

images into a conscious chronology. Without such a chronological consciousness, animals cannot make any but the simplest plans based on the past. Even chimpanzees, the smartest of the **smart**, have never planted a garden. The immediate future is all they have in focus. If they could recall even a few years in sequence, they would have noticed the progression of seed to fruit and tried it out long ago.

**Comment [PJT1]:** Risk here of a literalist reader saying, "But wait ... aren't humans the smartest of the smart?" Consider using "non-human primates" instead

Self-~~consciousness~~**awareness** is also limited by memory, as we must be aware of the many details ~~which~~**that** ~~allow~~ **differentiate** us ~~to differ~~ from each **other**. We know ourselves only to the extent that we recall personal past experience that affected us in the ways that form individual personality. Conscious and unconscious memories underlie our likes, our dislikes, our hopes, and our fears. As any sense of self is dependent upon the detail and subtlety of recall, the better memory we have, the more self-~~aware~~**conscious** we can be. Animals, for all their variegated plumage and behavior, are remarkably similar to each other. If dogs had character traits as complex as those of humans, they wouldn't be using their noses to **greet** each other. Reptiles are so lacking in observable personality that their mannerisms are truly **reptilian**.

**Comment [PJT2]:** I think this is your intent here. I understand the notion of using "conscious" in many ways in wordsmithing this set of ideas; but both Webster and Oxford explicitly define "self-consciousness" as "uncomfortable awareness" or "worried about how one appears." So your reader would be misled by "self-consciousness" in this sentence. (Although I don't doubt that "self-consciousness" is likely also limited by our awareness of how we differ from others 😊)

**Comment [PJT3]:** This is non-restrictive

**Comment [PJT4]:** I actually wonder if "from one another" might be more impactful here than "from each other." There's no right or wrong grammatically -- it's just a matter of preference. Simply wanted you to think about it.

It is possible, however, to shame a spaniel, and one can actually embarrass gorillas and the other great apes. Big brains do more than swell **heads**; they **allow** the development of complex personal and social structures. In comparison, an insect has no hopes, no bias, no conscious predispositions at all. It never

**Comment [PJT5]:** I wonder if "recognize" would be a better choice of word here?

**Comment [PJT6]:** I get the circular reference and it's cute. But I'm not sure it will be fully appreciated by the average reader, nor do I think it's particularly additive to your narrative, especially as the next paragraph picks up with the dog from the prior sentence. Your choice, of course, to keep it or drop it.

**Comment [PJT7]:** Nice economic use of words, but I fear it risks sending your reader in the direction of "swelled head" (exaggerated opinion of oneself), which I sort of don't think you intend. You can get the same economy of words by replacing "swell heads" with "expand skulls"

**Comment [PJT8]:** I actually think "enable" may be the more accurate word here.