

Book Review:

Seven Days that Divide the World: The Beginning according to Genesis and Science, by John Lennox

Review by Simon Turpin

Introduction

John Lennox is a professor of mathematics and a fellow in the philosophy of science at Oxford University. He is a devoted follower of Christ and a skilful apologist.

In his book *Seven Days That Divide the World* Lennox explores the ‘potential minefield’ of the controversy of Genesis and science. He wrote the book for people who have been put off considering the Christian faith because of the ‘...very silly, unscientific story that the world was made in seven days’¹ and for convinced Christians who are disturbed by the controversy but also for those who take the Bible seriously but do not agree on the interpretation of the creation account.² Although the book is not intended to be exhaustive in its scope, it has been written in response to many requests made of Dr. Lennox over the years.

Lennox, an advocate of old earth creationism, does affirm that man is a ‘direct special creation’³ by God and that humans have not evolved. He asks whether ‘...it is crucial to the theology of salvation that Adam was the first actual member of a human race physically distinct from all creatures that preceded him?’⁴

A History Lesson

Lennox recognizes that this is a controversial topic and that disagreement over it has been, at times, acrimonious. In order to gain perspective on the way to handle this controversy he looks at another major controversy in history: the Copernican revolution.

Unfortunately, all Lennox achieves is that of raising the tired old issue of geocentrism, noting that the Bible in certain passages seems to suggest a fixed earth (1 Chron. 16:30; Ps. 93:1; Ps. 104:5; 1 Sam. 2:8) and that the sun moves (Ps. 19:4-6; Eccl. 1:5).⁵

Presuming that his readers now accept the heliocentric view Lennox now asks: Why do Christians accept this “new” interpretation, and not still insist on a “literal” understanding of the “pillars of the earth”? Why are we not still split up into fixed-earthers

¹ John Lennox., *Seven Days that Divide the World: The Beginning According to Genesis and Science*: Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011. Page 12

² Ibid. Page 12

³ Ibid. Page 69

⁴ Ibid. Page 73

⁵ Ibid page 16-17

and moving-earththers? Is it really because we have all compromised, and made Scripture subservient to science?⁶

For some reason he brings up this issue throughout the book, insisting that if we applied the same reasoning we use to interpret the days literally to the interpretation of the foundation and pillars of the earth, then we would be still insisting that the earth does not move⁷.

Although Lennox tries to show from the history of the Galileo affair that the church got it wrong, and it did, it was not because science showed that the Bible to be wrong, but only that the church's faulty interpretation of the Bible was wrong.

However, he totally misses the real reason, which is that the Roman Catholic Church in Galileo's day accepted pagan Greek Philosophy over Biblical revelation and that this had to be accommodated in order to understand Scripture and derive theology. Therefore, when the pagan Greek scientist Ptolemy said the earth was at the centre of the solar system, then so be it – scripture had to accommodate this view. Galileo was fighting against the Geocentric view of the academic leaders in the church of his day, whose key interpretive principle was that autonomous human knowledge and traditions of men came first and their way of thinking had to be within the prevailing pagan Aristotelian philosophy.

The irony of this history lesson is that in Galileo's day the church was interpreting poetical passages of the Bible literally whereas today they are saying that Bible passages which are written as historical narrative, such as Genesis 1-3, should be read as poetry.

For example Psalm 93:1b says '*Indeed, the world is firmly established it will not be moved.*' However, the Psalms are poetic books which include figurative speech so we should be careful of concluding that a specific verse should be read literally. The Bible was simply using the earth as a reference frame, just as we do today.

The unfortunate lesson from Galileo's day is that the church has still not learnt from history, insisting on taking the popular ideas of the age, i.e. evolutionary ideas, as its authority rather than allowing the Bible to speak for itself. The historical events surrounding Galileo are a warning to theistic evolutionists and long-agers, not to Young Earth Creationists.

To answer Lennox's question as to why we are not split into fixed-earththers and moving-earththers:

- 1: Because the Bible does not teach this.
- 2: Because observational science supports the heliocentric view.

⁶ Ibid. Page 19

⁷ Ibid. Page 61

Church Fathers

Lennox does recognize that neither YEC nor OEC are a recent invention and rightly notes that Luther, Calvin and the Westminster Confession of Faith held to the twenty-four hour day view.⁸ He also recognizes that “...*the understanding of the days of Genesis as twenty-four hour days seems to have been the dominant view for many centuries.*”⁹

Nevertheless, he does cite the Jewish scholar Philo and the church Fathers Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen and Augustine to support his old earth views¹⁰, emphasizing that they were not ‘...*influenced by contemporary science, such as geology and evolutionary biology*’ but yet *did not believe the days of creation were of twenty four hours.*’¹¹

Even though these men were not influenced by contemporary science, they did have other influences. Philo for example, who allegorized the Old Testament, attempted to synthesize Greek philosophy with the world of Hebrew thought.¹²

The Early Church Fathers, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, based their ideas on the days being epochs on the basis of Psalm 90:4 and 2 Peter 3:8, as Lennox recognizes. However, Davis Young notes that the patristic fathers:

...equation of the days and millennia was not applied to the creation week but rather to subsequent history. They did not believe that the creation had taken place over six millennia but that the totality human history would occupy six thousand years, a millennium of history for each of the six days of creation.¹³

Origen¹⁴ and Augustine,¹⁵ who was influenced by neo-platonic philosophy, while they did not believe that the days were literally twenty-four hours, they also did not believe the earth to be ancient but rather was less than ten thousand years old.

The Days of creation:

When it comes to the Genesis account of creation, Lennox, unlike theistic evolutionists, rightly understands that it is a historical narrative. Affirming that Scripture is God’s revelation he correctly points out that “*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.*”¹⁶

⁸ Ibid. Page 40

⁹ Ibid. Page 42

¹⁰ Ibid. Pages 40-42

¹¹ Ibid. Page 42

¹² J.M.Bassler, “Philo,” in *Harpers Bible Dictionary*, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1985), 791.

¹³ D.A. Young, *Christianity and the Age of the Earth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), p. 20. It should be noted that Davis Young believes the earth is old.

¹⁴ *Contra Celsum (Against Celsus)* 1.19, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*4:404

¹⁵ Augustine, *The City of God* 12.10

¹⁶ Lennox., *Seven Days That Divide the World.*, Page 48

The ‘unmistakable impression’ of the text according to Lennox, is that of a chronological sequence of events, giving the briefest of brief histories of time...’¹⁷ He rightly notes that the word ‘day’ can have a number of meanings and points out four different meanings of the word in Genesis 1:1-2:4.¹⁸

In Genesis 1:5 two primary meanings for the word ‘day’ appear in the same verse: ‘daytime’ and ‘twenty-four hours.’ He points to the third meaning of the word ‘day’ on the seventh day since there is no mention of ‘evening and morning’ as with the first six days. He believes that ‘the seventh day is arguably different from the first six days, which are the days of creative activity’. He, as do other long agers, believes that we are still today in God’s Sabbath rest citing Hebrews 4:3-11.¹⁹

Finally (fourthly), he notes that in Genesis 2:4 the word ‘day’ is used to describe a period of time. He concludes that in Genesis 1:1-2:4, the word ‘day’ has several distinct meanings each of which are natural, primary, “literal” meanings.²⁰ Lennox also points out that the first five days in the Hebrew text are missing the definite article although it is present in days six and seven. The question now is ‘...how should we interpret them’?

Lennox is correct in pointing out that the word ‘day’ can have a number of different meanings, though YEC have long pointed this out. He is correct in the meaning of ‘day’ in Genesis 1:5 and also with the meaning of ‘day’ in Genesis 2:4, although this does not prove what he is trying to conclude. ‘Day’ in Genesis 2:4 is used in the idiomatic sense in that it correctly summarizes the entirety of the six days of creation. To use ‘day’ here as an example of the days being figurative in chapter 1 is a failure to recognize the difference between the absolute noun (Gen 1) and the construct noun (Gen. 2:4).

However, his conclusion regarding the seventh day is misplaced. Why is there no mention of ‘evening and morning’ on day seven? First of all it should be noted that God’s created work did not cease on the seventh day but that it was finished ‘by the seventh day.’ Day seven, like the other days, is a literal historical day of twenty-four hours as it is numbered like the previous days. It is not a day of creation but of rest.

There is a five-fold framework apparent in the first six days which is absent in day seven. This framework is used in Genesis 1:1-2:3 to shape each of the days:

‘God said...’

‘let there be...’

Fulfilment ‘there was’

Evaluation ‘God saw that it was good’

And conclusion ‘there was evening and morning’

¹⁷ Ibid. Page 48

¹⁸ Ibid. Page 50-51

¹⁹ Ibid. Page 50

²⁰ Ibid. Page 51

The evening and morning formula that has been used with the other days is no longer needed on day seven as it had a rhetorical function to mark the transition from the concluding day to the following day. The creation week is now complete and therefore it is not necessary to use the formula 'evening and morning.'

However, it is not only 'evening and morning' that are missing from the seventh day but none of the other parts of this framework are used either on the seventh day. The framework is used to represent accurately God's work involved in His creative activity. The reason this framework is not used on the seventh day is to show that God had ceased creating. Therefore, the reason evening and morning are not used is related to the other parts of the framework.²¹

Also, the reason the definite article is used for first time on the sixth day is to indicate the completion of the work of creation upon that day.²²

Is the seventh day unending according to Hebrews 4? No, Hebrews 4:3 is referring to the Kingdom of God and that for those who exercise faith in Christ they will enter into a spiritual rest. Hebrews 4 quotes Gen.2:2 and Ps. 95:7-11 and it is used by the author as an argument to warn of the danger of unbelief. Also, if the seventh day is unending then this surely raises some theological problems of God cursing the earth while at the same time blessing and sanctifying it.

The Nature of the Creation Week:

Lennox believes that the initial act of creation (Gen.1:1-2) is separated from the six days of creation that follow it because of the pattern to the days each beginning with the phrase 'And God said' and ending with the statement "*and there was evening and there was morning the nth day.*"²³ This leads him to conclude that day one begins in verse 3 and not verse 1.²⁴ He points out that the verb 'created' in Genesis 1:1 is in the perfect tense, and 'the normal use of the perfect at the very beginning of a periscope is to denote an event that took place before the storyline gets under way.' The narrative begins in verse 3²⁵. This implies that 'the beginning' of Genesis 1:1 did not necessarily take place on day 1 as is frequently assumed²⁶. According to Lennox, the initial creation took place before day one, but Genesis does not tell us how long before.

This is one of the main reasons Lennox believes:

...that the question of the age of the earth (and of the universe) is a separate question from the interpretation of the days, a point that is frequently overlooked. In other words, quite apart

²¹ <http://www.dbts.edu/journals/2006/McCabe.pdf>

²² Keil and Delitzsch., Commentary on The Old Testament 1., Pentateuch. Page 50.

²³ Lennox, *Seven Days That Divide the World.*, Page 52

²⁴ Ibid. Page 52

²⁵ Ibid. Page 52

²⁶ Ibid. Page 53

from any scientific considerations, the text of Genesis 1:1, in separating the beginning from day 1, leaves the age of the universe indeterminate.²⁷

He also suggests C. John Collins's view that the days are 'analogical days' as a possible way to interpret the days. This view takes the word 'day' in its ordinary meaning, but applies in analogically.

With regards to Exodus 20:9-11 being support for a six day creation week. He believes that although there are similarities between God's creation week and our work week, there are also obvious differences so that it is not possible to draw straight lines from Genesis to our working week. Therefore, Exodus 20:8-11 does not demand that the days of Genesis 1 be the days of a single week²⁸.

Lennox's reasoning that Genesis 1:1-2 being separated from verse 3 is simply a more sophisticated version of the gap theory. In verse 1 the verb is in the perfect tense form and in verse 3 we have the way consecutive. Verse 2 however begins a different way it does not begin with the way connected to the imperfect verb, it begins with the way attached to the noun 'the earth', this is called way disjunctive. It means that verse 2 is a little parenthetical statement saying something about what the earth was like when God first created it. The narrative of events goes from verse 1 to verse 3, verse 2 is not a narrative of events it is just describing what the earth is like.

Also, in verse 4 God separates the light from the darkness and in verse 5 God calls the darkness 'night' – both have the definite article. However, the only darkness that has been mentioned so far is in verse 2 which means that verse 2 is describing the state of the earth at the beginning of the first night. While verse 5 has the first night between evening and morning as it defines the day. There is no need to place a gap anywhere in the days of creation unless you are trying to fit something in which is ultimately what he is trying to do.

With regards to Exodus 20: 9-11 and the days as being analogous to God's day of rest oversimplifies and misrepresents the correlation between the two texts. Exodus 20:9-11 has a number of connections with the creation week: a 'six-plus-one' pattern, 'the heavens and the earth,' 'the seventh day,' 'rested,' 'blessed,' and 'made it holy.' All of this suggests that, at the least, one of God's purposes in creating the heavens and the earth within six, successive literal days followed by a literal day of rest was to set up a pattern for his people to follow. Also, Exodus 20:8-11 uses an adverbial accusative of time (in six days) which indicates the duration of God's creative activity.²⁹

The pattern of the creation week is also mentioned in Exodus 31:14-17 as Israel's observance of the Sabbath was a sign of the Mosaic covenant. Both Exodus 20 and 31 affirm that the creation week was literal and not analogous.

²⁷ Ibid. Page 53

²⁸ Ibid. Page 57

²⁹ Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, p. 171;

The Problematic Fourth Day

Lennox has previously suggested that his interpretation of Genesis is primarily textual and has not been influenced by ‘science’³⁰ but this is hard to believe given his objection regarding the fourth day. He asks “*If there is a chronological dimension to the days, how is it that the sun was made on day 4*”? There is no problem in the text with the sun being created on day four but there is if you hold to the theory of the big bang, which he does³¹, as there the sun and stars come before the earth.

He simply cannot understand how the first three days can be twenty-four hour days if the sun is not yet there³². For Lennox, the ‘...*the logical alternative is that the sun existed at the beginning of the Genesis week; and that the account of day 4 would have to be read in light of that fact.*’³³ To do this he looks at two arguments used by Hugh Ross and C.J. Collins. Ross argues that the Sun, moon and stars were not created on day four but appeared then when the cloud cover that had concealed them dissipated. Meanwhile, Collins suggests that the verb ‘made’ in Genesis 1:16 does not specifically mean ‘create’; although it can, but it can also refer to ‘working in something that is already there,’ or even ‘appointed.’ Lennox favours Collin’s interpretation as it fits well with the function of the sun and moon as visible lights in the sky. Effectively, God is speaking about their role in the cosmos not their creation or appearing³⁴.

In order to dismiss the argument of the sun being created on day four, Lennox says:

some have tried to overcome this by postulating the existence of a non solar light source that functioned for the first three days...though we know nothing about such a light source, either from Scripture or science.³⁵

This is simply not true. The Bible tells us that that God created light on day one (1:3) although it does not tell us what the source was. Is it really too difficult, however, for the God who is light to create a source of light without the sun or the stars? No, we are told that there will be no need for the sun in the new heavens and earth, the reason being that the presence of the glory of God provides the needed illumination (Rev. 21:23).

Lennox’s lack of understanding as to how the first three days can be literal days without the sun is precisely that: ‘his lack of understanding.’ Genesis is clear that the sun was created on day four and not at the beginning of creation week. Did the sun appear on day four? The word for appear is used in Genesis 1:9 so why wouldn’t the author use this word if he meant that the sun and stars appeared on day four? Even though the roles of the sun and stars are given to us on day four, this does not mean that they were not created that day. The word for ‘make’ is ‘*asah*’ and is used throughout Genesis 1 and sometimes it is used interchangeably with create ‘*bara*’ Genesis 1:26-27.

³⁰ Lennox. *Seven Days That Divide the World.*, Page 53

³¹ Ibid. Page 154

³² Ibid. Pages 58-59

³³ Ibid. Page 59

³⁴ Ibid. Page 59

³⁵ Ibid. Page 59

Death and Suffering

Concerning the issue of death and suffering, Lennox realizes the limitations in dealing with it in a short book³⁶. Nevertheless, he does recognize that the Apostle Paul's statement in Romans 5:12 is '*...a serious issue with profound implications for the doctrine of salvation, as...if Paul is wrong in his diagnosis of the origin of sin and death, how can we expect him to be right regarding its solution?*'³⁷

He rightly understands Romans 5:12 as referring to human death, believing that Paul leaves open the question of death at levels other than human.³⁸

For example, he reasons that since man ate plants then plant death cannot be an issue or a consequence of human sin, even though plant death is death.³⁹ This overlooks the fact that plants are not looked upon as being '*...alive in biblical Hebrew or in second Temple Jewish literature...*'⁴⁰

What about animal death? Lennox argues that there must have been death before the fall because mammals such as whales, who do not live on green vegetation, but on live sea food which must cause death,⁴¹ ruling out the possibility of other food.⁴²

He also suggests that no animal death before human sin makes the existence of predators problematic,⁴³ suggesting that if predators were the result of the fall:

...would it not make that sin the trigger of a creation process – a feature that seems very unlikely, and on which the Bible appears to be silent? Or did God foresee the change, build the mechanisms into the creatures in advance, and then do some to set them in operation⁴⁴?

In order not to have to argue this way Lennox thinks that Ockham's Razor (all things being equal, the simplest solution tends to be the best one) may need to be applied at this point to restrict the multiplication of unnecessary hypotheses.⁴⁵ However, his application of Ockham's Razor is used with regards to Paul's statement in Romans 5:12 which is not a text YEC would use to argue for animal death. He would be correct in his application only if Romans 5:12 were being used this way. Ockham's Razor, the simplest explanation or the one with the fewest assumptions that explains the facts is to be preferred when used with the correct Biblical texts concerning no death of any kind before the fall (Gen.129-31; Gen.3 Rom.8:19-22; Rev.21:4; 22:3).

Lennox anticipates the objection that Romans 8:20-21 refers to all death being the result of sin.⁴⁶ Believing that corruption, disease and human death may well be a consequence of

³⁶ Ibid. Page 76

³⁷ Ibid. Page 76

³⁸ Ibid. Page 78

³⁹ Ibid. Page 78

⁴⁰ Kennard, Doug. "Hebrew Metaphysics," *Answers Research Journal*, no. 1 (December 2008): 169,

⁴¹ Lennox, *Seven Days That Divide the World.*, Page 78

⁴² Ibid. Page 79

⁴³ Ibid. Page 79

⁴⁴ Ibid. Page 79

⁴⁵ Ibid. Page 79

⁴⁶ Ibid. Page 79

human sin but animal and plant death are not, however, he fails to comment on Romans 8:22.⁴⁷

He goes on to imply that there was only no death in the Garden of Eden: ‘*From the Biblical text one does not get the impression that the entire world was like Eden.*’⁴⁸ Asking ‘*Was there...a difference between the behaviour of animals outside the Garden of Eden and that of those in the idyllic situation inside*’?⁴⁹ The Bible nowhere makes these implications but tells us that all of God’s creation was very good (Gen. 1:31) and not just Eden.

Although Lennox implores us to note carefully what scripture says, at times he does not follow his own principle. Regarding Genesis 1:30 he believes, the instruction concerning vegetation as food for animals was given to humans and not animals.⁵⁰ Yet he seems to miss completely what the text says: Genesis 1:29 tells us explicitly that the food for humans was to be vegetation. Following on, verse 30 tells us that animals also were to eat green plants for food. This means that both animals and humans were vegetarian to begin with.

In trying to fit plant and animal death into the pre-fall world, Lennox fails on a number of points. Firstly, he fails to recognize that plants do not have that life principle (*nephesh* in Hebrew) that animals and humans have. Secondly, although he is correct to point out that Romans 5:12 refers to human death, his obvious lack of engagement with YEC writings mean that he is unaware of the fact that this is not a text used in arguing for no animal death before the fall which he seems to think is used.

Biblically, there are a number of reasons for no death of any kind before the fall. Since God made his creation ‘very good’ (Gen. 1:31) and both humans and animals were originally vegetarian (Gen.1:29-30), death could not be a part of God’s creation. Furthermore, [Isaiah 11:6–9; 65:17–25](#) suggests that there was no carnivorous activity before the fall. The Bible also states that God cares for animals (Ex.23:12; Prov.12:10) and yet if animals were suffering in this creation, then this does not reflect well on God’s character. It is also a fallacy to read the present state of the world, such as predators, back into the Biblical account of creation. This is the uniformitarian principle ‘*the present is the key to the past*’ (given to us by Charles Lyell) which assumes that everything that we see happening now in our present world is the way it has always been. This is a common assumption among Old Earth Creationists. Revelation, and not the present, is the key to understanding the past.

Genesis 3 also makes it very clear that the fall had a cosmic effect on creation as Paul concludes in Romans 8:22, a verse that Lennox does not discuss. Paul’s point in verse 22 is that the creation, which is non-human,⁵¹ is groaning and suffering, not from natural disasters and suffering before the fall, but from the fall of Adam in Genesis 3 as Romans 8:19-25 makes it clear.

⁴⁷ Ibid. Page 80

⁴⁸ Ibid. Page 81

⁴⁹ Ibid. Page 82

⁵⁰ Ibid. Page 89

⁵¹ James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8; 38a Word Biblical Commentary* (Texas: Word Books Publishers, 1988), 472.

The book of Revelation also makes it very clear that in the new heavens and earth there will be no more pain or death (Rev. 21:4) and the curse will be no longer (Rev. 22:3). I fail to see how anyone could look forward to a new heaven and earth filled with death of any kind.

Age of the Earth

When it comes to the age of the earth, Lennox is not convinced that the old-earth reading is less natural than the young-earth reading if we are simply thinking in terms of the age of the earth.⁵² The reason being that the text of Genesis 1, he believes, separates the initial creation from the first day, the age of the earth is a logically separate matter from the nature of the days.⁵³

However Lennox's understanding of the age of the universe is controlled more by the theory of the Big Bang than the Biblical text:

...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." There is a certain irony here, in 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.⁵⁴

His reliance on the Big Bang is unfortunate as not only is it based upon the philosophy of naturalism (the belief that nature is all there is) but it contradicts the Biblical account of creation in several ways. Firstly, accepting the big bang model is to ignore what the creator has revealed concerning how he created the universe. The Bible clearly teaches that God created everything in heaven and earth within six days (Ex 20:11). This is in contrast to the big bang model which explains the universe and earth being created over billions of years. The big bang theory has the stars existing for billions of years before the earth while the Bible teaches that the stars were created (not appearing) on day four, three days after the earth was created. The Bible also teaches that the earth was made from water (Gen. 1:2-9; 2 Pet. 3:5) whereas the big bang model teaches that the earth started out as a hot molten blob.

In looking for a way forward in this controversy he suggests four salient considerations: 1. The current scientific evidence for an ancient earth. 2. The honest and admirable admission of prominent YEC that "*recent creationists should humbly agree that their view is, at the moment, implausible on purely scientific grounds...*" 3. The fact that Scripture, although it could be interpreted in terms of a young earth, does not require such an interpretation. 4. The fact that we do not know everything.⁵⁵

Unfortunately, Lennox's argument for an old earth from Genesis 1 simply does not work, seeming to be imposed on the text rather than read out of it. The controlling factor in his

⁵² Lennox, *Seven Days That Divide the World.*, page 66

⁵³ Ibid. Page 66

⁵⁴ Ibid. Page 154

⁵⁵ Ibid. Pages 86-87

interpretation of an old earth is ‘scientific evidence’ which is simply the result uniformitarian assumptions used to interpret the evidence rather than Biblical ones.

Lennox’s choice of Nelson and Reynolds as YECs to interact with is strange. It was mystifying enough that they were asked to argue for YEC in the *Three Views On Creation and Evolution* book⁵⁶ given their background is in philosophy and not in science or theology.

His admission that Genesis can be interpreted in terms of a young earth is commendable but his assertions that it does not have to be interpreted that way have nothing to do with the text of Genesis but everything to do with his prior assumptions concerning the age of the earth. He is also right that we do not know everything but we do know the one who does and we can trust Him when He tells us how long he took to make everything.

Conclusion

John Lennox is a committed Christian whose writings and debates against the New Atheists, such as Christopher Hitchens and Richard Dawkins, have done much to encourage Christians to hold firm to and defend their faith. However, one of the major disappointments with the book is that Lennox has clearly not engaged in a meaningful way with any of the foremost Young Earth Creation literature of our own day. If he had done so then he may not have had to write the book as most of his arguments have long been refuted. The only Young Earth Creation position that Lennox seems to have read is the view in the book *Three Views of Creation and Evolution*,⁵⁷ which is a very weak presentation of Young Earth Creation argued for by people who are not at all well known defenders of that view. Unfortunately his arguments for Old Earth Creation are seriously flawed Biblically, and history shows that compromise on Genesis undermines the Bible and the effectiveness of sharing the gospel.

Review by Simon Turpin, December 2010

All page references are from:

John Lennox, *Seven Days that Divide the World: The Beginning According to Genesis and Science*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011, Copyright Zondervan 2011, ISBN 978-0-310-49217-7

Simon Turpin

Simon Turpin has a B.A in Theology and Inter-cultural Studies from All Nations Bible College UK (2010) and works full-time for an Evangelical Church in St. Albans. Previous to his studies Simon spent a year as part of a missions team working in North America, India and Germany sharing the gospel. Through his time in the church in England and overseas he saw the increasing need to use the creation message to share not only the truth of the Bible, but the full story of the message of redemption through our Creator and Saviour Jesus.

⁵⁶ Paul Nelson and John Mark Reynolds “Young Earth Creationism,” in *Three Views on Creation and Evolution*, ed J.P. Moreland and John Mark Reynolds, eds., (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999).

⁵⁷ Lennox, *Seven Days That Divide the World*., Pages 66, 86