

Points of Similarity Between Nobie Stone and John Lennox

The following comparison is taken from examining the work of Nobie Stone, *Genesis One and Lessons From Space* and John Lennox's work, *Seven Days That Divide The World*.

1. Nobie Stone's book is copyrighted 2014. John Lennox's book is copyrighted, c. 2011. Lennox's book precedes Stone's book by 3 years.
2. Stone does not mention Lennox by name in his book nor does he cite Lennox's work as a reference. However, the following comparisons show that Nobie Stone was familiar with Lennox's work.
3. Both men argue for a new look at Genesis 1.
 - a. Nobie Stone, p. 62, the section is titled, *The Second Logical Possibility and A New Look at Genesis 1:1*.
 - b. John Lennox, p. 48, "If we believe in the inspiration of Scripture, we must take the text seriously because it is Scripture that is inspired and not my particular understanding of it, as I said earlier. One way of doing this is to try to read Genesis 1 as if we had never read it before."
4. Both men believe that creation was a process.

Nobie Stone, "creation was accomplished in a sequence, as a process, and the first step was the creation of all the necessary substance, the three constituents mentioned above—space, time, and matter-energy." P. 64-65.

Lennox, "According to Genesis, then, creation involved not just one, but a sequence of several discrete creation acts, after which God rested. This surely implies that those acts involved processes that are not going on at the moment." P. 161.
5. Both believe that the Big Bang theory has merit.
 - a. Nobie Stone, see p. 66.
 - b. John Lennox, "Similarly, we do not have to choose between God and the Big Bang. P. 153. Lennox believes that scientists describe the Big Bang in terms of physics while the Bible describes it in Gen. 1:1. Scientists believe that space-time had a beginning and they call it the Big Bang. Arno Penzias who won the Nobel Prize for Physics for discovering an echo of that beginning in the cosmic microwave background wrote, "The best data we have...are exactly what I would have predicted, had I nothing to go on but the five books of Moses, the Psalms, and the Bible as a whole." Therefore, the Standard (Big Bang) Model developed by physicists and cosmologists can be seen as a scientific unpacking of the implications of the statement, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Lennox adds, "There is an irony here that the very same Big Bang cosmological model of the universe that confirms the biblical claim that there was a beginning also implies that the universe is very old" p. 154.
6. Both accept the Gap Theory.
 - a. Nobie, p. 67, Stone believes that there is a grammatical break between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 1:2. What right do we have to impose any constraint on this clear break? Is it continuous? Is there a gap? We truly do not know."
 - b. Lennox, p. 52-53. Lennox believes that the age of the universe is indeterminate.
7. Both accept the Cosmic Microwave Background theory. (Part of the Big Bang Theory)
 - a. Nobie, p. 53; 66.
 - b. Lennox, p. 154.

8. Both believe that there were long periods of time between the days of Genesis 1.
 - a. Nobie. P. 68, “Third, there is nothing in the grammar throughout the rest of Genesis Chapter One that requires these to be consecutive days. A period of time placed between the first day and the second day is consistent with the language” These may be “days of creation” separated by a period of time.”
 - b. Lennox, p. 54, “However, there is another possibility: that the writer did not intend us to think of the first six days as days of a single earth week, but rather as a sequence of six creation days; that is, days of normal length (with evenings and mornings as the text says) in which God acted to create something new, but days that might well have been separated by long periods of time.”
9. Both call for humility on the part of Christians that would most certainly disagree with their interpretations and conclusions.
 - a. Nobie Stone, p. 70, “To be sure, there are difficulties with our attempts to observe and explain nature. Science is an evolutionary process that, apparently, will always be incomplete and should never be considered absolute. There are difficulties with our understanding of some aspects of the scriptural record, but the most dangerous thing to do in discussions of this kind is to put words into the mouth of revelation. Our current understanding of Scripture may not correctly reflect what was intended to be communicated and we should, therefore, be open to alternative ways the wording of disputable passages may be understood.”
Nobie Stone, p. 108-109, “So how, as Christians, should we proceed? First, we must proceed as ambassadors of our Lord’s church in a spirit of love and respect for those having a different point of view. We must be careful to determine exactly what Genesis is actually telling us—and what it is not. It is more sophisticated than one might think from a quick, cursory reading.”
 - b. Lennox, p. 87, “The fact that Scripture, although it could be interpreted in terms of a young earth, does not require such an interpretation. There are other possible interpretations in terms of an ancient earth that do not compromise the authority of Scripture. The fact that we do not know everything. Humility is often seen in the greatest scientists. It is also a Christian virtue.”
10. Both argue that it doesn’t make any difference if you interpret the days of Gen. 1 as 24-hour periods or long periods of time or even other ways.
 - a. Nobie. P. 68, “But if God chose to create in a sequence over a period of time, why are we concerned whether that period was six consecutive 24 hour periods, or six separate days of creation spread out over an indeterminate period of time?”
 - b. Lennox, p. 58, “It would be a mistake, of course, to overemphasise (sic) the differences between some of the views mentioned in this chapter. No major doctrine of Scripture is affected by whether one believes that the days are analogical days or that each day is a long period of time inaugurated by God speaking, or whether one believes that each of the days is a normal day in which God spoke, followed by a long period of putting into effect the information contained in what God said on that particular day.”
11. Both argue that the geocentric view was a false view and that the mistake made by both science and theologians who affirmed it may be being repeated with regard to the age of the universe, and the age of the earth.

a. Nobie, p. 70, “The Catholic Church made this mistake centuries ago when it endorsed the contemporary scientific consensus of the day, a geocentric view of the universe, and made this concept church dogma—much to the detriment of both faith and science.”

b. Lennox, devotes the first two chapters of his book to this topic.

12. Both believe that the interpretation of Gen. 1 is sophisticated.

a. Nobie Stone, pp. 108-109. Referenced above at #9.

b. Lennox, p. 54, “This point of grammar may also be a signal to us that the text is rather more sophisticated than we might first have thought.”

13. Nobie Stone reviewed rather favorably the book by John Lennox in *Sufficient Evidence* (fall, 2016) which is published by the Warren Christian Apologetics Center. The Warren Christian Apologetics Center also published the book by Nobie Stone in 2014. Why is the Warren Center promoting the false ideas of Nobie Stone concerning the doctrine of creation when Nobie Stone is taking his ideas from John Lennox? John Lennox’s ideas have been refuted many times (see *Answers in Genesis Journal* articles that refute Lennox).

14. There are other points of similarity that could be given. For instance the use of the same terminology like the words, “singularity” and “sequence” and “process.” The same words used by both authors and the same concepts used by both authors is striking.