

Part of the talking-ape lore may come from the subjectivity of researchers. The Sebeoks note that when Koko is led to give the sign for drink and makes the proper gesture but touches her ear instead of her mouth, Psychologist Patterson assumes not that the gorilla has made a mistake but that it is joking. If koko smiles when asked to frown, she is displaying a 'grasp of opposites.' Say the Sebeoks: 'Real breakthroughs in man-ape communication are the stuff of fiction.'

Such words touched off angry responses. . . .

As for the man in whose honor Nim was named, he has no doubts. Says Noam Chomsky: 'it's about as likely that an ape will prove to have a language ability as that there is an island somewhere with a species of flightless birds waiting for human beings to teach them to fly.'

(g) Morality and Religion

Only man is considered to be a moral being, capable of actions which have moral and ethical value. Animals may be vicious, treacherous, ruthless; they may kill, commit adultery, steal; but they are not considered criminals.

And only man is a religious being. All men have same form of religion, even atheists and agnostics. All men manifest commitment or devotion to some system of beliefs which they hold to with ardor and devotion, which system of beliefs pertain to matters which they hold to be of ultimate importance. No culture in the history of man has been without some form of religion. There is no evidence whatever of religion among the animals.

b. Scriptural Considerations

(1) The antiquity of man

William Henry Green, Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary from 1859 until 1900, published a historic article in *Bibliotheca Sacra* in 1890 entitled 'Primeval Chronology.' (The article has been reprinted most recently in Appendix II in *Genesis One and the Origin of the Earth*, by Robert C. Newman and Herman J. Eckelmann, Jr.). A few excerpts from this article follow.