

# The Fictional Principle that Meredith Kline Discovered in Genesis 2:5

Nathan Clay Brummel



## **Making Hay out of Genesis 2:5**

Supporters of the Framework Hypothesis have made a lot of hay out of Meredith Kline’s misinterpretation of Genesis 2:5. Kline, one of the inventors of the framework hypothesis, is responsible for a journal article in which he claimed to find a principle in Genesis 2:5 that demonstrates that Genesis 1 contains a literary framework and not an historical, chronological description of six historical days. (Kline, 1958) Moses wrote in Genesis 2:5: “When no bush of the field was yet in the

land and no small plant of the field had yet sprung up—for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land, and there was no man to work the ground.”

In 1958 Kline published his novel interpretation of Genesis 2:5. He claimed that Genesis 2:5 reveals that no plants existed prior to it raining. He finds a principle embedded in this revelation. The principle is that God did not use extraordinary providence during the creation week. God only used ordinary providential means of working. Normally and ordinarily plants need rain to grow—so God did not create plants before it rained.

Kline takes the reference to bushes and plants in Genesis 2:5 to refer to all plant life. He concludes that it could not have been the case that God created plants on the third day. Kline thought that Genesis 2:5 taught that no plants existed until God caused it to rain. Since it did not rain until God placed Adam in the Garden of Eden, no plants were created prior to that time. Kline’s conclusion is that Genesis 2:5 teaches the principle that God only used ordinary providence during the creation week (which he does not take to be a historical week). Since reading Genesis 1 as a historical account of what happened in six chronological days conflicts with the principle that Kline finds in Genesis 2:5, one must read Genesis 1 as providing a literary framework rather than a historical, chronological account of creation.

Kline believes that Genesis 2:5 conflicts with a literal understanding of Day Three. The account of Day Three implies that in one day God created the dry land and caused it to dry sufficiently so that he could create plants. The speed of this drying would be miraculous and fast. But Kline thinks that Genesis 2:5 implies that God used ordinary providence to create things—and under normal conditions it would take a long time to dry the land.

Mark Futato, following Kline, argues that Genesis 2:5 teaches that ordinary providential means, in this case rain and human cultivation, existed during the period of creation and that it was through these means that plants and herbs grew.

Paulin Bedard challenges Kline's claim that rain was necessary for plant life. He even points out that there would have been sufficient moisture on earth for the initial plants since God created dry land on the third day. Bedard writes:

This dry land must still have been a little wet! In other words, the lack of rain should not have constituted a reason for not creating plants if God was using extraordinary providence during the creation week. (Bedard, 2013, p. 49)

It is odd for Kline to talk about God using ordinary providence during the creation week—when the entire week was devoted to supernatural activity as God created new creatures and performed wonders. For example, Moses records that on Day Three God created the dry land. The creation of dry land and then plants on the third day constituted astonishing acts of creation and providence. Likewise, the creation of light on Day One, even though God had not yet created the celestial luminaries is not an act of ordinary providence. The formation of planet earth did not occur according to ordinary providence; God created the matter of planet earth by fiat creation.

The pious Christian who believes God's Word will be surprised to learn that Kline denies the creative acts that I have just mentioned. First, Kline claims that God did not create light on the first day. He does not believe that there ever was an alternate source of light. He claims that God used ordinary providential means during the creation and since God ordinarily provides light and heat through the sun and moon, Genesis 1 must be read in light of this. So, Kline dares to deny that God originally created a source of light on the first day as the text so clearly states. Second, Kline does not believe that God created dry land and plant life on the third day. He writes that it would be impossible for the dry land to dry according to ordinary providential means in part of one day. Therefore, he argues that the creation of dry land took a long period of time. Once again, Kline rejects the clearly teaching of what occurred on Day Three. Third, Kline denies that God created the material of

planet earth prior to the creation of the sun, moon, and stars. He claims that scientific cosmology does not allow for the formation of planet earth prior to the formation of the stars and planets. So, he rejects the clear teaching of Genesis 1 that the earth existed prior to the creation of the sun, moon, and stars. This is despite the clear chronological order in the text and that on Day Four we read that God created the heavenly luminaries for the express purpose of providing light for the earth. Kline clearly holds to an evolutionary view of the formation of the stars, planets, and earth. This is how far he goes in denying supernatural acts of creation or extraordinary acts of providence during the creation week.

It is odd that Kline can write about God only using ordinary providence during the creation week when the entire week was devoted to extraordinary acts of creation and providence as God created new creatures. But there certainly is no contradiction between God creating trees and placing them in ground that is still partially wet. But the very acts of fiat creation described on Day Three are the farthest thing from ordinary providence. Ordinary providence involves trees growing and producing fruit and seed and offspring as occurs throughout history. Genesis 1 describes something altogether different with the creation of plant species on the day that God creates dry land.

Kline's novel reinterpretation of Genesis 2:5 is done in the service of undermining the historicity of Genesis 1. He thought that the principle he found embedded in Genesis 2:5 meant that Genesis chapter 1 could not be read as a literal, historical account but only as a literary framework. He is willing to admit that the creation of plants was a supernatural providential act. But this creative act, Kline is convinced, did not occur historically on a third day of history. Instead, it occurred at the point in history when God caused it to rain. His unique claim is that Genesis 2:5 teaches that God would not have supernaturally created plants until their conservation, preservation, and growth could occur by ordinary providential means.

He thinks that Genesis 2:5 teaches what one of these ordinary providential means was rainfall. Another thing that Kline would include in this ordinary providence would be the heat and light that comes from the sun. Since the Bible says that God created plants on Day Three and the sun on Day Four, according to Kline, one cannot take the days of Genesis 1 to be historic and chronological.

### **The Implications Drawn from the Fictional General Principle**

Kline blows up his principle. He philosophizes that not only plants needed ordinary providences to conserve them, but it was also the case with all other creatures. Kline explains his principle:

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. (Kline, 1958, pp. 149-150)

Therefore, Kline believes that plant life was not created prior to the existence of the sun or rainfall. Therefore, the days of Genesis 1 cannot be read as sequential, historical days. The days are posited as part of a literary framework that makes some points about creation kingdoms and the creatures that inhabit them.

A problem with Kline's claim about Genesis 2:5 is that a particular does not prove a universal. For the sake of the argument, let us admit that God did not create a single plant until it rained. This would not prove that God used ordinary providential circumstances for the rest of the creation. A particular does not prove a universal. If I make the point that Lionel Messi is a soccer player from Argentina, this does not allow me to create the universal principle that all soccer players come from Argentina.

## **Inconsistencies in Kline’s View of Genesis 2:5**

Paulin Bedard identifies inconsistencies in Kline’s interpretation of Genesis 2:5. First, Bedard argues that it is inconsistent to claim that God only used ordinary providential means (like He uses throughout history) to conserve plant and animal life when Genesis 2:6 mentions a means of God watering the earth that is dissimilar to what we experience today. Moses records that “a mist was going up from the land and was watering the whole face of the ground” (Genesis 2:6). Supporters of the Framework Hypothesis attempt to explain Genesis 2:6 as simply describing rain. Bedard thinks that the text implies that the source of moisture was extraordinary compared to the providential means that God uses today to water the earth:

The text seems to point in this direction when it says that this one “mist” (singular) watered the whole surface of the ground. It is difficult to find normal meteorological conditions similar to this phenomenon on earth today. (Bedard, 2013, p. 52)

A second inconsistency is that supporters of the Framework Hypothesis make so much out of Genesis 2:5, claiming that it teaches that plants could not be created until God had provided the ordinary providential means of rainfall. But the text not only speaks of a lack of rain—it also speaks of the lack of any man to cultivate the ground. If Genesis 2:5 is taken to refer to the impossibility of any plants existing until it rained, they must also admit that the text teaches that not a single plant could be created until there was a “man to work the ground” (Genesis 2:5b). Do you perceive the dilemma that supporters of the Framework Hypothesis have created? God must create humans to cultivate the ground before he can create plants. A moments reflection should lead you to recognize the problem with this. Genesis 1 describes man as the apex of the creation. God creates the best last. Plants are created on Day Three. But God makes man last as the crown of creation. But supporters of the Framework Hypothesis paint themselves into a corner. Plants are created last.

They are the crown of creation. Perhaps we should not be vegetarians after all. Maybe we should be exclusively carnivorous meat-eaters? The Bible teaches that God created plant life on Day Three, which the fish, birds, animals, and man who were created later could eat. Robert Godfrey does not hesitate to affirm: “man seems to be created before the vegetation.” (Godfrey, 2003, p. 81) Kline himself recoils from this implication:

The implications of man’s position as lord of creation, the scope of the cultural mandate, and other considerations require that the creation of man concluded the creative acts of God in the actual historical sequence as well as in the order of narration. (Kline, 1958, p. 154)

If Genesis 2:5 is speaking in a universal way of all plant life, then the text must be interpreted as saying that no plant life could exist until two conditions were met: (1) rain was needed and (2) man was needed to cultivate the ground.

While Kline claims to discover some universal principle in Genesis 2:5, namely that God used normal providential means (understood as the same providential means with which the Israelites would have been familiar) during the creation week—the context speaks of two miraculous events. First, God causes a supernatural watering of the whole face of the ground by a mist to deal with a deficiency of water. Secondly, He engages in the supernatural act of creating Adam and Eve to meet the deficiency of there being no one to cultivate the ground.

### **The Implications of the Hebrew *terem* (before/yet)**

Some commentators think that the Hebrew word *terem* which is translated as “before” in the KJV reading of Genesis 2:5 and “yet” in the ESV implies that the bushes and plants are the ones that God created on Day Three. Then the significance of the word *terem* is that it communicates that these plants were created in the past, on Day Three. This neutralizes Kline’s view that the text is stating that God could not have created these plants back on Day Three. John Calvin held to the

interpretation that the word *terem* points to the fact that God had created the plants in question in the past. We find the same interpretation in Matthew Henry. The study notes in the Dutch Staten Bijbel also interpret Genesis 2:5 in this way.

The reason for this interpretation is that the word *terem* has an adverbial meaning that is temporal. There is a long exegetical tradition, at least going back to John Calvin, that understands the adverb *terem* (before) used in Genesis 2:5 to communicate that the bushes in question were made on Day Three. Paul Bedard writes: “The word *terem* in Genesis 2:5 may be taken as an adverb having the sense of “not yet,” or functioning in Hebrew as a conjunction having the sense of “before.” (Bedard, 2013, p. 55) Look at how the KJV and the ESV translate *terem* in Genesis 2:5. We will place the translation of *terem* in italics.

KJV: And every plant of the field *before* it was in the earth, and every herb of the field *before* it grew: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground (Genesis 2:5).

ESV: When no bush of the field was *yet* in the land and no small plant of the field had *yet* sprung up—for the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the land, and there was no man to work the ground (Genesis 2:5).

Bedard explains the implications of the word *terem* and why he thinks that the KJV correctly translated the word:

This means that when God created every plant and herb of the field (or bush and small plant of the field, according to ESV), the normal conditions for growth and culture of these plants, as we know them today (rain and human agriculture), did not exist yet. *In spite of* these “deficiencies,” God did actually create these plants. (Bedard, 2013, p. 55)

John Calvin also understood *terem* as communicating that God had already made the mentioned plants on Day Three:

But although he has before related that the herbs were created on the third day, yet it is not without reason that here again mention is made of them, in order that we may know that they were then produced, preserved, and propagated,



in a manner different from that which we perceive at the present day. (Calvin, Commentary on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis, vol. 1, 2010, pp. 110-111)

Calvin writes that the plants that God created on Day Three “possessed durable vigour...not by the help of rain, not by the irrigation or culture of man; but by the vapour with which God watered the earth.” (Calvin, Commentary on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis, vol. 1, 2010, pp. 110-111)

### **The Identity of the Bushes and Plants in Genesis 2:5**

The KJV translates the two kinds of vegetation mentioned in Genesis 2:5 as *plants* and *herbs*. The ESV translates the two vegetations as *bushes* and *small plants*. John Calvin and Matthew Henry took the bushes and herbs mentioned in Genesis 2:5 as referring to plants that God had already created on Day Three. Other commentators interpret the plants, herbs, or bushes as vegetation that was created on the sixth day to beautify the Garden of Eden or to provide grasses like wheat for agricultural production. These commentators retain the adverbial connotation of *terem* as “not yet” “without necessarily concluding that all the plants of the earth were created only when normal conditions for their life existed.” (Bedard, 2013, p. 56) They take Genesis 2:5 as referring to the creation of certain plants in a local area. While Kline understood Genesis 2:5 as referring to the creation of all plant life, this interpretation understands the plants mentioned in Genesis 2:5 as referring to plants in either a local agricultural area or the Garden of Eden.

Joseph A. Pipa, C.F. Keil, and M.H. Kruger identify the bushes and plants as vegetation created on the sixth day for the Garden of Eden. Joseph Pipa writes: “The text is not dealing with a universal defect but highlights the placing of Adam in the garden...its reference is to the garden and not to the creation as a whole.” (Pipa, 1999, p. 161) M.J. Kruger takes the same position:

The only reason Kline sees ordinary providence as the only *modus operandi* is because he thinks Genesis 2:5 is referring to Day Three (Tuesday) in the creative process and thus applicable to all the Earth...However, Kline simply fails to realize that Genesis 2:5 is not speaking of Day Three (Tuesday) at all. As we have demonstrated above, Genesis 2:5 is only concerned with specific plants in the Garden of Eden and does not impact the plants spoken of in Day Three. (Kruger, 1997, p. 109)

C.F. Keil also interprets the plants as those that God creates in the Garden of Eden on Day Six: “The creation of the plants is not alluded to here at all, but simply the planting of the garden of Eden.” (Keil, 1986, p. 77) Keil further explains the reference to shrubs, sprouting herbs, and the “field” mentioned:

The growing of the shrubs and sprouting of the herbs is different from the creation or first production of the vegetable kingdom, and relates to the growing and sprouting of the plants and germs which were called into existence by the creation, the natural development of the plants as it had steadily proceeded ever since the creation. This was dependent upon rain and human culture, their creation was not. Moreover, the shrub and herb of the field do not embrace the whole of the vegetable productions of the earth. It is not a fact that ‘the field is used in the second section in the same sense as the earth in the first’. [Sadeh] is not ‘the widespread plain of the earth, the broad expanse of land, but a field of arable land, soil fit for cultivation, which forms only a part of the ‘earth’ or ‘ground.’ (Keil, 1986, p. 77)

Genesis 2:5 does not teach that due to two deficiencies God could not create plant life. Quite the opposite. Paulin Bedard writes: “Genesis 2 does not focus on the “deficiencies” but on the fact that, in spite of these “deficiencies” (no rain, no man to till the ground), God preserves a wonderful garden of Eden.” (Bedard, 2013, p. 58) So, in Genesis 2:5 Moses describes how on Day Six God created a beautiful garden that man had not planted. It was a gift from God. The plants in the garden were not watered by rain. Instead, God used a special mist to water the garden.

Paulin Bedard relates and distinguishes the plants mentioned in Genesis 2:5 from the plants created on Day Three:

The “bush[es] of the field” (2:5) and “the small plants of the field” (2:5) are not necessarily the same plants as those already created on the third day, i.e., “vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit” (1:11). Maybe these specific plants in Genesis 2:5, at least “the bush[es] of the field,” are already created but do not produce buds or sprouts yet (which is the possible meaning of the word “spring up”). In any case, Genesis 2:5 would not be related to the third day but to the sixth day. The “earth” (*erets*) would refer to a large geographic area, whereas the “field” (*sadeh*) would refer to a more limited geographic area, a suitable place for agriculture. (Bedard, 2013, p. 57)

Several other commentators, including Frank Walker Jr, Jonathan Sarfati, and Kenneth Matthews provide better explanations (than Kline) of the identity of the plants mentioned in Genesis 2:5.

Frank Walker Jr. understands Moses’ statement in Genesis 2:4, “These are the generations,” as a phrase that “introduces the results of the previous section.” (Walker, "A Critique of the Framework Hypothesis", 2001, p. 69) The following section focuses in more detail on the creation of man in the Garden of Eden. “Thus, Genesis 2:5 is not another explanation of Day Three, but a detailed description of an already created world with specific information relating to man’s place in that world.” (Walker, "A Critique of the Framework Hypothesis", 2001, pp. 69-70) So “Genesis 2:5-7 anticipates the story that follows.” (Walker, Genesis 1 Versus the Framework Hypothesis, 2001, p. 70)

Walker interprets the plants mentioned in Genesis 2:5 as those that would be recorded as growing *after* the Fall. Genesis 2:5-7 is signaling the change that will occur after the Fall. Walker writes:

The plants mentioned in Genesis 2:5 are the same as those mentioned in Genesis 3:18. In fact, exactly the same words are used for *herb of the field*. Thus, Futato’s definition of these plants as “wild vegetation” and “cultivated grain” is essentially correct. But what he misses is that neither of these kinds of plant life grew before the Fall exactly as they grew afterward. When Adam sinned, God cursed the entire world: *Thorns also and thistles shall it bring*

*forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread* (Gen. 3:18-19). Wild vegetation became a hindrance and an annoyance to man; God himself would provide rain to cause it to flourish in man's world. Cultivated grain needed the tireless labor of a cultivator. (Walker, "A Critique of the Framework Hypothesis", 2001, p. 70)

Jonathan Sarfati distinguishes the plants mentioned in Genesis 2:5 from those classified as created on the Third Day in Genesis 1:11-12. He takes the plants in Genesis 2:5 to be "*different types* of plants." (Sarfati, 2018, p. 295) Back on Day Three Moses uses a Hebrew word, *deshe'*, which is a more encompassing word that refers to grass and vegetation "*in general.*" (Sarfati, 2018, pp. 295-96) Moses uses a "more restrictive" words in Genesis 2:5 when he refers to "*shrubs* of the field" and "*plants* of the field." Moses uses the word *'eseb* (non-woody vegetation) in Genesis 1:11 but in Genesis 2:5 he refers to the more specific *'eseb hassadeh* (refers to any non-woody plant that requires cultivation).

Sarfati concludes that God did not cause certain types of vegetation to sprout until man was created. Moses is explaining the reason for this: "The main reason is that man was not yet around to cultivate these types of plants. Indeed, pre-Fall man was able to live on fruit from the trees." (Sarfati, 2018, p. 296) Only after the Fall did Adam need to till the ground in the sweat of his brow.

Sarfati admits that Meredith Kline was right about something. That is a start. Sarfati writes: "He rightly states that God did not make plants before the earth had rain or a man (although this is talking about cultivated plants)." (Sarfati, 2018, p. 297) About Kline's claim that Genesis 2:5 teaches that ordinary providence was functioning during the creation week, Sarfati responds:

But this is desperate eisegesis to accommodate uniformitarian 'science'. Even if normal providence were operating, it would not follow that miracles were *not*. In fact, there is no miracle in the Bible that does *not* operate in the midst of normal providence. (Sarfati, 2018, p. 298)

Sarfati concludes:

So, in conclusion, Kline presupposes normal providence as God's *sole modus operandi* for Genesis 2:5, wildly extrapolates it to the entire Creation Week, and further presumes that normal providence excludes miracles. This error is compounded by failing to note the narrow focus of Genesis 2 on man and his needs. (Sarfati, 2018, p. 299)

Kenneth Matthews also distinguishes between the plants mentioned by Moses on the Third Day in Genesis 1:11 and the plants he refers to in Genesis 2:5. He understands Genesis 2:5 within the context of Genesis 2:4 and following. Moses begins what is our Genesis 2:4 by writing, "These are the generations..." Matthews thinks that the purpose of this section is to contrast life before and after the Fall. He writes that

When viewed in this way, we find that the "shrub" and "plant" of 2:5 are not the same as the vegetation of 1:11-12. "Plant ('*eseb*) of the field" describes the diet of man which he eats only after the sweat of his labor (3:18-19) after his garden sin, whereas "seed-bearing plants" ('*eseb mazria' zera*'), as they are found in the creation narrative, were provided by God for human and animal consumption (1:11-12, 29-30; 9:3). These plants reproduce themselves by seed alone, but "plant," spoken of in 2:5, requires human cultivation to produce the grains necessary for edible food; it is by such cultivation that fallen man will eat his "food" (3:19). (Matthews, 1996, p. 194)

### **Kline's Startling Application of His Fictional General Principle to the Origin of Planet Earth**

Meredith G. Kline makes startling applications of the general principle that he derives from Genesis 2:5. In essence the general principle that he derives from Genesis 2:5 is that the God who created the world did so as a Deistic god. He envisions the world coming into existence through the mechanisms formulated by atheistic macro evolutionists. The philosophical naturalism that underlies how atheistic evolutionists envision the origin of life is shared by theistic evolutionists. Kline's interpretation of Genesis 2:5 places him within the camp of the theistic

evolutionists who decry any role for design in the origin of the world. Kline supports the scientific cosmology advanced by atheists and what they believe about stellar evolution and the subsequent formation of the planets over a period of billions of years.

In Genesis 2:5 Kline believes that he has discovered the general principle that God only used ordinary providential means during the creation “week.” I place the word “week” in quotes because Kline does not believe that God created the world and everything in it in an historical week. He mocks the idea that Day Three of the creation week was a Tuesday. Apparently, he thinks that it is a joke to refer to the first day of creation as Sunday or the last day of the creation week as a Saturday. Kline’s generally consistent application of his pet principle leads him to startling and absurd conclusions.

First, Kline believes that God did not create an alternate source of light on an historical first day. Since God normally uses the sun to warm and light planet earth, Kline requires that the sun alone provide light and heat during the creation “week.”

Second, Kline requires the existence of rain prior to the creation of plants. Therefore, God did not create plants on Day Three prior to the creation of rain.

Third, God did not create plants on Day Three prior to the creation of the sun on Day Four.

Kline is only warming up. He is not content to contradict the plain sense of the text of Genesis 1 about the order and chronology in which God created various creatures.

He then startles the pious Christian by making another claim. Fourth, he claims that God could not have created the material of planet earth on a Day One of creation prior to the creation of the heavenly luminaries, which were made on Day Four. I should place the words “Day One” and “Day Four” in quotation marks when using them in the sense that Kline grants to them. He does not believe that they are

historical days. But Kline is claiming that God did not create the material of planet earth prior to the origin of the heavenly luminaries. In plain language he does not believe that God created the material of planet earth on Day One and then three days later created the sun and stars. I hope you are beginning to comprehend what Kline is claiming. He takes his principle that God only used ordinary providential means during the creation “week” to mean that God could not have created the earth prior to the sun and stars.

The humor of the situation, if it is appropriate to mention humor about such a solemn topic and in relation to such a grave error, is that Kline claims that the strength of the Framework Hypothesis is that instead of reading Genesis 1 as recording a literal history about how and the chronological order in which God created the world, it accents the theological truths being revealed in the literary framework of Genesis 1. One of the greatest theological points made by pious commentators is that God put off the creation of the sun, moon, and stars until Day Four to communicate that the celestial luminaries are not gods and merely creatures. Kline undermines this great theological implication that flows from the chronology of the creation week.

Given our acquaintance with how atheistic, evolutionary scientists formulate the Big Bang, stellar evolution, and the origin of planet earth; it is stunning to discover that Kline believes that the principle he finds in Genesis 2:5 forces Christians to affirm this “scientific cosmology”! He believes that planet earth evolved according to ordinary providential means like those described by evolutionists who claim that planet earth evolved in the context of the billions of years involved in stellar evolution. This is exactly the view of the origin of planet earth that I was taught in class at Calvin College by John Cannon and Howard J. Van Til. Van Til and Cannon were prominent theistic evolutionists. Howard J. Van Til depended upon Meredith Kline’s formulation of the Framework Hypothesis to

support his theories of theistic evolution as developed in his book *The Fourth Day*. (Van Til, 1986) Listen to what Meredith Kline writes about the origin of planet earth and how the principle he finds in Genesis 2:5 requires that he support an evolutionary view of the origin of the stars and planets:

And of course the existence of the earth itself on day one confronts the traditional approaches with a gigantic exception to normal providential procedure. For according to them the earth would have come into existence by itself as a solitary sphere, not as part of the cosmological process by which stars and their satellites originate, and it would have continued alone, suspended in a special void (if we may so speak) for the first three days of creation. All the vast universe whose origin is narrated on day four would then be younger (even billions of years younger) than the speck in space called earth. So much for the claimed harmony of the narrative sequence of Genesis 1 with scientific cosmology. (Kline M. G., 1996, p. 15)

Kline assumes that the universe is billions of years old. He also thinks that the “scientific cosmology” of Darwinians explains the origins of the universe and planet earth. He believes that planet earth came into existence much later than the stars, billions and billions of years later.

Given the fact that on each of the creation days God is recorded as doing marvelous creative acts that are connected to extraordinary providences, it is extraordinary that Kline can make his claims with a straight face. It is true that God used ordinary providences on Day Three after He created the dry land and the plants. But God first engaged in extraordinary providences in creating dry land masses and then drying the land sufficiently to create plant life. God engages in supernatural creative acts that are on a par with miracles. He creates and oversees extraordinary providences while also creating order and putting ordinary providential means into action.

God does not bring the fish and birds into existence on Day Five by ordinary providential means. He certainly does not create Adam and Eve on Day Six



according to ordinary providential means. God's creative activities involved miraculous ways of bringing creatures into existence; such actions are the opposite of ordinary providence.

Kline's emphasis on God only using ordinary providential means during the creation "week" reminds me of how theistic evolutionists deny any role to design. Theistic evolutionists affirm that God, whose god is like the god of Deism, simply created the laws governing the universe and the raw material and then life and humanity evolved through natural selection and random mutations over long periods of time. In other words, theistic evolutionists only allow ordinary providential means to contribute to the origin of life and humanity. And this ordinary means is understood in terms of unguided natural selection. They have a weak view of ordinary divine providence. If Kline is consistent, the only way that planet earth, the stars, and animal life could have come into existence was by an "ordinary providence." And we know that ordinary providence does not produce new creatures.

M.H. Kruger expresses the horns of Kline's dilemma. He must either reject his principle that God only used ordinary providential means during the creation "week" or affirm the mechanisms of theistic evolution which are neo-Darwinian mechanisms.

But even Kline does not suggest in his "framework hypothesis" that all things were created simultaneously, thus he too must posit certain acts of extraordinary providence intermingled with ordinary providence during the creation process. The only way in which Kline can maintain a purely naturalistic and ordinary creation process is to suggest that God used some evolutionary mechanism. (Kruger, 1997, pp. 108-109)

Kline is teaching a form of Deism. Kline's easy affirmation of a "scientific cosmology" which is the atheistic and evolutionary view of the origin of planet earth

is evidence for his Deism. He does not even allow the creation of the material of planet earth by fiat creation.

Kline's view is absurd given what Genesis chapter 1 records about God's creative activity during the creation week. Frank Walker writes:

During the first five days God ruled the world entirely by extraordinary providence. There is no evidence in Genesis 1 of anything else. But with the creation of man (to whom the Lord gave a fair amount of responsibility) ordinary providence was put into effect. (Walker, 2001, pp. 4-5)

Genesis chapters 1 and 2 are filled with extraordinary providences connected to supernatural creative acts. Yet Kline allows himself to be so blinded by the fictional principle that he thinks that he discovers in Genesis 2:5 that he is unable to see how God's creative acts by extraordinary providences are everywhere clearly manifested in Genesis 1 and 2.

# Works Cited

- Bedard, P. (2013). *In Six Days God Created: Refuting the Framework and Figurative Views of the Days of Creation*. Xulon Press.
- Calvin, J. (2010). *Commentary on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis, vol. 1*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software.
- Godfrey, R. (2003). *God's Pattern for Creation*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing.
- Keil, C. (1986). *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes, vol. 1: The Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Kline, M. G. (1958). Because It Had Not Rained. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 146-157.
- Kline, M. G. (1996). Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmology. *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*, 2-15.
- Kruger, M. J. (1997). An Understanding of Genesis 2:5. *CEN Technical Journal*, 106-110.
- Matthews, K. A. (1996). *The New American Commentary: An Exegetical & Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture. NIV. Genesis 1-11:26*. Printed in U.S.: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Pipa, J. A. (1999). From Chaos to Cosmos: A Critique of the Non-Literal Interpretation of Genesis 1:1-2:3. In e. Joseph A. Pipa, *Did God Create in Six Days?* Greenville, SC: Southern Presbyterian Press.
- Sarfati, J. D. (2018). *The Genesis Account: A theological, historical, and scientific commentary on Genesis 1-11*. Powder Springs, Georgia: Creation Book Publishers.
- Van Til, H. J. (1986). *The Fourth Day: What the Bible and the Heavens are Telling us about the Creation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Walker, F. (2001). "A Critique of the Framework Hypothesis". In e. P. Andrew Sandlin, *Creation According to the Scriptures: A Presuppositional Defense of Literal, Six-Day Creation*. Vallecito, CA: Chalcedon Foundation.
- Walker, F. (2001). Genesis 1 Versus the Framework Hypothesis. *Reformed Herald*, 57:6.