

Re: A China–Sumer connection

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005–02/1635.html>

From: Peter T. Daniels (*grammatim_at_worldnet.att.net*)

Date: 02/21/05

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 14:18:37 GMT

Alaca wrote:

>

> *Harlan Messinger wrote in: 37s3r4F5f2tgeU1@individual.net,*

>> *Alaca wrote:*

>>> *phippmartin in:*

>>>> *Well, except that animals, so the argument goes, rely more on*

>>>> *instinct that is passed down by artificial selection. An animal*

>>>> *eats an edible plant not because the animal _knows_ it is safe but*

>>>> *because its ancestor _didn't_ die from eating it.*

>>>

>>> *But how does he know his ancestor didn't die,*

>>> *or how does he know his ancestor did die from*

>>> *eating another plant?*

>>> *More important: Is there any sense of ancestors*

>>> *among animals?*

>>

>> *That was the point of mentioning instinct--that for animals it has*

>> *nothing to do with knowledge. The earlier animals in a species that*

>> *had an instinct to eat--or lacked an instinct to avoid--certain*

>> *things that were poisonous died out. Later generations represented*

>> *the earlier ones that *did* have an instinct to avoid the poisonous*

>> *foods, and they carried on that instinct.*

>>

>>>> *You're right though: people should have known already what was*

>>>> *safe to eat and that it another argument against this legend*

>>>> *being literally true.*

>>>

>>> *What is the difference between man and beast in this?*

>>

>> *I repeat: knowledge versus instinct. Are you not familiar with these*

>> *concepts?*

>

> *Yes I am, but it seems I'm not able to express myself adequate.*

> *Another attempt in a difficult matter and a foreign language:*