

A Critique of the Framework Interpretation of the Creation Account (Part 2 of 2)

Robert V. McCabe

Editor's note: This article was originally published in *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal*, **11** (2006):63–133. It is posted here with kind permission of the journal.

Keywords

framework interpretation, Creation, geology, biblical inerrancy, Professor Arie Noordzij, Meredith G. Kline, two-register cosmology, *waw* consecutive, providence, progressive revelation

This article is the second of a two-part critique of the framework interpretation of the creation account.^{1,2} In essence, the framework interpretation argues that the Creation “Week” itself is a figure, a literary framework, designed to present God’s creative work in a topical, nonsequential manner, as opposed to a literal week comprised of sequential, literal days. As noted in the previous article, the framework interpretation is supported by four theses: the figurative nature of the creation account, the creation account controlled by ordinary providence, the unending nature of the seventh day, and the two-register cosmology. In the first article, I specifically demonstrated that the first thesis of the framework view, which argues for a topical arrangement of the “days” of the Creation “Week,” cannot be consistently supported with the overall exegetical details of Genesis 1:1–2:3. And it ultimately undermines the literary nature of the creation account as a genuine historical narrative serving as a prologue for the remainder of the historical narrative in Genesis. My purpose with this concluding article is to evaluate the remaining three theses of the framework interpretation.

The Creation Account Controlled by Ordinary Providence

According to some advocates of the framework position, Genesis 2:5 assumes that God used ordinary providence (God’s non-miraculous operations in sustaining and directing all of creation)³ to govern the creation events recorded in Genesis 1. The chief advocate of this position is Meredith G. Kline.⁴ Not only is his interpretation based on this assumption about Genesis 2:5, but also an appeal to the analogy of Scripture.⁵

In addressing how these framework advocates interpret Genesis 2:5–7, two items need to be summarized: the “because it had not rained” interpretation of Genesis 2:5, 6 and how it relates to Genesis 2:5–7 in the context of Genesis 1–2. As the first article noted, the “because it had not rained” argument in Genesis 2:5 says that God used ordinary providence, rather than extraordinary providence (God’s miraculous intervention in the created order),⁷ for the creation period recorded in Genesis 1.8 According to Meredith G. Kline, the underlying assumption of this verse is that “divine providence was operating during the creation period through processes which any reader would recognize as normal in the natural world of his day.”⁹ This means that there was “a principle of continuity between the mode of providence during and after the creation period.”¹⁰ Since a literal interpretation of Genesis 1 requires God’s use of extraordinary providence in the Creation Week, the literal interpretation is in conflict with the “because it had not rained” argument. If this argument is correct, “Genesis 2:5 forbids the conclusion that the order of narration [in Genesis 1] is exclusively chronological.”¹¹

When the “because it had not rained” interpretation of Genesis 2:5 is integrated with verses 6–7, this provides, according to Mark D. Futato, a further justification for interpreting verses 8–25 as a topical account, rather than a chronological one¹² as the 21 uses of *waw* consecutive in Genesis 2:4–25 seem to suggest. It is further argued that this non-chronological interpretation of these verses provides an implication for reading Genesis 1:1–2:3 as a non-chronological account.¹³ While I only alluded to this interpretation of Genesis 2:5–7 in the first part of this series,¹⁴ Futato’s understanding of verses 5–7 requires more explanation since this interpretation of verses 4–25 buttresses the thesis that the creation account of 1:1–2:3 was ruled by ordinary providence.

Predicated upon Kline’s interpretation of Genesis 2:5, 15 Futato has argued that Genesis 2:4–25 “is a highly structured topical account with a two-fold focus on vegetation and humanity.”¹⁶ He has drawn this conclusion by examining the internal evidence within this passage and external evidence by comparing 1:1–2:3 with

2:4–25. In presenting the internal evidence, he describes this Hebrew style of writing as an example of a “synoptic/resumption-expansion” technique.¹⁷ Following this writing technique, the narrative flow in this passage indicates that verse 5a presents a dual problem of having neither wild vegetation nor cultivated grain and verse 5b a twofold reason for the problem: rain is required for wild vegetation to grow and a cultivator, man, is necessary to develop cultivated grain. Verses 6–7 provide a solution for both problems: the inception of rain 𐤀 in verse 6 and the creation of man in verse 7.¹⁸ Verses 5–7 provide the setting for verses 8–25. Verse 8 provides a synopsis of this setting. In verse 8a, God planted a garden; and, in verse 8b, he placed the recently created man of verse 7 in the garden. Verses 9–25 resume and expand on verse 8 with verses 9–14 focusing on vegetation—the garden (verse 8a)—and verses 15–25 on the placement of man in the garden (verse 8b).¹⁹ While avoiding any substantive discussion of the sequential force of the 21 *waw* consecutives in Genesis 2:4–25,²⁰ Futato’s “synoptic/resumption-expansion” approach argues that the internal evidence in verses 4–25 suggests that it is a topical account about plants and man.

From the perspective of external considerations, this topical understanding of Genesis 2:4–25 is additionally supported by demonstrating that a sequential interpretation of it cannot be harmonized with the same literal interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3. For example, in Genesis 1:24–27, animals are created before men, but in Genesis 2:7–19, man is created before the animals. On the surface, the two accounts appear contradictory. How do framework advocates harmonize them? While the *prima facie* reading of Genesis 2:4–25 appears to be chronological, a supposedly more precise reading, when compared to Genesis 1:1–2:3, indicates Genesis 2:4–25 cannot be chronological. “The author,” as Futato states, “is guided at this point by concerns that are not chronological.”²¹ Consequently, internal considerations within 2:4–25 and external comparisons exhibited by comparing this narrative with 1:1–2:3 argue for a topical reading of 2:4–25, rather than a literal, sequential reading.²² By demonstrating that the narrative of 2:8–25 flows out of verses 5–7, and successively suggesting that verses 4–25 is a topical account, Futato bolsters Kline’s thesis that Genesis 2:5 assumes that ordinary providence governed the creation period.

Since I have described a framework interpretation of the assumption of Genesis 2:5 and its interpretation of verses 5–7, we need to next examine how the analogy of Scripture reputedly supports the premise that Genesis 1:1–2:3 was controlled by ordinary providence. If the creation period was controlled by normal providence, as framework advocates claim Genesis 2:5 implies, this contradicts a literal interpretation of 1:1–2:3 that necessarily appeals to the divine use of extraordinary providence. For example, on Day 3, Genesis 1:9–13, the waters under the heavens are gathered into one place and named “seas,” dry ground appears from the seas and is called “earth,” and flourishing vegetation is formed out of the earth. However, an earth instantaneously formed out of the sea does not dry up in simply a few hours by normal providential means. Only an extraordinary providence could dry up the earth in this short period. But framework interpreters object that an appeal to extraordinary providence, as a literal interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3 demands, contradicts the underlying assumption of Genesis 2:5 and undermines the analogy of Scripture.²³ “The analogy of Scripture,” according to Irons and Kline, “as applied in the context, forces the Bible-believing interpreter to abandon a literalist reading of the creation narrative.”²⁴

Our summarization of this premise suggests a number of questions. Since some significant advocates of the framework position focus on Genesis 2:5, how is this verse to be interpreted, and how does it relate to the surrounding verses? In addition, is Genesis 2:4–25 set up as a topical account of creation? Or, do the many uses of *waw* consecutive²⁵ suggest that the mainline narrative sequence in Genesis 2:4–25 is a chronological account? Furthermore, do the statements in Genesis 2:5 about the lack of rain and man provide a physical reason why the entire earth had no vegetation? To state this question differently, is the specified vegetation in Genesis 2:5 the same as that mentioned in Genesis 1:11–12? In other words, does Genesis 2:5 look back to Genesis 1:11–12? Or, does it anticipate the creation of the Garden of Eden? Finally, does Genesis 2:5 assume that God worked exclusively through ordinary providence in the creation period of Genesis 1:1–2:3?

We must now address these questions to determine whether or not Genesis 2:5 assumes that normal providence was the *modus operandi* in controlling the creation period. In the following section, Genesis 2:5 will be discussed in relationship to the immediate context of verses 4–7. This will be followed by a discussion of how verse 5 relates to the surrounding context of 2:4–25 and finally by the wider context of Scripture.

The immediate context of Genesis 2:5

A significant argument used by some framework advocates is that Genesis 2:5 presupposes that God worked through natural processes in the creation period which, in turn, demands a nonliteral interpretation of the days of the Creation Week; however, the context of Genesis 2:4–7 works against their argument:

This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created, when²⁶ the LORD God made earth and

heaven. 5Now no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprouted, for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth, and there was no man to cultivate the ground. 6But a mist used to rise from the earth and water the whole surface of the ground. 7Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.

In reading Genesis 2:4–7, the framework’s presupposition that verse 5 assumes God worked exclusively through natural processes in the creation period is not clearly implied from verse 5. In order to evaluate this presupposition, we, nevertheless, will examine the textual details of verses 4–7 to determine if it is a possible inference from verse 5. These four verses may be divided into two subdivisions: verse 4 and verses 5–7.²⁷ In this section, I will argue that verse 4 serves as a heading and verses 5–6 provide background information for the mainline narrative sequence that begins with the use of the first *waw* consecutive in verse 7, “the LORD God formed,” אֱלֹהִים וַיִּצְרֶה יְהוָה. Initially, we must look at the significance of the heading in verse 4.

The heading in Genesis 2:4

Many framework proponents, who understand Genesis 2:5 like Kline, acknowledge that verse 4 is a heading that introduces new material.²⁸ While agreeing with Kline’s interpretation of verse 5,²⁹ framework defender Henri Blocher maintains that verse 4 introduces a second account of creation.³⁰ With either framework interpretation of verse 4, their understanding of Genesis 2:5 does not integrate well with the significance of the heading in verse 4.

The use of *Tôl’dôt* in Genesis

To understand the significance of Genesis 2:4 as a heading, we need to examine the introductory use of *tôl’dôt*, תּוֹלְדוֹת, in this verse as well as its other uses in Genesis. The feminine plural substantive תּוֹלְדוֹת is derived from the Hiphil stem of the verb וָלַד, to “beget,” “cause to bring forth.”³¹ Since תּוֹלְדוֹת is a cognate of the verb וָלַד, it refers to “those things which are begotten.”³² It has been assigned glosses such as “generation,” “account,”³³ “descendants,” “successors.”³⁴ This substantive has reference “to that which is born or produced”³⁵ and, in the context of Genesis, “developments that arise out of” something else.³⁶ In each heading found in Genesis, תּוֹלְדוֹת is part of a construct-genitive relationship, with תּוֹלְדוֹת being a construct substantive followed by a specified genitive. For example, in Genesis 6:9, תּוֹלְדוֹת אֵלֶּה, “this is the account³⁷ of Noah,” the construct, “account of,” refers to what developed from the genitive, “Noah.” While the genitive in 6:9, “Noah,” connects the narrative of 6:9–9:29 with the preceding narrative in 5:1–6:8, the point of the heading in 6:9 is to introduce a new account dealing with key events that developed in Noah’s life, such as the universal flood and Noah’s role as a second Adam with a renewed creation after the flood. In short, the genitive Noah indicates where the narrative started and תּוֹלְדוֹת indicates what happened to Noah.³⁸

In the various headings in Genesis, the construct substantive תּוֹלְדוֹת is generally followed by a proper name that functions as a genitive. The construct noun “account of” is followed by a proper name in Genesis 11:10, “the account of Shem.” A similar phrase is Genesis 10:1, “account of Noah’s sons.” What is distinctive about Genesis 2:4 is that the genitive phrase does not contain a personal name. The construct noun, “account of,” is followed by a genitive phrase, “the heavens and the earth,” which is further qualified by a temporal qualifier, “when they were created.” Furthermore, the second half of verse 4, “when the LORD God made earth and heaven,” is chiasmatically connected to the first half.³⁹ This suggests that the entirety of verse 4 should be taken as a heading for verses 5–25. Thus, the extended genitive phrase, “the heavens and the earth when they were created, when the LORD God made earth and heaven,” initiates this narrative and תּוֹלְדוֹת reflects what developed the recently created heavens and earth.

The substantive תּוֹלְדוֹת is most often used in Genesis in the catchphrase “this is the account of [תּוֹלְדוֹת] . . .”⁴⁰ When תּוֹלְדוֹת is used in this phrase, many commentators recognize that the תּוֹלְדוֹת formula is a rhetorical device that serves as a heading to introduce a new segment of narrative in Genesis.⁴¹ In this regard, this formula functions as an organizing principle that divides Genesis into various narrative segments. Though there is a basic unity of function for this formula, its use allows for a little diversity. This diversity is reflected in that the תּוֹלְדוֹת rubric often serves as a heading for a genealogy, and at other times it introduces a narrative cycle. For instance, this formula introduces an extended genealogy (Genesis 5:1, 10:1, 11:10, 25:12, 36:9), and it initiates a narrative cycle with a brief genealogy (Genesis 6:9, 11:27, 25:19). And twice it begins a cycle of narratives associated with a person referenced in the heading (Genesis 36:1, 37:2).⁴² When תּוֹלְדוֹת appears in this type of heading, the sense of “account,” rather than “generations,” harmonizes readily with its range of uses as a stereotypical rubric that organizes the narrative cycles in Genesis. Taking תּוֹלְדוֹת in the more general sense of “account” allows for it to introduce an account that develops key events, often including genealogical records, associated with the person and, on one occasion, the objects that are specified in the heading.

Tôlêdôt as a heading and link

Because Genesis 2:4 is the only heading that does not have a personal name associated with it, this is one of the issues that has allowed for some ambiguity with the interpretation of תולדות in Genesis. This type of ambiguity has provided an occasion for some interpreters to take verse 4 as a subscript, a colophon for 1:1–2:3.⁴³ However, as we have noted, the semantics of תולדות work against taking this formula as a colophon. Furthermore, another significant problem for taking the תולדות formula as a colophon in 2:4 is that it is consistently used throughout Genesis as a heading (Genesis 5:1, 6:9, 10:1, 11:10, 27, 25:12, 19, 36:1, 9, 37:2). With the exception of Genesis 1:1–2:3, each new narrative subdivision is introduced by the תולדות formula.⁴⁴ Genesis 5:1, for example, uses the תולדות heading “This is the book of the account of [תולדות] Adam.” The construct תולדות, “account of,” refers to those who were reproduced, the descendants, from the genitive “Adam.” In the narrative of 5:1–6:8, 5:1a is a heading with verses 1b–2 providing a few specifics about the creation of Adam and Eve, 5:3–6:5 develops the narrative line which includes an extended genealogy, and 6:6–8 concludes the narrative with a statement of God’s grief over fallen humanity, the descendants of Adam, with Noah as an exception who “found favor in the eyes of the LORD.” The starting point of the narrative was “the account of Adam” in 5:1. This account draws a historical line of Adam’s descendants to a conclusion in 6:6–8. Thus, the תולדות phrase gives a starting point for a new narrative unit and the remainder of the narrative develops what has been summarized with תולדות.⁴⁵

Not only does the תולדות heading introduce a new narrative cycle, but it also looks back to the previous section. Returning to the example in Genesis 5:1, the genitive, “Adam,” provides linkage with 4:25–26 and the construct, “account of,” anticipates new narrative material about the descendants of Adam and what became of the world in which they lived. As already noted, “Noah” in 6:9 looks back to 6:6–8 with “account of” advancing the narrative about what happened to him. In this regard, the תולדות heading provides a link with the previous material and introduces the next sequence of narrative material.⁴⁶ As such, this heading, as Mathews observes, “serves as a linking device that ties together the former and the following units by echoing from the preceding material a person’s name or literary motif and at the same time anticipating the focal subject of the next.”⁴⁷ The תולדות heading is used 11 times in Genesis and it divides the book into 12 sections. The only place that this heading is not found is Genesis 1:1–2:3, and its omission is for good reason: there is no created substance prior to it.⁴⁸ Therefore, the תולדות formula is consistently used in Genesis as something of a hinge that points to an aspect from the preceding section but advances the focus to the subsequent material. As this relates to the heading in Genesis 2:4, the genitive phrase, “the heavens and the earth . . .,” provides a link with the previous material in 1:1–2:3, and the construct, “account of,” introduces the development of the subsequent history of Adam and his family.⁴⁹ Since Adam had no human predecessors, this introductory תולדות heading does not have a personal name.

The significance of tôlêdôt in Genesis 2:4

Our discussion of the תולדות heading has a twofold significance for understanding Genesis 2:4 and how it connects 2:4–25 with 1:1–2:3. First, while verse 4 looks back to 1:1–2:3, its main purpose is to shift attention to the creation of man and his placement in the garden.⁵⁰ It does not introduce a second account of creation.⁵¹ Two items communicate this shift. Initially, it may be seen in the chiasmic arrangement of verse 4:

This is the account of
 A—the heavens
 B—and the earth
 C—when they were created
 C¹—when the LORD God made
 B¹—earth
 A¹—and heaven.

The chiasmic arrangement of the two parts of this verse is readily apparent: A—“the heavens,” B—“and the earth,” C—“when they were created” is reversed to C¹—“when the LORD God made,” B¹—“earth,” A¹—“and heaven.” Since this intentional chiasm prohibits this verse from being bifurcated,⁵² it indicates that the entirety of verse 4 should be regarded as a heading that introduces the account that begins in verse 5.⁵³ Moreover, this chiasm significantly reverses the generally recognized Old Testament pattern of “the heavens and earth” to “earth and heaven.” This reversal only occurs in one other place, Psalm 148:13, an apparent allusion to Genesis 2:4.⁵⁴ By reversing the normal order of heaven and earth, attention is shifted to focus “on what happened on the earth after the creation of man, particularly in the garden.”⁵⁵

In addition, this shift in focus is reflected by the use of divine names. The compound use of divine names יהוה אלהים, “the LORD God,” is found for the first time in Genesis 2:4. This compound is used 20 times in Genesis 2:4–3:23, and only one other time in the Pentateuch, Exodus 9:30. Prior to Genesis 2:4, the divine appellative

אלהים, “God,” is found 35 times in Genesis 1:1–2:3. This appellative stresses God’s sovereign might and is appropriate to portray his role as Creator of the universe in 1:1–2:3. The divine name יהוה, “the LORD,” is God’s personal name and is often associated with his covenant-keeping ability. The use of יהוה is apropos in a context like Genesis 2–3 since the emphasis is no longer universal but on Adam’s responsibility in the garden. The conjoining of the two divine names in Genesis 2–3 stresses that the sovereign God who created the universe is also the LORD who is a personal God and holds man accountable to his moral rule. The conjoining of the two names communicates the concept that “the transcendent God of Genesis 1 is the same as the immanent God of Genesis 2–3.”⁵⁶ Consequently, these two shifts in emphasis in Genesis 2:4 indicate that Genesis 2:4–25 is not a second account of creation, as advocated by framework proponent Henri Blocher.⁵⁷

Second, Genesis 2:4 links 2:4–25 with 1:1–2:3. The language of 2:4 looks back to the creation account. “The heavens and the earth” (הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ) had been used in 1:1 and 2:1. “Created” (בָּרָא) had been used four times in 1:1, 21, 27, 2:3, and “made” (עָשָׂה) 10 times in 1:7, 11, 12, 16, 25, 26, 31, 2:2 (twice), 3. Yet, the use of the heading הוֹלֵךְ הוֹדֵא to initiate verse 4 suggests that additional information was intended to expand on what had been set forth in 1:1–2:3. In contrast with the framework position, 2:4–25 expands on the sixth day of the Creation Week when God made man, as the first of 21 uses of *waw* consecutive in Genesis 2:4–25 implies in verse 7 (“[Then the LORD God] formed”), and, as the chiasmic arrangement of verse 4 suggests, focus is directed to what developed from earth. From the context of 2:4–25, the focus on earth is to emphasize that man was placed in a paradisiacal environment, the Garden of Eden. Of course, some framework advocates agree with this observation.⁵⁸ At this point, the path of those who follow a traditional interpretation and Kline’s framework view depart. Someone following the traditional interpretation would not use this information to suggest that Genesis 2:4–25 was set up to undermine or contradict the sequential narrative of Genesis 1:1–2:3.⁵⁹ For example, framework advocate Mark Ross briefly acknowledges the point that Genesis 2 is set up to develop the subsequent history of “the heavens and the earth after they were created.”⁶⁰ He then attempts to demonstrate how a chronological reading of 2:4–25 cannot be harmonized with a similar reading of 1:1–2:3.⁶¹ Furthermore, if 2:4–25 neither undermines nor contradicts a chronological interpretation of 1:1–2:3, this implies that the use of Genesis 2:5 as a hermeneutical grid to reinterpret 1:1–2:3 is not as certain as these framework advocates assert.⁶² A more consistent way to interpret Genesis 2:4–25, including the framework’s key text, verse 5, is as an account that complements 1:1–2:3.⁶³ In contrast with the framework position, we will develop how Genesis 2:4–25 relates to 1:1–2:3 and how 2:5–7 correlates with a literal, sequential interpretation of 2:4–25.

The structure of Genesis 2:5–7

Having examined the heading in Genesis 2:4, we must now examine verses 5–7. Interpreters have seen a number of difficulties in Genesis 2:5–7.⁶⁴ While the purpose of this paper does not allow for an examination of all the difficulties in these verses, it is necessary to treat the structure of Genesis 2:5–7 as it relates to the interpretation of verse 5

Genesis 2:5–6 contains six clauses with four of them being circumstantial clauses, with one in verse 5 being an explicit causal clause,⁶⁵ and with a final one in verse 6 a clause introduced by *waw* consecutive plus a perfective verb form.⁶⁶ The circumstantial clauses are readily identified since each is introduced by a simple conjunctive *waw* attached to a non-verbal form.⁶⁷ To illustrate the circumstantial use of *waw*, I have inserted *waw* in brackets in the following arrangement:

5Now [*waw*] no shrub of the field was yet in the earth,
and [*waw*] no plant of the field had yet sprouted,
for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth,
and [*waw*] there was no man to cultivate the ground.
6But [*waw*] a mist used to rise from the earth,
and water the whole surface of the ground.

Not all commentators view the four circumstantial clauses as being equally coordinate. The specific issue relates to the last clause in verse 5, “and [*waw*] there was no man to cultivate the ground.” Is this last clause outside of the preceding causal clause and coordinate with the other three circumstantial clauses, as our preceding textual arrangement reflects? Or, is this clause coordinate with the previous causal clause, “for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth”?⁶⁸ If it were part of the previous clause, the text would look like this:

5Now [*waw*] no shrub of the field was yet in the earth,
and [*waw*] no plant of the field had yet sprouted,
for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth,
and [*waw*] there was no man to cultivate the ground.

6But [*waw*] a mist used to rise from the earth,
and water the whole surface of the ground.

As this last arrangement sets forth, it is possible, from a syntactical perspective, that the fourth clause (“and [*waw*] there was no man to cultivate the ground”) is coordinate with the causal third clause. This is to say, the *waw* conjunction that begins the fourth clause extends the causal sense from the third clause. Because the *waw* conjunction at the head of the fourth clause implies a close syntactic relationship with the preceding causal clause, my preference is to take the fourth clause as coordinate with the causal third clause. This would indicate that the last two clauses provide two reasons for the vegetation deficiencies specified in the first half of verse 5: no rain and no man. Verses 6–7, then, explain how the two shortages were corrected: God provided a water supply (verse 6) and created man (verse 7), who becomes the focus of the narrative sequence in verses 7–25. God’s taking care of both deficiencies indicates that he had not finished his week of creation. Nevertheless, I recognize that commentators are divided about the clausal arrangement and that a reasonable case may be marshaled to support either view.⁶⁹

What appears to have more clarity is that whichever view a commentator follows about the arrangement of the clauses in verse 5, most maintain that verses 5–6 provide a setting for verse 7. For example, Westermann has stated it like this: “The structure of this first part is quite clear and easy to explain: verses 4b–6 comprise the antecedent, verse 7 is the main statement.”⁷⁰ Hamilton provides another example and explains verses 4b–7 as having a protasis followed by an apodosis: “Verses 4b–7 are one long sentence in Hebrew, containing a protasis (verse 4b), a series of circumstantial clauses (verses 5–6), and an apodosis.”⁷¹ While both explanations about the relationship between verses 4–7 are nuanced differently, each has the formation of man in verse 7 as the primary proposition. To state this another way, the six clauses of verses 5–6, which, in contrast to the 21 *waw* consecutives initiated in verse 7, are grammatically nonsequential and provide certain conditions associated with occurrence of the action in the main clause of verse 7 (“Then the LORD God formed man of the dust from the ground”).⁷² This main clause contains a *waw* consecutive (וַיַּבְרָא, “formed”) that initiates the mainline narrative sequence followed by a series of *waw* consecutives in verses 7–9.⁷³ If, for the moment, we harmonize both views about the clausal arrangement in verses 5–6, verses 5–7a could be viewed in this manner:

5Now [*waw*] no shrub of the field was yet in the earth,
and [*waw*] no plant of the field had yet sprouted,
for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth,
and [*waw*] there was no man to cultivate the ground.

6But [*waw*] a mist used to rise from the earth,
and water the whole surface of the ground.

7Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground,

While the formation of man from dust of the ground in verse 7 undoubtedly provides a semantic link with verses 5–6, the *waw* consecutive at the head of the Hebrew text in verse 7 (וַיַּבְרָא, “formed”) initiates the mainline narrative thread that is sequentially followed by five *waw* consecutives in verses 7b–9. The paragraph in verses 10–14 interrupts the string of *waw* consecutives with a series of circumstantial clauses that explain the resplendent nature of the eastern area of Eden where God had planted the garden and placed man in verse 8. This paragraph, focusing on the four rivers that flowed from Eden, is anticipatory of the next *waw* consecutive in verse 15⁷⁴ that resumes the narrative sequence with a series of 15 *waw* consecutives in verses 15–25. As I noted in the first part of this series, the *waw* consecutive is an unambiguous grammatical device that generally affixes to past time narration an element of progression.⁷⁵ While I recognize that four of the 21 *waw* consecutives in these 22 verses are not sequential, I will argue in a subsequent section that the mainline narrative is advanced by 17 sequential uses of *waw* consecutive. Assuming for the moment that the *waw* consecutives in 2:4–25 are employed consistently with their general Old Testament uses as advancing the narrative sequence, this should raise some questions about Futato’s “synoptic/resumption-expansion” approach to Genesis 2:4–25.⁷⁶ As previously noted, Futato says that Genesis 2:5–7 provides the setting for verses 8–25, with verse 8 serving as a synopsis from the setting and verses 9–25 providing a resumption and expansion of the synopsis.⁷⁷

However, this approach minimizes the sequential nature of the six *waw* consecutives in verses 7–9. If the three *waw* consecutives in verse 7 are made part of the background information in verses 5–6,⁷⁸ why not also include the following three *waw* consecutives in verses 8–9 as part of the background information? In keeping with the general use of *waw* consecutives in narrative literature, the three *waw* consecutives in verses 8–9 are preferably taken sequentially. The first *waw* consecutive in verse 8a (“[the LORD God] planted [a garden],” וַיִּטַּע) presents the fourth sequence after the formation of Adam: God planted a garden. With the fifth *waw* consecutive in verse 8b, the next sequence is introduced: God placed the man in the garden (“[there] He placed [the man],” וַיִּשָּׂא). The *waw* consecutive at the head of verse 9 initiates the sixth sequence: God caused the trees in Eden to

grow (“[Out of the ground the LORD God] caused to grow [every tree],” *וַיַּצְמַח*). While I must concede that not all *waw* consecutives are sequential⁷⁹ and, therefore, that it is possible that the first *waw* consecutive in verse 8 is an example of a pluperfect—an action that is anterior to the mainline narrative sequence—also referred to as a past perfect or a flashback, as the NIV apparently reflects (“had planted”), there is no clear contextual evidence to support the pluperfect rendering.⁸⁰ With Futato’s discussion of the two parts for his synopsis in verse 8 (with each part introduced by a *waw* consecutive), he did not provide any examples of other *waw* consecutives that would parallel the six *waw* consecutives found in verses 7–9.⁸¹ This is to say, verses 7–9 have an uninterrupted sequence of clauses introduced by *waw* consecutive, with no other *waw* clauses that break up this chain of *waw* consecutives. Are there other examples of a tight sequence of *waw* consecutives like Genesis 2:7–9, which do not have explicit contextual evidence to reflect a disruption, where the sequence is interrupted by a “synoptic” use of *waw* consecutive?⁸² In the final analysis, it would seem that the “synoptic/resumption-expansion” approach creates an unwarranted discontinuity with the uses of the *waw* consecutives in verses 7–9.⁸³ Consequently, it is preferable to take verses 5–6 as providing background information for the development of the narrative sequence initiated with the first *waw* consecutive in verse 7. Nevertheless, my objective is not complete because it is not the structural arrangement of Genesis 2:5–7 that is the key component for Kline’s framework position, but the interpretation of Genesis 2:5. How then is this verse to be understood?

The Interpretation of Genesis 2:5

Since I have established that Genesis 2:5–6 provide the setting for the series of six *waw* consecutives initiated in verse 7, we must now look at the contextual setting of verse 5 and how this affects the interpretation of verse 5.

In placing Genesis 2:5 in its contextual setting, three items should be highlighted. Initially, 2:4–25 is tightly connected to 3:1–24. This close linkage is reflected by the use of the divine compound “the LORD God.” As previously noted, “the LORD God” is found 20 times in these two chapters, with only one other appearance in the Pentateuch, Exodus 9:30. Since the divine compound appears neither in the pericope before 2:4–25, 1:1–2:3, nor in the one after 3:1–24, 4:1–26, its 11 uses in 2:4–25 and 9 in 3:1–24 reveal a close connection between these two chapters. The common subjects in Genesis 2:4–25 and 3:1–24 and the same geographical matrix further indicate this tight relationship between both pericopes. For example, the LORD God, Adam and Eve are used in both sections. There is also a common spatial setting, the Garden of Eden. These items reflect that both chapters are closely connected. However, this linkage is not so tight that both chapters should be considered one pericope. While the key participants and the geography remain the same in 2:4–25 and 3:1–24, the introduction of the serpent at 3:1 reflects a turning point in the narrative.⁸⁴ As such, 2:4–25 and 3:1–24 are more closely related to each other, though distinct, than they are to 1:1–2:3.

Additionally, the contextual setting is reflected by the sequential movement of Genesis 2:4–25 and 3:1–24. *Waw* consecutive appears 21 times in 2:4–25 and 34 times in 3:1–24. The use of this grammatical device represents a sequential movement in these two chapters,⁸⁵ just as we noted in the previous article about the 55 *waw* consecutives advancing the sequential movement in 1:1–2:3.⁸⁶ Not only, as just noted, is there a tight thematic connection between 2:4–25 and 3:1–24, the use of *waw* consecutive indicates that 3:1–24 advances historically from 2:4–25. This is to say, the sequence of events advanced by *waw* consecutive in 2:4–25 provides a foundation for the next sequence of events advanced by *waw* consecutive in 3:1–24. As a result, if the contextual setting of Genesis 2:5 is 2:4–3:24, the focus of 2:5 is not intended to provide a hermeneutical grid to reinterpret the clear chronological advancement of 1:1–2:3 as a non-chronological, topical account, but to focus on the formation and fall of man and woman in their paradisiacal environment in Eden.

Finally, the contextual setting of Genesis 2:5 is Day 6 of the Creation Week. Genesis 1:1–2:3 is a cosmogony that summarizes the events of the Creation Week. On Day 6 (Genesis 1:26–28), this cosmogony includes a brief outline of the creation of man and woman in the image of God. In the context of 1:26–28, no hint is given that the woman was subsequently taken from the rib of Adam, to mention just one omission. This type of detail is reserved for the expansion of details for Day 6 in Genesis 2:4–25.⁸⁷ Moses’ style of writing initially gives an overview of the Creation Week in 1:1–2:3. Drawing from selective items in the overview, Moses expands on these items in 2:4–25.⁸⁸ What is clearly set forth in this latter context is a focus on the formation of each of God’s image bearers and their marital union in the Garden of Eden. This focus is unmistakably observed when the narrative thread of 2:4–25 is initiated with the first *waw* consecutive in verse 7 that presents the creation of man, “then the LORD God formed man” (*וַיַּצְרֵם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱדָמָה אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁתוֹ*). The final four *waw* consecutives in this chapter (verses 22 [twice], 23, 25) describe the formation of woman as a complement for the man along with the formation of their marital union. Since the creation of man and woman is described in 1:26–28 as taking place on Day 6 and the narrative sequence of 2:7–25 gives an expanded view of the same creative activities, the

emphasis of the narrative thread in 2:7–25 is an expansion of Day 6 with a focus on the divine image bearers in their pristine environment. As noted earlier, the superscription in Genesis 2:4 introduces the narrative unit of 2:5–25, with the six nonsequential clauses of verses 5–6 providing the setting for the narrative sequence started in verse 7.⁸⁹ Therefore, Genesis 2:4–25 describes in greater detail key events that happened on Day 6, but had not been included in the summarized description of the creation of man and woman in 1:26–28. As such, the connection of Genesis 2:5 with Day 6, as well as the previous two items discussed, indicates that the contextual setting for verse 5 is Day 6.

In looking at the immediate interpretation of Genesis 2:5, some framework advocates maintain that Genesis 2:5 prohibits a literal reading of Genesis 1:1–2:3. If, according to their argument, God used extraordinary providence to uphold creation during the creation period, as a literal interpretation of 1:1–2:3 requires, it is contradictory for God to give an explanation that is generally associated with normal providence, the lack of rain, as a reason for not creating vegetation.⁹⁰ As noted earlier, this is the “because it had not rained” argument.⁹¹ This title is derived from Kline’s original 1958 article.⁹² With his explanation of Genesis 2:5, Kline contends, “The Creator did not originate plant life on earth before he had prepared an environment in which he might preserve it without by-passing secondary means and without having recourse to extraordinary means such as marvelous methods of fertilization. The unargued presupposition of Genesis 2:5 is clearly that the divine providence was operating during the creation period through processes which any reader would recognize as normal in the natural world of his day.”⁹³ This “un-argued presupposition” is the sine qua non of Kline’s framework position.⁹⁴ Is this presupposition demanded by verse 5? In evaluating this, a closer examination of this verse is in order.

Interpretative difficulties associated with Genesis 2:5–6 are legion. As far as this paper is concerned, the difficulties relate to the connection between the vegetation in verse 5⁹⁵ and the cosmogony in 1:1–2:3. Interpreters maintain that 2:5 either conflicts or harmonizes with a sequential interpretation of the creation account.

Interpreters who identify a conflict between Genesis 2:5 and 1:1–2:3 either see a contradiction between the P and J sources⁹⁶ or harmonize this conflict by reinterpreting the sequentially arranged days of 1:1–2:3 in light of their understanding of 2:5. According to Kline’s framework position, verse 5 teaches that God did not create vegetation before he established normal providence to sustain plant life. God’s establishment of normal providence to sustain the flora took place before his creation of man during the creation period of 1:1–31.⁹⁷ As reflected in this paper, this latter option is the approach of some framework defenders.

As noted above, verse 5 has four clauses with the first two functioning as circumstantial clauses and the last two as causal clauses. To again review verse 5, I prefer to arrange the clauses of verse 5 like this:

5Now [*waw*] no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and [*waw*] no plant of the field had yet sprouted, for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth, and [*waw*] there was no man to cultivate the ground.

Initially, if Genesis 2:5 means that the entire earth had no vegetation because the earth lacked rain, the syntax of the last clause, as the preceding arrangement sets forth, indicates that the lack of man provides a second reason for this global floral deficiency. To interpret the first two clauses as a reference to a universal vegetation deficiency implies that God created rain and man before vegetation. However, even some framework interpreters reject the creation of man before vegetation. And this rejection is because, according to Kline, it conflicts with “natural revelation.”⁹⁸ To relate the vegetation of 2:5 to the entire earth, framework supporters must somehow marginalize the last clause of verse 5 to fit their interpretative scheme. In the final analysis, a normal reading of this text does not support a marginalization of the last clause of verse 5.

In addition, a contextual understanding of the clausal arrangement in verse 5 indicates that there is no need to marginalize the last clause. The first two circumstantial clauses state that, at the time of man’s creation (verse 7) on Day 6, the shrubs of the field were not yet in the earth and the plants of the field had not yet sprouted. The last two causal clauses explain that God’s work in creation, as it related to the specified vegetation in this verse, was incomplete in two areas: a water source for irrigation and a man for cultivation. A problem for framework interpreters who follow Kline’s approach to Genesis 2:5 is that there is, in reality, only one reason for the flora deficiencies in verse 5a: no rain. As such, this approach marginalizes the last clause of verse 5 to a parenthetical remark.⁹⁹ The syntactical constraints of verse 5 suggest that the last clause of verse 5 could either be coordinate with the other three circumstantial clauses in verses 5–6 or coordinate with the preceding third, causal clause in verse 5. Neither view, however, suggests that there is a conflict between verse 5 and the creation account, as some framework proponents maintain.¹⁰⁰ To interpret the statement about the lack of man to a parenthesis is syntactically tenuous. Furthermore, if the last clause in verse 5 about the lack of man, who would be formed out of dust in a specific location, is coordinate with the preceding causal clause, as the *waw* conjunctive implies, this indicates that the vegetation mentioned in verse 5 is used with a restrictive rather than a universal sense.¹⁰¹ Thus, it is questionable to interpret Genesis 2:5 as conflicting with the creation account.

In contrast to this problematic understanding, other interpreters maintain that Genesis 2:5 is compatible

with a sequential view of the creation account. This interpretation of verse 5 provides background information for the events of Day 6 described in verses 7–25. Since one of the events focuses on the placement of man in the Garden of Eden, the vegetation of verse 5 is used restrictively. Those who follow a restrictive reading of verse 5 have followed a day-age interpretation of 1:1–2:3,¹⁰² analogical day interpretation,¹⁰³ or historic literal day view.¹⁰⁴ What distinguishes the historic literal day view from the other two is that events of 2:7–25 are understood as having occurred on a literal sixth day that is a part of a sequence of literal days that are chronologically arranged in a literal week. Though a restrictive view of 2:5 is not the exclusive domain of the historic literal day view, this understanding correlates well with it. In keeping with this interpretation of the specified vegetation in verse 5, a contextual case will be made that this verse relates to a specific geographical matrix, Eden, and the creation of man to dwell in this location.

As previously noted, the contextual setting of Genesis 2:5 is Day 6 of the Creation Week with the formation of humanity and their placement in Eden. This suggests a specific location, rather than a general reference to the entire globe. The purpose of the *tôlêdôt* heading in verse 4 is to depict what developed from “earth and heaven”: the creation of man and woman and their life in the Garden of Eden both before and after sin. The NASB translates the two uses of אֶרֶץ in verse 5 as “earth.” This term has a broad semantic range. It can relate to the entire earth, as opposed to the heavens. This is how אֶרֶץ is used in Genesis 1:1–2, 2:1 and in the heading of 2:4. In 1:10–31, אֶרֶץ refers to dry land as opposed to the sea. Most translations render the three uses of אֶרֶץ in 2:5–6 as “earth”; however, the ESV renders each of these as “land.” Since this context focuses on the creation of man and his placement in Eden, אֶרֶץ is preferably taken as “land,” with the ESV. In the context of 2:4–25, the heading in verse 4 uses אֶרֶץ twice as a reference to the entire globe. The vocabulary of verse 4 suggests that the writer linked his new narrative material with the creation account of 1:1–2:3. While drawing from the creation account in verse 4, Moses’ objective is to develop what happened to the pristine habitat of Eden both before both before and after Adam’s sin.¹⁰⁵

Two other geographical terms are also used in verse 5: שָׂדֵה (“field”) and אֲדָמָה (“ground”). “Field,” שָׂדֵה can refer to open fields where wild animals (Genesis 2:19–20, 3:1, 14) and plants (Genesis 2:5, 3:18) reside. It can also refer to cultivated fields (Genesis 4:8).¹⁰⁶ Man is taken from the dust of אֲדָמָה, “ground,” (Genesis 2:7) and will return to it at death (Genesis 3:19). Because of Adam’s sin, אֲדָמָה is cursed and man will eat, in his toil, from it (Genesis 3:17). Thorns and thistles grow from the cursed “ground” (Genesis 3:18). In Genesis 2:5, these three geographical terms overlap in use, as they describe the location where Adam would rule. Thus, the purpose of this *tôlêdôt* section is to depict mankind both in his glorious residence in and disgraceful expulsion from Eden.

Genesis 2:5 is best understood in light of Genesis 3:8–24.¹⁰⁷ The language used in verse 5 anticipates that Adam’s sin would relate to the specific vegetation found in Eden. Adam was to joyfully cultivate the vegetation in Eden (Genesis 2:15). However, after Adam fails his probation, he is driven in judgment from Eden with the result that he would cultivate the cursed ground from the context of his own depraved nature until the day his body would return to dust (Genesis 3:23). In the context of Genesis 2–3, Eden is the epicenter from where Adam and the created order would be cursed. If the language of 2:5 anticipates the Fall, the “shrub [שִׁיחַ] of the field” and the “plant [עֵשֶׂב] of the field” are preferably interpreted as two categories of vegetation in Eden that, according to the remainder of the verse, need a water supply and farmer. “Plant,” עֵשֶׂב occurs more often in the Old Testament than “shrub,” שִׁיחַ. “Plant,” עֵשֶׂב, found 33 times in the Old Testament, generally refers to “plants” used as food for both people and animals.¹⁰⁸ Besides its use in Genesis 2:5, the identical phrase, “plant עֵשֶׂב of the field,” is used in 3:18. In this latter context, man’s diet, after the Fall, is taken from the “plants עֵשֶׂב of the field” and is further specified as “bread” in verse 19. Similar wording in each verse reflects the connection between “plants” and “bread”: “you will eat plants עֵשֶׂב of the field” (verse 18) and “you will eat bread [לֶחֶם]” (verse 19). This suggests that “plants עֵשֶׂב of the field” are those grains that require man’s cultivation to produce bread.¹⁰⁹ Since עֵשֶׂב is also used in 1:11–12, 29–30, as a reference to God’s creation of “plants” over the entire land mass of earth, some have connected the “plants of the field” in 2:5 with the universal creation of plants in Genesis 1.¹¹⁰ However, this connection is unlikely for three reasons. Initially, since the context of Genesis 2:5 focuses on humanity and their placement in Eden, the “plants of the field” refer to a restrictive category that was indigenous to Eden. Additionally, the “plants עֵשֶׂב yielding seed” in 1:11–12 reproduced by their own seed, while the “plants of the field” in 2:5 require man for cultivation. Finally, God gave the “plants yielding seed” in 1:11–12, 29–30 to be used as food for man and for every animal of the earth; however, after the Fall, man eats the “plants of the field” in 3:18 as a result of a divinely imposed intensification of man’s labor.¹¹¹

“Shrub,” שִׁיחַ, is only used four times in the Old Testament (Genesis 2:5, 21:15, Job 30:4, 7).¹¹² In Genesis 21:15, Hagar left Ishmael under one of the “shrubs.” This was a desert shrub large enough to provide some protection for her son. Since “plant of the field” in Genesis 2:5 is used again in 3:18, it is also likely that the “thorns and thistles” in verse 18 help to define “shrub” in 2:5. The result of God’s curse on the ground are the

“thorns and thistles” of 3:18. Apparently, the “shrub,” *רִיב*, created before the Fall, became, at least in part, “thorns and thistles” with the curse.¹¹³

Therefore, rather than taking the vegetation of Genesis 2:5 as a global reference, the vegetation of verse 5 has a restrictive use that anticipates its precise identification as Eden in verse 8. Mathews summarizes this contextual understanding: “Thus 2:5–6 does not speak to the creation of the overall vegetation but to specific sorts of herbage in the world to follow. The language of cultivation, ‘work the ground’ (2:5), anticipates the labor of Adam, first positively as the caretaker of Eden (2:15) but also negatively in 3:23, which describes the expulsion of the man and woman from the garden. God prepared a land for the man, but in telling of his creation and the land in which he is placed, the text anticipates the land will suffer from the effects of Adam’s sin.”¹¹⁴

With this evaluation of the immediate context of Genesis 2:5, we have examined the *tôl’dôt* heading in Genesis 2:4 and the literary context of 2:5–7. In treating the heading in verse 4, it was shown that, between the chiasmic arrangement of this verse and the use of divine names, this heading does not introduce a second account of creation. It was further proven that, while establishing a link with 1:1–2:3, the heading in verse 4 shifts the focus toward man’s formation and his placement in the garden. As a result, Genesis 2:4–25 is preferably taken as a complement to the creation account in 1:1–2:3, rather than providing a conflict with it. In reference to the literary context of 2:5–7, the structure of verses 5–7 as it related to the interpretation of verse 5 was presented. With the structure of verses 5–7, verses 5–6 provide background information for the narrative sequence that is initiated in verse 7 with the first *waw* consecutive and continued with a series of *waw* consecutives. With this interpretation of verse 5, its contextual setting on Day 6 of the Creation Week focuses on the creation of human beings and their placement in an ideal environment. The reference to geography in verse 5 refers to the setting in Eden where God chose to place the couple that he created in his image. The vegetation has reference to the plants and shrubs Adam would cultivate in the Garden. How does Genesis 2:5 in its immediate context relate to the surrounding context of verses 4–25?

The surrounding context of Genesis 2:4–25

Genesis 2:5 is part of a series of six nonsequential clauses in verses 5–6 that provide circumstances associated with the formation of man in verse 7: “Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.” This creative activity in verse 7 is summarized by a series of 3 *waw* consecutive verbs (“formed” *וַיַּצְרֵם*), “breathed” *וַיִּפְחֵם*, “became” *וַיִּהְיֶה*). In the Hebrew text, each of the three *waw* consecutives advances a narrative sequence. The *waw* consecutive is a significant component of Hebrew historical narrative in that it generally adds to past time narration an element of sequence.¹¹⁵ *Waw* consecutives, according to Pratico and Van Pelt, “are used primarily in narrative sequence to denote consecutive actions, that is, actions occurring in sequence.”¹¹⁶ While this grammatical device has uses other than a strict sequential verb form, it nevertheless has a primary function of representing sequential movement. By minimizing the sequential force of the *waw* consecutives in Genesis 2:4–25, this seemingly supports the argument of some framework advocates that this pericope is a topical account. Though a few *waw* consecutives in this passage are not strictly sequential, the majority of them are used sequentially and they establish a sequence of activities that took place on Day 6 of the Creation Week.

While the *waw* consecutive is unmistakably identifiable in a Hebrew text, the same is not true in an English version. As was noted in the first part of this series about Genesis 1:1–2:3,¹¹⁷ the *waw* consecutives provide the basic framework that advances the narrative sequence, though the sequential use is not its only use. While *waw* consecutive has different uses in Genesis 2:4–25, the sequential use of 17 of the 21 *waw* consecutives is the backbone of this narrative section. To communicate this, I have taken the liberty of adapting the NASB’s translation of the 21 *waw* consecutives. Though the semantic distinction between some of my italicized conjunctions is arbitrary, my purpose with supplying the italicized conjunction is simply to denote a distinction in uses of *waw* consecutive. These *waw* consecutives are used in four ways: 17 are sequential (81%), two are resumptive (9%), one is a pluperfect (5%), and one a consequential use (5%). In Table 1, I have supplied an italicized “then” with the 17 examples of sequentially arranged *waw* consecutives (listed in the chart as Sequential WC), an italicized and for the two resumptive uses (abbreviated Resump WC), an italicized “now” for the lone pluperfect (abbreviated as Pluper WC), and an italicized “thus” for the final example of a consequential use (abbreviated Conseq WC).

General observations about *waw* consecutive

To explicate the narrative development in Genesis 24–25, some general observations about the various uses of *waw* consecutive are appropriate. First, the mainline narrative begins in verse 7a, is continued by a tight sequence of five *waw* consecutives in verses 7b–9, briefly interrupted by five verses, verses 10–14, that presents

Table 1.

Verse	Sequential WC	Resump WC	PluperWC	Conseq WC
7	<i>then</i> the LORD God formed man <i>then</i> breathed <i>then</i> man became			
8	<i>then</i> the LORD God planted a garden <i>then</i> there he placed			
9	<i>then</i> the LORD God caused to grow			
15		<i>and</i> the LORD God took the man <i>and</i> put him into the Garden of Eden		
16	<i>then</i> the LORD God commanded			
17	<i>then</i> the LORD God said			
19			<i>now</i> the LORD God had formed	
20	<i>then</i> brought them <i>then</i> the man gave names			
21	<i>then</i> the LORD God caused a deep sleep <i>then</i> he slept <i>then</i> he took one of of his ribs <i>then</i> he closed up the flesh			
22	<i>then</i> the LORD God fashioned <i>then</i> he brought her			
23	<i>then</i> the man said			
25				<i>thus</i> the man and his wife were both naked

background information setting up the resumption of this text in verse 15 with two *waw* consecutives, and subsequently advanced to completion with 13 *waw* consecutives in verses 16–25. Second, since the mainline narrative sequence begins in verse 7, this suggests that verses 4–6, as we have noted, is an informing background for verse 7 with its inception of the narrative unit that continues through verse 25. Third, the mainline sequence of events in this passage is advanced by 17 sequential uses of *waw* consecutive. The 17 uses of *waw* consecutive (81%) show that this passage is a historical narrative that is incrementally moved along. Fourth, the two *waw* consecutives in verse 15 have a resumptive function. While the two *waw* consecutives in this verse form a sequence with the event represented by the fifth *waw* consecutive in verse 8 (“placed,” וַיִּצַע), they do not form a strict sequence with the sixth *waw* consecutive in verse 9 (“caused to grow,” וַיַּצְמַח). Fifth, the final *waw* consecutive in verse 25 (“Thus [the man and his wife] were,” וַיְהִי) brings this unit to a conclusion.¹¹⁸ The preceding *waw* consecutive in verse 23a (“then [the man] said,” וַיֹּאמֶר) communicates Adam’s delighted response to the formation of the woman from his “rib.” As opposed to the animals that Adam had just assigned names, the woman was of the same substance as he; she was a genuine complement for him.¹¹⁹ The storyline has advanced to verse 23 with the twentieth example of a *waw* consecutive; however, the editorial interruption in verse 24 applies the creation ordinance of marriage to Adam and Eve’s posterity. As an outgrowth of the whole narrative, especially verses 23a–24, the account is completed with the final *waw* consecutive in verse 25. A *waw* consecutive that concludes a storyline, as verse 25 does for verses 4–24, provides an example of its consequential use.¹²⁰ Sixth, while the two resumptive uses of *waw* consecutive in verse 15 and the one use of a pluperfect in verse 19 (14%) may seemingly create a problem for my interpretation of the creation account, they are readily harmonized with the sequential material. Since the reputed difficulty with the *waw* consecutive revolves around these three uses of *waw* consecutive, these need more explanation.

Resumptive uses of *waw* consecutive in Genesis 2:15

Most commentators recognize that the two *waw* consecutives in Genesis 2:15 resume the narrative thread of verse 8.¹²¹ However, the issue for framework advocates who follow Kline is not exclusively tied to the issue of resumption. Rather the issue is related to demonstrating that these *waw* consecutives are nonsequential and

that they, therefore, imply that other *waw* consecutives should be taken topically rather than sequentially.¹²² Both *waw* consecutives in verses 15, according to Irons and Kline, are examples of temporal recapitulation.¹²³ Drawing from verse 15 and a few other examples, they conclude, “Thus, temporal recapitulation for the purpose of topical arrangement appears to be a key structural device in Genesis.”¹²⁴ Though *waw* consecutive may at times reflect temporal recapitulation, Irons and Kline’s conclusion is overstated and undermines the sequential substance of the *waw* consecutive.

Since the context of Genesis 2 clearly indicates that verse 15 resumes the narrative thread of verse 8, both sequential verbs reflect some level of temporal recapitulation. Nevertheless, this recapitulation is restricted by its context. What Irons and Kline do not point out is that both *waw* consecutives are bound to a context that is advanced by a series of 17 *waw* consecutives used sequentially. This is to say, the actual sequential chain to which the two *waw* consecutives in verse 15 belong controls the recapitulation. The narrative line in this pericope begins with the first *waw* consecutive in verse 7 and is advanced by a tight chain of five other *waw* consecutives in verses 7b–9. After the three *waw* consecutives describing the creation of man in verse 7, the next three *waw* consecutives in verses 8–9 picture God’s planting a garden in Eden, placing man in the garden, and adorning this garden with various kinds of beautiful trees that had nutritious fruit, as well as including, in the middle of the garden, the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The sequence of *waw* consecutives is broken by a *waw* disjunctive in verse 10 (“now [*waw*] a river”) and this disjunction is continued through verse 14. Since none of the verbs in verses 10–14 are *waw* consecutives, the sequential chain is temporarily set aside. This digression from the narrative sequence in verses 10–14 is a series of verses summarizing the resplendent nature of the garden where God had placed the man. While verses 10–14 may seem out of place since it does not advance the sequential chain, its intention is to describe the glories of the garden environment in which God had placed man and where man would subsequently fail his probationary test in Genesis 3. After this brief excursus about the splendor of the Garden of Eden, two *waw* consecutives in verses 15 resume the narrative chain by repeating, as well as expanding on, the *waw* consecutive in verse 8 (“[there he] placed,” *וַיִּטֵּעַ*). Consequently, it is preferable to take these two verbs as examples of resumptive repetition.

Genesis 2:15 provides a good context to describe the literary technique of resumptive repetition. In this regard, we should note that both verbs in verse 15 (“took” *וַיִּקַּח*) and “put” *וַיִּטֵּעַ*) have some semantic overlap with the second *waw* consecutive in verse 8 (“placed” *וַיִּטֵּעַ*).¹²⁵ The semantic overlap in the vocabulary reflects some form of repetition. Because the two verbs in verse 15 pick up the sequence from verse 8, this is a resumption of the sequential line. Resumptive repetition takes place with a *waw* consecutive when, after a significant event is initially represented by a *waw* consecutive and the narrative line is temporarily diverted, a subsequent *waw* consecutive that semantically overlaps with the initial *waw* consecutive continues the sequential line.¹²⁶ With the use of resumptive repetition, this does not require that the verbs involved with the resumption are strictly synonymous. In Genesis 2:15, the Hiphil form of “put,” adds the nuance of bringing rest to someone.¹²⁷ Adam was securely placed in the garden to tend it with divine blessing. While there is some semantic overlap between the verbs in verse 8 and verse 15, the Hiphil *waw* consecutive of *וַיִּטֵּעַ*, while resuming the narrative thread, additionally implies that “God prepares the garden for man’s safety, where he can enjoy the divine presence.”¹²⁸ Thus, while the *waw* consecutives in verse 15 resume the narrative sequence, they also add to the sequence that man with divine security was placed in the garden. This also indicates that both verbs in verse 15 are sequential in that they resume the situation presented by the *waw* consecutive in verse 8.¹²⁹ By using resumptive repetition, Moses shows how the sequence of verse 15 relates to the overall sequential chain in this account. In addition, the use of resumptive repetition in this context also shows how the digression of verses 10–14 is skillfully related to the immediate context.¹³⁰

Though the description of the *waw* consecutives in verse 15 as examples of resumptive repetition indicates that they do not reflect a strict chronology, this does not mean that chronological constraints have been abandoned by the narrative sequence.¹³¹ Since the two sequential verbs in verse 15 are part of a chain of 17 other *waw* consecutives, these other sequential verbs advance the chronological and sequential substance of this account. The use of the *waw* consecutives in 2:7–25 are part of a larger Old Testament scheme that uses this sequential framework to present Israel’s historiography. Therefore, both *waw* consecutives in verse 15 sequentially resume the narrative line. In addition, though the *waw* consecutives in verse 15 are not sequential, the 17 sequential *waw* consecutives in 2:7–25 establish the chronological advancement of this passage. In the final analysis, the two resumptive *waw* consecutives are a non-issue since they practically function like the 17 sequential *waw* consecutives.

Pluperfect use of *waw* consecutive in Genesis 2:19

The third *waw* consecutive used to support a topical interpretation of Genesis 2:4–25 is found in the first

part of verse 19 (“[the LORD God] formed,” *וַיִּצְרֵן*). If the narrative line is followed in many English translations, Genesis 2:19a is part of a chronological sequence. The sequential development in verses 18–19 is exhibited in the NASB:

Then the LORD God said [*waw* consecutive], ‘It is not good for the man to be alone; I will make him a helper suitable for him.’ 19Out of the ground the LORD God formed [*waw* consecutive] every beast of the field and every bird of the sky, and brought [*waw* consecutive] them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called a living creature, that was its name.

I have placed in brackets the *waw* consecutive after the appropriate three verbs in verses 18–19. We should observe that the initial *waw* consecutive in verse 19 is translated as a past tense, just like the other two *waw* consecutives in verse 18 and verse 19b. The past tense rendering of *וַיִּצְרֵן*, “formed,” is also followed in the KJV, NKJV, ESV, NRSV, NLT, and NET BIBLE. If the translation of the NASB and other versions is correct, this reflects a narrative sequence in these two verses that looks like this:

1. The LORD God said it is not good for man to be alone.
2. The LORD God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the sky from the dust of the ground.
3. The LORD God brought every beast of the field and every bird of the sky to man so that man could name them.

Before the sequence in verses 18–19, the narrative sequence was initiated by the creation of man, verse 7, then the formation of the Garden of Eden, verses 8–9. Following the sequence in verses 18–19, woman was formed from man, verse 22. According to the apparent sequence in Genesis 2, the beasts and birds were formed after the creation of man in verse 7 but before the formation of woman in verse 22. This sequence may conflict with the creation account. On Day 5 God created birds (Genesis 1:21–22). On Day 6, God initially created wild animals, livestock, and creeping things (verses 24–25), and he finally created man and woman (verses 26–28). If *וַיִּצְרֵן* is rendered as a past tense, “formed,” the sequence in Genesis 2:4–25 seemingly contradicts the arrangement in 1:1–2:3. Two solutions to this reputed contradiction will be examined.

First, some framework advocates claim that a topical interpretation of Genesis 2:4–25 resolves this contradiction. This position states that man was created before beasts and birds if *וַיִּצְרֵן* is used as *waw* consecutives normally function to show chronological sequence.¹³² However, since the formation of man before beasts and birds conflicts with a chronological reading of Genesis 1:1–2:3 that has birds and beasts created before man, the past tense translation of *וַיִּצְרֵן* indicates that the account should be read topically rather than chronologically. According to Kline’s framework position, a chronological reading of the sequential verb in 2:19, as well as the two *waw* consecutives in verse 15, is inconsistent with a literal sequence in 1:1–2:3.¹³³ As such, the account in Genesis 2:4–25 has examples of sequential verbs that indicate a temporal recapitulation.¹³⁴

While framework interpreters use the sequential verb in Genesis 2:19, as well as the two verbs in verse 15, as examples of temporal recapitulation, this does not prove that all the *waw* consecutives in 2:4–25 are not chronological. It indicates that three of 21 uses of *waw* consecutive reflect some level of temporal recapitulation. Nevertheless, it does not demonstrate that all of the other 18 *waw* consecutives reflect temporal recapitulation.¹³⁵ Furthermore, to have 2:4–25 function as a dischronologized account, some framework supporters assume that 2:4–25 and 1:1–2:3 are in conflict with each other. And, the discontinuity that 1:1–2:3 has with 2:4–25 is predicated on the “unargued presupposition” that 2:5 assumes God worked exclusively through normal providence in the creation period. This was Kline’s thesis in his 1958 article. This “unargued presupposition” of verse 5 became the basis to deny a literal, chronological interpretation of 1:1–2:3 and to support a figurative interpretation of this passage.¹³⁶ Another development from this “unargued presupposition” of verse 5 was that 2:4–25 also had no chronological significance but was better interpreted as a topical account.¹³⁷ However, if the assumption of verse 5 is questionable, as has been previously noted, should not this give some pause about the validity of assuming that 1:1–2:3 has a discontinuity with 2:4–25? By the nature of the content of 2:4 and the events described in verses 7–25 being coordinate with Day 6 of the Creation Week, as addressed earlier in this paper, 1:1–2:3 has a basic continuity with 2:4–25.¹³⁸ As such, is there not a better interpretation of the sequential verb in 2:19 that harmonizes both pericopes?

Second, if the first sequential verb in Genesis 2:19a is a pluperfect, a chronological reading of 2:4–25 is preserved as well as the account maintaining a continuity with 1:1–2:3.¹³⁹ This view says that *וַיִּצְרֵן*, in the midst of a chain of sequential *waw* consecutives, may be translated as a past perfect, “has formed,” reflecting a temporal activity that preceded the mainline sequence in 2:4–25.¹⁴⁰ While the NASB, like other English versions, translates verse 19a with a past tense: “Out of the ground the LORD God *formed* every beast of the field and every bird of the sky” (emphasis added), the NIV translates verse 19a with a pluperfect: “Now the LORD God *had formed* out of the ground all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air” (emphasis added). In this context, the NIV best preserves the continuity of 1:1–2:3 and 2:4–25.

From the perspective of some framework supporters, the *waw* consecutive as a pluperfect is not a clear syntactic option in Genesis 2:19. A pluperfect sense could have been communicated by other grammatical constructions. As a result, the author of Genesis intended to convey something other than a chronological sequence.¹⁴¹ However, what is overlooked by this reasoning is that pluperfect may be used within a sequence of *waw* consecutive verbs. Though *waw* consecutive is generally used to advance a narrative timeline one incremental stride after another,¹⁴² a *waw* consecutive may be used to denote an action prior to an immediate narrative sequence. Waltke and O'Connor provide a few examples where the *waw* consecutive corresponds to the pluperfect (Exodus 4:11–12, Numbers 1:47–49, 1 Kings 13:12).¹⁴³ Another example is found in Genesis 12:1. According to the sequential verbs in 11:31, Abram had left Ur of the Chaldeans with his father Terah, set out for Canaan, and had settled in Haran. However, the *waw* consecutive that initiates 12:1 does not incrementally advance the timeline, but provides a flashback when the LORD had spoken to Abram about initially leaving his father's country in Mesopotamia before moving to Haran (Genesis 15:7, Acts 7:2). The mainline sequence is further interrupted by a series of clauses, verses 1b–3, that contains God's promises to Abram with the narrative sequence being resumed in verse 4. In keeping with this pluperfect use, the NIV translates verse 1a: "The LORD *had said* to Abram ..." (emphasis added). Pipa provides another example from Exodus 10:24–11:8. This narrative sequence is advanced by a series of *waw* consecutives. However, in 11:1, Moses uses a *waw* consecutive to introduce an interruption in the narrative sequence that serves as a flashback to "introduce a revelation previously given to Moses."¹⁴⁴ Although Moses had other syntactic options to convey a pluperfect, his syntactic preference, with these examples, was to use a *waw* consecutive for this anterior action.

Like the two *waw* consecutives in Genesis 2:15, וַיִּצְרַח in verse 19 is an example of temporal recapitulation. Both verses reflect two different types of temporal recapitulation. The sequential verbs in verse 15 are restricted by the immediate narrative sequence in verses 4–25. Because of the immediate narrative, we have noted that both verbs are examples of resumptive repetition. However, the temporal recapitulation in verse 19 transcends the immediate pericope of 2:4–25 and looks back to the previous pericope in 1:1–2:3. Because וַיִּצְרַח in 2:19 transcends the immediate episode as it looks back to the preceding one, it is better to view this as an example of a pluperfect.¹⁴⁵ Various criteria are used to indicate that a *waw* consecutive is used as pluperfect, such as a sequential verb starting a new pericope or paragraph.¹⁴⁶ The context of Genesis 1–2 reflects another criteria for determining if a verb is used as a past perfect. This technique is what Collins calls the "logic of the referent."¹⁴⁷ With this technique, the literary context establishes that the event represented by a *waw* consecutive verb occurred before the situation represented by a prior verb.¹⁴⁸

In the context of Genesis 2:4–25, we have seen how the *tôlêdôt* heading was arranged as a chiasm. More specifically, the actual words used in this chiasm ("heavens," "earth," "created," "made") inextricably link 2:4–25 with 1:1–2:3.¹⁴⁹ The mainline narrative sequence was advanced in Genesis 1:1–2:3 by the use of 55 *waw* consecutives to give an overview of the first literal week in the realm of the created. Genesis 2:4–7 interrupt the mainline narrative as a way of briefly reversing the sequence of events so that more details may be given about the key events that occurred on Day 6. While using vocabulary in the chiasm of verse 4 to link the second account with the first, the *tôlêdôt* heading in verse 4 shifts the narrative focus to describe what developed from the "earth" and "heaven." More precisely, this purposeful shift in focus to Day 6 begins with the creation of the man from dust, continues to the formation of his wife from his own body, and finally concludes with a statement about their marital union. The heading in verse 4 is followed by a series of six nonsequential clauses, verses 5–6, providing circumstances associated with the formation of man in verse 7. While the overview of the Creation Week in 1:1–2:3 was sequentially advanced by 46 of 55 *waw* consecutives,¹⁵⁰ moving from the first day through the seventh, the pericope of 2:4–25 backs up to Day 6 and resumes the narrative sequence with the first *waw* consecutive in verse 7 ("Then the LORD God formed [*waw* consecutive] man of dust from the ground"). The initial sequential verb in verse 7 starts a sequence of 21 *waw* consecutives that advance the mainline narrative of Day 6. While 4 of the 21 *waw* consecutives in this pericope are not chronological, the actual chronological sequence started in verse 7 is advanced by 17 sequential uses of *waw* consecutives. While we do not want to gloss over the 4 *waw* consecutives that are not chronological, we should not ignore that these 4 nonsequential *waw* consecutives, with good syntactical justification, are tethered to a context of 17 sequential *waw* consecutives that advance the mainline narrative. The precise use of the nonsequential *waw* consecutive in verse 19a is defined by the logic of the referent. In this context, the logic of the referent for the event summarized by וַיִּצְרַח in verse 19 is the literary environment of the previous pericope, especially Days 5–6, 1:20–31.¹⁵¹ Since Moses intended 1:1–2:3 and 2:4–25 to be read as complementary accounts, this suggests that וַיִּצְרַח in 2:19 is preferably translated as a pluperfect, "had formed." The pluperfect translation of וַיִּצְרַח is consistent with a traditional reading of Genesis 1:1–2:3 as an overview of each day in the creation week and 2:4–25 as an expansion of the sixth day of the creation week.¹⁵²

In closing this discussion of the *waw* consecutives in 2:4–25, the 3 *waw* consecutives in verses 15 and 19 reflecting temporal recapitulation do not provide a justification for reinterpreting the overall narrative sequence as a dischronologized account. Should the three exceptional uses of *waw* consecutive (14%) define the nature of the narrative sequence? Or, should not the 17 normal uses (81%) define the mainline narrative? Since the *waw* consecutives in verses 15 and 19 are connected to 17 other *waw* consecutives that demonstrate a normal sequential use of *waw* consecutive, Genesis 2:4–25 should be taken as a chronological account that has three examples of temporal recapitulation. What defines this pericope is the mainline sequence of 17 sequential *waw* consecutives. In the final analysis, this certainly does not sound like a use of 21 *waw* consecutives that are dischronologized.

The wider context of Scripture

As initially noted in this paper, the reputed “unargued presupposition” of Genesis 2:5 is that God exclusively operated in the creation period through ordinary providence. Kline has stated his position like this: “Embedded in Genesis 2:5 ff. is the principle that the *modus operandi* of the divine providence was the same during the creation period as that of ordinary providence at the present time.”¹⁵³ Kline’s point is that the literal historic day interpretation of Genesis that the literal historic day interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3, by presupposing that God “employed other than the ordinary secondary means in executing his works of providence,” contradicts this embedded principle in 2:5.¹⁵⁴ When this thesis that questions the use of extraordinary providence in Genesis 1:1–2:3 by Kline and some framework advocates¹⁵⁵ is examined, it is found to be in conflict with the account of creation, the overall tenor of Scripture with regard to miracles, and the correct use of the analogy of Scripture.

Defending extraordinary providence from Genesis 1:1–2:3

The Creation Week provides no evidence that God worked exclusively in this week through ordinary providence; and, in fact, the evidence is to the contrary. While the reference to the Spirit of God moving over the water surrounding the unformed and empty earth in Genesis 1:2 has some difficulties,¹⁵⁶ it clearly pictures divine protection and care of the earth at the beginning of the Creation Week.¹⁵⁷ The Spirit of God, like an eagle protectively and vigilantly hovering over its young (Deuteronomy 32:11), supernaturally preserved the earth.¹⁵⁸ In addition, if there is any supernatural intervention, extraordinary providence, this calls into question this thesis of the framework. For example, God directly intervened in 2:7 when he “formed man out of the dust from the ground,” “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life,” and “man became a living being.” In addition, Young noted that the only works described on Day 3 are not works of ordinary providence, but that of extraordinary providence. “Indeed, on no viewpoint can it be established that ordinary providential working prevailed on the third day. The only works assigned to this day were the result of special, divine, creative fiat. If ordinary providence existed during the third day, it was interrupted at two points by divine fiat.”¹⁵⁹ Because the Creation Week reflects that God intervened by fiat and by supernaturally preserving his creation, the framework’s thesis cannot be consistently used to deny the literal, sequential interpretation of the Creation Week.

We have observed that Kline maintains that the providence of the creation period was the same as it is today. However, this assessment cannot be correct. Only if God created everything in a nanosecond could this assessment possibly be true. Furthermore, since Kline allows for the creation era to be punctuated with supernatural acts of creation,¹⁶⁰ he allows for some extraordinary providence in this period. However, his point is that normal providence was the characteristic of the creation period and this certainly implies that this period has an era-perspective.¹⁶¹ A closer reading of the creation account in Genesis 1:1–2:3 reveals that it is more accurate to say that the Creation Week is governed by extraordinary providence while, concomitantly, establishing the conditions in the created order so that it could begin to operate according to normal providence.

After God’s initial creation of the heavens and the earth in Genesis 1:1, the Spirit of God is also pictured in verse 2 as conserving and guiding this inanimate creation. Not only does God’s direct creative work show extraordinary providence but also the Spirit’s moving over the earth’s watery surface suggests his supernatural work in preserving and directing creation. With God’s use of normal secondary causation in providence, every part of a multifaceted universe must be in place so that it can function without God’s continual miraculous intervention. “Whether it is,” according to Kruger, “the balance of gravity in our intricate solar system or the complex interdependence of the Earth’s ecosystem, it is essential that all parts be in place in order for them to operate effectively.”¹⁶² Therefore, in contrast to the framework view that has an era of creation characterized by normal providence, my point is that the literal Creation Week was characterized by extraordinary providence, both by direct creation¹⁶³ and by the Spirit preserving the creation intact, and that during this week the conditions for the earth to operate according to normal providence were being established in such a way that at

the end of this week the earth would be ready to effectively operate in ordinary providence.

Defending extraordinary providence from progressive revelation

The overall tenor of progressive revelation opposes this thesis of the framework since God has not limited himself in biblical history to work exclusively through ordinary providence. While God used extraordinary providence in the Flood, such as sending rain upon the earth 40 days and nights and breaking open the fountains of the great deep, Noah and his family in ordinary providence built the ark and took care of the animals in the ark for about a year. Does this sound like God suspended normal providence because he used extraordinary providence with the Flood? In the case of the ten plagues on Egypt, should it be assumed that, because God miraculously intervened with each plague, God placed a moratorium on ordinary providence? When God brought the plague of total darkness on Egypt for three days, while the Israelites had light where they lived (Exodus 10:21–29), did God postpone the operation of normal providence with the Israelites, while he supernaturally imposed a judgment of darkness on the Egyptians? In addition, when framework defenders deny a literal interpretation of the Creation Week by maintaining that Genesis 2:5 denies God had miraculously dried up the ground on Day 3,¹⁶⁴ this clearly conflicts with God miraculously drying up the wet ground of the Red Sea when he divided it so that the Israelites, in ordinary providence, could cross it on dry ground (Exodus 14:21–22).¹⁶⁵ In the New Testament, Christ performed many miracles, while, in normal providence, he grew up and lived a life of perfect obedience fulfilling the demands of the Law. Since biblical history reflects a mixture of God's use of both extraordinary and ordinary providence, God used both in the Creation Week.¹⁶⁶ "Every creative act of God," as Grossman writes, "is presented as an extraordinary act of God. Furthermore, every miracle in the Bible occurs in the midst of ordinary providence and gives lie to the idea that the two cannot coexist."¹⁶⁷ Since the Creation Week included a mixture of extraordinary and ordinary providence, it was, therefore, not exclusively characterized by ordinary providence.

Defending extraordinary providence from the analogy of Scripture

While some framework proponents insist that the type of interpretation that I just presented about extraordinary providence preserving the created realm is only "exegetical presumption,"¹⁶⁸ I am convinced that this is a necessary exegetical implication from the context of Genesis 1:1–2:3, as well as the overall teaching of Scripture that has a bearing on the creation account.¹⁶⁹ Additionally, Irons and Kline claim that the historic literal day view is in conflict with the teaching of Genesis 2:5–6 and that those who take a literal day view should adopt a view that does not conflict with Genesis 2:5–6: "If we believe that Scripture is inspired, and therefore inerrant, we are required to adopt an interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3 that does not conflict with Genesis 2:5–6. The analogy of Scripture, as applied in this context, forces the Bible-believing interpreter to abandon a literalist reading of the creation account."¹⁷⁰ In effect, the analogy of Scripture, as it relates to Kline's original interpretation of Genesis 2:5, requires believers to jettison a literal interpretation of 1:1–2:3.

Besides the tenuous nature of their interpretation of Genesis 2:5, Irons and Kline's appeal to the analogy of Scripture is questionable. The hermeneutical principle known as "the analogy of Scripture," *analogia scriptura*, also at times referred to as "the analogy of faith," *analogia fidei*,¹⁷¹ says that Scripture interprets Scripture. Since Scripture is a self-authenticating special revelation from God, Scripture is a self-interpreting book.¹⁷² As such, "what is obscure in one passage may be illuminated by another. No single statement or obscure passage of one book can be allowed to set aside a doctrine which is clearly established by many passages."¹⁷³ In essence, *analogia scriptura* maintains that the totality of Scripture is the context and guide in interpreting specific passages of Scripture, such as Genesis 2:5.¹⁷⁴

This appeal to the analogy of Scripture as applied to Genesis 2:5 is tenuous.¹⁷⁵ According to the analogy of Scripture, Scripture's overall teaching on creation should have a bearing on a difficult text like Genesis 2:5. The overall context of 2:4–25 indicates that the context of verse 5 is Day 6 of the Creation Week.

Because Genesis 2:5 has been the subject of some interpretative ambiguities,¹⁷⁶ caution should be exercised in using Kline's novel interpretation to solve what is really only a post-Darwinian problem.¹⁷⁷ Yet, Kline, as well as his followers, maintains his interpretation of verse 5 is clearly taught: "The unargued presupposition of Genesis 2:5 is *clearly* the divine providence was operating during the creation period through processes which *any reader would recognize as normal in the natural world of his day*" (emphasis added).¹⁷⁸ If this "unargued presupposition" of verse 5 is so "clearly" recognized "as normal in the natural world" of any reader, why is this presupposition not found in orthodox commentaries before 1958? Since Kline has influenced some others about the legitimacy of his interpretation of verse 5, why is this not reflected in any major commentaries since 1958?¹⁷⁹ Evidently, verse 5 is not as clear as some think it is! Whatever else verse 5 teaches, it neither makes a precise statement nor clearly implies that Genesis 1:1–2:3 was characterized by normal providence. Furthermore, while

overlooking Kline's interpretation of 2:5, most commentators connect this verse with the formation of man in anticipation of the Fall in Genesis 3. In short, rather than using a novel interpretation of 2:5 to reinterpret 1:1–2:3, the overall message of Scripture about creation, including 1:1–2:3, should have substantive value with any interpretation of a difficult text like 2:5. This approach would be a legitimate use of the analogy of Scripture.

In concluding this examination of the framework's second thesis that the creation period was controlled by ordinary providence, the "unargued presupposition" of Genesis 2:5 does not demand that the Creation Week was exclusively controlled by ordinary providence. In contrast to the framework view, Genesis 2:5 provides the setting for the creation of man along with his placement in the Garden of Eden to tend its vegetation in anticipation of the Fall in Genesis 3. Briefly stated, Genesis 2:5 does not provide any evidence to abandon the traditional, literal interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3. Therefore, my conclusion is that the literal Creation Week was characterized by extraordinary providence and that during this week God miraculously established the conditions for the earth so that, at the end of the six days of divine creative activity, the earth would be able to operate in normal providence.

Unending nature of the seventh day

This premise of the framework pertains to the unending nature of the seventh day. If Day 7 is an unending day, it is not a literal, earthly day, but rather a figure that reflects a heavenly time of divine rest. Additionally, if Day 7 is a metaphor, then the first six days that are subsidiary to this day are also metaphorical days.¹⁸⁰ The seventh day, according to Kline, "had a temporal beginning but it has no end (note the absence of the concluding evening-morning formula). Yet it is called a 'day,' so advising us that these days of the creation account are meant figuratively."¹⁸¹ Two items support the unending nature of Day 7. First, while each of the six days of the Creation Week are concluded by the evening-morning formula, the description of Day 7 in Genesis 2:1–3 omits the evening-morning formula. As Blocher has noted, this omission "is deliberate. There can be no doubt about that in a text that has been composed with exact calculation."¹⁸² Second, Hebrews 4 confirms this understanding of Day 7 with the motif of an eternal Sabbath rest.¹⁸³

Kline mentions this argument in his 1958 article,¹⁸⁴ as has Irons in his paper "Framework interpretation: An exegetical summary."¹⁸⁵ Irons states the case like this: "The final exegetical observation that ultimately clinches the case [for the framework interpretation] is the unending nature of the seventh day."¹⁸⁶ Blocher¹⁸⁷ and Ross¹⁸⁸ also use this argument. More recently, this argument has become a key plank in Kline's more complex two-register cosmology argument.¹⁸⁹ Regardless of whether the extended nature of the seventh day is treated as a major thesis or as a supporting thesis for Kline's latter argument, framework advocates who follow Kline use some form of this thesis to support their position. Thus, it is necessary to address the two items that sustain this thesis.

The omission of the evening-morning formula on Day 7

Because the evening-morning conclusion is not explicitly used in Genesis 2:1–3, God's rest, according to the framework position, started on the seventh day and continues until today.¹⁹⁰ This omission indicates that Day 7 was an eternal rather than a literal day. "The seventh day," as Irons states, "is unique in that it alone lacks the concluding evening-morning formula, suggesting that it is not finite but eternal."¹⁹¹ According to Blocher, the open-ended nature of Day 7 is the "most simple and natural conclusion" that can be drawn from this deliberate omission.¹⁹² There are four reasons why an open-ended interpretation of Day 7 cannot be the "most simple and natural conclusion."

First, as noted in the first part of this critique, the evening-morning conclusion is one part of a fivefold structure that Moses employed in shaping the literary fabric for each of the days of the Creation Week.¹⁹³ None of the other parts of this fivefold arrangement are mentioned on the seventh day.¹⁹⁴ Moses used this fivefold pattern to represent, in a brief yet accurate manner, God's creation of the heavens, the earth, and all things therein in the space of six, sequentially numbered, literal days. By excluding the fivefold pattern, Moses' theological emphasis was to demonstrate in literary form that Day 7 was a day of cessation from divine creative activity.¹⁹⁵ This is to say the omission of the evening-morning conclusion is related to the omission of the other four parts of this fivefold pattern. Since the other four parts are not needed in that God's creative activity is finished, this concluding formula was not needed either. This overall structuring device was not utilized for the apparent reason that God is no longer creating after Day 6. Because Day 7 is a historic literal day, it is numbered like the previous six days.

Second, the evening and morning conclusion has another rhetorical function that is to mark a transition from a concluding day to the following day.¹⁹⁶ If the first week was completed, there was no need to use the evening-morning conclusion for transitional purposes. Pipa has precisely summarized this argument: "The

phrase ‘evening and morning’ links the day that is concluding with the next day. For example the morning that marks the end of day one also marks the beginning of day two. Thus, we do not find the formula at the end of the seventh day, since the week of creation is complete.¹⁹⁷

Third, the omission of the evening-morning conclusion as a support for seventh day being eternal is an argument from silence.¹⁹⁸ Genesis 2:1–3 neither explicitly state nor necessarily imply that Day 7 was eternal: “1Thus the heavens and the earth were completed בָּלָה, and all their hosts. 2By the seventh day [הַשְּׁבִיעִי בַיּוֹם] God completed [כָּלָה] His work which He had done, and He rested [שָׁבַח] on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. 3Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested [שָׁבַח] from all His work which God had created and made.” The translation of verse 2 by the NASB clearly indicates that God’s creative work did not cease on the seventh day but that it was finished “by the seventh day [הַשְּׁבִיעִי בַיּוֹם].”¹⁹⁹ Other English translations have a level of ambiguity in that God is seemingly presented as completing his creative work “on the seventh day”: “And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made” (KJV, this is essentially the same in NKJV, NRSV, ESV). This translation lacks clarity since God did not finish his creative work “on the seventh day.” This point is confirmed by Israel’s practice of gathering manna for the first six days of the week during their wilderness wanderings so that they could rest on the Sabbath, as indicated in Exodus 16:29–30: “‘See, the LORD has given you the Sabbath; therefore He gives you bread for two days on the sixth day. Remain every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.’ 30So the people rested on the seventh day.” Thus, Genesis 1 clearly has God creating the heavens, the earth, and all things therein in the space of six days. In other words, God’s creative work is finished on the sixth day, and not the seventh. Thus, בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי, in Genesis 2:2 is best translated with NASB as “by the seventh day.”²⁰⁰

Fourth, two narrative texts in Exodus dealing with the Sabbath ordinance rule out an open-ended interpretation of the Day 7. The first text is 20:11: “For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.” The second is 31:17: “for in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, but on the seventh day He ceased from labor, and was refreshed.” Based upon God’s week of creative activity, Israel was commanded, in both passages, to imitate his pattern by working six days and resting on the Sabbath (20:9–10; 31:15–16). Because both passages have been clearly understood as references to man imitating the divine pattern established in the first week of temporal history by working on six consecutive, normal days and resting on a literal seventh day,²⁰¹ framework advocates attempt to dodge the force of 20:11 by stating that even literalists have to take God being “refreshed” in 31:17 as an analogy, rather than a literal statement of God being refreshed. “If,” as Irons and Kline assert, “a nonliteral interpretation of the divine refreshment does not invalidate the Fourth Commandment, neither does a nonliteral interpretation of God’s seventh day. Thus, the objection from Exodus 20:8–11 completely loses its cogency, unless literalists insist on taking the divine refreshment of Exodus 31:17 literally.”²⁰² However, God’s response of delight to his cessation from creative activity does not indicate that the days of creation were nonliteral. Does something that relates to God’s being, which is certainly analogical since it pictures God as “refreshed,” indicate that the creation days were also anthropomorphic? To say that the anthropomorphism of divine refreshment precludes a literal interpretation of the days of creation is a comparison of apples and oranges.²⁰³ Since there is no inherent connection between God’s nature and the duration of his creative activity, the real issue focuses on whether Scripture affirms that God created on heavenly or earthly time. With a proper use of the analogy of Scripture, Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 unequivocally indicate that God did not create on heavenly time, but on earthly time. He created the universe in six, sequentially arranged, normal days. Both passages use an adverbial accusative of time (“in six days”). This grammatical construction indicates the duration of God’s creative activity by stating how long it occurred, “during six days.”²⁰⁴ This construction, as Benjamin Shaw has correctly noted, “implies both that the days were normal days, and that the days were contiguous. Thus, the ‘dayness’ of the six days, as well as the seventh, is essential to the meaning of the Sabbath commandment. It is not simply analogy—God rested one period after six periods, so in a similar way we rest one day after six of work. Rather, because God made the six days and the seventh, we work the six days and rest the seventh.”²⁰⁵ Therefore, the biblical evidence demands the Day 7 of the Creation Week was a literal day.

A literal interpretation of the seventh day is also consistent with the employment of two verbs in verses 1–2, “completed,” כָּלָה (verses 1, 2), and “rested,” שָׁבַח (verses 2, 3), and the divine pronouncement of blessing on the seventh day. Twice in verses 1–2, Moses stated God “completed,” כָּלָה,²⁰⁶ his work of creation. By utilizing the passive Pual form of כָּלָה in verse 1, the agent of creation is not specifically given; however, the agent of creation, God, as subject of the active Piel stem of כָּלָה, is specified in verse 2. The verb כָּלָה is used 17 times in the Old Testament, with two uses in the Qal stem, 14 in the Piel (with one of these in Genesis 2:2), and only one in the Pual (Genesis 2:1). This verb has two general nuances: to “destroy,” “consume,” “use up,” or to “bring to an end,” “finish.”²⁰⁷ In this context, כָּלָה has the clear nuance of bringing to an end. In commenting on these two nuances,

Hamilton has stated: “The context offers no reason to apply the first nuance [destroy] to Genesis 2:1–2. The point made by this verb is that the universe is no longer in a process of being created.”²⁰⁸ The nuance of bringing to completion indicates that, as of the separately enumerated, seventh day, God’s preceding six days of Creation were finished.²⁰⁹

Additionally, “rested,” *נָשָׁב*, is used twice in verses 2–3. Though *נָשָׁב* is translated as “rest” in most English versions (NASB, ESV, NIV, TNIV, KJV, NKJV, HCSB, NLT), it may also be translated as “ceased,” with the NET BIBLE.²¹⁰ Because “sabbath,” *שַׁבָּת*, is cognate with this verb,²¹¹ it is not surprising that most versions translate this as “rested” in verses 2–3. If this translation is followed, it must not be taken that God had to renew his strength.²¹² This type of understanding would be a theological abomination. In the context of Genesis 1–2, “rest,” *נָשָׁב*, unmistakably means to “cease.” Wenham has noted that *נָשָׁב* has three related nuances: “to cease to be,” “to desist from work,” and “to observe the sabbath.” It is clear that the second sense is central here.²¹³ The nuance of desisting from work specifically refers to “the cessation of creative activity.”²¹⁴ This verb is used with the same sense of cessation from activity in Joshua 5:5: “Again Pharaoh said, ‘Look, the people of the land are now many, and you would have them cease [*נָשָׁב*] from their labors!’” Cessation of talking is found in Job 32:1: “Then these three men ceased [*נָשָׁב*] answering Job.” Thus, the concept of cessation is a significant element in the semantics of *נָשָׁב*, and it is specifically the required sense in Genesis 2:2–3.²¹⁵ Gentry has made this very point: “In Genesis 2:2 Moses declares simply that God ceased his creative process. And he ceased it at a particular moment in time, that is, on *that* particular day. In fact, God does not ‘rest’ from *all* labor, for he ‘made’ (*עָשָׂה* [sic], *asah*) coats of skins for Adam and Eve (Genesis 3:21). He does permanently cease from creating the world, but not from all temporal creative activity.”²¹⁶

Finally, the seventh day must be a literal day because God blessed and sanctified it. If the seventh day is unending, this means that not only did God bless and sanctify it, but he also, on the same unending day, cursed the earth with the Fall of Genesis 3. From a theological perspective, this is questionable. “We must assume,” as John Whitcomb has astutely observed, “that the seventh day was a literal day because Adam and Eve lived through it before God drove them out of the Garden. Surely, he would not have cursed the earth during the seventh day which he blessed and sanctified.”²¹⁷

Therefore, the omission of the evening-morning conclusion on Day 7 does not imply that this day was unending. The omission suggests that, since Day 7 was a cessation from divine creative activity, it was substantively different from the preceding six days that were characterized by divine creativity. Further, since Day 7 did not involve a transition to another day of creative activity, there was no need to say “and there was evening and there was morning, the *seventh* day.” Day 8 was not a day of divine creation; it could not have been characterized as a day of extraordinary providence. On Day 8, the created order was fully functioning according to normal providence and Adam and Eve began their divinely given responsibility of cultivating and maintaining the Garden of Eden. Genesis 2:1–3 has no implication that the seventh day is an eternal day. Finally, Genesis 2:1–3 explicitly affirms that God ceased his creative activity as of a normal, literal day, as reflected by “day,” *יּוֹם*, being qualified by the ordinal number “seventh,” *שִׁבְעִי* (Genesis 2:2, 3), and as it is part of an uninterrupted sequence of days.²¹⁸ How is this literal interpretation of Day 7 to be harmonized with Hebrews 4 where God’s eternal Sabbath rest is seemingly equated with Genesis 2:2?

The motif of God’s rest in Hebrews 4

Some framework proponents equate God’s eternal Sabbath rest of Hebrews 4 with the seventh day of the Creation Week. As Irons and Kline state this argument: “One might be tempted to assume that the seventh day ended, whereas God’s rest continues eternally. But the author of Hebrews equates the two According to this inspired New Testament commentary [Hebrews 4:4, 9–10] on Genesis 2:2, the seventh day itself is equated with the Sabbath rest that awaits the people of God. And this Sabbath rest is an ongoing, eternal reality Therefore, God’s Sabbath rest is clearly eternal.”²¹⁹ In contrast to the framework view, the eternal rest in Hebrews 4 cannot be equated with Day 7 of the Creation Week for three reasons.

Initially, this equation of Hebrews 4 with Genesis 2:2 is only legitimate if Genesis 2:1–3 implies that Day 7 was unending. Since, as just argued, Genesis 2:1–3 neither explicitly affirms nor necessarily implies that Day 7 was an unending day, this interpretation is invalid. Hebrews 4 never states that the seventh day of the Creation Week is an unending day.²²⁰ In actuality, the use of Hebrews 4 to prove that the seventh day in Genesis 2:1–3 is an ongoing day assumes what needs to be demonstrated. In Hebrews 4:3–11, the author cites Genesis 2:2 and Psalm 95:7–11 as a warning against unbelief. The passage is a call to persevere in the faith. If one does not persevere, he will not enter into God’s eternal rest. The eternal rest presented in Hebrews is based on an analogy with God’s creative rest in Genesis 2:1–3. The author of Hebrews uses the Mosaic omission of the evening-morning conclusion as a type patterned after God’s eternal rest.

Moreover, in Hebrews 5:6–10 and 7:1–4, the author of Hebrews uses Melchizedek’s lack of a genealogical record in Genesis 14 and the omission of his death in Scripture as a type of Christ. Scripture’s silence about Melchizedek’s family background and death serve as an archetype for the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ.²²¹ Just like it is invalid to repudiate the historical reality of Melchizedek’s ancestral background and death based upon the absence of these two items in Hebrews, so it is illegitimate on this foundation to reject the historical reality of a literal seventh day in Genesis 2:1–3.²²²

Finally, the actual kind of rest in Genesis 2:2–3 is completely different than the rest in Hebrews 4:3–11. The rest of Genesis 2:2–3 is a cessation from divine creative activity. Only the Creator can cease from that activity. It is absolutely impossible for the creature to experience that cessation. However, the Sabbath-rest of Hebrews 4:3–11 is a rest that the people of God actually experience. Therefore, the “rest” in both contexts cannot be identical. The framework position assumes that the “rest” of Genesis 2 is identical with Hebrews 4. However, instead of assuming that the “rest” of Genesis 2 and Hebrews 4 are identical, framework advocates need to demonstrate this identity. Because of the Creator-creation distinction, the only possible relationship between Genesis 2:2–3 and Hebrews 4:3–11 is one of analogy and not identity. Consequently, Hebrews 4:3–11 establishes that God’s eternal rest is an analogy drawn from God’s rest on the literal seventh day in Genesis 2:1–3. As such, Hebrews 4 does not preclude Day 7 of the Creation Week as a historic literal day.

Neither the omission of the evening-morning conclusion for Day 7 nor the use of Genesis 2:2 in Hebrews 4 provide support for the seventh day of the Creation Week as an unending, nonliteral day. Rather than sustaining the framework’s third thesis, the omission of the evening-morning conclusion coupled with explicit references to God’s cessation of his work of creation and pronouncement of blessing indicates that the seventh day was a day that was a specific, literal day that concluded a series of six, consecutive literal days.

Two-register cosmology

With the goal of offsetting a literal interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3, Kline crafted out a new argument in 1996 that focused on using a two-register cosmology to further support the framework position.²²³ This argument states the created cosmos has two distinguishable registers, an upper and lower register. The upper register is the invisible, created dwelling place of God and his angels; and the lower register is the visible, created cosmos that extends from planet earth to the stars in the heavens. An analogical relationship exists between the upper and lower tiers. The lower register analogically replicates the archetypal upper register.²²⁴ Kline’s two-register cosmology is supported by his interpretation that both the “heavens” in Genesis 1:1 and the “seventh day” in 2:2–3 refer to upper register, heavenly time. The “heavens” in 1:1 and the “seventh day” in 2:2–3 form an *inclusio* arrangement. This *inclusio*, or “bracket” argument, suggests that the intervening six days also operate according to heavenly, figurative time, rather than earthly, literal time.²²⁵ What this means for the interpretation of the creation narrative is that Irons and Kline’s identification of five upper register elements in Genesis 1:1–2:3 is replicated by a comparable element in the lower register. According to this approach, the lower register element of the “earth” in verse 1 corresponds to the “heavens” in the same verse, the “deep” in verse 2 to the Spirit, the fulfillments on Days 1–6 to the fiat, man as God’s image bearer on Day 6 to the divine council on the same day, and the Sabbath ordinance of Day 7 to the divine rest.²²⁶ This analogous association between the five items of the upper and lower registers implies that the objective reality behind the chronological material in the creation narrative, such as the days of the Creation “Week” with their attendant evening-morning refrain, is the time associated with the upper register.²²⁷ Irons and Kline describe this two-register cosmology this way:

Each relationship is an example of earthly things being used as metaphors for upper-register realities. Our argument, then, is that the language of the days and “evenings and mornings” is not literal but an instance of lower-register terms being used metaphorically to describe the upper register. Just as the heaven where God dwells does not have literal clouds or a rainbow, so heavenly time is not literally measured by solar days or earthly evenings and mornings. Because of the analogical relationship between the two registers, Scripture employs the language of earthly time to speak of the progress of heavenly time.²²⁸

In simplified form, Irons and Kline’s argument is that just like there is a spatial/dimensional distinction between the realm of the heavens and the earth, so there is a temporal distinction between the heavenly realm and the earthly.²²⁹ Scripture unequivocally affirms that there is an absolute distinction between the Creator and creation, as Irons and Kline’s affirm²³⁰ and that there is some truth to their distinction between the heavens of God’s created realm and the earth (Genesis 1:1).²³¹ However, the problematic areas of Kline’s two-register cosmology relate to the lack of contextual clarity in Genesis 1:1–2:3 about his spatial/dimensional upper and lower registers and, more specifically, to the false dichotomy that his questionable two-register cosmology sets up between heavenly and earthly time.

A qualification of the two-register cosmology thesis

In reality, the framework's final thesis about a two-register cosmology is not so much a major premise supporting the framework but an explanation that integrates the preceding three major premises with Kline's overall understanding of biblical cosmology as a justification for taking the temporal elements of Genesis 1:1–2:3 as upper register time. Duncan and Hall have made this basic point: "The 'two-register cosmology' supplies a biblical explanation of the significance of the nonliteral nature of the time indicators in Genesis 1 The two-register cosmology is not evidence for the framework view but rather something that would be consistent with it if it were true. However, it could also be consistent with views other than the framework position."²³² Framework proponent Robert Godfrey even acknowledges that this fourth argument does not have the same significance as the other arguments: "Here we will simply note that while the 'two-register cosmology' is present in Scripture, it is not clear that it is a *helpful key* with reference to the days of Genesis 1. Genesis 1:2 focuses our attention on the earth, not on the heavenly realm. From that focus follow the days of Genesis 1, which are all about the creation of the visible world, including the creation of day itself" (emphasis added).²³³

Irons and Kline themselves agree that the two-register cosmology is an explanation to justify a metaphorical understanding of the temporal elements in Genesis 1:1–2:3, rather than an exegetical supporting argument: "Taken together the two triads and the 'because it has not rained' argument are sufficient to show that the framework interpretation lays claim to a solid exegetical foundation. However . . . two-register cosmology *explains the significance* of the nonliteral nature of the time indicators in Genesis 1 within the overall cosmological teaching of Scripture" (emphasis added).²³⁴ Briefly stated, Kline's two-register cosmology is more of a synthesis of his preceding theses with an explanation from Kline's understanding of biblical cosmology to justify the metaphorical nature of the temporal elements. The substance of Kline's two-register cosmology rises or falls on the substance of the first three major premises addressed in this two-part critique. If the three theses are unconvincing, then the two-register cosmology is also not a credible justification for the time indicators of Genesis 1:1–2:3 to serve as metaphors for upper register time. Since this two-part critique has responded to each of the framework's three theses, my concluding objective is to demonstrate that there is no biblical distinction between heavenly and earthly time.

Time indicators and metaphorical language

According to framework defenders, the time indicators are either anthropomorphisms or metaphors used as references to a divine time schedule.²³⁵ For example, Blocher has referred to the Creation Week as an "anthropomorphic expression,"²³⁶ and N.H. Ridderbos described "creation in six days" as an "anthropomorphic mode of expression."²³⁷ Ross sees the temporal indicators as metaphors or analogies.²³⁸ Returning to Irons and Kline's reputed five upper register elements in Genesis 1:1–2:3 that have corresponding parts in the lower register of earth, they describe this relationship as being fundamentally analogical: "The upper register is an archetype, and the lower register is an analogical replica of the upper register."²³⁹ As just noted, their argument, therefore, is that the use of days, evenings, and mornings in the creation account are earthly metaphors that describe figurative, heavenly time.²⁴⁰ If the time indicators related to the creation account, such as day, evening and morning, can be proven to be figurative as framework proponents contend, Genesis 1:1–2:3 is a nonchronological, topical account.

However, the framework's identification of the specified time markers in the creation account as metaphors is inconsistent with the use of these same temporal expressions in other Old Testament narratives. As has been argued in the first part of this critique, the 55 uses of *waw* consecutive in Genesis 1:1–2:3 demonstrate that this pericope is clearly a narrative prologue that introduces the narrative of Genesis.²⁴¹ It was further shown that the singular "day," יום, "day," when not part of a compound grammatical construction, is invariably used in the Old Testament for literal days.²⁴² Again, when the singular "day," יום, has a numeric qualifier and is part of a sequential scheme, which occurs in two other Old Testament narratives, "day," יום, is a literal day and is set apart from the other numbered days in the sequential scheme.²⁴³ In addition, "evening" and "morning" are used 19 times in the Old Testament, excluding six uses in Genesis 1, and 38 times without "day," יום. In each case, "evening" and "morning" refer to literal days.²⁴⁴ The Old Testament evidence clearly shows that the specific time markers used in Genesis 1:1–2:3 are undeniably used to refer to literal, earthly time in all other contexts.

How is the literal view of the Creation Week to be harmonized with the anthropomorphism of God's rest in Genesis 2:2–3 and Exodus 20:11, as well as God being "refreshed" in Exodus 31:17? Is God's formation of man out of the dust of the ground in Genesis 2:7 another anthropomorphism? My argument in supporting a literal interpretation of the Creation Week does not deny that the normal use of language includes the use of figures of speech such as anthropomorphisms. Since God is the infinite Creator and man the finite creature,

God has condescendingly given special revelation about himself to those created in his image. Of necessity, the infinite Creator would need to use analogies to convey truth about himself to man. Additionally, since the infinite Creator knows everything originally and exhaustively, including the use of human language, he has accommodated himself to use the medium of human language with its various metaphors in such a way that he truthfully and accurately conveys his special revelation to his image bearers. This suggests that, when God uses an anthropomorphic analogy to describe himself, there is some point of comparison made about his person or nature so that man can comprehend the analogy. To recognize that language used by God's image bearers contains metaphors and anthropomorphisms is not incompatible with a literal interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3 since the goal of a literal hermeneutic is to interpret a given text the way it was originally written. And this task is accomplished through a historical and grammatical hermeneutic which interprets literal expressions literally and figurative expressions figuratively. As such, a literal hermeneutic recognizes the use of metaphors and anthropomorphisms; however, it also recognizes that when a text has the marks of a literal narrative, it interprets the text literally. The traditional view of Genesis 1:1–2:3 has been the literal interpretation.²⁴⁵

In Genesis 2:7 God's formation of man from the dust of the ground uses a verb that elsewhere refers to a potter's activity ("formed," *יצר* formed). God directly created Adam at a specific time on Day 6 from the dust of the ground.

God's rest in Genesis 2:2–3 does not mean that God was exhausted and needed rest to rejuvenate himself. The reference to God's rest is clearly anthropomorphic. As has already been noted, the comparison with God's rest is to show that God had ended his week of creative activity. God's rest, cessation from creative work, in verses 1–3 is the foundation upon which the fourth commandment in the Decalogue is based: "For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy" (Exodus 20:11). God did his creative work on Days 1–6 and ceased from his work on Day 7. The point of this command is for man to shape his weekly schedule to conform to the first week in temporal history (Genesis 1:1–2:3), rather than God having shaped his week of creative activity to conform to man's work week. What does this suggest about narrative in Genesis 1:1–2:3? At the minimum, Weeks states, "there has to be some sort of divine activity which man can imitate. Further than that, it has to be an activity that is adequately represented by a pattern of six days of work and one of rest. Here the framework theory is shown to be untenable. For it alleges that the seven days of Genesis 1 are only a framework to describe events. God's activity did not have that form. How then could man imitate God's activity in the weekly cycle if God's activity was not originally as described in Genesis 1?"²⁴⁶

This interpretation of God's rest indicates that, at the end of the Creation Week, God ceased from his creative activity, while necessarily continuing to work in providence. However, the problem with this interpretation, according to framework supporters, is that it does not explain God being "refreshed" in Exodus 31:17: "For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, but on the seventh day He ceased from labor, and was refreshed."²⁴⁷ Since God needs neither rest nor refreshment, both expressions are anthropomorphisms. However, framework advocates maintain that for any literalist to recognize this point is to concede that God speaks analogously: "Literalists must admit that the command is still valid because there is an analogy between God's rest and man's, even if there is not exact identity But if the literalists recognize that the nature of the rest is not identical to man's, why not recognize the same thing with respect to the duration of the rest? If the nonliteral interpretation of the divine refreshment does not invalidate the Fourth Commandment, neither does a nonliteral interpretation of God's seventh day."²⁴⁸ Irons and Kline's argument is that if "refreshed" is an analogy, and clearly not equating man's refreshment with God's, then the temporal statements in both Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 must also be an analogous. Unfortunately, this is an invalid comparison of apples and oranges. "We know," as Pipa unmistakably avers, "God needs no rest so we look for the comparison. The phrase expresses the great delight God took in contemplation of his handiwork."²⁴⁹ In the final analysis, anthropomorphisms are used in Scripture to describe God's person and nature; however, there are no clear examples of anthropomorphisms used to describe days, evenings, or mornings, unless Genesis 1:1–2:3 is the exception.

A false dichotomy between heavenly and earthly time

Kline's framework position argues that as there is a spatial/dimensional distinction between the heavenly upper tier and the earthly lower tier so there is also a temporal distinction between the heavenly and earthly registers. This two-register cosmology "demonstrates that while the days are not ordinary solar days,²⁵⁰ neither are they simply a literary figure having no referential connection to objective reality because they are as real as the upper register of which they are a part."²⁵¹ Kline's two-register cosmology, which he claims provides an "umbrella" under which his earlier arguments can be subsumed,²⁵² gives an answer to a charge that Young had perpetuated from G. C. Aalders. In responding to Noordtzijs figurative days in Genesis 1, Aalders charged

that Noordtzij's figurative understanding of the days in Genesis 1 had no reality behind the figure.²⁵³ Kline's two-register view of reality seemingly provides an answer to this claim;²⁵⁴ however, there are two reasons why identifying the objective reality behind the creation days cannot be heavenly upper register time.

First, the basis for Kline's analogous relationship between the two temporal schemes is tenuous. Irons and Kline's identification of five spatial/dimensional upper register elements that are replicated in the lower register raises questions at each point of correspondence. Initially, verse 1 does not say that God created "the invisible realm of the divine Glory and angelic beings."²⁵⁵ While it is certainly true that the Creator, the uncaused Being, formed the realm of the created, which includes visible and invisible, verse 1 does not equate the heavens with an invisible realm and the earth with a visible realm. Verse 1 simply indicates that God created the initial substance that comprises the entire universe. This was the beginning of the space and time continuum. Over the course of the following five days of creative activity, God would bring his initial creation to completion with his focus on earth where his image bearers were to reside. Even the sun, moon, and stars created on Day 4 have some connection with the earth and its inhabitants. The point is that the corresponding relationship between the heavens and earth in verse 1 does not have the clarity that Irons and Kline maintain. Can an analogous relationship exist between the so-called heavenly, invisible realm and the visible earth, when the text does not specify that the heavens in verse 1 be clearly identified with the invisible realm? Moreover, the relationship between the Spirit and the "deep" in verse 2 is unconvincing. The focus of verse 2 is unambiguously on the earth and not the supposed upper register.²⁵⁶ Does this verse or any other indicate that the reference to the Spirit in verse 2 is contextually connected with the upper register? How does this correlate with the Spirit's immensity and omnipresence? Rather than taking the Spirit's moving over the surface of the deep as a reference to an analogous relationship between the upper and lower register, it would be preferable to say that the omnipresent Spirit was preserving God's just-created, unformed and empty, water-covered earth. While Genesis 1:1–2:3 emphasizes God's transcendence, 1:2 also says something about his immanence.²⁵⁷ In addition, though framework advocates recognize the fiat-fulfillment scheme in Days 1–6, their focus on the fiats ("let there be" or an equivalent) occurring in the upper register and corresponding fulfillments ("there was," "it was so" or a corresponding expression) in the lower register²⁵⁸ says something the text of Genesis 1:1–31 does not say. The eternal God himself, without any hint that he dwells in the upper, invisible realm, spoke the fiats. Rather than the relationship between fiat and fulfillment being simply one of analogy, the textual focus in verses 1–31 is one of cause and effect. The self-existent triune God, who cannot be confined to the created realm, whether visible or invisible, actually spoke his creative activity (fiat), and his fiat was immediately and effectively accomplished (fulfillment). Does the creation account's fiat-fulfillment scheme sound like an analogy reflecting a two-tiered view of the created cosmos? In reality, Genesis 1:1–2:3 suggest a two-tiered view of Creator and creation, but not a two-layered spatial/dimensional upper and lower registers within the created order. The framework's spatial/dimensional relationship is not explicitly taught in Genesis 1:1–2:3.

Furthermore, Irons and Kline's analogous relationship between the divine council of God deliberating with his angels in Genesis 1:26 ("Let Us make") and man being "created in the image not only of God but also of the judicial council which is a central feature of the upper register"²⁵⁹ is misleading. According to Irons and Kline, "man is a lower-register counterpart to the judicial authority of God and His angels in the upper register."²⁶⁰ Though their correlation of "Let Us" in verse 26 with God addressing an angelic host is accepted by a number of commentators, many commentators take a dissenting view.²⁶¹ Irons and Kline's identifying the image of God as including God's judicial council with angels has far less support from commentators.²⁶² Because of the Creator-creation distinction, there is an analogous relationship between God and man. What is questionable is the connection of God who along with his angels dwells in the upper register and man as their lower register counterpart. Biblically speaking, man is not made in the image of God and his angels who dwell in the upper register. Man is in the image of God (Genesis 1:26, 27, 9:6).

Finally, Day 7 does not clearly indicate that it is an ongoing day. Since Day 7 has been taken by some to be an ongoing period, Day 7 in the framework view segues from a spatial/dimensional upper and lower register to a temporal distinction. "If the seventh day," according to Irons and Kline, "was unending and eternal, it certainly cannot be an ordinary, lower-register day. But if the seventh day is an upper-register day, the entire week of which it is an integral part must be an upper-register 'week' as well."²⁶³ As I have previously argued, the evidence from Genesis 2:2–3 and Exodus 31:17 does not support interpreting Day 7 of Genesis 2:1–3 as an ongoing day. I also further contended that the omission of the "evening-morning" conclusion in verses 1–3 is an argument from silence; and the appeal to Hebrews 4 is invalid because it assumes what needs to be proven.

Consequently, the five areas of spatial/dimensional correspondence between the heavenly and earthly registers raise a number of questions. Two concluding items give me pause with Kline's two-register cosmology. To begin with, Irons and Kline's spatial/ dimensional dichotomy between the realms of the heavens and the earth

allows for God to be confused with the localized manifestations of his being and operations in the space-time continuum.²⁶⁴ The Creator in Genesis 1 is the triune God of Scripture who in his immensity and omnipresence manifests his presence uniquely in the invisible realm of the created, while also concurrently manifesting his presence in realm of the visible creation. The triune God manifests his presence in the invisible and visible heavens in a way that is distinct from his presence on earth.²⁶⁵ Because the framework view uses the two-register cosmology primarily to locate God in the upper register, the framework allows for confusion about God's immanence and omnipresence in Genesis 1:1–2:3.²⁶⁶ Moreover, this two-register grid is superimposed on the text of Genesis 1:1–2:3. This is to say, it is a grid that is not explicitly taught in Genesis 1:1–2:3. Therefore, the spatial/dimensional distinction between the upper and lower registers cannot be harmonized with a contextual understanding of Genesis 1:1–2:3.

Second, Kline's comparison between a spatial/dimensional two registers and a bifurcated temporal scheme is invalid for three reasons. At the start, Scripture neither explicitly teaches nor implicitly hints that there are two different temporal schemes in the created order. As we have seen, when the singular noun "day" is not part of a complex grammatical construction, it is consistently used in Scripture to refer to a normal day, or a portion thereof. The words evening and morning are used either independently or together in excess of 50 times in the Old Testament and these terms are never used to refer to anything other than literal time.²⁶⁷ Irons and Kline cavalierly dismiss the argument about the use of these lexical items as immaterial. In particular, they say, the lexical data related to "day," יוֹם, is "irrelevant. It misses the basic point that the critical question is not the meaning of yom but the nature (literal or metaphorical) of the total image of the week of days."²⁶⁸ Of course, their argument is that days are "part of an extended chronological metaphor. In all metaphors, words are employed to make a comparison between a literal referent and a metaphorical referent."²⁶⁹ Accordingly, literal, earthly days are used analogously in reference to figurative, heavenly days. "Terms properly used to denote lower-register units of time have been appropriated to refer to upper-register time. Because the Holy Spirit intentionally and quite fittingly employed terms with lower-register significance to describe upper-register realities beyond our ordinary experience. Thus, the word *yom* in Genesis 1 denotes an ordinary, lower-register, solar day. Yet it is being used metaphorically to describe an upper-register unit of time that is not defined by the earth's rotation with respect to the Sun [sic]."²⁷⁰ If the framework argument about the two-register time is so clearly intended by the Holy Spirit, why is it that the literal words "day," "evening" and "morning" are never used this way anywhere else in Scripture? Further, how is it that in the history of doctrine the Holy Spirit's clarity on this subject has been missed until the last half of the twentieth century?²⁷¹ Perhaps, the biblical teaching about the perspicuity of Scripture is also a metaphor!²⁷²

In reality, doctrine has not changed over the course of Church History. What has primarily changed in the last couple of centuries has been the way fallen man defines and uses science. Unfortunately, even professing evangelicals have been influenced by our world's insistence that "science" teaches an old earth model. While some evangelical scholars explicitly argue for an old earth cosmology,²⁷³ Kline has crafted out a modern exegetical reinterpretation of the creation account that allows for an old earth model. Though Irons and Kline claim that those who accept the framework view need not espouse a particular view about the age of the earth,²⁷⁴ this claim is hollow. Perhaps, the best that can be said about this claim is that the explicit argumentation used to support the framework position does not deal with the precise subject of the earth's age. Nevertheless, in actuality, three items imply that the "unargued presupposition" of the framework is an old earth model. At the outset, if Genesis 2:5 teaches that ordinary providence operated exclusively during the creation period of 1:1–2:3, this suggests that the creation period involved an extended period of time. This may be inferred from Kline's assertion: "Genesis 2:5 reflects an environmental situation that has obviously lasted for a while; it assumes a far more leisurely pace on the part of the Creator, for whom a thousand years are as one day. The tempo of the literalists—reconstructed cosmogony leaves no room for the era-perspective of Genesis 2:5."²⁷⁵ This certainly allows for an old earth model that is billions of years old.²⁷⁶ Furthermore, Kline has implied a presumed commitment to modern scientific opinion when he states that traditional interpretations of the creation account are guilty of creating a conflict between the Bible and science.²⁷⁷ In actuality, a literal interpretation of the Creation Week is in conflict with Kline's interpretation of Genesis 2:5.²⁷⁸ Finally, in a context affirming his acceptance of Scripture's authority about Adam's federal headship, Kline states the following: "In this article, I have advocated an interpretation of biblical cosmogony according to which Scripture is open to the current scientific view of a very old universe and, in that respect, does not discountenance the theory of the evolutionary origin of man."²⁷⁹ In the final analysis, an old earth model shaped by our evolutionary age provides the matrix in which the framework view has been conceived.²⁸⁰

If we did not live in this current age, could framework advocates even have dreamed of using "day," "evening" and "morning" as metaphors referring to heavenly time, as if in the realm of the Creator there is any temporal

sequence?²⁸¹ From my perspective the complex framework interpretation could not have been conceived because there is no scriptural reason to think that the temporal markers of Genesis 1:1–2:3 could be taken in any way other than a literal use. Since outside of Genesis 1:1–2:3, there is no support for the complicated framework view, the only way to conceive of this view is to say that the actual text of Genesis 1:1–2:3 has historically been misinterpreted and a new enlightened exegetical solution gives the correct interpretation. At the end of the day, there is no biblical reason, as Jordan incisively avers, “to think that heavenly time has a differently ticking clock from earthly time. There is no evidence in the Bible for such a notion, however it may be expressed.”²⁸²

In addition, some framework advocates falsely assume that a two-register spatial view of cosmology implies that time also has a twofold scheme. The framework position says that Genesis 1:1–2:3 has five spatial/dimensional upper register features that are analogously replicated by five comparable lower register elements. As their argument goes, from the inception in Genesis 1:1 to its conclusion in 2:1–3, the spatial/dimensional distinction between the upper and lower registers pervades the creation account. “At each point, the upper register has been replicated in a lower-register analogue, thus charging the lower register with meaning that will later be tapped in biblical images of the upper register. The use of lower-register language to describe the upper register is well established, not only in Scripture generally, but in the creation account specifically.”²⁸³ Since the two-register pattern is clearly seen in the spatial/dimensional scheme, Irons and Kline’s contention “is that the days and the evenings and mornings are to be explained as further examples of lower-register language being used metaphorically in description of the upper register.”²⁸⁴ My contention is that the temporal features of the creation account are not “further examples” of lower register metaphors describing upper register time. Not only does Scripture not imply that the temporal markers are used as metaphors to refer to heavenly time, but we have an example in Exodus 24:16–18 where God works within the time frame of normal days. According to Kline, the Spirit, who dwells in the upper register, is pictured in Genesis 1:2 as hovering over the lower-register earth. Since Deuteronomy 32:11 also used the irregular term hover (פָּרַח), this suggests that the theophanic cloud, “the Shekinah, the theophanic cloud of glory,”²⁸⁵ who led Israel through the wilderness, is identified as the Spirit of Genesis 1:2. This suggests “the Spirit of Genesis 1:2 represents the upper-register dimension, while the deep over which the Spirit hovers is the lower register.”²⁸⁶ When this same theophanic cloud appears in Exodus 24:16–18, this cloud moved according to earthly time. This is seen in verse 16 where the theophanic cloud covered Mount Sinai for six literal days and on the seventh literal day the LORD called to Moses from the midst of the cloud. In verse 18 Moses climbed the mountain and entered the cloud for “forty days and forty nights.” Because the numerous references to this passage assume a literal interpretation,²⁸⁷ this clearly has the Spirit of the upper spatial/dimensional register moving according to earthly, literal time.²⁸⁸ Though passages such as Colossians 1:16 clearly reflect that there is a distinction between the visible and invisible aspects in the spatial realms of creation, none of these passages indicate that there is a similar temporal distinction. When God manifested his presence in the theophanic cloud, it was “the heavenly realm,” as Jordan notes, “inserting into the earthly. But this means that God marches in earthly time along with his people . . . Thus, even if there were two kinds of time, God chooses to come into earthly time and move with it. And since Genesis 1 has to do with the lightening, forming, and filling of the earth, it has to do with earthly time.”²⁸⁹ Consequently, it is invalid to assume that a two-register spatial view of cosmology implies that time also has a twofold scheme.

As a final point, while Scripture is clear that God created the heavens, the earth, and all things therein, including the visible and invisible over the course of six literal days, the framework’s two-register cosmology is a grid that is superimposed on the creation account. Based upon Kline’s questionable spatial/dimensional distinction in Genesis 1:1–2:3, a dichotomy between an upper and lower time is erected. If the foundation is questionable, then the superstructure is also tenuous.

Summary and Conclusion

This article is the conclusion of a two-part critique of the framework interpretation of the creation account. In the first article, the framework position was summarized by developing four major theses of the framework position followed by an evaluation of the first thesis. The four major theses are (1) the figurative nature of the creation account, (2) the creation account controlled by ordinary providence, (3) the unending nature of the seventh day, and (4) the two-register cosmology. In evaluating the framework’s first thesis, three arguments were used to show that this thesis was at best tenuous. This concluding article has evaluated the remaining three theses.

In examining the framework’s second thesis, we investigated the immediate context of Genesis 2:5, the surrounding context of verses 4–25, and the wider context of Scripture. In terms of the immediate context of verse 5, we looked at the heading in verse 4 and the literary context of verses 5–7. While providing a link to the preceding pericope through its vocabulary, the use of הַלְלוּת in the heading of verse 4 indicates that that

the pericope it introduces was designed to expand on what had been addressed in the cosmogony of 1:1–2:3. Because 2:5 immediately follows verse 4 and is part of a syntactical unit that sets up the main narrative line that begins with the first *waw* consecutive in verse 7, verse 5 supports the complementary nature of verses 4–25, rather than serving as a hermeneutical grid, as Kline has argued, that reinterprets the cosmogony of 1:1–2:3. Additionally, the literary context of 2:5–7 shows that verses 5–6 give background information for the narrative sequence that is initiated in verse 7 with the first of 21 *waw* consecutives that develop the narrative thread in this unit. The contextual setting reveals that 2:4–25 is tightly connected to 3:1–24, that it describes the formation and fall of humanity in their paradisiacal environment in Eden, and that, finally, its contextual setting is Day 6 of the Creation Week. In keeping with this contextual setting, the references to geography and vegetation in verse 5 were taken restrictively, rather than globally, as references to the environment in Eden as it anticipated the Fall in 3:1–24.

In reference to the surrounding context in Genesis 2:4–25, our focus was on the development of the narrative sequence in verses 7–25. I demonstrated that the first *waw* consecutive in verse 7a (“formed”) begins the mainline narrative sequence that is continued by a tight sequence of five more *waw* consecutives in verses 7b–9. While this tight sequence is briefly interrupted by a series of circumstantial clauses in verses 10–14, the narrative sequence is resumed with a *waw* consecutive in verse 15a (“took”) and subsequently advances to its conclusion with 14 other *waw* consecutives in verses 15b–25. In identifying the uses of *waw* consecutive in verses 7–25, 17 were classified as examples of a sequential use, two as a resumptive (twice in verse 15), one as a pluperfect (verse 19a), and the final one as a consequential use (verse 25). The alleged problems for a sequential understanding of the narrative thread in verses 4–25 are three examples of temporal recapitulation: two resumptive uses in verse 15 and one pluperfect in verse 19a. It was demonstrated that the pericope of 2:4–25 is defined by the mainline sequence of 17 sequential *waw* consecutives. This shows that the narrative line in verses 4–25 is essentially a chronological account with three examples of *waw* consecutive reflecting temporal recapitulation and one example reflecting a consequential use.

Concerning the wider context of Scripture, we considered the framework’s dismissal of extraordinary providence in the creation narrative. With this examination, I demonstrated that the framework’s dismissal of extraordinary providence is in conflict with 1:1–2:3, with the overall tenor of Scripture as it relates to miracles, and with a proper understanding of the analogy of Scripture. Initially, a closer look at divine providence in the creation week revealed that this period was characterized by extraordinary providence and that during this period God established the conditions so that at the end of this week the earth could fully function according to ordinary providence. Additionally, the “unargued presupposition” of verse 5 that demands that God worked exclusively through ordinary providence in the creation account was found to be unconvincing since God has not limited himself to work exclusively through ordinary providence in biblical history. Finally, the appeal to the analogy of Scripture with Genesis 2:5 was found questionable. Rather than using a recent questionable interpretation of a difficult text like 2:5 to reinterpret 1:1–2:3 as a nonliteral text, Scripture’s overall message about creation, including 1:1–2:3, should have the major interpretative force in understanding a difficult text like 2:5.

The evaluation of the third thesis demonstrated that neither the omission of the evening and morning conclusion nor the use of Genesis 2:2 in Hebrews 4 furnished unequivocal support for the seventh day being an unending, figurative day. In contrast, the omission of the evening and morning conclusion, along with explicit reference to God’s cessation of creative activity and his specific blessing on Day 7, shows that this day was a specific, literal day that concluded the first literal week in the realm of the creation.

In assessing the fourth thesis, the framework’s argument is that as there is a spatial/dimensional upper and lower register so there is also a temporal upper, heavenly, and lower, earthly register. It was argued that the analogous relationship between heavenly and earthly time was faulty because the basis of the comparison is unconvincing. The framework’s five points of contact in Genesis 1:1–2:3 between the spatial/dimensional upper and lower registers cannot be contextually supported in this text. The spatial/dimensional upper and lower register was a grid read into the creation narrative and not an actual part of the textual substance of this narrative. As such, the comparison was fundamentally flawed. Furthermore, the bifurcation between heavenly and earthly time was questionable since Scripture never hints that there is twofold scheme to time; and when God works in the created realm, he operates according to the earth’s temporal scheme.

The theological and exegetical arguments used to support the framework interpretation have been set forth and evaluated. Rather than the exegetical evidence of Genesis 1–2, as well as the rest of Scripture, supporting the framework view, the evidence is consistent with the historic literal day interpretation of the creation account. The impetus for the framework view is an attempt to merge the biblical creation account to the modern scientific view of cosmogony. In this attempt, it stretches the creation account beyond where it fits as a straightforward

exegesis of Genesis 1:1–2:3. Such exegesis demands that we accept the narrative account of Genesis 1:1–2:3 as it describes God’s supernatural work in creating the universe in six, sequential, 24-hour days, followed by a 24-hour day of cessation from creative activity. Finally, rather than demonstrating a distinction between heavenly and earthly time, the creation account shows a distinction between the creature and the Creator who is not circumscribed the limits assigned to him by framework advocates.

Footnotes

1. McCabe, R. V., 2006. A critique of the framework interpretation of the creation account (Part 1 of 2). *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 11:63–133.
2. McCabe, R. V., 2007. A critique of the framework interpretation of the creation account (Part 1 of 2). *Answers in Depth* 2:17–42.
3. Ordinary providence is generally referred to simply as providence. For a discussion of providence, see Frame, J. M., 2002. *The doctrine of God*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, pp.274–88.
4. Kline, M. G., 1958. Because it had not rained. *Westminster Theological Journal* 20:145–157.
Others who follow Kline include:
Blocher, H., 1984. *In the beginning*. Trans. D. G. Preston. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, pp. 53, 56.
Futato, M. D., 1998. Because it had rained: A study of Genesis 2:5–7 with implications for Genesis 2:4–25 and Genesis 1:1–2:3. *Westminster Theological Journal* 60:2–10, 13–17.
Ross, M., 1999. The framework hypothesis: An interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3. In, Pippa, J. A. Jr. and D. W. Hall (eds.), *Did God create in six days?* Taylors, South Carolina: Southern Presbyterian Press, pp. 122–128.
Irons, L., and M. G. Kline, 2001. The framework view. In, Hagopian, D. G. (ed.), *The Genesis debate: Three views on the days of creation*. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press, p. 230.
Godfrey, W. R., 2003. *God’s pattern for creation*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, pp. 52–53.
However, a number of framework interpreters do not use Genesis 2:5 to support their interpretation of the literary framework in Genesis 1:1–2:3. See
Hamilton, V. P., 1990. *The book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17, new international commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp. 53–56.
Hughes, R. K., 2004. *Genesis: Beginning and blessing, preach the Word*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, pp. 24–27.
Waltke, B. K. and C. J. Fredricks, 2001. *Genesis: A commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 56–58, 73–78.
Wenham, G. J., 1987. *Genesis 1–15, word biblical commentary*. Waco, Texas: Word, pp. 19, 39–40.
Youngblood, R. F., 1991. *The book of Genesis*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, pp. 24–33.
5. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 25–27.
6. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 230.
7. Extraordinary providence is generally referred to as miracle. For a discussion of miracle, see Frame, Ref. 3, pp. 241–273.
8. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 25–26.
9. Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 149–150.
10. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 230.
11. Kline, Ref. 4, p. 154. So also Godfrey, Ref. 4, pp. 52–53.
12. Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 1–13.
13. Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 13–17. So also Ross, Ref. 4, pp. 122–128.
14. McCabe, Ref. 1, p. 26, n. 38.
15. In addition to Kline, Ref. 4. See also Kline, M. G., 1996. Space and time in the Genesis cosmogony. *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 48:2–15.
16. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 13.
17. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 12.
18. Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 2–5.
19. Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 12–13.
20. Futato notes that two *waw* consecutives in verse 15 (“took” and “put”) and one in verse 19 (“formed”) cannot be taken chronologically.
Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 10–12.
Irons and Kline also reference the two *waw* consecutives in verse 15.
Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 222.
They additionally mention that וַיִּבְרָא (“formed”) in Genesis 2:19 is an example of temporal recapitulation, a non-chronological use of *waw* consecutive.
Irons, L. and M. G. Kline, 2001. The framework reply. In, Hagopian, D. G. (ed.), *The Genesis debate: Three views on the days of creation*. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press, pp. 282–283.
21. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 11.

22. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 10.
23. Kline, Ref. 4, p. 152. So also Godfrey, Ref. 4, pp. 52–53.
24. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 234.
25. In this paper, as in the first part of this series, I use the expression *waw* consecutive as a simplified expression to refer to a specialized form of the Hebrew conjunction *waw* that is prefixed to an imperfect form, a derivative of the archaic preterite. As far as actual Biblical Hebrew grammar is concerned, there are actually two types of *waw* consecutives: *waw* consecutive prefixed to an imperfect/preterite form and *waw* consecutive prefixed to a perfect form. The most common of these two forms is the first kind, *waw* consecutive plus the imperfect/preterite (this is also referred to as *waw* conversive, *waw* inersive, relative *waw*). This type of *waw* consecutive is generally used in narration connected with past time. The second type of *waw* consecutive is joined to the perfect aspect. This may be used in reference to future time. For a brief discussion of these two forms, see Lambdin, T. O., 1971. *Introduction to biblical Hebrew*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 107–109. In addition, *waw* consecutive plus the perfect also commonly carries over a temporal situation presented in a preceding verb. See Waltke, B. K. and M. O'Connor, 1990. *An introduction to biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, pp. 502–504. In the book of Genesis, the *waw* consecutive attached to the imperfect/preterite is found 2,107 times, with 55 uses of it in Genesis 1:1–2:3, 21 uses in 2:4–25, and 34 in 3:1–24 (these statistics about the use of *waw* consecutive in Genesis are derived from my use of Accordance 7.03, OakTree Software, 2006, available at www.oaksoft.com. These statistics indicate two issues related to Genesis. First, Genesis is historical narrative. Second, many uses of *waw* consecutive in Genesis reflect a sequential advancement of the narrative. While *waw* consecutive is not always sequential, the majority of uses are sequential. For a presentation of the various uses. See Waltke, B. K. and M. O'Connor, 1990. *An introduction to biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, pp. 543–563. Chisholm, R. B. Jr., 1998. *From exegesis to exposition: A practical guide to using biblical Hebrew*. Grand Rapids: Baker, pp. 94–99. Arnold, B. T. and J. H. Choi, 2003. *A guide to biblical Hebrew syntax*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, pp. 83–87.
26. All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise noted, are taken from the 1995 edition of NASB. However, I have modified NASB's rendering of *b'yo'm*, בַּיּוֹם, from "in the day that," to "when." When the preposition *b'*, בְּ, is prefixed to the construct noun *yo'm*, יוֹם, and these words are followed by an infinitive construct, as is the case in this verse, this complex construction forms a temporal idiomatic expression that is more precisely translated in English as "when". For a discussion of this, see McCabe, R. V., 2000. Defense of literal days in the Creation Week. *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 5: 117–118.
27. Since the first *waw* consecutive in Genesis 2:7 ("formed") initiates a sequence of six successive *waw* consecutives in verses 7–9, we could extend our discussion to include verses 8–9. Depending on how the mainline narrative in verses 7–9 is integrated with the heading in verse 4a and thematic elements of this section, verses 4–9 could be divided into three paragraphs (verse 4a, verses 4b–7, verses 8–9 [so NIV and NLT] or verse 4, verses 5–7, verses 8–9 [so NET BIBLE]), two paragraphs (verses 4–7, verses 8–9 [so HCSB and NKJV], verse 4, verses 5–9 [so ESV], or verse 4a, verses 4b–9 [so NRSV] or even one paragraph [so NASB]). However, to establish the immediate context of Genesis 2:5, it is only necessary to see how verses 4–6 connect with verse 7. For a discussion of some of the intricacies associated with the development of this narrative unit. See Kempf, S., 1996. Introducing the Garden of Eden: The structure and function of Genesis 2:4b-7. *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 7: 35–43.
28. Kline, M. G., 1996. Space and time in the Genesis cosmogony. *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 48:11. Kline, M. G., 2006. *Kingdom prologue: Genesis foundations for a covenantal worldview*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, pp. 8–9. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 12.
29. Blocher, Ref. 4, pp. 53, 56.
30. Blocher, Ref. 4, pp. 31–32.
31. Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner, 1994–2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. Rev. Baumgartner, W. and J. J. Stamm, study ed., vol. 1, p. 411. Leiden: Brill (hereafter cited as HALOT).
32. Young, E. J., 1964. *Studies in Genesis one*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, p. 59.
33. Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, eds., 1972. *A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament*, reprint ed. Oxford: Clarendon, p. 410. Hereafter cited as BDB.
34. HALOT, Ref. 31, vol 2, pp. 1699–1700.
35. *New international dictionary of Old Testament theology and exegesis*, s.v. "וָיָדָה" by V. P. Hamilton, 2:459.
36. Walton, J. H., 2001. *Genesis, NIV Application Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 40.
37. In this paper, I consistently replace NASB's "generations" with "account" whenever הַדּוֹרוֹת is used as a heading. NASB's one exception to rendering הַדּוֹרוֹת as "generations" is Genesis 2:4, where it more precisely renders it as "account." Since the translators of NASB have rendered הַדּוֹרוֹת as "account" in this verse, I saw no need to modify this part of Genesis 2:4. My emendation of all the other translations of הַדּוֹרוֹת by NASB, when it is part of a heading, is consistent with the way the NET BIBLE and NIV have translated הַדּוֹרוֹת in Genesis.

38. Woudstra, M.H., 1970. The Toledot of the book of Genesis and their redemptive-historical significance. *Calvin Theological Journal* 5:187.
39. The chiasmic arrangement of Genesis 2:4 is discussed more fully in a following subsection, “Significance of *Tôledôt* in Genesis 2:4.”
40. *תולדות* is used 39 times in the Old Testament with 13 of its uses in Genesis. Of these 13 uses, 11 are part of a heading (Genesis 2:4, 5:1, 6:9, 10:1, 11:10, 27, 25:12, 19, 36:1, 9, 37:2) and 2 are not (Genesis 10:32, 25:13). Outside of Genesis, *תולדות* is used in the same formulaic heading in Numbers 3:1 and Ruth 4:18. In both of these cases, *תולדות* introduces a genealogy. I have derived these statistics about *תולדות* from Accordance 7.0.3.
41. For a citation of commentators who follow this interpretation along with his own preference for it, see Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 49.
For some recent supporters of this interpretation of the *תולדות* heading, see the citation of these supporters along with critique by Hamilton, Ref. 4, pp. 2–11.
Currid, J.D., 2003. *A study commentary on Genesis, volume 1: Genesis 1:1–25:18*. Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, p. 96.
Mathews, K.A., 1996. *Genesis 1–11:26, New American commentary*. Nashville: Broadman, pp. 26–41.
Ross, A.P., 1988. *Creation and blessing*. Grand Rapids: Baker, pp. 69–88.
Walton, Ref. 36, pp. 69–74.
Waltke and Fredricks, Ref. 4, pp. 17–21.
42. See Hamilton, Ref. 4, pp. 2–3.
43. For a critique of conservative scholars who take this approach. See Mathews, Ref. 41, pp. 32–35.
Hamilton, Ref. 4, pp. 9–10.
Some critical scholars have said that Genesis 2:4 is associated with two different documents: a Priestly source and a Yahwistic one. According to this debatable use of sources, verse 4a is associated with P and verse 4b with J. So Skinner, J., 1910. *A critical and exegetical commentary on Genesis, international critical commentary*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, pp. 39–41, 54–56.
For a refutation of this use of sources. See Cassuto, U., 1961. *A commentary on the book of Genesis: Part one—From Adam to Noah*. Trans. Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, pp. 96–99.
44. Currid, Ref. 41, p. 96.
45. Woudstra, Ref. 38, p. 187.
46. Young, Ref. 32, p. 59.
Pipa, J.A., Jr., 1999. From chaos to cosmos: A critique of the non-literal interpretations of Genesis 1:1–2:3. In, Pipa, J.A., Jr. and D.W. Hall (eds.), *Did God create in six days?* Taylors, South Carolina: Southern Presbyterian Press, p. 158.
47. Mathews, Ref. 41, pp. 33–34.
48. Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 35.
49. Mathews, Ref. 41, pp. 183–184. See also Stordalen, T., 1992. Genesis 2,4: Restudying a locus classicus. *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 104: 175–177.
50. Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 158.
Hess, R.S., 1990. Genesis 1–2 in its literary context. *Tyndale Bulletin* 41:152.
51. Blocher, Ref. 4, pp. 31–32.
52. Besides Cassuto’s refutation of an artificial division of this verse, Ref. 43. See Niccacci, A., 1994. Analysis of biblical narrative. In, Bergen, R.D. (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, pp. 183–184.
53. Instead of associating Genesis 2:4a with the P source and verse 4b with the J material, some critical scholars also take verse 4 as a unity. See Stordalen, Ref. 49, pp. 169–173,
Stordalen, T., 1992. Man, soil, garden: Basic plot in Genesis 2–3 reconsidered. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 53: 175–177.
54. The chiasm of this verse creates a tight unit that works against dividing this verse into two parts. Some translations, such as the NIV and NLT, subdivide Genesis 2:4 with the first half treated as a separate paragraph and the second half as a beginning for the following paragraph. The NET BIBLE does not subdivide verse 4 and treats it as a separate paragraph. NASB treats verse 4 as the first sentence that begins a paragraph that continues through verse 9. While some commentators follow subdividing verse 4 into two parts, there are commentators who are supportive of verse 4a introducing a new paragraph. A few of these are Kidner, D., 1967. *Genesis: An introduction and commentary, TOTC*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, p. 59.
Aalders, G. Ch., 1981. *Genesis*, 2 vols. Trans. W. Heynen, 2nd ed. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, vol. 1, pp. 81–82.
Mathews, Ref. 41, pp. 191–192.
Young, Ref. 32, pp. 60–61.

55. Pipa, Ref. 46 p. 158.
56. Currid, Ref. 41, p. 97. See also Cassuto, Ref. 43, pp. 87–88.
57. Blocher, Ref. 4, pp. 31–32.
58. For example,
Kline, Ref. 28, p. 11.
Futato, Ref. 4, p. 13.
59. So
Gentry, K. L. Jr., 2002. Rebuttal of the framework hypothesis. In, Gentry K. L. Jr, and M. R Butler (eds.), *Yea, hath God said: The framework hypothesis/six-day creation debate*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, pp. 89–90.
60. Ross, Ref. 4, p. 123.
61. Ross, Ref. 4, pp. 123–128.
62. So
Futato, Ref. 4, p. 12.
Kline, Ref. 28, p. 11.
63. See
Collins, C.J., 2006. *Genesis 1–4: A linguistic, literary, and theological commentary*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, pp. 132–134.
Collins, C.J., 1995. *Wayyiqtol* as ‘pluperfect’: When and why. *Tyndale Bulletin* 46:138–139.
64. Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 57.
65. This clause is introduced by the causal conjunction ׀.
66. As noted above, n. 25, *waw* consecutive plus the perfect may carry over a temporal nuance from a preceding verb. The last clause in Genesis 2:6 is an example of this. In this case, the *waw* consecutive plus the perfect ׀ַׁׁׁ, “and [used to] water” carries over an iterative sense from the preceding imperfect form ׀ַׁׁׁ, “[a mist] used to rise”. See Waltke and O’Connor, Ref. 25, pp. 502–504.
67. For a description of a simple conjunctive *waw* used circumstantially. See Arnold and Choi, Ref. 25, p. 147.
68. For example, Ross sees three circumstantial clauses, with the last clause of verse 5 serving as an addition to the preceding causal clause.
Ross, Ref. 41, p. 119. As does Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 193.
69. Tsumura, D., 2005. *Creation and chaos*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, pp. 78–80.
David Tsumura presents some of the difficulties with Genesis 2:5–6, while supporting the option that there are four coordinate circumstantial clauses.
70. Scullion, J.J., trans. 1984. *Genesis 1–11: A commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, p. 197. So also Von Rad, G., 1961. *Genesis*. Philadelphia: Westminster, vol. 1, pp. 74–75.
71. Hamilton, Ref. 4, p. 156.
Other interpreters who essentially follow this view include
Collins, C.J., 2006. *Genesis 1–4: A linguistic, literary, and theological commentary*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, p. 133.
Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 193.
Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 157.
Reyburn, W.D. and Fry, E. McG., 1997. *A handbook on Genesis*. New York: United Bible Societies, p. 60.
Ross, Ref. 41, p. 119.
72. So also
Andersen, F.I., 1974. *The sentence in biblical Hebrew*. New York: Mouton Publishers, p. 86.
Tsumura, Ref. 69, p. 80.
Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 57.
73. So
Niccacci, Ref. 52, p. 187.
Part of my objective with this paper is to develop the mainline narrative as carried along by the 21 *waw* consecutives in Genesis 2:4–25. In this regard, verses 7–9 should be connected. However, I recognize that the semantics of verse 7 provide linkage with verses 4–6. So, a case may be made that verses 4–7 form a distinct paragraph. So Kempf, Ref. 27, pp. 40–45. Because verse 8 shifts its emphasis to planting a garden and placing man in it, a case may be made that verses 8–9 form a new paragraph. My concern is that the *waw* consecutive is treated as the primary narrative line, rather than as a subsidiary line. See
Longacre, R. E., 1992. Discourse perspective on the Hebrew verb: Affirmation and restatement. In, Bodine, W.R., (ed.), *Linguistics and biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, pp. 178–179.
Andersen, F.I., 1987. On reading Genesis 1–3. In, O’Connor, M.P. and D.N. Freedman (eds.), *Backgrounds for the Bible*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, p. 141.
74. At this point, I am following
Niccacci, Ref. 52, pp. 187–188.

- While Genesis 2:10–14 may provide background information for the previous *waw* consecutives used in verses 7–9 or for the following *waw* consecutives that begin in verse 15, Niccacci has provided a reasonable explanation for verses 10–14 anticipating the following *waw* consecutives that resume the narrative sequence initiated with the first *waw* consecutive in verse 15.
75. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 34–37, especially nn. 74, 76.
76. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 1.
A primary purpose of Futato’s article is to complement Meredith Kline’s framework interpretation. Another related purpose is apparently to resolve what he considers to be an unwarranted “straining” to preserve a rigid chronological interpretation of Genesis 2:4–25,
Futato, Ref. 4, p. 11.
Is Futato’s “synoptic/resumption-expansion” grid for Genesis 2:4–25 derived strictly from exegesis? If he were not attempting to advance Kline’s framework position, would he have derived this approach for Genesis 2:4–25?
77. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 12.
78. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 2, n. 5.
79. For a description of the various uses of *waw* consecutive. See
Waltke and O’Connor, Ref. 25, pp. 547–554.
Arnold and Choi, Ref. 25, pp. 84–87.
80. For a discussion of the inadequacies with a pluperfect translation of the *waw* consecutive in verse 8, as translated in the NIV. See
Buth, R., 1994. Methodological collision between source criticism and discourse analysis. In, Bergen, R.D. (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, pp. 148–149.
Collins, C.J., 1995. *Wayyiqtol* as ‘pluperfect’: When and why. *Tyndale Bulletin* 46:140, n. 75.
81. Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 10–14.
82. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 12, n. 38.
In this note, Futato cites
Brichto, H.C., 1992. *Toward a grammar of biblical poetics: Tales of the prophets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 13–19 to support his point.
While Brichto presents the “synoptic/ resumptive” technique, with an acknowledgement that this is “imaginative thinking” and “speculation” (p. 16), and discusses it in relation to *waw* consecutives (pp. 16–18), Brichto’s example from 1 Samuel 3:3–7 is not the same as Genesis 2:7–9. In Brichto’s example his “flashback” is initiated by a clause begun with a *waw* conjunctive (a *waw* attached to a noun in 1 Samuel 3:3, “and [*waw*] the lamp of . . .”), rather than a *waw* consecutive. The digression begun in verse 3 is continued in verses 4–6 with nine *waw* consecutives. The difference between Brichto’s example and Futato’s is that Futato’s example has a *waw* consecutive initiating the synoptic flashback. It would have been helpful to see some examples of this “synoptic” *waw* consecutive in a series of uninterrupted *waw* consecutives that advance the mainline narrative thread like Genesis 2:7–9.
83. Collins, J.C., 1999. Discourse analysis and the interpretation of Genesis 2:4–7. *Westminster Theological Journal* 61:273, n. 19.
84. Niccacci, Ref. 52, p. 189.
85. Longacre, Ref. 73, p. 178.
86. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 57–62.
87. Dumbrell, W.J., 1997. *Creation and covenant*. Nashville: Nelson, pp. 35–36.
Dumbrell takes Genesis 2 as an exposition of 1:26–28.
88. For further support. See
Cassuto, Ref. 43, p. 91.
Kelly, D.F., 1997. *Creation and change*. Fearn, Great Britain: Mentor, p. 123.
89. See
Collins, Ref. 71, pp. 109–110.
90. Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 152–153.
Blocher, Ref. 4, pp. 53, 56.
Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 230–234.
Godfrey, Ref. 4, pp. 52–53.
91. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 230–232.
92. Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 145–157.
93. Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 149–150.
94. Duncan, J.L. III and Hall, D.W., 2001. The 24-hour response. In, Hagopian, D.G. (ed.), *The Genesis debate: Three views on the days of creation*. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press, p. 263. So also
Gentry, Ref. 59, p. 88.
Butler, M.R., 2002. The question of Genesis 2:5. In, Gentry, K.L. and M.R. Butler (eds.), *Yea, hath God said: The framework hypothesis/six-day creation debate*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, p. 102.
95. While a full discussion of Genesis 2:6 is not necessary for the argument of this paper, “mist” מִטָּה has been the subject of considerable discussion for over a century. Since this term is only used twice in the Old Testament, Genesis 2:6 and Job 36:27, and its etymological background is disputed, this allows for a level of ambiguity with this term’s semantics. This uncertainty

is reflected by comparing the gloss in BDB, “mist”, p. 15.

HALOT, “stream”, Ref. 31, vol. 1, p. 11. So also

Clines, D.J.A. ed., 1994–. *The dictionary of classical Hebrew*, 5 vols. to date. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, vol. 1, p. 118.

This same variation is also reflected in English translations: “mist” (KJV, NKJV, NASB, ESV), “streams” (NIV, TNIV, NRSV), “water” (HCSB, NLT), and “spring” (NET BIBLE). A number of scholars suggest that טַרְס is a stream that was fed from subterranean waters. So

Tsumura, Ref. 69, pp. 85–106.

Waltke and Fredricks, Ref. 4, p. 84.

Wenham, Ref. 4, pp. 58–59.

Thus, Hebrew lexicons and English translation take this difficult term either as “mist” or some form of “streams.” However, there is a third option that takes טַרְס as a “rain-cloud”. So

Kline, Ref. 28, p. 12.

Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 231–232.

Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 5–9.

Of the three options, the last one as “rain-cloud” is the most improbable of the options since no English translation or significant commentaries take טַרְס as “rain-cloud”. See

Butler, Ref. 94, pp. 110–120.

Though the first two options do not have enough evidence to draw an absolute conclusion, a reasonable case can be made to retain “mist” as a legitimate translation of טַרְס in Genesis 2:6. For support, see

Hasel, G. F. and Hasel, M. G., 2000. The Hebrew term *’ed* in Genesis 2, 6 and its connection in ancient near eastern literature. *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112:321–340.

96. Von Rad, Ref. 70, pp. 74–75.

Coats, G., 1983. *Genesis with an introduction to narrative literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, vol. 1, pp. 45–46.

For a listing of others who take this view. See

Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 57.

97. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 13.

Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 230–234.

Futato, Ref. 4, p. 12, no. 41.

Futato understands that Genesis 2:5 refers to Days 3b and 6b: “I understand Genesis 2:5 as having a global reference that would parallel the situation prior to Days 3b and 6b, i.e., before God created vegetation (Day 3b) and people (Day 6b).”

98. For Kline’s recognition of the sequence of vegetation preceding man in the creation account. See

Kline, Ref. 4, p. 150.

In another context, Kline rejects the RSV’s treatment of Genesis 2:4b–7 because it teaches that “man was created before vegetation”.

Kline, M. G., 1970. Genesis. In: Guthrie, D. and J. A. Motyer (eds.), *New Bible commentary*, 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 83.

With his recognition of vegetation preceding man in the creation account, Kline reflects an underlying assumption that the prevailing modern interpretation of natural revelation takes priority over a literal interpretation of the Creation Week: “Surely natural revelation concerning the sequence of developments in the universe as a whole and the sequence of the appearance of the various orders of life on our planet (unless that revelation has been completely misinterpreted) would require the exegete to incline to a not exclusively chronological interpretation of the Creation Week”.

Kline, Ref. 4, p. 157.

99. Irons and Kline refer to the last clause as a “parenthetical statement”.

Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 230.

While Futato does not relegate the last clause of Genesis 2:5 to a parenthetical level, his “highly structured topical” approach to Genesis 2:4–25 gives verse 5 more substance.

Futato, Ref. 4, p. 13.

Nevertheless, Futato’s approach is “imaginative,” to use Brichto’s description.

Brichto, Ref. 82, p. 16.

Can this type of approach be used to negate the sequential substance of the 21 *waw* consecutives, the backbone of Hebrew narrative, in Genesis 2:4–25? In my opinion, 17 of the 21 *waw* consecutives in Genesis 2:4–25 clearly communicate a sequential movement of the narrative, and this should have some level of hermeneutical priority over Brichto’s “imaginative” “synoptic/resumption-expansion,” along with Futato’s application of it to Genesis 2:4–25.

100. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 230.

101. Kruger, M. J., 1997. An understanding of Genesis 2:5. *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 11:107.

102. For example. See

Grudem, W., 1994. *Systematic theology: An introduction to biblical doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 302–304.

Ross, H. and Archer, G. L., 2001. The day-age response. In: Hagopian, D. G. (ed.), *The Genesis debate: Three views on the days of creation*. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press, pp. 273–274.

103. So

Collins, Ref. 71, pp. 121–122.

- Collins also refers to his understanding of Genesis 1:1–2:3 as “anthropomorphic” days.
- Collins, J. C., 1999. Reading Genesis 1:1–2:3 as an act of communication: Discourse analysis and literal interpretation. In, Pipa, J. A., and D. W. Hall (eds.), *Did God create in six days?*. Taylors, South Carolina: Southern Presbyterian Press, p. 146.
- Collins, J. C., 1994. How old is the earth? Anthropomorphic days in Genesis 1:1–2:3. *Presbyterion* 20:109–130.
104. Some defenders of this are
- Currid, Ref. 41, pp. 40–41.
 - Duncan and Hall, Ref. 94, pp. 261–262.
 - Gentry, Ref. 59, pp. 85–92.
 - Grossmann, R. E., 1987. The light He called ‘day.’ *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 3:28–30.
 - Jordan, J. B., 1999. *Creation in six cays*. Moscow, Idaho: Canon Press, pp. 52–57, 235–245.
 - Kelly, Ref. 88, pp. 122–126.
 - Kruger, Ref. 101, pp. 106–107.
 - Pipa, Ref. 46, pp. 159–164.
 - Walker, F. Jr., 2001. A critique of the framework hypothesis. In, Sandlin, P. A. (ed.), *Creation according to the scriptures*. Vallecito, California: Chalcedon Foundation, pp. 68–71.
105. Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 194.
106. BDB, Ref. 33, pp. 75–76.
107. BDB, Ref. 33, p. 193.
- Gentry, Ref. 59, pp. 89–92.
 - Butler, Ref. 94, pp. 101–122.
 - From an earlier period. So also
 - Green, W. H., 1979. *The unity of the book of Genesis*. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, pp. 15–16.
108. HALOT, Ref. 31, vol. 2, p. 889.
109. Cassuto, Ref. 43, p. 102. So also
- Stordalen, T., 1992. Man, soil, garden: Basic plot in Genesis 2–3 reconsidered. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 53:11.
110. Futato, Ref. 4, p. 12, n. 41.
- Leupold, H. C., 1974. *Exposition of Genesis*, 2 vols. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, vol 1, pp. 112–113.
111. Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 194.
112. HALOT, Ref. 31, vol. 1, p. 889.
113. Cassuto, Ref. 43, p. 102.
- At the Fall, the created order was subjected to a curse, which included death and decay (Romans 8:19–22). Perhaps, the change that occurred at the Fall included the “shrub of the field” becoming “thorns and thistles.” Of course, this is a matter of my own interpretation since the text does not explicitly describe this change.
114. Mathews, Ref. 41, pp. 194–195.
115. Arnold and Choi, Ref. 25, p. 84, sec. 3.5.1.
116. Pratico, G. D. and Van Pelt, M. V., 2001. *Basics of biblical Hebrew*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 192.
117. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 57–63.
118. Niccacci, Ref. 52, p. 189.
119. Mathews, Ref. 41, pp. 218–219.
120. Arnold and Choi, Ref. 25, pp. 85–86.
121. For example. See
- Cassuto, Ref. 43, p. 121.
 - Hamilton, Ref. 4, p. 171.
 - Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 67.
122. So
- Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 219–224.
123. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 222–223.
124. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 223.
125. For a discussion of the resumption of the narrative sequence in Genesis 2:15. See
- Collins, Ref. 71, p. 133.
 - Niccacci also takes Genesis 2:15 as an example of resumptive repetition, though he restricts its use to the first sequential verb “took” תָּקַח.
 - Niccacci, Ref. 52, p. 187.
126. For a discussion of resumptive repetition. See
- Quick, P. A., 1993. Resumptive repetition: A two-edged sword. *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 6:301–304.
 - Buth, Ref. 80, pp. 147–148.
127. BDB, Ref. 33, p. 628.
128. Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 209.
- For a discussion of the resumption of the narrative sequence in Genesis 2:15. See
- Collins, Ref. 71, p. 133.
 - Collins refers to this as resumptive repetition. For a thorough discussion of this linguistic phenomenon. See

- Quick, Ref. 126, pp. 289–316.
129. See
Quick, Ref. 126, pp. 301–304.
Buth, Ref. 80, pp. 147–148.
130. Collins, Ref. 71, p. 133.
131. For a discussion of the chronology of Genesis 2:4–25 as it relates to Genesis 1. See
Young, Ref. 32, pp. 73–76.
132. Support for taking רָצַח as a past tense, “formed,” has been drawn from
Driver, S. R., 1892. *A treatise on the use of the tenses in Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon, pp. 84–89.
While writing from a text linguistic perspective, Buth has more recently supported a past tense translation for this sequential verb in Genesis 2:19
Buth, Ref. 80, pp. 148–149.
However, it should be noted that, though Driver did not allow for the *waw* consecutive to be a pluperfect.
Driver, S. R., 1892. *A treatise on the use of the tenses in Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon, pp. 84–89.
Buth supports a pluperfect use of *waw* consecutive but only under two conditions. First, lexical repetition or a specific reference looks back to a preceding event. Second, based “upon common cultural experience an event can be interpreted as giving a reason or otherwise commenting on the immediately previous event”, Buth, Ref. 80, p. 147. From Genesis 2, Buth uses עָרַב (“planted”) in verse 8 and רָצַח (“formed”) in verse 19 as examples and contends that, since neither condition is present, both verbs are preferably translated as past tense verbs, Buth, Ref. 80, pp. 148–149.
133. So
Irons and Kline, Ref. 20, pp. 282–283.
Ross, Ref. 4, pp. 123–126.
Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 10–11.
134. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 222–223.
135. Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 12–13.
Because Futato’s “synoptic/resumption-expansion” approach to Genesis 2:4–25 is problematic, I have not included in my count the adjustments that his approach would require. While Futato uses three *waw* consecutives from verse 15 and verse 19 to support his non-chronological interpretation of this pericope, he has additionally argued that a few other sequential verbs in verses 8–9 do not reflect a chronological sequence. Though, as previously noted, his approach raises some questions, he does not deal with the many other *waw* consecutives in verses 4–25 that are sequential.
136. In particular, note
Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 151–153.
137. For further support of this. See
Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 222–224.
Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 2–10.
138. For a good discussion of the complementary nature of Genesis 1:1–2:3 and 2:4–25. See
Collins, Ref. 80, pp. 134–140.
Collins, Ref. 71, pp. 108–112, 134–135.
139. A complementary view of Genesis 1:1–2:3 and 2:4–25 could also maintain that this is a restrictive group of animals that God created and then Adam named. With this understanding, the past tense rendering for רָצַח could be retained. So
Cassuto, Ref. 43, p. 129.
Hamilton Ref. 4, p. 176.
While it may be argued that this is a separate group of birds and animals created after the formation of Adam and then brought to him to assign names, this seems unlikely since the birds and animals were created prior to Adam on Days 5–6 (Genesis 1:20–25).
140. Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 156.
141. Futato, Ref. 4, pp. 10–11.
142. Buth, Ref. 80, p. 138.
143. Arnold and Choi, Ref. 25, pp. 552–553.
144. Pipa, Ref. 46, pp. 156–157.
145. Collins, Ref. 71, pp. 133–135.
146. Collins, Ref. 71, pp. 127–128.
147. Collins, Ref. 80, p. 128.
As we pointed out above in n. 132, Buth has itemized two conditions for a biblical writer to use the pluperfect. However, Buth did not go far enough. Building upon Buth’s text linguistic analysis, Collins provides a necessary corrective to Buth’s second condition, “common cultural experience.” Drawing from
Martin, W. J., 1969. ‘Dischronologized’ narrative in the Old Testament. In, *Congress volume*, Rome 1968, *Supplements to vetus testamentum*. Leiden: Brill, vol. 17 pp. 179–186.
Baker, D. W., 1973. The consecutive non-perfective in the historical books of the Hebrew Old Testament (Genesis–Kings). M.C.S. thesis, Regent College.
Collins demonstrates that Buth’s “common cultural experience” should be replaced with what he calls “the logic of the referent”
Collins, Ref. 80, p. 128, especially n. 40.

148. Collins, Ref. 80, p. 128, n. 40.
149. Collins, Ref. 71, pp. 109–111.
150. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 57–65.
151. Collins, Ref. 80, pp. 138–139.
Collins, Ref. 71, pp. 134–135.
152. This view is also reflected by others.
Pipa, Ref. 46, pp. 156–157.
Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch, F., 1973. *Pentateuch*, 3 vols. in 1. Trans. J. Martin, in *Biblical commentary on the Old Testament*, 10 vols. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, vol. 1, pp. 87–88.
Leupold, Ref. 110, vol. 1, p. 130.
153. Kline, Ref. 4, p. 151.
154. Kline, Ref. 4.
155. Godfrey, Ref. 4, pp. 52–53.
Blocher, Ref. 4, p. 56.
156. Mathews, Ref. 41, pp. 133–136.
157. Currid, Ref. 41, p. 61.
Hamilton, Ref. 4, p. 115.
Ross, Ref. 41, p. 107.
158. Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 164.
Butler, Ref. 94, p. 123.
159. Young, Ref. 32, pp. 64–65.
Kline claims that a literal interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3 would contradict the *modus operandi* of Genesis 2:5 requiring normal providence since the vegetation of Day 3, which came from land formed out of water on the same day, required an extraordinary evaporation process.
Kline, Ref. 4, p. 152.
However, what Kline ignores is that Genesis 1:9–13 explicitly portrays this day as more than a day of extraordinary evaporation but one also with miraculous geological activity. “Especially on the third day,” according to J. C. Whitcomb, Jr., and H. M. Morris, “was a tremendous amount of geological work accomplished. On that day, the Genesis account tells us that dry land was made to appear above the surface of the waters. This can only mean a great orogeny, as the rocks and other materials of the primitive earth were uplifted above the waters. This process would necessarily have been accompanied by great erosion and redeposition of surface materials as the waters flowed down into the new basins. On the same day, the record says, God made vegetation of all kinds to appear, implying that there was now a uniform mantle of fertile soil over the surface”
Whitcomb, J. C. Jr., and Morris, H. M., 1961. *The Genesis Flood*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, pp. 214–215.
160. Kline, Ref. 98, p. 83.
161. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 13.
162. Kruger, Ref. 101, p. 109.
God’s direct creation includes two concepts: *ex nihilo* (“out of nothing”) and *ex materia* (“out of material”). Creation *ex nihilo* refers to God not using any preexisting material to create. Creation *ex materia* refers to God’s instantaneous creation using previously created material and shaping it into something it was not. Jesus’ changing water into wine in John 2 is an example of creation *ex materia*. Jesus Christ instantaneously changed one substance into an entirely different substance. John Whitcomb has made this very point: “Creation *ex nihilo* refers primarily to angels (cf. Colossians 1:16), the astronomic universe (with all of its complexities of visible objects and invisible force fields), and this planet. When God created living things on the earth, however, He formed them suddenly from previously created inorganic substances. Thus, He commanded the waters to bring forth marine and flying creatures on the fifth day. However, the water by itself, even in the presence of sunshine, could never (even in billions of years!) have brought forth such marvelously complex and beautiful animals. By the same token, the water used by our Lord at Cana of Galilee (cf. John 2:1–11) could never have turned into wine, even if it vibrated with evolutionary anticipation in those stone jars for billions of years. In both cases, complex entities appeared suddenly, even though built upon preexistent lifeless materials. Thus, the fact that God commanded the earth to bring forth trees no more implies a gradual growth process than His use of the same inorganic elements to bring forth the full-grown body of a man at the end of creation week. Even with regard to the origin of the human race, many Christians have seen divine providence through time and process instead of divine miracle, and thus have twisted the Genesis record out of recognition.”
Whitcomb, J. C. Jr., 1986. *The early earth*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 26.
164. Kline, Ref. 4, p. 152.
165. Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 163.
166. Pipa, Ref. 46.
Sarfati, J., 2004. *Refuting compromise: A biblical and scientific refutation of ‘progressive creationism’ (billions of years), as popularized by astronomer Hugh Ross*. Green Forest, Arkansas: Master Books, pp. 99–100.
167. Grossmann, Ref. 104, pp. 28–29. So also
Jordan, Ref. 104, pp. 55–57.
168. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 234.

169. For a helpful treatment of the literal interpretation of the creation account and how it is developed throughout the entirety of Scripture. See
Duncan III, J.L. and Hall, D.W., 2001. The 24-hour view. In, Hagopian, D.G. (ed.), *The Genesis debate: Three views on the days of creation*. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press, pp.25–47.
170. Duncan and Hall, Ref. 169. So also
Currid, Ref. 41, p. 38.
171. While the expressions *analogia fidei* and *analogia scriptura* overlap in use, *analogia fidei* at times has been taken as a reference to an interpreter's personal "faith" being the final interpreter of Scripture. See
Osborne, G., 1991. *The hermeneutical spiral*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, p. 273.
Because of this type of semantic confusion, it is better to refer to this as the *analogia scriptura*. So also
Reymond, R., 1998. *A new systematic theology of the christian faith*. Nashville: Nelson, p. 394.
For a concise treatment of this hermeneutical subject. See
Terry, M.S., 1974. *Biblical hermeneutics*. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 579–581.
Maier, G., 1994. *Biblical hermeneutics*. Trans. R. W. Yarbrough. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, pp. 181–183.
172. According to the *Second London Baptist confession*, this hermeneutical axiom is stated like this: "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched by other places that speak more clearly" (chapter 1, paragraph 9). This axiom is taken from the earlier *Westminster confession of faith* (chapter 1, paragraph 9).
173. Terry, Ref. 171, p. 579.
174. Currid, Ref. 41, pp. 40–41.
Weeks, N., 1978. The hermeneutical problem of Genesis 1–11. *Themelios* 4:16–19.
175. See Pipa's insightful criticism of Irons and Kline's use of Genesis 2:5 and the analogy of Scripture.
Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 196.
176. Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 57.
While Derek Kidner offers his own interpretation of verses 5–6, he also acknowledges that these two verses have been the subject of misunderstanding.
Kidner, D., 1996. Genesis 2:5, 6: Wet or dry? *Tyndale Bulletin* 17:113.
177. Gentry, Ref. 59, p. 86.
178. Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 149–150.
179. As my previous documentation reflects, I have examined many major commentaries on Genesis 2:5 while writing both parts of this critique of the framework interpretation. I have not found any major commentary that positively reflects Kline's view, with the exception of Kline's own commentary.
Kline, Ref. 98, p. 83.
While excluding a reference to Kline's own commentary, Gentry had earlier made the same observation.
Gentry, Ref. 59, p. 86.
180. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 10.
Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 245–247.
181. Kline, Ref. 98, p. 83.
182. Blocher, Ref. 4, p. 50.
183. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 10.
184. Kline, Ref. 4, p. 156.
185. Irons, L., 2000. Framework interpretation: An exegetical summary. *Ordained Servant* 9:9–10.
186. Iron, Ref. 185, p. 9.
187. Blocher, Ref. 4, p. 56.
188. Ross, Ref. 4, pp. 121–122.
189. Kline, Ref. 28, pp. 10–11.
190. The use of this argument is not confined to framework interpreters, however. For example, this omission is one of the items that R. Laird Harris, a day-age proponent, uses to argue against a literal interpretation of the days in the creation week: "Unlike the others [Days 1–6], it [Day 7] has no conclusion. There was no evening to it and no morning leading to anything else. God rested from his creative activity Evidently, God's rest was and is still going on."
Harris, R.L., 1999. The length of the creative days in Genesis 1. In, Pipa, J.A. Jr., and D.W. Hall (eds.), *Did God create in six days?* Taylors, South Carolina: Southern Presbyterian Press, p. 109.
191. Irons, Ref. 185, p. 9.
192. Blocher, Ref. 4, p. 56.
193. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 55–57.
194. McCabe, Ref. 26, p. 114.
195. Gentry, K.L. Jr., 2002. The traditional interpretation of Genesis 1. In, Gentry K.L. Jr, and M.R Butler (eds.), *Yea, hath God said: The framework hypothesis/six-day creation debate*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, p. 62.
196. McCabe, Ref. 26, pp. 106–107.
197. Ross, Ref. 4, Genesis 1:1–2:3, p. 168.
198. Gentry, Ref. 195, p. 62.
199. Essentially the same translation is found in the HCSB, NIV, TNIV, NET BIBLE; While the NLT renders this prepositional

- phrase as “on the seventh day,” in agreement with KJV, NKJV, NRSV, ESV, their translators avoid this problem by translating the immediate clause in which this prepositional phrase is found as a pluperfect: “On the seventh day, having finished his task, God rested from all his work.”
200. Another way to avoid this ambiguity is to translate כִּי־גָמַל as “had completed”.
Hamilton, Ref. 4, p. 142.
Because I treated the Piel *waw* consecutive כִּי־גָמַל as an exegetical use in the first of this series.
McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 62–63.
I prefer the NASB translation “[By the seventh day God] completed.” This translation does not imply that God did any creative work on the seventh day.
201. Hasel, G. F., 1994. The ‘days’ of creation in Genesis 1: Literal ‘days’ or figurative ‘periods/epochs’ of time? *Origins* 21:28–30.
202. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 249–250.
203. For a reaction against taking the creation days as an analogy. See
Hasel, Ref. 201, p. 29.
Fretheim, T. E., 1986. Were the days of creation twenty-four hours long? ‘Yes. In, Youngblood, R. (ed.), *The Genesis debate: Persistent questions about creation and the Flood*. Nashville: Nelson, p. 20.
204. Joüon, P., 1993. *A grammar of biblical Hebrew*, 2 vols. Trans. and rev. T. Muraoka. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, vol. 2, pp. 458–459.
Waltke and O’Connor, Ref. 25, p. 171.
Arnold and Choi, Ref. 25, p. 19.
205. Shaw, B., 1999. The literal day interpretation. In, Pipa, J. A., and D. W. Hall (eds.), *Did God create in six days?* Taylors, South Carolina: Southern Presbyterian Press, p. 217.
206. HALOT, Ref. 31, 1:476–477.
207. HALOT, Ref. 31, 1:476–477.
208. Hamilton, Ref. 4, p. 142. So also
Cassuto, Ref. 43, pp. 61–62.
209. Gentry, Ref. 195, p. 62.
210. HALOT, Ref. 31, 2:1407.
211. HALOT, Ref. 31, 2:1409–1411.
212. Reyburn and Fry, Ref. 71, p. 55.
213. Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 35.
214. Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 178.
215. Walton, Ref. 36, p. 146.
216. Gentry, Ref. 195, p. 62. So also
Murray, J., 1957. *Principles of conduct*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 33.
217. Whitcomb, J., 1973. The science of historical geology in the light of the biblical doctrine of a mature creation. *Westminster Theological Journal* 36:68.
218. McCabe Ref. 1, pp. 39–43.
219. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 245.
220. Weeks, N., 1988. *The sufficiency of scripture*. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth, p. 115.
221. Kent, H. A. Jr., 1972. *The epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 82, n. 32.
222. Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 169.
223. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 2.
224. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 237–238.
225. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 246.
226. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 243.
227. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 10.
228. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 240.
229. See
Jordan, Ref. 104, p. 58.
230. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 237.
To clarify this point, those who embrace the historic literal day interpretation of Genesis 1:1–2:3 must agree with Irons and Kline when they affirm a Creator-creation distinction. Since Genesis 1:1 assumes that God existed prior to his creation of anything, there is, according to Morton Smith, “a two-layered view of reality. God is set forth as the self-existent, self-contained, self-sufficient Being who eternally existed prior to the creation of all else that exists. The phrase ‘heavens and the earth’ is an all-encompassing phrase of all that exists besides God. Everything that exists outside of God is created. It is, therefore, created and dependent reality, while God is uncreated, self-contained Being”.
Smith, M., 1999. The theological significance of the doctrine of creation. In, Pipa, J. A., and D. W. Hall (eds.), *Did God create in six days?* Taylors, South Carolina: Southern Presbyterian Press, pp. 243–244.
231. While I agree that there is some sort of spatial/dimensional distinction between the heavens and the earth in Genesis 1:1, it is contextually problematic to have God’s creation of “the heavens” in verse 1 as a reference to God creating a dwelling place for Himself and his angels. See
Gentry, Ref. 59, p. 93.

This interpretation is not even implied in Genesis 1:1. This text simply communicates that “in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” In contrast to Irons and Kline’s view that the creation of the “heavens” in verse 1 refers to creating a heavenly dwelling place for God and his angels, it has been understood that what initiated the space and time continuum in the created realm was God’s initial creation of two objects: the “heavens” and the “earth.” The use of “heavens” and “earth” has been understood as a merism to describe the “totality of the universe”.

Mathews, Ref. 41, p. 129.

While some commentators have understood the “heavens” and “earth” of verse 1 to be a completely organized universe, this seems unnecessary since the Genesis account presents how the universe was begun. As such, the merism of “heavens” and “earth” in verse 1 emphasizes totality. So

Pearson, A. T., 1953. An exegetical study of Genesis 1:1–3. *Bethel Seminary Quarterly* 2:20–21.

Rooker, M. F., 1992. Genesis 1:1–3—creation or re-creation? Part 2. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149:414–416.

With God’s first two creative activities, both the heavens and earth were created in totality, but incomplete. The heavens were dark and void of any heavenly objects and the earth was an unformed and empty, water-covered sphere surrounded by the darkness of the heavens (verse 2). The narrative sequence of Genesis 1:3–31 describes how God formed and filled the heavens and earth of verses 1–2.

Wenham has summarized this interpretation of “heavens” and “earth” in verse 1: “Commentators often insist that the phrase “heaven and earth” denotes the completely ordered cosmos. Though this is usually the case, totality rather than organization is its chief thrust here. It is therefore quite feasible for a mention of an initial act of creation of the whole universe (verse 1) to be followed by an account of the ordering of different parts of the universe (verses 2–31)”.

Wenham, Ref. 4, p. 15.

232. Duncan and Hall, Ref. 94, pp. 260–261.

Irons and Kline dismiss this argument by Duncan and Hall as simply an assertion without any exegetical or theological basis.

Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 284.

Irons and Kline’s dismissal is disappointing since they gloss over Duncan and Hall’s point.

233. Godfrey, Ref. 4, p. 53.

234. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 236.

235. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 67.

236. Blocher, Ref. 4, p. 57.

237. Ridderbos, N. H., 1957. *Is there a conflict between Genesis 1 and natural science?* Trans. John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 30.

238. Ross, Ref. 4, p. 120.

239. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 239.

240. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 240.

241. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 34–37, 57–65.

242. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 37–39.

A substantive article supporting this view is by

Hasel, Ref. 201, pp. 21–31.

243. McCabe, Ref. 1, pp. 39–43. So also

Stambaugh, J., 1991. The days of creation: A semantic approach. *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 5:73.

244. These statistics are derived from

Stambaugh, Ref. 243, p. 72. For additional discussion about this use of evening and morning. See also

Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 184.

Gentry, Ref. 195, pp. 36–39.

McCabe, Ref. 26, pp. 105–109.

245. For a historical summary of a literal interpretation of the creation days. See

Duncan and Hall, Ref. 94, pp. 47–52.

246. Weeks, Ref. 220, pp. 112–113.

247. Godfrey, Ref. 4, p. 61. So also

Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 249–250.

Ross, Ref. 4, p. 130.

248. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, pp. 249–250.

249. Pipa, Ref. 46, p. 171.

“Refreshed” describes God’s satisfaction with creation.

McKay, J. L., 2001. *Exodus*. Fearn, Great Britain: Mentor, p. 520.

250. When framework proponents refer to the “solar days” used by historic literal day advocates, this caricaturizes the traditional interpretation of the days of Genesis 1:1–2:3 since this view does not have the sun created until the fourth day. Rather than defining the days of the Creation Week as solar days, Genesis 1:5 defines a day as being composed of a physical day-night cycle, a period of physical, literal light and darkness. See

Grossmann, Ref. 104, pp. 11–16.

251. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 247.

252. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 2.

253. Young, Ref. 32, p. 47.
254. See
Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 247.
255. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 4.
256. So also
Godfrey, Ref. 4, p. 53.
Ross and Archer, Ref. 102, pp. 274–275.
257. Gentry, Ref. 59 p. 97.
258. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4 p. 242.
259. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4.
260. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4.
261. See
Wenham, Ref. 4, pp. 27–28.
262. Wenham, Ref. 4, pp. 29–32.
263. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 245.
264. See
Ross and Archer, Ref. 102, p. 274.
It should also be noted that Irons and Kline provide a response to this charge
Irons and Kline, Ref. 20, p. 298.
While it is clear from this response as well as many other places in *The Genesis debate*, Irons and Kline are clearly orthodox in their theology. My reservation primarily relate to their views on the early chapters of Genesis. However, the only way for Irons and Kline to adequately eliminate the confusion that Ross and Archer mention is to avoid superimposing their two-register cosmology on the text of Genesis 1:1–2:3.
265. See
Berkhof, L., 1966. *Systematic theology*, 2 vols. in 1. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, vol. 2, p. 61.
Shedd, W. G. T., 2003. *Dogmatic theology*, Gomes, A. W. (ed.). Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, p. 278.
266. See
Gentry, Ref. 59, p. 96.
267. See
Hasel, Ref. 201, p. 28.
Jordan, Ref. 104, pp. 203–209.
268. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 252.
269. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4., p. 251.
270. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4.
271. See
Duncan and Hall, Ref. 94, pp. 266–267.
272. See
Duncan and Hall, Ref. 94, pp. 265–266.
273. So
Newman, R. C., 1999. Progressive creationism. In, Moreland, J.P. and J.M. Reynolds (eds), *Three views on creation and evolution*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 105–133.
Ross, H., 1994. *Creation and time*. Colorado Springs: NavPress, pp. 65–69.
Ross, H. and Archer, G. L., 2001. The day-age view. In, Hagopian, D. G. (ed.), *The Genesis debate: Three views on the days of creation*. Mission Viejo, California: Crux Press, pp. 123–163.
Van Till, H. J., 1999. The fully gifted creation. In, Moreland, J.P. and J.M. Reynolds, (eds), *Three views on creation and evolution*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 161–218.
274. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 217.
275. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 13.
276. So also
Gentry, K. L. Jr., 2002. The framework hypothesis debate. In, Gentry, K. L. Jr. and M. R. Butler (eds), *Yea, hath God said: The framework hypothesis/six-day creation debate*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, p. 17.
277. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 14.
278. Booth, W. M., 2003. Days of Genesis 1: Literal or nonliteral? *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14:116.
279. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 15, n. 47.
280. See
Duncan and Hall, Ref. 94, p. 258.
281. See
Young, Ref. 32, pp. 100–103.
282. Jordan, Ref. 104, p. 62.
283. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 243.
284. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4.
285. Kline, Ref. 28, p. 5.

286. Irons and Kline, Ref. 4, p. 242.

287. See Exodus 34:28, Deuteronomy 9:9, 11, 18, 10:10.

288. See

Currid, J.D., 2001. *A study commentary on Exodus, volume 2: Exodus 19–40*. Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, p. 144.

289. Jordan, Ref. 104, p. 62.

Dr. Robert V. McCabe is Professor of Old Testament at Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary in Allen Park, Michigan.