

Paper 1

Introduction:

- It is clear what you are trying to prove to the reader

Body paragraph 1:

- “How could God intentionally deceive mankind in such a manner?” There are legitimate arguments about why God would do that, such as testing the faith of His followers. You may not need that sentence.

- “The notion of a ‘trickster God’ seemed antithetical to the image of God as an all-powerful, omnipotent being.” The notion of a trickster God does not contradict His omnipotence; He still has the power to do what He wants. Rather, this type of deception undermines God’s benevolence.

- “where Gosse failed in his synthetic attempt.” Synthetic is not the right word here. I know what you are trying to say, but “synthesis” does not turn into synthetic as an adjective.

- I agree that the undesirability of Gosse’s synthesis was largely responsible for its poor reception. Perhaps, however, part of the reason was due to how there was no evidence to support such a theory? People need to be compelled to believe, and the mere proposition of a logical theory without convincing arguments won’t sway devout followers of science or religion.

Body Paragraph 2:

- The discovery of human and dinosaur prints together is hardly proof of your claim. It may be so, but from the evidence provided I am not convinced. If the foundation of the argument is shaky, then the whole example has little to no credibility.
- “If God created all the earth and all the animals in it, then he must have created dinosaurs along with man.” Why must this be so? Are you trying to say that God created all forms of life on this planet at the same time? If so, what evidence besides the Bible points to this conclusion? There is much science that directly conflicts with this assertion, such as evolution.
- “the existence of dinosaur fossils is seen as antithetical to the word of God.” A brief description of why would be helpful for the reader.

Body Paragraph 3:

- I don’t see how this example makes sense. The Bible was written far after the extinction of dinosaurs. Surely, the coexistence of humans and dinosaurs at the time the Bible was written is completely illogical. How could the authors reference an animal that they have never seen? It wasn’t until long after the publication of the Bible did we even have the

technology to virtually reconstruct fossils in order to hypothesize about the shape and functions of dinosaurs.

- Do these animals really have to exist specifically as they are mentioned in the Bible? Couldn't hyperbole account for the descriptions of these referenced animals?

Conclusion:

-What about those people who do believe that the Word of God must be taken literally? Doesn't your synthesis, which involves reinterpretation of the Bible, insult those Christians?

-In your introduction you said "is still possible through the careful reinterpretation of Scripture and of scientific discovery." You did not reinterpret any scientific discovery; rather, you used scientific discovery to reinterpret the Word of God.

Overall Comments

-I agree that the Bible must be interpreted. Genesis blatantly contradicts itself in the creation story.

- Gosse's theory tried to reconcile the differences between all of science and religion. Your example of dinosaurs merely sets out to resolve one tiny controversy within this arena.

- I feel as if you maybe took on too much in your essay. You have formulated a whole new theory, which takes much more than a 4 page paper to explain.

- Some of your sentences are very long and too wordy. Try to be more concise to increase clarity.