

**Tribes of Israel Series**

# **The British Royalty, Tea Tephi and the British-Israelite Truth**

**By Craig M. White  
Version 1.4**





## ***The British Royalty, Tea Tephi and the British-Israelite Truth***

Authored by Craig Martin White. Copyright © Craig Martin White, GPO Box 864, Sydney, Australia 2001. All Rights Reserved.

This work is promoted through *History Research Foundation (USA)*, *History Research Projects (Australia)* and *Friends of the Sabbath (Australia)*  
[www.friendsofsabbath.org](http://www.friendsofsabbath.org)

No part of this work may be edited. It may be freely shared as part of research, projects or for educational purposes so long as quotes are properly cited.

Graphics are taken from the internet where they were made freely available.

### **History Research Projects**

GPO Box 864, Sydney, Australia 2001

[www.originofnations.org](http://www.originofnations.org)

[www.friendsofsabbath.org](http://www.friendsofsabbath.org)

No limitation is placed upon reproduction of this document except that it must be reproduced in its entirety without modification or deletions. The publisher's name and address, copyright notice and this message must be included. It may be freely distributed but must be distributed without charge to the recipient.

Our purpose and desire are to foster Biblical, historical and related studies that strengthen the Church of God's message & mission and provides further support to its traditional doctrinal positions.

## Contents

<b>Related &amp; Recommended Readings .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introductory Comments.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>British-Israelism and the Davidic Descent of the British Royalty.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Biblical Foundation for the Claim.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Descendants of David alive today .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Ezekiel 17:22 and Duality.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>The Legend of Tea Tephi and Jeremiah's Mission.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Usage of the Hebrew <i>Rak</i> .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Concluding Remarks .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix. Extract from <i>The United States and Britain in Prophecy</i> by Herbert W Armstrong (1980 edition) .....</b>	<b>18</b>

## Related & Recommended Readings

- *England, the Remnant of Judah and the Israel of Ephraim* by Frederick R. A. Glover.
- *Jeremiah in Ireland. Fact of Fabrication?* by John D. Keyser.
- *Jeremiah in Ireland. Proof from the Bible and the Irish Annals* by John E. Wall.
- *Joseph of Arimathea and David's Throne In Britain!* by John D. Keyser.
- [\*Notes on the Bible and Genetics\*](#) (chapter 3) by Craig M. White.
- [\*The Fulfillments of Genesis 49\*](#) by Craig M. White.
- [\*The Throne of Britain. Its Biblical Origin and Future\*](#) by Tom Robinson.

## **Executive Summary**

This paper advocates for the doctrine of British-Israelism, which asserts that the peoples of Britain, Northwest Europe, and their descendants are the direct heirs of the ancient Ten 'Lost' Tribes of Israel. A fundamental aspect of this belief is the assertion that the British royal family is in direct descent of King David, thereby fulfilling Biblical promises of a lasting Davidic throne until the return of Christ.

I will address the enduring criticisms of this doctrine, particularly the interpretation of Ezekiel 17:22 (the "tender twig" prophecy) and the related Tea Tephi legend, which posits that a daughter of Judah's last king, Zedekiah, was brought to Ireland by the prophet Jeremiah, thereby preserving the royal lineage through marriages that ultimately led to the British monarchy.

My focus is on a hierarchical method of researching national identities, and I also advocate for prophetic duality, which can be applied to Ezekiel 17:22 in relation to both the Messiah (Christ) and historically to the British royalty as a type or partial fulfillment.

The paper explores Biblical foundations, historical legends from Irish annals, and a linguistic analysis of Hebrew terms such as "rak" (tender), illustrating that such prophecies can pertain to others without negating their ultimate Messianic fulfillment. This author concludes that while the Tea Tephi narrative is not definitive proof, it is consistent with broader evidence that supports British-Israelism, and he urges British-Israelites to refine or enhance their arguments in response to critics.

“Thus says the Lord GOD: “I myself will take a sprig from the lofty top of the cedar and will set it out. I will break off from the topmost of its young twigs a tender one [*rak*], and I myself will plant it on a high and lofty mountain.” (Ezekiel 17:22, ESV)

## Introductory Comments

Over the decades I have read dozens and dozens of works (books, papers, articles) critical of the British-Israel truth. I still have those items and so am very much aware of the arguments against this doctrine. Of course, critics can find errors in the doctrine here and there, but by no means does that affect or negate the entire teaching. I have always read counter-arguments to my beliefs so that I can understand the other viewpoint and with their critique, find any holes in one’s positions that need attention and fixing.

I am of the view that we should learn from our critics (even if they do not learn from us) and fix up any errors; filling in any gaps; making corrections to solidify and improve the teaching. Many of the criticisms that I have read about since the mid-1970s (that is, over 50 years ago) are related to the duality interpretation of the ‘tender one’ of Ezekiel 17:22 and the associated Tea Tephí tradition; 3 overthrows or movements of the throne; timing of the blessings of Genesis 49; Stone of Scone; Christ’s visit to Britain; the 12 Apostles sent to the ‘lost’ House of Israel outside of Palestine (which would include any scattered remnants of Judah); Scottish claim to have come out of Scythia; an Irish emblem said to be derived from David’s harp and more recently issues related to DNA links supposedly disproving the Israel identity teaching (addressed in [Notes on the Bible and Genetics](#), chapter 3)<sup>1</sup>

Critics claim that none of this is true: that the British are not of ancient Israel; nor are the various elements which purportedly prove the throne’s continuity from David, making the British monarch “regent upon the Throne of David” until Christ’s return.<sup>2</sup>

As this author has pointed out from time immemorial, there is so much duality in Scripture that sometimes one can read over or cherry pick which ones to ignore. That includes the “tender twig” prophecy. Its fulfilment is not only in Christ’s ultimate and glorious return as King and Warrior, but also in the British Royalty, direct genetic descendants of King David.

Ignoring how all these British-Israelite positions and the prophecies and blessings dovetail into prophetic fulfillment and maintaining that they have no worth, is due to simply waiving away

---

<sup>1</sup> It was only in early 2025 that I came across a *YouTube* channel *Eli from Russia*. It was there that I was introduced to the Udmurts – an ethnic group that look a lot like Scots, though some are modified via mixing. I wrote about this in the article “Who are the Red-Haired Peoples of Russia?” *Origin of Nations* newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 4 (5 June 2025) and incorporated this information and more into *The True Roots and Origins of the Scots* paper (Appendix. *Who are the Red-Haired Peoples of Russia?*)

<sup>2</sup> Amongst the arguments by mainstream historians and Biblical scholars, who regard British-Israelism as pseudohistory, is the false claim that there are no ancient sources which mention Tea Tephí; the Stone of Scone is geologically local Scottish sandstone, not Middle Eastern, ignoring that the same sandstone is extant in the Palestine area; Davidic promises are interpreted spiritually (fulfilled in Christ) or conditionally and not dual, which includes the British throne. And that genetic, linguistic, and archaeological data show no Israelite migration to Britain. Perhaps they are blinded to or ignorant of the original racial stock in parts of the Middle East and also language shifts. They believe that the “lost tribes” assimilated in or rejoined Judah, misunderstanding New Testament references such as Luke 2:36. In the end, they view British-Israelism as false because the theory (in their opinion) relies on claims based on legendary genealogies and selective Biblical interpretation without corroboration. They are misled and misunderstand the arguments. Yet, perhaps we can do a better job at explaining and proving it. Unlike the British-Israel movement of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early twentieth centuries, the movement today has very few people with doctorates, professors, military leaders, aristocrats and such like. The few that do believe it would be too fearful to let it be known.

proofs and legends which are otherwise used to support beliefs from other ethnic groups and are accepted. Some, who believe the overall thesis, begin to not believe in one point or position after another and gradually will come to the point that they give up on this vital truth completely. There are all sorts of excuses such as 'it is not important for salvation' and so forth.

Of course, the Tea Tephi legend and the Stone of Destiny (discussed in chapter 3 of *Who are the Scots?*) are based on history and are not *critical* elements to the doctrine although there is enough proof for them. Their relative importance is minor and to address legends as minor proof, this author has always emphasised the following hierarchy in researching national identities:

1. Biblical descriptions and histories of peoples.
2. Bible prophecies and national characteristics (eg Genesis 10) which match given nations today.
3. Tribal names and following the migrations of peoples over centuries.
4. Physical anthropology and human biology.
5. National symbols.
6. And *lastly*, legends, traditions and mythology.

This is the order to research national origins and to come to an educated outcome or decision. That is how I collated and expressed the data in *In Search of ... the Origin of Nations* and *The Great German Nation*. This disciplined approach resulted in correcting what I believe to be errors in certain articles and resulted in core accuracy. Information for these books' contents are continuing to be collected which will continue to result in updated and expanded papers and books.

Legends etc are used to support the overall argument and add additional interesting stories and national historical knowledge that lends to providing corroboration to an existing truth. It is not proof or validation in itself but helps with certifying the larger, more important body of proofs. Well, that is how I see it given my research over the decades – a hierarchy of importance when studying tribal and national origins as found in Genesis 10 and 49.

But weaknesses in an argument on any doctrine does not negate the given doctrine. Internal critics such as John Keyser (*Jeremiah in Ireland. Fact of Fabrication?* and *Joseph of Arimathea and David's Throne In Britain!*) should be read, analysed and lead to review and improvement. Advocates such as Tom Robinson (*The Throne of Britain. Its Biblical Origin and Future*) has value added to the claim of British Royal Davidic lineage and the Tea Tephi belief.

So, when fronted with issues such as this, I ask myself several questions and try and answer them and respond thereby to the issue at hand. In regard to the matter at hand:

- Is the word *rak* used exclusively in relation to men in the Bible?
- How is it used outside of the Bible?
- Is there no proof at all for the Tea Tephi legend?
- Could male royals have found their way to Ireland and married into the previously established Royal line in Ireland?

Let us now proceed with handling this issue – seeking whether the “tender one” prophecy is dual and if the Tea Tephi legend is plausible.

## **British-Israelism and the Davidic Descent of the British Royalty**

As a quick outline to those who have little knowledge about the subject, British-Israelism (also known as Anglo-Israelism) is a belief that can be traced back centuries but began to accelerate in prominence during the 19<sup>th</sup> century and peaked around the 1920s. It asserts that the peoples of Britain and North-west Europe (and their genetic descendants around the world) are the literal descendants of the ancient Ten 'Lost' Tribes of Israel. A key subset of this doctrine claims that the British royal family descends directly from King David through the Judahite line, preserving the Davidic throne as promised in the Bible (e.g., II Samuel 7:12-16; Jeremiah 33:17-22). The arguments of the proposers to this doctrine is that it fulfills God's covenant that David's throne would endure forever, culminating in the return of Christ to rule from it. These prophecies, like so many others, are in effect, dual.

The prophecy in Ezekiel 17:22-24 describes God taking a tender sprig from the top of a cedar and planting it on a high mountain, where it grows into a majestic tree providing shelter for birds of every kind, symbolising restoration and protection over the lowly. This imagery has been interpreted by scholars as having Messianic implications, pointing to a future Davidic ruler, with many Christian commentators seeing an ultimate fulfillment in Jesus Christ while allowing for historical applications in the Davidic line, such as through Zerubbabel during the post-exilic restoration. Those attempting to argue against British-Israelism use this argument constantly.

### **Biblical Foundation for the Claim**

Those adherents who identify the British Royalty with the line of David, emphasise God's unconditional promise to David: "And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me. Your throne shall be established forever." (II Samuel 7:16, ESV). Believers interpret Ezekiel 21:26-27 ("... thus says the Lord GOD: Remove the turban and take off the crown. Things shall not remain as they are. Exalt that which is low, and bring low that which is exalted. A ruin, ruin, ruin I will make it. This also shall not be, until he comes, the one to whom judgment belongs, and I will give it to him.") as three transfers of the throne: from Palestine to Ireland, Ireland to Scotland, and Scotland to England.

In addition, adherents also cite:

"Behold, the days are coming, declares the LORD, when I will fulfill the promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah.

In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous Branch to spring up for David, and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land.

In those days Judah will be saved, and Jerusalem will dwell securely. And this is the name by which it will be called: 'The LORD is our righteousness.'

**"For thus says the LORD: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, [cp II Samuel 7:16]**

**and the Levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence** to offer burnt offerings, to burn grain offerings, and to make sacrifices forever." (Jeremiah 33:14-18, ESV. Cp. Vv. 20-21, 35-36)

There are many different and opposing opinions by commentators on the interpretation. For example Albert Barnes' *Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Bible* online:

"Jeremiah 33:17-18

Read literally, these verses promise the permanent restoration of the Davidic throne and of the Levitical priesthood. As a matter of fact Zedekiah was the last king of David's line, and the Levitical priest-hood has long passed away. Both these changes Jeremiah himself foretold Jer 22:30; Jer 3:16. In what way then is this apparent contradiction (compare Isa 66:20-23; Ezek. 40-48) to be explained? The solution is probably as follows. It was necessary that the Bible should be intelligible to the people at the time when it was written, and in some degree to the writer. **The Davidic kingship and the Levitical priest-hood were symbols, which represented to the Jew all that was most dear to his heart in the state of things under which he lived. Their restoration was the restoration of his national and spiritual life.** Neither was so restored as to exist permanently. But that was given instead, of which both were types, the Church, whose Head is the true prophet, priest and King." [emphasis mine]<sup>3</sup>

*The Pulpit Commentary* online (Joseph Exell, et al, eds):

**"David shall never want a man,** etc. This is, in fact, a republication of the promise given by Nathan in 2Sa 7:12-16. It agrees in form with the announcements in 1Ki 2:4; 1Ki 8:25; 1Ki 9:5."

With regard to Ezekiel 17:22, below are the views of some commentaries.

John Gill's *Exposition of the Old and New Testaments* online is on to something:

"I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one; and **by the "top" and "young twigs" of the highest branch of the cedar, or of the chief tribe in Israel, are meant the house and family of David, the royal family, and the descendants of it, the chief of the tribe of Judah; and by the "tender one" is designed the Messiah;** and so Jarchi interprets it; and which interpretation is mentioned by Kimchi, though *he would have Zerubbabel intended;* and owns it to be the sense of the Targum ..." [emphasis mine]

Carl Keil & Franz Delitzsch's *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*:

"The formula **לֹא יִקָּרַת לָא** וגו', "there never will be cut off from David one sitting," etc., has the meaning, David will never want a descendant to occupy his throne; or, the posterity of David will possess the kingdom for ever. **A temporary loss of the throne is not thereby excluded, but only such a permanent loss as would be caused by the family of David becoming extinct,** or by the kingdom in Israel either passing over to some other family, or in some way or other coming to an end; see on 1Ki 2:4. - The very same promise is given to the

---

<sup>3</sup> "Yahweh goes on to affirm a matching undertaking about the Levites that takes up the formulation of the Davidic promise. Once again, *there will not be cut off*. Both undertakings related to the Jerusalem focus introduced from the reworked promise in vv.15-16 - that is, Jerusalem will know the rule of David and the ministry of the Levites. So Jeremiah is not only confirming the promise about David in 1 Kings, he is also providing the Levites with a matching promise" (John Goldingay, *The Book of Jeremiah. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*, p. 698). And "Another argument similar to 31:36 is offered to prove the reliability and permanence of Yahweh's promises. The regular succession of day and night was established at creation (Gen. 1:5; 8:22). It was part of the nature of things. It is here described as Yahweh's *covenant (berit)* with day and night which could never be *broken*. If this were broken so that day and night did not function at the proper time, then one could expect Yahweh's covenant with his servant David and with the Levitical priests to fail. But the thought was absurd. David's son would sit on the throne, and the Levitical priests would *serve (seret)* Yahweh" (John Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*, p. 603).

Levitical priests, i.e., the priests of the tribe or family of Levi (לֵוִיִּים as in Deu 17:9, Deu 17:18; Deu 18:1, etc.).” [emphasis mine]

And

“The cedar, which it designated by the epithet *râmâh*, as rising above the other trees, is the royal house of David, and the tender shoot which Jehovah breaks off and plants is not the Messianic kingdom or sovereignty, so that **Zerubbabel could be included**, but the Messiah Himself as “a distinct historical personage” (Hävernîck). The predicate רך, tender, refers to Him; also the word יונק, a sprout (Isaiah 53:2), which indicates not so much the youthful age of the Messiah (Hitzig) as the lowliness of His origin (compare Isaiah 11:1; Isaiah 53:2); and even when applied to David and Solomon, in 2 Samuel 3:39; 1 Chronicles 22:5; 1 Chronicles 29:1, expresses not their youthfulness, but their want of strength for the proper administration of such a government. The high mountain, described in Ezekiel 17:23 as the high mountain of Israel, is Zion, regarded as the seat and centre of the kingdom of God, which is to be exalted by the Messiah above all the mountains of the earth (Isaiah 2:2, etc.). The twig planted by the Lord will grow there into a glorious cedar, under which all birds will dwell. The Messiah grows into a cedar in the kingdom founded by Him, in which all the inhabitants of the earth will find both food (from the fruits of the tree) and protection (under its shadow). For this figure, compare Daniel 4:8-9. צפור כל-כנף, birds of every kind of plumage (cf. Ezekiel 39:4, Ezekiel 39:17) ... “ (ibid) [emphasis mine]

Robert Jamieson, Andrew Fausett & David Brown’s *A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Whole Bible* online:

“a tender one—**Zerubbabel** never reigned as a universal (Eze 17:23) king, nor could the great things mentioned here be said of him, **except as a type of Messiah**. Messiah alone can be meant: originally "a tender plant and root out of a dry ground" (Isa 53:2); the beginning of His kingdom being humble, His reputed parents of lowly rank, though King David's lineal representatives; yet, even then, God here calls Him, in respect to His everlasting purpose, "the highest ... of the high" (Ps 89:27).” [emphasis mine]

Joseph Benson’s *Commentary on the Old and New Testaments* online:

“*I will crop off from the young twigs a tender one* — This may fitly be applied to our Saviour, in respect to the low estate to which the family of David was then reduced, and the meanness of Christ’s outward condition and appearance: see Isaiah 53:2.”

Charles Ellicott’s *Commentary for English Readers*:

“**A tender one.**—This epithet is used of the Messiah in reference to the lowliness of His immediate human origin and condition. (Comp. Isaiah 53:2.) David applies the same expression to himself (2Samuel 3:39), and to Solomon (1Chronicles 22:5; 1Chronicles 29:1), in reference to their want of strength for the work required of them as the heads of Israel. This figure of the Messiah as a scion of the royal tree of David, though naturally growing out of the allegory

here, had been used by the prophets long before, as in Isaiah 11:1, and the name “the Branch” had almost become a distinctive title for Him (Isaiah 4:2; Jeremiah 23:5, &c).”<sup>4</sup>

There can be no doubt that the prophecy *ultimately* points to Christ, but does it exclude duality given that so many prophecies are dual? We have seen that Zerubbabel is thought to be a type of the Messiah and thus can be seen in this prophecy – it is therefore considered a dual prophecy by some commentators. But is that all there is to it?

### **Descendants of David alive today**

Some detractors of British-Israelism have maintained that there could be descendants of David alive today among the Jews who do not know who they are.

British-Israelites refer to the Babylonian conquest (c. 587/86 BC) which ended a portion of the male line when Zedekiah's sons were killed (II Kings 25:7). However, proponents note Jeremiah 43:6 mentions "the king's daughters," arguing these survived and continued the line through female inheritance (per Numbers 27:8, where daughters inherit it if there are no sons).

The last king of the Kingdom of Judah when it fell to the Babylonians was Zedekiah (also known as Mattaniah before his inauguration – II Kings 24:17). He reigned from approximately 597 BC to 587/586 BC. Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon appointed him as a vassal king after deposing his nephew Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) following an earlier siege of Jerusalem in 597 BC. Zedekiah later rebelled against Babylon, allying with Egypt, which prompted Nebuchadnezzar to besiege Jerusalem again. The city fell in 587 or 586 BC leading to the destruction of Solomon's Temple, the razing of Jerusalem, and the Babylonian Exile from which most of Judah never returned.

Zedekiah attempted to flee but was captured; his sons were executed before him, he was blinded, and he was taken in chains to Babylon, where he died in captivity (II Kings 25; Jeremiah 39, 52). After this, Judah ceased to exist as an independent kingdom and became a Babylonian province (II Kings 25:22–24; II Chronicles 36; Jeremiah 40:7–12; 41; Ezra 2:1; Nehemiah 7:6).

Note: Zedekiah's daughters did not escape in the sense of avoiding the consequences of Jerusalem's fall; they escaped death or enslavement. Zedekiah had daughters (note "the king's daughters" in Jeremiah 41:10 and 43:6), who were left in Judah after the city's capture and initially under the protection of the Babylonian-appointed governor, Gedaliah at Mizpah.

However, after Gedaliah's assassination, these royal princesses—along with Jeremiah, Baruch, and remnants of the population - were taken to Egypt by fleeing Judeans fearing Babylonian reprisal (Jeremiah 43:5–7). From there history takes over.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> There are others which see the Zerubbabel link such as “The Tender One”, *Moment to Moment Bible Blog*, 1 February 2013 <https://bible-blog.org/2013/02/01/ezekiel-1722-24-the-tender-one/>

<sup>5</sup> Many find this story fascinating, including critics. See for example *From the Egyptian Nile to the Emerald Isle: Exploring the Lost Connections Between Ancient Ireland and Egypt* by the Breton Academy, 8 August 2023. Even these scholars state: “The narrative of an Irish-Egyptian connection, **while dotted with archaeological, mythological, and artistic evidence**, remains an enigma. Both cultures boast rich histories, and the overlaps, whether by coincidence or contact, are undeniably captivating. Yet, while the allure of a deep-rooted bond between Ireland and Egypt persists, concrete evidence is sparse. What’s clear is that the possibility ignites imagination and scholarly curiosity. As with many historical mysteries, **only further research and potential new discoveries will shed definitive light** on the true nature of this connection.” [emphasis mine] See also “Ezekiel 17”, *Beyond Today Bible Commentary*, 12 September 2003 [www.ucg.org/learn/bible-study-tools/bible-commentary/beyond-today-bible-commentary-ezekiel/ezekiel-17](http://www.ucg.org/learn/bible-study-tools/bible-commentary/beyond-today-bible-commentary-ezekiel/ezekiel-17)

British-Israelism traditions claim one or more daughters (often named Tea Tephi or Tamar Tephi) escaped with Jeremiah to Ireland (or elsewhere, dependent upon the legend), preserving the Davidic line through marriage to local kings. No contemporary historian can refute this claim. Modern historians tend to deny ancient traditions and legends from the British Isles, Scandinavia, continental Europe, Asia, the Middle East and elsewhere as if they were all 100% fabrications. Yet so many are true, partially true or based on real, historical events or persons. Their views come from a sense of superiority. There is disdain for the ancient as well as certain nations and many of them are evolutionists, atheists or neo-Marxist of one hue or another.

However, other princes (who were male heirs) of the royal Davidic line remained alive after Zedekiah's sons were executed. Zedekiah's branch of the family ended with the death of his sons (2 Kings 25:7; Jeremiah 52:10), effectively extinguishing direct male succession through him as the last reigning king.

However, the Davidic lineage continued through his nephew Jehoiachin, who had been deposed and exiled to Babylon in 597 BC which was 10 or 11 years before Jerusalem's final fall. See II Kings 25:27–30; I Chronicles 3:17–24 where Jehoiachin had descendants in exile, including his grandson Zerubbabel (I Chronicles 3:17–19), who later became governor of Judah under Persian rule and led efforts to rebuild the Temple (Ezra 3; Haggai 1–2).

This branch preserved the royal Davidic bloodline into the post-exilic period, but did some of the sons of Jehoiachin flee to Egypt and thence to Ireland, or with the tribes of Israel into Europe? No one can prove this postulation, but the promise and the prophecy that the line of David would continue indicates such.

## **Ezekiel 17:22 and Duality**

Critics of the Tea Tephi tradition point out that the verse's Hebrew grammar and context align with a male Messianic figure (cp. Isaiah 11:1,10; Zechariah 6:12). And that is correct. But what of the duality view?

Many writers on Bible prophecy apply Millennial prophecies to the Jews today with little criticism. They are correct in principle – a number of prophecies have been and are being fulfilled as a type of future fulfilment when the Messiah will rule the world. Why not for the royal line? Why should that be exempt from any dual application?

If prophecies dealing with Christ's future role can be applied to royalty, then which royal does it apply to? There is only one main line in an Israelitish nation that is so vast and famous that all others in Europe – while related to them – pale into minor roles. The answer is the British royal line.

Similarly the red heifer sacrifice found in Numbers 19 (a female) is a typology of Christ and thus has a dual application. So why cannot the "tender twig" of Ezekiel 17 be referring to a female as well as to Christ?

This red heifer is widely interpreted as a type of Jesus Christ, despite its female gender! But why a female heifer? It is likely because it emphasises Christ's perfect submission and obedience to the Father (see Luke 22:42), associated with the female animal's symbolic subjection.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Some commentators even connect it to Christ redeeming His "bride" (the Church - Ephesians 5:25-27), with the female heifer symbolising the redeemed.

In Biblical types (e.g., Passover lamb as male typifying Christ), details don't have to have a 100% complement or correspondence. The red heifer's gender seems to highlight humility and purification and thus does not contradict Christ's masculinity.

Another female metaphor is found in Luke 13:34:

“O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you were not willing!” (cp. Matthew 23:37)

Here a female metaphor is used. “But why a female (maternal) metaphor?” one may ask, given that the Bible predominantly uses masculine language for God (e.g., Father, King). Yet, there is the occasion where God uses feminine imagery such as God as a mother in labour (Isaiah 42:14); a nursing mother (Isaiah 49:15); and a comforting mother (Isaiah 66:13).

So, in Luke 13 the imagery evokes a mother hen's nurturing protection as she spreads her wings to shelter her vulnerable chicks from danger, cold, rain, or predators. She thereby provides warmth and safety. Jesus applies this to Himself, expressing his desire to gather and shield the people of Jerusalem similar to a hen - like a mother caring for her young.

Interestingly, academic research supports a dual (or layered) interpretation, where the passage may refer initially to the restoration of the Davidic monarchy in the near term (e.g., through a descendant like Zerubbabel, who led the return from exile and is linked to temple rebuilding in Haggai and Zechariah), but eschatologically points to the Messiah from David's line, culminating in Christ.

For instance, in a detailed scholarly analysis William R. Osborne, “The Early Messianic ‘Afterlife’ of the Tree Metaphor in Ezekiel 17:22-24,” *Tyndale Bulletin*, Vol. 64, No. 2 (2013), pp. 171-188, after examining the “afterlife” of the tree metaphor in Ezekiel 17:22-24 across early Jewish and Christian texts, argues that ancient Near Eastern royal tree imagery underpins the prophecy's association with a restored Davidic kingship (pp. 172-174).

“The Davidic line, once brought low through YHWH's judgement and exile, would eschatologically rise alongside the restored people of God.” (p. 180)

Indeed! And just as the House of Israel migrated to new promised lands in northwest Europe and colonies, so the Israelitish royalty migrated to Britain. The prophecies are dual or multi-layered and apply not only to the Messianic Kingdom where Israel will rule the world under Him and the saints, but also to the ancient and later the end-time (partial) fulfillment of the promises and prophecies.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Here are several commentaries and papers that identify some level of duality in all of this:

Dan Morrison, “The Present Davidic Reign: The Integral Relationship of the Davidic Covenant And the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit,” *Encounter: Journal for Pentecostal Ministry*, Vol. 7 (Summer 2010); Gerard Van Groningen, “Biblical Theology Lecture 18: The Exilic Prophets: Ezekiel & Daniel,” *Covenant Theological Seminary* (transcript from The Gospel Coalition, 2017); Iain M. Duguid, *Commentary on Ezekiel* (from The Gospel Coalition Bible Commentary series). Victor Lonu Budha, “The Davidic Covenant in Ezekiel 34:23–31: Influence of 2 Samuel 7:1–16,” *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, Vol. 4, Issue 3 (2020); Victor Lonu Budha, *The Biblical Concept of the ‘Davidic Covenant’ in 2 Samuel and Ezekiel*, HTS Religion & Society Series Volume 16 (AOSIS Scholarly Books, 2023).

## The Legend of Tea Tephi and Jeremiah's Mission

Central (though not critical or proof) to the royal descent claim is the story of Tea Tephi who was supposed to be a daughter of Zedekiah. British-Israel writers like Rev. Frederick Robert Augustus Glover *England, the Remnant of Judah and the Israel of Ephraim* (1861); John Arthur Goochild's *The Book of Tephi* (1897) which is a collection of ancient Irish traditions<sup>8</sup>; and later John Harden Allen *Judah's Sceptre and Joseph's Birthright* (1902) propose that the prophet Jeremiah escaped Jerusalem's fall with Tea Tephi, his scribe Baruch, and sacred relics. They fled to Egypt, then to Ireland, where Tea Tephi married Eochaidh (Heremon), a high king of the Milesian line (from the tribe of Judah's Zarah branch).<sup>9</sup>

This union transferred the Davidic throne to Ireland's Tara kings, later to Scotland (via Fergus MacErc), and finally to England under James I (uniting crowns). Genealogies in 19th-century works trace the line from Zedekiah through Irish/Scottish kings to modern British monarchs, such as Queen Victoria or Elizabeth II. This movement in three phases or overturns (Ezekiel 21:27) is thus fulfilled:

- First overturn → to Ireland (via Jeremiah and Zedekiah's daughter).
- Second → to Scotland.
- Third → to England/London (British monarchy).

“And you, O profane wicked one, prince of Israel [Zedekiah], whose day has come, the time of your final punishment, thus says the Lord GOD: Remove the turban and take off the crown. Things shall not remain as they are. Exalt that which is low, and bring low that which is exalted.  
A ruin, ruin, ruin I will make it. This also shall not be, until he comes, the one to whom judgment belongs, and I will give it to him.” (Ezekiel 21:25-27, ESV)

The Hebraic expression is *emphasis* because this is a prophetic judgment against the kingdom of Judah and its final king, Zedekiah, during the Babylonian conquest yet the throne would ultimately be occupied by Christ. But what happens in the interim? The triple repetition emphasises complete ruin or overthrow of the Davidic throne in Jerusalem. Yet it does not become desolate which commentators claim. It continued on and they just cannot see this truth.

The Hebrew word 'avvâh (עוֹנָה or *av-vaw'* – see Strong's H5754) is translated as “ruin, ruin, ruin” in some translations but is translated as “overturn, overturn, overturn” in *Young's Literal Translation* and the *King James Version*.

Could duality be applicable to this prophecy as well in similarity to where Cyrus is typological of Christ in Isaiah 41:2-4, 25; 44:28; 45:1-4, 13? This should not be ruled out.

Ernest Martin, PhD (who was not a believer in British-Israelism) shows that three movements are possible. He argues in his article *The Past as Guide to the Future* (1993) that overturns are cyclical historical destructions of Jerusalem/Temple: first Babylonian (587 B.C.), second Roman

---

<sup>8</sup> NB: Apparently, pre-19th-century Irish manuscripts mention Tephi as Zedekiah's daughter or connected to Jeremiah.

<sup>9</sup> Herman Hoeh does not refer to Tea Tephi, though he does discuss the Milesians and others in chapter 5 of his *Compendium of World History* (1969 edition). He examines Irish history, the Milesian royal lineage, and notable individuals such as Ollamh Fodhla (whom some associate with Jeremiah). It should be noted that he connects the Davidic lineage to the Milesians via an earlier blood descendant from around 1000 BC, as opposed to the widely accepted view that involves Zedekiah's daughter Tea Tephi arriving alongside Jeremiah from the 6th century BC.

(A.D. 70), and third future. Thereby entertaining the view of dual prophetic emphasis on recurring divine judgments until Christ's arrival.

In Irish mythology, there was a figure named Tea (also spelled Téa or Temair) described as the wife of Érimón (also known as Heremon or Éremón). Érimón was a legendary Milesian chieftain and one of the first High Kings of Ireland after the Milesians conquered the Tuatha Dé Danann (pronounced as "TOO-ah day DAN-an" in modern Irish) which means 'tribe of the gods' or 'tribe of (the god) Danu' equating with the Biblical tribe of Dan and a segment of Judahites. According to Medieval Irish texts like the *Lebor Gabála Éirenn* (*Book of the Taking of Ireland*) and the *Annals of the Four Masters*, Tea was the daughter of Lugaid (son of Íth) and accompanied Érimón to Ireland. She is credited with giving her name to Tara (Teamhair or Temair), the ancient ceremonial capital, explained etymologically as "Tea's Wall" (Tea-mur). She was buried there and was the mother of Íriael Fáid (or Íriael the Prophet), a progenitor of many later High Kings.

Unfortunately, anti-national/globalist/woke historians consider this Tea as a purely mythological figure from pseudo-historical Irish legends. They claim that there is no archaeological or contemporary evidence for her existence, and the Milesian invasion story is considered legendary rather than factual history.

However, the Tea or Tara story is too early for Tea-Tephi by hundreds of years and seems to have been bungled in Middle Ages texts. Rather than there being two different Teas, it seems that there was only one. All this needs to be further researched and expounded upon in a future paper.

Lack of evidence that please modern historians does not negate the legend. And Glover's book is not rubbish. It is over 180 pages of intense detail and research into very ancient documents. In poring through the book (I have a hard copy, [PDF and HTML versions](#) in my possession), he cites several chief sources. After checking I noticed that he does not give the complete title for some of them and hence, include that information in the list of these sources below:

- *Annals of the Four Masters*: Full title is *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland (Annála Ríoghachta Éireann)*, compiled by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh between 1632 and 1636 AD. The annals cover events from A.M. 2242 (a mythical date) to 1616 AD.
- *Chronicles of Eri*: Full title is *Chronicles of Eri: Being the History of the Gaal Scot Iber: Or the Irish People*, authored by Roger O'Connor (1762–1834), published in 1822.
- Mr. Petrie's Paper. When was Teamir Teamir?: This refers to George Petrie's (1790–1866) paper titled *On the History and Antiquities of Tara Hill*, presented in 1837 and published in the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy in 1839. "Teamir" is an ancient Irish name for Tara Hill, and the paper explores its history.
- Poem by Amergin (from *Annals of the Four Masters*): The poem is by Milesian poet and Druid from around 1287 BC. It draws from earlier sources like the *Lebor Gabála Éirenn* (*Book of Invasions*).
- Poem on Tara by Cu-au O'Cochlain (1024 AD): This is a bardic poem on the history of Tara Hill, composed by Cúán ua Lothcháin who was a prominent Irish poet.
- Bardic Traditions: This refers to the general tradition of Irish bardic poetry, an oral and written practice from the Celtic era through the Medieval period.
- *Keating's History*: Full title is *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* (translated as *The History of Ireland from the Earliest Period to the English Invasion* or *The General History of Ireland*), authored by Geoffrey Keating (c. 1570–1644), written around 1634 with a preface dated 1629. First published in Irish in the 17th century; English translation in 1723.

- Toland's *History of the Druids*: Full title is *A Critical History of the Celtic Religion and Learning: Containing an Account of the Druids*, authored by John Toland (1670–1722), first published posthumously in 1726.
- Edward O'Reilly's *Irish Dictionary*: Full title is *An Irish-English Dictionary: With Copious Quotations from the Most Esteemed Ancient and Modern Writers*, authored by Edward O'Reilly (1765–1830), first published in 1817.
- *2 Maccabees*: This is the book from the Apocryphal texts, authored around 124 BC.
- Vallancey's *Prospectus of a Dictionary*: Full title is *Prospectus of a Dictionary of the Language of the Aire Coti, or Ancient Irish*, authored by Charles Vallancey (1721–1812), published in 1802.
- Ledwich's *History and Antiquities of Ireland*: Full title is *Antiquities of Ireland*, authored by Edward Ledwich (1738–1823), first published in 1790.
- Moore's *Ireland*: Ollamh Fodhla's historicity and chronological issues (vol. i pp. 113-114); Milesian colonization (vol. i pp. 91, 123, 161); seven-year slave release law (vol. i p. 219 note): Full title is *The History of Ireland*, authored by Thomas Moore (1779–1852), published in four volumes between 1835 and 1846. The references are to Volume I, covering early Irish history and mythology.

## Usage of the Hebrew *Rak*

It is alleged that typically, British Israelites, take Jeremiah 33:17 out of its future/prophetic context of Christ and use this verse as a proof-text that someone has sat on the throne of David from the time of Zedekiah. One can, in turn, accuse the detractors of doing the same thing with regard to Genesis 49, Deuteronomy 33; Micah 5:8-10 etc which are interpreted as only referring to ancient Israel by most, but not all.

I can only point out yet again and have written of this – there is clear duality to these and other Scriptures that pertain to Millennial Israel and the King of Kings – they also refer to Israel in the last days and to the Royal line.

As such, this principle can be applied to Ezekiel 17:22:

“Thus says the Lord GOD: “I myself will take a sprig from the lofty top of the cedar and will set it out. I will break off from the topmost of its young twigs [Heb. = *rak*, which is normally masculine form] a tender one, and I myself will plant it on a high and lofty mountain.” (ESV)

NB: according to experts, the Hebrew *rak* is an adjective meaning "tender," with the implied noun drawn from the contextual reference to *yonqotav* (young twigs or shoots). This allows for translations like "tender twig" or "tender shoot" which fits the imagery of a young, fragile offshoot from the cedar – a humble Messiah.<sup>10</sup> But does it exclude a prince or princess?

British Israelites argue that *rak* refers to a daughter of Zedekiah because the Hebrew word *rak* (רַךְ) typically means "soft," "tender," or "weak" (as an adjective), and its direct female form is *raka* (רַכָּה), which carries the same meanings applied to a feminine noun. Yet, the masculine form points to the Messiah or a prince. But why cannot this prophecy be dual like so many others?

---

<sup>10</sup> Some references advocating for this view are: Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel. New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Chapters 1–24 (1997); Lamar E. Cooper, *Ezekiel. The New American Commentary*, p. 253 (1994). Thomas L. Constable, *Notes on Ezekiel*, p. 138 (2025); John Gill, *Exposition of the Entire Bible* (1748); Carl F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament* (1857). Block argues the passage preserves the Davidic dynasty historically (linked to Jehoiachin's line and post-exilic figures like Zerubbabel), but its global scope (e.g., sheltering all nations) points to a Messianic fulfillment in Christ as the "greater Son of David."

From an investigation, it is clear that the adjective רַךְ (*rak*) is used for males and its feminine form רַכָּה (*raka*) has been used to describe females - both in the Hebrew Bible and in later Hebrew texts. However, the investigation demonstrates that usage and nuance differ depending on the context and historical period.

There is one example referring to females:

“The most tender and refined woman among you, who would not venture to set the sole of her foot on the ground because she is so delicate and **tender** [*rôk*], will begrudge to the husband she embraces, to her son and to her daughter.” (Deuteronomy 28:56, ESV) [refers to a woman, describing someone pampered, soft, and unaccustomed to hardship]

NB: *rak* and *rok* are related terms derived from the same root. While *rôk* appears only once in the Old Testament, *rak* appears on multiple occasions.

“Come down and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon; sit on the ground without a throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans! For you shall no more be called **tender** [*rak*] and delicate.” (Isaiah 47:1, ESV) [here used of a woman with the meaning of one who is soft, delicate and pampered]<sup>11</sup>

So in the Bible both *rak* (only one time) and *raka* or *rok* are used for women. As such, its dual use in Ezekiel 17:22 must not be ruled out.

## Concluding Remarks

The Critics of British-Israelism are blinded to its inherent truths because they do not understand or accept it in the first place. But if they did, they would understand its interpretations and positions and how plausible they really are including the principle of prophetic duality.<sup>12</sup> And this goes for any doctrine. There is nothing to be embarrassed about holes in the argument – every doctrine of any denomination or researcher has issues to be addressed and fixed. There is nothing unique or unusual about such.

In turn, British-Israelites need to take into account criticisms so that they can present an acceptable and accurate message.

In the paper *The Abrahamic Covenant and Israel in Prophecy. A Position Paper Presented to the Manuscript Review Team* by John A. Halford & Ricky L. Sherrod (June 1991) has this to say about the issues:

- “Critics target several areas that they feel invalidate this theory:
- a. The story of Jeremiah Baruch, Tea-tephi, Heremon, etc. cannot be established from historical records. Many go as far as to say it is a total fabrication, with no basis of historical truth whatsoever.
  - b. According to some geologists the Coronation stone is almost certainly of Scottish, and not Middle eastern origin. It is however, very difficult to get definitive, authoritative information on this.

---

<sup>11</sup> Further information at [www.blueletterbible.org/lexicon/h7390/kjv/wlc/0-1/](http://www.blueletterbible.org/lexicon/h7390/kjv/wlc/0-1/)

<sup>12</sup> Much like prophecies relating to Christ’s first and second coming; the Day of the Lord; oracles against specific nations in the Old Testament which can be applied anciently and for the last days.

c. There are short interregnum periods in the line of David. So why not a long one, from Zedekiah's death to the return of Christ?

d. We have misinterpreted the meaning of the "everlasting covenant" with David.

Some of these criticisms have merit. The historical material is complicated, and is based on legend, although there is an evident basis of truth. A new presentation must be thorough, and clearly show how much weight can be put on the historical value of legend." (p. 15)

The above is my position also. History and such depth and length of legend should not be ignored. It is too old and fits in well with other data to believe that it is implausible. Far too many legends are true or later found to be true including those relating to the origin of the nations as referred to in the book *In Search of ... the Origin of Nations*.

Also, it should be noted that this paper does not explore the various Tea Tephi and associated legends and histories. Rather, it explores the plausibility of the legend and more importantly, how Ezekiel 17:22 cannot be restricted to a prophecy about Christ alone. For, as well intentioned the attacks upon British-Israelism might be, they are unfounded. Issues and problems that are brought up need to be addressed and fixed lest we lose believers.

So, personally, I have always taken Ezekiel 17:22 as dual given what I read in commentaries and various works. Other prophecies (Zephaniah 3:10; Isaiah 11:12), referring to Israel and Judah which have Millennial context can also be taken as dual and referring to Israel in their current abodes – typological of their Millennial fulfillment. Similarly with Genesis 49; Micah 5 (cp. Numbers 23:24). Refer to my paper [The Fulfillments of Genesis 49](#) available for free download – this paper was developed in table form to demonstrate the 3-fold fulfilment of the prophecies in that chapter.

Finally, it would be very odd indeed that the throne of David would not continue into the British Isles and be at the helm of the British Empire and be received with awe and wonder by the world, if it were not from David. Together with the fact that there are so many Judaic elements in Scotland makes it rather incredulous that the kingly line would not continue over the centuries up until the return of Christ when the rightful One takes over that throne and rules perfectly, unlike His predecessors.

As such, it appears that the Tea tephi tradition is accurate and plausible, though it is not a critical proof that the Anglo-Saxon-Kelts descend from Israel or that the British Royalty descend from David. However, whether the missing link between King David and the British Royalty is Tea Tephi (one of the various legends), Scota, another figure, or an Israelitish prince, there is far too much strength to the argument for the continuation of the royal line in Britain to be ignored or rejected.

## **Appendix. Extract from *The United States and Britain in Prophecy* by Herbert W Armstrong (1980 edition)**

NB: This material as presented by Mr Armstrong, was based on older British-Israelite works. In line with the works he had read, Herbert W. Armstrong discusses the biblical promise that David would never lack a descendant to sit on his throne (primarily referencing verses like Jeremiah 33:17, "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel"; 2 Samuel 7:12-16; and related passages) in his book *The United States and Britain in Prophecy*.

However, Mr Armstrong explains that after the fall of Judah to Babylon (and the end of Zedekiah's reign), the throne was **overturned** (transplanted) three times—as prophesied in Ezekiel 21:27 ("I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is")—while remaining occupied by a Davidic descendant.

This explanation appears primarily in Chapter 5 ("The Davidic Covenant"):

“Now briefly let us consider what is found in the ancient annals, legends, and history of Ireland, and we shall have the scene of Jeremiah’s “planting” and the present location of “lost” Israel.

The real ancient history of Ireland is very extensive, though colored with some legend. But with the facts of biblical history and prophecy in mind, one can easily sift out the legend from the true history in studying ancient Irish annals. Throwing out that which is obviously legendary, we glean from various histories of Ireland the following: Long prior to 700 B.C. a strong colony called “Tuatha de Danaan” (tribe of Dan) arrived in ships, drove out other tribes, and settled there. Later, in the days of David, a colony of the line of Zarah arrived in Ireland from the Near East.

Then, in 569 B.C. (date of Jeremiah’s transplanting), an elderly, white-haired patriarch, sometimes referred to as a “saint,” came to Ireland. With him was the princess daughter of an eastern king and a companion called “Simon Brach,” spelled in different histories as Breck, Berech, Brach, or Berach. The princess had a Hebrew name Tephi—a pet name—her full name being Tea-Tephi.

Modern literature of those who recognize our national identity has confused this Tea-Tephi, a daughter of Zedekiah, with an earlier Tea, a daughter of Ith, who lived in the days of David. This royal party included the son of the king of Ireland who had been in Jerusalem at the time of the siege. There he had become acquainted with Tea-Tephi. He married her shortly after 585—when the city fell. Their young son, now about 12 years of age, accompanied them to Ireland. Besides the royal family, Jeremiah brought with them some remarkable things, including a harp, an ark, and a wonderful stone called “lia-fail,” or “stone of destiny.” A peculiar coincidence (?) is that Hebrew reads from right to left, while English reads from left to right. Read this name either way—and it still is “lia-fail.”

Another strange coincidence—or is it just coincidence? is that many kings in the history of Ireland, Scotland, and England have been coronated sitting over this stone—including the present queen. The stone rests today in Westminster Abbey in London, and the coronation chair is built over and around it. A sign beside it labels it “Jacob’s pillar-stone” (Gen. 28:18).

The royal husband of the Hebrew princess Tea was given the title Herremon upon ascending the throne of his father. This Herremon has usually been confused with a much earlier Gede the Herremon in David’s day—who married his uncle Ith’s daughter Tea. The son of this later king Herremon and Hebrew princess continued on the throne of Ireland and this same dynasty continued unbroken through all the kings of Ireland; was overturned and transplanted again in Scotland; again overturned and moved to London, England, where this same dynasty continues today in the reign of Queen Elizabeth II.

Another interesting fact is that the crown worn by the kings of the line of Herremon and the other sovereigns of ancient Ireland had twelve points!” (pp. 99-102)



## ***The British Royalty, Tea Tephi and the British-Israelite Truth***

**By Craig M. White**

**History Research Projects  
GPO Box 864, Sydney, Australia 2001  
[www.originofnations.org](http://www.originofnations.org)  
[www.friendsofsabbath.org](http://www.friendsofsabbath.org)**

No limitation is placed upon reproduction of this document except that it must be reproduced in its entirety without modification or deletions. The publisher's name and address, copyright notice and this message must be included. It may be freely distributed but must be distributed without charge to the recipient.