

Filthy Communication Out of the Mouth

Shaun Willcock

“But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth” (Col. 3:8)

“Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers” (Eph. 4:29)

“But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks” (Eph. 5:4)

Difference Between a Fall and a Walk

These scriptural texts are very plain. The believer in Christ, in his speech no less than in his actions or in his very thoughts, should always seek to glorify his Lord. And this means that he should not make use of vulgar words, swear words, or obscene language, in his speech. Anyone who regularly and without remorse uses such language, reveals that he is not as yet a regenerate person, regardless of any claims he may make.

Let me be correctly understood at this point: even true Christians fall into sins of all kinds. Just as Peter, when he was afraid, “began to curse and to swear” (Matt. 26:74), many Christians, in moments of weakness and temptation, may utter words which are sinful to speak, just as they may commit other sins. “For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body” (Jas. 3:2). A fall into sin does not mean that a person is unregenerate! Sinless perfection does not exist in any believer this side of heaven. Knowing all too well that “the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity... an unruly evil, full of deadly poison” (Jas. 3:5-8), the true child of God prays, as David did, “Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips” (Psa. 141:3). He knows how easily he may sin with his tongue, and he prays for the Lord’s grace to preserve him from it.

But when a professing Christian *readily* uses filthy language, not in a moment of temptation but as a way of speaking, and then proceeds to justify and defend it, this is a *walk* in sin, which is a very different thing from a *fall* into sin! *This* kind of behaviour reveals a heart still in love with the world, showing no remorse and quite at peace with using the language of the world. Such a person is not to be received as a brother or sister in Christ, regardless of the profession of faith they may make.

Yes, Words Differ in Meaning from Place to Place, But...

It is true that what is considered an obscene word in one place or culture may not be considered obscene in another. Words develop different meanings in different places. In the United Kingdom, for instance, a word or a phrase which has an obscene meaning may have no such meaning whatsoever in the United States; and *vice versa*. The same may be true of what is considered a filthy word in South Africa, which when spoken in another English-speaking country may have no such connotations. Allowances must be made for “region-specific” word-meanings, and a Christian visitor from another country must be mature about this, and not take offence when a word is used which clearly does not have the meaning he would attach to it “back home”.

But when a word or phrase is viewed as obscene in a particular country or culture, it should never be used by believers from that country or culture; and when it is *universally* viewed as obscene, it should never be used by believers anywhere.

Yes, Words Change in Meaning, But...

Also, it is true that words change in meaning as time goes by. A word which, originally, was perfectly innocent may, with the passing of time, come to be used as a vulgar or obscene word; and a word which was once considered vulgar or obscene may, with the passing of time, cease to be viewed as such. All this is true – but even so, in our ordinary, everyday speech we are to be guided by how a word is used *at the present time* – not how it was once used or how it may perhaps be used in the future.

A good illustration of this is a phrase found a number of times in the Bible: “pisseth against the wall”. When the King James Version was translated, this word was perfectly acceptable, and meant “urinates”. But today, in everyday speech in many parts of the English-speaking world, it is not in decent use and is considered vulgar – and indeed is frequently used with no reference to urinating at all. So what should the believer do? The answer is simple: in reading the Bible, he is to understand that this word was perfectly acceptable at the time when the King James Version was translated, and thus he need have no qualms at all about its usage in the Scriptures. In precisely the same way, he may read a piece of classic literature which makes use of words which are unacceptable today, for he knows their use must be set in their historical context at the time of writing. But *in his own everyday speech* he should not use the word, for its usage today is viewed as vulgar.

What One’s Speech Says about One’s Heart

The world loves its foul language, as it loves everything that is impure and corrupt. It is considered “manly” for men to pepper their sentences with obscene words. And although in earlier and better times, women generally guarded their tongues far more than men, for it was considered very unbecoming in a decent woman to use filthy language, this is no longer the case, and many women seem to delight in “proving” that they can swear as much as men, if not more so. Such are the times we are living in.

That is the way of the worldly. The worldly will do what they will do. But when *professing Christians* use the same language, this is disgraceful, an inexcusable conformity to the world and its ways (Rom. 12:2). It is outright disobedience to the Word of the Lord, and tells us much about the heart of the one using such language, when it is done as a matter of course and he has no remorse for it. It tells us that such a heart is not renewed, and he or she is not a new creature in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17); for the Lord Jesus said, “O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things” (Matt. 12:34,35). These words of the Lord apply to much more than only obscene language, of course; but such language is certainly included in what is being condemned here. The mouth speaks from what fills the heart. Therefore, if the mouth is willingly using filthy language, what does this tell us about what is in the heart? All men are known by their fruits.

Once upon a time, evangelicals were known as people who hated worldliness, and sought to live separated lives unto the Lord; lives which were not conformed to this world, so as to glorify the Lord. But today, so many professing “evangelicals” (unworthy of the name, for in reality they are *neo-evangelicals*) are more than willing to justify all kinds of worldliness, whether it be drinking, dancing, worldly music and movies – or swearing. And to do this, they will hide behind the excuse that they are “saved by grace”, and that this is all that matters.

A “Christian” Justifies Filthy Language

An email I received recently led to a most extraordinary exchange of correspondence, which illustrates, very starkly, how the standards of previous generations of professing believers have been tossed aside, and there is a new kind of “evangelical” abroad, one who not only is happy to use obscene language, but to go further and actually *defend* its use, pouring scorn on any attempt to reprove him for doing so.

I heard from a man (who happens to live in the United States, but his sort is found everywhere these days) who wanted to interview me online about my book, *Jesuit Hollywood*. Let us call him A.B. Unfortunately, he is a “flat-earther”: he believes that the earth was flat and that the sun revolves around the earth. Now this would not be relevant to the issue at hand, except that when I pointed out that this belief was foolish, he was not at all happy with me for saying such a thing. In fact, he was *so* angry that this professing Christian emailed me and said of what I had written, “The foolish argument is total – [obscurity deleted]. Unless one is more interested in the praise of men than of God.”

I therefore wrote to him again and said, “Your ready use of [filthy language] speaks volumes. Eph. 4:29; 5:4a. This is not how Christians are to speak. It is a disgrace to that blessed Name whom you claim to worship.”

That is all I said. But it generated the following extraordinary response from the man. I have taken the liberty of improving the grammar somewhat:

“Using scripture to manipulate and control someone for the only reason of dismissing them is not what Eph. 4:29 & 5:4a is about. And yes it is – [again, the obscenity], whether or not you like the phrase. See, if – [the same obscenity again] offends you then it is a reflection on you and nothing to do with me. I am very sure my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ cares very little about the – [obscurity used again]. If someone like you is childishly offended by – [same obscenity], well I can only imagine how offended you are by people poop. Both are part of the reality of our life. If you bother to get know me you will come to realize I am not nasty even if I am not afraid to mention – [same obscenity again].”

To this shocking defence of obscene language on the part of a professing Christian, I replied as follows:

“The fact that you can dismiss the Scriptures I mentioned as being inconsequential and an attempt on my part to manipulate you, the fact that you can use a swear word in the same sentence as the blessed Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, deliberately and calculatingly, and the fact that you can say, as only a fool would speak, that if the filthy language offends me then this is somehow a reflection on me, reveals that you are an unconverted worldling, a man in love with the things of the world.” I added, “You are a blind man. May the Lord yet open your eyes.”

Clearly, this was not the case of a Christian falling into the sin of using foul language, then repenting of it. A *fall* into sin is one thing; a deliberate *walk* in sin is quite another, and this man not only did *not* repent, but strongly attempted to justify his disgraceful use of an obscenity; called the mere references to certain relevant scriptural texts an attempt to “manipulate” him; claimed that the fault was somehow mine for being offended by his use of the word (almost beyond comprehension, this one!); and *repeatedly* used the word in his email to me.

His next email was as follows: “We will see who is blind and who will need to be making amends. It is a shame. All I wanted to do was talk to you about your book, and you went on the judgmental bandwagon. You are not much of an example of a follower of Christ. Revelation 18:24 describes someone like you best. I hope some day God will change your heart and your lost soul.”

Just how Rev. 18:24 describes someone “like me” for simply reproving him for using foul language, I will have to leave to keener minds than mine to figure out; for try as I might, I cannot make the connection. It says, “And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.”

As far as he was concerned, he did not need to repent for using obscene language repeatedly; rather, I needed to repent for being “judgmental”. And apparently, if a believer seeks to obey the Scriptures

and reprove a professing fellow-believer for a sin he has committed, he is a bad example of a follower of Christ!

And Then Another One Does So!

Well, I thought that was that. The correspondence ended, for it was evident that the Lord had not given him repentance, at least at this time. But then I heard from another man in the United States (let us call him C.D.), who was planning to interview A.B. online, so that he could share his “testimony” with C.D.’s listeners on his own programme. I therefore dropped C.D. a note and said, “Having been recently in touch with A.B., I would question the ‘testimony’ of a man who, in his email to me, proudly boasted of his open use of a swear word in the very same sentence as the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and then mocked my rebuke of him for doing so. The evidence is available if necessary.”

I received the following reply from C.D (the reference to E.F. is to another professing Christian, known to C.D. and to whom I had written many months before regarding his own use of foul language; E.F. is of course merely what I am calling him here, for purposes of this article):

“I would appreciate the information and also appreciate your concern and discernment. I would also say that I have spent about four hours with A.B. who is a fairly new Christian to the faith. Because of his confession that Jesus Christ is his Lord and Saviour and because he has openly condemned and come out of the New Age Movement and because He has such a hunger for the Bible and his new life in Christ I feel compelled not to throw him under the bus so to speak. I know that you are very sensitive regarding language and that people that use it and call themselves Christians highly offends you and that you rebuked E.F. because of his use of a word that was distasteful. But the manner in which you rebuked E.F. certainly didn’t gain you lasting respect with him.

“I am not endorsing the use of bad language by any means and I certainly do not believe in taking the name of our Savior in vain and those will be held accountable for doing so; but I believe we should season our condemnation with grace to hopefully restore and build up one in the faith once delivered to the saints.

“Please pray for all of us that we would be found faithful and repent of those areas in our lives that Christ is not well pleased with as we will pray for you as well. This is the ‘real mark’ of Christian brotherhood.”

In my reply I said:

“I will send you the correspondence between A.B. and myself. I’m not ‘throwing a man under a bus’ because I rebuke him for foul language. A true Christian would gladly take that rebuke, as being for his spiritual good – he would not react the way A.B. did, saying my rebuke of him was somehow a reflection on me. This was absurd and nothing but an attempt at self-justification for his sin.

“You wrote: ‘I know that you are very sensitive regarding language and that people that use it and call themselves Christians highly offends you and that you rebuked E.F. because of his use of a word that was distasteful.’ I am disappointed that you seem to imply that me being offended by foul language is merely being somewhat too ‘sensitive’. In the light of what the Scriptures say about our language, we *should* be offended – yes, even highly! – when a professing Christian brazenly uses it and then justifies his use of it! It’s one thing to sin in a moment of weakness, whether in the use of a filthy word or in some other way. All Christians sin, and yes in such cases we must be gentle in our reproof, considering ourselves and our own struggles with sin. But when a man actually justifies his sin, and hurls accusations at the one pointing it out, even further justifying himself by trying to wriggle out of his sin instead of just repenting —this is a different matter altogether. There is simply no excuse for it and he should not be defended.

“You said that A.B. is a ‘fairly new Christian’. If this is so, then he should be humble and willing to learn, instead of hurling accusations at one who sought to rebuke him and furthermore telling me that my use of the Scriptures I mentioned was merely ‘manipulating’ them. That is very haughty for one who should be learning, not teaching.

“Then you wrote: ‘But the manner in which you rebuked E.F. certainly didn’t gain you lasting respect

with him.’ If someone no longer respects me because of it, well, that can’t be helped. If he used foul language, he sinned, and if I told him so and he no longer respects me, this does not concern me. I must again say I’m surprised at how you seem to think it’s a personal sensitivity I have, the implication being that being ‘highly offended’ is all a little over the top, an over-reaction.”

And how did C.D. reply after he saw the correspondence between his friend A.B. and myself? This is how:

“Paul used the word DUNG and it means exactly the same thing as the word A.B. used and you are ready to call him a ‘worldling’ and preaching a false gospel for doing so. Give me a break. I am not going to continue this conversation any longer. Search your heart brother. The tenure of your conversation with the three people I mentioned was like this. I am up here and you are down there you scum of the earth. It’s not so much what you say but how you say it. God help you!”

I replied:

“Your response was utterly pathetic and I will add – disgusting. There is the world of difference between the swear word A.B. used, and the word ‘dung’. Any child knows this and so do you; you are being Jesuitical here.

“As for A.B. preaching the Gospel, he doesn’t. He preaches a bizarre flat earth theory, and he has much to say about Jesuits and Rome, but the Gospel? He doesn’t preach it. Nor should he even be doing so if – as you said – he is a ‘fairly new Christian’. He should be a pupil, not a teacher.

“I’m not surprised you won’t continue this conversation, for you cannot.... You can argue with me but you can’t argue with God’s Word. Oh, but wait: A.B. argued with it, saying I ‘manipulated’ the verses I mentioned to him; perhaps you would copy him and do the same. You are so busy trying to bend over backwards to accommodate men you think are brethren when they openly sin, instead of doing the right thing and pointing it out to them.

“Daily, you send out articles by J.C. Philpot – a man who would have rebuked you strongly for this sinful, unbiblical approach. You and A.B. are disgracing the blessed Name of the One you profess to love and serve.”

“Shoot the Messenger” – Ignore the Message

There was no softening of the heart; no repentance. But what followed in his next email was so typical of so many, who, knowing they are in the wrong and unable to extricate themselves without true repentance, being too proud for that, fall back on the “shoot the messenger” tactic: they seek to deflect attention away from their sin by focusing instead on the perceived failures of the one who issues the original reproof. He wrote:

“You are disgracing the name of Christ with your proud and haughty spirit. I refer you to the following, brother, and ask that you would again examine your condemning spirit.” He then proceeded to quote a list of Scriptures about meekness and humility.

My reply:

“Amazing. What started out as a rebuke to a man who professes to be a Christian and yet uses foul language – and before you know it, he and you have tried to turn it around so that it’s now supposedly about me! This says far more about your own heart than you apparently realise. *He* is the one who swears, yet *I* am the one who is somehow sinning for pointing it out! A Christian says to another who professes to be a Christian that he shouldn’t use language like that – even giving a few verses of Scripture to show it – and suddenly that foul-mouthed individual is the righteous, holy believer, wrongly picked on by a haughty, proud, condemnatory man who should not have dared to even bring the subject up.

“A.B. and you are the ones disgracing the name of Christ. Far better to keep your dirty mouths shut than to think the all-holy God will overlook your own overlooking of sin. All that was required was for A.B. to say, ‘Yes, I should not speak that way; I repent from my heart.’ That’s all. Yet he defends his tongue, you defend his tongue, and then you both accuse me of this, that and the next thing.”

This elicited his angriest and most accusatory, condemnatory email yet:

“What you were wanting me to say is you are right, and A.B. was wrong in using the term – [obscurity]. I think you have overreacted in the way you have handled the matter.

“You say – [obscurity] is a swear word. Many Christians would disagree with you on that point. But you want to hold everyone to your view on that point. How can you prove that – [obscurity] is a swear word?

“Would you say that everyone who disagrees with headcoverings for women in worship is also teaching false doctrine? Do you perfectly keep the law of God? Or do you subscribe to the higher law of faith in the completed work of Christ and trusting in His righteousness alone? Are you trusting in your own righteousness, Shaun? Are you trusting in your ability to find what’s wrong with everyone else and screening them out of your life so you don’t have to deal with them if they don’t agree with you on every doctrinal point? If someone subscribes to the geocentric theory do you automatically put them in a class of heretics? Have you truly prayed to God regarding your response to A.B. and myself on this matter? Even if you disagree with me and consider me an enemy you are still commanded to love your enemies.

“I have liked many of your materials and that is why I have promoted them but you do nothing but condemn and call me a false teacher and have said some very unkind and hurtful things to me; but I still forgive you and call you brother. I hope you consider these things.

“Have you ever been wrong in your entire life about anything? Have you never made a mistake? Is your life about showing others how perfect you are and that by your works you are saved? Are you proclaiming God’s forgiveness by your actions? When was the last time you asked God to forgive you? Do you always have to have the last word? When was the last time you looked in the mirror and said, ‘God be merciful to me a sinner’? Are you saying thank God I am not like A.B. and C.D.?

“Now I know you are thinking they are both Antinomian, lawless, heretics for A.B. using the word – [the obscenity again] and myself for not immediately jumping on my bandwagon and condemning A.B. for doing so. Well I didn’t because I think you over-stepped your condemnation of A.B. and made all kinds of allegations regarding him and myself as a result of him using that word. And if this was the first time this happened I would have probably overlooked it; but you also did it when my friend E.F. used the word – [another obscenity] in an email to you as well. You immediately went on the attack when he was merely describing his feelings regarding the pope, the Anti-Christ.”

A most extraordinary email! And let it be remembered that all this began when I merely pointed out that A.B.’s use of an obscene word was sinful, as he professed to be a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. Again, note the “shoot the messenger” tactic, now taken to great heights: the hurling of all kinds of accusations that had absolutely nothing to do with the issue at hand; and, most important of all, his continual justification of the obscene language used by two of his friends. Perhaps new friends are in order! For as the Scripture says, “Evil communications [associations] corrupt good manners [behaviour]” (1 Cor. 15:33). A man is known – and influenced – by the company he keeps.

There was no need to continue the correspondence, and so I replied as follows:

“There is no need for me to reply to anything more in your email than that which concerns the language of A.B. and E.F., men you prefer to keep as friends than to accept that you are wrong in your support of them.... you, just like A.B., have done your level best to make this all about me and my rebuke of the man, when *from the beginning* it has been about his unjustifiable use of language that is simply unacceptable when coming out of a Christian’s mouth.

“So, briefly in reply:

“Yes, absolutely and without hesitation, I affirm that M. A. was wrong in using the term, and I was right in telling him so. This does *not* mean I am right in everything, nor does it mean I am perfect as you are trying to imply I am saying, it only means I was right in reproving him for this word. That is beyond all question. You know, if you are honest, that J.C. Philpot, a man you love and whose writings you disseminate, would *never, ever* justify or condone such language. But you have spent a lot of time telling me I was wrong and essentially that I should have just ‘let it go’ because I ‘over-reacted’. Yet neither one of you could argue with the fact that Scripture tells us how we should speak, and instead of

dealing honestly with *those* Scriptures, you listed a whole batch of others which you claim are against me. Once again (since you clearly are not getting this through your head): *he* sinned in his language, and I told him so. That is all there is to it.

“Yes, it *is* a swear word. What a stupid thing for you to say: ‘How can you prove that it is a swear word?’ Do you do this with every swear word? If someone uses a well-known four-letter word, do you rush to their defence and say, ‘It can’t be proved that this is a swear word!’ What? I have never read such nonsense. I don’t have to ‘prove’ what people across the English-speaking world know is a swear word.

“Lastly: you now justify E.F. in his use of foul language, *because he applied it to the pope of Rome!* Oh well, I guess that makes it all right then (hardly!)!”

Hiding Behind “Grace”

As terribly sad as the emails from these three men were, they were fairly representative of a sizeable portion of those who would profess to be within the “evangelical” camp, but who are really within the “new-evangelical” camp. For although they may be able to speak well of the doctrines of grace, and to speak up against Popery, etc., they are at the same time prepared to tolerate – and even justify – worldliness to varying degrees; whether it be (as in this case) worldly speech, or whether it be such things as worldly entertainments, worldly dress, or whatever. And frequently, this worldliness – this toleration of that which is of the world and which the Word of God condemns – is craftily hidden behind an excuse such as “God’s grace”. Yes, salvation is by the grace of God alone, and yes, while we are in this world, all believers struggle against sin, and commit sins daily. But they ignore the Scripture which says, “For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, *teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts*, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world” (Tit. 2:11,12). Salvation by grace does *not* mean we are free to sin and then say, “Oh, but let’s focus on grace!” God’s grace teaches us to *deny* ungodliness and worldly lusts! “Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a *new creature*: old things are passed away; behold, *all things are become new*” (2 Cor. 5:17): including his speech, his amusements, everything.

Self-Justification, Hurling of Accusations, Shifting the Focus – But No Repentance

As I wrote in another pamphlet, entitled *The Ministry of Rebuke – and How to Receive It*: “‘Open rebuke is better than secret love. Faithful are the wounds of a friend’ (Prov. 27:5,6).... Secret love – keeping silent when one sees a fault that needs rebuking – is of no value. A Gospel minister shows himself to be a true friend of a professing believer when he faithfully ‘wounds’ him if need be, knowing there is a risk in doing so, given the natural tendency of men to hate reproof; but it is the scorner who hates reproof, and the wise man who loves the rebuker, for he sees it is for his good (Prov. 9:8). Truly, ‘A reproof entereth more into a wise man than an hundred stripes into a fool’ (Prov. 17:10).”¹

The Scriptures command Gospel ministers to rebuke those who sin (2 Tim. 4:2; Tit. 1:13; 2:15). But they also show that every believer, when there is a need for it, must rebuke what is sinful in his brother (Lk. 17:3). David was more than willing to receive rebukes, when necessary. He said, “Let the righteous smite me; it shall be a kindness: and let him reprove me; it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head: for yet my prayer also shall be in their calamities” (Psa. 141:5). But it has been my experience, in the ministry, that far too often, instead of professing believers meekly receiving a rebuke and repenting, they immediately go on the defensive, and proceed to hurl all kinds of counter-accusations, seeking to “shoot the messenger” instead of heeding the message. This stands out starkly in the emails quoted above. A rebuke is given for a sin committed. But instead of leading to humble repentance, it leads to anger towards the messenger, self-justification, the hurling of accusations, a shifting of the focus from the original sin being reproofed to all kinds of accusations of sin in the messenger, especially criticising the manner in which the rebuke was given. The focus is always on the *way* in which the reproof was given, not on the reproof itself.

And *what* of the way in which a reproof is given? In *The Ministry of Rebuke – and How to Receive It*, I wrote: “It is true of ministers that they ‘have this treasure in earthen vessels’ (2 Cor. 4:7); meaning they are but men, ‘men of like passions with’ other men (Acts 14:15), and therefore their ministrations towards the saints will be mixed with imperfections. But when a messenger of the King brings a royal message to his subjects, it is not for the subjects to say to the messenger, ‘We don’t like the language in which you have delivered the message’, or, ‘You should have been more gentle’; much less should they take him out and shoot him! Yet this is precisely what so many professing Christians do when one of the Lord’s messengers speaks to them about some fault of theirs. They focus on the messenger instead of the message. They fail to remember that the messenger has the King’s treasure in an earthen vessel. They fire away at the messenger, and ignore the message!

“When Arthur W. Pink once used very plain speaking in dealing with a man to whom he was ministering, he wrote to him: ‘A postman may be gruff, even surly, but that is (relatively) a trifling matter if he hands you a valuable letter! I am an “earthen” and not a golden vessel. I may not be as suave as you might wish, I may even appear harsh, but I hope you will not suffer such defects in your would-be physician to prejudice you against his *treatment* of your case. This is a day which calls for *plain dealing*, not Judas-like kisses.’”²

Conclusion: “Keep the Door of My Lips”

May all true believers, who read these words, prayerfully seek to make certain that in their speech no less than in all other aspects of their lives, they are not conformed to this world, but transformed by the renewing of their minds (Rom. 12:2). “Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man” (Col. 4:6). “But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned” (Matt. 12:36,37).

Therefore let us pray earnestly: “Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips” (Psa. 141:3).

Shaun Willcock is a minister, author and researcher. He runs Bible Based Ministries. This pamphlet was published in 2016. For other pamphlets (which may be downloaded and printed), as well as details about his books, audio messages, articles, etc., please visit the Bible Based Ministries website; or write to the address below. If you would like to be on Bible Based Ministries’ email list, please send your details.

ENDNOTES:

1 *The Ministry of Rebuke – and How to Receive it*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2015. Available on our website: www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.

2. *The Life of Arthur W. Pink*, by Iain H. Murray, pg. 146. The Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, UK, 1981.

Bible Based Ministries

info@biblebasedministries.co.uk

www.biblebasedministries.co.uk

This pamphlet may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full