

The Self-Denial Revealed in Preaching of Jung Am

(Subtitle: *Sarks-Attacking* As the Sermon Telos)

White Young Jeon

Introduction:

Reformed Symphonic Preaching¹ that I pursue in the aspect of preaching theory depends on the theological thought of Rev. Jung Am, Yun Sun Park. The term of “Symphonic” means that it can solve some controversy that has happened between the interpretation and the application by the perspective of Jung Am's Preaching.

The purpose of this paper is to reveal the self- denial or, the mortification as the ultimate *telos* of Jung Am preaching.

I. The biblical definition of *Sarks-attacking*

Sarks which were expressed as “ body”, “ carnal desire”, “ secular desire” and “Self” means the corrupted character that activates strongly within the believer.(Mt. 26:41 Rom8:3-8, Gal5:24)

And also the fighting with *Sarks* that is, the self-denial should be happened until arriving to the tomb continuously in the Christian whole life, as the same concept of repentance that comes out of the Calvin's Institute.²

And “attacking” is the one of apologetic methods with defending element and explaining element. And it is the most positive and the strongest method. This is the faithful life to the our Lord's command of Lk. 9:23, “Then he said to them all: 'If anyone would come after me, he must deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me'.” So Paul, the Apostle claimed that it is the foundational continuation in his whole ministry for the church as the battle against the *Sarks* according to Roman7:21-25 and also it was the ultimate goal of his preaching ministry. And also it was served as the ultimate goal in the preaching ministry of the reformers and the puritans who had been faithful to the teaching of the Apostle.

I have observed that generally as the biblical preachers concentrated on the change of the audience heart, Jung Am focused on the attacking the *Sarks* deliberately. In other words, the *Sarks- attacking* as the ultimate *telos* is one of cores of his every preaching because I has found that his preaching drived his congregation to the *Sarks -attacking* as the ultimate goal of his preaching although he took several *telos* of his sermons that I have listened and read them. This preaching walks together on the same way of Peter's preaching that he demanded the repentance

and faith or, the answer of this congregation, "(Acts2:37), Stephan's preaching that was an example of the redemptive historical preaching (Acts 7:54) and also Paul's preaching that he took the *telos* of the pastoral, apologetic preaching that he demanded the same preaching goal to the several congregation with several methods.

His preaching of 1979 at the pulpit of Chong Shin Theological Seminary and the preaching preached at Hap Shin chapels that was located in Southern Seoul church building and also his 240 sermons that were edited in 3 volumes (Vol. I-90 sermons, Vol. II-118 sermons and vol. III-32 sermons) and the sermons that included in the every commentaries of the Scriptures proves the importance of our theme obviously. At that time after I had impressed 20 years ago out of his inspired preaching, now I remember his passionate *telos* of preaching, *sarks attacking*. I would like to arrange my observation as 7 items as followings: 1. *the operated view of the Scripture as the Word of God* 2. *The view of prayer that stressed the absolute answer of God* 3. *The view of Calvinistic godliness that stressed the lordship and the miserable state of the man.* 4. *the assurance that he realized the kingdom of God with applying the unconditional faith.* 5. *the assurance of the reformed theology that he harmonized between the redemptive perspective and puritan perspective.* 6. *the tension that he desired to participate with the living stream that flows in the history of the martyrs.* 7. *the assurance of the priority of preaching in the church*(see the directory of corporate worship in the Westminster Confession 1670), which related to the *sarks attacking* directly or, indirectly.

We can find that Jung Am had led the congregation into the state of repentance by applying the meaning of a term, "am I?" in order to point that Judas's sin is our sin in preaching "One who sells the Lord and one who can not sell Him" Mt.10:26-28 on December 6, 1970 at the Han Sung church. (The prayer that received God's answer p37) And also as he explained the life that we look up the coming kingdom(Mt10:26-28)³ I. The life that is centered the word of God(26) – the life to keep the written Word II. The life that is centered the soul(28) – the life that consider more important the soul than the body, he had concludes his sermon as the term "we have to live the kingdom centric life by accepting the Christ through the work of Holy Spirit, by being occupied by the Word and by being ruled by it in our spirit. ... And you should be flamed to live your soul." This conclusion focused on the *sarks attacking* as the ultimate goal of his preaching obviously. (Pages 16-23), And we can find that in his preaching "the prayer that receives God's answer" in Lk11:5-8 after he used three structures, I. The prayer among the night- "the man has much

hypocrisy.” II. The prayer that we have the heart of friend to all men. - ... It is not the heart that we want to receive God's answer.” III. The prayer that we requests strongly to God. - “The ministers who do not pray shall be failed surly.”(pp51-52), he revealed that he attacked to their *Sarks* by the truth. And also at the page 183 of the same book, Jung Am 's preaching , “ The pastoral theory of Paul in the Calvinistic perspective”(included in the Theological Journal) had explained the contents of I Tim. 4:12-16 verse by verse and continuously he had quoted the explanation of Calvin at verse 16 “ I. The minister should examine themselves carefully. (Our first enemy is the devil and then the next one is our thinking and affection that e do not want the ruling of the Scripture. II. The ministers should watch out the great ambition” and then he revealed the unique character that he tried to attack the *sarks* by the truth.

II. His theological Motive that he hold *the sarks attacking* as his sermon telos.

We can observe four motives in his preaching.

First, It come out of the view of salvation that is depended on the revelation. Jung Am had taken the experimental event of the assurance that the Scripture is the Word of God at the time of his senior middle school through a certain mysterious understanding in his heart. Such experience was revealed at his studying the Scripture repeatedly as he revealed his spiritual state, as he understand the meaning of the Word of God, “I want to die in the state of this experience. ⁴ It proves that he assured to pursue the view of the Scripture that our Lord believed, “ ... (Jn6:6) ” In other word, It means that as he contacted on the life of the Scripture, the *Sarks* will be attacked by the truth, or, as he attacked on the *Sarks* intently , he took the experimental event that the Scriptures will be opened by the truth. I assured that it related to “ the unique view of salvation that was depended on the revelation(the written word, that is, the Scripture).

Second, It comes out of the assurance of Calvinistic life. “The life of true christian” which John Calvin wrote according to his Institute for the French reformed Christians introduced 5 items, those are, 1) true life to imitate Christ – humble obedience 2) Self- denial 3) Cross- bearing life 4) the hope of coming kingdom 5) present directions and reveals that the self denial is the whole summary of christian life.⁵ So we are suggested naturally by assurance that *sarks attacking* should serve as the ultimate goal. Jung Am seemed to understand the meaning of *kerryso* (not communication but proclamation) (II Tim 4:2) considerably.

Third, It comes out of the godliness of Puritanism. We observe that Jung Am was a puritan reformed preacher because his preaching and his life follow the stream of puritans and the reformed godliness. Just like puritan preachers, John Bunyan, John Owen, Richard Baxter ect treated the theme of self denial gravely, wonderfully in their preaching.

I remember that at the one day of 1981 at the M. Div. classroom he shouted⁶ “ Korean churches should learn the blooded stream of British church history. “ in holding with the a book of *Fox's Martyer* written by John Fox. It means that his theology was ruled by the eschatological tension that he wanted to participate into the stream of experimental puritan godliness. So We can assure that the purpose of Jung Am's preaching is the same line of the puritan reformed preachers who stressed the self denial.

Fourth, It comes out of the assurance that watch out the theoretical danger that the redemptive historical theological may trend. Jun Am accepted the excellence of redemptive historical theology as “ a cow eats the grass on the field without dividing them but a bee eats some honey out of some flowers with discerning”, they enjoy the grace of redemption out of the many events of the Scriptures. However he did not stop to see the abundant world of redemptive history that Vos and Ridderlbos claimed, but can overcome the dangerous arrogance that come out of *Sarks* desire of theoretical reformed teaching.⁷

Therefore we can conclude that he could not replace the priority of the *Sarks attacking* as the ultimate goal of preaching by the other themes in the above theological motives.

III. His positive reason that he hold the *sarks attacking* as the sermon *telos*

The most sermons of Jung Am are consisted of two or three divisions and the last division and also the conclusion is executed beyond any reasonable format that his received truth(big idea) might attack toward the *sarks* of congregation in order to break it and to reconstruct their lives at that exact time with spiritual empowering. So Jung Am defined that “the preaching is like to put a nail on the board with a hammer.” (The prayer that shall be answered pp. 50-52, “ the preaching is not a product of trouble philosophy that come out of the man's head,... the preaching shall be made of listening to the Word of God in heart of the preacher... the preaching is the answer of God of his prayer

What are more positive reasons that Jung Am chose the *sarks attacking* as the ultimate *telos* of

his preaching? 1) He assured that the state of self denial in a christian must be the example of the normal christian, and 2) He believed that the revival of the church shall be begun with the personal self denial(in the introduction of the sermon book ,” let us follow the Lord” he defined that preaching is to proclaim the words of the Scripture directly to the congregation. Therefore the preacher should understand the Word of God and proclaim it rightly. The preacher should study the Scripture deeply and also should take the hours of prayer very much. Moreover the preacher himself should live as the Word of God. Unless he live as the word of God, his proclamation shall be noneffective.” 3) And He know that the self- denial is the concrete tool to restore the world. His consist able method that the preacher himself can not pause at the theory of *sarks* denial but should stay at that place, first of all, will be happened by understanding the Scripture (it means the volitional decision that he accepted it as his own word , and by praying passionately in admitting the operative power of Holy Spirit in order to receive the wonderful answer of God. Even though Jung Am did not use such term, “the anointing or unction” he occupied the free power of Holy Spirit broadly through understanding the Scripture.⁸

Conclusion:

True reformation should begin at the self denial, walked in the way of self denial and should be ended by the self denial. When we stand firm on the such seat that Jung Am pointed in his preaching, we can overcome against the crafty temptation of the modern theological stream effectively as well as we can use the most powerful and effective methodology, not only to criticize them, but guide them into the world of the truth. Especially when we may be tempted to solve the suffering things by the carnal method, truly we have to choose the way of self denial. And also the preachers who had been called by God's calling should not give up the basic position that the *sarks attacking* is the priority. We have to be faithful to the position that the Lord command, “deny your self and bear your own cross and follow me” just like our teacher, Jung Am had done in his preaching.

Endnotes

1 Symphonic preaching, my preaching theory follow the line of perspectivalism in order to solve a certain controversy between the interpretative style of redemptive historical preaching and the applicatory style of the experimental preaching. Too Carrick who is a homiletic professor of Greenville Theological Seminary had felt the same controversy I did criticized the redemptive historical preaching style as followings. "We see no dichotomy between preaching that is Christocentric and preaching that is applicatory. I have insisted on the following balance: Christocentricity is indeed vital in the preaching of the Word of God; but Christocentricity must not be permitted to degenerate into Christomonism, the Christocentric does not and must not exclude the exemplary; the indicatives of history do not and must not exclude the imperatives of ethics. Really we have to accept that our normal center of our preaching has to admit the pattern and structure of indicative-imperative. Indeed, we regard the indicative- imperative pattern or structure of New Testament Christianity as pivotal in regulating preaching... Therefore the preacher, if he is to sustain a ministry that is balanced, must see to it that he preaches sermons that are balanced, must see to it that he preaches sermons that are balanced, The doctrinal must be balanced by the practical; the historical must be balanced by the ethical; *historia salutis* must be balanced by *ordo salutis*; the work of Christ must be balanced by the work of the Spirit. It is absolutely essential that the great indicatives of Christ's accomplishment of redemption be balanced by the great imperatives of the Spirit's application of redemption." However biblical preaching follows the perspectivalism that had symphonic character better than balancism. Because the redemptive historical preaching add the weak points of the experimental preaching style, but the experimental preaching style supports the weak points of the redemptive historical preaching style.

2 Calvin's Institute vol 3 chapter 3 verse 5

3 The analysis of Jung Am's preaching are made by the perspective of Symphonic preaching style. It is observed obviously in his sermon, "the prayer that can receive God's answer" that included 32 his sermons that mainly he preached for 1970-71. at the Dong San church and the Han Sung Church. Moreover when we analysis vol 14 of his cassette preaching, we can see the realistic preaching.

4 Refer to his book, "the Scripture and my life(1992 p44)" and biblical theology p17

5 John Calvin told us that the normal life of christian consists of humble obedience, self denial, cross-bearing, the hope of in the future and the direction of present life and suggested that the self denial is the summary of the whole life of christian. (vol. III chapter 7) The proposition that self denial is the core of the obedience life of the christian is the conclusion of my research through comparing of the wheel life of Navigator bible study 2:7.

6 The self denial that the puritan preachers stressed is same to Jung Am's one. Free Grace Broadcaster(2603 West Wright St. Pensacola, Florida 32505 USA) published the Article #201 about "mortification" which include the perspectives of 9 puritan theologians, those are; Arthur W. Pink, John Flavel, Benjamin Needler, Horatius Bonar, John Owen, Martin Lloyd-Jones, Ezekiel Hopkins, Ralph Erskine, Christopher Love, which reveals the concern of puritan theology about the *sarks attacking*.

7 Jung Am's perspective that accepted the redemptive historical perspective is same line of the perspectivalism of John Frame and Vern Poythress.

8 The view of Holy Spirit, the Scripture and the Prayer that Jung Am had taken interrelated to each other.

Especially the stress of the power of the preacher is the same line of the puritan view of the Holy Spirit.