

The Throne of Britain: Its Biblical Origin and Future - Part 3

 sightedmoon.com/sightedmoon_2015/

By Joseph F. Dumond

January 1, 2010

~part 14 of 23~ 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 Zerah and thereby perpetuate the throne of David.

~part 15 of 23~ 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 Zerah 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.

~part 16 of 23~ 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 relievo [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.”

~part 17 of 23~ 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”**).

~part 18 of 23~ 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 YeremYah, 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.

~part 19 of 23~

Tea-Tephi or Scota?

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

her with other women. Also in favor is that if the other names mentioned were aligned with Jeremiah, she would fall into place as well.

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

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

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

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

On the other hand, it may be that Lughaidh and Ith were actual people and that this Tea was not Zedekiah’s daughter. Perhaps, instead, Lughaidh was synonymous with the earlier mentioned Gathelus who supposedly married a “pharaoh’s daughter” named Scota in the Irish and Scottish histories. She may well have been Zedekiah’s daughter, as some contend. Gathelus and Scota, in certain accounts, never made it to Ireland. And in this scenario, TeaTephi, 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"**).

To Continue #4 The Throne of Britain:Its Biblical Origin and Future