

Stone-Age African Language of Life – Living in the Ngbarnyi (Gonja) Concept

Rashid Abubakar Iddrisu^{1,2}

¹CEO of WIACT, Ghana

²Founder of CEHDA Ghana

Corresponding author

Rashid Abubakar Iddrisu, CEO of WIACT, Ghana and Spain.

Received: January 08, 2026; Accepted: January 14, 2026; Published: January 22, 2026

ABSTRACT

An Epistemological Challenge to the Darwinian System of Evolution

This study is not presented from the standpoint of laboratory-based experimental science. Rather, it is advanced from the perspective of culture as a foundational system of knowledge and wisdom, operating in harmony with the natural rhythms of existence.

From Ngbarnyi-Gonja cultural perspective, the first culture of every living species, including human beings, is language, and the earliest foundation of human civilization is language itself. Language, therefore, constitutes civilization within the life history of all species. It forms the basis of everyday wisdom and serves as the primary medium through which beings interpret, organize, and understand the natural world.

Language emerges from daily life and sustained observation across generations. It develops from what people think, imagine, see, experience, test, smell, and remember over time. In this sense, language functions as a form of science—not formalized laboratory science, but an experiential science grounded in observation, repetition, survival, and transmission.

Keywords: Ngbarnyi, Gonja, Epistemology, Language, Evolution, African Philosophy

Introduction

Before the emergence of scientific instruments, formal theories, or written formulas, humans observed nature, named what they encountered, described processes, and preserved those descriptions in language. Through this cumulative process, language became a repository of collective knowledge and wisdom.

Language records how heat behaves, how water moves, how soil responds to rainfall, how the wisdom of the seed responds to the sun, how life develops, and how matter changes form.

Nevertheless, considering these matters from Ngbarnyi epistemological perspectives fundamentally differs from the

Darwinian system of evolution. This study is not articulated from the standpoint of laboratory-based experimental science; rather, it is advanced from the standpoint of culture as a foundational system of knowledge.

Language is not separate from science; rather, it represents its earliest form. Everyday wisdom encoded in language constitutes humanity's first systematic engagement with the natural world. Culture, language, and observation are inseparable, and together they form the epistemic foundation upon which later scientific inquiry was constructed.

The Origin of Life-Living-Ngbarnyi-Gonja (The Origin of Living Beings)

Ngbarnyi-Gonja is the linguistic medium through which this study is articulated. The analysis presented herein examines the

Citation: Rashid Abubakar Iddrisu. Stone-Age African Language of Life – Living in the Ngbarnyi (Gonja) Concept. J Envi Sci Agri Res. 2026. 4(1): 1-13.

DOI: doi.org/10.61440/JESAR.2026.v4.144

scientific and philosophical knowledge embedded within the Ngbarnyi language and its explanation of how existence itself came into being.

Within Gonja, Ngbarnyi carries a deeply layered, nuanced meaning when translated literally.

“**Ngbar**” denotes reliance.

“**Nyi**” denotes knowledge and wisdom that lead to civilization.

When combined as Ngbarnyi, the term signifies knowledge, wisdom, and civilization upon which one can depend with full trust and confidence.

Kuso K’ma fara K’ Joo-Nbuu na

According to the Ngbarnyi-Gonja language-civilization of the Gonja people, everything begins, or comes into being, from stone. This foundational principle is articulated in the formulation: “**Kuso K’ma fara K’ Joo Nbuu.**”

Stone-everything is touched and set into motion from stone. You, the one reading, and the one listening, are attached to stone; without stone, you would not have existed. Stone is the mainstay of

life-living, and all living life originates from stone. All else that exists continues to live, depend on, and remain in contact with stone.

Life itself is understood to have originated from stone, a conception supported by the linguistic, philosophical, and cosmological heritage of the Gonja people. This understanding is further reinforced by the well-known proverb: “Fo Chir/chari kanan k’ma fo manfo k’joombuu,” which literally states that no matter how long one lives, one can never outlive a stone.

K’joombuu

In the Gonja language, “K’joombuu” commonly refers to stone (maternal). However, within Gonja natural philosophy and indigenous scientific thought, the term carries a far deeper and more complex meaning.

Linguistically, “**K’joo**” signifies waiting or remaining in readiness, while “**Nbuu**” denotes a long journey or an extended duration before something comes into existence. When combined, “**K’joombuu**” expresses the idea that stone existed long before human arrival; it was already present, settled, weighed, and firmly positioned within the universe (a material). Stone is therefore understood not as a passive object, but as an ancient, enduring presence, being a suspended stage.

K’Sa Awole-Suspended within Space

Through sustained observation of the natural world, Gonja thinkers further conceptualized this stone- body as suspended and therefore named it “**K’Sa Awole**,” literally translated as “self-suspending,” thus: “it is suspended within space.” The term “it is suspended” thus conforms to an object in suspension, which is the uni-stone (the uni-verse), surrounded by immense emptiness.

“**K’Sa Awole**”—thus, it is suspended—encodes the idea of the universal, the planetary body, and a foundational entity within existence.

Within the Gonja philosophical framework, this stone-body is not merely an inert object but a living entity, implying that it may have been created, originated, or emerged from another dimensional force. While this originating force is not defined in mechanistic terms, Gonja philosophy assumes the existence of a self-subsisting, creative energy incubated or concealed within a higher, intensely warm, higher-density heat dimension, identified with the Sun. From this concealed energetic source, all things come into being.

This creative force is understood to have generated everything, including light emerging from darkness, symbolized through phenomena such as lightning. For this reason, the Gonja philosophical and natural designation for this concealed generative energy is “**BøPO**,” which literally means “Creator.” BøPO is understood as the creator of all existence and all beings, encompassing visible and invisible dimensions, including life, matter, energy, and spirit beings.

Gonja philosophers further describe this creative force using the expression “**BøPO-TALA**,” meaning “Creator-Bright,” a reference to a higher, intensely warm dimension of heat and light energies. “**BøPO**” signifies Creator, while “**TALA**” signifies brightness or illumination. “**BøPOTALA**” therefore denotes the light from which creation emerged and is the term used by the Gonja to describe the creator of nature and existence.

Gonja philosophical concepts further maintain that “**BøPOTALA**,” the creator of nature and existence, exists in suspension within space and is therefore reflected in the physical image described as “**K’Sa Awole**,” meaning self-suspending, thus: “it is suspended in space.” “It is suspended,” thus serves as a confirmation of a single unit-object, referring to one stone-body, cosmologically understood as planetary within the universe-space.

Uni refers to the single, while verse refers to the components of a body or object and the space surrounding it.

Spiritual Dimension

In Ngbarnyi (Gonja) culture and cosmological science, the spiritual dimension refers to Amin, Amen, Ameen, and related terms. The term Amin or Amen in the Ngbarnyi-Gonjan language is translated symbolically as “the hairs you have on your head” or “to swallow something.” Still, philosophically, it means “to overcome.” Gonja cosmic science describes hair as an idea of something that swallows or overcomes you because it is positioned on top of you.

These concepts within Ngbarnyi’s (Gonja’s) cosmology refer to natural forces that exist beyond, or have overcome, the intelligence and wisdom of all species, including the limits of human understanding.

Therefore, in Ngbarnyi’s (Gonja’s) thought, the universe is understood as the totality of material bodies in existence, together with their spiritual dimensions that sustain them, and the entirety of the cosmic space surrounding them. In this worldview, the spiritual dimension of the universe refers to the DNA of its blueprint—that is, the fundamental design that underlies and structures the universe itself.

However, the spiritual dimension should be understood as the source of the DNA of this original or foundational blueprint, and not as “spirit” in the sense of demonic or supernatural entities. The spiritual dimension lies beyond the scope of empirical verification and cannot be proven through the methods of human scientific inquiry.

Within the cosmological framework of Gonja philosophy, the universe is conceived as a material body, while the emptiness that surrounds it is designated as "**Awolpar**" or "**Awolparga**", meaning space. The term "**Awol**" or "**Awolto**" denotes space in general, whereas "**Par**" or "**Parga**" refers to the vast dimensional expanse encompassing the universe. Consequently, "**Awolpar**" signifies the immense and boundless emptiness identified as cosmic space.

According to Gonja philosophers, the space surrounding the universe is immeasurable.

From the perspective of Gonja natural science, space is understood as emptiness, an emptiness that is inherently immeasurable, untouchable, and non-traversable precisely because it is void. In this framework, emptiness can only be conceived as measurable when two distinct universes exist in relation to one another.

The term *uni* signifies one. The concept of the *uni*-verse or *versal* therefore implies a single original stone that expanded and exploded, giving rise to multiple stones, understood as universes or planets. A state of oneness thus produced multiple verses. Consequently, many stone bodies (planetary) originated from one primordial stone.

However, if Earth is described as part of the universe, the question arises as to the location of the other “verses.” The Moon, Jupiter, Uranus, and other planetary bodies suggest an original unity. Initially, there was one verse. Expansion and explosion transformed it into many. Linguistically, the concept of the universe becomes paradoxical: it was once one and is now many.

Apeinjin

In the Ngbarnyi(Gonja) language "**Apeinjin**" refers to the sun symbolically. However, a word in the Ngbarnyi(Gonja) language is not just a reference to the sun only, but the definition of the Sun as the primary source of natural cosmic multiversal constant burning forces that pull and release substances, driving the multiversal planetary system and supporting life-living on Earth and the multiverse.

How the Universe (Planetary) Reproduction Occurs

Within this framework of the natural cosmic constant burning forces of the sun, Gonja philosophy explains the transition from a single planetary body to multiple planetary bodies through the concept known as "**Tushi-fonto-nti**." This term refers to the Gonja philosophical method of boiling and heating.

Gonja conceptual cosmology maintains that the universe was once much closer to the natural, cosmic, and constant burning forces of the sun than it is today, and that the sun’s intense atmospheric heat overheated the stone (universe), causing it to undergo the process of "**Tushi-fontonti**." This process forced

reactions across multiple dimensions, including warming, rotation, and expansion. Rotation itself generates both internal and external heat, which leads to expansion.

“**Tushifontonti**” signifies constant heating that results in expansion and eventual explosion, dispersing matter widely across different dimensions.

Gonja linguist Mr. Rashid Iddrisu Wari has analyzed the components of “**Tushifontonti**” as follows: “**Tushi**” denotes heat, warming, or boiling through excessive heat, implying the presence of water. “**Fonto**” denotes boiling, blowing, or expansion, implying oxygen within water.

“**Nti**” or “**Ntito**” denotes explosion and wide dispersion in the air across different dimensions, implying the presence of “**gasa-gas**.”

Rotation and warming produce expansion, and expansion produces explosion, dispersing matter across different dimensions. Observationally, boiling water circulates and moves. Gonja teaching affirms that when an entity becomes hot, it moves, expands, and may explode.

Gonja philosophers articulated this understanding long before the emergence of Western laboratories and formal scientific institutions: when an object is heated beyond its limit of resistance, an explosion may occur, redistributing the object and its fragments across different positions and layers.

This process is encoded in the Gonja language through the following expressions

K'bangto: meaning cracked into large parts.

K'borto: meaning broken into medium parts.

K'beeto: meaning broken into smaller multiple parts.

K'shisir: referring to particles.

K'punpun: meaning disintegrated into dust.

Through this process, one universe becomes a multi-versal planetary system. “**Shisir**” or “**Sisir**” refers to sand, literally meaning “particles.” Each particle of sand is a stone object rooted in the original mother stone, confirming Gonja's scientific wisdom that the universe was once a single stone planet surrounded by immense space.

Through observation of “**Tushifontonti**”, Gonja thinkers understood planetary reproduction as a process through which one planet gives rise to many. The term *uni* signifies one.

Among these multiversal planets, the one that possesses weather and climatic conditions suitable for the physical abode of life-living seed to be generated is the planet Earth. The Gonja name for Earth is “**Dunya**”. This term has been adopted across many languages to refer to the world, especially the Arabs. However, within the Gonja philosophical framework, “**Du-nya**” is not merely a name but a philosophical concept used to precisely and uniquely describe the shapes of the multiversal planets. Through the conceptual model of sowing and harvesting—the natural life cycle of plants—the Gonja describe how each planet appears and preserve knowledge about their forms and structures within language itself.

In Gonja philosophy, “Du-nya” functions as a conceptual framework describing planetary shape and function through the analogy of sowing and harvesting.

“Du” means to plant a seed, and “Nya” means to harvest or gain.

This understanding is preserved in the proverb “**Dunya-kulbi, ne kumo be k'bawuta bee-kulti**,” which literally states that the Earth is a round seed sustained through rotation. This affirms that the Earth is round and in motion, comparable to the natural life cycle of plants.

In the Ngbarneyi / Gonja Language:

“**Ga**” = gas (components: air, carbon dioxide, traces of gases from digestion)

“**Sa**” = to release into space or the atmosphere

“**Gasa**” = the act of releasing gas into space or the atmosphere

This refers to what occurs after eating or drinking. Air and food enter the stomach, where digestion and heat occur. As digestion proceeds, gases are produced, and pressure builds within the stomach. When this pressure increases, "ga" (gas) is released through the mouth, a process commonly known as belching.

In the Ngbarneyi-Gonja language, “**Gasa**” refers specifically to the involuntary release of gas into the atmosphere. From a physiological perspective, this gas is most often expelled through the oesophagus rather than through the intestines, as a significant portion of gastrointestinal gas originates in the stomach and upper digestive tract.

During food intake, especially when meals are large, air is swallowed (aerophagia), and additional gas is produced during digestion. Excessive intake leads to gastric distension, which increases internal pressure. This pressure can affect nearby structures such as the diaphragm and lungs, slightly restrict their movement and produce a sensation of fullness or mild breathing discomfort.

As intra-gastric pressure rises, gas is preferentially released upward through the oesophagus rather than downward into the intestines. This results in belching, a normal physiological mechanism that helps regulate internal pressure.

It represents a coordinated interaction between the digestive and respiratory systems and should be regarded as a natural bodily response rather than a disorder.

This release is involuntary. The gas expands due to heat and pressure, and its release disperses it into the surrounding environment. Although this process does not constitute an actual explosion in scientific terms, it resembles an expansion followed by outward release. From a philosophical perspective within Ngbarneyi's(Gonja) thought, this process reflects natural patterns observed in the universe. Just as pressure gives rise to expansion, and expansion facilitates formation and movement in nature, “**Gasa**” symbolizes a universal principle of release, transformation, and balance. Accordingly, “**Gasa**” is not merely a bodily function but represents a broader cosmic process in which pressure leads to expansion, expansion to release, and release to transformation.

The gas contains air and other elements, and heat and pressure drive its expansion. This expansion can result in a forceful release that produces dispersion in multiple directions. Such a process mirrors natural phenomena observed in the universe, analogous to how energy expands and contributes to the formation of matter, planetary bodies, and cosmic systems. From the perspective of Ngbarneyi(Gonja) philosophy, “**Gasa**” is therefore not simply a bodily function; rather, it embodies a universal principle of pressure, expansion, and symbolic explosion. This interpretation reflects a deeper and more symbolic understanding of natural processes.

Scientific Clarification (Important)

From a medical and scientific point of view, a gastric belch occurs primarily due to the swallowing of air (aerophagia) and the production of gas during digestion. The gas consists mainly of nitrogen and carbon dioxide, with small amounts of oxygen. It is not the result of combustion or burning.

The stomach does not reach temperatures high enough to cause combustion. The process is pressure- based rather than fire-based. Scientifically, therefore, the sequence is: pressure → release → gas expulsion. It does not involve burning, explosion, or carbon combustion.

However, as a philosophical or metaphorical explanation, the comparison to cosmic expansion remains meaningful. Within this interpretive framework, the process serves as an analogy for broader universal dynamics involving pressure, expansion, and transformation.

In simple terms

“**Gasa**” = pressure + heat + digestion → gas release

And symbolically: Pressure → expansion → release →explosion-dispersion → creation

Ka-abɔ ne Kakur'awuebi-Creation and Reproduction

Ka-abɔ ne Kakur'awuebi-The Progenitor. The perception of the universe's reproduction is often a central focus among species; however, Gonja philosophy extends this logic further by applying it on a cosmic scale.

Accordingly, Ngbarneyi (Gonja) natural science holds that species reproduction arises from a species' own genetic self-interaction, as well as from genetic interactions within the same species.

But the fundamental seed for the species' existence, before interactions for reproduction, comes from natural cosmic creation.

From this perspective, "Ngbarneyi"(Gonja) philosophers state that the origin of "**Bi**" the seed of species life, comes from "**Adepor**".

In Gonja linguistic usage, "**A/Eche**" denotes a woman, "**Ani**"/"**Anio**" denotes a woman capable of receiving seed, "**Afur**"/"**Afor**" denotes menstruation, literally meaning "washing" or "cleaning," signifying the preparation of the incubator. "**Ani-Puuli-Ebi**" expresses pregnancy: **Ani** means stacked, "**Puuli**" means buried or incubated, and **Ebi** means child, learner, or seed.

Adepor-Mud

According to Gonja philosophy, the origin of "Bi", the species seed of life, comes from "**Adepor**", symbolically meaning mud. "**Adepor**" is a condensed conceptual phrase in which "**Ade**" denotes protection, concealment, or guidance, and "**A/Epor**" denotes growth or development. "**Adepor**," therefore, signifies protected development. Mud, composed of dust, the final particle of stone, combined with moisture, constitutes the incubator of life. Without mud, a seed cannot develop; consequently, the ground is understood as the mother.

From this perspective, the planet itself functions as a natural incubator of life. All species originate as seeds incubated within them. Dust, as the final particle of stone, becomes mud when combined with moisture, forming the medium of life. Gonja philosophy, therefore, does not hold that humans originated from monkeys. Instead, it maintains that all species possess distinct seeds, incubated within the planetary body and brought forth through development rather than transformation from one species into another.

From Gonja's point of view, humans originated from the "**Adepor**"(Mud). Then the human body will contain traces of mud when examined by modern, sophisticated scientific instruments.

What I mean by elements of dust are: Mud, dust, and tiny particles of stone.

In the Gonja language, when someone is growing slim, we express it as "**Abewol**"- meaning he or she is drying, indicating that the moisture content in the mud is reducing or extracting out and leaving the dust particle, which is from the stone, and the stone is a dry material or substance.

Universe

In the Ngbarnyi(Gonja) language, "**K'Sa**" denotes "suspension," while "**Awole**" signifies "the immense space." When combined, the term "**K'Sa Wole/k'sa awole**" is translated as "Self-Suspending-it is suspended in space in reference to the Universe."

The expression further conveys the understanding that the totality of the universe and its measurement are fundamentally unknowable and immeasurable, and that climatic conditions and other forces shaping the nature of existence cannot be identical or occur simultaneously across all regions of the cosmos.

Through sustained observation of the natural world, Gonja thinkers developed this concept to articulate existence as a heavy stone body suspended within cosmic space. The term reflects a broader cosmological framework in which the universe is perceived as dynamic and indeterminate, governed by natural forces that vary across it. Within this conception, the universe encompasses all of space and time, all matter and energy, all galaxies, stars, and planets, as well as the laws that govern them; all, therefore, 'Suspension the Ngbarnyi research sees them from.

"**K'Sa Awole**", thus, refers to the stone itself, conceived as a singular and distinctive planetary body. It is regarded as one Universal Body—resulting in multiple verses, as earlier mentioned above, as components of the One Universal Body—

and as a foundational element of existence, embodying both material presence and cosmological significance. Within this worldview, the ground is not merely physical terrain but a metaphysical entity situated within an ever-unfolding and complex universe."

Fo mantin nchi n'yil awolto-You cannot step on space.

"Ngbarnyi" (Gonja language). This proverb is often used to describe something that one cannot achieve.

This proverb is not merely an ordinary saying; rather, it scientifically preserves the idea that space cannot be touched. It articulates and encodes principles of natural science and the behavior of nature. The expression of the proverb, "**Fo mantin nchi n'yil awolto**," conveys the idea of an action from

which nothing can be achieved when it is based on emptiness. In other words, Gonja philosophy emphasizes that meaningful action cannot be grounded in nothingness.

A critical and careful examination of the Gonja statement reveals that the concept "awoleso" refers to "space" as the distance or interval between two objects, entities, or dimensions.

The study further establishes that space itself cannot serve as a support or foundation, since it represents emptiness or absence. Consequently, space cannot be physically grasped, occupied, or manipulated. One cannot stand on space, nor can one rely on it as a basis for action.

The language further explains that one cannot step into or travel to space, because space itself is defined as the emptiness between two objects. Space is not an object in itself; rather, it is the absence or interval separating objects. In this sense, space represents nothingness.

Consequently, it cannot be occupied, possessed, or physically stepped upon. The distance between objects constitutes space, but space itself has no touchable physical material substance.

Within the Gonja (Ngbarmye) linguistic and philosophical framework, this understanding carries important implications. In counting and numeration, the Gonja numeration science does not recognize the concept of zero, as zero signifies nothingness. Since nothingness cannot be owned, relied upon, or treated as an entity, it is excluded from their numerical system. Counting, therefore, begins from one object onward, not from zero.

From this perspective, any claim that one has "traveled to space" or "stepped on space" reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the very concept of space. One may move through space, but one cannot arrive at space or stand on it, because space is not a physical entity. Accordingly, anyone who asserts having stepped into space reveals a lack of understanding of the scientific and philosophical position articulated in Ngbarnyi(Gonja) earlier statement.

A proper understanding of this concept requires engagement with the Gonjas' worldview, which emphasizes that space is merely the absence between entities rather than a destination or an object in itself. This worldview reinforces the principle

that nothingness cannot serve as a foundation for action, measurement, or ownership. The absence of zero as a numerical symbol in the Gonja system stems from its conceptualization as space.

In Gonja thought, numbers function as references to tangible entities; they indicate relationships between objects rather than abstract quantities. Consequently, numeration is grounded in the presence of objects, beginning with one and proceeding onward. While symbolic representations exist for numbers such as one and two, no symbol exists for zero, as zero represents absence rather than substance.

Within this framework, the interval between numerical values—such as the gap between one and two—is understood as space. Space, therefore, is not an entity in itself but rather the distance or separation between reference points. Because space depends on the existence of objects for its definition, it cannot be conceptualized independently. Without reference points, space cannot be measured, calculated, or meaningfully described.

This understanding further explains why, in Gonja thought, one cannot travel to space but rather through space. Space is not a destination; it is the medium that exists between locations. Accordingly, claims of having traveled to or stepped on space reflect a conceptual misunderstanding. Movement occurs within space, not toward it, because space is simply the distance between one reference point

and another. From the Gonja scientific and philosophical perspective, one does not travel to space but rather through space.

Space is understood as emptiness or the interval between physical entities, similar to air, which cannot be stood upon without physical support. Just as one cannot stand in the air without being in suspension, one cannot stand in space, because space itself is not a tangible entity.

According to Gonja's view, when an individual claims to have traveled to space, that claim reflects a conceptual misunderstanding. What actually occurs is movement through space from one reference point to another. For example, if the Earth is considered the first reference point and another planet the second, movement takes place between these two points. The distance separating them is called space. Thus, space is not the destination but the interval through which movement occurs.

In this sense, when a person travels from one planet to another, they do not arrive in space itself; rather, they arrive at another physical object or creature. The space encountered is merely the gap between the two objects. Therefore, claiming to have traveled to space misrepresents the nature of space as understood in Gonja philosophy. One can only pass through space, not arrive at it.

Furthermore, even upon reaching another planet, space continues to exist between that planet and others. Movement, therefore, always occurs from one object to another, with space serving solely as the medium between them. Space itself remains

intangible and cannot be occupied; consequently, it cannot be considered a destination or a physical location.

From this perspective, the assertion that humans have traveled to space is inaccurate. Rather, humans have traveled through space from one physical body to another. Both the point of departure and the point of arrival are material entities; the space between them is merely the void through which movement occurs.

In Gonja thought, space is not regarded as an object or an entity but as emptiness or absence—comparable to zero. It cannot be seen, touched, occupied, or stood upon. For this reason, Gonja's philosophical understanding rejects the idea of “standing in space” or “traveling to space.” One cannot remain suspended in emptiness without support.

This understanding is reflected in the Gonja philosophical principle expressed in “**Fo mantin nchi n'yil awole**”, which conveys that one cannot stand on nothing. Space, being equivalent to emptiness, cannot serve as a foundation for existence or action.

Finally, interpreting such concepts requires careful attention to the Gonja language itself. In Ngbarneyi- Gonja, meaning is often embedded directly within words. Words are not arbitrary labels; rather, they inherently carry meaning through their pronunciation and structure. For instance, terms such as “**Ngbarneyi(Gonja)**” intrinsically convey knowledge and wisdom without the need for additional explanation. Language, therefore, functions simultaneously as expression and interpretation.

In conclusion, from the Gonja worldview, space is not a place one can travel to, but a conceptual gap between entities. Movement occurs between objects, not toward emptiness. Thus, space is neither a destination nor an object, but the absence that allows motion to be perceived.

A clearer understanding of the Ngbarneyi(Gonja) explanation emerges through an examination of the Gonja system of numerical enumeration. In Gonja's thought, the absence of the numeral zero is deliberate and philosophically grounded. Zero is not recognized because it lacks a reference point. Numerical meaning is derived from relational positioning rather than abstraction. That is, counting begins with one and proceeds to two, three, and beyond, with each number defined in relation to the others. There is no conceptual transition from zero to one because zero represents nothingness and therefore cannot serve as a reference.

Within this framework, the interval between one and two is understood as space. Likewise, the interval between two and three, as well as between three and four, is also regarded as space. Space, therefore, is not an object but the relational gap between entities. It exists only where there are two or more reference points.

To illustrate, if one object is positioned at point one and another at point two, the distance separating them constitutes space. Although this space may contain matter, energy, radiation, or forces, it is not itself an object.

If one moves from point one to point two, one travels through this space and ultimately arrives at the second object. The destination is not space itself but the object located at the second reference point.

This conceptualization applies equally to planetary motion. The distance between planets is what constitutes space. When a spacecraft travels from Earth to another planet, it does not arrive at space; rather, it passes through space and lands on another physical body. The planet reached is not space but a distinct object with its own identity. If planets were themselves space, they would not have individual names such as Earth, Mars, Venus, or Jupiter. Their distinct naming indicates that they are objects situated within space, not space itself.

Thus, from the Gonja philosophical perspective, it is inaccurate to claim that one has traveled to space. Rather, one travels through space, moving from one object to another. Space functions as the interval or medium between reference points, not as a destination in itself. Any claim of traveling to space, therefore, reflects a misunderstanding of the nature of space as conceptualized within this framework.

In conclusion, space in Gonja thought is relational rather than substantive. It is defined by distance, not by physical existence. Movement occurs across space, not toward it. Consequently, one may traverse space, but one cannot arrive at space itself. Birds may wish they could live in space, but space is not steppable.

According to Ngbarneyi's science and philosophical thought, the expression "**Fo mantin nchi n'yil awolto**" conveys the principle that one cannot step on space.

This assertion is grounded in the Ngbarneyi understanding of space as a relational concept rather than a physical entity. Space is defined as the distance or interval between two or more reference points—whether between two, three, or multiple objects. It is not an object in itself, but the gap that exists among objects.

From the Ngbarneyi perspective, space cannot be found, as it exists only as a relationship between entities. When one moves from one point to another, one is said to travel through space, not to space.

The destination—where one eventually arrives—is an object, not space itself. Space is merely the interval traversed between the point of departure and the point of arrival. If space were itself an object, it would bear a distinct identity or name, just as planets do. The fact that planets have individual names demonstrates that they are not part of space, but rather objects situated within it.

To illustrate, when a person stands on Earth and observes the Moon, the distance separating Earth and the Moon constitutes space. If one were to travel from Earth to the Moon, that movement would occur through this spatial interval. Upon arrival, one would be standing on the Moon, not in space. The Moon is an object, whereas space is the gap between Earth and the Moon. If the Moon itself were space, it would not possess a unique identity or name.

Therefore, within Ngbarneyi's philosophical reasoning, the claim that one has "traveled to space" reflects a misunderstanding of the concept of space. A more accurate expression would be that one has traveled through space to reach another object. Space cannot be a destination because it is not a physical entity that can be occupied or stood upon.

In conclusion, Ngbarneyi(Gonja) philosophy maintains that space is not an object but a relational interval between objects. It serves as a means of movement rather than a destination. Consequently, no one can travel to space; one can only travel through space from one reference point to another. If traveling through space from one point to another signifies traveling to space, then anyone who travels by plane from one point to another would also have traveled to space.

Rotation generates heat; heat produces expansion, and expansion leads to transformation. As the universe warms, it expands and ultimately explodes.

Ancient wisdom encoded in living culture and preserved as inherited knowledge cannot be discovered externally, because it already exists within the people themselves. **Darwin's discoveries did not emerge in isolation and may reflect encounters with ideas preserved within ancestral knowledge systems.**

From a Gonja cultural and traditional perspective, this study does not rely on scientific or religious frameworks, yet it remains consistent with observable phenomena. Boiling produces bubbles; bubbles indicate gas; heating produces expansion and rupture.

These processes affirm Gonja's knowledge of warming, expansion, and transformation. Life, warmth, and transformation are encoded in the language, philosophy, and observational wisdom of Ngbarneyi- Gonja.

The inapplicability of Darwinian evolution within the Gonja knowledge system does not constitute an emotional rejection nor a laboratory-based scientific rebuttal.

Rather, it represents a cultural and epistemological distinction. Darwinian theory presupposes linear biological ancestry, species transformation through mutation, and competition as a primary driver of life. Gonja knowledge, by contrast, assumes seed-specific origins, incubation rather than mutation, planetary and cosmic reproduction, and knowledge encoded and transmitted through language across millennia. These systems do not converge at the level of first principles.

Consequently, Darwin's theory cannot be amended, supplemented, or completed by Gonja philosophy; it is methodologically and ontologically inapplicable within it. From a Gonja cultural perspective, this study operates independently of Western scientific or religious frameworks while remaining grounded in observable natural processes such as heating, expansion, motion, and transformation. Life originates from stone. Species do not evolve from other species. Each living being emerges from its own seed, incubated within the planetary body.

Language functions as an archive, culture as a laboratory, and observation as inheritance.

Gonja first proverb: “**Bɔamin mo ni bi la Bɔamin na**” — meaning the seed of a human mother is human.

Among the Gonja, the term mother seed refers to the fundamental source or origin of something. This Gonja proverb scientifically affirms that the human seed is human, not a product of evolutionary transformation.

Gonja philosophy, therefore, constitutes an indigenous African Stone-Age knowledge system that does not merely contest Darwinian evolution empirically, but challenges it epistemologically by presenting a distinct, coherent, and everlasting, self-sustaining framework for understanding origins.

Gonja's second proverb: “**Lakesa Chir/chari ka nank'ma, k'mantin ki Bɔamin**”—literally translated as no matter how long a monkey lives, it cannot transform into a human being.

Lakesa is a Gonja scientific term referring to all species of monkeys. However, when the term Lakesa is examined etymologically within the Gonja language, it reveals a semantic structure that is fundamentally classificatory rather than genealogical.

The morpheme La functions as a marker of confirmation or acknowledgment, indicating that something appears to be “like” or “as if.” At the same time, La conveys a dynamic semantic dimension, implying motion or ongoing activity rather than a fixed or completed state.

This dual semantic function is central to understanding the philosophical significance of the term within Gonja epistemology.

In Gonja, Lakesa does not denote origin, identity, or equivalence. Rather, it signifies resemblance, likeness, or behavioral similarity. The term is employed to describe entities that look like, behave like, or appear similar to others, without asserting sameness, identity, or shared origin. Accordingly, Lakesa operates within a framework of analogy and comparison rather than lineage, descent, or derivation.

Consequently, Lakesa explicitly rejects co-equality. To designate something as Lakesa is to assert non-equivalence in both origin and identity. The concept affirms difference while simultaneously acknowledging superficial similarity.

This linguistic distinction is deliberate and carries significant philosophical weight within the Gonja knowledge system. Within this epistemic framework, Lakesa may be applied to beings that resemble human beings in certain observable respects; however, such resemblance is not interpreted as evidence of common origin. The resemblance is phenomenological rather than ontological. It does not imply descent, source, or evolutionary derivation from human beings, nor does it suggest that human beings originate from Lakesa. Instead, the term reinforces categorical separation. Humans are distinct from Lakesa, and Lakesa are equally distinct from humans.

In Gonja epistemology, Lakesa refers to beings contemporarily classified as apes—specifically monkeys and chimpanzees—which are recognized as a separate group of entities possessing their own identity, nature, and origin. Accordingly, the Gonja linguistic and philosophical treatment of Lakesa does not merely suggest that Darwinian evolutionary claims are incomplete; rather, it renders them inapplicable within this indigenous epistemological framework.

The language itself encodes a metaphysical boundary that precludes interpreting apes as ancestral sources of humanity. In this sense, Gonja epistemology constitutes a self-contained scientific-philosophical system governed by its own criteria of knowledge, classification, and truth.

The third proverb, “**Kusobɔ k'ma ne mo kumu be K'fuibi**” may be interpreted as meaning: “Every species of organism has its own genetic factor or origin.” Conceptually, the proverb may be analyzed as follows. “**Kusobɔ**” denotes being, species, or organism. “**K'ma ne mo kumu**” signifies “each has” or “every possesses,” while “**be K'fuibi**” refers to genetic origin, genetic factor, or fundamental essence.

Epistemologically, this proverb articulates a principle that closely aligns with modern biological understanding: each living organism carries a distinct set of hereditary factors—what contemporary science identifies as genes—that define its nature and lineage. This reflects the long-standing recognition within indigenous African knowledge systems of biological uniqueness and continuity prior to the formalization of genetics as a scientific discipline. The proverb thus represents a cultural articulation of inheritance and biological identity.

However, when the question of chimpanzee- and ape-based evolutionary models is examined from a cultural and epistemological perspective, an alternative explanatory framework emerges.

Naming Ceremony

In the Ngbarnyi-Gonja cultural system, particularly through the institution of naming ceremonies following marriage between two individuals, there exists a long-standing tradition that challenges the proposition that human beings evolved from chimpanzees, apes, or other monkey species.

Within traditional Ngbarnyi-Gonja society, a culturally significant practice concerns the naming of the first child born to a married couple, especially in cases where both the man and the woman entered marriage as virgins. According to this tradition, when such a couple gives birth to their first child, the name assigned is determined by the child's sex.

If the first child is male, he is named "**Adem-Adam**" if the first child is female, she is named "**Adema- Adama**". This naming convention is not arbitrary but is embedded within a broader cosmological and moral framework that emphasizes purity, origin, and human distinctiveness.

Adema (Adama) refers to being first to be born; however, from the Ngbarnyi (Gonja) perspective, being born is not merely about bearing a child but about being initiated into existence.

Etymologically, Adema (Adama) carries a profound meaning when traced linguistically within the Ngbarnyi (Gonja) language and its natural science. Thus emerges “Adema” or “Adama” Ade (Ada). “Ade (Ada)” denotes care, and “Ma” represents me; therefore, when these two are combined as Adema (Adama), the expression translates as “care for me.” In Gonja understanding, to care for something is to care for yourself. Adema (Adama), in Gonja terms, therefore means care for self—because caring for a child is also caring for yourself.

This cultural practice resonates strongly with narratives found in primary religious texts, which identify Adam as the first human being.

Consequently, if certain evolutionary theories propose that human beings originated through a gradual biological transformation from chimpanzees or other apes, a critical question arises: how should the figure of “**Adem** or **Adam**” as referenced in religious traditions and mirrored in Ngbarnyi-Gonja cultural practice, be understood within such evolutionary frameworks? Specifically, does this imply that “**Adem** or **Adam**” himself was a monkey or a chimpanzee? Or that a chimpanzee existed before Adam, the first human being?

The age-old Gonja tradition offers a clear response to this question by affirming the existence of a first human being on earth, identified as **Adama**.

Within the Ngbarnyi-Gonja cultural tradition, the naming of a child is governed by clearly defined moral, biological, and ritual conditions. When a man and a woman, both regarded as virgins and morally upright enter into marriage, and the woman conceives without any prior sexual history, the outcome of that first conception carries significant cultural meaning.

If the conception proceeds without miscarriage and results in a successful birth, the child's sex determines the name assigned within the Ngbarnyi-Gonja linguistic system. If the child is male, he is named Adam; if the child is female, she is named Adama.

However, this naming convention applies strictly and exclusively to the first successful conception. If a couple's initial conception results in a miscarriage, that conception is nevertheless culturally recognized as the first, despite the absence of a live birth. Consequently, if the woman later conceives again and successfully delivers a child, that child—whether male or female—cannot be named Adam or Adama. The occurrence of miscarriage in the first conception permanently disqualifies subsequent children from bearing these names, regardless of sex.

In contrast, where there is no miscarriage in the first conception, and the child is born successfully, the naming follows the established rule without exception. A male child born from the first uninterrupted conception is named Adam, while a female child born under the same conditions is named Adama. These names, therefore, signify not merely biological sex but also the integrity, continuity, and success of the initial conception within a morally sanctioned marriage.

This naming practice demonstrates that, within Ngbarnyi-Gonja epistemology, human identity is deeply linked to origin,

sequence, and moral context. The names Adam and Adama are not arbitrary personal identifiers but symbolic affirmations of first human emergence, purity of conception, and the successful continuity of life.

This account is understood to confirm rather than contradict the narratives presented in religious scriptures concerning human origins.

From this perspective, the first human being did not emerge through processes of transformation or transmorphosis from one biological stage to another, but rather existed as a complete human entity from the outset, formed in “Mud.” This position raises a further epistemological challenge to evolutionary accounts: if the first human being, identified as Adam or Adama in religious and cultural texts, did not evolve from a prior non-human species, how should claims of human descent from chimpanzees be reconciled with these deeply rooted cultural and religious narratives?

If evolutionary theory were to suggest that the first human was originally a chimpanzee, this would imply that Adam himself was a monkey—an implication that directly conflicts with both Ngbarnyi- Gonja tradition and religious scripture. Moreover, if Adam is understood as the progenitor of the world's human population, it becomes increasingly difficult, within this cultural framework, to sustain the claim that contemporary human beings originated from chimpanzees.

Therefore, the central question remains unresolved within evolutionary discourse when examined through Ngbarnyi-Gonja epistemology: Does the assertion that humans evolved from chimpanzees imply that the first human being was a chimpanzee? If so, how does this claim align with cultural, religious, and historical conceptions of Adam as the first fully human individual?

On these grounds, as well as several other cultural and epistemological grounds, evolutionary theories that assert that human beings evolved from chimpanzees do not coherently align with Gonja traditional knowledge systems. The Gonja cultural framework—particularly as expressed through naming ceremonies—offers an internally consistent account of human origin that affirms the identity of the first human, irrespective of sex. This cultural logic closely corresponds with narratives found in the sacred texts of the world's most influential and enduring religions, both historically and in the present era.

Furthermore, within the Ngbarnyi-Gonja linguistic and cultural tradition, additional evidence emerges through the conceptualization of childbirth and labor. When a woman is in labor, the Gonja expression A/Eche “**Be Kur'awuebi**” is used to describe this condition. The phrase is repeated for emphasis—“**Echi Be Kur'awuebi**”—to signify that the woman is actively engaged in the critical process of delivering a child. Within this same semantic framework, expressions such as “**Ebe Kur'awu**” and “**Ebi**” underscore the intensity, strain, and physical exertion inherent in labor.

Central to this conceptual system is the term “**AKur'awuebi**,” which in Gonja means “digging to have a child.” In this context, labor is metaphorically understood as the process of

digging out something that is firmly lodged. The unborn child is described as being “stuck” or embedded within the womb, and the woman in labor is therefore said to be “digging” the child out. This imagery is neither incidental nor merely poetic; it is linguistically and philosophically significant. The “stuck” child is referred to as mud, previously defined as a composite of moisture, soil, and other elemental substances. Consequently, the womb is conceptualized as the ground, the child as a seed embedded within that ground (incubated), and childbirth as the act of excavation required for emergence.

Within this framework, labor is not treated as a purely biological event but as a culturally theorized process. When something is deeply embedded in the ground and must be removed, digging becomes necessary. Gonja language, therefore, frames childbirth as the act of excavating a seed that has been planted and nurtured (incubated) within the womb. This linguistic construction illustrates how the Gonja worldview understands human emergence as originating in an elemental, earth-based process rather than in a biological transformation from an animal species.

Accordingly, the Gonja tradition does not conceive of human origin as a progression from a monkey or chimpanzee stage to a human stage. Such an evolutionary model lacks grounding in Gonja cultural heritage, philosophy, or language.

Instead, the tradition frames human origin as a process involving seed, soil, moisture, and emergence—elements symbolically associated with mud. Hence, when a woman is giving birth, the expression “**Ebe Kur’awuebi na**” is used, meaning that she is digging for the seed to germinate and shoot out. The “shooting out” of the seed signifies the birth of the baby.

This linguistic and conceptual system in Ngbarneyi-Gonja supports an understanding of human origins rooted in elemental processes rather than primate evolution. The idea that human beings originated from mud, rather than from chimpanzees or apes, is consistently reinforced through naming ceremonies, childbirth expressions, and broader cultural practices.

Importantly, these linguistic and cultural processes did not emerge recently. They existed long before the formulation of modern evolutionary theories. Therefore, it cannot reasonably be argued that these traditions were influenced by or derived from contemporary evolutionary discourse. Even a young child in Gonja society can articulate these concepts when asked about childbirth or naming practices, using established Ngbarneyi-Gonja expressions that clearly encode the full process within the language itself.

Because the process is explicitly embedded and preserved in the language, it requires no external validation to be understood or accepted within the cultural system. The clarity of this process, as articulated through Ngbarneyi linguistic structures, stands in contrast to evolutionary claims that human beings originated from chimpanzees or apes—claims that, within the Gonja epistemological framework, lack cultural, linguistic, and philosophical validity.

The process of childbirth and the subsequent naming of a child in Gonja tradition serve as a culturally embedded confirmation of the identity of the first human being to come into existence. This process, as encoded in the Gonja language and practice, reflects a worldview that does not support the claim that human beings originated from chimpanzees or apes. Rather, it affirms a distinct and original human beginning.

Gonja language and tradition predate the formulation of modern evolutionary theories. Within this long-established linguistic system, the name associated with the first human being corresponds directly

with the name identified in religious scriptures. This convergence between local language and sacred texts serves as a form of cultural validation, suggesting that the first human being was recognized as fully human from the outset. Consequently, this alignment serves as evidence that human beings did not originate from chimpanzees or apes.

Within this framework, Adam is understood unequivocally as a human being. There is no historical, cultural, linguistic, or religious evidence indicating that Adam was a chimpanzee, a monkey, or any non-human entity. No evolutionary account has successfully traced the origin of the first human being back to a chimpanzee identified as Adam. All available narratives—religious, cultural, and linguistic—consistently describe Adam as human. There is no proof, however minimal, that associates Adam with a chimpanzee or any other primate species.

If evolutionary arguments are followed to their logical implication, they suggest that monkeys or chimpanzees must have existed before Adam and that Adam emerged after them. However, this implication is not supported by religious texts, oral histories, or cultural traditions. There is no credible account, whether in sacred literature or in historical storytelling, that indicates the existence of monkeys as ancestral beings preceding Adam in the role of the first originator of humanity. On the contrary, available narratives consistently affirm that human beings existed prior to the emergence of such evolutionary explanations.

This indicates that Adam existed before the formulation of evolutionary theories and before the conceptualization of human origins through chimpanzees or apes. Therefore, the assertion that humans evolved from monkeys implies a sequence of events that is not substantiated by religious, cultural, or linguistic evidence. If monkeys had existed first and Adam had emerged later, such a sequence would be reflected in language, tradition, or scripture. Yet no such reflection exists.

Accordingly, theories that explain human origin exclusively through chimpanzee or ape evolution remain unclear and insufficient when examined from the Gonja epistemological perspective. These theories require reconsideration, particularly in light of indigenous knowledge systems that have preserved consistent explanations across generations.

The Gonja language, which is transmitted even at the level of primary education and everyday instruction, clearly articulates

processes of human origin, childbirth, and naming that stand in contradiction to evolutionary claims of descent from chimpanzees.

Because this language is taught, learned, and understood across generations, even a primary-level teacher can coherently explain these processes within the established cultural framework.

In this sense, the language itself serves as evidence, demonstrating that certain evolutionary theories lack grounding in indigenous epistemologies.

From this perspective, theories proposing that humans evolved from chimpanzees are viewed as lacking a solid cultural, historical, and linguistic foundation.

In conclusion, contemporary theories of evolution do not adequately reflect the ancient wisdom that existed long before the emergence of modern researchers and academicians. Nor do they fully engage with both historical and present-day understandings of how life and living beings came into existence within the totality of nature. Furthermore, contemporary theories of human evolution fail to align with the epistemological foundations and wisdom encoded in the Ngbarneyi-Gonja language, which articulates its own scientific understanding of how life originated and emerged within nature.

If it were indeed true that human beings evolved directly from monkeys, chimpanzees, or apes, then the original ancestral species would no longer exist in its prior identifiable form.

Under such an evolutionary assumption, the species from which humans allegedly transformed would have undergone complete transformation and transmorphosis into human beings. Consequently, the original species—monkey, chimpanzee, or ape—would have disappeared as a distinct and identifiable form of life.

If such a transformation had occurred, it would not be possible to continue identifying monkeys or chimpanzees as separate species in nature today. Their names, physical characteristics, and biological identities would no longer persist independently, as they would have been fully absorbed into human existence. The continued presence and recognizability of monkeys and apes, therefore, raises a critical question regarding the internal logic of such evolutionary claims.

To illustrate this point, if one assumes hypothetically that a goat transformed into a dog, the original identity of the goat would cease to exist. It would no longer be possible to identify the goat as a distinct species, because its form, name, and characteristics would have been entirely replaced by those of the dog. The persistence of the original species would contradict the notion of complete transformation.

From this perspective, the continued existence of monkeys, chimpanzees, and apes as distinct species in nature challenges the claim that they were transformed into human beings. Within this line of reasoning, transformation implies replacement, and replacement implies disappearance. Since monkeys and apes remain clearly identifiable and continuously present in the natural

world, the assertion that human beings originated through their complete transformation becomes logically problematic.

If one accepts that an entity originally identified as a goat underwent a complete transmorphosis into a dog, then the identity and name of the goat would no longer apply. Once transmorphosis has occurred, the original form, designation, and classification would cease to exist. The goat would no longer be recognized as a goat after becoming a dog.

Applying this same logic to claims of human evolution from chimpanzees or monkeys, if human beings had indeed evolved through a complete transformational process from chimpanzees, then the designation “chimpanzee” would no longer exist as a recognizable category. That species would have disappeared through transformation, and its name would no longer be known or applied. However, chimpanzees and monkeys remain clearly identifiable, named, and continuously present in nature.

It is also important to emphasize that naming is an act performed by human beings. Humans assign names to species and objects observed in nature; species do not transform into humans and subsequently receive new names from them. If chimpanzees had evolved into human beings, the original species would no longer exist for humans to observe, identify, and name.

The continued existence of chimpanzees as a named and observable species indicates that they did not undergo a complete transformation into human beings.

Therefore, if such a transformation had occurred, the species in question would no longer be present, nor would it be possible to identify it retrospectively as a source of human origin. The fact that chimpanzees and monkeys continue to exist as distinct species undermines the claim that human beings emerged through their complete transformation into humans. From this perspective, the evolutionary argument becomes internally inconsistent, as it presupposes the persistence of a species that, by its own logic, should have ceased to exist.

The Epistemological Problem

The argument under consideration highlights a fundamental epistemological tension within evolutionary theory. On the one hand, evolution maintains that human beings arose through non-teleological, purposeless natural processes. On the other hand, human beings demonstrably possess capacities that appear irreducible to such processes, including purpose-oriented cognition, moral reasoning, symbolic language, and metaphysical inquiry.

While evolutionary models may describe the biological substrates associated with these capacities, they do not adequately explain why such features exist or toward what end they are directed. In this respect, evolutionary explanation accounts for anatomical structures and physiological mechanisms—what may be termed the explanation of “bones”—but not for the ontological condition of being itself.

The Ngbarneyi-Gonja Concept versus the Evolutionary Narrative.

The Ngbarnyi-Gonja Concept Verses the Evolutionary Narratives

From the Ngbarnyi-Gonja epistemological perspective, any coherent account of human origin must satisfy a structured explanatory sequence. First, origin must account for identity; second, identity must ground continuity; and third, continuity must meaningfully explain an end. A theory that explains beginnings without essence, variation without meaning, and survival without purpose remains ontologically incomplete.

This position does not constitute a rejection of science as such. Rather, it represents a critical classification of the limits of scientific explanation. Scientific models may successfully describe empirical patterns, yet still fail to address deeper ontological and teleological questions that fall outside their methodological scope.

Human Permanence and the Question of Ends

A critical question, therefore, arises: Does evolutionary theory assert that humanity will necessarily remain human? The uncomfortable conclusion is that it does not. Within the evolutionary framework, humanity is contingent and potentially temporary. Consciousness is afforded no ultimate value, morality no final grounding, and humanity no guaranteed future. Evolution explains biological change, not destiny.

This leads to a significant asymmetry: while evolutionary theory offers speculative reconstructions of human origins, it provides no authoritative account of human ends.

This limitation arises because evolutionary theory is descriptive rather than teleological; it explains processes of change but does not posit purpose, direction, or final causality. Consequently, it cannot answer fundamental questions such as what humans are for, what humans are becoming, or what humans ultimately become.

Methodological Limits of Evolutionary Explanation. Several commonly raised criticisms of evolutionary accounts of human origins are not religious objections but methodological ones. Evolutionary theory cannot determine the ancestral populations' initial skin color, identify the first transforming organism, demonstrate a discrete moment of transformation from non-human to human, or explain the origin of human consciousness.

These limitations are widely acknowledged within the philosophy of science. Scientific knowledge depends upon observation, comprehensibility, and measurement. Human origins, understood as singular and unrepeatable past events, cannot be directly observed or experimentally replicated.

Evolutionary theory, therefore, functions as a historical reconstruction model rather than as an experimentally verifiable account of origins. Skin Color, Ancestry, and Explanatory Limits.

Evolutionary theory neither knows nor can know the skin color of hypothetical ancestral populations, as such traits do not fossilize and cannot be empirically recovered. When asked how radically different human skin colors emerged from a single ancestral population, evolutionary explanations typically invoke

environmental pressures, extended temporal spans, and genetic variation. Whether this explanation is ultimately convincing remains a philosophical and theological question rather than a conclusively settled empirical fact.

In this context, the popular notion that monkeys, chimpanzees, or apes transformed directly into human beings becomes conceptually problematic. The absence of identifiable transitional moments, definitive ancestral traits, and clearly demonstrable ontological continuity renders such claims difficult to regard as empirically grounded explanations rather than interpretive narratives.

Final Conclusion

Evolutionary theory is effective in describing biological variation within living systems. However, it does not adequately ground the human as human, nor does it explain consciousness, human destiny, or the ultimate end of humanity. When evolutionary discourse extends beyond biological variation to address absolute origins and final ends, it operates less as settled empirical science and more as a belief-based interpretive framework.

Thus, the question of how humans will end reveals a profound issue: any theory that explains the origin while remaining silent on the end is necessarily incomplete. The inquiry at hand is therefore not merely a challenge to evolutionary theory, but a deeper interrogation of what constitutes knowledge, explanation, and completeness in accounts of human existence.

One traditional Gonja procedure for determining the genetic relationship between a child and a parent—particularly the father—begins by detecting hair on the body. Once located, the practitioner rubs the palm over a specific area of the body for less than two minutes, generating heat within the body. Following this, the practitioner examines the scent produced. The same procedure is then applied to the suspected child. The underlying principle is that the father's scent corresponds to the child's scent, thereby allowing for identification or confirmation of biological relatedness.

From a cultural and epistemological perspective, this Gonja method has also been interpreted as challenging certain claims of Darwinian evolutionary theory, which posits that humans evolved from chimpanzees, monkeys, or other apes.

According to this traditional approach, a sample from a chimpanzee, monkey, or ape could be collected, the palm rubbed on its skin for a period of time, and the resulting scent compared with that produced from a human body. If the scents do not correspond, this is taken as evidence that humans and these species do not share a direct biological lineage, offering a culturally grounded critique of the evolutionary model from the Gonja epistemological standpoint.

In Ngbarnyi-Gonja traditional science and philosophy, the human body is understood as a complete system of knowledge acquisition, in which each sense performs a specific and purposeful role. This understanding is deeply rooted in indigenous epistemology and is articulated clearly within the Ngbarnyi-Gonja linguistic and philosophical framework.

According to this worldview, the senses are not merely biological functions but instruments of knowledge, perception, and verification. Within this system, each sensory organ is assigned a distinct function. The tongue is responsible for taste and discernment, the nose for detecting scent, the ears for hearing and interpreting sound, and the eyes for vision and observation.

These sensory roles are not arbitrary; they are carefully defined and culturally understood as interconnected tools through which human beings engage with the world and acquire truth.

In Ngbarnyi-Gonja philosophy, the sense of smell holds particular epistemological significance. It is regarded as a reliable means of identifying origin, authenticity, and biological connection. The ability to detect scent is not viewed as accidental but as an inherited sensory capacity developed through generations of observation and practice.

Through scent, individuals are believed to perceive essential information about objects, animals, and human beings, including lineage and biological relationships.

This traditional system recognizes that human beings possess innate sensory knowledge that predates modern scientific experimentation. Long before the introduction of laboratory-based science or technological testing, African societies had already developed methods of observation, comparison, and verification rooted in lived experience and environmental understanding.

In the context of human identity and kinship, Ngbarnyi-Gonja traditional knowledge maintains that biological relationships—such as parentage—can be identified through sensory processes. These processes involve the careful observation and interpretation of bodily scent, which is believed to carry hereditary markers unique to individuals and their lineage. Through culturally guided procedures, practitioners can determine whether a child

is biologically related to a particular mother or father. This method is not arbitrary; rather, it follows a structured and culturally recognized process. In cases of dispute regarding parentage, established traditional procedures are used to assess the child's sensory compatibility with the alleged parent. These procedures rely on controlled observation, comparative analysis of scent, and culturally sanctioned frameworks of interpretation. According to tradition, this process is both efficient and reliable, often providing immediate clarity without the need for prolonged dispute.

Historical accounts and communal practice indicate that such methods have been applied in regions such as Geneza, where disputes over biological parentage were resolved through traditional sensory verification. These methods were widely accepted within the community and recognized for their effectiveness, accuracy, and social legitimacy.