

# **Servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 applied to African Pentecostal Christianity**

**by**

**Mookgo Solomon Kgatle**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree Philosophiae Doctor  
in  
The Faculty of Theology  
Department of New Testament Studies  
University of Pretoria**

**September 2015**

**Supervisor: Prof Ernest van Eck**

## Acknowledgements

I thank the God-head: God the Father for His love, kindness and grace, God the Son for saving my life and God the Holy Spirit for the revelation and inspiration of writing this thesis.

My wife Tumi, and our two lovely daughters Blessing and Divine, I really appreciate your love and support. This became even more practical when I was busy with this thesis. I took your time and resources in order to invest in it. Thank you very much.

To the leadership and the congregation of Divine Life Christian Centre thank you for your fellowship, prayers and financial support from which I drew strength. Thank you for understanding my busy schedule.

Apostle J Sithole, my father in the Lord, You found me at a time of giving up. I had lost hope in ministry but you picked me up and encouraged me to continue with the thesis citing that it would be relevant in my calling and ministry.

My supervisor, Prof Ernest van Eck, ours is a divine relationship. Thank you for your scholarly contribution to my postgraduate studies (Masters and PhD). You have done a great job to raise an African scholar from a disadvantaged background.

Dr Agrippa Khathide, my academic mentor, thank you for taking my calls at the time of inconvenience. You helped me to find hidden information in available data.

I acknowledge and express my gratitude to the librarians at the University of Pretoria, and Pastor Joe Mametja at the University of South Africa. Betheul Makgate and Nkululeko Sithole, I acknowledge the fact that you took interest in the research. Your contribution is appreciated.

My mother and siblings, thank you for your support and inspiration.

Mrs S Duncan and Miss Mokgadi Jade Mathale thank you for proofreading the thesis.

## Plagiarism declaration

### Declaration

1. I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.

I declare that this thesis is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, internet or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.

2. I have not used work previously produced by another student or any other person to hand in as my own.
3. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.



**SIGNATURE**

## Summary

The focus of this study is servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 applied to African Pentecostal Christianity. Concepts like leadership, servant leadership and African Pentecostal Christianity are defined and described for a better understanding of the study (Chapter 1). A diachronic approach is used to determine the authorship, date, place, recipients, structure, purpose, discipleship and Christology in Mark. The historical background of Mark is studied in order to interpret Mark 10:35-45 in its historical context (Chapter 2).

A synchronic approach is used to interpret Mark 10:35-45 to get to a possible meaning of the text. The text is divided into two parts: first the request made by the sons of Zebedee in Mark (10:35-40), and second Jesus' response in Mark (10:41-45). The interpretation of Mark 10:35-45 is aimed at understanding leadership misconceptions by the sons of Zebedee in Mark 10:35-40, and servant leadership principles by Jesus in Mark 10:41-45 (Chapter 3).

The historical background of African Pentecostal Christianity is then described to apply servant leadership in a relevant manner. The study investigates the historical origins of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement to understand the historical origins of African Pentecostal Christianity. Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa is singled out as an African Pentecostal Christian church (Chapter 4).

The study also uses reader-response criticism to apply servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 to African Pentecostal Christianity. Identified leadership misconceptions in Mark are applied to leadership misconceptions in African Pentecostal Christianity. Similarly, servant leadership principles in Mark are applied to servant leadership principles in African Pentecostal Christianity (Chapter 5).

Finally, the study compares leadership misconceptions in Mark and African Pentecostal Christianity. In the same way, it compares servant leadership principles in Mark and African Pentecostal Christianity to make certain conclusions and recommendations regarding servant leadership (Chapter 6).

## Keywords

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Servant leadership</b>        | A style of leadership that is built on a moral authority rather than the control of others and prioritises service rather than a position  |
| <b>African Pentecostalism</b>    | A part of Christianity in Africa that is influenced by a worldwide Pentecostal Movement that started in the United States of America.  |
| <b>Pentecostal Movement</b>      | A Christian movement that places special emphasis on a direct personal experience of God through the baptism with the Holy Spirit.   |
| <b>Azusa Street Revival</b>      | A revival movement with its roots in black American religiosity and black leadership.  |
| <b>Zionist movement</b>          | A Christian movement that is influenced by a Pentecostal Movement and acquainted with the rejection of medicine, taboos, attire, Sabbath observance, holy dances and purification rites etc.                 |
| <b>Apostolic Faith Mission</b>   | A Pentecostal church started by American missionaries that initially practiced racial segregation and white supremacy but finally united under one name.   |
| <b>Racial segregation</b>        | The domination of a less powerful group by a dominant and more powerful group, which stems from the belief that the dominant group is superior to the lesser on account of human traits and characteristics. |
| <b>White supremacy</b>           | A term that refers to the differences in the degree of occupational differentiation by colour.   |
| <b>Reconciliation Commission</b> | A commission established in South Africa to help victims of political crimes during apartheid to reconcile with their perpetrators.  |
| <b>Marginalised community</b>    | A community in South Africa that lived under oppression, racism, and White supremacy.  |

## Table of Contents

### CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>1.1 BACKGROUND</b> .....                                 | 9  |
| <b>1.2 TERMINOLOGY</b> .....                                | 11 |
| 1.2.1 Definition of leadership.....                         | 11 |
| 1.2.2 Different styles of leadership .....                  | 13 |
| 1.2.3 Definition of servant leadership .....                | 14 |
| 1.2.4 Description of African Pentecostal Christianity ..... | 17 |
| <b>1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT</b> .....                          | 20 |
| 1.3.1 Context of Study: Mark 10:35-45.....                  | 20 |
| 1.3.2 The problem .....                                     | 23 |
| 1.3.3 Hypothesis .....                                      | 23 |
| <b>1.4 RESEARCH HISTORY AND GAP</b> .....                   | 23 |
| 1.4.1 Research history .....                                | 23 |
| 1.4.2 Research Gap.....                                     | 27 |
| <b>1.5 METHODOLOGY</b> .....                                | 27 |

### CHAPTER 2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF MARK

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>2.1 AUTHORSHIP, DATE, PLACE OF WRITING AND RECIPIENTS</b> ..... | 30 |
| 2.1.1 Authorship .....   | 30 |
| 2.1.2 Date of writing .....  | 39 |
| 2.1.3 Place of writing.....  | 44 |
| 2.1.4 Recipients .....   | 51 |
| <b>2.2 STRUCTURE OF MARK</b> .....                                 | 56 |
| <b>2.3 PURPOSE OF MARK</b> .....                                   | 65 |
| <b>2.4 DISCIPLESHIP IN MARK</b> .....                              | 71 |
| <b>2.5 CHRISTOLOGY IN MARK</b> .....                               | 74 |
| <b>2.6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</b> .....                           | 76 |

### CHAPTER 3 SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN MARK 10:35-45

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>3.1 LEADERSHIP MISCONCEPTIONS IN MARK 10:35-45</b> ..... | 78 |
| 3.1.1 Kinship misconception.....                            | 79 |

|            |  |            |
|------------|--|------------|
| 3.1.2      | Self-interest and ambition misconception.....                    | 82         |
| 3.1.3      | Position misconception.....                                      | 85         |
| 3.1.4      | Competition misconception .....                                  | 92         |
| 3.1.5      | Lordship and authority misconception .....                       | 95         |
| 3.1.6      | Conclusion .....   | 102        |
| <b>3.2</b> | <b>SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN MARK 10:35-45</b> .....                 | <b>103</b> |
| 3.2.1      | Servant leadership is the ‘cup’ and ‘baptism’ of suffering.....  | 103        |
| 3.2.2      | Servant leadership positions are granted by God the Father ..... | 110        |
| 3.2.3      | Servant leadership means to be servant of all .....              | 113        |
| 3.2.4      | Summary.....   | 123        |
| <b>3.3</b> | <b>SON OF MAN: A GREAT ROLE MODEL</b> .....                      | <b>124</b> |
| 3.3.1      | Jesus as a minister and a servant of all .....                   | 124        |
| 3.3.2      | Jesus as life giver.....   | 127        |
| 3.3.3      | Summary.....   | 130        |

## CHAPTER 4

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL CHRISTIANITY

|            |  |            |
|------------|--|------------|
| <b>4.1</b> | <b>THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE WORLDWIDE PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT</b> .....        | <b>132</b> |
| 4.1.1      | The distinctive features of the worldwide Pentecostal movement .....             | 132        |
| 4.1.2      | Founding father of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement.....                       | 138        |
| <b>4.2</b> | <b>THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL CHRISTIANITY</b> .....          | <b>157</b> |
| 4.2.1      | Andrew Murray and the 1860 Dutch Reformed Church revival .....                   | 157        |
| 4.2.2      | Azusa Street and African Pentecostal Christianity .....                          | 160        |
| 4.2.3      | The Zionist movement and African Pentecostal Christianity .....                  | 163        |
| 4.2.4      | Conclusion .....   | 171        |
| <b>4.3</b> | <b>EARLY HISTORY OF APOSTOLIC FAITH MISSION OF SOUTH AFRICA: 1908-1913</b> ..... | <b>173</b> |
| 4.3.1      | Important role players during these years .....                                  | 173        |
| 4.3.2      | The role of the Central Tabernacle congregation .....                            | 177        |
| 4.3.3      | The Apostolic Faith Mission and the Pentecostal Mission.....                     | 178        |
| 4.3.4      | The origin of name: Apostolic Faith Mission and registration .....               | 181        |
| 4.3.5      | Conclusion .....   | 182        |

## CHAPTER 5

### SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL CHRISTIANITY

|            |   |            |
|------------|---|------------|
| <b>5.1</b> | <b>LEADERSHIP MISCONCEPTIONS IN THE APOSTOLIC FAITH MISSION BEFORE 1996</b> ..... | <b>184</b> |
| 5.1.1      | Racial segregation.....   | 185        |
| 5.1.2      | White supremacy .....   | 196        |
| 5.1.3      | Schisms.....  | 200        |

|                              |  |            |
|------------------------------|--|------------|
| 5.1.4                        | Summary.....   | 212        |
| <b>5.2</b>                   | <b>SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN APOSTOLIC FAITH MISSION AFTER 1996..</b>              | <b>213</b> |
| 5.2.1                        | Servant leadership is unity .....  | 213        |
| 5.2.2                        | Servant leadership positions in a transparent elections .....                  | 221        |
| 5.2.3                        | Servant leadership and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission .....           | 223        |
| 5.2.4                        | Summary.....   | 228        |
| <b>5.3</b>                   | <b>FRANK CHIKANE: A LIVING ROLE MODEL .....</b>                                | <b>229</b> |
| 5.3.1                        | No life of my own.....   | 229        |
| 5.3.2                        | Servant of reconciliation .....  | 236        |
| 5.3.3                        | A servant leader of unity.....   | 238        |
| 5.3.4                        | Summary.....   | 240        |
| <br>                         |  |            |
| <b>CHAPTER 6</b>             |  |            |
| <b>CONCLUSION</b>            |  |            |
| <br>                         |  |            |
| <b>6.1</b>                   | <b>LEADERSHIP MISCONCEPTIONS.....</b>  | <b>242</b> |
| 6.1.1                        | Kinship and racism.....  | 242        |
| 6.1.2                        | Positions and schisms.....   | 244        |
| 6.1.3                        | Lordship and White supremacy.....  | 245        |
| <b>6.2</b>                   | <b>SERVANT LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES.....</b>                                      | <b>245</b> |
| 6.2.1                        | Divine appointment and elections .....   | 245        |
| 6.2.2                        | Service and unity.....   | 246        |
| <b>6.3</b>                   | <b>SERVANT LEADERSHIP APPLIED TO AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL<br/>CHRISTIANITY.....</b> | <b>248</b> |
| <b>6.4</b>                   | <b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>   | <b>249</b> |
| <b>6.5</b>                   | <b>AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH .....</b>  | <b>249</b> |
| <b>WORKS CONSULTED .....</b> |  | <b>251</b> |

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

Leadership is an interesting topic of discussion that has dominated space across all mediums in general. It is casually discussed almost every day in social media and networks. Leadership is formally discussed by talk show hosts on radio and television stations and by social commentators and political analysts in the print media. In the South African parliament, for example, most motions are passed on a specific leader or leadership of a political organisation. Leadership is common in all areas of one's life in the family, sports, politics, church and community, private and public institutions. It is evident that leadership is an unavoidable and pertinent topic of discussion.

In the African context, leadership is equally an interesting topic of discussion. According to James (2008:359) Africa needs extraordinary leadership skills because of the overwhelming challenges of poverty, disease and conflict. In addition, Africa requires leaders of remarkable vision, ability, and integrity at all levels of society. Kgatle (2012:5) opines that Africa as a continent is not in a financial crisis but a leadership crisis. In most African countries, the political leadership does not have the interest of the people at heart but hungry for power and positions. Therefore change in Africa can be effected by change in leadership. Fourie, Van der Merwe and Van der Merwe (2015:1) emphasises that the lack of responsible leadership is the reason for the continued challenges on the continent and good leadership is the solution for developing Africa.

Leadership is central to any organisation. The world today, for examples, companies, political organisations or sport teams need strong leadership for optimum effectiveness or success (Kgatle 2012:5). It is common that when such different organisations succeed, everybody becomes a hero or heroine but when they fail, people are quick to blame it on the leadership. This dependence on leadership causes both the public and the private sectors to spend a lot of money by hiring leadership experts to head big organisations. For example today, companies pay

their Chief Executive Officers (CEO) and executives lucratively in order to bring the optimum results required by the company.

In academia many books, published articles and other publications have been written on leadership or related topics. As a research topic, leadership has attracted well established and many emerging scholars. In Africa, it is one of the few topics that straddle academia and casual conversation. Theoretically, Leadership in Africa provides one of the most exciting and perplexing topics currently available to researchers interested in comparing and enriching research on leadership conducted in or on regions other than Africa (see Fourie *et al.* 2015:1).

This study on servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 applied to African Pentecostal Christianity is a scholarly contribution to a continued engagement on the topic of leadership. It seeks to provide solutions for leadership problems especially in an African context. It also seeks not to reproduce the work done by Western leadership scholars but to engage Western scholarship in order to be relevant to African scholarship.

It is true that Africa is witnessing a resurgence of interest in leadership rooted in indigenous values. Much of the empirical research in this context has been conducted by Western researchers, through Western paradigms, for consumption by Western audiences (Bolden & Kirk 2009:14). Such researchers cannot claim to change this trend alone. It is only through a more inductive appreciation of what Africans themselves say about leadership that a richer and more contextually sensitive account is possible.

Although leadership is studied from the field of theology in the New Testament, it is not confined to the field of theology. The study of leadership cuts across all other fields and disciplines. Leadership in Africa remains one of the most energising and interesting themes for scholars interested in interdisciplinary research with societal relevance and impact. It is a theme that fundamentally challenges absolute divisions between disciplines but disables scholars from divorcing their research interest from its societal impact (see Fourie *et al.* 2015:4).

## 1.2 TERMINOLOGY

### 1.2.1 Definition of leadership

Leadership is an interpersonal process that can take place between two people (Killerman 1984:10). In that interpersonal process Swart (1985:4) points out that a leader needs to create a climate in which individuals or groups are activated to pursue a goal or goals within a specific situation. According to Gardener (1990:1) leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held or shared by the leader and his or her followers.

People or organisations are allowed to achieve goals by the sharing of power and responsibilities so that they may think and make proper decisions. Empowerment emphasises skills development in competencies needed to discharge such responsibilities and removing organisational obstacles to personal and organisational development (Charlton 1992:33).

Similar to an interpersonal process, a group process involves interaction between at least two persons in pursuit of a goal. Leadership focuses on the power of the leader's personality to change workers' goals. Workers are inspired when a model that they want to emulate is provided in the organisation. They forsake their own goals and adopt those of the leader (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein 1996:2). In addition leadership is an activity which produces progress, rather than stagnancy. Progress is achieved through establishing direction, aligning and motivating people (Jones, Blunt & Sharma 1996:459). In support of a group phenomenon, Nahavandi (1997:4) indicates that in a group process there are no leaders without followers. As such, leadership always involves interpersonal influence or persuasion.

Leadership may be perceived as influencing the course of development. First, when viewed as a social structure or specifically as a structure of power and influence in society, leadership is no more than a dependent variable — one that is subject to the behaviour of variables external to it. Second, where leadership is viewed as a *role* especially the role of deciding where to go and how to get there, it becomes an independent variable — one that has the ability to determine the fate of other

developmental variables. The third possibility places leadership somewhere in between the two extremes of helplessness and omnipotence (Balogun 1997:238).

Leadership as an influence according to Blanchard (1998:22) refers to a process in which you try to help people to accomplish goals. All good leadership starts with a visionary role. This involves not only goal setting but also establishing a clear picture of perfection (what the operation would look like when it was running effectively). Leadership in this process starts with a sense of direction for the followers. In order to influence followers Batten (1998:50) proposes that effective leaders need to set an example of what they expect and want from team members. Maxwell (1998:17) maintains that leadership is influence, nothing more, nothing less. Maxwell (2005:7) goes on to say that leadership is a choice you make, not a position that you occupy.

Leaders need to possess the ability to manage the organisation, mission and to mobilise people around that mission (Hesselbein & Cohen 1999:12). In addition individual leader provides leadership for followers and lead by providing a compelling vision of the organisation (Moxley 2002:47). They set direction and determine strategy for the followers. They motivate and inspire others by sharing that vision. As a result leadership is co-created as individuals relate as partners and develop a shared vision, set direction, solve problems, and give meaning to their work. Leadership as a partnership is a distributed process shared by many ordinary people rather than the expression of a single individual.

Leadership is not a position but a fiduciary calling where hope plays a critical part in the lives of followers. Fiduciary leaders design, build, and serve inclusive communities by liberating the human Spirit and potential, not by relying only on their own abilities or experiences or judgement (Depree 2002:91). Leadership is not defined by position but in terms of the power relationship that exists between leaders and followers (Northhouse 2004:2).

Social leaders influence followers by leaving a mark. It is initiating and guiding that result in change of character and direction. By their ideas and deeds, leaders show the way and influence the behaviour of others (Manning & Curtis 2007:2). As a social influence leadership is not the function of a position a person holds. It has its

foundation in the will of an individual to improve the circumstances of any situation as a service to others (Van Rensburg 2007:2). In addition leadership is the ability to inspire confidence and support to the people who are needed to achieve organisational goals (Dalglish 2009:14).

The leader does not lead alone but involves the followers. According to Pietersen (2009:205) leadership is a process that occurs within the interaction between leaders and followers. Leadership is the ability to create the changes needed to fulfil the potential in people and organisations through personal influence. In order to involve followers, Grint (2010:4) explains that leadership is the activity undertaken by someone whose position on a vertical, and usually formal, hierarchy provides followers with the resources to lead. Another way to involve the followers according to Armstrong (2011:21) is to develop and communicate a vision for the future, motivate and involve the people.

Leadership can therefore be defined as an interpersonal, group, persuasive, influential and visionary process that exists between a leader and followers in order to achieve goals. A leader is not the one who sits on the position but the one who influences followers by interacting with and communicating the vision of the organisation. A leader empowers the followers and shares responsibilities in order to make the goals achievable.

### **1.2.2 Different styles of leadership**

There are four basic leadership styles based on a decision-making model and four basic leadership styles based on a path-goal model.

The four basic leadership styles based on the decision-making model are:

- Autocratic, the power to make decisions lies with the leader.
- Democratic, there is freedom of expression and followers are given an opportunity to participate in any way.
- Consultative, the leader seeks ideas from followers.
- Group-directed, the leader utilises the group's ability by encouraging participative decision-making.

The four basic leadership styles based on the path-goal model are:

- Directive, the leader gives an authoritative instruction without expecting opposing views; there is a clear and specific direction in that the followers will always know what is expected.
- Supportive, people have a sense of belonging and feel at home with the leader because the leader treats them equally; their efforts, ideas and opinions are supported.
- Participative, a leader allows the subordinates to take part in the day to day running of the organisation, church or company; the leader does not run the show individually but collectively.
- Achievement oriented, the leader puts challenging goals to subordinates and endeavours to improve performance (see Kgatle 2012:41-42).

A recent study by Fourie (*et al.* 2015:4) shows that there are about seven leadership styles in Africa:

- Intimidatory leadership depends primarily on fear and on instruments of coercion to assert authority.
- Patriarchal leadership commands neo-filial reverence.
- Leadership of mobilisation is activated by ideological factors.
- Leadership of reconciliation is built on effectiveness from qualities of tactical accommodation and capacity to discover areas of compromise.
- Instrumental leadership depends on the role of the leader.
- Transformational leadership depends on the change a leader can bring.
- Transactional leadership depends on what the leader can receive.

### **1.2.3 Definition of servant leadership**

Servant leadership is a different style of leadership. It follows neither a decision-making model nor the path-goal model discussed above. Servant leadership is centred on service. Wilkes (1998:18) states that true servant leadership begins when the leader is humble enough to carry out the mission rather than a personal agenda. Manz (1999:120) adds that serving the needs of others is at the centre of servant leadership. To be a servant means to look for others' needs and try to meet them. The golden rule is 'do to others as you would want them to do to you'.

Service to the followers is prioritised in contrast to personal agenda and power. Becoming a servant leader begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve. This conscious choice then aspires one to leadership. A servant leader is sharply different from the one who is leader first, perhaps because with a need to assuage an unusual power-drive or to acquire material possessions (Greenleaf 1997:13; 1998:19; 2002:23; 2004:6).

The spirit of servant leadership is the spirit of moral authority (Covey 2002:31). A leader is not controlled by ego, but by service to subordinates. The leader models leadership in order to maintain the spirit of a servant. Beazley and Beggs (2002:57) concurs that servant leadership begins with the concept of serving first and out of the desire to serve, that is, seeking to lead through the judicious and appropriate use of power. The goal or idea is to improve followers by increasing their autonomy, health, wisdom and freedom, thereby ensuring that the least privileged in society will either benefit or will not be further deprived.

Followers should feel positively influenced rather than being controlled (Lore 1998:307). Servant leadership is the power to influence rather than the power to control. People sometimes think that when one chooses to influence people, rather than control them, it at first might seem like weakness. This choice, however, calls forth an inner strength. Leaders who make this choice serve to engage and develop the creativity, productivity and vibrancy that already exist in a specific group or movement.

Servant leadership is a calling to the servant leader to serve followers. Jones (2002:45) believes that servant leaders are called to be leaders of the aesthetic, the imaginative and the sensing heart. Servant leaders need to embrace such practices as listening for the restorative power of language and story. They need to keep faith with the living word. Servant leaders should make a home for others through the appreciation of beauty of the environment. They need to develop the sense of seeing gifts in others through first being committed to discerning and using the gifts that are within themselves.

Personal quest for power, prestige or material rewards are not priority but serving the followers. Instead, from this perspective, servant leadership begins with a true motivation to serve others. The motivation to serve is not a weakness but it is a fulfilment on the part of the servant leader. Servant leaders are not intimidated by followers because they have a passion to serve them. The focus of servant leadership should be on sharing information, building a common vision, self-management, high levels of interdependence, learning from mistakes, encouraging creative input from every team member and questioning present assumptions and mental models (McGee-Cooper & Trammell 2002:144). At its core, servant leadership is a long term, transformational approach to life and work. In essence, a style of leadership that has the potential for creating positive change throughout society (Spears 2004:12).

The idea of the leader as a servant is rooted in the far-reaching ideal that people have inherent worth. A dignity not only to be strived for, but beneath this striving a dignity irrevocably connected to the reality of being human (Ferch 2004:226).

Philosophically, if one believes in the dignity of the person, the ideas of servant leadership and the experiences of leading or being led from a servant perspective not only makes sense but contain the elegance, precision, and will power necessary for human development.

Servant leadership is quite simple, it is authentic, ethical, trustworthy, exemplary and servile (Frick 2004:5). This is a matter of intent, action, skills, capacities and being. A servant leader stands in sharp contrast to the person who wants to be a leader first and then, after assuming a leadership position, decides to perform acts of service. Servant leadership is about 'the nature of legitimate power and greatness' and it all begins with the individual. Servant leadership goes beyond individuals. For example in order to build a more caring society, organisations and their trustees can and should also function as servants.

It is emphasised that servant leaders lead by serving others. In political leadership for example, servant leaders become 'public servants'. This is the kind of leadership that will be honoured and respected, and the titles that go with a leadership role are earned, not inherited (Bell 2006:19). In addition servant leaders are more concerned

about followers receiving recognition for their achievements than receiving accolades for their success (Hale & Fields 2007:398). A servant leader strives to build an environment in which followers have a voice. In some cases, a servant leader may make personal sacrifices to secure the involvement, well-being and achievements of their followers.

In addition the emphasis of servant leadership according to Spears (2010:13) is on the following: increased service to others, a holistic approach to work, promoting a sense of community and the sharing of power in decision-making.

Servant leadership therefore is built on a moral and ethical authority rather than the control of others. It prioritises service rather than a position or a title that the leader holds in an organisation. A servant leader serves the needs of others instead of personal needs. Servant leadership embraces humility, suffering, kindness, sacrifice and service.

#### **1.2.4 Description of African Pentecostal Christianity**

In order to describe African Pentecostal Christianity, it is important to define Pentecostalism first. Pentecostalism is a renewal movement within Christianity that places special emphasis on a direct personal experience of God through baptism with the Holy Spirit (Anderson 2000:24).

Pentecostalism is based on the events as described in Acts 2:1-4 that when the day of Pentecost fully arrived, they were all with one accord in one place. Suddenly there came a sound from heaven like a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the entire house where they were sitting. There appeared unto them cloven tongues as if on fire, and it sat upon each of them. They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

A firm belief in the authority of the Bible as the inspired Word of God is the foundation of Pentecostalism. Pentecostalism believes that salvation comes through confession of one 'sins and a belief' in Jesus. A unique characteristic of Pentecostalism is baptism in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. Pentecostalism believes in divine healing and other gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Pentecostalism is probably the fastest growing religious tradition in the world (Westerlund 2009:7). Described as a religion 'made to travel' it has from the outset been a strong mission movement. Research on this important branch of Christianity has now increased considerably, but its remarkable fast growth is still not very well-known. Pentecostal missionaries and pastors preach a universal message. However, it is always contextualised or inculturated in various localities.

The origin of the Pentecostal Movement in the United States of America also has profound implications for African Pentecostal Christianity in South Africa. The impetus that generated the worldwide Pentecostal Movement originated in two possible places and events. In a Black church in Azusa Street, Los Angeles, where the emphasis on the 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' with the 'initial evidence' of speaking in tongues was propagated by William Seymour and Charles Parham's Bible College at Topeka, Kansas, 1901 (Burger & Nel 2008:24). African Pentecostal Christianity can therefore be described as a part of Christianity in Africa that is influenced by: a Pentecostal Movement that started in the early church of the Apostles recorded in the book of Acts 2:1-4 and Pentecostal Movement that started in the United States of America. In both influences, it is characterised by salvation, speaking in tongues, divine healing, working of miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit. In essence, it is a Pentecostal Christianity in an African context.

African Pentecostal Christianity had a great influence on many churches and Christianity in general. Anderson (2000:35) continues to say that, it included: first, those churches originating in Western Pentecostal Mission initiatives. Second, new 'Pentecostal churches' were not very different from Western Pentecostal churches, but were initiated and governed by Africans. Third, the type which still forms the great majority of African Pentecostal churches was the 'prophetic-healing' churches'.

It must be stated early in this study that to say "African" is to distinguish this study from a Western context and interpretation. This does not suggest that everything within African Pentecostal Christianity will be addressed here. It will be an impossible task. 'African' is to classify or locate Pentecostal Christianity outside of Western society and culture. Khathide (2007:312) points out that there is a certain Africanness about the culture and religious beliefs and practices that can be

recognisable and discernible in the broader African perspective. However, it is not easy if the study is full of generalisations given the fact that Africa is too large and diverse. To avoid such generalisations and irrelevance the study concentrates on African Pentecostal Christianity in South Africa. In South Africa, the Apostolic Faith Mission as an African Pentecostal Christian Church stands out among other Pentecostal churches and becomes the focus of the study.

In addition 'Africa' is used as a category denoting societies that share a unique set of characteristics. This set consists of four interrelated dimensions. In its most descriptive sense, 'Africa' denotes a group of societies that share the same geography, which has gained a distinct geopolitical meaning. Politically, these societies are postcolonial. They are coming to terms with a period during which many societies with different historical traditions merge into a [single] history. They are obliged to operate within an economic system primarily developed and controlled by the West. Socio-culturally, 'Africa' denotes a group of societies with a high-level of plurality. Economically, 'Africa' denotes a group of societies all of which are faced with the need for substantial socio-economic development (see Fourie *et al.* 2015:2).

### **1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT**

#### **1.3.1 Context of Study: Mark 10:35-45**

This section of the study will assist to interpret Mark 10:35-45 in a proper way and to apply it to African Pentecostal Christianity. In simple terms, the context of Mark 10:35-45 refers to the theme(s) of the passage of the scripture. Blaney, Hanson and Harvey (1955:137) points out that the text is about the two sons of Zebedee who came to request for positions of pre-eminence in Christ's glory. Evidently they were either wanting places of honour at the messianic banquet, or places of honour and authority in a political messianic kingdom which they thought was about to appear.

A study in Mark 10:35-45 is a fitting climax to the theme of discipleship (Johnson 1972:178). The study of discipleship was introduced early in the gospel and developed most thoroughly throughout the gospel. Furthermore, Jesus' teaching on humble service is nowhere better expressed than in Mark 10:43-45, and it is characteristic of Mark that the pattern is the Son of Man. He is not just an apocalyptic judge but the one who has healed the sick, embraced children and patiently taught His disciples.

It is not only about discipleship but the disciples' misunderstanding of the teachings presented by Jesus. Anderson (1976:254) states that Mark's dominant theme is the disciples' lack of understanding in the face of the truth. They misunderstand that God's way of suffering and sacrifice for Jesus is identical with God's way for His disciples. The ransom which rounds the story is of the highest importance for the evangelist since it holds up the one who suffers for the many as a paradigm for all those followers who must suffer in their turn.

Sanner (1979:362) divides the text into two major themes:

- Selfish seeking (Mark 10:35-40).
- Selfless service (Mark 10:41-45).

Above the failure and the misunderstanding of the disciples according to Williamson (1983:190), this scripture affirms that Jesus' life was one of service and that His

death was for others. His life and death were of peace, for the supreme service of Jesus Christ was the voluntary giving of His life as a ransom for many.

The request for places of honour displayed a continuing feeling among the disciples that Jesus was going to Jerusalem to restore the glory of the fallen throne and kingdom of David. This was a normal, though selfish, reaction to Jesus' recent words about the twelve's occupancy of twelve thrones in that kingdom. Not only had James and John missed the point with regard to humility, they had also failed to grasp the necessity for delay because of the Messiah's coming passion (Gundry & Thomas 1988:165).

Although the disciples do not understand Jesus the application of this teaching to the life of Mark's own community would have been clear. There may well have been church leaders there whose attitude was similar to that of James and John, seeing leadership in terms of status and privilege (Hooker 1991:246). For them, the teaching that true greatness is seen in service was certainly necessary. At the same time, the threat of persecution was a very real one. The warning that being Jesus' disciple was likely to mean sharing His suffering may have been all too relevant to their situation. A public address to James and John and a public address to the ten, the attitude which Jesus demands of His disciples are based on imitating His own life of service and acceptance of death.

Jesus' teaching in this text according to English (1992:182) shows discipleship as a self-denying, self-risking part of lowly service for the redemption of the world. In contrast much of Christian life is about gaining a secure position in society, inviting others to join us where we are, doing little to change the structures of our political and social life. Seeley (1993:234) combines two ideas in Mark 10:41-45, lordship and service. The two stand in sharp contrast to one another. Indeed, it is precisely the tension between them that gives the passage much of its force. Unlike those who are regarded as ruling over nations, a disciple of Jesus should become a servant if he wants to be first.

Furthermore Jesus teaches His disciples that the places of honour are not His to appoint. Evans (2000:125) indicates that Jesus can tell them what is expected of the

disciples. They cannot be like the “great one” of the world, who likes to rule over people. Instead, the disciples are to seek opportunities of service. Jesus Christ is the epitome of this service. As “Son of man” He does not desire to be served instead “seeks to give His life as a ransom for many”. Geisler (2007:73) is adamant that Jesus in Mark 10:35-45 instructs His disciples in humility and in service. Hutchison (2009:54) agrees that in Mark 10:42-45 Jesus challenged His disciples to a radical and paradoxical form of leadership and showed that He Himself would provide the ultimate example through His suffering and death.

In addition Stein (2008:489) points out that His death is not only the supreme example of what it means to be “Great” in the kingdom of God, that is, being a servant and slave of all. It is also the once-for-all sacrifice by which He vicariously ransomed humanity from sin and death.

James and John made a request for positions with Jesus, asking if they can be guaranteed seats at His right and left in glory as a demonstration of failure of discipleship. Despite their failings, Jesus keeps them as His disciples. The point, for Mark, seems to be that discipleship is a relationship established by the call of Christ and defined by His own faithfulness, not by any merit that can be attributed to the disciples themselves (Powell 2009:142).

Mark 10:35-45 according to Henry (2010:1594) is about two reprimands by Jesus to His disciples:

- The reprimand Jesus gave to two of His disciples for their ambitious request.
- The reprimand He gave the rest of the disciples for their uneasiness.

If the context of Mark 10:35-45 is viewed only in the request of James and John, that is, their failure to grasp the message of Jesus, then “the ambition of James and John” becomes the main theme of the text in Mark 10:35-45. The misconceptions of leadership: kinship, self-interest, position, competition and lordship become the features of that theme. Although it addresses the ambitious request made by James and John, the theme does not address the main message of the text, the response

of Jesus to the two brothers' ambitious request. As a result the theme becomes one sided and limited.

A closer look at the response of Jesus to James and John's request and failure draws out a balanced and broad theme of the text. It is a balance between the request of James and John and the response by Jesus. It is a balance between the misconception of James and John (kinship, self-interest, position, competition and lordship) and the servant leadership principles (suffering, divine appointment and servant-hood). The balance in the text makes the context of Mark 10:35-45 to be servant leadership.

### **1.3.2 The problem**

Are the leadership misconceptions and servant leadership principles in Mark 10:35-45 applicable to the leadership misconceptions and servant leadership principles in African Pentecostal Christianity by using a reader-response criticism?

### **1.3.3 Hypothesis**

The leadership misconceptions in Mark 10:35-45 have propelled Jesus to teach His disciples about the principles of servant leadership. Suppose these leadership misconceptions and servant leadership principles are similar to the leadership misconceptions and servant leadership principles in African Pentecostal Christianity, then servant leadership in Mark can be applicable to African Pentecostal Christianity by using reader-response criticism.

## **1.4 RESEARCH HISTORY AND GAP**

### **1.4.1 Research history**

Generally, a study on leadership and related research topics has been extensively explored in different fields of study including biblical scholarship. It affirms a notion that leadership study is a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary study. It also affirms a fact that leadership is a diverse and a very complex topic of discussion. As a result a literature review on leadership in general will be a futile exercise.

However, a recent literature review by Fourie (*et al.* 2015:2) shows that there are about three hundred and eighty two references on leadership in Africa published

between 1950 and 2010. About two hundred and seventy seven of the total references were peer reviewed articles. These articles were covering different topics in leadership:

- political leadership
- leadership and management
- leadership styles
- leadership and gender
- leadership development
- leadership and African values
- traditional leadership, individual leadership
- leadership and ideology
- leadership and religion
- local leadership
- leadership succession
- leadership in education

In recent years especially in the 21<sup>st</sup> century or the last two decades there has been a growing trend of biblical leadership. According to Clark (2012:1) there are two factors that contribute to this change. First, the emergence of biblical leadership scholars like John Maxwell who had a church background and taken a key interest in the study. Second an exponential growth of Pentecostal-charismatic churches that are now known as “Mega churches”. The growth of such churches has forced them to function like big companies or enterprises. Church leaders (pastors) in these churches function like a modern day CEO.

Maxwell has written and published extensively on leadership. His books on leadership include: *Developing the leaders around you* 1995, *21 irrefutable laws of leadership* 1998, *Power of partnership* 1999, *21 Indispensable qualities of a leader*, 1999, *The right to lead* 2001, *Leading from the lockers* 2001, *Power of influence* 2002, *Leadership 101*, *The 360<sup>0</sup> leader* 2005, *Leadership Gold: Lessons I have learned from a lifetime of leading* 2008, *21 laws of leadership* 1998, and *The five levels of leadership* 2011. None of the books listed above applied leadership to an African context.

In servant leadership, Greenleaf, R.K (1904-1990) coined and modelled scholarly research of this study in the late seventies. For this reason, servant leadership is now known as his leadership theory and practice. He is also known as the founder of the servant leadership movement and the Greenleaf Centre for Servant Leadership. In his book, *Servant Leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*, he concluded that a great leader is seen as a servant first and that simple fact is the key to his greatness (Greenleaf 1997:7).

Since then many other servant leadership scholars have come on board in support of this study, theory and philosophy based on service. In 1998, Batten, Bauch, Blanchard, Bottum, Graham, Lenz, Melrose, Schuster, contributed to *Insights on Leadership*. In 2002, Beazley, Beggs, Bennis, Depree, Covey, Farnsworth, Jones, McGee-Cooper, Moxley, Ruschman, Smith, Spears, Trammell, Williams and Young all contributed to *Focus on Leadership: servant leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. In 2004 Burkhardt, DeGraaf, Ferch, Frick, Neal, Spears and Tilley made a contribution to practising servant leadership. In 2006, Flaniken asked an important question: is the bible relevant to servant leadership? In 2010, Bekker, Dierendonck and Patterson contributed to *Servant Leadership: Developments in theory and research*.

All of the above servant leadership scholars almost come to the same conclusion as that of Greenleaf. These scholars, like Greenleaf, applied servant leadership in corporate business. It is clear that the basis of their philosophy and teaching was not a biblical one and that they had never applied this ideology to African Pentecostal Christianity. Hutchison (2009:53) acknowledges the fact that many books have been written on the subject of leadership by Christian and secular leaders in corporate business. Few topics have created as much discussion and debate in both contexts as the concept of servant leadership. Since Jesus and essentially every New Testament writer inextricably associated Christian leaders with servant-hood, one would expect to find this subject discussed in Christian literature.

Hutchison (2009:53) continue to say that Greenleaf never claimed that his book is religious in nature. Yet he presented a new paradigm for business managers, one that has gained followers in the past thirty years.

Gene Wilkes' book on servant leadership is an exception he developed the seven principles of servant leadership by using the text in Mark 10:45:

- Jesus humbled Himself and allowed God to exalt Him.
- Jesus followed His father's will rather than seeking a position.
- Jesus defined greatness as being a servant and being first by becoming a slave.
- Jesus risked serving others because He trusted that He was God's son.
- Jesus left His place at the head of the table to serve the needs of others.
- Jesus shared responsibility and authority with those He called to lead.
- Jesus built a team to carry out a worldwide vision Wilkes (1998:12).

In African Pentecostal Christianity few scholars in the Apostolic Faith Mission have discussed a topic of leadership let alone servant leadership. Anderson 1992, *Bazalwane: The African Pentecostals in South Africa*; De Wet 1989, *The Apostolic Faith Mission in Africa: 1908-1980, a case study in church growth in a segregated society*; Erasmus 1996, *Theological Education in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa*; Lapoorta 1996, *Unity or Division? The unity struggle of the black churches within the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa*, Maxwell 1999, *Historicizing Christian independency: The Southern African Pentecostal Movement 1908 to 1960*; Chandomba 2007, *The History of the Apostolic Faith Mission and other Pentecostal Mission in South Africa*; Clark 2007 *Contemporary Pentecostal Leadership: The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa*; Burger and Nel 2008, *The Fire Falls in Africa*; Richardson, L.K , 2013. *What has Pentecostalism to do with race relations? A study of the Apostolic Faith Mission In South Africa?*

There is a value therefore in doing a doctoral thesis on servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 because it is a scholarly research input for biblical or Christian leadership. It is of great value to apply servant leadership from Mark 10:35-45 to African Pentecostal Christianity. The latter makes a great contribution to African biblical scholarship. The study of servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 is a scientific task that requires academic research and response.

### **1.4.2 Research Gap**

The research history of servant leadership found in Mark 10:35-45 has three implications. First, it demonstrates thorough scholarly research on servant leadership in a broad-spectrum but a minimal one on servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45. Second, it is also evident that servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 is yet to be applied to African Pentecostal Christianity. Third, a gap in the kind of method used to study servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45.

In contrast, servant leadership in a broader spectrum and in Mark 10:35-45 has been researched and applied to the Western context on a larger scale. The type of method that Western leadership scholars have used, forced them to interpret and apply the study within their own literary context. Consequently, there is a need for New Testament African scholars to develop research in their own context. There is a need for more New Testament African scholars to make their research available for African readers.

The above research history further indicates that a research gap exists with regard to three areas of research. First, the research gap exists in the biblical scholarship of servant leadership. Second, it exists in the application of servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 to African Pentecostal Christianity. Third, it exists with the methodology used to study servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45. The purpose of this dissertation project is to address this research gap in all three research areas.

## **1.5 METHODOLOGY**

In order to apply servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 to African Pentecostal Christianity. One will use the following approach: The first task will be to determine the historical background of the gospel of Mark. A Diachronic approach will be used to determine the authorship, date, place, recipients, structure and purpose of the gospel of Mark. The historical background of the gospel Mark will help the study to understand the meaning of Mark 10:35-45. The second task will be to deduce the meaning of the text in Mark 10:35-45. The synchronic approach will be used to interpret the questions asked by the sons of Zebedee and the answers by the Lord Jesus Christ.

Fourie (*et al.* 2015:4) explains the synthesis between the diachronic and synchronic approach. A diachronic approach to research on leadership is helpful for gaining a sense of the dynamics within such research. The study needs to complement the diachronic with a synchronic approach in order to move beyond the analysis of data towards a synthesis. Research on leadership covers an extremely wide range of themes, and that it is not possible to speak of a distinct theory of leadership. In fact, it is not sensible to attempt to synthesise the data into one distinct theory of leadership. Such a project would run the risk of glossing over the socio-cultural, economic and political diversity of the text.

In the third task, it will be important to research the historical background of African Pentecostal Christianity as it was important for the gospel of Mark. This will be done by investigating the historical origins of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement. The historical origins of African Pentecostal Christianity are pivotal. The early history of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South African is essential for this study. This will help to understand the leadership misconceptions and servant leadership principles of African Pentecostal Christianity.

The above three tasks help to reach the final task of this study. This is to use a reader-response criticism to apply Mark 10:35-45 to African Pentecostal Christianity. The aim is to determine if the leadership misconception and principles of servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 are applicable to African Pentecostal Christianity. This is similar to reading Mark 10:35-45 in an African context.

In reader-response criticism, the reader is inscribed or encoded in the text, is a property of the text, and is part of the text's meaning; the critic's function is to interpret the signals transmitted to the inscribed reader of the text. Other forms of reader oriented criticism give the reader complete dominance over the text; meaning is a creation by and in the individual reader. Still others see the act of reading as a dialectical process. An "implied" reader or an "informed" reader interacts with the text; meaning is thus a product of the dynamic of reader and text interaction (Resseguie 1984:307). Reader response critics do tend to value all reading, but insofar as they are critics working within the guild, the implicit critical presuppositions

of the guild guide their work. They are not just readers; they are expert, critical readers (Fowler 1985:6).

Porter (1990:279) lists five characteristics of reader-response criticism. First, reader-response criticism explicitly shifts the centre of authority from the text itself, where it resides in formalism, or the author, where it resides in traditional biographical and historical criticism, to the reader, not an historical first reader or any particular subsequent reader but a contemporary reader. Second, the reader is involved in a complex interplay with the text, which chronicles his or her struggle to comprehend. Third, meaning is not a single thing but the reader's making and then responding to the text. Fourth, the result of the abandonment of independent meaning is that the meaning which one produces cannot be checked against some objective standard but is the product of a reading strategy. Fifth, those who hold to similar reading strategies constitute 'interpretive communities'.

The reader-response school of thought focuses on the act of reading and on the activity of readers as they read. This trend can be distinguished from methods which focused on the text in itself and on the author. Readers play a role in the conception of functions of biblical texts that match their experiences and needs. A common image used to explain the reader-response approach is to suggest that the text functions as mirror instead of window (Cahill 1996:89). Reader-response criticism focuses more on the role of the reader. It is the reader who has to fill the gaps in the text with meaning, as well as to iron out the repetitions, doublets and inconsistencies (Du Rand, Coetzee, Nortje-Meyer & Viviers 2005:52).

Reader-response criticism focuses on how texts have been understood and might be understood by readers who engage them in different ways and in various contexts. Reader-response critics are typically in the capacity for any text to mean different things to different people. Most reader-response critics are interested in exploring how readers contribute to the process of interpretation, bringing their own perspectives and presuppositions to texts and reading them in the light of these. They analyse how factors of social location (age, gender, nationality, economic status, etc.) inevitably affect the ways readers engage texts and help to determine what they think those texts mean (see Powell 2009:54).

## Chapter 2

### Historical background of the gospel of Mark

#### 2.1 AUTHORSHIP, DATE, PLACE OF WRITING AND RECIPIENTS

##### 2.1.1 Authorship

The possible author of the gospel of Mark is investigated by looking at both the internal and external evidence in the church tradition, namely the tradition of Papias. Arguments that support the tradition of Papias and arguments against the tradition of Papias will be discussed, and a conclusion on possible authorship will be made.

The source for internal evidence is the gospel itself and other New Testament documents, particularly 1 Peter. The source for external evidence comes from the earliest church Fathers such as Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexander, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome and Eusebius.

##### 2.1.1.1 The church tradition: the tradition of Papias

The core of this tradition affirms that the author of the gospel was Mark, He was the interpreter of Peter. Although he was not a follower (eyewitness) of Jesus, Mark wrote down accurately the remembrances of Peter.

Other (later) patristic witnesses repeat certain of Papias' statements, and make explicit what is only implied in his writing. In the so-called Anti-Marcionite prologue (*circa* 160-180 CE), Mark is named as Peter's interpreter who worked in the regions of Italy. Irenaeus (*circa* 130 CE) asserts that Mark was Peter's disciple and interpreter who wrote in Rome after the death of Peter and Paul. Clement of Alexandria (*circa* 215 CE) and Origen (*circa* 250 CE) add significant amplification to the above patristic tradition that is, according to Clement, Peter knew of Mark's writing, and Origen states that Peter even instructed Mark to write the gospel (see Van Eck 2013:19).

### 2.1.1.2 Arguments that support the tradition of Papias

The following arguments (internal and external) by various Markan scholars support the tradition of Papias:

It can be stated categorically that the author was almost certainly John Mark (Blaney, Hanson & Harvey 1955:113). He was Peter's companion in 'Babylon' at the time of the writing of his first letter (1 Pt 5:13). John Mark was the son of Mary, an early Christian of comfortable circumstances, who owned a house and kept servants (Ac 12:12-17). His first name was John, by which he is quoted in Acts 13:5 and 13. Mark was his surname (Ac 12:12, 25; 15:37).

A summary of the profile of the author shows that Mark was Peter's translator. This does not imply that the apostle wrote anything; it can mean either that he acted as interpreter, translating into Greek as Peter spoke in Aramaic. He had not heard Jesus speak, nor was he one of his original disciples. Mark did not write 'in order'. Last, Mark was as accurate as he could be under the difficult circumstances; he tried not to omit anything and did not deliberately falsify (Sherman 1960:17).

As an interpreter or translator, Mark memorised everything Peter did and taught. The fact that he wrote so accurately and excellently it can be believed that he had experienced what he wrote. As he gives an account of the gospel, one can almost think that he was there when Jesus performed miracles or on his day of crucifixion. The truth is that he was not one of the disciples of Jesus.

If Mark was the kinsman of Barnabas and did live in Jerusalem, it still does not make sense that he was also a disciple of the earthly Jesus. The Mark known to us in Acts was probably a very young man when he left home to travel with Barnabas and Paul (Ac 12:25). This could perhaps be 15 years after the resurrection. During Jesus' ministry he would probably have been a child (Allen 1969:256). To suggest that Mark derived all his materials from Peter is very unlikely. Mark would hardly have omitted an incident of Jesus' life of which he knew and which suited his purposes just because he had not received it from Peter.

There seems no reason to doubt that the writer of the second gospel is the person associated in Acts (Ac 12:25, 13:5, 15:37-39) with Paul and Barnabas, and spoken of by Peter (1 Pt 5:13) as his 'son'. To his Jewish name 'John' was added the Latin surname 'Mark' according to the custom of the time (Burn 1974:1). Nothing is known about his father; but his mother, Mary, was evidently a woman of some note among the early disciples at Jerusalem (Ac 12:12). He was also a cousin to Barnabas, and therefore a member of the tribe of Levi. When or how he first came under Christian influences there is no means of determining, but he was probably converted in the same way as Peter.

Mark is not only a replica of Peter's preaching but also an intellectual portrait. This is seen from the form and content of the gospel. It is evident that he was a charismatically endowed teacher and evangelist (Lane 1974:23). His use of the Old Testament wilderness-motif in the prologue and throughout the gospel displays a significant grasp of Old Testament revelation and its relevance for the church (Mk 1:1-13, 35-39, 6:30-34). The employment of the allusive qualities of rare vocabulary (e.g., Mk 7:32; 8:3) and of the parenthetical clauses introduced by the conjunction 'for' to evoke the biblical background which informs an event (Mk 1:16; 11:13) exhibit an agile mind.

Papias pictures Mark as a non-apostle who had not even been a disciple or hearer of the Lord. Thus, in Papias' view, Peter's preaching is the source of Mark (Kalin 1975:332). He wrote down accurately, with no falsification, as much as he remembered what Peter had preached. With the exception of the fact that he was Peter's interpreter, Papias says nothing about who Mark was, nor where Mark wrote or when. Papias is silent on whether Mark wrote before or after Peter's death.

Although Mark was not one of the twelve disciples, Sanner (1979:263) is virtually certain that the author of Mark was John Mark, a native of Jerusalem, a cousin of Barnabas, and a close associate of Peter and perhaps of Paul as well. From the beginning of the second century, Mark's name, and no other, has always been associated with the gospel. This is a remarkable fact. At a time when the church sought to assign apostolic authorship to its literature, it is highly unlikely that a secondary name would be linked to a gospel unless there was a good reason for

doing so. Papias, Justin Martyr, the Anti-Marcionite Prologue to Mark, Irenaeus, and the Muratorian Canon all attribute the gospel to Mark as an interpreter for Peter.

It is clear that what gives the gospel and its authorship authority is the association with Peter. If the 'John Mark' mentioned in Acts is the cousin of Barnabas, as well as in several of Paul's letters, and in a letter by Peter, consequently his mother and Peter's home is known to the audience (Price 1983:1). Vivid details suggest an eyewitness account events favourable to Peter are omitted, whereas less favourable events, such as the denial, are told with considerable fullness. The prevailing opinion is that Peter was one of Mark's principal sources.

Mark was faithful in articulating what Peter taught. He became Peter's interpreter and wrote accurately everything he remembered, though not, indeed in the order of the things said or done by the Lord (Kalin 1975:332). Mark did not hear the Lord, nor followed him. He later on followed Peter, who used to give teaching as necessity demanded but not making, as it were, an arrangement of the Lord's oracles. As a result Mark did nothing wrong in writing down single points as he remembered them. The one thing he gave attention to was to leave out nothing of what he had heard and to make no false statements in them.

Considerable internal evidence, indeed, links the gospel with Peter (English 1992:23). Mark begins at the point where Peter became a disciple and features the Galilean ministry as it centred around Capernaum with John Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, companion to Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey and later, according to tradition, a companion to Peter.

The view of authorship taken here is that the writer was John Mark, to whom reference is found in Acts 12:12, 25; 15:37-39; Colossians 4:10; 2 Timothy 4:11 and Philemon 245. He was evidently close to Peter and after an initial failure, travelled with Paul; his pedigree is therefore strong.

The traditional view of authorship can be traced to the early second century and is based on the testimony of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who according to Eusebius

(*Ecclesiastical History* III.39.14-16) attributed it to an unknown contemporary, 'the Elder' (Telford 1999:10).

In the early second century, Papias of Hierapolis defended Mark's authority: 'Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote down accurately whatever he remembered of what was or done by the Lord, but not in order' (LaVerdiere 1999:3). The preface shows that the author speaks in his name using the first person and addresses the readers or listeners using the second person. In the case of Mark, the first and the second person are implied. The prologue demonstrates that the author uses the third person.

If the author spoke in the first person and addressed the recipients in the second person; it raises questions about whether he really did interpret for Peter or wrote the gospel account himself. If indeed Mark interpreted for Peter it is expected that he would indeed speak in the third person.

Papias attributed this and other traditions to the Elder John whom he distinguished from the apostle (Painter 2007:4). The Mark spoken of by Papias was named by Mary who had a house in Jerusalem where the early Christians used to meet (Ac 12:12). It may well have been the house where the last supper was held. Some say that Mark was the 'young man' who tried to warn Jesus on the night of Jesus' arrest (Mk 14:51).

If the last supper was held at the house of Mark's mother and that the early Christians met at that same house, then Mark was not an ordinary man, he cannot be only identified as the interpreter or translator of Peter but as an influential and independent man. This evidence further adds to the authority of the author.

The author in question has the following biographical sketch:

- (1) He was familiar with the geography of the land and Jerusalem (Mk 5:1; 6:53; 8:10; 11:1; 13:3).
- (2) He knew Aramaic, the common language of the day (Mk 5:41; 7:11, 34; 14:36).
- (3) He understood Jewish institutions and customs (Mk 1:21; 2:14, 16, 18; 7:2-4).

- (4) The account is vivid and detailed, revealing contact with Jesus' 'inner circle' James, Peter, and John.
- (5) He used Peter's words and deeds (Mk 8:29).
- (6) He alone added 'and Peter' in the resurrection account (Mk 16:7).
- (7) There is a striking similarity between his broad outline and Peter's sermon in Acts 10:34-43 (see Geisler 2007:68).

Given the above profile, Geisler (2007:68) concludes that the book was written by John Mark, a companion of Peter. John was his Hebrew name and Mark his Latin name. He was:

- (1) An associate of Peter (1 Pt 5:13).
- (2) Once a companion of Paul (Ac 13:5).
- (3) The son of one Mary (Mk 12:12).
- (4) A nephew (or cousin) of Barnabas (Col 4:10).
- (5) The subject of dispute between Paul and Barnabas (Ac 15:37-40).
- (6) Later reconciled with Paul (2 Tim 4:11).
- (7) Perhaps the person whose home was the 'upper room'.
- (8) Possibly well-to-do (owned a big home) and his cousin owned land (Mk 4:36-37).
- (9) May have been the unclad lad who fled the garden (Mk 14:51-52; Geisler 2007:68; cf. Morris 1995:1457).

Although Mark was not one of the original twelve disciples, it appears that he did witness much of what happened in the early church and he appears to have known and heard Jesus (Blackaby 2007:8). Some believe the last supper was held in the home of Mark's mother, and Mark identified himself in writing as a young man wearing only a linen cloth in the garden of Gethsemane (Mk 14:51-52). Early church prayer meetings appear to have been held in his home (Ac 12:12).

Mark is not only associated with Peter. Henry (2010:1566) recognises the fact that Paul also counted John Mark among his fellow workers (Phlm 24). Peter called Mark his son (1 Pt 5:13); whether this Mark was the same as the one known to Paul is uncertain. It is true that Mark was not an apostle, but we still have good reason to

think that both he and Luke belonged to the seventy disciples who received a commission similar to that of the apostles.

The tradition of the early church is unanimous: the Second gospel was written by John Mark and presents the preaching of Peter. Tertullian (c 200) and Origen (c. 230), unite in affirming that Mark's gospel gives us the preaching of Peter (Douglas & Tenney 2011:896).

A common understanding here in support of the Papias tradition is that the author is Mark and that he wrote for Peter. Although not one of the original twelve disciples of Jesus Christ, he is a witness. Some scholars even place him as one of the seventy disciples. Therefore, the author was familiar with the teaching of Jesus on discipleship and the kingdom of God.

Furthermore the author is authenticated by his association with the eyewitnesses of Jesus. The fact that Mark is writing on behalf of Peter and his association with both Paul and Barnabas, points to his authority as the author of the gospel.

### **2.1.1.3 Arguments against the tradition of Papias**

The following arguments (internal and external) by various Markan scholars argue against the tradition of Papias:

Nowhere in the gospel does the author divulge his own identity. A number of commentators have none the less detected a signature of sorts in the work. Such commentators suggest that the strange and faintly humorous note about the young man fleeing naked from the scene of Jesus' arrest in the garden (Mk 14:51) is a brief autobiographical reminiscence of the author. Reconstructions suggesting that the youth followed Jesus from his home, 'the house of Mary the mother of John whose surname was Mark' (Ac 12:12), where the last supper was held go much too far.

If the gospel writer wished to intrude himself in the narrative, he chose an extremely condensed and cryptic way of doing so. It is not even necessary to assume that the writer would only have inserted the memorandum about the youth if it had come to him directly from an eyewitness (Anderson 1976:29). Possibly he had to hand an old

piece of information about a youth who after the death of Jesus joined the Christian community and told his story there.

Since 'Mark' was a common name, thus the name does not provide much help in linking the gospel to its author (Keck 1994:517). The New Testament refers to a Jewish Christian named Mark who was initially associated with Paul (Ac 12:12, 13:5, 13, Col 4:10; Phlm 24). 1 Peter 5:13 refers to Mark as an associate of the imprisoned Peter.

Where internal evidence is concerned, the clues given to the gospel's real author provide little correlation with the New Testament tradition regarding John Mark (Telford 1999:11). The author of the text shows unfamiliarity with the geography of Palestine (e.g. Mk 5:1, 6:45, 7:31, 8:22, 10:1, 11:1), Jewish customs (Mk 7:1-2, 10:2, 14:1, 14:64), and even the Jewish leadership groups (e.g. Mk 3:6, 6:17, 8:15, 12:13). The gospel was written in Greek with Gentiles in mind and offers harsh criticism of Jews and Judaism.

The book is anonymous, and the identity of its author can only be predicted. Powell (2009:128) explains that by the beginning of the second century, Christians were writing 'according to Mark' on manuscripts of the book; however, 'Mark' was a very common name. Around the middle of the second century, Papias, a Christian leader, identified Mark as 'Peter's interpreter', writing his gospel based on Peter's own remembrances. The strong implication is that the Mark who wrote this gospel is the Mark mentioned in 1 Peter 5:13 as having been with the apostle Peter in Rome.

Although Mark was a very common Roman name, there is no reason to think that Mark was not a Jew by birth. As Saul took the Roman name Paul, so this evangelist took the Roman name Mark (Sanner 1979:244). John Mark was the son of Barnabas' sister. Paul was displeased with him (Ac 15:37-38) but later showed great kindness to him, not only ordering the churches to receive him (Col 4:10) but also sending him to be his assistant, with this commendation: He is profitable to me for the ministry (2 Tim 4:11).

Like the other canonical gospels, Mark nowhere identifies its author, nor even, as is the case with Luke (1:1-4) and John (20:30-31), the occasion of writing (Edwards 2012:1007).

Van Eck (2013:20) cites the following problems with the Papias tradition:

- Although the gospel gives no information concerning the author of the gospel, the patristic witnesses purport that it was Mark. The author never identifies himself in the gospel as the author, or gives any indication that he was an eye or ear witness.
- How trustworthy are, therefore, the Papias tradition, and, for that matter, the Anti-Marcionite prologue and the writings of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Origin, especially if the cumulative aspect of their arguments is taken into consideration?
- For someone who stayed in Jerusalem, Mark is less Jewish than for instance Matthew who most probably was a Hellenistic Jew. Mark also takes his citations from the Old Testament not from the Hebraic text, but from the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament (LXX). Also, for someone who was familiar with Jerusalem, his lack of knowledge of Palestine seems odd.
- The description of 'Mark' in Papias sounds defensive, and the tradition shows an apologetic tendency (Peter wrote 'accurately', 'erred in nothing', 'not to omit or falsify').
- Mark, who was not a disciple of Jesus, is connected with a disciple, Peter. Moreover, it seems that the connection between Mark and Peter is based primarily on one verse, namely 1 Peter 5:13.
- The Papias tradition does not take into account the results of historical criticism which indicate that the gospels developed in a gradual (evolutionistic) way, and that the evangelists made use of specific sources.

#### **2.1.1.4 Conclusion**

The arguments that question the Papias tradition seem to be valid. The historicity of this tradition can therefore be questioned. Mark, like the other gospels, initially circulated anonymously until the third century when, inter alia on the basis of the

tradition of Papias, was given the superscript (title) 'The gospel according to Mark' to delimit the different gospels from one another in Greek text that contained all four gospels this makes the author of Mark to be unknown (Van Eck 2013:21).

Thus, the position taken in this study is that the author of the gospel of Mark is unknown. He was not an apostle and not even a disciple. The source of his gospel was the preaching of Peter. The author heard clearly and he wrote accurately what Peter preached. It is also assumed that the author wrote with an audience in mind. He did not only interpret Peter, but went further and contextualised his message. The context of the gospel of Mark will apply to any Christian community undergoing similar challenges as the audience of Mark.

The most important fact in this section is that the kind of a Christian community that the author wrote to would later be likened to an African Pentecostal Christianity.

### **2.1.2 Date of writing**

The dating of the gospel of Mark and/or any other gospel is problematic because no specific date can without question be postulated. Thus the choice of a date of writing becomes an assumption. Considering the main factors regarding the date of Mark, one can at least come to a close estimate of the date of writing. These factors include among others the death of Peter and Paul, the fall of Jerusalem, Neronian persecution, the Roman-Jewish war and the Apocalypse (Mk 13).

There are uncertainties with regard to the dating of the gospel of Mark. The passage quoted from Irenaeus probably means that Mark was not written until after the death of Peter and Paul, although other early writers place it during Peter's lifetime. Perhaps a date in the sixties would be acceptable, although an earlier dating is not excluded (Blaney, Hanson & Harvey 1955:114).

The earliest conceivable date for the gospel is in the forties, shortly after the composition of the 'little Apocalypse'. If it is correct to understand the great fire in Rome and the martyrdom of Peter as part of the background. A date earlier than 64 CE is excluded. It is because the death of Peter happened somewhere in 64 CE. In

addition the death of Peter aligns with the tone of the gospel of persecution and martyrdom (Sherman 1960:19).

Although the date for the composition of Mark cannot be given in assurance, Allen (1969:256) opines that if it was written in Rome and after the death of Peter, it must have been written no earlier than 65 CE. If it was used by the authors of Matthew and Luke, as is generally acknowledged, it cannot be much later than 70 CE.

The time of writing of Mark is often fixed at 65-70 CE, based on the assumption that Mark wrote after the death of Peter (which probably occurred during the Neronian persecution of 64-65 CE), but before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE (Sanner 1979:264). Many believe the gospel was written earlier, perhaps in the fifties. This dating is based upon the belief that Luke and Acts were written before the death of Paul (64 CE); hence Mark was written earlier.

The position of Burn (1974:3), with regard to the date of the gospel of Mark, is based on the statement of Irenaeus, namely that, 'after the departure of Peter and Paul, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, even he delivered to us in writing the things which were preached by Peter'. The time of 'the departure' or decease of the two apostles are uncertain. Dates between 64 and 68 CE have been suggested by scholars, and it would be wrong to attempt to draw the line closer than somewhere between these two dates. It is also possible that the gospel left its author's hands later than 70 CE.

The gospel of Mark is rarely dated within the decade 60-70 CE. The early tradition preserved in the Anti-Marcionite prologue to the gospel and in Irenaeus, Mark wrote subsequent to the letter of Peter, who was martyred in Rome during this period. Another early strand of tradition, found in Clement of Alexandria, asserts that Mark produced his gospel while Peter was yet alive (Lane 1974:17).

Various attempts have been made to show that both of these lines of tradition are correct. It has been argued that Mark began his gospel during Peter's lifetime but completed it after his death, or that Irenaeus did not mean to imply Peter's death but only his departure from the place where Mark was. While the first proposal is

possible, the second is disallowed by the earliest witness that has been preserved, the Anti-Marcionite prologue. It clearly dates the origin of Mark after the death of Peter.

The words in Mark 13:14 about 'the abomination of desolation' standing where it ought not, they must have been written just prior to the assignation of the emperor Caligula on 24 January 41 CE. Caligula, it is true, planned an outrage against the Jerusalem temple when he commanded his statue to be set up in the sacred precincts (Anderson 1976:24). The prophecy of Mark 13:14 might equally belong to a considerably later time when the seer was expecting another imminent sacrilege no less sinister than Caligula's or as a reference to Titus in the temple in 70 CE, which dates the gospel after 70.

Mark was written sometime after 64 CE as indicated, and before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE which is still in the future of the gospel, taking the prophetic element of the gospel seriously (English 1992:22).

The other element of apocalyptic literature, portray characters as predicting events that have already happened (the so-called *vaticinium ex eventu*, literally, a revelation after the event). This means that the events that are described in Mark 13:14 already have taken place before Mark was written (Van Eck 2013:37). There is abundant evidence that the event referred to in Mark 13:14, the fall of the temple, took place in 70 CE, Mark had to be written after 70 CE.

Since Mark was written before Matthew and Luke, and since the turmoil in Judea, which led to the destruction of the temple, appears to have been in progress or recently completed by the time the gospel was written. Most scholars agree that Mark wrote his gospel probably around 70 CE (Keck 1994:517). Those who hold out for the tradition of a Roman origin prior to Peter's martyrdom opt for the earlier end of the spectrum, c. 62-64 CE.

By considering the factors regarding the date like: the fall of Jerusalem which occurred in 70 CE, the development of the tradition before Mark, the Neronian persecution, and the Roman-Jewish war Telford (1999:13) suggests the following four possibilities:

- A general consensus accept a date not much earlier than 65 CE and not much later than 75 CE, that is, some time before or after the fall of Jerusalem which occurred in 70 CE. A substantially earlier date is usually dismissed since it takes insufficient account of the development of the tradition before Mark as well as the internal evidence (especially Mk 13) which suggests that events in the sixties formed the backdrop for the final form of the text.
- Some would argue for the mid-sixties, that is, in the aftermath of the Neronian persecution.
- Others would opt for the second half of the sixties during the period of unrest and apocalyptic fervour occasioned by both the Roman-Jewish war and the civil war throughout the Empire.
- Others still, taking the prediction of the destruction of the temple as a *vaticinium ex eventu* (Mk 13:1-2), or prophecy after the event, would hold that it was written shortly after the fall of Jerusalem when eschatological expectation had perhaps begun to be tempered by the delay in Jesus' second return or Parousia (Mk 13:10).

It is possible to asset a post-70 CE date for Mark by arguing that Mark was using a pre-Markan apocalyptic tractate or Apocalypse in the composition of Mark 13, consisting of at least Mark 13:6-8, 12-13, 14-22, and 24-27 (Kloppenborg 2005:425). With this view, the anticipation of an 'abomination of desolation' originally referred to an anticipated desecration (rather than destruction) of the temple, as it did in the case of Daniel, and was inspired either by the Caligula episode or a more general apocalyptic topos of the appearance of an anti-Christ. In order to sustain this dating, it is also necessary to invoke the supplementary hypothesis that Mark edited his pre-Markan apocalyptic source, not bothering to adapt its details to what he knew of the events of 70 CE.

The content of Mark 13 is prophetic and apocalyptic. It is about the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and things related to this, the rise of deceivers, the wars of the nations, the persecution of Christians, the end of the world, and the timing of these events. The question is the source of Mark 13; did he use a pre-Markan apocalyptic source as Kloppenborg (2005:425) suggests? Or was he writing of the

events that had already happened? Thus it is possible that he wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem.

It is believed that Mark wrote after Peter's 'departure' rather than after the fall of Jerusalem. If this means his death, then Mark wrote between 68 and 70 CE, but this is unlikely since the internal evidence favours an early date for Mark. Geisler (2007:69) mentions the following reasons:

- (1) Luke may refer to Mark by 60 CE (Luke 1:1).
- (2) The interpretation of the term 'departure' may have been wrong or misunderstood.
- (3) 'Departure' may be understood geographically; and
- (4) Papias said Matthew was written first, and then Mark before Luke (who wrote in 60CE). Hence, Mark would have been written *circa* 55-60 CE.

It is maintained that the gospel of Mark most probably was the first gospel written. Most scholars think that it was produced sometime between 65 and 73 CE, around the time of the Jewish war with Rome and just after the Roman persecutions that took the lives of Peter, Paul and many other Christians (Powell 2009:128). If indeed the gospel of Mark was the first gospel written, it means both Luke and Matthew referred to the gospel of Mark. This would suggest that the two gospels were written after the completion of the gospel of Mark.

Mark is the earliest of the gospels and conservatives commonly hold to a date in the fifties. Mainstream scholarship places the writing of Mark between 65 and 70 CE, and if one accepts the tradition that Mark wrote after Peter's death, the later date would have to be adopted (Douglass & Tenney 2011:896). The gospel must have been composed sometime after 64 CE, when Peter arrived in Rome, but probably before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, for Mark 13, which reflects some aspects of the first Jewish revolt, does not seem to reflect the fall of Jerusalem (Geisler 2007:69).

According to the scholars quoted above, there are various possibilities for the dating of the gospel of Mark. Scholars favouring an earlier date in the forties attest it to the 'little Apocalypse'. If Luke-Acts was written before the death of Paul (64 CE) and Mark is prior, then an earlier date in the fifties will be possible. Another possibility is

70 CE before the fall of Jerusalem. A more common date is 65-70 CE, after the death of Peter which happened during a Neronian persecution (64-65 CE) and before the fall of Jerusalem. A post 70 CE date is possible because Mark used a pre-Markan apocalyptic tractate in composing Mark 13 and because of the Jewish war with Rome and Roman persecutions.

This study supports a date post 70 CE; possibly because Mark 13:14 refer to an event that has already taken place. In other words when Mark wrote his gospel the fall of the temple in 70CE already has taken place. The author is acquainted with the message of persecution, suffering and martyrdom. The persecution referred to in Mark 13:9-13 must have taken place later, most probably in Palestine where the Markan community were persecuted for not taking part in the Jewish war, but also because of them being an open community; something that was unheard of in a Jewish environment (Van Eck 2013:38). Although written centuries ago, the important aspect here is the relevancy of the message of Mark for his audience and readers today in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **2.1.3 Place of writing**

It is important in this study to determine the place where the gospel of Mark was written. The choice of the place of writing will later help in establishing who the recipients of the gospel of Mark were. Such a choice will further help in understanding the context of Mark 10:35-45.

There are three main geographical areas suggested by Markan scholars as possible places where the gospel of Mark was written. These three possibilities will now be discussed in order to decide on the most probable place of writing.

#### **2.1.3.1 Rome**

The view that the tradition that says Mark's gospel originated in Rome is early and almost unanimous (Blaney, Hanson & Harvey 1955:114). Sherman (1960:15) offers a comprehensive exposition of Rome as the place of origin on the basis of the following points:

- (1) In 1 Peter, which is probably a Roman document of the late first century, Mark is associated with Peter.
- (2) Although many of the traditions behind the gospel have an authentic Palestinian flavour, there are many indications that the evangelist himself is not acquainted with Palestine.
- (3) Mark certainly writes for a non-Palestinian audience when he explains the customs of the Pharisees and gives translations of Aramaic words.
- (4) His Latinisms cannot be used as an argument for the Roman origin of the gospel, since Latin words were used in Greek and even in Hebrew in various parts of the Empire.
- (5) Although Mark was supplanted in popularity by Matthew early in the second century, there are signs that Mark early achieved a secure place in the church in Rome.
- (6) Mark's dating of the last supper, which conflicts with that of John and probably with the tradition, on which Mark drew, may have been due to the fact that already the church in Rome had its own date for celebrating the Lord's resurrection.
- (7) Finally, if one asks which of the great seats of Christendom is most likely to have produced a gospel of this character, Rome seems to be the most natural answer.

The relationship between 1 Peter and the gospel of Mark, or even the relationship between Peter himself and Mark, cannot be argued further. The most appealing reason to rule out Palestine is the fact that the gospel was well received by the church at Rome.

There is other grains of confirmatory evidence which may be drawn from the mention of Alexander and Rufus (Mk 15:21), the latter being probably the person referred to by Paul in Romans 16:13 (Burn 1974:3). This might mean that Mark spent some part of his life in Rome, coupled with the fact of his Roman surname 'Marcus' gradually superseding the Hebrew 'John'; and from the conciseness of his narrative, which made it so suitable for the vigorous intelligence of Roman hearers.

In agreement with the Roman method of reckoning time, Mark speaks of four watches of the night, rather than of the three which were traditional in Jewish reckoning (Mk 6:48; 13:35). It is even possible that Mark has structured his passion narrative in accordance with the four Roman night watches (Lane 1974:24). Since Jesus enters Jerusalem to share the Passover with his disciples in the evening (Mk 14:17), the hour of betrayal in the garden of Gethsemane is very probably midnight (Mk 14:41). The denial of Peter occurs in connection with cock-crow (Mk 14:72), and the time when Jesus is brought to Pilate is early morning (Mk 15:1).

Ancient testimony to Rome as the place of composition is manifold. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria (around 200 CE) as quoted in Eusebius, and the Anti-Marcionite prologue states that 'after the departure of Peter himself', he (Mark) wrote down this same gospel in the regions of Italy' (Burn 1974:3). Such testimony is invariably closely linked to Mark's association with Peter, for which the evidence of Papias is fundamental. Though Papias does not himself mention Rome, other estimates of the value of the ancient testimony linking the gospel with Rome will be proportionate then to the estimation of the value of Papias' evidence linking Mark with Peter.

A stronger case can be made for Rome as the place of writing than for any other ancient city, although Alexandria and Antioch have also been mentioned (Sanner 1979:264). Mark explains Jewish customs (Mk 7:3-4) and translates Aramaic terms, it is clear that he was writing for non-Jewish readers. The testimony of tradition (the Anti-Marcionite prologue, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria) points to Rome, as does the presence of a number of words borrowed from Latin (e.g., centurion, denarius and legion). The overtones of persecution and suffering also support this view. Peter (1 Peter 5:13) specifically states that Mark, 'my son' was with him in 'Babylon' which is used as a reference to Rome. If the Rufus of Mark 15:21 is to be identified with the Rufus mentioned in Romans 16:13, the case for Rome is further strengthened.

By 200 CE there was considerable and wide-spread agreement among Christians that Mark's gospel was written in Rome and was reflective of the preaching of Peter (Reardon 1992:109). Mark is associated with Peter in Rome. The concentration of Mark on the passion of Jesus and the call of the disciples to follow Jesus, bearing a

cross, is thought to fit the situation in Rome at the time of Nero's persecution or consciousness of it (Painter 1997:7).

Mark 13 makes sense in a Palestinian context, immediately before, during, or soon after the Jewish war. Thus it would be unwise to tie Mark to a Roman context. Mark 13 makes the Jewish war a more specific and likely context for Mark, which was probably written in the turmoil leading up to the war or in the throes of the war itself.

Rome is the traditional place of origin for Mark's gospel. It is supported by external evidence (chiefly the Anti-Marcionite prologue, Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria), but this again may simply be a deduction from 1 Peter 5:13 where Mark, Peter and Rome (or Babylon) are connected (Telford 1999:14).

Certain internal clues have been adduced in favour for a Roman provenance, such as the frequent Latinisms (e.g. Mark 5:9 [legion]; Mark 6:27 [speculator or military executioner]; Mark 12:42 [quadrants, a Roman coin]), the indications of Gentile addressees or the evidence which links the gospel with the Neronian persecution in 64 CE or the anti-Jewish sentiments prevailing shortly after 70 CE in consequence of the Romano-Jewish war. The fact that Mark came to be used by Matthew and Luke within a relatively short time after its composition suggests to some that it emanated from an important church-centre like Rome.

The readers of Mark were located in Rome and the Roman world. Although it was written in Rome, it was written in Greek, as was Paul's letter to the Romans, because Greek was the more universal language of this period (Geisler 2007:70 cf Henry 2010:1566).

From the early church to the present it has been generally believed that Mark's gospel was written in Rome (Douglass & Tenney 2011:896). Several distinctive features point in this direction. Mark uses ten Latin words, some of which do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. He explains Jewish customs because he is writing to Gentiles. To his Roman readers he presents Jesus as the mighty conqueror and the suffering Servant of the Lord. No genealogy or infancy narratives are given because of this purpose. These are found only in Matthew and Luke.

The external evidence also points to Rome. Papias, Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, attest that Mark composed the gospel as a result of Peter's preaching in Rome, although he took liberties with the chronological order of some events (Edwards 2012:1007).

### **2.1.3.2 Antioch in Syria**

In support of a Syrian provenance, as opposed to a Roman provenance, Bartlett (1922:34-40) argues that since Peter was connected to the Antiochene church, the fact that Antioch was a great centre of Roman culture (and the place where the term 'Christian' was coined), and the fact that Simon of Cyrene (Mk 15:21) is referred to in the gospel, points to a possible Syrian setting for the gospel. Moreover, Mark's use of Aramaic words and his unexplained use of the Palestinian geography indicate that the writer of Mark could not have lived in Palestine.

Mark was written in Jerusalem in Aramaic and later translated into Greek while the author was in Antioch (Allen 1915:6). The language of Mark, as well as the miracle stories and Mark 13, clearly show that the gospel has a Hellenistic background, a background that suggests an origin in Antioch (Fuller 1966:107). This recognition of the Hellenistic and Palestinian features in the gospel is also recognised by Vander Broek (1987:31).

Mark is seen as defending Jesus against the accusation of abandoning the Jewish law and against the suspicion of Jewish nationalism (Kummel 1975:43). Mark ascribes all human guilt in Jesus' crucifixion to the Jewish leaders (e.g., Mk 2:6-8; 3:6; 7:7, 13; 12:13, 28; 14:1, 55). This apologetic of Mark is intended to make his Gentile readers aware of the riddle of Jewish unbelief and their own grace, an apologetic intent that could only have been understood by a Gentile audience such as in Syria. The internal evidence in the gospel in this regard is abundant: Jesus' disciples went from village to village to perform healing and exorcism (Mk 3:14-114; 6:13), a career that demanded a break with one's natural family (Mk 3:31-35); and the gospel's setting aside of the ritual laws of clean and unclean (Mk 7:1-13). Such a community could only have been situated in Syria (Kee 1984:245-255).

A major city like Antioch in Syria would be fitting with its mixture of Roman and Jewish culture (Telford 1999:14). It fits with its links with the primitive Jesus movement (see Ac 11:19-30). If one were to accept the traditional view of the gospel's authorship with Peter (Gl 2:11), with Mark's uncle Barnabas (Ac 11:22-26) and also with Cyrene (Ac 1:20) from where the (unexplained) Simon of Mark's text is said to have come (Mk 15:21).

### 2.1.3.3 Galilee

In Mark, a direct opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem can be detected (Lohmeyer 1936:162). Galilee is the centre of Jesus' ministry, the sphere of divine activity, while Jerusalem is typified as the centre of opposition towards Jesus' ministry, the sphere of hate and misunderstanding. In Mark Jerusalem is replaced by Galilee.

This opposition is further seen in the fact that the first nine chapters of the gospel of Mark centres around Galilee, while the rest belong to Jerusalem. In the first nine chapters of the gospel Jesus often calls for repentance, he calls for secrecy about his true identity, and exorcisms are the order of the day (Lightfoot 1938:124-125). In contrast, in the last part of the gospel, there is no invitation to repentance, no charge to secrecy, and no exorcisms are carried out.

Although most of the references to place the gospel are already anchored in the tradition, according to van Eck (2000:979), the evangelist inserts Galilee as the place of Jesus' activity in all his redactional remarks (see Mk 1:7, 9, 14, 15, 16, 28, 39; 3:7-8). Galilee is the centre of Jesus' activity, the centre of the Markan community, as well as the place awaiting the Parousia (see Mk 14:28; 16:7)

The opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem in the gospel can be scrutinised down to an opposition between the new household of Jesus on Galilean soil and the temple in Jerusalem. Van Eck (2000:981) continues to say that by, *inter alia*, performing exorcisms, healing people from their illness and forgiving sins on Galilean soil, Jesus in Galilee created a new household that practiced open commensality women and children were welcome. This shows the characters of an egalitarian that

again shows God as present especially to the so-called 'sinners' of his day. This inclusivity household stood against the exclusivity household of the temple.

In favour of Galilee as a place of writing is the author's clear dependence on the Palestinian tradition. His special interest is Galilee (e.g., Mk 1:14, 16, 28, 39; 3:7; 7:31; 14:28; 16:7), and his use of Galilean and Judean place-names throughout without explanation (Telford 1999:14). Such a location would also be consistent with the evidence linking the gospel with the events of the war and the eschatological excitement it precipitated in Palestine.

#### **2.1.3.4 Conclusion**

The possible places of setting for Mark are Rome, Galilee and Antioch in Syria. Markan scholars who support Rome do so because of frequent Latinisms in the narrative. The author explains Jewish customs, translates Aramaic terms and there is several references on persecution and suffering in the narrative. This can be argued by the fact that such explanations are a tradition that Mark followed which is also adopted by Matthew or as part of the oral tradition.

The possibility of Antioch in Syria is supported because of the mixture of Roman and Jewish culture, and its links with the primitive Jesus movement. There is also recognition of the Hellenistic and Palestinian features in the gospel.

Galilee is another possibility because there is dependence on Palestinian traditions. The author has a special interest in Galilee, and uses Galilean and Judean places. Furthermore, in Mark a definite opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem can be indicated, an opposition in which Galilee is pictured as positive and Jerusalem as negative (van Eck 2013:33). From this, the logical conclusion has to be that Mark was written somewhere in northern-Galilee. This conclusion then in principle simply rules out the possibility of Syria as place of origin for Mark. Otherwise it would not make sense for the author to emphasise Galilee to the extent he does if the gospel was written in Syria.

## **2.1.4 Recipients**

Scholars address the recipients differently; some prefer 'the readers', or 'audience', or 'listeners' or 'addressees'. The designation also depends on the question whether Mark is seen as an oral tradition than a book to be read, the reason being that by the time of writing the recipients were illiterate and unable to read. Mark wrote to an audio-visual oriented recipient rather than to a reader-oriented recipient. Thus most scholars use 'audience' or 'listeners' than readers of Mark. For the purpose of this study; the title 'recipients' is adopted to include both readers and listeners.

Based on the solution to the provenance problem, there are mainly two possibilities with regard to the recipients of Mark: Greek-speaking believers in the Diaspora (either Rome or Syria) and Jewish Christians in Palestine.

### **2.1.4.1 Greek-speaking believers in the Diaspora (Rome or Syria)**

Nearly every interpreter of Mark recognises that the gospel is addressed to Christians who are forced to endure some kind of persecution (Longstaff 1980:34).

Certainly the Markan readers would have most readily identified with the disciples in the narrative since they too considered themselves followers of Jesus. Mark's portrayal of the disciples in the narrative seems deliberately designed as a mirror for his readers. As the portrayal becomes more and more negative, the readers would have been forced to distance themselves from the disciples and ponder why Jesus' followers failed (Bailey 1985:22). In turn, the narrative would invite the readers to examine themselves in their discipleship role.

The theme of discipleship is very frequent throughout the gospel of Mark. It dominates both the content and the context of the gospel. Second, there is a strong emphasis on the prerequisite of such discipleship. Perhaps Mark is writing to a group of people who are already disciples or potential disciples. If that is the case it will make sense of the fact that Mark did not pay attention to the genealogy of Jesus Christ. It will not make sense of the fact that he prioritises miracles rather than parables or the teaching on discipleship.

Placing Mark's gospel in the context of the death of Peter in Rome tells a great deal about the congregation to which it was directed. Forceful testimony from patristic times assigns the martyrdom of Peter to the Neronian persecution that followed the fire in Rome in the summer of 64 CE (Reardon 1992:109). Mark was writing for a congregation faced with the daily threat of martyrdom

Of the four suggested destinations (Egypt, Antioch, Galilee, and Rome) the last would seem still to be the most likely. The people addressed include a majority of Gentiles, since Mark needs to explain Jewish customs. He is not apparently writing to a church torn by Jewish-Gentile power struggles within its life (English 1992:22). The spread of the gospel of Mark, and its use by other gospel writers, suggests that a reliable and strong believing community stood behind it. Obviously the relevance to the 'suffering' element in discipleship hints at a place and time of current persecution. Rome under Nero certainly provides such a scenario, and is supported by the fact that the gospel was written after the death of the apostle Peter, and probably of Paul too.

As in the case for a Roman provenance, the hypotheses of Palestinian origins provide a possible explanation for some of the details in the narrative. Josephus's own account of the Jewish war shows that it was possible for a Jew living in Rome to offer an account of those events some years after Mark's gospel was written (Keck 1994:516). Josephus's writing serves an apologetic function. Unlike the Zealots, whose excessive pride God punished by destroying the temple, the Romans demonstrated reverence for Jerusalem as a holy place. Mark needs not have written his gospel in immediate proximity to the events of the Jewish revolt. He needs not to use them as evidence for the truth of Jesus' predictions concerning the temple and the fate of Israel.

In addition to the persecution, is the martyrdom that followed the death of Peter. Many of Mark's addressees then would have been familiar not only with the content of Greek tragedy, but also with its literary analysis and presentation. Second, Mark's audience may have been acquainted as well with the Roman drama which was much in vogue at that time (Smith 1995:228).

There is an ancient tradition that he wrote mainly for the information of Roman believers (Morris 1995:1457). He did indeed place strong emphasis on the actions of Jesus, using the word 'immediately' or some similar word at least forty times, and this would appeal to action-oriented Romans.

When features like the nature of the material used (its parenetic, catechetical and polemical characteristics) and the content of the issues addressed are considered, then, there is a possibility of a 'community' (rather than simply a 'readership'). This community faces a common threat. It is in tension with its Jewish heritage, oppressed, possibly persecuted, in need of moral guidance, sees Jesus as a paradigm for its faith and expects a speedy resolution of its problems (Telford 1999:17). Features such as these could still apply to urban Gentile Christians in Rome suffering persecution. They could also apply to Jewish Christians in Galilee awaiting the Parousia or a rural and ethnically inclusive community in Southern Syria with an apocalyptic orientation. As a result, a Roman audience is not an obvious choice.

Mark was written for Roman Christians. This is supported by:

- (1) The Latinisms.
- (2) The servant theme in Mark 10:35-45, which fits Roman culture, since about half of its people were slaves.
- (3) His explaining the Jewish customs to his non-Jewish audience (Mk 7:3);
- (4) Fewer Old Testament references (only 63) than Matthew (128) and Luke (90-100).
- (5) The Roman tone.
- (6) The fact that Mark was probably in Rome with Peter (1 Pt 5:13).
- (7) The long discourses found in Matthew that are missing in Mark (see Geisler 2007:69).

These are strong factors suggesting a Roman Christian audience. Powell (2009:129) concurs that the audience does not have much knowledge of Jewish matters intrinsic to Palestine. They need a definition of Aramaic words used by Jews in Palestine. They however know the meaning of Latin words and concepts drawn from the Roman world. Mark is probably writing for an audience of Roman Christians for

whom the story of Jesus and His disciples is a sacred history; sacred insofar as it is foundational for their religious faith, but history in that it happened some time ago among people who were quite different from them.

In the narrative Mark differentiates between insider and outsider, but the audience lies somewhere between insider and outsider because of the way Mark includes and excludes the audience. The potential status for the audience, however, far outstrips that of any character in Mark, save Jesus, because the audience already knows more than the insider disciples by the end of the story (Ahearne-Kroll 2010:734). If the audience become insiders, they will possess all that the disciples do and the additional knowledge of Jesus and divine world that Mark gives only to the audience. The insider refers to the disciples of Jesus and the outsider is unknown at this stage. The unity between the outsider and insider is found by correlating the narrative with the insider. In other words, if the narrative relates to the insider, then the recipients have something to do with discipleship.

The readers/listeners of Mark's gospel are Christians; Mark 7:3-4 demonstrates that they are not Jewish Christians. When the widow's mite is explained with a Latin loaned word, this intimates that they are living farther West in the Roman Empire rather than in Palestine (Hartman 2010:11). Furthermore, when the first generation of Mark's readers heard, for example, about leprosy (Mk 1:40-45), they did so in their own condition. Not in Jewish ones, even less in a Palestinian/Jewish condition as illuminated by, for example, knowledge of how some rabbis thought about the disease. Mark's audience read Greek, but equally required an explanation of Jewish customs, Aramaic terms and phrases, and even some Greek terms. This supports the long standing theory that Mark's audience is largely composed of Gentile converts to the Christian faith (Nightingale 2012:108).

There is a difference between Roman Christians and Roman Gentiles. If Mark composed the gospel in Rome for Roman Christians, then his primary audience was Roman Gentiles (Edwards 2012:1007). This is corroborated by the fact that Mark seldom quotes from the Old Testament, explains Jewish customs unfamiliar to Gentiles (Mk 7:3-4; 12:18; 14:12; 15:42), translates Aramaic and Hebrew phrases by

their Greek equivalents (Mk 3:17; 5:41; 7:11; 10:46; 14:36; 15:22, 34), and incorporates a number of Latinisms.

#### **2.1.4.2 Jewish Christians in Palestine**

Mark 1:1 ('The beginning of the gospel about Jesus Christ, the Son of God'; NIV) implies that the first readers of the gospel were Jews. Readers from a Greco-Roman background and would not recognise 'Christ' as a name; for most of them it was not even a meaningful title. The word comes from the verb 'anoint', and typically referred to someone who had just had a rubdown (with oil). 'Christ', on the other hand, was a title in Jewish circles; the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew 'Messiah'. This simply means that the gospel was written for Jews.

The author of the gospel also takes it for granted that his readers accept the scriptures of Israel as the Word of God (you have let go of the commands of God and are holding on to the traditions of men; Mk 7:8; NIV). Again they understand what it means to give life as a ransom (sacrifice) for others—a reference to the system of sacrifice in the Old Testament ('For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and give His life as a ransom for many; Mk 10:45; NIV) (van Eck 2013:35). It can therefore be concluded that Mark's first readers most probably were from Jewish descent.

#### **2.1.4.3 Conclusion**

There are features to consider when making a choice of who were the recipients of Mark. Among others, these features include the death of Peter at Rome, a threat of martyrdom and the Neronian persecution, suffering in discipleship, explanation of Jewish customs, Aramaic terms and Hebrew terms, Latinisms, fewer Old Testament references in comparison to Matthew and Luke, servant theme in Mark 10:35-45, and a Roman tone present in the text.

It has already been argued above that the explanation of Jewish customs, Aramaic terms and Hebrew terms and Latinisms were most probably part of an oral tradition that was followed and maintained by Mark. After all, Matthew also explains Jewish traditions to Jews, simply because he respected the tradition received from Mark.

These features cannot be used in support of the Greek-speaking believers in the Diaspora.

It then leaves us with one possibility, Jewish Christians in Palestine. It is for simple reasons that the author of the gospel also takes it for granted that his readers accept the scriptures of Israel as the Word of God. They again understand what it means to give life as a ransom (sacrifice) for others-a reference to the system of sacrifice in the Old Testament.

The marginalised community in Mark, understood the message of servant leadership, however, the way in which the disciples in Mark is following Jesus is not servant leadership (Hanson & Oakman 1998:133). The earliest witnesses to Mark's gospel indicate that the first listeners to that gospel stood especially in 'need' of hearing precisely the message of Jesus about servant-hood (Reardon 1992:108). Jesus' words about leadership would fit the societal norms of Jewish Christians in Palestine because of their social cultural context. The community of Mark understood the message of the cross because they are suffering like Jesus did (Hutchison 2009:55).

The persecution and suffering that the marginalised Markan community in the gospel of Mark went through can to a certain extent be compared to the challenges that are facing African Pentecostal Christians. Thus, a parallelism is drawn between the audience of Mark and African Pentecostal Christians. The African Pentecostal community generally suffer from poverty, crime, unemployment, inequality, HIV-Aids and other social-ills. African Pentecostal Christianity is marginalised through racial segregation and White supremacy. They are marginalised because of their life of suffering, sacrifices and servant-hood.

## **2.2 STRUCTURE OF MARK**

The primary purpose of discussing the structure of Mark in this study is to generally look at the themes, style or features used by Mark in the gospel and to further investigate the theme of Mark 10:35-45. This will be achieved by looking at Markan-structures proposed by Markan scholars and adopt the most probable or relevant structure.

Sherman (1960:24) outlines a detailed structure of the gospel of Mark:

I The beginning of the Good News (Mk 1:1-15)

- A. Keynote (Mk 1:1)
- B. Jesus and the Forerunner (Mk 1:2-13)
  - 1. Biblical prophecies (Mk 1:2-3)
  - 2. Three manifestations of the Spirit (Mk 1:4-13)
- C. Proclamation of the Kingdom (Mk 1:14-15)

II The earlier ministry (Mk 1:16-8:26)

- A. The conflict with Satan (Mk 1:16-3:35)
  - 1. First manifestations of power (Mk 1:16-2:12)
    - a. Call of the first four disciples (Mk 1:16-20)
    - b. Teaching with power (Mk 1:21-22)
    - c. Healings with power (Mk 1:23-45)
    - d. Transition: power to forgive (Mk 2:1-12)
  - 2. The heightening of controversy (Mk 2:13-3:35)
    - a. Four defences of Jesus' action (Mk 2:13-3:6)
    - b. Summary of healings and exorcisms (Mk 3:7-12)
    - c. Appointment of the twelve (Mk 3:13-19)
    - d. The charge of madness (Mk 3:20-21)
    - e. The charge of possessing Beelzebub (Mk 3:22-30)
    - f. Jesus' true family (Mk 3:31-35)
- B. The preparation of the twelve (Mk 4:1-8:26)
  - 1. The secret of the kingdom of God (Mk 4:1-34)
  - 2. Manifestation of power (Mk 4:35-5:43)
    - a. The storm at sea (Mk 4:35-41)
    - b. The demoniac of Gerasa (Mk 5:1-20)
    - c. Two healing miracles (Mk 5:21-43)
  - 3. The rejection of Jesus and the Baptist (Mk 6:1-30)
    - a. Rejection in the home village (Mk 6:1-6)
    - b. The sending of the twelve (Mk 6:7-13)
    - c. Herod hears of Jesus; the death of John (Mk 6:14-29)

- d. Return of the twelve (Mk 6:30)
- 4. Manifestation of power (Mk 6:31-56)
  - a. Two epiphanies (Mk 6:31-52)
  - b. Summary: healings (Mk 6:53-56)
- 5. Transition: the clean and unclean (Mk 7:1-23)
- 6. Jesus in Gentile lands (Mk 7:24-37)
  - a. The Syrophenician woman (Mk 7:24-30)
  - b. To the Decapolis territory (Mk 7:31)
  - c. The deaf mute (Mk 7:32-37)
- 7. Blindness and its healing (Mk 8:1-26)
  - a. Feeding of the Four Thousand (Mk 8:1-16)
  - b. Rejection of a sign, dullness of minds (Mk 8:11-21)
  - c. Transition: the blind man of Bethsaida (Mk 8:22-26)
- III. Teaching the Way of the Cross (Mk 8:27-10:52)
  - A. The turning point (Mk 8:9:29)
    - 1. Caesarea Philippi and the first passion prediction (Mk 8:27-9:1)
    - 2. The Transfiguration (Mk 9:2-8)
    - 3. Discourse at the foot of the mountain (Mk 9:9-13)
    - 4. Healing of the epileptic boy (Mk 9:14-29)
  - B. The return to Galilee (Mk 9:30-50)
    - 1. The second passion prediction (Mk 9:30-32)
    - 2. Teaching on 'little ones' (Mk 9:33-48)
    - 3. Fire and salt (Mk 9:49-50)
  - C. On the way to Jerusalem (Mk 10:1-52)
    - 1. Geographical introduction (Mk 9:1)
    - 2. Divorce (Mk 10:2-12)
    - 3. Children (Mk 10:13-16)
    - 4. Rich men (Mk 10:17-31)
    - 5. The third passion prediction (Mk 10:32-34)
    - 6. Leaders among the disciples (Mk 10:35-45)
    - 7. Transition section: blind Bartimaeus (Mk 10:46-52)
- IV The Jerusalem ministry (Mk 11:1-13:37)
  - A. His entrance and public teaching (Mk 11:1-12:44)

- B. The last discourse to the twelve (Mk 13:1-37)
- V. The passion narrative (Mk 14:1-15:47)
- VI The empty tomb (Mk 16:1-20)

Geisler (2007:71) points out that the three sections of the structure of Mark are about servant-hood, namely the service, sacrifice and the sovereignty of the servant.

- I the Service of the Servant (Mk 1:1-8:26)
  - A. His ministry (Mk 1-2)
  - B. His message (Mk 3:1-6:29)
  - C. His miracles (Mk 6:30-8:26)
- II. The Sacrifice of the Servant (Mk 8:27-15:47)
  - A. Foretold-coming passion (Mk 8:27-13:37)
  - B. Focused-crises present (Mk 14)
  - C. Fulfilled-culmination pressed (Mk 15)
- III. The Sovereignty of the Servant (Mk 16)
  - A. In arising-resurrection (Mk 16:1-8)
  - B. In appearing-reappearances (Mk 16:9-14)
  - C. In arising-reception (Mk 16:15-20)

Powell (2009:126) outlines an overview of the gospel of Mark: John the Baptist is preparing the way for the Lord (Mk 1:1-8). When Jesus is baptised by John, a voice from heaven calls him God's 'beloved Son' (Mk 1:9-11). After being tempted by Satan, Jesus begins preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God (Mk 1:12-15) and calling disciples (Mk 1:16-20). Mark describes a day in his ministry: Jesus teaches with authority, exorcises a demon, heals many people, and gets up early the next morning to pray and continue this work (Mk 1:21-40). He becomes involved in a series of controversies over matters such as the authority to forgive sins, eating with tax collectors, fasting and Sabbath laws (Mk 2:1-3:6).

Continuing his ministry, he appoints twelve of his followers to be apostles (Mk 3:7-19). Tensions mount as his own family tries to restrain him and the Pharisees accuse him of using the power of Beelzebub (Mk 3:20-35). Jesus tells a series of parables, including the well-known parable of the sower (Mk 4:1-34). He then works four

miracles: he stills a storm at sea, casts a legion of demons out of a man and into a herd of pigs, heals a woman who has been haemorrhaging, and raises Jairus' daughter from the dead (Mk 4:34-5:43).

Jesus teaches in his hometown and in the surrounding villages (Mk 6:1-6). He then sends his disciples out on a mission, and while they are gone, Mark provides a retrospective report of how Herod killed John the Baptist (Mk 6:7-33). Jesus miraculously feeds five thousand people and walks on water (Mk 6:34-52). Then, after a controversy with the Pharisees over ritual purity (Mk 7:1-23), he is accosted by a Syrophenician woman whose surprising faith obtains healing for her (Mk 7:24-30). Jesus expands his ministry into Gentile territory, going throughout the Decapolis where he heals a deaf man (Mk 7:31-37) and feeds four thousand people (Mk 8:1-9). A tense discussion with his disciples reflects on the significance of the two feedings (Mk 8:10-21).

Jesus heals a blind man at Bethsaida (Mk 8:22-26), and Peter confesses that Jesus is the Messiah at Caesarea Philippi (Mk 8:27-30). This introduces a new phase of the narrative, in which Jesus instructs his disciples about his upcoming passion and its meaning for their vocation as his disciples (Mk 8:27-10:52). Jesus enters Jerusalem on a donkey (Mk 11:1-11), curses a fig tree, and expels merchants from the temple (Mk 11:12-25). His authority is challenged in a series of encounters with religious leaders (Mk 11:27-12:37) against whom he tells the parable of wicked tenants (Mk 12:1-12). He castigates the scribes but praises a widow who gives all she has to the temple (Mk 12:38-44). He then gives a long discourse on the end-times and his second coming (Mk 13:1-37).

Mark concludes his gospel with an account of Jesus' passion and resurrection. Jesus is anointed by an unnamed woman (Mk 14:1-11), and he shares a last supper with his disciples (Mk 14:17-25). He then is betrayed, denied and deserted by those disciples, as he is arrested and put on trial, first before the Jewish Sanhedrin and then before Pilate (Mk 14:26-15:20). On Easter morning, some women come to the tomb in which his body was placed, and they are told that he has been raised from the dead (Mk 16:1-8).

Edwards (2012:1009) proposes a simple outline of Mark:

1. Ministry in Galilee (Mk 1:1-8:26)
  - A. Preparation for Ministry (Mk 1:1-13)
  - B. Summary of Jesus' message (Mk 1:14-15)
  - C. Galilean Ministry (Mk 1:16-7:23)
  - D. Jesus Travels to Gentile Regions (Mk 7:24-8:9)
  - E. Opposition from Pharisees and Disciples (Mk 8:10-26)
2. Journey to Jerusalem (Mk 8:27-16:20)
  - A. Peter's Confession at Caesarea Philippi and the Transfiguration (Mk 8:27-9:29)
  - B. 'On the Way' to Jerusalem (Mk 9:30-10:52)
  - C. Stories of conflict in the Temple in Jerusalem (Mk 11:1-13:37)
  - D. The Abandonment of Jesus in Jerusalem (Mk 14:1-72)
  - E. The Trial and Crucifixion of Jesus in Jerusalem (Mk 15:1-47)
  - F. The Resurrection (Mk 16:1-8)
  - G. Later Resurrection Traditions (Mk 16:9-20)

Recently van Eck (2013:50) outlined a very comprehensive structure of the gospel of Mark. While other scholars have only summarised the main themes of the gospel on one hand, van Eck included the teaching of Jesus and the reaction of the audience on the other. Furthermore his structure is inclusive in the sense that every passage of scripture in Mark is given a theme. Thus the task of knowing the theme of Mark 10:35-45 becomes possible.

### **1:1-15: INTRODUCTION**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 1:1     | The gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God                |
| 1:2-8   | John the Baptist prepared the way (fulfilment of promise) |
| 1:9-11  | Baptism of Jesus  |
| 1:12-13 | Temptation  |
| 1:14-15 | Kingdom of God  |

### **1:16-8:21: JESUS IN GALILEE**

- |          |                                      |
|----------|--------------------------------------|
| 1:16-3:6 | (Jesus powerful in word and deed)    |
| 1:16-20  | Calling of disciples (clean persons) |
| 1:21-26  | Exorcism in Capernaum                |

- 1:27 Reaction of crowd
- 1:28 Reaction of Galilee
- 1:29-31 Healing in Capernaum
- 1:32-34 Healings and exorcisms in Capernaum
- 1:37 Reaction of crowd
- 1:39 Teaching and exorcism in all of Galilee
- 1:40-45 Healing of leper
- 1:45 Reaction of leper  
Reaction of Galilee  
Teaching of Jesus
- 2:1-11 Healing of lame man
- 2:12 Reaction of crowd
- 2:13-14 Calling of Levi (unclean person)
- 2:15-16 Reaction of Pharisaic scribes
- 2:17 Teaching of Jesus
- 2:18 Reaction of followers of John and the Pharisees
- 2:19-22 Teaching of Jesus
- 2:23 Act of Jesus on the Sabbath  
Reaction of Pharisees  
Teaching of Jesus
- 3:1-5 Healing of Jesus
- 3:6 Reaction of Pharisees  
(planning with the Herodians to kill Jesus)
- 3:7-8:21 (More teaching and healings and escalating resistance)**
- 3:7 Reaction of people from all of Palestine
- 3:10-12 Healings and exorcisms
- 3:13-19 Jesus appoint the Twelve to do what He is doing
- 3:20-21 Reaction of Jesus' family
- 3:22 Reaction of scribe from Jerusalem
- 3:23-30 Teaching of Jesus
- 3:31-32 Reaction of Jesus' family
- 3:33-34 Teaching of Jesus
- 4:1-9 Teaching of Jesus in parables

- 4:10-20 Teaching to the disciples because they do not understand
- 4:21-32 Teaching of Jesus in parables
- 4:33 Teaching: explanation of Jesus' teaching to the crowd  
Teaching of Jesus to the crowd and disciples
- 4:35-41 First boat-episode
- 5:1-19 Healing of Gerasene demoniac
- 5:20 Reaction of Gerasene demoniac
- 5:21-24 Healing of Jairus' daughter
- 5:25-34 Healing of the woman with haemorrhage
- 5:35-42 Healing of Jairus' daughter
- 5:42 Reaction of crowd
- 6:1-6 Reaction of hometown
- 6:6 Teachings of Jesus
- 6:7-13 Jesus sends out the Twelve
- 6:14-16 Reactions on Jesus' identity
- 6:17-29 Death of John the Baptist (anticipation of Jesus' death)
- 6:30 The Twelve return
- 6:34 Teaching of Jesus
- 6:35-44 First multiplication of the bread and fish  
(Jewish territory)
- 6:45-51 Second boat-episode
- 6:53-56 Healing of Jesus across the sea
- 7:1-24 Teaching of Jesus on the interpretation of the law
- 7:24-30 Healing of Syro-Phoenician women
- 7:31-37 Healing of dead mute in Tirus
- 8:1-10 Second multiplication of the bread and fish  
(Gentile territory)
- 8:11-13 Reaction of Pharisees
- 8:13-21 Third boat-episode  
Teaching: Jesus warns the disciples against the yeast of Pharisees
- 8:22-10:52: CHRISTOLOGY AND DISCIPLESHIP**
- 8:22-8:26 Blind healing: unidentified person, repeated healing
- 8:31 First passion pronouncement

- 8:32-33 Misunderstanding of Peter on Jesus' identity
- 8:34-9:1 Teaching on discipleship  
(self-denial, taking up one's cross, discipleship)
- 9:31 Second passion pronouncement
- 9:32 Misunderstanding of disciples
- 9:33-37 Teaching on discipleship  
(First and last, being a servant, to be like a child)
- 10:35-37 Misunderstanding of disciples
- 10:38-45 Teaching on discipleship  
(Greatest and first, being a servant to all)
- 10:46-10:52 Blind healing: Bartimaeus, single healing and immediate discipleship)

### **11:1-16:8: JERUSALEM**

- 11:1-10 Entry into Jerusalem  
Reaction of crowd (positive)
- 11:11 Jesus visits the temple
- 11:12-14 Jesus curses the fig tree
- 11:15-17 Jesus' action in the temple (condensation of 1:16-8:21)
- 11:18 Reaction of chief priests and scribes (negative)
- 11:20-26 Withered fig tree
- 11:27-33 Controversy story: Jewish leaders (Jesus' authority)
- 12:1-11 Teaching: Jesus teach in a parable (condensation of whole gospel)
- 12:12 Reaction of Jewish leaders
- 12:13-17 Controversy story with Jewish leaders (paying of taxes)
- 12:18-27 Controversy story with Jewish leaders (resurrection))
- 12:28-34 Controversy story with Jewish leaders (the greatest commandment)
- 12:35-37 Teaching of Jesus in temple
- 12:38-44 Teaching of Jesus in temple
- 13:1-37 Teaching of Jesus in temple (apocalyptic speech)
- 14:1-2 Reaction of Jewish leaders (plan to kill Jesus)
- 14:3-9 Jesus is anointed for his death
- 14:10-11 Judas undertake to betray Jesus
- 14:12-16 Preparation for Passover meal
- 14:17-21 Jesus predicts that one of his disciples will betray him

- 14:22-25 Eating of Passover meal
- 14:26-31 Jesus predicts that Peter will deny him
- 14:32-42 Jesus in Gethsemane (Disciples sleep three times)
- 14:43-51 Jesus is arrested
- 14:53-65 Jesus before the Jewish council
- 14:66-72 Peter denies Jesus three times
- 15:1-5 Jesus before Pilate
- 15:6-14 Reaction of crowd
- 15:15 Jesus is handed over by Pilate
- 15:16-20 Reaction of Soldiers (mocking of Jesus)
- 15:21-38 Jesus is crucified and dies
- 15:39 Reaction of Roman officer
- 15:40-41 Reaction of women
- 15:42-46 Jesus is buried
- 15:47 Reaction of women
- 16:1-7 Women find the grave empty
- 16:8 Reaction of women (negative)

This study adopts van Eck's structure given the fact that it clearly outlines themes in the gospel of Mark: Jesus in Galilee, Christology and discipleship and Jerusalem. It shows that Mark 10:35-37 is about a leadership misunderstanding or the wrong perception of the disciples; Mark 10:38-45 is about teaching on discipleship with a key interest on leadership (the great and first, being a servant of all).

### **2.3 PURPOSE OF MARK**

The purpose of Mark will also help in understanding Mark 10:35-45, the context of this study.

Mark was written in order to present the Master as men had seen Him as He was mingling with different classes of people in Galilee and Judea, healing the sick, performing miracles, debating with the scribes and Pharisees, teaching the multitudes and the twelve, facing the cross, and conquering death (Blaney, Hanson & Harvey 1955:116). Mark presents the life Jesus of Nazareth, whose mighty words and deeds demonstrated that He was 'the Son of God' (Mk 1:1). Jesus is presented

‘in the awe-inspiring grandeur of his human personality as a Man who was also the Incarnate, the wonder-working Son of God’.

Generally, Matthew and Luke wrote for similar purposes outlined here except for the fact that Jesus Christ is not only seen as the ‘wonder-working Son of God’ but also as the suffering servant. Mark hesitates to show the victory of Christ but hastens to show or tell the audience the pain of Christ.

The gospel of Mark was written in a way that would serve to strengthen and guide the disciples of Mark’s day in their situation of grief and doubt, of danger and persecution (Allen 1969:258). This is clearly seen in the exhortation to the discipleship of self-denial and the taking up of one’s own cross (Mk 8:34). The gospel of Mark then deals with Jesus as an example for his disciples. The disciples of Mark’s day were men whose friends had become martyrs and who lived in a society hostile to their Christian commitment.

Mark’s story is about consistency in detail, of a picture whose central figure is drawn in lines of fire (Burn 1974:4). Those rapid and decided touches are inspired by a conviction of the love, the glory and the strength of Jesus, the Son of God. He is so full of his great subject, so wrapped up in the contemplation of his divine Hero, as if in breathless haste to reach the vantage-ground of the resurrection morn, followed by the triumphant ascension into heaven and the session at the right hand of God.

A clear conception of Mark’s intention in the gospel sheds light on the distinctive character of his style. Mark’s task was to project Christian faith in a climate of uncertainty where martyrdom had been a reality (Lane 1974:25). He selected and arranged the tradition to present the Christ who continues to speak and act meaningfully in the context of crisis.

Mark has other means of remonstrating with exponents of a ‘theology of glory’ and of indicating to his readers how genuine Christian faith must express itself (Anderson 1976:56). He directs attention, not to the person of Jesus in isolation nor to any messianic titles or dignities or the confession thereof for their own sake, but to the Master in relation to and in company with his disciples. In insisting on the mission of Jesus in His onward movement to the cross, he emphasises what is common to the

Master and his followers. The gospel for Mark is not just a spectacular record of what Jesus said and did in life and in death as the Son of God, but it carries within itself necessity of suffering for his sake and sounds forth the summons to follow him in cross-bearing. Faith is no static acknowledgement of Jesus alone but active discipleship.

The gospel of Mark must be read as a theological book addressing a set of serious problems that conceivably had arisen in his church. It can be assumed that such problems included the questions around the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ (Martin 1978:26).

Through the testimony of Peter and other eyewitnesses (including possibly his own reminiscences), John Mark caught a vision of the man of Nazareth, who was also the Messiah, the heavenly Son of Man, and the Son of God. In Him the kingdom of God had come near. This strong Son of God engaged Satan and his minion-demons, disease and death-in mortal conflict and emerged as a Victor (Sanner 1979:267). Mark wanted all mankind to see the suffering servant and follow Him all the way to Golgotha, through the empty tomb, and into glory that is to come. He wanted to hearten and galvanise believers as they girded themselves to face ostracism, ridicule and brutal martyrdom under hostile Roman emperors.

Mark may be seen as a gospel written to show how Matthew and Luke are rightly to be understood and interpreted (Longstaff 1980:40). In his selection and arrangement of the material which he incorporates, Mark recalls the humiliation and death of the Messiah. He encourages the followers of Jesus to endure their own suffering confident that vindication will come at the time of the Parousia, and he rejects any view of exaltation, either of Jesus or of his followers, which comes before that time.

The gospel of Mark, according to Rhoads and Michie (1982:1), does not only deal with great issues, life and death, good and evil, human triumph and human failure. It also teaches life principles that are most important: one must be least; to enter the rule of God, one must become like a little child; nothing is hidden except to become known. Whoever wants to save one's life must lose it. It is not a simple story in which virtue easily triumphs over vice, nor is it a collection of moralisations on life. What

may on cursory reading appear to be simple answers to many of life's complications are really very tough pronouncements fraught with irony and paradox.

In other words, Mark makes it difficult for the disciples who want to join Jesus and makes it easy for those who want to leave Him. Discipleship in Mark is not as easy as the disciples thought, it comes with responsibilities.

First, to try to answer certain questions that exercised the minds of the early Christians. For example, how and why did Jesus die, and who was responsible for His death? What was His attitude towards the Sabbath and towards the leaders of the Jewish religion? What did it mean to be a true disciple? Second, Mark was writing in a time of great crisis and to people in great need to bring comfort to persecuted Christians. That is why he included so many miracle stories, rather than parables. He concentrated on what Jesus did rather than what He said, because he wanted to show how Jesus could help people in trouble. Third, to show that those who witness for Christ do so as evidence of what they know to be true. It may well mean martyrdom for them (Price 1983:2). Mark passes a strong message of conviction rather than persuasion because of what his audience was going through in life. It is clear that he wanted them to be strong and courageous. He was writing to an audience who expected practical things rather than just theory.

Mark, the first gospel written, was a creative work. The work did not simply describe Jesus' parabolic presentation of the kingdom of God as an event of the past. Mark became the parabolic medium of that surprising gospel of Jesus Christ in a new historical context pregnant with problems and promise (Bailey 1985:24).

There are two special features of the gospel of Mark: There is the connection with the preaching of Peter and the needs of those to whom Peter was accustomed to preach. The early Christian persuasion that the sequence of details in the gospel of Mark was not determined by considerations of historical accuracy but by pastoral preoccupation with the spiritual needs of living contemporary Christians (Reardon 1992:105). The pastoral disposition of the received material was already operative before the composition of the gospel itself. Thus the tradition reflected in the gospel

was not only preservative but also pastorally interpretative and applied. The written gospel is reflective of an earlier 'preached' gospel.

Mark certainly offers the gospel as good news. Equally he is presenting it for the first time as a whole account in written form. Perhaps most important of all however he is announcing an event after which the history of the world will never again be the same (English 1992:15). At the centre of this event is Jesus Christ. Mark makes it clear that the person at the heart of his story establishes continuity with God's previous activity in the world.

Mark was not composed to record historical remembrances of Jesus. Mark 1:1 refers to what follows as the 'beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ'. In Paul's letters, 'gospel' refers to the message of salvation that the apostle preached. Mark 1:14-15 retains that sense of the gospel as 'preached message'. Therefore, the opening words of Mark suggest that what follows fulfils the function of earlier preaching (Keck 1994:518).

The gospel as good news needed to be presented and communicated clearly. Smith (1995:230) suggests that although the evangelist made use of the many rhetorical and dramatic devices available for him, his overriding aim was not aesthetic, but theological and ethical. There is no doubt, despite the degree to which his work was informed by the literary conventions of his day, particularly formal and structural ones, Mark was also an innovator. For Mark's audience the newness is in the dynamic gospel message, but it was a message that would have been unintelligible to the literary genre which was presented and would have been totally unfair. Mark chose to present his gospel in terms of tragic dramatic conventions which would have already been a part of his audience's cultural heritage.

Telford (1999:28) explicates that in order to arrive at the specific purpose of the gospel of Mark, the following major themes should be considered:

- (1) The secrecy motif and the writer's interest in the true but hidden identity of Jesus.
- (2) An interest in the passion of Jesus (His suffering, death and resurrection) and its significance for Christology.

- (3) An interest in the nature and coming of the kingdom of God and in the question of Jesus' return as Son of Man.
- (4) An interest in Galilee.
- (5) His use of the term 'gospel'.
- (6) An interest in Gentiles and the Gentile mission.
- (7) An interest in persecution, suffering and martyrdom and the true nature of discipleship.
- (8) His harsh treatment of the Jewish leadership groups, Jesus' family and especially His original disciples.

The author wrote to build his readers in faith. With a suffering church in mind, he intended his theology of the cross to equip them to face persecution as well as resist the temptation of their culture. In order to equip such an audience the gospel needed to provide both comfort and challenge to those who were brought through suffering and hardship. The cross is central to any understanding of who Jesus is, and the failures of Jesus' original disciples may be recalled as a source of empathy (Telford 1999:29 cf Powell 2009:144).

Although Mark, a Jew, gave some explanation to his readers about Jewish customs and Aramaic words or phrases (Mk 7:2-4; Mark 3:17; 5:41, respectively), his purpose was not to convince his readers of Jesus' qualifications. The Jewish Messiah as was to present Jesus as the Christ for all who would believe in Him (Blackaby 2007:9). For this reason, many new Christians today find Mark the most accessible of the four gospels in gaining a sweeping overview of what Jesus did and said.

The purpose of the gospel of Mark is simple and clear that is to provide a brief historical-theological account of the ministry of Christ that focuses on his activity as evidence that He is the Son of God (Douglass & Tenney 2011:896).

It can be deduced that Mark intended his gospel to serve a pastoral function. Presenting a picture of discipleship, in which the affirmations of the prologue balance the turbulence of the remainder of the gospel. Mark has a catechetical and parenetic purpose, moulding and shaping those who are already disciples (Nightingale 2012:117). Mark does not only depict a discipleship that bears the tension between

the ongoing reality of knowing and not knowing. There is, indeed, a sense of discipleship, something which can be, and must be, constantly renewed.

It seems that Mark was written for the primary purpose to exhort a community that was suffering persecution. It is only astounding that the gospel deemed as the earliest omitted the narrative around the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ. The omission of such an important theme is justified by the audience of the gospel. Many scholars for example think that they did not necessarily need such information. Nonetheless, Mark is a complete gospel as it presents the gospel of truth. It also covers other important themes around the life of Christ like His crucifixion, death and resurrection. The purpose of the gospel of Mark can therefore be summarised as follows:

- To encourage Christians to endure their own suffering and hardship.
- To be confident that vindication will come at the time of the Parousia.
- To redefine discipleship as carrying your own cross and following Jesus.
- To introduce Jesus Christ as the Suffering Servant of the Lord, the Son of Man, and, the Son of God worthy to be believed and followed.
- To answer the main questions about Jesus' crucifixion, death and resurrection.

## **2.4 DISCIPLESHIP IN MARK**

In Mark the life of the disciple is presented as being essentially continuous with that of Jesus (Waybright 1985:287). Jesus as Son of God, came to suffer and serve. True disciples are followers of God's rule as revealed in the Son of God, they too are expected to suffer and serve. A disciple therefore is the one who follows Jesus, identifies with his words and deeds, and shares in Jesus' persecution.

A disciple is one who is able to willingly accept the dislocations and disorientations which come with following the Son of Man (Barton 1994:150). Discipleship means to follow the way of being with others that may lead to suffering and death. Suffering is not an end in itself, but the consequence of a life-praxis of solidarity with the outcasts of society (Medley 1994:14). Discipleship for Mark is not construed as assent to series of faith propositions or the full acquisition and understanding of divine mysteries. It is predicated on becoming connected with Jesus by following Him after

His call and acting like Him because He is the manifestation of the kingdom of God on earth (Ahearne-Kroll 2010:734). Becoming a disciple of Jesus meant taking up your cross and following Him into non-violent warfare against the spiritual powers of evil (Boomershine 2011:411).

The disciples of Jesus, especially James and John, struggle with kinship, self-interest, position, competition, lordship and authority. They do not grasp the message of servant leadership because it is in contrast to what they already know. The disciples do not understand the message of suffering, sacrifice and servanthood. They fail to understand the message of Jesus about the cross.

Despite all what Jesus taught them, despite their intimate association with Him, despite everything they had seen Him do, the disciples could not understand Jesus as a suffering Son of Man (Achtemeier 1978:350). The disciples have two specific kinds of misunderstanding:

- (1) Misunderstanding the necessity of Jesus' sufferings.
- (2) Misunderstanding their own position in the community (Tyson 1961:262).

They do not only misunderstand the message of suffering, but also reject Jesus' suffering, Son of Man Christology and call for suffering discipleship (Longstaff (1980:34). They persist in taking the human point of view and not the view of God. On the contrary, they embrace glory, honour, and the sense of self-exaltation, superiority and veneration.

In the call of the disciples, they failed to understand that the radically communitarian dimension of the kingdom is vividly affirmed. Discipleship is not only about hearing the words of Jesus on suffering, but also to act upon the words so that others may follow (Donahue 1983:19). Mark has a unique description of the disciples; rather than idealise the first followers of Jesus. He seems to highlight their weakness and failure.

They often appear confused and baffled; they misunderstand Jesus and recoil before the message of the cross (Senior 1984:36). The reason for the confusion of the disciples is that for the Markan Jesus the kingdom is a new inclusive household. This

new household is opposed by the temple. In Galilee it seems that the new household and the disciples succeed in replacing the kingdom but not in Jerusalem. God's kingdom which was announced as being near has drifted from the horizon (Van Eck 2011:85).

The conflict between Jesus and the disciples and that between Jesus and the authorities interweave, interpret and illumine each other. The disciples like the religious leaders, fail to grasp the essential nature of God's boundary-shattering reign. This nature expresses itself in a concept of messianic authority oriented not to power over others, but power exercised to spread holiness and life to a world locked in Satan's grasp. Both the disciples and the authorities stand to lose much in such a kingdom; they both fail to grasp the paradoxical truth driven home time and again by the Markan Jesus through his teaching, healing and suffering. The truth is that only by losing one's life to the powers of the world which stand opposed to God can one save it (see Hanson 1998:155). It was truth to be understood only through the paradox of a different value system. Hence Jesus' closest followers found the message of suffering, servant-hood and sacrifice difficult to accept (Hutchison 2009:57).

The disciples of Jesus cannot understand His message of suffering because discipleship is more costly than imagined and beyond the expectations of Jesus' disciples (Nightingale 2012:116). It involves cross-bearing, suffering, preference for the lowly and losing one's life. The disciples resisted and rejected; confused and fearful, they lack understanding and fail to the utmost degree. They are drawn to Jesus, but do not understand what the suffering Son of Man means. Although Jesus speaks about the suffering, rejection, death, and resurrection of the Son of Man the disciples do not understand these; instead they ask for special places of honour (Nicklas 2012:362).

Discipleship in Mark is not only about being called by Jesus, it is not only about taking up the cross and following Jesus as he heals people and performs miracles. It is not about positions of glory in the seat of Jesus. Discipleship at the core is about a life of sacrifice, suffering and service to others. The disciples of Jesus fail to

understand this kind of message as they insist on the life of positional and autocratic leadership.

## 2.5 CHRISTOLOGY IN MARK

The scholarly estimation of Mark's Christology has varied over the years. Mark's Jesus was seen as a royal non-divine figure during the nineteenth century. Scholars then for a long period attributed a high Christology to Mark, either by appealing to Hellenistic categories or along more traditional lines. A majority of scholars contend that Mark's Jesus is not exalted, but merely a human figure. Another group of scholars maintain that Mark's picture of Jesus amounts to considerably more than that. Some exegetes defend a high, Hellenistic influenced Christology. Others claim that Mark's Jesus is transcendent and in some sense divine (see Johansson 2010:388).

Jesus in Mark is a servant as the suffering of Son of Man. In addition His message in the gospel is contextualised around servant leadership and it further addresses the misconceptions by His disciples. Jesus does not only teach servant leadership, He is prepared to model the concept. The themes of suffering, service and sacrifice define the tone of His message.

If there is no Jesus without the cross, and if there is no Jesus without faith, then it is also true, that there is no faith without the cross. If faith means to follow Jesus, then it means to follow Him if need be, to the cross itself. It is abundantly clear in Mark that those who follow Jesus must follow Him with a total commitment of their lives (Achte-meier 1978:351). Authentic messiahship is suffering messiahship which leads inevitably to crucifixion (Longstaff 1980:31). This authenticity ultimately results in servant leadership.

Mark presents Jesus from the beginning of the gospel as Christ, the beloved Son of God, whom God has sent in confirmation of God's promises of a redeemer to Israel (Hanson 1998:128). In the gospel of Mark the cross is neither a surprise nor an arbitrary final event in the life of Jesus. Jesus' life and death derive meaning from His commitment to a life-praxis of solidarity, which is grounded in His *Abba* experience, with those oppressed by patriarchal structures (Medley 1994:5).

Mark reveals Jesus' character through six stages of the gospel, each stage building on the preceding one. The reader is progressively led to recognise Jesus' attributes as a healer, a rejected prophet, a servant who undergoes public humiliation, death, a rising, returning Son of Man (Johnson 1999:82). However, of all the six attributes the servant imagery frames the whole of Jesus' story throughout the gospel and the centre of the story is the passion account. Servant imagery is thus a passion metaphor which moves out from the scenes of Jesus's death to encompass the whole story and it provides a distinct pattern for the characterisation and Christology in the gospel of Mark (Broadhead 1999:107).

The theme of suffering linked not only to Jesus, the suffering Christ and Son of God as Son of Man, but also to the disciples and the suffering followers of Jesus is presented in Mark (Meyer 2002:233). Mark's theology and Christology are no abstractions. They are closely connected to following Jesus and living the life of discipleship – suffering discipleship.

Mark's explicit portrayal of Jesus through the synonymous titles 'the Christ' and 'the Son of God' is that Jesus is 'the Christ.' (Bateman 2007:558). He is not merely a wonder-working Christ as portrayed and misunderstood by His disciples, but rather suffering Christ as understood by the Mark's audience. The true meaning of Jesus as 'the Christ' occurs at the foot of the cross. In both life and death, Jesus is 'the Christ.' Thus the explicit and plain meaning of the phrase 'Son of God' in Mark means first and foremost 'the Christ.'

The dominant conceptualisation of Jesus in the gospel of Mark is one of a man possessed and driven by a supernatural power. There is an aura surrounding Jesus which literally crackles with power (Bennet 1977:6). Even though He can impart this to others, it is almost independent of Jesus' own will and use of this power. It is this power which invests Him with authority, authority over the supernatural powers of evil and authority to challenge traditionally established religious practices. This power sets Jesus apart from others.

The affirmation of Jesus as the one who uniquely reveals the radical possibilities of genuine human existence and gives meaning to life and history, implies the

acceptance and integration into one's own value system of Mark's perspective on suffering as the only true road to glory. This is not a masochistic affirmation, but rather an insight into the fundamental human and therefore Christian truth that death precedes life (Manno 1975:628). Jesus' character throughout the gospel never changed. He remained committed to the Father's call on His life. Out of that call and character, He adopted a style of leadership to meet the moment. Jesus' leadership style however often presented a paradox to those who tried to follow and to those who observed Him (Wilkes 1998:96).

The Son of Man is willing to give His life through the cross as a living sacrifice and He is more willing to serve others. As the Son of Man He fulfils His messianic calling of a suffering servant. Jesus is a great model of servant leadership of all time. Leaders that admire a leadership style of suffering, sacrifice and servant-hood should look up to Jesus.

## **2.6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

In this chapter the possible author, date, place, recipient, structure and purpose of Mark were discussed. This study has not identified the author of the gospel. The author writes to a marginalised community that can be likened to African Pentecostal community. He probably wrote post 70 CE and he wrote to Jewish Christians in Palestine who were going through suffering and persecution because the temple elite wanted them to be excluded from temple worship.

What is most important for the next chapter is that this study sees Mark as the gospel that epitomises servant-hood; much so Mark 10:35-45, which especially denotes the reason the gospel was written. Discipleship in Mark is characterised in servant-hood. Exaltation or promotion comes with price tag of suffering and hardship. Jesus Christ is not only a miracle worker and saviour but above all He is the suffering servant. Hence it is seen that the Jesus of Mark is approachable and accessible to different classes of people.

The purpose of Mark will equally be relevant to African Pentecostal Christianity. African Pentecostal Christians do need encouragement in the day to day challenges of life. They can overcome the challenges of unemployment, poverty and inequality.

They need to know that whatever they are going through today will be vindicated on the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. They need to understand Jesus not as a distanced Messiah but as the Son of Man who cares about their needs. Christians today need to know that the same God who performed miracles in the gospel of Mark can do the same for them today.

In Mark discipleship at the core is about a life of sacrifice, suffering and service to others. Jesus is the Son of God, the Messiah, the one that had to suffer and die.

## Chapter 3

### Servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45

#### 3.1 LEADERSHIP MISCONCEPTIONS IN MARK 10:35-45

The request made by James and John in Mark 10:35-45 raises five misconceptions of leadership. The first misconception is in view of the familial relationship that James and John, the sons of Zebedee had with Jesus. It was this close relationship that encouraged them to come to Jesus. 'And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came up to Him, saying, Master; we desire that you should do for us whatsoever we shall ask' (Mk 10:35). They had the courage to approach Jesus because they knew they were closely related to him. This is called kinship misconception.

Second, they asked Jesus to grant them their own desire. This can be seen as ambitious, vanity and self-centredness. The two disciples perceived leadership as pursuing self-interest. It is called self-interest and ambition misconception.

Third, in Mark 10:36-37, 'He said unto them, what would you that I should do for you?' They said unto him, 'grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on the left hand, in your glory'. They thought that leadership was the place that a person sits in or a position that one occupies. This is called position misconception.

Fourth, the other ten disciples responded with indignation in Mark 10:41, 'and when the ten heard *it*, they began to be extremely displeased with James and John'. They wanted to compete with James and John. This would suggest that they equally wanted to sit on the left and right. Therefore the fourth misconception is competition.

Finally, in Mark 10:42, 'Jesus called them *to Him*, and says unto them, you know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them'. Jesus knew that their idea of

leadership is about lordship and authority over the followers. Therefore the final misconception is lordship and authority.

Thus, the five misconceptions are kinship, self-interest, position, competition and lordship and authority.

### 3.1.1 Kinship misconception

Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου λέγοντες αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὁ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν.

‘James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came up to Him, saying, Master; we desire that you should do for us whatever we shall ask’ (Mk 10:35).

Kinship and politics were the most fundamental social structures of the first century Mediterranean world. To add on that all other social institutions, such as economics, education and religion, were embedded in them (Malina 1986:84). Kinship refers to familial or social relationship. The two primary expressions of this value system were in the family structure and the public and private favours that patrons/benefactors bestowed on recipient in society (Hutchison 2009:60). In fact the misconceptions of leadership faced by Jesus’ disciples are as a result of this value system and concepts like kinship, patronage and honour.

In this context, it refers to the way in which James and John related to Jesus as compared to the way in which other disciples related to Him. James and John were close relatives of Jesus and therefore took advantage of this relationship. The two natural brothers have made a distinction between themselves and the other disciples in requesting places of honour as the benefactors of a family relationship.

In order to know who James and John were, it is necessary to know who their parents were. It is also important to inquire what their relationship with Jesus was that gave them the courage to approach Him about who sits on the left and right.

#### 3.1.1.1 Zebedee

Zebedee was a Galilean fisherman, father of the apostles James and John (Mk 1:19-20; 3:17; 10:35). He was the husband of Salome and in all probability lived in the

vicinity of Bethsaida (Mk 15:40). One would judge that he had been a man of means and influence because of Mark's reference to his hired servants (Mk 1:20 cf Douglas & Tenney 2011:1550).

Fishermen were people of status in the economy and prominence in the community. Zebedee was equally a man of prominence and influence in the community, and most probably had a positive honour rating.

### **3.1.1.2 The mother of James and John**

Salome was one of the women who followed and ministered to Jesus in Galilee. These were women who witnessed the crucifixion, and afterwards went to the tomb to anoint His body (Mk 15:40-41; 16:1). She is identified as the wife of Zebedee and therefore the mother of James and John (Douglas & Tenney 2011:1270). According to John 19:25, she was the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, but others interpret the phrase 'His mother's sister' as a reference to 'Mary the wife of Clopas'. If indeed she was the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, James and John were cousins of Jesus.

Matthew 20:20 adds an interesting point in that it was Zebedee's wife who was behind this request. Was it from a masterful woman that James and John took their fiery nature? Old Zebedee quietly fishing by the Sea of Galilee, alone with the hired servants, may well have been but a cipher in the home (Cole 1961:169). Certainly there is nothing heard from him, while the wording in Matthew suggests that his wife was one of the circle that ministered to Jesus (Lk 8:3).

Mark frankly puts the request down to them, while Matthew says their mother did the asking (Mt 20:20). Even then, however, James and John were standing with their mother, since Jesus' response was a question to them (English 1992:181). Luke omits this embarrassing story because of his positive rendering of the disciples. What is clear is that the greater the pressure upon them on the fateful journey they were taking with Jesus on his way to Jerusalem, the more the twelve settled into discussion of their own greatness and status.

Matthew placed the request made by James and John, the sons of Zebedee, in the mouth of their mother, perhaps in an attempt to show the two disciples in a less creditable light. Mark's frank account of the disciples' behaviour suggests that the story may be authentic (Hooker 1991:246). In Matthew 20:20 the mother and sons joined efforts in making the request. She requested the robe for her two sons in Jesus' kingdom. She was thinking about an earthly kingdom about to be established. She therefore asked for the most powerful positions, the one on the left and one on the right.

The mother factor in the request of James and John in Mark, does not have to be direct as Matthew points out. Salome did not have to accompany her two sons to Jesus; she is influential in her absence. So it is possible that she initiated the request and acted as if she was not involved. The important thing in this context is her close relationship with Jesus that either directly or indirectly gave her two sons the courage to approach Jesus and make an unusual request.

### **3.1.1.3 James and John**

James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were Galilean fishermen and two of the twelve disciples of Jesus (Mk 1:19-20; Douglas & Tenney 2011:689). James, John and Simon (Peter) comprise a trio that attained a place of prominence among the disciples of Jesus in Mark. They are often found at the centre of important events, such as the raising of Jarius's daughter (Mk 5:37), the transfiguration (Mk 9:2), and Jesus' agony in the garden of Gethsemane (Mk 14:3).

It can be deduced that James and John were the sons of Zebedee, a man with a high honour rating. Their mother was a close relative of Jesus and one of the faithful servants in His ministry. James and John were the confidants of Jesus. Jesus shared the secrets of the kingdom of heaven and demonstrated healing power in their presence (see, e.g., Mk 4:10-12). Being part of the biological extended family of Jesus James and John had an added advantage to make this request. The audacity of the Zebedee brothers' request to Jesus may likely be explained by the familial relationship of James and John's mother to Mary. James, John and Salome were faithful followers and travelling companions of Jesus, but they were also family (Hutchison 2009:61).

Kinship identity carried a great deal of influence in both Greco-Roman and Jewish society, being part of the Mediterranean basin in which in-group relations and dyadic personality played an important role in relationships. A person's merits (honour rating) began with the merits of their lineage and the reputation of their ancestral house (ascribed honour). Greeks and Romans received a basic identity from their larger family. This is even more pronounced in Jewish culture. Though the request of James and John makes perfect sense in kinship circles, it was not well received by the other disciples and superseded by Jesus. Jesus' real family, after all, were those who did the 'will of God', and not those related to him in terms of biological ties (see Mk 3:35).

### 3.1.2 Self-interest and ambition misconception

Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου λέγοντες αὐτῷ· Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὁ ἔαν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν.

'James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came up to Him, saying, Master; we desire that you should do for us whatever we shall ask' (Mk 10:35).

In order to understand James and John's request as well as the reason for the request, it is important to define ambition or desire. Ambition is an instinct of nature, a desire to rise; and like all other instincts, capable of good and evil (Burn 1974:385). Satan took hold of it and said 'for God knows that in the day you eat of it, then your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as God, knowing good and evil'. Jesus enshrined it, 'And Jesus said to them, truly I say to you that you who have followed Me, when the Son of Man sits in the throne of His glory, you shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Mt 19:28).

A wrong ambition is to go out of a line of calling into another person's calling, to which evidently God has not purposed for a specific leader. When a leader tries to get to the very top of a line of calling, that ambition is right. When a leader seeks great things for personal reasons, it is worldly ambition. When a human being pursues great things for usefulness, for the church or for Christ, the same principle is in place, but it is consecrated, pious and good. Consequently, it is not wrong to be

ambitious or to have a human desire to rise. It is only wrong when that ambition only benefits the person carrying it. If ambition benefits others, it becomes positive and embraced. Negative ambition on the other hand is selfish and repels other people.

James and John were thus not wrong having the desire or to be ambitious. They, (as soon as they requested Jesus to grant to them their own heart's desire) gave signs of a selfish, self-centred, egocentric desire or negative ambition. James and John exposed their weakness in discipleship or even leadership. Johnson (1971:178) indicates that James and John (the 'sons of thunder'; Mk 3:17) and their request was an example of their impulsive abruptness, possibly their presumption. This kind of ambition is a negative one.

If James and John realised the true cost of a high place in the kingdom of God, they would not have dared to make such a request in spite of their brave words (Carson, France, Motyer & Wenham 1994:966). In addition, the request by James and John showed a lack of spirituality, short memory and unabashed selfishness (Sanner 1979:360).

The inner circle or the confidants of Jesus comprised of three disciples but only two disciples ask for seats of glory. This is the only time the two (i.e., James and John) feature together in the gospel without Peter as the other member of the inner circle (France 2002:18). Although Peter has taken the lead in Mark 8:29-33, and acted as spokesman for the three in Mark 9:5, Peter's recent discomfiture in Mark 10:31 perhaps suggested that his leading position was not unassailable. James and John's approach, however, suggests some delicacy in broaching such a self-request. Otherwise, they would have come with their companion; the only problem is that there are only two seats on that kingly throne of Jesus.

James and John left Jesus with no option but to give to them whatsoever they wanted Him to do for them. Jesus replied, 'what it is', a sign that He was willing to give them a signed cheque without a figure. They sought a monarch's boon, a sort of 'blank cheque' of His favour. This was the way of kings; it befitted their majesty (Cole 1961:168). Nevertheless, a wise king would put a top limit on such blank cheques; witness Herod's response to the dancing girl 'half of my kingdom' (Mk 5:23). Without

doubt, James and John would have interpreted Jesus' question in reply; they would have seen it as natural caution, not spiritual insight.

James and John were selfish and self-centred. Their request is the equivalent of asking Jesus for a 'blank cheque' (Donahue & Harrington 2002:311). Their self-centeredness shows how they, like Peter in Mark 8:32-33 and the other disciples in Mark 9:33-34, were apparently arguing about places of pre-eminence in the group formed by Jesus during His earthly ministry. James and John are seeking places of special prominence at the Parousia (second coming) of Jesus and the full coming of the kingdom of God.

The request of James and John is not only an indication of self-interest or even a blank cheque. It is also an indication that they are failing to understand the teaching of Jesus. It is a failure in discipleship (William 1974:378). The request of James and John is a misunderstanding which attended each of the previous prophecies of Jesus' suffering asserted itself in blatant form. The disciples had failed completely to grasp the significance of Jesus' teaching that He would be treated with contempt and put to death.

This demand for places of honour in the glory of the Son of Man immediately follows Jesus' announcement that they were going to Jerusalem and that after three days the Son of Man will rise. The enthusiasm reflected in the sweeping terms of Mark 10:35 and the form of the petition in Mark 10:37, in the context of approaching the royal city, demonstrates that the brothers regarded Jesus as the eschatological Lord who goes to Jerusalem to restore the glory of the fallen throne of David. The question of rank, involving an inflated understanding of their position, is best explained in the context of royal messiah-ship.

In addition the request of James and John demonstrates how far they are from comprehending Jesus' teaching. It is seen that they appear to think they have a right to demand a reward. They also perceive that this reward is the best position in the messianic kingdom which Jesus is about to set up. They perhaps imagine that Jesus is entering Jerusalem in order to claim the Davidic throne and rule the nation (Hooker 1991:246). The disciples of Jesus still misunderstand Jesus' message. In

Mark 8:32-33 Peter failed to grasp it. Now the two others in Jesus' inner circle do the same (Thurston 2002:116).

James and John, sons of Zebedee, along with Simon Peter, was the 'inner circle' of leaders among the disciples. This position of trust was most evident on the mount of transfiguration just before this event (Mk 9:2) and in Gethsemane shortly thereafter (Mk 14:33). James and John were probably cousins of Jesus, their mother being Jesus' aunt, the sister of Mary (Hutchison 2009:57).

Peter had mentioned the sacrifice that he and the rest of the twelve had made, Jesus had assured them that they would be well repaid. Then, on the way to Jerusalem, Jesus the third time predicted His death and resurrection. Immediately after this, Zebedee's sons, James and John, arrived requesting positions of pre-eminence in Christ's glory (Earle, Blaney & Hanson 1955:137).

The three reasons stated above perhaps are good reasons for James and John to make a request to be part of Jesus' glorious kingdom. The following make their request to be wrong: They make such a request in a selfish manner. It is not about the kingdom of heaven but about the two positions to be occupied by two people only. They want Jesus to do what they want. They are asking for a 'blank cheque', they do not care about what Jesus wants and desires for His disciples. They misunderstand Jesus' message about the glorious kingdom. It is not necessarily about seats or position, but service (Mk 10:45).

### 3.1.3 Position misconception

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· Δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου.

'He said unto them, what would you that I should do for you? They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory' (Mk 10:36-37).

James and John desired to sit one on the left and the other on the right. The left and right hand in glory speak about positions of honour. James and John believed they had prior knowledge that Jesus will not only die on the cross, but also resurrect and

reign again as the king and restore the kingdom of God. This, after all, was Jesus' statement about His death, and this caused the sons of Zebedee to ask for positions of power at Jesus' right and left hand (Senior 1984:31). Given their knowledge, they obviously did not want to miss an opportunity to sit next to the king. This is nothing but hunger for position. James and John perceived leadership as only limited to the positions on the left and right hand side.

In requesting to sit on the left and the right hand side, James and John were evidently either wanting places of honour at the messianic banquet, or places of honour and authority in a political messianic kingdom which they thought was about to appear (Earle, Blaney & Hanson 1955:137). James and John, having witnessed the transfiguration, realised that Jesus will come in glory; yet they cannot rise above the concept of earthly messiah-ship. They asked to be seated at His right and His left as the two principal members of His 'cabinet' (Johnson 1971:179).

The two places described here are those of honour everywhere, not only in the east or in ancient times, but at any public dinner no less than in royal courts (Alexander 1960:290). The desire to be close to Jesus was not wrong in itself, only because it involved unwillingness that others should enjoy the same advantage. This desire may have been nurtured by the honour which He had already given these two disciples with Peter. Furthermore by the place that John appears to have occupied at the table next to Christ, and therefore leaning or reclining on His bosom.

These two places either refer to the present or future moment. The present moment in the sense that Jesus is about to sit and dine with His disciples at the last supper table. The future moment relates to the events of the last days. Jesus will reign and rule as king. The latter is more probable, given the fact that prior to the request Jesus had already made such a promise to the disciples. The request may be for the places of honour at the messianic banquet or for the position of eminence and authority at the Parousia, when Jesus is enthroned as the eschatological judge (William 1974:379). The place of honour is the seat on the right and left. The announcement of Jerusalem as the goal of the journey suggested that Jesus' glory was imminent.

James and John ask for places at the right and left of Jesus, still hoping that the trip to Jerusalem will, despite their apprehension, end in glory. Two robbers will in fact occupy those places and it will not be in glory. Jesus will be enthroned as king, but his throne will be a cross and His crown one of thorns. Indeed James and John do not know what they are asking for (Williamson 1983:192).

It is ironic that James and John are still fantasising about the coming glory and are scheming for positions of privilege despite Jesus' rebuke of Peter. They ignore His teaching about denying self, taking up the cross and losing one's life (Mk 8:34-37). James and John do not pay attention to His rebuke of the squabble over greatness by the example of the child and His words about being last of all and servant of all (Mk 9:35-36). They also ignore His threefold prediction of His own suffering and death at the end of this road.

James and John knew that positions in the messianic kingdom would be influential. They knew that the right hand side is the side of authority and dominion. The right hand is 'your right side' or 'your strong arm'. Equally so the left hand side is not an ordinary seat, but a seat of command (Bratcher & Nida 1961:332). James and John first believed that Jesus was about to establish a messianic kingdom and therefore the sons of thunder asked for the highest positions possible (Williamson 1983:192). They asked that one of them may sit, one, on the right hand side and the other on the left hand side. The grand vizier stood at his sovereign's right hand, the commander in chief at his left.

It was not mere desire to be near Jesus at the moment of triumph that moved them to this request. It was ambition not loyalty that moved such a request. For John, at least, it must have seemed a natural extension of his position as the disciple of love (Cole 1961:169). James and John were, after all, not only part of the twelve, but part of the three. There was a double irony in their request, in that those on the right and left of Jesus at the great moment of His triumph were two thieves (Mk 14:27), making it plain in the vivid parable that closeness to Him meant sharing His cup and His baptism.

The request to sit at Jesus' right and left is an inevitable reminder of the account of the death of Jesus, when two robbers are crucified on His right and left. This is probably a deliberate irony, though the promise that the seats of glory belong to those for whom they have been prepared refers to places of honour in the kingdom of God (Hooker 1991:247).

Another matter that needs attention is the fact that James and John were not only asking for seats, but seats in His 'glory'. It would not make any difference just to sit next to Jesus. It would not make sense for James and John to request to simply sit next to Jesus. They sat next to Him previously, in other words no one has ever been closer to His vicinity than James, John and Peter. As a result, the key word in this request is glory. It is glory that is attached to the seats of a messianic kingdom. They knew that when Jesus is on the throne the seats next to Him will not be ordinary seats, but seats of influence, affluence and power.

Glory in this context refers to power, majesty, might, that which belong to a king (Bratcher 1981:139). The kingdom of which James and John speak about is the future kingdom in which Christ will rule as king. When they said 'sit with you' the two wanted to have a share in Christ's power; the places immediately to the right and to the left of the throne were the places of greatest honour.

In addition the request was precipitated perhaps by the excitement of coming closer to Jerusalem, the 'royal city', assuming that Jesus as 'king' will have a position of honour and influence. To speak of sitting (rather than reclining, as at a banquet) on the right (or left) of someone implies a royal throne with places of the highest honour on either side. There are of course only two such places, leaving no room for Peter. The fact that the word glory is used, confirms that they envisaged Jesus as 'king' (France 2002:17).

Traditionally, the seats to the right and left of the monarch or king were, in an oriental court, seats of honour, seats that symbolised special dignity. They were not ordinary seats, but seats of great importance. These seats belonged to a selected few or the royal house. Equally so, glory is a metaphor for 'kingly power' (Thurston 2002:116). In James and John therefore lies human aspiration or ambition for dignity and power. They were tired of ordinary places and ordinary seats. James and John wanted honour and glory. Unfortunately, the request for those seats was contrary to the way of Jesus' kingdom and the will of God.

The first statement of John and James, namely 'that we may sit', it is hard to know whether James and John are evoking the image of the messianic banquet or that of the heavenly throne. Their second statement, 'one at your right hand and one at your left', is ironic in the sense that Jesus is crucified with two bandits one on the right and one at the left. Their last statement, 'in your glory', may refer to the glorious Parousia that James and John know but their willingness to ignore the content of Jesus' very detailed passion predictions reveals the depth of their misunderstanding of Him (Donahue & Harrington 2002:311).

When James and John requested the two seats on the left and the right hand side, they were literally asking for positions of leadership in the messianic kingdom. The

position of being a disciple of Jesus at the moment is not enough for them; they are looking for something more commanding and authoritative.

James and John wished to measure leadership by the position they will attain in the future eternal kingdom, where a position of importance will bring them honour from others. This is how many ordinary people might argue about success, but it is not that easy. Jesus says to those who want such positions, they must be ready to drink of His cup and be baptised in His baptism (Best 1981:128). James and John, whose importance is notorious, admitting the speculative abandonment of their business (Mk 1:19-20), they hoped by way of compensation for at least a dominant position in the miraculous administration of the messianic world (Derrett 2006:452).

Leadership is mistakenly defined by James and John as a position which leaders occupy, especially a higher position. People are not ready to bring change unless they are given a position. James and John have the same thought, and wanted to be forerunners in positions of leadership. They were aware that such positions will be contested, given the number of the disciples. But leadership is more than the position that a leader occupies.

It is more than a position in an organisation or personal qualities of the person in that position (Holloman 1984:110). While position or personal qualities may enhance a person's chances of being accepted as a true leader, these factors alone do not constitute leadership. Leadership is a characteristic of functioning groups, resulting from the interaction of a leader, group and situation. Leadership is not a simple position but a combination of character, skills and competence (Melrose 1998:295). The best model for leadership is that of a servant leader, who leads by serving the needs of people. A servant leader does not do the job of others, but rather enables others to learn and make progress toward mutual goals. When a leader creates an environment for personal growth, people rise to their potential and beyond.

Leadership is a fiduciary calling and inherent in this calling is the knowledge that hope plays a critical part in the lives of followers. Fiduciary leaders design and build; it serves inclusive communities by liberating the human Spirit and potential. Leaders do not rely only on their own abilities but also on the abilities of followers (DePree 2002:91).

Leadership is not a position. A promotion or a position has never made anyone a leader. It is a choice that one makes, not a position or place in which one sits (Maxwell 2005:7). As a result, anyone can make a difference no matter where the person is located in an organisation. If leadership is not defined by a position, then anyone at any level can assume a leadership role. The problem is that James and John never thought of it in this way. They defined leadership as sitting in an important place, not a place of function. The truth is that every level of an organisation depends on leadership from someone but it does not mean that the person needs to be appointed to a position to lead that level.

James and John were adhering to the cultural behaviour of their time. Hutchison (2009:65) observes that many leaders of that time aspired to take positions of privilege, power and authority because these were recognised measurements of importance. James and John were pursuing models of leadership, greatness, and even service that reflected the value system of their culture. Anyone would be expected to pursue such positions in both the Jewish and Greco-Roman world because those cultures valued honour and sought above all to avoid dishonour. Jesus was asking His disciples to abandon their way of thinking and to adopt a new value system that would govern His kingdom.

Jesus' response to the disciples demonstrates that Jesus was ready to challenge that kind of a culture of leadership. He wanted to introduce another culture or style of leadership. This culture is not power hungry and when in power does not lord it over the other followers. It is not motivated by position, but by service. According to Jesus' response, even if James and John are inclined and susceptible to their culture, they are not justified in making advances for such a position.

Instead, they must reverse that culture and be acculturated to another one called servant leadership. Servant leadership is by no means limited to top down hierarchical relationships. It can also occur in any setting, between occupants of any organisational position or level, and in any interpersonal relationship (Graham 1998:145). In servant leadership, the leader's exemplary life and mentorship result in the healthy growth of followers. Servant leaders who hold executive level positions, however, may have an even broader impact, one concerning strategic decisions for

the direction and functioning of an organisation as a whole. It is typical that at the most senior levels of an organisation's responsibility, that major strategic decisions are made and policies are put into effect.

### **3.1.4 Competition misconception**

Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.

'And when the ten heard it, they began to be much displeased with James and John' (Mk 10:41).

The ten means the other ten disciples other than James and John as they were twelve disciples in total. They were displeased, or grieved and indignant on the account of the request that James and John had made (Alexander 1960:292). There are two possibilities for the indignation of the other ten disciples. They either wanted to defend Jesus' teaching on discipleship and greatness in the kingdom (Mk 9: 30-50) or they wanted to contest James and John for similar positions (Thurston 2002:117).

They were not angry because James and John missed the point but because James and John were quicker than them in making the request. When the ten became aware of this selfish request they became indignant because they, too, wished preferment (Earle, Blarney & Hanson 1955:138). The other ten overheard this blatant grab for power and became indignant, suggesting that they were harbouring the same vision. They possibly wanted the only two limited seats in the messianic kingdom and were angry that they are about to be occupied (Elmer 2006:23).

The word competition, according to Fraker and Spears (1996:60), in common usage means to contend with others for supremacy over them in some sort of win-lose contest. In a sense the winner gains power over others. It is human nature to be competitive. In this context, James and John were contending with the rest of the disciples. The ten were aware that if James and John are going to occupy the seats of supremacy, James and John would have won and they would have lost. They may

have thought that the two would lord it over them and they would remain followers. If the other ten had remained silent, then there would not have been an issue.

The ten, in turn, portrayed their spiritual shallowness by being indignant of the spiritual shallowness of the two who had skilfully stolen a march on them. A man's character is shown by the things that provoke his strongest reactions; and so Jesus justly rebuked both of them and ten at once by showing them their common ignorance of the very nature of servant leadership (Cole 1961:170). Jesus shows that all leadership is humble service, for it takes its colour from His example, who is, above all, the suffering servant (Mk 10:45). Thus closeness to Him is not something at which to grasp thoughtlessly without realising its nature and cost.

The anger of the ten makes it look like the request was made by all the disciples. When Jesus rebuked all of them it further proved that they were all wrong to make requests for positions of honour and glory. They too failed the test of discipleship and leadership. According to Senior (1984:31), the rest of the disciples shared in this blatant failure when they became indignant at the nimble manoeuvre of James and John. The ten reacted to the situation instead of responding to it. They perceived leadership as jostling and wrestling for limited positions instead of perceiving it as an opportunity to serve others.

The other ten disciples were indignant because they were jealous of their own dignity and fearful lest the two brothers should secure some advantage over them. Their insensitivity to the seriousness of the moment links them with James and John, and suggests the cruel loneliness with which Jesus faced the journey to Jerusalem (William 1974:382). It also indicates the degree to which selfish ambition and rivalry were the raw material from which Jesus had to fashion leadership for the disciples.

The ten had the opportunity to correct James and John and receive praise from Jesus. They missed such an opportunity and as a result they are also the subject of Jesus' reprimand. The ten had an opportunity to be big brothers to the childish James and John. They had an opportunity to be models and champions of greatness and service. The other ten disciples might have come out of this incident well, but

when they learned what had happened they showed their anger with James and John, perhaps at being upstaged by them (English 1992:182).

If the two sons of Zebedee appeared in a poor light, the remaining ten disciples were no better, for when they heard of it they burst into indignation at James and John (Sanner 1979:361). The earlier dispute over 'who should be the greatest' (Mk 9:34) flared up again. With unflinching persistence, Jesus called them to Him and sought to show them His values. The great among the followers of Jesus is the one eager to be a minister and servant of all.

For a moment one may think that the ten disciples were angry for good reason, but they were not. Williamson (1983:192) remarks that when the other ten heard of the request, they began to be indignant with James and John. Their anger may have been perceived as moral indignation at James and John's ambition, but the picture of the disciples throughout Mark leads the reader here to suspect that the other ten were angry because they wanted those places for themselves. Hooker (1991:247) agrees that the ten were indignant with James and John not because their own attitudes were different, but because they also wanted to make the same request. Hence, Jesus summoned them and addressed the whole group.

The ten other disciples appeared just as shocking as James and John when they were angry with them because of their request. There is no doubt they had wanted these places for themselves. As a result Jesus patiently explained to them once more the totally different pattern of God's kingdom where greatness is humble service (Carson *et al.* 1994:967).

Was the other disciples' reaction also a righteous indignation, repudiating the self-centred attitude of their two colleagues? Did they learn the lessons about the kingdom of God sufficiently to be able to take Jesus' side against the very status seeking they had previously been guilty of (Mk 9:34)? France (2002) is of the opinion that Mark's consistently critical presentation of the disciples in this part of the gospel is against such an interpretation because the rebuke which follows in Mark 10:42-44 is apparently addressed not to James and John but to all disciples. This suggests that their annoyance was not over the ambition of the two brothers. It was over the

fact that James and John have made their request first and tried to gain an unfair advantage over their colleagues in the competition for the highest places. On this issue they were all equally at fault.

Perhaps it was because the other ten were not included in the inquiry. It is more likely that the other disciples were irritated because James and John were using their familial ties with Jesus. They used the influence of their mother to 'get the edge' on acquiring positions in the kingdom (Hutchison 2009:59). Jesus spoke to all twelve disciples, because they were all missing the point. He addressed their misdirected understanding about leadership and authority and gave the disciples a new paradigm for measuring greatness as a leader.

The other ten disciples were angry at the two for seeking precedence, because each of them hoped to have it for himself. Here we see the disciples showing their own ambition, in their indignation at the ambition of James and John. Jesus used this occasion to warn them against negative ambition (Henry 2010:1595). The other disciples were 'indignant' with James and John for their request of special honour, perhaps because they secretly hoped for it themselves (Mk 10:41). The dissension among the twelve becomes the pretext for one of Jesus' most important lessons and self-revelation (Burge & Hill 2012:1036).

The other ten disciples have degraded themselves to the lower level of James and John. This is a level of misunderstanding of the teaching of discipleship and greatness. It is a level of seeking for positions in leadership without service. It is level of fighting for positions and places of honour and glory. In doing so, they suffered the same repercussions of being rebuked by their master who is very patiently teaching them that leadership is about service to others.

### **3.1.5 Lordship and authority misconception**

καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν.

‘But Jesus called them to Him, and says unto them, you know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them’ (Mk 10:42).

Jesus here is addressing a perception in leadership that sees leadership as an abuse of position and authority. James and John sought positions to categorise themselves with a Gentile understanding of leadership. In this understanding leaders are dictators and autocrats because they dominate and rule their followers or subordinates. They take advantage over other people, instead of serving them. This class of leadership is known for two things: exercising lordship and authority over people. This kind of leadership is power hungry, hence the desire or ambition for positions of power.

The expression ‘rulers among the Gentiles’, indicates that the brothers’ request is understood as a demand to hold positions of authority. As a result, the disciples of Jesus should not follow that pattern of leadership, instead, they should become servants (Hooker 1991:247).

Jesus speaks about a type of leadership accountable to Gentiles. The word Gentiles used in Mark 10:42 refers to political authorities, who, in their exercise of authority, embody the prevailing norms for measuring greatness. These norms are as prevalent now as they were then. The phrase ‘It shall not be so among you’ suggests the goal of discipleship is to transform the entire culture (Williamson 1983:195). This further suggests a permanent minority status for disciples, a dichotomy in principle between Christians and their culture.

The expression that the same leaders rule or lord it over others needs further explanation in order to understand what Jesus is saying to His disciples. ‘Accounted to rule’ refers to the unsubstantial nature of all human principalities and powers or those who are recognised as chiefs and generally known to be so (Alexander 1960:293). ‘Great ones’ refers to greatness with priority of rank and power. ‘To exercise authority’ means that in worldly positions, superiority of rank can only be maintained by force and by coercing or restraining followers.

This kind of leadership oppresses people instead of liberating them. Bratcher and Nida (1961:332) elucidate all the concepts in this text: *To rule* means 'to command', 'to boss', or 'to govern'. '*Lord it over*' may be rendered as referring to exorbitant demands 'make them run back and forth' in the sense of constantly running errands or self-exaltation. '*Great*' is usually interpreted in terms of physical strength, with metaphorical extensions such as 'strong', 'mighty', 'powerful' or 'authority' or position to command 'with authority'. '*Exercise authority*' may be rendered as 'tell them exactly what to do' or 'constantly boss them'.

These leaders are those who are recognised as ruling the Gentiles, possibly 'reputed as ruling' or 'seem to rule'; for although men recognise their rule, they are not the ultimate rulers. Such men lord it over them, and this was expected in the ancient world. It is still true in political and economic life that the exercise of power impresses men, but Jesus was an exception to the rule (Johnson 1971:180). They are not necessarily leaders but are recognised as rulers among the people. Jesus here is referring to self-appointed leadership that is in contrast to divinely appointed leadership.

When Jesus says, 'are considered', it does not mean that Jesus is denying that such men are, in fact, rulers. Perhaps the best way to represent the idea is to say, 'who assume the right to rule' or 'who claim to be rulers'. Rulers of heathens are men who govern people who do not believe in God, and as a result they rule over them (Bratcher 1981:139). The terms 'rule' and 'Lord it over' help to characterise this experience as one of being subject to unlimited and overwhelming imperial power (Donahue & Harrington 2002:312). Jesus illustrates to His disciples that the way to manifest authority is by serving others.

In seeking to impress the truth of Mark 9:35 on the twelve, Jesus contrasted the conduct of Gentile rulers with the submission to service and sacrifice which is appropriate for discipleship. It is probable that His most direct contact with the expression of power and authority of the petty rulers of Palestine and Syria and the great lords of Rome was through the coins which circulated in Palestine (William 1974:382). There is a biting irony in the reference to those who give the illusion of ruling, but simply exploit the people over whom they exercise dominion. In their

struggle for rank and precedence, and the desire to exercise authority for their own advantage, the disciples were actually imitating those whom they undoubtedly despised.

It is a difference between leading by authority and leading by service. The text further illustrates a difference between Jesus-followers and unbelievers. Kingdom concept of greatness is opposed to that of the secular world; strictly speaking the contrast is not between two ways of exercising authority, the good way (that of Christians) and a bad way (that of secular rulers), but between good or bad authority and service (Best 1981:126). The point that the text combines two ideas, namely: ruler-ship and service which stand in sharp contrast to one another. Indeed, it is precisely the tension between them that gives the passage much of its force. Unlike those who are regarded as ruling over nations, a disciple of Jesus should become a servant if he wants to be great and a slave of all if he wants to be first (Seeley 1993:234).

The following table by McGee-Cooper and Trammell (2002:145) shows the difference between the traditional boss (those who lord it over) and the servant as a leader. It is a distinction between secular leadership and servant leadership – a distinction between rulers of Gentiles and disciples of Jesus:

| <b>Traditional boss</b>   | <b>Servant as leader</b>   |
|---|--|
| Motivated by personal drive to achieve.                                       | Motivated by desire to serve others.   |
| Highly competitive; independent mind-set.<br>Seeks to receive personal credit | Highly collaborative and interdependent.<br>Gives credit.                                    |
| Understands internal politics and uses them to win personally                 | Sensitive to what motivates others<br>empowers all to win.                                   |
| Focuses on fast action.   | Focuses on gaining understanding.  |
| Relies on facts, logic and proof.   | Uses intuition and foresight to balance facts, logic and proof.                              |
| Controls information in order to maintain power.                              | Shares information generously.   |
| Spends more time giving orders.   | Listens to others.   |
| Feels that personal value comes from manipulation.                            | Feels that personal value comes from mentoring and working with others.                      |
| Sees network of supporters as power base.                                     | Develops trust across a network of and perks and titles as a signal to other constituencies. |
| Eager to speak first.   | Eager to listen first.   |
| Uses personal power and intimidation to leverage what he/she wants.           | Personal trust and respect to build bridges.   |
| Accountability is more personal.  | Accountability is about making it safe to  |

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
|                                | learn from mistakes.   |
| Uses humour to control others. | Uses humour to lift others up and make it safe to learn from mistakes. |

Jesus' response is a clear and accurate picture of the manners and behaviour of earthly lords and rulers, of which the Greco-Roman world practiced (Thurston 2002:117). The kingdom of God reverses this pattern. Greatness in the kingdom is measured by servant-hood and 'firstness' in terms of the willingness to deny rights and become like a slave without rights.

Jesus takes up the idea of royal privilege from the brothers' request and universalises it to refer to the Gentiles. It is not so much, however, that Jesus wishes to acquit Jewish leaders of the sort of attitude towards authority which Gentiles display, but rather if you wanted to see absolute power in the world of the first century it was necessary to look outside politically; where Israel was subjected to those who held real power (France 2002). Jesus does not question the reality of their rule, but rather draws attention to the fact that they are seen to rule, and that their status is publicly recognised. They, however, convey the oppressive and uncontrolled exploitation of power, the flaunting of authority rather than a benevolent exercise.

There are two kinds of authority; the Gentile authority and the kingdom of God authority. One is authority over and the other is authority under (Schroeder 2006:298). James and John are hooked up on Gentile authority because they want to be on top. Jesus says 'it shall not be so among you', because servant leadership authority is the upside down pyramid, serving and not being served. In this kind of leadership, authority means to place yourself below others and lead from there. Unlike those who lead the Gentiles want to be over and above the followers.

The disciples must shun Gentile authority and embrace the authority of the kingdom of God. When they follow Gentile authority they become like those who rule and lord it over others. Jesus censures all of the disciples with His more severe reprimands (Elmer 2006:23). They are acting like heathen rulers who lord it over them and those who exercise authority over them. The lordly model is not for the disciples. Jesus is a

servant and a minister of all and the disciples should follow this model. The disciples are not to follow Him in His lordly role but in His servant role.

Rulers like Caesar, Herod the Great, Herod Agrippa and other Roman magistrates were regarded as the most powerful human figures of their day. Jesus said that Gentile rulers, 'lord it over' others (Hutchison 2009:64). This could be rendered 'exercise lordship over them', in keeping with the next phrase translated or 'their high officials exercise authority over them'. Jesus' point focuses more on the motive for power, and in these simple statements he contrasted His teaching with Roman cultural standards of success.

Jesus knew that political rulers wielded immense power. Their subjects had to submit to their authority. As leaders, they could throw their weight around. At the same time, they craved popularity. They wanted to play the role of benefactor, so they liberally dispensed privileges (Hian 2010:16). Dominion was generally abused in the world of Jesus. The concern of the rulers was what they can get from their subjects to support their own pride and grandeur, not what they could do for them. That dominion therefore should not be admitted into the followers of the Jesus movement. The leaders must be like shepherds taking care of the sheep. Followers should not be like horses under the command of the driver (Henry 2010:1595).

Domineering over other people was the culture and custom of the day. It was a system that took pride in exercising authority and lording over other people. Jesus exposes that culture and its way of doing things. He indicates that even if it is common to abuse power, it is not the only way of leading people. Jesus points to the surrounding culture and its way of leading. The surrounding culture dominates and in most cases oppresses those under their rule (Sweet 2012:33). In fact, it celebrated that domination-that hierarchy. It again esteemed the rights and privileges that come from being on top. Jesus calls the disciples instead to follow the model of the house servant and the bond slave that is to give up rights and privileges in order to serve the interest of another.

Jesus does not only expose the wrong way of doing things or the wrong style of leadership. He also provides an alternative style, a style that helps leaders lead by

not oppressing or the abusing power-a style that does not take advantage of people nor undermines them. Furthermore leaders lead by providing a service to the people being led. The disciples of Jesus should not lead like the leaders of the Gentiles, but lead the same way that Jesus was leading them. The disciples must embrace the teaching on leadership and be great by serving others.

In contrast to lordship and authority, Lore (1998:307) states categorically that servant leadership is the power to influence rather than the power to control. When a servant leader chooses to influence people rather than control them, it at first might seem like weakness, but it really calls for an inner strength. It really serves to engage and develop the creativity, productivity and vibrancy that already exists. The leader uses his power and position to influence others, instead of using it to control others. He transfers the power to others instead of yielding to it. The failure to give power to others produces dictators.

In order to be an effective servant leader, the leader must yield significant power to others until they are sufficiently prepared, those others may not wish to share in that power. Smith and Farnsworth (2002:220) agrees that the leader must believe that the only reason for holding exclusive power is to exercise control over others, or to compensate for lack of trust. When trust is a major objective and control is not, power must be shared. Unlike the authoritative models in which the boss is not questioned, it invites constant review and evaluation of the leader and his or her action. It does not mean that the leader is absolved of final responsibility but it means that possibly everyone's voice is heard before a decision is made.

Servant leadership is empowering rather than demeaning. It is far from servitude or slavery, because it is offered out of love rather than coercion. It comes from judicious power appropriately applied, not from an abduction of power or illusions of power (Beazley & Beggs 2002:58). The servant leader does not initially concentrate on power, but on others. When he receives power, he distributes it to others through team building and training. This is exactly what Jesus has done; He gave away power and authority to His disciples. He empowered His followers instead of controlling them. Jesus showed them that they can do what He has achieved, even greater things than what He has done.

### 3.1.6 Conclusion

James and John took advantage of the reputation of their father in the community and the reputation of their mother in the ministry of the Jesus. They further took advantage of their own relationship with Jesus, and on this basis, made a request. James and John did this because they perceived leadership as kinship. People still think that because they are connected with high people, they can receive positions of authority for their own benefit. James and John represent a group of individuals who want to succeed by 'bloodline', and not by merit.

Ambition is not wrong as long as it serves the purpose and other people. If ambition does not serve a purpose and others, it is evil and selfish. It serves the self-interest of the ambitious person. On the other hand, if one has the ambition to serve others and fulfils his or her calling, it is positive ambition. James and John made a mistake by excluding other people in their request. They made this request to meet their own needs. In doing that, they failed to understand the meaning of discipleship and leadership.

The positions on the left and right hand side were positions of honour in the world of the text. James and John thought Jesus would rise as a king and rein a victorious kingdom, and therefore they had vacant positions of leadership. It was a misunderstanding of what Jesus taught and demonstrated. Leadership is of course not a position; a leader only needs a position in order to influence others. The leader influences others by serving and ministering to them.

The reason the other ten disciples became indignant is because they equally competed for positions of honour. They were not necessarily against James and John in order to defend the teaching of discipleship. The ten were only against James and John because they were also quick to discover vacancies in the supposed throne of Jesus. As a result, they were in competition with James and John. This is seen by the response that Jesus gives to them. It addresses the rest of the disciples, apart from James and John. People would sometimes do anything for positions of leadership, because they perceive leadership as a position of merit and such positions are only limited to the few.

Finally, in making this request, the disciples seem to be thinking the same way as the rulers of the Gentiles. Leaders in this category do not care about the people they are leading. They dictate to their followers or subordinates because they think that leadership is authority and lording over others. The minute a person makes a request for a position, it is a desire to be a boss. Jesus picked up this attitude from His disciples, that is, they also perceived leadership as dominating and ruling over others.

### **3.2 SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN MARK 10:35-45**

Jesus' response to the disciples' leadership misconceptions, introduces three principles of servant leadership: In Mark 10:38-39, Jesus said unto them, 'you know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? And be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with?' And they said unto him, 'we can'. And Jesus said unto them, 'you shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptised withal shall you be baptised': This response demonstrates that servant leadership is about suffering and sacrifice.

In Mark 10:40 Jesus says, 'but to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared'. This demonstrates that servant leadership is from God the Father.

The last response is Mark 10:43-44: 'but so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: And whosoever of you will be the chief, shall be servant of all'. It shows that servant leadership is about servant-hood.

#### **3.2.1 Servant leadership is the 'cup' and 'baptism' of suffering**

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐκ οἶδατε τί αἰτέισθε· δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι;

'Jesus said unto them, you know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? And be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with? And they said unto him, we can. And Jesus said unto them, you shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptised withal shall you be baptised' (Mk 10:38).

This response of Jesus demonstrates that servant leadership is about suffering and sacrifice. Jesus responded by asking James and John if they were able to drink of His own cup and be baptised with His baptism? There are various possibilities to the meaning of the 'cup' and 'baptism' of Jesus. Was He referring to His water and Spirit baptism when He was baptised by John the Baptist? And what about the 'cup'? Which cup was Jesus drinking from? Was it the Eucharistic cup (the Christian sacrament commemorating the last supper by consecrating bread and wine)? Or does Jesus refer to His cross and death?

James and John answer 'yes' to Jesus' question and He consents. Yet another question still remains as to whether the two answered 'yes' to the symbolic sacramental meaning of cup and baptism or to literal martyrdom. Best (1981:124) explains that the symbols cup and baptism may be understood either literally in relation to martyrdom or sacrament. In the context of a sacrament, James and John feature as typical believers – all believers participate in sacraments in the passion of Jesus; there cannot then be special seats in glory for special believers. If, alternatively, it is assumed the reference is to literal martyrdom, then it can either regard the context as an explicit allusion to a supposed martyrdom of James and John. Setting aside the question of the historicity of John's early martyrdom, it is difficult to see any reason why Mark should wish to emphasise their death other than as examples.

In the context of James and John's martyrdom, the response by Jesus suggests that priority in the kingdom is related to a martyr's death. This also indicates that Jesus asked the two disciples in symbolic terms if they were prepared to undergo a fate like His own (Nineham 1963:279). They understood Him and expressed their willingness. Jesus prophesied that martyrdom would in fact be their lot.

In order to fully understand the meaning of the cup and baptism as used in this context it is important to know the etymology of these words. This section of the study looks at the meaning of cup and baptism in the Old Testament. The different possible meanings of baptism and the cup in Mark will first be discussed, and conclude with the understanding of these two symbols in other New Testament texts.

### 3.2.1.1 The meaning of cup and baptism in the Old Testament

The symbols of both the cup and baptism are used several times in the Old Testament. In most cases they depict difficult times and suffering. The cup is an Old Testament symbol for suffering, especially one for enduring the wrath of God, as well as for joy (Cole 1961:170). The Old Testament speaks of a cup of joy or salvation (Ps 16:5; 23:5) and a cup of suffering or punishment (Ps 11:6). 'Baptism' is referred to as baptism of tribulation and death (Johnson 1971:179).

In the Old Testament the figure of the cup was also used as symbol for the punishment God sends on the wicked (Bratcher 1981:138). In addition, the cup in a number of Old Testament passages is about suffering and punishment, usually at God's hand. This suggests that what lies ahead of the Son of Man is to be full of woe (English 1992:181). The cup and baptism (or floods) are defined as Old Testament pictures of judgement and suffering. Jesus warned them that suffering would indeed come, but it would not necessarily lead to high place in the kingdom of God. This was for God alone to give (Carson *et al.* 1994:967).

In the Old Testament the cup is sometimes an image of blessing (Ps 16:5; 23:5; 116:13), but more often of judgement (Ps 75:8; Je 25:15-29; 49:12; Ezk 23:31-34; Hab 2:16; cf. Rev 14:10 16:19; see France 2002:416). Normally it denotes the punishment of the wicked, but in Isaiah 51:17-23 and Lamentations 4:21 it is used as reference to the suffering of God's people, which will now be passed to their oppressors. Donahue and Harrington (2002:311) refers to the understanding of the image of cup in terms of the Old Testament theme of the cup of suffering or the cup of wrath.

The figurative meaning of the cup is complex, according to Thurston (2002:116) in Hebrew scripture, cup can symbolise joy and salvation (Ps 16:5; 23:5; 116:13) or suffering and punishment (Ps 11:6; 75:8; Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15, 17). Hutchison (2009:62) traces the cup back to a common Jewish metaphor which generally refers to one's appointed destiny (Ps 16:5), joy and blessing (Ps 23:5; 116:13) or divine judgement against sin (Ps 75:7-8).

It is clear that the metaphor of the 'cup' as used in the Old Testament refers to suffering. The metaphor also refers to what God has in store for an individual, whether it is good or bad (Ps 23:5). The metaphor of 'Baptism' was used for calamity in the Old Testament (Ps 42:7). The verb 'to be baptised' means to be flooded with calamities. Therefore both cup and baptism in the Old Testament are symbols of suffering.

### **3.2.1.2 Possible meanings of cup and baptism in Mark**

Jesus explicitly uses it in the first sense in the garden of Gethsemane (Mk 14:36). In later Judaism it took on another meaning of a purification nature (Mk 6:4). Jesus uses it first in Luke 12:50, and although the New Testament concept of Christian baptism is rich and manifold, it is still nevertheless 'into Christ's death' (Rom 4:3). Both baptism and the Lord's Supper are a reminder, by their symbolism, of the cost of following Christ; the servant must be like his Master (Cole 1961:170).

The cup offered to James and John, however, is not vicarious, but simply an image for destined suffering (France 2002:416). Baptism, in a narrative context of Mark, supposes that Jesus uses it to depict the suffering and death into which he was soon to be 'plunged' (Thurston 2002:116). In Mark's gospel, the cup appears in the context of great suffering in Jesus' Gethsemane prayer (Mk 14:6). In addition 'Cup' is also a Jewish expression for a share in someone else's fate. The baptism that Jesus accepted was not just the water baptism of John the Baptist, but the baptism of fire to which John alluded (Mk 1:8). 'To accept baptism' (or 'deep water'), used in ancient literature for 'flood' or 'getting soaked', is to accept God's way of suffering.

Since Jesus applied the cup uniquely to Himself, it is best taken here as His submission to the Father's will in facing the cross (Mk 14:36). The metaphor of the 'baptism' is a parallel thought. Baptism conveys the idea 'to identify with', showing Jesus' acceptance of the suffering ahead (Hutchison 2009:62).

James and John think of God's kingdom in terms of benefits. In contrast, Jesus speaks about cup and baptism-metaphors of suffering as the costs of participating in God's kingdom (Burge & Hill 2012:1036). It seems like the meaning has not changed in the New Testament as baptism is a sacrament signifying the death and

resurrection of Jesus. Equally so, the table of drinking the wine and the bread should be performed to remember or partake in the suffering Lord and servant.

The promise that James and John will share the cup and baptism of Jesus is sometimes seen as a prophecy, reflecting knowledge of the later martyrdom of the brothers. James was put to death by Herod at an early date (Ac 12:2), but the fate of John is uncertain. Cup and baptism therefore are violent images connected with sorrow and grief.

### **3.2.1.3 The meaning of cup and baptism in Mark and other New Testament texts**

The cup itself is a scriptural figure for one's providential portion or the lot assigned to him by God, whether good or evil (Alexander 1961:291). The same thought applies to baptism, which means to be bathed but with a specific reference to the ceremonial washing of the law. This definition of baptism is not far away from the New Testament's water baptism which in a way symbolises the washing of sins.

For Paul, the Christian rite of baptism is the identification with Jesus in His death which is followed by rising to new life (Rom 6:3-4). If the disciples are to have the privilege of this, they must share the vocation of the suffering Son of Man who gives this to them. Even though they do not know what they are asking, they reply, 'we can'. James certainly underwent martyrdom (Ac 12:2). The fate of John is uncertain. According to the tradition, he lived to a great age, but a fragment of Papias preserved in Philip of Side says that 'John the theologian and James his brother were put to death by Jews' (Johnson 1971:179).

In the New Testament the image brings out the idea that sharing in the Lord's Supper means sharing in Jesus' suffering (Donahue & Harrington 2002:311). The image of baptism reminds the readers that they were baptised into the death of Christ (Rom 6:3-4). The baptism that Jesus will undergo is His passion and death. Being 'in Christ' involves a participation in His death.

The New Testament alludes to baptism as the meaning of suffering. It is clear that anyone who seeks the prestigious seats of glory is in actual fact asking to take part

in Jesus' death. The cup and the baptism of Jesus are not as easy as James and John perceive them; they are deeper than what they bargain for, and they refer to hard times.

Some scholars argue that the cup and baptism should not only be confined to suffering. Burn (1974:385), for example, suggests that the word cup signifies the portion of good and evil which is assigned to men in this life. It probably arose from the custom in ancient times of the master of the household distributing to his children and servants an allowance of meat and drink according to their importance. The same custom was also observed in entertaining guests. The word 'Baptism', which signifies immersion, is also familiarly used in scripture to denote a person being overwhelmed with calamities, as it were with floods of water. The cup then, which Jesus was to drink of, was one of affliction; the baptism with which He was to be baptised was that of a cruel and ignominious death. Those who wanted to follow Jesus, therefore, were to drink deep of the cup of suffering and be immersed in the darkest horrors of human barbarity.

If the cup and baptism symbolise both the good and the bad, suffering and the enjoyment, obviously James and John were requesting only the good part. They seem to be misunderstanding and misrepresenting the teaching of Jesus about true discipleship. Otherwise they would not have agreed to drink His cup and be baptised with His baptism. Their 'yes' exposes their naïve understanding of what it means to drink of His cup and to be baptised with His baptism.

It is maintained here that the cup refers to inward suffering and the baptism refers to agony and overwhelming sorrow or outward persecution and affliction (Sanner 1979:361). Jesus was asking James and John if they were able to bear being plunged into the trials which He is plunged and which overwhelmed Him. James and John replied 'yes' and indeed in due time they did drink from Christ's cup of agony and experienced something of His baptism of death, as Acts 12:2 and Rev 1:9 confirms this.

Jesus was asking them if they were willing to suffer with Him, or to share in His suffering the same way He is going to suffer. 'Be baptised' is a figure of difficulties

and sufferings which 'drown' a person, that is, which causes that person to die. The figure was not uncommon. If interpreted figuratively then Jesus is asking them, 'Are you willing to be baptised, as it were, in the same way'? Or if taken literally 'I will die as a result of troubles and persecution. Are you willing to die in the same way'?

It means that to drink the cup is to partake in the suffering of Jesus. To be baptised in His baptism is to sink deep into His suffering. If baptism means immersion then to be baptised into His suffering means to be immersed into the trials and tribulations of Jesus. Did James and John understand the meaning or were they only saying so for the sake of seats in glory?

In interpreting the enigmatic language of the cup and baptism it is crucial to recognise that these images do not bear the same significance when applied to Jesus and disciples. When applied to Jesus the cup and baptism signify that Jesus in His passion will be the voluntary sacrifice for the sins of men. When applied to the disciples in Mark 10:39 these images suggest their moral participation in Jesus' passion. To share someone's cup was a recognised expression for sharing in His fate (William 1984:379).

The two brothers were confident that they were prepared to share Jesus' destiny, even with reference to suffering if this was the necessary prelude to glory. Their naïve reply only serves to indicate that they were as incapable of understanding the full import of Jesus' reference to His cup and baptism as they were of grasping the real significance of His prophecy of the passion.

When James and John affirmed that they are able to drink his cup and be baptised with His baptism, Jesus accepts their words, but turns them right side out (Williamson 1983:193). They thought of His cup and His baptism as a means to share in His glory. Jesus breaks that connection, and affirms the cup of suffering and the baptism both of death and of empowerment for mission as the means of fellowship with Him and as the only way to follow Him. He accepts them as they are, but firmly points them in a new direction, in the way that He Himself is going.

They thought that their 'yes' is a license to occupy positions of influence, but Jesus makes it more difficult for them. Jesus' reply is a reminder about the necessity of suffering (Hooker 1991:246).

The call for James and John to take part in drinking Jesus' cup and to be baptised in His baptism is a call to a kind of leadership that shares the suffering of Jesus before occupying any position. Leadership is defined as suffering servant-hood precisely because Jesus' cross defines the meaning of service (Tan 2009:88). The cross-shaped pattern of Christian leadership is every bit as radical as it was on Golgotha. In today's culture many leaders still gravitate toward patterns of leadership oriented by dominance, control and power. This happens when Christian leaders become squeezed into the world's mould of leadership or when they deliberately adopt the world's leadership pattern.

### **3.2.2 Servant leadership positions are granted by God the Father**

τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἠτοίμασται.

'To sit on my right hand and on my left hand are not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared' (Mk10:40).

Jesus' second response is that leadership positions in the kingdom are granted by the Father. In this context Jesus does not shift responsibility nor afraid of James and John to only refer them to the Father. Jesus is only recognising the Father as the supreme authority. He is recognising the sovereignty of God the Father. Jesus is not delegating upwards, but observes protocol. 'It shall be given to them for whom it is prepared'. Who are the lucky ones? Who are the pre-selected, pre-elected or pre-destined? James and John may feel sidelined here, but Jesus' explanation about the prerequisite makes it possible for anyone to take part or be the leader.

There are three possibilities to the meaning of Mark 10:40: It disproves the divinity of Christ because it is irreconcilable with His omniscience. It is understood merely as His present errand or commission, into which the distribution of rewards and honours

did not enter. The text is understood as merely determining objects (Alexander 1961:292).

This is a reminder that even the Son is in loving subjection to His Father; it is not even for Jesus to dispense honours at His will but only at the Father's will (Cole 1961:170). Similarly, the last hour is hidden deep in the counsel of God (Mk 13:32); and this is not 'subordination', but voluntary. In other words, Jesus chooses to obey and submits to the Father. This alone is a sign of humility and obedience. Jesus is not necessarily under oppression, but He willingly opts to submit to His Father. He is in authority because He is under the authority of His Father. The more He obeys, the more He receives honour. Once again, Jesus is not only teaching His disciples, but leading them by example.

Jesus' denial of the right to set men on His right or left hand is consistent with His refusal to accept even the appearance of an arbitrary authority (William 1974:381). His prerogatives are limited by His submission to the Father, and Jesus frankly admits this (Mk 13:32). The appointment of the places of honour is the Father's prerogative, and James and John are only given the assurance that these will be assigned to those who have been prepared by Him.

Furthermore, the text signifies the importance of such places. If anyone can dispatch them as he likes, they become ordinary seats. The more Jesus points to the Father, it signals that the positions are extraordinary. There are no true honours which are lightly won on earth or in heaven (Burn 1974:385).

Often people use kinship or authority to seek for positions. In this regard, Jesus implied that 'it is merit, not favour, not self-seeking, which secures promotion in the kingdom of God' (Sanner 1979:361). To sit on the left and right is not for Jesus to give, but it is for those it has been prepared. Places of honour and corresponding responsibility are not distributed upon request. These come in the very nature of the kingdom, for those that it has been prepared by qualities of character and spirit. They come because God chooses to give them to a particular individual not because somebody paid a bribe to receive them.

In addition, Jesus is saying that He does not have the right, authority or power to decide who sits on the left and the right. These places or positions will be given to those for whom God has prepared. The choice of people to occupy those places of honour is not His to make, that decision has been made by God (Bratcher 1981:139).

Jesus does not reject the position James and John assign to Him, but does explain that the assignment of positions of honour is not His role (Thurston 2002:117). Even Jesus cannot usurp God's authority (Mk 14:36). This is an indication of Jesus' understanding of His relation to God and the inevitability of God's benevolent purposes, even in the face of apparent suffering and failure. The assumption is that only God (the Father) can make these assignments (Harrington 2002:312). This saying is often linked to Mark 13:32: 'But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father'. Both Mark 10:40 and Mark 13:32 suggest that some functions are left to God the Father.

Jesus surprisingly does not deny that there will be such places of honour, but refuses to reserve them for even the most ambitious or the most loyal disciple (France 2002:418). Those to whom it will be given are those whom God has prepared. Who are these favoured people? In the light of the preceding pericopes, it is certain that it will not be those who would have been expected or who would expect themselves to take precedence, but rather those who are like the child, the little ones.

Jesus, whom they believed would reign as the Messiah, did not have authority to grant positions of leadership in His kingdom. Put in patron/client terminology from the Graeco-Roman culture, Jesus said He could not grant the wish of the two brothers because God the Father was the real 'patron' in this situation, and Jesus was the 'broker' representing the Father (Hutchison 2009:63). Both God the Father and God the Son participated in this plan, with each one having specific roles.

The brothers assured Jesus of their willingness to bear the costs of discipleship. Despite their assurance, Jesus declares that the rewards of glory are hidden in the

eternal purpose of God. Disciples are not to follow Jesus because of future rewards, but because they wish to be with Jesus wherever he leads (Burge & Hill 2012:1036).

### 3.2.3 Servant leadership means to be servant of all

οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος·

'But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister. And whosoever of you will be the greatest, shall be servant of all' (Mk 10:43-44).

Mark 10:43 and 44 is an excellent example of a synonymous parallelism (Donahue & Harrington 2002:313). Their structure is basically the same, with some minor variations for emphasis. While in the New Testament letters *diakonos* is often used to refer to a church official (deacon), here it carries the more basic sense of 'servant'. Jesus' ideal of a servant leader as *diakonos* also appears in Mark 9:35. The verb *diakonein* is also used in the context of serving others in Mark 1:13; 1:31; 10:35 and 14:47. The phrase 'slave of all' is deliberately paradoxical. A slave (*doulos*) usually belongs to one owner and does the bidding of that one owner. By recommending that His followers become the 'slave of all', Jesus underlines His ideal of universal service toward others.

Jesus is asking His disciples to be different from the worldly system of leadership. 'It shall not be so among you', in other words, the disciples should not lead like Gentile leaders. They should not lead by exercising authority or by exercising lordship over others. Jesus introduces another style different from what the disciples already know as the norm. In contrast, to exercising authority and exercising lordship, they should minister and serve others. Jesus repeats this teaching for the second time, because they did not understand Him the first time. In Mark 9:30-50 Jesus taught the disciples humility and servant-hood, but this teaching is disorientating for them as they already take leadership as authority and lordship.

When Jesus said it shall not be so among them, the natural expectation of society is reversed and leadership is characterised by service, by being under authority of

others instead of being in authority (France 2002:19). Leadership is not an ambition to occupy the highest rank within a recognised hierarchy, but to become like a slave and serve others. James and John and anyone who aspires to be a leader, must make an adjustment to what they already regard as leadership and become a servant of all.

James and John are looking for higher positions, and Jesus seems to offer them a lower position. The diaconate, however, is not the lowest order of ministry but the highest, and the first shall be slave of all; service is not merely in title but in attitude and deed, for this is the nature of the Son of Man Himself (Johnson 1971:180). Servant denotes a worshipper of God (Ps 34:22), or one called by God to a special service (Rom 1:1).

To be great means to be important or to occupy a high place. 'To be the servant of the rest' refers to a person who serves others. Being 'First' refers to the one who is most important or the leader and 'slave' refers to the one who occupies the lowest rank or status (Bratcher 1981:140). Therefore any leader who wants to occupy an important high position must first occupy the lowest position by serving others. In addition, the one who wants to be great and important shall be the servant of all. The leader that desires to be truly great and important needs to do well to all. Those who are most useful will not only be the most honoured later, but also the most honourable now (Henry 2010:1595).

The idea of a 'slave', a position of absolute inferiority in the ancient world, being 'first' was as paradoxical as the idea of a camel going through the eye of a needle (Mk 10:25). Disciples must practice service rather than authority because it is Jesus' posture: 'The Son of man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many' (Mk 10:45). Jesus calls disciples not to an ethical system but to 'the way of the Lord' (Mk 1:3), the very pattern of incarnation. Servant is preeminent because a world servant gives, and giving is the essence of God, who gave His Son for the sins of the world (Burge & Hill 2012:1036).

True discipleship is characterised by a costly pouring out of one's life for another. This might be an ageing parent, difficult spouse, special child, another member of

the Christian fellowship who has unusual needs, or any person whose situation elicits neighbourly service at personal cost (Williamson 1983:195). It is about prioritising others over oneself. This kind of leadership can happen at all level in society, from family to community service, from the church to the workplace or market place. The leader in this context does not only take care of his needs, but also the needs of other people around him. This is the leadership style of Jesus; He came to serve and to give His life for others. Anyone who contemplates following Jesus without fear and trembling has not understood true discipleship, because according to Mark, true discipleship comes through selfless service.

A servant of the servants of God is where leader and follower alike are held to obedience to defined doctrine; neither of them may act on his own autonomous will alone (Litzinger & Schaefer 1984:139). Leadership therefore endures so long as it assumes a posture of humility, a spirit of followership. It means every leader should be accountable to another leader above him. Every leader should be under authority in order to have authority. Hence Jesus always refers to the Father in heaven. He receives orders from Him. Anything He implements on earth is directly from the Father.

To be a servant involves several things: the loss of property, separation from roots, abuse by unkind owners, loss of individuality, and not having freedom to choose. Being a servant ultimately means to give up the right to be served and the right to be in charge. Giving up this right to be served is the freedom to serve others. Choosing the place and work of a slave removes every barrier that keeps people apart (Wilkes 1998:113).

Servant leader characteristics, according to Stubbs (1998:319), include the following:

- Service to the people is the keystone of the company's mission.
- Core values shape the culture and provide liberating support to associates.
- Value is placed on community service in the communities in which the corporation operates.
- The transformation is occurring in the context of a learning organisation.

- Value is placed on the initiatives of associates to continuously improve the system.
- Emphasis is placed on teamwork and alignment.
- Importance is placed on walking the talk.

Servant leaders associate with people in a way that helps them be as responsible as they can in doing their job. Their hierarchy can help set the direction, but effective servant leaders in the future, when it comes to implementation, will figuratively and literally turn the pyramid upside down and work side by side with their people in a supportive way. Their eventual goal is to help their people increase their skills to the point that they will be able to perform just as well when their leader is not there as when he or she is there. Servant leaders are attached to the people they work with. They believe in a team and cascading information to other people (Blanchard 1998:28).

Batten (1998:39) outlines the following principles that can help the leader to prepare for servant leadership:

- *Applied thought*: Servant leaders believe this is the most practical form of labour.
- *Generate enthusiasm*: Servant leaders do not look to others to charge their batteries, but take the necessary action to internalise perpetuating values, inspiration, and intellectual enrichment.
- *Not deterred by small people*: Servant leaders secure maximum participation from their key people and move resolutely toward the actual practice of management by integrity.
- *Build on strengths*: Although servant leaders recognise that they as well as all people have weaknesses, their primary concern is the strengths of the people.
- *High expectations*: Servant leaders stretch themselves and their people.
- *Goal-oriented*: Since a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, servant leaders know there must be a clear goal for the future.
- *Significance*: Servant leaders know people can truly live and grow only if they feel real, if they can experience faith, hope, love, and gratitude.

- *Team synergy*: This occurs when the effort of two or more people adds up to a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts.
- *Enrich lives of others*: Servant leaders are proud of their lives and seek to enrich the lives of others by the richness of their own.
- *Live integrity*: Servant leaders know that management by integrity is realistic and workable; that, in reality, there is no fit substitute for it.
- *Emphasise results, not activity*: Tough-minded servant leaders measure the performance of their team members by results, not activities.
- *Define their philosophies*: Servant leaders take steps to ensure that their organisations and families' philosophy, objectives, and standards are researched, developed, and clearly communicated.
- *Define results expected*: Servant leaders know that people are more efficient and happy when they understand clearly what results are expected.
- *Age of the mind*: Servant leaders define management or leadership as ever-changing.
- *Manage change*: Servant leaders require and encourage a climate conducive to innovation and creativity.
- *Relate compensation to performance*: Servant leaders believe that providing rewards solely for seniority, long hours, education, and old school ties denies the dignity and worth of the individual.
- *Understand people*: Servant leaders continually strive to attain a better understanding of people and their difference.
- *Need for respect*: Servant leaders realise that respect is primary.
- *Grace*: It is a special warmth felt and expressed toward all other human beings; an absence of pettiness and self-concern.
- *Tough-minded*: Servant leaders are flexible, pliant, lasting, durable, high quality and difficult to break.

The real secret of servant leadership: It is grounded in a deep and objective understanding of the human person (Bausch 1998:240). It creates an environment or culture that nurtures new meanings of work in large and small organisations. Servant leadership strives to enhance the dignity of each and every person, most importantly

the subordinates, impacted by the organisation. This growing dignity, in turn, releases the creativity necessary for sustainable success.

A servant leader does not simply serve, but makes followers independent and capable and desirous of serving other people. This kind of leadership is not a position and only needs moral authority. The spirit of servant leadership is the spirit of moral authority (Covey 2002:31). Servant leader becomes a model by serving other people. In other words, a position alone is not enough for a servant leader – it must be combined with character. That character is built on love-the fruit of the Holy Spirit; a servant leader serves from a base of love (Zohar 2002:120). This service is to do something beyond the given: a wish to make people happy and to serve future generations, inspired by a vision of the interconnectedness of existence.

Servant leadership is much more than a feel-good concept, it is more than ambition; it is an integrated way of serving all people involved within an organisation. In a way servant leadership is tenacious takes risks. It possesses a high degree of trust required to make the changes that will foster a servant-led organisation. Such an organisation excels and succeeds because of team effort not just an individual leader in his position (Ruschman 2002:139).

To practice servant leadership, one must do the following (see McGee-Cooper & Trammell 2002:150):

- Listen without judgement. A servant leader must listen to understand, for feelings and for facts.
- Be authentic. To admit mistakes openly and to be open and accountable to others for the role in the things that were not successful.
- Build community. To show appreciation for those who work with the leader.
- Share power. The team members should make contributions to decision-making or actions that the leader takes.
- Develop people. The servant leader should take time to develop others into higher levels of leadership.

According to Schuster (2002:345) servant leadership is sevenfold:

- It provides new measuring sticks of human effectiveness; service is raised above acquisition as a means of becoming fully human.
- It is holistic; it takes into account the great human questions of meaning and purpose.
- It is biased for people. Leaders get their power by showing service to their followers and to society.
- It is community-oriented. The idea of drawing legitimacy as a leader because the leader serves followers is the creation of community.
- It emphasises well-being over material riches.
- It is inclusive because anyone can work for the good. It is a leadership model based on greatness of Spirit.
- It generates connections and healing, and it goes against the cultural wounds of separateness and winning through competing over others.

The power of the concept of servant leadership remains embedded in one's ability to combine the best of being a leader with the best of being a servant. In the end, being a servant leader is not something you do, but rather something you are. It is about creating the right environment to get the best out of people and unleash their true potential. Servant leadership should not be interpreted as soft management, but as effectiveness (DeGraaf, Tilley & Neal 2004:164). To answer a call of servant leadership is a humbling experience. It is about a rediscovery of an individual and to connect with the highest aspirations of the organisation (Kim 2004:223).

There are four roles of servant leadership. The leader must first be a model of credibility, diligence, and the spirit of servant leadership. The second role of leadership is path finding, wherein a vision is discerned. The third role is that of alignment; unless you institutionalise your values, they will not happen. The fourth role is to empower people; the fruit of the three other roles (Walls 2004:130).

The idea of a leader as a servant is rooted in the far-reaching ideal that people have inherent worth, a dignity not only to be strived for, but beneath this striving a dignity irrevocably connected to the reality of being human. Philosophically, if one believes in the dignity of the person, the ideas of servant leadership and the experience of

leading or being led from a servant perspective not only makes sense; it contains the elegance, precision, and will power necessary for human development (Ferch 2004:226). A servant places value in people, not in tangible things or materials things. A servant leader is not interested in getting another position in order to despise and undermine followers but is interested in the development and well-being of the followers.

Burckhardt and Spears (2004:72) states the following as the characteristics that are considered central to the development of servant leader:

- *Listening*: Servant leaders reinforce communication and decision-making skills with a focus on listening intently and reflectively to others in order to identify and clarify the will of a group of people.
- *Empathy*: Servant leaders strive to understand and empathise with others.
- *Healing*: Learning how to heal difficult situations is a powerful force to transforming organisations.
- *Persuasion*: Servant leaders seek to convince others rather than to coerce compliance.
- *Awareness*: Awareness aids one in understanding issues involving ethics and values, and it enables one to approach situations from a more integrated, holistic position.
- *Foresight/vision*: It enables the servant leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequences of a decision for the future.
- *Conceptualisation*: Servant leaders seek to nurture their abilities to dream great dreams.
- *Commitment to the growth of people*: Servant leaders are deeply committed to the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of everyone within an organisation.
- *Stewardship*: Everyone has a responsibility to be a good steward within an organisation.
- *Building community/team*: Servant leaders seek to build a sense of community among those within an organisation.

Servant leadership has the potential for maximising empowerment participation because it supremely values the importance of each individual. Servant leadership is the antithesis of marginalisation (Echols 2006:107). Once again the qualities of servant leadership and transformational leadership stances have the potential for compensating for the weaknesses of each other. Greatness therefore is not the goal. Service is the goal, and greatness is defined by Christ in His lifelong exercise of servant-hood. For the life of Christ to be reproduced in the disciples, it must be through servant-hood (Elmer 2006:24).

Leadership and servant-hood are immensely compactable. Servant-hood is not weakness and it is not to make everyone happy. It is not a mindless assent to comprise in order to keep peace. Servant-hood is not artificial harmony and people pleasing (Ortberg 2009:134). Servant-hood means to be of use to others, to assist them in ways that are of good and their best. It is to provide for others, through goods or service or direction. Inherent in servant-hood is the deep belief that people are of ultimate value and that serving them is a great thing.

Service is willing, working, and doing in which a person acts not according to his own purposes or plans, but with a view to the purpose of another person and according to the need, disposition and direction of others (Augsburger 2009:101). It is an act whose freedom is limited and determined by the other's freedom. Service is an act whose glory becomes increasingly greater to the extent that the doer is not concerned about his own glory but about the glory of others.

Servant-hood does not avoid leadership. Instead, it is a different kind of leadership, one committed to meeting the needs of others. Similar to the first century slaves, true servant leaders give up their rights for the sake of others. True greatness and true leadership is achieved not by reducing men to one's service, but in giving oneself in selfless service to them (Hutchison 2009:69). The true spiritual leader is concerned infinitely more with the service he can render God and his fellow men than with the benefits and pleasures he can extract from life. He aims to put more into life than he takes out of it. A true servant leader is a Spirit-led leader.

True servants with a servant's heart make themselves available to serve and pay attention to needs of others. They do their best with what they have and with equal dedication. True servants are faithful to their ministry and maintain a low-profile (Tan 2009:78). Furthermore, they think more about others than themselves; they think like stewards, not owners, they think about their work, not what others are doing. True servants base their identity in Christ; and they think of ministry as an opportunity, not an obligation.

The servant leader is tough in love and in spirit. The servant leader is willing to walk that extra mile, give, and engage fully in the wellbeing of the organisation and followers. This will sometimes mean having to face the idea of loving the unlovable, and yet, for the servant leader, this concept is a misnomer, in that all people are worthy human beings, deserving of love and respect (Patterson 2010:76). This is much easier to say than to do, and yet the cup of the servant leader is full, full enough to reach for all with this love. The servant leader is willing to love, willing to show up with all of who they are, and willing to engage followers in all that they are: this is not easy. Consequently servant leadership is for the brave.

Contentment, grace and ease, gratitude and humour, love, wisdom, inspiration, forgiveness and appropriate power, all of these are the hallmarks of true personhood, true consciousness and true leadership (Ferch 2010:88). In addition, reaching more mature levels of thought and action requires willing submission, surrender and devotion to the quality of being true. In this sense to be willing, listen, and obey is not a burden but a heartfelt response to love. Thus, true leadership is love. Leaders at mature levels of consciousness love deeply, and are deeply loved. They are not easily hurt. Servant leaders have legitimate power, and they help others engage legitimate power.

Humility is a dimension of servant leadership. It is the ability to put one's own accomplishments and talents into proper perspective. Servant leaders dare to admit they can benefit from the expertise of others. An element of humility is the willingness to stand back, putting the interest of others first and facilitating their performance (Dierendonck & Rook 2010:159). It is also about modesty; a servant leader retreats into the background when the task has been successfully

accomplished. Together, humility and standing back help create a learning environment where mistakes are allowed. It fosters a social climate that encourages experimentation and creativity.

### **3.2.4 Summary**

Leadership is suffering, symbolised by cup and baptism. Do the sons of thunder really know what they are agreeing to when they consent to drink the cup of Jesus and be baptised with His baptism? This is ironic in the sense that both James and John died the death of a martyr. It seems that they latterly received what they asked for. Leadership is not positions of power or seats of glory; leadership is suffering for the sake of others. When one asks to sit on either the left side or the right side on the throne of the king, one must be ready to drink the 'cup and to be baptised with the same baptism of that king. In this context it is a readiness to partake with Jesus in His persecution and tribulations.

Leadership is not self-appointed; the position of leadership is granted by God the Father. Jesus steps out of divinity and trinity to confine the appointment of leadership positions in the kingdom to only God the Father and to whom it is prepared. Once again the humility and obedience of Jesus is proved by the fact that He does not want to be equated with the Father. In doing so He also does not want James and John to take advantage of their kinship with Him and think that positions are for sale. A servant leader does not appoint himself or ask for position, but waits on God for a position to come.

Leadership is servant-hood because the one who wants to lead must be ready to serve and the one who wants to be first must serve the rest of the followers. Jesus says that a desire for a leadership position is not wrong as long as it is accompanied by service. A desire to be given preferential treatment should be accompanied by a desire to serve subordinates. This is the core of a servant leadership: it is built on service. Servant leaders are those who combine leadership with servant-hood, because without service leadership becomes lordship and dictatorship. Jesus reverses the common and traditional style of leadership and introduces servant-hood to His disciples. If you follow Jesus you must be ready to submit to His authority in order to have authority or position.

### 3.3 SON OF MAN: A GREAT ROLE MODEL

Jesus as the Son of Man does not only teach servant leadership, but demonstrates it to his disciples (Donahue & Harrington 2002:313). He demonstrates servant leadership by becoming a suffering servant, a ministering servant and a life giving servant: 'For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many' (Mk 10:45). Jesus becomes an epitome of servant leadership in that He is the best example of His own ideal of servant leadership.

#### 3.3.1 Jesus as a minister and a servant of all

καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι

'For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister' (Mk 10:45a)

Mark 10:45a suggests that James and John had no other alternative but to lead the same way that Jesus leads. If Jesus as their Master came to serve, how can they as disciples come to be lords and men of authority? Second, it shows that Jesus leads by example: He does not teach what He does not practice. What He requests His disciples to do, that is, to serve others, He does. He came to serve the whole world.

The Son of Man, the Messiah in His humiliation, did not come into the world to be ministered unto, waited upon or personally to be served by others, but to minister, serve or wait on others (Alexander 1960:293). This was true in the whole course of His public life. Most emphatically, true of the great sacrifice He made that was to end His life. Although it was the great end of His mission and His incarnation, yet He did not boast about it.

The reversal of all human ideas of greatness and rank was achieved when Jesus came not to be served, but to serve (William 1974:383). He voluntarily veiled His glory as the Son of Man (Mk 8:38; 13:26; 14:62) and assumed the form of a slave who performed His service unto death because this was the will of God (Phil 2:6-8).

In Mark 10:45, the death of Jesus is presented as His service to God and as a vicarious death for the remission of sins.

The formulation 'the Son of Man came', places the entire statement in the context of Jesus' messianic mission (Mk 2:17). The service in which the royal will of the Son of Man is displayed and fulfilled in His giving of Himself. In a Jewish frame of reference this expression was characteristically used for the death of martyrs (*1 Macc* 2:50; 6:44). In this context it expresses the element of voluntariness or self-sacrifice in the death of Jesus who offers Himself in obedience to the will of God. His death has infinite value because He dies not as a mere martyr but as the transcendent Son of Man.

This is the character of His life, the Son of Man ministers to the sons of men (Burn 1974:387). He restores health, brings back the dead, speaks and there is great calmness. Then after a hard day's ministering He awakes up a great while before day to pray for strength to minister more. It was an act of His free choice. He came to minister and He ministers still.

He came as a self-emptied One. Jesus had no ambition for Himself, there was no carefulness as to His own well-being. He came not to be ministered to, not to compel men to gather about Him, to serve Him, and lift Him, and honour Him; not to secure His own immunity from suffering or sorrow, or to make sure of His own joy and His own pleasure (Morgan 1985:243). He came 'to serve'. He was God-centred and kingdom minded. When He said that He came not to be ministered unto but to minister, He did not refer to the fact that He came to serve men, but that He came to serve God.

The word 'slave' graphically describes what it meant for Jesus to pour out Himself. Slavery in the Roman Empire meant the extreme deprivation of rights. A slave was a piece of property to be bought and sold. Slavery denied a person the right to anything, even his own life. Unlike other people, a slave had no inherent rights. Jesus was like a slave in that he stripped Himself of all rights and security (Macleod 2001:320). It emphasises that Jesus entered the stream of human life as a slave, a person without advantage, with no rights or privileges of His own; the express

purpose was placing Himself completely at the service of all humankind. Jesus pouring out of Himself involved the surrender of His position in heaven. He left his Father's throne above, gave up His riches and left behind the glories of heaven.

The context does not denote a particular role, but rather the paradoxically subordinate status of the one who should have enjoyed the service of others. It does not specify the form of service, but rather adds a further and yet more shocking example of the self-sacrificing attitude which He in turn enjoins on His followers (France 2002:420).

Jesus became human for humanity's sake: Jesus became a servant to set humanity free; salvation is possible only because Jesus became human. Jesus' humanity moulds and shapes our humanity; His humanity makes Him approachable to us. He went through a time of suffering; therefore we are able to overcome the suffering of our sinful desires (Matz 2004:283). Jesus still intercedes for humanity today because of His union with humanity. The reason He was incarnated was that He was to be part of the world. He was going to save and without Him there is no salvation. Hence He bears the title, 'Son of Man'.

Jesus radicalised the notion of servant leadership with the ultimate act of self-sacrifice. The ritualisation of Jesus' radical message of service and self-sacrifice in leading takes the form of a ritualised dinner in which companions re-enact the death of Jesus (Bekker 2010:64). The servant leadership of Jesus of Nazareth, culminating in his atoning and self-sacrificial death, has been the central focus to find an effective and moral model for leadership.

Wilkes (1998:12) lists seven servant leadership principles that Jesus illustrated while on earth:

- Jesus humbled Himself and allowed God to exalt Him.
- Jesus followed His Father's will rather than seeking a position.
- Jesus defined greatness as being a servant and being first by becoming a slave.
- Jesus risked serving others because He trusted that He was God's son.

- Jesus left His place at the head of the table to serve the needs of others.
- Jesus shared responsibility and authority with those He called to lead.
- Jesus built a team to carry out a worldwide vision.

### 3.3.2 Jesus as life giver

ἀλλ ἃ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

‘[A]nd to give his life a ransom for many’ (Mk 10:45b).

Ransom refers to that which one is set free, and particularly, the price paid to redeem (buy back again) a slave or captive out of bondage (Alexander 1960:294). This was the purchase which the Son of Man had come to make by the payment of Himself, His very soul or life, as a satisfaction to the divine justice.

‘To give His life’ cannot be rendered literally. The meaning here is ‘to die’, but the implication is that He surrenders himself to death rather than being forced by others. A ransom means to pay for something. The implication in the text means that by His payment many were released (Bratcher & Nida 1961:332). This ransom price metaphor was one greatly beloved by the early church. It remains a strong statement of the purpose and efficacy of the atonement, and of its cost to God (Cole 1961:171).

The image of ransom shows that the idea of the martyr deaths of the righteous being accepted as compensation for the sins of the people was by no means unfamiliar at that time (Nineham 1963:281).

The ransom metaphor sums up the purpose for which Jesus gave His life and defines the complete expression of His service. The prevailing notion behind the metaphor is that of deliverance by purchase, whether a prisoner of war, a slave, or a forfeited life is the object to be delivered. The idea of equivalence, or substitution became an integral element in the vocabulary of redemption in the Old Testament because it was proper to the concept of a ransom (William 1974:383).

It speaks of liberation which connotes servitude or an imprisonment from which man cannot free himself. In the context of Mark 10:45a, with its reference to the service of

the Son of Man, it is appropriate to find an allusion to the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53, who vicariously and voluntarily suffered and gave His life for the sins of others. The specific thought underlying the reference to the ransom is expressed in Isaiah 53:10, which speaks of 'making His life an offering for sin'. Jesus, as the messianic Servant, offers himself as a guilt-offering in compensation for the sins of the people. The release affected by this offering overcomes man's alienation from God, his subjection to death, and his bondage to sin. Jesus' service is offered to God to release men from their indebtedness to God.

The statement 'Christ's life the ransom for many' has at least five implied meanings: First, life is forfeit. Second, sin so great an evil that even God cannot, without sacrifice, free people from it. Third, freedom without penalty or atonement would make people indifferent to doing wrong. Fourth, in love to man God punishes sin. Last, Christ shares that punishment to save people thoroughly from sin (Burn 1974:387).

The Son of Man came to give His life as a redemptive price for the freedom of slaves (Sanner 1979:362). The word 'for' literally means 'instead of' or 'in place of', which points to the element of substitution essential to biblical understanding of atonement. This shows clearly how Jesus knew himself called to fuse in His own destiny the two roles of the Son of Man and the Servant of the Lord.

Jesus' love in His death and its uniqueness has a redemptive significance (Best 1981:127). In this context no one other than Jesus can give his life as a ransom for others. For Mark, Christianity is not the imitation of Jesus. If it was, the theme would have appeared more often. For Mark the main theme is redemption through Christ, and it is only on the basis of this redemption that imitation becomes possible. 'Ransom' as a word comes from a world in which it was possible to buy freedom of prisoners of war, slaves, or condemned criminals (Williamson 1983:190). The sum paid was called a 'ransom', a term used here (and parallel to Mt 20:28) in the New Testament. The act of setting a person free in this way was called 'redemption'. The person accomplishing the liberation was called a 'redeemer'.

'To give His life' means that Jesus died voluntarily. A ransom refers to the price paid to release someone (Bratcher 1981:140). The question then is, 'to whom is the price paid?'. He gives His life as a 'ransom' for 'many', but what about the rest? The Son of Man's giving of life in ransom for the many is an act of service that contrasts sharply with the exploitive use of power and authority that characterises the 'great ones' of the Gentiles who 'lord it over' those they rule (Senior 1983:33). Greatness for the disciples consists of giving life not in snatching it or exploiting it.

Behind the great and gracious word 'to give His life as a ransom for many' lurks around the dark shadows of slavery, oppression, and tyranny, all the things that blight and blast humanity (Morgan 1985:242). The Son of Man came to give His life as a ransom for many. As a result, the Son of Man came to mediate between man and God.

If ransom were here understood to be a sacrifice of substitute, then it would mean 'instead of'. It is important not to read back into this saying idea which belongs to later centuries. If the noun has the more general meaning of 'redemption', as suggested above, the preposition will mean 'for the sake of' or 'on behalf of'. In some mysterious way, which is not spelt out, the suffering of one man is used by God to bring benefit others. His death is said to benefit 'many'. The word 'many' suggests exclusion, which is, 'many but not all'. In Semitic thought the emphasis is more likely to be inclusive: the contrast is not between the many who are saved and others who are not, but between the many and the one who acts on their behalf (Hooker 1991:249).

Ransom was a familiar image in Jewish, Roman and Greek cultures. It was the price paid to liberate a slave, a prisoner of war, or a condemned person. The paying of the price cleaned the slate. To set a person free like this was known as redemption (English 1992:182). Jesus's action in setting people free is described as 'redemption'. There is no benefit in asking to whom the ransom price was paid: this is not the point of the image. Its single purpose is to make clear that Christ, the Son of God and Son of Man was Himself the price paid to liberate the people. At the source of all Christian service in the world is the crucified and risen Lord who died to liberate everyone into such service.

The use of the word 'many' does not mean that Jesus died only for some people, not for all; it stresses rather the great number of those ransomed by His death (Carson *et al.* 1994:967). This is one of the few places in Mark where the way in which Jesus' death saves people is explained. Mark is far more interested in the fact that Jesus saves people rather than the way in which it does. Ransom is one of the many pictures by which salvation is explained in the New Testament. It means the buying back of people from slavery or prison or death by paying a price. In this context the price was to be the death of Jesus.

Jesus asks of those who follow Him is nothing less than what He Himself did. He came to serve and 'to give His life as a ransom for many'. This refers to the significance of the death of Jesus, and it is an important text of atonement (Thurston 2002:117). The word 'life' in this context refers to 'His complete life'. The word is used variously to mean earthly life itself (Mk 8:35), the inner life of a person, his or her feelings and emotions (Mk 12:30), and the life that transcends earthly existence (Mk 8:36, 37). The idea is that Jesus came to give the entire essence of His being as the 'ransom for many'. Ransom means 'price of release' or 'what is given to gain release'. In Greek documents at the time of the New Testament, the word appears in the context of money paid for the release or manumission of slaves.

Ransom refers to the price for releasing a captive or for a slave to buy his or her freedom (Donahue & Harrington 2002:313). In addition a ransom was used mainly for a payment to secure release, whether from slavery or from capture. It was traditionally used to refer to God's redemption of His people, not only from slavery in Egypt, but also from spiritual oppression and for payment to preserve a life which is legally forfeit or subject to divine punishment (France 2002).

### **3.3.3 Summary**

The Son of Man leads by example. He does not lead by requesting for a position on a heavenly throne. He does not lead by competition or even lording over others, but serving others. The Son of Man is a suffering servant who does not ask to be served, but voluntarily serves His followers. He stepped down from divinity to humanity in

humility without compulsion. He was found in a fashion as a man and He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death even the death on the cross (Phil 2:8).

He illustrated humility by serving those who were called to serve with Him. He formed a team of disciples in the beginning of His ministry. He shared responsibilities with the team while on earth and empowered the team to take over when He ascended to heaven. As the main leader, He believed that His disciples can do great works or even greater works than what He has achieved (Jn 14:12). This shows that as the leader He was not intimidated by His followers.

He also illustrated humility and service by washing the feet of His disciples, including the feet of the one who was going to deny Him and betray Him (Jn 13:12). Jesus did the same when He served the Eucharistic bread and wine; He overlooked the weaknesses of His disciples. The climax of His servant-hood is His crucifixion, death and resurrection.

The Son of Man is the giver of life in the form of a price for many in the world. He lays down His life, no one takes it from Him (Jn 10:18). He does not only give His life, but He is ready to pay the price by His life. The blood of Jesus was that price for the release of those who are enslaved by sin. Thus, the life, crucifixion, death and resurrection of Jesus are a gift for fallen humanity.

Servant leaders need to lead the same way Jesus led. It means ambition should follow service to others. The servant leader should not run after positions but be ready to suffer for the sake of others. A servant leader is the one who builds a team, shares responsibilities with the team and empowers that team to do more even in the absence of the leader. A servant leader leaves a legacy of service.

## Chapter 4

# Historical background of African Pentecostal Christianity

### 4.1 THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE WORLDWIDE PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT

#### 4.1.1 The distinctive features of the worldwide Pentecostal movement

The Pentecostal Movement has unique and distinct features in comparison to other movements such as the Reformation, ecumenical and holiness movements. These features inform the basic doctrine of the Pentecostal Movement. A description of the features of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement will assist in tracing the history and the type of leadership found with African Pentecostal Christianity. African Pentecostal Christianity owes its origin to the world wide Pentecostal Movement.

The main teaching or the doctrine of a Pentecostal Movement is summarised in five fundamental teachings:

- The promise of the Father that says all believers should earnestly seek the promise of the Father and the baptism of the Holy Spirit.
- Miraculous gifts, with baptism from the Holy Spirit, comes the bestowing of gifts.
- The evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit, the initial physical sign of speaking in tongues.
- Entire sanctification, a life of holiness without which one cannot see the Lord.
- Divine healing, Christ died for sickness and sins (Aldrich 1951:1).

Pentecostals are founded on justification, baptism, sanctification, salvation and baptism in the Holy Spirit (McDonnel 1966:609). The common denominator of true Pentecostals is baptism in the Holy Spirit, with the 'initial sign' of speaking in tongues.

These features have been consistent in the movement over time as Horn (1989:70) outlines that the traditional doctrines of the Pentecostal Movement are baptism in the

Spirit, the gifts of the Spirit, salvation sanctification, divine healing and the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. Khathide (2010:62) echoes this sentiment that the major five teaching of the Pentecostal Movement are:

- (1) Justification by faith.
- (2) Sanctification as a definite work of grace.
- (3) Baptism in the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues.
- (4) Divine healing 'as in atonement'.
- (5) The personal pre-millennial rapture of the saints at the second coming of Christ.

The distinct features of a Pentecostal Movement are:

- (1) Affirmation of the possibility of a personal experience of God discussed in terms of a 'new birth' under the agency of the Holy Spirit.
- (2) Insistence that Christian religious experiences are to influence the manner in which one lives, often discussed in terms of 'sanctification'.
- (3) The necessity of cohesive Christian community for edification of believers and for making a common cause to reform the world.
- (4) A concern with having theological formulations to guide the process of salvation.
- (5) A vision for mission as central to their identity (Bundy 1999:299).

This is the message of the full gospel that Pentecostalism originated in the body as much as the spirit. The 'full gospel' promised renewed health along with saved souls. The embryonic ethos of the 'full gospel' valued the human embodiment of divine initiative (Baer 2001:735). Glossolalia and other ecstatic manifestations authenticated God's presence and power, reflecting the reality of the Holy Spirit within believers. It was the materiality of the culture that gave rise to Pentecostalism which also received its fullest expression in 'divine healing'.

Indeed the Pentecostal Movement emphasises personal salvation-the belief that forgiveness follows an act of repentance in the light of God's grace (Machingura 2011:18). It is an emphasis on sanctification that stresses the necessity to live a holy life as a second work of grace. An emphasis on the filling of the Holy Spirit results in speaking in tongues as an experience subsequent to conversion. It is also seen as a sign of the revelation of the character, power of Christ in the believer and belief in the

immanent second coming of Christ. Finally it lays emphasis on divine healing and tithing.

The above view highlighted features concentrate on the five-fold distinct features of the Pentecostal Movement. Scholars agree that the encompassing features of the Pentecostal Movement are salvation, baptism of the Holy Spirit, sanctification, divine healing, and the second coming of Christ.

A second view is a scholarly inquiry that only pinpoints four-fold distinct features of the Pentecostal Movement. One such a scholar is Hart (1978:254), who says that Pentecostals preach a full gospel of:

- (1) Salvation.
- (2) Holy Spirit baptism with speaking in tongues.
- (3) Healing.
- (4) The second coming of Christ (see also Dayton 1980:4).

Pentecostalism has understood itself to proclaim a 'full gospel'. The elements of this 'full gospel' are four fundamental teachings: salvation through the Lord Jesus Christ, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, divine healing, and the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The third view, supported by scholars such as Smylie (1979:39), reduces the features to three. The Apostolic Faith Church, which grew out of Seymour's revival at Azusa, represents a three-stage Pentecostalism: work of God's grace in justification brings the remission of sins, work of God's grace in sanctification brings holiness and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. This baptism is confirmed by the evidence of speaking in tongues. Del (1997:86) agrees that the Pentecostal experience is intrinsically Trinitarian in structure. Through the pneumatic effusion of Spirit baptism, a Christian is empowered with the Holy Spirit in the mission of Jesus Christ for the glory of God the Father.

Pentecostalism, born in American revivalism and the Holiness Movement, came to accent a series of crisis experiences with God which included conversion, holiness, and Spirit baptism (Macchia 1996:34). Of course, Pentecostalism has been divided

throughout most of its history over the issue of the crisis nature of sanctification. Pentecostals believed that the urgency of the moment in the light of the soon-coming Parousia of Christ called forth very dramatic experiences of holiness for gifted witness.

The fourth view is the one that is based on two-fold feature. Pomerville (1982:13) opines that if salvation and the work of Jesus Christ were the dominant themes of the Reformation movement that produced Protestant denominations, then sanctification and the work of the Holy Spirit are significant themes in the movements that resulted in the formation of holiness and Pentecostal churches. Jones (1999:253) concurs with the view that says that Pentecost was the teaching of the Holiness Church which taught that entire sanctification and the endowment of power received by the disciples on the Day of Pentecost are one. In simple terms, believers were cleansed, from inner sin, baptised with the Holy Spirit, and empowered for effective Christian service.

Finally, although Pentecostalism has other characteristics such as faith healing, spirited music, certain theologies and a particular kind of piety, speaking in tongues is the movement's most distinctive feature (Beckmann 1974:11). The essence of Pentecostalism is the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit, especially the gift of speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit (Hocken 1976:83). In addition the Pentecostal Movement refers to that radical expression of Christianity which emphasises ecstatic speech in an unknown tongue as proof of the presence of the Holy Spirit (Tinney 1976:34). This Pentecostal experience, although not a new phenomenon, has attracted the attention of the world. Pentecostalism ultimately became the fastest growing stream of Christianity in both the United States and the rest of the world.

A characteristic of the Pentecostal Movement is an emphasis on charismata, above all, speaking in tongues (Holm 1991:136). Those who were influenced by the movement and the ones who began speaking in tongues normally joined a Pentecostal congregation. All Pentecostal churches throughout the world attach great importance to the 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' (Anderson 1993:114). The common ground among Pentecostals was that an authentic baptism of the Spirit was

accompanied by a God-given sign of speaking in tongues (Randall 1997:64). Pentecostals were committed to a more explicitly supernatural form of baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore the Pentecostal Movement teaches the gift of speaking in tongues as the initial and necessary evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit (Roy 2000:120). In this teaching a good starting point may be the central place given to the presence of the Holy Spirit, as experienced by the gifts of healing, speaking in tongues and prophecy; all of which have the human body as their locus (Droogers 2001:45). Pentecostal Movement is seen as the form of Christianity where believers receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit and have ecstatic experiences such as speaking in tongues, healing and prophecy (Robbins 2004:117). This teaching and the experience of Spirit baptism has expanded the Pentecostal Movement from the United States to other regions (Onyinah 2004:218).

Pentecostal Movement is built on the manifestation of spiritual gifts and purity (Fatokun 2005:159). The experience of Pentecostal spirituality is a hallmark of Pentecostalism. The Holy Spirit is personally and powerfully present to orchestrate the continuing redemptive ministry of Jesus Christ to the uttermost parts of the earth (Klaus 2007:41).

The gift of the Holy Spirit was the bedrock upon which the Christian church was founded according to Acts 2. For this reason, the Pentecostals strongly believe that the experience of the Spirit which occurred on the day of the founding of the church is meant to be normative in the life of the church and of believers, irrespective of race, language and culture. Andersson (2014:113) adds that the Pentecostal Movement, at least in its beginning, had a particular experience at its centre: baptism in the Spirit. It is also a movement of restoration that aspires to restore biblical Christianity.

While the baptism in the Spirit will obviously forms part of the doctrine of the Pentecostal Movement, it does not constitute the totality of the structures and culture of the movement. It is just a part of what the whole Pentecostal Movement is built

upon (Clifton 2007:216). As time progressed the movement shifted to a more systemised and formal doctrine (Johnston 1984:55).

The systemised doctrine according to Johnston (1984:55) refers to other features like salvation, sanctification, divine healing and the second coming of Christ other than 'speaking in tongues'. Thus it is true that Pentecostalism began with an emphasis on Christian experience. This was seen as being consistent with biblical truth. As Pentecostalism flourished, both within its historic denominations and wider Protestantism and Catholicism through the charismatic renewal movement, Pentecostals recognised the need for a more biblical doctrine.

Pentecostal Movement is God-centred; all things relate to God. This fusion of God with the phenomenological does not plummet God into creation. Instead, it is a predisposition to see the transcendent God at work in, with, through, above, and beyond all events. It is holistic; Pentecostalism has historically subscribed to a dispensation that emphasises a progressive unfolding of revelation and an interrelation of the ages (Johns 1995:88).

There are five key aspects of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement which resonate with African spirituality.

- Pentecostal spirituality is oral.
- It does not dichotomise the material and the spiritual.
- It is the affective epistemology which privileges an affective mode of knowing.
- God continues to work in the church through supernatural means.
- Pentecostalism prioritises hope and enables Pentecostals to maintain a tension between the 'now' and 'not yet' and to imagine the world otherwise (Nkurunziza 2013:61).

These Pentecostal features, show that Pentecostalism as a world-wide movement originated within an African community or society facilitated by an African leader.

There are also five implicit Pentecostal values which direct the Pentecostal mission efforts and spirituality:

- (1) A strong emphasis on their personal religious experience.
- (2) A preference for oral communication.
- (3) Spontaneity in their conduct and in corporate worship.
- (4) A strong belief in the spiritual and supernatural.
- (5) A strong belief in biblical authority (Esqueda 2013:33).

It can be concluded that the Pentecostal Movement believes that after salvation a person should be baptised in the Holy Spirit. The baptism of the Holy Spirit will be followed by the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The gift of speaking in tongues, although not the only evidence, is the initial evidence that one has been baptised in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit baptised person will live a holy life. This holy life overcomes sin and sickness with divine healing, and is patiently waiting for the second coming of Jesus. As such, the gospel of the world wide Pentecostal Movement is a full gospel.

#### **4.1.2 The Founding father of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement**

Now that the main features of the world wide movement have been discussed, the next task is to determine the founder or the leader of the movement. There are four possibilities for this quest. The first possibility rejects a human contribution and only acknowledges God or the supernatural as founder of the movement. The second possibility is that the movement was founded by Charles Parham. The third possibility is that both Charles Parham and William Seymour are the founders of the Pentecostal Movement. Finally, there is also a possibility that the founder was an African American-William Seymour.

There are several divergent points of view concerning the origin and founding of the Pentecostal Holiness Movement. The first strand of thought suggests that twentieth century Pentecostalism began during the turn of the century under the leadership of Charles Fox Parham. The second strand of thought suggests that the modern Pentecostal Movement had no single founder; it was interracial in its founding with an emphasis on Parham and the Topeka Bible School events of 1901 and W.J Seymour in the Los Angeles Azusa Street Revival of 1906. The third strand of thought suggests that the Pentecostal Movement of the twentieth century was primarily Afro-American in origin under the leadership of W.J Seymour in Los Angeles in 1906. The fourth strand suggests that Pentecostalism came suddenly

from heaven to a converted livery stable in the ghetto and was exclusively initiated by the Holy Spirit (see Lovett 1972:36).

There are other Pentecostal centres that emerged more or less spontaneously in the rest of the world (Case 2006:126). Various revivals such as the revival in Wales in 1904 to 1905, the Korean 'Pentecost' of 1907, the Mukti revival in India in 1905 to 1907, the Hebden revival in Toronto in 1906 to 1907, and the emergence of Pentecostalism out of the Methodist Church in Chile in 1910. Each revival produced centres of Pentecostal activity (Robeck 2007:76). These radical revivals, which could be found on six continents, marked the birth of world Pentecostalism.

The focus here is on the origin of the Pentecostal Worldwide Movement and its impact on African Pentecostal Christianity. Therefore, the possibilities suggested by Lovett become the focal point in this context. The four major possibilities of the origin of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement are:

- The possibility that the emergence of Pentecostalism cannot be linked to any specific place or person but the sovereign God.
- Charles F Parham and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Topeka, Kansas in January 1901.
- The interracial origin that recognises both Charles F Parham and William Seymour as founders.
- William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival that took place in Los Angeles, California between April 1906 and the end of 1909.

#### **4.1.2.1 Arguments that support a supernaturally originated movement without any human leader**

A supernaturally originated movement suggests that the God-head is the founder. The view dismisses other possibilities and probabilities of a human leader or a founder. This is a strand that removes a human element and contribution to the supernatural. In this context, it means that the modern day Pentecostal Movement's origin and foundation has nothing to do with humans. It can also mean that although humans made a valuable contribution they cannot make such a claim.

One extremely significant feature of the Pentecostal Movement that distinguished it in a striking way from other movements is its supernatural origin (Gee 1949:3). The Pentecostal Movement does not owe its origin to any outstanding personality or religious leader, but was a spontaneous revival appearing almost simultaneously in different and various parts of the world.

The supernatural origin does not only dismiss the human element, but also the place or location of origin. No particular location can be called the birthplace of the Pentecostal Movement. God, after all, can move from one place to another and cannot be limited to one particular place. McClung (1986:160) points out that the Pentecostal explosion at the advent of the twentieth century was not an isolated event. Although Azusa Street seemed to be a focal point, especially from 1906 to 1908, the movement cannot be said to have been centred in any one place.

Moreover, as the Pentecostal Movement spread throughout the United States, the importance of both Azusa Street and Los Angeles decreased. In addition, no particular personality can be said to be the originator of the movement. The originator of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement is the Holy Spirit Himself as He was already at work in the first century church.

The falling and fallen cannot be linked to such a great movement from God in human history. This view is most probably because Parham 'fell into an awful sin' and was indicted by the civil authorities in Texas (Lapoorta 1996:28). Seymour's blackness on the one hand, and Parham's awful sin on the other, were the reasons for these proponents making acrobatic jumps across history ending up with a supernatural origin to which no human receives any credit. In other words, because there was no one eligible for this position, it reverted back to God and His divinity.

Pentecostalism has been a global endeavour right from its beginning. No country or place can claim the origin of Pentecostalism. It is only that many Pentecostal and charismatic churches in Africa, Asia, and Latin America display quite a strong White North American evangelical flavour. They source in the huge missionary activities undertaken by Pentecostals from the United States. Although, Theological statements of faith are copied from American Pentecostal originals, vernacular

theological literature is translated from American sources, and in many cases worship service and style are shaped by American cultural patterns. An impression has been given that being Pentecostal, wherever it might be, means practising an American Pentecostal style of spiritual life. Pentecostalism is a global phenomenon (see Bergunder 2007:69).

In what is probably still the most wide-spread historical interpretation of Pentecostalism, the origin of the movement is attributed to supernatural influences (Ware 2008:119). Pentecostalism is viewed as the result of God's agency, providently at work to ignite a revival of the church at what is thought to be the end of the world. The Pentecostal Movement is God's miraculous intervention in human affairs.

This view is short-sighted; it may also be concluded that everything else was originated by God because the natural cannot claim the supernatural. This view is supported because the natural is both fallible and vulnerable. In contrast, God uses humankind in all its weakness and sin to do great things. William Seymour cannot be dismissed because of his blackness or Charles Parham because of his sins. This study does not support this view because from the beginning God chose to work with humankind to change humankind. In a similar way as in the early church, God used Peter and the other apostles to usher many to a Pentecostal experience. Although they cannot claim originality, they did make a valuable contribution that deserves recognition.

#### **4.1.2.2 Arguments that support Parham as the founder of this movement**

Charles Parham is known for his acquaintance with the Holiness Movement of John Wesley and the message of 'divine healing' propagated by John Alexander Dowie. He is also known for pioneering a Bible school where he taught that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence that one has been baptised in the Holy Spirit.

Charles Fox Parham was born on June 4, 1873, in Muscatine, Iowa. He was associated with the Congregational Church as a lay preacher. Parham joined the Methodists, before joining the fast growing Holiness Movement. He was trained as a minister at South-Western Methodist Episcopal College at Winfield, Kansas. Parham

was well remembered as the founder of the Topeka Bible School and the Divine Healing Home in Kansas. He was very influenced by the healing ministry of Dowie, and by the fact that he personally experienced divine healing when he was completely healed after being crippled (Lapoorta 1996:25).

The most likely candidate for nomination as father of the modern Pentecostal Movement is Charles Fox Parham. According to Menzies (1990:29), following a summer tour of holiness-oriented groups in the eastern United States, he became convinced that tongues was the biblical 'sign' of Spirit baptism. He opened an informal Bible school, and during the fall months of 1900 urged students to search the scriptures for biblical teaching regarding this experience. On January 1, 1901, one of his students, Agnes Ozman, received a blessing. Within days Parham, along with many of the students, reported the same experience. By 1906 Parham, with more than eight thousand followers, was the principal leader of the Pentecostal Movement in the Midwest.

Parham is the founder of the Pentecostal Movement because he first formulated the new religion's defining theological tenet. He preached tongues as the initial evidence of Holy Spirit baptism. It was also because he first preached a Pentecostal full gospel message, which included the themes of conversion, sanctification, Holy Spirit baptism, divine healing from all sickness and the premillennial rapture of the saints (Cerillo 1993:79). These themes appealed to the social and spiritual needs of the intellectually alienated, socially dislocated, physically and psychologically hurting, politically powerless and economically struggling poor and working-class people

In the United States the person usually looked upon as the founder of American Pentecostalism was a Methodist preacher named Charles Parham. Feeling a lack of power in his own life, Parham established a Bible school with students at an odd-looking house in Topeka, Kansas (Williams 1974:52). They studied independently and finally concluded as a group that the distinguishing mark of early Christians was an empowerment of the Holy Spirit and that the initial sign of true conversion was 'tongues'.

In January of 1901, Parham preached at a church in Topeka. Liardon (1996:108) explains that Parham, was telling the people of the wonderful experiences that were happening at Stone's Folly. He told them that he believed he would soon speak in tongues. That night after returning home from the meeting, he was met by one of the students who led him into the Prayer Room. When he stepped inside, he was amazed at the sight of twelve denominational ministers. They were sitting, kneeling, and standing with hands raised, and they were all speaking in tongues. Some were trembling under the power of God. An elderly lady approached Parham, to relate how moments before he had entered the room, 'tongues of fire' sat upon their heads.

Although Charles F. Parham is supported as the theological founder of Pentecostalism, his student, William J. Seymour, led the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles in 1906 which sparked a worldwide spread. Parham formulated the basic teaching of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and taught it in his Bible school. William Seymour caught that message and implemented it in Los Angeles and from there it spread to other regions of the world (Baer 2001:754). The Pentecostal Movement originated in 1900 in Topeka, Kansas and gained worldwide influence after the Los Angeles Azusa Street Revival in 1906 (Fiedler 1994:26).

Parham was simply one of the members of the Holiness Movement at the turn of the century. He was influenced by Wesley, and searching for something more in his relationship with the Lord (Burger & Nel 2008:18). It would not be fair to call him the father of the Pentecostal Movement. Although he was the first person to formulate the basic Pentecostal dogma and played an important part in spreading the message, his students were the ones who had studied the Bible and prayed for the fulfilment of the promise of Pentecost.

Pentecostalism was born from the ferment of holiness efforts to work out a stable form of frankly supernatural and experientially robust Christianity around the notion of the second blessing of the Spirit. Its primary innovation was to see speaking in tongues as the necessary 'initial physical evidence' of Spirit baptism. Credit for this innovation belongs to Charles Parham, a holiness preacher who made it a central teaching from 1900 onwards (Robbins 2004:120). The Pentecostal Movement is commonly believed to have begun during the first days of 1901 among believers at

Bethel Bible School at Topeka, Kansas, in the United States of America, who sought baptism in the Holy Spirit accompanied by speaking in tongues similar to instances recorded in Acts. The acclaimed founder of the modern day Pentecostal Movement was Charles Parham (1873-1929), a holiness preacher and former Methodist pastor (Fatokun 2005:160).

Pentecostalism had its humble beginnings in a small Bible College in Topeka, Kansas, where a female student first spoke in tongues on January 1, 1901 (McClymond 2007:275). The person who initiated the paradigm shift was Charles Parham. He appears to have been the channel through which all emerging ideas of the nineteenth century flowed. He took part in camp meetings with their emphasis on holiness and entire sanctification. In this sense he came through the Holiness Movement. His main emphasis was healing. He visited centres of healing established by John Alexander Dowie and A.B Simpson. After his tour ended, Parham returned to his Bible school in Topeka, Kansas with renewed zeal (Letson 2007:114).

Charles Parham is one of the most enigmatic yet important figures in early Pentecostalism. Parham unabashedly advocated what could be called 'eschatological inclusivism'. For Parham commitment to the absolute uniqueness and necessity of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour complemented openness to a possibility of divine reality and redemption in extra-Christian religions consummated in the *eschaton* by Christ (Richie 2007:138). It means that Charles Parham's preaching was not only grounded on the message of the Holiness Movement; the message of holiness and sanctification but also the message of eschatology.

Parham believed that baptism in the Holy Spirit accomplished two things in the life of a Christian: it sealed the bride of Christ and bestowed gifts (Friesen 2009:45). The experience of his students in January 1901 led him to narrow his understanding of Spirit baptism. He still maintained that it sealed one as a member of the bride of Christ to be raptured to heaven before the end-time tribulation. However, he then believed that a genuine experience of Spirit baptism would give the recipient one particular gift: the gift of tongues. This gift gave one the power to witness at home and in foreign lands in an unknown, unlearned language.

The support for Charles Parham as founder of the world wide Pentecostal Movement is based on the following: he participated in the camp meetings of the Holiness Movement built on holiness and sanctification which later became features of a Pentecostal Movement. Another highlight was his influence on the message of divine healing, and the fact that he experienced divine healing himself, also one of the features of the Pentecostal Movement. He believed that speaking in tongues is a biblical sign that one has been baptised in the Holy Spirit and called it the second blessing. One of his students, Agnes Ozman, received the second blessing of speaking in tongues.

His critics, discredited him for failing to unite people of all races. African American students such as William Seymour were discriminated against in the Charles Parham Bible School. The revival of 'second blessing' in Topeka, Kansas, did not spread to other regions of the world the same way that the Azusa Street Revival did in Los Angeles. Pentecost, as it happened in Acts 2, united people of all race, colour and ethnicity. Pentecost in the early church also spread to other regions of the world. For these reasons Charles Parham cannot be seen as the founder of the modern day world-wide Pentecostal Movement.

This position however does not discredit Charles Parham's valuable contribution to the modern day and worldwide Pentecostal Movement. If it had not been for his teaching on the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the gift of speaking in tongues, Pentecostalism would not have been established. Thus he can be recognised as the forerunner, a mentor or teacher of the Pentecostal Movement.

#### **4.1.2.3 Arguments that support interracial theory with both Charles F Parham and William J Seymour as founders**

The interracial theory recognises both Charles Parham a White man and William Seymour, a Black American; it is the recognition of what happened in Topeka, Kansas' second blessing and what happened in the Azusa Street Revival. It is the recognition of both the teacher and the student because William Seymour was one of the students from Charles Parham's Bible School in Topeka.

At the earliest 'revival' stage of the movement, certain charismatic personalities provided leadership. Charles Fox Parham was the acknowledged leader in Kansas and Texas, while a former student of his, William J Seymour, inherited a similar role in the Los Angeles area, where the Azusa Street Revival launched Pentecostalism as an international movement (Hart 1978:251). William Seymour, in actuality became the nearest equivalent to a 'founder' of the movement.

Leadership in the Pentecostal Movement moved from one person to another. When Pentecostalism appeared in 1901, it was led by a White man, Charles F Parham, a former Methodist from Topeka, Kansas (Synan 1990:44). Parham insisted on speaking in tongues as the 'initial evidence' of baptism in the Holy Spirit. This position on tongues became a distinguishing hallmark of the movement. Parham's leadership in the movement waned after 1907, precisely at a time when Blacks came to leadership under Seymour at Azusa Street.

In actual fact it was the confluence of African American and Wesleyan spiritualities within the broader context of North American revivalism which precipitated the modern Pentecostal Movement of participation in the Spirit. In a way, both movements were also subsets of the broader North American revivalist context (Land 1992:23).

Others hold the view that such a confluence and interracial theory of the origin of the Pentecostal Movement existed long before Charles Parham and William Seymour. Irvin (1995:34), for example, considers that in order to understand the early Pentecostal Movement one should recognise the complex interracial character of the nineteenth century Holiness Movement that lays immediately behind Seymour, and behind the majority of the participants in the revival, both Black and White. There can be no understanding of Seymour and the theological complexity of the events without understanding the matrix in which they were nurtured. Seymour came to the Pentecostal experience through the Holiness Movement. Holiness themes would figure prominently in Seymour's own theological synthesis and especially in his ecclesiology.

Azusa Street promoted an interracial theory. The subversion of racial and gender and class barriers, rather than the doctrine of Spirit baptism accompanied by

tongues, constituted the core of early Pentecostal theology. The role of Charles Parham as the founder of Pentecostalism is downplayed and points out that early Pentecostalism arose solely from the Black church (Creech 1996:410).

To assume that most of early Pentecostalism had been interracial, it is the historical conclusions that are tenuous at best. Although Seymour's egalitarian agenda continues to be prophetic in an American Protestantism separated by racial categories. African American culture has undoubtedly shaped Pentecostal worship styles and spirituality. The breakdown of social boundaries at Azusa can be considered the core of Pentecostal theology only if one concedes that only a handful of early Pentecostals adhered to it.

William J. Seymour, the Black leader at Azusa Street, built on foundations laid by his teacher and patron, Charles F Parham. Charles F Parham at Topeka, Kansas, had come to regard the ability of his students to speak in languages as the new acts of the Holy Spirit in the last days. There, waiting for the endowment of power in one of the turrets of a sometime mansion known as Stone's Folly, Parham believed they had seen re-enacted events recorded in Acts 2. At Azusa Street in the years 1906 to 1908, amidst phenomena reminiscent of the Upper Room, Seymour and his disciples believed that they too experienced Pentecost (Jones 1999:254). Seymour alone cannot claim the origin of the modern day Pentecostal Movement as he only built on the foundations that had been laid by Charles Parham.

Such an observation is echoed by Roy (2000:121) who says that in 1901 former Methodist preacher Charles Parham, principal of the Bethel Bible School in Topeka, Kansas, came to the conviction that speaking in tongues was the evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit. The new Pentecostal Movement received its greatest impetus from the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles between 1906 and 1909 led by William Seymour, a Black holiness preacher and former student of Parham.

Pentecostalism entered the Black community from two sources. One was the so-called Holiness Movement or the Wesleyan doctrine of sanctification. The other one was the Azusa Street Revival that took place under the leadership of an African American preacher named William J Seymour in Los Angeles between 1906 and

1908 (Russell 2004:36). While Parham communicated his own eagerness for the restoration of apostolic experience to his adherents on the one hand, Seymour carried the word to Los Angeles that ushered many to a Pentecostal experience on the other. In the tumultuous world of American radical evangelicalism in Los Angeles, as elsewhere, competing claims about spiritual power fuelled intense debate. Seymour offered verifiable 'Bible evidence' for his views. He set his message of an encounter with the Holy Spirit in the context of an end-times restoration of the Apostolic Faith (Blumhofer 2006:59).

The arguments that support this view also agree on one thing. There are two main events that contributed to the origin of the Pentecostal Movement, one at Topeka, Kansas and the other at Azusa Street. Furthermore, these events built upon each other. It is an agreement that the Topeka, Kansas's second blessing experience paved the way for the Azusa Street Revival that spread worldwide. Both Charles Parham and William Seymour are recognised as founders.

The interracial theory equally has its loopholes just like the supernatural origin view. Lovett (1972:41) points out that the problem with the interracial theory of the origins of the Pentecostal Movement is that it fails to make a clear distinction between the early interracial stages of the movement and the actual founding. It also fails to see that Parham's efforts were a continuation of sporadic experience. Seymour's Azusa Street Revival because of its nature and thrust was the torrential down-pour that created a major worldwide flood.

The interracial theory as the probable origin and foundation of the Pentecostal Movement can be dismissed on the grounds that it fails to separate the early development of the Pentecostal Movement and the origin of the Pentecostal Movement. It means between the events of the Topeka, Kansas' second blessing and the events of the Azusa Street Revival, one is an early development and the other is the founding event. Most scholars only recognise Seymour as a mere African American student of Parham. The view undermines the valuable contribution of Seymour because he was Black and student of Parham.

#### **4.1.2.4 Arguments that support William Seymour as the founder of this movement**

As indicated in the preceding sections, the possibility of the supernatural founder without a human leader, the possibility of Charles Parham as a founder, and the possibility that both Charles Parham and William Seymour are together founders of the Pentecostal Movement have been succinctly discussed. The finding is that none of the above is founder of the Pentecostal Movement. The last possibility under discussion is the arguments that support William Seymour, an African American, as the founder of this movement. Obviously support for this view is based on the events at Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles.

William Joseph Seymour was born on May 2, 1870, in Centerville, Louisiana. His parents were released slaves who used to work on the cotton plantations in the south of the United States. Seymour was raised in a Baptist church, but when he took up a job as a waiter in Indianapolis, Indiana, he became a member of the Black Methodist Episcopal Church. When he moved to Cincinnati, Ohio, he joined the Evening Light Saints church, which was in the holiness fold. Again, When he moved to Houston, Texas, in pursuit of his family, he became associated with a Black Holiness Church which had a woman, Lucy Farrow, as pastor. In her absence she left the caring of the flock in his hands. It was through her mediation that he became a student at Parham's Bible School in Houston. It was at this school where he was taught about the initial evidence doctrine, by Parham. Although he did not experience the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Houston, he firmly believed that it was a necessity for every believer and those who spoke in tongues evidenced outward manifestation thereof (see Lapoorta 1996:29).

In congruence with this view Lovett (1972:42) is adamant that the twentieth century Pentecostal Movement in America originated from the womb of Black religious experience. From a converted livery stable in the ghetto of Azusa Street in Los Angeles in 1906 to the world, the Pentecostal Movement has ushered in the era of the Holy Spirit. Once again God has used a 'saving remnant' from the ranks of the despised and oppressed people of the earth to inject new life and power into the church universal.

In support of William Seymour as the founder, father or leader of modern Pentecostalism, Tinney (1976:36) suggests the following:

- (1) For the first time, this manifestation was regarded as unique and superior to all other physical motor phenomena.
- (2) For the first time speaking in tongues was offered and sought for its own value, and given theological importance as a special sign and gift from God.
- (3) Seymour taught that tongues were the first evidence, the inevitable accompaniment, of possession by the Holy Ghost.
- (4) For the first time generally, a whole doctrinal framework called the baptism or filling of the Holy Ghost was attached inseparably to tongues.
- (5) All other tongue speaking occurrences were short-ended, limited to sporadic manifestations.
- (6) Other events of the phenomenon were local in scope and isolated in circumstances of influence. This Los Angeles event immediately became publicised and was given worldwide attention, drawing observers from every part of the United States and several foreign countries.
- (7) Other ministers, under whose ministries tongue speaking had occurred, were identified often as eccentrics, quacks, or moral indigents, there discrediting the phenomenon itself. Seymour had an impeccable reputation which gave credence to the phenomenon.
- (8) This was possibly the first time tongue speaking was recognised by foreigners or immigrants, including words and messages in actual, discernible foreign languages.
- (9) Key leaders and founders of every major United States Pentecostal denomination which developed, attended the Seymour meeting and received the experience at his hands.
- (10) Historiographers of every major United States Pentecostal group have acknowledged the Los Angeles revival as the birthplace of the entire movement known as Pentecostalism.
- (11) Without exception, all recognise Seymour as the acknowledged leader and founder of the Los Angeles revival.

The history of the beginnings of Pentecostalism can be found particularly in the ministry of William Seymour, an American Negro and the influence of Azusa Street

spread to other countries and continents (Bond 1974:12). The Pentecostal Movement actually began at the Azusa Street Mission, a predominantly Black congregation in Los Angeles (Beckmann 1974:22). Pentecostalism did not only begin but it also gained attention and spread as a national and international movement (Smylie 1979:38).

William Seymour, a Black Holiness preacher and a student of Parham (a White man) in Houston, carried the new message to Los Angeles and became one of the key leaders in the Pentecostal revival, which occurred in a former African Methodist Episcopal church in Azusa Street (McGee 1988:58). Thus, the central figure in the American Pentecostal story is William Seymour who was born during slavery and developed his new religious ideas in Louisiana, then Texas, and finally in California (Poewe 1988:145). His religious experiences represent a consistent merging of African and new world components which persisted in precisely those churches which are closest to the Black masses. The central place of such experiences and encounters is Azusa Street in Los Angeles.

The fire from heaven descended in 1906 and the leader is a self-educated travelling preacher named William J Seymour (Cox 1995:37). He assured followers that if they prayed for weeks with sufficient earnestness, God was ready to send a new Pentecost. Like the miraculous event described in Acts, this latter-day outpouring of the Spirit would be demonstrated with tongues of flame, healing, speaking in tongues, and other signs and wonders.

William J. Seymour turned a tiny Los Angeles horse stable in Azusa Street into an international centre of revival (Liardon 1996:125). Seymour became the leader of the first organised movement that promoted this experience because baptism of the Holy Spirit combined with the evidence of speaking in tongues was a major part of the meetings held there. At Azusa, Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, and Europeans met and worshiped together. They crossed formerly impossible cultural lines. Although the success of the revival was short-lived, we still enjoy its fruits. Today, Azusa remains a common word within God's household.

Several recent historical studies have explored the significance of the interracial character of the Azusa Street Revival. Irvin (1995:28) points out that without question, the major factor shaping this aspect of the vision of the mission was its leadership under William J. Seymour. Prior to coming to Los Angeles Seymour has associated with Charles F Parham and embraced his doctrine of tongues as the biblical sign accompanying the baptism of the Holy Spirit. After Parham visited Los Angeles in October of 1906 and attempted unsuccessfully to take over leadership of the revival, Seymour broke with his former teacher. He continued to assert the connection between tongues and interracial solidarity. Further experiences of European/Americans seeking to wrestle leadership away from him eventually led Seymour after 1911 towards a more pessimistic ecclesiological assessment of interracial solidarity. The power of the early vision experienced in the Azusa Revival remained.

The choice between Charles Parham and William Seymour depends on what it is considered to be the essence of Pentecostalism. If Pentecostalism is qualified by a religious experience then one might consider Parham as its founder. Again if it is the oral missionary movement, with spiritual power to overcome racism and chauvinism, then there is only one candidate left. That candidate is Seymour who of course does not exclude speaking in tongues but gives it its rightful place in spiritual life (Hollenweger 1999:42).

The Pentecostal Movement has a responsibility to rewrite its own history to accurately reflect its Black roots and formally accept William J Seymour as its founder. Failure to do so may result in a continuation of the unhealthy tension that exists between Black and White Pentecostals (Oliver 1999:47). It must be noted that throughout a soul searching period of historical reflection, the opportunity for realising the ecumenical theology of Seymour has never been better. The Pentecostal Movement must progress from saying the right things and begin to do what is right and just.

The 'Black roots' of the Pentecostal Movement extend back to the earliest days of the American republic, and maybe beyond. According to Bundy (1999:291) this is not to minimise the role of William Seymour as a major progenitor of Pentecostalism or

to detract from the courageous vision of the saints at the Azusa Street Mission. It is certainly true that Seymour and early Pentecostals saw the abolition of the colour line as their duty and the will of God.

Charles Parham spoke of a 'second blessing' in addition to salvation when referring to the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the gift of speaking in tongues. William Seymour preached that God had a third blessing, besides conversion and sanctification, and this blessing was the baptism of the Holy Spirit. His sermon resulted in him being excommunicated by the Black female pastor of the church, Neely Terry. That led him to hold meetings in private homes in the city. It was in April 1906, that an eight year old boy, along with other people began to speak in tongues. Some days later, Seymour and his follower rented an old church, formerly of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and there began a movement that took the name of 'Apostolic Faith' (Waldo 2000:6).

William Seymour is widely regarded as the father of modern Pentecostalism. He endorsed tongues to be a sure sign of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. He also found that speaking in tongues alone was an insufficient sign. Seymour discovered that some White people could speak in tongues and continue to treat people of colour as inferior to them (De Kock 2000:109). While speaking in tongues could serve as evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit even as initial evidence, it was not considered absolute evidence. Seymour believed that tongues accompanied by the dissolution of racial barriers were the indisputable sign of the Holy Spirit.

Seymour, an African American who attended the Houston school, learned about the initial evidence of receiving the baptism in the Holy Spirit. In April 18, 1906, four days after services began at Azusa Street, the great San Francisco earthquake occurred. This was prophesied at the revival before it happened. A traditionally racist newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, reported on the revival and that led to an around the world recognition for the Pentecostal Movement (Dupree 2001:98). With deep conviction that the Pentecost experience (baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues) was both biblical and necessary, Seymour set out to propagate it. He received an invitation in 1906 to pastor a Black Holiness Church

in Los Angeles. In April of that same year, he opened the historic meeting which gave Pentecostalism its global fame at 312 Azusa Street (Fatokun 2005:161).

Parham may be rightly considered the initiator of a new paradigm but forging of Pentecostalism into a world force is reserved for one man, William Seymour (Letson 2007:114). Between 1906 and 1909 the Azusa Street Mission became the focus of attention of thousands of people around the world. Stories of what was happening were carried in both secular and Christian press and much of it not very complimentary. So if anyone deserves the right to be recognised as the founder of modern day Pentecostalism it must be William Seymour. It was his vision, leadership, teaching and drive which kept the movement on track.

William J Seymour summed up the evangelistic and missionary focus and impact of his work during the first decade of its existence. He viewed the purpose of the mission, indeed, of the 'Apostolic Faith' people as a whole, as evangelisation of the entire world. During that decade (1906-1915), Seymour had witnessed the teachings of the 'Apostolic Faith' including the call to personal repentance and faith, the pursuit of personal and corporate holiness, and the acceptance of power for ministry through the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Robeck 2007:78). These teachings became the basic message of hundreds of congregations across North America, Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

As the founder William Seymour preached a message which highlighted the empowerment of Spirit baptism as the necessary force by which a new type of community where race, gender and ethnicity would not be categories of division (Klaus 2007:40). This multicultural perspective can be summarised as focusing on a new community of justice and equity. The anticipation and participation in this new community as a full member certainly could be viewed as a liberating experience by any definition.

In addition, Afro-Pentecostal rituals permit and promote participation with varieties of experiences, perceptions, movements, styles, roles, gifts and talents. There is something for anyone and everyone to do (Leatherman 2008:918). The hesitant and insecure are most encouraged when they take the risk to participate. Invitation to

personal action, whether building a habitat for humanity house or Afro-Pentecostal worship, encourages participation.

There are a number of highlights that lead to the support of Seymour as the founder. For example, Brathwaite (2010:219) lists the following: Seymour insisted that tongues-speech did not automatically qualify a person for ministry. He affirmed that no one should be considered to have Spirit baptism on the basis of tongues alone. Seymour inveighed against the idea that speaking in tongues was equivalent to Spirit baptism. He rejected the notion that tongues were essential for salvation and indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Seymour argued that tongues were neither an indication of doctrinal purity, nor a substitute for Christian character. Overall, Seymour rejects the exaltation of glossolalia and tries to bring balance to what he sees as an over-dependence on the evidentiary value of tongues.

The story of a worldwide Pentecostal Movement cannot be adequately told without mentioning the Holy Spirit explosion at Azusa Street in Los Angeles, California, in 1906. The name of William Seymour, an unlettered Black minister with vision in only one eye, is central to the historic events of Azusa Street (Khathide 2010:61). Indeed Seymour is given preference over Charles Parham when events began to unfold at the Azusa Street Mission in the summer of 1906, Seymour stood virtually alone in his efforts to provide a theological framework that would account for the move of the Spirit (Coulter 2012:304). More than this, however, Seymour was forced to contend with Parham's pastiche of ideas connected to Spirit baptism, which, upon close examination, did not sit well together. To place the new work on firmer theological footing, Seymour situated Spirit baptism within holiness theology.

The close connection between Pentecostalism and African American religions leads to African American roots of the Pentecostal Movement. Vondey (2012:150) admits that Black, oral liturgy is central to the characterisation of global Pentecostalism. William Seymour inspired a congregation to develop its liturgy. The construction of a broader support for an African American basis of Black liturgy requires two premises: Pentecostal origins are deeply connected to African American spirituality. This African spiritual heritage was exposed in the North American context to interracial and complex religious impulses of European, Hispanic and other cultures.

Finally, Euro- and African-Americans participated in the Azusa Street Revival. For southerners, the mixed race setting was particularly unusual and every southern state had recently mandated regulations that separated the races in public spaces. Upon returning home from Azusa Street, southern Pentecostals briefly worshipped in interracial assemblies and allowed women to lead services. Although these practices had previously occurred in holiness revivals, the rapid growth of the Pentecostal Movement drew added attention. Among White southerners, that attention often took the form of extreme disapproval (Scott 2013:31).

To sum up, William Seymour is a preferred candidate because unlike the Topeka, Kansas second blessing, the Azusa Street Revival spread in the United States and other parts of the world. It moved from being a national revival into an international one. The Pentecostal experiences in Azusa Street are consistent with African experience and most importantly with the miraculous event described in Acts 2.

William Seymour abolished the colour line that divided the races of the world because in the Azusa Street Revival, Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, Europeans worshiped together. In addition he broke the gender line that divided men and women because in Azusa Street, women were given an equal opportunity to minister the same way to their men counterparts did. William Seymour was a man of character and influenced other key leaders of Pentecostal denominations and churches. It must also be noted that the Pentecostal experience at Azusa Street was neither instant nor sporadic. It continued for a long time and made an impact across the globe at least for the next three and half years.

The modern day worldwide Pentecostal Movement was not founded by a supernatural without a human leader. It was not founded by Charles Parham as other scholars suggest. It was not the interracial theory that recognises both Parham and Seymour as founders. There is only one possibility available for consideration, the possibility that William Seymour was the founder of the Pentecostal Movement.

#### **4.1.2.5 Conclusion: The marginalised African origins of this movement**

In conclusion, the first view is the supernatural one that disregards a human element and marginalises both Parham and William Seymour. Although it has the full

recognition of the God-head in the Pentecostal Movement, it removes the human element in the divine. On the one hand Parham is dismissed because of his sinful life and lack of character. On the other Seymour is marginalised because of the colour of his skin and his lack of education. Second, the view that recognises Charles Parham as the founder, merely views William Seymour as a student and therefore a subordinate of Parham. William Seymour is too 'Black' to be given priority over Charles Parham.

Scholars, who argue for the priority of Charles F. Parham, a White man, do so to establish his priority over William J. Seymour, an African American (Robeck 2007:76).

The third view that supports an interracial theory that recognises both William Seymour and Charles Parham also overshadows the Azusa Street Revival by the Topeka, Kansas's second blessing. It also fails to separate the early developments with the actual founding of the Pentecostal Movement. This is a failure to separate the theological or doctrinal foundation of the Pentecostal Movement and the actual Pentecostal experience. Although it is generally agreed that Seymour built on the foundations of Parham, it does not make him the founder.

All three views, the supernatural view, the Charles Parham view and the interracial theory marginalise William Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival. It is the marginalisation of the 'Black roots' of the world wide Pentecostal Movement. Consequently, the marginalisation of an African community in the same way the Markan community has been marginalised.

## **4.2 THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL CHRISTIANITY**

### **4.2.1 Andrew Murray and the 1860 Dutch Reformed Church revival**

The 1860 revival in the Dutch Reformed Church was part of a worldwide revival that started in America and Britain during 1858. A general spirit of liberalism and rationalism generated a spirit of prayer among serious believers. This revival was followed by revivals in 1874 and 1884 that were more limited than the first one (Burger & Nel 2008:25).

One person who influenced such a revival in the Dutch Reformed Church in 1860 is Andrew Murray. Hollenweger (1972:113) states that in 1862 Murray was made Moderator of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa. During the Boer War he took the side of the Boers and fought for the removal of the concentration camps set up for Boer prisoners. He opposed slavery and advocated total abstinence. In his doctrine of holiness and in his practical Christianity he was influenced by Moody, Boardman, Smith, Stockmayer and Miss A. von Wattenwyl. For twenty years he was president of the Holiness Movement in South Africa. He also introduced the two-stage way of salvation and the doctrine of the baptism of the Spirit to South Africa, as well as a doctrine concerning the healing of the sick by prayer which was in many respects one sided.

There is a link between the Dutch Reformed Church 1860 revival and the Pentecostal Movement. In South Africa the origins of Pentecostalism, mainly through the Apostolic Faith Mission, would seem to be connected with the ministry and revival of Andrew Murray within the Dutch Reformed Church. In 1860 the Spirit fell in Andrew Murray's church in Worcester (Bond 1974:13). Andrew Murray, infused a spirit of revival into the Dutch Reformed Church. Murray had a weak throat and voice. For this ailment he had visited various European centres of faith healing and was fully restored and healed. The experience impressed him. He followed the ministry of divine healing and wrote a book on the biblical message concerning the subject 'Jesus the physician of the sick' (Sundkler 1976:16).

In addition, Andrew Murray made his Dutch Reformed Church start missionary work among the Black Africans and started a seminary for the training of missionaries. After being sick for two years and having lost his voice, he went to Europe to contact the leaders of the Holiness Movement and the Healing Movement. Returning to South Africa, he became the leading Holiness preacher there. His Holiness books and conference talks in South Africa, United Kingdom and the United States made him one of the best known Holiness leaders (Fiedler 1994:219). Ever since the revival from 1860 to 1861 there were days that were set apart for prayer throughout the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa those days were set to seek for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the church. The responsibility of providing

meditations for these meetings fell on Andrew Murray. They were praying for the Holy Spirit and mission or the full blessing of Pentecost (Douglas 1986:157).

The first factor creating the climate for South African Pentecostalism, according to Maxwell (1999:245), was the 1860 revival in the Dutch Reformed Church which itself was part of a worldwide movement. The revival was followed by two more localised revivals, in 1874 and 1884. All three awakenings were characterised by a deep conviction of sin followed by conversion, fervent prayer and some ecstatic phenomena. When Pentecost began in South Africa in 1908 its character was familiar to some older Dutch Reformed members, and many came in search of it.

Andrew Murray was one of the church leaders who seriously prayed for revival and who was significantly influenced by what happened in the 1860's. During his time of ministry, he was perhaps the most influential minister and spiritual giant in the Dutch Reformed Church. While studying in Europe, he was positively influenced by the Swiss *reveille* movement and was also exposed to some charismatic ministries such as pastor Blumhardt's in Germany.

During these years, in spite of the general spirit of liberalism and humanism at the universities in Holland, Burger and Nel (2008:26) explain that he became convinced that God had not changed and He was still able to perform miracles such as those that happened during biblical times. A few outstanding characteristics of the life and ministry of Andrew Murray were his strong emphasis on holiness. He was one of the most influential holiness preachers of that era. He was also the father of the Keswick conferences in South Africa; a movement that prepared many people worldwide for the Pentecostal Movement

The influence of Andrew Murray and the Dutch Reformed Church revival is derived from the following factors: leading to the 1860 Dutch Reformed Revival Andrew Murray led prayer meetings for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Parham named it the 'second blessing', they named it the 'full blessing of Pentecost'. Murray had contact with the leaders of the Holiness Movement, and embraced the message of holiness.

The 1860 Dutch Reformed Church revival, and the subsequent revivals in 1874 and 1884, are regarded as the factors that prepared a suitable climate for the Pentecostal Movement in South Africa. Three awakenings have a link to the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa through one of the leaders P.L. le Roux, who attended the 1884 revival. Le Roux later became an influential leader in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

#### **4.2.2 Azusa Street and African Pentecostal Christianity**

There is no question that Azusa Street gave birth to the world wide Pentecostal Movement. The question in point is its influence on the African Pentecostal Christianity. There is evidence that the influence of the Azusa Street Revival was central to the formation of the Pentecostal Movement in the United States. Its influence went beyond the borders of the nation to other parts of the world, including Africa (Pomerville 1982:73). In addition the Azusa Street Pentecostal revival movement knew no colour, but it was nevertheless a revival movement with its roots in Black American religiosity and under Black leadership. So there is some reason to call it an African Christian revival, which started in the United States and soon made its influence felt worldwide (Fiedler 1994:117).

The origin of the Pentecostal Movement in the United States of America has also profound implications for African Pentecostalism in South Africa. The impetus that generated the worldwide Pentecostal Movement originated in a Black church in Azusa Street, Los Angeles, where the emphasis on 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' with the 'initial evidence' of speaking in tongues was propagated by William Seymour. What was so remarkable about the Azusa Street Revival and of significance to South African Pentecostalism was that all this took place during America's worst racist period. At Azusa Street people of all races and social backgrounds 'achieved a new sense of dignity and community in fully integrated Pentecostal services'.

John G Lake and other American Pentecostal missionaries to South Africa may have received the teaching of 'Spirit baptism' at Azusa Street; although details of this are uncertain. Lake visited Azusa Street on several occasions and he described Seymour as having 'more of God in his life than any man he had ever met up to that time'. Although the relationship between Lake and Seymour is unclear, it appears

that Seymour was a 'spiritual father' to Lake and multitudes of Pentecostals. Lake revisited Azusa Street on at least one occasion to report to Seymour about what was happening in South Africa (Anderson 1996:117).

During the time when Lake experienced the baptism in the Holy Spirit Lake also met with William J Seymour and attended some meetings in which Seymour was presiding (Lapoorta 1996:23). Lake and Seymour maintained contact with each other and they shared their experiences even after Lake returned from South Africa. It is important to note that prior to the South African visit, Lake had contact with both Dowie, the founder of the Zionist movement, and Seymour, the founder of the Pentecostal Movement.

Regarding the influence of the Azusa Street Revival on South African Pentecostalism, news of the Azusa Street Revival soon reverberated around the international holiness and evangelical missions and churches by means of tracts and itinerant missionaries and clergy. By 1908 South Africa had its own Pentecostal awakening, characterised by a strong interaction with the American movement (Maxwell 1999:245). Not only did it have an influence on Africa but the rest of the world. Azusa Street Revival became famous and recognised as the base for the creation and worldwide spread of the modern Pentecostal Movement. Protestants of several countries came to see what was happening and left from there to go to other countries as missionaries (Waldo 2000:6).

The Azusa Street Revival according to Omenyo (2006:247) was significant in many respects: First, it was second to none in terms of its reach and the depth of its influence both in the United States and abroad. This consequently led to the emergence of several centres of Pentecostalism in cities throughout the United States. It thus produced many Pentecostal denominations. Second, and more significant, is the unprecedented number of missionaries that the Azusa Street Revival produced. Within five months of the birth of this movement, thirty-eight missionaries had gone out from Azusa. In only two years it had spread to over fifty nations worldwide. The nations include China, India, Japan, the Philippines, South Africa, the Middle East and Liberia.

Azusa Street Revival was anticipated for a long time Azusa Street. It claimed to be the definitive formula and a sure beginning of the end-time revival. Azusa Street fulfilled all revival hopes that were transmitted through the missionary (Bergunder 2007:65). Azusa became the central mythic event for early Pentecostals because they perceived it to be the location where God initiated an eschatological plan for the restoration of the church (Creech 1996:407).

Azusa Street prayer meetings were begun and before long, wonderful scenes took place. There were prostrations, strong crying unto God, weeping and manifestations of joy. Most notable of all, those who were filled with the Holy Spirit experienced physical manipulation of face and body and the final exercise of speaking in tongues as the Spirit of God gave utterance (McDonnell 1996:610). The Pentecostal experiences in Azusa are similar to the ones in the book of Acts 2. These Pentecostals believed the cornerstone of this restoration was the duplication of the first Pentecost. Azusa was signified by the re-enactment of the Apostle's experiences recorded in Acts 2. It was signified by the baptism of the Holy Spirit accompanied by speaking in tongues.

The Azusa Street Revival came to symbolise early Pentecostal's theological assumptions and especially their eschatological hopes. As a symbolic point of origin, Azusa offered theological and historical meaning for the Pentecostal experience and the movement itself. Azusa Street went global from the very start and began to channel their message through the vast international evangelical and missionary network that was receptive to revivals.

At Azusa Street Mission a more symbolic correlation began to emerge alongside their more inclusive understanding of the results of Spirit baptism. The ability to speak in tongues was understood as an avenue of praise to God that symbolised the heavenly praise that would soon be instituted in the rapture. The idea of tongues as a private prayer language also began to emerge in Apostolic Faith as a symbol of a direct communion with God reminiscent of Parham's notion of 'the anointing that abides'. Speaking in tongues was increasingly seen as an experience that in different ways symbolised the many varied blessings and benefits of Spirit baptism testified to by people at Azusa Street (Friesen 2009:52). The subsequent meetings

that were held in the former Methodist church at 312 Azusa Street in Los Angeles have consequently come to be referred as Azusa Street Revivals (Machingura 2011:16).

### **4.2.3 The Zionist movement and African Pentecostal Christianity**

#### **4.2.3.1 The influence of John Alexander Dowie**

John Alexander Dowie was of mixed Scottish and Australian descent. He founded the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in 1896, with its headquarters at Zion City, near Chicago. 'Zion' was a theocracy and John Alexander himself was a first Apostle of Jesus Christ, though he was later to regard himself as 'Elijah the restorer'. He became known as a great healer. Divine healing, without doctors or medication, was one of the tenets of his church, together with a number of taboos against such things as pork, alcohol and tobacco (Sundkler 1976:30). The overriding goal of Zionism by John Alexander Dowie was to bring all aspects of personal and social existence under theocratic direction. Zion City's official motto, 'where God rules, man prospers', succinctly expressed the interpretation of religious and economic motives that pervaded the community. Zion City simply followed 'God's plan' for economic and spiritual prosperity (Wacker 1985:501).

There are a number of legalistic practices that were underway in Zion City. John Alexander Dowie made the word 'Zion' familiar in the hearts and minds of many people throughout the world, and not the least in South Africa. He gave to it a specific connotation, namely that it stands for faith healing, rejection of medicines, alcohol and tobacco, and also for conscientious visitation of people in need and Blacks in small Christian communities (Oosthuizen 1987:1). John Alexander Dowie was born in Scotland, and trained in Australia as a congregational pastor. Dowie established the CCACZ in 1896 in Chicago, and three years later founded his own Jerusalem on the shores of Lake Michigan, a sacred city designated for the religiously pure, those who could faithfully abide by divine law. In Zion City, alcohol and tobacco were prohibited along with pork and medicine (Albright 1995:99).

In addition, Zion was to be a centre of commerce and government as well as religion. In short, Dowie constructed homes, banks, schools, a hotel and a wooden tabernacle. Attendees were greeted with large signs stating that Zion was 'the only

place where it is easy to do right and difficult to do wrong' (Synan 2000:194). Indeed, Zion would be a place where holiness and healing would be in and everything else would be out.

John Alexander Dowie became convinced of the practical message of divine healing and in 1874 started a publication, *Leaves of healing*. In South Africa Dowie's publication was eagerly read by those interested in the message of divine healing (Roy 2000:120). These included Pieter L. le Roux, a Dutch Reformed missionary and a disciple of Andrew Murray, Johannes Buchler, a Congregationalist pastor, and Edgar Mahon, a Salvation Army officer.

Dowie regarded Zion as the Lord's designated force for restoring the power and purity of the Apostolic Church and hastening the premillennial return of Christ. Baer (2001:750) explains that he preached individual empowerment and purification, but he also sought to embody apostolic glory in his church, in Zion City and in himself. Dowie bolstered his authority by assuming the mantle of prophetic office.

John Alexander Dowie continued to grow. In the years between 1900 and 1907, he was internationally renowned as the founder and leader of Zion City, a Christian utopian society established on 6, 800 acres of farmland, north of Chicago (Hudson 2003:289). His outlandish claims and radical actions caused most in the Holiness Movement to disassociate themselves from him or his teaching. However, his public ministry and the number of Pentecostal leaders who came from Zion City cannot be underestimated.

A distinct feature of his ministry is divine healing, Poloma (2006:60), remarks that John Alexander Dowie is one of the best known and most controversial historical figures in the early healing movement. The 1893 Chicago World's fair provided a public forum for Dowie to practice his healing powers in meetings. His healing ministry flourished and his vision of a pristine Christianity left no room for the medical profession. Anyone who sought prayers had to relinquish all medical treatment and rely on the power of faith for healing.

Although Dowie died during the height of the Azusa Street Revival that gave birth to Pentecostalism, according to Poloma (2006:61) he is commonly seen as an important forerunner of the Pentecostal Movement. He established 'healing homes' and influenced John G Lake-the Pentecostal evangelist who is regarded as the grandfather of the Healing Rooms Movement. Dowie became a mentor to Lake when Lake's wife was instantly healed from tuberculosis after Dowie prayed for her. Following healing, Lake joined Dowie's ministry and served as an elder in the Zion Catholic Apostolic Church.

The passion and love for the ministry of divine healing, caused John Alexander Dowie to become the pastor of a Congregational Church near Sydney. Unfortunately two years later an epidemic killed forty members of Dowie's congregation. This event initiated Dowie's divine healing ministry. In 1882 he founded the International Divine Healing Association and healing became the hallmark of his ministry (Mohr 2010:57). Moreover the ministry of John Alexander Dowie was also known for its belief in the return of the Lord. Zion City reflected Dowie's conviction that his movement was to prepare for the return of Christ. As much as possible, Zion was to reflect conditions expected during the millennium. All life within the city was structured in ways to encourage the desired behaviour (Faupel 2007:208).

Zion City was a theocracy and John Alexander himself, was the first Apostle of Jesus Christ. Zion City emphasised; divine healing, threefold baptism of adult believers by immersion and holiness as their fundamental teaching (Khathide 2010:36). Zion City was to prepare for the return of Christ, which was anticipated before the year 2000, followed by 1000 years for the millennial reign of Christ on earth. The city was also to be economically self-supporting, principally by means of a lace factory (Stanley 2011:84).

#### **4.2.3.2 The beginning of a Zionist movement in South Africa**

On 8 May 1904 the first missionary of Dowie's Christian Catholic Church, the overseer Daniel Bryant, arrived in Johannesburg and baptised twenty seven Africans by threefold immersion. The greater part of this church later developed into the Pentecostal Apostolic Faith Mission. The healing practice of the Christian Catholic Church provided the example that has been followed by the South African

Pentecostal Movement and the independent churches that have broken away from it. To this day the threefold immersion at baptism remains a mark of distinction between the Apostolic Faith Mission, influenced by Dowie's doctrine of baptism, and other South African Pentecostal churches (Hollenweger 1972:120).

In order to build a Zion in South Africa, Dowie needed a gifted and dedicated person. Daniel Bryant was such a man, he and his wife had much to give to their little Zion community in Johannesburg. For four years they served Dowie's cause of Zionism in South Africa. However, after the fall of Dowie they returned to the United States (Sundkler 1976:34). It was not only the overseer Daniel Bryant who brought Zionism to South Africa. Although the development of Afro-Pentecostal churches has been largely independent, they originated from Pentecostal missions. The Zionist movement of Southern Africa was sparked by missionaries associated with the Apostolic Faith Mission who arrived in 1908 in the name of John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhach (Beckmann 1974:24).

Bryant and company arrived at Armadale Castle in Durban where the 'Zion Tabernacle' was filled to capacity during the last service. About sixteen were baptised and twenty one accepted as members of the Christian Catholic Church in Zion. These adherents were also introduced to 'Zion lace'. The purpose of the Zion industries was to assist members in earning a living and support the work of the church. Inculcating a work philosophy and utilising one's possessions in the context of the community are emphases which made an impact on the African mind where the sense of community is strong (Oosthuizen 1987:15).

It was out of a group of about 150 Zionists who had left the Dutch Reformed Church with Le Roux that the first leaders of the Zionist movement sprang. Poewe (1988:148) draws attention to the fact that when Le Roux began to work more closely with the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, these men were alone. They would not follow him. What they did was a pattern that would repeat itself to the present day. They gathered for a fast and prayer. As they met on their mountain top or near a deep pool, they shared their visions, dreams and prophecies as of old and believed that they were confirmed by scripture. In the process they gave birth to a Zionist movement that now claims several million followers in Southern Africa.

There are three factors which caused the Zionist movement to prepare a way for the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa: emphasis on baptism by triple immersion and divine healing influenced many people in South Africa. Second, the mother church of the Zionist movement in South Africa, in Bree Street, Johannesburg, came over to the Apostolic Faith Mission entirely in 1908, after a revival brought about by the preaching of John G. Lake. Third, both John G. Lake and P.L. le Roux were members of the Zionist movement for some time (Burger & Nel 2008:27). Lake and Hezmalhalch were influenced by John Alexander Dowie, the Zionist preacher under whose healing ministry both Lake's paralysed brother and his sister who suffered from chest cancer, were miraculously healed. Not long after this experience, Lake moved to Dowie's Zion City with the intention of learning more about the healing power of Jesus Christ as it was manifested in the ministry of Dowie in particular (Lapoorta 1996:23). Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa traces its roots to John G. Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch, who were the first Pentecostal missionaries in South Africa.

Many African Initiated churches and Pentecostal churches in South Africa have their roots in events that occurred in Wakkerstroom in Mpumalanga province Anderson (1999:90) states that in 1902 or 1903 Pieter le Roux, a Dutch Reformed missionary working there joined the Zion movement founded in Chicago, Illinois, together with some 400 African co-workers and converts. In 1904 Daniel Bryant arrived as Dowie's appointed overseer of the church, soon after his arrival, Bryant baptised 141 converts at Wakkerstroom, including Le Roux. The Wakkerstroom group grew to five thousand members by 1905, and was the source out of which eventually the whole series of Zion and Apostolic African Initiated Churches would emerge.

From the Wakkerstroom congregation came many future leaders of Zionist churches in South Africa, so that Wakkerstroom can be called the 'Jerusalem' of the Zionists of South Africa. Bryant later ordained Le Roux as the overseer of the Christian Catholic Church of Zion in Pretoria (Roy 2000:120). In keeping the connection between John Alexander Dowie and the Zionist movement in South Africa, Maxwell (1999:246) maintains that a factor shaping the South African Pentecost was the Zionist movement originating from John Alexander Dowie's Zion City, Chicago, United States of America. Dowie had formed the American Zion in 1896, drawing a following

from the impoverished urban communities of the industrial Midwest. This new industrial community was characterised by a set of teachings which resisted the values of modernity, though not necessarily its tools.

From the Wakkerstroom congregation came many future leaders of Zionist churches in South Africa, so that Wakkerstroom can be called the 'Jerusalem' of the Zionists of South Africa. Bryant later ordained Le Roux as the overseer of the Christian Catholic Church of Zion in Pretoria (Roy 2000:120). Wakkerstroom has an important place in the history of the beginnings of Zion and Pentecost in South Africa. Wakkerstroom in the South-Eastern Transvaal (now Mpumalanga) produced many Zionist leaders of the early twentieth century. It can be called the 'Jerusalem' of AmaZioni of South Africa (Khathide 2010:38).

Zion stands for salvation, Healing and Holy Living which is referred to as the 'full gospel'. Included in this summation is the understanding that Christ's atonement had a threefold dimension: Jesus as saviour, sanctifier and healer (Faupel 2007:231). Zionist Christianity has long and deep roots in South Africa. The term 'Zionist' itself may lead to the mistaken impression of a direct connection with Jewish Zionism, whereas in fact the term derives from the New Testament's book of Revelation and its description of the gathering of the elect on mount Zion by the lamb during the end-time events. Nonetheless, many churches in this category embrace strong elements of Jewish identification through an emphasis on the Old Testament and biblical Judaism (Andersen, Nicole, London & Scott 2009:94).

African Zionist Christian churches share an emphasis on the Holy Spirit and its expression through prophecy, and, in particular, healing. The rise of African Zionism as an alternative to Western denominations can also be read as an expression of resistance to colonial domination, and a response to difficult social and economic conditions.

#### **4.2.3.3 The distinct features of South African Zionist movement**

The distinct features of the Zionist churches in South Africa are not necessarily derived from an American paradigm. According to Etherington (1979:125), Zionist churches, though they took their name and initial pattern of organisation from White

American fundamentalists, displayed a strong element of traditional Nguni religion right from the beginning. In Africa many Zionist churches were formed primarily from ethnically homogenous units. Thus Zionist churches are closely identified with particular tribal groups.

In addition, Zionist churches focus on the holiest of all holy places, Zion City. These are churches of prophecy, healing and the Holy Spirit. These churches are about African independence from missionary control and about the superior biblical legitimacy of African Christianity. Many of them were stimulated by Black American breakaway churches, particularly the African Methodist Episcopal church which sent 'Negro' missionaries to South Africa (Ranger 2007:65).

In Zionism there was an active manifestation of the Spirit and the African religious expressiveness was not suppressed as it was in other churches and denominations. Most of the Zionist churches were independent of White control even during apartheid (Khathide 2010:46). African spirituality understands salvation manifesting in health, fertility, success and material goods in the 'here and now', not the 'hereafter', as emphasised by mainline churches (Machingura 2011:24).

That gospel, besides Pentecostals claiming to derive it from the Bible, already exists in the African spiritual worldview. The emphasis on glossolalia has a spiritual appeal to Africans. Africa has always recognised the link between body and spirit. Africa further recognises that there are good and bad spirits which can inhabit man. Bad spirits are associated with witchcraft and sometimes cause illness. Hence the casting of demons goes together with divine healing as the gift of the Holy Spirit.

There is a view that links Zionist church features with an American paradigm especially that of John Alexander's Zionism on the one hand and the Pentecostal Movement on the other. For example, Pomerville (1982:42) points out that the characteristics of Zionist churches include among others: emphasis on the Holy Spirit in healing, prophecy and revelation, legalism, schism, a de-emphasis on education, mistrust in medicine and emphasis on healing administered by 'prophets', a restoration of the 'place' of the supernatural, rapid growth, the authority of the religious experience and the involvement of the laity or discovery of community.

The teachings of the Zionist movement on divine healing played a significant role in evangelism. Another role is the practice of baptism by triune immersion of the converts of the Zionist movement (Lapoorta 1996:169). The main teachings of the Zion movement are: baptism by triple immersion and the emphasis on divine healing which influenced many people in South Africa (Burger & Nel 2008:27). Furthermore the message of divine healing and the Leviticus style taboos on alcohol and pork were first preached by Dowie in Chicago. These taboos were taught by Lake and Hezmalhalch in South Africa. Other Zionist type practices such as triune immersion during baptism, pacifism, the style of preacher's certificate, derived from Zion City, Chicago and the Apostolic Faith Mission (Maxwell 1999:251).

With the growth of the Zionist movement a wide range of teachings and practices emerged. According to Roy (2000:113), there remained certain features which have continued to characterise the great majority of Zionist churches. These include threefold baptism by immersion; belief in divine healing and the rejection of medicine and doctors; taboos against alcohol, pork and tobacco; the wearing of white robes with green and blue coloured cloaks, cord and turbans; holy sticks; Sabbath observance; holy dances; purification rites and various degrees of accommodation with traditional African customs.

Indeed there is a commonality between the churches of the Spirit of South African Zionism and 'classical' Pentecostals in the United States of America. Anderson (2001:100) observes that they all practice gifts of the Spirit like healing, prophecy and speaking in tongues. Most of their earlier studies of these churches considered them 'syncretistic', 'post-Christian' and 'messianic' groups because of their 'Spirit' manifestations and pneumatological emphases and experiences,.

The other distinct characteristic of Zionist churches in South Africa is water baptism. Zionists mainly practice adult baptism of faith. Children may be 'baptised' but only later, when the children have confessed their faith and have received baptism of faith, do they become full members of the church. This practice mostly takes place at the age of 15. Baptism is always carried out by total immersion in a pool, river or sea. Zionists as a rule baptise in the name of the triune God, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. Baptism initiates people into the church, it is a transition from the old to a

new life, to a new fellowship it means death and resurrection with Christ and purifies from sin. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is an important theme in Zionist churches together with divine healing (Austnaberg 2010:223). Zionist churches only baptise adults through immersion, believing that complete immersion is 'vital to salvation'. Zionist churches call it the baptism of John the Baptist. The importance of John the Baptist is highlighted as a central figure in the South African Zionist cosmos, personifying the pragmatic harnessing of divine power through the baptismal waters of the River Jordan (Masondo 2013:160).

Zionism was faced with the falling apart of the world of pre-colonial culture, and disillusioned by false promises and role assignments of first colonialism and increasingly globalisation. It might perhaps also be seen as a kind of integration landscape, physically encapsulated and marked off by a strong emphasis on membership requirements, outward appearance including unique uniforms and badges rituals and symbols (Muller & Kruger 2013:146).

There are Zionist features that are closer to African traditional religion and are ethnically oriented. These features include the rejection of medicine and doctors, taboos of various rites, attire, Sabbath observance, holy dances and purification rites. Zionism from an African perspective sought independence from White control and supremacy. Zionism is for the manifestation of the Spirit and religious experience.

On the other hand, there are features that are closer to the Pentecostal Movement that grew out of the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles like salvation, sanctification, baptism in the Holy Spirit, divine healing and the second coming of Christ. What is distinct about Zionism is that it practiced baptism by triple immersion and divine healing. Zionism did not believe in the baptism of children as only adults could be baptised.

#### **4.2.4 Conclusion**

First, in South Africa the prayers, belief in the full blessing of the outpouring of the Spirit and an involvement in African mission by Andrew Murray and the 1860 Dutch

Reformed Church and other subsequent revivals in 1874 and 1884 prepared a way for the Pentecostal Movement.

Second, African Pentecostal Christianity can trace its roots from the Azusa Street Revival. According to Omenyo (2006:258) African Christians can state with certainty, that the gallant attempt Seymour and the Azusa missionaries made to work in Africa was a glorious effort. Africans should appreciate the initiative and sacrifice made by Azusa missionaries, which has transformed African Christianity into a viable and vibrant one.

They constitute a major factor that accounts for the paradigmatic shift of the centre of gravity of Christianity to the southern continents, particularly Africa. This is because the bulk of the growth and the bulk of African missionaries in foreign lands are found in the Pentecostal Movement. This has implications for the shape of world Christianity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. African spirituality and theology are increasingly becoming a global phenomenon and is representative of Christianity for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This story must be told loud and clear through research and the writing of African and indeed world church history, with Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival given their proper place

Third, the history of the birth of both the Zionist and the African Pentecostal movements in South Africa has been traced (Anderson 1996:147). The line from the 'Restorer' John Alexander Dowie of Zion City, Illinois to his emissary, Daniel Bryant, his converts P L le Roux and eventually 5000 Blacks, his former elder, John G Lake, and the emergence of hundreds of 'Zionist' churches from 1910 onwards, all reinforce the argument that there was essential continuity between Zionism and Pentecostalism in South Africa, and that one cannot isolate them from one another, at least not in the early years. In 1908 the Pentecostal missionaries who came to South Africa had links with Zion, and their Zionist converts remained Zionists while adding Pentecostalism to their beliefs.

There is a strong link between the Zionist movement and the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. It is such that the history of the church cannot be told without mentioning the Zionist movement. The first services of the church were held at the

Central Tabernacle in Zion in Bree Street until the establishment of the church. Most of the features of the Pentecostal Movement practiced in the Apostolic Faith Mission were also features of the Zionist movement in South Africa.

### **4.3 EARLY HISTORY OF APOSTOLIC FAITH MISSION OF SOUTH AFRICA: 1908-1913**

#### **4.3.1 Important role players during these years**

##### **4.3.1.1 John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch**

In 1908 a group of Pentecostal missionaries came to the South African Christian Catholic Church. They brought a Pentecostal light to South Africa. They discovered that 'Zion' taught immersion and divine healing, but not Pentecost. Meetings were first conducted in conjunction with the Apostolic Faith Church in Zion as the Christian Catholic Church as it was known in South Africa at that time (Hollenweger 1972:120). Le Roux also joined Lake's Apostolic Faith Mission and soon became one of its key leaders in South Africa. However, to all intents and purposes his Black colleagues remained Zionists, whilst embracing the new doctrine of the Holy Spirit emphasised by the Pentecostals at this stage; and Le Roux was still regarded as one of their leaders (Anderson 1996:116).

In January of 1908, Lake began to pray for the needed finances to take the Africa trip. Thomas Hezmalhalch joined him, and they determined the trip would cost two thousand United States Dollars. Exactly four days later, they received the money for the trip. In April of 1908, the group left for Africa. The team was made up of Lake, Jennie his wife, their seven children, Thomas Hezmalhalch, and three of his companions. One of Thomas Hezmalhalch's companions had lived in Africa for five years, could speak Zulu, and would serve as interpreter (Liardon 1996:161).

This demonstrates that the missionary team that God had sent to Africa was a team of faith and determination. They did not rely on their own strength and might but only on the provisions of the Lord. These American missionaries were also ready to give up their comfort zone in order to follow the calling of God in their lives. They showed a strong characteristic of servant leadership 'sacrifice'. They were not self-centred and did not run after positions.

While Lake was busy conducting a gospel campaign in North Western Illinois, he felt the deep burning urge to come to South Africa with the intention of preaching the gospel (Lapoorta 1996:49). The American missionaries had no organisation behind them, and had only been able to buy one way tickets due to the last moment generosity of a friend (Maxwell 1999:246). This further shows that the two American missionaries, John Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch, came to South Africa not as an extension of a particular organisation but genuinely called to serve God in South Africa.

John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch were influenced by Zionism through Zion City, Illinois USA in 1897 and influenced by Pentecostalism of the Apostolic Faith Church through Azusa Street, Los Angeles where the outpourings of the Holy Spirit took place (Oosthuizen 1987:11). Lake was formerly an elder in Dowie's Zion City and was acquainted with Seymour. Both Thomas Hezmalhalch and John G Lake visited William Seymour in Azusa Street (Roy 2000:121). It means that John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch did not only come to South Africa as independent ministers, but also came with the Zion movement and Azusa Street Revival influence.

In addition, the arrival of John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch influenced the founding of the Apostolic Faith Mission and other churches as well. According to Fatokun (2005:163), South African Pentecostalism has its origins in the pioneering work of John G Lake (1870-1935) who in April 1908 led a large missionary party to Johannesburg. There he began to spread the Pentecostal message throughout the nation. This enterprise resulted in the founding of two large influential and Pentecostal churches in South Africa 'Apostolic Faith Mission' in 1910 and 'Zion Christian Church'

The main missionary leaders continued to work together and shared responsibilities. When John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch started Pentecostal work in South Africa, they worked as a team of equals. After localising the work at the Bree Street Tabernacle, they acted as co-ministers of that congregation. The first set of minutes from a meeting of those early workers was dated 17 September 1908. In the months following, meetings were regularly held two or three times a month. It is noteworthy

that no leader or president was appointed at this stage. Hezmalhalch's name would appear first in the list of those present. On 27 May 1909 brother Hezmalhalch was chosen as the first president of the Apostolic Faith Mission, with brother Lake as Vice-president. By the end of 1910 Hezmalhalch was replaced as president by Lake (Burger & Nel 2008:35).

However, Clark (2012:3) argues that although the positive contribution of Lake to leadership was his powerful healing ministry, his selfless care for the emerging ministers of the movement and his ability to interact with secular leadership outside the church were also positive aspects. The negative aspects of his leadership were his poor relationship with his fellow-worker Thomas Hezmalhalch, and the suffering inflicted on his family by his absolute commitment to the ministry of the Apostolic Faith Mission.

John G Lake spent the rest of 1910-1912 ministering healing as he prayed for the sick. Great miracles were performed that still affect Africa today. Lake and his congregation regularly published a newsletter that was mailed to thousands of people. Before they were mailed, church members would lay hands on them and pray that the pieces of literature would be filled with God's Spirit. They believed the power of God would anoint the newsletter's paper, just as it occurred with the handkerchiefs of Paul. As a result, thousands of letters would pour in from all parts of the world, stating how the Spirit of God came upon the recipients as they opened the paper.

In short, John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch together with their team came in 1908 to South Africa with a Zionist influence through the ministry of John Alexander Dowie. But most importantly is the Azusa Street Revival influence through William Seymour. They came to South Africa by faith without any support from a missionary organisation to support their missionary work in Africa. When they arrived they conducted services in Doornfontein Zionist Church but soon moved to Bree Street Central Congregation also belonging to the Zionist movement. The two leaders continued to work together and sharing responsibilities until their departure back to the United States.

#### 4.3.1.2 Elias Letwaba

Letwaba was one of the first African Pentecostals in South Africa and quite influential. He was mentioned in the Executive Council minutes of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa in February 1909 and considered to be one of the most outstanding Black leaders in the history of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Letwaba was born in the former Northern Transvaal (now Limpopo Province) around 1870, after his mother had received a remarkable revelation about his future. His father, an Ndebele Christian, did not allow his son to attend the customary initiation school and Letwaba was raised in a Christian environment. At the age of fourteen he rescued a man from drowning in a river and he felt called by God to rescue men and women out of the black river of sin and death (Anderson 1996:125).

Elias Letwaba was a respected minister in the church at the time he met John G Lake at the beginning of 1909. Letwaba was so impressed by the miracles of God's power that he decided to stay with Lake in his home to learn from him. He accompanied Lake on his journey to Bloemfontein and received the Pentecostal 'baptism' there in February 1909. Embarking on an evangelistic tour of the Northern Transvaal, his home province, he walked many hundreds of miles, preaching the gospel of salvation, healing and baptism of the Holy Spirit. His teachings were the main fundamental teachings of the Pentecostal Movement. One of the highlights of Letwaba's achievements was the establishment in 1930 of the Patmos Bible School, the first theological training facility for Blacks in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa (Roy 2000:122).

Burger and Nel (2008:386) highlights the fact that in spite of political and economic difficulties pastor Elias Letwaba, the Black overseer of Northern Transvaal, was able to fulfil Bible education without financial guarantees. His 'Black' Bible School paved the way for the development of a Pentecostal theological educational institute with roots in Africa. His faith and determination made him the pioneer of theological education in the Apostolic Faith Mission, being the principal of the first Bible School. In addition to the Patmos Bible School, a primary school with 150 pupils was established next to the Bible School.

Elias Letwaba was one of the first Black leaders of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, a man whose ministry in the northern parts of the country led to the establishment of a large African church (Clark 2012:3). In addition Letwaba was a humble man who accepted the racial indignities imposed upon him by White church leaders. His influence in the church was his powerfully charismatic evangelistic ministry and his involvement in theological training.

In summary, Letwaba was called for the work of ministry at a very tender age of fourteen. Since then, he never looked back and today he is considered to be one of the first African Pentecostals in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. He preached a Pentecostal message of salvation, divine healing and the baptism in the Holy Spirit which is in line with the teaching of a Pentecostal Movement. He founded and led a Bible School called 'Patmos Bible School' which also registered pupils in primary school. And with all these accolades he remained humble and obedient to White superiority. These show qualities of a servant leader.

#### **4.3.2 The role of the Central Tabernacle congregation**

Central Tabernacle congregation played a significant role in the early developments of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Lapoorta (1996:50) describes the events as follows: Meetings of American missionaries commenced in a small Zionist Church in a Black residential area of Doornfontein, in Johannesburg. From the very first day numerous people were miraculously healed through prayer. It was at these meetings that the dividing walls of race and colour were erased by the blood of Jesus and through the move of the Holy Spirit. Due to the large numbers in attendance at the meetings the premises in Doornfontein became totally inadequate to accommodate the people. They had to move to the Central Tabernacle of the Zionist movement. Eventually all the members of the Zionist assemblies became members of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

South Africa's Pentecost was inaugurated in Doornfontein's Zion chapel in the suburbs of Johannesburg. The movement bore remarkable resemblances to the Azusa Street Revival, particularly in its initial multi-racial character. There were similar ecstatic phenomena such as glossolalia, 'holy laughter' shakings and prostrations under the power of the Spirit, and a pronounced public confession of

sins. News of miraculous healings and conversions was propagated by word of mouth, and by the press which was often hostile. Members of other denominations came to see and often receiving Spirit baptism (Maxwell 1999:246).

In addition Zion Tabernacle in Bree Street in South Africa became the headquarters of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa the same as Azusa Street in Los Angeles as the headquarter of the world wide Pentecostal Movement (Roy 2000:121). There were similar occurrences of Pentecostal experience of Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles and at the Central Tabernacle congregation in Johannesburg, South Africa. Thus, a parallelism is drawn between Azusa Street and Bree Street in relation to the Pentecostal Movement.

The Central Tabernacle in Bree Street, Johannesburg, was the first place where the Apostolic Faith Mission assembled and it played an important part in the early history of mission. The Zionist Church had a contract with the owners. When the Apostolic Faith Mission was founded in 1908, almost the whole Zionist congregation became members of the Apostolic Faith Mission and they took over the church building. For many years this congregation was the heart of the Apostolic Faith Mission (Burger & Nel 2008:72).

When John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch came to South Africa, they used the Central Tabernacle congregation in Bree Street, Johannesburg which is similar to Azusa Street in Los Angeles in the Pentecostal Movement context. Just like at the Azusa Street Revival in this congregation there was a Pentecostal experience through prayer and many people received their healing and other miracles. There were no racial barriers or dividing walls of race and colour, they were erased by the blood of Jesus.

#### **4.3.3 The Apostolic Faith Mission and the Pentecostal Mission**

In order to explain the relationship between the Apostolic Faith Mission and the Pentecostal Mission, Sundkler (1976:52) is of the opinion that the fire of Pentecost had been kindled at the 'Azusa Street Mission' in Los Angeles in 1906, and sparks from that conflagration were also flying into parts of South Africa. Archibald Cooper played a leading part in the 'full gospel' movement in South Africa. In 1907, he

received the first 'apostolic papers' published by the 'Azusa' movement in Los Angeles. In this way he was influenced in a similar way as John G Lake of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

There are two views to the relationship between the two missions; one view believes that the Pentecostal Mission or Full Gospel Church started by the mission is a faction from the Apostolic Faith Mission. This view is held by Lapoorta (1996:79), who contends that the Pentecostal Mission that gave birth to the Full Gospel Church came about as the result of a split from the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa by Archibald Cooper. The reasons for the split initiated by Cooper revolved around the issue of leadership, after Lake and Hezmalhalch left for the United States of America. Cooper aspired to become the president of the movement, but to his surprise the people elected Pastor Pieter Louis le Roux. Cooper used the issue of language to draw away some of the English speaking members with him to form the Full Gospel Church.

A second view believes that a missionary by the name of George Bowie who received a Pentecostal experience in a similar way as John G Lake came to South Africa and started the Pentecostal Mission. Roy (2000:125), for example, asserts that in 1909 George Bowie, a Scottish immigrant to the United States of America, was sent by the Bethel Pentecostal assembly of Newark, New Jersey, to South Africa, where he founded the 'Pentecostal Mission'.

Over the years various attempts were made to combine the Pentecostal Mission and the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. The differences over baptism with the Pentecostal Mission practising single immersion and Apostolic Faith Mission practising triple immersion could not be overcome. The other major difference was church governance where by congregations in the Pentecostal Mission enjoyed local autonomy rather than those in the Apostolic Faith Mission.

In disagreement with the differences between the Apostolic Faith Mission and the Pentecostal Mission, Anderson (2000:102) argues that there are many similarities between the story of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa and the Pentecostal Mission. Like the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, in the Pentecostal Mission Church, Whites were the exclusive decision-making legislative body and had the

sole right to change the constitution. Blacks felt heartache at their virtual exclusion, as they did not have adequate training facilities and were the victims of an inferior education system that denied them many of the opportunities accorded to Whites. There are certain similarities between the origins of the Pentecostal Mission and the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Like John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch, George Bowie had experienced Pentecost in America and came to South Africa to do missionary work. That is the same George Bowie would later be involved in the unfortunate alienation between John G Lake and Hezmalhalch (Burger & Nel 2008:75).

The Pentecostal Mission began in 1910 the same time as the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. According to Khathide (2010:51) it started with the arrival of the North American missionary, George Bowie, who was sent by the Bethel Pentecostal Mission of Newark, New Jersey. The Pentecostal Mission among Black people depended much upon financial assistance from the Bethel Pentecostal Mission and when the depression came many Black pastors suffered. The connection between the Apostolic Faith Mission and Pentecostal Mission was influenced by the connection between Archibald Cooper and Pieter L. le Roux. They were prominent leaders in the Pentecostal Mission and Apostolic Faith Mission respectively

George Bowie came to South Africa through the 'Azusa Street experience' in a similar way to John G Lake of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. The Pentecostal Mission is believed to be the 'mother church' of the full Gospel in Southern Africa (Chetty 2012:25).

In conclusion, the Apostolic Faith Mission should not be confused with the Pentecostal Mission. The Pentecostal Mission is not a faction of the Apostolic Faith Mission but was started independently by George Bowie. However, there are similarities between both missions because both their founders had a Pentecostal experience in the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles. On the grounds of these similarities attempts were made to merge the two missions but however there were also doctrinal differences that made it impossible for the two missions to be merged.

#### **4.3.4 The origin of name: Apostolic Faith Mission and registration**

In 1910 the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was founded with Thomas Hezmalhalch as its first president. Other prominent pastors were J.H. Greef and John G. Lake, who had formerly been an elder in Dowie's Christian Catholic Church in Zion, and P.L. le Roux, originally a missionary of the Dutch Reformed Church. He was a disciple of Andrew Murray, later a pastor in the Christian Church in Zion. He was President of the Apostolic Faith Mission for 29 years. Le Roux had already experienced his 'Pentecost' or 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' in 1907. (Hollenweger 1972:120)

John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch founded the Apostolic Faith Mission which received state recognition in October 1913 when the Apostolic Faith Mission was registered as an unlimited association with registration of the act of establishment and statutes (Oosthuizen 1987:12). Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was born in the spirit of Azusa. When the Spirit fell at Doornfontein the walls of race, class and gender were wiped out, but when the Spirit subsided the walls were built up again (Lapoorta 1996:84).

The early practices of the South African Pentecostal Movement were institutionalised in the formation of the Apostolic Faith Mission (Maxwell 1999:249). The Apostolic Faith Mission grew out of a committee based at the Central Tabernacle in Bree Street. The first recorded meeting occurred in September 1908. The first constituted executive occurred in May 1909. Rather than coordinating work, this 'mother' church initially acted as a catalyst, only slowly taking control of the movement. The Apostolic Faith Mission was not registered until November 1913 because its leaders were in no hurry to set up another religious body. Neither Lake nor Hezmalhalch had been sent to South Africa by a church or a mission organisation. They came as 'Apostolic Faith' missionaries seeking to testify to, and demonstrate the power of the Holy Spirit.

The church that grew out of the Pentecostal preaching of John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch was registered with the government in 1910 as the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa (Roy 2000:122). The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa

was legally registered under the Companies Act in 1913 until it was registered under Private Act 24 of 1961 (Anderson 2000:97).

In the eyes of South African law, the Apostolic Faith Mission was a single entity, but the problem was that it was constituted as a White church. Whites determined the constitution, and power was vested in an all-white executive council chaired by a president. A missions department with a mission's director appointed by the White church controlled the Black, Coloured and Indian sections of the Apostolic Faith Mission. This meant that these three sections had no legal standing and, in fact, only Whites could become legal members of the church.

John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch saw themselves as part of the Pentecost Movement or the Apostolic Faith Mission/Movement in America. According to Burger and Nel (2008:63) it was for this reason they called themselves the 'Apostolic Faith missionaries'; when they arrived in South Africa. Although the name was not formally registered until 1913, it was used right from the beginning, also in minutes and the church magazine.

There is a further indication that the early Pentecostals in South Africa were not over particular with the name business and were quite satisfied merely to be regarded as part of the worldwide Pentecostal Movement. The Apostolic Faith Mission grew out of the Apostolic Faith missionaries John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch in 1910. The name Apostolic Faith Mission grew out of the Azusa Street Revival connected to William Seymour in Los Angeles, United States. In South Africa it grew out of the Central Tabernacle congregation in Bree Street, Johannesburg. The church was fully registered in 1913 under the Companies Act.

#### **4.3.5 Conclusion**

The early developments of the Apostolic Faith Mission of SA are linked to John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhach who played a major role as missionaries from the United States. Prior to their trip to South Africa John G lake and Thomas Hezmalhach had contact with both John Alexander Dowie of Zion City, Chicago and William Seymour of the Azusa Street Revival, Los Angeles. This connection authenticates the relationship between the Apostolic Faith Mission and the Zionist

movement. It authenticates the relationship between the Apostolic Faith Mission of SA and the Azusa Street Revival.

John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch's role in the foundation of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa should not be overemphasised to a level of disregarding other role players like Elias Letwaba. Elias Letwaba was the founder of Patmos Bible School that was once recognised as the only theological training in the Apostolic Faith Mission. Upon arrival in South Africa, there were already functional churches and/or movements that ushered John G Lake and his team into a great ministry.

The above further illustrates that the Black role and contribution to Pentecostalism is undermined and marginalised. It is the marginalisation of the Black roots and origin of Pentecostalism in ignoring the link between Azusa Street and African Pentecostalism. It marginalises the role played by many African pastors and leaders as forerunners to the revival that was brought by the missionaries John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch. This marginalisation is similar to the marginalisation of the community in Mark.

The other role was played by the Central Tabernacle congregation that belonged to the Zionist movement before the church owned it. This role by the Central Tabernacle congregation further proves the link between the Apostolic Faith Mission and the Zionist movement in South Africa. It is important to separate the Apostolic Faith Mission with the Pentecostal Mission or the Full Gospel Church. Although, the two churches in question had similar developments leading to their formation, they are not one church. The name of the church 'Apostolic Faith Mission' is directly linked to the 'Apostolic Faith' of William Seymour in the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles.

Although Apostolic Faith Mission in South Africa was registered with government in 1913, it was never the plan of John G Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch to start an organisation. They purely came to South Africa with a Pentecostal message of healing and deliverance. It is also evidenced that when the church became more structured and with the departure of the missionaries, Apostolic Faith Mission lost touch with its Pentecostal message.

## Chapter 5

# Servant leadership in African Pentecostal Christianity

### 5.1 LEADERSHIP MISCONCEPTIONS IN THE APOSTOLIC FAITH MISSION BEFORE 1996

Before 1996 the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was divided into four main sections namely: the Black, Coloured, Indian and White sections. These sections came as a result of racial segregation and discrimination. The church started as interracial in the beginning, but as time went by it became segregated along colour lines. The first misconception to be discussed is racial segregation according to the sections of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

Second, the four sections of the Apostolic Faith Mission were not equal in power and responsibilities. The White section of the church was the major and domineering section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. In the second leadership misconception, this study discusses White supremacy.

Third, as stated in the previous chapter, the Apostolic Faith Mission was started as a mission to Africa by American missionaries with no intention to establish an organisation. Positions in the Executive Council were highly contended by leaders because the church was finally registered, and American missionaries had departed. It must be noted that although the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was divided into four main sections, not all members could be represented in the Executive Council of the church, positions were given to the selected few in the church.

In the light of the above, since its inception, the Apostolic Faith Mission experienced schisms that threatened church growth and expansion. There were many pastors especially in the Black section who were dissatisfied in the church because they did not participate in leadership positions and as a result decided to start their own

organisations or churches. In some instances the church suffered huge membership loss because of these schisms.

## **5.1.1 Racial segregation**

### **5.1.1.1 Introduction**

It is important to define both racism and segregation in order to understand the context of racial segregation in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Racism is the ‘attitude, action, or institutional structure or any social policy that subordinates persons or groups because of their colour’ (Hearn 2009:275). It is domination of a less powerful group by a dominant and more powerful group, which stems from the belief that the dominant group is superior to the lesser on account of human traits and characteristics (e.g., skin colour). Racism results in various forms of violence including but not limited to derogatory remarks, separation, physical and emotional abuse, and laws and actions aimed to perpetuate racial inequality.

Segregation denotes a complex amalgamation of political, ideological and administrative strategies designed to maintain and entrench White supremacy at every level. It was elaborated in the context of South Africa’s experience of rapid industrialisation and was intended to defend the prevailing social order from the threat posed by the growth of a potentially militant African proletariat. As an ideological justification of political inequality, segregation was founded on a dual principle that first, was the recognition of an African’s right to land ownership which was conditional on the sacrifice of their claims for common citizenship. Second, that Africans were the wards of their White ‘trustees’, under whose benevolent guidance they would be encouraged to develop autonomously (Dubow 1989:1).

Racial segregation was an economic policy for societal advantage through political, ideological and administrative strategies. Sibeko and Haddad (1997:84) adds that the system of apartheid guaranteed that political, economic, and cultural power was controlled by the White minority. Social deprivation was heightened even further by the policy of separate development resulting in the forced removal of millions of people from their homes. A restrictive urbanisation policy directed towards African people, implemented through pass laws and influx control measures.

Through the vein of religion, for example, the apartheid system in South Africa enabled Whites to establish superiority in a land where they were, in fact, the minority. Through the system, Whites would come to possess eighty seven percent of South Africa's land and wealth, leaving the Black African population a diminutive thirteen percent. This system of classification proved economically beneficial for Whites (Howard 2006:143). As indicated earlier, Africans were a majority and as a result they could not be marginalised without segregation. The purpose of racial segregation was to divide the African majority into ethnic groups and to channel African political and economic aspirations towards the bantu-stands which would be the 'homelands' for those ethnic groups. A further purpose was to deprive all Africans of South African citizenship thereby turning African workers in White areas into 'foreign' visitors (Maylam 2001:195).

Although segregation was predicated on perceptions of racial difference and was developed in the aftermath of colonial conquest, South African segregation was not just racial subordination. Its underlying principle was the enforced separation, not just subordination, of Blacks and Whites in the spheres of work, residence and government (Worden 2012:80). Racial segregation was reinforced by the increasing institutionalisation of apartheid policies. This was especially so after the gazetting of the so-called 'church clause' of the Native Laws Amendment Bill in 1957, which attempted to force racial segregation by restricting 'Black' people from attending services in designated 'White' residential areas (Czegledy 2008:289).

With this understanding of both racism and segregation as defined above, it is important to make a distinction between personal prejudices and structural racism. As a result personal prejudices should not be confused with institutionalised and structural racism. Cone (2004:144) explains that dealing with people's personal prejudices should not be the major concern. It is emotionally too exhausting and achieves very little in dismantling racism. The issue is always structural. While people dislike one another, it is important that the law prevents them from harming each other on the basis of their prejudices.

By this definition it means that it is not wrong to describe people in their racial groups as Black, Coloured, Indian and White. It is however wrong when one racial group

benefits more than the rest of other groups on the basis of their race or colour. It is worse when one race is marginalised by the rest of the racial groups. To ignore one's race or colour would be hypocritical, but to judge one on the basis of colour or race would be racial segregation.

The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa started as a non-racial church. Early attempts to introduce racial separation in worship were resisted by the founding missionaries. When the missionaries left the country to return to their homelands, the church was set on a course of racial separation in compliance with the racial ideology of the country. Protests by Blacks were not heeded because a paternalistic mentality characterised the White churches involvement with regard to the Black church (Paul 2006:78).

The position of American missionaries on either prohibiting or permitting racial segregation is argued by the fact that the founding missionaries in the person of John G. Lake and Thomas Hezmalhalch made a strong case for separate works among Black, Coloured, Indian and White congregations though under the umbrella of the Apostolic Faith Mission (Poewe 1988:147). In 1908 and 1909, Apostolic Faith Mission adopted policies that would doom its considerable initial growth in the more distant future. By the time John G Lake departed from South Africa in 1913, many Black leaders had already formed their own groups.

The minutes dated 17 September 1908, apparently at Lake's instigation, according to Roy (2000:122) show that the missionaries supported racial segregation. Lake spoke of the necessity of getting adequate accommodation for the holding of services in Doornfontein especially for the Coloured people. Less than two months later, they decided that, 'the baptism of natives shall in future take place after the baptism of the White people'. At the executive meeting in February 1909 it was decided that the superintendent over the 'native work' must be White. The minutes of July 1909 read: 'in future, the baptism of Whites, Coloured, Indians and Natives shall be separate'.

However it might be true that the poor missionaries were under social pressure because Pentecostals, like other churches in South Africa during apartheid, yielded

to the pressures from White society and developed racially segregated churches. The Apostolic Faith Mission is a striking example of the differences in outlooks of White and Black members of the same church (Anderson 2001:3). The American missionaries supported racial segregation because to a certain extent they were stimulated by societal and racial mind-sets. In addition to practices in the country at that time and self-generated separation for reasons of language and cultural differences (Chandomba 2007:23).

The Apostolic Faith Mission laid the foundation for racism in the church when they decided to separate the baptism of Blacks and Whites. Horn (1991:5) clarifies that during the first few months White and non-White were even baptised together, however at the end of 1908 some Afrikaans speaking brothers came onto the Executive Council. The fact that they understood the history and the nature of the racial feelings in South Africa better, possibly contributed to the gradual separation of the races. It is possibly correct to conclude that the pioneers deviated from non-racialism because of White racist pressure rather than theological conviction.

Another aspect of racial segregation was seen in the membership of the Apostolic Faith Mission as exemplified by Matika (2004:70) that until 1991, only White people could be legal members of the Apostolic Faith Mission. The church participated freely in the repressive government of racial segregation. It was eager to promote good relations with the traditional Afrikaner churches, especially the Dutch Reformed Church.

In 1944, four years before the National Party government took over, the Apostolic Faith Mission took a resolution that the mission stands for segregation that highlighted its support for the philosophy of apartheid. The fact that the Black, Indian and Coloured are saved does not render them European. The church also asserted its support for Bantu Education, that is, Native Education: The mission stands for a lower education [for Black people] but is definitely against a higher education.

The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa continued with the mission practice of 'daughter churches,' similar to that practiced by the Dutch Reformed Churches. The practice led to the establishment of four major groupings in the Apostolic Faith

Mission: the White (parent) church, a large Black daughter church, a Coloured (mixed race) daughter church, and an Indian daughter church. The Black church consisted of many different components, ordered primarily by language and region (Clark 2005:144). A separate meeting hall was opened in which services could be held. It was a reversal of the initial interracial character of the movement that supported interracial worship between the movement's adherents. In addition the Apostolic Faith Mission instituted a series of racially motivated policies and structures whose effect was to fundamentally change the way in which persons participated in the church (Richardson 2013:29).

It is understood here that although the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa started as a racially integrated church. American missionaries adopted racial policies that were socially acceptable at that time to divide the church into four main sections namely the Black, Coloured, Indian and the White section. The study looks at each section in order to determine the severity of racial segregation in all the sections of the Apostolic Faith Mission. To determine the most vulnerable, deprived and marginalised section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

#### **5.1.1.2 The Black section**

The paternalistic approach to missions in the Apostolic Faith Mission was clearly demonstrated by two facts. First, the fact that the Black Council consisted of fifty percent Whites to assist fifty percent Blacks. In other words the minority White people led the majority of Black people. Second, the fact that every decision of the Black Council had to first be confirmed by the White Executive Council before implementation. This meant that even if the decision did not go in their favour, the Black section could not reverse such a decision (De Wet 1989:96).

The power of the White missionaries increased in the mission committee. The firm hold Whites had on Blacks was reinforced. Only Whites were allowed to assume important positions in mission work. The participation of Black leaders in the mission work was very minimal. Black people were only seen as mission targets and not participants (Erasmus 1996:44). All the minutes of the meetings of the Missionary Council in the Black section, as well as the Workers Council, had to be approved by the White Executive Council and no decision could be implemented without the

approval of Whites. The first time the Missionary Council discussed the need for an Executive Council for the 'Natives' was in 1947, but it was decided to leave the matter till the next conference. By 1962 the Indian and Coloured sections had already received the right to form an Executive Council, but the Black section had not been allowed to form one (Burger & Nel 2008:233). It means that there was a difference between the ways in which the White section treated the Black section compared to other sections of the church.

It was not all dark and doom in the Black section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Clark (2005:145) makes an interesting point that although the Apostolic Faith Mission was divided constitutionally into four separate churches, there was often contact between White congregations and those of the other sections. However, contacts with Blacks tended to be very 'top down', and many White members would preach regularly in Black townships or mine hostels. Contact between Whites and Indians and Whites and Coloured people was an easier option because of many cultural similarities.

The White section continued to oppress and undermine the Black section in the Apostolic Faith Mission. According to Lapoorta (1996:104) the turnaround in this section emerged in 1976 when the Bible College students expressed their dissatisfaction with the racially segregated Apostolic Faith Mission. They openly challenged the racial connotations in the study materials. The students wanted to know if that material was used in all Apostolic Faith Mission colleges. The main objective was to reach a non-racial, non-sexist Apostolic Faith Mission just as it was in the beginning at the Azusa Street Revival.

### **5.1.1.3 The Coloured section**

Coloureds were allowed to attend church with Whites compared to Blacks who were not. At the same time a distinction was made between 'Worthy Coloureds' and 'Unworthy Coloureds'. This distinction was made to differentiate between Coloureds with a darker skin and Coloureds who were lighter (De Wet 1989:166). Coloureds were segregated in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa but because of colour and many other similar cultural traits they were treated better compared to other sections especially the 'Black section'.

Both the 'Coloured' and 'White' church spoke the same language and basically shared the same culture. They also shared the same faith in Jesus Christ, were baptised through triune immersion and baptised in the same Holy Spirit with the initial evidence of speaking in tongues. Given these reasons, the Coloured church thought that it would be easy for it to unite with the White church given the above mentioned reasons. In contrast, the unity issue was deeper than race and colour (Lapoorta 1996:92). It means that even colour and language did not necessarily benefit the Coloured section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa during racial segregation.

In support of the view that the White section racially separated with the Coloured section regardless of many similarities between the two sections, Erasmus (1996:64) reiterates that in the years between 1924 and 1949 racial separation continued in the Apostolic Faith Mission. Even though most of the 'Coloureds' spoke Afrikaans, there was a tendency to keep the races apart. The White Executive Council even resolved that Whites should be discouraged to worship in the 'Coloureds' assemblies.

In the same way the White section controlled the Black section. Burger and Nel (2008:281) states that the chairman and leader was always an appointment made by the White Executive Council. He served as chairman of both the Workers Council and Executive Council. It was also at the 1969 Workers Council, after the adoption of the constitution that the first Coloured Executive Council came into being. Prior to this, the advisory board governed the Coloured work.

#### **5.1.1.4 The Indian section**

The Indians who were brought to Natal between 1860 and 1911 to aid its struggling agricultural industry were socially and politically discriminated against. They encountered bitter anti-Asiatic resistance in the nineteenth century in Natal. They were threatened with repatriation to India for the first half of this century. Their movement and domicile were legally controlled and they were disenfranchised. For example, during the 1960s, 176 000 Indians were moved under the Group Areas Act from the city and resettled in Indian areas. Their land was reclaimed for either White settlement or the development of industry (Pillay 1987:39).

In the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa the Indian section was represented by White missionaries without their consent. Lapoorta (1996:103) makes a number of valuable comments in this regard. The constitution governs them without any input. There was also a loss of membership due to racism in the church. In addition, members on the ground also were confronted daily with a racism problem and it seems that the church was lagging behind the government in advocating change.

The Indian daughter church in the Apostolic Faith Mission thrived as a daughter church during the period of racial segregation. Clark (2005:156) argues that although some of the restrictions on leadership brought some limitations. Once the church dissolved its separate racial sections and united as a non-racial church, the single greatest loser became the Indian church. As a small minority within the nation and the church, the daughter church concept protected them and allowed the development of their own training institution. Powerful and effective Indian church leaders, and of meaningful interaction between Indian congregations were trained. This protection does not exist anymore, and the continued success of the Indian work in the Apostolic Faith Mission is one of the critical challenges facing the denomination in the new century.

It means that racial segregation in the Apostolic Faith Mission did not disadvantage all the sections. On the contrary other sections benefited from such a system and would have loved to stay longer in the system. The system was a favour to others while it was a disgrace to some like the Black section. It was a win situation for some and loss for others.

Burger and Nel (2008:318) maintains that until 1983 the Indian section was governed by a separate policy. Instructions were formulated and drawn up by the Executive Council in consultation with the Missionary Council. There was paternalism exercised by the Whites over the Indian mission whereby the Indian church co-existed with the mother church of the Whites.

This shows that the Indian section was also oppressed by a system of autocratic leadership and centralising all the structures and section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa under the Executive Council. Even other councils like the

Missionary Council were also ruled and governed by Whites and were designed to oppress other sections based on colour and race.

#### **5.1.1.5 The White section**

The victory of the Nationalist Party in 1948 and the introduction of the policy of apartheid caused the White section in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa to conform to the *status quo*. The social equality between Whites, Indian, Coloured and Blacks was not promoted by the mission. It was discouraged altogether. God is no respecter of persons, and that in all races are people who fear God. Although the gospel is proclaimed to all people of all races without exception, the mission has made provision for its White, Indian, Coloured and Black members to worship God in their own separate places of worship, where sacraments are administered to them (Lapoorta 1996:57).

This view makes an assumption that the White section only began to racially segregate with other sections with the victory of the Nationalist Party whereas racial segregation began as early as 1908 in the Apostolic Faith Mission when the church was founded. The church was a forerunner in racial segregation even before the Nationalist Party became the ruling party. It is correct, however, to say that the system gained more power and prominence in the church when the Nationalist Party became the ruling party.

Boundaries between races were sanctified and were accepted as a natural part of God's ordering of the universe. A collection of biblical verses was used to justify as well as explain God's desire to keep races of people segregated (Welty 2005:46). By 1960 the White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission church had evolved into what was practically an Afrikaans church. As the apartheid policies of the governing party in South Africa led to further segregation of the country, predominantly from the rest of Africa, the Apostolic Faith Mission became a South African Afrikaans church that did not look outside the boundaries of the country. The church had little interest in overseas mission work, and saw itself as existing primarily for the benefit of its own members because of the political situation in South Africa (Chandomba 2007:38). The racial segregation did not only make impact in the Apostolic Faith Mission but in African Pentecostalism as a whole. Racial segregation has with few

exceptions divided White from Black Pentecostalism in South Africa (Yong 2006:130).

Many Whites were convinced that there was no way people of different races could unite because of their differences. For the White section, it was obvious that God wanted a variety of races, each with its own purpose. Racial integration was sin. Apostolic Faith Mission leaders were defending the mental, emotional and spiritual superiority of the White race, all based on the scriptures. White Pentecostals not only acquiesced to the apartheid ideology, but also actively defended it.

The involvement of the White section in 'mission' activities in terms of relationships with their local Black churches also meant that institutionalised segregation did not necessarily imply total segregation. The relationship was extremely paternalistic, but the discrepancy in economic resources between White and Black sections during the period under discussion left little alternative. The fact was that some very close relationships and friendships developed between White and Black Pentecostals even in a segregated church environment (Clark 2005:149).

#### **5.1.1.6 The marginalised section**

It can be concluded that of all the sections (Black, Coloured, Indian and White) in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, the White section was the domineering section of all sections and the Black section was the marginalised section of all sections. Although the Coloured section and the Indian section were also oppressed by the supreme White section, the Black section was the most oppressed. Therefore the Black section can be classified as the marginalised section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. It is compared with the marginalised community in Mark.

Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was inconsistent in their dealings with White and Black pastors. For example White pastor Wessels was actively involved in party politics and even served for many years as a National Party senator, while he remained in active ministry (De Wet 1989:208). In 1981, the Black pastor, Frank Chikane, was accused of being involved in politics and suspended from ministry even though he never had been directly involved in any political organisations between 1974 and 1983.

The roots of the oppression and marginalisation of Blacks and other minorities in the country were based in a theology of a privileged Western civilisation to the exclusion of all other groups. Concomitant with this privilege was the thin line that divided Western theology and Christian theology. For the Black majority to be liberated liberation theology was needed. The more the Black section inclined towards a Western theology the more they were oppressed (Welty 2005:71).

This marginalisation was seen in the leadership positions of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Anderson (2005:61) correctly states that racism was more blatantly practiced in South African Pentecostalism than in most other countries in the world. African pastors were given only nominal and local leadership opportunities and the practice became the accepted practice of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Other prominent leadership positions were reserved for the White pastors who could also lead in Black churches and communities. The same pattern pertained in all other White-led Pentecostal denominations until the 1990s.

The God-given dignity and worth of Blacks as human beings was disregarded in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa as well as in society. They were robbed of their rights and freedom by their White oppressors in the country (Lapoorta 1996:91). In South African society of discriminatory acts in the republic were passed, although often without the means of effective enforcement. Africans were forbidden to carry guns and they were subject to vagrancy and pass laws. Blacks were permitted to register land ownership. Although many controlled land held nominally by missionaries and other Whites, in some cases the land was purchased by African chiefs in the years after the South African War (Worden 2012:79).

A defining characteristic of a large portion of the Pentecostals in the Apostolic Faith Mission is that they are Black. Even more definitive is that along with their blackness, Black South Africans experienced oppression. They were victimised in ways that have left a permanent impression on their cultures; but the experience of oppression was not only a negative one. Given the roots of oppression that have been a part of their experience, a yearning for liberation has become rooted in their culture, not the least of which is facilitated by and mediated through their faith (Richardson 2013:44).

In the Apostolic Faith Mission, Black leaders were not given an opportunity to take part in the high echelons of the church. It means that decisions were taken on their behalf without their consent because they were not members of such decision making bodies of the church. The Black people were regarded as adherents and not members of the church as only Whites could become full members of the church. This marginalisation became a source of humility and submission for the majority of Black pastors. To some it was a source of inspiration to seek a solution through zeal and knowledge whereas others reacted by starting their own organisation.

## **5.1.2 White supremacy**

### **5.1.2.1 Definition**

White supremacy, for example, refers to the differences in the degree of occupational differentiation by colour. A more general concern is to provide an understanding of the life styles of Whites and Blacks and of the complex system of race relations in which they are both involved. The major social mechanism which serves to maintain White supremacy includes political control, Black deprivation, economic and social imbalances (Richard 1975:40).

In a much more restricted sense, the term for example can be used to describe the regimes of the American Old South and apartheid South Africa. In broad terms Charles (1994:108) suggests a more general concept that would refer more broadly to the European domination of the civilised world. For the past several hundred years, it has left others with a segregated distribution of economic, political and cultural power in the world today.

White supremacy is another form of racism centred upon the belief. It is a belief that White people are superior in certain characteristics, and attributes to people of other racial backgrounds. Consequently, Whites should politically, economically and socially rule non-Whites. The term is also typically used to describe a political ideology that perpetuates and maintains the social, political, historical and or industrial domination by White people. It refers to a system where Whites enjoy a structural advantage over other ethnic groups (Wildman 1996:87).

There is a thin line that divides racial segregation with White supremacy. White supremacy is inextricably interwoven with the notion and practice of White racism. It manifests in the social, economic, political and cultural history of a nation. It has affected the lives of peoples of African descent throughout the world over a long period of time (Mark 2002:180). Another concept closer to White supremacy is 'racial sovereignty' whose citizenship includes 'normative Whiteness'. This citizenship precludes the pre-emptive detention that may occur for other racial groups like Black, Coloured and Indian (Grewal 2013:191).

### **5.1.2.2 White supremacy in the Apostolic Faith Mission**

In South Africa, Whites determined the identity of Blacks, that is, the life they should live and where and how they should live it. Whites determined the friendship, marriage and education for the Black majority. Whites determined the possibilities and the boundaries of humanity for Black people based on the colour of their skin (Boesak 1984:6).

In relation to White supremacy in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa De Wet (1989:162) explains that the early White leaders followed closely a policy of paternalism. Only White superintendents were appointed over the native work. When the first elders of the Apostolic Faith Mission were appointed, there were no Blacks amongst them because they were not part of the church membership but a section of the church. The Black leaders were not part of a decision making body but were only informed about decisions taken and that their only option was to obey. Otherwise all decisions taken by Blacks had to be subjected to the scrutinising and approval of the White Executive Council. Erasmus (1996:26) adds that the Native Council that governed the 'native work' from 1910 consisted of three White leaders and three Black leaders. The strong White control was partly responsible for the schisms in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa during the period of racial segregation was very conservative and White controlled. This was the case although the majority of the membership was Black together with the Coloured and Indian church. The structure of the Apostolic Faith Mission was basically just like the Dutch Reformed Church whereby the main church was the White church and the rest were mere

missions. The superintendent was appointed to oversee the mission churches (Sider & Chikane 1988:9). In addition the appointment of superintendents over Blacks on a national and regional level, as well as the Bible School principals and lecturers, was the prerogative of the Missionary Council. All members of this council were White (Lapoorta 1996:52).

Another sign of White supremacy is that anyone from the White race in the Apostolic Faith Mission automatically became superior to Blacks. Moripe (1998:96) indicates that White ministers who did not have congregations could come to Black congregations and give orders, and they also took money; these White ministers together with their wives refused to do what Black people were doing during a church service.

In other words the Whites controlled even the work among Black people. The Black people could not lead alone or take part in the Executive Council. Anderson (2000:86) makes an interesting point that by 1915 this racist attitude had become even more pronounced, when the Executive Council of the Apostolic Faith Mission declared that a Black church official could not make an ordination or leadership appointment without the consent of the White superintendent. By 1925 the Executive Council had decided that all Black districts should be under the control of a White overseer, under the White chairman of the White district.

The White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa had its own Executive Council and President elected by Whites (Paul 2006:79). Since the founding of the church in 1908, White members had determined the constitution and power had been vested in an all-White Executive Council (Els 2007:560). While other sections of the church did not have an Executive Council instead a mission director was appointed to take responsibility for what was called 'daughter' churches, or 'mission' churches chaired all the meetings of these churches. These churches were merely extensions of the mother church that is the White church, the true church, while the mission church was just a stepchild.

Another sign of White supremacy is that the White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission centralised the whole church organisation, with the result that the local

assembly was not allowed to buy or sell property (Burger & Nel 2008:331). All decisions, as well as any building project, had to be approved by the Executive Council. The local assembly could only recommend to the District Council and Executive Council what it thought best for itself. The Executive Council had the final say. The district committee advised the Executive Council in property matters.

The primary function of the Executive Council was responsible for the business of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa when the Workers Council was not in session (Nel 2014:109). The Executive Council was formed by the chairpersons of the different districts (later called regions) and the national office bearers elected by the Workers Council. The Workers Council comprised representatives of all assemblies.

In terms of history, the Apostolic Faith Mission was a White church that rather casually laboured among Blacks and developed Black daughter churches that never really influenced the denomination seriously until the 1990s. The Apostolic Faith Mission unashamedly identified with the social developments in South Africa that were formulated by the Afrikaner Nationalist government. In the early years, this was simply because that was how Europeans in Africa thought and behaved. It also found expression in the Apostolic Faith Mission in a determined resistance to communism and Black Nationalism, and an emotional identification with Afrikaner Nationalism (Clark 2005:155).

### **5.1.2.3 Overcoming White supremacy in the Apostolic Faith Mission**

In order to fight White supremacy in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa Cone (2004) recommends and proposes that Whites need to support Black empowerment in society, church and theology. Black empowerment refers to Blacks thinking, speaking and doing for themselves. The Black church and Black theology are Black empowerment in religion. To create an antiracist theology, White theologians must engage the histories, cultures and theologies of people of colour. It is not enough to condemn racism. The voices of people of colour must be found in theology. White theologians do not have to agree with Black perspectives but they need to understand them and incorporate their meaning into the theological discourse.

### **5.1.3 Schisms**

#### **5.1.3.1 Introduction**

The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa has suffered many schisms since the early stages of the church. Many of these schisms were never recorded in the history of the church, especially schisms that came from the Zionist movement associated with P.L. le Roux and Black pastors. P.L. le Roux was one of the prominent leaders of the Apostolic Faith Mission with a Zionist background. Many of those Zionists wanted to retain their Zionist character and features in the Apostolic Faith Mission. When that was impossible it then caused splits.

These schisms should not be underestimated as they impacted negatively in the Apostolic Faith Mission and the Pentecostal Movement in South Africa. If it had not been because of the schisms the church would have grown much larger in number than the status quo. The church would not have suffered the divisions that spanned for a long period. Although it is the largest Pentecostal church in Southern Africa, the Apostolic Faith Mission is not the largest Christian church because of competition by Zionist churches.

This study considers the following schisms:

- (1) Zion Apostolic church associated with Elias Mahlangu and also considered one of the earliest schisms in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.
- (2) Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion is associated with Daniel Nkonyane but it should not be confused with John Alexander Dowie's Christian Catholic Apostolic Zion Church, Daniel Nkonyane just added the Holy Spirit to John Alexander Dowie's name,
- (3) Zion Apostolic Faith Mission founded by Edward Motaung who was also a member of the Apostolic Faith Mission.
- (4) Latter Rain was founded by Martha Fraser in Benoni in the East Rand.
- (5) Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission.
- (6) Protestant Pentecostal Church.

This section of the study is concluded by looking at the main reasons that caused these schisms in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. The reasons may differ,

for example, from the schisms that emanated from the Zion Movement and those that happened within the church as a Pentecostal Movement. The other factor is that the schisms happened in different periods in the history of the Apostolic Faith Mission. As a result each schism had its unique reasons of occurrence.

### **5.1.3.2 Zion Apostolic Church**

In the beginning the name 'Zion' was used to refer to the 'Zion' branch of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. The Black leaders were more willing to cooperate under the name and still remain with the Apostolic Faith Mission. The decision was taken on the understanding that they would be permitted to carry on their work independently and indigenise the Pentecostal Movement. When this was not possible under the White Executive Council, leaders like Elias Mahlangu seceded to form the 'Zion Apostolic Church'. The reason historians in the church do not consider 'Zion Apostolic Church' a schism is because most Zionists at that time were regarded as part of the Apostolic Faith Mission (see Erasmus 1996:34).

P.L. le Roux was spending much of his time and energy away from this branch and concentrating more in the Apostolic Faith Mission, he was therefore advised to resign. Elias Mahlangu emerged as a leader. During this time there was a major proliferation of Zionist groups becoming independent (De Wet 1989:34).

Elias Mahlangu as an Apostolic Faith Mission preacher did not break with the White Pentecostals until about 1917. He then left to establish the Zion Apostolic Church of South Africa, one of the earliest of much secession from the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa (Anderson 1999:288). For many years the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa regarded this congregation as its Zion branch. There was a gradual estrangement which occurred between the Pentecostals and the Zionists that ultimately resulted in the breakaway by this branch (Roy 2000:113). This would suggest that the Zion Apostolic Church and Elias Mahlangu were a part of the Apostolic Faith Mission for a long time until the departure of P.L. le Roux.

The split between the Zion Apostolic Church and the Apostolic Faith Mission was basically a split between Zion and Pentecost (Khathide 2010:49). The split was not necessarily centred around an individual like Elias Mahlangu but based on

fundamental differences between Zion and Pentecost. One of the outstanding differences was the issue of ritual symbols during a church service like the wearing of white robes and carrying crosses and holy sticks. These symbols were not synonymous to South African Zionism but were practiced initially by John Alexander Dowie's Zionism in Zion City.

On 8 December 1915 a special meeting was arranged to discuss the fusing of the Apostolic Faith Mission with the Zion Apostolic Church. After voting it was decided against working with the Apostolic Faith Mission. At a Workers Conference a few of the workers who had come out of the Zionist movement testified why they had left the Zionists. The proposal that the Apostolic Faith Mission would not have any fellowship with the Zionist movement was accepted (Burger & Nel 2008:246).

### **5.1.3.3 Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit church in Zion**

Whilst some of the Zionist congregation eventually followed P.L. le Roux into the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, fifty and six others like Daniel Nkonyane, used their relative autonomy and the low-key links they had with the Apostolic Faith Mission to develop their own Zionist followers. Nkonyane therefore founded the Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion. Once free from missionary supervision; these leaders developed Africanised versions of Pentecostalism very different in form and intent from the original American packages. These Africanised versions were more visible when it came to divine healing and liturgy (Maxwell 1999:250).

In supporting this view of Africanised and Zionism versions of the Pentecostal Movement, Roy (2000:113) mentions that between 1912 and 1920 Daniel Nkonyane, the most impressive among the early Zion leaders founded the Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion. It was Nkonyane who, as a leader in the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion had introduced certain elements into worship which have remained visible hallmarks of Zionism to this day: white robes, bare feet, holy sticks, and Old Testament symbolism. P.L. le roux and other White Pentecostals objected to the use of such symbols. As a result of these differences Daniel Nkonyane broke away from the Apostolic Faith Mission to initiate the Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion.

There is another view on the existence of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion. The African church continued to work together with the Apostolic Faith Mission, Whites passed racist laws and kept all significant leadership positions within their ranks. This contributed to the many schisms that took place thereafter and the African Zionist leaders left. Two of the Zulu leaders associated with P.L. le Roux were Daniel Nkonyane and Fred Luthuli, both of whom already had hundreds of followers of their own by 1905 and were to establish a significant number of African Independent Zionist Churches after breaking with the Apostolic Faith Mission from 1910 onwards. Nkonyane broke with the Apostolic Faith Mission in 1910, eventually forming the Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion (Anderson 2008:28).

Nkonyane took over the leadership in Zionist congregation. He had worked alongside P.L. le Roux from 1890. He looked for a White leader to take P.L. le Roux's place. Edgar Mahon, formerly a captain in the Salvation Army, baptised by Büchler, served for a short while in that congregation. He bought land for Nkonyane's work at Charlestown and Nkonyane changed the name of his church to the Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion. The Apostolic Faith Mission took Nkonyane's ordination certificate away because he left the church (Nel 2005:139).

As P.L. le Roux became increasingly involved in the activities of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, Daniel Nkonyane, presumably one of the most trusted co-workers, started emerging as an outstanding leader of the Zionists (Khathide 2010:46). He had been with P.L. le Roux ever since the latter's Dutch Reformed days in the 1890's and was himself originally a member of the Dutch Reformed mission. Daniel and Nkonyane and his wife shared P.L. le Roux's experiences. When Nkonyane was dismissed as a leader, he founded the Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion.

#### **5.1.3.4 Zion Apostolic Faith Mission**

Edward Motaung (also known as Edward lion) the founder of the Zion Apostolic Faith Mission was at first a preacher in the Apostolic Faith Mission as he joined the church

in 1912 and was given oversight of the work in Lesotho. The reasons for the breakaway with the church are not that clear but it is assumed that he became involved in heretical teaching and prophecies which resulted in him being discredited. Nevertheless, he was one of the first early Pentecostals with the intent of founding a 'City of Zion' in Lesotho similar to the one of John Alexander Dowie in Chicago. It seems that the dream was fulfilled because he also influenced Engenas Lekganyane, the founder of Zion Christian Church and Zion City Moriah (see Anderson 1992:41).

To add to the uncertainties of the Zion Apostolic Faith Mission and Edward Motaung, Roy (2000:115) estimates that as late as 1921 the Apostolic Faith Mission still regarded him as the leader of its work in Lesotho, but some time before that he had seceded to form the Zion Apostolic Faith Mission. Other evidence suggests that he seceded from the Zion Apostolic Church in 1920. These uncertainties are caused by the fact that there was a thin line in the early stages that divided the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa and Zionist churches.

In order to give clarity to these uncertainties, Maxwell (1999:250) explains that prior to the South African Pentecost, Lion had cultivated links with White Zionist, Edgar Mahon, but from 1910 to 1919 he maintained relations with the Apostolic Faith Mission. Lion was considered Apostolic Faith Mission Overseer for Basutoland and his delegates attended the 1918 Native Conference. He went his own way again in 1921, printing his own identification cards which bore a remarkable resemblance to the one previously issued to him by the Apostolic Faith Mission. He subsequently developed a very distinctive and controversial set of Zionist practices.

To sum up Burger and Nel (2008:205) states that the father of Sotho-Zionism was Edward Motaung. He had a charismatic ministry with large number of followers in Basutoland. When the first Apostolic Faith Mission workers arrived in Basutoland in 1912, they met with Edward Motaung, who was already working on his own for a number of years, disseminating a form of Zionism. After negotiations, Edward joined the Apostolic Faith Mission and renamed his church the 'Zion Apostolic Faith Mission'. In 1914 Apostolic Faith Mission had problems with Edward because of lack of submission and in 1921 the final break came and did a lot of harm to the Apostolic Faith Mission in Lesotho.

### 5.1.3.5 The Latter Rain group

The Latter Rain group in South Africa was not in any way connected with the well-known international Latter Rain Churches, but had sought similar manifestations and emphasis to the known Latter Rain Churches at large. These comprise of rigorous bodily participation, mutual in both worship and in use of the gifts of the Spirit; liturgical dance; stress on private revelation in spite of inconsistency with scripture; sins; atypical forms of clothing; prophesying; and firm individual and authoritarian leadership (Chandomba 2007:32).

The Latter Rain group in South Africa came about as a result of a split that happened in the Apostolic Faith Mission. According to Burger and Nel (2008:107), this was one of the most unfortunate episodes in the early history of the Apostolic Faith Mission. It started with Mrs. Maria Fraser, who joined the church in Benoni, in 1920. After a few years she developed the conviction that the church was spiritually ‘cooling down’ and that sins were on the increase. She firmly believed that a worldly inclination was taking over in the church. She alleged that this placed a damper on the free operation of spiritual gifts

The motivation and inspiration to start the Latter Rain group by Mrs. Maria Fraser were not only because she was anti-sin but also because she was pro-manifestation of the Holy Spirit. Roy (2000:112) acknowledges the fact that in 1927 Mrs. Maria Fraser prophesied a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit within the Apostolic Faith Mission. During the following nine months Fraser’s followers experienced times of heavenly ecstasy with singing in tongues, holy dancing, laughing in the Spirit and visions of angels. The Apostolic Faith Mission leadership reacted strongly to what they regarded as the strange behaviour and unfair criticism of Maria Fraser and her followers, who were eventually expelled from the church.

The reason for the expulsion was that Mrs. Maria Fraser led a large number of Apostolic Faith Mission members into conflict with the church officials on the issue of Holy Spirit-inspired prophecy. Eventually the conflict led to a schism in which the Latter Rain movement found its expression in South Africa in 1928. Her women followers wear Blue Dresses and until today are known as Blue Dresses by the

general and Christian public. The single positive contribution of Mrs. Maria Fraser to the Apostolic Faith Mission was an awakened re-emphasis upon the work. The presence of the Holy Spirit in church and ministry, together with the caution that such work and presence can never be assumed (as the Latter Rain people were assuming) outside of the parameters spelled out in the scriptures (Clark 2007:45).

#### **5.1.3.6 Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission**

Christina Nku was a member and a minister of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. When P.L. le Roux had objected to some of her more elaborate displays of prophetic rapture, she left to start the Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission. She also had a vision of a big church with twelve doors and she was told to follow the baptism of John and Jesus. She had another vision in which she was shown the exact place where she was to build the church near Evaton in Johannesburg. She became famous as a faith healer and prayed for bottles and buckets of water which were used for healing. These practices soon distanced Christina Nku from the Pentecostal Movement (Anderson 1992:106).

Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission should not only be seen as a breakaway or a faction, but as a church that came through a vision and revelation from God. The church began in 1938 when its Black female founder, Mother Christina Nku, received a vision from God to establish the church (Thomas 1997:13). Since then, branches of the church, with a total membership exceeding two million have spread throughout Southern Africa. Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission signifies a nuanced form of survival and resistance within macro-structures during both the apartheid and post-apartheid dispensations.

Christina Nku, who took the title 'Founder and General President' of the Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission, became well-known as a person of prayer with healing power. She gathered thousands into her church. It was particularly her practices, however, that brought increasing distance between her and the Apostolic Faith Mission (Roy 2000:118). In 1906, at Derdepoort (Botswana), a twelve year old Tswana girl named Christina Nku experienced the first of a series of divine visions that eventually led to the founding of a powerful African independent church under the name Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission (Landman 2006:1).

In addition Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission is a type of an African independent church that is relevant to divine healing and deliverance. Masondo (2013:157) brings attention to the study that Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission and all its splinter groups can be theorised as presenting a crisis model for managing change. These churches provide their members with a well worked out path of inclusion through baptism and related rituals, as well as, alleviation of crisis through an assortment of healing, cleansing and deliverance rituals.

### **5.1.3.7 Protestant Pentecostal Church**

The Apostolic Faith Mission underwent major upheaval in the 1950s over what was perceived as open support of the Nationalist government. In 1956 it permitted its vice-president, G.R. Wessels, to accept a Nationalist government nominated seat in the South African Senate. This move inaugurated a major split in the church when, after bitter controversy, twelve Apostolic Faith Mission ministers and several of their members seceded to launch a new denomination, the Pentecostal Protestant Church. The dissenting group did not object to the policies of the Nationalist Government but rather to the political involvement of one of the Apostolic Faith Mission officials (Pillay 1987:47).

The election of G.R. Wessels as a Nationalist senator in 1955, was both politically and spiritually controversial. Horn (1991:7) explains that from a spiritual perspective it was an extraordinary decision by the Apostolic Faith Mission to allow a pastor to become a politician while keeping his pastoral credentials and staying on as vice-president. From a political point of view it meant that the Apostolic Faith Mission as the church supported the political ideologies of the National Party especially ideologies of racial segregation.

At the 1956 Workers Council of the Apostolic Faith Mission, a motion stated that no full-time worker should be actively involved in party politics. G.R. Wessels, the vice-president of the church at that time held on to the position until 1970, when he decided to retire from ministry and relinquished this powerful position. This resulted in heavy inner fights in the church and eventually culminated in the schism (Lapoorta 1996:69). In the same year that G.R. Wessels became senator, the Apostolic Faith

Mission magazine 'The Comforter' argued in support of the belief that Whites were mentally, emotionally and spiritually superior to Blacks, using scripture to support this assumption. The White church also discouraged Blacks from being involved in politics or voicing their political beliefs. In other words it was acceptable for a White pastor to be involved in politics but unacceptable for a Black pastor to take part in political activities (Matika 2004:71).

The appointment of G.R. Wessels as senator and his ultimate involvement in politics was intentional and positive. The intention was to alienate the non-Afrikaner membership of the movement, as well as those Afrikaners who did not support the National Party. It backfired as this led to eventual radicalisation of some younger Black pastors (e.g., Frank Chikane), and the eventual loss of most of the English membership. Furthermore, a major schism of Afrikaner members who (among other grievances) did not support his politics took place. It was positive because it led to the church being allowed to register as a religious denomination (as opposed to its registration under the Companies Act in 1908) with all the benefits it brought to its public ministry. The benefits included access to the state-controlled airwaves, entrance to a ministry in the security forces, and hospitals and prisons as chaplains and lay-workers (Clark 2007:46).

The Apostolic Faith Mission under the leadership of G.R. Wessels, aligned itself with the politics of the National Democratic Party. This led to the disappointment of a large number of its members. The church sought for recognition and social standing on par with the other Afrikaner church organisations within the country. Some members of the Apostolic Faith Mission openly expressed their disappointment in the church's newsletters; other members eventually left to form new churches (Richardson 2013:50).

This appointment of G.R. Wessels was not the only reason for the 1958 schism. Chandomba (2007:36) identifies the well-known healing evangelists William Branham and Oral Roberts's tour to South Africa in 1951. With their great and touching services, their tour aroused a passion amid countless others for a more extrovert Pentecostal liturgy. The miraculous gifts of the Spirit could manifest throughout their services demonstrating the power and the Spirit. These components

blended to bring about a division of the Apostolic Faith Mission membership into two factions. The first faction was the Old Apostolic Faith Mission and the second the New Apostolic Faith Mission.

The other cause of the Protestant Pentecostal Church schism was competition for position especially in the White Executive Council. Burger and Nel (2008:160) cites one example of such jogging for positions which also resulted in unrest and schism in the church in 1958. The person referred to in this case is Pastor JH Snyman, the main character and soul of the schism as a result of personal vendetta and competition for senior posts. He is said to have had ambitions of becoming the General Secretary of the church, and when he was not chosen for the post, he started the schism.

#### **5.1.3.8 Main reasons for schisms**

There are so many reasons which gave rise to the schisms in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Among these reasons were differences in doctrine, political affiliations, competition for leadership positions and racial discrimination as a result of the segregation policy of the Apostolic Faith Mission, the ambitions of the Black leadership and the indigenisation of the religious experience of Black people. The latter is the major cause of the proliferation of African Independent Churches, mostly Zionist churches. The Zionist churches in this context refer to the Zion Apostolic Church, Christian Catholic Apostolic Holy Spirit Church in Zion and Zion Apostolic Faith Mission.

In some instances it was mostly negligence of African leaders than racial segregation. The Apostolic Faith Mission left Black pastors without any support. From about 1915 onwards African pastors of the then Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, were either neglected or made independent (Hollenweger 1972:102). When P.L. le Roux changed further to work more closely with the Apostolic Faith Mission, these men were alone. They would not follow him. What they did was of a pattern that would repeat itself to the present day. They gathered to fast and pray. And there as they met on their mountain top or near a deep pool, they shared their visions, dreams and prophecies as of old and believed that they were confirmed by

scripture. In the process they gave birth to a movement that now claims several million followers in Southern Africa (Poewe 1988:148).

There were other factors that caused a proliferation of Zionist churches at this period Poewe (1988:148) goes on to say that the Old Testament emphasis in Zionist churches has made for easy accommodation of Zulu predilections for dreams, visions, prophecies, dancing and praise songs. This accommodation and the acceptance of polygamy, no doubt contributed to the rapid growth of the Zion churches. Erasmus (1996:34) is adamant that it was the strong historical ties of P.L. le Roux with the American 'Zion' movement and the exclusion of the word 'Zion' in the name of the Apostolic Faith Mission that played a strong role in these schisms. Equally important was the strong domination by the 'Whites' who enforced westernised thinking on Africans without their consent.

The following are the two factors that led to the existence of these African Independent Churches: South African history reveals that the macro-structures such as the Apostolic Faith Mission during racial segregation developed to give advantages to White South Africans. Consequently, they guaranteed the underdevelopment of African, Asian and Coloured communities in South Africa. These macro-structures are biased. They are also a direct outgrowth of the culture, and history which White South Africans brought with them from their European origins. Poor Black Africans have developed healing rituals to reorient, and, in a sense, reinvent their social reality (Thomas 1997:13). In relation to this proliferation, African leadership was not given space to emerge and function. This eventually resulted in sessions of independent Zionist and Apostolic churches, and increasing distance between Black and White Pentecostals in the same denomination. The sessions from the Apostolic Faith Mission marked the beginning of the independent African Pentecostal churches, which mushroomed from some thirty churches in 1913 to three thousand by 1970, and over six thousand by 1990 (Anderson 2001:3).

Racial prejudice encouraged the split that took place in the early phase of the Apostolic Faith Mission. Those Blacks who had joined the Apostolic Faith Mission from the Zionist group of P.L. le Roux eventually found themselves estranged from the decision-making of the church, since most of the converts among the Whites

were Afrikaners. These so-called 'Poor Whites' found themselves in economic competition with Blacks, particularly in the urban setting and tensions were not long in developing. In 1919 a large group of Black members withdrew from the Apostolic Faith Mission (Clark 2005:144).

In the schisms that led to the beginning of the African Independent and Zionist Churches Chandomba (2007:33) agrees that racism played a major role in the breaking away of the Black Zionists to launch their own organisation. The open support of the apartheid policies in South Africa by the White leadership of the Apostolic Faith Mission led to such destruction of the relationship between the Black and White members of the Apostolic Faith Mission from which both groups needed liberation.

Many of the Black leaders who broke away from the Apostolic Faith Mission did so when they noticed that they were being systematically excluded from the leadership functions of the church. This refers to especially leaders who were in the Zionist movement led by P.L. le Roux. These leaders could not stand to be sidelined from the tasks they were accustomed to. For many Black leaders, to leave the Apostolic Faith Mission served as their mechanism for protesting the racially divisive policies implemented by the leadership of the Apostolic Faith Mission. It was also a means to protest against the theological and political positions that the institutional church took on the issues of the day. For others, continued participation in the Apostolic Faith Mission combined with engagement in the struggle for racial equality through a variety of means was the approach that they chose to take (Richardson 2013:30).

The Latter Rain group was expelled from the Apostolic Faith Mission as a result of the manifestations of the Holy Spirit that the leaders could not understand. Similarly, the Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission was founded on the basis of the prophetic utterances and demonstrations of the Holy Spirit that P.L. le Roux could not understand. The other similarity between the Latter Rain group and Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission is that both were started by women, Mrs. Maria Fraser and Christina Nku respectively.

It is probable that these two women were undermined in the Apostolic Faith Mission because of their gender rather than their race. One reason for this probability is the fact that their male counterparts in the Apostolic Faith Mission like G.R. Wessels committed greater sin by taking part in politics as a pastor without the church's permission but was never expelled. It is beyond doubt that gender might have played a part in the schisms that led to the foundation of both the Latter Rain group in Benoni, East Rand and Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission in Evaton, in the Vaal.

There are three possibilities to the schism that started the Protestant Pentecostal Church. The first one is the appointment of G.R. Wessels to the National Party senate, second, the political upheaval around G.R. Wessels events concerning the salt river congregation as it was opposed to pastor G.R. Wessels' participation in politics. Third, it is the difference between the Old Order that accepted the humanistic manifestation of the Holy Spirit and the New Order that rejected the humanistic manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the Apostolic Faith Mission. Fourth, it is the competition for positions in the Executive Council. The same way with James and John in Mark, members of the Executive Council wanted to sit on the left and on the right in places of glory. They did not prioritise service over ambition and self-interest but continued to seek positions and competed for them (see Burger & Nel 2008:146).

The mentioned causes of schism highlight the fact that greed and competition are the source of division and disgruntlement among members of the same organisation. Furthermore, the Protestant Pentecostal Church schism shows that the White leaders were permitted to take part in party politics and still remain ministers of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Black leaders could not take part in party politics; otherwise they would be labelled terrorists and be suspended from the church.

#### **5.1.4 Summary**

The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was racially segregated into four sections, the Black, Coloured, Indian and the White section. The most privileged section was the White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission which was considered a church while others were considered missions. Church Members were only in the

White section, in other sections they were as followers. In all the four sections, the Black section was the most marginalised section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

Prominent positions in the leadership of the Apostolic Faith Mission especially in the Executive Council were only occupied by the White leaders. Even in the Black section the White leaders were elected to lead Black people. Many of these leaders continued to occupy positions in political parties and government, even when it was against the constitution of the church at that time. When competition for leadership arose, some left the church to start their own.

Splits and secessions were not only caused by competition for positions but the racial line that divided the sections of the church also contributed a great deal. Churches like the Zion Apostolic Faith Mission and the Saint John Apostolic Faith Mission were started as a result of racial discrimination against Black leaders. The Latter Rain Church was started as a result of doctrinal differences but the Pentecostal Protestant Church was a split from the Apostolic Faith Mission because of a number of reasons such as political upheavals, personal interests and competition for positions.

This section of the study highlights an important aspect of the history of the church. The White section of Apostolic Faith Mission was a domineering section in the church. This section led by ruling and lording over other sections of the church. White Pentecostals practiced White supremacy in the church because there was no other race that could assume a role in the leadership of the church especially the Executive Council. One minority race was superior and other majority races were inferior.

## **5.2 SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN APOSTOLIC FAITH MISSION AFTER 1996**

### **5.2.1 Servant leadership is unity**

#### **5.2.1.1 Introduction**

The leadership misconceptions caused by the divisions in the church needed leaders who believed in unity, transparency, reconciliation and service to all people regardless of their race, or colour. Servant leadership is seen in unity-between Black,

Coloured and the Indian section of the Apostolic Faith Mission and unity between what is known as the Composite Division (Black, Coloured and Indian) and the White Division. Servant leadership is ultimately seen in the unity of the whole church under the single name, Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa without sections and divisions.

The first move towards church unity within the Apostolic Faith Mission came in 1974 when guidelines were drawn up for the development of the 'daughter churches'. This was followed by a decision later that year that the Coloured church should merge with the White church to form one Executive Council in future. In 1975 administrative unity between the White and Coloured sections was adopted. In 1976 the Coloured section was allowed to choose their own district chairman, the Indian section followed in 1978 and the Black section in 1980 (Erasmus 1996:89).

Since 1974 there were constant negotiations towards unity in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. In 1985 according to Lapoorta (1996:74), the four sections of the church drew up a declaration of intent towards unity. The following statements formed the basis of all future actions in the unity process:

- The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa confirms its acceptance of the biblical principles of unity.
- The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa rejects the system of segregation based on racial discrimination as a principle in the kingdom of God and within the structure of the church.
- The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa accepts the principle that the church should operate as a single structural unit based on the above principles.
- The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa agrees that worship and membership of the church should be based on the spontaneous grouping of believers.
- In the light of the above intent a committee representative of all the sections of the church should be appointed to formulate further steps for the implementation of the above.

In the light of these negotiations among the sections of the church there were many challenges against church unity. It is for this reason that during this time the White section Executive Council decided to call upon the mother and daughter churches of the Apostolic Faith Mission to dedicate a special time of fasting and prayer from January to March 1975 for the saving of souls, regaining of the healing ministry, sanctification among members, as well as the realisation of unity in the church (Burger & Nel 2008:406). In 1989 the Committee for unity met a delegation from the White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission. The committee came with a proposed constitution from the White section Workers Council which was unacceptable to the delegates from the other three sections. They saw this as a backward step; the proposed interim constitution was still the only basis for unity (Anderson 1992:80).

During this period there was a zeal for the unity of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa especially the three sections of the church namely: the Black section, Coloured section and Indian section. It seems that the White section was taking a step backward in relation to the unity of the church. It explains the reason why it has taken Apostolic Faith Mission from 1974 since the negotiations started to reach a state of unity.

### **5.2.1.2 Unity in the Composite division**

The composite division existed as a result of delaying tactics and reluctance for unity by the White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission. The Black, Coloured and Indian sections of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa decided to unite to form what is called the Composite Division. While the White section remained independent it was declared a White Division. As a result of the Composite Division, Apostolic Faith Mission moved from four sections to two divisions: the Composite Division (Black, Coloured and Indian) and the White Division.

In September 1990 the three sections (Black, Coloured and Indian) gave expression to the declaration by merging. The leadership consisting of the office bearers of each section was responsible for the joint administration of the Composite Division. In April 1991 the Workers Council of the White section accepted a new constitution, allowing corporate administration of the legal personality by the White single Division and Composite Division. It also reaffirmed its intention to create a single structure for

the whole church (Horn 1991:11). In the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa during the years of struggle the three sections of the church moved from three ethnic sections to one division, and the sections reached an amicable constitutional arrangement in which the constitutional control of the White Division over the powerless sections had been curbed. The three sections united while negotiations were still continuing to finally unite with the 'White' Division (Lapoorta 1996:115).

An important meeting was held in Port Shepstone in May 1988, when six delegates from each of the three sections Workers Council came together. It was agreed that the committee for unity should continue to negotiate with the White Division, but that the three sections should themselves unite and become a legal entity within the Apostolic Faith Mission. Legal opinion was sought, as it was clear that the Whites were not moving towards real unity. They were advised that the interim arrangement should be to agree to two divisions in the Apostolic Faith Mission constituted by two statutes, each of which was subsidiary to Private Act 24/1961 under which the Apostolic Faith Mission had legal standing (Anderson 2000:99). When the three sections of the Apostolic Faith Mission finally united to form the Composite Division, it was after various attempts were made to unite the White, Black, Indian and Coloured churches, but the White section had some reservations and asked for more time. As a result the Black, Coloured and Indian sections unified in 1992 and formed the Apostolic Faith Mission Composite Division (Matika 2004:70).

In other words the three sections of the church became impatient with the delay for the unity of the whole church. Paul (2006:80) points out that five years between 1981-1986 of unity talks and discussions followed, which varied between hope, despair and frustration on both sides. No discernible positive results toward unity were achieved. A crisis point was reached in 1991, which led the three sections (Black, Coloured and Indian) to unite without the White section. The union of the mission churches revitalised negotiations between the White and Black churches.

The foundation of the Composite Division in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was as a result of the White section of the church's delay in the unity process. This led to the formation of the two divisions in the Apostolic Faith Mission from January 1993. It is obvious that the other three sections of the church were more

pro-unity than the White section. It is a sign that these three sections were uncomfortable with the current system of racial segregation in the church. While the White section continued to benefit from the system.

Although a move in the right direction, the Composite Division however did not solve the two major problems of the Apostolic Faith Mission: Racial segregation and White supremacy. The church was still divided under two divisions, the Composite and White Division. In conclusion Richardson (2013:30) indicates that although the Black, Coloured, and Indian sections united to form the Composite Division under one leadership and largely governed their own affairs, they did so in the context of the White Division decision-making on church-wide policies. The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa still had to unite under one constitution and name to defeat a system of racial segregation and White supremacy.

### **5.2.1.3 Unity between the Composite and White divisions**

As indicated in the above section, there were few factors that hindered unity between the Composite Division and the White Division. One of the factors is that the White Division insisted on geographically-linguistically demarcated districts in order to maintain their predominantly Afrikaans speaking districts intact (Lapoorta 1996:108).

These obstacles did not stop the strong drive in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa towards unity. The two presidents of the Apostolic Faith Mission, one (Frank Chikane) elected by the Composite Division of the church, and the other (Isak Burger) elected by the White Division moved towards unification. They moved towards the Apostolic Faith Mission under one legal entity tied together by a common constitution and at an executive level by liaison committees with equal representation, dealing with property and finance, liaison and doctrine, ethics and liturgy (Anderson 2000:100).

It took both Frank Chikane from the Composite Division and Isak Burger from the White Division to unite the two divisions of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. The two leaders saw a possibility of a united Apostolic Faith Mission. They respectively made sacrifices in order to accommodate the other division. It takes a humble servant to prioritise the needs of others. It further takes qualities of servant leadership such as described in Mark to pursue unity.

Although the White Division was initially skeptical, Matika (2004:70) states that the division finally united with the Composite Division in 1995, one year after South Africa's first democratic elections. Throughout its history, this Afrikaner dominated division supported apartheid until the early 1990s when the government indicated willingness to negotiate a democratic settlement.

In June 1992, Whites and Blacks agreed on a new constitution. The constitution took into consideration the existence of the two divisions. For the first time in the history of this church, the constitution set the two divisions on an equal footing. Intensive and painful negotiations continued between the two divisions followed by an agreement on structural unity of the church. The Composite Division adopted the new constitution in July 1994, and the White Division adopted it in April 1995 (Paul 2006:80). The fact that the Composite Division adopted the unity constitution earlier than the White Division is further proof that the Composite Division was a willing negotiator in the process of unification in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. However after 1994, the White Division moved dramatically fast towards unification with the Composite Division, but not before they had devolved power to the local churches to control church property (Horn 2006:236).

At the beginning of 1995 the Composite Division requested that the process of unity be accelerated. A joint meeting of both Executive Councils was held on 22 February 1995 to discuss the request (Burger & Nel 2008:429). At this stage the Composite Division was on the point of giving up negotiations with the White Division. Frank Chikane as the President convinced the Composite Division to pursue unity. He argued that history will one day honour the Composite Division for their determination. At that stage on the other hand Burger shared his dream of a unified church with a number of the Regional Councils of the single division. He convinced them that unification was God's will for the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

The White section experienced a lot of tension and fears about the future of the unified church. At one stage the possibility of a schism was a looming reality. Many conservative Whites believed that unification with the Composite Division would inevitably lead to domination by the majority. The Executive Council requested

Burger to visit all White Regional Councils before the crucial Workers Council of 1996 to inform pastors and other leaders about the process of unification. He successfully convinced the White Division to complete the road to unification (Nel 2012:139).

The two divisions finally united against all the odds of unity in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. They united against all racial segregation, White supremacy, competition for posts, personal interest and ambition, and the schisms that happened over time. Even with the fears of the White Division, these fears were not strong enough to oppose the unity in the church. According to Chandomba (2007:40), in 1996, the Composite Division of the church officially unified structurally with the White Division of the Apostolic Faith Mission to form one single unit.

#### **5.2.1.4 The United Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa**

Finally the whole church was united under one name Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa in 1996. This meant that the church was no longer divided according to sections but became one single body. It meant that the church had one constitution, one legal persona, one Workers Council, one Executive Council and open membership.

The structural racial unity process took twenty two years from the time of the first move in the direction of unity, until the point was reached where structural unity became a reality in 1996 (Erasmus 1996:128) . The White Division was in full control of the whole church up to the mid-eighties and gradually lost control up to the point where the church united to form a non-racial structure. The structural unification took place, but it might take a long time before there will be racial equality.

The unification of the Apostolic Faith Mission took a long time and came as a surprise after the years of Pentecostal support for racial segregation, but it brought some fruits and benefits. Mathole (2005:252) explains that in 1996, unification was ushered in to bring about the integration of previously segregated churches within the Apostolic Faith Mission churches. Unification destroyed the bonds of the historical legacy of an apartheid society. This resulted in the integration of their separate denominational structures, which had been organised according to various

racial categories, into one national structure – a change that enriched the church as a whole.

During the dramatic unification service in which Isak Burger embraced Frank Chikane, the Apostolic Faith Mission gained the respect of both political and religious leaders in South Africa. Since 1996, the church has moved on to become a respected church and member of the South African Council of Churches (Horn 2006:236). On April 3, 1996, the Apostolic Faith Mission became the first church in South Africa to unite all races together and to constitute the united church on the basis of a mutually agreed upon constitution (Paul 2006:81). The church set the precedence, and points to a way of transforming South African society from a racially and ethnically divided society to a society which is based on the values of the Christian faith.

This unity in the Apostolic Faith Mission came with some changes in the leadership structures to suit the united church. The Executive Council was renamed the National Leadership Forum, and the Regional Councils were renamed the Regional Leadership Forums. The senior local pastor of each assembly is now termed the assembly leader, whereas previously all accredited ministers and part-time ministers were simply referred to as workers. The annual largest representative body, called the Workers Council, became known as the General Business Meeting and convenes only tri-annually. Furthermore, the General Business Meeting consists of few representatives compared to the former Workers Council. Most of its powers have been removed and given to the National Leadership Forum. The day to day running of the church as a denomination is the task of the four national office bearers (President, Vice-president, General Secretary and General Treasurer) who enjoy significant executive authority of their own (see Clark 2007:42).

Another highlight of the unity of Apostolic Faith Mission after 1996 according to Chandomba (2007:41) is that English is now the official language. This was a key change in the Afrikaner culture for many. Since less than four percent of the pastorate or congregants have English as their home language, it is felt to be a middle ground for almost everyone.

The issue of language and culture was important for the formation of identity, while for others they were regarded as more functional, as a prerequisite for communication. Some regarded unity as total integration, while others argued that integration would lead to loss of identity defined in terms of language and culture, and that worship should be defined in terms of language and culture. The National Leadership Forum emphasised that the church should exert itself at all levels to educate its members in prejudice reduction, cultural interaction, cultural sensitivity and appreciation of cultural diversity. Caring for one another should be encouraged through involvement in sharing resources with one another in the form of financial assistance to struggling assemblies. Assemblies in poor areas should be adopted by economically strong assemblies. Involvement in community development projects should also be encouraged among strong assemblies (Nel 2012:39).

In summary: After 1996 the various sections of the church were reconstituted into one homogenous unit and the Apostolic Faith Mission became one church in its structure. The leadership structure was changed to make sure that it now represents all different races in the church. Though there is no racial requirement or quota written into the Apostolic Faith Mission's constitution, it has been the practice of the organisation to ensure that the four office roles that are a part of the National Leadership Forum - the Apostolic Faith Mission's senior leadership body - are each occupied by a different racial group - Black, Coloured, Indian and White (Richardson 2013:31).

### **5.2.2 Servant leadership positions in a transparent elections**

In the past leadership positions were given to people based on the colour of their skin to an extent that Black pastors never had an opportunity to assume such positions. It has already been discussed that the majority were led by a minority because of White supremacy. It is no longer the case after the unity of the Apostolic Faith Mission. Everyone has an opportunity to be granted a leadership position. Black pastors can now be part of a regional leadership forum, national leadership or even national office bearers of the Apostolic Faith Mission.

The difference is between a democratic process and divine appointment. Jesus said that servant leadership positions are granted by the Father and not by people. It

seems then that when a leader has been voted into a position it is a human appointment. In the divine appointment paradigm, God raises up such leaders, their leadership becomes self-evident, and there is no real place for a democratic practice of electing leaders. Ideally, leaders would be 'recognised' for their capabilities and vision (see Clark 2007:43).

The Apostolic Faith Mission had to merge the two paradigms in the sense that those who have been chosen by God to lead still needed to take part in an election process. In practice, Clark (2007:43) continues to say that the Apostolic Faith Mission has retained an election process for electing national leaders. This process is also influenced by the generally unspoken need to ensure that the four office bearers of the church always represent the significant ethnic groups within the church. There is also a process for electing leaders within at least those Regional Leadership Forums which are constituted geographically.

In the voting for office holders of the Apostolic Faith Mission, a White President and General Treasurer were elected, while people of colour were elected as the Vice-President and General Secretary. This was a significant point at that time that Black leaders became part of the leadership structures at the highest level. While the race barrier has been demolished, the church still needs to bridge the age gap in leadership. The constitution stipulates that a President of the Church may only serve until 65 years of age. This regulation has caused much controversy between the young aspiring Presidential candidates and older presidents. The young generation of leaders sees the impossibility of taking up a 'Presidential position' because the current leaders stay longer in such positions as permitted by the constitution (Chandomba 2007:40).

During a joint meeting on 3 April 1996 of the United Workers Council a motion of structural unity was presented. The Workers Council also decided that the proposed new Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa constitution is amended and accepted (Burger & Nel 2008:431). At the same council, an election of new office bearers for the united church took place. Isak Burger was elected as president with the first vote, Frank Chikane was elected as vice-president with the first vote, Pastor Mahlobo as

General Secretary with the second vote and Pastor Peter de Witt as General Treasurer with the first vote.

In addition the church took a decision that every third year the general business meeting shall hold elections. Leaders shall be elected from the ranks of the full-time workers of the church who qualify (as an ordained pastor in a registered local assembly of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa). A president, a deputy president, a general secretary and a general treasurer, such elected persons shall take office as the national office bearers of the church (Constitution of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa 01 October 2000:12).

### **5.2.3 Servant leadership and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission**

#### **5.2.3.1 Introduction**

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established in South Africa to help victims of political crimes during apartheid to reconcile with their perpetrators. If possible also grant amnesty to perpetrators of such crimes. Thomson (1999:12) explains that reconciliation refers to a process of coming together from which a healing outcome occurs. Hence it may be concluded that violation proceeds reconciliation which in turn promotes healing. While violation creates the conditions of separation the Truth and Reconciliation Commission clearly places the telling and witnesses of the truth told as the essential mechanism for healing through reconciliation.

The goals of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission as set out in the promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act, according to Graybill (2002:6) were to develop a complete picture of the gross violations of human rights that took place in and came through the conflicts of the past. To restore to victims their human and civil dignity by letting them tell their stories and recommending how they could be assisted. In addition to consider granting amnesty to those perpetrators who carried out their abuses for political reasons and who gave a full account of their actions to the commission.

Before an assessment into the gross violations of human rights could be carried out, first important issue in the reconciliation process in South Africa was the

establishment of an effective truth-seeking instrument (Vorster 2004:2). In the establishment of such an instrument two decisive topics had to be addressed: the instrument had to be an effective means to ensure that the truth would be revealed in order to serve reconciliation. The instrument had to contain the capacity and the freedom of judgement to decide when the truth is sufficient to serve this broader purpose.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was unique among truth commissions. It was formed for the purpose of fostering reconciliation rather than vengeance. Amnesty was to be granted on an individual basis for all politically motivated crimes as long as there was full disclosure. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission presented to the world a unique model which will be referenced by many polarised societies for their benefit (Matika 2004:8). It was not a judgmental exercise but to make sure that the perpetrator is remorseful so that the victim can forgive and forget. The goal was to offer amnesty to perpetrators of apartheid crimes in exchange for the truth about the past in the full disclosure of their deeds to the victims (Paul 2006:164).

The purpose was to reconcile with former enemies with the hope of bringing healing and reconciliation to the entire nation. The South African Council of Churches recognised that the divisions among societies are systemic, which were institutionalised by the legislation of the apartheid government. Therefore, peace and reconciliation became a major activity in post-apartheid South Africa. Hence the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission to achieve that goal of peace and reconciliation (Abebe 2007:139). Furthermore the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established because of the dark past of South Africa's history and to offer the opportunity to all South Africans to write a new page of their history. The Human Rights Violations Committee was set up to investigate and hear the offender and offended. The Amnesty Committee was set up to deal with political crimes. The Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee was set up to assist the victim (Pedro 2007:62).

In order to foster reconciliation, the truth needed to be revealed about gross violations of human rights between March 1960 and May 1994. Its purpose was to

provide as complete a picture as possible of the gross violations of human rights on all sides of the conflict. To identify the perpetrators of these violations and determine their accountability, to restore the human and civil dignity of victims by giving them the opportunity to refer their own accounts of the violations they had suffered. To grant amnesty from both civil and criminal liability for politically motivated acts proportionate to the political objectives pursued. The purpose was to make recommendations regarding reparations for victims. To compile a comprehensive report (Mouton & Smit 2008:41). In addition the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was set up in order to promote unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding which transcended the conflict and divisions of the past (Masango 2008:697).

To sum up: Rodio (2009:68) outlines the four objectives of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission as follows:

- It establishes as complete a picture as possible of the causes, nature and extent of the gross violations of human rights.
- Facilitates the granting of amnesty to persons who make full disclosure of all the relevant facts relating to acts associated with a political objective and comply with the requirements of this Act.
- Establishes and makes known the fate or whereabouts of victims and by restoring the human and civil dignity of such victims by granting them an opportunity to relate their own accounts of the violations of which they are the victims, and by recommending reparation measures in respect of them.
- Compiles a report providing as comprehensive an account as possible of the activities and findings of the Commission.

Pentecostals must be careful not to support 'cheap reconciliation' that canonise the *status quo*, generated from forty years of oppression. Horn (1994:28) warns that even confession, the key word when reconciliation is addressed, is not enough. Restitution is as much a biblical term as confession and reconciliation. A relevant Pentecostal witness will help both White and Black to understand the necessity of reconciliation. While Whites will have to accept the fact that reconciliation will cost

them something, Blacks will have to sacrifice all ideas of revenge. Restitution is not an act of revenge, but merely the levelling of the playing field.

### **5.2.3.2 Apostolic Faith Mission before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission**

The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa as part of the unity process also appeared before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission to find disclosure about the wrongdoings of the past in order to forgive and reconcile.

During the submission, Isak Burger and Frank Chikane started by acknowledging the fact that it was not easy to appear before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Just as there were members who had voted against unification, there were also members who opposed the decision for the submission. Some members even resigned from the church because of the submission. Isak Burger and Frank Chikane said that the Apostolic Faith Mission is grateful to present a truly rainbow submission in which Black, Coloured, Indian and White members jointly accepted responsibility for the past (Els 2007:174).

This submission and representations were not only made for the Apostolic Faith Mission but were also executed on behalf of the Pentecostal Churches in South Africa. After showing a video of the historic unity celebration earlier that year, they confessed that they 'jointly accepted responsibility for the past' and had 'helped maintain the system of apartheid and prolong agony'. These representations indicate that a significant change of view had taken place, and that the apartheid government was now seen as part of the evil invisible forces that had been overcome by good forces of reconciliation and truth (Anderson 2001:7). The Apostolic Faith Mission confessed that it had failed in its duty to question the system and pledged to become a more faithful watchdog to ensure that history would never be repeated. As a result of these submissions, in November 1997, more churches responded to the Commission's invitation for a special public hearing of the faith communities (Graybill 2002:135).

The submission according to Horn (2006:226) is vague and clearly does not represent Black voices in the new non-racial church. Other significant public statements of the church made by its charismatic president Isak Burger do not give the reader much insight into the intercultural dynamics in a broad based community consisting of local congregations representing all the colours of the rainbow nation. On the contrary, it could have come from any church representing a conservative Afrikaner community.

The Church appeared before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission to seek forgiveness and reconciliation. However reconciliation also happened outside the commission (Chandomba 2007:41). In a moving unity ceremony at Centurion Park, newly-elected president of the united church Isak Burger on behalf of the old White church, sought forgiveness from the former Coloured, Indian and Black sections, while the then newly-elected Vice-President of the Apostolic Faith Mission. On the other hand Frank Chikane accepted Isak Burger's plea. Since that day, the Apostolic Faith Mission unity has truly flourished and the church has been greatly blessed.

Although the unity ceremony achieved a lot yet it was still necessary for the Apostolic Faith Mission to appear before the commission for a public testimony. The united Executive Council also decided that the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa should make a submission to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In this submission it should state that the church had operated within the parameters of the past, either by being supportive of or by being reactive towards an aggressive system. (Burger & Nel 2008:432). That is when the leadership of the Apostolic Faith Mission issued a statement to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission where they acknowledged the role that the church played in perpetuating racial injustice. The church proceeded on a frenzied pace to becoming an interracial church (Richardson 2013:31).

### **5.2.3.3 Gaps in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission**

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission has unfinished business, not only in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, but in the country as a whole. Many people still live in hatred and prejudice because of the racial segregated past. There is a need therefore for more dialogue in order for people to open up for reconciliation to

take place. Nonetheless, the Apostolic Faith Mission needs to be applauded for the initiative they have taken. They should also be applauded for the goals achieved thus far although there is still more that needs to be done.

To illustrate the preceding point, Nel (2012:131) indicates that in 2002 the Apostolic Faith Mission also revisited the state of reconciliation. The Church realised that the hurts and prejudices of the past had not yet been adequately attended to in South Africa. Apostolic Faith Mission, failed to address the past due to denial and the fear that it would open up wounds. Repentance and forgiveness had been expressed and experienced on various occasions. The vertical dimension of reconciliation between God and humanity was high on the agenda of the church, but the horizontal dimension of reconciliation between persons and especially races was still at a superficial level.

In order to address the reconciliation gaps in the Apostolic Faith Mission Nel (2012:131) continues to say that it was decided to declare the first decade of the twenty-first century a Decade of Reconciliation within the Apostolic Faith Mission. It was proposed that quality time for leadership to interact and discuss issues openly and cross-culturally be created, that pastors and members become sensitive and appreciative of cultural sensitivity. It was also decided that healing sessions be organised where people would be given an opportunity to express their pain and be guided to deal with it. In addition opportunities for relationship building between pastors and members of different cultures would be encouraged.

#### **5.2.4 Summary**

The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa started with four racially segregated sections: Black section, Coloured section, Indian section and the White section. When the negotiations for unity started in 1974 there was reluctance on the part of the White section of the church because of the fear for the future and the comfort zone of the present. The White section feared that if they unite some may lose their leadership positions or be demoted to lower levels. Unity had many implications including financial and property related implications.

As a result of that fear and reluctance, the three sections of the Apostolic Faith Mission excluding the White section decided to unite to form one Composite Division. The White section remained as a single division for a long time, thus creating two divisions in the church, the Composite Division and the White Division. The total unity was achieved in 1996 when the two divisions finally united and became the United Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa under one constitution and as one legal persona.

As a united church, the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa held democratic elections to choose their National Office Bearers. The outcome of the elections reflected the demographics of the church whereby all races were represented in the highest leadership positions. This was a sign that the racial segregation and White supremacy and domination were ended. Furthermore a sign that Black people do not only have the right to vote but the right to be elected to the National Office of the church.

Another sign of a United Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was when the church appeared before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. This was seen as a positive sign even by people outside the church including the then deputy president of the republic of South Africa Thabo Mbeki. Soon after the Apostolic Faith Mission submission other denominations followed suit. True reconciliation and forgiveness took place among people of different races and colour. They forgave each for the wrong doings of the past and embraced the future. Although there are gaps in reconciliation, the church is praised for taking the initiative.

### **5.3 FRANK CHIKANE: A LIVING ROLE MODEL**

#### **5.3.1 No life of my own**

##### **5.3.1.1 Background and student activities**

Frank Chikane grew up within a Christian family and grappled with the questions of salvation in the classical, evangelical sense. When he was at secondary school, he became a member of the Student Christian Movement and evangelical group (Sider & Chikane 1988:9). As a young Pentecostal in high school he was regularly challenged by non-believing Black students about the dispossession of Blacks of their land and livestock and the oppression of Blacks by so-called White Christians,

who even justified their practices from scripture. He had to choose either to reject the Bible because it was misused or reinterpreting it in a relevant context (De Wet 1989:144). Frank Chikane was born and bred in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. He knew no other church than the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. As a youngster he accepted the Lord Jesus as his personal saviour. He was subsequently baptised in water by triune immersion and baptised with the Holy Spirit with the initial evidence of speaking in tongues (Lapoorta 1996:71).

In order to outline his background post basic education Lapoorta (1996:71) goes on to say that after matriculating in 1971, he enrolled as a student for a bachelor's degree in science at the University of the North (Now University of Limpopo). He was confronted with the philosophy of Black Consciousness, Black or Liberation Theology and Black Power. He became involved in student politics and was expelled during his third year of study. When he could not return to the university to resume his studies, he became a member of Reinhardt Bonke's Christ for All Nations Evangelistic Team.

In order to describe Frank Chikane as a radical Black Pentecostal, Anderson (1992:49) compares him with other Black Pentecostals. If Elias Letwaba belonged to the first generation of the Black Pentecostals of Apostolic Faith Mission, and Richard Ngidi to the second, Frank Chikane is an outstanding example of the new third generation of Black Pentecostal leaders in South Africa. In this respect Chikane is in stark contrast to Letwaba and Ngidi, and in fact as many African Pentecostals in South Africa. Unlike them, Frank Chikane was not raised in a rural environment. He was born in 1951 and raised in the home of an Apostolic Faith Mission elder-Pastor James Chikane in Soweto, Johannesburg. Many White Christians have looked suspiciously at Frank Chikane and have even doubted his faith. Some regard him as a 'liberation theologian' at best; and a 'communist' at worst. Chikane is a Pentecostal in every sense of the word.

Frank Chikane was not only born in a Christian family or a pastor's child but he also served as a young Black Pentecostal. Frank Chikane served in the Apostolic Faith Mission assembly in Soweto in various ways, including secretary of the congregation at age eighteen. A brilliant student and gifted leader, he studied mathematics and

physics at University of the North (Balcomb 2004:27). He became politically active whilst he was a student. Chikane was influenced by the Black Consciousness Movement and its ideologies. In 1979, Frank Chikane completed his training as a pastor in the Apostolic Faith Mission, but he was afterwards suspended because of his political ideas and participation (Chandomba 2007:39).

### **5.3.1.2 Detention by the Nationalist Government**

Frank Chikane was detained by the Nationalist government more than once. To illustrate the series of events that led to his detention Sider and Chikane (1988:10) outline that the first detention was purely because of Frank Chikane's pastoral work. The police were looking for his younger brother and one of his friends, who belonged to his father's congregation in Soweto. They came to Frank Chikane because they thought his brother might be hiding with him. It was later discovered that both parents of the other youngster were also detained. The second time Frank Chikane was detained was because he helped families of detainees. The police detained Frank Chikane and tortured him heavily for six weeks. A White deacon from the Apostolic Faith Mission supervised the torture.

Frank Chikane was repeatedly detained by the government for his subversive activity (Yong 2006:130). He had been imprisoned several times by the South African government for his involvement in politics. During one of his incarcerations he was removed from his congregation. Since he was imprisoned for his political convictions, he was regarded as a terrorist by the White church. This was precisely the strategy of the apartheid system. They would detain legitimate leaders of the community for representing the grievances of their communities and thereby criminalise them. This was how they justified brutal and inhuman acts against Blacks to stop them from resisting oppression and exploitation (Paul 2006:80).

### **5.3.1.3 Suspension by the church**

As a result of Frank Chikane's detention as indicated in the preceding section Sider and Chikane (1988:11) states that the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa decided to remove him from the church while in detention, because he was an embarrassment to the church. The White section of the church demanded his removal; otherwise they would withdraw their financial support to Frank Chikane's congregation. The congregation did not agree to his removal while he was in

detention. Rather, they preferred that after his release Frank Chikane should come and answer for himself. On the contrary when he was released after seven months, the White leaders convened a meeting to suspend him.

In relation to the reasons for Frank Chikane's suspension, during August 1981 he was suspended by the West Rand District Council of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. He was accused a number of times by the church for involvement in community projects and politics (De Wet 1989:147). The reasons for the suspension were that 'he did not keep the promise he made regarding the conditions of his ordination and that there is no change in his attitude'. He was not reinstated the following year; and he was asked to return his credentials a year after that. It was only by the 'reinstate Frank Chikane campaign'-an organisation within the Apostolic Faith Mission that the suspension was eventually lifted by 1990 (Anderson 1992:52).

The charges which formed the basis of his suspension are as follows:

- He should not appear in the press especially in a critical sense against the state.
- He should not attend or accept invitations by other groups outside the church, especially political groups.
- He misdirected his efforts by speaking against the church in South Africa in non-Christian gatherings.
- His ideas are revolutionary and communistic. Last, that he has not submitted to the authority of the church (Lapoorta 1996:72).

Frank Chikane, a budding pastor in the Black section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, was suspended because he disagreed and voiced his reservations about apartheid and worked to undermine it. Frank Chikane's ordination as an Apostolic Faith Mission pastor in 1980 was on the condition that he renounces politics. He was suspended by the church in 1981 for failing to abide by that condition. In 1990, the church lifted Frank Chikane's suspension because the state had lifted the ban on all political parties and released political prisoners. In 1993, he was elected leader of the Composite Division of the church (Matika 2004:71).

Although detained and suspended, Frank Chikane earned his reputation as a political activist. Chikane's activist career began within his own church, and there is every reason to believe that it was his experiences at the hands of an insensitive White Apostolic Faith Mission leadership that led to Chikane's complete identification with the political aims of the Black Liberation movements in South Africa (Clark 2005:160). Moreover he continued to oppose apartheid, and was arrested again in 1985 on charges of treason. Although released on bail, he was placed under house arrest from dusk to dawn, resulting in his house being attacked with fire bombs, among other assassination plans which were discovered. After Chikane was formally acquitted of the treason charges, he continued the resistance and he was elected General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches in July 1987 (Yong 2006:131).

Frank Chikane was disciplined by the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa because his actions were perceived as 'involvement in politics' by the leaders of the church. Frank Chikane's ordination was revoked, in one instance; and in another, his family was asked to leave the church parsonage even though they were unable to locate other accommodations and would have effectively been homeless. Despite the challenges from leaders within the church and a series of beatings and torture by South African authorities, Chikane resisted the unjust racial policies that seemed to pervade South African society, even when they found expression in his own church (Richardson 2013:51).

#### **5.3.1.4 Pentecostal ministry and political activism**

Frank Chikane participated in the development of the Apostolic Faith Mission assembly in Naledi, Soweto. This assembly was a classical Pentecostal church, with a small congregation which started mostly from houses and under trees. The services were participatory, people sang together, shared testimonies and prayed together (Chikane 1988:31). Furthermore Chikane's vision of the responsibility of churches contributed in a major way to the evolving Pentecostal Movement discourse in South Africa during the late 1980s. Time and again he offered a direct challenge to Christian individuals and institutions to become overtly political actors on the side of the liberation movements, both inside South Africa and out. These

new Pentecostal ideas, coupled with the worsening political context, contributed to the growing spiral of involvement (Borer 1995:255).

Frank Chikane did not only concentrate on his local assembly. According to Lapoorta (1996:71) he, as the pastor of the Kagiso-assembly, extended his ministry beyond the boundaries of vertical concentration. Frank Chikane ventured into community development in order to balance the pendulum between the vertical and horizontal aspects of ministry. He proclaimed a gospel that encompasses salvation and liberation, reconciliation and social justice.

The involvement of Frank Chikane in the Pentecostal Movement did not go unchallenged. Balcomb (2004:27) correctly notices that he met great resistance from both ends of the Pentecostal/political spectrum. On the one hand, it was resistance from his politically conscious peers, who identified him with the oppressor because of his faith. On the other, it was resistance from his fellow Pentecostals because they identified him with political radicalism. Both Pentecostals and political activists continually pressured him to choose either Christ or the struggle (an experience shared by many evangelicals who joined the struggle against apartheid during the 1970s and 1980s). The greater pressure he received to reject his faith, the greater intense he became, and the greater pressure to reject politics caused him to continue in activism.

The reason Frank Chikane was suspended because of politics as a Pentecostal, is that it was taboo according to Christian beliefs. Light and darkness had nothing in common. Empowerment of the Holy Spirit had nothing to do with society. Pentecostals saw political change as irrelevant at best or even contrary to God's plan and thus counter-productive (Horn 2006:227). Consequently the power of the Holy Spirit and the empowerment of the believer operated in a restrictive personal domain of gifts, holiness and witnessing to the world but not in politics.

Similar to many evangelists and fundamentalists in South Africa, Pentecostals maintain that the secular and the sacred (the church and the 'world') must be kept apart (Pillay 1987:46). This attitude has been the result mainly of their fundamentalist commitment to the 'salvation of the Soul', a highly spiritualised interpretation of the

salvation of persons, and its emphasis on 'eternal life'. Any attempt to question the church's responsibility in socio-political matters was dismissed as an 'unspiritual' concern.

In keeping with the traditional apolitical stance of classical Pentecostalism (learned from their North American missionaries), according to Yong (2006:130) involvement in politics was considered as sinful and advocated only by liberal Christians. At best, individuals had to resign from pastoral church ministry to engage in the struggle against apartheid; at worst, such persons were considered 'backslidden' in pursuing these kinds of activities. Following the government's official position, African nationalism and Black political movements were considered to be inspired by communism. Hence, the representative of the evil system of an anti-Christ is proliferated.

Frank Chikane as a Pentecostal was not wrong to be involved in politics Yong (2006:134) goes on to say that the reason for that is because Pentecostal theological reflection cannot remain focused only on the otherworldly or spiritual dimensions. It needs to ask the difficult questions of what the good news means for the poor, the marginalised and the oppressed. Chikane stands as a striking counter example to the typical apolitical orientation of much of classical Pentecostalism. As a prophetic voice that challenges the political quietism characterising the classical Pentecostal tradition, Chikane and other South African Pentecostals have insisted that justice deprived requires the demanding of justice. A viable world Pentecostal theology for the twenty-first century cannot ignore this aspect of biblical traditions.

Frank Chikane professed that theology is demanding because it challenged theologians to forfeit power and status to align with God's disadvantaged (Howard 2006:176). The people and the community must become the centre piece of theological discussion. Christian witness, then, is motivated by the quest to approximate on earth the kingdom of God.

In this context a Pentecostal theologian or leader must be able to leave their comfort zone and be practically involved with people in need. A Pentecostal theological discourse is engaged with the task of liberating the oppressed and the marginalised

community. Without this kind of involvement and participation the study thereof remains irrelevant. Frank Chikane modelled a type of a leader that wanted to be relevant to a social context. Hence, he was involved in politics. To be Pentecostal should not be misunderstood as being apolitical.

Chikane's theology sought to return to the community for solutions to racial injustice. Chikane was relevant to Black culture primarily through a focus on community centeredness. Chikane yearned to do the same under God's authority, establishing a liberation motif for the disadvantaged community. His theology spoke out against those who used the Word of God and talked above the congregation. Using Western and academic ideals, their interpretation of the Bible was irrelevant to a Black audience. Chikane noted that the discrepancies in theology flourished in South Africa. The domination of theology resulted in power for Whites and oppression for Blacks (Howard 2006:175).

His great knowledge of politics and involvement made him more influential in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa (Clark 2007:47). Frank Chikane's experience of his church indicated the depth of racial division within the church. Chikane remained committed to the church as well as confronting its dominant Afrikaner ethos. He did so even when the White section leadership of the church assumed that involvement in racism.

Frank Chikane remains one well-known example of Black Pentecostals who challenged racial injustice within the Apostolic Faith Mission. Despite the disapproval of the better part of the leadership body of the church - including some Black leaders, Chikane, a pastor within the movement, actively participated resisting apartheid (Richardson 2013:51). He remains one well-known example that a Pentecostal leader can also be actively involved with the day to day challenges faced by ordinary people on the ground. Chikane remains a model in servant leadership that humility is not silence, that one can be humble and radical at the same time.

### **5.3.2 Servant of reconciliation**

This quality of servant leadership in Frank Chikane was further seen when he reconciled with a former Minister of a Nationalist Government Adriaan Johannes

Vlok. Adriaan Johannes Vlok is the former Minister of Law and Order and Correctional Services during the apartheid government. As a minister under the apartheid government he was given a mandate by the National Party government and involved in the assassination of anti-apartheid activists, especially at the time when he was still Minister of Law and Order. Frank Chikane was one of Adriaan Vlok's victims, he ordered chemical poisoning for Chikane, although Chikane survived the poison (Mandela 1994:704).

According to a report by the BBC (28 August 2006), in mid-2006 Vlok came forward with public apologies for a number of acts that he had not disclosed to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and for which he could therefore be prosecuted. In a dramatic gesture, Vlok washed the feet of Frank Chikane who, as Secretary General of South African Council of Churches, had been targeted by him for assassination. Subsequently, he washed the feet of the ten widows and mothers of the 'Mamelodi 10', a group of anti-apartheid activists who had been lured to their death by a police informant. Later that year (2006) Adriaan Vlok appeared at the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa's tenth year unity celebrations conference in Boksburg, offering the same gesture.

It took Vlok two months to arrange the meeting. He had one thing in mind and that was to ask for forgiveness. At this meeting forgiveness was asked and given and as an act of humility, Vlok washed Chikane's feet. Adriaan Vlok, who gave orders to blow up Khotso House, and so many other operations, had undergone a transformation after the death of his first wife in 1994. He said it took him twelve years to come to a point where he could rid himself of his own pride and selfishness (Els 2007:216). The move by Adriaan Vlok should be applauded. There are other ministers who served in the apartheid government and were involved in similar acts. Some of them failed to appear before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in fear of incarceration. It took more than boldness for Vlok to appear before Truth and Reconciliation Commission and subsequently to wash the feet of Frank Chikane. It took humility and submission to take this huge step (Kgatle 2012:114).

Equally so, that initiative would not have been possible had Frank Chikane resisted the request by Adriaan Vlok. In order for reconciliation to take place the victim and

the perpetrator must forgive each other. Kgatle (2012:114) continues to say that it also took humility and forgiveness for Frank Chikane to welcome Vlok in his office so that he may wash his feet. Frank Chikane had a choice, to reject his apology, but instead embraced him. Therefore, the two leaders are servant leaders because of their humility, submission and forgiveness.

The confession by Adriaan Vlok and forgiveness by Frank Chikane helped most Whites in South Africa to believe that a so-called Christian government would do such a thing as poisoning with chemical and biological weapons (Chikane 2013:50). Similarly, confessions from the scientists who produced the chemicals and from Adriaan Vlok opened the eyes of many people. Consequently, White people could realise how evil the apartheid system was towards Black people.

In addition the unexpected and courageous act of remorse and confession towards Chikane by Adriaan Vlok is remarkable. His forgiveness by Chikane has shown an entirely new light on reconciliation in South Africa. It occurred completely outside the official process of Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The act may not have completely turned the tide by itself, but it has set a benchmark for integrity. This is a genuine reconciliation that the country has not experienced from senior politicians. The act by Vlok now leaves them exposed, if not ashamed. It is also a singular testimony to the power of the Holy Spirit in the life of a person and an example of genuine reconciliation inspired by the example of Christ (Boesak 2008:645).

### **5.3.3 A servant leader of unity**

In the United Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa Frank Chikane's courageous stand is acknowledged by many members Black and White (Anderson 2000:96). After he led the creation of the Composite Division and subsequently the unification of the two divisions there was a lessening of the tension among members of different races in the church. Frank Chikane remains one of the outstanding ecumenical church leaders in South Africa, and one of the finest ever to emerge from the Pentecostal Movement.

During Chikane's leadership in the Institute for Contextual Theology and South African Council of Churches, their profile and influence as instruments of change

became extremely significant. He led them through one of the most crucial periods in the history of the struggle against apartheid, just before its demise. He won wide-ranging respect in both the political and ecclesiastical spheres as well as the admiration of the youth in the townships, which can be described as the anti-apartheid movement 'storm troopers'. Chikane also enjoyed extensive contacts with key overseas governmental and Non-Governmental Organisations that benefited South Africa. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, he was able to mediate between the South African government and the African National Congress, right up to F.W. De Klerk's announcement of the release of Mandela. It is difficult to overstate Chikane's influence during this period (Balcomb 2004:28).

Frank Chikane's involvement in politics as a Pentecostal was motivated by his experience in the township of Soweto. As a mediator, he saw the violence against an entire generation of children and youth evidenced in their malnutrition, poverty, housing rot and ideological education. He also experienced violent repression and imprisonment without trial of non-violent resisters on suspicion of 'non-co-operation with government' (Yong 2006:131).

In a socio-political context Frank Chikane continued to lead and unite movements across all sectors (Chandomba 2007:39). In December 1997, he was elected to the National Executive Member of the African National Congress. He became a Director General in the office of the Presidency of Thabo Mbeki. Chikane was very influential in condemning the racial segregation in the Apostolic Faith Mission. He advocated unity because he saw no point in preaching the gospel without practicing it.

Frank Chikane played a role in uniting the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa especially from the perspective of the White section. He convinced the White community in the church that unity was possible. That enabled him to lead in the United Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. He also convinced the Black section to hold on until the day of unity.

During his term as vice-president, Chikane's contribution was constructive and positive (Burger & Nel 2008:458). He never tried to agitate Whites, even though he had been tortured by an Apostolic Faith Mission elder from the White Division during

the years of struggle. His expertise in public administration and excellent abilities to establish relationships at the highest levels of government worked to the advantage of the Apostolic Faith Mission in various countries. Chikane's good reputation brought about connection with several states.

The achievements highlighted above were not going to be possible if Frank Chikane remained silent about the injustices in his Pentecostal church and in the government of South Africa. A leader like Frank Chikane is a servant leader because of the courageous steps he took to move towards the unification of all races in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

### **5.3.4 Summary**

Frank Chikane has never had a life of his own. From youth days he always has been involved in the Pentecostal Movement in general and the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa in particular. He was detained by the Nationalist government of South Africa and suspended by the church but continued to be a faithful Pentecostal minister while engaged in politics. Chikane led the Institute for Contextual Theology and South African Council of Churches.

One of the outstanding qualities of his leadership was seen when he reconciled with the former enemy Adriaan Vlok. He allowed Vlok into his own personal space. Chikane allowed Vlok to wash his feet. Genuine forgiveness and reconciliation took place after the act. The gesture became a perfect example not only in the Pentecostal Movement but also in society as a whole that forgiveness was possible even outside a formal process like the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

These are the same qualities of servant leadership in Mark. In addition to these qualities, Frank Chikane stood at the centre between the White Division and Composite Division of the Apostolic Faith Mission in order to unite the two. When the conservative Whites were reluctant to unite because of the fear that the majority Black members would take over he assured them that they will be safe and still lead. When the Blacks wanted to give in because of the Whites' reluctance to a unified church, he promised them that one day justice will prevail.

Indeed justice prevailed, the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa was united and Frank Chikane became the first Black vice-president of the United Apostolic Faith Mission. He now serves as the President of the Apostolic Faith Mission International.

# Chapter 6

## Conclusion

### 6.1 LEADERSHIP MISCONCEPTIONS

#### 6.1.1 Kinship and racial segregation

Kinship as a leadership misconception in Mark is compared with racial segregation as a leadership misconception in Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Kinship and racial segregation concepts relate to each because they involve human relationships. One has been defined as familial relationship and the other as racial relationship respectively.

Kinship is not only about familial relationship but also about race relations. According to Robinson (1940:330) people who are not related by blood are bound together by common tribal or racial blood. This indicates the broad meaning of the word kinship. All those who belong to the same tribe or to the same race are regarded as possessing kinship, or as being in the relation of kinship to each other. Thus the idea of kinship may be given an entirely different meaning. Instead of defining it genealogically as the blood tie that binds those who descend from a common pair of ancestors, instead of thinking of it as being determined by the laws of heredity, it is defined in terms of a common-racial blood-type, and think of it as being determined by the principle of racial solidarity.

Kinship is a dominant category of social organization in traditional Mediterranean societies. The family in a traditional Mediterranean society can be understood as a diachronic and synchronic association of persons related by blood, marriage and other social conventions, organized for the dual purpose of enhancement of its social status and legitimate transfer of property (Osiek & Balch 1997:41).

Naively, kinship seems to entail the study of biological relationships. Early on anthropologists realized that what they were studying was not biological per se, but rather a social construction whose relation (if any) to biology could not be

ascertained a priori. A distinction was drawn, for instance, between pater/mater (social parents) and genitor/genetrix (biological parents); later, the latter pair was also recognized as a social construction (of biological parentage), and the pair of pairs theoretically augmented with a third (Frishkopf 2003:1).

In order to illustrate the point Rhoads (2004:284) introduces different types of kinships. Fictive kinship relationships are fictional and not blood relationships. Another term sometimes used is "surrogate family," suggesting that the relationships are an alternative family to blood relations. "Metaphorical kinship" refer to a more real family of God. Kinship relations were the strongest bonds in antiquity. To use them to depict relationships with people who were not blood relatives was to use the strongest possible analogy to depict their relationships.

In addition racial segregation is a form of pseudo-kinship that tricks the brain into thinking that because a person looks like the other, they can be related. A person that believes what one does must be family which benefits the genetic pool that permits this disingenuity. This explains the reason for the universality of racism and its survival over a period of time. On the other hand in a multiracial world, racism no longer usefully enlarges the community (MacIntyre 2004:653).

It means that the White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission in a way, was a family or group that did not want to associate with the other family or group in the Black, Coloured and Indian sections because of colour. Furthermore colour was used to segment the church into four different family groups. One minority group received more benefits than the rest of the groups who were in majority.

Jesus reinterpreted the concept of family relationship. Then His brothers and His mother came, and standing outside they sent to Him, calling Him. And a multitude was sitting around Him; and they said to Him, "Look, Your mother and Your brothers are outside seeking You." But He answered them, saying, "Who is my mother, or My brothers?" And He looked around in a circle at those who sat about Him, and said, "Here are my mother and my brothers! For whoever does the will of God is my brother and my sister and mother." (Mk 3:31-35).

Kinship through blood was enlarged, if necessary, superseded to include all those who chose to do the will of God. People actually did follow Jesus as a group of brothers and sisters. They ate together, talked together and visited in each other's houses regardless of their colour, age or gender (Finger 1994:18). The children of God, became fictive kinship group, that is, a collection of people who are not genealogically related but who nevertheless consider one another as family, attempting to relate at that higher level of intimacy, belonging and mutual commitment. As sisters and brothers believers share honor within one household, working together toward the advancement of the honor of the members of this family rather than competing with one another for honor as if between unrelated individuals (DeSilva 2000:76).

### **6.1.2 Positions and schisms**

Competition for positions as a leadership misconception in Mark led to disgruntlement among the disciples of Jesus. In similar way competition for position as a leadership misconception in Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa led to schisms. Therefore competition for position in leadership is a cause of schisms and factions.

James and John made a request for positions of glory and when the other ten disciples competed with them, there was a threat of division among the disciples of Jesus. In contrast, Jesus was quick to respond to this crisis by teaching them servant leadership principles.

Equally, the study has shown that most schisms which happened in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa came as a result of competition for positions. Schisms happened because one social group wanted to hold on to power at the expense of the other social group. The White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission took all the influential and powerful positions in the Executive Council and other committees. This caused resentment among many Black pastors who then resorted to starting their own organisations.

In this sense positions as a leadership misconception in Mark is similar to schisms as a leadership misconception in African Pentecostal Christianity. Elsewhere in the

organisation, business and churches, breakaways or factions are commonly caused by competition for high positions. Kgatle (2012:5) shows that sometimes the infighting within political organisations is not based on debate or intellectual engagement but jostling for positions. In politics, for example, some quit their current political organisation to start their own, making sure that they stay in a leadership position for selfish reasons.

### **6.1.3 Lordship and White supremacy**

Lordship as a leadership misconception in Mark is compared with White supremacy as a leadership misconception in Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Leaders of Gentiles lead are authoritarian and lord over the followers on one hand. Supreme leaders undermine and marginalise followers on the other.

Jesus warned His disciples about lordship and authority because one group felt more powerful than the other. Jesus perceived that James and John sought positions because they wanted to have more authority over the rest of the disciples of Jesus. A familial relationship with Jesus in the perception of James and John made them more superior and other disciples more inferior.

Similarly, White section of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa perceived itself as a better section because of positions in leadership, power in society and land acquisition. The section was distinct compared to the Black, Coloured, and Indian sections. The White section developed a sense of supremacy and dominion over other races. They lorded and exercised authority over other races in the same that Jesus warned His disciples.

## **6.2 SERVANT LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES**

### **6.2.1 Divine appointment and elections**

Positions that are granted by God the father as a servant leadership principle in Mark is compared with a process of transparent and democratic elections in Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Free and fair elections ensure that a leader that has been predestined by God to take an organisation to another level ultimately occupies that position.

To sit on the left and to sit on the right of Jesus in the seats of glory were not positions for sale. These positions are granted by the Father for leaders who are predestined to occupy them. In simple terms, James and John cannot make a request for such positions to Jesus because it is not His prerogative to grant them but the Father's. If the Father appoints then this kind of appointment is a divine appointment.

The problem is that elections especially through a democratic process become a leadership battle between the candidates which is in contrast with divine appointment, leadership by the Father. If people elect one into a leadership position they can equally remove that person from such a position. Conversely through prayer and discernment the voters can elect the right person into a leadership position. In the Apostolic Faith Mission, positions were only granted to one racial group through human appointment. To address this problem, elections were used. Elections are a transparent process that allows all racial groups to participate and receive an opportunity to occupy positions. It merges divine appointment with human appointment.

### **6.2.2 Service and unity**

The study here compares two important messages. The message in Mark 10:35-45 is that servant leadership moves from position to service. The message in African Pentecostal Christianity is that servant leadership moves from racial segregation to unity. Therefore service and unity are at the centre of servant leadership in both Mark and African Pentecostal Christianity respectively.

The disciples are used to the tradition of competing for positions in order to dominate other people. Jesus teaches a different message of leadership that is centred on suffering, service and sacrifice. On the other hand the message of servant leadership in African Pentecostal Christianity especially in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa notwithstanding other Pentecostal churches moves from racial segregation to unity.

Servant-hood in Mark is closely related to the message of unity in African Pentecostal Christianity according to Medley (1994:15) Jesus' vision and praxis, as shown in the gospel of Mark, were an iconoclastic critique of the existing social and

symbolic order and a call to transformation and inclusivity. His concept of servanthood advances an attitude of receptivity. Such an atmosphere of receptivity provides space to allow those in bondage to experience emancipation and freedom. Thus, Jesus' life-praxis, grounded in his solidarity with God's cause, has redemptive and salvation meaning.

Jesus' instruction on leadership in Mark 10:35-45 warned the disciples that they were not to function like Gentile rulers (Hutchison 2009:62). In a culture that valued honour and sought to avoid shame at all costs, Jesus' description of the road to leadership was uninviting. Leadership positions would be gained through the path of sacrifice and suffering. Being crucified like a common criminal, considered in first century Palestine as the most shameful kind of death sentence, became the standard for such sacrifice. Echols (2009:109) adds that the very focus for the servant leader is in the followers and serving their needs, not in pursuing the leader's vision. Servant leaders do not aspire to be leaders but are in a sense drafted into the role in order to serve.

In a similar way the context of servant leadership in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa is that people from different races and cultures had to learn to trust each other (Burger & Nel 2008:436). The regions of the church were integrated and the church made confessions before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Its role in reconciliation and healing and bridging gaps in unity, to doctrinal and ethical pronouncements and other developments shaped the church. The most important of these, is that the church moved from racial segregation to racially mixed leadership at national and local level.

The Apostolic Faith Mission's example typifies the potential of Pentecostal spirituality to tap into the hope of an oppressed people for liberation. It serves as a conduit for grassroots action, even in the face of institutional policies that are, at best, agnostic. Pentecostal spirituality, in the hands of an individual believer who has tasted the bitter taste of oppression is a powerful tool for liberation (Richardson 2013:53).

### **6.3 SERVANT LEADERSHIP APPLIED TO AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL CHRISTIANITY**

This study has shown that servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 can be applied to African Pentecostal Christianity in general and in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa in particular by using reader-response criticism. First, both the communities of Mark and African Pentecostal Christianity are marginalised and therefore understand the message of servant leadership.

Second, the disciples of Jesus and the White Pentecostals of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa struggle with the same leadership misconceptions. The disciples of Jesus struggled with kinship, self-interest and ambition, positions, completion, lording it over others and authority. White Pentecostals struggle with racial segregation, White supremacy and schisms. There is similarity between kinship and racial segregation, between competition for position and schisms, between lordship, authority and White supremacy.

Third, there is similarity, between the messages in Mark 10:35-45 'from position to service' and in African Pentecostal Christianity 'from racial segregation to unity'. The principles of servant leadership in Mark are suffering, divine appointment and service. The principles of servant leadership in African Pentecostal Christianity are unity, transparent elections and reconciliation. The study draws similarities between divine appointment and elections and between servanthood and unity.

Finally, the servant leadership principles modelled by Jesus Christ in Mark are also modelled by African Pentecostals like Frank Chikane in African Pentecostal Christianity. Jesus was a minister, servant of all, and a life giver. In the same way Frank Chikane never had a life of his own, he is the servant of reconciliation and unity.

### **6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (1) The church needs to adopt servant leadership as its style of leadership. If possible this should be part of the curriculum in the theological college of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. Servant leaders like Frank Chikane

should devote time and energy in the training of pastors and leaders in the church to illustrate servant leadership.

- (2) There is a need for a national forum on reconciliation in the church. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission could not achieve all the goals of reconciliation because of certain limitation. The proposed national forum on reconciliation will reach almost all the local assemblies of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. The forum will be a platform whereby all members of the church can participate in addressing the wrongdoings of the past, forgive each other and focus on the future.
- (3) Transformation is pivotal in key positions of the church. Positions that were previously occupied by minority groups should now be occupied by the majority. The church should also appoint a task team that will address issues of transformation in all the departments of the church.
- (4) The unity of the church was achieved in 1996 and all the members of the church became one under the umbrella of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa. The church needs to review the status of non-geographic regions as it encourages division in some instances. All the local assemblies of the church should submit to their geographic regions according to their location.
- (5) A discussion on unity should be a continuous one. Members of the church should feel free to report any sign of division on a daily basis without fear of intimidation. The National Leadership Forum and the National Office Bearers of the church should open up their offices for such engagements.

## **6.5 AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

- (1) Servant leadership is a research interest that moves beyond the discipline of theology and addresses other disciplines like political science. The study can further apply servant leadership to African political leaders.
- (2) Servant leadership in Mark 10:35-45 is not confined to African Pentecostals but also exists in African Public servants. The study can further apply servant leadership in Mark chapter 9 to institutions like the Public Protectors office.

- (3) Servant leadership principles are not only limited to suffering, divine appointment, transparent elections, unity, reconciliation and service. The study can further apply servant leadership principles like teamwork, community building and stewardship.
- (4) Racial segregation as a subject could not be discussed in detail in this study; themes like the theology of racism need further research.
- (5) Although unity was achieved in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, there are still gaps in this unity. For example, the non-geographic regions in the church exist purely because there are members who do not want to be part of geographic regions based on race or social status. Therefore the study can further research the 'motive' of non-geographic regions in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.
- (6) The Truth and Reconciliation Commission, especially in the context of the church, did not achieve its optimum results; there were gaps in the Commission that need to be addressed.
- (7) African Pentecostals like Elias Letwaba and Frank Chikane are the selected few but there is quite a number of African Pentecostals who played a role of servant leadership who could not be mentioned in this study. A study can research the role of African Pentecostals in the history of Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

## Works Consulted

- Abebe, L., 2007, The role Christian councils have played in peacemaking in Kenya and South Africa: 1990-2000, PhD Thesis, Graduate Faculty of George Mason University, Washington.
- Achtemeier, P.J., 1978, Mark as Interpreter of the Jesus Traditions, *Interpretation* 32(4), 339-352.
- Ahearne-Kroll, S.P., 2010, Audience inclusion and exclusion as rhetorical technique in the gospel of Mark, *Journal for Biblical Literature* 129(4), 717-735.
- Albright, J.R., 1995, Independent churches: a South African experience of mission and modernity, *Currents in Theology and Mission* 22(2), pp 96-101.
- Adrich, R.L., 1951, Is the Pentecostal movement Pentecostal? *Bibliotheca Sacra* 108(430), 172-185.
- Alexander, J.A., 1960, *The gospel according to Mark*, Banner of Trust, London.
- Allen, D., 2007, Revival: a classic Pentecostal view, *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 27(2), 118-127.
- Allen, W.C., 1915, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, Macmillan, New York.
- Andersen, Nicole, London, Scott., 2009, South Africa “Jews”: The Moemedi Pentecostal Church and the construction of Jewish identity, *Nova Religio* 13(1), 92-105.
- Anderson, A., 1992, *Bazalwane: The African Pentecostals in South Africa*, Unisa, Pretoria.
- Anderson, A & Otwang, S., 1993, *Tumelo: The Faith of African Pentecostals in South Africa*, Unisa, Pretoria.
- Anderson, A., 1996, African Pentecostalism, *St Hist Eccl* 22(2), 114-148.
- Anderson, A., 1999, Dangerous memories for South African Pentecostals in A.H, Anderson & W.J Hollenweger (eds.), *Pentecostals after a Century: Global perspectives on a Movement in Transition*, pp 89-107, Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Anderson, A., 1999, The Lekganyanes and Prophecy in the Zion Christian Church, *Journal of Religion in Africa* 29(3), 285-312.
- Anderson, A., 2000., *Zion and Pentecost: The Spirituality and Experience of Pentecostal and Zionist/Apostolic Churches in South Africa*, Unisa, Pretoria.

- Anderson, A., 2001, stretching the definitions? Pneumatology and syncretism in African Pentecostalism, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10(1), 98-119.
- Anderson, A., 2001, Pentecostals and Apartheid in South Africa during Ninety Years 1908-1998, *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-charismatic research*, <http://www.pctii.org.cyberj/index.html> (1 March 2015).
- Anderson, A., 2005, The dubious legacy of Charles Parham: Racism and cultural insensitivities among Pentecostals, *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 27(1), 51-64.
- Anderson, A., 2008, African independent churches and Pentecostalism: historical connections and common identity, *Ogbomoso Journal of Theology* 13(1), 22-42.
- Anderson, H., 1976, *The Gospel of Mark*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London.
- Andersson, G., 2014, To live the biblical narratives: Pentecostal autobiographies and the baptism in the Spirit, *Pentecostudies* 13(1), 112-127.
- Armstrong, M., 2008, *How to manage people*, Koganpage, London.
- Augsburger, D., 2009, Evaluating servant-hood: From servant leadership to leading as serving in Jacobsen, E.O (ed.) *The three tasks of leadership: Worldly wisdom for pastoral leaders*, pp. 99-109, William B Eedrmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Austnaberg, H., 2010, Baptism in the Zionist churches of Africa: Traditional African elements and Christian sources in dialectic complementary, *Mission Studies* 27(2), 220-234.
- Baer, J.R., 2001, Redeemed bodies: the functions of divine healing in incipient Pentecostalism, *Church History* 70(4), 735-771.
- Bailey, J.L., 1985, Perspectives on the gospel of Mark, *Currents in Theology and Mission* 12(1), 15-25.
- Balcomb, A., 2004, From apartheid to the new dispensation: Evangelicals and the democratization of South Africa, *Journal of Religion in Africa* 34(1), 5-38.
- Balogun, MJ. 1997, Enduring clientelism, governance reform and leadership capacity: A review of the democratization process in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 15(2), 237-260.
- Baloyi, M.E., 2014, 'A pastoral examination of the Christian Church's response to fears or reactions to witchcraft amongst African people in the Limpopo province of South Africa ', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 70(2), 1-9.

- Bartlett, J.V., 1922, *St Mark*, New York, Oxford Press.
- Barton, S.C., 1994, *Discipleship and family ties in Mark and Matthew*, Cambridge, University Press.
- Bateman, H.W., 2007, Defining the titles “Christ” and “Son of God” in Mark’s narrative presentation of Jesus, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 50(3), 537-559.
- Batten, J., 1998, ‘Servant leadership: A passion to serve’, in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 38-53, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Bauckham, R., 1998, For whom were the Gospels written, in Bauckham, R (ed), *The gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the gospel audiences*, pp. 9-48, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans.
- Bausch, T.A., 1998, Servant-leaders making human new models of work and organization, in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 230-245, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- BBC News Africa., 2006, ‘Feet washed in apartheid apology’, viewed 28 August 2006, from <http://news.co.uk/2/hi/africa/5292302.stm>.
- Beazley, H. & Beggs, J., 2002, ‘Teaching servant-leadership’, in L.C. Spears, & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 53-64, John Wiley & Sons. New York.
- Beckmann, D.M., 1974, Trance: From Africa to Pentecostalism, *CTM* 45(1), 11-26.
- Bekker, C.J., 2010, a history of service as leadership, in D. Dierendonck & K Patternson (eds.), *Servant leadership: developments in theory and research*, pp. 55-66, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Bell, A., 2006, *Great leadership*, Davies-Black, California.
- Bennet, W.J., 1977, The Gospel of Mark and Traditions about Jesus, *Encounter*, 38(1), 1-11.
- Bennis, W., 2002, ‘Becoming a tomorrow leader’, in L.C. Spears & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 101-110, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Berding, K., 2003, The hermeneutical framework of social scientific criticism: How much can evangelicals get involved? *EQ* 75(1), 3-22.
- Bergunder, M., 2007, Constructing Pentecostalism: On issues of methodology and representation, *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, 26 (2), 55-73.

- Best, E., 1978, Mark's use of the twelve, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, 69(1-2), 11-35.
- Best, E., 1981, *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the gospel of Mark*, Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Bird, M.F., 2005, Jesus is the Christ: messianic apologetics in the gospel of Mark, *Reformed Theological Review*, 64(1), 1-14.
- Blanchard, K., 1998, - 'Leadership revisited', in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 21-28, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Blanchard, K., 2011, *Leadership & the one minute manager: Increase effectiveness by being a good leader*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Harper Collins, London.
- Blaney, S.T.M, Hanson, C & Harvey, J.S., 1955, Exploring the New Testament, in Earle, R (ed), *Beacon New Testament Commentary*, pp. 453-477, Beacon, Kansas City.
- Blumhofer, E.L., 2006, Revisiting Azusa Street: A centennial retrospect, *international Bulletin of Missionary Research* 30(2), 59-64.
- Boesak, A., 1984, *Black and Reformed: Apartheid, liberation and the Calvinist Tradition*, Skotaville, Johannesburg.
- Boesak, A., 2008, And Zaccheus remained in the tree: Reconciliation and justice and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, *Verbum et Ecclesia* JRG 28(3), 636-654.
- Bolden R. & Kirk P., 2009, African leadership: Surfacing new understanding through leadership development. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 9(1), 69–86.
- Bond, J., 1974, Pentecostalism in the Pentecostal churches, *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 7(1), 10-22.
- Boomershine, T.E., 2011, Mark: Forming disciples for the way of peace, *Currents in Theology and Mission* 38(6), 405-411.
- Borer, T.A., 1995, *Challenging the state: Churches as a political actors in South Africa, 1980-1990*, PhD Thesis, Department of government and international studies, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.
- Bottum, B. & Lenz, D., 1998, 'Within our reach: Servant leadership for the twenty-first century', in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 157-169, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

- Bratcher, R.G & Nida, E.A., 1961, *The Gospel of Mark*, UBS Handbook series, New York.
- Bratcher, R.G., 1981, *A translator's guide to the gospel of Mark*, United Bible Society, London.
- Brathwaite, R., 2010, Tongues and ethics: William J. Seymour and the "bible evidence": a response to Cecil M. Robeck, jr, *Pneuma Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 32 (2010), 203-222.
- Broadhead, E.K., 1999 Naming Jesus titular Christology in the gospel of Mark, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Buchanan, J.M., 2006, Pentecostalism, *Christian Century* 123(5), 18-34
- Bundy, D., 1999, Pentecostalism as a global phenomenon: A review essay of Walter Hollenweger's Pentecostalism: origins and developments worldwide, *Pneuma* 21(2), 289-303.
- Burger, I. & Nel, M., 2008, *The Fire Falls in Africa*, Christian Art, Vereeniging.
- Burge, G.M. & Hill, A.E., 2012, *The Baker illustrated bible commentary*, Bakerbooks, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Burkhardt, J.C & Spears, L.C., 2004, Servant-leadership and philanthropic institutions, in L.C, Spears & M, Lawrence (eds.), *Practices servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*, pp. 71-90, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Burn, J.H., 1974, *The preacher's complete homiletic commentary on the Gospel according St Mark*, Bakerbooks, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Carson, D.A, France R.T, Motyer, J.A, Wenham, G.J., 1994, *New Bible Commentary*, 21<sup>st</sup> century edition, Intervarsity press, Leicester, England.
- Case, J.R., 2006, And Ever the Twain Shall Meet: The Holiness Missionary Movement and the Birth of World Pentecostalism, 1870-1920, *Religion and American culture: a Journal of Interpretation* 16(2), 125-159.
- Cerillo, A., 1993, The Origins of American Pentecostalism: A Review Essay of James R. Goff, Jr., Fields White unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and The Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism, *Pneuma: Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, 15(1), 77-88.
- Chandomba, L., 2007, *The History of the Apostolic Faith Mission and other Pentecostal Mission in South Africa*, Authorhouse, Milton Keynes.

- Charles W. M., 1994, Revisionist Ontologies *Theorizing White Supremacy* 43(3), 105-134.
- Charlton, G.D., 1992, *Leadership: The Human Race*, Juta, Kenwyn.
- Chetty, I.G., 2012, Pentecostals and Socio-political Engagement: an Overview from Azusa Street to the new Kairos Movement, *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 143(1), 23-47.
- Chidester, D., 1992, *Religions of South Africa*, Routledge, London.
- Chikane, F., 1988, *No Life of my own*, Skotaville, Johannesburg.
- Chikane, F., 2013, *The things that could not be said: from Aids to Zimbabwe*, Picador, Africa, Johannesburg.
- Chopra, D., 2010, *The Soul of Leadership*, Rider, London.
- Clark, M., 2005, Two Contrasting Models of Missions in South Africa: The Apostolic Faith Mission and the Assemblies of God, *Asian Journal of Pentecostal studies* 8(1), 143-161.
- Clark, M., 2007 Contemporary Pentecostal Leadership: The Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, *Asian Journal of Pentecostal studies* 10(1), 42-61.
- Clarke, C.R., 2013, Pan-Africanism and Pentecostalism in Africa: Struggle Bedfellows or Perfect Partners? A Pentecostal Assist Towards a Pan-African Political Theology, *Black Theology* 11(2), 152-184.
- Clifton, S., 2007, Pentecostal Ecclesiology: A Methodological Proposal for a Diverse Movement, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 15(2), 213-232.
- Cole, A., 1961. *The Gospel According to St Mark: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale, London.
- Collins, J., 2011, 'Level 5 Leadership: The Triumph of Humility and Fierce Resolve in HBR 10 must reads on leadership', pp. 115-136, *Harvard Business Review*, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Comfort, P.W., 2008, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, Tyndale House Publishers, Carol Stream, Illinois.
- Cone, J.H., 2004, Theology's Great Sin: Silence in the Face of White Supremacy, *Black Theology* 2(2), 139-152.
- Constitution of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, A Church Incorporated in Terms of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa (Private) Act, 24 of 1961, as Amended, 1 October 2000.

- Coulter, D.M., 2012, The Spirit and the Bride Revisited: Pentecostalism, Renewal, and the Sense of History, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 21(1), 298-319.
- Covey, S.R., 1989, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, Simon & Schuster, London.
- Covey, S.R., 2002, Servant-leadership and Community Leadership in the Twenty-First Century, in L.C. Spears & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on Leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, pp. 27-34, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Cox, H., 1995, *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century*, Cassell, London.
- Crawley, A.T., 2008, Let's get it on Performance Theory and Black Pentecostalism, *Black Theology* 6(3), 308-329.
- Creech, J., 1996, Visions of Glory: The Place of the Azusa Street Revival in Pentecostal History, *Church History* 65(3), 405-424.
- Cross, T.L., 2009, The Divine Human Encounter Towards a Pentecostal Theology of Experience, *Pneuma* 31(1), 3-34.
- Czegledy, A., 2008, New Christianity in a New South Africa: Charismatic Christians and the Post- Apartheid Order, *Journal of Religion in Africa* 38(1), 284-311.
- Dakes, F.G., 2001. *Dake's Annotated Reference Bible: The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments of the Authorized King James Version*. Dake publishing, Lawrenceville, Georgia.
- Dalglis, C., 2009, 'The Nature and Importance of Leadership', In E. Zyl (ed.), *Leadership in the African Context*, 1-19, Juta, Cape Town.
- Danove, P., 1998, The Narrative Rhetoric of Mark's Ambiguous Characterization of the Disciples, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 70(1), 21-38.
- Dayton, D.W., 1980, Theological Roots of Pentecostalism, *Pneuma* 2(1), 3-21.
- DeGraaf, D, Tilley, C & Neal, L., 2004, Servant-leadership Characteristics in Organizational Life, L.C, Spears & M, Lawrence (eds.), *Practicing Servant Leadership: Succeeding Through Trust, Bravery, and Forgiveness*, pp. 133-166, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- DeKock, W.J., 2000, Pentecostal Power for a Pentecostal Task: Empowerment Through Engagement in South African Context, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 16(1), 102-116.

- Del, C.R., 1997, Oneness and Trinity: A Preliminary Proposal for Dialogue with Oneness Pentecostalism, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10(1), 85-110.
- De la Rey, C., 2005, Gender, Women and Leadership, *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity*, *Women and Leadership* 65(1), 4-11.
- Depree, M., 2002, 'Servant-leadership: Three Things Necessary', in L.C. Spears & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on Leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, pp.89-100, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Derrett, J.D.M., 2006, Armor-bearers of Christ (Mark 10:33-40), *The Expository Times* 117(11), 452-453.
- DeSilva, D.A., 2000, Honor, patronage, kinship and purity: unlocking New Testament culture, Intervarsity, Downers Grove.
- De Wet, C.R., 1989, The Apostolic Faith Mission in Africa: 1908-1980. A case study in church growth in a segregated society, unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of religious studies, University of Cape Town.
- Dewey, J., 2006, Women in the Gospel of Mark, *Word and World* 26(1), 22-29
- Dierendonck, D. & Patterson, K. (eds.), 2010, *Servant Leadership: Developments in Theory and Research*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Dierendonck, D. & Rook, L., 2010, 'Enhancing innovation and creativity through servant leadership', in D. Dierendonck & K. Patterson (eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research*, pp. 155-168, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Dinkmeyer, D. & Eckstein, D., 1996, *Leadership by Encouragement*, Delray Beach, St.Lucie Press, Florida.
- Donahue, J.R., 1983, *The Theology and Setting of Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- Donahue, J.R & Harrington, D.J (eds), 2002, *The Gospel of Mark*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota.
- Douglass, W.M., 1986, *Andrew Murray and his Message: One of God's Choice Saints*, Oliphants, London, Edinburgh.
- Douglas, J.D. & Tenney, M.C., 2011, *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids.
- Droogers, A, 2001, Globalization and Pentecostal Success in Corten, A & Fratani R.M, (eds) *Between Babel and Pentecost: Transnational Pentecostalism in Africa and Latin America*, Hurst & Company, London.

- Dubow, S., 1989, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-1936*, Macmillan, Oxford.
- DuPree, S.S., 2001, In the Sanctified Holiness Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement, *Pneuma* 23(1), 97-114.
- Du Rand, J.A., 2005, Bringing the reader into exegetical play, applied to the gospel of John in Du Rand (ed.), *More than one way of reading the bible*, department of biblical and religious studies, University of Johannesburg.
- Earle, R, Blaney, S.T.M, & Hanson, C., 1955, *Exploring the New Testament*, Beacon Hill Press, Kansas City.
- Echols, S., 2009, Transformational/Servant Leadership: A Potential Synergism for an Inclusive Leadership Style, *Journal of Religious Leadership* 8(2), 85-116.
- Elliot, J.H., 1986, Social Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: More on Methods and Models, *Semeia* 35(1), 1-33.
- Elmer, D.H., 2006, *Cross-cultural Servant-hood*, IVP books, Downers Grove, Illinois
- Els, C.W., 2007, Reconciliation in Southern Africa: The role of the Afrikaans Churches: A Historical and Analytical Study of the Contributions of the Afrikaans Churches to the Process of Reconciliation in Southern Africa, with special Reference to their Response to the Work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria.
- English, D., 1992, *The Message of Mark*, in Stott, J,R,W (ed), Inter-Varsity Press, Leicester.
- Erasmus, L.J., 1996, Theological Education in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Department of practical theology, Unisa, Pretoria.
- Esqueda, O.J., 2013, The Growth and Impact of Pentecostalism in Latin America, *Christian Education Journal* 3(10), 32-38.
- Etherington, N., 1979, The Historical Sociology of Independent Churches in South East Africa, *Journal of Religion in Africa* 10(2), 108-126.
- Evans, G.A., 2000, *Word Biblical Commentary*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville.
- Fatokun, S.A., 2005, Pentecostalism Globalization, Ogomoso *Journal of Theology*, 10(4), 159-170.
- Faupel, D.W., 2007, Theological Influences on the Teachings and Practices of John Alexander Dowie, *Pneuma* 29(1), 226-253.

- Ferch, S.R., 2004, 'Servant Leadership, Forgiveness, and Social Justice?', in L.C Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Practicing servant-leadership*, pp. 225-240, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Ferch, S.R., 2010, Consciousness, Forgiveness and Gratitude in D. Dierendonck & K Patternson (eds.), *Servant Leadership: Developments in Theory and Research*, pp. 77-89, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Fiedler, K., 1994, *The Story of Faith Missions*, Regnum, Oxford.
- Finger, R.H., 1994, Open homes and fictive kin groups: Jesus reinvents the family, *Daughters of Sarah* 20(1), 18-22.
- Finzel, H., 2007, *The Top Ten Mistakes Leaders Make*, David Cook, USA.
- Flaniken, F., 2006, Is the Bible Relevant to Servant Leadership? *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 32-39.
- Fowler, R.M., 1985, who is 'the reader' in reader response criticism, *semeia* 31(1), 5-23
- Fraker, A.T & Spears, L.C. (eds.), 1996, *Seeker and Servant: Reflections on Religious Leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- France, R.T., 2002, *The Gospel of Mark: Commentary on the Greek Text*, William b Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Freston, P., 2008, Researching the Heartland of Pentecostalism: Latin Americans at Home and Abroad, *Fieldwork in Religion* 3(2), 122-144.
- Frick, D.M & Spears, L.C., (eds.), 1996, *Robert K. Greenleaf: On becoming a servant leader*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Frick, D.M., 2004, *Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership*, Beret-Koehler, San Francisco.
- Friesen, A., 2009, The called out of the called out: Charles Parham's Doctrine of Spirit Baptism, *The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, 42-54.
- Frishkopf, M., 2003, Spiritual kinship and globalisation, *religious studies and theology* 22(1), 1-25.
- Gardner, J.W., 1990, *On Leadership*, The Free Press, New York.
- Gee, D., 1949, *The Pentecostal Movement*, Elim Publishing, London.
- Geisler, N.L., 2007, *A Popular Survey of the New Testament*, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

- Gouws A., 2008, Changing women's exclusion from politics: Examples from southern Africa. *African and Asian Studies* 7(4), 537–563.
- Gouws A., 2008, Obstacles for Women in Leadership Positions: The Case of South Africa, *Semeia* 34(1), 21-27.
- Graham, J.W., 1998, Servant Leadership and Enterprise Strategy, in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on Leadership*, pp. 145-156, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Graham, S.L., 1991, Silent Voices: women in the Gospel of Mark, *Semeia* 54(1), 145-158.
- Graybill, L.S., 2002, *Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa, Miracle or Model?* Lynne Rienner, London.
- Greenleaf, R.K., 1997, *Servant Leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*, Paulist Press, New York.
- Greenleaf, R.K., 1998, 'Servant leadership', in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 15-20, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Greenleaf, R.K., 2002, 'Essentials of Servant-Leadership', in L.C. Spears & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 19-26, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Greenleaf, R.K., 2004, 'Who is the servant-leader?', L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Practising Servant-Leadership*. 1-8, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Grewal, I., 2013, Racial Sovereignty and Shooter Violence, *Sikh Formations* 9(2), 187-197.
- Grint, K., 2010. *Leadership: A very short introduction*. Oxford, New York.
- Gros, J., 2003, A Pilgrimage in the Spirit: Pentecostal Testimony in the Faith and Order Movement, *Pneuma* 25 (1), 29-53.
- Guenther, H., 1995, Patriarchy as an evil that God tolerated: analysis and implications for the authority of scripture, *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 38(3), 321-336.
- Gundry, N.S & Thomas, R.L., 1988, *the NIV Harmony of the Gospels*, Harper, San Francisco.
- Hale, J.R and Fields D.L., 2007, Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership* 3(4), 397–417.
- Hallencreutz, C.F., 1998, Bantu Prophets, *Swedish Missiological Themes* 86(4), 581-600.

- Hanson, J., 1998, The Disciples in Mark's Gospel: Beyond the pastoral/polemical debate, *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 20(2), 128-155
- Hart, L., 1978, Problems of Authority in Pentecostalism, *Review and Expositor* 75(2), 249-266.
- Hearn, M., 2009, Color Blind Racism, Color Blind Theology, and Church Practices, *Religious Education* 104(3), 272-288.
- Heath, M., 2010, *Leadership Secrets*, Harper Collins Publishers, London.
- Henry, M., 2010, *The New Matthew Henry Commentary*, ed. by M.H. Manser, Zondervan, Grand Rapids.
- Hesselbein, F& Cohen, P (ed.) 1999. *Leader to leader*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Hian, C.W., 2010, *Learning to Lead: Biblical leadership then and now*, Authentic, Hyderabad, Colorado Springs.
- Hocken, P., 1976, The Significance and Potential of Pentecostalism, in Hocken, P, Mills, J.O, Tugwell, S & Every G (eds) *New Heaven? New earth? An encounter with Pentecostalism*, pp. 15-67, Templegate, Springfield, Illinois.
- Hollenweger, W,J 1972. *The Pentecostals*. SCM Press, London.
- Hollenwger, W.J., 1999, The Black Roots of Pentecostalism in A.H, Anderson & W.J Hollenwger (eds.), *Pentecostals after a Century: Global perspectives on a Movement in Transition*, pp. 33-44, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Holloman, C.R., 1984, Leadership and Headship: There is a difference, in W.E Rosenbach & R.L Taylor (eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*, pp. 109-116, Westview Press, London.
- Holm, N.G., 1991, Pentecostalism: Conversion and Charismata, *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 1(3), 135-151.
- Holmes, M.W., 2006, *The Apostolic Fathers in English*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Hooker, M.D., 1991, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*, Hendrickson, London
- Hooten, J., 2008, Theology as Social Science, *Bulletin* 37(4), 116-117.
- Horn, N., 1991, Crossing Racial Borders in Southern Africa a lesson from history, cyber-journal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research, <http://www.pctii.org.cyberj/index.html> (1 March 2015).
- Horn, N., 1994, After Apartheid: Reflections on Church Mission in the Changing Social and Political Context of South Africa, *Transformation* 11(1), 25-28.

- Horn, N., 2006, Power and Empowerment in the Political Context of some Afrikaans-speaking Pentecostals in South Africa, *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 32(3), 225-253.
- Horrel, D.G., 1999, *Social Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh.
- Howard, D.C., 2006, An Analysis of Black Power and Black Consciousness Philosophies and the use of Christian Religion as a Tool for Empowerment and Social Protest, PhD Thesis, Proquest, Department of African studies, Howard University, Washington.
- Hudson, N., 2003, Early British Pentecostals and their relationship to health, healing and medicine, *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 6(2), 283-301.
- Hutchison, D., 2009, Servant-Hood: Jesus' Countercultural call to Christian Leaders, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 166(1), 53-69.
- Hybels, B., 2002, *Courageous Leadership*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Irvin, D.T., 1995, Drawing all Together in one Bond of Love: the Ecumenical Vision of William J Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival., *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 6(1), 25-53.
- James, R., 2008, Leadership development inside-out in Africa. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 18(3), 359–375.
- Johansson, D., 2010, The identity of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark: Past and Present Proposals, *Currents in Biblical Research* 9(3), 364-393.
- Johns, J.D., 1995, Pentecostalism and the Postmodern Worldview, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 7(1), 73-96.
- Johnson, S.E., 1972, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Adam & Charles Black, New York.
- Johnston, R.K., 1984, Pentecostalism and Theological Hermeneutics: Evangelical Options, *Pneuma* 6(1), 51-66.
- Jones, C.E., 1999, The Color line Washed Away in the Blood? In the Holiness Church, at Azusa Street and afterward, *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 34(1), 167-183.
- Jones, M., 2002, 'Servant-leadership and the imaginative life', in L.C. Spears & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 35-46, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

- Jorgensen, K., 2012, *Equipping for Service Christian leadership in Church and Society*, Regnum Resources for Mission, Oxford.
- Kgatle, M.S., 2012, *Servant Leadership in Philippians 2:5-11: Concept and Application*, unpublished mini-dissertation, department of New Testament, University of Pretoria.
- Khathide, A.G., 2007, *Hidden Powers: Spirits in the First-Century Jewish World, Luke-Acts and in the African Context* published doctoral thesis, Acad SA, Kempton Park.
- Khathide, A.G., 2010, *Hamba Vangeli Elisha: A Portrait of Rev Job Y Chiliza-Pioneer of the African Gospel Church*, Acad SA, Kempton Park.
- Khauoe, J.M., 2008, *Developing a Sustainable Missionary Programme for Black South African Churches: An Analysis of the Role that Churches in Black Community are Playing in Terms of their Missionary Obligation*. PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Killerman, B., 1984, *Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- Kim, D.H., 2004, Foresight as the Central Ethic of Leadership, in L.C, Spears & M, Lawrence (eds.), *Practicing Servant Leadership: Succeeding Through Trust, Bravery, and Forgiveness*, pp. 201-224, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- King James Version, 1994, *Holy Bible and Reference*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Klaus, B.D., 2007, Pentecostalism and Mission, *Missiology: An International review* 1(1), 39-54.
- Kruger, F & Muller R., 2013, Rain and Water Baptism in Southern Africa Religious Systems: Continuity and Change, *Exchange* 42(10), 143-156.
- Kotter, J.P., 2001, What leaders really do in HBR'10: Must reads on leadership', pp. 37-56, *Harvard Business Review*, 1 December issue
- Kuperus, T., 2011, The Political Role and Democratic Contribution of Churches in Post-Apartheid South Africa, *Journal of Church and State* 53(2), 278-306.
- Kummel, W.G., 1975, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Nashville, Abingdon.
- Land, S.J., 1992, A Passion for the Kingdom: Revisioning Pentecostal Spirituality, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 15(1), 19-46.
- Landman, C, 2006, Christina Nku and St John's: A Hundred Years Later, *Studia Historicae Ecclesiasticae* 32(1), 1-32.

- Lapoorta, J.J., 1996, *Unity or Division? The unity struggle of the black churches within the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa*, Department of religious studies, university of the Western Cape, Bellville, Cape Town.
- Larbi, E.K., African Pentecostalism in the context of global Pentecostal ecumenical fraternity: challenges and opportunities, *Pneuma* 24 (2), 138-166.
- Leatherman, C.G., 2008, Anthropology, Polanyi and afro-Pentecostal ritual: A Scientific and Theological Epistemology of Participation, *Zygon* 43(4), 909-923.
- Letson, H., 2007, Pentecostalism as a paradigm shift: a response to Hans Kung's paradigmatic model, *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 27(2), 104-117.
- Liardon, R., 1996, *God's generals: Why they succeeded and why some failed*, Tulsa, Oklahoma, Albury.
- Liddell H.G & Scott R., 1889, *Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Lightfoot, R.H., 1938, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, New York, Harper.
- Litzinger W & Schaefer, T., 1984, Leadership through Followership, in W.E Rosenbach & R.L Taylor (eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*, pp. 138-143, Westview Press, London.
- Loader, W., 1996, Challenged at the Boundaries: A Conservative Jesus in Mark's tradition, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 63(1), 45-61.
- Lohmeyer, E., 1936, *Galilea und Jerusalem*, Gottingen, Vandenhoeck.
- Longstaff, T.R.W., 1980, Crisis and Christology: The Theology of the Gospel of Mark, *Perkins Journal* 33(4), 28-40.
- Lore, J.S., 1998, 'Servant leadership in a Christian organization: The sisters of St Joseph health system', in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on Leadership*, pp. 297-307, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Lovett, L., 1972, Perspective on the black origins of the contemporary Pentecostal Movement, *Journal of I.T.C* 1(1), 6-49.
- Lues, L., 2009, 'Team leadership and motivation', in E. Zyl (ed.), *Leadership in the African Context*, pp. 222-245, Juta, Cape Town.
- Macchia, F.D., 1996, God present in a confused situation: The mixed influence of the charismatic movement on classical Pentecostalism in the United States, *Pneuma* 18(1), 33-54.

- Machingura, F., 2011, The significance of glossolalia in the apostolic faith mission, Zimbabwe, *Studies in world Christianity* 17(1), 12-29.
- MacIntyre, F., 2004, Was a Religion a Kinship Surrogate? *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 72(3), 653-694
- Macleod, D.J., 2001., 'Imitating the Incarnation of Christ: An exposition of Philippians 2:5-8'. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158(63), 308-330.
- Makhubu, P., 1988, *Who are the Independent Churches?* Skotaville, Johannesburg.
- Malbon, E.S., 1983, fallible followers: women and men in the Gospel of Mark, *Semeia* 28(1), 29-48.
- Malina, B.R., 1982, The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation, *Interpretation*, 36(3), 229-242.
- Malina, B.R., 1986, *Christian origins and cultural anthropology: practical models for biblical interpretation*, Atlanta, John Knox Press.
- Mandela, N.R., 1994, *Long walk to freedom*, Abacus, London.
- Manning, G. & Curtis, K., 2007, *The art of leadership*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Manno, B.V., 1975, The identity of Jesus and Christian discipleship in the gospel of Mark, *Religious Education* 19(6), 619-628.
- Manz, C.C., 1999, *The Leadership wisdom of Jesus: Practical lessons for today*, Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco.
- Marxsen, W., 1959, *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Gottingen, Vandenhoeck.
- Mark, C., 2002, An African-Centered Perspective on White Supremacy, *Journal of Black Studies* 33(2), 179-198.
- Masango, M., 2008, Reconciliation: a gift from God, *Verbum Et Ecclesia* 28(3), 697-707.
- Masondo, S., 2013, The crisis model for managing change in African Christianity: the story of St John's Apostolic Church, *Exchange* 42(1), 157-174.
- Mathole, E.M.K., 2005, The Christian witness in the context of poverty with special reference to the South African Charismatic Evangelicals, PhD Thesis, Department of science of religion and missiology, University of Pretoria.
- Matika, B.M., 2004, Religion and the advent of democracy in South Africa, MA Dissertation, Graduate school, Texas Woman's University.

- Maxwell, D., 1999, Historicizing Christian independency: The Southern African Pentecostal Movement 1908 to 1960, *Journal of African History* 40(2), 243-264
- Maxwell, J.C., 1998, *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville.
- Maxwell, J.C., 2003, *The 4 Pillars of leadership*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville.
- Maxwell, J.C., 2005, *The 360 degree leader*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville.
- Maylam, P., 2001, *South Africa's racial past: the history and historiography of racism, segregation, and apartheid*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- McClung, G., 1986, Explosion, motivation, and consolidation: the historical anatomy of the Pentecostal Missionary Movement, *Missiology* 14(2), 159-172.
- McClymond, M.J., 2007, We are not in Kansas anymore: the roots and routes of world Pentecostalism, *Religious Studies Review* 33(4), 275-290.
- McDonnel, K., 1966, The Ecumenical Significance of the Pentecostal Movement, *Worship* 40(10), 608-629.
- McGee-Cooper, A. & Trammell D., 2002, 'From hero-as-leader to servant-as-leader', in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 141-152, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- McGee, G.B., 1988, The Azusa Street Revival and twentieth-century missions. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 58-61.
- Medley, M.S., 1994, Emancipator solidarity: the redemptive significance of Jesus in Mark, *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 21(1), 5-22.
- Melrose, K., 1998, Putting servant leadership into practice, in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 279-296, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Menzies, W.W., 1990, The Movers and Shakers, in H.B. Smith (ed.), *Pentecostals from the inside out*, pp. 29-41, Victor Books, Wheaton.
- Meyer, M., 2002, Taking up the cross and following Jesus: discipleship in the Gospel of Mark, *Calvin Theological Journal* 37(1), 230-238.
- Mohr, A., 2010, Out of Zion into Philadelphia and West Africa: Faith Tabernacle Congregation, 1897-1925, *Pneuma* 32(1), 56-79.
- Morgan, G.C., 1985, *The Gospel according to Mark*, Fleming H. Revell Company, London.
- Moripe, S., 1998, The Reformed Apostolic Faith Mission in Africa, *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 24(1), 95-106.

- Mounce R.H. & Mounce W.D. (eds.), 2008, *Greek and English interlinear New Testament (NASB/NIV)*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids.
- Mouton, E & Smit, D., 2008, Shared Stories for the Future? Theological Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa, *Journal of Reformed Theology* 2(1), 40-62.
- Moxley R.S., 2002, 'Leadership as Partnership', in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 47-52, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Nahavandi, A. 1997. *The Art and science of leadership*. Prentice-hall, New Jersey.
- Nel, M. & Le Roux, P.L., 2005, Dutch reformed missionary, Zionist preacher and leader of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, and the origin of some of African Independent Churches in Southern Africa, *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 31(1), 127-143.
- Nel, M., 2012, The process of unification of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 38(2), 121-141.
- Nel, M., 2014, A hundred years of theological training in the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa, *Acta Theologica* 34(1), 108-126.
- Nkurunziza, C, 2013, Pentecostal Spirituality: A disregarded cornerstone for the contextualization of African theologies? *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 145(1), 59-74.
- Nichole, I.T., 1971, *Pentecostalism*, New Jersey, Plainfield.
- Nicklas, T., 2012, The Crucified Christ and the silence of God in Karakolis, C, Niebuhr, K.W, Rogalsky, S (eds) *Gospel images of Jesus Christ in church tradition and in biblical scholarship*, pp. 349-372, Mohr Siebeck, Tubingen.
- Nightingale, D., 2012, 'Do not be late' assessing the cost of mission the prologue in the gospel of Mark, *Evangelical Quarterly* 84(2), 107-118.
- Nineham, D.E., 1963, *The gospel of St Mark*, Penguin Books, London.
- Nkomo S.M & Ngambi H., 2009, African women in leadership: Current knowledge and a framework for future studies. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies* 4(1), 49–68.
- Northouse, P.G., *Leadership: Theory and Practice* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Sage, California.
- Oliver, E., 1999, Response in A.H, Anderson & W.J Hollenwger (eds.), *Pentecostals after a Century: Global perspectives on a Movement in Transition*, pp. 45-47, Sheffield Academic Press, England.

- Ogunsanya, K., 2007, Qualifying women's leadership in Africa. *Conflict Trends* 1(2), 50–54.
- Omenyo, C.N., 2006, William Seymour and African Pentecostal historiography: the case of Ghana, *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 9(2), 244-258.
- Onyinah, O., 2004, Pentecostalism and the African Diaspora: an examination of the mission activities of the Church of Pentecost, *Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 26(2), 216-241.
- Oosthuizen, G.C., 1987, *The Birth of Christian Zionism in South Africa*, University of Zululand, KwaDlangezwa.
- Ortberg, N., 2009, Ministry implications of service in Jacobsen, E.O (ed.) *The three tasks of leadership: worldly wisdom for pastoral leaders*, pp. 131-138, William B Eerdmans, Grand Rapids Michigan.
- Osei-Mensah, G., *Wanted: Servant-leaders: The challenge of Christian leadership in Africa today*. African Christian Press, Achmimota, Ghana.
- Osiek, C. & Balch, D.L., 1997, families in the New Testament world: households and house churches, Westminster John Knox, Louisville
- Patterson, K., 2010, Servant leadership and love, in D. Dierendonck & K Patterson (eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in Theory and Research*, pp. 67-76, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Paul, S.A., 2006, Deconstructing a South African narrative of oppression: the influence of religion in public policy: Christianity in South Africa 1948-2004; exploring the African narrative of ubuntu, PhD Thesis, Proquest Information and Learning Company, Department of practical theology, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena.
- Pearce, L.L. & Conger, J.A., (ed) 2003. *Shared leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of leadership*, Sage, California.
- Pedro, L.L. M., 2007, The Ministry of Reconciliation. A Comparative study of the role of the churches in promoting reconciliation in South Africa and Angola. PhD Thesis, Department of science of religion and missiology, University of Pretoria.
- Phillips, V., 2011, The other instance of women's silence in the Gospel of Mark, *Conversations with the Biblical World* 31(1), 129-142
- Pietersen, E., 2009, 'Leadership power and influence', in E. Zyl (ed.), *Leadership in the African context*, pp. 195-221, Juta, Cape Town.

- Pillay, G.J., 1987, Pentecostalism with a South African community: The question of social change, *Mission Studies* 4(2), 39-51.
- Poewe, K.O., 1988, Links and parallels between black and white charismatic churches in South Africa and the States: Potential for Cultural Transformation, *Pneuma* 10(2), 141-158.
- Poloma, M., 2006, Old wine, new wineskins: the rise of healing rooms in revival Pentecostalism, *Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 28(1), 59-71.
- Pomerville, P.A., 1982, Pentecostalism and missions: distortion or correction? The Pentecostal contribution to contemporary mission, university microfilms international, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena.
- Porter, S.E., 1990, Why has not reader-response criticism caught on in New Testament studies? *literature and theology* 4(3), 278-292.
- Powell, M.A., 2009, *Introducing the New Testament: A historical literary, and theological Survey*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Powers, B.P., 1979, *Christian leadership*, Broadman Press, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Ramsay, R.B., 2007, *Basic Greek and exegesis*, P&R publishing, New Jersey.
- Randall, I.M., 1997, Old time power: relationship between Pentecostalism and evangelical spirituality in England, *Pneuma* 19(1), 53-80.
- Ranger, T., 2007, African Initiated Churches, *Transformation* 24(2), 65-71.
- Reardon, PH., 1992, The cross, sacraments and martyrdom: an investigation of Mark 10:35-45, *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 31(1-2), 103-115.
- Reed, D.A., 1979, Origins and development of the theology of oneness Pentecostalism in the United States, *Pneuma* 1(1), 31-37.
- Resseguie, J.L., 1984, Reader-response criticism and the synoptic gospels, *Journal of the American academy of religion* 52(2), 307-324
- Rhoads, D.M., 2004, Children of Abraham, children of God: metaphorical kinship in Paul's letter to the Galatians, *Current in Theology* 31(4), 282-297
- Richie, T., 2007, Eschatological inclusivism: Exploring early Pentecostal Theology of Religions in Charles Fox Parham, *The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 27(2), 138-152.
- Richardson, L.K., 2013. *What has Pentecostalism to do with race relations? A study of the Apostolic Faith Mission In South Africa?* school of divinity, regent university.

- Richard, R., 1975. On the Social Mechanisms of White Supremacy: A Comment and Analysis, *The Pacific Sociological Review* 18(1), 40-47.
- Robeck, C.M., 2007. Pentecostalism and Mission from Azusa Street to the ends of the earth, *Missiology: an International Review* 35(1), 75-92.
- Robbins, J., 2004, The globalization of Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33(1), 117-143.
- Robinson, D.S., 1940, Kinship and brotherhood, *Shane quarterly* 1(4), 329-335
- Rodio, E.B., 2009, More than truth: Democracy and South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission, PhD Thesis, Department of political science, University of Syracuse, Syracuse.
- Roy, K., 2000, *Zion City RSA: the story of the church in South Africa*, South African Baptist Historical Society, Pretoria.
- Ruschman, N.L., 2002, 'Servant-leadership and the best companies to work for in America', in L.C. Spears & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 123-139, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Russel, K.A., 2004, *Pentecost*, *Living Pulpit* 13(2), 4-48.
- Sanner, A.E., 1979. *The Gospel According to Mark*, Beacon Hill, Kansas City.
- Schroeder, E.H., 2006, A second look at the Gospel of Mark, *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 33(4), 291-299.
- Schuster, J.P., 1998, 'Servants, egos, and shoeshines: A word of sacramental possibility', in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 271-278, John Wiley & Sons, INC, New York.
- Schuster, J.P., 2002, 'Servant-leadership and the new economy', in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 333-348, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Scott, L., 2013, Extremism in relation to what? The case of early Pentecostalism, origins of Pentecostalism, *Journal of Theta Alpha Kappa* 37(2), 28-45.
- Seeley, D., 1993, 'Ruler Ship and Service in Mark 10:41-45', *Novum Testamentum*, 35(3), 234-250.
- Senior, D., 1984, *The passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*, Michael Glazier, Wilmington, Delaware.
- Shaw, PWH, 2006, Vulnerable authority: A Theological approach to leadership and teamwork, *Christian Education Journal* 3(1), 119-133.

- Sheets, D. & Jackson C., 2005, *Second in command: Strengthening leaders who serve leaders*, Destiny Image, Shippensburg.
- Sibeko, M & Haddad, B., 1997, Reading the Bible “with” women in poor and marginalized communities in South Africa, *Semeia* 78(1), 83-92.
- Sider, R & Chikane, F., 1988, interview with Frank Chikane, *Transformation* 5(2), 9-12.
- Smith, D.K., 1997, The following part of leading in F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith & Beckhard (eds.), *The leader of the future*, pp. 199-208, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Smith, M.R. & Farnsworth, K.A., 2002, ‘Servant-leadership in community colleges’, in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 211-221, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Smith, M.R. & Spears, L.C., 2002, ‘Servant-leadership and philanthropic institutions’, in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 223-244, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Smylie, J.H., 1979, testing the spirit in the American context: Great Awakenings, Pentecostalism, and the Charismatic Movement, *Interpretation* 33(1), 32-46.
- Spears, L.C., 2004, ‘The understanding and practice of servant leadership’, in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Practising servant-leadership*, pp. 9-24, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Spears, L.C., 2010, ‘Servant leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf’s legacy’, in D. Dierendonck & K. Patterson, (eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research*, pp. 9-24, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Stanley, B., 2011, Edinburgh and world Christianity, *Studies in World Christianity* 17(1), 72-91.
- Stein, R.H., 2008, *Mark*, Louisville Kentucky.
- Stubbs, I.R., 1998, A leverage force: reflections on the impact of servant leadership, in L.C. Spears (ed.), *Insights on leadership*, pp. 314-321, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Sundkler, B.C.M., 1961, *Bantu Prophets in South Africa*, Oxford, London.
- Sundkler, B., 1976, *Zulu Zion and some Swazi Zionists*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Swart, J.P., 1985, A Comparison of the current situational leadership theories, Unpublished mini-dissertation, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.

- Sweet, L., 2012, *I am a follower*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville.
- Synan, V., (ed.) 1975, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, New Jersey, Plainfield.
- Synan, V., 1990, An equal opportunity movement, in H.B. Smith (ed.), *Pentecostals from the inside out*, pp. 43-50, Victor Books, Wheaton
- Tan, S., 2009, The primacy of servant-hood in Jacobsen, in E.O (ed.) *The three tasks of leadership: Worldly wisdom for pastoral leaders*, pp. 77-90, William B Eerdmans, Grand Rapids Michigan.
- Tinney, J.S., 1976, William J. Seymour: Father of modern-day Pentecostalism, *Journal of I.T.C* 1(1), 34-44.
- Thomson, R.I.W., 1999, An empirical phenomenological study of the experience of testifying at the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Thurston, B.B., 2002, *Preaching Mark*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Tyson, J.B., 1961, The blindness of the disciples in Mark, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80(3), 261-268.
- Van Eck, E., 2000, 'A Sitz for the gospel of Mark? A critical reaction to Bauckham's theory on the universality of the Gospels', *HTS* 56(4), 974-987.
- Van Eck, E., 2013, *Introduction to the New Testament: The Synoptic problem and introduction to and exegesis and theology of Mark*, University of Pretoria: Faculty of Theology-Department of New Testament Studies, Pretoria.
- Van Eck, E., 2013, 'Mission, identity and ethics in Mark: Jesus, the patron for outsiders', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 69(1), Art. #2003, 13 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v69i1.2003>.
- Van Rensburg, G., 2007, *the leadership challenge in Africa*, Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- Van Rensburg, G., 2009, *Leadership thoughts: inspire yourself; inspire others*, Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- Vondey, W., 2012, The making of a Black Liturgy: Pentecostal worship and spirituality from African slave narratives to American cityscapes, *Black Theology*, 10(2), 147-168.
- Vorster, J.M., 2004, Truth, Reconciliation, Transformation and Human Rights, *Ecumenical Review* 56(4), 480-502.
- Wacker, G., 1985, Marching to Zion: Religion in a modern utopian community, *Church History* 54(4), 496-511.

- Waldo, C, 2000, Daily life and transcendence in Pentecostalism, in Shaull, R & Waldo C (eds) *Pentecostalism and the future of the Christian churches: Promises, limitations, challenges*, pp. 3-111, William B Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- Walls, W.J., 2004, Anatomy of collaboration: an act of servant-leadership, in L.C, Spears & M, Lawrence (eds.), *Practising servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*, pp. 113-132, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Ware, F.L., 2008, What does it mean to be “black” and “Holy”, *Black Theology* 6(1), 119-131.
- Waybright, G.L., 1985, *Discipleship and possessions in the gospel of Mark: A narrative study*, University Microfilms International, Marquette University.
- Welty, E.E., 2005, Liberation or Domestication?: An examination of the role of religion during apartheid in South Africa, MA Dissertation, Proquest, School of international service, American University, Washington.
- West, G., 1994, Difference and dialogue: Reading the Joseph story with poor and marginalized communities in South Africa, *Biblical Interpretation* 2(2), 152-170.
- Westerlund, D., (ed) 2009, *Global Pentecostalism: Encounters with other religious traditions*, I.B Tauris, London.
- Wildman, S.M., 1996, *Privilege revealed: How invisible preference undermines America*, NYU Press, New York.
- Wilkes, C.G., 1998, *Jesus on leadership*, Tyndale House, Wheaton, Illinois.
- William, L.L., 1974, *The gospel according to Mark*, William B Eerdmans, Grand Rapids Michigan.
- Williams, L.E., 2002, ‘Fannie Lou Hamer: Servant of the people’, in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 65-88, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Williamson, L.R., 1983, *Interpretation: A Bible commentary for teaching and preaching*, John Knox, Atlanta.
- Williams, J.D., 1974, Modern Pentecostal Movement in America: A brief sketch of its history and thought, *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 9(2), 50-60.
- Worden, N., 2012, *The making of modern South Africa: conquest, apartheid, democracy*, (5<sup>th</sup> edition), Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, West Sussex.

- Yong, A., 2006, Justice deprived, justice demanded: Afro-Pentecostalism and the task of world Pentecostal Theology today, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 15(1), 1-26.
- Young, D.S., 2002, 'Foresight: The lead that the leader has', in L.C. Spears & M. Lawrence (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 245-256, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Zohar, D., 2002, 'Servant-leadership and rewiring the corporate brain, in L.C. Spears & Lawrence, M. (eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, pp. 111-121, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Zyl, E., 2009, 'The difference between leadership and management', in E. Zyl (ed.), *Leadership in the African context*, pp. 20-39, Juta, Cape Town.