



Emerald24 5 days ago

@Truth Time Radio

1Cor 15:17 does, in fact, prove that NO one was forgiven AT the cross. IF Christ had not risen, according to that verse, who/how many could have been forgiven AT the cross? Praise God, He did raise from the dead, enabling all who trust in His work to receive forgiveness and justification.

I read your explanation for Acts 26:18; it makes no sense. The payment was made for all, and is available, waiting to be received through faith. IF forgiveness was automatically applied, no one would need to "receive" it. It would work like sin; we don't "receive" sin; it's an automatic, involuntary fact of reality. Why would Paul beseech people to be reconciled, if they were already sinless, and therefore, right in God's eyes?

Those at the WTJ will be judged according to their works, but you teach that they have no "bad works"/sins to be judged for? Why did Jesus teach degrees of punishment, if everyone in hell will one day be perfectly sinless, just spiritually dead, all on equal ground?

You say "Saved people have His justification, because He is just." Yet, at the same time, you teach that a just, an Holy God (whose requirement to be made holy in His sight has been met by the payment of Christ's shed blood) is still condemning sinless, washed souls to a place of horrible punishment? Are we "sanctified" because sanctified is an attribute of Christ?

Do you think Alexander the coppersmith was forgiven all sin? What will the Lord be "rewarding" him for? Remembering that a "reward" can be something bad, not just a good thing.

Why will God punish those who persecuted the Thessalonians with everlasting destruction, if those persecutors are sinless? For that matter, why is there a day of God's wrath and vengeance coming at all? It isn't just Israel that will suffer through the Tribulation; the whole world will endure His wrath. Sin is not being imputed presently, that does not equate into automatic forgiveness for all during this, or any dispensation.

Look up the definition for Justify/Justified/Justification (I realized you prefer to create your own definitions for words, such as you did for "regeneration", but, honestly, it's ok to consult an old dictionary, like Webster's 1828.) There are several examples to give, but here are just a few.

Justify a. :to prove or show to be just, RIGHT, or reasonable (When a soul has no sin on their account, therefore they are forgiven, how can they not be "right" in God's eyes?)

Justification a. :the act or an instance of justifying something: VINDICATION

2 c. Archaic: ABSOLVE-to set (someone) free from an obligation or the consequences of guilt

To pardon or forgive (a sin): to remit (a sin) by absolution

Eph 1:7 & Col 1:14 "In whom (when we are IN Christ) we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." If what you teach is true, then no one need to be IN Christ to be redeemed or forgiven.

Universal Forgiveness is a dangerous error; a 1/2 step away from Universal Salvation.

John 8:24 is an example of faith being required in any dispensation. There are many trans-dispensational truths in scripture; necessary FAITH in God and His instruction is just one example. After the cross, Jesus told his apostles that "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." That was speaking of individual's, not national Israel's; that could've applied to Gentiles, as well. Are Jewish saints in 1 John already forgiven? That means some were obviously not forgiven.

Your universal forgiveness doctrine does not hold up against the whole of scripture. You cherry pick verses, then twist them, and redefine words, to make them try to fit. No matter how you contort, you still end up with a just God condemning sinless souls, who also would had to have been "washed" by the blood sacrifice of Christ, in eternal torment, although they had been made "right"/justified in His eyes, because if you're sinless, all your "wrongs" are gone, and you are justified.

Show less

Bryan Ross: This is a screenshot of the YouTube comment that TTR is responding to in this Blog post.

For the record, I have never left a comment upon any of TTR's YouTube videos.



Bryan Ross: Who is this talking about? How many "history teachers" with ministries are there in the greater grace space?

The following is an exchange with a Limited Forgiver who plays gymnastics with God's word.

Bryan Ross: "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."

Listener: "1Cor 15:17 does, in fact, prove that NO one was forgiven AT the cross. IF Christ had not risen, according to that verse, who/how many could have been forgiven AT the cross? Praise God, He did raise from the dead, enabling all who trust in His work to receive forgiveness and justification."

TTR: Why you want to present a moot point as an argument is beyond me, but have at it. The more you say "If Christ had not risen" while knowing that He absolutely **did** raise – you prove your own argument as irrelevant.

By continuing with your objections, you are just putting on display the fact that you absolutely do not comprehend what took place on the cross, and how the resurrection verifies what happened AT THE CROSS for the entire world, including you. If you really knew what God did on your behalf, it's unlikely that you'd be here "right-fighting" in an attempt to gain some sort of credit for what Christ did for you, without consulting you first, and without waiting for you to **believe it** so He could do it. Understanding the full implications of the **finished** crosswork tends to result in thankfulness to God, and humility – knowing that He forgave you while you were still His enemy. But, instead, you're begging for some credit. You've just **got** to have your fingers on it somewhere.

That's the difference between self-righteousness and the righteousness of Christ. There isn't much space for Christ's righteousness to dwell in a prideful heart.

Bryan Ross: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

Listener: "I read your explanation for Acts 26:18; it makes no sense. The payment was made for all, and is available, waiting to be received through faith. IF forgiveness was automatically applied, no one would need to "receive" it."

TTR: It doesn't make sense to you because you are missing it on purpose. Forgiveness is something to be "applied?" Since when? You're just making stuff up now.

If I forgive you for a wrong, even if you don't think you did anything wrong – then according to your argument, my forgiveness toward you is irrelevant, non-existent, illogical, and in vain – all because **you** did not receive it as a valuable thing. Get over yourself. When someone else forgives you – it isn't **about** you. Only an impenitent, self-absorbed, self-important, reprobate would think that the value of forgiveness is in the guilty party's acceptance of it. You're still operating in the religious mindset of "God waiting for you to come to Him and apologize" to receive forgiveness. As if He's like carnal man, sitting up there with His arms crossed, holding a grudge against the world until they come and beg for forgiveness. If that's the god you're here to defend, then it's best you move on.

Listener: "It would work like sin; we don't "receive" sin; it's an automatic, involuntary fact of reality. Why would Paul beseech people to be reconciled, if they were already sinless, and therefore, right in God's eyes?"

TTR: Sin isn't being imputed, but that doesn't mean anyone is "sinless" -so I don't even know what you're talking about. You seem to have an odd idea about how "sinning" works. Otherwise, you wouldn't make blanket statements like "it's involuntary." People voluntarily sin all the time. There isn't just "one type" of sin. The fact is that **ALL** sin was once being imputed (counted against us) but no longer is, because of the finished crosswork.

When you say "if they were already sinless" --- who is the "they" you're talking about? The lost world? Have you looked at yourself, lately? Are **you** "sinless, and therefore right in God's eyes?" (Surely you aren't going to answer "yes" to that.) Of course you're not. You probably committed sin since posting your last comment here, and you may even be sinning now as you read this. So what is your point? Why would you ask something about "them" that you, yourself have not even achieved the status of?

Let me say this slowly:

Sinless. People. Don't. Need. Forgiveness.

Please read that last sentence as many times as you need to for it to sink in.

Listener: "Those at the WTJ will be judged according to their works, but you teach that they have no "bad works"/sins to be judged for?"

TTR: We do not teach that. This is yet another false assertion from someone who has failed to educate themselves before making a knee jerk judgment.

Listener: "Why did Jesus teach degrees of punishment, if everyone in hell will one day be perfectly sinless, just spiritually dead, all on equal ground?"

TTR: First of all, we have an entire podcast about different degrees of punishment. It's called "Is All Sin Equal?" Secondly, there you go with that "sinless" thing again - and now you're adding to the drama with "**perfectly** sinless."

Listener: "You say "Saved people have His justification, because He is just." Yet, at the same time, you teach that a just, an Holy God (whose requirement to be made holy in His sight has been met by the payment of Christ's shed blood) is still condemning sinless, washed souls to a place of horrible punishment?"

TTR: "condemning sinless, washed souls to a place of horrible punishment" - Another false assertion that doesn't deserve a response.

Listener: "Are we "sanctified" because sanctified is an attribute of Christ?"

TTR: If you're saved, you are also sanctified; made holy, because He is Holy; set apart by being placed into His Body. We don't teach Sonship Edification here.

Listener: "Do you think Alexander the coppersmith was forgiven all sin?"

TTR: Yes. That's an odd question, even for you. Under your "Limited Forgiveness" doctrine which requires belief for forgiveness to be "applied," do you know if he ever believed the gospel? Paul turned him over to Satan so that he'd learn not to blaspheme. (Just like the guy in 1 Corinthians 5.) Are you assuming that he never believed Paul's gospel, therefore, according to your false doctrine of Limited Forgiveness, he was never forgiven? Why are you bringing up someone who may have been no more "unsaved" than the guy in 1 Cor. 5?

Listener: "What will the Lord be "rewarding" him for?"

TTR: His works. Just like Paul says.

Listener: "Remembering that a "reward" can be something bad, not just a good thing."

TTR: Yep. -I don't know who you think you're preaching to here. The word used is "reward" not "award."

Listener: "Why will God punish those who persecuted the Thessalonians with everlasting destruction, if those persecutors are sinless?"

TTR: I'm not answering a question that is based on your false premise that people can somehow be "sinless." That's a "you" problem.

Listener: "For that matter, why is there a day of God's wrath and vengeance coming at all?"

TTR: Again, this is a "you" problem, based on your own assumptions. We don't teach that people are "sinless." We teach that people are forgiven. Also, what you're referring to is a different dispensation. We don't preach other gospels for salvation, either. And we don't conflate different aspects of instruction, terminology, and doctrine just to make mainstream christianity comfortable here. -Likely the reason why we've rubbed you the wrong way.

Listener: "It isn't just Israel that will suffer through the Tribulation; the whole world will endure His wrath."

TTR: Ok? And that relates to this conversation, how? --- You're still arguing against your assumptions about what we teach.

The publication date of this Blog by TTR was March 20, 2022.

TTR's comments about looking "at the available sources from the same time period" i.e., the 17th century, and conducting "etymological research" are interesting. In anticipation of the argumentation utilized here by TTR, namely, that Noah Webster's 1828 "American Dictionary of the English Language" is more than 200 years removed from 1611, I conducted the extensive etymological research that TTR is advocating for in this Blog. In doing so, I consulted the following resources:

- 1) Oxford English Dictionary (the most thorough and complete dictionary on the etymology of English words),
- 2) Middle English Dictionary,
- 3) Online Etymological Dictionary, and
- 4) The Table Alphabetical.

The Table Alphabetical is of particular importance here because it dates from 1604 the same year that King James authorized the translation project that produced the KJB. Therefore, the Table Alphabetical is a primary source for the meaning of English words during the exact time period when the KJB was being translated (1604-1611). According to the Table Alphabetical the words "regenerate" and "regeneration" carried the following meanings in 1604:

Regenerate--born again
Regeneration--a new birth

See the images appended to this document on pages 8 & 9 for photographic proof of our findings regarding the etymology of the word "regeneration."

TTR also spoke of "looking at relevant sources from the same time period" as well as consulting "the contextual usage of that word in other relevant sources." One wonders if TTR would consider pre-1611 English translations of the Textus Receptus i.e., the stream of preservation held to by King James advocates as "relevant sources."

Listener: "Sin is not being imputed presently, that does not equate into automatic forgiveness for all during this, or any dispensation."

TTR: So, which non-imputed sin do you need to get forgiven during **THIS** dispensation? I'll wait.

Also, we do not teach "automatic forgiveness" for other dispensations. That would be unscriptural. Maybe do a little research on who you are criticizing before creating strawman arguments. That would save us a lot of time.

Listener: "Look up the definition for Justify/Justified/Justification (I realized you prefer to create your own definitions for words, such as you did for "regeneration", but, honestly, it's ok to consult an old dictionary, like Webster's 1828.)"

TTR: No one's creating "new" definitions. Just letting the King James say what it says. You should try it. It's unfortunate that you have an issue with that and feel the need to "consult" other sources as your final authority. But I'll entertain your irrelevant claims for a second: "new birth" (which is the definition of regeneration being strongly pushed lately) and RE-birth are not even the same thing.

NEW (never before)

RE (again)

If the best I could do was claim that "new" and "again" were both the same thing, I'd probably just shut up. -And I definitely would not preach entire sermons on it. -But that's just me.

Also, if I want an extrabiblical source for helping to define words from 17th century text, I usually find it more appropriate to look at the available sources from that same time period. Do etymological research, consult the contextual usage of that word in other relevant sources, etc. -Instead of putting all my trust in something from 200 years **after** that time period, which contains obviously proven incorrect definitions of other words. But again, that's just me.

Listener: There are several examples to give, but here are just a few. Justify a. :to prove or show to be just, RIGHT, or reasonable (When a soul has no sin on their account, therefore they are forgiven, how can they not be "right" in God's eyes?)"

TTR: Just because I don't hold your wrongs against you doesn't mean you didn't commit those wrongs. However, if you were "justified" in committing those "wrongs" then the "wrongs" wouldn't be wrong. -Kind of like 1st degree murder vs. self-defense homicide. One is unjustifiable and one is justified.

Listener: "Justification a. :the act or an instance of justifying something: VINDICATION 2 c. Archaic: ABSOLVE-to set (someone) free from an obligation or the consequences of guilt To pardon or forgive (a sin): to remit (a sin) by absolution"

TTR: These definitions remind me of how Christendumb defines the word "repent." Also looks a little bit like Roman Catholic lingo. By the way, you ever looked up the word "repent" in your beloved 1828?

Listener: "Eph 1:7 & Col 1:14"In whom (when we are IN Christ) we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." If what you teach is true, then no one need to be IN Christ to be redeemed or forgiven."

TTR: Just more "gotcha verses." It's apparent that you Limited Forgivers have allowed your prejudices to blind you from truth. This is basic grammar from 8th grade English class. The "in whom" refers to the person of Christ being the **SOURCE** of forgiveness and not the location one must be in to **GET** forgiveness.

Do you not respect the word of God enough to just allow it say what it says in context, instead of searching verses out to support your argument? If you could refrain from **ADDING** "the body of" in the middle of the words "in Christ" you wouldn't have this problem. Stop reading things into the scriptures. If that's all you're going to use the Bible for, then you'd be better off closing it. Maybe one day you and your ilk will realize that we don't respect your word searches and cherry picking scriptures to fit your agenda, and move on.

The words "the body of" are no where in those verses, and no one has been redeemed YET.

Listener: "Universal Forgiveness is a dangerous error; a 1/2 step away from Universal Salvation."

TTR: The Limited Forgivers have been saying this at least since 2013. Yet you haven't been able to give even ONE example of it happening. However, one of your **own** mid actors turned into a full blown unapologetic universalist, didn't he? And the silence about his "universal forgiveness doctrine" **leading to it** - is DEAFENING. You can't very well say that he got that from universal forgiveness because he never **taught** universal forgiveness. "1/2 step" huh?

It is actually **your leader** who is responsible for the initial propagating of this lie of forgiveness on the cross leading to universalism, and I see you all are still parroting it with zero evidence. Nearly 10 years of saying the same thing over and over - expecting different results. (Can someone say "insanity?")

10 years of creating all out campaigns which caused confusion, further divisions, and contention where before, there was none. Mud-slinging, false accusations, deception - all to

As part of my research, I looked at these translations to see how they translated the Greek word παλιγγενεσας (palingenesia) in Titus 3:5. Tyndale (1526), Coverdale (1536), Matthews (1537), Great (1539), and Geneva (1560) all had "new birth" in Titus 3:5 (see the images on pages 9 & 10). It was the Bishops Bible (1568) that changed "new birth" to "regeneration" a word that means "new birth" according to the Table Alphabetical from 1604, a 17th-century primary source on the meaning of English words if ever there was one.

The fruit of the research recommended by TTR does not square with the distinction between "NEW (never before)" and "RE (again)" alleged in their Blog post. Likewise in TTR's video from March 16, 2022, titled "Wretched Radio vs. Truth Time Radio: To Be, or Not To Be Born Again" a confused and self-contradictory definitional distinction is presented:

"(18:42) No need to word search, you can lay down the man-made dictionaries. And you don't have to Greek it. The Bible in English is just fine. This Bible, God's word is its own dictionary. We simply compare scripture with scripture and sit back and watch the dots connect. . . regeneration, when you look at the word, notice the letter GEN, reGEN, regeneration (19:31). GEN as in the book of Genesis. The beginning of something. . . (20:36) Paul mentions regeneration only once and it is for the purpose of being positionally identified with Christ. It does not equate to Israel's born again. In 2 Cor. 5 were told that we are a new creature reGEN, regenerated. We are the genesis of this thing folks. Never before done. Which means we are not again anything. We are the first. The new. The church, the body of Christ. Not the church the body of Christ again. Its not as if there was a church which was his body previously and God just wanted to update it. We are the first church which is his body. Something new is first but born again is when the old is redone. That is Israel (21:35)."

push a self-aggrandizing agenda... Continuing to fuel the fire, cause further divisions, and without the ability to just let it go and move on. He's obsessed with proving himself right, and yet he does a terrible job of it. I have zero respect for the so-called "history and social justice teacher" that you have so much admiration for. He's a blemish to the body of Christ, IF he's even in it. Don't come here promoting his nonsense. No one's delusions of grandeur will be entertained here and neither will your promotion of such.

Listener: "John 8:24 is an example of faith being required in any dispensation. There are many trans-dispensational truths in scripture; necessary FAITH in God and His instruction is just one example."

TTR: Who said "faith" isn't required in any dispensation? Who are you arguing with about this? You may have time to waste, but as ministers of reconciliation **we do not!**

Listener: "After the cross, Jesus told his apostles that "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." That was speaking of individual's, not national Israel's; that could've applied to Gentiles, as well."

TTR: "could've applied?"

This. Was. Before. The. Cross. No one can "remit" sins today. - Not even according to your Limited Forgiveness Doctrine.
So what are you talking about?

Listener: "Are Jewish saints in 1 John already forgiven?"

TTR: Their past sins are: Romans 3:25. Future sins **will be** blotted out. You may listen to us, but do you pay attention to what you're hearing?

Listener: "That means some were obviously not forgiven. Your universal forgiveness doctrine does not hold up against the whole of scripture. You cherry pick verses, then twist them, and redefine words, to make them try to fit. No matter how you contort, you still end up with a just God condemning sinless souls, who also would had to have been "washed" by the blood sacrifice of Christ, in eternal torment, although they had been made "right"/justified in His eyes, because if you're sinless, all your "wrongs" are gone, and you are justified "

TTR: I told you to stop using that type of fallacious argument in my last response to you. If you want to come here and debate, try learning the rules of debating. You can't use a faulty premise to come up with a logical conclusion. It invalidates the point you're trying to make. The only way to respond to a logical fallacy is by showing the lack of logic contained. I've already done that once, and yet you refuse to stop and use logic correctly. -So we're done here.

The highlighted text to the left speaks for itself.

Parties interested in my actual view of "social justice" are encouraged to consult my 6-part series on YouTube titled "Critical Social Justice & Scripture."

Bryan Ross: Part 2 of 2

Did you catch it? In the Blog, TTR insists that "NEW" and "RE" are different. Yet in the video when speaking about the body of Christ TTR states, ". . . In 2 Cor. 5 were told that we are a NEW creature; reGEN, regenerated (20:47)." TTR is redefining words contrary to their historic meanings. "reGEN, regeneration" was stressed in the same breath with 'new' while ignoring the respective documentable definitions of the words in question.

Moreover, it is important to point out that TTR offers no documentary proof, scriptural or otherwise, for their proposed definitions while at the same time mocking Emerald24 for using Webster's 1828 Dictionary. In their Blog, TTR shames Emerald24 for using "man-made dictionaries" while at the same time promoting their own man-made definitions. Put another way, put down the "man-made dictionary" and allow TTR to privately define words for you.

In a later YouTube comment, in which a link to this Blog was shared, TTR told Emerald24, "we are not going to promote BR's BS on the "history of the text"" (see image on page 10).

On Sunday, March 6 & 13, 2022, I taught publicly on the subject of "regeneration" in Titus 3:5 at Grace Life Bible Church (GLBC). Therefore, all the documentation presented in this PDF was in the public space prior to both March 16 & March 20 when TTR published its YouTube video and this Blog or made the follow-up comment to Emerald24 (see page 10).

These comments regarding my "BS" work on "the history of the text" reveal that either:

- 1) TTR was not serious in their Blog when they advocated for "etymological research" and examples of 17th century word usage,
- 2) they attacked me publicly with full knowledge of the scope of my research, or
- 3) TTR was totally unaware of my work on this topic and elected to call it "BS" anyway. Regardless of the option one prefers, wonderment exists over whether TTR is willing to "stand behind" their words in the face of the very type of evidence demanded in their Blog post.

I pray that you will learn to take your eyes off man and his flawed reasoning, and put your sights on God's Word. More importantly, understand and believe the implications of the **FINISHED** crosswork, and what occurred on the cross without your belief in the equation.

God didn't need you to be a part of what He did. You just need to **believe** what He did. First, you've got to stop putting yourself where you don't belong. You play NO PART in the gospel.

You are not invited to "help" God do what He's already done. Salvation is not getting your sins forgiven. It's believing they already ARE!

Please do your homework. Then if you still don't agree - fine. Move on and stop wasting your time here. We will not be changing our mind concerning the finished cross-work of Christ. We are not like the "mid actors" who simply give it lip service. We actually **BELIEVE** it.

Share this post:



RELEVANT TIMELINE:

3/6/22--Born Again or Regenerated: Is There A Difference? (Taught @ GLBC)

3/13/22--Born Again or Regenerated: Is There a Difference? (Part 2) (Taught @ GLBC)

3/16/22--Wretched Radio vs Truth Time Radio: To Be, or Not To Be Born Again (TTR released video on YouTube)

3/20/22--"What Happens When You Put A "History Teacher" Above God's Word?" (Blog published by TTR)

3/20/22--TTR published "BS" comment on YouTube in response to Emerald24 with a link to the Blog post.

1604

Bryan Ross: Table Alphabetical 1604

regenerate, boine againe
regeneration, a new birth,

Bryan Ross: Oxford English Dictionary

Etymology & Definition 1.a.

regeneration, n.

View as: Outline | Full entry

Quotations: Show all | Hide all Keywords: On | Off

Pronunciation: [ⓘ] Brit. /rɪ,dʒɛnə'reɪʃn/, /rɪ,dʒɛnə'reɪʃn/, U.S. /rɪ,dʒɛnə'reɪʃ(ə)n/, /rə,dʒɛnə'reɪʃ(ə)n/

Forms: Middle English **regeneracioun**, Middle English **regeneraciun**, Middle English ... (Show More)

Frequency (in current use): ●●●●●●●●

Origin: Of multiple origins. Partly a borrowing from French. Partly a borrowing from Latin. **Etymons:** French *regeneration*; Latin *regeneration-*, *regeneratio*.

Etymology: < Anglo-Norman *regeneraciun*, Anglo-Norman and Middle French *regeneracion*, Middle French *regeneration* (French *régénération*) process or fact of being spiritually reborn (c1175 in Old French), formation of new tissue or cells (1314) and its etymon post-classical Latin *regeneration-*, *regeneratio* process or fact of being regenerated, re-creation (Vetus Latina), process or fact of being spiritually reborn (Vulgate), formation of new animal tissue (13th cent. in a British source) < classical Latin *regenerāt-*, past participial stem of *regenerāre* (see **REGENERATE U.**) + *-iō* *-ION* suffix: see *-ATION* suffix. Compare Catalan *regeneración* (c1400), Spanish *regeneración* (second half of the 15th cent.), Portuguese *regeneração* (1589), Italian *rigenerazione* (14th cent.). Compare later **REGENERATE U.** (Show Less)

1.
a. The action of coming or bringing into renewed existence; recreation; rebirth; restoration.

Thesaurus »

2.

a. The process or fact of being spiritually reborn; the state resulting from this. Also in extended use: reform, moral improvement.

Thesaurus »
Categories »

Bryan Ross: Oxford English Dictionary

Definition 2.a.

Middle English Dictionary Entry

reġenerāciōun n.

Quotations: [Show all](#) [Hide all](#)

Entry Info

Forms **reġenerāciōun n.**

Etymology OF **regeneracion** & L **regenerātio, -iōnis**.

Definitions (Senses and Subsenses)

1. (a) The power of growing or growing again; the process or power of causing flesh to grow again; (b) spiritual regeneration; also, the resurrection before the last judgment.

[Show 9 Quotations](#)

regeneration (n.)

mid-14c., *regeneracioun*, "act of regenerating or producing anew," originally spiritual, also of the Resurrection, from Old French *regeneracion* (Modern French *régénération*) and directly from Late Latin *regenerationem* (nominative *regeneratio*) "a being born again," noun of action from past participle stem of Latin *regenerare* "make over, generate again," from *re-* "again" (see **re-**) + *generare* "bring forth, beget, produce," from *genus* "race, kind" (from PIE root ***gene-** "give birth, beget," with derivatives referring to procreation and familial and tribal groups).

Originally theological, "radical spiritual change in an individual accomplished by the action of God;" of animal tissue, "power or process of growing again," early 15c.; of forests, 1888.

Titus 3:5

Tyndale⁽ⁱ⁾ 5 not of ye dedes of rightewesnes which we wrought but of his mercie he saved vs by ye foutayne of the newe birth and with the renyunge of the holy goost

Bryan Ross: Online Etymological Dictionary

Titus 3:5

Coverdale⁽ⁱ⁾ 5 not for ye dedes of righteousnes which we wroughte, but after his mercy he saued vs by the fountayne of the new byrth, and renuyng of the holy goost,

Titus 3:5

Matthew⁽ⁱ⁾ 5 not of the dedes of rightuousnes, which we wrought but of hys mercy he saued vs, by the fountayne of the newe byrth, & with the renuyng of the holye ghost,

Titus 3:5

Great⁽ⁱ⁾ 5 not by the dedes of rightewesnes which we wrought, but accordyng to hys mercye he saued vs by the fountayne of the newe byrth, and renuyng of the holy goost,

Titus 3:5

Geneva⁽ⁱ⁾ 5 Not by the woorkes of righteousnesse, which we had done, but according to his mercie he saued vs, by the washing of the newe birth, and the renewing of the holy Ghost,

Titus 3:5

Bishops⁽ⁱ⁾ 5 Not of workes which [be] in ryghteousnesse wrought, but accordyng to his mercie, he saued vs by the fountayne of regeneration and renuyng of the holy ghost



Truth Time Radio 3 days ago (edited)

@Emerald24 Click below and find your answer to your above post:

<https://truthtimeradio.com/listener-q%26a-blogs/f/what-happens-when-you-put-a-history-teacher-above-gods-word>

And while I am here I'll go ahead and address your other post.

We are not going to promote BR's BS on the "history of the text" or his take on social justice. We are not the least bit concerned with his version of history. It is littered with bias at almost every turn. Now screen shot that and share it with whomever you wish. We are more than happy to stand behind what we say.

As to our ability to "defend the word of God."

I can assure you that we have no problem defending the word of God by answering your sophomoric questions. You obviously think much too highly of yourself. You brought nothing new to the table and your supposed "gotcha verses" didn't get anyone. They have already been addressed.

"Praise and adoration" ??? If you had done your due diligence you would know how ludicrous you sound. We most definitely do not always get "praise and adoration" I assure you. Try reading the comments we receive.

Show less

👍 5 🗨️ REPLY

Bryan Ross: Here is the comment referred to above:

"We are not going to promote BR's BS on the "history of the text" or his take on social justice."

Again, those interested in my actual view of "social justice" are encouraged to consult my 6-part series on YouTube titled "Critical Social Justice & Scripture."