

the previous truths.

36. **BibleWorks for Windows**, Ref. 16.
37. Of course, if Genesis 1-11 are not to be considered historical, then the most pressing question is why did God use deceptive language? The most straightforward reading of the text would cause one to conclude that the events occurred as they are depicted — at least such was the case with virtually all of Jewry and Christendom until the 1800s.
38. John 3:7. Actually, double entendre may be at work in John 3:7. **Δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν** (*Dei humas gennēthēnai anōthen*) (You must be born again). **Ἄνωθεν** (*anōthen*) (again) is a compound of which the preposition **ἀνά** (*ana*) is a [**Ἄνά** (*Ana*) can mean 'above' or 'again', depending upon the context. In truth, either meaning fits this context, and both may well have been intended by Jesus.

**David G. Shackelford** has a B.S.E. from the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, and a M.Div. and Ph.D. from the Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, Memphis, Tennessee, the latter majoring in New Testament and Greek and minoring in Theology, Old Testament and Hebrew. He is Associate Professor of New Testament and Greek at the Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary/Northeast Branch, Schenectady, Albany area, in the state of New York.

### QUOTABLE QUOTE: Compromising with Naturalism

*'Scientific naturalism is the spirit of the age, at least in the universities, and even many Christian intellectuals are at least half convinced that naturalism is true. Some abandon their theism for just this reason, while others think about the contradiction as little as possible or struggle in various ways to reconcile theism in religion with naturalism in science.*

*The simplest way to resolve the contradiction is to withdraw one's personal theism from the world of objective reality. Perhaps the consequences of divine action are inherently invisible to science, although they may be apparent enough to the eye of faith. If evidence of divine action in the history of the universe is conspicuous by its apparent absence, then we may still choose to believe that the universe would disappear if God did not constantly uphold it with his mighty (but scientifically undetectable) word of power. Wise metaphysical naturalists will smile at these transparent devices, but they will not openly ridicule them. Why should they — when theists implicitly comply with the naturalistic doctrine that "religion" is a matter of faith, not reason?"*

Johnson, Phillip E., 1995. **Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education**, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, p. 101.