

Dinosaur

(The Bible's Forgotten Prophecy)

By Richie Cooley

Licensed by:

Richie Cooley (2015)

Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 International

Email: hortonhearsahoo@shazzlemail.com

Dinosaur photo by: Outsider

Unless otherwise noted, Old Testament Scripture is taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®, copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Unless otherwise noted, New Testament Scripture is taken from the Analytical-Literal Translation of the New Testament: Third Edition. Copyright © 2007 by Gary F. Zeolla of Darkness to Light ministry. Previously copyrighted © 1999, 2001, 2005 by Gary Zeolla.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction: Popper and Plesiosaurus

II. The Giant Find

III. It Was Written

IV. It Was Prophesied

V. Conclusion: Creator and Constancy

VI. Works Cited

I. Introduction: Popper and Plesiosaurus

For reasons great and small people often choose a paradigm and stick to it, interpreting everything along those lines; ergo, they become very convinced of their theory, being strengthened by their friends, and interpreting everything as “evidence.” After all, was not Darwin only putting forth a theory to explain the “origin of species?” Why then do all branches of science, from astronomers to psychologists, cite Darwinian evolution as a cornerstone of their knowledge? What do galaxies and emotions have to do with the HMS Beagle?

Phillip Johnson, the Berkley law professor who is the grandfather of the I.D. movement, stated something poignant about the vapid universality of modern theories in the final chapter of his book, *Darwin on Trial...*

Karl Popper provides the indispensable starting point for understanding the difference between science and pseudoscience. Popper spent his formative years in early twentieth century Vienna, where intellectual life was dominated by science-based ideologies like Marxism and the psychoanalytic schools of Freud and Adler. These were widely accepted as legitimate branches of natural science, and they attracted large followings among intellectuals because they appeared to have such immense explanatory power. Acceptance of either Marxism or psychoanalysis had, as Popper observed,

The effect of an intellectual conversion or revelation, opening your eyes to a new truth hidden from those not yet initiated. Once your

eyes were thus opened you saw confirming instances everywhere: the world was full of verifications of the theory. Whatever happened always confirmed it. Thus its truth appeared manifest; and unbelievers were clearly people who did not want to see the manifest truth; who refused to see it, either because it was against their class interest, or because of their repressions which were still 'un-analyzed' and crying aloud for treatment... A Marxist could not open a newspaper without finding on every page confirming evidence for his interpretation of history; not only in the news, but also in its presentation -- which revealed the class bias of the paper -- and especially of course in what the paper did not say. The Freudian analysts emphasized that their theories were constantly verified by their 'clinical observations.'

Popper saw that a theory that appears to explain everything actually explains nothing. If wages fell this was because the capitalists were exploiting the workers, as Marx predicted they would, and if wages rose this was because the capitalists were trying to save a rotten system through bribery, which was also what Marxism predicted. A psychoanalyst could explain why a man would commit murder -- or, with equal facility, why the same man would sacrifice his own life to save another. According to Popper, however, a theory with genuine explanatory power makes *risky* predictions, which exclude most possible outcomes. Success in prediction is impressive only to the extent that failure was a real possibility (pgs. 145-146).

Humankind has the nasty habit of bending its entire outlook to conform to a pet idea, thus making its

constructs beyond the ability to disprove. Dr. Keith Wanser, a young earth creationist who has several degrees, including a PhD in condensed matter physics from the University of California, commented on this oft-observed proclivity...

One of the major problems with the so-called theory of evolution is that the details depend on who is telling the story. Those details that become commonly accepted as “facts” are often changed in light of more recent discoveries. This has happened on numerous occasions, with little notice that the supposed prior facts were not facts at all. In other words, there is not one theory of evolution, but a body of opinions, speculations and methods for interpretation of observational facts so that they fit into the philosophy of naturalism.

An example of a supposed fact demonstrating an ancient age of the earth is the rate of growth of stalactites and stalagmites in limestone caverns. As a young boy I toured Carlsbad Caverns in New Mexico and remember the tour guide informing us matter-of-factly that the limestone caverns and formations were formed over many millions of years, which did not seem to agree with what I had been taught in Sunday school. A sign above the entrance until 1988 said the caverns were at least 260 million years old. In recent years, the age on the sign was reduced to 7–10 million years, then 2 million years, and now the sign is gone perhaps as a result of observations that stalactite growth rates of several inches a month are common (Wanser).

The Bible on the other hand has continually demonstrated an uncanny ability to be outside the possibility of distortion while displaying grand, risky

predictions. Various students of Scripture often try to muddy the waters through bad translations and even worse interpretations, but the truth is there, well preserved in the Hebrew and Greek, and shines forth despite every attempt to tarnish.

An example of how people can try to ruin the Bible is the recent upsurge in a theory I particularly dislike, popularly known as “the Islamic Antichrist.” For centuries prophetically-minded believers have understood that Daniel called for a final empire to reign when the Messiah arrived, which was the Roman Empire. The Christ did indeed come just as Daniel predicted, only, after his death, resurrection, and ascension, he didn’t immediately return and destroy Rome. Bible students then pragmatically assumed that the delayed return of Christ must mean that Rome (i.e., Europe) would rise again. It has risen again in our lifetime.

However, even though a unified Europe is rising from the dust to the amazement of many prophecy students, another kingdom has energetically made great strides lately, i.e., the ideological kingdom of Islam. Many conservatives are not only alarmed by the atrocities happening by violent Muslim groups in the Middle East and North Africa, but they are also concerned that Western politicians seem more or less asleep to the dangers, as Muslim immigration soars unabated. This fear of Islam has led to a number of knee-jerk overreactions (including evangelicals writing books telling Christians it’s time to flee the U.S., etc.), not least of which is an impossible reinterpretation of prophecy: *out with Europe, in with Islam.*

There are no Biblical reasons to make this swap, but those who desire to do so have magnified obscure and

unrelated passages (such as Jeremiah 50-51; cf. John Price's book, *The End of America*) and snatched at slight semblances (e.g., *the book of Revelation says the Antichrist will behead people and Saudi Arabia practices beheadings, etc.*). Now one could look at this state of affairs and mock Bible prophecy: "sure, if everyone is 'prophesying' somebody is going to be right!" It's understandable why some might say that, but it's wholly inaccurate.

Look at Messianic prophecy. No one fully understood what passages like Psalm 22, Psalm 118, Isaiah 52-53, etc., fully meant until the Lord Jesus was rejected, scourged, and crucified. Yet who cannot look at these Scriptures now and clearly see the suffering Messiah predicted? Messianic prophecy is so compelling that the world has been forced to come up with ridiculous pseudo-theories to explain them, such as *Caesar's Messiah* (an idea that sky-rocketed in popularity after Richard Dawkins tipped his hat towards it; so does this mean Dawkins admits "Messianic prophecies" need explaining?).

The Hebrew and Aramaic words that make up the prophecies have been terrifically preserved for all to behold, whether there are periods of bad translations and interpretations or not. This is true when it comes to Messianic prophecies (i.e., the predictions of what would happen when the Messiah came the first time) and eschatology (the predictions of what will happen before he comes again), but there is also a "general" category. There are prophecies that neither deal with the first nor second coming of Christ explicitly, such as what would happen to various nations. The most remarkable example of a general forth-telling that has come true in recent history is the discovery of *dinosaur* bones.

Join me on a brief and Biblical dinosaur safari. First I will give an overview of the dinosaur's significance from history and science and then I will give a quick, Biblical sweep of the passages that clearly describe them. Finally I will attempt to show how God even uses a dinosaur motif in describing the two Advents. If you haven't heard, Google is now looking for Nessie; no need, for God already told us all about great sea monsters thousands of years ago! Before getting started, let's review a few notes that will help make sense of this booklet...

*The terms *LORD*, *GOD*, and *Hashem* are all ways to describe the personal name of God, often rendered as "Yahweh" or "Jehovah."

*Unless otherwise stated, the Old Testament quotes are from the NASB and the New Testament are from the ALT3.

The ALT3 distinguishes between singular and plural second person pronouns by means of an asterisk ().

*This book mostly uses British spelling, except for the Bible versions quoted, which use American spelling.

*Divine pronouns are normally not capitalized, unless they appear that way in Bible versions or other quotes.

*Words that appear in brackets within quotes are not found in the original texts, and were added by the translators or are my personal comments, etc.

II. The Giant Find

Although it may be fairly common knowledge, many people do not realize that the existence of "dinosaurs"

in more modern times was only fully confirmed less than two hundred years ago. *The Princeton Field Guide to Dinosaurs* gives a very succinct, bog-standard description of this history...

Dinosaur remains have been found by humans for millennia and probably helped form the basis for belief in mythical beasts including dragons. A few dinosaur bones were illustrated in old European publications without their true nature being realized...

Modern dinosaur paleontology began in the 1820s in England. Teeth were found, and a few bones of the predatory *Megalosaurus* and herbivorous *Iguanodon* were published and named. For a few decades it was thought that the bones coming out of ancient sediments were the remains of oversized versions of modern reptiles. In 1842 Richard Owen recognized that many of the fossils were not standard reptiles, and he coined the term "Dinosauria" to accommodate them...

The first complete dinosaur skeletons, uncovered in Europe shortly before the American Civil War, were those of small examples (Paul; pg. 9)...

-- And on the story goes to bigger and better things.

Now let's back up and take this standard description a step at a time. First of all the hand is waived over all the many ancient stories of dragons, which actually go to prove that dinosaurs and man once lived together in the recent past. These anomalies scattered throughout the pages of history, including the Bible, cannot possibly be pawned off as being inspired by early, haphazard palaeontology. Job's record, which will be described later, dates back to the dawn of recorded time. The

description he gives of dinosaurs is remarkably specific. It's much easier to surmise that such accounts were not because he stumbled upon dinosaur "remains" while digging a well but that there were *actual* dinosaurs. There are simply too many stories of dragons, yet no evidence that giant dinosaur skeletons or anything similar were ever found and understood by ancient man. *Answers in Genesis* points out...

For evolutionists, legends of men slaying dragons must be mythical because their timeline has creatures like dinosaurs die out over 60 million years before humans existed. But dragon accounts aren't easy to dismiss as mere fantasy.

Dragons are memorialized in legends, historical accounts, and artwork from around the world. To name a few, there's an Aboriginal depiction of a water monster that resembles a plesiosaur, an ancient historical account of serpents in Egypt with bat-like wings, the epic poem *Beowulf* with its account of a fiery flying serpent, and Native American petroglyphs (etchings in stone) that resemble dragons. Dragons are depicted on flags, emblems, tapestries, maps, pottery, pictographs, and more.

Although from disconnected cultures, the descriptions are remarkably similar -- perhaps because dragons were real ("Dragons: Fact or Fable?")?

The fact that so many cultures told a similar story surely must cast doubt on Princeton's speculation as to the origin of dragon legends.

Moving on, the history from the field guide then goes on to say that "A few dinosaur bones were illustrated in old European publications without their true nature

being realized.” A famous example of this involved a scientist named Robert Plot (1640-1696)...

“Come we next to such [stones] as concern the...Members of the Body: Amongst which, I have one dug out of a quarry in the Parish of Cornwell, and given me by the ingenious Sir Thomas Pennyston, that has exactly the Figure of the lowermost part of the Thigh-Bone of a Man or at least of some other Animal, with capita Femoris inferiora, between which are the anterior ... and the large posterior Sinus...:and a little above the Sinus, where it seems to have been broken off, shewing the marrow within of a shining Spar-like Substance of its true Colour and Figure, in the hollow of the Bone...In Compass near the capita Femoris, just two Foot, and at the top above the Sinus...about 15 inches: in weight, though representing so short a part of the Thigh-Bone, almost 20 pounds...”

Plot decided, on the basis of the internal structure, that this specimen was indeed a petrified bone but, given its great size, what animal could it have come from?

According to Plot, some specimens did seem to have a true organic origin. If this large specimen was indeed part of a femur, from which creature did it come? Nowadays we can identify it as part of the femur of the dinosaur *Megalosaurus*, but this was not an explanation available to Plot (*Oxford University Museum of Natural History*).

The writings of Robert Plot are sometimes credited as being the first modern evidence of a dinosaur bone, although obviously it would be a few hundred years

before this reality could fully come to light. The Princeton field guide then goes on to give brief mention to the man who really started it all, Richard Owen. This scientist isn't given the credit he deserves. There was a good article by a British newspaper a few years ago about him...

In 1861, William Gladstone, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, stood up in the House of Commons and paid tribute to a man he called a "splendid genius", and the world's greatest living naturalist. Yet today, Professor Richard Owen may be remembered as the first superintendent of the Natural History Museum in South Kensington, but for little else.

In fact, when listing his achievements, it is hard to know where to start. Elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1834, at the age of 30, he was a comparative anatomist with an extraordinary range and depth of knowledge in zoology, biology and palaeontology. He described and named an astonishing number of creatures new to science, and published more than 600 books and papers on subjects as diverse as the duck-billed platypus and the gorilla. It was Prof Owen who gave the name "dinosaur" to the order of great extinct reptiles that were then being discovered.

Owen's greatest legacy is the Natural History Museum, but he was also an adviser to governments, reported on environmental health issues and was awarded more than 100 honours -- including a knighthood. He was a famous lecturer, tutored the royal children in science and was awarded a grace-and-favour home by Queen Victoria. His friends included Charles Dickens, Sir Robert Peel and Alfred, Lord Tennyson (Shindler).

So why have so few people heard of him? The article gives the reason...

...He fell out with Darwin...

It's amazing that even in the very early days of Darwin he was given immediate, haloed, sacrosanct status by some. His theory could have hardly had enough time to be "proven" at this point, and his very famous book about the matter openly admits the many weak spots that needed strengthening. "Darwinism" was fairly untouchable from the beginning, yet clearly not because of "science."

So moving on, the guide ends its historical overview by stating how more fossil finds became increasingly expansive and impressive, finally culminating in a large public interest. So again, it's important to understand that the knowledge we have of giant dinosaurs like *T-Rex* or the *Brontosaurus* have only recently been in the public domain.

Before closing this little chapter on the discovery of dinosaurs, I'd like to make a few comments on what their fossils contribute to the subject of creation versus evolution. In the past I've given long quotes about how many anomalies such as soft tissue have been found in dinosaur fossils, providing tremendous proof of the validity of young earth creationism; so I won't go over that ground again. Moreover, since I've mentioned elsewhere most of the bigger issues categorically I'll keep this brief, but I don't want to be completely neglectful of this important topic in case the reader is unfamiliar with my other writings. Apart from the soft tissue I think three of the greatest lessons that can be learned is (1) catastrophism, (2) stasis, and (3) the counter-intuitive

assumptions of evolutionists. Let's take a brief look now at each category...

(1) Catastrophism

In the past I've given a quote about the tremendous dinosaur graveyards scattered throughout the world. In many places there are massive amounts of dinosaur bones all clumped together; why? This is even more pertinent when you consider the fact that fossils are normally only formed when creatures are entombed in mud at the time of death. How did all these dinosaurs become buried together throughout the world? The best answer is Noah's flood. This catastrophic burial is not only confirmed by the fact that many dinosaurs were buried together but the fossil record also gives evidence that many of the creatures were caught off guard. Where in evolutionary dogma were there ever swiftly moving, giants waves of wet sand throughout the world? *Answers in Genesis* highlights a strange fossilized occurrence of dinosaurs being caught off guard and being encased in sandstone...

Did you know that scientists discovered some amazing fossils of two dinosaurs that look like they were fighting? In 1971, they found these two dinosaurs in the Gobi Desert in Mongolia. The fossils are of a *Velociraptor* wrapped around (fighting?) a *Protoceratops*. The *Velociraptor's* hands appear to be grabbing the head shield of the *Protoceratops* while its sickle-like claw goes deep into the *Protoceratops'* body. The *Protoceratops* has the *Velociraptor's* right arm in its jaws. Were they really fighting? We simply don't know. What we do know is that they were buried in this amazing position, which looks like they were in a fight. So what could have caused these dinosaurs to be buried so rapidly that they didn't have a chance to

escape? The answer can be found in the Bible (“Dinosaurs: Fossilized While Fighting?”).

On a footnote, Ken Ham and company had a devil of a time trying to get permission to publish the amazing picture of this fossil. No museum would give him permission; shades of Richard Owen!

Another interesting point is that dinosaurs made for good fossils because of their size, but their ecosystem often isn’t represented in the fossil record in the same place. In other words, many fossils obviously were swept away together and sorted by water. This is why bones are found in one place and plants (coalbeds) are found in other places. Ariel Roth, who has a PhD in biology from the University of Michigan, comments on such oddities...

Animals require plants for food in order to survive. Yet in several of our important geologic formations we find good evidence for the animals, but little or no evidence for the plants necessary to support the animals. The fossil assemblages found represent incomplete ecosystems. How did the animals survive for the millions of years postulated for the deposition of these formations without adequate food?

Examples include:

1. The *Protoceratops* dinosaur-bearing layers of the Gobi Desert of Mongolia, where the paucity of plants is considered “baffling” [D.E. Fatovsky, D. Badamgarav, H. Ishimoto, M. Watabe, D.B. Weishampel, *The Paleoenvironments of Tugrikin Shireh (Gobi Desert, Mongolia) and Aspects of the Taphonomy and Paleoecology of Protoceratops (Dinosauria: Ornithischia)*, *Palaios* 12:59–70, 1977.].

2. The Coconino Sandstone of the southwestern United States, which has many hundreds of good animal trackways, but no plants.

3. The important dinosaur-bearing Morrison Formation of the western United States, where “identifiable plant fossils are practically non-existent” [T.E. White, *The Dinosaur Quarry*, in E.F. Sabatka, editor, *Guidebook to the Geology and Mineral Resources of the Uinta Basin, Intermountain Association of Geologists, Salt Lake City, UT, p. 21–28, 1964.*]. What did these behemoths eat as they evolved over the millions of years? It is estimated that a large dinosaur would eat 32 tons of vegetation in one day.

A more plausible scenario for these deposits is that they represent layers laid down rapidly during the biblical Flood, with the waters of the Flood sorting the organisms into various deposits, the plants forming some of our huge coal deposits (Roth).

(2) Stasis

It’s very ordinary to encounter a young man who thinks he’s super smart and far too sophisticated for the Bible; his answer will almost always be the same: *I’m a Darwinist!* He refuses to listen to the Bible because he’s “a Darwinist.” I’ve never understood how someone with a half-baked theory about how large animals morph into other large animals over time is supposed to possess the power to ignore the rest of physical scientific phenomena, which percentage-wise is bound to make up about 99.999 percent of observable processes. What does being a “Darwinist” have to do with the question of where a universe-worth of stuff came from? How did this universe-worth of stuff achieve such symmetry and fine-tuning? How are

galaxies and solar systems and planets and stars formed? How did molecular life begin? *Why* did molecular life grow into something bigger and *how* did it grow into something bigger (if the modern ideas were true)? Up until the point where true natural selection takes place Darwin can't help you. So what does it mean to be a Darwinist?! Not much!

I suppose "being a Darwinist" means a belief that the helter skelter, if slowed down to a crawl (i.e., viewed from the vantage point of one human life-time), appears "designed" to uneducated man. And this is what smart people believe? This is their *theory of everything*? If Darwinism was truly a theory of everything, the driving force behind all testable laws, then why is it completely negligible in everyday life? All engineers and even school children playing with toys must abide by the laws of gravity and inertia and cause/effect, etc.; who takes evolution into consideration? You never buy an old car from a lot or adopt an elderly dog from the pound and think: *it's not much now, but just wait a few years, and then she'll be a beaut!*

You never use evolution in day-to-day life because neither does nature. Now this lack of evolutionary usage is bore out via dinosaurs in the fossil record that is supposed to represent their times. Since all things are prone to dramatic changes then *all things should change over vast stretches of time*. Why wouldn't they? How could the process of evolutionary change be so powerful as to morph amoebas into men yet fail to touch life at every level somewhat consistently? If "being a Darwinist" means a belief that all physical realities are floating through a process of perpetual change, then how would this not affect all life? Yet many creatures you see today are represented somewhere in the "ancient" fossil

record, and they look like they do now. Yes, the dinosaurs may be extinct, but many of the smaller animals from “their time” are not...

Scientists discovered a tiny moth on Australia’s Kangaroo Island and gave it the name *Enigmatinea glatzella*. The name is quite descriptive, as *Enigmatinea* means “enigma moth” in Latin (see 1 and 2 below). But why is this moth an enigma to evolutionary scientists?

Today’s living representatives of this moth have “basically the same features” as their ancestors, which evolutionists claim lived forty to fifty million years ago (3). Hence, virtually no evolution has occurred in all that supposed time! Ted Edwards, one of the scientists tasked with describing the new moth family said, “It’s really quite remarkable because it means that the ancestral line has continued right through without changing a lot of its basic structures” (1).

For this reason, scientists are calling *Enigmatinea glatzella* a “dinosaur moth.” Since, in evolutionary thinking, dinosaurs became extinct 65 million years ago, the discovery of living representatives of a creature that is at least forty million years old is as remarkable as discovering a living dinosaur.

The lack of evolution is even more surprising when one realizes that the moth has an extremely short lifespan: These dinosaur moths emerge from their cocoons, mate, lay eggs, and die within a single day. Although the *total* lifespan (egg to adult) of the dinosaur moth is apparently not well-known, other short-lived moths have total lifespans of about a month (4). This means that *hundreds of millions* of

generations of dinosaur moths could easily have lived and died in this supposed forty-million-year interval. Even though death is the engine that supposedly drives evolution, essentially no evolution has occurred in all that alleged time (Herbet).

[References:

1. Casey, M. "Living dinosaur" moth discovered in Australia. *CBS News*. Posted on cbsnews.com March 4, 2015, accessed March 12, 2015.
2. Kristensen, N. P. et al. 2015. A new extant family of primitive moths from Kangaroo Island, Australia, and its significance for understanding early Lepidoptera evolution. *Systematic Entomology*. 40 (1): 5-16.
3. Moth discovered may be a 'living dinosaur.' AOL News. Posted on aol.com March 6, 2015, accessed March 12, 2015.
4. Williams, E. et al. "How long do butterflies or moths live?" Frequently Asked Questions. The Lepidopterists' Society. Posted on lepsoc.org, accessed March 18, 2015.]

(3) Counter-intuitive evolutionists

Evolutionary constructs don't hold much water. Darwinists chide creationists for jumping to conclusions because DNA is so complex and therefore looks designed but then come up with all sorts of bizarre theories based on "looks." Ironically, their theories are always MUCH simpler than DNA! One popular, persistent idea is the theory that dinosaurs evolved into birds. Really? People believe that?! "Intellectual" people believe that?! My oh my. Take a picture of a *Brontosaurus* and put it next to a picture of a hummingbird; hmm, I

think this idea is a bit underdone. But you see, some birds and dinos have hips that point the same way, so bingo! Never mind the *one in a trillion to the trillionth power* odds that the first living cell could have ever arisen through the helter skelter; that's not important; rather, how do creationists explain how some dinosaurs and some birds have similar hips?!

But just to answer this popular myth more directly, let's look at some facts from John Morris that disparage the idea of dinosaur to birds...

What structural and physiological transformations must occur to change one into the other? The following abridged list of evolutionary obstacles might be helpful.

Wings: The proposed ancestors of birds are thought to have walked on their hind legs. Their diminutive forelimbs had digits similar to a hand, but consisting only of digits one, two, and three. Bird forelimbs consist of digits two, three, and four. Today, most hold that ground-dwelling theropods learned to run fast and jump to catch insects and eventually used arms with frayed scales to fly. But flight requires fully formed, interlocking feathers and hollow bones, not to mention the flight muscles and keeled sternum to anchor the muscles.

Feathers: Feathers are not at all similar to scales. Even if scales were frayed, they would not be interlocking and impervious to air as are feathers. Actually, feathers are more similar to hair follicles than scales. Could such precise design arise by mutation? In all the recent discoveries of dinosaur fossils with "feathers," the "feathers" are merely

inferred. What is actually present is better described as thin filaments which originate under the skin.

Bones: Birds have delicate, hollow bones to lighten their weight while dinosaurs had solid bones. The placement and design of bird bones may be analogous to those in dinosaurs, but they are actually quite different. For example, the heavy tail of dinosaurs (needed for balance on two legs) would prohibit any possible flight. And besides, the theropods were “lizard-hipped” dinosaurs, not “bird-hipped” as would be expected for bird ancestors.

Warm blooded: Birds are warmblooded with exceptionally high metabolism and food demands. While dinosaur metabolism is in question, all modern reptiles are cold-blooded with a more lethargic life style.

Lungs: Birds are unique among land-dwelling vertebrates in that they don’t breathe in and out. The air flows continually in a one-directional loop supporting the bird’s high metabolism. Reptilian respiration is entirely different, more like that in mammals.

Other organs: The soft parts of birds and dinosaurs, in addition to the lungs, are totally different. A recent “mummified” dinosaur, with soft tissue fossilized, proved to be quite like a crocodile, and not at all like a bird (Morris).

III. It Was Written

I remember riding in a car with a man who had been affected by the anti-Bible bias of a local radio D.J. One of the arguments he employed against God's book is that dinosaurs aren't in the Bible. The man said something along the lines of "the Bible has some explaining to do." Not so; actually, he and the local D.J. will have some explaining to do, for they should have studied the Bible to see if their knee-jerk criticisms were accurate. Dinosaurs are mentioned throughout the Bible from start to finish. First we will do a quick sweep of the terms used to refer to dinosaurs in the Hebrew Old Testament, and then in the next chapter we will see how prophets used this motif to speak of the first and second comings of Christ.

1. *Tan*

God created the great **sea monsters** and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good. -- Genesis 1:21

There is a bit of controversy over just how expansive this word is used in the Old Testament to refer to great reptiles. For example, the *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* states that the various forms of the Hebrew *tan* indicate if it should be rendered as "jackal" or *large reptile*. The common assumption among this camp is that *tannim* is normally spoken of in terms of plural desert-dwelling creatures whereas *tannin* is an intensive descriptive of an aquatic creature. For some odd reason "jackal" is chosen instead of a land-dwelling dinosaur or rhinoceros, which would seem more natural; for what do jackals have in common with sea monsters?

Other linguists affirm that there shouldn't be a distinction, and that they are both referring to the exact same thing. Two prominent examples in terms of Bible translations can be seen with the *King James Version* and Isaac Leeser's Tanakh. Most everyone has an *a priori* commitment-level to faith in the supernatural. Some are willing to throw peer pressure to the wind and allow the supernatural prowess of the Bible to shine forth; most do not, especially the kind who get advanced degrees in Ugaritic or Koine Greek, etc. Generally speaking, most translations would rather not stick their necks out and be seen to be "too" spiritual, thus only conservative translators among Christians and Jews will render *tan* more consistently to favour dinosaurs.

The KJV translators were the epitome of conservative and Isaac Leeser is still, in my opinion, the only English Judaist translator that sought to be fully literal while handling God's Word. Amazingly, neither version was written when dinosaurs were fully understood. The KJV has its roots in 1611, and Isaac Leeser lived from 1806 to 1868. Both versions prove however that God's word is best left unadulterated; his Word shines most brilliantly through the unbridled Holy Spirit, and not through stifling pretentiousness. I lament modern versions who have the knowledge of dinosaurs but still choose to translate applicable Hebrew terms as "jackals" or "crocodiles" or "hippos." As is especially evident in the latter chapters of Job, this can only be an intentional effort to stymie what the Bible is clearly saying. The evangelical church is desperate to not only incorporate theories of the old earth (which has already been made popular through Pember, Spurgeon, Pink, Hodge, Grudem, Macdonald, and J. Vernon McGee, etc.), but even quasi-Darwinism itself. Dinosaurs and man living together is therefore taboo; that's no way to sell Bibles!

Moving on, I prefer to see *tannin* and *tannim* as being the same thing, for even as the Theological Wordbook points out, in Ezekiel 29:3 and 32:2 the word *tannim* is clearly being used as a substitute for *tanninim* (*the plural of tannin; they simply say that the Hebrew is mistaken, which I take to be near blasphemy*). The idea behind *tan* is *elongation*, and therefore when the context doesn't give rise to specifics, *tan* is best rendered as "monster" or "wild beast," and could probably encompass anything from a dino to a rhino. Lamentations 4:3 states that's it's a wonderful thing to see a *tan* suckle its young; obviously this would have to be the "rhino" option, and wouldn't it be a telling one. When you see these giant creatures at zoos with tough skin and giant horns suckle their young it's a pretty unexpected sight!

But for the sake of argument let's just assume that there is a division of the term *tan*, and let's look at a sampling of the other instances (i.e., apart from Genesis 1:21 above) where the NASB translates it in the reptilian school of thought (the words in bold is where *tan* appears; also, all bracketed notes come from the original translators, and not from me)...

When Pharaoh speaks to you, saying, "Work a miracle" [*Lit Show a wonder for yourselves*], then you shall say to Aaron, "Take your staff and throw [it] down before Pharaoh, [that] it may become **a serpent.**" -- Exodus 7:9

Their wine is the venom of **serpents** [**Lit dragons**], and the deadly [*Lit cruel*] poison of cobras. -- Deuteronomy 32:33

Am I the sea, or **the sea monster**, that You set a guard over me? -- Job 7:12

You [Or *You Yourself*] divided the sea by Your strength; You [Or *You Yourself*] broke the heads of **the sea monsters** in [Lit *on*] the waters. -- Psalm 74:13

You will tread upon the lion and cobra, the young lion and **the serpent** [Or *dragon*] you will trample down. -- Psalm 91:13

Praise the LORD from the earth, **sea monsters** and all deeps... -- Psalm 148:7

In that day the LORD will punish Leviathan [Or *sea monster*] the fleeing serpent, with His fierce and great and mighty sword, even Leviathan [Or *sea monster*] the twisted serpent; and He will kill **the dragon** who [lives] in the sea. -- Isaiah 27:1

Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the LORD; awake as in the days of old, the generations of long ago. Was it not You who cut Rahab in pieces, who pierced **the dragon**? -- Isaiah 51:9

Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon has devoured me [and] crushed me, he has set me down [like] an empty vessel; he has swallowed me like **a monster**, he has filled his stomach with my delicacies; he has washed me away. -- Jeremiah 51:34
[on a footnote, it's hard to tell if the NASB intended "he" or "He" throughout this quote; also "me" is probably "us" throughout]

Speak and say, "Thus says the Lord GOD, 'Behold, I am against you, Pharaoh king of Egypt, **the great monster [Lit *tannim*]** that lies in the midst of his rivers [Or *Nile*], that has said, "My Nile is mine, and I myself have made [it]."' -- Ezekiel 29:3

There are a few marvellous observations here from the Biblical writers that beg to be mentioned. First of all it's uncanny how the Bible clearly describes dragons/sea monsters as being directly related to serpents. Like with Genesis 1:21, some uses of the term clearly call for a large sea creature where some, such as Exodus 7:9 and Deuteronomy 32:33, call for a land-based serpent that slithered on the ground and had venom, such as a king cobra or a *Laophis crotaloides*. How did they know that dinosaurs and serpents were similar? If some ancient person did dig up a large tooth or femur near a marsh, why immediately jump to the conclusion that it was related to small-headed, limbless snakes?

Next Job seemingly says that these monsters had guards set over them. Wouldn't this be most sensible? If you knew that a ferocious carnivore was living out by a swamp then it would be imperative to have some means of tracking the animal. Dinosaurs obviously would have been a giant problem for ancient man (pun intended), and this perhaps explains Nimrod's popularity. Perhaps ancient man felt hemmed in by the great beasts and Nimrod was their "liberator"...

Now Cush became the father of Nimrod; he became a mighty one on the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the LORD; therefore it is said, "Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before the LORD." The beginning of his kingdom was Babel and Erech and Accad and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. -- Genesis 10:8-10

Why is it written that his hunting was "before the LORD?" Some might see this as attributing something pernicious to Nimrod, but I don't think that's the simple reading. It seems that although Nimrod was a sinister man (probably responsible for the Babel rebellion), he perhaps started as a hero for God, like Jehu. This notion

sends chills down my spine, for it is the exact career I picture the future Antichrist having. I believe Islam will continue to cause such a stink that the call for a deliverer will grow greater and greater. I fully believe that the Antichrist will NOT be Muslim, but rather will grow in popularity by *opposing* Islam. I believe he will be like Jehu, zealously hunting God's "enemies," never realizing that he is one himself. On an unrelated yet amusing footnote, history has shown that Jehu served a dragon...

A monument called the Black Obelisk was found at Calah (Nimrud) in the palace ruins of Shalmaneser. It is about 1 foot square and is 6 feet tall. Carvings picture Shalmaneser receiving tribute from defeated foes. In the inscription it tells of King Jehu paying tribute, and a carved picture shows Jehu bowing in the presence of Shalmaneser, saying, "Tribute of Jehu, son [or descendant] of Omri, gold, silver, golden goblets, and pitchers, golden vases and vessels, scepters from the hand of the king, javelins I received from him." This obelisk bears the only image or contemporary likeness of any Israelite king. One of Shalmaneser's inscriptions refers to himself as "the legitimate King, King of the universe, King without rival, the 'Great Dragon,' the only power within the four rims of the whole earth...who smashed all his foes like pots" (Boyd; pg. 169).

2. *Rahab*

Whereas *tan* means "elongation," this term means "stormy pride." It doesn't appear too frequently but it is fascinating nonetheless, fitting into the monster/enemy nation motif employed in the books of Daniel and Revelation.

God will not turn back His anger; beneath Him
crouch the helpers of **Rahab**. -- Job 9:13

He quieted the sea with His power, and by
His understanding He shattered **Rahab**. -- Job 26:12

I shall mention **Rahab** [I.e. Egypt] and
Babylon among [Or *as*] those who know Me; behold,
Philistia and Tyre with Ethiopia [Lit *Cush*]: “This one
was born there.” -- Psalm 87:4

You Yourself crushed **Rahab** [I.e. Egypt] like one
who is slain; you scattered Your enemies with Your
mighty arm [Lit *the arm of Your might*]. -- Psalm 89:10

Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the LORD;
awake as in the days of old, the generations of long
ago. Was it not You who cut **Rahab** in pieces, who
pierced the dragon? -- Isaiah 51:9

Some passages, such as Psalm 87, clearly call for a national interpretation (hence the NASB applying it to Egypt), yet others, like Job and Isaiah, seem to be speaking of a romanticized dinosaur/dragon. The way the Biblical authors seem to use mythology a bit when describing Rahab and the next term (Leviathan) shouldn't lead the reader to believe that the writers regarded such creatures as literally illegitimate or mythology as truth. As we will see, Leviathan is spoken of in literal, concrete terms by God himself. As far as using mythology, the Theological Wordbook has a nice statement...

Just as in the parallel figure of “leviathan,” negative criticism seeks to discover in “Rahab” a belief in pagan mythology rather than recognizing its symbolic use by the inspired prophets and poets of the OT (IDB, IV, p. 6). The sea (Ps 89:9 [H 10]) is identified

with a Canaanite water deity, Yam, overcome by Yahweh at creation. Rahab is seen as the chaos monster Tiamat, crushed in primordial combat with, originally, Marduk, god of Babylon; and the “helpers of pride” (Job 9:13), with her eleven demonic deputies (nma lish, 1:105–7).

But all of these suggested connections and derivations fail to explain the complete absence in the OT of belief in the existence or reality of any of these mythological figures that are alluded to. If such figures are alluded to, they would be analogous to Milton’s use of Greek mythological figures in *Paradise Lost*...

Again, it’s interesting to think of Revelation in this context, for just as Rahab is synonymous with a nation that held Israel captive, so will the coming dragon, fully represented by the Antichrist and his nation, oppress Israel (Revelation 12-13). Moreover, this leader will have “ten kings” as special helpers (Revelation 17).

3. *Leviathan*

Let those curse it who curse the day, who are prepared [Or *skillful*] to rouse **Leviathan**. -- Job 3:8

[Ch 40:25 in Heb] Can you draw out **Leviathan** [Or *the crocodile*] with a fishhook? Or press down his tongue with a cord? -- Job 41:1

You [Or *You Yourself*] crushed the heads of **Leviathan** [Or *sea monster*]; You [Or *You Yourself*] gave him as food for the creatures [Lit *people*] of the wilderness. -- Psalm 74:14

There the ships move along, [and] **Leviathan**, which You have formed to sport in it. -- Psalm 104:26

In that day the LORD will punish **Leviathan** [Or *sea monster*] the fleeing serpent, with His fierce and great and mighty sword, even **Leviathan** [Or *sea monster*] the twisted serpent; and He will kill the dragon who [lives] in the sea. -- Isaiah 27:1

It's hard to know exactly what is meant by the first line from Job. He is in the midst of lamenting the day he was born when he utters this verse. One possibility is that those who would try to rouse Leviathan would do so in order to bring chaos (or some say an eclipse) to a day. Another is that rousing Leviathan might be some sort of suicidal dare instigated in desperation or recklessness. No matter what the specifics behind the wish are, it certainly paints the picture of Leviathan being capable of colossal damage.

As for the term itself, "Leviathan" appears to be a composite of two terms. The first is "levi," which signifies conjunction, from the close joining of its scales" (Gill). The next word is *tan* again. It would be pertinent to note at this point that Keil and Delitzsch says that *tannin* refers etymologically to "long-extended monsters." Taking both ideas together certainly would seem to beg for the description of the dinosaur.

The dinosaur interpretation has a couple of setbacks however. First, as I've mentioned above, even the evangelical world is being heavily pressured to fully accept the old earth ideas and partially accept Darwinian evolution. No one who wants any amount of academic respect is going to harp on about dinosaurs and men living together. Second, most of the commentators that conservatives value were written hundreds of years ago before dinosaurs were fully understood; these commentaries might even try to steer clear of such interpretations to cut off occasion for critics to say the

Biblical writers believed in mythology. Still, with all that against the interpretation, there has been a growing voice calling a spade a spade. Many study apps give this definition for Leviathan, although I have no idea who originally wrote it...

A large aquatic animal, perhaps the extinct dinosaur, plesiosaurus, the exact meaning is unknown. Some think this to be a crocodile but from the description in Job 41...this is patently absurd. It appears to be a large fire breathing animal of some sort. Just as the bombardier beetle has an explosion producing mechanism, so the great sea dragon may have an explosive producing mechanism to enable it to be a real fire breathing dragon.

And even the old-earth William Macdonald states in summation to God's speeches to Job...

The descriptions of the wild animals and possibly dinosaurs in these chapters *reflect* the glory, power, and majesty of God Himself (pg. 539).

The quote from Job 41:1 is just one verse among thirty-four! The entire chapter describes this creature in amazing, albeit sometimes obscure, detail. Here are some of the interesting things said about it. Any statements made in the following list are based upon the translation found in *The Hebrew-English Interlinear ESV Old Testament...*

1. You cannot draw him out with a fish hook.
2. You cannot press down his tongue with a cord.
3. You cannot put a reed in his nose.
4. You cannot pierce his jaw with a thorn.
5. You cannot play with him as a bird.

6. You cannot put a leash on him for your young girls.
 7. You cannot fill his skin with harpoons or his head with fish-spears (*which couldn't be said of a crocodile by the way; neither can most of what follows*).
 8. If you lay a hand on him you will never do it again (*Steve Irwin invalidated the crocodile interpretation for this verse*).
 9. No one is so fierce that he stirs him up (*again, think of lovable Mr. Irwin*).
 10. No one is able to open the doors of his face.
 11. His teeth are a terror.
 12. His back are shields shut narrowly together; they clasp together and are not separated.
 13. His sneezing flashes forth light.
 14. His eyes are as the dawn.
 15. Torches and sparks of fire proceed from his mouth.
 16. Smoke comes out of his nose and a flame from his mouth.
 17. His neck remains in strength, the folds of his flesh aren't moved, and his heart is as a stone.
 18. A sword, spear, stone, or javelin cannot reach unto him (for destruction).
 19. Iron is as straw and bronze is as rotten wood to him; sling-stones and arrows are useless.
 20. Under him are points as of potsherd.
 21. He makes the deep sea boil like a pot.
 22. He is completely fearless.
- Sounds like a dragon/dinosaur to me!

The above line from Psalm 74 again takes us to the book of Revelation, as the political antichristian beast-nation that comes out of the sea has seven heads. In fact, it's possible to think that Revelation 13 has Leviathan particularly in mind, for Macdonald relates...

The term Leviathan in ancient Canaanite literature referred to a "seven-headed sea dragon" (pg. 538; *I think he is quoting Francis Anderson here*)...

There's a part of the description from Job 41 that I didn't include that also could tie in to Bible prophecy...

Will he make a covenant with you? Will you take him for a servant forever? -- verse 4

Israel will make a covenant with the Antichrist (cf. Daniel 9:24-27); yet is it wise to think to enter an agreement with a wild, ferocious animal? There's something else interesting when considering Leviathan prophetically. There comes a great false prophet(s) who will give glory to the Antichrist. It is written that he will cause fire to come down out of heaven (cf. Revelation 13:11-18). Yet the witnesses [or witness] who oppose the beast will have fire coming out of their mouths (cf. Revelation 11). So the false prophet(s) will seem as Elijah (who made fire fall in 2 Kings) and the witnesses [or witness] will seem as Leviathan. I guess appearances will be deceiving.

4. *Behemoth*

This takes us to the last major term in the Old Testament that probably directly refers to a dinosaur. There may be other terms or other constructions of more common terms that encompass dinosaurs but I can't think of any more now. Behemoth also is mentioned while God speaks to Job (chapter 40), and

again, the language excels anything that can be understood of modern animals. The name itself is plural of the more general word for beast, which seems to indicate intensification. Some chief points of his description are as follows...

1. Behemoth was made with Job, or more probably, humankind in general (if this is a dinosaur than language can't be any clearer that man dwelt with them).
2. He eats grass.
3. His strength is in his loins and his power is in the muscles of his belly.
4. His tail is as a cedar.
5. The sinews of his thighs are interwoven.
6. His bones are as bronze and his limbs are as bars of iron.
7. He is the first of the ways of God.
8. His maker [can only] bring near his sword.
9. He lies under lotuses with reeds and marsh and willows of the brook.
10. A rushing river does not frighten him.

William Macdonald has a nice short statement on this creature...

God presents the behemoth as the first of His ways, that is, as Exhibit A in the animal kingdom. Although we cannot identify it with certainty, we know that it is herbivorous, amphibian, and exceedingly powerful. It rests in shady, marshy areas and is not easily intimidated. The lesson is that if Job can't even control this brute, how can he control the world?

The behemoth is sometimes identified with the hippopotamus, and some translations, such as the Louis Segond translation in French, actually put that animal in the text. But by no stretch of the imagination can the hippopotamus be called “the first of the ways of God” -- an elephant or a mammoth might merit that epithet but hardly a hippo! When children go to the zoo they squeal with glee at the cute, stubby tail of the hippo -- hardly a tail like a cedar!

Some Christian scientists are now convinced that the behemoth must be an animal now extinct, or perhaps found in some remote parts of the African jungle. In fact, a reptile of the dinosaur type does fit the description very closely (pg. 538).

Before closing this section it’s marvellous to note that, although there is some overlap, the Behemoth is primarily described as a land animal and Leviathan as an aquatic animal. Revelation 13 describes two great beasts as well, one coming from the sea and the other from the land.

IV. It Was Prophesied

Darwinists never attack the God of the Bible, but rather the overly-simplistic God of the inadequate “clock-maker” motif. Everything in Sunday School is presented as being so neat and tidy; when you get out and experience the real world, it can be confusing to a heart fed such simplistic fodder.

Imagine a man leaving England to experience all the strange flora and fauna of South America for the first

time. Not owning a HD TV, the images would be startling. *Why does it seem like everything is colour coded? Why is everything so in tune with its surroundings, as if some strange fairy redesigned everything to be much more vibrant and resplendent than the grey U.K.?* It would be easy to think God was not in this, for all these creatures couldn't have marched off the ark and then migrated to the exact location, to be joined with all the others specially made for this lively locale. The point is, the realization of differences via natural selection didn't mesh with simple Sunday School, thus it much more easily slotted into a godless system.

The fault often isn't with the God of the Bible but rather with the teachers of the God of the Bible. For example, I love the Bible but get easily flustered by the complex nature of textual criticism (*the final frontier to resolve all perceived discrepancies*). When you see all the different manuscripts and variants it could easily slot into the idea that there is no Word of God; this however is allowing complexity to get the best of you. This is something that scientists are supposed to be against, not allowing themselves to be pawned off by over-simplistic explanations (such as is comparable to the "KJV only" people), but rather being willing to roll up their sleeves and do some hardy, gruelling work. Just because the work is hard doesn't mean that it's apart from God, yet the seemingly complex relationship between *creation and adaptation*, between *beauty and disease*, and between *providence and free will* have been popular excuses to ditch the fear of God.

The alternative lie is that scientists are brainy geniuses whose hearts bleed blue for truth and righteousness and at some point in the recent past they locked themselves into a room. In that room they performed every possible

experiment with a completely open mind; they exuded strenuous effort and stretched their amazing brainpans, and, ach, sad to say, they uncovered the doleful truth that there is no God. I think that is the perception anyway.

Yet are scientists smarter than the average? Many are I suppose, but relative to what? Could an Olympic athlete run faster than me? Of course. Could they run faster than a sports car? Of course not. Someone may be faster than another, but generally speaking, if both are reasonably physically fit, the difference is only a small percentage. Just so, the average scientist may be smarter than the average trash poker, yet if both have reasonably sound minds, the difference is not very great. I think because the brain is hidden behind the eyes we imagine that some people's is larger than it really is. No scientist is "smart enough" to understand that God is a delusion; this often isn't even a decision that is made with the mind, but rather with the emotions.

According to Alistair McGrath (who is NO friend of fundamental Christianity, despite any reputation to the contrary), in his book *Dawkins' God*, there were at least two religious notions that coloured Charles Darwin's thinking. The first is that he couldn't come to terms with all the bad in the world, especially being hurt by the loss of a young daughter...

It is widely agreed that what C.S. Lewis termed "the problem of pain" is one of the most significant obstacles to Christian belief, and it is entirely understandable that one as sensitive as Darwin should feel the weight of this matter, particularly in the light of his own protracted (and still unexplained) illness. The death of his daughter Annie at the tender

age of ten unquestionably deepened his feeling of moral outrage over this issue (pg. 74).

The second is that he hated fundamental Christianity, especially its doctrine of damnation...

...Darwin reacted with repugnance to ideas such as the damnation to everlasting Hell of those who did not explicitly believe the Christian gospel. Darwin felt this outrage with particular force, on account of his father's somewhat unorthodox religious beliefs. As he wrote in his *Autobiography*:

I can indeed hardly see how anyone ought to wish Christianity to be true; for if so the plain language of the text seems to show that the men who do not believe, and this would include my Father, Brother and almost all of my friends, will be everlastingly punished. And this is a damnable doctrine (pg. 75).

But doesn't the reader instantly see a problem here? He loathes the idea of judgment and he loathes the idea of bad in the world. You obviously can't loathe both and hope to understand the God of holiness and justice. Suppose I came up with a theory that every supermodel was madly in love with me. After a few weeks past and I received no gushing love letters and no expensive gifts, could I then in my bitterness and anger postulate an idea that supermodels don't really exist? This would be ridiculously vain, not to mention looney. I came up with a bad theory about a group of people, the theory turned out to be false, and so then I deny that the people exist? Why not rather deny and revise the bad idea about them? Why not rather postulate a new theory that I'm not too handsome and supermodels have eyes?

With the death of the young daughter why didn't he rather revise his ideas about eternal damnation? Why didn't worms and parasites make him admit to the existence of a fearfully holy God who was exacting painful judgments upon a backslidden world? Why not rather admit that humankind isn't quite as beautiful in God's eyes as we all would like to think? Perhaps Darwin wasn't so ignorant, but just plain bitter. My e-pastor Kenny Baldwin of Virginia recently said in a sermon, "We think that when God punishes us we should punish him." What a dangerous attitude!

Either way, to be mad at God for exacting judgment is to get it all wrong. We are the ones that sin and he is the one who has provided a remedy in his Son, Jesus Christ. We all know life isn't what it could be, even what it should be, so we can either admit that it is owing to the sinfulness of man and justifiable divine wrath, or we can believe in escapist nonsense, such as the slow-as-molasses-helter-skelter notions of today. Perhaps affliction is the great classroom of God, where the rubber of our ideas really meet the road of his Person, thus exposing our theology.

It was during the affliction of the Lord Jesus Christ in the wilderness when the Devil came to him with crafty temptations. One temptation is very pertinent to our discussion...

Then the Devil takes Him along to the holy city [i.e., Jerusalem] and sets Him on the pinnacle of the temple, and says to Him, "Since You are God's Son, throw Yourself down, for it has been written, 'He will give orders to His angels concerning You,' and 'they will lift You up on [their] hands, lest You strike Your foot against a stone.'" -- Matthew 4:5-6

Let me start by saying that this whole encounter fascinates me. The Son of Man went up against the most potent created being and he didn't use trigonometry or supernatural power; it was truly the battle royale but it seemed more like a grade school quiz. Men strut or flex; heavenly beings get down to the real business.

The Devil was quoting Scripture; he was quoting Psalm 91. The Lord Jesus, although weary and ravenous with hunger, must have fought back laughter at this point. What a horrible Scripture for the Devil to quote! Let's take a look at what this Psalm says more fully...

No evil will befall you, nor will any plague come near your tent [Or *dwelling*]. For He will give His angels charge concerning you, to guard you in all your ways. They will bear you up in their hands, that you do not strike your foot against a stone. You will tread upon the lion and cobra, the young lion and the serpent [Or *dragon*] you will trample down. -- verses 10-13

The passage Satan quoted would go on to speak of his impending doom! The Lord Jesus Christ was prophesied back in Genesis to crush the head of the serpent. Adam introduced sin into the world, and that sin brought about the judgment of death. In Genesis 3:15 God promised however that one day a deliverer would come who would defeat the serpent...

... For this [reason] the Son of God was revealed, so that He should destroy the works of the Devil. -- 1 John 3:8

Therefore, since the young children have shared of flesh and blood, He Himself [*i.e., Jesus Christ*] also likewise shared in the same, so that through death He should destroy [or, render powerless] the one having the power of death, that is, the Devil, and release

those, as many as [due to] a fear of death, throughout all the [time] to live [fig., all their lives], were subjects of slavery. -- Hebrews 2:14-15

Now someone might object that they have not feared death throughout their lifetime. Okay, you might not fear the pleasant side to death; namely, cessation from strife and labour. Death means more than lying in a casket however. Death means embarrassment; it means regret; it means making a fool of yourself; it means being exposed as vapid and naked; it means pain; it means terror; it means, worst of all, *hopelessness*. The man in hell begged Lazarus for a tiny drop of water; why? Just to savour the very ideas of comfort and blessing, for these were treasures completely withheld from him forever. Should you not fear that?!

Yet Jesus Christ came to rid us of this problem...

And we have known [or, have come to know] and have believed [or, have been convinced of] the love which God has in us. God is love, and the one abiding in that love abides in God, and God abides in him. By this, love has been perfected [or, completed] with us, so that we shall be having confidence [or, a joyful sense of freedom] in the day of the judgment, because just as that One is, [so] also we are in this world. [There] is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear, because fear has punishment... -- 1 John 4:16-18

This is the great news of the Gospel: “just as that One is, [so] also we are.” If we have called out to God and repented of being sinful and asked him for forgiveness through His resurrected Son Jesus Christ, we have been forgiven of our sins, and most gloriously, we have been clothed in his righteousness; we have “put on” Christ.

Just as he is justified and in glory, so will we be. We will not be put to shame; we will have no regrets, nakedness, or pain.

This great passage from Genesis 3:15 invoking the serpent is what the prophets probably had in mind when they foresaw the Lord slaying a dragon...

You [Or *You Yourself*] divided the sea by Your strength; You [Or *You Yourself*] broke the heads of the sea monsters in [Lit *on*] the waters. You [Or *You Yourself*] crushed the heads of Leviathan [Or *sea monster*]; You [Or *You Yourself*] gave him as food for the creatures [Lit *people*] of the wilderness. -- Psalm 74:13-14

In that day the LORD will punish Leviathan [Or *sea monster*] the fleeing serpent, with His fierce and great and mighty sword, even Leviathan [Or *sea monster*] the twisted serpent; and He will kill the dragon who [lives] in the sea. -- Isaiah 27:1

Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the LORD; awake as in the days of old, the generations of long ago. Was it not You who cut Rahab in pieces, who pierced the dragon? -- Isaiah 51:9

Trying to define just what these quotes mean does require a bit of conjecture. It is clear that on one hand something in the past is being mentioned: "Was it not You who cut Rahab in pieces, who pierced the dragon?" On the other hand something future is also being referenced: "In that day the LORD will punish Leviathan."

The conjecture I mentioned is required to fully understand the reference to the past. Poetically it is probably a way of describing divine intervention at the

fall of Satan and also the deliverance of Israel from enemies; it is probably also a clever way of attributing power and glory to God. Many ancients were honoured for slaying dragons and the Biblical authors are perhaps asserting that behind any beneficial conquest of man was the power and goodness of the Lord.

No matter what its historic roots, it's clear what the future holds for the outworking of this metaphor. It is directly described in Revelation 12. This chapter has perhaps the most succinct account of salvation history anywhere in the Bible. Revelation 12 begins with a woman who is about to give birth to a child “who is about to be shepherding [or, ruling] all the nations with an iron staff. And her Child was caught up to God and to His throne” (verse 5).

A great red dragon, who is described as “the ancient serpent [see Gen 3:1], the one being called Devil [“Slanderer”] and Satan [“Adversary”], the one leading astray [fig., deceiving] the whole inhabited earth” (verse 9) tries unsuccessfully to devour the child. Even so the Lord Jesus Christ successfully resisted all the temptations of the Devil and finished his course.

After the ascension of the Son of God the Serpent is wholly defeated: “he was thrown down to the earth, and his angels were thrown down with him” (verse 9). The war then intensifies just as it will throughout the very end days: “and the dragon was enraged against the woman, and he went off to make war with the rest of her seed [fig., offspring], the ones keeping the commandments of God and having the testimony of Jesus” (verse 17).

Yet in the end the Arm of Hashem (see Isaiah 53) will smite the great antichristian system with a word of his mouth...

And I saw the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies having been gathered together to make war with the One sitting on the horse and with His army. And the beast was captured, and the false prophet with it, the one having performed the signs before it, by which he led astray [fig., deceived] the ones having received the mark of the beast and the ones prostrating themselves in worship before its image. These two were thrown living into the lake of fire, the one being burned with sulfur [or, brimstone]. And the rest were killed with the sword of the One sitting on the horse, the [sword] having proceeded out of His mouth, and all the birds were filled from their flesh. -- Revelation 19:19-20

I know I make references to these verses a lot in my writings. I'm not trying to be redundant but I can't think of a better way to attempt to strengthen the hearts of believers in these latter days. Even if the whole world was set against us, the LORD of Glory, the Jewish God-man, is still powerful enough to overcome with just a word.

As I mentioned earlier, a few darker clouds than normal have appeared on the horizon and many Christians are beginning to freak out. They're publishing books and recording radio programs describing plans for moving here or there or making provisions for apocalyptic survival. This is all foolish for three major reasons:

(1) Our call is clearly not self-preservation. The Lord Jesus Christ made this ABUNDANTLY CLEAR:

Then Jesus said to His disciples, “If anyone desires to come after Me, he must deny [or, disown] himself and take up his cross and be following Me. For whoever shall be desiring to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it...For the Son of Humanity is about to be coming in the glory of His Father, with His angels, and then He will reward each according to his work.” -- Matthew 16:24-25, 27

(2) If these really were the very end times there would be no safe place to flee to anyway:

Alas, you who are longing for the day of the LORD, for what purpose [will] the day of the LORD [be] to you? It [will be] darkness and not light; as when a man flees from a lion and a bear meets him, or [Or *then*] goes home, leans his hand against the wall and a snake bites him. -- Amos 5:18-19

(3) A selfish spirit could quickly stymie the work of God.

I'm particularly thinking about the rapture of the church here. I believe that before the tribulation period comes the believers in Jesus Christ will be taken up to Heaven. Yet if Christians are beginning to publish books about how they are going to flee it could provide a handy excuse as to why so many are missing from society. It could be postulated that they suffered mass hysteria believing the end of the world was upon them.

Yet this point could also be extended to encompass a lot of specifics stemming from point 1 above. Since self-preservation isn't the goal, what is? Obviously it's the great commission, the charge to preach the Gospel to every man, woman, and child. How can we do this if we are all turning and running?! Moreover, how can we ever minister to Muslims if the church is being whipped into

a frenzy about how scary they are? How can we personally minister to those from other countries if we're trying desperately to pass legislation to ship them out in order to protect our own precious GDP? Ezekiel was taken captive and Jeremiah stayed with the rebellious remnant; God wants his people as his witnesses in every nation and within every situation, until the true end of the world.

V. Conclusion: Creator and Constancy

I often write things that make it seem as if the world is full of atheists, but I know I'm speaking in a hyperbolic fashion of sorts in such instances. For all intents and purposes though the world *is* full of *practical* atheists, for a weak conception of some blurry God is another form of atheism in my estimation. A belief in a God with a shifting and plastic definition is just a fancy way of worshipping yourself. You create a god in your own image, fashioning him/her/it to slot into your own petty desires and wishes. This is similar to Hillary Clinton's recent call during the Woman in the World Summit to change "deep-seated cultural codes and religious beliefs." When you wish to create a law apart from any god you are declaring yourself to be a god (and ironically just previous to this she said laws needed implemented; what about the Bible!). Clinton's speech was no better than Herod's speech before the people of Tyre, for as James wrote...

...But if you judge [the] Law, you are not a doer of [the] Law but a judge. [There] is one Lawgiver, the One able to save and to destroy... -- James 4:11-12

I'll never understand why people want to void Judeo-Christian beliefs in order to do what is "right." What basis is there for "right" if you've just dispensed with traditional morality? You can only steal so many gold watches from the jewellery shop before it has to close; likewise, you can only bash your own moral system for so long before it falls, and then you're left with a chaotic Northern Kingdom as opposed to a stable Southern Kingdom. Apostasy gives people a rush, but it will have a nasty aftertaste.

If atheists or anti-theists have the good fortune to live in a society still governed by religious belief, or even its afterglow, they may feel free from absolute moral bonds, while those around them are not. This is a tremendous liberation for anyone who is even slightly selfish. And what clever person is not imaginatively and cunningly selfish (Hitchens; pg. 108)?

The fact of the matter is that these politicians don't think about the logic of the things they say. Or else why stay married to a husband that has seduced more females than Don Juan and probably raped a woman? Is that a good feminist thing to do? (Cf. Christopher Hitchens, *No One Left to Lie To*). It used to be expedient for her to try and seem moderate and now she must go after the ultra-left vote; yet why speak with conviction when you are just serving yourself?

"Marriage has historic, religious, and moral content that goes back to the beginning of time, and I think a marriage is as a marriage has always been, between a man and a woman," she said in 1996, according to *God and Hillary Clinton* by Paul Kengor (Martin).

I don't think she feels that way anymore! The worst of it is that people are oblivious to this obvious chicanery; they're too busy enjoying the rush to see the cunning. This lamentable public blindness also bolsters the theory of evolution.

Darwinism is a rubbery concept that is also beyond being disproven. A good example of the shifting, plastic nature of modern "science" is a news article recently published in *The Guardian*...

Fossil hunters in Chile have unearthed the remains of a bizarre Jurassic dinosaur that combined a curious mixture of features from different prehistoric animals.

The evolutionary muddle of a beast grew to the size of a small horse and was the most abundant animal to be found 145 million years ago, in what is now the Aysén region of Patagonia.

The discovery ranks as one of the most remarkable dinosaur finds of the past 20 years, and promises to cause plenty of headaches for paleontologists hoping to place the animal in the dinosaur family tree.

"I don't know how the evolution of dinosaurs produced this kind of animal, what kind of ecological pressures must have been at work," said Fernando Novas at the Bernardino Rivadavia Natural Sciences Museum in Buenos Aires (Sample).

Instead of saying, "Well here we go again, another piece of evidence that the theory of evolution is bunkum, as natural selection could never have produced a composite animal like this according to our perceived timeline," it's assumed that some "kind of ecological pressures must have been at work." What kind? *Ah, who*

cares, say anything: whatever kind that allows us to look at celebrity swank in peace.

Two of the biggest problems with the theory of common descent are that there is no *common* and no *descent*; there are no established patterns. Think about it. Why does natural selection never have a direction? Just about all the goalies for world class soccer teams are tall. Moreover, every center (a position equivalent to soccer's "goalies") in the NBA is tall. Never would a professional basketball team use a five-foot center. They're always closer to seven feet. This is intentional selection as seen in sports. Your last line of defence needs to be as tall as possible in a latch ditch effort to keep the other team from scoring.

There are offensive anomalies like Magic Johnson or Marouane Fellaini because having a low centre of gravity doesn't always translate into goal scoring/assisting; yet height does translate into good defensiveness. What is natural selection aiming at? Reproduction? Energy efficiency? Where are the patterns? Is there a real Max Cohen out there who can sort this out? Why doesn't the animal kingdom have a pattern when it comes to the type of creatures it is apt to produce?

My guess would be that if Darwinian evolution was true there would be two slants. One is that creatures would become increasingly smaller over time (so how did they ever get big?), for the smaller the animal is the less energy it needs to consume. The second is that the creatures that have more offspring would trump everything else, as they are obviously more capable of spreading their fertile-genes that would spread more such genes that would spread more such genes, etc. So the great question is, why does anything exist except bacteria, or at most, a roach? Why would natural

selection “create” massive, clumsy, energy-hoarding humans who only have a couple of babies in their lifetime? That would never happen! Remember, this force must be tremendously strong to create amoebas to men in a relatively short amount of time. Where are Darwin’s biceps?

I hope Google finds Nessie. Don’t get me wrong, I’m not convinced that it exists; but it’d make for a nice reminder to society. I say *reminder* because God has already blessed the world enough to see the error of their ways by uncovering a “living fossil...”

One of the most spectacular living fossils is the coelacanth, a lobe-finned fish. Once known only from fossilized remains, this fish was considered by many to be a key transitional form (a “missing link”) between fish and amphibians. Its fossils are found in Devonian strata, which are assigned a stunningly vast age of 400 million years. However, a live coelacanth hauled up in a fishing net off Madagascar in 1938 showed the same well-designed form as the fossils. It uses its unique fins to orient itself vertically in the deepest seas of the Indian Ocean, not to walk onto land from shallow waters. Where is any evidence of “natural selection” having made even one significant change in this fish over its supposed 400-million-year existence? A similar question could be asked of a host of living fossils.

The most straightforward explanation for why the living form looks so much like the fossilized one is that instead of eons of evolution having taken place, both were created recently (Morris III; pgs. 125-126).

Humankind changes its morality, therefore it’s no wonder they want to embrace a science that is all about

change as well. The link between social behaviour and scientific belief has always been a profound one.

In closing, what about the Bible? Is it disprovable? No, it isn't. The only way for it to be disprovable would be to invent a time machine and to demonstrate that there was no Isaiah who wrote chapter 53 and that there was no Christ who died on a cross 2,000 years ago. There will never be such a time machine, and since major swathes of prophecy are being fulfilled before our eyes there's no need for one anyway.

God never changes as manifested by his works. He created genomes to remain intact. Moreover, his Word teaches us about his unchanging Son. The dragon-slayer motif from Revelation 12 proves that the Father in the Old Testament prophets referenced the Messiah when he spoke of Hashem destroying Leviathan and Rahab. Thus God the Father clearly states that the Messiah is Hashem, and thus also clearly states that he is the promised serpent-slayer from Eden. For just as God promised that a stone would smite the feet of Rome, so the theme of the dragon-slayer is just another extension of that, as seen in Daniel 7. The dragon-slayer motif proves that Christ is coming to destroy a European antichristian system, not a Middle Eastern Muslim one. We can trust Jesus for our eternal salvation from sins and also from our present foes (is so he wills)!

There's salvation in Jesus Christ for every evolutionist, for every Clinton, for everyone in the world. All God asks is to repent of sins and trust in his Son. The Lord Jesus overcame the Devil through childlike faith, and that's what he calls us to do...

And Jesus having summoned a young child, He set him in the middle of them and said, "Positively, I say

to you*, unless you* are turned around [fig., changed inwardly] and become like such young children, by no means shall you* enter into the kingdom of the heavens. Therefore, whoever will humble himself like this young child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of the heavens.” -- Matthew 18:2-4

Now the God of peace will crush Satan under your* feet with quickness. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ [be] with you*. -- Romans 16:20

VI. Works Cited

- Boyd, Robert. *Boyd's Handbook of Practical Apologetics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1997.
- “Dinosaurs: Fossilized While Fighting?”
Answersingenesis.org. Accessed April 2015.
- “Dragons: Fact or Fable?” Answersingenesis.org.
Accessed April 2015.
- Herbert, Jake. “Dinosaur Moth: An Evolutionary Enigma.” Icr.org. Accessed April 2015.
- Hitchens, Peter. *The Rage Against God*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2010.
- Johnson, Phillip. *Darwin on Trial*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1991.
- MacDonald, William. *Believer's Bible Commentary*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1995.
- Martin, Sami K. “6 Interesting Facts About Hillary Clinton's Christian Faith.” Christianpost.com. Accessed April 2015.

- McGrath, Alistair. *Dawkins' God*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- Morris III, Henry. *Exploring the Evidence for Creation*. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 2009.
- Morris, John. "What Would Need to Change for a Dinosaur to Evolve into a Bird?" Icr.org. Accessed April 2015.
- Oxford University Museum of Natural History. Accessed April 2015.
<http://www.oum.ox.ac.uk/learning/pdfs/plot.pdf>
- Paul, Gregory S. *The Princeton Field Guide to Dinosaurs*. Princeton, New Jersey: University Press, 2010.
- "Roth, Ariel A." *In Six Days*. Online edition (Answersingenesis.org). Accessed April 2015.
- Sample, Ian. "'Bizarre' Jurassic dinosaur discovered in remarkable new find." Guardian.co.uk. Accessed April 2015.
- Shindler, Karolyn. "Richard Owen: the greatest scientist you've never heard of." Telegraph.co.uk. Accessed April 2015.
- "Wanser, Keith H." *In Six Days*. Online edition (Answersingenesis.org). Accessed April 2015.

This book was distributed courtesy of:



For your own Unlimited Reading and FREE eBooks today, visit:

<http://www.Free-eBooks.net>

Share this eBook with anyone and everyone automatically by selecting any of the options below:



To show your appreciation to the author and help others have wonderful reading experiences and find helpful information too, we'd be very grateful if you'd kindly [post your comments for this book here](#).



COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

Free-eBooks.net respects the intellectual property of others. When a book's copyright owner submits their work to Free-eBooks.net, they are granting us permission to distribute such material. Unless otherwise stated in this book, this permission is not passed onto others. As such, redistributing this book without the copyright owner's permission can constitute copyright infringement. If you believe that your work has been used in a manner that constitutes copyright infringement, please follow our Notice and Procedure for Making Claims of Copyright Infringement as seen in our Terms of Service here:

<http://www.free-ebooks.net/tos.html>

THE BEST BOOKS IN YOUR POCKET!

Jam-pack your Kindle, iPad, Android, Nook, or any device, full of amazing books with your own e-GO! Library. At your leisure pick your favorite titles from a wide array of categories for all tastes. Total speed, convenience & mobility are yours. Your e-GO! Library is an innovative way “to have & hold” a fresh and plentiful supply of great titles. It’s seemingly endless entertainment without the need for the internet or downloading! All in a preloaded, USB memory flash drive which puts a thousand of today's best books in your pocket!

Enjoy Anywhere Anytime!


- ✓ **CONVENIENCE** of Preloaded USB flash drive
- ✓ **FORMATS** for ALL eReaders & Mobile Devices
- ✓ **NO** need for Wi-Fi or Internet
- ✓ **AVOID** Downloading

- ✓ **SAVE** Tons of Time & Effort
- ✓ **PERFECT** for Travel
- ✓ **FUN** for the Whole Family
- ✓ **MAKES** a Great Gift

TODAY'S TOP


1,000 BOOKS

+250 BONUS CLASSICS








e-GO!
Library

- ✓ Total Mobility & Convenience
- ✓ Pre-Loaded. Over 32 Categories
- ✓ No Internet / Wifi Needed
- ✓ Perfect for Travel
- ✓ Read Anywhere, Anytime



EXTRA BONUS!
+25 AUDIO BOOKS
at
eGoLibrary.com/bonus

 Apple
  Windows
  android
  nook
  kindle

CHECK IT OUT HERE