Then I remember that when I came to Gobustan, I had seen a stone slab with Roman inscriptions. I contacted the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan. I was taken to the place, and I got the exact wording of the inscription. There's a very logical way of figuring out when this was written. It had to be written after the year 84 AD and before the year 97 AD. If this inscription matched Snorre's record, it would mean that Odin left for Scandinavia during the second half of the 1st century AD.

"Then I counted the members of the generations of kings, every king up to the grandfather of the king that united Norway into one kingdom, because such information is available—around 830 AD. In anthropology we reckon 25 years per generation for ruling kings. In modern times, a generation may extend up to 30 years, but on average the length of a generation in early reigns is 25 years. When you multiply 31 generations by 25 years, you come exactly back to the second half of the 1st century AD. So there is proof that these inscriptions carved by the Romans in stone coincide with the written history written almost 800 years ago in Iceland" ("Scandinavian Ancestry," *Azerbaijan International*).

A caption from the same article reads: "Heyerdahl is convinced that people living in the area now known as Azerbaijan settled in Scandinavia around 100 AD." And by this he means under the leadership of Odin, who in Heyerdahl's historical scenario could have lived a good ways into the second century.

Furthermore, the location of origin given is most intriguing. For, as explained in our free booklet *The United States and Bible Prophecy*, the Caucasus region is the very area from which the tribes of Israel, which had been deported by the Assyrians, made their great, centuries-long migration into Europe.

Considering this fact, observe what Milner says of Odin: "His name is Hebrew—*Aud'n* or *Odn* (for the broad A in the Hebrew carries often the sound of O), meaning *Lord*—human or divine" (p. 32). *The Companion Bible* states: "*Adon* is one of the three titles (*Adon, Adonai, Adonim*), all generally rendered *Lord*; but each has its own peculiar usage and association. They all denote *headship* in various aspects. They have to do with God as over-lord" (E.W. Bullinger, app. 4).

This title is the origin of the Greek *Adonis*, equivalent to the Canaanite *Baal* or Babylonian *Bel*, names also meaning “Lord.” Indeed, it is clear that many of the stories surrounding Odin have nothing to do with the historical character we are describing. Most of these mythical aspects may be traced back to the fountain of false religion, ancient Babylon, and its wicked ruler Nimrod (see Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 1916, 1959).

It is thus evident that the name Odin was already a title of deity when our historical figure came to power. Perhaps he fashioned himself with the title merely to be addressed as lord. However, based on the stories that show him as some kind of sorcerer, it is also possible that Odin took this name to himself to be identified with this false god—to inspire fear or loyalty in his followers. This could mean there were multiple people with this title, though likely in the same line of descent. There may even have been an earlier Odin, as we’ll see momentarily.

## Surprising genealogy

Of the one most clearly denoted as Odin (because of his recurrence in genealogies at the same point) we have a most remarkable genealogical origin preserved in the Icelandic *Prose Edda* of Snorri. He records: “Near the center of the world where what we call Turkey lies, was built the most famous of all palaces and halls—Troy by name . . . In the citadel were twelve chieftains and these excelled other men then living in every human fashion. One of the kings was called Munon or Mennon. He married a daughter of the chief king Priam who was called Troain, and they had a son named Tror—we call him Thor [who was perhaps not completely mythical in origin after all]. He was brought up in Thrace by a duke called Loricus . . . [Thor] took possession of the realm of Thrace—we call that Thruthheim. After that he traveled far and wide . . .

“In the northern part of the world he met with and married a prophetess called Sibyl whom we call Sif. I do not know Sif’s genealogy but she was a most beautiful woman with hair like gold. Loridi [Hloritha in Anglo-Saxon], who resembled his father, was their son. Loridi’s son was Einridi, his son Vingethor, his son Vingener, his son Modi, his son Magi, his son Seskef [or Sceaf], his son Bedvig [or Bedwig], his son Athra [or Hathra], whom we call Annar, his son Itrmann [or Itermon], his son Heremod, his son Skjaldun, whom we call Skjold [or Sceldwa], his son Biaf whom we call Bjar [or Beaw], his son Jat [or Geata], his son Gudolf [or Godwulf], his son Finn, his son Friallaf whom we call Frithleif [or Frithuwulf]; he had a son named Voden [or Woden] whom we call Odin; he was a man famed for his wisdom and every kind of accomplishment. His wife was called Frigida, whom we call Frigg [or Freya]” ([www.heathenry.org/lore/snorra\\_edda/prologus/english.html](http://www.heathenry.org/lore/snorra_edda/prologus/english.html)).

A few people do seem to be skipped in this genealogy, as they appear in other Teutonic genealogies starting with Sceaf. Support for an earlier Odin comes from the Danish chronicler Saxo Grammaticus, who mentions a Dan (perhaps Wo-Dan) as the grandfather or earlier ancestor of the above Skjold (see *History of the Danes*, Book 1, [www.heathenry.org/lore/saxo/book1e.html](http://www.heathenry.org/lore/saxo/book1e.html)). Some have equated this Dan with Sceaf (see John Keyser, *The Trojan Origins of European Royalty*, on-line at [hope-of-israel.org/i000109a.htm](http://hope-of-israel.org/i000109a.htm)).

Nevertheless, what is significant to notice in the above genealogy is Odin’s descent (indeed, Sceaf’s too) from the house of Troy. And as we have elsewhere seen, the royal line of Troy was descended from Judah’s son Zerah (see Appendix 3: “Aegean Royal Lines From Zerah.”). Of Odin, Milner eloquently remarked: “To him a crown was given by the great Overruler of all things, which he multiplied, crowning his sons kings of the countries he conquered, thereby securing his own position as the Royal Ancestor of all the dynasties of Europe. They converge, as by one consent, in the Royal House of Britain” (p. 32).

Milner also provides evidence that the Frankish or Sicambrian kings of the French were descended from the house of Troy by another line (pp. 35-36, 41). And he details many other connections besides. His book, *The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty*, is recommended for further study. It is available to order from The Covenant Publishing Co. in London at [www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm](http://www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm).

What this all means is that the untold thousands of intermarriages between the various royal families of Europe have not diminished in the slightest the Jewish heritage of the royal family of Britain. Indeed, just the opposite. It has been reinforced thousands of times over—and not just in

Britain, but also in every royal family of Europe. How amazingly God has made sure of his promise that the scepter would not depart from Judah.

©2002 United Church of God, *an International Association*

## Appendix 11: Joseph of Arimathea and the Line of Nathan

The Davidic line of kings that ruled over the ancient nation of Judah came through David's son Solomon. At the time of Judah's fall to the Babylonians in 586 B.C., this lineage, as explained in this publication, was continued by a transferal of the monarchy to Ireland. The Solomonic monarchy was later moved to Scotland around A.D. 500 and, later still, transplanted into England when King James VI of Scotland became king of all Great Britain. Thus, the current British sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, is a direct descendant of David through Solomon. But she may be descended from another son of David as well.

This possibility revolves around certain people who lived at the time of Jesus—chief of whom is a man referred to in the New Testament as Joseph of Arimathea, who is identified with Britain in medieval tradition. As we will see, it is a rather fascinating story.

### The immediate family of Jesus

King David had a number of children. Great honor, of course, went to Solomon, who was blessed with riches and the aforementioned dynasty. Yet the *greatest* honor actually went to David's son Nathan—for from him descended Jesus Christ. Matthew 1 contains the genealogy of Jesus' adoptive father Joseph—son of Jacob (verse 16)—from Solomon. Luke 3, which lists the genealogy from Nathan, might *also* seem to be the family record of Joseph—but he is here listed as being the “son of Heli” (verse 23). Actually, the literal Greek says only “Joseph of Heli”—not “*son* of Heli.” Now the genitive “of” *does* imply “son of” throughout the remainder of the genealogy. But in this case, it is widely acknowledged to mean “son-in-law of”—making Heli the father of Joseph's wife Mary, who truly was the mother of Jesus.

Yet Jesus and Mary were not the only ones mentioned in the New Testament who shared this royal lineage from Nathan. Mary had other children besides Jesus. The people of Nazareth asked regarding Jesus: “Is not His mother called Mary? And His brothers James, Joses, Simon and Judas? And His sisters, are they not all with us?” (Matthew 13:55-56). Indeed, these brothers and sisters were also of the line of Solomon, being children Mary had with Joseph.

We also see mention of Jesus' “mother, and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas” (John 19:25). Jesus' aunt here, also a daughter of Heli, of the line of Nathan, is widely acknowledged from scriptural context to be the “mother of James the Less and of Joses” (Mark 15:40; see verse 47; Matthew 27:56). James the Less is understood to be one of two of the original 12 apostles named James—James the son of Alphaeus (“James,” Paul Gardner, editor, *The Complete Who's Who in the Bible*, 1995, p. 294).

And there is yet another New Testament figure who appears to have been a close relative of Jesus—Joseph of Arimathea. The place name he's identified with occurs in the Old Testament as the home of the prophet Samuel, *Ramathaim* Zophim (1 Samuel 1:1). The Septuagint Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures renders the italicized word as Arimathaim. Also known by its shortened form Ramah, this village is apparently synonymous with modern Ramallah, a town about five miles north of Jerusalem.

Referred to as a “rich man” and “prominent council member,” Joseph was a “good and just man” who “had not consented” to the kangaroo trial that condemned Jesus (see Matthew 27:57-60; Mark 15:42-46; Luke 23:50-53). After Christ's death, Joseph, “being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly, for fear of the Jews, asked [the Roman governor Pontius] Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus; and Pilate gave him permission” (John 19:38). Then, after preparing it for burial, Joseph laid the body in a rock-hewn tomb in a garden (verses 39-42; and see previous references). The tomb was obviously *owned* by Joseph, as the Messiah was prophesied to be buried in a rich man's grave (see Isaiah 53:9).

Mark says that Joseph went *boldly* to Pilate to request the body of Jesus (Mark 15:43)—and just in time. *Barnes' Notes on the New Testament* comments: “Unless there had been a special application to Pilate in behalf of Jesus, his body would have been buried *that night* in the common grave with the malefactors [with whom He'd been crucified], for it was a law of the Jews that the body of an

executed man should not remain on the cross on the Sabbath [John 19:31]. At this critical juncture, God called forward this secret disciple . . .” (1970, note on Mark 15:43).

## Evidence of Joseph’s kinship

But on what grounds did Joseph claim the body? Not on his being a disciple, for in the same context we read that he took pains to conceal this fact out of fear of the Jews. Yet how do we square this with the boldness of his request? Let us consider what exactly Joseph was afraid of. It *could* be that he was concerned the Jews would come after him as they had Jesus. Perhaps fear of reprisal had kept him from revealing that he was a disciple in the past—and his boldness now was in taking an action that revealed him for what he was.

However, there is another way to understand Joseph’s specific fear in this instance and his action taken. We later discover that under no circumstances did the Jewish authorities want Jesus’ body to fall into the hands of His disciples—out of worry that the disciples would dispense with it and concoct a resurrection fable (Matthew 27:62-66). Thus Joseph likely feared, in approaching Pilate, that if it became known he was a disciple, the Jewish authorities would pressure the governor into refusing Joseph’s request for Christ’s body.

Therefore it seems that Joseph must have approached Pilate on some other basis. Simple friendship with Jesus? No. Besides appearing as patronage and discipleship, there would have been another hurdle to jump.

“The Sanhedrin had declared Jesus a criminal. According to both Roman and Jewish law, unless the body of an executed criminal was immediately claimed by the next of kin, the body of the victim was cast into a common pit, where as with others, all physical record of them was completely obliterated. Certainly, the fanatical Sadducean element of the Sanhedrin who sought the total extinction of Jesus, even in death, would have allowed nothing short of a legal claim on the body of Christ” (E. Raymond Capt, *Traditions of Glastonbury*, 1983, p. 20). The Jewish authorities, who hated and despised Jesus, would surely have resisted his being given an honorable burial in a private tomb—unless there were irrefutable grounds in favor of Joseph receiving the body.

Therefore, we may infer from these verses that Joseph was a close relative of Jesus. This probably accounts for the boldness of Joseph’s request—not bold in the sense of facing his fears but bold because it was an *assertion of his rights* to Christ’s body. No other family members of Jesus are mentioned as coming forward. His legal father Joseph, last mentioned when Jesus was 12 years old (Luke 2:44-52), had evidently died long before—Jesus being referred to in Nazareth as “the carpenter, the son of Mary” (Mark 6:3).

Mary herself was in no state to deal with the matter—and this would not have been a woman’s responsibility anyway. Jesus’ brothers were probably in their 20s or teens, perhaps considered too young to assume responsibility over the family—and thus to take care of this unsavory business. Or they could have been away—or were perhaps simply afraid to be associated with Jesus at this time.

In, then, steps Joseph of Arimathea—again, evidently a close relative. By some traditions this wealthy relative had become an adoptive father of the family after the death of Mary’s husband Joseph. More specifically, “Joseph of Arimathea is by Eastern [Orthodox] tradition said to have been the younger brother of the father of the Virgin Mary” (Richard W. Morgan, *St. Paul in Britain*, 1860, 1984, pp. 69-70 footnote)—thus making him Mary’s uncle and Jesus’ *great* uncle. Mary’s father Heli was essentially a royal prince of the Davidic line of Nathan—and so would Heli’s *brother* have been. So Joseph of Arimathea may well have been of royal blood. (Some claim an earlier tradition reckoned Joseph as the brother of Mary and thus Jesus’ direct uncle—which would still have made him of the same family.)

## The noble decurio

Joseph was, as we’ve seen, described as a “prominent council member” (Mark 15:43). The original Greek here is *euschemon bouletes*. The Amplified Bible gives this as “noble and honorable in rank and a respected member of the council.” The first Greek word here can mean noble in character or, evidently, in birth: “The women who are incited against [the apostle] Paul in Acts 13:50 are

‘prominent [*euschemon*],’ as are those in Acts 17:12. They belong to a higher social stratum” (*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Logos Software).

Of the second word we are told regarding Joseph, “He is also called by St. Mark and by St. Luke a *bouleutes*, literally, ‘a senator,’ whereby is meant a member of the Sanhedrin or supreme council of the Jews” (“Joseph of Arimathea,” *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, 1910, Vol. 8, Online Edition, 1999, [www.newadvent.org/cathen](http://www.newadvent.org/cathen)). Yet because this is a “non-Jewish designation” for the council (*The Bible Knowledge Commentary*, Logos Software, note on Mark 15:52-53)—applied to advisors of gentile officials in Acts 25:12—some say Joseph’s office was “in the [Roman] state, and that he was one of Pilate’s privy council; [but] his post rather seems to have been . . . [as] one of the *great Sanhedrim* of the Jews” (*Matthew Henry’s Commentary on the Bible*, Logos Software, note on Mark 15:42-47). This we understand from Luke’s comment that Joseph did not vote with them to condemn Christ (Luke 23:50).

Still, the Greek words *euschemon bouletes* could be properly read as “noble senator” in the Roman world of the first century—in fact, even in *this* case since the term senate could denote governing councils of subject nations such as the Sanhedrin: “senatus . . . the Roman senate . . . [but] used also of similar bodies in other nations” (“senatus,” *The Classic Latin Dictionary*, 1941). However, when the Catholic “church father” Jerome produced, in the late 300s, the first version of the Vulgate, the earliest Latin translation of the Bible, he rendered the Greek words above as *nobilis decurio*.

In the word *nobilis* we can obviously see the English word “noble.” But what of the Latin word *decurio*? Besides being a military title, “decurio was applied to a member of the local council or senate of a *colonia* (a community established by Roman citizens and having full citizenship rights) or *municipium* (a corporation and community established by non-Romans but granted certain rights of citizenship). Qualifications were numerous, and the position was regarded as an honour. The *decuriones* had wide powers in local administration, finance and judiciary proceedings” (“Decurio,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, 1985, p. 953). Perhaps Jerome had access to more information about Joseph.

The apocryphal *Gospel of Peter* says Joseph was a friend of Pilate. Information in such sources is often inaccurate, but it is entirely possible that Pilate knew and respected him, which may have added to his readiness to hand over Jesus’ body (of course, this alone would not have been enough to secure the body).

In any event, it seems that Joseph was a man of considerable means. Not just wealthy—but also quite influential. In medieval tradition, he is called Joseph de Marmore, which may bear on that. Some recognize *marmore* as the Greek and Latin word *marmor* meaning “marble”—or perhaps quarried “stone” (*Abingdon’s Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*: “Greek Dictionary of the New Testament,” 1890, 1981, No. 3139; “marmor,” *Classic Latin Dictionary*). Others see Marmore as a place name. There’s La Marmore, the highest peak in Sardinia, the *Sea* of Marmore between the Aegean and Black Seas, and the Roman province of Libya in North Africa known as Marmarica—all of these evidently named after marble.

Yet there may be another possibility. Joseph seems to have been a wealthy nobleman of Judah with broad influence, certain rights of citizenship and perhaps even a high enough social standing to have regular personal interaction with the Roman governor. Indeed, by tradition he appears to have been a royal prince of the line of David—which would have given him even further status with the Jews. Is it possible, then, that Marmore was actually a title reflective of Joseph’s status?

In Hebrew the words *mare morah* would mean “lord dread” or “dread lord” (*Strong’s*: “Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary,” Nos. 4172, 4758)—that is, a lord to be properly feared and respected. Such a title has made its way into more recent times. Note how the Pilgrims referred to the British king in the Mayflower Compact of 1620: “We whose Names are under-written, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord King James, by the grace of God . . .” Indeed, this has been a rather common way of addressing kings for millennia.

If Joseph bore such a title, it is conceivable that medieval authors, who would likely not have understood it, wrote it down as Marmore, thinking of it as a place he was identified with. Or perhaps they considered it to mean quarried stone, maybe drawing a connection between quarrying and a rather strong tradition surrounding Joseph—his involvement in tin mining in southern Britain.

## Glastonbury traditions

We should consider the traditions connecting Joseph with Britain. Regarding him the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states: “according to all four Gospels, a secret disciple of Jesus, whose body he buried in his own tomb . . . Joseph is accorded a long history in later literature [much of it mythical] . . . In Robert de Boron’s verse romance *Joseph d’Arimathie* (c. 1200), he is entrusted with the Holy Grail (cup) of the Last Supper. A mid-13th-century interpolation [a textual alteration believed by scholars to have been made to a 12th-century work by the English historian William of Malmesbury] relates that Joseph went to Glastonbury (in Somerset, Eng[land]) . . . as head of 12 missionaries dispatched there by the Apostle St. Philip” (“Joseph of Arimathea, Saint,” 1985, *Micropaedia*, Vol. 6, p. 621).

It is generally agreed that William’s original did mention the mission sent by Philip and that Glastonbury’s founding went back to the time of Christ. Glastonbury is identified by many as the mysterious Isle of Avalon in the stories of King Arthur. Notice this regarding the remains of an old church there: “Glastonbury Abbey, a ruined abbey in Somersetshire, about 6 miles south of Wells, England. Tradition has it that it was here that Joseph of Arimathea established the first Christian Church in England” (*Collier’s Encyclopedia*, 1959, Vol. 9, p. 120).

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Edition, states: “According to the legends . . . the first church of Glastonbury was a little wattled [or thatched] building erected by Joseph of Arimathea as the leader of the twelve apostles [that is, the 12 “missionaries” mentioned earlier] sent over to Britain from Gaul by St. Philip” (“Glastonbury,” Vol. 12, on-line at [81.1911encyclopedia.org/G/GL/GLASTONBURY.htm](http://81.1911encyclopedia.org/G/GL/GLASTONBURY.htm)).

An old saying from the English countryside, believed to be a refrain of an ancient miners’ song, maintains that “Joseph was a tin man.” Indeed, as mentioned, this is understood to mean that he was involved in tin mining and, more importantly, the tin trade with the Mediterranean. Many believe that he actually came often to Britain during the life of Jesus, perhaps even before—and that after Christ’s death and resurrection Joseph came again, this time as an evangelist.

This whole story sounds fabulous, to be sure. Yet was it a complete invention of the late Middle Ages—or was it a tradition that went further back? And could there be some actual truth in it?

To answer the first part, there appears to have been a reference to Joseph being at Glastonbury from a certain Melkin, identified as Maelgwyn of Llandaff (ca. 480-550), ruler of Gwynedd in North Wales who was educated at the same school the well-known early British historian Gildas was: “John of Glaston, their [i.e., Glastonbury Abbey’s] last historian, writing at the beginning of the fifteenth century . . . quotes in support of the actual burial of Joseph in the cemetery [there] . . . an ancient British historian, named Melkin, who lived before Merlin [the historical Welsh bard Myrddin], and wrote concerning the mission of St. Philip’s disciples; that they died in succession, and were buried in the cemetery: ‘Amongst them Joseph of Marmore, named of Arimathea, receives perpetual sleep. And he lies in linea bifurcata near the south corner of the oratory, which is built of hurdles [wattle].’

“It is worth remarking here that when [Henry VIII’s royal antiquarian John] Leland visited Glastonbury, about 1540, Abbot Whiting admitted him to the library of the monastery, in which he found a fragment of Melkin’s history, *Historiolam de rebus Britannicis*: an author, as he tells us, entirely unknown to him. He read this fragment with great interest and pleasure, and found in it the very narrative quoted above. Doubtless the manuscript was the identical one employed by John of Glaston, whose chronicle was unknown to Leland. Melkin was placed by Leland in his catalogue of British writers, and figures accordingly in the works of his copyists” (Robert Willis, *The Architectural History of Glastonbury Abbey*, 1866, chap.2, on-line at [vrcoll.fa.pitt.edu/medart/image/England/glastonbury/mainglastonbury.html](http://vrcoll.fa.pitt.edu/medart/image/England/glastonbury/mainglastonbury.html)).

If legitimate, this puts the first known historical mention of Joseph at Glastonbury 700 years before the mention generally accepted as first by modern scholarship.

## Tin mines of southern England

What, then, of any truth in the stories? As elsewhere pointed out in this publication, the tin trade with Britain had been going on since the days of the Phoenicians (“Industries, Extraction and Processing,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1985, *Macropaedia*, Vol. 21, p. 424). In the ancient

Mediterranean world, the British Isles were referred to as the Cassiterides, the “Tin Islands”—the primary source, along with Spain, of Mediterranean tin. This was still the case in Roman days. “The Cornish tin mines [of Cornwall in southwest England] were famous by the time the Romans conquered Great Britain in the 1st century AD” (p. 424).

Other metals were mined in Britain as well. “Specimens of Roman-British lead (from the Mendip mines [near Glastonbury]) have been found in various parts of the Roman Empire. About 1950 an ancient Roman drain-pipe, bonded with lead, was found at Ostia, the sea-port of Rome. Analysis showed the lead had been mined in the Mendips” (Capt, p. 35).

Furthermore, there is evidence that Jews were involved with some of these mines, as explained by Dr. Bernard Susser, a Jewish rabbi, in his 1993 book *The Jews of Southwest England*, originally written as his 1977 Ph.D. thesis at the University of Exeter in England. It is available on-line at [www.eclipse.co.uk/exeshul/susser/thesis](http://www.eclipse.co.uk/exeshul/susser/thesis). In it he states: “Jewish settlement in Devon and Cornwall, the two most South-Westerly counties of Great Britain, began in the remote mists of Biblical and Roman times . . .

“The presence of smelting ovens in Cornwall and Devon which are called ‘Jews’ Houses’ or ‘Jew’s Houses’ (White’s *Devonshire Directory* (1850) . . . p. 41 . . .) may point to early Jewish participation in the mining industry . . . This type of oven was in use from the second century B.C. until about 1350 A.D. and was called by eighteenth century tanners ‘a Jew’s House’ (A.K. Hamilton-Jenkin, *The Cornish Miner* (1962), p. 68f . . .). The tin from a Jew’s House was known as ‘Jew’s House tin’ (W.C. Borlase, *Antiquities of Cornwall* (1769), p. 163. See also T. Hogg, *Manual of Mineralogy* (1828), p. 74, and *Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall*, IV (1871), 227) . . .

“Jews may have had at least one well established trading centre in Cornwall in the pre-Roman period, as the town Marazion (this name is itself suggestive of Hebraic origin, meaning either ‘sight of Zion’ or ‘bitterness of Zion’) was anciently known as Market-Jew, and the main street of Penzance which leads to it is even today called Market-Jew Street. Nor is this the only town in Cornwall whose name is said to be Hebraic in its origin. There is also the village of Menheniot, which name, a correspondent to the Jewish Chronicle suggested, is derived from the two Hebrew words, *min oniyot*, which mean ‘from ships’ (JC [*Jewish Chronicle*], 1 June 1860) . . . It is worth noting that much of the evidence which points to Jewish settlement or influence in Britain during the pre-Roman period, relates in the main to Devon and Cornwall” (preface and chap. 1).

## **Jews in Roman Britain**

The Roman period began when Julius Caesar invaded in 55 B.C., defeating native forces the following year—although Britain wasn’t truly “Romanized” for some time. “The inhabitants, referred to collectively as Britons, maintained political freedom and paid tribute to Rome for almost a century before the Roman emperor Claudius I initiated the systematic conquest of Britain in AD 43. By 47, Roman legions had occupied all the island south of the Humber River and east of the Severn River. The tribes, notably the Silures [whom we’ll see further mention of shortly], inhabitants of what are now the Wales and Yorkshire regions, resisted stubbornly for more than 30 years, a period that was marked by the abortive and bloody rebellion in 61 led by the native queen Boudicca. At this time Britain became an imperial province of Rome, called Britannia, administered by Roman governors. About 79, Roman legions subdued the tribes in Wales and established partial control over those in Yorkshire” (“Britain, Ancient,” *Microsoft Encarta 2001*).

Dr. Susser discusses this period: “Were there Jews in Roman Britain? This question has been considered by Dr. [S.] Applebaum [in his article “Were There Jews in Roman Britain?” (*Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, XVII, 1950 p. 205), even the possibility] . . . that there were some Jewish traders who were connected with the import of pottery, glass and oriental [i.e., Eastern Mediterranean] wares. They may even have formed small communities at Colchester, York, Corbridge and London . . .

“The archaeological evidence relates to finds of coins and pottery. According to Dr. Applebaum, Near Eastern coins of the Roman period found in Dorset and Devon show an early connection between those areas. A close analysis of these coins indicates that Exeter was one of the first ports of call for sea-traffic coming from the Mediterranean up the Channel. Analysis of the coins also shows that they mainly originate from Antioch, Chalcis, Cyrrhus, Hierapolis, Edessa, Samosata, Zengma

and Singara, all of them towns with a high percentage of Jews in their population (Applebaum, “Roman Britain,” p. 190). The particularly strong link between Exeter and the Near East makes it likely that there were some early Jewish associations with that city” (chap. 1).

Dr. Susser further says: “A persistent legend also refers to the presence of at least one Jew in England at the beginning of the Christian era. He was Joseph of Arimathea, a wealthy Essene Jew who, it is said, out of sympathy with Jesus gave him burial in a rock tomb near Jerusalem . . . (*Jewish Encyclopaedia* (New York, 1901) . . .). A variant of the legend makes Joseph travel through Cornwall accompanied by Jesus . . . This legend may be the folk memory of some ancient time when one or more notable Jews visited England” (chap. 1).

Thus, we return once again to Joseph of Arimathea. Perhaps, besides being a Davidic lord and a noble council member, he was also a merchant prince—made rich through the trade of metal from Britain and, in turn, pottery and glass from the Middle East. Among his distinctions, this one would have given him the greatest standing with the Romans and may well have put him in regular contact with Pontius Pilate.

Furthermore, if all of this is true, it provides a good reason for Joseph’s being in Britain after the death and resurrection of Christ. He could have been continuing in his former trade, all the while spreading word of what had happened in Judea. Or perhaps he was strictly an evangelist at this time—yet went to this place familiar to him, where he had important contacts.

## **Apostolic journeys**

And there are other good reasons why Joseph and even others of Christ’s original followers may have gone to Britain. When Jesus first commissioned His apostles, He told them: “Do not go into the way of the Gentiles, and do not enter a city of the Samaritans. But go rather to *the lost sheep of the house of Israel*” (Matthew 10:5-6; compare 15:24). Now this likely applied in part to the spiritually lost Jews in the Holy Land. But it would seem to primarily identify the 10 “lost tribes” of Israel. Of course, Jesus later told His apostles to take His message to all nations (Matthew 28:19-20), and salvation was opened to the gentiles (Acts 10–11). But still the gospel message was to be “for the Jew [Israelite] first and also for the Greek [gentile]” (Romans 1:16). All of this seems to indicate that the primary target for evangelism was to be the Israelites. Even Paul, the apostle to the gentiles, was also commissioned to preach to “the children of Israel” (Acts 9:15).

In any case, to the people of Christ’s day, “all nations” would certainly have applied to the breadth of the Roman Empire and beyond. And the lost tribes of Israel were at that time located along the entire length of the northern border of the Empire, stretching from Parthia and Scythia in the east all the way to Spain, France and Britain in the west.

In the early 300s, the renowned church historian Eusebius wrote in his well-known *History of the Church*: “The holy apostles and disciples of our Saviour were scattered over the whole world. Thomas, tradition tells us, was chosen for Parthia, Andrew for Scythia, John for Asia [Minor], where he remained till his death at Ephesus. Peter seems to have preached in Pontus, Galatia and Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia [Minor], to the Jews [or, rather, Israelites] of the Dispersion” (Book 3, chap. 1). Paul specifically mentioned his intention to go to Spain (Romans 15:24, 28). Might he have gone?

In another of his works Eusebius wrote, “The apostles passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles” (*Demonstratio Evangelica* or *Proof of the Gospel*, book 3, chap. 7). He didn’t mention which apostles, but is it so fantastical to imagine that some did? After all, going from Judea to Britain was nothing more than traversing the Empire. Consider that myriads of people moved from the eastern United States to the western territories in pioneer days by wagon. And travel was accomplished by stagecoach. Yet travel from the Holy Land to Britain would have been far easier and faster—because the distance could be covered over water by sailing ship and over land by Roman roads, which were well maintained.

The earliest generally acknowledged historian of Britain, Gildas the Wise, already mentioned, writing around 550, stated, “We certainly know that Christ, the true Son, afforded His light, the knowledge of His precepts, to our Island in the last year of Tiberius Caesar” (*De Excidio Britanniae* or *On the Ruin of Britain*). Tiberius died in March of A.D. 37. So Gildas says that within six years of Jesus’ death and resurrection, the gospel was already planted in Britain. This was well before the

apostles dispersed throughout the known world and established congregations outside the Holy Land. But it does correspond to the terrible persecution brought on the church by Paul prior to his conversion around A.D. 35.

But was Joseph of Arimathea among those who arrived? In four Catholic councils of the early 1400s, it was determined that France and Spain had to yield in points of antiquity and precedence to Britain, as its church was founded by Joseph of Arimathea immediately after the death and resurrection of Christ.

## Legends in perspective

Catholic Cardinal Cesare Baronius, who was appointed curator of the Vatican Library in 1597, mentions Joseph in an interesting context. In his monumental *Annales Ecclesiastici (Annals of the Church)*, under the year A.D. 35, he describes a sea voyage in a boat “without oars” by the disciples Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, Martha, their servant Marcella and another disciple name Maximinus—who eventually put ashore at Marseilles in southern France (Vol. 1, year 35, sec. 5). For this information Baronius footnotes “Acts of Magdalen and associated works.”

Indeed, as David Mycoff states in his introduction to *The Life of Saint Mary Magdalene and of Her Sister Martha: A Medieval Biography* (1989), this basic story was evidently contained in a number of documents going back to at least the ninth century (pp. 5-6)—many of which have Lazarus and Mary Magdalene then spreading the gospel in southern France.

These and other traditions came together to form the document he translates in his above book—attributed in a manuscript from around 1408 to the ninth-century abbot Rabanus Maurus (p. 7), but believed by scholars, including Mycoff, to date from the late 12th century (p. 10). This document lists the passengers of the boat as “Maximinus the archbishop, along with the glorious friend of God, Mary Magdalene, her sister the blessed Martha, and the blessed archdeacon Parmenas, and the bishops Trophimus and Eutropius, together with the rest of the leaders of the army of Christ” (chap. 37, lines 2141-2145).

Baronius goes a step further. Citing in a footnote what he refers to as a “historical English manuscript that is held in the Vatican library,” he says that this party separated, some then accompanying “Joseph of Arimathea the noble decurio” to Britain. While the cardinal had not originally mentioned him with the others, it is interesting that Joseph shows up in the narrative (sec. 5).

But did this really happen? There’s no way to know for sure of course. It does fit the time frame of Gildas regarding the gospel coming to Britain at the end of Tiberius’ reign. Yet there are problems with the scenario. For one, the traditions connecting Lazarus to southern France are rather questionable—likely to have actually derived from a fifth-century bishop of the area named Lazarus who spent time in the Holy Land before returning to live out his days in Marseilles (see “St. Lazarus of Bethany,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1910, Vol. 9, Online Edition, 1999, [www.newadvent.org/cathen](http://www.newadvent.org/cathen)). However, it is possible that this person was intentionally following in the footsteps of his namesake, so to speak.

Furthermore, one might wonder why the Catholic councils of the early 1400s considered the British church to be older than that of France if evangelizing began first in southern France? This reason alone makes it appear that Joseph was not associated with the “boat without oars” at the time of these councils. What seems more likely is that Baronius conflated two traditions into one—or took his information from an earlier conflation. This does not take away from Joseph’s early arrival in Britain. Indeed, it is remarkable that, even considering these traditions regarding Lazarus and Mary Magdalene in southern France at an early date, the church councils still decided that Joseph’s early presence in England gave Britain the honor of oldest congregation outside the Holy Land.

Certain of the apostles are also reported by tradition to have visited Britain over the course of the next few decades following Tiberius’ death—among them Simon the Zealot, Peter and Paul. Yet of all the traditions, Joseph’s are the most prominent, mainly because of their involvement with the “holy grail” of the Arthurian romances.

What was the grail? There are several interpretations. It is likely that the grail legends sprang from a number of sources that became interwoven, some of them pagan. Yet the most popular form of the grail in legend is that of the sacred cup of the “last supper,” with which Joseph is said to have

caught drops of Christ's blood from the cross—and that drinking from this cup brought healing and perpetual life. Perhaps we can recognize in all this a rather obvious corruption of something scriptural.

On the night before His death, at His final Passover with His disciples, Jesus presented a cup of wine as representative of His “shed blood” for sin to initiate the New Covenant. He elsewhere said that whoever drank His “blood” would have eternal life. Consider that if Joseph conducted a Passover in the midst of a pagan land, word could easily have gotten around to this effect: “Joseph has a cup that has Jesus’ shed blood in it. If you drink from it, you’ll live forever.” Possibly in Joseph’s repeating of Christ’s words, “*This cup is the new covenant in my blood*” (1 Corinthians 11:25), some mistakenly thought He was using the very same cup. And thus was perhaps born the grail legend—or at least the most well known version of it. Of course, we must be very cautious about accepting anything from legend as having any real substance—though legends do often contain a kernel of truth.

## Reconciling dates

Returning to events, in what has already been referred to as the 13th-century interpolation in William of Malmesbury’s text we are told that Joseph crossed from France to Britain in the year 63 at the behest of the apostle Philip. While this could be entirely fictional, it could also indicate a genuine tradition, even if it were inserted into William’s text by the monks of Glastonbury, as scholars argue. It would not necessarily mean that Joseph had not earlier been in Britain.

Indeed, perhaps he did arrive in Britain around 37 but later went back to the European continent and perhaps even all the way back to the Holy Land before later being sent out to Britain again. It could be that he even went more than once. This would not be too surprising considering that Joseph, if the traditions be true, had made such journeys numerous times before. It is also possible that Joseph didn’t come with a larger company until 63. Joseph could even have been a traveler on the “boat without oars” after all—albeit at a later time than he originally came to Britain.

E. Raymond Capt, favoring the early arrival of Joseph’s company in Britain and basing his comments on other recorded traditions, says: “Joseph and his companions were met by King Arviragus of the Silurian dynasty of Britain. He was the son of King Cunobelinus (the Cymbeline of Shakespeare) and cousin to the renowned British warrior, Caradoc, whom the Romans renamed ‘Caratacus’” (p. 39). Capt infers: “Undoubtedly, Arviragus and Joseph were well known to each other; Joseph’s business as a metal merchant for the Romans would have brought him in contact with the king on more than one occasion. Later, King Arviragus was to play an important role in the struggle against Roman dominance of Britain” (p. 39).

According to the timeline laid out in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *History of the Kings of Britain*, Arviragus would have been king at this time. However, Arviragus, who is mentioned by the later Roman satirist Juvenal, seems to be a later king reigning in the time of the Emperor Domitian—around 50 years after Joseph’s supposed arrival (to better see the difficulty of sorting out the period, see Luke Stevens, *Speculations on British Genealogy and History in Antiquity and the Literary Transmission Thereof*, chap. 3: “The Heirs of Caratacus,” on-line at [www.geocities.com/Athens/Aegean/2444/specs](http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Aegean/2444/specs)).

Yet some have proposed Arviragus as a *title*—similar to *ard righ*, the Irish Gaelic term meaning “high king”—and see it as applicable to all the early British high kings, including Caradoc. Others have made Arviragus and Caradoc cousins—even co-rulers. Of course, the various British tribes had their own lesser kings at this time. Exactly who was reigning when and where during this murky period of Britain’s past is uncertain, records then being a matter of bardic oral traditions.

Joseph is said to have converted “Arviragus” to Christianity, whichever ruler he was. Of course it could be that nothing of the sort actually happened—or perhaps he converted some important person and this was later reported to be the king. Amazingly, there is actually scriptural evidence, in light of known history, that seems to verify that some members of the British royal family of this period actually *were* converted—but whether this happened in Britain or not is uncertain.

## Royal converts

When Paul later lived as a prisoner in Rome around the early 60s A.D., he mentions those of “Caesar’s household” who were members of the Church in Rome (Philippians 4:22). He also mentions Pudens, Linus and Claudia as prominent members there (2 Timothy 4:21). From Roman history it appears these verses are referring to the same people. Claudia, the adopted daughter of former emperor Claudius (who died in 54), had been converted—along with her husband Pudens and brother Linus.

Claudia, whose birth name was Gladys, was the daughter of the British high king Caradoc, who was captured in the Romano-British war. Her extraordinary beauty (celebrated later by the Roman poet Martial) and her keen intellect so affected Claudius that he adopted her as his own daughter. Her husband, Rufus Pudens Pudentius, commonly called Pudens, was a Roman senator and former aide-de-camp of Aulus Plautius, one of the most famous and brilliant military commanders of his day, and the commander Claudius sent to Britain in A.D. 43 to reduce the island to submission.

When did these people become Christians? Some say it was due to Paul’s preaching in Rome, but a good case is made that they were *already* Christians in Rome when Paul first arrived there (see Morgan, *St. Paul in Britain*). Thus, it is possible that they were converted previously while still in Britain—where Joseph of Arimathea is said to have interacted with the British high king.

In fact, Joseph is associated in the medieval romances with another British ruler called Brons, who is often identified as Bran the Blessed, believed by some to also have been a Christian convert. It should be mentioned that many scholars consider Bran to be mythical because of outlandish legends surrounding him—and they identify him as a Celtic god. Yet this is *often* the fallback of modern academia when it comes to sorting out ancient Celtic rulers—usually a reasonable position but one that often proves incorrect since there certainly *were* important people throughout those times, and traditions *did* accumulate around many of them. Bran appears in genealogies that many consider generally legitimate.

Morgan explains: “In the clan times . . . the preservation of a pedigree meant the preservation of all that was valuable in blood, station, and property. Without it a man was an outlaw; he had no clan, consequently no legal rights or status. Genealogies were guarded, therefore, with extreme jealousy, and recorded with painful exactitude by the herald-bards of each clan. On the public reception, at the age of fifteen, of a child into the clan, his family genealogy was proclaimed, and all challengers to it commanded to come forward. Pedigree and inheritance, indeed, were so identified in the ancient British code, that an heir even in the ninth descent could redeem at a jury valuation any portion of an hereditary estate from which necessity had compelled his forefathers to part” (pp. 42-43).

Morgan then gives Caradoc’s genealogy from the Welsh Pantliwydd Manuscripts of Llansannor: “Caradoc ab [of] Bran Fendigaid [i.e., “the Blessed”] ab Llyr Llediath [Shakespeare’s King Lear], ab Baran [etc.] . . .” (p. 43). He also quotes the medieval Welsh Triads of the isle of Britain: “Bran, son of Llyr Llediath, who first brought the faith of Christ to the Cymry [the Welsh] from Rome, where he had been seven years a hostage for his son Caradoc, whom the Romans put in prison . . .” (p. 84). Further, Morgan quotes from an ancient Welsh proverb: “Hast thou heard the saying of Caradoc, the exalted son of the noble Bran? ‘Oppression persisted in brings on death’” (quoted on p. 85). Bran, then, was very likely the father of Caradoc and grandfather of Claudia and Linus—and, as mentioned, he appears to have interacted with Joseph of Arimathea.

## Twelve hides of land

We may also notice that Joseph’s religious commission appears to have obtained substantial favor with the British authorities: “King Arviragus [whichever king he actually was] is recorded as having granted to Joseph and his followers, ‘twelve hides’ of land (about 1900 acres), tax free, in ‘Ynis-witrin’ [“Isle of Glass”—i.e., Glastonbury] . . .” Confirmation of this Royal Charter is found in the official Domesday Book of Britain [the national survey commissioned by William the Conqueror] (A.D. 1086 which states: “. . . This Glastonbury Church possesses, in its own villa XII hides of land which have never paid tax” (Domesday Survey folio p. 249b)” (Capt, p. 41).

It could well be that this granting of territory is when the “interpolated” date of A.D. 63 actually applied to. Perhaps Joseph and his company had settled in the Glastonbury area upon their arrival in 37 but weren’t actually given the land there until this later time. Or perhaps Joseph had come on his own or with just a few people in 37, went back to the Holy Land, and came back with others at this

later time of 63. In the intervening years, Rome would have invaded the island again starting in 43, as we've already seen. This would frankly have been a good reason to leave Britain. But amazingly, the Romans were stopped from conquering the western extremes of Britain by Boudicca's rebellion of 61. The rebellion also freed the part of the island where Glastonbury was from Roman dominion—and the area continued under British sovereignty, then, for almost two decades. It is interesting to note that the year 63, when the land grant to Joseph is supposed to have occurred, came just two years after the rebellion.

Historian Geoffrey Ashe, who is rather skeptical of the Joseph legends, admits regarding the story of Joseph and his company settling at Glastonbury in Somerset: "What is so piquant is that whoever started the tale should have hit so neatly on a time when a British chief may actually have been holding central Somerset, and able to give the wanderers a haven. Until the Cadbury hillfort [nearby, thought by some to later be the Camelot of Arthur] was excavated, there was no evidence for unconquered Britons in that area so long after the [Roman] invasion. A linkage of legends may be hinted at in the fact that Bran appears, as Bron or Brons, accompanying Joseph in romances of the Holy Grail. These stories, and the passage in Gildas, all seem to be hovering round a notion that there *were* Christians in Britain—very few, with no serious impact—in the immediate post-Boudicca phase" (*Kings and Queens of Early Britain*, 1982, 1990, p. 45).

Yet they might have had *quite* an impact. Though disputed, the nation may have been heavily Christianized within a few decades by what was likely the same royal family in the person of King Lucius—and, if that's so, likely due in part to groundwork laid at Glastonbury. Of course, we don't know how faithful to the truth the later converts would have been. In that regard, it is interesting to note what happened 500 years later when the Roman Catholic priest Augustine came to "convert" the British, who still held to their own form of Christianity.

The Anglo-Saxon historian Bede, himself a Catholic, wrote regarding the year 603: "Now the Britons did not keep Easter [Latin *Pascha*, i.e., Passover] at the correct time but between the fourteenth and twentieth days of the moon . . . Furthermore, certain other of their customs were at variance with the universal practice of the Church. But despite protracted discussions, neither the prayers, advice, or censures of Augustine and his companions could obtain the compliance of the Britons, who stubbornly preferred their own customs to those in universal use among Christian [i.e., Catholic] Churches" (*A History of the English Church and People*, 731, Book 2, chap. 1; compare chap. 19; Book 3, chap. 25 translated by Leo Sherley-Price, 1955).

Bede then describes how the British started to make an about-face after Augustine supposedly performed a miracle of healing—yet kept holding to their old ways. In any case, the practice described above appears to have been derived, at least in part, from the original apostles, who observed the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread from the 14th to the 21st day of the first month of the Hebrew calendar (see Leviticus 23:4-8; 1 Corinthians 5:7-8; and our free booklet *God's Holy Day Plan*). Considering the apostasy that enveloped most of the Christian world by the second century, Britain's isolated continuance in such early Church practices adds to the strong likelihood that the gospel was preached in the island by some of Christ's early followers.

## Other references

Thus, with such prevalent traditions surrounding Joseph of Arimathea's presence in southern England in the first century A.D., and numerous corroborating factors, it seems quite probable—though we may not be able to know the specifics of what happened—that he really was there.

There are numerous sources available that provide even further corroborative evidence to that effect. A few are given here, some that have already been cited. Please bear in mind that a recommendation of outside sources for further study is not an endorsement of all that is contained within these sources. Indeed there are statements in the referenced material with which we would strongly disagree. Nevertheless, the following items do contain valuable and pertinent information on the subject at hand and also refer to other sources:

- Richard W. Morgan, *St. Paul in Britain*, 1860, 1984 (available to order from [www.artisanpublishers.com](http://www.artisanpublishers.com) or [www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm](http://www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm))

- E. Raymond Capt, *Traditions of Glastonbury*, 1987 (available to order from [www.artisanpublishers.com](http://www.artisanpublishers.com) or [www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm](http://www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm))
- Herman L. Hoeh, “Where Did the Twelve Apostles Go?” (on-line at [www.british-israel.ca/Where.htm](http://www.british-israel.ca/Where.htm)).
- Robert Jones, *Joseph of Arimathea: Biblical and Legendary Accounts*, 1997 (on-line at [www.sundayschoolcourses.com/joseph/joscont.htm](http://www.sundayschoolcourses.com/joseph/joscont.htm))
- Arthur Eedle, “Amazing Historical Evidence,” *The Prophetic Telegraph*, No. 76 (on-line at [www.oxleigh.freeseerve.co.uk/pt76.htm](http://www.oxleigh.freeseerve.co.uk/pt76.htm))
- Arthur Eedle, “The Tin Islands,” *The Prophetic Telegraph*, No. 77 (on-line at [www.oxleigh.freeseerve.co.uk/pt77.htm](http://www.oxleigh.freeseerve.co.uk/pt77.htm))
- John Keyser, “Joseph of Arimathea and David’s Throne in Britain,” Hope of Israel Ministries (on-line at [hope-of-israel.org/i000111a.htm](http://hope-of-israel.org/i000111a.htm)).
- W.M.H. Milner, *The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty*, 1902, 1964 (available to order from [www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm](http://www.britishisrael.co.uk/booklist.htm))

## Joseph founds dynasties?

What, then, does all of this have to do with the throne of David? How does it actually relate to the British monarchy? Consider that Joseph’s proclamation of the gospel would have included the fact that Jesus was of the royal line of David—and, if Joseph were Jesus’ great uncle, the British would have understood him to be royalty as well. Indeed, from their prior dealings with this merchant prince, it is possible that the British kings already knew as much. They at least surely recognized him as a noble of great importance. In their eyes, this would have made him and his family candidates for intermarriage with British royalty.

In that light, it is remarkable to find in the grail stories that Joseph founded a line of kings. Most of the information in these stories is certainly fictitious—but there are probably some kernels of truth imbedded within them, as again is often the case with legends. Around 1212, Robert de Borron wrote in his work *Joseph of Arimathea* that Jesus appeared to Joseph and gave him the “secrets of the Savior,” which were only to be shared with the “family” of the grail. This is obviously fictional, but this “family” is prevalent in the stories. “Later, as Joseph is dying, the voice of the Holy Spirit speaks to him, telling him that he has established a lineage which will continue until, in a far-off time, one will come who shall achieve the Grail. This is [the Arthurian knight] Perceval” (John Matthews, *King Arthur and the Grail Quest: Myth and Vision from Celtic Times to the Present*, 1994, p. 127).

“In this same text we find reference to Joseph’s *brother*, Brons, who receives the name of ‘The Rich Fisherman’ after he feeds the company of the Grail from a single fish—a clearly enough reference to the miracle of the loaves and fishes from biblical tradition. Interestingly, of course, Brons is a name which derives from Bran” (p. 89, emphasis added). Joseph is seen to be brother—at least related—to the British king Bran.

A slightly earlier work about Perceval, called *Parzival*, “was composed by a Bavarian knight named Wolfram von Eschenbach c. 1207 . . . [It] is vastly elaborated and threaded through with a huge and mysterious symbolic structure involving numerology and a precise organization of the chapters so that the story spirals inward to the centre . . . and outward again to the end. Much ink has been spilled in attempts to crack Wolfram’s ‘code’ and arrive at a deeper, more esoteric meaning within” (p. 114).

In Wolfram’s story, the “grail” is not a cup but a mysterious *stone*, which sustains its guardians—the lineage of the mystical grail family (pp. 128-130). Commenting on *Parzival*, John Matthews, an acknowledged expert on Arthurian traditions, states: “Wolfram here [in a particular passage] seems to be speaking of a physical succession, perhaps even of an elite body of people who are bred to serve the Grail in a wholly calculated way. He also indicates that the disposition of the Grail lineage is a secret known only to the angels” (p. 130).

A little later, the collection of Arthurian stories referred to as the *Vulgate Cycle* was published. In an introduction to its first book, *History of the Holy Grail*, “the focus of attention shifts rapidly from Joseph of Arimathea to his son Josephus and thence to a converted pagan prince named Nasciens. In a lengthy adventure, the latter finds himself on an island. A ship appears on which are a rich bed, a

golden crown and sword of magnificent workmanship. Documents explain that these had once belonged to the biblical King David . . . The ship had been constructed by Solomon” (Matthews, p. 99). Again, this is clearly fictional—but the references to David and Solomon should pique our interest.

## Secrets and corruptions

In Wolfram’s *Parzifal*, the grail guardians are referred to as the “Templiesen,” which many have seen as a reference to the medieval Knights Templar, who ruled Jerusalem during the Crusades and established a network of castles throughout Europe. Though there is no actual proof, it is widely believed that Wolfram himself was a Templar and that he was hiding secret Templar knowledge in his work. Further, many identify the Templars as the source of Scottish Freemasonry. In that regard it is perhaps significant that most kings of Scotland and England have apparently been Masons and that one of the traditional Masonic beliefs is that the house of David was transferred to northwest Europe from the Holy Land, as noted in Algernon Herbert’s *Britannia After the Romans* (1849).

Some actually accuse the Masons of deceptively originating the idea of supposed connections between the house of David and the British monarchy. But although they may have recognized it early, they clearly did not manufacture all the evidence in this regard, which stands on its own merit. We certainly do not look to the Masons as the source of our beliefs on this matter. Rather, we look first and foremost to Scripture and then to secular history and widespread tradition, which support the link.

Anyway, with Wolfram’s story as background, some have concluded that the “holy grail” of Christ’s blood, represented by a stone, is actually the bloodline of David through the family of Jesus—from which the lineage of British kings has sprung. In fact, some have even argued that this royal bloodline came through Jesus Himself, whom they claim did not die on the cross but married Mary Magdalene and fathered children by her (the premise for the popular 1982 book *Holy Blood, Holy Grail* by Michael Baigent, Henry Lincoln and Richard Leigh). This teaching is, of course, contrary to Scripture and utterly nefarious—flying in the face of the whole purpose and plan of God.

Yet it could be a terrible corruption of something true and factual—as false doctrine often is. Perhaps the bloodline of David was transferred to Europe through Jesus’ extended family and not Jesus Himself. Certainly we have seen evidence that the Solomonic line was transferred to Ireland at the time of Jeremiah. But this other transfer would involve the line of David’s son Nathan. It should be noted that the royal transfer could not have come through Christ’s brothers for, while they were of the line of both Solomon and Nathan, their lineage from Jeconiah through their father Joseph—which Jesus did not share—prevented them or their descendants from ruling (compare Matthew 1:6-16; Jeremiah 22:24-30). But other family on their mother’s side would have sufficed—including Joseph of Arimathea.

To examine this possibility, we turn to the last source in our list above, *The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty* by Milner. He mentions that King Arthur was descended from Arviragus (p. 28). It should be pointed out that Arthur has not been clearly identified historically. However, it is well accepted in scholarship that he actually existed as a British ruler of the fifth or sixth century—following the end of Roman rule. Since tribal leadership was maintained even during the period of the Romans, it is quite likely that Arthur was descended from the dynasties of the early Roman period.

Citing another source, Milner also notes: “‘We find in John of Glastonbury [mentioned earlier],’ writes . . . W[alter] W. Skeat, in his *Joseph of Arimathea, or, The Romance of the Holy Grail* [1871], ‘some verses and a couple of genealogies shewing King Arthur’s descent [on his mother’s side] from *Joseph*, which I here subjoin. ‘Helaius, nepos [nephew or grandson of] Joseph, genuit [begot] Josue. Josue genuit Aminadab . . . [and so on to Arthur].’” The second genealogy derives the husband of Arthur’s sister from a ‘Petrus’ who was ‘consanguineus [blood-related to] Joseph ab Armathia.’ These independent lists prove [or at least help to substantiate] that Joseph did start dynasties in Britain. And here it may be noted that the original meaning of the Latin ‘nepos’ is not nephew but ‘grandson’—see White and Riddle’s *Latin Dictionary*, 1880 [as well as *The Classical Latin Dictionary*, 1941]” (pp. 28-29, footnote).

Notice Joseph's supposed grandson Helaius in the genealogy. He seems to be synonymous with the Helias le Grose (Heli the Great) of the medieval romances. Geoffrey of Monmouth, in his *History of the Kings of Britain*, gave the name Heli to the father of Cassivelaunos, the British king at the time of Julius Caesar (Book 3, chap. 20). Yet this person was too early to have been a grandson of Joseph of Arimathea. Old Welsh tales mention a Beli the Great—whom many consider synonymous with Geoffrey's Heli.

## British relations to Mary?

Notice what historian Geoffrey Ashe says: "Medieval texts . . . such as the collection of Welsh tales called the Mabinogion, have preserved a fair amount [of Celtic mythical tradition] . . . Welsh legend, for instance, introduces Beli son of Manogan, a reputed ancestor of several royal families. Beli has no real relationship to chronology [in Ashe's estimation]. He appears as king of Britain in the fourth century A.D., as a brother-in-law of the Virgin Mary, as the grandfather of another hero—Bran—who [it is supposed] must be earlier than that. But his name recalls Geoffrey's Belinus [an earlier ruler], and there is solid evidence for a Celtic god called Belenus who is the common original" (p. 23). However, it should be noted that the Celtic root *Bel* just means "Lord"—as with the Hebrew *Baal*. Therefore, this could easily be a title for a ruler.

The relationship to Mary should certainly grab our attention. As should the mention of Bran—whom we have seen repeatedly associated with Joseph of Arimathea. Milner refers to an exhaustive work from 1900 called *The Welsh People*, by Oxford University professor John Rhys and David Brynmor Jones (still published).

He states: "To return now to Bran. The authors of *The Welsh People* above referred to cite the Mabinogion (a collection of old Welsh tales), as calling Bran 'the son of Llyr (Lear) and Penardim, daughter of Beli, son of Mynogan.' Penardim, however, they show to have been Beli's sister and Beli the son of—not 'Mynogan,' but 'The words translated 'son of Mynogan' were not to be found in the original of the Mabinogi,' having been introduced by a subsequent hand, the actual words having been *Beli maur, map Aun, An, or Anau*, which occurs as *Beli mabr m. Anna* in one of the Pedigrees in Jesus College, MS. 20, supposed to be of the thirteenth century—that is—'*Beli the great, Son of Anna*'" (p. 27).

Rhys and Brynmor Jones translated another Welsh statement from the records as follows: "That Anna used to be said by the men of Egypt to be cousin to the Virgin Mary" (p. 27). This statement, they remark, is also made in the pedigree of Owen, son of Howel the Good: "Amalech, who was the son of Beli the Great, and Anna his [Beli's] mother who was said to be cousin of the virgin Mary, mother of our Lord Jesus Christ" (translated from p. 27).

Owen son of Howel is a reference to the Welsh king Owain (died 988), son of Hywel (916-950). From Owain descended the Tudor kings of England and, by multiple lineages, the present Queen Elizabeth (Patrick Montague-Smith, *The Royal Line of Succession with Genealogical Tables*, Pitkin, 1968, p. 23).

"This genealogy of Owen up to Anna is incorporated in the *Annales Cambriae* [*The Annals of Cambria*, i.e., of Wales] . . . published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of H.M. Treasury (Longmans, 1860), under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. In the same place is recorded the pedigree of Owen's mother, Elen, up to Constantine the Great and his Royal British mother, the Empress Helena, who on further research proves to have been eighth in descent from Bran the Blessed, son of Lear—and Penardim, sister of Beli, whose mother was Anna, 'cousin of the Virgin Mary'" (Milner, pp. 27-28).

## Sorting out lineages

Now how could this Anna have been cousin to Mary? One answer is: If she were the daughter of Joseph of Arimathea. This would have made Beli the grandson of Joseph. The grandson of Joseph is referred to in the other genealogies as Heli—truly fascinating considering that the name of Joseph's brother, Mary's father, was Heli. Milner suggests that it may have been a family name.

This Beli would have been too late to be the one who fathered Cassivelaunos. In fact he even seems too late to be the uncle of Bran, as Milner and his sources suggest. This seems rather difficult

to work into the little chronological understanding of the period we have—as it requires Joseph to have been unreasonably old even at the time of Christ’s death.

Perhaps the truth is that Anna was not the mother but the wife of Beli. The pedigree of Owen above could even be read that way: “Amalech, who was the son of Beli the Great, and Anna his [that is, *Amalech*’s] mother, who was said to be cousin of the virgin Mary.” Beli’s daughter Penardim may not have been the same one that married Lear—as the name Penardim means “Head Highest” and could have been a generic title for high queen. There are many possibilities.

Yet if there is any truth to this, it would seem to require that Joseph’s daughter married into the British royal family long prior to Christ’s death—perhaps closer to the time of Christ’s birth, in the early days of Joseph’s travels to Britain. It could even be that his daughter being royalty in Britain is what brought Joseph back to Britain seeking refuge in time of persecution. And perhaps this is what gained him such favor with the British rulers as we have seen.

We should also consider Joseph’s previously mentioned son, also named Joseph or Josephus. He too, if genuinely historical, seems to have been involved in founding dynasties. In any case, it is certainly possible that the Davidic bloodline of Nathan passed into the British royal lineage at this point—especially when we consider that the Romans conducted a purge of David’s house late in the first century, which no doubt prompted many Davidic descendants to flee to outlying areas of the Empire (see Appendix 12: “The Attempt to Destroy David’s Lineage”).

## The Cerdic connection

Around 500 years later, the Angles and Saxons invaded the island and pushed the original Celtic British into its western recesses. People often see no dynastic continuity from the British to the Saxons. But there may have been. The question centers on a person named Cerdic (died 534). “Cerdic, the Saxon Chieftain who founded the Kingdom of Wessex, was also the virtual founder of the British Monarchy [or at least the English monarchy]” (Montague-Smith, p. 6).

Geoffrey Ashe explains: “The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland grew around England, which grew around Wessex, and the House of Windsor is still descended from the West Saxon kings, through all interminglings of Scandinavians, Normans, Welsh, Scots, and Germans. Elizabeth II’s first Wessex ancestor is Cerdic, who landed on the shore of Southampton Water with a grown-up son and five shiploads of followers. So says the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, putting the event in 495. In other words, the Queen’s pedigree goes back to someone whose life overlapped Arthur’s.

“As history the Chronicle’s early West Saxon entries carry even less weight than most, and the early line of West Saxon kings is dubious. But the founder, Cerdic, is certainly real, because no Saxon court genealogist would have invented him. His name is not Saxon at all but British [Celtic]. It appears in various forms, one of them being Ceredig [whence derives Cardigan], the name borne by the Clyde rulers, so that it was definitely a royal name among fifth-century Britons. Cerdic of Wessex may have had Saxon blood, seeing that Saxons accepted him as a leader; but he seems to have reckoned himself a Briton, because he gave his son a Celtic name too, Cynric” (*The Discovery of King Arthur*, 1985, pp. 196-197).

Ashe rejects Cerdic’s Saxon pedigree, which names his father as Elesa (p. 198). However, he does offer the possibility of British-Saxon intermarriage. Perhaps Cerdic, the son of British nobility, married the daughter of the Saxon Elesa. Another source states concerning Cerdic’s son:

“Cynric is a hybrid name; half British, half Saxon, suggesting he was of mixed blood . . . [Here] we see the distinguishing name affix ‘Cyn,’ as in Cynglas (Cuneglasus [whom some have reckoned as Arthur or closely related to Arthur]) and Cynfawr (Cunomorin [ruler of southwest Britain at the time]). Since ‘Cyn’ is the Welsh version of the Latin ‘Cun,’ this is further indication that Cynric was a member of the Cunedda family [ruling Wales and southwest Britain during that period], very possibly a relative of Cunomorin . . . It appears to have been common practice at the time to seal an alliance between Saxon and Briton families by marriage” (Graham Phillips and Martin Keatman, *King Arthur: The True Story*, 1992, pp. 148-149).

Thus, like the various rulers of Wales, the pedigree of the first West Saxon rulers, from which all English monarchs have sprung, may also go back to Anna the cousin of Mary and possibly other members of Christ’s immediate family.

## David's house in Europe

Indeed, there is another means of descent that could perhaps have made this possible. It is the fact that the lineage of Elesa, mentioned above, is traced back just eight generations to Woden or Odin (Montague-Smith, p. 5)—a genealogy often considered legendary but likely true. Though reckoned as a god, Odin was evidently an actual person of the second or third century descended from the Trojan line of Zerah-Judah—and from him descended many of the royal houses of Europe, including all those that have combined to produce the modern British royal family (see Appendix 10: “The Family of Odin”).

Milner mentions an ancient manuscript he and others inspected when it lay in the possession of the Herald's College of London—now called the College of Arms. “It is called on the back of the binding ‘Pedigree of the Saxon Kings’” (p. 25). Milner explains that in this manuscript, “Frea, the wife of Odin, figures apparently as the daughter of Cadwallader, son of [early British] King Lucius, himself descended from Anna. Should this mean that she—Frea—was a daughter of that house, it follows that, *through their mother*, all the lines of Odin come from David. It is a fact, recorded by several early church historians, that Lucius left his kingly throne in Britain and became the evangelist of Switzerland and Bavaria. Frea might well have been his daughter or grand-daughter, settled in Central Europe, at the epoch of Odin's historic march into the West” (p. 35).

We should also consider the possibility that the line of David became intertwined with the Zerah line at an even earlier point, as ancient Armenia's rulers claimed descent from David and Solomon (see Appendix 4: “The Colchis Connection”).

In any event, it is entirely possible that not only from Zerah but even from David have the various royal families of Europe descended. Indeed, it would seem to be true anyway due to the intermarriage that we know took place in later ages between the British royal family and the royalty of other European nations. This is quite remarkable. It would even seem to give new insight to God's punishment upon David for his great sin against God—wherein he committed adultery and murder (2 Samuel 11). God told him: “Now therefore, the sword shall never depart from your house” (12:10). Certainly this was true in David's own lifetime. But it has also been true in the ages since. Europe has been wracked by war for centuries, its kings battling against each other over every reason imaginable—and these kings, we now learn, are all of the house of David. What a sad footnote to include in our picture of the glorious legacy of David's throne. It should serve as a warning of the devastating and often long-lasting consequences of sin.

Finally, then, we have seen elsewhere how the Davidic line of Solomon (of Perez) was, in the days of Jeremiah, fused with Milesian royal line of Calcol (of Zerah). Now we see that the Davidic line of *Nathan* (of Perez) was, in the days of Joseph of Arimathea, very possibly fused with the line of the early British kings descended from Brutus, himself of the Trojan royal house of Darda (of Zerah). The Davidic lineage of Nathan was, it seems, *doubly* fused with the line of Zerah at the time of Odin. Finally, all these strands later became intertwined through a vast sea of intermarriages. Indeed, the lines had fused long before the dominant throne of David's line was transferred from Scotland to Ireland.

Thus, it would appear that Queen Elizabeth and her family are many times over the descendants of Solomon and Nathan. But in the end, at the return of Jesus Christ, the Solomonic element in the throne will terminate. Solomon's line will no longer be perpetuated. Rather, Jesus Christ, born of the line of Nathan and not of Solomon, will sit on the throne thereafter—to reign in glory forever and ever. The human corruption and infighting that has plagued David's house will at long last be over. For Jesus Christ will enforce peace throughout all nations. What a wonderful world awaits.

## Appendix 12: The Attempt to Destroy David's Lineage

Jesus had other family members who were also of the line of David. For instance, Matthew 13:55-56 mentions four brothers (James, Joseph, Simon and Jude) and sisters. Jesus also had other relatives of Davidic lineage (see Appendix 11: "Joseph of Arimathea and the Line of Nathan.") Indeed, there were certainly many known descendants of David living in Judea in Christ's day.

Of two of Christ's brothers, Joseph and Simon, nothing further is known. James and Jude, however, are known to have become Christian apostles. They wrote the biblical books of James and Jude. James, pastor of the Jerusalem Church, was martyred—according to the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, this occurred in A.D. 62. It is not known what happened to Jude, although two of his grandsons reportedly lived in Judea at the end of the first century.

The following is quoted from the fourth-century church historian Eusebius (*The History of the Church*, Book 3, secs. 19-20):

The same emperor [Domitian, A.D. 81-96] ordered the execution of all who were of David's line, and there is an old and firm tradition that a group of heretics accused the descendants of Jude—the brother, humanly speaking, of the Saviour—on the grounds that they were of David's line and related to Christ Himself. This is stated by [the second-century church father] Hegesippus in so many words:

And there still survived of the Lord's family the grandsons of Jude, who was said to be His brother, humanly speaking. These were informed against as being of David's line, and brought . . . before Domitian Caesar, who was as afraid of the advent [coming] of Christ as Herod had been. Domitian asked them whether they were descended from David, and they admitted it. Then he asked them what property they owned and what funds they had at their disposal. They replied that they had only 9,000 denarii [a denarius being a day's wages, thus around \$300,000 total in today's money] between them, half belonging to each; this, they said, was not available in cash, but was the estimated value of only twenty-five acres of land, from which they raised the money to pay their taxes and the wherewithal to support themselves by their own toil.

Then, the writer continues, they showed him their hands, putting forward as proof of their toil the hardness of their bodies and the calluses impressed on their hands by incessant labour. When asked about Christ and His Kingdom—what it was like, and where and when it would appear—they explained that it was not of this world or anywhere on earth but angelic and [now] in heaven, and would be established at the end of the world, when he would come in glory to judge the quick and the dead and give every man payment according to his conduct. On hearing this, Domitian found no fault with them, but despising them as beneath his notice let them go free and issued orders terminating the persecution of the Church [at Jerusalem]. On their release they became leaders of the churches, both because they had borne testimony and because they were of the Lord's family; and thanks to the establishment of peace they lived on into [Emperor] Trajan's time.

We can imagine that many of David's descendants had been killed before the hunt was called off—including many descendants of those in Christ's immediate family. Yet some may have escaped, finding refuge in outlying areas of the Empire, including faraway Britain.

## Appendix 13: The Nobility—Also Jewish

We have elsewhere seen that the royalty of Europe is descended from Judah's son Zerah, in accordance with the prophecy that the scepter would not depart from Judah (Genesis 49:10). Indeed, the royal house of Britain is a fusion of the lines of Zerah and Judah's other son Perez through his descendant King David. Because of intermarriage, the other royal houses of Europe are Davidic as well.

Yet it might be considered that the Jewish element in these royal houses, including Britain's, has been "bred out," so to speak, through thousands of years of intermarriage with non-Jewish nobility and commoners—leaving almost no genetic trace of Jewish heritage. This would mean that these royal families are, practically speaking, not really Jewish at all.

But we should consider several points here. First of all, through long ages royalty and nobility *rarely* intermarried with commoners, as any lengthy study into the matter will reveal. Next, we must understand the nature of nobility or aristocracy. Who *are* the nobility? By far their most common origin is simply the extended family of royalty. This alone should help us to see that the royal bloodlines have not been bred out but, rather, reinforced time and again ad infinitum.

The other origin involves descent from the landed gentry—that is, landowners of the remote past. How did the forebears of these families come by their land? We should not think of the pioneers of America staking claims on the frontier. Rather, land in the Old World was either granted by the king or it was conquered and taken. In the first case, it normally involved people who were already of some social status—perhaps because of friendship with the king, likely due to military support. Yet it was usually those who were already members of a warrior "class" who were trained as fighters. And those who were able to *conquer* land were thus, in essence, also of this warrior class. It was a rare commoner indeed who could take land and build an estate.

### Scottus nobilis

Surprisingly, even in the granting of land there was a large pool of people of Jewish descent to draw from. Consider that the Milesian Scots who took over Ireland from the Tuatha de Danaan (the tribe of Dan) were largely of Jewish extraction, many having descended from Zerah. Irish historian Thomas Moore writes: "It is indeed evident that those persons to whom St. Patrick [A.D. 400s] applies the name Scots, were all of the high and dominant class; whereas, when speaking of the great bulk of the people, he calls them *Hiberionaces*—from the name *Hiberione*, which is always applied by him to the island itself" (1837, Vol. 1, p. 72).

Dr. James Wylie explained: "The Scots are the military class; they are the nobles . . . The latter [the Hiberni] are spoken of as the commonality, the sons of the soil" (*History of the Scottish Nation*, 1886, p. 281). Wylie also adds: "St. Patrick often uses Scoti and Reguli [princes] as equivalent terms. To the term *Scottus* he adds often the word *Nobilis*; whereas he has no other appellation for the native Irish but *Hyberione*, or *Hyberni genae*, the common people" (p. 282 footnote). While the common people of Ireland were simply Hiberni or Hebrews—the tribe of Dan—the early Scot overlords were Jewish. And it was this Jewish aristocracy with whom the Irish royalty intermarried.

The Scottish Uí Nialls or O'Neills of Ulster, through whom the high kingship was transferred to Scotland shortly after Patrick's time, were heavily Jewish—having as their symbol the red hand of Zerah. Thus, the later nobility of Scotland was also largely Jewish.

What about the early British line of Brutus of Troy? He supposedly divided the island of Britain between his three sons (see Appendix 5: "Brutus and the Covenant Land"). Whatever the line of royal succession might actually have been, it seems likely that the line of Brutus was heavily diffused throughout early Celtic British nobility over the course of 1,500 years before the Anglo-Saxons arrived.

## Jews among the Scythians

Speaking, in turn, of the Anglo-Saxons, just who made up *their* nobility? As our booklet *The United States and Britain in Bible Prophecy* explains, the Anglo-Saxons and other Teutonic lines of Scandinavia and the rest of northern Europe—all of Scythian extraction—may be traced back to the Israelites who were taken into captivity by the Assyrians in the late 700s B.C. Israel's northern capital, Samaria, was conquered by the Assyrians around 722 B.C.

However, an important fact often overlooked is that the Assyrians also deported many people of the southern kingdom of *Judah*. The Bible records that two decades after the fall of Samaria, during the reign of Judah's king Hezekiah, the Assyrian emperor Sennacherib invaded the Jewish nation. Notice these words of Sennacherib, inscribed on his famous hexagonal clay prism: "But as for Hezekiah, the Jew, who did not bow in submission to my yoke, forty-six of his strong walled towns and innumerable smaller villages in their neighborhood I besieged and conquered . . . I made to come out from them 200,150 people, young and old, male and female . . . and counted them as the spoils of war" ("*Sennacherib's Prism*," *Eerdmans Handbook to the Bible*, 1983, p. 280).

Judah was a nation of Judahites (Jews), Benjamites and Levites. Thus it appears that a large number of these tribal groups were added to the captivity of the northern Israelites—who were at this time located in Assyria and Armenia in the west and Media and Persia in the east. It seems likely that the Jewish captives were taken to these same areas.

Author Stephen Collins notes: "When describing the Sacae Scythian tribes who migrated out of Asia in the second century B.C. [previously captive Israelites—descendants of Isaac], George Rawlinson notes that the greatest tribe, the Massagetae, was also named the 'great Jits, or Jats' ['Jats,' *The Sixth Oriental Monarchy*, 1872, Vol. 11, p. 357] . . . The term 'Jat' has survived as a caste-name in Northwest India [which bordered Persia and Parthia] into modern times, attesting to the ancient dominance of the Jats in that region" (*The "Lost" Tribes of Israel . . . Found*, 1992, 1995, p. 343).

This name could conceivably be a contraction of Judahite (Hebrew *Yehudi*, which perhaps became *Jehuti* (we'll see more about phonetic shift in language in a moment). However, it should be pointed out that "Jat" designates the peasant caste of northern India and Pakistan ("Jat," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Micropaedia, 1985, Vol. 6, p. 510). Yet that could be because the Jews came to the area as slaves. Or, perhaps more likely, because later conquerors subjugated the Jats and made themselves the upper caste.

Jat may even have initially meant highborn. In a separate article, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states: "Jati, also spelled jat, in India, a Hindu caste. The term is derived from the Sanskrit jata, 'born' or 'brought into existence,' and indicates a form of existence determined by birth. In Indian philosophy *jati* (genus) describes any group of things that have generic characteristics in common. Sociologically, *jati* has come to be used universally to indicate a caste group [in general] within Hindu society" ("Jati," p. 511). Perhaps the notion of Jews as nobility is where the concept of Jat as applied to birth and caste actually began.

It is possible that these people were related to a group known as the Yueh-chih. Says the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: "Yueh-chih, also called Indo-Scyths, ancient people who ruled in Bactria (now Afghanistan) and India from c. 128 BC to c. AD 450. The Yueh-chih are first mentioned in Chinese sources at the beginning of the 2nd century BC as nomads living in . . . northwest China . . . They and related tribes are the Asi (or Asiani) and Tocharians (Tochari) of Western sources" ("Yueh-chih," Vol. 12, p. 869). And the Asi may well be the Aser of the Norse sagas (again, see Appendix 10: "The Family of Odin").

In the same article the *Britannica* says: "The Hephthalites . . . [were] originally a Yueh-chih tribe." They were also known as the "White Huns" and their names are sometimes given as "Nephthalites" (compare "Ephthalites, or White Huns," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Edition, on-line at [89.1911encyclopedia.org/E/EP/EPHTHALITES.htm](http://89.1911encyclopedia.org/E/EP/EPHTHALITES.htm))—likely, as Collins points out, a derivation of the Israelite tribe of Naphtali (p. 237). If the name Yueh-chih perhaps derives from Judah or Yehudah, then the description of Naphtali as a Yueh-chih tribe could possibly indicate that the Jews were dispersed throughout the other tribes as leaders in their migrations.

## The Jutes

Collins sees a connection between the Jats and the Jutes of Europe (p. 343), and one may well exist—particularly when we realize that a Norse equivalent for the Scythian names Geat or Goth was Jat (see the *Edda* genealogy in Appendix 10: “The Family of Odin”). But who were the Jutes? They were a tribe of people who gave their name to Jutland, the mainland peninsula of Denmark.

Furthermore, though we often think of the Angles and Saxons who settled in Britain and became the English, it is more correct to say that Britain was invaded in the fifth through seventh centuries by the Angles, Saxons and Jutes: “Most of the country was conquered by these Teutons, of whom the principle tribes were the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, who finally fused into one people, under the name of Anglo-Saxons, or *Angles* or *English*, while that portion of Britain in which they made their home was called *England*” (Gene Gurney, *Kingdoms of Europe: An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Ruling Monarchs from Ancient Times to the Present*, 1982, p. 129).

In fact, the Jutes actually arrived first! “The first of these Teutonic kingdoms was founded in Kent. A despairing British chieftain or king, Vortigern . . . to save his people from their northern foes . . . invited the Teutons to come to his aid. Two well-known Jutish Vikings, Hengist and Horsa, accepted the invitation with their followers, and in the year 449 landed on the island of Thanet, the southeastern extremity of the England . . . Eric, a son of Hengist, was, in 457, formally crowned king of Kent, that is, of England’s southeastern coast. He was the first of her Teutonic kings” (p. 129).

Now the critical question: Could the name Jute—and perhaps Jat—be related to Judah? Notice the following from a linguistics textbook: “The German linguist Jakob Grimm (of fairy-tale fame) . . . published a four-volume treatise (1819-1822) that specified the regular sound correspondences among Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and the Germanic languages. It was not only the similarities that intrigued Grimm and other linguists, but the systematic nature of the differences . . . Grimm pointed out that certain phonological changes that did not take place in Sanskrit, Greek, or Latin must have occurred early in the history of the Germanic languages. Because the changes were so strikingly regular, they became known as ‘Grimm’s Law’ . . . [one example of which is] d → t . . . voiced stops become voiceless” (Victoria Fromkin and Robert Rodman, *An Introduction to Language, Fourth Edition*, 1988, p. 315).

Thus, the people who were later known as the *Juten* or *Yuten* (as J is pronounced Y in German and Scandinavian languages) would originally have been known as the *Juden* or *Yuden*. With the Hebrew plural this would be *Judim* or *Yudim*—*J’hudim* or *Y’hudim* being the actual Hebrew for Jews. Indeed, *Juden* is the German word for Jews.

Hengist and Horsa, then, were leaders of Jutes who were likely Jews. As this Jutish population expanded in southern England, it took over more and more land—the Jutes thus becoming nobles. Indeed, their early arrival ensured that they were the longest established noble families of the Anglo-Saxon population. Furthermore, Hengist and Horsa are traced in descent from Woden or Odin, making them royal descendants of Zerah and perhaps even David (see Appendix 9: “The Family of Odin” and 10: “Joseph of Arimathea and the Line of Nathan”). The same is true of the kings of the Angles and Saxons who soon followed.

In the 800s, Danish Vikings took over the western half of England before the Anglo-Saxons repelled them. And the Danes later ruled England from 1013-1042 before it came back under Saxon sovereignty. In both instances, Danish nobility was mixed with the local Anglo-Saxon nobility. But consider that the Danish rulers were descendants from Odin—and the Danes themselves came from Jutland, thus likely ensuring that many of their nobles were of Jutish (and therefore probably Jewish) descent. This would be parallel with Ireland, where the common people were the tribe of Dan but the nobility were the Milesian Scots, who were Jews. In Denmark, the common people were again the tribe of Dan but the nobility were in all likelihood Jutes who were, yet again, Jews.

## The Norman Conquest

Then came the pivotal Battle of Hastings in 1066, which began the Norman Conquest of England under William the Conqueror. “The major change,” says the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, “was the subordination of England to a Norman aristocracy. William distributed estates to his followers

[barons from Normandy] on a piecemeal basis as the lands were conquered” (“United Kingdom,” *Macropaedia*, Vol. 29, p. 33).

Historian Michael Wood writes: “The redistribution of land after the Norman Conquest has been called a tenurial revolution of the most far-reaching kind and a catastrophe for the higher orders of English society from which they never recovered. The record of *Domesday Book*, completed only twenty years after Hastings, shows that though some Englishmen still held considerable estates, very few held any position of influence. It has been estimated that only eight per cent of the land was still held by English thegns in 1086” (*In Search of the Dark Ages*, 1987, p. 233).

In fact, Wood says that much of the former English nobility left the country: “There is much evidence for a widespread emigration of Englishmen into other countries, into Denmark, into Scotland and, most remarkably of all, to Greece and the Byzantine empire where there is good contemporary evidence that large numbers of Englishmen took service with the emperor in Constantinople in the generation following Hastings” (p. 233). It is *truly* remarkable for it enabled nobility of Jewish heritage to be even further diffused throughout Europe—so as to intermarry with the various royal houses and, ironically, reinforce the Jewish bloodline of the British throne when these other European lineages were later blended with it.

But what of the new Norman nobility of England? Just who were the Normans? As before, Danish Vikings—thus likely led by a Jutish (probably Jewish) warrior class or nobility. Yet not quite as before, for *these* Vikings had settled in *northern France* in the 800s. In 911, the Frankish king Charles ceded land to them in return for their loyalty and protection against other Viking incursions—naming their chief Rollo a duke. “His Vikings melded into the local culture much more rapidly than in England. They took local women as wives and concubines and watched their children grow up speaking the Frankish tongue” (*TimeFrame AD 800-1000: Fury of the Northmen*, Time-Life Books, 1988, p. 38).

The Norman nobility in France intermarried with the French nobility. Yet who were *they*? The Sicambrians or Franks (who gave their name to France) were part of the Teutonic invasion of Europe, which followed on the heels of the Celtic ingress. On page 611 of James Anderson’s *Royal Genealogies or the Genealogical Tables of Emperors, Kings, and Princes, from Adam to These Times* is a table of “The Sicambrian Kings” beginning with “Antenor, of the House of Troy, King of the Cimmerians, 443 B.C.” (see also W.M.H. Milner, *The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty*, 1902, 1964, pp. 35-36, 41). So another Jewish line of descent from Troy!

The Frankish nobility was blended with the Gaulish nobility from Celtic times. Indeed, this nobility likely had its origins in both Cimmerian Israelites migrating west across Turkey and into Europe as well as the Milesians who had founded the early colonies of southern France. These latter, at least, were apparently predominantly Jewish. The Gauls had intermarried with the noble Romans when Rome took over the area. Of course, Roman nobility traced its descent from Aeneas of the house of Troy—and thus from yet another Jewish line.

So the nobility of France was, very likely, predominantly Jewish. It intermarried with the Norman nobility, which was likely of Jutish and thus probably Jewish heritage. Indeed, the Norman chiefs were almost certainly Jewish, being descended from Odin of the line of Troy. And the Normans became the new nobility of England—intermarrying with the remnants of a prior Jewish nobility. These finally intermarried with Welsh nobility, which was also Jewish, having descended from Brutus. When, at last, the primary Davidic line from Scotland was brought down into England, it intermarried with this nobility—many of whose members were already even of other Davidic heritage.

Of course, this is not to say that the nobility is wholly Jewish. It almost certainly is not. Still, how incredible it is to realize the lengths to which God has gone to make sure that the royalty of Europe is of Jewish descent—not by some meaningless fraction like one-millionth part Jewish, but rather very *much* Jewish—enough to refer to them collectively as Jews. It is staggering to contemplate the “family planning” God has been engaged in. It truly is an awesome miracle.