

“TELEGONY”, FACT OR FICTION?

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

With this exposé, we will scrutinize the hypothesis concerning “telegony”, which is a superstitious belief that goes back hundreds of years. I covered this same subject in an article I entitled *Special Notice To All Who Deny Two Seedline, #18*. This false premise is rearing up its ugly head again, so I will repeat what I said in that article, adding more data to show just how fraudulent such a belief is! Before we get involved in this discussion, it would be helpful to see how the 1996 *Webster's New Unabridged Dictionary* defines it. While sometimes it is advisable to refer to an older dictionary, in this case, with the many advances in the knowledge of genetics, a newer one would be more advantageous.

“telegony ... n. a former belief that a sire can influence the characteristics of the progeny of the female parent and subsequent mates. [1890-95; TELE- + GONY] ...”

The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary (1986): **“telegony ... n. Biol. The alleged influence of a previous sire on the progeny of the same mother from subsequent impregnation by other males. [<TELE- + GONY] ...”**

In his 1978 book *The Babylonian Connection*, Stephen E. Jones used “telegony”, along with many other spurious arguments, in a cunning attempt to discredit Two Seedline doctrine, thus exercising his skills as a master of deception. At the time he was able to get by with that false premise, as it was just prior to the general awakening of startling new technology coming on the scene. On December 3, 1967 Dr. Christian Neethling Barnard of South Africa pioneered the first heart replacement. By 1968, nearly 100 heart transplants had been performed throughout the world. Some years later, the general public became aware of the need for anti-rejection drugs when a recipient receives an organ transplant. This factor of “immunity” alone will destroy the “telegony” hypothesis, but there is much more evidence to show Stephen E. Jones' conclusions on this to be flawed. Let's take a look at his primary conclusion on page 85:

“The reason for including telegony in this discussion has been to relate it to the sexual interpretation of Genesis 3. Those who teach that Eve's act was to have had sexual relations with, and to have been impregnated by, a negro, Satan, or anyone other than Adam, cast doubt on the purity of Abel, or Seth, and indeed upon Eve herself. And thus we may even doubt the racial purity of the entire white race, including

Jesus Christ Himself ...” If telegony were true, which it isn’t, Stephen E. Jones would be correct in this conclusion. Yet there are those who teach Two Seedline in Israel Identity who contradict their own position by embracing the flawed belief of telegony!

Had one followed Jones’ scheming line of reasoning up to this point, one would have fallen disastrously headlong into his deception. Once he concocted this false premise, he was able to “establish” a perilous, erroneous, misleading conclusion. Like pretzels and Swiss cheese, Jones’ thesis is twisted and full of holes. In order to impress his readers and make himself appear an expert on the subject of “telegony”, Jones quoted from various publications predating the modern discovery of DNA and the intricate world of chromosomes. Nowhere did Jones address the modern-day study of genetics relating to DNA and chromosomes. Anyone having a basic understanding of today’s developments in genetics can quickly detect Jones’ unmitigated lies.

In his book, pages 77-85, Jones cites Trofim D. Lysenko, Conway Zirkle, Scheinfeld and Herbert L. Cooper, C. L. Redfield, V. A. Zhelnin, and Dr. Austin Flint. In citing these men and their opinions, Jones is using ideologically distorted information. I have before me the 11th edition of *The Encyclopedia Britannica* (1910), which has an unbiased account of “telegony”, vol. 26, pages 509-510 and vol. 13, page 354. This encyclopedia cites nearly the same men, incidences and observations on cattle breeding as Jones does, but with many conclusions to the contrary. While cattle breeding in the 1800’s wasn’t the exact science it is today with the new knowledge of DNA and chromosomes, they managed to carry on experimental breeding under controlled conditions, which proved the theory of “telegony” to be false. Interestingly, many of the ideas about “telegony” during that period were coming from Charles Darwin, who is credited as the inventor of the theory of evolution. In this same encyclopedia, vol. 26, page 509, it says this:

“Darwin says, ‘It is worth notice that farmers in south Brazil ... are convinced that mares which have once borne mules when subsequently put to horses are extremely liable to produce colts striped like a mule’ (*Animals and Plants*, vol. i. p. 436). Baron de Parana, on the other hand says, ‘I have many relatives and friends who have large establishments for the rearing of mules, where they obtain from 400 to 1000 mules in a year. In all these establishments, after two or three crossings of the mare and ass, the breeders cause the mare to be put to a horse; yet a pure-bred foal has never been produced resembling either an ass or a mule.’

“The prevalence of the belief in telegony at the present day [before 1910] is largely due to a case of supposed infection reported to the Royal Society in 1820 by Lord Morton. A chestnut mare, after having a hybrid by a quagga, produced to a black Arabian horse three foals showing a number of stripes – in one, more stripes were present than the quagga hybrid. The more, however, the case so intimately associated with the name of Lord Morton is considered, the less convincing is the evidence it affords in favor of ‘infection.’ Stripes are frequently seen in high-cast Arab horses, and cross-bred colts out of Arab mares sometimes present far more distinct bars across the legs and other zebra-like markings than characterized the subsequent offspring of Lord Morton’s seven-eighths Arabian mare. In the absence of control experiments there is therefore no reason for assuming Lord Morton’s chestnut mare would have produced

less striped offspring had she been mated with the black Arabian before giving birth to a quagga hybrid. To account for the stripes on the subsequent foals, it is only necessary (now that the principles of cross-breeding are understood [before 1910]) to assume that in the cross-bred chestnut mare there lay latent the characteristics of the Kattiawar or other Indian breeds, in which stripes commonly occur.”

This evidence is **entirely opposite** to what Jones tried to make it appear about Lord Morton’s horses. Is it deliberate deception or just sloppy scholarship? What underlying influence prevails over manifold errors to this end? Why does Stephen E. Jones take the same position as the infamous Charles Darwin? Then in turn, all of the other anti-seedliners, in reading and believing Jones’ book, (like Weiland and company) follow suit.

Returning to *The Encyclopedia Britannica* of 1910, 11th edition, on page 510, we read the following under the heading *Telegony in Dogs*: “Breeders of dogs are, if possible, more thoroughly convinced of the fact of telegony than breeders of horses. Nevertheless, Sir Everett Millais, a recognized authority [before 1910], has boldly asserted that after nearly thirty years’ experience, during which he made all sorts of experiments, he had never seen a case of telegony. Recent experiments support Millais’s conclusion. Two of the purest breeds at the present day are the Scottish deerhound and the Dalmatian (spotted carriage-dog). A deerhound after having seven pups to a Dalmatian was put to a dog of her own breed. The result was five pups, which have grown into handsome hounds without the remotest suggestion of a previous Dalmatian mate of their dam.” *[with more incidences cited]*

Continuing on page 510: “Experiments with cats, rabbits, mice, with sheep and cattle, with fowls and pigeons, like the experiments with horses and dogs, fail to afford any evidence that offspring inherit any of their characters from previous mates of the dam; *i.e.* they entirely fail to prove that a female animal is liable to be so influenced by her first mate that, however subsequently mated, the offspring will either in structure or disposition give some hint of the previous mate.”

Now that we have substantial testimony offsetting and overriding Stephen E. Jones’ fraudulent claims, let’s examine the process by which this hypothetical “telegony”, according to his book, is supposed to have taken place. Jones claims the following quotation is taken from “Applied Trophology.” This, in turn, was supposedly translated into English from Russian by a Bennett McCutcheon from Arizona State University. During the period leading up to 1978, when Jones was writing the book, free exchange of information with the Soviet Union was rather scarce because of the imposed “Iron Curtain”. Thus, Jones felt quite safe presenting alleged documentary evidence from that area during that era of time, for who could check its authenticity? After all, how many people are going to try to find a document on the topic of telegony in an inaccessible land written in a foreign language, and then have it translated into English? According to Jones, page 80, this article was marked “Circulation Restricted to Professional Use”. Generally, when a document is translated from one language to another, grammar suffers from direct translation. Strangely, this alleged translation is very smooth and very easy to read. From his description, it is evident this paraphrase

may never have been in any book or circulated by any recognized authority. Anyway, this is what that reputed article allegedly said, page 82:

“ In pregnancy the rapid cell division promotes the release of greater than normal quantities of protomorphogens into the blood from the embryo, and the maternal gonad becomes loaded up with embryo blueprints, as it were, which causes subsequent germ cells of the female to be contaminated with the blueprints of the father, for all embryo protomorphogens are one-half duplicates of the genes of each parent.

“ It is obvious, these protomorphogens circulating in the maternal blood influence repair and reconstruction to a tremendous extent.

“ It will be obvious that this presence of paternal ‘blueprints’ in the blood of a female who has had a child by one husband and subsequently remarries, the children of the latter marriage will be carrying characteristics of both male mates.”

Then, Jones comments on that quotation by stating: “*When this newly-fertilized cell begins to divide itself and grow, they say, there is a subsequent release of some protomorphogens into the blood of the mother ... and thus the paternal genes could have a definite effect upon the mother herself and all subsequent offspring.*” [emphasis mine]

It’s at this point that Jones really blows his argument and exposes his ignorance. It’s common knowledge that there is no connection between the mother’s blood and the embryo or fetus. The fetus makes its own blood of a different type dependent upon the father’s chromosomal contribution. The only use of the umbilical cord between the mother and fetus is for nourishment and oxygen in one direction and the elimination of waste products in the other. Without this separation, principles of immunity dictate the mother’s immune system which would reject and destroy any part of the fetus, and vice versa. All this bull manure on the part of Jones is pure conjecture and outright fabrication, yet he finds those who agree with and support his finagling! *The Collier’s Encyclopedia*, published in 1980, vol. 2, page 174, under “Anatomy, Human; The Reproductive System” says:

“... There usually is no continuity between the mother’s blood and that of the embryo or fetus.” This is common knowledge and is found in many medical related publications. The definition of “continuity” is: (1) *state or quality of being continuous*, (2) *a continuous or connected whole*. The definition of “trophology” (trophoblast) from the 1995 *Webster’s New Universal Unabridged Dictionary* is:

“... *n. Embryol.* **the layer of extraembryonic ectoderm that chiefly nourishes the embryo or develops into fetal membranes with nutritive functions.**” Notice: it is “fetal membranes”, and not tissue of the mother. Jones and all those anti-seedliners use some of the most distorted arguments I’ve ever heard!!! Well, let’s continue.

Again, Jones uses Darwinian logic on pages 83-84, where he quotes Dr. Austin Flint’s *Textbook of Human Physiology*: “Dr. Flint then commented on the belief that when a man and a woman have been married to each other for a long period of years, they begin to resemble each other. This phenomenon is called *saturation*. Dr. Flint asked of telegony: ‘May we not have here the explanation of the fact, which has frequently been pointed out, that husband and wife show a tendency to grow like each

other, both physically and mentally, the resemblance after a long married life being sometimes very striking?”

Do you comprehend the implications of what is being said here? Both Flint and Jones are surmising that gradually the genetics of the couple are changing until they are alike. This is a harebrained suggestion! Well, if we understand the mechanics of intercourse, surely, with such a hypothesis, only the wife’s genetics could change to that of the husband’s. Or could it be that the husband is affected genetically by kissing?!?! Surely, Judah, being married to the Canaanite woman, daughter of Shuah, for several years didn’t take on her Canaanite features! This convoluted, absurd hypothesis suggests that the wife’s genetics are modified by the husband’s during intercourse! For a moment, let’s take a look at what happens at conception. Scientists know today that each single cell of the human body has two sets of 23 chromosomes, or a total of 46. I will now quote *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 9, page 192d:

“Every human body cell contains two sets of 23 chromosomes. These two sets look very much alike. Each chromosome in one set can be matched with a particular chromosome in the other set. Egg cells and sperm cells have only one set of 23 chromosomes. These cells are formed in a special way, and end up with only half the number of chromosomes found in body cells. As a result, when an egg and a sperm come together, the fertilized egg cell will contain the 46 chromosomes of a normal body cell. Half of the chromosomes come from the mother, and half from the father.”

We can clearly see that every cell in our bodies contains these same 2 sets of 23 chromosomes; one set having its origin from the male sperm and the other set from the female egg. In essence, both Flint and Stephen E. Jones are surmising that somehow one or both parties of this marriage lose some of the original 23 chromosomes from each of their parents – enough to alter their appearance. Such a thing would only create greater complications, as conception starts with one united cell containing 46 chromosomes (23 from each parent). As these cells divide and redivide they are directed to become various tissue such as muscle, heart, brain, bone etc. In doing this, every cell making up the body has this same genetic code built into it as in the original cell (half from the father and half from the mother).

Are Jones and Flint suggesting there is some kind of device that goes to all the millions of cells and gradually changes their original DNA genetic code? I find such an idea fantastically unrealistic! Does this device somehow trade the wife’s chromosomes she got from her two parents in exchange for the chromosomes of her husband’s two parents? Well, this seems to be their concocted conclusion. If what Flint and Jones are implying is true, at what point does a man’s wife become his sister?; and at what point in time does that married couple discontinue having normal lawful sexual relations and start to commit unlawful incest? Surely, if a wife takes on the genetic makeup of her husband, she would be genetically equivalent to his sister!

Moreover, eventually, by that hypothesis, one of that couple could receive an organ transplant from the other without requiring anti-rejection drugs, which brings us back to the subject of immunology. Before we consider that, let’s first look into the DNA. Here is what the 1980 *Collier’s Encyclopedia* said 29 years ago in vol. 4, page 180:

“The gene theory states that the characteristics of each generation are transmitted to the next by the units of inheritance known as genes. The genes are composed of deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA. The large complex molecules of DNA are made up of four kinds of subunits, called nucleotides, which are arranged in a double helix. The information in each gene resides in a particular order of these subunits. Since each gene is composed of 10,000 or so nucleotides arranged in some specific sequence, there is a very large number of possible combinations of nucleotides and therefore a large number of different sequences representing different bits of genetic information ...

“The information in each gene is transmitted from one generation to the next by a code, called the genetic code, which involves the linear sequence of the four nucleotide units making up the gene. In each cell generation the gene undergoes replication, so that when the cell divides each of the two daughter cells gets an exact copy of the code. Also in each cell generation one or more transcriptions of the code may be made by which the genic [*genetic*] information is used to regulate the assembly of a specific enzyme or protein.” What this is referring to is replication of the cells within one’s body; **NOT the next generation of people!**

It is overwhelmingly apparent the Almighty created us with a well regulated genetic code which can only be damaged through miscegenation, and once defiled it can never be repaired. Our body’s cells are controlled by this “genetic code”, and not subject to telegony. Ladies, you’ll always be the genetic daughter of your father and mother, not your husband. Genesis 1:11 says the “seed *is* in itself ... after his kind.” In other words, our Creator has placed safeguards within us to protect that genetic code. That is why, when one receives an organ transplant, one must forever continue to take anti-rejection drugs to suppress one’s immunity. The subject of the “rejection process” is quite complex, but the following from the 1980 *Collier’s Encyclopedia*, vol. 18, page 219, under the topic of “Organ Transplantation” will serve for this discussion:

“... When the donor and the recipient are identical twins or members of the same inbred line of animals, the procedure is known as isotransplantation ... Transplants performed between two individuals of different species or of the same species but not identical twins are subject to a process known as rejection. Identical twins, being derived from a single ovum, are exactly alike in all their tissues and therefore will accept tissue from each other without rejection ... According to present concepts, the immunological reaction is called forth by the exposure of the recipient to certain substances that are present in or on the living cells of the donor organ but are lacking in the recipient. These substances are called histocompatibility antigens. Histocompatibility antigens are determined by histocompatibility genes in much the same way as an individual’s hair color or iris color is determined: Each individual inherits a set of genes, basic units of heredity, and thereby antigens from each of the parents. Upon exposure to the donor’s antigens, the recipient responds by recognizing the tissue as foreign.”

This data is sufficient to demonstrate, if any sperm cells survived from a former sire, and somehow found their way into the blood of the mother, they would be recognized as “foreign” and would be rejected by her immune system’s response to them. Secondly, if somehow the sperm cells of that sire survived in the blood and

managed to find their way to her egg supply, they could in no way alter the genetics of those eggs. The 23 chromosomes of the male are paired to the 23 chromosomes of the female, and are directly opposite each other in each cell's helix. Therefore, there is no way the male sperm could modify the 23 chromosome contribution of the female. Under such a hypothetical condition as Jones and Flint suggest, the chromosomes would be so misaligned and confused, if a next pregnancy were to occur, it would only result in a genetically deformed disorderly mass of twisted flesh. We only have to look at Down's syndrome for comparison. For this, we will again use *Collier's Encyclopedia*, vol. 16, pages 454-455:

"MONGOLISM, now usually called Down's syndrome, a development disorder characterized by mental retardation as well as by abnormalities of bone growth and other physical malformations ... The disorder is characterized by the presence of physical traits that are normal at an early stage of fetal development. Among these fetal traits are the narrow, slanting eyes which give such cases a superficial resemblance to Asiatic races ... Down's syndrome actually has no racial connotations, but is a pathological condition that may occur in any human race ...

"Causes. Although many factors have been proposed as causes of Down's syndrome, it has now been established that persons with this disorder typically have 47 chromosomes instead of the normal 46. The occurrence of the additional chromosome results from an abnormality in the process of reproductive cell formation. In the normal process of reproductive cell division, one member of each chromosome pair goes to each cell ... In Down's syndrome, the failure of one specific chromosome pair to separate (non-disjunction) results in the occurrence of that particular chromosome in triplicate in the offspring ..." If only one misplaced chromosome can cause that much havoc, consider the complications that would result under Jones' imagined concept.

For further proof that Stephen E. Jones was using Darwinian theory in his *The Babylonian Connection*, pages 77-85, endorsing the hypothesis of "telegony", I will now quote a paragraph from *The Etiology of Racism in Europe* from the website <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/grupe/eg/eg17/04.htm> which says: "Later, when racist theories took hold of the 'scientific community', the racial inferiority of the Semites [Jews] was explained by the long-term adverse effects of their religion on the blood. This went so far as to revive telegony which implied that the fetus engendered by a mongrel male in a pure blood female modified the mother in its image in such a way that the latter descendants of the same mother were also condemned to impurity. It is noteworthy that this idea was forwarded by Spencer and found support in many writings of Darwin. Hence the source of Hitlerian laws prohibiting mixed marriages. Another consequence of Darwinian science was the reinforcement of heredity, promoting it to the rank of a universal law, and greatly contributing to racist theories and practice."

While we can agree to a small degree with this last quotation, we must differ somewhat with the last sentence, for Darwin was interested to a greater degree on environment affecting future generations rather than heredity. The reason for including it here is to show the Darwinian connection and his unproved theory of telegony. On one occasion Darwin, because he couldn't account for the many various features of a particular breed of cattle, said it was due to "spontaneous variations." Based on

modern DNA genetic science, it would be ridiculous to account for any variations in man or animal somehow happening in such a haphazard way. Evidently, Darwin, like today's anti-seedliners, never read Genesis 1:12 "after his kind." That's comparable to saying all the races came from Eve. Inasmuch as the anti-seedliners love Darwin's theories, wait till they start spreading that one. From all this one can see that when Stephen E. Jones promotes telegony loudly, the rest of the anti-seedliners, desperate for any pseudo-science to bolster their unbelief – believes it strongly – and purchases Jones' "Brooklyn Bridge."

WHAT IS A GESTATION?

From the *Library Of Universal Knowledge*, volume 6 of 15, page 657. "A Reprint of the last (1880) Edinburgh and London edition of Chambers's Encyclopedia." New York: American Book Exchange, Tribune Building, 1880. My copy was once the possession of the Library of Hillsdale College #11082.

"**GESTATION**, in physiology, is the term applied to the period that intervenes in the mammalia, between impregnation and the bringing forth of the young. The period and the number of young produced at a birth vary extremely in different mammals, but usually stand in an inverse ratio to one another. Thus, in the larger herbivora, as, for example, the elephant, the horse, the ox, and the camel, the female seldom produces more than one at a time, but the period of gestation is long; while in the smaller ones the progeny is numerous, but the period of gestation only a few weeks. In the elephant, the period of gestation extends over twenty or twenty-one months; in the giraffe, it is fourteen months; in the dromedary, it is twelve months; in the mare, upwards of eleven months; in the tapir, between ten and eleven; in the cow, nine; and in many of the larger deer somewhat more than eight months. In the sheep and goat, the period is five months. In the sow, which produces a numerous litter, the period is four months. In the rodentia, the progeny is numerous and imperfectly developed, and the period of gestation is comparatively short: in the beaver, one of the largest of the order, it is four months; in the rabbit and hare, from thirty to forty days; in the dormouse, thirty-one days; in the squirrel and rat, four weeks; and in the guinea-pig, three weeks or less. The young of the carnivora, like the young of the rodentia, are born with their eyes closed, and in a very immature condition; and in even the larger carnivora the period of gestation is far shorter than in the larger ruminantia or pachydermata; it is six months in the bear; one hundred and eight days in the lion (the period in this animal is stated by Vander Hoeven at three months); seventy-nine days in the puma; sixty-two or sixty-three days in the dog, the wolf, and the fox; and fifty-five or fifty-six days in the cat. In the marsupial animals, which, from a structural peculiarity, produce their young in a far more immature state than any other mammals, the period of gestation is very short, being thirty-nine days in the kangaroo, the largest of the marsupial animals, and only twenty-six days in the opossum. Nothing certain is known regarding the period of gestation of the cetacea. The quadrumana produce one, sometimes two, at a birth; and the period of gestation, as far as has been observed, seems to be seven months. In the human race, forty weeks is the usual period of gestation, but this period is liable to certain deviations, which are noticed in the article FŒTUS."

Sometimes people demand a second witness that a term is understood and used in a certain way. From the 1894 *Encyclopedia Britannica*, ninth edition, volume 5, under the subject "Cattle", and speaking specifically of oxen on page 214, it is stated: "... The period of gestation in the cow is nine months, when she usually produces a single calf; occasionally, however, two are born, and when these are of different sexes, the female is almost invariably barren, and is known as a 'free-martin,' that is, a cow free for fattening, from the Scotch word 'mart,' signifying a fattened ox. ..."

I would point out that "gestation" in this case was considered to take a period of nine months for the oxen.

For a third witness, I will use the 1980 *Collier's Encyclopedia*, volume 15, page 300, under the subject "Mammals" and the subtopic "Reproduction". On this page there is a chart showing the following information, and the chart is entitled:

"AVERAGE GESTATION PERIODS IN SOME COMMON MAMMALS:

Opossum = 12 days; Hamster = 16 days; Mouse = 21 days; Rat = 21 days; Rabbit = 30 days; Cat = 9 weeks; Dog = 9 weeks; Swine = 16 weeks; Sheep = 21 weeks; Cow = 9 months; Chimpanzee = 9 months; Man = 9 months; Horse = 11 months; Elephant = 18-21 months."

For a fourth witness which shows that a "gestation" is a full-term pregnancy from conception to birth is the 1971 *World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 8, page 162:

"GESTATION, *jess TAY shun*, or the condition of *pregnancy*, is the period of time women and other female mammals carry their unborn young in the *uterus* (womb). In marsupials, such as kangaroos, gestation also includes the time when the mother carries its young in its outer pouch.

"In general, large mammals which usually bear one offspring at a time have long gestation periods. A woman's gestation period is about 9 months long. Small mammals that bear *litters* (groups of young) generally have short gestation periods. In rabbits, the average gestation period is 30 to 32 days long."

For a fifth witness, I will use the 1951 *World Scope Encyclopedia*, volume 5, under the subject "Gestation Period", (this encyclopedia has no pagination):

"Gestation Period (*jes-ta' shunpe' ri-oy*) in physiology, term designating the interval between impregnation and delivery of the mammal. This interval varies widely: 22 months for the elephant, for smaller mammals three weeks or less. With human beings the gestation period is between 275 and 280 days."

For a sixth witness concerning the meaning of the term "gestation", I will quote from *The American Heritage Dictionary Of The English Language*, William Morris editor. This is a dictionary that every person in Israel Identity should have in their library! If one has a *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*, one has a source for checking out the meaning of nearly every Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek word in the Bible, but *The American Heritage Dictionary* gives all the root words of the Indo-European family of 72 languages. "Gestation" is one of those root words and comes from the Latin:

"ges•ta•tion (jēs-stā-shən) *noun* **1.** The period of carrying developing offspring in the uterus after conception; pregnancy. **2.** The development or duration of development of a plan or idea in the mind. [Latin *gestātiō*, from *gestāre*, frequentative of

gerere (past participle *gestus*), to carry, bear. See **gerere** in Appendix *] – **ges·ta·tó·ry** (jës·tə·tôrē·tôrē) *adjective*.”

All of this simply boils down to the fact that the term “gestation” means the period of time a mother carries a child from conception until its birth, and if something goes wrong it is called a miscarriage.

HOW DOES ALL OF THIS APPLY TO EVE IN THE GARDEN?

Two Seedliners holding the “telegony” theory demand that Eve would have to have had seven gestations after birthing the half-breed Cain. That would mean that she would have to have carried seven full-term children to a successful birth before obtaining an unpolluted, racially pure child. They do not designate whether the 7th or 8th would be the pure one. However one might count them, it would mean that both Abel and Seth would be racially polluted. However, Matt. 23:35 speaks of “righteous Abel” who had “righteous blood”. The telegony advocates never cite any Scripture where Eve had seven or eight children between Cain and Seth. Where is their documentation? Where are their required two witnesses? And where is the proof that if telegony really did exist, seven or eight pregnancies could undo the damage in the first place? These assertions are all ridiculous!

Conclusion: IT CAN'T BE BOTH WAYS: Either telegony is true, or Two Seedline is true. To believe both is a contradiction, and destroys one's premise. Therefore, Two Seedline is true, and telegony is “fiction”!