

## CHAPTERTWELVE An Adamic Thesis

The evidence of preceding chapters is enlightening in portrayal, broad in gamut, and profound in meaning. The remote past of this planet witnessed a pair of beings who were more than an ordinary man and woman. The impact of that pair is seen across the entire spread of Caucasian people from India to the shores of the North Atlantic. Their existence is indicated by tales of folk origin, by social practices of European nobility, by social titles and honors still used widely in Spain, Portugal, South America, France, and England, by names for rivers and lands, and with connection to Semitic languages preserved in Hebrew as a living tongue.

While the evidence is limited it is sufficient to cause us to rethink our views of our planetary past. If we are to truly understand our biological and social origins we must consider this information.

1. Do the data derive from myths or from living realities?
2. Is it possible the various *Don* phenomena of place names, titles, myths and Hebrew verbs are unrelated, each originating independently of the others?
3. If so, what are the sources?
4. Are the Hebrew traditions of folk origin from a specially created pair independent of the European traditions of folk origin from a god and goddess? How do we reconcile the Sumerian Dumuzi and Inanna, the Babylonian Thammuz and Ishtar, or the Greek Adonis and Aphrodite with these other traditions?
5. What practice in the remote past would cause Semitic words to be carried down through the generations among European people?
6. If *Don* and *Dona* are the European memory of Adam and Eve why do their original names appear derived from Semitic sources but Semitic people do not remember the original names?
7. If the Semites are of Caucasian descent why do they speak Semitic tongues and not Indo-European tongues? Where did the break take place?
8. If Adam and Eve were named in a Semitic mother tongue was that tongue spoken by the generation that named them? If not why would they receive names from a foreign language?
9. Is it possible Adam and Eve spoke the Semitic mother tongue and that Indo-European languages were a later development? If so the Semites of today speak languages derived from that original tongue while other Caucasian people somehow moved over to a different language system.
10. If the answers to the last two questions are in the affirmative it would suggest that perhaps the Semites preserve more of the original Adamic blood lines while the Indo-Europeans blood lines were diluted.

11. These thoughts raise the further question of the origins of the Semitic and Indo-European languages. Are the parent tongues evolutionary languages? Or is it possible they were designed languages? What evidence can be adduced pro and con?

Many other questions could be asked. Obviously we have a breadth and depth of implication to our planetary past which would require major human resources, serious dedication, and our best minds to resolve. Following are a few brief thoughts.

Assume that Don and Dona were mythological.

Widespread belief in the Don and Dona pair across Indo-European lands shows that origin of the myth was prior to the diffusion of the Indo-European people from their common ancestral source. The lack of pair identification among ancient Greek people with no Dona goddess, and among Britons, Italians and Indians with no Don god, is merely the result of loss over time. A deeper search might find the missing mates but the apparent lack of evidence does not seriously modify our basic conclusions. Evidence for this pair does exist in other memory: Dumuzi and Inanna, Thammuz and Ishtar, Adonis and Aphrodite. People change names in myth stories. The solid remembrance of the Don and Dona names and titles over many countries and through long periods is surprising and demonstrates the strength of the traditions. Don and Dona represent the core of the original while other myths represent social devolution.

The strength of the Don and Dona traditions highlights the problem of why a myth would be remembered in social practices, titles, and place names. If the names derive from a myth why did diverse people all come to venerate that myth with such deep conviction? It is far easier to believe the traditions derive out of some original pair who were held in great honor and respect and who transmitted their titles to their sons and daughters, from generation to generation, down to modern times.

Which is most sensible: a thesis of origin in myth or in real, living beings? If we assume they were real they become the source of the river and place names, the social titles and honors, the social customs of nobility, and the stories of folk origin. The stories may be degraded — they may be adulterated with the thoughts of later generations — they may contain embellishments to enliven memory which became dim — they may be laden with psychological coloring reflecting the longings of their descendants — but they originate in a reality which now is mostly lost to our view.

Can any rational mind accept that the river and place names, the titles, and the stories are unrelated to one another? We would be forced to find an explanation for each independently of the other. We would become involved in complex theories and tortuous explanations of why we should exclude one set of data from another. It is far easier and quite simple to propose that the evidence all points to that original pair. Mental integrity and scholarly honesty demand that we find the most simple yet most comprehensive explanation.

The strength of the tradition is surprising in two respects. First, that it would be preserved in such pure form among Indo-Europeans titles; second, that it would be preserved in such pure form in the Hebrew verb. The Semitic mother tongue must have existed before the Indo-European parent language, otherwise the names would carry distinctly Indo-European forms. The Indo-European people may have evolved new languages but the names and titles were preserved through linguistic conservatism. Furthermore, modern Hebrew could not be too far removed from the Semitic mother tongue; otherwise it would not have preserved the *Don* verb so clearly.

The phenomenon is almost bewildering in its ramifications. We cannot realistically divorce the Hebrew verb from the titles, nor the stories from the river names, nor the titles from the stories. All are interrelated and interwoven into one grand phenomenon. Could the elements of river names, titles, gods, and verbs all have independent origins any more than the various branches of the Indo-European languages have independent origins or the various people of the Caucasian race have independent origins? If we are unwilling to accept an Adamic thesis we must find another consistent, logical, simple and sensible explanation.

Assume that the *Don* and *Dona* god and goddess names in Ireland and Wales were borrowed from Iberia. This would require a modification from social honor to mythological stories. Did the Iberians also have myths that are now lost to memory but which were borrowed by the Irish Celts? Would it make any difference? Or did the Iberians borrow the names of a god and goddess from other people and then evolve the practice of naming their noble elite by those titles? If the Iberians titles came from Latin why do they express the prevalent *don* and *dona* form and not the inflected *dominus* and *domina* of the Romans? Is it not easier to believe the Romans also inherited the *don* and *dona* titles but incorporated them into the Latin linguistic inflectional system? Did the Scandinavian Teutons get their story of *Don* from the Greek Danaus? Where did the Greeks get it?

We could go on and on. The most sensible explanation is that Adam and Eve were real and were remembered by all those people in different traditions, reflecting evolutionary changes over time and distance. The explanation is simple; it is clean. Any other thesis leads to unreal intellectual contortions.

### LANGUAGE FACTORS

No competent linguist today would propose that the various branches of the Indo-European languages originated independently of one another. Many studies show undeniable ties in morphology and etymology that could derive only out of a common mother tongue, although the exact form of that tongue may not be known, nor its location, nor its antiquity.

What created the differences among the various branches? Did a group, a tribe, or clan, migrate to intermarry with foreign stock, imposing their language upon the region, thus modifying and blending elements? Did they migrate to

unsettled regions to become isolated from sister groups and thus evolve their own unique form? Will a language evolve without the influence of foreign linguistic elements?

Wider geographical separation shows greater differences among language. The Hindi of India is considerably different from Scots Gaelic. The Teutonic, Celtic and Romance branches have closer geographical ties and display closer linguistic kinship. Their evolution may have taken place merely by geographical separation.

On the other hand foreign elements bring about accelerated evolution. Old English, the tongue of the Anglo-Saxons, was greatly modified by mixing with native Celtic stocks. Invasions of Norsemen and French Normans into England, together with many loan words from Greek and Latin, greatly accelerated the evolution of English. Today it preserves little of the original Indo-European inflectional system.

Some Indo-European languages seem little evolved from early forms. Lithuanian, on the shores of the Baltic Sea, shows considerable resemblance to Sanskrit, in the heart of India<sup>HEL</sup>. The two languages are so similar some linguists claim the people of Lithuania might understand simple phrases from Sanskrit. The wide geographical separation of the two people, and their biological differences, suggest languages may be conservative if no outside influences modify them.

Comparative study of the Indo-European languages offers insight into the people who used the original tongue. Common words found across the entire region show that the original was the language of domesticated people who lived in a climate with winter but probably did not know the sea<sup>HEL</sup>. They had common names for oak, beech, pine, birch, willow, bear, wolf, otter, beaver, marten, weasel, deer, rabbit, mouse, horse, ox, sheep, goat, pig, dog, eagle, hawk, owl, jay, wild goose, wild duck, partridge or pheasant, snake, tortoise, crab, ant, bee, and so on. They did not have common words for elephant, rhinoceros, camel, lion, tiger, monkey, crocodile, parrot, rice, banyan, bamboo or palm. They originated in temperate climates, not tropical. Words for horse, ox, sheep, goat, and pig show they had domesticated animals. They had made the transition from purely stone-age tools to the use of copper. They lived in settled houses with some agriculture. They raised grain and wool and knew how to spin and weave. Their system of society was patriarchal.

We do not know the antiquity of that original group. They could have lived 5,000, 10,000 or 30,000 years ago. We do know that the settlements at Çatal-Hüyük in Anatolia show social features which agree with the features indicated by the early Indo-European language. Those settlements date back 8,000 years<sup>CAHU</sup>.

Semitic languages, in contrast, appear to have derived from people who knew a nomadic way of life, and tropical climates. If the early Semites had been in intimate cultural association with early Indo-Europeans we would expect a cross influence but, if any, it was restricted to articles of trade and not to culture. This confirms that common elements in the Don and Dona data had to originate early in the common history of both people and not in recent times.

The Indo-European languages are strongly different from the Semitic. Linguistic scholars, impressed with the differences, have generally discounted a relationship between the two. If the original names of Adam and Eve were Don and Dona, preserved so well in the Hebrew verb, how did they get into the Indo-European traditions? On the other hand why were the Don and Dona titles not preserved in Hebrew when the verb carried such power? We would expect the original titles to be carried among the Semites far better than among the Indo-Europeans. Did the Semites reject the titles along with the godlike attributes? If so, they must have done so long before biblical times. No clear evidence for Don and Dona titles exists in archeological diggings of the Near East, nor in Near East folk tales that have come down to us. The Near East carries the oldest human records; we would expect those records to preserve the Don and Dona names if they carried such great social weight.

The differences in tradition could be understood if the Indo-Europeans carried biological legacy different from the Semites. Perhaps the Semites were more directly descended from Adam and would tend to not ascribe godlike qualities to their ancestors, while the Indo-Europeans may have had more pagan blood and tended to ascribe greater glory to their ancestor. However, the Hebrew Semites were mostly alone; their immediate neighbors, the Babylonians and Phoenicians, closely related in blood and language, thought of their ancestors as gods.

#### **BIOLOGICALIMPACT**

When we view the races of man today we are faced with the scientific problem of how biological differences arose. Why do some groups show skin color with definite red or yellow casts? How did the black man become black?

A theory with much popular appeal suggests that skin color is determined by environment. The black man is black because he inhabited the hot sunny regions of Africa. He developed a dark skin as protection against the hot sun. The fair Scandinavian is white because he moved from the original biological homelands of Africa to the northern climates with less sun. Evolution took place in melanin, the pigment which colors the skin. But we do not know how long the black man lived in Africa or the white man in the north, nor do we know how long in biological time it would take to create such great differences. Furthermore this simplistic view ignores other possibilities.

If the man of Africa is black why is the Polynesian not equally dark? If the frigid north produced white skin why did the Eskimo not become equally pale? He is older. His origins are so far in the past that even the number of his teeth is different from the rest of the world. Why did the yellow man turn yellow? Why did the red man turn red? What climates produced those skin colors?

Simplistic views of environment and skin color are not adequate to explain the differences. The black man may have migrated to the heart of Africa because he prefers a climate that does not require great physical exertion. Perhaps the Scandinavian prefers northern climates with superb physical challenge. One can view the differences among men from more than one perspective.

The white man is distinguished not only by his skin color but also by his taller stature, his prominent nose, his hair, and his eyes. White man has thin hair that may be blond, red, and brown, as well as black. His eyes are blue, green, hazel, and brown, as well as black. Other races universally have black hair, dark eyes, flatter faces and shorter stature. Are the distinguishing features evolutionary, or do they come from Adam? If Adam's blood intermingled only among certain populations across Indo-European and Semitic regions, and not with other evolutionary people, would this create the differences we see today?

If Adam's seed mixed with a Negroid population of India those people may have acquired many of his physical attributes while retaining their dark skins. The fair Scandinavian might reflect more of the Adamic blood, less diluted by native stock. They would then remember themselves as the descendants of an ancient progenitor *from whom, so saith antiquity, the pedigree of their kings flowed in glorious series like channels from some parent spring.*

#### SOCIAL DIFFERENCES

We should recognize that Caucasian man has had more impact upon the evolution of this planet than any other people. Civilization, as we know it, sprung from the mists of Near East cultures. The Semites were major contributors. The high moral views of the Hebrews and the deep philosophical works of the Greeks came from that region, from those people who knew themselves as descended from Adam or Danaus. Refined legal systems came from the Romans while democratic governments evolved through the people of Europe. The great art of the Greeks and the Italians, the lofty architectural enterprises of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans and Europeans, sophisticated symphony orchestras, profound developments in medicine, science and technology C all came from Caucasian people. White man conquered the globe, not the black man nor the yellow man nor the red man. Today the world borrows the great white-man culture while other cultures rapidly fade away.

Surely potentials exist within Caucasian blood which were not expressed through other people. Yet this race appears on the world scene more recently than all others. Did these potentials and world dominance come strictly through accidental biological evolution? Or was a divine gift given to man through a specially created being, a being who then betrayed his mission and brought near catastrophe to the world? If he had not fallen from his high commission would he have produced even more profound social changes on our world?

#### NOBILITY

If the myths and social practices of people from Indo-European biological stock reflect an original source in a godlike ancestor we would have a different explanation for the customs of nobility.

The idea of a noble class is prevalent in Europe. It was preserved in Spain through the Franco regime of the mid-twentieth century, is observed in France where lists of members of the nobility are still published, is observed in England where the right of kingly descent is still maintained, was preserved in Russia and Germany until the upheavals attendant upon the first World War, and continues to be regarded in Scandinavia. The noble families of Europe were closely related to one another, with cousins marrying cousins from Russia and Germany to England. The close inbreeding produced genetic disorders of hemophilia and mental retardation. Proscriptions on marriage outside nobility are still observed in England and other European countries. The nobility were far stronger in earlier centuries, holding rights to land by divine right. They provided a broad base for a social elite through blood ties and rights of inheritance. The close knit identity gradually diluted over the past thousand years until today it is difficult to find pure blood, while land rights have virtually disappeared. The prestige of this group has sharply declined; in former centuries they were regarded as truly superior in attributes and personal qualities.

If we accept the biblical claim that Adam and Eve were the first man and woman we are faced with the problem of how they started the human race. With no other human mortals their children, brothers and sisters, had to marry one another. In the following generation marriage could be no farther afield than among cousins, and so on.

But another view can be taken. If Adam's mission was to upstep the evolutionary races he may have been instructed to restrict marriage among evolutionary people until a sufficient body of Adamic blood had been created. If he had permitted marriage before this pool was sufficiently large the blood potentials might have become diluted too quickly. And this may be the source of the biological problems we observe in the white races today.

Something went wrong. The historical traditions among nobility suggest there was an elite group which should not intermarry with common people. If that original genetic pool never fully matured, permission to marry outside never reached fruition. The proscriptions evolved into traditions to continue a noble class with close inbreeding, but eventual dilution, down to the present day.

From modern secular viewpoints we can propose nobility evolving from evolutionary people. Individuals from among tribes became elevated to positions of honor until they gradually built a select group with great social dominance. They became an elite who restricted marriage to their elite group.

But such view is unsuitable to the evidence we now have available. Furthermore, other evidence influences our conclusions.

I shall elaborate.