

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

RESEARCH TOPIC FOR PHD STUDIES

TITLE

**A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF 'SUBMIT TO THE GOVERNING
AUTHORITY' (RM 13:1) AMONG SOME AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL
PREACHERS IN ZAMBIA**

STUDENT: LORDWELL SIAME

STUDENT NUMBER: 14212481

**SUPERVISORS: PROFESSOR ERNEST VAN ECK
DOCTOR ZORODZAI DUBE**

Dedication

I dedicate this piece of work to my beloved late wife Veronica Simwanza-Siame, for her love and care. Her unwavering support in my quest to attain the highest level of education cannot go unnoticed.

Additionally, this dissertation is dedicated to my late dad and mum, who have not lived to see the fruits of their labour. My parents had a dream of who they wanted me to be, as such they always encouraged me to work hard at school. I recall dad's constant reminder that *"Isuukulu tata wane, weso nu nyoko"* (my son, school is your mum and dad) and mum would agree with him saying, *"Lordwell, mwanane, cingatenga ne nyoko ntasambilila, lelo nawa na minso ni njelu ukumanya kuno mwelimonye Isukulu anzima- limbicila tata wane"* (Lordwell, my son, I may not be educated, but I am wise enough to see and affirm that education is good- keep pushing hard). The echoes of these words have let me reach this far; and I can only say, continue resting in eternal peace my advisors.

Acknowledgements

Many people and institutions have contributed immeasurably to my academic journey. However, I would like to particularly express my profound gratitude to my supervisors Prof. Ernest van Eck and Dr. Zorodzai Dube who have travelled with me on this path. Bembas (Zambian dialect) say, “*Uwakwensha ubushiku, bamutasha nga bwacha*” literally translating that “The one who escorts you in the night, must be thanked at dawn.” Prof Van Eck and Dr. Dube walked with me on this sleepless journey up to the end. I truly value their insights, corrections, criticisms and humour during the period I sat under their tutorage. Indeed it was a journey worth undertaking, especially with the right kind of teachers alongside. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the massive support I received from the United church of Zambia (UCZ), Lusaka presbytery, under the leadership of Bishop Rodwell Mwape Chomba and the synod office for granting me permission to pursue further studies. Many thanks go to the Rev. Dr. Simon Muwowo and Rev. Dr. Luckson Chibuye who encouraged and motivated me to pursue studies at the University of Pretoria. I also, want to acknowledge the Rev. Dr. Kangwa Jonathan, the registrar at the UCZ-University for his comments and insights that later shaped my research proposal out of which this study has emerged and Mr. John Musanya for proof reading my work. Many thanks go to my colleagues both clergy and laity within my church and other denominations for the motivations and encouragement they accorded me during my studies. I cannot forget to particularly mention Rev. Dr. Kuzipa Nalwamba my all-weather friend, sister and mentor, Rev. Stephen Simumba for believing in me. I also thank my two former New Testament lecturers Rev. Prof. Teddy Kalongo and Rev. Jeremiah Chenge who encouraged me to pursue biblical studies at post graduate level. Thanks too to the Justo Mwale University management who helped me with access to their library and the Bethel UCZ congregation who had to endure the absence of their minister each time I was required to be in Pretoria or in the library at Justo Mwale. My special thanks goes to the respondents of this study who took time to provide information that has been used in this study.

I acknowledge the support I received from the University of Pretoria members of staff too numerous to mention, who in one way or the other contributed to the success of my academic journey. I also acknowledge the support I received from my children; Cecilia-Towera, Salifya-Limba, Tusankine and Zipa-Winile who were deprived of my presence whenever I was glued to books. May this piece of work inspire you my beloved children to work extra hard at school. Lastly, I salute my angel and God given friend, my late wife- Veronica, who at the time I was working on this dissertation was unwell and consequently died before my graduation. Veronica endured my absence and together we financed my studies out of our meagre family resources, depriving our family of the good life they could have had. *Gratia* and *Bravo*, Sweetheart! May your sweet soul continue resting in eternal peace.

List of abbreviations

AACC	All Africa Council of Churches
AD	Anno Domino
AIC	African Initiated Churches
ATR	African Traditional Religions
BCE	Before Common Era
CCZ	Council of Churches in Zambia
CSO	Central Statistical Office
EFZ	Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia
ICOZ	Independent Churches Organization of Zambia
LMS	London Missionary Society
MMD	Movement for Multiparty Democracy
NHoP	National House of Prayers
PEMS	Paris Evangelical Missions
PF	Patriotic Front
SSC	Social Scientific Criticism
UCZ	United Church of Zambia
UPND	United Party for National Development
VMI	Victory Ministries International
WCC	World Council of Churches
WOFBI	Word of Faith Bible Institute

ZCCB Zambia Conference for Catholic Bishops
ZNBC Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation

Abstract

This study focuses on a critical analysis of the usage of 'submit to the governing authority' (Romans 13:1) among some African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia. The study deals with the role ordinary citizens in Zambia play in keeping their political leadership accountable, or otherwise, by looking at how biblical texts in Zambia are used in the democratic dispensation. In Zambia, Romans 13:1-7 is widely used to support the political *status quo*; any political government that comes into power is assumed to have been ushered in by the will of God. Hence, in some circles it is assumed that whatever these leaders say or do is divinely proclaimed, therefore, criticising them is tantamount to fighting the will of God. African Pentecostal preachers are widely accused of being the ones championing this kind of teaching. Thus, the research questions; how do African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia understand and interpret Romans 13:1-7? Is their interpretation of the text legitimate? In my view, the way scriptures are interpreted, coupled with the consciousness drawn thereof, they influence citizens actions and decisions. Therefore, the way in which an understanding of Romans 13:1-7 by African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia is arrived at and grounded is the concern this study has thoroughly investigated.

In Chapter 2, a summary is given on how some selected scholars have interpreted and analysed Romans 13:1-7, using different lenses and approaches. This history of interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 will then be used to identify the research gap that will be addressed in the study.

In Chapter 3 a discussion on the theoretical perspectives of this study has been given. The chapter begins with a discussion on the meaning of social-scientific criticism (SSC), and an overview or description of social-scientific criticism. Secondly, in this chapter a detailed discussion on "African enchanted worldview" and "field consciousness" theories have been given. The description of the above-mentioned theoretical perspectives is necessary because it will be against this understanding of the approach that the understanding and interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 among African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia will be undertaken.

In Chapter 4 an analysis of Romans 13:1-7 is presented in order to uncover its possible original intended (contextual) meaning and purpose. This is done by discussing the socio-cultural-, economic- and political situation in which Paul's letter to the Romans

was applicable. In order to achieve this, the study engages with social-scientific models and theories that are designed to unlock the meaning entrenched in ancient texts.

Chapter 5 provides an overview on the role African Pentecostals play in the Zambian political dispensation. The Chapter has given a brief history of Pentecostalism and African Pentecostalism respectively. Furthermore, the chapter paints a vivid picture of the church and state relationship championed by African Pentecostals in Zambia. Additionally, the Chapter attempts to outline the impact of such church and state relations model on the democratic dispensation of the country.

Chapter 6 provides an overview on how some selected African Pentecostal preachers understand and interpret Romans 13:1-7. Using “enchanted worldview” and “field consciousness” analytical lenses, the chapter analyses how these selected preachers interpret and understand Romans 13:1-7 and how such interpretation and understanding impacts on the democratization of the country: Zambia.

Chapter 7 outlines the findings of the study, as well as recommendations for further research.

Table of contents

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Introduction..... 1
1.2	Problem statement 1
1.3	Motivation..... 3
1.4	Literature review..... 3
1.4.1	Pentecostalism 3
1.4.2	History of interpretation 3
1.5	PRINCIPLE APPROACHES AND MODELS EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY 4
1.5.1	Social-scientific criticism..... 4
1.5.2	Enchanted worldview and field consciousness models 4
1.6	OBJECTIVES 5
1.7	RESEARCH QUESTIONS 5
1.8	RESEARCH MODELS AND METHODS 5
1.8.1	Methods..... 6
1.8.1.1	Open ended interviews 6
1.8.1.2	Documentation 6
1.9	CHAPTER OUTLINE 6

CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 13:1-7

2.1	INTRODUCTION 8
2.2	AFRICAN PENTECOSTALISM 8
2.3	THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION OF LUKE 4:16-30 10
2.3.1	Colin G. Kruse 10
2.3.2	James R. Harrison..... 15
2.3.3	Charles Hodge 17
2.3.4	F.F. Bruce 21
2.3.5.	J.D.G. Dunn 24
2.3.5.1	The historical context 25
2.3.5.2	The context of Romans 27
2.3.5.3	Particular issues of Romans 13:1-7 28
2.3.6	Jonathan E.T. Kuwornu-Adjaottor..... 31

2.3.6.1	The context of Romans 13:1-7	31
2.3.7.	Sze-Kar Wan	33
2.3.7.1	Reading from top to down (Public discourse)	34
2.3.5.2	Reading from bottom up (hidden discourse)	35
2.3.7.3	coded resistance	36
2.3.8	Jonathan A. Draper	37
2.3.8.1	Sociological models of authority: First century Roman Empire	37
2.3.8.1.1	Legal rational	37
2.7.8.1.2	Traditional-sacral.....	37
2.2.8.1.3	Charismatic revolution	38
2.3.8.2	Paul's assumptions concerning his own authority.....	38
2.3.8.2.1	Paul's rejection of traditional-sacral authority	38
2.3.8.3	Literally context of Romans 13:1-7.....	39
2.3.8.4	Exegetical analysis	40
2.3.9	Pol Vonck	41
2.3.9.1	What does it say? What did it mean?	41
2.3.9.2	Literal context of the letter	42
2.3.10	John Calvin.....	43
2.3.10.1	Identity of the powers	43
2.3.10.2	Grounds of obedience.....	44
2.3.10.2.1	Limits of obedience	44
2.3.11	Matthew G. Neufeld.....	44
2.3.11.1	The text within the text	45
2.3.11.2	Paul's argument for submitting to the authorities	45
2.3.11.3	The possible historical and social circumstances behind Romans 13:1-7.....	45
2.3.12	Hebert Gale	46
2.3.13	Allan Boesak	48
2.3.14	T.L. Carter	48
2.3.15	Jan Botha	51
2.3.16	David May	51
2.3.17	Mark Nanos.....	52
2.3.18	Joshua Steele.....	53
2.3.19	Robert Jewett	54
2.3.20	A.B. du Toit.....	55
2.3.21	Sung U. Lim.....	55

2.3.21.1	A double voiced reading of Romans 13:1-7	56
2.3.21.1.1	A hidden voice of Romans 13:1-7	56
2.4	CONCLUSION	57

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1	INTRODUCTION	58
3.2	SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC CRITICISM	58
3.2.1	Definition of Social-scientific criticism	58
3.2.1.1	Models.....	59
3.2.1.1.1	Etics.....	60
3.2.1.1.2	Emics.....	60
3.2.2	Advantages of Social-scientific criticism	61
3.2.3	Disadvantages of Social-scientific criticism	62
3.2.4	The importance of Social-scientific criticism.....	63
3.2.5	Topographies of Social-scientific criticism	65
3.2.6	Exegetical method applicable to social-scientific criticism	67
3.2.6.1	Exegesis.....	67
3.2.6.2	Socio-cultural investigation.....	67
3.2.6.3	Social-scientific exegesis	67
3.2.6.4	Models.....	68
3.3	ENCHANTED WORLDVIEW	69
3.3.1	Hierarchy of power	70
3.3.2	Charismatic power.....	70
3.3.3	Ordinary life infused by the divine	71
3.3.4	Strong sense of reward and punishment from the spiritual world	71
3.4	FIELD CONSCIOUSNESS	71
3.4.1	Society.....	72
3.4.2	Consciousness	73
3.5	Point of departure.....	74
3.6	CONCLUSION	74

CHAPTER 4

A SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC READING OF ROMANS 13:1-7

4.1	INTRODUCTION	76
4.2	SOCIAL, CULTURAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL MILIEU OF THE FIRST CENTURY MEDITERRANEAN WORLD	77

4.2.1	The first century Mediterranean world: An advance agrarian society ..	77
4.2.2	Features of an advance agrarian societies	78
4.2.3	Honor and shame	81
4.2.3.1	Honor	81
4.2.3.2	Shame	83
4.2.4	Patronage and Clientism	84
4.2.4.1	Reciprocity	85
4.2.4.2	Features of patron-client societies.....	90
4.2.1.3	Patronage system in the Roman Empire.....	91
4.2.5	First Century Mediterranean Personality	92
4.2.6	Kinship: The dominant institution in the first century Mediterranean world.....	94
4.3	ROME AND POLITICS	95
4.3.1.	The Roman civic cult	97
4.3.2	The hierarchy of honor	99
4.3.3	The situation of the Jewish community in Rome	101
4.3.4	The origin of Christianity in Rome	103
4.4	SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS OF ROMANS 13:1-7	105
4.4.1	Introduction	105
4.4.2	Patron and client relationship in Roman 13:1-7	106
4.4.3	Honor and shame in Romans 13:1-7	108
4.4.4	Dyadic personality in Romans 13:1-7	109
4.4.5	Benefaction and reciprocity in Romans 13:1-7.....	110
4.5	CONCLUSION.....	113

CHAPTER 5

AFRICAN PENTECOSTALISM AND POLITICS IN ZAMBIA

5.1	INTRODUCTION	114
5.2	PENTECOSTALISM	114
5.2.1	An overview on Pentecostalism in Africa.....	115
5.2.2	African Pentecostalism	118
5.2.2.1	The first response	119
5.2.2.2	The second response.....	119
5.2.2.3	The third response.....	119
5.3	BRIEF PERSPECTIVES ON THE PRESENCE OF CHRISTIANITY IN ZAMBIA	123

5.3.1	The presence of Pentecostalism in Zambia	126
5.3.2	Chiluba and the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation	132
5.3.3	The declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation.....	133
5.3.4	Position of African Pentecostals on the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation.....	135
5.3.5	African Pentecostalism and politics in Zambia	136
5.3.4.1	Advantages of African Pentecostal participation in politics in Zambia ..	137
5.3.4.2	Disadvantages of African Pentecostal participation in politics in Zambia.	138
5.3	CONCLUSION	146

CHAPTER 6

PREACHERS FROM AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL CHURCH IN ZAMBIA'S INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 13:1-7

6.1	INTRODUCTION	148
6.2	BISHOP KAUNDA LEMBALEMB	149
6.2.1	Bishop Lembalemba's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7.....	150
6.2.1.1	The purpose of Romans 13:1-7	150
6.2.1.2	Romans 13:1-7: An instruction from God.....	151
6.2.1.3	Leadership comes from God.....	151
6.2.1.4	God appoints leaders even bad ones	151
6.2.1.5	God influences elections	152
6.2.2	Appraisal of bishop Lembalemba's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7....	152
6.3	PASTOR GERALD MUYAWALA	154
6.3.1	Pastor Muyawala's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7.....	155
6.3.1.1	God appoints leaders for the purpose	155
6.3.1.2	Romans 13:1-7: An instruction from God.....	156
6.3.1.3	God appoints leaders even non-Christians with specific mission to achieve	157
6.3.2	Appraisal of pastor Muyawala's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7	157
6.4	BISHOP EDWIN SILAVWE	158
6.4.1	Bishop Silavwe's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7	159
6.4.1.1	Romans 13:1-7: An instruction and order from God	160
6.4.1.2	Authorities are established by God	160
6.2.1.3	God appoints leaders for the purpose	161
6.2.1.4	God influences elections of leaders	161

6.5	PASTOR JOYCE NAMAKAU	161
6.5.1	Pastor Namakau’s interpretation of Romans 13:1-7.....	162
6.5.1.1	God has ordained all forms of power	162
6.5.1.2	God influences leadership.....	162
6.5.1.3	Authority comes from God	163
6.5.2	Appraisal of pastor Namakau’s interpretation	164
6.6	BISHOP JENNIPHER MUCHELENG’ANGA	164
6.6.1	Bishop Mucheleng’anga’s interpretation of Romans 13:1-7	164
6.6.1.1	All authorities are from God.....	165
6.6.1.2	Submission to authority must start from the household	166
6.6.2	Appraisal of bishop Mucheleng’anga’s interpretation.....	166
6.7	SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE VIEWS OF ZAMBIAN AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL PREACHERS REGARDING THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 13:1-7.....	168
6.7.	Similarities	168
6.7.1.1	All authority comes from God.....	168
6.7.1.2	God influences elections the election of political leaders	168
6.7.1.3	Romans 13:1-7: An instruction from God.....	168
6.7.1.4	Approach to the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7	169
6.7.2	Differences	169
6.8	GENERAL APPRAISAL OF THE AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL PREACHERS OF ZAMBIA	169
6.9	ENCHANTED WORLDVIEW, FIELD CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 13:1-7 BY AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL PREACHERS IN ZAMBIA.....	172
6.9.1	Introduction.....	172
6.9.2	Enchanted worldview and the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7.....	174
6.9.2.1	Hierarchy of power	174
6.9.2.2	Charismatic power.....	175
6.9.2.3	The idea of ordinary life infused by the divine	177
6.9.2.4	A strong sense of reward and punishment from the spiritual world.....	178
6.9.3	Some salient aspects of the context of African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia	179
6.9.4	Role of the Holy Spirit in interpretation.....	180
6.9.5	Mode of biblical interpretation among African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia	180

6.9.6	Underdetermining in Romans 13:1-7	181
6.9.7	Consequences of African Pentecostal preachers enchanted worldview in a democratic dispensation of Zambia	181
6.10	CONCLUSION	186
 CHAPTER 7		
CONCLUSION		
7.1	CONCLUSION	187
7.2	POSSIBLE FUTURE STUDY EMERGING FROM THE STUDY	190
 BIBLIOGRAPHY		204

Chapter 1

Introduction to the study

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF STUDY

This study focuses on how Romans 13:1-7's mention of "submit to the governing authority" is interpreted by some African Pentecostal preachers in the course of preaching and teaching in Zambia. According to Neufeld (1994:90), Romans 13:1-7 is one of the famous and hotly debated texts in the Pauline corpus. The text has been erroneously used by some theologians and politicians to justify various political orders that are oppressive in practice. For example, in South Africa, Romans 13:1-7 was used in defense of the apartheid policy, and in Germany it was used to support absolute obedience of the Third Reich¹ (Feinberg 1999:88). In Zambia, this text is mostly widely used to support the *status quo*. Any political government that comes to power is perceived to have been ushered in by the will of God. Hence, it is assumed in some circles that whatever the government says is divinely proclaimed, and therefore any criticism is tantamount to fighting the will of God. The African Pentecostal preachers are widely understood to be the ones who champion this kind of teaching.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

African Pentecostal churches² have brought about a new twist to the understanding of church and state relationships on the continent. In the past, the Catholic Church in Zambia related to the state on mutual independence and self-governance terms (Komakoma 2003:8). This state of affairs has enabled the mainline churches, in the main, to fulfill their prophetic role of being the conscience of the nation. It is for this reason that mainline churches remain free to critique government on several social and political order matters (Komakoma 2003:8). Mainline churches, more specifically those who are members of the Council of Churches in Zambia (CCZ), tend to advocate for a separation of the church and state on the one hand, while advocating for

¹ The third Reich is the German empire under the Nazis (1933-1945).

² African Pentecostal churches are a strand of Pentecostal churches which has a purely African foundation. These churches are largely independent from foreign churches. They arose in the 1970's in the context of interdenominational evangelical campus and school Christian organizations, from which charismatic leaders emerged with significant following. These churches previously operated as non-denominations, but eventually developed into denominational churches with structures (Anderson 2001:170).

collaboration in other specific matters. These churches are both passive and vocal at times on matters of political nature (Zwanyika 2013:60).

African Pentecostal churches, however, tend to advocate for a totally different approach. The position of most churches in this category is that, the state is not supposed to be criticized. They presume all existing powers (or institutions) to be under the authority and will of God. They advance a notion of parallel government, one in heaven which is more powerful, and the other one on earth which exist through the permissive will of God (Zwanyika 2013:59). They therefore tend to support the state as a way of promoting a good relationship with the state. This understanding and interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 has the attendant consequences. It threatens and silences any reasonable efforts by many Zambians to advocate for good policies and practices of the state and government (Henriot 2003:1). Furthermore, this kind of understanding is detrimental because leaders infer from it that whatever they do is right by virtue of being selected by God. The Zambian republican president Edgar Chagwa Lungu, for instance, after the 2016 presidential elections, took a swipe at the opposition political party that petitioned his election in the courts of law by asserting that that 'the voice of the people should be respected because it was a voice of God' (*Daily Nation*, 15 April 2017). This position is problematic because there are many ways in which people ascend to Political offices in Zambia. Some ascend to Political office because of their good manifestos, which appeal to the electorate; while others have ascended to Political office through sympathy votes, as was the case for Rupiah Banda and Edgar Lungu, who were elected into office after the deaths of their predecessors Levy Mwanawasa and Michael Chilufya Sata respectively.

The presupposition that leads to such an understanding of the Romans passage is in most cases left undisclosed. All we hear are preachers calling upon Zambians to submit to the authority of elected rulers because leadership comes from God. The way in which this kind of understanding is attained and grounded is the concern this study intends to investigate. Is this kind of reading legitimate? Does this kind of reading reflect the message of Paul as portrayed in the book of Romans? With this *state of affairs* in mind, this study sets out to investigate how some African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia understand and interpret "submit to the governing authority" in Romans 13:1-7.

1.3 MOTIVATION

Generally, I do not have any problem with any form of authority or governance. As a minister in the United Church of Zambia, I willingly submit to the authority of my church. In addition, as a good Zambian citizen and as required by the state, I pay taxes, obey most, if not all the laws of our country, and I highly respect the office of the republican president and the local authorities. However, I have problems with how submission to authority in Romans 13:1-7 is read and understood by some African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia.

1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW

This study focuses on two areas of concern; Pentecostalism and the history of the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7.

1.4.1 Pentecostalism

Pentecostalism represents a brand of Christianity that is fast-growing in Africa. It is a complex and socially visible strand of Christianity on the continent. There are three streams of Pentecostalism; classical Pentecostal churches, indigenous/independent Pentecostal churches, and African Pentecostal/Charismatic churches (see Kalu 2008, Adogame 1998, Gifford 2001). In this study, we have reviewed literature on global and African Pentecostalism extensively. From this discussion, it is clear that a substantial amount of research has been done on Pentecostalism, focusing on its growth worldwide, its beliefs, and mode of interpreting scriptures. However, in most and if not all these works, no mention is made of the mode of interpretation employed by Pentecostal preachers in Zambia in their quest to decipher their messages from Romans 13:1-7. That is the gap this study intends to fill.

1.4.2 History of interpretation of Roman 13:1-7

In this study, we look at various interpretation of Romans 13:1-7, observing that extensive interpretations of Romans 13:1-7 from different approaches and perspectives have been done. Furthermore, we also appreciate that some scholars have arrived at the same interpretations and conclusions. Many more scholars have interpreted Romans 13:1-7 in different and similar ways. However, not many of them have interpreted the text from a social-scientific perspective in a Zambian context,

which is the approach that this study employs. Moreover, no study has been done on how Pentecostal preachers in Zambia understand and interpret “submit to the governing authority in Romans 13:1-7” using social-scientific criticism for interpretation and appropriation. This is the specific focus of this study.

1.5 PRINCIPLE APPROACHES AND MODELS EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY

1.5.1 Social-scientific criticism

In this study, we employ social-scientific criticism we to demonstrate how Romans 13:1-7 can be used and interpreted in a Zambian context. Social-scientific criticism is probably the hermeneutical approach that takes matters of social concern in ancient texts the most seriously (Van Eck 1995:80). We adopt the approach in this study in order to tease out the contours of the socio-political context of the book of Romans to enabled us to gain insight into the possible meaning of Romans 13:1-7, and its use of “submit to the governing authority” (Rm 13:1). Furthermore, the approach helps us to see how Romans 13:1-7 would be relevant in Zambian political context through the process of interaction between the reader and the text. We conclude this process by showing the impact that a social scientific interpretation of a biblical text could have on believers.

1.5.2 Enchanted worldview and field consciousness models

While Paul Gifford’s “enchanted worldview” and Peter Berger’s *et.al* (1974) “field consciousness” are fully grown theories in their own domain, in this work they are applied as a combined analytical framework. They are used as social-scientific models to interpret phenomenon of Pentecostalism in Zambia.

An enchanted worldview refers to a mind-set that revolves around the spirit world. An enchanted mind-set believes in a spirit-world that permeates all spheres of human endeavours (Gifford 2016:13). This is a world where real power, spiritual power, resides where life is played out between good and evil (Gifford 2016:13). On the other hand, field consciousness presents an outline of sociology of knowledge from a phenomenological perspective, the major assumption of this theory is that “modern people are afflicted with a permanent crisis, a condition conducive to considerable nervousness” (Berger *et.al.* 1974:78). As such, a comprehensive understanding of any social reality must include a study of subjective consciousness of individual human beings. This in the end helps to clarify a number of problems encountered in specific

societies (Berger *et al.* 1974:11). Although these two theories seem to be at variance with each other, they seem to converge on their quest for studying the human cognitive environment and how that helps in constructing social reality.

1.6 OBJECTIVES

To interrogate Zambian Pentecostal preachers' understanding and interpretation of the 'submit to the governing authority' claim found in Romans 13:1-7. The study, among others:

- explores the socio-historical context of Paul and the Romans from which the claim was made;
- determines the meaning of the statement based on the historical context;
- explores the various meanings and usages in Zambia among Pentecostal preachers; and
- appraises and critiques its usage within the context of Zambia.

1.7 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

How do Pentecostal preachers in Zambia understand and interpret 'submit to the governing authority' as found in Romans 13:1-7? Other questions include:

- What is the rhetoric of the phrase in the context of Paul and that of the Romans?
- What was the meaning of the statement in the context Paul addressed?
- How do Pentecostal preachers in Zambia understand and interpret 'submit to the governing authority' as found in Romans 13:1-7?
- How should we understand Romans 13:1-7 using the social scientific criticism model?

1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

This study is first a socio-historical study to determine the rhetoric of the phrase 'submit to the governing authority' to the Romans, with a view to critique its discursive usage in Zambia among Pentecostal churches. It is also an empirical study because it focuses on a 'contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context' (Yin 1984:13). This is because the study aims at investigating how preachers in Zambia understand and interpret 'submit to the governing authority' as found in Romans 13:1-7. In addition, the quest of this study is to 'make sense of feelings, experiences, social situations, or

phenomenon as they occur in the real world, and therefore want to study them in their natural setting' (Blanche, Martin & Durrheim 1999:287).

1.8.1 Methods

1.8.1.1 Open ended interviews

In this study, open ended qualitative interviews with five preachers from different Pentecostal churches in Zambia were conducted. This exercise was done for the sole purpose of understanding their viewpoints on “submit to the governing authority” (Rm 13:1) and the entire Roman 13:1-7 text. The five (5) preachers interviewed consisted of two (2) women, two (2) men and one (1) male youth. All the interviewees are pastors in their respective churches. The interviews were conducted in December 2017 and in January 2018 in the city of Lusaka. That is in keeping with Ukah’s (2004:415) argument that cities in Africa are epicenters of Pentecostal expansion.

Not all the sampled twenty (20) interviewees could be interviewed because the data collection (interviews) reached a saturation. The researcher realized after interviewing five (5) people that the respondents were giving almost the same view points and perspectives when answering the questions. Hence the researcher decided to discontinue and opted to work with the data that was collected from five (5) interviewees. The data was collected through tape-recording and was later transcribed. The transcribed data was coded into interpretive variables that form the discussion in Chapter 6.

1.8.1.2 Documentation

Literature in the form of sermons, newspapers and church constitutions produced by African Pentecostals churches were examined. As Yin (1984:80) observes, documents in research are very useful tools as they corroborate the evidence at hand.

1.9 CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter 1 is an introduction to the study and deals with the background to the study, the problem statement, research questions and objectives, and research methodology and methods. In short, the chapter introduces the reader to the issues addressed in this study.

Chapter 2 discusses the presence of Pentecostalism globally and its expansion in Africa. This chapter also looks at how different scholars have interpreted and analyzed Romans 13:1-7 using different lenses and approaches throughout history. The discussion on Pentecostalism and the history of interpretation justifies the research gap identified.

Chapter 3 describes the theoretical framework used in this study, namely, social scientific criticism, the enchanted worldview and field consciousness models.

Chapter 4 looks at the social-scientific exegesis of Romans 13:1-7. Out of this exegesis, the chapter goes further to probe the possible meaning of the phrase “submit to the governing authority.”

Chapter 5 discusses African Pentecostalism and politics in Zambia. The chapter gives a detailed scenario of how African Pentecostalism impacts on the political landscape of the country.

In Chapter 6 we have analyzed and critiqued Zambian African Pentecostal preachers’ understanding and the use of Romans 13:1-7 using enchanted worldview and field consciousness lenses.

Chapter 7 serves as a conclusion and offers the recommendations of this study.

Chapter 2

Literature study

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter gives a literature study on two areas of concern; African Pentecostalism and the history of interpretation of Romans 13:1-7. To begin with, we cite some works on Pentecostalism and African Pentecostalism in particular. Secondly, the Chapter paints a picture of how some selected scholars have interpreted and analysed Romans 13:1-7 using different lenses and approaches. Herein we explore the interpretation of twenty-two scholars, namely, Colin G. Kruse, Robert Jewett, James Harrison, Charles Hodge, F.F Bruce, D.G. Dunn, Jonathan E.T Kuwornu-Adjaottor, Sze-Kar Wan, Jonathan Draper, Pol Vonck, John Calvin, Mathew Neufeld, Oscar Cullmann, Hebert M. Gale, Allan Boesak, T.L. Carter, Jan Botha, Mark Nanos, Joshua Steele, A.B. Du Toit and Sung U. Lim. These works on African Pentecostalism and the history of interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 are used to justify the research gap identified.

2.2 AFRICAN PENTECOSTALISM

Allan Anderson in *Pentecostals after a century: Global perspectives on a movement in Transition*, broadly defines Pentecostalism as a brand of Christianity that emphasises the operation of the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts (1999:20). Paul Gifford (1990:373), a sociologist and African scholar, wrote on Pentecostal experiences in Africa in general as well as in countries such as Ghana, South Africa and Liberia in particular. In this study, focus is on the impact of Pentecostal expressions on society. Gifford took note of the impact of Pentecostal charismatic movements in Africa and attributed its rise to the influence of the American Tele-evangelist's teachings (1990:373-388). Adogame (1998) describes Pentecostalism as representing a brand of Christianity that is fast-growing in Africa. On the other hand, Kalu (2008) describes it as a complex and socially visible strand of religion in Africa. Paul Gifford (2001) identifies three streams of Pentecostalism that are visible in Africa namely; classic/mission Pentecostal churches, indigenous/independent Pentecostal churches, and African Pentecostal/Charismatic churches. And similarly, Hollenweger (1972:149) in his book *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments worlds* traces the origins and

five roots of Pentecostalism in Africa and appeals to the Pentecostals to be involved in Ecumenical activities. These works are similar in that they all capture Pentecostalism as a global phenomenon which traces its roots from the Azusa street revivals of 1906.

These churches are mostly founded purely on the basis of Pentecostal teachings and exist for the purpose of engaging in Pentecostal practices. Engelsma (2001), in *Pentecostalism: Spirit-filled or dangerous heresy?*, asserts that Pentecostalism is now present in almost all churches. The non-Pentecostal churches such as Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and many more traditional churches have also welcomed Pentecostalism in their membership (preachers) and life. This observation is supported by other writers such as Aurther (2000:52-53) who, in his *Pentecostals and Charismatics: A Confessional Lutheran Evaluation*, affirms that a number of Protestant denominations have embraced charismatic renewal in their denominations.

Anderson (2000:167) attributes the expansion of the New Pentecostal/charismatic movement to the liberal policies of globalization that characterized the post 1970 period, which he thinks contributed to the expansion of this stream of Pentecostalism due to rapid travels and the advancement of mass communication. Shorter and Njiru (2001:28-29) argue that New Pentecostalism is rapidly spreading in Africa due to the nature of their teachings and shape of their commitment. According to Allan Anderson (2007:168), New Pentecostals/Charismatics espouse a specific doctrine that makes them distinct from the other streams of Pentecostals. They hold a belief that they are saved and the rest of humanity is doomed to perdition. Therefore, Pinnock writes: 'we cannot consider Pentecostalism to be a kind of aberration born of experimental excesses, but a 21st century revival of the New Testament theology and religion. It has not only restored joy and power to the churches, but a clear reading to the Bible as well'. The authoritative *Dictionary of Pentecostals and Charismatics movement*, edited by Burgess *et.al.* (1988) says that the Pentecostal/Charismatic movement is 'one worldwide trans-denomination outpouring of the spirit of God'. With this understanding, they imply that the movement promotes ecumenicity, whereby members of different denominations like Protestants and Roman Catholics alike share this one spirit, regardless of their differences (1988:159). Carson (1987:12), in *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14*, gives a sympathetic presentation of

how non-Pentecostals and classical Pentecostals view Pentecostal charismatic. He says:

Non-Charismatics think have succumbed to the modern love of ‘experience’, even at the expense of truth. Charismatics are thought to be profoundly unbiblical, especially when they evaluate their experience of tongues to the level of theological and spiritual *shibboleth*. If they are growing, no small part of their strength can be ascribed to their raw triumphalism, their populist elitism, their promise of short cuts to holiness and power ... (they are) devoid of any real grasp of the Bible that goes beyond mere proof texting.

(Carson 1987:12)

Fee (1976:122), in *Hermeneutics and Historical Precedence*, demonstrates how Pentecostals exegete scriptures using their own experiences. This is a view supported by Menzies (1985:13), a Pentecostal member himself, in *Methodology of Pentecostal Theology: An Essay on Hermeneutics* when he writes that ‘if a biblical truth is to be promulgated, then it ought to be demonstrated in life’. In the same vein, Stronstand (2017:1) shows that Pentecostals have restored a clear reading of the Bible to the church and a clear growing number of Christians are coming to a similar conclusion. Pentecostals bring valid experiential prescription to the interpretation of Biblical texts, rather than just doing what he calls superior historical-grammatical exegesis of texts.

From the discussion above, we note that, a substantial amount of work has been done on Pentecostalism and African Pentecostalism in particular, with much emphasis on its growth, its beliefs, and the mode of interpreting scriptures. However, in almost or not all these works, no mention is made of the mode of interpretation employed by African Pentecostal preachers in their quest to decipher their messages from Romans 13:1-7. That is the gap this study sets out to fill.

2.3 THE HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 13:1-7

2.3.1 Colin G. Kruse

According to Colin Kruse Romans 13:1-7 is a continuation from Romans 12:17-21. In this pericope the apostle Paul set out to instruct his audience about how they were supposed to conduct themselves in relation to outsiders (2012:489). Paul in this text specifically addresses the issue of how his audience ought to relate to the governing

authority. He reminds his audience that “rulers are not a terror to [those who do] good but to [those who do] wrong” (2012: 489). In this statement, Paul implies that, rulers are servants and agents of God to mete out good and the wrath of God on those who do good and wrong respectively. Kruse argues that, the theme of “doing good or evil” in relation to the outsider’s context is predominant in Chapter 12 and 13 of the book of Romans. As such, he is of the view that, it is impossible to be dogmatic about the exact *Sitz in Leben* of Paul’s (exhortations) instructions in Rm 13:1-7.

It is in that regard that, Kruse’s opinion differs with scholars such as Carter (2010), Witherington (2000) and many more, whose findings suggest that Paul in Romans 13:1-7 was speaking ironically and subverting the need for the subjects to submit. Kruse is of the view that, such opinions are questionable because of two main reasons. 1) They contradict Jesus’ response to those who wanted to know whether he was paying taxes to the Roman government or not. (Give to Caesar what is Caesar’s and to God what is God’s [Mk 12:21; Lk 20:25]), for Kruse, Jesus’ response in this regard was likely known by Paul and it must have had influenced his rendering. (ii) He regards Carter’s view as a contradictory of the Pauline view for not being consistent with the straight forward advice in Titus in 3:1; “Remind the people to be subject to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready to do whatever is good” (Kruse 2012:491-492).

With this in mind, Kruse is of the view that the possible interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 could be as follows:

Romans 13:1; let everyone be subject to the governing authorities

The apostle Paul begins his instruction with the verb “everyone” denoting the whole person. This emphasises the fact that Paul’s recipients should not regard themselves as exempt from paying attention to this instruction. In this regard, when Paul exhorts his audience to submit to the governing authorities appointed by God, he uses the verb “submit” in the similar way he uses it to other audiences (Kruse 2012:492). For example, when Paul points out the failure by his Roman recipients to “submit” to God’s righteousness (10:3); when he exhorts the Corinthians believe to “submit” to Christian workers who labour in the service of saints (1 Cor 16:15-16); and when he instructs Ephesian believers to “submit” to one another (Eph 5:21); wives should “submit” to their husbands (Eph 5:24, Col 3:18; Tit 2:5); and slaves should “submit” to their

masters (Tit 2:9) (Kruse 2012:492). According to Kruse, submission to the ruling authorities in this case was to be given willingly and not uncritically, this is because there would be moments when those in authority demand something contrary to the will of God (Rm 12:2) (2012:492).

Romans 13:1-2; *for there is no authority except that which God has established the authorities that exist have been established by God.*

According to Kruse (2012:493) when Paul write Romans 13:1-7 he drew upon insights from Jewish literature about God's sovereignty over the rise and fall of rulers that it emphasised. This literature is familiar with both good and bad rulers. However, the authors of this literature assert that God rules over all rulers (Kruse 2012:493). Kruse asserts that the way church fathers interpreted Paul's teaching and applied it is very instructive. They did so out of their experience and knowledge of rulers who could abuse their God given authority. For example, Origen asks, 'Is an authority which persecutes the children of God, which attacks the faith, and which undermines our religion, from God?' In answering this question Kruse asserts that:

Nobody will deny that our senses, sight, sound and thought are given to us by God. But although we get them from God, what we do with them is up to us.... God's judgment against the authorities will be just, if they have used the powers, they have received according to their own ungodliness they have received according to their own ungodliness and not according to the law of God.

(Kruse 2012: 494)

Largely, Kruse affirms that all authorities are appointed by God to exercise authority over others. It is for this reason that he asserts that it is not human wickedness of individuals which comes from God, but rather the establishment of the ruling power itself (Kruse 2012:494-495). Consequently, whoever rebels against the authorities is rebelling against what God has instituted. Kruse argues that, in this case, "Paul is speaking in the light of his earlier proposition that the authorities that exist have been established by God", as such, rebelling against any established authority is tantamount to rebelling against God. And for all those who dare rebel, they risk attracting God's judgment on themselves, which is carried out by the authorities on behalf of God. However, in light of the earlier form of divine judgment Paul talks about in Roman (2.2,

3; 3:8, 5:16) it is clearly demonstrated that Paul had in mind God's tribunal and the government verdicts (Kruse 2012:495).

Romans 13:3-4; *for rulers hold no terrors for those who do right, but for those who do wrong*

Kruse (2012:495) posits that in Romans 13:3-4, Paul outlines the role of the authority as God's appointed agents. And one of the roles identified, is that of affirming those who do "good" and to punish the evil doers. This thought, culminates from Paul's earlier sentiments in 12; 17-21, in which he instructs believers on how to conduct themselves in the world, in order to overcome evil by doing good. Kruse is of the view that, in this case Paul assures his audience that those who do good have no reason to fear the Roman authorities, because the Roman rulers hold no terror for those who do right - only for those who do wrong.

Kruse believes that, it is likely for this reason that Paul gives a rhetorical question to his audience when he exhorts them as follows; "Do you want to be free from fear of the one in authority? Then do what is right and you will commend" (Kruse 2012:495). The phrase Paul uses here; "...who do 'good' may expect commendation from the governing Authority" is from Hellenistic civic life. Kruse (2012:495) says, there is overwhelming evidence from inscriptions that suggest that rulers praised and honoured people who did good works which benefitted the entire human community in the present and also in future. Hence, it is in Paul's interest at this particular moment to exhort his audience, that, as believers, if they too do "good", they will receive approval from Roman authorities. It is for this reason therefore that Paul asserts that "the one in authority is God's servant for your good?" and adds that "if you do wrong, be afraid, for rulers do not bear the sword for no reason" (Kruse 2012:495).

Kruse argues that, Paul's statement about 'bearing the sword' is widely interpreted and several meanings have arisen from those interpretations. However, Kruse is of the view that, the probable meaning of the statement is that authorities have a right to mete out capital punishment on their subjects. According to Kruse, in the New Testament wherever the word "sword" is mentioned it is used to imply inflicting capital punishment (cf. Rm 8:35 Acts 12:2, 16:27, Heb 11:34, 37). Hence when Paul says "authorities" are God's servants, agents of wrath to bring punishment on evil doers, he

actually makes it clear that in meting out punishment, these authorities act as God's agents. Kruse argues that even though Roman authorities in Paul 's time inflicted punishment on wrong doers without any regard for God and Jesus, they still functioned under the sovereign will of God (Kruse 2012:497).

Romans 13:5-6; *Therefore, it is necessary to submit to the authorities not only because of possible but also as a matter of conscience*

Kruse (2012:498) posits that in Romans 13:5-6, Paul opens the section with the verb "submit", as he does in the opening section of the passage. Paul does this in order to sum up what he had to say on the entire subject. However, in as much as Paul had already exhorted his audience to submit to the authority in order for them to be approved as good citizens and to avoid God's wrath, in this section, he also encourages his audience to submit to the governing authorities out of their own consciences. He does so because being aware of the fact of "human conscience adjudication upon human actions in the light of the highest standard person perceived" (Kruse 2012:498). Hence, in Paul's opinion someone's conscience helps him/her to pass judgment upon actions undertaken in the present and future. It is for this reason that Paul calls upon his audience to submit to the authorities as a matter of conscience. Kruse argues that, this call must be understood within the historical context of Romans that Paul sought to address. In doing so, one needs to be alive to the fact that the social political situation that prevailed then (in the Roman Empire) is very different from today (Kruse 2012:498).

Paul continues to say that the reason why taxes are to be paid to the government is because governing authorities are God's servants, whose full time vocation is to govern. This implies that, the reason why people paid taxes in this context was because their consciences told them to do so. Secondly, they paid because they recognized the role the authorities played as God's servants. Kruse is of the view that, the usage of the word 'servant' in this text is of significance. In the *LXX* the word is used with a cultic connotation. Paul uses it in Rom 5:16 to describe himself as a minister of Jesus Christ. Since cultic allusions are obvious here, it was appropriate for Paul to use the title in respect to the Roman authorities, whom he describes as God's appointed servants. However, it is important to note that this term was also widely used in Hellenistic community in reference to those who performed public service. This

being the case, Paul's usage of the term was appropriate (Kruise 2012:498). Furthermore, from the time of Tacitus (Ann. A.D 58) at the time Paul was writing the letter to the Romans, evidently, there were serious complaints about the taxation system. There were also challenges with the conduct of tax collectors in the entire Roman Empire. As such, taxation reforms were inevitable. Paul's exhortation in that regard was therefore appropriate (Kruise 2012:498-499).

Romans 13:7; *taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue*

In conclusion, Paul instructs Christians to give whatever they owed anyone: "if taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue; if respect then respect; if honour then honour." In this case, the term "everyone" refers to any Roman officer charged with the responsibility to demand for payment of taxes, those who collected revenue and those to whom honour and respect should be accorded (Kruise 2012:499).

2.3.2 James R. Harrison

According to James Harrison (2011:309) Roman 13:1-7 is positioned within the wider section of the passage which deals with Paul's instructions to the Roman Christians on how they were to relate with non-Christians. He argues that, the text discusses in context the sensitive issue of how Roman Christians were to cooperate with the Roman authorities (Harrison 2011:309). For Harrison, Paul's instructions to the believers to submit to the governing authorities should be understood in the light of the "Old Testament, - the second temple Judaism, - and the dominical traditions which contain a great deal of information that talks about the establishment of authorities by God" (Harrison 2011:310). Harrison is of the view that the theocentric emphasis of the entire passage (Rm 13:1-7) clearly demonstrates that, Paul was strongly steeped into exilic traditions of the Hebrew Scriptures which supports the idea of God's sovereignty and control over Jewish and non-nations and their rulers for his purpose. He argues that this same idea is emphasized in the Pseudo-graphic and the apocryphal literature of the second Temple Judaism too (Harrison 2011:310).

Harrison furthermore asserts that it is worth noting that in his letter to the Romans, Paul repeatedly appealed to believers to have a healthy fear of the authorities (Rm 13:36, 46, 76). However, in Romans 13:7-13 he uses "hidden transcript" or coded language in his quest to drive home his point with a view to avoid provoking unwise

behaviour on the part of Romans (Harrison 2011:313). Harrison posits that, by giving instructions through hidden codes, Paul endeavoured to warn Roman Christians about the danger posed by the governing authorities (Harrison 2011:313). According to Harrison the usage of coded communication is one of the tactics which was used in Second Temple Judaism whenever someone intended to speak against the ruler's behaviour in a covert, careful and considered manner (Harrison 2011-313). In Romans 13:36, 46, 76, Paul used coded communication in his instructions to his audience. Even though he sounds muted, his words were powerful when understood or viewed in context (Harrison 2011:313). Paul's emphasis to his audience to judiciously "fear" the ruling authorities clearly shows that it is not only astute usage of "hidden transcript" that he was aiming at, but an indication and acknowledgement of the political realities that characterized the first century Greco-Roman world (Harrison 2011: 313). Harrison posits that, even though the book of Romans was written at a time when the Roman Empire was experiencing a period of relative peace and stability, overwhelming evidence from the Pseudo-Seneca's Octavia transcripts clearly shows how in that same period the "ruler's sword"³ would specifically be targeted at Roman Christians (Harrison 2011:313).

According to Harrison, submission to the rulers in that case meant that, believers were expected to abide by requirements such as payment of taxes to the state (Rm13:7). Harrison argues that Paul might, in this case, have been echoing the dominical instruction as contained in Mark 12:17, Matthew 22:21; Luke 20:25; 'render unto Caesar...' in order to make his case. During this period, many groups of people in the Roman Empire were pulling back from paying both direct and indirect taxes. Hence Paul encourages his audience to honour system of the Roman Empire, by rendering what appropriate and due to the governing authorities on special occasions (Harrison 2011:316).

³ The ruler's Sword in this case implies wrath or Anger (Harrison 2011:313)

2.3.3 Charles Hodge

According to Charles Hodge (1972:404), in Romans 13:1-7, Paul stipulates the political duties of a Christian. In this text, the Apostle Paul enforces the duties that Christians owe to the civil authorities. Hodge interprets the text as follows:

Romans 13:1a; *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers*

The expression of every soul in this text refers to “everyone” while “higher powers” naturally and commonly referred to those in authority. In abstract terms, the words power and authority in the New Testament are mainly used in reference to those who are entrusted with power (Lk 12:2, Eph1:21), so in this case Paul is urging his audience to subject themselves to those vested with authority to rule them (Hodge 1972:404).

The reason why Paul gives this form of instruction to the Roman Christians is that, during the Apostolic age there was a peculiar necessity to inculcate the duty of obedience to the governing (civil) authority. This necessity arose as a result of Jewish Christian converts who were opposed to the idea of submitting to heathen authority. This peculiar indisposition was agitated by an impression that prevailed among Jewish people that it was unlawful and derogatory for them to submit to heathen authorities in their capacity as the people of God (Hodge1972:404). Another compounding reason that made Jewish people resist any foreign authority is the idea of a messianic kingdom. They expected a temporal Prince whose kingdom was not of this world and for whom they were ready to rebel against any form of foreign dominion. These and other similar causes demonstrate the depth of their entrenched collective feelings towards the Roman government (Hodge 1972:406). As a result of this, Jewish Christians and non-Christians alike constantly broke into uproars which could result into expulsion from the city of Rome and arguably led to the destruction of Jerusalem. Hodge (1972:406) argues that it is therefore not a surprise that converts from such a background needed a command to “submit to the governing authority”. This is because, their feelings and attitudes towards the Roman authorities ran against the very nature of Christianity itself.

Romans 13:1b; *For there is no power but of God: and the powers that be are ordained of God*

Hodge argues that the statement Paul makes in Romans 13:1b (quoted above) is a very comprehensive proposition (Hodge 1972:406). To begin with, Paul in this text acknowledges the fact that all authority is of God. Hence, no human being has power over others which is not derived from God. The implication of this statement is that all human power is delegated and ministerial. Hodge asserts that, “all governments (authority) is derived from God” the implication of this statement in this context is that every magistrate is of God; that, his [her] authority is *Jure divino*.” When one compares the usage of the other clauses of the passage in verses 3 and 4 where the words “rulers” and “ministers” are substituted for the abstract word “power”, it becomes clear that the injunction is contained in the all doctrine Paul is trying to teach in Romans 13:1-7. In this matter, Hodge is of the view that human governments are to be obeyed regardless of who holds office, for they derive their authority from God. According to him, by nature governments exist as divine institutions whose functions are exercised and determined by God’s Providence (1972:406).

Romans 13:2; *Whose, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God*
Hodge (1972:407) argues that, this statement is a continuation of the preceding verse. In this case, it is his view that, “if it is God’s will that there shall be civil governments and people appointed to exercise authority on others, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation thereof. It therefore follows that if anyone resists them, such a one disobeys God.” Hence Hodge postulates that since from a Christian point of view, disobedience is sin, sinners are to be punished. In this view, the word rendered damnation implies sentence or judicial decision, which can either be favourable or adverse depending on the context it is applied to (Hodge 1972:407). In modern era, the word damnation is restricted to the final and eternal condemnation that shall be meted out by God on sinners. By using such a word in his context, Paul is therefore not referring to the punishment the civil magistrates may mete out upon a wrong doer. Rather, he is referring to the punishment that those who disobey the authorities will receive from God (Hodge 1972:407). Hodge (1972:407) argues further that, Romans 13:1-7 demonstrates closely that, regardless of the governance system that may exist in a society - monarchy, aristocracy, democracy et. al. - all are instituted by God. Therefore, the authority vested in those who are appointed to govern must be

obeyed regardless of how and by whom they are appointed. In this regard, what is of utmost importance is to acknowledge the fact that earthly governments or authorities are de facto God-ordained governments.

Romans 13:3; *For rulers are not a terror to good works, but for evil*

This text is connected to the first verse, it re-emphasizes the need for obedience towards those in authority, as it is stated in Romans 13:3 “will thou then be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shall have praise of the same” (Hodge 1972:407). Hodge asserts that the idea behind this statement is that government is not an evil to be feared. Those in authority are appointed to punish evil doers and to praise those who do good. In this case, Paul is talking about the legitimate design of every form of governance (Hodge 1972:407).

Romans 13:4; *For he is the minister of God to thee for good*

According to this verse amplifies the proceeding verse. In this verse, Paul re-affirms the fact that God designed every government for the benefit of humanity. Those who are appointed to rule are not appointed for their own advantage and honour, but for the good of society (Hodge 1972:408). Hodge is of the view that, the people in authority are servants of the people and God. And it is for this reason that Paul sounds a warning to his audience: “... but if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, revenge to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.” In this view, punishment is regarded to be part of the design of governance, implying that any form of governance is delegated authority to protect public good (Hodge 1972:408). In this case, it is imperative that people must restrain themselves from committing any evil, because government “... beareth not the sword in vein.” Hodge argues that in this context, a sword symbolizes authority. In the entire New Testament the usage of the word ‘sword’ does not refer to the dagger worn by the Roman Emperors as a sign of office, but infers the right that those in authority have to mete out capital punishment on would-be offenders (Hodge 1972: 408).

13:5; *Therefore, ye must be subjects, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake*

Hodge argues that in verse 4, Paul encourages his readers to carry themselves in their role as subjects by submitting willingly rather than out of fear of being punished

by the authorities. For Paul, such submission demonstrates obedience to God (Hodge 1972:408).

Romans 13:6; *For this cause pay ye tribute also.*

Hodge argues that this text should be connected by words “for this” and the word from the proceeding verse “conscience” to imply that Paul is saying pay your taxes as a matter of conscience;

...since civil governments are constituted for the benefit of society, for the punishment of evil doers and for the praise of those that do well, ye should cheerfully pay contributes requisite for its support.

(Hodge1972: 408)

Romans 13:6b; *For they are the ministers of God, attending continually on this very thing.*

Hodge (1972: 408) says it should be noted that in Romans 13:6b the word “minister” means public servant, referring to men and women appointed for any public work, civil or religious. In this text, Paul introduces another reason why Roman Christians were supposed to pay taxes to the ruling authorities. Hodge suggests that these authorities are not only the tax gatherers, but rulers to whom such tributes are due. These taxes are necessary, because they are the means by which they were to discharge their duties (Hodge 1972:408).

Romans 13:7; *Render, therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute; custom to whom custom; fear to who fear; honour to who honour.*

In this verse, Paul re-emphasize the fact that since authorities are instituted by God, Christians must therefore render to each office what rightfully belongs to it. The word tribute herein refers to land, taxes and levies (custom) that were charged on merchandise. The words “fear” and “honour” in this context, are used to denote difference in degree of expected respect. The former expresses reverence to superiors, while the latter refers to the respect which is supposed to be rendered to equals. (Hodge 1972: 409).

2.3.4 F.F. Bruce

Bruce F.F. (1963/2007:231) begins his interpretation by giving a two-sided picture of the kind of relationship that existed between Christians and the authorities in the first century Roman Empire. He argues that, the relationship between these two parties was destined to be acute at individual and corporate level. If the church at Rome remained predominantly Jewish in its composition, the problem of how Christians would relate to the ruling elites would be crucial, especially after Paul wrote the epistle to the Roman church. This was the case because Jews had difficulties to relating with non-Jews (Bruce 2007: 231).

At the time Paul was writing the letter to the Romans the status of Jews as citizens in the Roman Empire had been regulated by a succession of imperial edicts. Firstly, despite Jews being subjects of the Roman Empire, certain exceptional privileges were granted to them. For instance, their religion was regarded as *religio licita* as Bruce outlines:

Their various religious practices which marked them off from [non-Jews] were confirmed. These practices might seem absurd and superstitious to the Romans, but they were safeguarded non-the-less by the imperial law.

(Bruce 2007:231)

Secondly, after the death of Jesus some of the Roman authorities took cognisance of Christians. They looked at them as one of a variety of the group Jews (Bruce 2007:231). For example, when Paul was accused before Gallio (proconsul of Achaia) by the Corinthian Christians in AD 51 (Acts 18:12ff). Gallio did not pay much attention to the charge because for him “Paul was as self-evidently a Jew as his accuses were, and the dispute between him and them in Gallio’s perspective was just a difference in the way both interpreted some parts of the Jewish law” (Bruce 2007:231-232). This experience of Roman justice gave Paul enough protection for him to continue with his apostolic mission and propagating of Christian message in many parts of the Roman Empire (Bruce 2007:232).

It is such benevolent experience of Roman Justice which is reflected in Paul’s writing of Romans 13:6 that magistrates, who he refers to as God’s ministers “are not a terror to good works, but to the evil”. Bruce postulates that this particular principle was only

valid in Paul's dealing with Gallio and not necessarily all situations thereafter (Bruce 2007: 232).

According to Bruce (2007: 232), another side of the picture of Christians' relationship with the state in the first century Roman Empire indicates that, Christians were handicapped before the eyes of the Roman law. The Roman law regarded Christianity with suspicion in that, its founder (Jesus) was convicted and executed by a Roman magistrate. Therefore, Jesus' movement was considered to have challenged the sovereign claim of Caesar. For example, Tacitus many years later, described Christians before his leaders as people who got their name from Christ who was executed by procurator Pontius Pilate when Tiberius was emperor. For Bruce, the implication of such a description is that, it characterises Christians as rebellious in the eyes of the Romans (Bruce 2007:232). Consequently, when Paul faced opposition in Thessalonica, his opponents accused him before the civic magistrates to be one of the men who fermented subversion throughout the world (Acts 17:6- 7). Bruce argues that these are only a few cited incidences when riots of a similar nature happened in the Roman Empire. Overwhelming evidence exists which shows that such disturbances also happened in places such as Rome (at the instigation of Chrestus) and Alexandria, where Christians were implicated as the rabble rousers. However, in most cases, custodians of the law were able to draw their own conclusions, despite wide accusations (Bruce 2007:233). In this regard, it remained incumbent upon Christians to remain alert and careful when it came to their behaviour in the public sphere. They were also expected to pay due honour to, and obey the authorities (Bruce 2007:233). On this score, Jesus had already set a precedence through his words "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's" (Mk 12:17). Even though these words were spoken in relation to the payment of tributes, the words express general principles in their application (Bruce 2007:233).

According to Bruce (2007: 233), in Romans 13:1-7, Paul placed the question of human authority on a very high plane. According to Paul, God is the fountain from which all authority comes, and those who exercise it in any form on earth, do so by God's delegation. Hence disobedience to them implies failure to obey God. Bruce observes that, by implication Paul suggests that human governments are divinely ordained and the powers to coerce and commend that they possess have been entrusted to them

by God for the sole purpose of encouraging those who do good and the repression of criminals. It is for this reason that Christians are called upon to obey the laws set out by those in authority and to pay taxes and revenues due to them, and to respect their authority, not because of the consequences that failure to obey would attract, but because by doing so they would be serving God (Bruce 2007:233).

Bruce asks, “but what if the authorities themselves are unrighteous? What if [the authorities] claim not only things that are [due to them], but the things that are God’s?”. Bruce posits that, even though the apostle Paul does not deal with these questions directly in the Romans 13:1-7, these were among the burning issues in the Roman Empire at the time (Bruce 2007:234). For instance, during Emperor Caesar’s rule, in many instances he acted in a manner that exceeded the limits of his divinely-given jurisdiction by claiming divine honours and waging war against the saints. In view of that, Bruce questions whether it would then be ideal to recognize Paul’s magistrate’s as ministers of God, who possessed the authority to reward or punish. What about “the beast from the abyss” much talked about in John’s apocalyptic writings? Who received authority from the “great red dragon” and uses such authority to enforce universal worship of himself and to exterminate those who oppose worship of him? Overwhelming evidence shows that, despite all of these provocations, Christians remained loyal to the state, and it was their patience that wore down the fury of persecution. However, in instances where the decrees of the civil authorities conflicted with God’s commandments, Christians resolved to say “we ought to obey God rather than men” (Ac 5:29), and when Caesar trespassed on territory which did not belong to him, Christians resisted him (Bruce 2007:234).

The words Paul wrote on the eve of Persecution of Christians in Rome; “be subject for the Lord’s sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme, or to governors as sent by him to punish those who do wrong and praise who do right,” (Bruce 2007: 234), clearly paint the picture of how effectively the Roman church took to heart Paul’s instructions about their duties towards the state and the powers-that-be of their time (Bruce 2007: 235).

According to Bruce, Romans 13:1-7 contains some of the most important words that have ever been written on political thought in the Bible. He goes on to say, it would be

a mistake to assume that Paul's readers adhered to his political opinions every time and in every situation. Rather, suffice it to say that they tried to follow his opinion more deliberately than others (Bruce 2007:236).

Bruce (2007: 236) is of the view that, in the statement "Let every soul be subjected to the higher powers", the word "every soul" implies "every person", while "higher powers" in general biblical view implies the secular powers that are wielded by "the host of the high ones upon the earth" (Is. 24:21). Likewise, Paul in other writings uses a plural of the word "power" (*exousia*) freely in the sense of angelic rulers (cf. Rm 8:38, col 1:16, 2:10,15; Eph 1:21, 3:10, 4:12). However, in the context of Romans 13, he uses the word "power" to refer to human rulers; "and he who for him wield the word for protection of the good and punishment of the evil, it is to them that taxes are to be paid and due honour and obedience." This is because these powers (rulers) are ordained by God (Bruce 2007: 236).

2.3.5 J.D.G. Dunn

Dunn argues that Romans 13:1-7 is a classic test of any Christian hermeneutic aimed at rooting discipleship firmly. The text is one of the few New Testament texts which appear to give guidance on Christian attitude towards the state and the governing authorities (Dunn 1986:55). However, even though the text has provided biblical validation for a theology of the state, a fact acknowledged by modern Scholars, the text has also been used to justify state power to suppress radical groups, to appeal for support and in some instances, it has been used to challenge state oppression (Dunn 1986:55). In order to make a meaningful contribution to the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 discourse, Dunn seeks to find answers to the following question:

Can we determine the historical context of the text? And if so what? Does limited historical reference impose a similar limitation on all subsequent interpretations? If the exhortation of Rm 13:1-7 was written with a view to address a particular circumstance of the time, which soon changed anyway, can it be given a different or wider reference, and if so, on what grounds and by what criteria? Is there an assumed framework of thought, some Christological or eschatological reservation, and if so, should that continue to condition the significance of the text, or should we simply read the text in the light of our own theological framework and presupposition?

(Dunn 1986:55)

In order to answer these questions, Dunn begins by giving a historical exegesis of the text to locate the text in its context and to see how specific it was in the original reference. In short; he attempts to first locate the context of the time and situation in which the text was written and thereafter locates the context of the arguments of the text (1986:55-56).

2.3.5.1 The historical context

According to Dunn (1986:56), the fact that the letter to the Romans was addressed to Christians who were citizens in the capital city of the Empire, it is likely that Paul had this state of affairs in his mind and it had a bearing on this letter. Dunn is of the view that Paul was to some extent influenced by the political realities within which Christians in Rome operated. It is therefore important in this regard, to inquire into the political circumstances of the Christians in Rome then (Dunn 1986:56). There is overwhelming information about the conditions that prevailed in Rome than in any other city of the Roman Empire. Even though Christian tradition seems to be silent on the initial appearance of Christianity in Rome, epigraphic evidence has provided insights on the historical circumstances that prevailed in the Roman Empire and the city of Rome in particular (Dunn 1986:56).

Dunn argues that it is of utmost importance that this discussion begins by highlighting the relationship that existed between the first Christians and the Jewish community in Rome. This discussion must start by acknowledging that Christianity emerged out of the matrix of Judaism (Jewish Synagogues). Overwhelming evidence attests to this fact (Dunn 1987:57-58).

- The earliest report in Acts 2:5, 10 attests to the linkage between Christianity and Rome (the presence of Jews from Rome among the Jerusalem Crowd who witnessed the Pentecostal outpouring). These first Christians who appeared in Rome were possibly Jewish merchants and travellers.
- Christian evangelism in Rome was probably rooted in the synagogue. This is because, during the Period AD 70 synagogues were natural community centres and forums for Jewish preaching and discussions. And according to the book

of Acts, Paul's strategy in his evangelism begun with preaching in a synagogue (1986:57).

- The expulsion of Jews from Rome by Claudius due to disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, is sufficient confirmation. Regarding this fact, Dunn argues that it is generally agreed that these disturbances erupted as a result of disagreements between Jews and Christians Jews over the latter's claim concerning the divinity of Jesus Christ.
- Finally, the letter to the Romans too, is another piece of evidence that supports the idea of Christianity emerging out of Judaism in Rome (Dunn 1986:57).

According to Dunn the following historical evidence sheds light on the attitude of the Romans towards Jewish people, and it further paints a picture of the experiences of Christians in Rome:

- The intelligentsia of the Roman Empire were generally suspicious of foreign cults. For example, in 59 BCE, Cicero in defending Flaccus who was accused of stealing Jewish gold described the Jewish "idiom" for gold as a "barbaric superstition". Pliny (Roman elder) on the other hand, called the Jewish people "a race remarkable for their contempt for divine powers" (Dunn 1986:58)
- Roman hostility towards Jews erupted several times during Paul's own life-time. Jewish people were expelled twice from the city of Rome; in AD 19 most Jews were expelled by Tiberius and thousands of them were shipped to Sardinia. The reason for these expulsions was that their proselytizing was too successful. In AD 49, Claudius also expelled them (Dunn 1986:58).

Another factor is that the organization of the Jewish community was very weak. There were many synagogues in Rome, yet they were fragmented. As such, Romans regarded each synagogue as independent from the other rendering the Jewish community very weak. For that reason, there was no single controlling organization to represent all the Jews to the authorities. This state of affairs left the Jews politically exposed despite any form of protection Julius Caesar accorded them. And this rendered them vulnerable to sanctions mounted against sects by the Romans, including those which were not targeted specifically at them. Dunn argues that, when Paul in his letter addresses his readers as "..." (Rm 1:17), he also strongly suggests that Christians in Rome too functioned as several churches (cf. Rm 16:5) with no single

representative entity (Dunn 1986:59). Dunn cites Tacitus' report that in the year 58 AD, there were persistent public complaints regarding indirect taxation in the Roman Empire. The initial response of the Roman authorities was to abolish it. Dunn argues that Tacitus' report strongly suggests that the collection of taxes in 58 AD was a very sensitive matter. Jewish Christians were in a vulnerable position and more prone to be cited for tax evasion should they complain or opt to follow other dissenting individuals or groups of people by refusing to pay taxes. Paul, knowing the vulnerable situation of the Christians in Rome, opted to advise his readers to keep a low profile on these matters (Rm 13:6-7).

According to Dunn (1968:60) the historical context given above elaborates the situation and circumstances Jewish Christians in Rome found themselves in. However, what all this history may mean in the light of Romans 13:1-7 is an issue that needs to be pursued further. And to get to the root of the matter at hand, Dunn attempts to locate the text in its literary context.

2.3.5.2 The context of Romans

Dunn (1986:60) argues that, it is very difficult to locate Rm 13:1-7 within the letter to the Romans because the logic of this letter is usually misunderstood. He goes on to say:

[I]f Romans is understood as Paul's exposition of the gospel essentially in individual terms, then it is natural to see the climax of the letter in chap 8, with 9-11 as a kind of appendix, Chapters 12-15 can then be read as a sequence of ethical corollaries which do not follow thematically from what has gone before and which may have been somewhat randomly chosen perhaps as standard pattern.

(Dunn 1986:60)

Dunn (1986:60) argues that this kind of thinking is counter productive because looking at Romans in this sense neglects the fundamental corporate dimension of Paul's argument in the letter to Romans. He argues further that what Paul embarked on in the letter to the Romans is a quest to redefine the people of God (1986:60). In other words, Paul's intention was to redraw the boundaries which marked the People of God as a distinct group. The boundaries of the Jewish community at the time, were marked

as the “People of God defined ethically as descendants of Abraham, marked out by circumcision; those who lived within the law, under the law and performing works of the law which maintained their membership of the convenience” (Dunn 1986:60).

Consequently, Paul in Romans 2-4 and 9-11 sought to breakdown such attitudes, subvert the prevailing boundaries created and redraw them more appropriately (Dunn 1986:61). He aimed at creating an atmosphere where group identity was no longer determined by the law and the works of the law. However, the question of how the group was to define itself socially could not be ignored. Therefore, from chapter 12 onwards Paul spends much time expounding the social and ethical expression of the newly created corporate identity of the eschatological people of God (Dunn 1986:61). Dunn is of the view that, this idea would entail profound ethical and social consequences on Paul’s readers. The reason is that in their previous self-definition as the people of God, ethical guidance was clearly spelt out within the boundaries of the law (Torah) that defined them as the covenant people. The law determined how these covenant people related mutually with one another and with outsiders. Hence re-aligning such boundaries entailed that their ethical characteristics needed to be re-expressed too (Dunn 1986:61). It is for this reason that Paul in Romans 13:1-7 turned his attention to the whole question of how the redefined people of God were to relate to the state (Dunn 1986:62).

2.3.5.3 Particular issues in Roman 13:1-7

Dunn’s assessment of the historical context analysis given above, Dunn asserts that the , information seems unconventional. This helps us to locate Romans 13:1-7 into the context the Christians in Rome found themselves(1986:63).

Romans 13:1 *“let every person be subject to the governing authority for there is no authority except from God, and the powers that have been established by God”.*

Dunn (1986:63) argues that, in this chapter Paul turns abruptly to the relationship between Christian congregations and the Roman authorities because his concern was obvious. To begin with the political stratification of the Roman Empire stipulated clearly the responsibilities and power of the government. And these powers and responsibilities were exercised by the few individuals based on their birth right, connections, wealth and social standing. The majority of the citizens had no political

power and they had no chance to wield power at any point (1986:63). Paul knew that his readers too had no power to change the *status quo*. Therefore, the only option they had was to accept the existing structures and accommodate them like other citizens did (Dunn 1986:64). According to Dunn (1986:64), Paul's opening words; "let everyone be subject to the governing authorities", were not new to his readers or unheard of. These words expressed what was already in practice. His words were a statement of common sense or a wise statement commonly advocated by other Christians elsewhere (cf. 1 Peter 2:13; Titus 3:1). During this period political governance was the preserve of few individuals, the rest of the citizens were subjects who were expected to operate within the laid down statutes instituted by the state (1986:64). Hence, it's obvious that the first thing Paul said in his exhortation on how the people of God were supposed to live in a politically vulnerable context was to advise them to be subject to the authorities. He knew that their situation demanded them to do so. Dunn says this reminder was more like a suggestion to say: "Since you cannot change the situation under which you live and since your situation is already hazardous, remember the political realities of the politically powerless and live accordingly" (Dunn 1986:64).

Dunn (1986:64) advances that the rationale behind Paul's exhortation in this case is clear. It is that all authority comes from God. In this regard, Paul is announcing a principle that was already familiar in Jewish Wisdom (Proverbs 8:15-16 states that "by me kings and rulers decree what is just; by me princesses rule, and nobles govern the earth"). Furthermore, Dunn (1986:64) points out there are many instances where historically Jewish people were confronted with similar situations of being ruled by foreign kings many centuries ago. In such situations, prophets acknowledged the fact that even those rulers were appointed by God. Therefore, for the Christians in Paul's, the affirmation of the oneness of God required them to also accept the fact of continuity with their history that all authority emanates from the same God (1986:64). Dunn (1986:64) argues that it is in line with this state of affairs that Paul in the second half of verse 1 gives a solid theological undergirding to the practical wisdom of Rom 13:1, in which he reaffirms the wisdom of the Jewish people which they applied during the time when they were under the rule of the regional superpowers of the time. In this instance, Paul retains the older boundaries between the people of God and the secular authorities.

According to Dunn, in verses 3 to 4, Paul attempts to restate Jewish wisdom in what seems like a theology of orderly statecraft of good governance (1986:65). And the principle behind this is that, in order to ensure “good”, society needs constraint and such constraint must be for the purpose of rewarding the “good” and punishing the “bad”. And the implication of accepting that God gives dominion to the rulers is that, God does so for the good of the creation. In this sense, the rulers are the servants of God, therefore, resisting them implies resisting God, and whoever does so attracts judgment towards himself/herself (v2, 5). Therefore, Paul may as well say that submission to political authority must be a matter of conscience. The word “conscience” in this case is new in Jewish thought. There is an overlap with Hellenism (Wisd 17,11; Philo, Det 146; Josephus, ant 16.13). By using this term Paul attempts to undergird the principle of good citizenship with firm theological thinking, while drawing from his own Jewish tradition (Dunn 1986:65).

Dunn (1986:65) asserts that, Paul’s theological reasoning mentioned above was not specifically embedded within Christian thought. This might have been Paul’s after-thought, bearing in mind the vulnerable situation in which Roman Christians found themselves. In other words, Paul’s argument in this case, is a theological one rather than a Christological one. It is expressed within a circumstance of social order.

Lastly, Dunn views the discussion in verses 6-7 as a build-up to the climax about paying taxes. In the entire Pauline literature, there is nowhere else this subject has been mentioned apart from these verses. This is not incidental, and it is rather striking. From the discussion on the historical context of the text in question, it is brought to the fore that at the time Paul was writing the letter to the church at Rome there was a considerable unrest over the issue of paying taxes in the Roman Empire (Dunn 1986:66). And Paul knew well the sensitivity of the matter. He knew that his readers needed to be cautious of this matter. Failure by Christians to pay taxes (indirect and direct) would draw the attention of the authorities and put at risk the little congregation that existed in the city of Rome (Dunn 1986:66). Dunn points out that in this case, it is not clear what Paul meant by his advice that “pay what is due to the authority”. Was he suggesting that his readers pay excessive taxes without any protest? In Dunn’s view what Paul was doing here was simply undergirding the policy of political prudence with a theological assertion. No wonder Paul says, by authorities levying taxes they

act simply as servants (*leitourgoi*) of God (vs. 6), and that the taxes levied are equivalent to the temple taxes, offerings and sacrifices which the people of God brought to the altar from time in memorial. Dunn is of the view that in this case Paul again drew insights from his inherited Jewish wisdom of his native faith in order to give guidance to the newly redefined people of God, who were still living under foreign or alien and potentially repressive rulers (Dunn1986:66).

In view of the above, Dunn concludes that Romans 13:1-7 was written in a specific context. Paul wrote to a Christian group in Rome at a time of difficult political transition. The letter was written with these specific challenges in view. Hence, the arguments outlined in Romans 13:1-7 are related to the larger argument of the entire letter to the Romans. In this letter Paul attempted to spell out social and political realities of the newly defined people of God (Dunn 1986:66).

2.3.6 Jonathan E.T. Kuwornu-Adjaottor

Adjaottor (2012:101) attempts to find the meaning behind Romans 13:1-7 by probing the inexactness of the meaning of the language embedded in it. He contends that the text is written in an ambiguous way, hence it can be understood in many varied senses. Adjaottor's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 begins by first locating the text in its context and then he applies it to the Ghanaian context of political governance.

2.3.6.1 The context of Romans 13:1-7

Adjaottor (2012:102) argues that, the background to Romans 13:1-7 can help us to understand the commands that Paul pressed upon the Roman Christians; "Everyone must submit to the governing authority" (Rm 13:1) to pay taxes and many more. According to Adjaottor the letter to the Romans was written in AD 57 when Nero Caesar was the Emperor. During this Period the Political conditions in the Empire were relatively stable (Adjaottor 2012:102). However, Adjaottor acknowledges that other interpretations exist with regard to the background of Romans 13:1-7, which suggest that at the time Paul was writing this letter, the political situation in Rome was volatile. They point to Claudia's expulsion of the Jews in the city of Rome at about AD 49 and AD 58 as an example of the prevailing volatility. Adjaottor posits that all these incidents of volatility appear not to be relevant at a time Paul was writing his letter. This is

because, the expulsion of the Jews happened 8 years after the letter was written while the protests against taxation under Nero were not brutal enough to warrant any danger (Adjaottor 2012:102). During this period Christians in Rome enjoyed a status of *religio-licita* as they were regarded as part of the Judaism fold (Adjaottor 2012:102). Adjaottor regards the arguments for volatility as mere speculations, which are not supported by any evidence.

Adjaottor (2012:102) argues that in Roman 13:1-7, Paul encourages Roman Christians on the right kind of conduct toward the state. However, Adjaottor is of the view that, it is very difficult to spell out what prompted Paul to give such kind of encouragement to his readers. Therefore, to interpret Romans 13:1-7 properly, one needs to first understand the Greek etymology of the three key words which Paul uses in this text; *Pasa Psuche*, *hypotassestho* and *exousias*. According to Adjaottor several scholars have looked at the meaning of these words. And among all the ensuing meanings Adjaottor adopts the following: *Pasa Psuche*, which for him means “all souls”, and whose can literal translation is “all persons”, Christians or not, Jews or non-Jews (Adjaottor 2012:102). Adjaottor explains that, Paul’s exhortation to submit to the governing authority was not only meant for the recipients of his letter, but for all people. He goes on to say, *hypotassestho* means “submit”. According to Adjaottor this word is the most important among the all key words identified in the text. The usage of *hypotassestho* to discuss submission to God in Romans 8:7 and to the divine decree in Romans 8:20, implies that, those who are to submit have to do so voluntarily, through obedience and in pursuit of cohesion (Adjaottor 2012:102-103). The usage of this word in Roman 13:1-7, indicates the proper attitude that Paul expected out of his reader, that is, “proper attitude of a Christian to his/[her] superiors, recognition of the civil authority as part of God’s plan for the world but not blind uncritical obedience to that authority’s every command”.

In Adjaottor’s view, the word *Exousias* means “civil powers” and those powers do not refer to any specific person but the offices of authority. Adjaottor argues that the usage of the word in Rm 13:1-7 primarily emphasizes the authority given to governments to rule. Hence in this passage it should not be inferred that all rulers are chosen by God, rather it should be noted that it is their rule, not their person, that is divinely ordained

by God. And God ordains ruling authorities for them to keep law and order in society (Adjaottor 2013:103).

In view of the above, Adjaottor asserts that, Romans 13:1-7 does not in any way teach that God ordains specific individuals to rule over others. Neither does God mandate a government to rule (Adjaottor 2012:103). According to Adjaottor there are specific lessons that can be drawn from this passage for political education in the context of Ghana today (Democratic Government). The first lesson is that every Government is divinely ordained. But it is not every government that is chosen by God. In Romans 13:1, it is clearly indicated that God does not ordain specific individuals nor does God mandate a specific form of government (Adjaottor 2012:104). Secondly, people must recognize, honour and respect of those in authority. The recognition, honour and respect does not entail that people be forced, instead it must be accorded voluntarily. Thirdly recognition, honour and respect must not be given to individuals, but to the offices they hold. Fourthly, People must support those in authority and criticize them whenever the situation demands. And the last lesson is that criticizing those in authority is not tantamount to rebelling against them. It is a means of helping them to do the right things for the common good (Adjaottor 2012:104).

2.3.7 Sze-Kar Wan

Wan (2008:173) argues that Roman 13:1-7 has been subjected to intense scrutiny and its interpretation has proved to be notoriously difficult. The appropriations that have been teased out of such interpretation are fraught with dangerous implications. Wan goes on to say, in certain cases the text has been used to justify unjust regimes, while in other situations it has been used to clamp down on critical voices in certain societies. Therefore, Wan asserts that due to the ambiguity of the text in question, a classical locus for formulating a form of church-state relationship backed by the New Testament has been pursued (Wan 2008:173).

Wan in his interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 has observed a hidden meaning behind the text. He argues that Romans 13:1-7 is an ambiguous discourse which can only be explained by “Paul’s own Hybridity” as a Greek-speaker, a Jew living in a diaspora within the Roman Empire (Wan 2008:174). Wan argues further that the ambiguity of the text is embedded within the prevalence of terms and concepts which Paul uses in

this text. Wan envisages a double meaning of Romans 13:1-7. He avers that it is likely that those who read the text with ruling class lenses heard nothing from text other than a reaffirmation of their values and *status quo*. While insiders (Roman Christians) might have shared Paul's coded language embedded within his rhetoric which seemed to advocate for a docile revolution according to outsiders. Furthermore, the fact that Christians (insiders) were conscious of their own powerlessness it is obvious that they read the text as a subversive text (Wan 2008:174). Wan (2008:174) is of the view that it matters how these two groups entered the discourse and their understanding thereof was dependent upon their status in society (ruler/ruled; oppressor/oppressed; dominant/dominated).

Largely, the social status of Paul's intended recipients of Romans 13:1-7 had a bearing on how they understood the terms and concepts which he used in the text (Wan 2008:174). Wan (2008:179) suggests that, a proper reading of the text requires one to take into consideration the two discourses encoded in the text simultaneously. Furthermore, "in any unbalanced relationship between dominant ruling elite's and its subordinate's discourses are constructed on two levels." And for Wan in Romans 13:1-7 these conversations are constructed as follows:

2.3.7.1 Reading from top to down (public discourse)

Wan argues that for the ruling class (elites) and those who were sympathetic to the government in first century Roman Empire, their understanding of Paul's words and rhetoric was different from their subjects (Wan 2008:174). He exemplifies it with the text that opens with a call for every soul to submit to the governing authority which in Greek reads *pasa psyche exousians hupochousains hypotassestho*. In this instance, *Exousia* implies "freedom" or "authority" conferred on somebody to perform a certain task either politically, militarily or in many other designations of responsibility. In Wan's view *Exousia* in this context refers to the authority of those who possess political power (Wan 2008:174). Wan argues that with such an opening statement when the passage is before the Hellenistic administration, *Hoi archontes* (Rm 13:3) would be understood to mean "public officials" (Wan 2008:175), while *agathon ergon* would be interpreted as "deeds or actions conducted politically rather than morally" (Wan 2008:175). Hence reading such a statement from the top (ruling class) it would justify the notion that leaders are appointed by God and that whoever opposes power also opposes the will

of God. Furthermore, this notion was compounded by the Old Testament's promotion of the idea of foreign leadership being used by God. Hence, during Paul time anyone who was familiar with the Jewish culture would know this. According to Wan such information worked to the advantage of the Roman elites. Even though this history was probably not important for them, it was enough for them to know that this text supported their right to bear arms (Rm 13:4c) and to collect customs and taxes (Rm 13:1-7). It is likely that, the ruling elites interpreted this passage as a resolution by their Jewish subjects to support foreign authority which was agreed upon (Wan 2008:176).

2.3.7.2 Reading from bottom up (hidden discourse)

Wan (2008:184) argues that, insiders who were familiar with Paul, those who knew the social implication of his words in Romans 13:1-7 heard the text with vastly different conclusions from those of the elite (ruling class). In the first place, these people were inclined to understanding Paul's words in traditional biblical and Hellenistic Jewish terms. Hence Wan postulates that these people might have thought that, if indeed it is "...God, who tolerates, even ordains political structures of the world [God] can just as easily overthrow them if they fail to live up to expectation." On this score, Wan argues that Paul's apocalypticism presented in Romans 13:1-7 radicalizes divine judgment even further. However, according to him, this fact is hidden from outsiders who are unschooled in Jewish wisdom or apocalyptic thought (Wan 2008:184).

In short, Paul in Romans 13:1-7 addresses the insiders using coded resistance-laden ideas to mislead the powers-that-be. The functional administrative terms were later re-defined in the Jesus movement (Wan 2008:179).

2.3.7.3 Coded resistance

According to Wan (2008:180) the interconnectedness of the hidden and public scripts in Romans 13:1-7 can be seen through two designations Paul uses in the text in connection with government; *theou diakonos* (deacon of God) and *theou leitourgos* (servant of God). The usage of these designations to refer to civil officials and the reference to God thereafter is meant for coddling the self-understanding of those in authority. They understood political power as divinely ordained just as their own Hellenistic political philosophy seemed to suggest too. However, for the insiders, (the

recipients of the epistle) *diakonos* and *leitourgos* had special meanings as “servant” and “minister”, designations which also referred to a priest of God (Wan 2008:180). For the insider, Paul used these two terms metaphorically and intentionally.

Wan argues that, observing the weight of the theological usage of *diakonos* in this passage, it is unlikely that Paul could have called the governing officials by this title (Wan 2008:181). However, judging from the way Paul changes the plural *exousiai* to a singular word *exousia* it is likely that this shift indicated a dual reference to government officials and the general supremacy of God, respectively. The same change can be detected in Romans 13:3-4. In this section, Paul begins with the praise of rulers, who he declares publicly as not being a terror to the good but to the evil doer (Wan 2008:182). According to Wan what follows this public declaration is a coded statement structured in form of a question; “do you wish to fear the authority?” Wan observes that the change from plural designation “rulers” to single “authority” shows how Paul disguises the hidden script (Wan 2008:182). For Wan, this drastic change naturally omits the monotheistic connotation in the former, and this could only be noticed by the members of Paul’s inner group.

In conclusion, Wan notes that the rest of the Romans 13:1-7 text builds upon the opening verse, drawing out consequences that follow failure to do good and the rationale behind doing good (Wan 2008:182). Wan asserts that, the basic principle of why Paul wrote the text remains the same, that is to deliver a coded message to the recipients which misleads the colonizers. They presume to be the arbiters of conduct and benefactors, yet the insiders identify the true and absolute authority of God over any conduct and benevolence, who alone can mete out punishment to the entire humanity including the colonizers themselves (Wan 2008:183).

2.3.8 Jonathan A. Draper

Jonathan Draper (1988:30) in his article entitled “humble submission to almighty God” and its biblical foundation follows a different route of interpreting Rm 13:1-7 using the sociological model of Max Weber as the basis of a contextual exegesis of Rm 13:1-7. He admits that Weber’s theory is not the only sociological approach to biblical interpretation available. Other sociological theories exist that also provide useful insights in this regard. Draper applies Weber’s analysis in an attempt to throw light on

Paul's teaching and its usage in a South African apartheid context (1988:30). In his interpretation, Draper examines the validity of the implicit appeal made to Roman 13:1-7 in the South African constitution during the apartheid era. He first examines the kind of authority Paul assumed legitimate for himself and the Roman imperial government (Draper 1988:33).

In his attempt to exegete Romans 13:1-7, Draper interrogates the sociological models of authority of the first century Roman Empire. In this quest, Draper relies on the insights provided by Weber (Draper 1988:33).

2.3.8.1 Sociological models of authority: First-century Roman Empire

According to Draper, Max Weber's analysis divided the grounds of entitlement by those in authority into three (3) categories; legal-rational, traditional and charismatic.

2.3.8.1.1 Legal rational

According to Draper, legal rational authority represents a kind of authority which is based on the legality of normative rules and the right under those rules to issue commands. In this kind of arrangement, a leader is expected to issue commands only in spheres where they are competent. This kind of authority is basically based on a "Social Contract" kind of arrangement that exists between the ruled and the rulers and it is usually conferred on the rulers for the benefit of those who are ruled (Draper 1988:31).

2.3.8.1.2 Traditional-sacral

Traditional-Sacral authority is based on immemorial traditions. The authority structures are derived from the sanctity of tradition. The legitimacy to have authority over others is by inheritance through tradition norms and/or chieftainships. This kind of authority is typical in patrimonial and patriarchal societies. It represents norms which are considered sacred. An infraction of them would result in magical or religious evil sanctions (Draper 1988:31).

2.3.8.1.3 Charismatic-revolutionary

Charismatic authority is that authority which rises in times of social upheaval and stresses. It happens when the claims and characteristics of a leader from outside find

expression through the channels of power or authority and they resonate with the aspirations, purpose and needs of a particular community (Draper 1988:31).

2.3.8.2 Paul's assumptions concerning his own authority

Draper (1988:33) argues that the authority and legitimacy that Paul claims in this letter is charismatic. This is evidenced by the struggle that he had in his attempt to define his authority to the community of Rome, which he failed to conclusively establish. This is clearly evident. Paul begins with the claim that he had a special call from God (*kletos*) followed by his other claim that he had a special commission (*apostolos*). That Paul repeats these claims in all the subsequent letters he wrote (Gal 1:1, Rm 1:2 and others), for Draper clearly demonstrates Paul's self-understanding and his own special sense of charismatic authorization (Draper 1988:33). Furthermore, the way in which Paul's argumentation on this score comes across in many verses of the letter to the Romans imply Paul's need for the community to confer authority on him, despite his claim that the Lord already conferred it on him (1988:33).

2.8.1.2.1. Paul's rejection of traditional–sacral authority

Draper suggests that, Paul in his ministry spent much of his time contesting the claims of the Jewish authorities, who based their "legitimacy on time-honoured traditions sacralised by appropriate religious sanctions (and regard) the fathers, circumcision, conferring of authority from Rabbi to disciples, the function of Sanhedrin and synagogue and oral tradition" (1988:33) as channels through which traditional–sacral authority was tapped. Paul regarded all these assumptions as mere "boasting". Thus in Romans 3:21-31 he dismisses such kind of boasting as unnecessary in Christianity circles because the righteousness of God was more important than mere observance of the law (Rm 3:21).

Draper (1988:34) argues that even though Paul affirms the basis of charismatic authority, in this Christian community, on the other hand he counters this notion and instead he affirms the fact that "...a Person has authority only in the area of his/her gift (*charismata*) and each member of the community is held to have his/her own special gift" and this state of affairs guarantees democracy within the community (Draper 1988:34).

2.3.1.3 Literally context of Romans 13:1-7

Draper argues that in Romans 13:1-7 the focus on authority shifts from authority within a Christian community to the authority outside which Christians in Rome had no power to effect (1988:35). Draper is of the view that Paul's instruction in the text was more for his recipients than their rulers. Thus, Paul's parenthesis is to a large extent occasional and it contained no "ethic" which articulates a perceived or designed set of normative behaviour for Christians (1988:34). Therefore Roman 13:1-7 is not a blue-print for any government, nor does it confer any form of sacral status to any government. It is unlikely that Paul would have conceived of such a blue-print when he had rejected traditional sacral model. Hence Paul could not therefore conceivably provide for such a view elsewhere in his writings (Draper 1988:35). Draper argues that Paul's concern when he was writing Romans 13:1-7 was more the welfare of the church rather than the creation of a theology of the state. This is confirmed by the literary context of the text; Firstly, Romans 13:1-7 fits well with the general reading of the entire corpus from 12:1-2 where Paul emphasized to his audience the need for them to present themselves as living sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God. In this case, Paul emphasises the fact that true worship of God meant a life of service in the real world (Draper 1988:35).

Secondly, Romans 13:1-7 is situated within Paul's teaching on love as a mark of a believer fulfilling the law (12:3-21; 13:8-14). The inclusion of Rm13:1-7 therefore appears to have only been deliberately infused into the already existing corpus to some extent. However, this does not seem to be the case, because the Paul's teaching on loving one's enemy fits into the Romans 13:1-7 argument. At the time, the state was regarded as an enemy. The text in question therefore explains Paul's intention for inserting a text on civil responsibilities of Christians (Draper 1988:35).

2.3.8.4 Exegetical analysis

In his analysis of Romans 13:1-7, Draper demonstrates that certain words Paul used in the text were part of the normal language of the secular government of his day. For Draper this clearly demonstrates how Paul used parenetics which were at his disposal as he wrote the letter to the Romans. To begin with, the usage of the word *hypotassesthai* (to place under) has no roots in the Old Testament, nor does it have

any meaning in Hebrew. The word is from the Hellenistic environment, and in that particular context it meant “obedience” (Draper 1988:36). Draper argues that all Pauline material on submission to governing authorities originated from secular usage, which was subsequently inserted in Christian *Haustafel* (a list of ethical rules to guide everyday conduct). Draper holds that “all the teachings of Paul are pressed into the reservation of the grace of God in Christ Jesus” (Draper 1998:36).

Draper posits that in the same fashion, Paul’s ethic and Christian tradition modified the *Haustafel* in a fundamental way. For instance, there is no evidence that shows that Jewish people or Greeks used a tradition of reciprocity. However, when one looks at the Christian usage of reciprocal relations it is characterized by what Christians copied from Roman values. For example, authority over another person is accompanied by responsibilities towards her/him; “wife must submit to the husband, the husband is required to offer special love” (Draper 1988: 36).

Draper (1986:36) asserts further that Paul in Romans 13:1–7 took up the Christian *Haustafel* and amplified its teachings concerning civil authorities. However, it is important to note that the elements of reciprocity are not clearly spelt out in the text, but its intent is embedded therein. For example, it was expected that, a Christian was to obey those in authority and those in authority are expected to reciprocate by offering approval and protection to their subject.

Draper points out that, here Paul has de-sacralised the state and so envisages reciprocity of conduct between the subjects and the state (Draper 1988:37). Furthermore, Draper is of the view that Paul does not allow the state to be the orbiter of good and evil. What underlies Paul’s teaching in this case is a “Social Contract” kind of arrangement. However, in this regard, “Paul’s idea of legitimacy within the church reflects both charismatic and the legal rational models suggested by Weber” (Draper 1988:37). He specifically rejects the traditional-sacral model for the church. For the civil authorities he affirms what is essentially the “Social Contract” language of the legal rational model.” (Draper 1988:37).

2.3.9 Pol Vonck

Pol Vonck (1984:338) argues that Rom 13:1-7 has been used uncritically and naively. This has made the text appear very problematic. He goes on to say, in certain sections of society church men and women have used this text to support the powers-that-be by invoking Paul's statement as implying, "He who resists authorities resists what God has appointed". As such, the text has been widely abused in the interest of political theory (Vonck 1984:338-339). In his attempt to interpret Rm 13:1-7, Vonck answers the following questions: "What does it say? What did it mean? What does it mean?" (Vonck 1984:339).

2.3.9.1 What does it say? What did it mean?

Vonck (1984:339) maintains that Romans 3:1-7 can best be interpreted by first interrogating the context it emanated from. According to Vonck, the text was written around 58 A.D during a period when the church at Rome comprised of Jewish and non-Jewish Christians, influenced by Jerusalem missionaries. The relationship between Christians and the powers-that-be of that time was tense as is widely reported by several historians. For instance, ten years before Paul wrote the letter to the Romans, "Claudius expelled Jews from Rome because of their constant disturbances impelled by Chrestus". This might have arisen from squabbles which were eminent among Jews themselves on the status of Jesus of Nazareth (Vonck 1984:339). After the death of Claudius, his successor the Emperor Nero Caesar did not show animosity towards Jews initially. There is therefore no compelling reason for a critical political theology or rebellious tendencies among Roman Christians during this era. This benevolent atmosphere did not however wipe out the reality of corruption and petty despotism in the administration of the Roman Empire (Vonck 1984:339).

2.3.9.2 Literal context of letter

Vonck (1984:340) having outlined the social cultural context of the letter to the Romans, turns to the literal meaning and context of letter in order to show how Romans 13:1-7 fits into it. Vonck argues that the literal context of the Romans 13:1-7 can be appreciated by how the entire book of Romans is outlined. A possible outline of the book is as follows:

Chapter 1-11 predominantly talks about the theological exposition of the entire book; chapter 12-15 a program of Christ's life; chap 13:1-7 gives out the

practical case of conquering evil by doing good; 13:8-14 a summary of previous exhortations and chapter 14-15 special exhortations in connection with more liberal looking down at the more scrupulous.

(Vonck 1984:340)

Vonck holds that the scattered outline given above indicates that Roman 13:1-7 is all about “doing good” and that this theme runs through the whole passage. Thus, Paul’s intention when he wrote this text was not to encourage obedience towards the authorities per se. It was for the purpose of demonstrating to his audience that if submission is required, it is because in the plan of God political authorities have been given the task to encourage good and to discourage evil (Vonck 1984:340).

Vonck asserts that Romans 13:1-7 is a partial text which is only important because it emerges out of a meaningful juncture as a practical part of Paul’s greatest theological synthesis. Secondly, it is important because it expresses vital issues concerning how Christians ought to live in the world (Vonck 1984:344).

In Vonck’s view Paul wrote Romans 13:1-7 in order to respond to a particular context in history, a context which the 21st century generation knows little or nothing about (Vonck 1984: 340). Therefore, when dealing with this text it is important to locate it in the exact intersection on the graphs of the polarities mentioned above. Thus, for Vonck the text only fits within a theology of management rather than a theology of liberation. This is because for him, the text speaks more to law and order than encouraging critical solidarity (Vonck 1984:345).

2.3.10 John Calvin

John Calvin, in his 1540 commentary on Romans 13:1-7, translated by Ross Mackenzie (1960) in the article, *John Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, begins by uncovering the *Sitz im Leben* of the text. According to Calvin, Paul wrote Romans 13 in order to restrain the “restless spirits” who thought that Christian liberty meant the abolition of all earthly powers (Mackenzie 1960:2). In Calvin’s view, since the Roman Empire persecuted the early Christian communities, it seemed absurd for the Christian to render obedience to the authorities who were “contravening to snatch the kingdom of Christ”. It was particularly important

therefore for Paul to emphasize the authority of the magistrates in his writing. Calvin argues that, Paul did so by making an analogy of the “restless spirit” of the first century and that of his audience in his own time. He however notes that Paul made sure that his strategy was veiled, and only to be unveiled to and understood by his recipients (Mackenzie 1960:2).

There are several questions that Calvin raises in his quest to interpret Romans 13:1-7. He asks, “who for example is the higher power to whom Christians should be subject? Does Paul have in mind both secular magistrates and ecclesiastical superiors? Do Christians owe such powers unqualified obedience? On what grounds is obedience owed to any human power? May Christians discharge the role of a magistrate with a tranquil conscience? Or does obedience to God inevitably set Christians at odds with the state?”

2.3.10.1 Identity of the powers

About the identification of the power that Paul refers to in the text, Calvin’s view is that Paul had in mind secular magistrates. He sums up his view on this matter as follows; “The whole of this discussion concerns civil governments (*de civilibus praefecturis*). Those therefore, who bear rule over people’s consciences attempt to establish their blasphemous tyranny from this passage in vein” (Mackenzie 1960:76).

2.3.10.2 Ground of obedience

Calvin argues that rulers must be obeyed because they rule by divine ordination, and that despising human governments is therefore tantamount to despising the providence which set them in place. Thus, governments must be obeyed, not as human necessity but on grounds of obedience to God (Mackenzie 1960:78). Even though Calvin takes this position, he does not rule out the fact that of magistracy as an instrument of promotion of the public good and restraint of human wickedness. He asserts that, it is sinful to oppose the legitimate functioning of the state. For him, even wicked rulers and weak ones who do not have power to impose their will on their subjects have to be obeyed. In his view, the duty to obey does not rest on the goodness of the ruler, but on God’s commandant (Mackenzie 1960:78). Calvin argues that, the state is ordained by God for the purpose of human wellbeing and not to afflict pain on society. For him magistrates have a right to collect taxes, but not to squander

them. Taxes are public property to be used for public good and not for the benefit of rulers (Mackenzie 1960:78).

2.3.10.2.1 Limits of obedience

Calvin's focus on magistrates and their limitations posits that, magistrates are mere servants, not lords. Hence their power limited and restrained by statutes that promote the common good of their subjects. They are ministers and stewards of God who are answerable to God for abusing their power (Mackenzie 1960:79).

2.3.11 Matthew G. Neufeld

According to Neufeld (1994:90), Romans 13:1-7 is one of the most debated texts of the Pauline literature. The text has been used in most cases to justify a few political orders. Therefore, an interpreter must approach the interpretation of such a text with a lot of caution. In his interpretation of text, Neufeld avers that when Paul was writing Romans 13:1-7, he did not set out to make a rigid doctrine on how the state and church ought to relate. Instead, what Paul intended to do was to give pastoral advice to a community of Christians in history (Neufeld 1994:90). Below is how Neufeld interprets the entire text:

2.3.11.1 The text within the letter

Neufeld (1994:90) begins his interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 by locating the text within the letter to the Romans. He argues that Romans 13:1-7 is located within ethical advice that Paul gives to his readers starting from chapters 12-15. In these chapters Paul makes his intentions known. Paul calls for a response of gratitude and commitment, which would result in the re-orientation of the Christian community in Rome (Neufeld 1994:90). However, Neufeld is of the view that if gratitude and commitment were Paul's hope for the Roman Christians, then it merits a probe of why Paul digressed from his attention on these two matters in 12:12 and 13:1 only to continue in the next six chapters (Neufeld 1994:90). On this score, Neufeld argues that the sudden shift from the ethical section alluded to earlier, does not imply that the text was an interpolation. Paul here was advocating for an attitude of love and non-resistance in the face of suffering. Thus, it was important at this point for him to discuss the relationship of between the Christian community in Rome and the governing authority. It is for this reason that Paul addressed the particular problem the Roman

Christians were facing in this section. Neufeld points out that this kind of arrangement must be understood in context as this was a “letter written to a group of People who were committed to Christianity who were living in the capital city of the Roman Empire” (Neufeld 1994:90).

2.3.11.2 Paul’s argument for submitting to the authorities

According to Neufeld (1994:91), Paul in Romans 13:1-7 states it clearly that authorities are instituted by God. In their service, these authorities continue to serve God and render a service to their subjects. Thus, it was incumbent upon the Roman Christians to submit to their rule. In a nutshell, Paul was informing the Roman Christians that rulers of Rome were to be respected and obeyed out of one’s conscience and about the possible wrath that would accompany failure to do so.

2.3.11.3 The possible historical and social circumstances behind Romans 13:1-7

According to Neufeld (1994:4), the historical and social context of Rome which informs Romans 13:1-7 is that Rome had a sizeable Jewish community who kept links with kinsfolk in Palestine. During this period Roman Christians in the city of Rome were at the receiving end of the anti-imperial policy. They faced a lot of hardships just like their brothers and sister in Palestine. Thus, the Jews developed anti-Roman sentiments around 56 AD - the period in which the letter to the Romans is likely to have been written. Neufeld says these anti-imperial sentiments may have fuelled ethnic fragmentations within the Christian community in Rome (Neufeld 1994:4). Hence, Paul in previous chapters, talks about the equality of Jews and non-Jews in God’s plan. Neufeld observes that after addressing the issue of equality among Roman Christians, “Paul perhaps realized the need to address concerns specific to the audience in chapter 12.” Thus, in Romans 13:1-7 Paul sets out to advise the Jewish Christian who had just returned in the capital of the empire (after expulsion by Claudius) not to get involved in any Palestine-Jewish national fervour (Neufeld 1994:5).

Neufeld arguing from this social context analysis, concludes that we can appreciate the fact that, after expressing his understanding of the problem behind Jewish people’s rejection of the gospel, Paul had to turn to the problem that he thought had the potential to alienate Jewish people from non-Jews, namely, their attitude towards the Empire.

Neufed is of the view that Paul was aware that failure by the Jewish people to accept the Roman rule would provoke another expulsion from the city of Rome (Neufed1994:5).

2.3.12 Herbert M. Gale

Herbert M. Gale, in his article “Paul’s view of the state: a discussion of the problem in Romans 13:1-7”, attempts to deal with the problems raised by many scholars who have interpreted this particular scripture. He submits that, “it appears that attempts to meet the problem created by this passage fail to meet it adequately more especially they fail to relate the manner of thought here to the otherwise evident mode of thought characteristic of Paul” (Gale 1952:411).

Gale points out several similarities that are found in Pauline letters which deal with governance and its functions, with the passages that are concerned with the law. (1952:411). He believes that such similarities point to Paul’s thinking concerning the law. For him, that information clarifies Paul’s thinking concerning the state (1952:412). Gale classifies some points of similarities as follows:

In the first place, Gale posits that in the Pauline literature, the idea of authority and the law are both divinely instituted. In other words, both concepts are divinely instituted. For instance, in Romans 7:12 Paul states that “the law is holy and the commandment is holy and just and good”, while in Romans 9:4 he says “They are Israelites and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenant, the giving of law, the worship and promises” and in Romans 3:2 he states that “the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God”. Gale argues that when one looks at these few examples given above, it is clear that in Paul’s own understanding that the law is a divine institution, just like authority (Gale 1952:412).

Secondly, in Paul’s sense both the state and the law have a common agenda; restrain wrong-doing. Thus, Paul in Roman 13:4 says the state “is the servant of God to execute his wrath on the wrong doers.” Gale asserts that the law serves the same function (Gale 1952:412).

Thirdly, another similarity that Gale brings to the fore, is the way Paul portrays the function of the government and the law as transcendent of love (1952:412). For example, Paul in Galatians 5:14 states that “for the whole law is fulfilled in one word, “you shall love your neighbour as yourself.” Gale argues that, this is the same thought Paul portrays concerning the process of government, when he deals with the issue of litigation in 1 Corinthians 6:1-6 where he states that if Christians are indeed brothers and sisters in Christ in their new found relationship taking each other to pagan courts should be unnecessary and irrelevant (Gale 1952:411). This same thinking is what Paul seems to advocate for in Romans 13:8 and 13:9, where Paul uses the concept of love as a virtue that the state should espouse in the administration of public affairs.

In view of the points of similarities given above, Gale asserts that the thinking behind Paul’s words with regard to the state, is parallel to his views about the law (Gale 1952:413). Gale argues that, when Paul says the law and authorities are divinely instituted, he does not mean that the two institutions must be understood in absolute terms (Gale 1952:413).

Gale asserts that when Romans 13:1-7 is read considering the information given above, the major difficulties encountered in its interpretation vanish (Gale 1952:414). Thus, in his view of Paul’s thought with regard to the law, he concludes that Paul had the same views about the state and the law, namely that both were divinely instituted. Despite that, the state does not possess final or absolute authority, nor do Christians owe it unqualified loyalty and obedience (Gale 1952:414).

2.3.13 Allan Boesak

Allan Boesak (1986:141) wrote his article, *What belongs to Caesar? Once again Romans 13*, in order to challenge the commonly shared view of the Christians in apartheid South Africa and the Christians world over, that Romans 13 is a command about absolute obedience and submission to governing authorities. Boesak’s hypothesis in this article is that, Romans 13 is often understood as the basis for unquestioning obedience. For him, this would take away from the idea behind the text, which is the pointed silent sharp criticism of government power (Gale 1986:141).

Boesak (1986:142) observes that there are two inferences held by most Christians who interpret this scripture on the face value. The first one is that the government has power and authority because it reflects the authority of God. The second is that government authority is God-given and must be recognised by subjects. Boesak (1986:145) argues that, contrary to the above inferences, Romans 13 does not advocate for blind obedience and submission to the authorities. Instead, the statements made in Romans 13 imply that authorities are servants (Rm 13:4) and ministers (Rm 13:6) of God “for your good” (Rm 13:4).

2.3.14 T.L. Carter

Carter (2004:210-11), begins his interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 by establishing the discontinuity he perceives in Paul’s description of the Roman power structure and the reality of systematic injustices that characterized the Empire. Carter asserts that, the community of Christians in Rome was likely made up of poor citizens, who had no legal position or official status (2004:11). This put them in a vulnerable situation, bearing in mind that the Roman natural justice system was imposed on citizens by means of intimidation and violence (Carter 2004:221).

Carter (2004:2015) argues that in light of the situation mentioned above, a cursory reading of Romans 13:1-7 gives the impression that the apostle Paul was just making insensitive remarks that could not have been received as a command. Carter is of the view that since the Roman Christians shared the common experience of oppression at the hands of the authorities, it is likely that Paul’s audience was thereby alerted to the presence irony in the text (Carter 2004:209).

To establish the plausibility of such a reading, Carter says that in the Greco-Roman world ironic inversion was widely used as a rhetoric device for censoring counterfeit praise (Carter 2004:209). Furthermore, Carter claims that Paul too, was fond of using irony in his writings as a way of shaming his opponents (Carter 2004:2014). And lastly, the picture Paul paints of the Roman powers-that-be seems incompatible with that of the basic convictions of the pharisaic Jews and his own experiences of Roman justice (Carter 2004:211-12).

Carter begins his interpretation by situating the periscope within its surrounding context. He offers that though many scholars have viewed the text in question as an interpolation that interrupts the flow of 12:14-21 to 13:8-10, an ironic reading ties the *Paraenesis* together without a problem. Carter notes that this *Paraenesis* is “bracketed by the exhortations to adopt a distinctive lifestyle in relations to the present age”. For Carter, chapter 12:1-2 and 13:11-14, function rhetorically as an “Inclusion” implying that the intervening passage must be “read as an exhortation on how Christians should conduct themselves in an evil age which is passing away” (Carter 2004:218).

According to Carter, in the immediate context (Rm 12:17-21), Roman authorities are considered to be enemies by the Christians in Rome. It is plausible to assume that this was normal since many Jews had just returned from expulsion under Claudius when they “Suffered violence, deprivation and extortion at the hands of the authorities”. The ironic reading of Romans 13:1-7, which portrays these authorities as enemies rather than friends, thus provides a perfect link with the preceding paragraph or periscope (Carter 2004:218). Carter breaks down ironic reading of Romans 13:1-7 as follows:

Carter (2004:219) begins by identifying the idea behind Paul’s claim that Roman authorities are ordained by God. He argues that the irony behind this statement reveals Paul’s aim to manipulate the system by not calling out its hostility directly, yet he fulfils his intention to indirectly castigate its representatives. Carter argues further that throughout Romans 13:1-7, Paul employs irony to covertly subvert political stereotypes. He captures the irony in these words, “Fear the governing authority officials’ may sound as an irreproachable advise to the authorities’ ear, but these are known as slaves to them and God as well (13:1)”.

Carter (2004:222) argues that, reference to the sword in Romans 13:1-4 is also likely a candidate for ironic reading “If there were a general perception that those in authority wielded the sword indiscriminately against both innocent and guilty people, it is corresponding likely that Paul’s audience would have detected irony in his portrait of those in power as the guardians of law and order.” In this instance, Carter has in mind a classical example in the history of the Roman Empire and how the Romans have been shown as having been using the sword as a way of maintaining their fame. Carter

posits that, Paul's audience who were familiar with this kind of history might have seen a leaning reference to these events mentioned in the historical document about "the consulship of Quintus Volusius and Publius Scipio (Carter 2004:222). In view of the above explanation, Carter suggests an ironic reading of the text (Rm 13:1-7), this is because he thinks that such kind of reading "peels back the surface meaning of the text to reveal a sharp criticism of Nero's excesses" (Carter 2004:272).

Carter (2004:225) also sees indications of irony in Paul's discussion of taxes in in 3:6. The terms used in this text had secular functionaries. For instance, "minister" signified "public servant" while a terms such as "priests of God" had cultic overtones. In some other texts Paul applied these categories to himself. Unfortunately, here he applies them to tax collectors, people who were notoriously serving their own interests at the expense of citizens. According to Carter, the

lack of correspondence between the language Paul employs and reality to which it refers is intended to signal the presence of Irony..... [while] the use of religious language to denote the activity of tax collectors stretches the meaning to breaking point and highlights the way in which the tax collectors fail to live up to the designation applied to them.

(Carter 2004:225)

Carter wraps up his argument by stating that, even though the authority of the Roman rulers was instituted by God, Paul's ironic language makes clear that if the authorities failed to live by their allotted responsibilities, submission to their authority as Paul exhorts would be bogus.

2.3.15 Jan Botha

Jan Botha's (1994) interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 presents what he calls an ethically responsible reading of the text. He presents an interpretation of the text in four linguistic perspectives.

Botha argues that, linguistic perspective is a useful method of interpreting biblical texts. He applies it to the meaning of selected key words from Romans 13:1-7, namely, *exousia*, *archn*, *hypotassesthai*, *antitassomai* and *syneidsis*. Apart from applying linguistics to the meaning of these selected words, Botha (1994) analyses the text at the sentence and discourse level. He spends more time studying the meaning behind

each word methodologically, even though he doesn't seem to come to any logical conclusion of analysis. However, Botha contends that the usage of discourse analysis in studying a text like Romans 13:1-7 is important, because it helps to discern the contours of the argument. It is in this vein that he has described Romans 13:1-7 as protreptic literature, implying that the text is a sustained argument in which syllogistic argumentation has been employed. Botha goes on to say that the benefits of studying Romans 13:1-7 from a literary point of view helps the reader to come to terms with Paul's intentions.

2.3.16 David May

According to David May (2012) "to see government authority as the focal point in this passage (Rm 13:1-7) is an interpretive mirage." He argues that one of the most important factors in the interpretation of the text in question is the "context" in which it was addressed. Probing the context that necessitated the writing of Romans 13:1-7, he has concluded that the text has nothing to do with the relationship that ought to be between the citizens and their governments; whether in the first century Roman Empire or in any other government in the proceeding centuries (May 2012). To him, this passage addresses the question of how the Roman Christians were supposed to relate with church leadership.

2.3.17 Mark Nanos

Nanos (1996:18) argues that Romans 13:1-7 was addressed to non-Jewish believers in the city of Rome. Paul, in this text instructed them to obey, not with reference to Roman secular or pagan authorities, but only to God's ordained authority bestowed upon synagogue rulers. According to Nanos, this presupposes that the early Christians in Rome continued to meet with Judean (non-Christians) in the same synagogues. It would seem that Christian believers divorced themselves from the synagogue by discarding Judaism to join a totally new religious movement (Nanos 1996:18). These believers met exclusively in homes to eat, sing and read correspondence on special occasions, without totally abandoning worship with their brothers and sisters who remained staunch Judaism faithfuls (Nanos 1996:18). Thus, Paul's greatest concern at this point was for the Christian believers who seemed to be about to leave the synagogue. This is because the action could have "cut the heart of theological understanding of what had happened in Jesus Christ. It [could have] defied his belief

that the new age had dawned in Jesus Christ, a very Judean messiah” (Nanos 1996:18).

In Rome the arrogance of Christian believers incensed the situation to an extent that believers in Jesus Christ wanted to cut off their fellowship with Judean roots and concentrate on their own mission (Nanos 1996:18). Paul could not stomach this, so he decided to write Romans 13:1-7 in order to give guidance to these Christian believers on how to relate with leaders of the synagogues (Nanos 1996:19).

According to Nanos, such a description of the Judean context makes sense to the reader of Romans 13:1-7. For example, when Paul speaks of the authority that comes from God in verse 1 and the appointment of the authorities by God in verse 2, this hardly sounds like a description of the Roman Emperor or his legion of magistrates. Instead, it rings true as being about Judean synagogue leaders who can also be called “God’s servants” (vs. 4) and “ministers of God” (vs.6) (Nanos 1996: 19). Nanos argues that, when Paul instructs gentile believers to pay taxes and revenue (vs. 6), he is telling his readers to pay, the two-drachma tax temple. The reason for this admonition is that as Roman historian Tacitus attests in his works, non-Jews and Jews who converted to Christianity stopped sending contributions to the temple during this period (1996: 19). Paul is therefore dealing with a group of people, who hesitated to make temple tax contributions. He urges them to make contributions to the temple as a way of demonstrating that Christ’s equality affects both Jews and non-Jews (Nanos 1996:19).

Lastly, Nanos explains that though the imagery in Romans 13:46, “for the authority does not bear the sword in vain”, seems to have originated from the Roman Empire, the word “sword” can also be likened to the knife used in circumcision (Jos 5:2). It could also be used metaphorically to symbolize the authority of the synagogue rulers to inflict punishment (Nanos 1996:19). Nanos argues further that, even Paul himself confirms that he had submitted to the punishment of the Jews when he says; “five times I have received from the Jew the forty lashes minus one” (2 Cor 11:24). Paul intends to remind non-Jewish converts that synagogue rulers were interpreters of the Torah and therefore believers were to give them the respect due to them (Nanos 1996: 19).

2.3.18 Joshua Steele

Joshua Steele (2012:2) argues that Romans 13:1-7 has been used to justify everything from utter obedience to totalitarian rulers to unquestionable support of unjust laws. He argues that Paul's text has been abused on many occasions to support the status quo. Steele argues that in Romans 13:1-7, Paul exhorts Roman Christians to apply the previous commands to love, live in harmony and peace, he gave them in Romans 12:9, 12:6 and 12:18 as an act of obedience to the government (Steele 2012:2). Thus to him, it is farfetched to comprehend suggestions that this text condenses the beliefs of Paul about any government past and present (Steele 2012:2). According to Steele this text is specific, and it was addressed to a specific context in history. Steele asserts that Romans 13:1-7 is a "historically conditioned pastoral address to the Roman believers, discouraging them from political unrest, disobedience and rebellion in order to protect their testimony and effectiveness of the Roman church in the gospel mission" (Steele 2012:2).

The historical context envisaged by Steele, is the situation in which the Roman Christian found themselves in A.D. 57. After the death of Claudius an Emperor who was cruel towards the Jewish People, his son-in-law Nero Caesar took over. The letter to the Romans was written during Nero's reign. The Empire at that time enjoyed relative peace compared to the later years (Steele 2012:3). Thus, the letter should not be read as though it was written in the later part of Nero's reign, when persecution was rampant.

Steele notes that given that background above, Paul gave apt advice to his audience in Romans 13:1-7. Paul wrote this text as a way of preventing his readers from adopting a negative attitude towards Nero, which could have affected the effectiveness of the gospel. However, Paul knew that despite the tranquillity that prevailed at that time in the tranquillity in the Empire was relative because, there were still underlying tensions in Rome which erupted in the years 57-58 CE stemming from the nasty practice of indirect taxation (Steele 2012:4). Additionally, the Jews who returned to Rome after being expelled by Claudius may not have been in good terms with the authorities and the non-Jewish Christians. Furthermore, during this period there were Jewish revolutionary sentiments going around in Palestine. Paul feared that such sentiments could spill over into the Roman church and ferment serious problems. This,

therefore, forced Paul to write Romans 13:1-7 in order to address the situation (Steele 2012:4).

2.3.19 Robert Jewett

Robert Jewett's (2007:789) approach to Romans 13:1-7 is to interpret the verbal details of the entire text. He considers the verbal details of the text to ascertain the rhetorical significance therein. He argues that when Paul wrote the text, he never intended to "create the foundation of a political ethic for all times and places in succeeding generations," neither did he concern himself with the burden Christian ethics. Paul's concern was to appeal to his Roman Christian audience with reference to their concerns that fitted in with the occasion of his forthcoming visit to Rome (Jewett 2007:789).

According to Jewett (2007:789) when Paul said all authority comes from God in Romans 13:1, he was not referring to the gods of the Roman cult, instead, he meant the God who is embedded in Jesus Christ. Thus, no matter what authority the Roman officials may lay claim to, for Paul, it did not matter. The reality remained that authority comes from the God of the Jewish and Christian faith. Jewett (2007:790) argues further that, therefore, what Paul was calling upon was a massive act of political cooperation, which if the Roman authorities realized, they would have realized that this was a ploy for subversion (Jewett 2007:790).

Paul's advice to his audience to submit to the authorities was not that their submission be directed towards the authorities, but rather that the respect be directed towards God who delegates all authority (Jewett 2007:790).

2.3.20 A.B. du Toit

According to A.B. du Toit (1995:325) at the time Paul was writing Romans 13:1-7, the church at Rome was still very vulnerable despite *Pax Romana* being in effect. Christians in the city of Rome were still associated with the Jewish community that had fallen out of favour with the Roman authorities. Paul, therefore, advised Christians not to do anything that would jeopardize or discredit the mission of the gospel. Instead, Paul advised them to excel in doing good, by paying taxes to those in authority (Du Toit 1995:328). Thus, Paul's advice as contained in Romans 13:1-7 is basic and not

aimed at a specific situation. Paul paints a descriptive picture of what an ideal state should look like (Du Toit 1995:328). Du Toit contends that, the basic motivation of Paul's text to his cadres was purely a strategy for survival to avoid attracting the attention of Roman authorities for the wrong reasons, such as civil disobedience. And this in turn would enable the church to concentrate on its mission of spreading the gospel (Du Toit 1995:323-4).

2.3.21 Sung U. Lim

Lim (2015:12) in his article *A double-voiced reading of Romans 13:1-7 in the light of imperial cult*, demonstrates that Romans 13:1-7 masquerades as a public transcript when in fact it is a double-voiced transcript between the elites and the hidden voice of the subordinates. He juxtaposes what he calls the public transcript of the elite (as widely attested to in Greco-Roman integrative) and the hidden transcript of the subordinates as presented by Paul, himself a colonized subject of the Roman Empire (2015:5). On the one hand, Lim shows that the public script endorses the imperial cult as it manifests in the ruling power of the elite to their subjects. On the other hand, he shows that Paul concealed his resistance against Emperor worship in the hidden script embedded within the text (2015:5). Lim explains that in order to understand what is at play in Romans 13:1-7, it is important to analyse the political and the religious characteristics of the imperial cult. This sheds light on the circumstances that compelled Paul to make use of hidden transcript in his writing (Du Toit 2015:11).

According to Lim (2015:11), emperor worship in the Roman Empire was both a religious and political act as there was no clear distinction between the two. This arrangement promoted the use of political propaganda and religion as an apparatus for consolidation of power for the ruling class. In other words, emperor worship (or imperial religion) was connected to imperial politics because there was no clear-cut distinction between the two in the ancient Roman worlds. This cult ensured that the subjects in the Empire remained loyal to both the emperor and the state through the worship of deities and the emperor himself (Lim 2015:11). Paul demonstrates sensitive when he opts to disguise his condemnation of the practice. If he openly condemned the act, it would have been too radical a challenge to the governing authority (Lim 2015:11). Paul decided to write a subversive message using a hidden script format in order to avoid the surveillance of the powers-that-be (Lim 2015:11).

2.3.21.1 A double voiced reading of Romans 13:1-7

2.3.21.1.1 A hidden voice of Romans 13:1-7

Lim (2015:13) claims that, Romans 13:1-7 can be interpreted in a variety of ways by those who are familiar with Pauline theology. According to Lim, by distorting his implied message, Paul as a subordinate employs a hidden script that undermines the public script of the elite (2015:13). Paul adopts the public scripts of the elites concerning imperial cult in his discourse. None of his readers would construe Paul's writing as advancing a claim that due honour should be paid to the Emperor. For the Roman congregation only God merits such honour (Lim 2015:14).

Paul also adopts public transcripts of the elites when he states that "Roman officials may cause fear for punishing the subjects for bad conduct (Rm 13:4)". In Romans 13:6-7, Paul seems to suggest that the fear of the rulers is pertinent in specific issues and/or occasions, such as non-payment of taxes. Thus, in this case, Paul encourages his audience to be paying taxes (Lim 2015:15).

2.4 CONCLUSION

From the discussion above, we appreciate that Romans 13:1-7 has been variously and extensively interpreted using different approaches and perspectives. However, apart from Draper, not many scholars have interpreted the narrative from a social-scientific perspective. That is the approach that this study employs. Moreover, no study of the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 has been done from the standpoint of African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia. This is the specific focus of this study and the gap it addresses.

The next Chapter expounds social-scientific criticism as exegetical approach used to analyze ancient texts.

Chapter 3

Theoretical framework

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter gives a detailed description of social-scientific criticism and how it functions as an exegetical approach. The explanation is essential in this study because it is against such a description that a proper interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 is proposed.

This study employs Peter Berger, Brigitte Berger and Hansfried Kellner's notion of "field consciousness" and Paul Gifford's idea of "enchanted worldviews". The additional objective of this Chapter is therefore, *inter alia*, to describe what constitutes "field consciousness" and enchanted worldviews. The description of these two concepts is necessary because it will be against the tenets of these two models that the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 by Pentecostal preacher's in Zambia will be analysed.

3.2 SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC CRITICISM

3.2.1 Definition of social scientific approach

John Elliott (2011:1) describes social-scientific criticism as an exegetical approach that analyses the social and cultural dimensions embedded in biblical texts. In his book *A home for the homeless*, Elliot argues that social scientific criticism is an expansion of the conventional historical-critical method, in that it brings on board other disciplines in its exegetical approach without paying particular attention to the social dimensions of the text and its contents (Elliott 1991:1).

According to Elliott (1991:1), social scientific criticism differs from other exegetical approaches that are labelled "social history" because it uses models to approximate social relations. In that regard, social scientific criticism directs its attention to latent patterns of factors in texts which shaped the context in which the text was produced. Furthermore, it probes why certain materials were selected and not others in the production and arrangement of selected materials, their rhetorical design and capacity

to stand as a meaningful and effective instrument of communication and social interaction (Elliott 1991:1).

3.2.1.1 Models

Social scientific approaches uses models to proximate the context reflected by the biblical narratives (see Malina 1983:14; Scroggs 1986). According to Pieter Craffert (1992:224), a model is an abstracted representation resulting from several concrete examples representing real world objects, events or social acts, which is used to interpret or understand other objects, events or communities. Elliott argues that models serve to:

[M]ake explicit those assumptions which the researcher has concerning the social world and its meanings. In social scientific research they serve as heuristic devices for investigating, organizing and explaining social data and their meaning.... Selecting and articulating certain theories about the nature and relationships of aspects of these phenomena, the model shapes research objectives, the kind of data to be gathered, and the way in which these data are to be assembled and interpreted.

(Elliott 1986:8)

Models in this case function as analytical lenses and cognitive maps by which interpreters or researchers view, filter and organise raw data into meaningful patterns (Elliott 2011:3). In the case of social-scientific criticism, the models that are used in the process of viewing, filtering and analysis are those from sociological nature, that is to say, in social-scientific criticism, sociological models are used in connecting what Elliott calls “social dots” on the textual and cultural landscapes and assess their social significance and impact (Elliott 2011:3). Elliott posits that conceptual models must be operative whenever one endeavours to investigate biblical texts or any other ancient texts (or their social context). He asserts that:

whether acknowledged or not, in every description of how things were, how things were related and how they worked. The question must not be about who uses the models and who does not? But who makes them explicit and who does not.

(Elliott 2011:3)

According to Van Staden (1991:156), models can be direct (emic), meaning they are drawn from the culture closer to the world of the Bible – for example, honour and shame, kinship, peasant and subsistent models. They can also be indirect (etic), meaning they can be drawn from any culture or context. Models are heuristic tools that assist to explain the dynamics behind the narrative by drawing on comparative explanations from the models. In short, models are comparative tools drawn from one context for the purpose of filling-in the gap (Van Eck 1994:160).

3.2.1.1.1 Emics

According to Gottwald (1979:785), “emics refers to the cultural explanations that draw their criteria from the consciousness of the people in the culture being explained.” That is to say, the emic mode aims at identifying the information provided by a native, from the native’s point of view as determined by his/her cultural setting, experience and variable knowledge (Elliot 1991:11). Gottwald argues that emics are unverifiable and they cannot be falsified by what cultural actors may deem true. They can only be verified and falsified by their predicative success or failure (Gottwald 1979:785).

3.2.1.1.2 Etics

According to Gottwald (1979:785), etics refer to the cultural explanations whose criteria derive from a body of theory and method shared in a community of the scientific observers. These explanations are embedded with “a corpus of predictions about the behaviour of classes of people.” Elliot (1991:11) posits that “etics identifies the perspective and categories of thought of investigator or interpreter as determined by his/her different social, historical, and cultural location, experience, and available knowledge.”

Malina and Neyrey (1988:137) argues that acknowledging the distinction between the emics and etics of models is important because it allows the interpreter understand that biblical data or material refers to reality that is vastly different from his/her own. One therefore has to be sensitive enough not to modernize the meaning of the text. It also makes the interpreter mindful of the conceptual gulf which exists between the observer and the observed.

3.2.2 Advantages of social-scientific criticism

According to Elliott (2011:4), one of the benefits of interpreting biblical texts using social scientific lenses is the use of models to expose cultural values that influence some behavioural scripts described or called for in a given text. In this case, attention is paid to the description and elaboration of social institutions presumed in the text, which are rarely fully described in the text when one reads on face value.

Social-scientific criticism allows the interpreter to be aware of the belief system typical of the circum-Mediterranean world and this knowledge enables an interpreter to detect within the text the presence and impact of beliefs that ancient people held which are only assumed in the text. Further, such knowledge helps an exegete “to spot tell-tale dots in the text” as it enables an exegete to connect knowledge and produce a coherent and vivid explanation of the interrelation and their importance (Elliott 2011:4).

Social-scientific criticism helps in demonstrating the benefits that can accrue in considering and ascertaining the group interests which prompted the writing of biblical texts. The interaction of group interest, theology and ideology and their complex relations to the behavioural patterns exhibited in the text, enables an interpreter to see the social and cultural locations that separate the ancient biblical world and modern communities (Elliott 2011:5). In this regard, social-scientific criticism assists an interpreter to read and reflect on biblical texts in their capacity as ancient scripts and products rather than a modern product. This way we can see that social-scientific criticism helps in clarifying the theory, premise and scenarios which interpreters bring in their reading of ancient texts (Elliott 2011:5).

Social-scientific criticism assists modern interpreters to avoid navigating into distortions that come with anachronistic and ethnocentric reading of the Bible. Thus, social-scientific criticism prevents Bible readers from misuse of scriptures, that is from using scriptures “as moral hammers or swords in current ethical debates by showing that certain perceptions and premises underpinning ancient moral standards and laws are no longer shared.” When scriptures are used in such a manner, they lack a plausible conceptual foundation and they are no longer judged relevant to contemporary life (Elliott 2011:5).

3.2.3 Disadvantages of social-scientific criticism

Like any other biblical interpretation method, social-scientific criticism has its weaknesses too. Many scholars have argued that engaging such an approach in New Testament interpretation may be a risky undertaking. The approach is prone to reductionist errors (Barton 1997:280). For instance, some critics feel that, when using social-scientific criticism, an interpreter may end up locating from the text (early Christianity) only what one is looking for or what sociology is equipped to discover and leave out other essential aspects of the text. In the event that the data available is insufficient to guarantee a thorough investigation, there may be excessive dependence on models drawn from observations of modern group's religious and cultural norms in order to fill in the blanks (DeSilva 2004:127). Another weakness is that this approach "may just be too blunt a tool of analysis to do sufficient justice to the startling novelty and historical particularity of the movement inaugurated by Jesus" (Barton 1997:280).

Many critics of this approach have questioned whether the available data has capacity to provide adequate sociological investigation, given that reliable social scientific investigations come out of observations and findings are tested with living examples (DeSilva 2004:127). Other critics feel social sciences are unreliable, given the concerns they have posed for the theological enterprise right from their inception in post-enlightenment atheism positivism. For example, Milbank (quoted by Barton), postulates that the social sciences "are parasitic on Christian orthodoxy and represent modern heretical deviations grounded in ideological and methodological atheism" (Barton 1997:280).

However, not every biblical scholar feels this way. Many support the idea that social-scientific criticism has provided the exegetical enterprise with a different flavour and perspectives which providing varied information that is required to give a real picture of the world behind the New Testament texts (Barton 1997:281).

3.2.4 The importance of social-scientific criticism

Social-scientific criticism is imperative and necessary in the exegetical enterprise. It is generally agreed that biblical texts are made up of events that are social in nature, that is to say, in them there are "social relations, social structures, social institutions, roles

performed and statuses held in social arena, as well as scripts to be enacted in social dramas of everyday life” (Elliott 2011:1).

Secondly, biblical texts, as they appear, are not only literal compositions but there are social and rhetorical overtones imbedded in them. These overtones are made up of literary, theological and social objectives. And their purpose is to serve as means of communication and social interactions and to prompt social action of the recipients.

Thirdly, Elliott (2011:1) argues that the exegetical enterprise needs a social scientific dimension, given that biblical texts are a product of social and cultural context. For this reason, he posits that biblical texts “embed, encode and presume elements of the social and culture systems in which they were produced, which means that the genre, content, structure and meaning of these texts are all socially and culturally determined” (Elliott 2011:1).

Therefore, in order to uncover the world behind these texts or determine their meaning, one needs to have a social model in order to extract social and cultural systems that the biblical texts presume. This can only be achieved by interrogating how these social and cultural systems were established, how they shaped the values, perspectives, interests and the aims of the writers and how these texts represent counter-cultural positions (Elliott 2011:1).

Fourthly, the need for social-scientific criticism is prompted by the fact that, even though social-scientific criticism gives social and cultural details of a particular text through exegetical and historical analysis, “it is essential in exploring and explaining the relations and patterns of sociality; the structure and components of social systems; the dynamics of social relations; core cultural values; typical attitudes and perspectives; and prominent social cultural behavioural scripts.” (Elliott 2011:1).

Fifthly, social-scientific criticism helps interpreters of biblical texts create mental reading scenarios, which help to understand texts. Elliott (2011:2) posits that an important task of interpretation demands a provision of adequate reading scenarios that are culturally suitable to the texts under scrutiny.

Sixthly, social-scientific criticism seeks to supply methods and models that help the interpreter to understand relations embedded within a particular social phenomenon. In most cases, such models and methods are absent in social historians' descriptions of the social reality of a given historical context. Social-scientific criticism interrogates how social relationships scenario are connected and how they work. It is for this reason that Elliott (2011:2) asserts that social description of a scenario must go beyond mere description of the social reality to social scientific analysis and explanation, and this is what social-scientific criticism aims to achieve. It differs with social historians' approach in this regard. It insists on the explication and development of conceptual models used for interpretation, which go beyond the scholarly theory-free analysis that social historians embrace.

Seventhly, Elliott (2011:2) argues that social-scientific criticism exegesis is necessary for biblical interpreters because it helps them to "move beyond enlightened 'hunches' of geniuses to analysing theories that can be tested and reapplied, refined or rejected- by all exegetes alike."

According to Elliott (2011:2) historians and exegetes in most cases focus on what is of outstanding and significance on a particular people, communities and personalities. This is to say, they pay particular attention to things like the character of Paul; the mode of Christianity being described in a particular text; the Q community and many more. In this case, historians and exegetes identify the social reality or interaction out of a singular or any of the unusual variables, which they then use as a standard by which to judge the kind of social reality that prevailed in a particular context. Social-scientific criticism attempts to address these same issues but at the level of the text and social context.

Finally, social-scientific criticism is important in the exegetical enterprise because it is driven by the idea that "all understanding, imagination, expression and communication is socially and culturally conditioned" (Elliott 2011:2). Thus, a method(s) for identifying and analysing conditions that have influential impact on perception, understanding, imagination, sociality and meaningful communication are inevitable because it is upon such that circumstances of the original communication and those of the hearing or reading of these communications of other times and places pertain (Elliott 2011:2).

3.2.5 Topographies of social-scientific criticism

According to Elliott (2011:3), critics of social-scientific criticism assume that all knowledge is socially conditioned and that it is perspectival in nature. As such, they insist that interpretation of biblical texts must involve clarification of the social location of both the interpreter and the texts under interrogation because proponents of social-scientific criticism hold a view that exegesis are not devoid of social presuppositions, just as exegesis is incomplete without theological presuppositions (Elliott 2011:3).

The second feature of social-scientific interpretation of biblical texts is that it interprets the text using models that approximate the meaning of those texts. This implies that the social-scientific process distinguishes between the information supplied by indigenous informants who usually present information based on their frameworks of experience, knowledge and rationalisation from the information supplied out of analytical perspectives and categories of modern investigators. These are, respectively, “emic” points of views that are presented in biblical texts and all ancient sources and “etic” views that represent views that are supplied by scholars and contemporary readers (Elliott 2011:3; 1991:11; Gottwald 1979:785; Malina 1986:190; Leach 1979:112). According to Elliott, that distinction helps

the exegete to remain conscious of the gaps separating the modern scholar from the world and literary productions of the ancient cultures under examinations. This in return prompts the interpreter to consider the “plausibility structures” that lend credence to beliefs and concepts striking moderns as unscientific or superstitious or merely bizarre.

(Elliott 2011:3)

Furthermore, this distinction helps to minimize anachronistic and ethnocentric readings in the evaluation of biblical and other ancient texts. It helps the interpreter to minimize or limit the exaggerated eagerness to apply biblical texts to contemporary ethical issues, the unnecessary critique and inappropriate ascription of modern perspectives and values to those of the first century Mediterranean society (Elliott 2011:3, Van Eck 1995: 156).

The third feature of social-scientific criticism is that in this category of interpretation, “the hypothesis about that nature and relationship of specific phenomena are set out

in conceptual models. These models are simplified, abstract representations of prominent features of related social phenomena” (Elliott 2011:3). This argument proceeds from social-scientific proponents’ conviction that there is no perception that is immaculate; all methods of interpretation proceed from particular hypotheses, theory and models of data collection, analysis and result-interpretation and explanation of the phenomena. Thus, in this regard, data is usually the product of the hypothesis, which is always based on the nature and reflection on some particular phenomena (Elliott 2011:3).

The fourth feature of social-scientific criticism is that it seeks to decipher the social arrangements, cultural values and norms that are latent in the biblical and other ancient texts because they are not clearly stated. In that regard, social-scientific criticism makes the texts more understandable (Elliott 2011:3). The proponents of social-scientific criticism are alive to the fact that in the ancient Mediterranean world for instance, spheres of human endeavours such social, political, economic, culture and others were not independent and free-standing spheres like they are in many modern societies. All of these spheres were arguably embedded in two major institutions of that period, namely the *polis* and *oikos*. As such, in their investigation or interrogation of the ancient or biblical texts related to this period, social scientific proponents for instance, speak of political religion as opposed to looking at religion as a separate entity (Elliott 2011:3).

Lastly, Elliott argues that when one looks at biblical cultures and compares them to traditional cultures peculiar to the pre-Enlightenment societies, there are as many similarities as there are differences. Thus, it is important that those who endeavour to interrogate and interpret historical cultures possess’ knowledge of the differences and similarities peculiar to these periods. This enables an interpreter to determine the patterns of belief and behaviour found in the biblical communities and writings (Elliott 2011:3).

3.2.6 Exegetical method applicable to social-scientific criticism

3.2.6.1 Exegesis

Du Toit (2009:112) defines exegesis as the science of critical interpretation of biblical texts in order to unveil their intended meaning. Exegesis provides an exegete with

methods and techniques which are essential for unlocking the world behind biblical texts and the concepts embedded therein. Du Toit highlights the importance of the enterprise of exegesis being devoid of exegetes' personal presuppositions or preferred exegetical methods and opinions. The most important thing to note in this undertaking is "the first and decisive rule of exegesis respects the summary of the text" (Du Toit 2009:112).

Social-scientific criticism takes into consideration broad concerns related to issues of social structures and cultural patterns that form the context of the given biblical text (Elliott 2011:4). The second area of focus is the biblical writings themselves and how they refer to "specific sets of values, models of social interaction or their social institutions and strategies for serving as effective means of social communication and interaction." Social-scientific criticism as an exegetical approach therefore takes two basic directions, namely, social cultural investigation and social scientific exegesis itself (Elliott 2011:4).

3.2.6.2 Socio-cultural investigation

Socio-cultural investigation pursues the social world embedded within a text, that is to say, it investigates how the text was composed and read in its original context. It takes into consideration the sociological data provided by the texts themselves as well as the investigation of the real social reality behind the text by studying issues such factors as the socio-economic, socio-political, social organization that influenced the formation of early Christianity (DeSilva 2004:119).

3.2.6.3 Social-scientific exegesis

The emphasis in this category is premised on the "analytic and synthetic interpretation of the text". This enterprise entails combining exegetical and sociological disciplines' practices and techniques (Elliott 1981:7). Hence, the social-scientific criticism exegetical process does not only focus on the exegesis of the text itself, but also looks at the ways in which social science research models and theories help in textual analysis. Sociology in this case plays a pivotal role. It raises questions which help to unveil the real world behind the text. This helps the reader to understand the text at hand (DeSilva 2004:119).

3.2.6.4 Models

According to Malina (1981:16-17), an exegete can understand biblical texts and cultures that underpin them by thinking in terms of abstractions, ideas or concepts. These abstractions are commonly used to understand the essence of things. These are technically called models. Carney argues that people use these models or abstractions as cognitive maps, consciously or unconsciously (1975:38). In this regard, Neyrey states:

Since every historical interpreter approaches the biblical texts with some model of society and social interaction in mind, the advantage of explicitly setting out one's model at the beginning is that it clearly lays bare the presupposed model of social relations and makes it possible for the reader to see how the model organizes and explains the data. This allows for the explicit test of the model in terms of its fit and heuristic power. To proceed otherwise is to proceed with hunches and conclude with guesses.

(Neyrey 1991: xvi)

From this discussion we infer that both Carney (1975:38) and Neyrey (1991: xvi) agree that people use models in their interpretation of social reality consciously or unconsciously. Thus, Van Eck argues that

by explaining, explicating and justifying one's own conceptual construction of social reality, the conclusions and results that grow from such an endeavour can be exposed to verification and critique, and thereby contribute to an actual advance in understanding.

(Van Eck 1995:157)

According to Van Eck (1995:157), one of the advantages of setting out a model explicitly is that it helps in laying bare the interpreter's presupposed model of social relations, which in this study is the first century Mediterranean society as reflected in the social world of Paul and the Roman Empire. Furthermore, when an exegete explains the model, he/she intends to use, he/she does not only show how the model is chosen and organised to explain the data, but also allows the model to be tested (Van Eck 1995:157).

According to Elliott (1986:3), the fact that models play a significant role in social scientific analysis, an exegete cannot ignore that “undifferentiated use of words such as “metaphors, images, analogies, type, reproduction, representation, illustration, pattern, parallel, symbol, paradigm as synonyms for model” can breed terminological confusion. Therefore, Elliott advises that exegetes must always seek clarity and precision whenever they use the term model.

3.3 ENCHANTED WORLDVIEW

In this study, Paul Gifford’s enchanted worldview theory is used as a social scientific model to interpret phenomenon of African Pentecostalism in Zambia. An enchanted worldview refers to a mind-set that evolves around the spirit world that permeates all spheres of human endeavour and the real power and spiritual power reside where life is played out between good and evil. It is a world of spirits and demons, witches and wizards, wonders and miracles as well as the most dreaded curses (Gifford 2016:29).

According to Paul Gifford (2016), an enchanted worldview is fundamental to the reality of many Africans. The African mindset and worldview is enchanted by nature. Africans live in a world largely influenced by the spirits. For example, it is quite common for Africans in search of a breakthrough to turn to enchanted solutions such as “miracles that will lead them to prosperity, victory and glory” (Gifford 2016:29) instead of political and economic models that can ensure progress.

The enchanted imagination model rests on the following tenets: hierarchy of power, ideas of charismatic power or leadership, the idea that ordinary life is infused in the divine and a strong sense of reward and punishment emanating from the spiritual world. We need to examine these principles closely.

3.3.1 Hierarchy of power

African tradition religions teach a hierarchy of power in which God is regarded as the supreme arbitrator (Gifford 2016:38). In this regard, it is generally believed that the spiritual world influences every aspect of human existence as alluded to earlier. For instance, in African governance systems, power to choose leaders such as chiefs does not reside with mortals, but with the ancestors and God. Thus, whenever a dispute arises about ascension to the throne , rather than holding elections, people consult

spirits and the spirits select a suitable and rightful heir. Any person who dares to usurp power by unlawful means incurs the punishment of the spirits until he/she relinquishes power (Shoko 2007:19)

3.3.2 Charismatic power

According to Gifford (2016:38), in an enchanted institution or society there is belief in charismatic power. According to that belief, power is divinely imputed to God-chosen individuals. This notion is commonly held by African Pentecostalism and African traditional religion practitioners. For instance, in African Christianity there is a strong belief that prophets are bearers of God's power, which is like a river. One characteristic of a river is that it flows down, not up. To partake of the power prophets carry, you must accept their place above you (Adeyepo 2000).

Adeyepo's disposition is held by several Pentecostals in Africa. Authority is believed to be conferred on a particular individual by God for the purpose of performing a certain task at an appointed time. For example, Adeyepo says:

Prophetic verdicts are divine verdicts; they are heavenly verdicts. They are God's commands given expressions to through mortals' lips.... Every time the prophet says, "Thus saith the Lord", it is actually the Lord Himself speaking. He is only using the prophet's vocal system as a microphone.... Prophetic verdicts will cause your daystar to rise. It will always bring change of position, as mountains and hopeless situation bow to it. It gives life to any dead situation and turns worthlessness to exceeding greatness.

(Adeyepo 2000:120).

3.3.3 Ordinary life is infused by the divine

According to Gifford (2016:13), in African traditional religions there is strong belief in the Supreme Being, lesser deities and spirits that dwell in the spiritual realm. Ordinary life is not separated from the realm of the spirit(s) either, that is to say, "in this enchanted world, boundaries are not hard and fast; the spiritual and the physical world interpenetrate one another" (Gifford 2016:24).

Gifford (2016) argues that the enchanted imagination is pervasive in African Pentecostalism. As such, religion in Africa is very concerned with explaining,

prediction and control of events in this part of the world. Consequently, a form of Christianity that meets felt needs has become widely accepted in most African communities (Gifford 2016).

3.3.4 Strong sense of reward and punishment from spiritual world

In the African enchanted imagination rewards and curses (punishment) are fundamental in human endeavours (Gifford 2016). Gifford points out that in African Pentecostal churches, just like in African tradition religions rewards are attributed to obedience to God (supreme being), while curses are understood as afflictions that God sends upon those who are disobedient. However, in both African religions and African Pentecostalism rewards and curses can also be administered by human beings. For example, a parent, pastor or leader can either curse or reward a child, congregant or subordinate. Pastor David Adeyepo, quoted by Gifford, says

[T]o resist a spiritual father will bring a curse; never sit down or gather against someone God has anointed. Never! Many have died like this. You don't look at your spiritual father and think he's your equal; you may just die in captivity! Don't do it! God sent me; and all that receive me, receive the one who sent me. Then the rewards and blessings that I am sent to convey become available to such!

(Gifford 2016:53)

3.4 FIELD CONSCIOUSNESS

Peter Berger *et al.* (1974) argue that a comprehensive understanding of any social reality must include a study of the subjective consciousness of individual human beings. This clarifies many problems encountered in specific societies. Field consciousness presents an outline of the sociology of knowledge from a phenomenological perspective. The major assumption of this theory is that "modern people are afflicted with a permanent crisis, a condition conducive to considerable nervousness" (Berger *et al.* 1974:78). Berger *et al.* briefly outline and define some of the basic principles and key terms that underpin "field consciousness" theoretical frame as follows:

3.4.1 Society

According to Berger *et al.* (1974), society is viewed through objective givenness and subjective meanings that are constituted by the reciprocal interactions of what people

experience as reality and what is experiences in individual human consciousness. In other words, social reality emanates out of a particular consciousness, that is to say every social reality has a component or element of consciousness. Berger *et.al.* posit that the consciousness held in a particular society encompasses a web of meanings that enable people to get along with ordinary events and encounters of their lives. And these meanings, which individuals share among themselves make up a particular social lifeworld (Berger *et al.* 1974:12).

Berger *et al.* (1974:19) posit that public institutions and practice are a result of shared “field of consciousness” or “specific constellation of consciousness”. People view or interpret reality through the lens of our worldview which provide “maps of meaning” from which they make sense of the world (external structures). They argue that

within a scientific worldview, reality is interpreted from the viewpoint of measurability, reproducibility, componentiality, interdependence of components, separability of means and end, implicit abstraction, problem solving inventiveness, emotional management, assumption of maximalization, multiple relationality.

(Berger *et al.* 1974:19)

Such worldview, according to Berger *et al.* (1974:19),

produces or operates in bureaucratic institutions that are characterised by competence, referral, coverage, proper procedure, awareness of redress, anonymity, orderliness, general and autonomous organizability, predictability, general expectancy of justice, and explicit abstraction among others.

(Berger *et al.* 1974:19)

3.4.2 Consciousness

According to Berger *et al.*, in this theory, consciousness “does not refer to ideas theories or sophisticated constructions of meaning,” rather it refers to the consciousness of everyday life, which is pre-theoretical and represents the worldviews of ordinary people. Berger *et al.* believe that a social reality of a given society, is constructed by ordinary people who inhabit it. In many cases reality definitions come out of people’s experiences. The inhabitants of the particular society tend to look at such output of meaning drawn from their experiences as real. The definitions or meanings of reality exist in different forms. Some are cognitive and refer to what is,

while others are normative and refer to what ought to be. However, these meanings have some degree of similarities, and insofar as they relate to “field consciousness” the similarity is that they are all collectively adhered to (Berger *et al.* 1974). For example, Berger *et al.* note that there

are meanings attached to bodily experiences. In many traditional societies such experiences are defined as resulting from intervention of supernatural beings; in a modern society they are generally defined in terms of biological, chemical or sometimes psychological causes.

(Berger *et al.* 1974:13)

In order to probe and analyse the kind of consciousness that is prevalent in a particular society or institution, Berger *et al.* (1974) suggest that the inquiry be based on the sociology of knowledge. Sociology of knowledge involves a systematic description of specific constellations of consciousness. And Berger *et al.* argue that even though consciousness is a subjective phenomenon, it can be described objectively because it is naturally made up of socially significant elements which are constantly shared among individuals (Berger *et al.* 1974). To ascertain those socially significant elements, the researcher may ask the following questions:

[W]hat are the distinctive elements of consciousness in this situation? How do they differ from the consciousness to be found in other situations? Which elements of consciousness are essential or intrinsic, in the sense that they cannot be “thought away”

(Berger *et al.* 1974:14)

The second task involves the description of specific field of consciousness. That involves arranging randomly picked elements of consciousness in organised patterns and describing them systematically. Each field of consciousness is a structure made up of modes and contents that are consciously experienced in a particular place. Thus, there is need to organize them in their respective domains. For example, the contents of the field may be kinship as established in a particular society and the field may refer to the mode of experience in a particular society (Berger *et al.* 1974:14).

The third and last task involves linking the structures of consciousness of particular institutions and institutional processes. This task involves the usage of other analytical

concepts such as “carriers” for the analysis of specific institutions and institutional processes as a way of bringing specific structures of consciousness that underpin such public institutions (Berger *et al.* 1974:16).

3.5 Point of departure

From the discussion of the theoretical frameworks advanced by Gifford and Berger *et al.*, we propose as a methodological point of departure, a combination of enchanted worldview and field consciousness for the analysis of African Pentecostal preacher’s interpretation of Romans 13:1-7. Though these scholars’ presuppositions have methodological agreements and differences, our interest is to use some of their insights to analyse how Pentecostal preachers in Zambia, understand “submit to the governing authority” based on the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7. We ask the what motivates their interpretation and if their interpretation is legitimate?

In order to make our methodological point of departure more explicit, we show that some aspects of the insights advanced by Gifford and Berger’s *et al.* are necessary for a study of this nature.

3.6 CONCLUSION

In this Chapter we have described social-scientific criticism in terms of how it operates as an exegetical approach. In the next chapter we turn our attention to the description of different models that we have applied to the exegesis of Romans 13:1-7 from a social-scientific perspective. We analyse the text and the social world behind it and draw from it possible political implications.

In Section 3.4, we have discussed the possibilities of combining enchanted worldview and field consciousness in the quest to analyse how African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia interpret scriptures. We concluded that the combination of the two models is not only feasible, but essential, in it that both models bring to the fore the question of how people interpret reality through maps of meanings that emanate from their experiences.

Chapter 4

Social-scientific reading of Romans 13:1-7

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the last chapter we discussed and outlined in detail the social-scientific exegetical approach. We have established that the social-scientific approach uses models to proximate the context reflected by the biblical narratives. In other words, it interprets biblical texts using models that proximate the meaning of those texts. Furthermore, we learnt that social-scientific criticism brings the exegetical enterprise sociological and anthropological paradigms to bare on biblical texts.

According to Van Eck (1994), in sociological research, researchers use models to select and apply certain theories in their investigation and interpretation of certain data. Elliott (1986) defines a model as a tool for transforming theories into research operations. Carney (1975), in his turn, defines a theory as a basic proposition through which a variety of observations or statements become explicable. The difference between a model and a theory is that a model acts as a link between the theory and observations. In this case, a model utilises one or more theories in order to bring to the fore a simplified framework which can be brought to bear on any given data. Thus, the theory, in this process, stands out to be a stepping stone through which models are built.

Consequently, we can infer that theories determine the model to be used in a particular study. Van Eck argues (1994) that the researcher's preferred theories and research objectives determine the models to be used. In this study, thus, the theories that we use in reading Romans 13:1-7 are derived from "honour and shame" as pivotal values of the first-century Mediterranean world; and "patronage and clientism". Thus, in the first section of this Chapter we discuss the social, economic, political and cultural milieu of the first-century Mediterranean world and the theories identified from therein. In the second section we read Romans 13:1-7 using identified social-scientific paradigms in order to give an overall meaning of Paul's text to the Christians in Rome.

4.2 SOCIAL, CULTURAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL MILIEU OF THE FIRST-CENTURY MEDITERRANEAN WORLD

The first-century Mediterranean society was under Roman Empire rule from 63 BCE. This society was presided over by the emperor bearing the title *pater patriae* (father of the land). The Roman empire was an aristocratic society that was divided into haves (rulers) and the have-nots - the ruled (Carter 2006). However, in order to ensure peace and harmony in society, the Roman emperor delegated certain administrative powers to selected aristocrats. These aristocrats fulfilled important administrative duties on behalf of the emperor. Their roles contributed to the consolidation of the state sovereignty (Stegemann & Stegemann 1997).

4.2.1 The first century Mediterranean world: An advanced agrarian society

Stegemann and Stegemann (1997) describe the first-century Mediterranean society (Roman Empire) as an advanced agrarian society. This society was a pre-industrial agrarian society where agricultural production was principally the main source of wealth. That is to say there was no manufacturing industries apart from small scale handcraft making ventures (Lenski 1966; Borg n.d). Stegemann and Stegemann identify power structure and social inequality as one of the major factors which characterises an advanced agrarian society. They argue that in societies like this, power structures are stronger and well organised (Stegemann & Stegemann 1997). In the Roman Empire, the ruling class (elite) made up 1 to 2 percent of the population, and they lived in cities, while the ruled (peasants) made up the rest of the population who lived in villages and towns (Herzog 2005). In this society there was no middle class. The elite controlled almost all the wealth, approximated at one-half up to two-thirds of it. It was in the form of land, its produce and labourers - peasants (Carter 2006:3). We can therefore infer that the elite shaped “the social experience of the empire’s inhabitants, determined the ‘quality’ of life, exercised power, controlled wealth, and enjoyed high status” (Hanson & Oakman 1998:69). Horsley (1993) describes the relationship that existed between the rulers and the ruled as one of power. All important matters were in the hands of the elite and the peasants were not given any space to participate in the political dispensation of their society.

According to Oakman (1986), in the cities of Rome and Jerusalem the Herodian and aristocratic elites controlled the land, its yield, its distribution and the cultivators by

extracting taxes and rent. This was an act of domination against the will of the peasants. Tribute-taking in the Roman Empire was in the form of land, produce and human capital. The Roman tribute consisted of two basic forms, namely, *tributum soli* (land) and the *tributum capitis* (poll tax). Through these taxes, Rome ruled the land, the yield and people who worked the land (Fiensy 1991). Refusal or failure to pay taxes was considered a rebellion, a clear refusal to recognize Rome's sovereignty over land, sea, labour and production (Horsley 1993).

The Roman Empire was crowded and the elite ruled by coercion using the army. Any form of rebellion was met with aggressive military retaliation. In order to exercise sovereignty over the territory, military power was an integral part of governance system. The army enforced submission through intimidation on citizens who contemplated revolt. In other words, in this society "coercive diplomacy" was at work (Carter 2006:4). The army saw to the administration of larger domains. It was, however, not easily contained as a large area of first-century Mediterranean society was under the Roman rule as a conquered state, then. It required the constant and intensified presence of the military for it to be well managed and secured (Stegemann & Stegemann 1997).

4.2.2 Features of an advanced agrarian society

According to Lenski (1966), one of the salient features of advanced agrarian societies is inequality and steep hierarchy. For instance, in the first-century Mediterranean society people were classified into two categories, that is a large population of peasants (lower class) which produced food to make society run, and the small population of governing elite class (upper class) who ensured the protection of peasants. Apart from protecting peasants, governing (elite) authorities ensured that society was stratified and coercive, so that peasants produced surplus food in addition to paying burdensome taxes (Van Eck 1995). Lenski (1966:) outlines nine significant classes that characterised the first-century Mediterranean agrarian society as follows: "the upper classes are the ruler, governing, retainer, merchant and priestly classes. The lower are the peasants, artisans, the unclean class and the expendables." In a more detailed framework, Van Eck (1995:211-212) outlines the classes as follows:

- The *ruler* was really a separate class because all agrarian rulers enjoyed significant proprietary rights in virtually all of the land in their domains.
- The governing class was very small, only about one to two percent of the population. It was made up of both hereditary aristocrats and appointed bureaucrats. The governing classes of agrarian societies probably received at least a quarter of the national income of most agrarian states, and the governing class and the ruler together usually received not less than half.
- The *retainer class* averaged around five percent of the population and ranged from scribes and bureaucrats to soldiers and generals, but all united in service to political elite.
- The *merchant class* does not fit neatly into either the ruling or the lower classes. Merchants generally had low prestige, no direct power and were recruited from the landless. They escaped, however, the total control of the governing class since they stood in a market, rather than in an authority, relationship to them. The ruling class also needed them for luxuries and some essentials.
- The *priestly class*, last but not the least among the privileged elements in agrarian societies, depended on the governing class, as did the retainers. The leaders of the priestly class were members of the governing class, as well as the priestly class. Because of their contributions to the religious system, such as tithing, they often controlled great wealth.
- The *peasants* made up the bulk of the population because most labour had to go into producing food. They were heavily taxed, kept family under control and could gain power only when they had military importance or when there was a labour shortage.
- The *artisan class* was similar to the peasants in regard to lack of power. Artisans, along with unclean class to be listed, were only three to seven percent of the population. They were not productive enough to become wealthy for the most part. And they did not have power unless their skills were so difficult to acquire that they could command high wages and concessions. The artisan class was normally recruited from the ranks of the dispossessed peasantry and their non-inheriting sons and was continually replenished from these sources.
- The *unclean or degraded class* usually did noxious but necessary jobs such as tanning or mining. Within this class the prostitutes were also found.

- The *expendable class*, averaging between five to ten percent of the population in normal times, was the class for which the society had no place nor need. They had been forced off their land because of population pressures or they did not fit into society. They tended to be landless and itinerant with no normal family life and a high death rate. Illegal activities on the fringe of society were their best prospect for a livelihood. It is most likely that this bulk of the brigands, rebels and followers of messianic claimants came from this class.

Another noticeable feature is what Lenski calls “the proprietary state”. In advanced agrarian societies, the rulers treated conquered territories as their personal estates, as such they controlled land, confiscated, redistributed, distributed and displaced people at will (Lenski 1966). According to Van Eck (1995), there are various reasons why peasants lost their land. One of the factors that contributed to loss of land is that aristocrats confiscated land for their own use. Goodman suggests that although the rightful owners of the land were the peasants who inherited it from their ancestors, the elites and the rulers in most cases added such land to their estates by engaging the peasants in entrepreneurial investment. The elites provided loans to the peasants with clear intentions to grab the debtors’ land if they failed to repay debts (Goodman 1982). Indebtedness in this case, did not only result in peasants losing land, it also contributed to loss of status in the traditional social stratification (Horsley 1993). This heightened tension between the ruling elites and the ruled (peasants). However, in order to contain the situation, the ruling class devised an ideology that Ryan terms “blaming the victim” whereby ruling class blamed the peasants for their failure to pay back the loans (Ryan 1976:140).

According Horsley (1993), in such advanced agrarian societies rulers came to power through the use of force. They used different types of legitimizations to justify and declare their rule as divinely given. In the first place, they did it by claiming the favour of the gods through a formulated imperial theology by which they claimed Rome to be chosen by the gods, especially Jupiter, to rule over the empire eternally (Carter 2006). Imperial theology was legitimized and preserved by the administration of an imperial cult using temples, images, rituals and personnel installed in honour of the emperor (Horsley 1993). Another salient point of legitimization of power was through control of various forms of communication such as the design of coins, construction of

monuments and various infrastructure such as temples (Carter 2006) for imperial veneration. Herzog (2005) observes that during this period temples dispensed divine sanctions and blessings. The implication was that rulers were regarded as having come to power by the will of the gods or that they drew their mandate from heaven. They also did it through various developmental initiatives. They embarked on constructing various cities, roads and other infrastructure to give an impression of prosperity, even though these were built using forced labour (Horsley 1993). They also employed “indirect rule” to legitimize their power, by which they used temples or cult/religion as extensions of the governance systems. This advantaged the ruling elite because it “provided a bridge of legitimization that enabled an empire to divide and rule” (Horsley 1993:9). Herzog argues that Roman rulers made sure that any popular revolt against them was deflected to local aristocrats such as temple elites (religious leaders), while they watched from a distance. This approach, especially the use of temple, brought stability and reinforced certain traditions that were valued by the ruling aristocrats (Herzog 1993).

Lastly, another salient feature of an advanced agrarian society were the values and institutions which governed the way people related and conducted their day to day endeavours. Due to the limited scope of this study we only highlight two, namely, “honor and shame” and “patron client-relationship”.

4.2.3 Honor and shame

4.2.3.1 Honor

Honor and shame were key values in the first-century Mediterranean world (Van Eck 1995:165; Malina 1981:25). Malina describes honor as:

Socially proper attitudes and behaviour in the area were the three lines of power, sexual status, and religion intersect.... Honor is the value of the person in his[/her] own eyes (that is, one's claim to worth) plus the person's value in the eyes of his[/her] own social group.... Honor, then, is a claim to worth and social acknowledgement of the worth ... when a person perceives that his or her actions do in fact reproduce the ideals of society, he or she expects others in the group to acknowledge the fact, and what results is a grant of honor, a grant of reputation.

(Malina 1981:27-28)

According to Moxnes (1993:20), honor is fundamentally the public recognition of someone's status in society. It is either ascribed or acquired. Ascribed honor is inherited from the family at birth when a child takes on the status of the honoured family. Honor may thus be ascribed on an individual based on being born into a worthy family. This would be described as ascribed wealth. Ascribed honor is socially recognised claim to worth which attained by an individual without necessarily making any effort to achieve or fight for it. This kind of honor comes directly from family membership (Malina & Neyrey 1991; cf also Moxnes 1993; Van Eck 1995).

By contrast, acquired honor is conferred when an individual excels above other people through social interaction (Malina 1981:29). According to Moxnes (1993:20) acquired honor can either be gained or lost in the perpetual struggle for public recognition. He goes on to say, since in the Mediterranean society the group to which an individual belonged determined one's status, honor accrued primarily from group recognition (Moxnes 1993). However, even though honor may sometimes be regarded as an inner quality, the value of the person in his/her own eyes is dependent upon his/her recognition by others (Moxnes 1993). Honor is therefore, a public, rather than a private matter. It is expected therefore, that when an individual's claim to honor is recognized by the group, then it is confirmed, and it instantly becomes his/her status. Hence such a status is expected to be accompanied by honourable deeds on the part of an individual to whom it is given (Moxnes 1993).

In the first-century Mediterranean world, acquired honor went hand in hand with a "social game" known as challenge and response (challenge-riposte). Malina (1981) describes challenge and response as a social pattern or game in which people hassle among themselves within defined rules in order to gain the honor of the other. This social arrangement is typical of the Mediterranean societies where "social interaction between people is always characterized by competition with others for recognition... as such individuals in such a society people are constantly alert to defend their individual or family honor" (Moxnes 1993:20). According to Moxnes, social interactions like that of the Mediterranean society usually take a form of challenge and response, which is often verbal, but can also be in the form of symbolic gestures and even physical force where necessary (Moxnes 1993). Van Eck (1995) argues that the nature

of challenge and response typical in Mediterranean society, honor was of limited good. The implication of honour and challenge is that for someone to acquire honor someone else had to lose it. Challenge implies entering into someone else's social space or dislodging them from their status temporarily or permanently (Van Eck 1995). Van Eck aptly characterises it this way:

Challenges always take place in public, and normally consists of the following three phases: 1) The challenge itself in terms of some actions, word or both; 2) the perception of this challenge by both the one who is challenged and the public at large (or present); and 3) the reaction of the receiving individual and the evaluation of the reaction on the part of the public. Furthermore, these challenge-response can only take place between equals.

(Van Eck 1995:166)

4.2.3.2 Shame

Bechtel (1991) describes shame as one of the main values typically used to sanction human behaviour in the first-century Mediterranean world. She argues that, there is a difference between an emotional response attached to feeling shame or being ashamed. According to Bechtel (1991), the emotional response of shame is aroused in an individual when he/she fails to live up to internalized goals and ideals of society. Usually these goals and norms have to do with defined rules that dictate expectations of what a person or people should, "be able to do", "know or feel" as well as envision "what society should be." A shameless person is therefore an individual with a dishonourable reputation is someone who is outside acceptable standards of honor. Such a person may not have access to normal courtesies (Van Eck 1993). Bechtel (1991:53) observes that the first-century Mediterranean world functioned in the following manner: 1) "As social control to repress aggressive and undesirable behaviour; 2) as a pressure to preserve social cohesion; and 3) as an important means to dominate others."

Bechtel (1991) then goes on to describe shaming in social, judicial and political spheres of the first-century Mediterranean society. The political and social spheres are important for this study. On political shaming, Bechtel posits that it was shameful for an individual or group of people to be captured by an enemy or anybody. In most cases captured individuals were shamed by stripping of their clothes and exposure of their

private parts in public. This gesture was symbolic of the defenceless of the captured and it demonstrated failure to attain victory. Other ways of shaming the captives involved making them laughingstocks by pouring slander, taunts, scorn or mockery on them (Bechtel 1991). Socially, shame functioned effectively in this society because of the nature of its organization. Because first century Mediterranean people lived in groups, they were group oriented. As such people relied on and were pressured by other people's opinions. Those opinions were mainly influenced by the external appearances of things. The social structure made people more susceptible to shaming. For example, spitting into someone's was shame-inducing because such an action rendered the one spat on so unclean and socially unacceptable that she/he could be cut off from the community (Malina & Neyrey 1991). According to Douglas the act of casting the spat on out of the community was symbolic of the human body, which is bound up as a system that symbolised a community. In that regard, the substance produced by the body is only acceptable within the body and becomes unacceptable and unclean once it comes out of the body. Hence, in spitting saliva that comes out of the body is considered unclean for that very reason. It is like the unclean things that are cast out of the community.

4.2.4 Patronage and clientism

Ancient literary and epigraphic evidence indicate that from the first-century Mediterranean Roman Empire's social institutions were characterised by patron-client relations (Elliott 1987; Van Eck 1995). Malina and Rohrbaugh describe that patron-client relationship as follows:

Patron-client system are socially fixed relations of generalized reciprocity between unequals in which a lower-status person in need (called a client) has needs met by having recourse for favours to the higher-status person, well-situated person (called a patron). By being the granted favor, the client implicitly promises to pay back the patron whenever and however the patron determines. By granting the favor, the patron, in turn implicitly promises to be open for further requests at unspecified later times. By entering a patron-client arrangement, the client relates to his/[her] patron as to a superior and more powerful kinsman, while the patron sees to his clients as to his dependants.

(Malina & Rohrbaugh 2003:388)

Patronage in the first-century Mediterranean society was characterized by “reciprocity”, “brokerage” and “friendship” (Siame 2014:59).

4.2.4.1 Reciprocity

According to Malina, reciprocity is an implicit, non-legal contractual obligation, unenforceable by any authority, apart from one’s sense of honor and shame (Malina 1981). Foster (1961) notes that reciprocity is sometimes referred to as “dyadic contact” and he identifies two types of dyadic contacts, namely, those between equals (people of equal status) and that which involves people of unequal status (patron-client contact). Moxnes defines unequal patron-client contact as follows:

Patron-client relations are social relationships between individuals based on a strong element of inequality and different in power. The basic structure of the relationship is an exchange of different and very unequal resources. A patron has social, economic, and political resources that are needed by a client. In return a client can give expressions of loyalty and honor that are useful for the patron.

(Moxnes 1991:242)

According to Carney (1975), reciprocity involves the exchange of gifts, whereby the recipients of such gifts are expected to reciprocate the gesture. In this kind of arrangement people with substance acquired influence over other people or groups of people, such that they could call in their debts at any time.

Models of understanding the types of social exchange which were at play in the first-century Mediterranean society have been studied extensively by scholars from different social science backgrounds ranging from anthropology, sociology, and political science. These studies have been done from two perspectives particularly, namely, the interpersonal relationship angle (which studies particular dyadic relations among patrons and clients), and the institutional and social interaction angle, which focuses on investigating the social interactions among different associates such as elites and peasants (Batten 2009:168).

Reciprocity was practiced in three distinct forms, namely, general-, balanced- and negative reciprocity (Van Eck 2011a).

General reciprocity is an informal type of reciprocity that took place between family members and within a clan or tribe. In this kind of reciprocity, it was expected that if someone gave anything to another, such a one was not expected to receive anything in return. In this way, a patron may possibly acquire influence over client(s) and could demand for the payment of his/her debts at any time (Van Eck 2011a).

Balanced reciprocity, on the other hand, is a formal type of reciprocity that was practiced in two distinct ways. The first of which involved social equals, while the second form involved people of unequal social status. In both cases, a *pro quid pro* arrangement applied, that whenever somebody gave something, they expected something in return (Van Eck 2011a:6).

Negative reciprocity is a form of exchange between people of unequal status which usually resulted in exploitation and self-interest (Van Eck 2011a). For example, a patron would offer a much-needed resource to the client (who in most cases were peasants) in exchange of the client's most dependable resource such as land and honor. In this kind of arrangement, the aristocrats benefited at the expense of their peasant clients (Van Eck 2011a). Consequently, patron-client relations significantly damaged "horizontal group organization and solidarity", especially in cases where exchanges between the patron and client were not bound by any kind of legalism. The clients stood to lose because of exploitation by the patron and the client would have nowhere to turn to for protection (Van Eck 2011a:5-6).

Linked to the concept of reciprocity, is brokerage. Brokerage is one of the important elements in patron-client relationships. A broker is a social entrepreneur who manoeuvres exchanges between patron and clients. Brokers played a very significant role in the first-century Mediterranean society. The role of the broker was basically to bring two parties or individuals together. In the Roman Empire brokers were people who mediated between people of different classes, groups and individuals. They used strategic skills to broker relationships. Brokers were skilled in convincing both parties to venture into various enterprises for the obvious benefits that accrued to them. This is what motivated brokers to engage in such deals (Batten 2009; Boissevain 1974).

It was common for patrons in the Roman Empire to engage in brokered deals. Apart from giving their own resources to their clients, patrons also opted to broker certain deals. Clients accessed resources that belonged to the most powerful people in society through brokerage. For example, a patron could serve as a broker between local cities and the central government (Moxnes 1991).

There are two forms of brokerage which were practiced in the first-century Mediterranean society, namely, cultural- and divine- brokerage (Batten 2009). A cultural broker is someone who was a bridge between his community and the outside community. Usually cultural brokers acted like outsiders to both patrons and clients. Brokers, despite acting in this manner, still maintained membership of their respective communities such as ethnicity and religious affiliation, while at the same time brokering deals between the state and communities (Batten 2009). Brokers could either be trusted or distrusted in their communities depending on their dealings. Brokers, at times, acted as social agents of change. They were the voice of their respective communities and acted as channels of communication between two parties, namely, the elite and the peasants. When they copied the lifestyle and culture of the elite, brokers also acted as agents of cultural innovation in their respective communities (Batten 2009).

Batten (2009) has indicated that in the case of divine brokers, patronage, clientage, and brokerage applied equally to the religious sphere and social interactions. In the first-century Mediterranean society, a god was a benefactor, and worshippers were perceived as clients. Thus, various religious officials, such as priests and prophets, functioned as brokers between the gods and their followers. Brokers, in this case, brokered the favor of the gods in exchange for human gratitude and praise (William 1999).

In ancient Judaism, God (Yahweh) was perceived as a patron in addition to other roles such as father, king or Lord. In both the Old Testament and New Testament, many prophets and other biblical figures played the role of brokers by mediating between God (patron) and the people or worshippers (clients). The prophets normally presented the people's demands to God, and *vice versa*. This is evident in early-Christian writings, in which several figures play the role of a broker (Green 1989).

Friendship was another way in which patron-client relationships were practiced in the first-century Mediterranean society. This form of patronage was common in political and social relationships. Friendship was the only form of relationship that was less structured and less formal (Moxnes 1988). Friendship carried several obligations, such as helping a friend when in need. One was considered honorable if she/he fulfilled obligations and thereby minimized demands from a partner. As such sharing hospitality was normal and expected (Moxnes 1991).

The figure below presents in summary how these four forms of reciprocity operated. Furthermore, it names persons or groups that are potentially involved in the process of reciprocation:

TYPES OF RECIPROCITY

Form of solidarity

Ethical concepts-social forms

Familia reciprocity

Household-kinship-clan

Brotherly

Balanced reciprocity

(same status, symmetrical relationship)

Fellow villagers-neighbour- friends

General good deeds and borrowing

love of neighbour, love of friend

(exchange of goods and services)

doing good/kinship

Invitations or formal contracts as mutual

Agreements buying/selling/ marriage

General reciprocity

(unequal status-asymmetrical relationship)

Patron-client, teacher-student, rich poor

Good deeds (but client

patron-client

Cannot repay like with like, offers homage and loyalty

allegiance/discipline

Support or information)

compassion

Relationship to God

love of God

Negative reciprocity

Strangers-enemies

Hospitality

Love of enemy

(Stegemann & Stegemann 1999:36)

The diagram demonstrates that patron-client relations are underpinned by the idea of a powerful personality (*patronus*) applying his/her influence on dependants, that is the

lower person (*clientela*). In return the powerful count on their dependants for loyalty in political and economic matters (Stegemann & Stegemann 1999).

4.2.4.2 Features of patron-client societies

Moxnes (1991:248) argues that all patron-client societies, like the first-century Mediterranean society, are characterised by the following common features:

- They are particularistic and usually diffuse;
- they involve the exchange of a whole range of generalized symbolic media, like power, influence, inducement and commitment;
- the exchange entails package deals, so that generalized symbol media cannot be given separately (e.g. concretely useful goods must go along with loyalty and solidarity);
- solidarity entails a strong element of interpersonal obligation, even if relations are often ambivalent;
- these relations are not fully legal or contractual, but are strongly binding;
- in principle patron-client relations entered into voluntarily can be abandoned voluntarily, although always proclaimed to be life-long, long-range or forever;
- they are vertical and dyadic, and thus they undermine the horizontal group organization and solidarity of clients and other patrons; and
- they are based on strong inequality and difference between patrons and clients.

Additionally, Elliott (1988) identifies favouritism as another feature of patron-client relationship. He argues that, favour is the major goal pursued in dyadic relations, which makes favouritism a main quality of patron-client relations. Van Eck (1995) argues that the vocabulary of favouritism is sprinkled heavily across most New Testament writings. He is of the view that words such as benefactions, reward, gift and grace are embedded with favouritism connotations.

Malina (1988:7) identifies horizontal dyadic relations as relationships between people with equal status and power where favours were exchanged in times of need. Such favours were usually in similar quality and measure. However, in vertical dyadic relations (i.e. patron-client relationships) of people of high unequal status and power, the exchange of favours and help was different. In this case, material things were

exchanged with immaterial things such as “goods for honor and praise, force for status support” (Malina 1988:7).

According to Van Eck (1995), patron-client relationships are commonly used to remedy inadequacies of all institutions. This form of relationship cushioned those in inferior social status from the whims of life. For instance, through such an arrangement slaves were protected against risks of being sold, killed or beaten. Slave owners in return obtain the trust and commitment of the slave (Van Eck 1995).

4.2.4.3 Patronage system in the Roman Empire

According to Malina and Rohrbaugh (2003), even though patron-client relations were widespread in the entire first-century Mediterranean society, the Roman version of the system overwhelmed the formal institution of patronage among Roman Empire citizens. By the late years of the Roman republic, a large number of people in the Empire shifted from the previous patronage system and sought similar ties with great Roman upper-class families. Consequently, patronage spread rapidly in the entire Roman Empire.

The system of patronage became more formalized in the city of Rome and spread to the entire provinces of the Empire. In a more formalized institution like Rome, the first duty of the client was to give the *salutatio* (early morning call) at the house of the patron. Secondly, menial duties (serving patrons during meetings) were expected and public praise of the patron was considered fundamental to the patronage relationship. And in return for such gestures a variety of petty favours like a one-day meals were given to clients (Malina & Rohrbaugh 2003). Patrons who were powerful individuals in this society controlled literally all resources and used their positions to give favours to their inferiors based on friendship, personal knowledge and favouritism (Malina & Rohrbaugh 2003).

In the Roman Empire, benefactor patrons were expected to supplement the city, clients and villages generously. The emperor related with major public officers in the same way. Public officers extended the same gesture to the people below them and cities related to towns in the same way. This social network was pervasive such that anything that had less connections was regarded as shameful (Malina & Rohrbaugh

2003). According Malina and Rohrbaugh (2003) the social network of the patron-client relationship in the Roman Empire was mediated by brokers, which a common feature in patron-client relations of the first-century Roman Empire. Malina and Rohrbaugh describe those relations in the following way:

First-order resources-land, jobs, goods, funds, and power-are all controlled by patrons. Second-order resources-strategic contact with or access to patrons-are controlled by brokers who mediate the goods and services a patron has to offer. City officials served as brokers of imperial resources. Holy men or prophets could also act as brokers on occasion.

(Malina & Rohrbaugh 2003:389)

Stegemann and Stegemann (1999) state that reciprocity in the Roman Empire was prominent in the periphery of society (rural regions). The livelihood of rural people in the Roman Empire was severely endangered due to scarcity of monetary means. It is for this reason that solidarity through reciprocity and favouritism was sought after. According to Stegemann and Stegemann this kind of reciprocity, involved the exchange of modest goods and services between households and kinship groups. This kind of reciprocity in rural areas went beyond villages and kinship solidarity and naturally functioned in four distinct ways, namely, familia, balance, general and negative.

4.2.5 First-century personality

The discussion in § 4.2.1 indicates that honor and shame were pivotal values in the first-century Mediterranean world. In this society an honourable person was somebody who knew how to maintain and increase his/her honor along with that of his/her group. What sort of personality would someone who sees life in terms honor have then? Such a person would aspire to see him/herself through the eyes of other people (Van Eck 1995). As argued in § 4.2.1, honor is an endowment of reputation from other people. Because it matters how someone is perceived by other people, an honourable person who seeks to maintain his/her honor will need other people to be notable in society.

According to Pilch (2007), first-century Mediterranean people did not understand or share modern or Western ideas of individualism. What prevailed in terms of personality in that society was “dyadism”. Scholars refer to such group-oriented individuals as

“dyadic personality”. Dyadic is an adjective of the noun “dyad”, which means “pair” or “a pair”. Hence a dyadic personality counts on another person or persons to “assure identity, to grant social approval, to assist in making decisions, to prevent one from getting into trouble, to monitor behaviour etc” (Pilch 2007:69; see also Dunson 2012).

Pilch (2007) further states that people of the first-century Mediterranean world perceived themselves primarily in terms of the groups to which they belonged as family, disciple and others. They were group-oriented or group-centred by nature. Pilch advances that in such a society, the “individual desires, wishes, aspirations, hopes, plans, all [were] subject to group consideration and approval or rejection” (Pilch 2007:69). As such, people perceived themselves as interrelated to people or individuals. Van Eck further argues that:

[in that society a] person perceived himself or herself as always interrelated to other persons, as occupying a distinct social position both horizontally (with others sharing same status ranging from centre to periphery) and vertically (with others above and below in social rank). Such a person internalises and makes his own what others say, do and think about him[/her] because he[/she] believes it is necessary, for a human being to live out of the expectations of the others.

(Van Eck 1995:176)

Malina (1979) points out that people with strong group orientation usually think socially and make sense out of things from: “reasons, values, symbols and modes of assessment typical of the group.” In this particular case, social thinking entails thinking about people in stereotypical terms (1979:130). Malina and Neyrey (1991:74-76) outline the basic stereotypes which represent how first-century Mediterranean people understood themselves and others, as follows:

- Family and clan: people are not known individually, but in terms of their families. By knowing the parent or clan, one knows the children.
- Place and origin: Dyadic persons might be known in terms of their place of birth and depending on the public perception of this place, they are either honourable or dishonourable.

- Group of origin: people are known in terms of their *ethnos*, and certain behaviour is expected in them in terms of this. For example, to know one Greek [meant knowing] all Greeks.
- Inherited craft-trade: persons might, moreover, be known in terms of trade, craft or occupation. People have fixed ideas of what it means to be a worker of leather, land owner, a steward or a carpenter. Because of this, for example, trouble could arise if a carpenter displayed wisdom, performed great deeds and heals, acts which did not belong normally to the role of a carpenter.
- Parties and groups: furthermore, people might be known in terms of their social grouping or function as Pharisees, Herodians Sadducees. Membership of the groups was not a matter of personal or individual choice, but of group-oriented criteria, such as family or clan, place and/or group of origin or inherited craft or trade. This allowed access to and networking with specific people.

As a result of perceiving themselves in terms of specific qualities such as ascribed status, dyadic people look at human character as fixed and unchanging. It is for this reason that life within families, groups or clans is usually predictable (Malina & Neyrey 1991). As argued above, individuals who belong to such groupings are predictable and seemingly have no power to change the circumstances of their family or clan lineage and parentage. Thus, dyadic people regard their roles, that of their clans and families as ordained by God and that their social order is controlled by God. Malina and Neyrey (1991) argues that such a state of affairs results into an inbuilt resistance among dyadic people towards social flexibility to change their status and roles.

4.2.6 Kinship: The dominant institution in the first-century Mediterranean world

Van Eck (1995) notes that kinship was the dominant social institution in the first-century Mediterranean society. He further argues that even “politics, economics and religion were embedded into kinship to such an extent, that kinship, as a dominant institution could not be identified as such.” Malina (1986) holds that kinship is about nurture and nature of people as this institution holds people together by commitment and forms a structure of human belonging. Furthermore, Malina describes the form of kinship that was in practice in the first-century Mediterranean society as follows:

While all human societies presumably witness to kinship, the Mediterranean world treats this institution as primary and focal In fact, in the whole Mediterranean world, the centrally located institution maintaining societal existence is kinship and its sets of interlocking rules. The result is the central value of *familism*. The family or kinship group is central in social organization; it is the primary focus of personal loyalty and it holds supreme sway over individual life

(Malina 1989:131)

According to Malina, kinship being the centrally located institution it was in the Mediterranean society, without it society would have perished or been altered. The agrarian life, mainly centred on peasant families and village communities, depended on it (Malina 1989:131). And family being the central institution of this society, it was a hub into which all social networks were anchored or connected (Smith 1989). In the next section, we indicate that kinship, especially in the instructions of Paul to the Jesus community in Rome as narrated in Romans 13:1-7, is evident through Paul's categorization of members of the church at Rome.

4.3 ROME AND POLITICS

According to Jewett (2007), the city of Rome, within which an early congregation of Christians developed, was authoritatively transformed by Octavian's triumph over Mark Antony in the Battle of Actium in 31 BCE. This left Octavian as the sole principal of the Empire. Later on, Octavian prescriptively turned power over to the Senate, receiving the title of "Augustus" in 27 BCE for having restored the Republic. He subsequently ruled as the single head of state whose power derived from the oath of allegiance that the citizens of Rome and the governments of the provinces had granted him prior to the Battle of Actium.

Earl (1968:66,193) argues that as a result, the populace became Octavian's private clientele, with him the emperor as their patron. During this period Octavian led an effective propaganda campaign which portrayed him as the divinely appointed ruler who brought peace to a troubled world by restoring a legitimate government based on the rule of law and restoration of public virtue. In honor of this restoration, the *ludi saeculares* games and festivities were first celebrated in 18 BCE to thank the gods for

the Augustan peace, to purify the free citizens and to enjoy days of celebration provided by the state.

Earl (1968) records that Octavian embarked on an extensive building programme. The emperor and his wealthy supporters paid for the expenses of the project. This building programme transformed the city of Rome into a shiny city of marble that grew to house a million people. White (1999) writes that under Octavian's loyal son-in-law Agrippa, a new watercourse was built along with several public fountains; temples were restored; public gardens, baths, and theatres were erected. Furthermore, Agrippa influenced the reorganization of the entire city administration. He ensured that fire brigades and police protection were put in place. He also ensured that grain deliveries were made to Roman citizens. These improvements demonstrated that the golden age of peace and plenty had finally arrived. The beneficiaries of this vast programme of renewal were the citizens of Rome. the bulk of whom were slaves and immigrants who made up the early Christian congregations.

Barrett (1980:56) notes that the successors of Augustus (Octavia), Tiberius and Caligula, were poor administrators who nevertheless managed to keep the unnecessary system of propagandistic dictatorship going. Unlike Augustus, these two emperors never accounted for public funds. Under their rule, the difference between the huge personal wealth of the emperor and public wealth vanished, a clear indication of dictatorship. The reigns of Claudius (41-54 CE) and Nero (54-68 CE) were of more direct relevance for the situation of Paul's letter to the Romans.

Jewett (2007) notes that when Claudius ascended to emperorship, he continued the process of urban development. During his reign he created a new harbour for grain trade, improved the roads and watercourses. He also reorganized the court system and created an imperial bureaucracy which consisted of slaves, freedmen and women who administered the affairs of the empire in areas where the emperor had direct control. For example, two of the said leaders of this bureaucracy were the ex-slaves, Pallas and Narcissus, who combined their vast powers and wealth, consequently inducing the forceful resentment towards the Roman aristocrats. After Claudius, Nero came to power with the pledge to restore the role of the Senate and the rule of law. Nero was celebrated for steering in a golden age (Jewett 2007).

Griffin (1992) describes Nero Caesar as promoter Greek values, which he expected to be upheld throughout the Empire for the sole purpose of civilizing the Roman upper class. He promised to stop the practice of issuing commands through imperial agents. Around 62 CE, Nero changed his stance and opted to restore tyrannical tendencies like his predecessors. He became more brutal and practiced secret majesty trials with summary executions of political opponents, whichas Jewett adds, included the eventual execution of the apostle Paul himself (Jewett 2007). Griffin argues that at the time Paul wrote the letter to the Romans, Nero was providing an exemplary form of government and law enforcement, despite his reckless personal habits. Griffin describes him as an aggressive bisexual who enjoyed stalking the streets of Rome with his crowd of sycophants demanding sexual services from passers-by. He also indulged in brawls and petty thieving. Thus, Paul 's condemnation of immorality and his command to respect governmental agents as the source of law and order may derive in part from these peculiar circumstances (Afful 2011).

4.3.1 The Roman civic cult

Earl (1968) states that Octavian established the ideology of ruler cult in the city of Rome, even though many people in the city of Rome traditionally hated the divinization of human beings. Octavian influenced the practice, which began with honouring famous Roman citizens in temples and house shrines. He started by arranging for extravagant honours devoted to himself. As if that was not enough, he ordered for the erection of his statue next to the speaker's platform in the forum. Octavian was also called the "Son of the Divine Saviour." Initially, he was depicted as a military redeemer, in nude pose, with his foot resting on a globe, signifying that he was the universal ruler of the world. When he waged war against Mark Antony, who had installed himself as an example of Heracles and later of Dionysius, Octavian assumed the image of Apollo, resister of tyranny. By adopting this image, the victory over Antony at Actium was celebrated as a triumph of Apollo over dangerous Dionysius. Octavian's victory over the alleged forces of barbarism resulted in his being celebrated as the guarantor of peace and tranquillity. However, Octavian had overthrown a legitimately elected co-regent in an aggressive campaign that followed in the example of Julius Caesar who earlier gained sole access to dictatorial power. According to Beard *et. al.* (1998:318), the sophisticated form of imperial propaganda developed by Octavian carried no clear

elements of self-promotion but emphasised his Apolline role. This was now increasingly depicted in restored temples complete with traditional symbols of peace and tranquillity. Octavian strengthened his propaganda by melting down 60 silver statues of himself and ceremonially returning control to the Senate. Earl argues that the act of renouncing power allowed the Senate to save its face by crowning him *princeps*, and not king.

While possessing unlimited power and authority, Augustus Octavian went ahead and promoted the restrained values of the Republic and led Rome into what was celebrated as the Golden Age that personified religiousness (piety). Piety in this case was understood as respect for tradition, it was actualised in Octavian's gestures. He embarked on renovations of eighty-two (82) temples. He also built new ones with classical Roman styles. In these temples, sacrifices were made to the god of peace. In these new temples, Augustus was depicted as a symbol of Rome wearing a veil with a toga, abandoning the Greek pose of an uncovered head. Beard *et. al.* note that Augustus was no longer depicted as the half-nude divine hero, wearing a breastplate with honorific symbols. He was now depicted in poses of piety. Augustus' religious duties was an essential part of this propaganda, and he assumed the high priestly office of *pontifex maximus* in 12 BCE. In the letter to the Romans Paul criticizes and subverts the official system of honour achieved through piety on which the empire rested after Augustus. Paul offers a new approach to mercy, righteousness, and piety, one that avoided the propagandistic exploitation of the Roman imperial system (Beard *et. al.* 1998).

Georgi (1991:86) says, "Here, in Romans, there is a critical counterpart to the central institution of the Roman Empire," that is, redemptive kinship (see Rom 1:1-3). Augustus is celebrated in the poetry of Virgil as the saviour figure who ushers in "this glorious age" who receives the prophetic tribute and shall have the gift of divine life. In a similar vein, Georgi says, Claudius was voted the most dynamic emperor by the Roman Senate when he died in 54 CE. On his accession to the throne, Nero, was celebrated as the glorious leader who would usher in yet another Golden Age. This follows the pattern established by Augustus, who developed this masterpiece of propaganda. He as regent held unlimited power and supposedly resisted divinization

even while receiving divine honours as the humble Apollo who restored peace to the world.

Several aspects of the civic cult are reflected in the way the argument of the Epistle to the Romans proceeds. It begins with a description of divine wrath against those who seek to suppress the truth (Rm1:18) and worship the creature rather than the Creator (Rm1:25). It goes on to claim that all humans are liars (Rm3:4) and none is truly righteous (Rm3:19-10). Paul's description comprises the antithesis of the official propaganda of Rome's superior piety, justice, and honour. The civic cult is also countered by Paul's depiction of Christ. That he alone is "Lord" with a name above every name, and that he subjects everything under his authority, fits the pattern of an imperial ruler. As Maier (2005:386) observes,

the visual depictions found everywhere in Rome were designed to convince the inhabitants of the Roman Empire that they were governed by an order willed by the gods, with a divinely established ruler, indeed *ζῳοδ θεοϋ* (*huios theou*) – Son of God at its head. In contrast to Julius Caesar, who seized authority as dictator, Augustus, his successor, and Christ all renounce tyranny and claim to bring peace through service; and the argument of Romans revolves around the question of which rule is truly righteous and which gospel has the power to make the world truly peaceful. Furthermore, some scholars who include Earl (1968:54) suggest that the ideology of the ruler cult, especially with Augustan images, may well have influenced Paul.

(Maier 2005:386)

4.3.2 The hierarchy of honour

Lendon (1997) indicates that there is overwhelming evidence that the hierarchy of honour was the order of the day in the Roman Empire. The vast Empire was ruled by a relatively small number of officials. These rulers used force and propaganda in their approach to governance. Thus, the Empire flourished through patronage that held together the communities by "the workings of honour and pride," which provided "the underpinnings of loyalty and gratitude for benefactions" (Lendon 1997). Although the threat of force and the desire for gain were always present, "the duty to honour or respect officials, whether local, imperial, or the emperor himself, was vastly more prominent in ancient writings than the duty to obey.... Subjects and officials were

linked by a great network of honouring, and obedience was an aspect of that honouring". The explicit concern in ancient Roman society with the issue of honour was visible in their creation or what Judge (1964:28) has called "an aristocracy of esteem". They used the term *gloria* to describe the atmosphere that "arises from a person's successfully exhibiting himself to others," particularly in victorious political or military leadership. Such glory was viewed as intrinsic to the heroic person, raising that person's status above others. This was conveyed in expressions like "immortal glory" or "celestial glory". The superlative accomplishments would continue to resound after one's death. In contrast to Jewish thought, which reserved "glory" largely for descriptions of God, the Romans virtually restricted *gloria* to superior human accomplishments. Victorious military leaders were celebrated in religious processions that acknowledged the quality of immortal glory (Afful 2011).

Jewett (2007:50) states "that the glorious man is raised up from the human to the eternal sphere: he does not become a hero but remains thoroughly human, indeed a citizen." Such glory depends on the recognition granted by other citizens to its great man for performing public service. The glorious leader was thought to be capable of bringing the blessing of the gods upon the community. He was honoured as the source of righteousness and prosperity. A sophisticated system of gradation in the honour system was established. The Roman Senate designated appropriate rewards, offices, and celebrations for various levels of accomplishment in the fields of philanthropy or military strategy. The ambition of Roman leaders, usually drawn from leading families, was to gain ever higher levels of honour. The competition for honour was visible in every city of the Roman Empire. Members of the elite class competed for civic power by sponsoring games and celebrations, financing public buildings, and endowing food distributions. Public life in the Roman Empire was centred on the quest for honour. Moxnes (1980) affirms that there were inscriptions on every public building and artwork indicating those to whom honour should be attributed. Rome, in particular, was full of majestic public buildings such as temples, baths, fountains, and amphitheatres built to honour glorious leaders and triumphal occasions. In Cicero's memorable formulation (cited in Jewett 2007:51), the Romans boasted of being *religione multo superiores* ("with respect to religious observance far superior") in comparison with the other nations. They had incorporated religion into their empire. According to Afful, the

argument about overturning this corrupt and exploitative honour system is found throughout Paul's letter to the Romans (Afful 2011).

4.3.3 The situation of the Jewish community in Rome

The Christian congregation in Rome were to a large extent composed of the large Jewish community that was present in the city prior to the time of Paul's letter. Jewish families that had arrived as part of the diaspora were increased by Pompey, who brought large numbers of Jewish slaves from Jerusalem, captured in 63 BCE. Most of these Jewish people obtained Roman citizenship upon being granted the freedom to convert, and the community as a whole numbered between 15,000 and 60,000 in the late 50s (Stegemann & Stegemann 1999). Lichtenberger (1996) says Jews were mainly concentrated around the Porta Capena, as evidenced by grave inscriptions found on the Jewish Christian tombs as well as from references in non-Jewish sources. Most members of the community were relatively uneducated and impoverished (Leon 1995). Most of the inscriptions on the tombs were in Greek. Those in Latin date back to the third century, which confirms Rutgers' (1998) argument that the Jewish community in the city of Rome remained largely Greek-speaking until well after the time of Paul's letter. He argues further that there are very few Hebrew inscriptions or epigraphs that have been found in the excavated places. An analysis of his findings reveals that the that inscriptions found on Jewish and non-Jewish obituaries show close parallels that indicate a substantial degree of inculturation. He further states that Jewish families chose names that were popular in contemporary non-Jewish society at large (Rutgers1998). Schafer (1997) asserts that despite a fairly high level of "Judeophobia" in Rome, the rights of the Jewish community were repeatedly recognised by the government. For instance, Julius Caesar granted the Jewish communities leeway to follow their own laws and religion, which was later cemented by the approval of Senate in 44 BCE and continued under Augustus and Claudius. The "right to live according to Jewish Laws and ustoms encompassed permission to gather for worship and meals together, to organize a communal life, the right not to give bonds on the Sabbath, to have kosher markets, and to send funds to the Jerusalem Temple" (Williams 2004:36). One of the peculiar features of Judaism in Rome was the habit of fasting on the Sabbath, which may have reflected the mourning over the fall of Jerusalem to Pompey in 63 BCE (Willams 2004).

According to Leon (1995), the evidence about the life and organisation of synagogues is teased out of the information found on the Jewish Christian tombs in Rome. These underground cemeteries were excavated out of the soft tufa clay that contained thousands of tombs of members of respective synagogues. The critical examination conducted on these excavated materials point to the fact that Jewish Christian tombs date back to the second or third century. This assessment throws ambiguous light on the rise of early Christianity and the construction of the similar Christian tombs. In 2002 a group of researchers from the University of Utrecht, Rutgers and his colleagues, made one of the most important discoveries in biblical research. According to them, the carbon 14 (used to determine the age of an object) dating techniques they applied on their excavated materials prove that the Jewish Christian tombs in the Villa Torlonia date back to the period from 50 BCE. For them, this information confirms that these tombs were present in Rome at the time of Paul's letter. Furthermore, since the Christian tombs found appear to be related to specific synagogues, they conclude that each synagogue provided burial spaces for their members. This discovery throws light on the kind of membership and social organization were prevalent in synagogues then, which is relevant for the study of Paul's letter. The findings further bring to light the conflicts that existed between traditionalists and messianic advocates involving burial rights (Rutgers 1998). Although the carbon 14 tests have not yet been performed on the Christian tombs, it is likely that they also originated in an earlier period than could previously be demonstrated. It is a period when members or early congregations were refused the right to bury their dead in the Jewish Christian tombs where earlier members of their families had been interred.

According to Rutgers, the synagogue of the Hebrews was probably the earliest to be organised in Rome, and it was associated with the Monte Verde Christian tombs, to the south of Trastevere, which suggests that the synagogue could have been located in Trastevere itself (Rutgers). Rutgers (1998) posits that there were probably proselytes, God-fearers, and sympathizers in some of these synagogues, and an explicit evidence in Rome of conversions to Judaism. An assessment of the appeal of these synagogues is provided by Seneca (quoted in Rutgers 1998), the philosopher who served as chief administrator during the period when Paul's letter was written. Hengel (1974) argues to the contrary that there is solid evidence that conflicts with the findings in these synagogues. Another piece of evidence suggests that the

controversy of 41 CE was as related to Christian agitation as the event in 49 CE that led to the expulsion of non-Jewish and Jewish Christian leaders. Augustine had earlier contrasted the Jewish moral law with the new law of Christianity. In view of that, it is unlikely that Porphyrius believed that Judaism itself first arrived in Rome at this late date. He probably refers to a particular Jewish teaching derived from Syria, the area from which the first organised Christian mission movement is reported to have originated according to Acts 13-14.

4.3.4 The origin of Christianity in Rome

Suetonius (cited in Jewett: 2007), in his biography of emperor Claudius, reports that the emperor expelled Jews from Rome who were constantly making disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus. Suetonius apparently believed that the disturbances were instigated by a troublemaker named “Chrestus”, a common slave. Slingerland (1997) reports that Chrestus was the advisor to the Romans who caused Claudius to expel the Jews from Rome. According to Benko (1969), it is unlikely that Chrestus was a Jewish zealot who lived in Rome. It is unlikely that a single agitator could have evoked such a massive Roman reaction. That the name Chrestus does not appear among the hundreds of Jewish funeral inscriptions that have been assembled by Leon, further weakens the argument. Most historians infer that this is a reference to agitation in Roman synagogues concerning Jesus as the Christ, and that the resultant exile should be correlated with the detail in Acts 18:2 concerning the expulsion of Priscilla and Aquila from Rome around 49 CE.

Lampe (2003) argues that even though a number of scholars follow the details compiled in Acts that “all the Jews” were expelled, there is no need to read the Suetonius passage in this way. It seems more likely that the only Jews who were expelled are those who were responsible for the disturbances in Rome. Therefore, any history that suggests that a Christian movement existed in Rome prior to the 40s CE is shrouded in mystery and in the Acts 2:11text, which talks about Jews and proselytes who came from Rome to Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. However, scholars like Brown and Meier (1983) suggest that the Pentecost report in Acts represents the views of a latter summary of these historical events, indicating how Christianity spread through the then known world.

Lampe (2003) suggests that Christianity was brought to Rome by Jewish slaves and freed men and women who were attached to Roman households. He shows that Valerius Biton, the bearer of the letter from Rome to Corinth, was an old man who had been a believer since his childhood in the 30s or 40s CE. This information can be correlated with grave inscriptions and other references to Jewish slaves of the Valerius data. Lampe argues that even though the evidence, which could bind the details of the finding together in order to produce a coherent historical account, are unavailable, there is evidence from a variety of sources, which shows that Christianity penetrated Rome decades prior to the writing of Paul's letter. The scale of Christianity in Rome along with the indications of diversity, make a variety of avenues likely. Paul greeted many persons in Romans 16, whom he had met in previous missionary activities in the eastern half of the Mediterranean world. They were now back in Rome, which correlates with what is known about the Claudius Edict. The most probable explanation for Paul's acquaintance with these early Christian leaders is that they met while in exile. Paul knew that they had returned to the capital of the empire during the peaceful, early years of the Nero administration before he wrote in the winter of 56-57 A.D. from Corinth.

Balch (2004: 27 – 46) suggests that it is appropriate to infer that the Christian groups originating inside the various Jewish synagogues in Rome had been deprived of their Jewish Christian leaders by Claudius' deportation order in 49 A.D. and that they continued as house congregations with Gentile leaders for almost five years.

4.4 SOCIAL-SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS OF ROMANS 13:1-7

4.4.1 Introduction

In this section we apply the social, cultural, economic and political interpretive milieu constructed above, to Romans 13:1-7, addressing the issue of “submit to the governing authority.” According to Nanos (1996), Romans 13:1-7 does not fit well into the movement of Paul's instructions surrounding the context of Romans 12-13:8. He argues that the text appears to be abrupt for calling for the behaviour towards the governing authority. Feinberg (1999) states that Romans 13:1-7 is part of the paraenesis, that is, a group of exhortations, counsel or advice that Paul gives to the Jesus-group in Rome. This exhortation begins in Romans 12 and ends in Romans 15. However, some scholars like Nanos argue that Romans 13:1-7 is an intrusion in the

paraenesis. Some of these scholars suggest that the text was infused into this section by another person other than Paul (see Kasemann 1969; Dunn 1988; Moo 1996; Stein 1989; Stuhlmacker 1994; Porter 1990; Morris 1987). However, Feinberg thinks that this suggestion is not necessary, what is important is to look at the role the text plays in the life and work of the church at Rome. He asserts that,

Paul's teaching about transitioning character of this world is just the reason that he includes Romans 13:1-7, because a new era is coming, some may be tempted to reject every social institution including civil government. Moreover, there may be extreme attitudes which reject submission to civil authority as part of the command not be conformed to this age (Rm 12:2). Thus, there is need to be reminded that the natural world in which we live has not been entirely abandoned by God.

(Feinberg 1999:89)

Jewett (2003) posits that when dealing with the letter to the Romans and its first audience, one must be alive to the fact that the letter is not addressed to a congregation founded by Paul, and that the letter is not in the same genre as other Pauline letters that deal directly with congregational problems in an authoritative manner. In classic rhetoric perception Romans is regarded as an "ambassadorial" message which is presented in a demonstrative genre with the aim to encourage an ethos in a particular community. The introductory and concluding chapters clearly indicate that the primary reason Paul wrote the letter to the Romans was to elicit support, moral and financial for his westward (Spain) planned mission trip, mentioned in 15:24 and 28 (Ehrman 2013; see also Malina & Pilch 2006; Jewett 2003). Jewett asserts that Paul needed support from the Christians in Rome to prepare for his journey to the western regions of the Empire. Since he was not the one who founded the church at Rome and that he had never been to the said church, he had to introduce himself and his gospel in order to persuade the Christians in Rome to cooperate in this scary project (Jewett 2003). According to 16:1, the letter to the Romans was sent through Phoebe, a leader of the church in Cenchreae, a port near Corinth. She was a wealthy patron who probably accepted to endorse the impending trip to Spain (16:2, Ehrman 2013).

Jewett reconstructs the situation of the Roman churches from the evidence provided throughout the letter to the Romans. He argues that

Chapter 16 reflects Paul's knowledge of five groups of believers with differing leadership patterns and orientations, although in view of the large number of martyrs under Nero seven years later, there must have been many more groups. From inferences in Paul's greetings to the large number of leaders whom he had met during their exile from Rome after the edict of Claudius (probably in CE 49).

(Jewett 2003:92)

4.4.2 Patron and client relationship in Romans 13:1-7

Romans 13:1: *Let everyone be subjected to the governing authority*

In Romans 13:1, Paul sets out his advice to the Jesus group members (his recipients) about the attitude they ought to have towards civil authorities. He advises, "let everyone be subjected to the governing authority." In this case, the governing authorities he refers to, are the ruling aristocrats in the city of Rome, otherwise referred to as civic officials. The subjects are the citizens of Rome. Paul describes a worldview in which the emperor as the governor, the supreme emperor, and the Christian worldview that suggests that the emperor is somehow ordered by God (Yoder 1972). Isaak (2003) asserts that Paul's view is ambivalent because Paul did not personally experience life in Rome *per se*. Instead he seems to view the situation in the Roman city with blinkers from his own classic Judeo-Christian worldview which has three basic levels of hierarchy, namely, God, power and humanity. The Roman empire governance was executed in various ways as hierarchy, power and authority. These three were exercised in form of domination and oppression. And according to Paul, these governance systems were to be respected as ordered by God.

It is important that we do not confuse our modern understanding of government and its officials with what Paul is referring to in Roman 13:1. In the Roman context, governing officials were city officials who obtained their roles in various ways (see § 4.2.2). As shown in § 4.2.2, the city officials were elite landowners who were mainly concerned with their own livelihood and not that of their clients.

In the Roman Empire, emperors regarded as a significant aspect of their role to be patrons to client Roman citizens.. A citizen was a person with legal status or rights resident in the city (Malina & Pilch 2006). In Romans 13:1, Paul makes no mention whether all the recipients of the letter were legal citizens of Rome. Archaeological evidence indicates that at the time Paul wrote the letter, the Jesus-group in Rome comprised of non-Jewish and Jewish members. And several Jewish Christians did not have legal status in Rome (see § 4.3.4). Therefore, when Paul calls upon members of the Christian community, especially those of Jewish origin, he is calling for complete “subjection” or “subordination” that was the lot of resident aliens in the city (Malina & Pilch 2006). The word “authority” (*exousia* in Greek) that Paul used refers to the socially recognized entitlement to control the behaviour of others. In the Roman empire, such ability to control the behaviour of others was ascribed to interpersonal cosmic forces, which was realised by human beings who represented those forces. Those cosmic forces were the different deities who performed all sorts of roles, with Zeus as the head and controller of all human activities (see § 4.3.1). Romans believed that the civil authorities performed their roles on behalf of those forces. The Israelites, on the other hand, their only ultimate cosmic force was the God of Israel. Paul reaffirms that Judeo-Christian belief when he states, “there is no authority except from God”. For the Jewish Christians, thus, there was no other authority except that which emanated from the God of Israel. For Paul, therefore, if civil authorities drew their entitlement to rule from a deity, that deity could only be the God of Israel (Malina & Pilch 2006).

Romans 13:2: *therefore, whoever resists authority resists what God has appointed*

It is important for the contemporary reader(s) to understand that when Paul wrote the text in question, he did not have a contemporary post-Enlightenment representative democracy in mind. Also, Western liberal democracy is very different from the Roman empire governance system. In Western liberal democracy, leaders draw their mandate and authority from the people that elect them. Thus, God’s involvement in this system is not necessary for the logic of this system (Käsemann 1969; 1980; Malina & Pilch 2006). However, what Paul has in mind is the aristocratic system, with emperor on top of the stratum followed by the ruling elites. The authorities Paul refers to in Romans 13:1-2 can be understood in light of political patronage in which high ranking officials acquired positions by virtue of being born into elite families, belonging to a clique or

faction of elites and the like. Positions of influence were either acquired or ascribed to somebody, depending on their status or family standing in the community. The process of ascription attributed to God and taken for granted, just like someone's birth family, gender. Paul advises Christians not to resist such authorities, as doing so, would be tantamount to resisting the will of God that enabled such leaders to be born into ruling families. He goes on to say such action would attract condemnation from God.

When we look critically at what is at play in Romans 13:1-2, we can clearly see that Paul is reinforcing patron-client relationships. As outlined above, the patron-client relationship was pivotal in Paul's society. Societal tranquillity and the welfare of people depended on it. Paul presents God as a benefactor who delegates his power to the Roman authorities as God's appointed representative on earth. Paul, in turn, presents himself as a broker of God's favours for the Jesus group in Rome. The kind of brokerage, which is at play here, is divine brokerage. As presented above, patronage, clientage and brokerage applied equally to the religious sphere as to social interactions. In the first-century Mediterranean society a god was a benefactor, and worshippers were clients. Thus, religious officials, such as priests and prophets, functioned as brokers between the gods and their followers. They were brokers of the favour of the gods in exchange for human gratitude and praise (William 1999).

4.4.3 Honor and shame in Romans 13:1-7

Romans 13:3-4: for rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but bad. do you wish to have no fear of the authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive the approval; ... but if you do what is wrong, you should be afraid, for the authority does bear the sword in vain! It is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrong doers.

In Romans 13:3-4, Paul advises Christians in Rome to avoid terror by doing good. He does not necessarily unpack what doing good might entail in this context. He simply says, "then do what is good, and you will receive approval". According to Malina and Pilch (2006), in the Roman Empire, the word "wrath" was customarily used to describe the satisfaction derived from dishonouring or shaming another's behaviour. Thus, in Paul's view, it would seem, that if one dishonours the civil authorities they must be shamed as a wrongdoer in order to maintain their honourable status.

One may infer that Paul's advice encourages the Jesus group members to maintain and respect the *status quo* of Rome by upholding the value of honor and shame. They must do so in order to avoid being shamed in case of failure. He says, "do good, and you will receive approval." In other words, respect the *status quo* and you will be rewarded. In § 4.2.3, we have established that honor and shame were pivotal values of the first-century Mediterranean society. We also established that honour was either acquired or ascribed. And one way through which honor was acquired was as a reward for achieving something. Achievements in the Roman society came through a number of ways, one of these is gaining approval for good conduct in the community. For the Roman aristocrats, an honourable "subject" was someone who was obedient to the rules of the society.

4.4.4 Dyadic personality in Romans 13:1-7

Romans 13:4-5: *for it is God's servant for your good.*

In Romans 13:4 Paul refers to the authority as a human being when he says the authority "is God's servant for your good" (see Rom 13:4 [twice], 6). Paul advises that Jesus group members were to fear the authority not because of the consequences of failure (i.e. being dishonoured/shamed), but "because of conscience." Conscience means self-awareness based on and rooted in group awareness. As a member of a particular group in this society, one was expected to scrutinize oneself intensely and to be assessed through the prism of prevailing social norms. In the first-century Mediterranean society, one's image was distinguishable by virtue of being a member of a particular family, tribe, village, or city. Thus, for the Jesus group members, one's image was supposed to be in tandem with the image of the rest of the believers in Christ.

Paul in Roman 13:4-5 advises that the meaningful existence of a human being is supposed to conform to the standards of the Jesus group. A member of the group was expected to be aware of how other people in the group felt and think about him/hers. It was also expected that a member of the group was supposed to live up to that awareness. It would seem that by default this kind of expectation meant to live in breach of one's conscience. Conversely, a respectable member of the Jesus-group was expected to be self-awareness and live by their conscience. A member who lived by their conscience was considered respectable and an honourable person. In this

social context respect was earned through others because people lived in groups or had a dyadic personality as alluded to earlier. They each needed others in order grasp their identity in Christ. Thus, conscience was internalized from what the group said, thought about and did to the other person. Members of the group acted like judges and witnesses of their peers. The verdict passed by other members of the group on the other granted honor, which was necessary for individual existence.

4.4.5 Benefaction and reciprocity in Roman 13:1-7

Romans 13:6: *pay taxes for the authorities are God's servants*

In the Roman Empire taxes were paid out of coercion and extortion. That is because taxes went straight to the elites in power for their own purposes. According to Van Eck (1995), elites were granted honor from their clients (the general populace), hence they reciprocated the gesture by offering benefactions to the clients in terms of public works and provision of patronage for their clients. Since ordinary citizens in the first-century Mediterranean society had no rights to patronage and benefactions, they were obliged to pay taxes to the elites who in return provided security and other amenities to them. This kind of paternalism was typical in the Mediterranean society. In this text, Paul describes the high-ranking elites as "God's servants" (in Greek, *leitourgoi*) that is to say, they are administrators of the public good.

Romans 13:7: *pay all what is due to them: taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to who revenues are due, respect to who respect is due, honor to whom honor is due*

In the first part of Romans 13:7, Paul advises his audience to pay taxes and revenue to who they are due. According to Malina and Pilch (2006), the exhortation in 13:7a is rooted in the holiness of God, the giver of the ten commandments. In this particular verse the mentioning of taxes and revenue leads Paul to this concluding theme: "do not be personally indebted or obligated." Paul advises members of the Jesus group to always be free of social encumbrances by paying their debts. Paul gave such an advice because he was aware of the inconveniences that came with defaulting in such a society. Philo quoted in Stegemann and Stegemann describe an incidence which paints a picture of the inconveniences tax defaulters may encountered as follows:

So recently a man near us, who was summoned to the tax collector and was in arrears probably out of poverty, fled out of fear of unbearable penalties; his wife, children, parents, and all other relatives were taken away by force, beaten,

mistreated, and forced to suffer all kinds of shameful acts of violence, so that they would betray the fugitive or pay his debts- neither of which they could do, the former because they did not know where he was, and the latter since they were no less poor than the fugitive. He [the tax collector] did not release them until he had punished their bodies with instrument of torture and torment and taken their lives through outrageous means of killing; he tied cords to a basket filled with sand, hung this heavy load on their necks, and placed them in the market under open sky, so that they were driven to despair by terrible pressure of the punishments heaped upon them, by wind and sun burn, by shame before those passing by, and by the load with which they were burdened; others however, who had witnessed this punishment, felt the pain in advance. Some of the latter, who saw sharper with their souls than with eyes had felt themselves mistreated in person of others, ended their lives ahead of time through sword or throw poison or through rope, since death without torment seemed to them a good thing in their misfortune.

(Stegemann & Stegemann 1999:50)

In this society, taxes were unreasonable and unbearable. As such people invariably defaulted. This contributed to the indebtedness of most people, especially the peasants, who in most cases lost and/or sold their property such as land in order to pay back their dues. This contributed to more indebtedness (Stegemann and Stegemann 1999).

Paul, being a citizen of the Roman Empire, was obviously aware of the situation. Borg (1972:205-18) claims that "Paul's counsel was prompted by some Christians [in Rome, who he heard that they] joined forces with other Jewish friends in an anti-Roman take to revolt. Hence, he reminds them not to be insubordinate to the state".

Paul might have thought that the payment of taxes was a way of showing love to the aristocrats. And he knew that a peaceful situation would need to exist between the rulers and Christians in Rome, for him to successfully use Rome as a base for his westward mission to Spain. Furthermore, Paul's counsel focuses on the need for Christians in Rome to show responsibility by exercising good Judgment. How were they to do this? To answer this question, Paul says "pay to all what is due" (Rm 13:7).

Paul seemed to have drawn on the Jesus tradition. Jesus said, “give to Caesar to Caesar, God to God” (Mk 12:17). Paul’s statement was probably constructed out of an earlier commentary on what Jesus said (Toews 1986).

In the second part of Romans 13:7, Paul advises his audience pay respect and honor to those who deserve them. Paul was aware that honor was an important and sort after value in the first-century Mediterranean society. Losing honor in meant another person gained it. Paul might have known too that honor meant public recognition, and that challenging another person’s honor would be reciprocated (see § 4.2.3.1). History has it that Rome was tolerant of Christians at first. However, Christians had problems paying due allegiance to the emperor and ruling elites because of their belief system (Isaak 2003). The Roman authorities did not respond to the behaviour of Christians who failed to submit to their authority. Paul might have known this fact, given that he met with some of the victims of Emperor Claudius’ CE 49 edict (see § 4.3.4). Paul might have chosen to advise his audience to respect and honor the leaders in order to avoid the repeat of the same.

4.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have presented the social, cultural and political milieu of the first-century Mediterranean society. We have established that this society was an advanced agrarian community, which was divided between the “haves” and “have nots”. Additionally, we have established that in this society honor and shame were held up as pivotal values in society through patron-client relationships that governed the way people related to each other and the dyadic personality that shows that people in the first-century Mediterranean world lived in groups. The ensuing kinship lifestyle of this society conditioned the politics that permeated life and living.

Furthermore, in this chapter we have discussed “Romans and politics” extensively and established that the Romans Empire was governed by the emperor who was both the head of state and patron of the citizens who were his clients. In this government system, power was bestowed through inheritance. The imperial cult policy system held the belief that the emperor and the leaders were selected or appointed by the Roman gods such as Zeus. In this context, we have established that Christians were allowed

to worship their own God, and that Christians in the city of Rome comprised of Jews and non-Jews.

In the second section, we attempted to read Romans 13:1-7 in the light of above outlined context. We have established that when Paul advised his audience to subject themselves to the governing authorities, the authorities he had in mind were the aristocrats or civic leaders of Rome. Furthermore, we have concluded that the entire Pauline exhortation in Romans 13:1-7 was written for Paul's expediency. Paul advocated for a good relationship between government officials and Christians in Rome in order not to put his missionary journey to the westwards to (Spain) in jeopardy. Paul saw Rome as a launch pad for the mission he envisaged to undertake in Spain. We therefore infer that, Paul had a good reasons to advocate for a good relationship between the state and the church in Rome. The Roman government was remarkably tolerant of Christians though they later had problems pledging allegiance to the ruling elites due to their belief system.

Chapter 5

African Pentecostalism and politics in Zambia

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the presence and impact of African Pentecostalism in Zambian political space. In order to understand the presence and impact of this strand of Christianity in politics, we begin with a brief examination of the history of Christianity in general and the origin of Pentecostalism. This examination will help us locate the presence and impact of African Pentecostalism in the Zambian political space.

Pentecostalism in Zambia is intertwined with, and finds expression through various forms of “independent” churches. Thus, it is practically difficult to isolate Pentecostal churches from African initiated churches (AICs) in the country. In order to soundly clarify this complex situation, in this chapter, we attempt a typological analysis of the Pentecostal phenomenon in Zambia. The analysis will shed light on different forms of Pentecostalism in the country, which will help us to situate African Pentecostalism within that arena.

5.2 PENTECOSTALISM

The term “Pentecostalism” is an adjective of the noun “Pentecostal” the word traces its root meaning from the concept “Pentecost”. Pentecost is a Greek word prominent in the Old Testament, which means, “Feast of Weeks”. The feasts of weeks (Pentecost) was a festival which occurred on the 50th day, approximately seven weeks after the Passover festival. In the New Testament, the Pentecost assumed a new dimension altogether. As Ukpong (2008) has observed, Pentecost was celebrated in the church as the day on which the Holy Spirit descended (Acts 2), which manifested the fulfilment of the promise of Jesus (John 16:7-13). According to Acts 2:1-10:

And when the day of Pentecost: was fully come, they were all with one accord all of a sudden there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing might wind.... And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave utterance.

Accordingly, the doctrine of (glossolalia) which means the outpouring of the Holy Spirit expressed in speaking in other tongues, or also regarded as 'baptism in the Holy Spirit', is an indispensable aspect of Pentecostalism (Ukah n.d:10).

Pentecostalism is a religious brand within Christianity that emerged at the dawn of the 20th century during the Azusa Street Revival in the United States of America (Ukah n.d). Anderson (2004) states that one of the prominent convictions that gave rise to Pentecostalism in Azusa Street Revival was people's experience of what they termed baptism of the holy spirit. This experience was like a "fire" that ignited and spread throughout the world. This Pentecostal revival was understood to be the last day revival that would precede the second coming of Jesus Christ. During that period, predictions of global fire was the order of the day. However, even though some of these predictions have not come to pass yet, after the hundred (100) years of Pentecostalism and charismatic Christianity they have endured and Pentecostalism remains a significant movement.

Pentecostalism continues to flow rapidly across the world and particularly in Africa. A number of writers have attested to the viability of Pentecostal Christianity, which continues to be popular largely on account of its liveliness in the ways it seeks to mitigate existential developmental realities which particularly in Africa, as an example of the Third World context in which it has flourished (see, Gifford 2004, Maxwell 2006, Kangwa 2016, Kroesbergen 2017, Kalu 2004, Udelhoven 2010, Haar 1992).

5.2.1 An overview on Pentecostalism in Africa

Pentecostalism represents a brand of Christianity that is fast growing in Africa. It is a complex and socially visible strand of Christianity in Africa. There are three streams of Pentecostalism namely, classic/mission, -indigenous/independent Pentecostal -and African Pentecostal/Charismatic churches (see Kalu 2008, Adogame 1998, Gifford 2001).

The growth of Pentecostalism in Africa and the world over is well documented. The current trends of the growth of Pentecostalism indicate that the centre of gravity of this form of Christianity has shifted to African, Latin America and Asia (Amanze 2013; Gifford 1991; Robert 2000; Kalu 2002; Togarasei 2015). The Proliferation of

Pentecostalism in Africa is not a new phenomenon nor is it unique to one region on the continent. It is an experience that is common throughout the sub-Saharan region (Udelhoven 2010). Recent studies indicate that in Africa, Pentecostal-charismatic churches appear to be on the increase (Amanze 2013; Togarasei 2015). The explosion of Pentecostal-charismatic type of Christianity is more relevant today because the phenomenon is not only restricted to the new Pentecostal churches. The spirit of Pentecostalism has permeated into mainline churches (Kroesbergen 2017). Several scholars have studied and written on the “pentecostalisation” of mainline churches in Africa (for example, see Kangwa 2016, Haynes 2015:281, Anderson 2013). Kangwa (2017) notes that in Zambia many mainline churches have been forced to adopt and accommodate Pentecostal-Charismatic forms of worship within their churches (denominations). This situation arises out of a quest for mainline churches to engage with social, political, cultural and economic needs of their members in a way that corresponds to the African worldview.

According to Kalu (2018), many charismatic-Pentecostal types of churches display some features of spirituality that are also exhibited in the African traditional religions. Kroesbergen (2017) states that the spirit of Pentecostalism in Africa appears in different names in different places and contexts. Thus, in order to differentiate Pentecostal-charismatics from the classical western pioneered Pentecostalism scholars categorise this movement by differently, using phrases such as, “Newer charismatic churches,” “neo-Pentecostals,” “newer Pentecostal charismatic churches,” “new generation churches,” while others simply group them together as “African initiated churches” (Kalu 2007; Cheyeka 2008; Gifford 1994; Udelhoven 2010). However, it is important to note that these churches do not use such terms when referring to themselves. They simply refer to themselves as “Pentecostals” and view themselves as being in line with the order of classical Pentecostal traditions. Kalu (2007) observes that many African Pentecostals do not use the term “Pentecostal” either, but they prefer different designations. In Ghana, for example, they call themselves charismatics. Kalu (2007) attributes this to the fact that even though most of African Pentecostal churches are independent from western denominations, most if not all African Pentecostal churches sparked out as charismatic movements in mainline churches and spawned into independent groups. In Nigeria they are called “born again” churches, while in Congo Brazzaville they are referred to as “revival

churches.” Many charismatic Pentecostal churches came out of revival initiatives that characterised the classical Pentecostal and from mainline churches in the 1970’s (Kalu 2007:5). The identity and historical origins of African Pentecostal groups are linked to a trail of fermentations.

According to Gifford (1994) the charismatic movement is the brain child of western right-wing capitalists or neo-colonialists, who have encroached on unsuspecting Africans. Chiyeka agrees with this assertion and further argues that most African charismatic or “born again” churches are influenced by United States of America’s fundamentalists (tele-evangelists). He goes on to say:

[F]rom being solely the product of outside propaganda, or being instigated by alien forces to serve their own game of religious, political and economic domination, charismatic Christianity has found a home in [Africa] because it fits the African worldview.

(Chiyeka 2008:155)

Charismatic churches in Africa have to a great extent derived their features from African traditional cultures (Haar 1992). According to Haar, the features of African traditional religion have been co-opted into Pentecostalism. This can be seen through:

The use of prayers, consultations often through visions and prophecy, the following of ritual practices often linked with prayer and fasting, the importance of reading from the bible and the importance of ritual use of water, such as through baptism and immersion.

(Haar 1992:94)

Because of the infusion of African cultural practices into Pentecostal-charismatic worship, many scholars call this type of Pentecostalism “African Pentecostalism.” In this chapter, we adopt the use of “African Pentecostalism” to refer to the new form of Pentecostal/Charismatic phenomenon that is unique to the African context.

5.2.2 African Pentecostalism

According to Anderson (2001) African Pentecostalism is a strand of Pentecostalism that is built on an African foundation. He notes that African Pentecostalism is largely independent from classical Pentecostalism. This form of Pentecostalism is by and

large attributed to the charismatic revivals of the 1970's revival that rocked many African societies. These revivals came in the form of interdenominational evangelical campus and school Christian organizations. This movement produced young charismatic leaders who later commanded a significant following. Previously these young charismatics operated as non-denominational evangelists, but eventually they developed denominational institutions with structures (Anderson 2001).

However, since the emergence of academic studies on African Pentecostalism, writers and researchers have speculated on the causes of the advent and growth of this Christian movement in Africa. Even though, "literature on African Pentecostalism is relatively vast and growing rapidly, it is, unfortunately, caught in the circle of trying to define what African Pentecostalism is" (Wariboko 2017). However, Wariboko asserts that the

study of this religious movement, then, is not only about African Pentecostalism, but also about Africans bearing witness to their particular mode of being Pentecostal. It tells the story of the multi-directional openness of African Pentecostal social life without applying a constrictive universalizing framework to the fragmentary nature of African Pentecostalism. The movement is an assemblage of practices, ideas and theologies, and interpretations of reality, whose tangled roots burrow deep into the past, present, and future segments of African temporality. African Pentecostalism, like any other human endeavour, is full of fragments, and to understand it scholars must think in parts rather than in unified cultural wholes.

(Wariboko 2017)

Kalu (2008) states that right from the earliest period when Africans came into contact with the gospel, Africans have always strived to appropriate the charismatic aspects of gospel to the African identity. Furthermore, he posits that failure by historians to pay adequate attention to the precedents, historical roots and multi-sites that have given rise to the misrepresentation of facts. Kalu (2008:23) says, "in African Pentecostal historiography we must distinguish between the precedents in the colonial period, 1900 -1960, and the charismatic flares in the independence era, from 1970's forward." Thus, the rise of African Christianity is mainly attributed to the quest for Africans to respond to the inadequacies that were visible in Western pioneered Christianity, which

undermined African culture and identity in its approach. This response happened in three stages as follows:

5.2.2.1 The first response

Kalu (2008) states that the first response to the missionary message is what is dubbed Ethiopianism. This movement “challenged white representation of African values, cultures and practices of Christian faith” (Kalu 2008:24). Furthermore, this movement challenged white supremacy that enshrined white power and monopoly in decision making in the church and society. In short, Ethiopianism gave the impetus to the African people’s desire to Africanise the gospel.

5.2.2.2 The second response

Anderson (2001) states that African Independent Churches’ (AICs) approach and emergence constitute the second response to white missionaries’ approach and message. Within the mainline (missionary pioneered) churches, there emerged charismatic revival movements at the turn of the 21st century, witnessed in almost all missionary pioneered churches, including holiness and classical Pentecostal churches in Africa. Kalu posits that the revivals that rocked most of the mainline churches and classical Pentecostal churches gave rise to the third response of Africans to missionary churches. This was the sharpest response and the one that most flourished. It rose to the greater heights in the 1970’s and is still visible to date. It combines the rise of prophetic spirituality with charismatic movement features.

5.2.2.3 The third response

According to Anderson (2001), the emergence of prophetic figures as a form of spirituality at the heels of white missionaries’ era in the 19th century gave rise to charismatic elements in Pentecostal circles. He further asserts that in Africa, prophets started to emerge and they itinerated from one place to the other reinforcing what was started by the missionaries. This gave rise to indigenous worldviews engaging with charismatic elements of the Pentecostal Christian canon and symbols.

The first people to get attracted to this form of spirituality were the first generation of African university and college graduates. These young people gave voice to a new

brand of Christianity that sought to protect the entrails of indigenous spirituality as trail for appropriating the gospel (Kalu 2008).

Anderson (2001) is of the view that events in the aftermath of the first world war also contributed to the growth of the African brand of Pentecostalism. He argues that Africans in general were unsettled by the events of the aftermath of the war. The following challenges rocked the continent immediately after the war: the influenza outbreak, the intensification of the racial discrimination policies, alienation of African people from their land and the disfranchisement of Africans. These challenges gave impetus to the upsurge of prayer spiritual movements in Africa such as Zionist in South Africa, Aladura in West Africa and Abaroho in Eastern Africa. These churches were committed to actualising African people's agency in the quest for spiritual solutions to the above-mentioned challenges by infusing prayers for healing, indigenous symbols and liturgy in their worship (Kalu 2008, Anderson 2001).

The three African responses to the missionary approach to the gospel shed light on our understanding of African Pentecostalism and its appropriation of indigenous people's worldviews. Kalu (2008) states that the African Pentecostal movement seeks to provide answers for questions raised from the interior of various African worldviews. He goes on to say, those who look at African Pentecostalism with western enlightenment lenses miss several of its nuances. They tend to attribute African people's attraction to this movement to only such things as poverty. However, there is need to understand that many Africans that flock to these churches do not merely go there to seek global cultural flow. The millions of Africans in the Pentecostal movement have encountered a form of Christianity that takes seriously their fears and hopes that emanate from the interiority of their primal worldviews. This form of Christianity better serves the goals of African tradition religions (see Uzukwu 1993, Cheyeka 2008, Kalu 2008).

Gyadu (2013:1) states that "Pentecostalism has emerged as the most exciting and dominant stream of Christianity [in Africa] in the twenty first century." Even though Pentecostalism is a global phenomenon, Africans have innovatively appropriated its spirituality into their contextual needs (Gyadu 2013). Similarly, Kalu (2008:170) argues that African Pentecostalism "has grown because of its fit into indigenous worldviews

and its response to the questions raised within the interior of the worldviews.” Furthermore, he argues that African indigenous worldviews still dominates the contemporary African societies to such an extent that they have shaped African Pentecostalism too.

Uzukwu (1993) asserts that, the major contributions of African Pentecostalism to the African people’s livelihoods outweigh the negatives. For instance, the African Pentecostal movement addresses the reality of the forces expressed in African cultural forms. This stands in contrast with the early classical Pentecostal missionaries’ attitude which was premised on wiping out the African culture by advocating for the rejection of African worldviews. Secondly, African Pentecostalism takes seriously the map of the universe that acknowledges that African cultural practices are both a redemptive gift and capable of being high-jacked (Ukpong n.d). Thirdly, African Pentecostals perceive and acknowledge that African world views and the worldviews of the Bible are alike and they resonate. African Pentecostals thereby appreciate the strength found in the spiritual ecology of Africa (Haar 1992). It is very unfortunate that classical Pentecostal movement looked at African spiritual ecology in a negative way. Their reflections went as far as insinuating that “Jesus has come and Satan has run away⁴”(Haar 1992:223). implying that they brought the good news and all demonic practices (i.e. African cultural practices) were done away with (Ukpong n.d). Contrary to that, the African Pentecostal movement has chosen seeks to explore equivalence, going beyond deconstruction to new construction of reality (Kalu 2007:10). by bringing out the fundamentals of the African and biblical worldviews in the following way:

First, at the structural level, African and biblical worldviews share the cyclical perception of time though the New Testament also contains a linear perception of time. They share a three-dimensional space: the heavenlies, earth (land and water) or in the earth-beneath (ancestral world). Second, both subject manifest events to supernatural causation affirming that “things which are seen are made of things which are not seen’ (Heb. 11:3b) and that conflicts in the manifest world are first decided in the spirit world, therefore, ‘the weapons of our warfare are not carnal”. Third, the biblical worldview is that life is just as precarious as the

⁴ This statement is extracted in one of the popular songs sung by classical Pentecostal churches in Nigeria (Ukpong n.d:9)

traditional African imagines; the enemy is ranged in a military formation as principalities, powers, rulers of darkness and wickedness in high places. The Pentecostal goes through life as keenly aware of the presence of evil forces as the African does. Fourth, evil forces are ubiquitous and possess people and confer false authority. Satan even promised Jesus some of these if he complied. Thus, Pentecostals perceive dictatorial and corrupt rulers as being “possessed”. Fifth, the Pentecostal perceives witchcraft and sorcery as real, soul-to-soul attack. The born-again Christian responds to deliverance ministries because witchcraft and demonic oppression are taken seriously by Pentecostal preachers and to prosperity preaching because these are the reasons for visiting the native doctor or the Aladura prophet. Thus, the elements of African Pentecostalism that are strange to the Westerner could be explained from the cultural discourse.

(Kalu 2002:110-137)

Ukpong (n.d) argues that the attempt to decolonise Christianity in Africa with aim of making it an authentic faith encounter in local contexts, has enabled independent Pentecostal churches in many African societies to be considered vanguards of consciousness. Uzukwu observes that:

The political and liberation ring of popular religiosity in Africa has been maintained from the time of the emergence of independent churches. Being a product of the social, political, economic, and religious revolutions in colonial Africa, they cannot be excluded with a wave of the hand as simply the emergence of the irrational; they fully form part of the solution to these problems. Some of these churches separated from the parent missionary churches either because of the racist discriminatory policies of the missionaries or because of the insufficient attention paid to the African spiritual, human, and cultural values.

(Uzukwu 1996:27-28)

Hexham and Hexham (2003:230) argue that “initially [Pentecostal] churches reacted against both political and social discrimination, but they rapidly outgrew the negativity of protest to develop rich theologies that emphasise healing and the gift of the holy spirit.” One of the characteristics of Pentecostal churches is their emphasis on prayer in the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the growth of Pentecostalism in Africa is arguably attributed to the hardships and experiences of Africans between 1980’s to 1990’s due

to world economic recession that severely impacted on African countries. This situation contributed to the Pentecostal spiritual consciousness in many African societies. During this period African states saw a rise in the disease burden and mortality rate. The poverty levels in most countries rose to unbearable levels. These pervasive conditions were attributed to demonic forces and witchcraft. Hence, prayer was seen as the answer for combatting these challenges and evils (Hexham and Hexham 2003).

When African prophets came on the scene in the late 1980's leading to 1990's they spoke to these needs from the depth of their own religious consciousness. These prophets converted a lot of people to their kind of spirituality (Cheyeka 2008). These prophets put much emphasis on dreams and visions. Healing and exorcism are understood as the consequences of the divine intervention through prayer. These prophets strongly preach that God reveals his plan to those who pray and God empowers them with spiritual gifts (Hexham & Hexham 2003).

5.3 BRIEF PERSPECTIVES ON THE PRESENCE OF CHRISTIANITY IN ZAMBIA

According to Sakupapa (2016:133), in Zambia, Christianity is a representation of different "Christian expressions ranging from "mission" Christianity⁵ of the mainline churches to African initiated churches and Pentecostals. Each of these represent different varieties." Baur (2009) states that the decisive move to bring the gospel to the Zambian mission field came through the Scottish explorer and missionary David Livingstone during his missionary journeys in Central Africa after which a host of missionary societies followed in his footsteps. Livingstone's activities in Africa covered the period from 1849 to 1873 when he died. Baur (2009:194) further notes that "[Livingstone] did it without help from his European colleagues, but in close cooperation with his African brothers." Livingstone's missionary approach applied the famous "three C's missionary concept" of the early 1860s. In that view, mission was the introduction of Christianity, Commerce and Civilisation.

⁵ By Mission Christianity Sakupapa means the churches that were established by white missionaries from the Europe and America in the 19th and 20th centuries.

The London Missionary Society (LMS) was the first organisation to establish a mission station in Zambia. It was based at Niamikolo, close to Lake Tanganyika in 1883. Numerous London Missionary Society mission stations were later built throughout the northern part of the country. Part of the reason for the rapid spread of mission stations was the acceptance of missionaries among some of the smaller people groups of the northern region of Zambia (Musonda 2003). They perceived that the, “missionaries... would provide effective protection from more powerful tribes and tyrannical chiefs” (Kangwa 2017:1). Other mission organisations followed the London Missionary Society’s example and they established their presence in other regions of Zambia. They include the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society (PEMS) led by Francis Coillard who established the first station at Lealui in 1884/5. The Primitive Methodists who worked among the Ila people in Western Zambia (Kangwa 2017). The Church of Scotland (Presbyterians) established stations at Lubwa and Mwenzo in 1829 and 1894 respectively. They were led by David Julizya Kaunda⁶, who was sent by the Church of Scotland missionary society, and who had already established base at Livingstonia in Nyasaland (Malawi) as an evangelist in 1894 (Kangwa 2017:1). The “Catholic Church [is] by far the most influential denomination,” in the nation. It was established by the White fathers in 1894 among the Bemba speaking people. It later spread to other parts of the country. The first Anglican mission station began in 1911. This was established at Msoro by Leonard Kamungu, a priest from Malawi. This was followed by the emergence of the Watchtower Movement in Zambia. The Lumpa Church, an indigenous church, was established in 1954 by Alice Mulenga Lenshina-Lubusha from Kasomo village near Lubwa Mission in Chinsali District of the now Muchinga province of Zambia. It quickly spread to the whole of Northern, Eastern and Copperbelt provinces. The United Church of Zambia (UCZ) which is the largest Protestant church in Zambia, was formed in 1965 as a result of the union of Church of Central Africa, Rhodesia (a mission work of the Church of Scotland), the Union Church of Copperbelt, the Copperbelt Free Church Council, the Church of Barotseland and the Methodist church (Musonda 2003). Kangwa (2017) states that Missionaries with a Pentecostal background came into the country around 1940. This movement was pioneered by the classical missionary Pentecostal churches mainly from United States of America.

⁶ David Julizya Kaunda was later ordained and became a minister in the church of Scotland. He was the father to the first republican president of Zambia Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda.

Pentecostals with charismatic background appeared in the country around 1960's. During this period, the country started to experience the rise in Pentecostal spirituality. Around 1970's to 1990, the charismatic movement showed its presence. It is generally agreed that this movement was precipitated by Pastor Billy Graham's visit in 1967, and was later fuelled by Chiluba's declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation in 1991 (Cheyeka 2008).

Zambian Christianity is generally organised in the form of church "mother bodies", which represent various member churches in matters of public interest in the country (Gifford 1998). These church mother bodies are sometimes referred to as umbrella bodies. They are, namely, the Zambia Conference for Catholic Bishops (ZCCB), which was established in 1963 as Zambia Episcopal Conference (ZEC). ZEC is the administrative body of all ten Catholic dioceses in Zambia.

The Council of Churches (CCZ) in Zambia was established in 1945 as the Christian Council of Zambia. It acts as a link between its member churches and outside ecclesial bodies like the World Council of Churches (WCC) and All Africa Council of Churches (AACC). The member churches of the CCZ are all mainline churches in Zambia, The Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia (EFZ), established in 1964 is the mother body for all evangelical churches in Zambia and para-church organizations of an evangelical nature (EFZ 1998); while the Independent Churches Organization of Zambia (ICOZ), established in 2001 as an umbrella body for charismatic churches in Zambia (Cheyeka 2008).

5.3.1 The presence of Pentecostalism in Zambia

According to Kaunda (2017), Pentecostalism has been in existence in Zambia since the mid-1940s. However, its presence was only felt at around 1980. And its growth has been attributed to the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation in 1991. Since the declaration, the country has witnessed unprecedented growth of Pentecostalism (Gifford 1998, Haar 1992,2004, Kaunda 2017, Kangwa 2017, Cheyeka 2008). Kaunda (2017) observes that around 1980, Pentecostals in Zambia only accounted for 5 percent of the total population of Christians in the country. The 2010 census report indicates that Pentecostal followers make up approximately 23.6 percent of the Christian population in Zambia (CSO 2010). If we include charismatic Christians in

mainline churches to this statistic, they would account for almost half of the population of Christians in Zambia, as 49.6 percent of the Zambian population subscribe to Pentecostal-charismatic Christianity. Based on that, we can conclude that Pentecostalism represents the character of Zambian Christians.

Scholars of Pentecostalism suggest that while there is plenty of writings on Pentecostalism in many parts of Africa, the history of Pentecostalism in Zambia has received little attention in academia. There is minimal scholarly works on the historical development of Pentecostalism in Zambia (see Cheyeka 2008, 2005, Kaunda 2017, Haynes 2012 and M'fundisi 2014, Sakupapa 2016). Chiyeka, a Zambian theologian, asserts that anyone who attempts to search for relevant information on the new churches (African Pentecostals) they search in vain (Chiyeka 2008). Another Zambian theologian, Kaunda argues that those who have tried to give an account of the historical development of Pentecostalism in Zambia, have done so from sociological, anthropology and religious studies perspectives rather than theological ones (Kaunda 2017). In that regard, Gifford and other pioneers of the study of the development of Pentecostalism in Africa are classical. They do not specifically address the development of Pentecostalism in Zambia per se, but Africa as a whole. Gifford, in his book, *African Pentecostalism*, has dedicated a chapter to the influence of African Pentecostalism on Zambian politics since 1990. While Haar (1992) in her book *The spirit of Africa: the healing ministry of Archbishop Milingo of Zambia* has demonstrated how the charismatic movement and renewal from the west has been infused into African spirituality in Zambia. Haar and Ellis in their book. *Worlds of spirits: Religious thought and political practice*, have briefly touched on the influence of Pentecostalism on politics in Africa. Lindhardt (2014), in his article entitled, *Introduction: presence and impact of Pentecostal/Charismatic Christianity in Africa*, explores the impact Pentecostal/Charismatic Christianity has had on the growth of Christianity in Zambia. Phiri (2003) in her article entitled, *President Frederick J.T. Chiluba: The Christian nation and democracy*, looks at the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation and how this phenomenon has contributed to the proliferation of Pentecostalism in Zambia. Burges (2014) examines the contribution of Pentecostals in the second and third "democratic revolution" in Zambia and Nigeria and further looks at the influence of Pentecostalism on the political culture and changing church-state relationship, political theology and practice.

Cheyeka (2008) argues that due to lack of adequate material on the development of African Pentecostalism in Zambia, most of writings in this domain that have appeared in the last decade take a cue from the events that surround the post declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation by president Fredrick Chiluba. However, many of these writers forget the fact that African Christianity has a long history of dynamic religious movements, many of which had greater impact on the political land scape of the country (Udelhoven 2010).

Kaunda (2017) gives a vivid and detailed historical and theological historical development of Pentecostalism in Zambia. He categorises these developments in four phases which he calls “the four waves diffusion of innovative historical development with each wave overlapping with the others” (Kaunda 2017:110). His approach goes beyond western historians of Pentecostalism who restrict the historical development of Pentecostalism to three waves only, that is classical, charismatic and African Pentecostalism. According to Kaunda, the Zambian context provides a totally different case study because the development of the phenomenon has taken a different trajectory. He outlines the four waves as follows:

The first wave eruption. The original wave of classical Pentecostalism which started in Azusa and was brought by [white] missionaries in Zambia did not result in contextualization, dynamism, innovation and expansion of Pentecostalism.... The second wave begins with the mainline churches seeking renewal from within. The third wave was an urbanized phenomenon initiated by indigenous ministers; most of them were either classical secessionists or born again in the period most of the indigenous clergy in classical wave [or] within the wave were also born again. The fourth wave comprises prophetic movements, which have functioned in the way the charismatic movement did in the mainline churches as renewal movements within Pentecostalism. These tends to reject hegemonic clergy dominance, reinterpret certain Christian claims and insist on the pastors unlimited access to God.

(Kaunda 2017:117)

Kaunda (2017) notes that the waves of Pentecostalism development outlined above, did not progress in linear fashion. There are significant overlaps among them. In this

chapter, we focus our attention on the third and fourth waves. The two waves are combined for the purpose of this study and are together termed African Pentecostalism. Sakupapa (2016:113-14) aptly adds nuance to the term when he observes that “associated with the proliferation of [African] Pentecostalism in recent times, is the emerging of dominance of prophets as a popular category of religious functionaries within Zambian Christianity.” African Pentecostalism as referred to in this study is therefore a form of spirituality that brings on board both Pentecostalism (Charismatic) and African traditional spiritualities, in which the third and fourth waves that Kaunda outlines, overlap.

Udelhoven (2010) states that since 1990 new churches (African Pentecostals) have proliferated in Zambia. And he says that in describing this situation many Zambians speak of “mushrooming” of churches in the country, signifying that these new churches are multiplying. This description is a contextual figure of speech derived from the abundance of mushrooms that spring up after the first rains and continue throughout the rainy season. In the same way, churches have multiplied, seemingly from nowhere.. However, it is important to note though, that the churches that have mushroomed in Zambia have traceable origins.

In his analysis of the explosion of African Pentecostalism, Mbefo (1992) observes that there is dissatisfaction among members of missionary churches in Africa. He identifies inadequate liturgical ceremonies to meet the religious yearning of Africans as a significant factor in the rise and explosion of African Pentecostalism. Furthermore, Mbefo says:

Members of mainline churches’ expectations from their churches were not met. The missionaries of the older churches failed to address the type of questions the African situation raised for them; witchcraft, demon possession, haunting by evil spirits, the cult of ancestors; the rise of protective charms, talisman; sorcery and the tradition dancing from worship at the shrines. The tendency among the missionaries was to dismiss the questions due to ignorance arising from pre-scientific mentality.

(Mbefo 1992:109)

This general dissatisfaction gave room for newer religious experiences, which promised to give answers to many of the African questions. Cheyeka (2008) argues that in the Zambian context, Pentecostalism is not solely a product of western influence. This form of Christianity has been partially instigated by the mere fact that it fits in with the African worldview. Haar puts it this way:

[African Pentecostal] churches derive specific features from African culture. These include the use of prayers and consultations often through visions and prophecy, the following of ritual practices often linked with prayer and fasting, the importance of reading from the Bible, and the importance of the ritual use of water, such as through baptism by immersion.

(Haar 1998:94)

The foregoing, among others, are the reasons that Zambians were receptive to Pentecostalism in the 1970's and 1980's. At that time people were passing through many burdens of life for which they sought explanations from the metaphysical realm, since they tend to attribute their hardships to the evil forces (Haar 1992).

This kind of spirituality is now attractive to members of mainline churches, classical Pentecostals and the general populace in Zambia for obvious reasons as Kroesbergen (2017) notes. That spirituality continues to be compelling to people and many continue to change their church affiliations like they are changing clothes (Kangwa 2016, Kroesbergen 2017, Cheyeka 2008, Haynes 2015). The most interesting part of the explosion of Pentecostalism discourse in Zambia, is this phenomenon is not only restricted to newer churches and ministries. It has also spilled over into mainline churches. Kroesbergen (2017:2) observes that:

The same spirit of neo-Pentecostalism transforms existing churches also ... intending to keep members from leaving the missionary established churches ... mainline churches [in Zambia] saw themselves forced to adopt and accommodate to the spirit of neo-Pentecostalism within their own denominations as well. They found themselves challenged to engage with the social, cultural, economic and political needs of the people in the way that correspond to the African worldview.

(Kroesbergen 2017:2)

The exact time the African Pentecostalism movement emerged in Zambia is not precisely known. Cheyeka (2008:149) argues that “it is incontestable that the seed of the movement was sown as early as 1967 in Kitwe [district], where Billy Graham, an America Pentecostal televangelist held a seven-day crusade which attracted over 28,000 people.” From that time Christians in Zambia, charismatics adopted practices which later characterised the spiritual revivals of the 1970’s (2008). Cheyeka posits that in the 1970’s the country experienced a distinct form of religiosity distinct from that which came with the white missionaries. He says:

The central theme for the period was the widespread formation of charismatic churches of “born again” churches as they were popularly known in Zambia, and the breakdown to some degree, the Christian and religious unity.

(Cheyeka 2008:144)

Cheyeka (2008) concludes that between 1960 and 1970 the Scripture Union (SU) movement laid the foundation for neo-Pentecostalism in Zambia. It is through such movements that young and ambitious “born again” Christians emerged and went to form their own ministries/churches.

However, Kaluba (2015) attributes the rise of African Pentecostalism in Zambia to the revival that was ushered into the country by the famous German’s Christ for All Nations evangelist Reinhard Bonnke who conducted crusades in 1981 and 1988 which attracted approximately 10,000 to 12,000 people per day in Kitwe. Kaluba (2015) asserts that Bonnke’s missionary works opened for an influx of Pentecostal/Charismatic missionaries, especially from the United States of America, who were sent by Pentecostal/Charismatics to Zambia. Kaluba further says:

The emphasis on the miraculous and an acknowledgement of the impact of the spiritual realm on the physical world resonated with the youth who saw the routine lack lustre church services complete with hymn singing as boring. On the other hand, the new way of praying was zealous almost fanatical as it was characterised by speaking in tongues, lively singing, casting of demons and loud prayers.

(Kaluba 2015)

Chalwe (2008:12) argues that “the rootedness of [African] Pentecostal churches in Zambia is, for the most, part a gratifying worldview of the recipients of the message and not necessarily a tribute to the triumph of American missions.” In other words, the growth and acceptance of African Pentecostalism can be attributed to the contextual adjustment of spirituality to resonate with the Zambian way of life. Kaunda (2017) observes mainline churches like the Roman Catholics, United Church of Zambia, Dutch Reformed and Anglican churches and others were too rigid and resistant towards Pentecostal spirituality while they held on to Eurocentric church canons and doctrines. The Eurocentric spirituality had replaced African worldview inspired spiritualities, which mainline churches refused to incorporate into their Christian faith practices. For example, classical Pentecostal missionaries came into Zambia with much more openness to the African spiritual reality as opposed to the mainline churches’ missionaries. It is for this reason that classical Pentecostal missionaries started to slowly appeal to most citizens who were still functioning in a neo-primal worldview (Tembo 2012). As a result of this , around 1989, Zambia experienced a Pentecostal revolution, with a number of young people opting to conform to this type of spirituality. This form of spirituality was “nationalised, contextualised and populised and became a rapidly expanding phenomenon” (Cheyeka 2008:162). The declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation in 1991 made the presence of Pentecostal spirituality more visible in the political arena.

The kind of spirituality exhibited by the second republican president Fredrick Chiluba contributed to a greater pentecostalisation of Zambian Christianity. Since 1991, life in Zambian politics, traditions and culture and many other spheres have been permeated with religious overtones of a Pentecostal nature. Since 1992, every social, political, economic and other public meetings in Zambia are opened and closed with a prayer. Furthermore, Christian labels and slogans permeate daily speech and ordinarily conversations in the country (Kyambalesa 2010). Muntanga (2016) posits that due to the Pentecostalisation of Zambia, it is now difficult to distinguish between what is secular and sacred in the country.

5.3.2 Chiluba and the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation

President Fredrick Chiluba converted to the Pentecostal brand of Christianity in 1991 from the United Church of Zambia. At the time of conversion, Zambian Christianity

went through a Pentecostal/Charismatic transition that saw many churches, mainline inclusive, incorporating Pentecostal spirituality into their mode of worship (Mukuka 2014). Phiri (2003:407) points out that it was a “Swedish woman who prophesied over Chiluba that he was going to be the leader [in Zambia], but he did not take this seriously.” Another prophet, Kabalika, also prophesied the same words to Chiluba. In charismatic circles the two prophecies were understood to be a clear confirmation that God indeed was calling Chiluba to be the head of state, because in charismatic/Pentecostal understanding, the testimony of two different people is considered to be a confirmation of God’s will (Phiri 2003). At this point Chiluba started considering the matter seriously. In his statement declaring Zambia as a Christian nation, he acknowledged that he had made a vow privately after the prophecies, that, if indeed he was chosen to lead the nation of Zambia, he would give the country to God (quoted in Phiri 2003).

Njovu (2002) observes that Chiluba’s way of doing things and especially his spirituality reveals a pattern that suggest that Chiluba appeared like a person who was strongly convinced that he was chosen and appointed by God to lead the nation Zambia. Nothing could obstruct him from attaining that goal. During his presidency, Chiluba always punctuated his speeches with the mention of the name of God. According to Njovu (2002), this was more or less like a ploy to validate his strong claim and conviction that he was “Chosen by God.” His disposition reveals that Chiluba intended to dominate politically through the use of Christian religion. Christianity provided Chiluba a common language that he could use to persuade unsuspecting Zambians to accept him as a God given president. Mukuka (2014) asserts that Chiluba was easily accepted because many Zambians were swayed by his rhetoric that was characterised by the mention of the name God.

5.3.3 The declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation

Calls for the declaration of Zambia a Christian nation were heard from long before Chiluba actualised it. During the 1990 constitution review when the government of Dr. Kenneth Kaunda sought to ascertain whether Zambians wanted to revert back to multiparty democracy, the Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia (EFZ)⁷ through its

⁷ EFZ is the mother body of all evangelical and Pentecostal (mostly classical) churches in Zambia

executive director, pastor Joseph Imakando submitted that the country should be declared a Christian nation. The EFZ did not necessarily give details of what compelled the fellowship to make such a request. However, the recommendation did not go through (Times of Zambia, 24th February 1991).

The second call for the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation came through pastor Nevers Mumba, founder of the Victory Ministries International (VMI). Mumba's church is also a member of the Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia. He is one of the first renowned and influential televangelist that Zambia as ever produced, and who went on to become republican vice president. Mumba issued a statement, while preaching on his popular programme "Zambia shall be saved" aired on the public television, Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation (ZNBC). He called for Zambia to be declared a Christian nation. In justifying his statement, he used the increasing number of Moslems in the country as a scape goat. He claimed that the increasing population of Moslems in the country posed a danger to the Zambian community and Christian faith. He further claimed that Muslims were planning to take over the county (Njovu 2002). According to Mukuka (2014) it is statements like Mumba's that induced an anti-Islamic attitude in many Zambians. And he further says that "this led to a marriage of convenience between the religious right under the faith umbrella of Pentecostalism and charismatics and political right wing under the leadership of Chiluba" (Mukuka 2014:34). This partnership helped Chiluba to win elections in 1991 with a landslide victory (Times of Zambia, 9th March 1991). Immediately after taking over as a head of state, his government sought to correct all the mistakes the previous government had made. According to Phiri (2003), Chiluba promised to take Zambian governance to another level. At his instigation, Chiluba's government adopted "exclusivist non-participatory political discourse and religious freedom of all Zambians" (Phiri 2003:407). It was at this point that Pentecostal pastors and "born again" leaders in his government started pushing for the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation. Gifford (1998) claim that the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation somehow is a brain-child of Brigadier General Godfrey Miyanda and pastor Mbita Kabalika. The two started advocating for the declaration immediately the MMD took office. However, the national tone of lobbying for the declaration was already set discussed above. The declaration was finally actualised on 29th December 1991 when Chiluba stood alongside Miyanda, while addressing a group of Pentecostal pastors on the pillars of

state house (Olsen 2002). Thus, from that moment Chiluba as alluded to earlier, started using key biblical references and prayers at every function as a way of legitimising the declaration. This elated many Pentecostal/charismatics, while Christians from mainline churches and other religious groups were more cautious.

Njovu (2002) states that Chiluba used Pentecostalism in his political career in order to further his objectives. This was solidified and cemented by prominent televangelists from the United States of America. In the first place, Chiluba invited Ernest Angiley who conducted crusades and prayers in Zambia and on his return visit, he endorsed Chiluba as the chosen one and God-ordained to lead Zambia. Secondly, he invited Benny Hinn, who upon arrival in the country also endorsed him as the chosen one to lead the country. Hinn further pledged to raise campaign funds for Chiluba for his second mandate. During this period many Pentecostals in and outside Zambia rallied behind Chiluba, they considered him their hope in spreading of their brand.

Chiluba's political strategy contributed to what we see in Zambia today. His ploy to marry religion (Christianity) and politics has made the country become a very insensitive society where people no longer respect freedom of choice regarding religion and political affiliation (Komakoma 2008:114). For example, people who do not support the call for prayers by the government in power are labelled anti-Christians or pseudo Christians. For example, during parliament session, current republican vice president Inonge Wina labelled all those who did not attend prayers and fasting on 18th October 2018 as anti-Christ (Times of Zambia 19th October 2018). When Chiluba was voted chairperson of the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) party his supporters in this quest were mainly "born again" political conservative Christians (Mukuka 2014). We can see clearly from examples above that the pentecostalisation of the Zambian politics has alienated many Zambians who belong to other faiths and those who chose not to have anything to do with religion. Such people are alienated from taking part in the governance system of the country, even though the constitution of the country does not bar them from doing so.

5.3.4 Position of African Pentecostals on the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation

The response from the Pentecostal/Charismatic Churches to Chiluba's declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation is well documented. As it has already been emphasized in this chapter, the decision by Chiluba to declare the nation Christian, was influenced by the prosperity gospel that was spread by the conservative Pentecostal and Charismatic Churches, mostly from America (Gifford, 1995). Phiri (2003:407) argues that when the Christian nation declaration was made "... in the Pentecostal circles, especially the Northmead Assembly of God, were very happy about it because they saw the rule of God coming to Zambia through Chiluba." Unfortunately, those who supported the declaration saw themselves as the true Christians and those who did not were seen as the enemies of the Government and therefore pseudo-Christians" (Phiri, 2003:408). Pentecostals and Charismatics in Zambia have always argued that the procedure of the declaration did not matter, nor did the character and motive of the person who made the declaration. For them, what was important was putting God above everything.

Most Zambians and non-Zambians who belonged to Pentecostal and Charismatic churches abhor the pluralist theory that that all religions lead to salvation (Idowu, 1970 and Mbillah, 2004) although Zambia has been a plural society since independence. With the Christian nation declaration, religious freedoms were threatened as those that went against the declaration such as the mainline Churches and others were regarded as pseudo Christians. The Pentecostal and Charismatic support of the Christian nation declaration forced Zambians not to debate the issue, because it was based on one person's religious convictions (Gifford, 1995). Lack of debate on the Christian nation declaration limited the scope for theological reflection to discuss and reflect on the issues with regard for appreciation of diversity, healthy debate and creative tension (Stone and Duke, 1996).

5.3.5 African Pentecostalism and politics in Zambia

African Pentecostalism is one of the social movements growing at a fast rate in Zambia. Historically in Zambia, the allure of political clout in Pentecostal/Evangelical circles came to the fore during the build up to the multiparty elections in the 1990s. African Pentecostals, became highly political during president Chiluba's reign and they

have remained so even after his death. Their uncritical loyalty to the government of the day is visible (Cheyeka 2008). M'fundisi (2014) argues that Pentecostals are late-comers to Zambian politics. She goes on to say, prior to the 1990's Pentecostals lacked commitment towards politics. She attributes this inertia to the approach and attitude that Pentecostals had towards secular politics. Pentecostals (classical) generally advocated for a clear separation between the state and the church. They looked at politics as non-spiritual and worldly activity that would pollute the spirituality of a "born again" Christian (Kaunda 2017).

However, African Pentecostals have come on the scene with a different approach towards secular politics. Gifford (1998) says the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation appears to have given leverage to African Pentecostals to participate in politics. As argued above, it is generally agreed that Pentecostals are the ones who influenced Fredrick Chiluba to declare a Christian name. Among the leaders were, Bishop Joe Imakando, Pastor Nevers Mumba, Bishop Joshua Banda and many more. Since, then a number of Bishops and pastors from Pentecostal churches have been appointed to various government portfolios. For example, during Chiluba's reign, there was a minister of religious affairs portfolio at state house. While in President Lungu's government a Pentecostal pastor has been appointed minister in charge of the Ministry of Guidance and Religious affairs.

Kaunda and Kaunda (2017) argue that in Zambia, Pentecostalism plays a noticeable role in the political arena. In modern Zambian society, and politics specifically, Pentecostalism has become a force to reckon with. It is for this reason that every politician who is serious about winning elections strives to appeal to the unsuspecting Christian fraternity. And Pentecostal churches and pastors are usually the target by these politicians. Zambian Pentecostals position themselves as chief architects and guardians of spiritual matters. As such during national events that are political in nature, they always take a leading role in organising and participating. For instance, during elections many politicians frequent churches and in most case Pentecostal churches receive more political visits than mainline churches. Most of the leaders in these churches relate at personal level with politicians and these kinds of relationships give politicians leverage and access to their would-be voters.

Furthermore, in their approach to politics, Pentecostals use the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation as justification for a close relation between the state and the church (Kaunda & Kaunda 2017). Kaunda and Kaunda (2017:126) observe that “the declaration function as a national foundation for Pentecostals and populist politics in contemporary Zambia.” As such, Pentecostals have often used the declaration as a vehicle for championing their biased political positions. One of these biased positions they champion is that only a Christian is supposed to be the head of state. Unfortunately, most politicians in Zambia follow suit and tend to use the declaration as a campaign tool. For example, during the 2016 elections which were caused by the demise of the then president Michael Chilufya Sata, in his quest to become the head of state Edgar Lungu paraded himself as a “born again” Christian. He always appeared at worshiping places holding a Bible or in a praying posture (Kaunda & Kaunda 2017). And his campaign team and image builders posted pictures of him on social media and newspapers in that posture. And these pictures made him popular among unsuspecting Christians. Pentecostalism in Zambia has a strong inclination towards political views and they often swing the vote and manage to get politicians into office (Kaunda & Kaunda 2017).

5.3.5.1 Advantages of African Pentecostal participation in Politics in Zambia

Hinfelaar (2009) states that Christianity in Zambia has played a major role in shaping institutions and culture since the arrival of white missionaries in 19th century. It is generally believed that right after independence in 1964, Zambia was established as a Christian state by the first republican president Kenneth Kaunda. Since that time Christianity has remained part of the political history of Zambia. However, Phiri (2003) asserts that it was the second republican president Fredrick Chiluba who formally integrated Christianity into politics by declaring the country a Christian nation. It is important to note that the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation has not been fully accepted by everyone in the country. There are still misgivings about the declaration of a Christian nation amongst the citizens in general and in the church. Many people and scholars alike, believe that the declaration was not done in good faith. For instance, church mother bodies like Zambia Conference of Catholic Bishops (ZCCB) and the Council of Churches in Zambia (CCZ) from the onset objected to the declaration and argued that “a country cannot become Christian by declaration, but by people’s deeds” (Komakoma 2003:263). Some scholars have labelled the declaration

as an empty policy, that lacks fundamentals to enable the country introduce new substantive laws to help overcome the challenges that are pervasive in the country such as rampant corruption, nepotism, dictatorship, human rights abuse, breakdown of rule of law, neo-colonialism, social injustices (see Cheyeka 1998, 2008a, 2008b, 2016, Komakoma 2008). Kaunda and Kaunda (2017), however, believe that Pentecostal scholars, have looked at the impact of the declaration in a different way. They argue that scholars and churches that have labelled the declaration empty have not looked at the positives that the policy has brought in the country. They single out the fact that the policy has “presented to the country a distinctive form of political theology which has subjected the whole nation to Pentecostal “born again” theology and resistance to the influence of Satan in the life of the nation through spiritual warfare.” (Kaunda and Kaunda 2017:296).

5.3.5.2 Disadvantages of African Pentecostals participating in politics in Zambia

Pentecostalism brings to the fore various faith expressions, which have raised issues about orthodoxy in many African societies like Zambia. To this effect one would describe the movement as problematic. As Uzuoku observes

Sometimes one hears that religion has become a disease in Africa, that religion is an obstacle to the development of the continent. Some allege that right from the time of slavery to our own day, the African religious vision of the world substitutes escapism for facing the social, political, and economic challenges of the continent. The enslaved blacks in America developed the Negro spirituals as a means of carrying their burden without being liberated from it, without even knowing that heavy hands were unjustifiably laid on them. The poor in Africa pour into independent churches, healing homes, sects, and charismatic groups and delight in highly emotional or culturalist liturgies in order to drown their pains in the irrational/emotional instead of questioning the very structure which produce such pain or oppression

(Uzuoku 1996:26)

This situation remains a strong point of contention for Christianity and its relevance in Zambia. Scholars like Kalu have attributed this unfortunate situation to failure by mainline churches pioneered by white missionaries to incorporate Christian principles that are culturally liberating and anthropologically enhancing and religiously fulfilling in

African societies (Kalu 1998). According to him this omission contributed to the lamentable effects of African Pentecostalism in many African societies. He observes that:

A significant aspect of the nineteenth century was that as missionaries sowed the seed of the gospel, Africans appropriated it from a primal, charismatic world-view and read the translated scriptures in that light. Indigenous agencies recovered the spiritual resources of the gospel and challenged missionary Christianity to be fully biblical. This set the stage for the decolonization process that followed the world wars. New forces such as the implosion of the state challenged the heritage of African Christianity; and the collapse of the dictatorial states and attendant poverty probed the tensile strength of the church's stewardship. Inexplicably, charismatic and Pentecostal spirituality resurfaced to provide the energy for growth and sustainability in the midst of hostile circumstances.

(Kalu 1998: 11)

According to Freston (2001:23), overwhelming empirical evidence shows that, the pentecostalisation of Zambian politics has not translated into religious accountability. There is no obligation on the part of public officials (government officers) to account for their social behaviour towards promoting common good. Instead, the pentecostalisation of the country has contributed to the creation of an elite system of control that is in conformity with religious beliefs and practices about the source of power and authority to shape political leadership. For example, the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation is a product of Pentecostal theology which always associates every human problem and solution to the spiritual rather than moral forces. Thus, solutions to such challenges are always sort from the spiritual remedies rather than best practices (Kaunda 2018). It is for this reason that whenever the country is faced with challenges politically, economically and socially, instead of looking for pragmatic solutions by probing issues of governance and economic systems, leaders run to spiritual remedies. This is because pragmatic remedies are always labelled and perceived as anti-God and that they pose a danger to spiritual welfare (Kaunda 2018). For example, the ascension of the current president Edgar Chagwa Lungu to power after the demise of his predecessor Michael Chilufya Sata was surrounded by controversy and factionalism within the ruling Patriotic Front (PF) party. Lungu was

adopted as the presidential candidate after the intervention of Bishop Joshua Banda, a pastor of the Northmead Assemblies of God⁸ (Dairy Mail 21st December 2014). Lungu emerged victorious in the presidential bye election that the opposition disputed as rigged. When he took office, the country experienced economic challenges that resulted in the devaluation of the local currency (Kwacha) against major convertible currencies. In order to arrest the situation, president Lungu called for National prayer and fasting on 18th October, 2015 (Munshya 2015). During prayer and fasting, Lungu re-affirmed Chiluba's declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation and added in his declaration that "Zambia shall be set free from dark forces of evil" and he later gazetted 18th October, as a public holiday on which Zambians should pray and fast for the country (National Day of Prayers 2015).

Furthermore, the president ordered for the construction of the national Tabernacle house of prayer as a way of actualizing the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation (NHoP 2016). Lungu appointed Bishop Joshua Banda as chairperson of the advisory Board for the construction of the National House of Prayer, with a number of Pentecostal clergy as members of the Board. The only exception are two who members from the Roman Catholic church and United Church of Zambia respectively (Dairy Mail 4th December 2015). This has contributed to the partisan stance that many Pentecostals have taken in the country. For instance, during the 2016 general election campaign period, there was a group of Pentecostals who came up with a campaign team they called "Christians for Lungu". The aim of this group was to use church platforms to campaign for Lungu to retained as president as a 'reward' for his open declaration about Christianity (Lusaka Times 3rd March 2016). The group leader Dr. Liya Mutale openly declared that:

The assignment [we have] is from God, the devil and his agents are going to fight but we must remain resolute and focus on the mission⁹.... Lungu deserves our support, he has reaffirmed the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation,

⁸ After the demise of the then head of state of the republic of Zambia president Michael Sata, succession wrangles emerged. This led to the creation of two PF factions within the party; one group followed the acting Dr. Guy Scott who was the vice president and acting head of state at the same time. While the other faction wanted Edigar Lungu, party general secretary to take over. When the party was at the verge of entering into a serious crisis Bishop Joshua Banda of the Northmead Assemblies of God intervened and reconciled the two warring parties.

⁹ This statement was made in response to the people who were opposed to the idea and motive of forming such a group.

declared a day of national prayers and fasting, as if that is not enough, he leads the way in building a tabernacle for the worship of God. We have no choice, but to support him, God's hand is clearly evident in all he does.

(Lusaka Times, 3 March 2016)

Despite the main opposition, the United Party for National Development (UPND), which condemning the formation of such a group, they in turn followed suit later. A Pentecostal pastor of the City of Refugees and other ministries organised prayers for the United Party for National Development president Hakainde Hichilema, which they dubbed as "thanksgiving prayers" following the release of the Hichilema from prison¹⁰ (Lusaka Times, 24 August 2017). These Christians groupings were created for the purpose of praying for their respective political leaders. They later on engaged in cold war, in which any defamatory statements against either Hakainde Hichilema or Edgar Chagwa Lungu were echoed back. For instance, those who supported Lungu describes Hichilema as a Satanist and an anti-Christ (Lusaka Times, 1 September 2015), whilst those for Hichilema branded Lungu a drunkard and a visionless person (Lusaka Times, 19 November 2014).

It is believed that it is the Pentecostals who helped Lungu to win 2016 general elections. In appreciation, Lungu created a Ministry of Guidance and Religious Affairs and appointed a Pentecostal pastor, Godfridah Sumaili, from Bread of Life Church International as cabinet minister in charge of the ministry (Diggers, 4 September 2017). The creation of the ministry coincided with the opposition party's petition against the presidential election results in the constitutional court . Lungu won 50.3 percent votes and Hakainde Hichilema, the closest rival got 47.6 percent. The United Party for National Development claimed that the election was rigged, hence the petition to call for a recount of ballot papers (Lusaka Voice, 19 August 2016). Thus, Lungu argued that in such a situation it was imperative that a ministry in charge of national guidance and religious affairs was necessary. He felt that the ministry would help in operationalising the Christian nation values and practices (Dairy Mail, 8 November 2018). Mainline churches, mainly Roman Catholics and member churches

¹⁰ The UPND leader was incarcerated for a treasonable offence after failing to recognise Lungu as the legitimate president. And he was accused of planning to kill the incumbent president.

of the Christian Council of Zambia objected to the idea of creating a ministry in charge of religious affairs and describe it as unwise and unnecessary. In a statement Zambia Catholic Conference of Bishops President Archbishop Telesphore Mpundu and Council of Churches in Zambia president Rev. Alfred Kalembo said that “they neither see the creation of the said ministry as a top priority nor a prudent decision further expressing their belief that Zambians want their country to be a democracy rather than a theocracy.” Furthermore, these church mother bodies reiterated that there were more challenges facing the country than increasing the size of Cabinet (Zambia reports, 21 September 2016). They also felt that matters of religion were better left to the religious institutions rather than in the hands of the state. And Part of the pastoral statement states that:

We believe that as churches and other faith communities, we have thus far been able to exercise our God-given mandate and meaningfully contribute towards national development without having such a ministry.... We believe that the common denominator and our mutual rallying point between the Church and the State is that we are both concerned about the common good and the well-being of God’s people. As such, we see the need for the two to trust each other, engage in genuine dialogue and work as partners in promoting the development of its peoples, especially the poor.

(Zambia reports, 21 September 2016)

However, Pentecostals churches affiliated to the Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia (EFZ) and Independent Churches organization of Zambia welcomed the move (Zambia reports, 21September 2016).

The strategic partnership between Pentecostals and successive governments in Zambia, has led Pentecostals to behave as though they own the presidency. Pentecostals in Zambia have had unlimited access to public resources under government control since the time of Chiluba (Njovu 2002). This approach has ushered in a totally different kind of church state relations. Previously Pentecostals advocated for a total separation between the state and the church. They looked at politics as worldly activities that should not be mixed with sacred matters, but after 1991 the scenario changed. Today Pentecostals in Zambia have changed the expression, they now advocate for a tolerated direct involvement of the church in

politics (Njovu 2002). Political parties too, have compromised their position on church state relations. For instance, the Movement for Multiparty Democracy in their manifesto (1991) they stated that “there should be a separation between the church and the state, but they compromised this stance for expediency (MMD Manifesto 1991). The patriotic Front and the UPND and other parties, during the campaigns for the 2016 general elections, all equally promised to maintain the preamble of the Zambian constitution which states that “Zambia is a Christian nation” and asserted that that they would work closely with churches.

From the foregoing, we can clearly see that Pentecostals in Zambia have sought to transform the political psychology of the country by promoting what Kaunda refers to as “Pentecostal moral sensibility and political imagination” (Kaunda & Kaunda 2017:). Van Klinken (2014) argues that Zambian Pentecostals are particularly serious in influencing public discourse and defining the national agenda and identity. Kaunda and Kaunda (2017:296) supports this argument by observing that Zambian Pentecostals “have taken on a form of militant theo-political activism underpinning the search to pentecostalise the nation without regard to religious pluralism.” Pentecostals in Zambia have literally taken political engagement at a much higher level by seeking to influence politics through media, parliament and other government institutions, rather than using pulpits and prayers (Bombani 2016). This has rendered many Pentecostals in Zambia critical yet partisan in their approach. Pentecostals now, tend to regard any state action or gesture as God’s action. For example, when the ministry of Guidance and Religious Affairs was created, the gesture was understood as the gift from God. And when Lungu was voted into office, they understood his victory as the working of God (Daily Nation, 30th October 2015). And when they prayed and fasted for the economy on 18th October, 2015 and the currency posted positive gains, they understood it as God having answered their prayers (Mwebantu.news 8th September 2017).

Scholars of African Pentecostalism have posited that African Pentecostals have only one agenda in African politics and that is the promotion of a theo-political imagination (see Kalu 2018, Maxwell 2006, Marshall 2009, Van Klinken 2014). And through this agenda, Pentecostals seek to create several different theological paradigms in their political engagement (Wariboko 2012). This is evident from the way Pentecostal

pastors portray themselves in the political arena in Zambia. In most cases, they present themselves as the final arbiters of what ought to be done in the country. Munshya observes that:

Pentecostal church leaders in Zambia are almost unanimous. They will heed President Edgar Lungu's call to prayer, fasting and reconciliation on Sunday, October 18, 2015. Bishop Johnny Kaweme of the Fire Baptised Church released a statement on 11 October 2015 stating that, "it is our considered view that the National Day of Prayer, Reconciliation and Restoration as called upon by our Republican President be observed by all our churches." Capital Christian Ministries International president and founder Bishop George Mbulo quoted 2 Chronicles 7:14 and requested that "all peace-loving Zambians who love the Lord and believe prayer answers all things, to a special National Day of Prayer and Fasting Service, to be held on the 18th of October as declared by our Republican President his excellence Edgar Chagwa Lungu." Gospel Envoys Church leader, Pastor Choolwe stated emphatically that, "we encourage all to know that we will unwaveringly support any public nationwide recognition of our Lord Jesus Christ by any government both now and in the future. Political affiliation of governing authorities is inconsequential to the basis for our stance; we are Jesus driven." Bishop Safwali and countless others have echoed similar sentiments. There is a general consensus among Pentecostal believers that Zambia needs to pray and President Lungu has decided correctly to call for a day of prayer.

(Munshya 2015:1)

Ukpong (n.d) observes that in African Pentecostalism some of the charismatic leaders or pastors tend to exercise power in a tyrannical and dictatorial way. This creates a kind of serfdom and harem around these pastors. The situation tends to transform the spiritual hunger and desire for God in many unsuspecting Pentecostal faithfuls into religious enslavement. These pastors may use their excessive power to threaten members with curses. Their followers become their victims who believe that a separation from their "feudal holds" is an automatic malediction (Ukpong n.d). Uzukwu agrees with Ukpong's when he states that the "charismatic [leaders/pastors] appear to be very conscious of their power...a power which is often times maintained through the exploitation of the superstitious and irrational, of which distressed faithful are easy victims" (Uzukwu 1996:123).

Munshya (2015:2) observes further that when they make such threats to unsuspecting Christians these pastors forget that the church and indeed the Pentecostal/Charismatic fraternity is diverse. People under the constitution of the land have a right to make choices. Munshya (2015) blames this kind of attitude and approach on the political theologies held by some Pentecostal pastors that makes them insensitive to the reality. It is for this reason that Munshya is convinced that “[Pentecostal] theology must be informed by equality and the respect for human rights, [and that] Pentecostal political theology must be based on hard work and a commitment to the rule of law” (Munshya 2015:2).

The statements and political position taken by some Pentecostals in Zambia clearly show how divisive and divided the church is in the country. Pentecostals have become the mouth piece of the political parties and king makers instead of playing a prophetic role as is expected of the church. They are no longer the voice of the voiceless nor the moral conscience of society. Instead they have turned themselves into political cadres. Martin Luther King jnr. once remarked that “when the flag and the bible start flying together, know that one will influence the other.” In this case, it is the church that is being influenced in a bad way. Given the influence that Pentecostals have in Zambia, even some mainline church leaders and faithfuls have been influenced to speak, think and act like Pentecostals. For example, when opposition leader Hakainde Hichilema was incarcerated on alleged trumped up charges, church mother bodies (ZCCB and CCZ) issued a joint pastoral statement to denounce the stance taken by the state and they categorically stated that the country was in a crisis¹¹. However, the bishops of the United Church of Zambia and the Catholic Church distanced themselves and their respective churches from the joint statements, citing lack of consultation by the top leadership of their respective church mother bodies (Tumfweko 19th July 2018). Bishop Alick Banda of Ndola then, contradicted the statement by declaring that there was no crisis in Zambia. This statement was in line with the statement that was issued by the government in response to the pastoral letter. Banda called upon politicians in the country to focus on developing the nation instead of politicking. He asserted that “Elections are over and political leaders need to respect

¹¹ This was in reference to the incarceration of opposition leaders and other political leaders for failure to accept the 2016 elections results as genuine; economic challenges, violence perpetrated by ruling party cadres and many more (Tumfweko 19 July 2018).

the outcome of the courts regarding the August 11, 2016 polls”¹² (Tumfweko, 19 July 2017). On the other hand, bishop Sydney Sichilima of the United Church of Zambia-synod said that his church would not allow any person speak on its behalf concerning matters of national interest. He said,

The church as its own consultative process. Thus, on the said joint pastoral letter we were not consulted.... [the current position of the UCZ is that] for now we are praying for peace of the nation. For the unity of the nation. We should be One Zambia, One nation. We pray that God himself bestows peace on this nation.... we need to respect the structures of the nation.

(Tumfweko, 19 July 2017)

5.4 CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have discussed the background and growth of global and African Pentecostalism. This chapter has shown that the growth of Pentecostalism in many African societies and particularly in Zambia, has been necessitated by many factors namely; changing social atmosphere in many African societies, the poor economic situation and many more. Thus, African Pentecostalism’s stress on the role of the Holy Spirit and prayer as links to the metaphysical realm, have attracted many Africans to this brand of Christianity. The chapter has also sought to analyse the presence, role and impact of Pentecostals in the Zambian political arena. In this case, we have argued that African Pentecostals’ engagement in politics has been fuelled by the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation by President Chiluba. Since the declaration was made, the country has witnessed the uncritical loyalty to the government by Pentecostals to alarming levels. This has greatly impacted on the country’s democratic dispensation.

Furthermore, in this chapter, we have shown both the negative and positive impact of the Pentecostalisation of politics in Zambia. And that the negative impact outweighs the positives. In the next chapter, we shall look at how African Pentecostal preachers read and interpret scriptures that seem to have political connotations such as Romans

¹² UNPD appealed against the constitution court ruling on the 2016 general elections; the court dismissed the petition on a technicality; the constitution clause on this matter says “a petition must be disposed off within 48 hours” now due to many factors the lawyers representing the UPND failed to present the matter within the stipulated time and the court dismissed the matter and ordered for the inauguration of the president elect -president Lungu.

13:1-7 and how they appropriate them in the Zambian political context and how such interpretation impacts on the democratic process of the country.

Chapter 6

Preachers from the African Pentecostal Church in Zambia's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter, we analyze findings from the interviews of African Pentecostal preacher's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 in two basic sections. In the first section, we look at how African Pentecostal preachers of the gospel in Zambia interpret and understand the text. We note their broad and nuanced understanding of "Submit to the governing authority" (Rm 13:1) by noting the similarities and differences in their emphases. In addition, the preachers' interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 as gleaned from the interviews this researcher had with them are examined¹³ using enchanted worldview model discussed in chapter 3. In the second section, we employ enchanted worldviews and field consciousness¹⁴ as analytical tools to ferret out the inner logic behind the praxis of African Pentecostal preachers. We also ask the question of its relation to patron, client relations and brokerage.

African Pentecostal preachers in the general sense approach the interpretation of a text with lenses of their particular worldviews. These worldviews are anchored in African traditional religions' views of God. The description in Chapter 4 of this study of the advent and growth of African Pentecostalism in Zambia, i has shown that this form of Christianity understands political authority beyond what missionaries (classical) who brought Pentecostalism had taught. For one, Pentecostal missionaries never considered African traditions favorably. They looked at whatever was from the African culture as demonic and evil. Secondly, Pentecostal missionaries never anticipated the church-state relationship that African Pentecostal churches in Zambia promote today.

¹³ The researcher had interviews with preachers (mainly ministers) of the gospel across the denominational boundaries of African Pentecostal churches. These focused interviews were held with Bishop Kaunda Lembalemba the overseer of the Eleventh-Hour Ministries church; Pastor Gerald Muyawala of the Winner's Chapel; Bishop Dr. Edwin Silavwe of the eternal Glory church; Pastor Joyce Namakau from Dunamis Fire Impact church; Bishop Dr. Jennipher Mucheleng'anga of the Energema Ministries International.

¹⁴ "Enchanted worldview" and "field consciousness" were introduced in Chapter 3 of this study and some of the concepts discussed there shall be applied in this Chapter.

Structurally, the discussion of the survey findings will include a general introduction of each preacher in terms of conversion experience, ministerial and secular training/education, emphasis of ministry, understanding of “submit to the governing authority” (Rm 13:1), interpretation of Romans 13:1-7, appraisal of preachers’ interpretation and a general appraisal.

6.2 KAUNDA LEMBALEMBA

Bishop Kaunda Lembalemba is a senior pastor of the Eleventh-hour Ministries in Zambia. He was born in 1948 in Luwingu district of Zambia, at Kalundu mission of the Brethren in Christ. His parents were members of the Brethren church and he grew up in the same church. Upon completion of education, he joined the mines where he worked as a senior staff before he stopped to enter politics. He served as a Cabinet Minister, Government Chief whip in parliament and Member of Parliament for fourteen years under the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) government.

Bishop Lembalemba understands himself as someone who was born to become a servant of God. In infancy he was sickly. He recounted that as he was growing up, he suddenly developed a bloated tummy. He reminisced, “Mum was crying and praying, asking why God did you give me this son with such a condition. The devil really wanted me to die. God sent a white missionary to the hospital who operated on me.”

It was at the age of ten that he started winning souls for Christ. At the age of twenty he studied for a Certificate in Christian Gospel Studies by correspondence with the University of London. In 1990, Bishop Lemba-Lemba saw that things were not going well in the Christian Brethren Church. Around that year, he recalls how one day, as he read the Bible, he heard the voice of God telling him to form a ministry. He asked God what he should call the church. The word of God said to him that the church shall be called Eleventh hour Ministry. He proceeded to register the church, which he, of course, acknowledges was accomplished by a miracle. At that time, the government of the republic of Zambia had stopped registering churches. However, Bishop Lembalemba had what he termed a breakthrough. The Bishop has undertaken theological studies to master’s degree level with an American Evangelical University. However, Bishop Lembalemba strongly asserts, “despite all these studies I have in religious studies, I think all these [studies] do not matter in God’s work. I sorely depend

on God to give me a word to preach. One day when I went to church with a written sermon, I lost the sermon and God talked to me to preach out of Isaiah 43; I stood and preached. Wow! It was amazing how God used me and touched lives.” Bishop Lembalemba believes that the Lord circulates messages that people ought to hear from his throne on the particular day.

6.2.1 Bishop Lembalemba’s interpretation of Romans 13:1-7

6.2.1.1 The Purpose of Romans 13:1-7

According to Lembalemba, Paul wrote Romans 13:1-7 in order to address the misconceptions which prevailed within the Jewish community regarding submission to those in authority. Below are the excerpts of the interview.

The misconception which was there among Israelites at a time they were expecting the messiah to come and redeem them [from Roman rule]. Their understanding was that the messiah was to come and redeem from the powers of the Romans.... [because of] this impression some of them started refusing to honour those who were in government. [this is evident from] the book of Jude, I think 4:4 or 6, where is saying (author) there are people who have clipped into Christian faith; those are the people who were telling people not respect the authorities, not to respect authorities (his own repetition) these are people who are not speaking the true gospel of the Lord and the mind of the Lord. To be honest, this is an eye opener, and once we have people who are God fearing, once we start fearing the authority we will grow, probably some more 20 steps upwards and we are not going to be what we are, we are going to be real children of God, the Lord God almighty.

Bishop Lembalemba seems to understand the text in a literal sense. He does not bother to go into the whole business of exegesis. According to him, he applies the word of God as it appears in the bible. Additionally, before interpreting any biblical text, he awaits upon the Lord to reveal the right interpretation. Lembalemba does not believe in scientific analysis of the word of God.

6.2.1.2 Romans 13:1-7: an instruction from God

Bishop Lembalemba, in his own understanding of the phrase “submit to the governing authority” (Rm 13:1) says,

This [text] is an instruction that we need to submit to those in authority or rather that we should start respecting those in authority. This respect must be accorded to whoever is chosen to be a leader; “whether you like [him/her] or not, give [him/her] respect.”

6.2.1.3 Leadership comes from God

According to Lembalemba people must submit to those appointed or elected to rule because all authority comes from God. Lembalemba strongly believes that those who are not chosen by God cannot attain leadership. For him, it is only those who are appointed by God who can attain power. Thus, he posits that,

If you are not chosen by the Lord [God] you cannot come to the throne ... for instance, here in Zambia the person (republican president) who is there I know him personally, but I have to respect him. It is a fact that.... I know that, they (current regime) are making some mistakes but [I] cannot stand on the pulpit and insult them [chosen rulers] but if need be I can say [advise that] if my brother did this and this we can be a better nation.”

6.2.1.4 God appoints leaders, even bad ones

As mentioned above, Bishop Lembalemba strongly believes that, every leadership is ordained by God for the good of the subjects. Thus, even if a leadership is tyrannical or has come to power by usurping power, for him all that accomplishes God’s purpose. In justifying his position, he argues that, in most cases, such unfortunate appointments (of tyrants) are perpetrated by people’s lack of judgement;

[sometimes] We do not even look at that person [vying for political office] *aaah* if he [/she] can be the better person or rule, does he[/she] have the fear the Lord? God can as well put a person who is not a Christian in the position of authority, so that he can do bad to the Christians.” But these others [tyrants and those who usurp power] I am very sure that they were put in their positions by the devil.

Furthermore, Lembalemba posits that there

are times when God will punish Christians, there are times when someone I know have a lot of experience. Someone is not a true believer, and the Lord may know that this one is going to cause havoc. He may allow that person to go through knowing that if he doesn’t go through there will be very big trouble. But, [in such situations] the Lord knows how he does [things]. He knows how

he deals with situations like that. But, at a given time he brings someone who he thinks is much better, just like he did with Saul and David.

6.2.1.5 God influences elections

Bishop Lembalemba suggests that God has a say on who should be elected or appointed in any position of leadership. He argues that God appoints leaders or rulers for the good of their subjects. For example, he says that

[The Zambian republican president] was the chosen of the Lord at that particular time. All those who stood [against him]. All those who were vying for the position of president [in the last elections], in one way or the other they were not fit in the eyes of the Lord. And God chose the gentleman [president Edgar Lungu] to be the president, so let us give him respect, up to the time the Lord will say it ends [your mandate] here and someone will take over.

In this regard, Bishop Lembalemba recalls how he heard the voice of the Lord telling him that, he was going to be appointed a cabinet minister, and how in that encounter God revealed to him what he was going to accomplish in that particular assignment.

If the Lord said to me, I am going to put you [in the Cabinet], he didn't say I will tell the President to put you there. He said I am going to put you in that position. Why should I doubt the Lord especially in the country where people have been calling themselves Christians? and the Lord knows that this country is mine. Israel did not choose God but God chose Israel. God did not choose Zambia, but Zambia chose God. So, it is very important to know that if [one] pretend to know God and probably [pretend to say] the Lord chose us, while we know that behind [that pretense] there is something that we do that is anti-God; [such people] do not stay long in power.

6.2.2 Appraisal of Bishop Lembalemba's interpretation of Roman 13:1-7

Bishop Lembalemba is not out to do an exegesis of the text, in terms of its literary or social cultural context. However, the bishop has taken heed of the theological meaning of "submit to the governing authority" as stated in the text. He understands that all forms of authority emanate from God. His understanding of the text is based on the literal interpretation of Romans 13:1-7. Of note is that, even though he claims to be a

trained Bible student, he seems not to believe in scientific interpretation of the scriptures. He asserts that,

when it comes to reading and interpretation of the bible I consider myself a primitive person, I am not like these self-styled theologians.... I surely depend on God to give me what to say or word that I should preach.... God gives me messages [whenever I need to interpret a particular text]

For Lembalemba, it was God's act of "revelation" that caused him to understand Romans 13:1-7 in new light. However, the way he uses the "we/the" categories in the interview appears to imply that his rereading of Romans 13:1-7 did not take place in isolation. It appears that there is a group of fellow readers who have come to the same conclusion as he has. He unconsciously mentioned two of them during the interview when he said, there were two people who aspired to be members of parliament, at the time he was chairperson of the MMD party of the Copperbelt province. The two went to seek his approval as a man of God. Lembalemba recounts that,

these people prayed long prayers and they made me believe them that God had chosen them to take up those portfolios [and not the other aspiring candidates]. And right away I recommended them to the party because we [the MMD] wanted the reins of government to be entrusted in the hands of Christians ... we wanted] Christians to have a big stake in the government system [of Zambia] as opposed to what was obtaining [in the past regime] where most of the people [who were in authority] were pagans or half-baked Christians

Another group of "the others" identified are those who believe in God's intervention in human affairs like former president of Zambia, the late Dr. Fredrick Chiluba. Dr. Chiluba publicly announced that God had instructed him to declare Zambia as a Christian nation. According to Lembalemba this gesture shows that God chose Zambia among all nations. He also claims that God appointed him to be a cabinet minister before the president decided. He recounts that one-day God appeared to him and told him that he was going be appointed to the ministry of Energy and God gave him assignments to be accomplished. Later on what God had told him came to pass. For Lembalemba God appoints leaders to accomplish certain duties. He argues that, even those who are elected are only elected because God chooses them and that God therefore influences the minds of the electorate to vote for a candidate chosen by God.

He goes on to say, there are times when God allows even evil people to rise to power. There many reasons to why God would do such a thing. For instance, when God knows that if a particular candidate loses elections there will be turmoil, God will intentionally let the evil person go through in order to maintain peace.

6.3 PASTOR GERALD MUYAWALA

Pastor Gerald Muyawala is one of the youth pastors of the Winners Chapel, Zambia church. He is the pastor in charge of the Kaunda Square Chapel in Lusaka. He was brought up in a Roman catholic family where he served as an altar boy. He had a desire of becoming a priest, but his father and mother objected to the idea. According to pastor Muyawala, while he was still pursuing this dream, he had an encounter with the Holy Ghost which ministered to him and told him that he could not become a priest. On 13th of October, 2010, he attended Pastor Adeyepo's (Nigerian-founder of Winners Chapel) crusade which was held in Lusaka-Zambia:

When the man of God was ministering, he ministered and ministered. One of the words he said, he said that you can be coming to Church but if you are not aligned with Jesus if you have not received Jesus as the Lord and your personal Savior, there is nothing that you get out of it. So, give your life to Jesus. If you are a sinner, in as much as you come to Church there is nothing that God can hear from you, it is only a prayer of repentance that you need, come! to him you need to submit. I said God this word I have never heard before and he said that if maybe if you are doing wrong things, you are doing wrong to your wife, and to your parents to your siblings it doesn't count as long as you are doing it wrong to God is a sin you must repent. On the same night I gave my life to Christ on the same night 13th of October, 2010. I then came for believer's foundation class-Winners chapel-Lusaka on Monday that was on the 17th of October, 2010. Then On the 18th October 2011, I was baptized at adventure city.

Pastor Gerald Muyawala was trained at the Word of Faith Bible Institute (WOFBI). During his time at the Institute, he became convinced that he was called to ordained ministry. He recounts that;

During my days in the Bible Institute I was seeking God, I wanted to know more about God, I wanted to know more about God (repetition). Our resident pastor Kinsley Mweneumo, during the service, preached a message which made me

see something God was showing me in a room, a very big room there were a lot of people. There was a very different type of people, different types of people lame, white, black, then I was asking myself God what is this thing? Why are you showing me these things? And then Behold I heard something in my heart, this is your ministry by one man's disobedience many were made sinners but by one man's obedience many will be made righteous. So, you must preach the word of God, the word of obedience to people the more you preach it the more people will be turned to righteousness. People will obey God, the more they obey God they will reach their destined place their glorious place. So that's how I came to understand Gods calling me to minister his word. The specific word called me to preach was the word obedience. And he gave me a scripture Romans 5:19.

Pastor Muyawala is confident that the word he heard from God is still being fulfilled in his ministry. He has served in three branches of Winners chapel in Lusaka, namely, Mandevu (under a senior pastor), Chelston and now he is in charge of Kaunda Square.

6.3.1 Pastor Muyawala's interpretation of Roman 13:1-7

6.3.1.1 God appoints leaders for the purpose

In his interpretation of Romans 13:1-7, Pastor Muyawala begins by stating, "God is not the author of confusion and in anything that God does there is a purpose." As such, according to him the reason to why Paul wrote the text (Rm 13:1-7), was to remind his would be readers or recipients that

God knew that the earth without leadership or rulership, it (the earth) was going to be something else, that is why he instituted a government or authority to guide and help people. This is the reason why we must submit and obey the governing authority. Why? Because it was initiated by God. God is the one who established the Governing authority. We cannot say we obey God, when on the other hand we fail to obey the governing authority, then that will be tantamount to be lying to us and God. We must first love what God loves, if we don't love what God loves, then we cannot obey our Governing Authority, but by being obedient to the governing authority, our submission to it, it is showing to God that indeed we love God and we are in support of everything that God does.... This is because authority never came by itself it was God who instituted [it]. Anyone who rebels to the governing authority, he is doing it to the Lord. He is not doing it to the

government but he is doing it to the Lord, because the governing authority is subject to the Lord. Without the Lord, this thing (governing authority) was not going to be there. God knows that man without guidance, without someone ruling or seeing over him can go wild [astray]. There is a penalty for everything we do. If you do not obey or submit to God, there is a reward, there is a reward which one must get.

For pastor Muyawala anyone who fails to obey God's commandment given through Paul would face punishment. He looks at God as the source of authority and the one who has direct responsibility to appoint leaders and rulers. In his interpretation of the text, he does not pay any particular attention to the source of the text. The intentions of the author and the context in which a text was meant to be applied are secondary. The pastor simply recites the exact words of the author with a few additions.

6.3.1.2 Romans 13:1-7: an instruction from God

According to Pastor Muyawala, Paul's statement "submit to the governing authority" (Rm 13:1) is an instruction primarily from God and not necessarily from Paul. He posits that human beings do not see God directly, but they see God through his word (Bible). Thus, he is of the view that

'submitting to the governing authority' ... means that we cannot submit to the Lord if we cannot submit to the governing authority. We must submit with everything that we have because, 'submit' in my own understanding [as used in the statement- 'submission to the governing authority'] also means submitting to the Lord. You cannot manage to submit to the Lord [who you do not see] if you fail to submit to the governing authority which you see. So, you must first submit to the governing authority, our submitting to the Lord is never complete if we do not submit to the governing authority. This is because we are able to see those in authority, but we are not able to see God, we see God via the word. So, it is much easier for us to submit to the people that we see, to the governing authority that is in place which we can see because it is an obvious thing, it is an obvious thing (repetition).

6.3.1.3 God appoints leaders, even no- Christians with a specific mission to achieve

According to pastor Muyawala, God appoints leaders for a specific purpose. He believes that when God appoints leaders, he expects such leaders to lead their subjects to a specific destination. Muyawala argues that

The Bible says God does not call them to leadership in order to persecute people, to lead people to starvation, to stagnation, no, they are called to do something to help people. There are leaders who are called [appointed] by God who are not Christians but they are called [appointed by God]; they may not necessarily be Christians but they are called [appointed by God] to be leaders. God puts in them some level of leadership.

In pastor Muyawala's interpretation and understanding of Romans 13:1-7 we can see that he holds a conservative view. He holds that authority emanates from God and that the word of God as it appears in the Bible and it has no human element. It is purely the word from God directed to his people. Hence, pastor Muyawala asserts that failure to heed and apply the word literally, in one's lives attracts God's wrath.

6.3.2 Appraisal of Pastor Muyawala's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7

Pastor Muyawala argues that the hinge on which the text rests is that "God is not the author of confusion." It is in this regard that God in the beginning decided that human society shall be governed by human authorities. God established human authorities for society to live in harmony. Pastor Muyawala's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 is perhaps not a well thought out exegesis of the text, nonetheless it reflects his understanding of the text. His pleas for people to submit to the governing authority centers on God being the initiator and appointer of those who assume power regardless of the means. Muyawala postulates that God knew that without guidance those exercising authority among people would go astray. Just like in the case of the Israelites, God gave them ten commandments as a guide, so today God has given rulers to be the guiders.

The Winners Chapel to which pastor Muyawala belongs, is not known to critique political situations of the country or the status quo. Rather, his church's programs are usually well attended by politicians and the elites of the Zambian society. Positing that

God appoints all authority and that all people must submit to every authority, failure to which will attract a curse from God suggests a causal relationship. It makes any preaching of holiness hollow in the face of the massive self-aggrandizement of many politicians (those in power) and people in the positions of authority. This suggests an uncritical acceptance of leadership or authority and it smacks of naivete, as if there were righteous means to getting power. This stand-point pacifies the conscience of those in authority, leaving them with no sense of obligation to right the wrongs in society or to alleviate the sufferings of the masses. One wonders how the majority “the ruled” who are members of this congregation or church feel when listening to such kind of interpretation? Rather what they hear is that you

must stay in obedience, you must submit to the.....rules of God. Every delayed obedience is disobedience. So, if they [those in authority] are telling us to do something by way of instructions we must obey and if we fail to submit it amounts to disobeying God and God will bring a curse or punishment upon us.

6.4 BISHOP DR. EDWIN SILAVWE

Edwin Silavwe is the Bishop of Eternal Glory Church. Before he became a Bishop, he had been called into ministry for a long time already. His professional background is that of a school teacher. He first trained as a primary school teacher and later upgraded to secondary school after studying for a diploma in Mathematics and Geography at the University of Zambia in 2000. He then pursued theological studies with the Monrovia church's Theological College in Tanzania from 2002 to 2006. He graduated as the best student and in the same year of his graduation was elected as the General Secretary of the synod of the Moravian church in Zambia. He was General Secretary from 2006 to 2010 after which he was appointed and served as Chairperson of the Monrovia Church from 2010 to 2011. While he was serving as Chairperson, there were wrangles over leadership in the Church. According to Dr. Silavwe, a group of people were in contention for leadership against him. Thus, he gave up leadership as a result of the issues and misunderstanding. He subsequently left the church, with people who were interested in his ministry as way of setting himself free. He narrated:

That is how we left the church, as a family and with my family and with the people who were interested in my ministry, we started Eternal Glory Church in 2013. For I to start the people whom we started with 5 pastors who were with me, from there after a year we had election where they elected me as a Bishop of the

Church. So, from 2013 up to today we have 5 branches in Lusaka, we have 2 branches in Kabanana and also Kabangwe where we are. We also have a branch in Chipata, we have a branch in Kitwe and also in Nakonde. As at now we have a membership of close to a thousand, we are registered and we are under Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia, our mother body.

Dr. Silavwe is fully convinced that his calling is from God and affirms that “God calls us so that we can serve his people. And in my background before I became a Pastor, I experienced a call of God and I served people of God in different capacities.” His calling is from God. God called him to serve people. He served in many positions in the Moravian church as a lay leader before he received a calling to serve as minister of the word and sacrament in full time ministry.

6.4.1. Romans 13:1-7: An instruction and order from God

Bishop Dr. Edwin Silavwe understands Paul’s text in Romans 13:1-7 as a set of instructions and as an order from God, given to Paul’s recipients with regard to how they ought to respect those in authority. He says, “This is an instruction from God to his people on how they are supposed to regard those in authority.” Dr. Silavwe asserts that

[This is] an order that is set, so this is the standard which is there ... [set] for us to submit and give allegiance to the governing body. If we follow [this] standard.... If we follow that standard it will help us and it will shape the generation to come, it will shape families to come it will shape the communities. in order to avoid injustices that [are] obvious in our society today, we need to put the right [kind of] leadership and the right people who will avoid [indulging into] in issues [injustices] that confront humanity. Authorities that exist have been established by God. So, it means [that] in Paul’s context [this is to say] there will be leaders, and there will be followers. So, as followers we should always obey the leadership but not in impunity or in a punitive way, but as an ordained system which is there when the Bible is talking about marriage set up it says a woman should submit, before submission there should be love, so when there is love then there will be submission. If there is no love there will be no submission. And in this case when the authorities do what is expected of them they execute their plan, they organize people, they give people what is

due to them, then members will also submit, and they will actually follow what the authorities are talking about. God has ordained it. If God has ordained a system, God is omnipotent, he has all the powers. He is omnipotent; he knows our minds and he knows what is before us. So, he will look at the situation and because he is God you may try to argue here and there but he has a way of doing it. Because he is God.

6.4.2 Authorities are established by God

According to Dr. Silavwe all forms of authorities are established by God. He says, the authorities that exist are established and that whoever rebels against the authority is rebelling against the institution that God has instituted and those who do that they bring themselves on judgment. Now as the matter of fact we have to realize that whatever is given on earth ... realizing that before we were born (digresses) in Jeremiah 1:5 the Bible says, before we were born God knew us that we should be leaders or not, [from this text we can see that] whatever we do is planned by God. So, as we grow whether in the church or other government institutions.

6.4.3 God appoints leaders for the purpose

Dr. Silavwe is of the view that God chooses leaders for specific purposes. He says, God has a way of doing things, realize that when God has put a system there is a reason that everything is there for a purpose, when the children of Israel saw that the leadership that God had put for them, was not pleasing for them, they wanted their own leadership in the name of King Saul, what were the results, their programs were so disorganized and disoriented. And we saw the collapse of the kingdoms later on, until God put the right leadership. So, when somebody is not doing his part God has a way of removing such people. Because God sees in the future, God sees what is expected of them. For every leadership is for a purpose. All those people realizing that in every situation, whether political or church leadership, God has a purpose for a particular group of people, and a purpose for a particular time. For example, in our country [Zambia] we had the leadership of [Dr. Kenneth] Kaunda who was our first [republican] President and when things were not going on well we brought in [Dr. Fredrick] Chiluba to revive the economy and liberalize the economy. So,

everything has a purpose at that particular moment as long as we follow our laid down procedures realizing that we do not have to bring in selfishness.

6.4.4 God Influences election of leaders

Dr. Silavwe believes that God has a hand in the election of leaders into political office. He posits that,

[if we] follow the constitution of the particular country like in our country [Zambia, the constitution stipulates two] five years.... [terms for political office thereafter] somebody else is elected depending on the will of the people, because God speaks to his people in that way according to the context which is there.

In Bishop Silavwe's view, Romans 13:1-7 is a set of instructions from God to humanity. This is so because God knew at creation that for human society to live in harmony, there ought to be leaders and subjects. Thus, God interferes in human activities especially where ascending to leadership position of authority is concerned. God intervenes in this process at all levels. Hence, it is expected for the subjects to respect and submit to whoever is appointed or elected to lead them, as all leadership and authority is ordained by God.

6.5 PASTOR JOYCE NAMAKAU

Pastor Joyce Namakau is one of the senior pastors of the Dunamis Fire Impact church in Zambia. She is currently the chief administration officer of the entire church. Currently she is also the minister in charge of the Lusaka main branch. The interview with her was done in two phases. The first day I introduced the study to her. She showed willingness to participate, but due to her busy schedule, she opted to give answers in the written form. Below is the exact response that the researcher collected from her.

6.5.1 God has ordained all forms of power

Pastor Namakau, in her written submission, interprets Romans 13:1-7 as follows:

This passage addresses everyone as long as they are [human beings] that they were created by higher powers, that power is God Almighty. Therefore, people need to believe in him because he has ordained all the powers. For the kings, the chiefs, the Presidents, the Government name it, are all ordained by the

Almighty God, whether good ruler or bad or tyrant. We therefore should all recognize earthy headship for it all comes from above. Ezekiel 26:7 says “For thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, a King of Kings from the north, with horses, and with chariots and with horsemen and companies and much people.” In this passage, we see the Lord speaking through his prophet Ezekiel warning the children of Israel over their sin that he is going to bring a leader over them to punish them for their sin against the Lord whom they were supposed to believe, and fear, as the word of God states that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. Leadership is from the LORD in whatever form the word of God commands us to pray for those in leadership. But as a believer, we have to exercise our faith by pleasing God by honoring [and submitting to] those in leadership, because if we despise those in power, and disobey the law they have put in place the result will be punishment. Jeremiah 28:14 – “for thus Saith the Lord of truth, the God of Israel, I have put a Yoke of Iron upon the Neck of all those nations, that they may serve Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and they shall serve him, and I have given the beast of the field also.”

6.5.2 God influences leadership

According to pastor Namakau, God warned the children of Israel over their sins, through the prophet Ezekiel, that he was going to bring a leader to rule over them as a way of punishing them for their sin. So, for Pastor her,

God always influences leadership, we see in the book of 1 Samuel 10:1, when King Saul sinned against the Lord and the Lord tore the Kingdom of Israel from him and he instructed the Prophet Samuel to go and anoint the next King of Israel and they lined up the children of Jesse, starting from Eliab whom even the prophet Samuel thought was worthy to be a King, but the Lord rejected him, and all his other brothers except one who was not even on the line, but was out tending his father’s sheep in the bush, and yet the prophet said they were not going to rest until he comes, but David was chosen by God as evidenced by his coming and the anointing ceremony was successfully conducted. Yes, even in the case where a nation is at war, the Lord God Almighty will always influence the outcome of leadership. Yes, even in today’s elections God always has a hand

in them, not only in country's elections, but even in branch elections, the Lord ordains leadership.

6.5.3 Authority comes from God

Pastor Namakau understands the statement "submit to the governing authority" as an acknowledgement to the fact that all authority comes from God. Below are her arguments which the researcher teased out from her written sermon.

Paul's statement, "Submit to the Governing authority" means acknowledging any form of leadership, be it the community, the country, the province, the Chiefdom, the Church, the cell¹⁵ and many more. In some cases, no matter, how ruthless this type of authority maybe or ... dictators inclusive, all these are part of the plan of God. When the LORD Jesus walked on earth, tax collectors (governing authority) came to him asking him whether Jesus was paying tax to [the Roman government]. The Lord's ways are higher than our ways, therefore, the simplest thing to do therefore is to submit to the Lord and automatically to the governing authority.

6.5.4 Appraisal of Pastor Namakau's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7

Pastor Namakau interprets Romans 13:1-7 as an injunction to "submit to the governing authority", understood as the authority that human rulers and leaders possess, which emanates from God. As such it is imperative that subjects submit to any authority. In her interpretation she deals with the text literally without any critical analysis of the author's intention of the context he refers to in the book of Romans. We can see that pastor Namakau's understanding of the text is both literal and immediate. There is little awareness, if any, of the history behind the instructions in the text. As Tennison (1999:107) suggests, this state of affairs "does often not do justice to the text being interpreted." When we critically look at pastor Namakau's exegesis of the text, we can see that she applies the text immediately to the Zambian context without reference to the original context. As usual, like many other Pentecostals she appeals to her experiences as confirmation of her interpretation.

¹⁵ A cell is a small Christian community drawn from the larger congregation that is usually led by an elder or elders. In the Dunamis fire impact church a cell is one part of the entire church structure.

6.6 BISHOP DR. JENNIPHER MUCHELENG'ANGA

The bishop Dr. Jennipher Mucheleng'anga is the general overseer of the Energema Ministries international. She felt a sense of call to the ordained ministry at a tender age. She recounts,

to start with I really didn't know how to serve the Lord ... and I didn't expect it [pastorate] I have been and I am a very ambitious person. I had tried to study very hard throughout my life with an aim of wanting to become a public person, maybe become a minister, or vouch for presidency that was me and then at the age of eight, something started happening. I began to hear a voice, a strange voice. And whatever I heard came to pass. My mother and my father said I was demonic possessed they took me to witchdoctors ... and one of the witchdoctors who had come from Lusaka [who] they called a Mr. Mudenda he used to be in Kaunda square (a township in Lusaka) came and said this spirit on this person is higher than our spirit. And fortunately, my father also used to believe in the practice of [native doctors]. But unfortunately, they tried to put some tattoos on me, it never worked blood could not come out. And so, they thought I was a rebel or something was wrong with me. And things started happening.... I would hear a voice speaking to me or I would see a vision and I would tell my mother and they said that this person ... you are just wasting our time but those things came to pass.

Dr. Mucheleng'anga is a trained secondary teacher of mathematics. She trained for a bachelors' degree in mathematics at the University of Port Elizabeth in South Africa and worked as a teacher in several schools in Zambia. After working for a number year as a teacher, she heard the voice of God telling her to stop work and enter into full time pastoral work. By this time, she was a member of the Reformed Church in Zambia. When she inquired more on how that was going to be since she was not interested in such kind of work, she recalls that, God told her to form her own ministry which was later called Grace. Upon accepting the call, she embarked on theological studies for her to acquire the necessary skills for ministry. She has studied theology up to a PhD in Biblical studies, which is obtained from the North Western seminary in the United State of America. Bishop Mucheleng'anga interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 is as follows:

6.6.1 All authority is from God

Bishop Dr. Mucheleng'anga understands that all forms of authority on earth emanate from God. She argues on that basis that people are supposed to submit to authorities. She says,

meaning of this passage is authority is all from God and authority is God himself and therefore everyone must stand resolute to obeying what God is saying, but one thing sometimes you know God as he proclaims I will choose from among you they that are barely you know like people that you expect to stand. That authority ... and this is authority that issues from the throne of God ... and for me, it clearly indicates that the authority of God is given unto man but particularly they that have been called as servants. To stand in the gap. So, when God gives you an authority, in the vein of you becoming a servant of God he chooses you, he calls you and it means there is some justice according to Romans 10 justice that has been given to you as a man of God, as a woman of God, you do not only do things because you must do them, but you do things because God has predetermined your actions. so, there is that power that issues from the throne of God and it comes to you not to be abused and not be ... by you yourself and not to be abused by anyone else but the authority of God must stand. Hmm if this text was given to me to preach in a congregation, I would actually emphasize that, that [the authority] which comes from God is perfect, it is true and it must be adhered to. It must just be adhered to ... not me as a servant of God that is speaking those things but wherever I speak, for as long as I am right with my God ... issues from the throne of God.

6.6.2 Submission to authority must start from the household

Mucheleng'anga's views or understanding of "submit to the governing authority" (Rm 13:1) is that submission must permeate all spheres of human society that embedded within any form of authority, for example patriarchal societies, in which a woman is expected to submit to a man. She posits that

[g]overning authority, when you talk of authority governing it starts from right home like for example I'm a woman – yeah a lady – so you see I may be married, as I was married and when I come home I should not like say I'm a bishop, I'm a doctor, I am this ... no ... Corinthians, first Corinthians 7:6 commands me to submit to the man that has married me, which means I have to know how to

handle my power that God has given me and differentiate it from the power that I have found in my home, therefore God calls for me to submit to this authority in my home. But then you come out of your own home, maybe countrywide, nationwide you have the President. I am supposed to be an example, to respect the authority that God has put in place ... the way I was put in place as a servant to the Lord, he also whether they are children of God or not they have submitted to God or they haven't but we believe you and I being servants of God we believe that there is power that came from God and there is a selection and election that was done for them to be who they are and that is how you get surprise some people you think well they are not supposed, maybe they were not supposed to be President for this country but you find them ruling. God has a hand in choosing them ... remember King Pharaoh? what did the Lord say later on? I put them, I put him there for the purpose that my honour will be shown through him. And another good example Judas Iscariot... he was one of the disciples, twelve. The first people that really impacted or lived with the Lord Jesus Christ I wish I would be there. So, you see as time went this man was chosen to just prove the power of God. To just make the Lord undergo the test that has saved us today. So ... he came from the hand of God. But God had known him much earlier before he was born that he was going to be a part of the disciples of the Lord.

6.6.3 Appraisal of bishop Mucheleng'anga's interpretation of Romans 13:1-7

In bishop Mucheleng'anga's understanding God appoints leaders and that God ordains such women and men even before birth. She asserts that whatever happens on earth is predestined to happen as designed and ordained by God. Thus, subjects or "the ruled" are expected to submit to the authorities instituted by God. What is so fascinating about Mucheleng'anga's interpretation of the text is that, despite her being schooled as a biblical scholar to do justice to the interpretation of a text, she chooses to approach the text uncritically and literally. She does not pay attention to the authors intentions and the context in which such instructions were to be applied. In my view, this kind of approach confirms Allan Anderson's (1998). observation that African Pentecostal preachers chose to contextualize biblical texts in order for the text to suit their experiences and situations. This is what seems to be at play in Mucheleng'anga's interpretation. During the interview she had with the researcher, Mucheleng'anga, referring to herself, said,

for example, I am a woman ... so you see I may be married, as I was married and when I come home I should not like say I am a bishop, I am a doctor, I am this ... no! ... Corinthians, first Corinthians 7:6 commands me to submit to the man that has married me,

We must note here that Mucheleng'anga has made a shift from talking about submission to the governing authority as found in Romans 13:1-7 to submission of the wife to the husband as found in Ephesians 5:22-33. She presents these two texts as the same, but they are not. Furthermore, these texts refer to two different situations namely, in Romans Paul was encouraging his recipients to submit to the governing authority, while in Ephesians he was instructing wives to submit to their husbands.

The word "submit" or "submission" in this text is notably the attraction for Mucheleng'anga. However, in what context was this used in Romans and Ephesians? This is what she has not explained. Instead of exegeting the text and critically paying attention to what is at play in the text, Mucheleng'anga applies the text directly to her experiences and situation. Allan Anderson's observation about African initiated and African Pentecostal churches is apt, in that regard. They are susceptible to this kind of approach because they understand the Bible to be a supernatural book that has answers to every human aspiration (Anderson 1998).

6.7 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE VIEWS OF ZAMBIAN AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL PREACHERS REGARDING THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 13:1-7

6.7.1 Similarities

African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia (Pastors and Bishops) are usually very good friends who attend each other's programs and collaborate in the ministry. They interact in forums like the pastors' fellowships and in ecumenical prayer gatherings. The preachers who surveyed in this study exhibited similarities in a number of ways, among them their claim to have had an encounter with God. With the exception of Bishop Dr. Silavwe, all others recount their encounters with God vividly.

6.7.1.1 All authority comes from God

All the respondents in their interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 conclude that all forms of authority emanate from God and that God appoints leaders regardless of their statuses. Their conviction is that there is no authority on earth that exist on its own or by accident. Everything happens according to the will of God. They all posit that God puts rulers in place for the good of citizens.

6.7.1.2 God influences the election of political leaders

All the respondents believe that God influences the election of political leaders. Their understanding is that when a leader is voted into office, it is the will of God that prevails. They all agree that the person who emerges victorious in an election, is the chosen man or woman of God. For instance, Dr, Silavwe goes further to say when people go to the polling booths during elections, the choices they make are influenced by God. Muyawala agrees that the will of the people is the will of God. However, none of the respondents have not said how God influences people's minds when casting votes.

6.7.1.3 Romans 13:1-7: An instruction from God

All the respondents understand the statement "submit to the governing authority" (Rm13:1) to be a direct instruction from God to his people (of all generations). As such, the preachers feel duty bound to preach this message to their hearers. They should always submit to the governing authorities, as failure to do so, is tantamount to disrespecting and disobeying God, which attracts God's wrath. Silavwe, however, went further to say, in as much as the text is an instruction, it is equally an order from God that people must respect those God has appointed to rule them at all costs.

6.7.1.4 Approach to the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7

All the respondents seem to adopt the same pattern of approaching and interpreting Romans 13:1-7. All of them seem not to care about exegeting the text, to locate Paul's writing in the original context before they appropriate it to their own context - that is in Zambian democratic dispensation. Their interpretations only reflected their understanding of the text based on their situations and experiences.

6.7.2. Differences

If we look critically at how the respondents interpret and appropriate Romans 13:1-7, we can see that there are no differences in the way they understand and apply the text to the Zambian context. Hence the researcher could not go further in interviewing other respondents who were sampled. This is because, the researcher felt that the process was saturated as the same views and ideas were presented in almost all the interviews.

6.8 GENERAL APPRAISAL OF THE AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL PREACHERS OF ZAMBIA

Historically in Zambia, the allure of political clout in African Pentecostal circles came to the fore during the build up to the multiparty elections in the 1990's, according to Bernhard Udelhoven, the

coming of the third republic, thereafter in 1991, headed by the born-again president Fredrick Chiluba, the liberalization of the economy, an opening of public media, encouragement of many Pentecostal pastors in politics and the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation brought African initiated Pentecostal church into public forum.

(Udelhoven 2010:7)

In Zambia, Pentecostal presence is found literally everywhere, in the mass media and many public places (like bus stations, hospitals, schools, bars). African Pentecostals are missionary in character. They feel obliged to preach. It is natural to see energetic pastors founding their own churches or ministries. Most of these pastors generally lack or rarely undergo biblical formation (Banja 2009). Elias Munshya (2015) argues that, theologically, most African Pentecostals are a very diverse bunch. However, this does not mean they don't have any similarities. One similarity is that Pentecostals emphasizes "prophetism" strongly. That stream is very close to African tradition religion's (ATR) worldviews.

It is significant that the Zambian Pentecostal preachers adopted the teaching on submission to authority when it was most convenient for the Zambian political scene and governance arena. As argued by Madaritso Banja (referred to above) lack of theological training by most African Pentecostal preachers has created an ideal

setting for the spread of uncritical biblical messages by these preachers in Zambia. The chief propagandists of this kind of preaching and views are the preachers who belong to pastors' fellowships and who have strong influence on their followers. Most of the African Pentecostal preachers/ pastors the researcher interviewed have not attended any Bible/ theological school, with the exception of two, namely, for Dr. Silavwe and Dr. Mucheleng'anga. The rest were raised on the staples of their mentors (papas, pastors, bishops). For example, Pastors Muyawala and Namakau were raised by their mentors and bishops in whose footsteps they decided to follow.

Gordon Fee (1976) argues that the "Pentecostal" experience comes first for Pentecostal preachers' hermeneutics. It is for this reason that they tend to exegete their experiences rather than engaging in serious scientific interrogation of the biblical texts. Fee's observation looks like a negative critique of the Pentecostal preachers' hermeneutics. However, it exposes the fact that, like most New Testament writers, who saw Jesus' events as epochal and decided on that basis to reread and interpret the scriptures, they too need to do the same.

About patronage and clientism in Africa Pentecostal circles, one important question one would raise is how African Pentecostal preachers help their members to understand biblical texts like Romans 13:1-7. Or what African Pentecostal preachers see as their role in helping their members to participate in the political dispensation in Zambia. Most of the African Pentecostals and followers seem to believe that all authorities emanate from God and they must unconditionally submit to them. Such uncritical submission to those elected into political office is understood as a way of being obedient to God. And they consider condemning injustices and bad policies perpetrated by governing elites as being disrespectful. Munshya (2015) observes that Pentecostal church leaders in Zambia are almost unanimous. They will heed President Edgar Lungu's call to prayer¹⁶, fasting and reconciliation on Sunday, October 18, 2015. Bishop Johnny Kaweme of the Fire Baptized Church released a statement on 11 October 2015 stating that, "it is our considered view that the

¹⁶ The president of Zambia had declared 18th October as a day for national prayers. People on this day pray for all sorts of things affecting the country; like economic crisis, political tensions and many more. Many traditional churches have criticised the move. Instead, they have been calling for the head of state to respect the rule of law and human rights by putting in place favourable policies and rooting out corruption rather than resorting to prayer when the root cause to most problems is known.

National Day of Prayer, Reconciliation and Restoration as called upon by our Republican President be observed by all our churches.” Capital Christian Ministries International president and founder Bishop George Mbulo quoted 2 Chronicles 7:14 and requested that “ALL peace-loving Zambians who love the Lord and believe prayer answers all things, to attend a special National Day of Prayer and Fasting Service, to be held on the 18th of October as declared by our Republican President HE Edgar Chagwa Lungu.” Gospel Envoys Church leader, Pastor Choolwe stated emphatically that, “we encourage all to know that we will unwaveringly support any public nationwide recognition of our Lord Jesus Christ by any government both now and in the future. Political affiliation of governing authorities is inconsequential to the basis for our stance; we are Jesus driven.” Bishop Safwali and countless others have echoed similar sentiments. There is a general consensus among Pentecostal believers that Zambia needs to pray and President Lungu has decided correctly to call for a day of prayer.

Additionally, quite several Pentecostal preachers/pastors’ issue statements on the need to respect the declarations of the head of state, as well on the general governance issues by insinuating that the head of state is infallible. These preachers take a lead to shape Pentecostal members’ understanding of what “submit to the governing authority” as found in Romans 13:1-7 means in contemporary Zambia.

In addition, the African Pentecostal preachers clearly see themselves as brokers who broker God’s will to their clients. For example, pastor Lembalemba’s view on the question posed to him by the researcher; “if you were asked to preach on Roman 13:1-7 to your congregants what would you say to them? In response Lembalemba says:

I have been wanting to preach on TV on this text one day. This is because I have observed what is happening in this country. How people are insulting the [republican] president, people have lost respect for leaders in this country. God has been speaking to me to let people know that that president is chosen by God ... coming to your question, I would tell congregants to be respecting and submitting to the authority ... to find ways of advising those in authority and not in newspapers.

The respondents gave variations of a similar answer as the one Lembalemba's above. Pastor Muyawala added that, he would encourage his members to heed his word because. He understands that "men and women of God" speak the mind of God as they preach. Underlying these illustrations given above is the understanding that based on these preachers/pastors' intimate relationship with God, they are able to broker the benefits from the Kingdom of God to their clients.

Having appraised the understanding and the general views of the African Pentecostal preachers on the basis of their understanding of Romans 13:1-7 and scriptures in general, we shall now in the following section, analyze their interpretation by using Peter Berger's notion of 'fields of consciousness' and Paul Gifford's idea concerning enchanted worldviews theories.

6.9 ENCHANTED WORLDVIEWS, FIELDS OF CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 13:1-7 BY AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL PREACHERS IN ZAMBIA

6.9.1 Introduction

This section is essentially an application of Berger's notion of 'fields of consciousness' and Gifford's idea of enchanted worldviews. Here, we suggest that there is a plausible link between the type of political institutions and governance in Zambia, on one hand; and the 'field of consciousness' emanating from religious canopies provided by African Pentecostalism in their interpretation of Roman 13:1-7, on the other. These two theories are the analytical tools employed in this study to analyze how African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia interpret and understand the text.

In chapter 5 we analyze African Pentecostalism as a brand of Christianity that is imbedded within a belief system that hinges on enchanted imagination (Gifford 2016). This stream of Pentecostalism has generally coopted some ideas from African tradition religions into its praxis. Instead of advocating for the disenchantment and Weberian *entzauberung*, it upholds a magical view of the world. This has hampered its contribution towards development and social modernity (Gifford 2016). Gifford identifies the following major tenets of enchanted worldview model: hierarchy of power, ideas concerning charismatic leadership, ordinary life being infused with divinity and

a strong sense of reward and punishment from the spiritual world as the main driver of the enchanted imagination. These tenets are visible in the manner African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia interpret and understand Romans 13:1-7.

According to Peter Berger *et.al* (1974:19), public institutions and their practices emanate out of a shared field of consciousness or specific constellations of consciousness. This implies that people view and interpret reality using the lenses of their worldviews. These worldviews create “maps of meaning” out of which they make sense of the world. For instance, in a scientific worldview, reality is interpreted from the viewpoint of measurability, reproducibility, componentiality, interdependence of components, separability of means and end, implicit abstraction, problem solving inventiveness, emotional management, assumption of maximalization, multiple relationality. Such a worldview, according to Berger *et.al*, produces or operates in bureaucratic institutions that are characterised by competence, referral, coverage, proper procedure, awareness of redress, anonymity, orderliness, general and autonomous organizability, predictability, general expectancy of justice, and explicit abstraction among others (Berger *et.al* 1974). In contrast, African enchanted worldviews inscribe different fields of consciousness. For instance, within the Zambia context, when the economy of the country is not doing well, instead of looking for solutions from the fundamentals of economics, people opt for prayers. For example, when the Kwacha¹⁷ lost its strength against major convertible currencies (US Dollars, Pound Sterling and many more) the country opted to look up to God for a miracle;

President [Edgar] Lungu calls for prayer and fasting slated for Sunday October 18, 2015, [and] Pentecostals were among the first churches to support the prayers. Some are even believing that after October 18, 2015, the local currency will gain in value against the American dollar and the nation will be blessed.

(Munshya 2015)

This form of imagination to a greater extent, has influenced the way African Pentecostals reread, understand and interpret Romans 13:1-7 in Zambia. Using the tenets of the enchanted worldview model provided by Gifford let us now see how this

¹⁷ Kwacha is the Zambian currency.

plays out in the Zambian African Pentecostals preachers the researcher interviewed in Zambia.

6.9.2 Enchanted worldviews and the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7

6.9.2.1 Hierarchy of power

According to Shoko Karanga (2007), in most religions of Africa, especially African Pentecostalism, they teach and emphasize hierarchy of power in which God is regarded as the supreme arbitrator. Karanga argues that, this notion is derived from African tradition religions and African independent churches. Paul Gifford (2016:38) agrees with him when he remarks saying, “if we remove the modern musical instruments and songs, African Pentecostalism is merely a replica of African independent churches in terms of worldviews and practice.” The Zambian African Pentecostals carry this kind of notion in their re-reading and interpretation of Romans 13:1-7. They believe that what happens in the physical life is allowed by God and that everything happens by the will of God.

Informants of this study gave revealing commentaries in their interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 as well as the meaning of “submit to the governing authority”. All the respondents the researcher interviewed asserted that God appoints all leaders, even bad ones. This kind of belief has political implications. Bishop Lembalemba (interviewed 26 May 2016) gave an interesting commentary concerning the relationship between politics and religion in Zambia. Bishop Lembalemba, like the others, says

When one has been chosen, whether you like him or not, give him respect.... This is a fact that I spent 14 years in government [as cabinet minister and member of parliament] I know that they [current Government] are making some mistakes, but I can't stand in the pulpit and start criticizing the head of state.

Lembalemba went further to accuse people who are opposed to his ideas as wanting to sabotage the will of God. He says, ‘people who understand how God operates do not have problems in conceptualizing the political process in Zambia.’ Interpretations such as this one need closer scrutiny. Bishop Lembalemba’s thoughts are not isolated. They are shared by other informants who have left political processes to God’s will as evidenced from the similarities in understanding of the text stated in the discussion

above). What is of paramount in this regard, is that these, informants in their interpretation, rely on their worldview of the hierarchy of power. They are look at it from the standpoint that God influences what happens in reality.

Gifford (2016) argues that the idea of God being the final arbitrator of human activities, which Zambian African Pentecostal preachers seem to inhabit, is traced from African tradition religion's belief system that, the spiritual world influences every aspect of human endeavors. According to Karanga (2007), in African tradition system of governance, the prerogative to choose leaders is left to the ancestors and God. For instance, whenever disputes arise on who to ascend to chieftainship rather than hold elections, people consult spirits to ask them to select the rightful heir to the throne. People who usurp power through illegal incur misfortunes until they relinquish power (Karanga 2007)

6.9.2.2 Charismatic power

Enchanted worldviews strongly believe in charismatic power. In this category of thought, power is viewed as divine and that it is given to individuals (Gifford 2016). This notion is also perpetrated by African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia who generally understand power to be charismatic rather than democratic. One of the informants, Pastor Muyawala, asserts that "no one plans to become a leader and he ends up being one ... not even me I never knew I would become a pastor, until a certain time came." This notion is also shared by Dr. Silavwe who equally believes that power is given to individuals by God. He says,

In every situation, whether political or church leadership, God has a purpose for a particular group of people, and a purpose for a particular time. One, need to realize that certain leadership is there to [for a particular purpose] there is leadership meant for teaching, for rebuking, for correction. Maybe a particular situation may occur and God will look at the right people to be there so that they are sharpened to handle the situation. For example, in our country [Zambia] we had the leadership of [Dr. Kenneth] Kaunda who was our first [republican] President and when things were not going on well we brought in [Dr. Fredrick] Chiluba to revive the economy and liberalize the economy. So, everything has a purpose at that particular moment as long as we follow our laid down procedures realizing that we do not have to bring in selfishness

This form of belief and “field of consciousness” perpetuates what Gifford designates as the ‘big man syndrome’ in many African societies. In Africa, political power is usually understood as charismatic rather than democratic. The Zambian political arena is a classic example of how charismatic power is understood in Africa. It is a norm in Zambia to refer to the head of state as a father of the nation. This notion derives from the African culture where a father is looked upon as the head of the household. Accordingly, all the informants believe that election of political leaders in Zambia are influenced by God. Bishop Lembalemba has gone further to claim that when he was appointed in the cabinet, God first spoke to him to confirm that he would be appointed. The president’s subsequent decision to appoint him just ratified the will of God.

Culturally, in Africa, it is a sign of disrespect and generally considered a taboo to criticize elders. Even in the household, it is deemed disrespectful to criticize or hold a parent to account. This consciousness is widely held in Pentecostal circles, where power is centrally located. In Pentecostal stratification God is at the top of the hierarchy and assigns power to the head of the church, who is usually referred to as a bishop, pastor, prophet or other designations adopted by respective churches. In African Pentecostalism, a pastor’s power (authority) is measured by the number of followers he/she has. Secondly, his/her power is also determined by the abilities one has to heal, exorcise, to make sound predictions (prophecy) and other activities of this nature (Muchemwa & Muponde 2007). Furthermore, charismatic power in most African societies is infused into people’s consciousness through the way power is arranged in a household, whereby the father is the head of the house as the one who exclusively yields authority in decision making with no room for disruption of his pronouncements and decisions. From this illustration, we can see clearly that certain political metaphors of power in Africa bear patriarchal overtones from the family and religious systems (Muchemwa & Muponde 2007). This is the worldview informants exhibited because they share the same field of consciousness. All of them submitted that it is wrong to criticize political leaders in pulpits and to point at their wrongs in public. Bishop Lembalemba went further to say, “I was in cabinet and I know there are things that this government is not doing well, but I cannot go on the pulpit and start criticizing them ... all I can do is to say, if my brother [the president] did this and this it would have been okay.”

6.9.2.3 The idea of ordinary life infused by the divine

Gifford (2016:24) posits that “in this enchanted world, boundaries are not hard and fast; the spiritual and physical world interpenetrate one another.” According to Gifford (2016) Africans generally believe in the spiritual world which permeates all spheres of human endeavors. This worldview is real in many Africa people’s minds the belief in a world where spiritual power resides; where life is played out for good and evil. In Africa this kind of worldview can hardly be ignored as it is adhere to at the expense of modernity (economic and political models), in favour of ‘enchanted world’ solutions in search for progress (Gifford 2016).

The enchanted imagination Gifford refers is evident in African Pentecostal preachers that the researcher interviewed. Bishop Silavwe’s (interviewed on 3rd January, 2018) comment during interviews, like other respondents, is indicative of that. He holds that “God has a say in whatever happens on earth... during elections God influences the choices that people make.” He goes on to say “God interferes in human activities especially were ascending to leadership or position of authority is concerned.” It is on basis that Bishop Silavwe asserts that people must always respect elections outcomes and consequently submit to all authority. Pastor Namakau and Bishop Mucheleng’anga seem to agree with Bishop Silavwe’s assertions. Pastor Namakau is of the view that “God influences leadership...even in cases were the country is at war the Lord God almighty will always influence the outcome of leadership. In democratic elections too, God always has a hand [in choosing leaders].” Bishop Mucheleng’anga’s understanding of the role of God in electing leaders is that “whatever happens on earth is predetermined to happen as determined by God.”

From the discussion above, we clearly see that African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia subscribe to the worldview that strongly believes in the divine permeating ordinary life. As Gifford observes this belief influences how African Pentecostals view the role of the divine in human society. In the case of the Zambian African Pentecostal preachers the researcher encountered, this notion has a bearing on how the preachers understand and interpret Romans 13:1-7.

6.9.2.4 A strong sense of reward and punishment from the spiritual world

Gifford (2016) argues that curses (punishment) and rewards are an integral part of the African Pentecostal churches, just like African tradition religion. In these churches there is a strong belief in curses and rewards that emanate from the spiritual world. Curses are understood to be inflicted on all those who are disobedient to the divine or the divine's agents (mainly men and women of God). And rewards are reserved for those who are obedient to both the divine and agents.

This kind of enchanted worldview is prevalent in African Pentecostal preachers the researcher interviewed. One of the respondents, Bishop Kaunda Lembalemba's commentary exemplifies that view when he avers that all leaders are chosen by God even those who use underhanded methods to ascend to power by saying,,

[T]here are times when God will punish Christians by giving them leaders who are not Christians...[however,] it is important to know that if one pretends to know God and probably [pretend to say] the Lord chose us, while we know that behind [that pretense] there is something that we do that is anti-God [such people] do no stay long in power.

Bishop Lembalemba's commentary above implies that God rewards and punishes leaders. God rewards them for being good Christians and for aspiring for leadership for the good of society. God punishes those who pretend to be Christians for the sake of getting power by curtailing their time in the position of authority.

Other respondents also subscribe to this kind of belief. They agree with Paul that God appoints leaders for the good of the citizens and that the leader does not hold the sword in vain. For instance, Pastor Muyawala and Bishop Silavwe quoting Paul, say that every leader has been given powers by God to reward and punish those who fail to submit to them.

From the commentaries given by the respondents, we can clearly see that what has influenced these preachers' perception is their enchanted worldview. Secondly, we can see that these views have influenced their understanding and reading of Romans 13:1-7 concerning political leadership in Zambia.

6.9.3 Some salient aspects of the context of the African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia

The preachers we have discussed above share the Zambian context as described in chapter 5. However, these preachers share a context with more nuance than the laity. They are all located within a Christian nation declared by a “born again” president. Since then the preamble of Zambia’s constitution reads, “this country shall be called a Christian nation.” It is commonly believed in Zambia, especially in Pentecostal circles, that the declaration confirms that God is the one who is in charge of the affairs of the country. As Isabel Apawo Phiri avers, “the declaration has had the inadvertent consequence of giving Pentecostals a clear basis on which to judge the [presidency] and the Zambian state, and hence has served as a catalyst for more energetic and extensive Pentecostal political engagement” (Phiri :2003:401). We therefore note that, this enchanted Zambian context has led African Pentecostal preachers to re-read the phrase “the authorities that exist have been established by God” of Romans 13:1-7 with its in the light of that enchanted worldview. They have concluded with a contextual application that God’s will prevails in electing political leaders whether good or bad in Zambia.

6.9.4 Role of the Holy Spirit in interpretation

The ability to preach and interpret scriptures among African Pentecostals is usually attributed to the Holy Spirit attached to Jesus’ promise that, the Holy Spirit who the father will send will “teach you all things” (Jn 14:26). This all-encompassing promise has usually been used by Pentecostals to justify the choice not to conform to conventional and traditional ways of understanding scripture. This view fuels the perception, as most Pentecostals have it, that theological studies may negate the operation of the Holy Spirit. It is instructive that only two of the informants are graduates of theological training institutions. The emphasis of ministry among many African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia, is on demonstrating God’s power through miracles. And since such power cannot be obtained through theological training, undertaking theological studies is not much emphasized. This perception is self-contradictory. If Pentecostals believe in the word of God that is inspired by the Holy Spirit, then the contrast between the working of the Holy Spirit and studying the word of God, which is the Holy Spirit has inspired is deceptive.

6.9.5 Mode of Biblical Interpretation among Africa Pentecostal Preachers in Zambia

When one looks at how African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia interpret Bible passages, it is clear that they often rely on catch phrases and concordance-like modes of interpretation. In this mode, a word or phrase of interest that occurs in a particular passage is lifted and linked to a word or phrase that occurs in another passage(s) and used as an interpretive key. Preachers do not bother to explore the context of the passage to arrive at its intended meaning. In the case of interpreting Romans 13:1-7, the phrase “the authorities that exist have been established by God” (Rm 13:1c) was emphasized and isolated from the wider discourse of the passage. For this reason, the phrase was not considered in light of what Paul essentially meant. As a result, justice was not done to the entire witness of the passage. The preacher rather gave a narrow interpretation of the text, focusing on the catch phrase while leaving out other aspects of the pericope unattended.

6.9.6 Underdetermining in Roman 13:1-7

Among all the aspects of interpretations from the African Pentecostal preachers that we have brought out thus far, two statements stand out, namely, that “the authorities that exist have been established by God” and that God anoints such leaders for the betterment of society. While this form of interpretation and appropriation may not necessarily be wrong in general analysis, it however, bears the inference supplied by the preachers surveyed. Their general assumption of how the world runs, muzzles the text from speaking within its own context, and denies it the ability to critique its readers.

6.9.7 Consequences of African Pentecostal preacher’s enchanted worldviews in a democratization of Zambia

One of the adverse consequences of interpreting Romans 13:1-7 in the light of enchanted worldviews is, according to Gifford (2011) that it may not be helpful to Africa’s development and progress. In Gifford’s words, “Africa’s only hope of joining the modern world is to transcend neo-patrimonialism, enforce the rule of law, build institutions, and adopt rational bureaucratic structures, systems, and procedures in education, health, agriculture, transport and so on” (Gifford 2011:11).

From the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 in the light of enchanted worldview, we can see that this kind of interpretation breeds a field of consciousness that may not be desirable in modern societies like Zambia. It is this researcher's view that Zambian African Pentecostal preachers' enchanted worldviews results in a particular "field of consciousness" which they continue inculcate in their hearers and followers. As Peter Berger (*et.al* 1974:12) observes, all

social reality has an essential component of consciousness. The consciousness of everyday life is the web of meanings that allow the individual to navigate his way through the ordinally events and encounters of life with others. The totality of these meanings, which he [she] shares with others, make up a particular social life-world.

The meanings teased out African Pentecostal preachers' interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 are shared with their followers and these continue to impact the share Zambian social and political life. For example, Miles Sampa, a Patriotic Front¹⁸ Lusaka city mayoral candidate in 2018 has been quoted in public media as having said, "The Bible tells us, 'honour and respect your leaders because leaders are appointed by God'. And if you disrespect any leader, God will bring you down. If you kneel down to any leader appointed by God, God will uplift you because you are humble" (Phiri 2018). This kind of thinking emanates from the content of preaching and Christian religious orientation that Zambians like Sampa have received. . Many Zambians, especially those who are followers of African Pentecostal preachers like Sampa will parrot what they hear from their pastors, bishops and other men and women of God. In the end this has created a field of consciousness whereby people have a particular way in which they look at the spiritual world and the influence it has on their physical life.

According to Stephen Ellis and Gerrie Ter Haar (2007), most African people's worldviews have the capacity to provide a thought form that influences political practices in Africa. True to this assessment, it appears that the thoughts and worldviews of African Pentecostal preachers in their interpretation and understanding of Romans 13:1-7 has capacity to influence political practices in Zambia. Holding views like the ones mentioned above, is reminiscent of patriarchal societies where

¹⁸ Patriotic Front (PF) is the ruling political party in Zambia.

dissenting views or opposing views are not entertained. Such notions of charismatic power breed violence, and the Zambian political space is a classical example of such tendencies of charismatic power and brewing violence. Although political violence in Zambia is agitated by many factors, it is however plausible to attribute it to those tendencies. The cases of political cadres fighting in order to insulate and protect their leaders from attack so that they can consolidate their power is instructive in that regard. For example, we have referred to the current president of the republic of Zambia's group of political cadres who are pastors and religiously inclined called "Christians for Lungu". This group of Christians are organized around the sole aim of using any means to deal with those who criticize them and head of state. This kind of hero worshipping is common to most all political parties in Zambia. Each political party president has cadres who are ready to kill to protect their charismatic leader. This kind of behavior emanates from patriarchal tendencies to use coercion rather than dialogue to bring on board people with divergent views.

Zoro Dube (n.d.) argues that believing that political leaders are selected by the will of God or the gods renders democratic elections a sheer waste of time. It is pointless for one to go to the polling booth to cast a vote when God has already selected and ordained somebody to be head of state. This notion breeds passive citizens, who may not exercise their God-given rights as required. Furthermore, this can contribute to apathy during elections and leave the legitimacy of the elected leader in question.

In a society with enchanted worldviews like Zambia, institutions of governance are hierarchical, with the spiritual or religion placed at a top. As such spirituality permeates all spheres of life so that instead of people being creative in their day to day lives, people tend to hide behind scriptures and prayer.

Another consequence of the charismatic power hold is "hero worshipping" of and "blind loyalty" to leaders. In Zambia, a republican president is revered and almost considered infallible. The first president, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda during his reign, was viewed like a god. His followers had fascinating slogans like, *Kumulu, Lesa! Panshi, Kaunda*. (literal translation: "In heaven, God! On earth, Kaunda."). He was also called, *tata Kaunda!! tata Kaunda!!* (translated: Our father, Kaunda! Our father, Kaunda). This blind loyalty and hero-worshipping that was so rampant during the one party

participatory democracy still prevails today in a multiparty participatory democracy. This has been exacerbated by the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation. This breeds an image of a leader who cannot be criticized or held accountable in the minds of citizens. Their leadership categories in which these leaders are cast are vastly distorted and different from what they are in reality. Followers of such leaders tend to sing praises to their leaders instead of advising them. That extends public media that is in the fore front to build an imaginary image of incumbent political leaders at the expense of reporting on matters of interest to the citizens. Miles Sampa's perception of his role in politics serves as a good illustration. When he was adopted to stand on the Patriotic front ticket as Lusaka mayoral candidate he said the following in an interview on Radio Phoenix,

my coming back into politics, one, its God's will because without God nothing is possible, two, I am coming into politics to join the President's vision. He is doing great things and working very hard. I am coming into politics to serve the President, I am his servant and every Zambian is the President's servant. The Bible tells us [that] 'honour and respect your leaders because leaders are appointed by God'. And if you disrespect any leader, God will bring you down. If you kneel down to any leader appointed by God, God will uplift you because you are humble. So I am coming to serve the President and I am coming to serve the people of Zambia. And I am in this case, God has decided that I serve the people of Lusaka.

(Phiri 2018)

This behavior and conduct is what Gifford refers to when he points out that after gaining political independence African states have embraced "big man syndrome" by degenerating into neo-patrimonial state such that

superior provides security for an inferior, who is a client and then provides political support for his patron. Those lower in hierarchy are not subordinate officials with defined powers and functions of their own, but retainers whose positions depend on a 'Big man' to whom they owe allegiance. Control of the state carries with it access to wealth, the ability to provide (and of course to withhold) security and to allocate benefits in the form of jobs, development projects and so on. The system is held together by loyalty or kinship ties rather than by hierarchy of administrative grades and functions

The notion that political power resides with God who in this case graciously chooses who to appoint is problematic. Such an understanding suggests that there is no distinction between religion and politics and that two define each other, implying that power and religion are inseparable. In the African Pentecostalism context this kind of understanding is alive and well. The kind of church-state relations that is held in African Pentecostalism in Zambia is that, the church ought not to be critical of the state. The role of the church in its relationship with the political sphere is reduced to prayer for and legitimization of those in leadership.

This is exemplified by the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7. Preachers see their role as confined to uncritically agreeing with political leaders. Their literal reading of the words in the text as they stand oversimplifies the layers and nuance imbedded in that text. Simply upholding the fact of all authority emanating from God cultivates a consciousness that divinizes religious practitioners and political leaders who cannot be held to account or challenged.

Lastly, it is important to note that the other consequence of holding enchanted worldviews in the African political context is that, such worldviews encourage citizens to be passive and only pray without engaging robustly with political and governance spheres.

In modern societies political institutions are made up of rulers that govern the interactions and well-being of citizens. Rulers play an important role in ensuring that human and societal rights are protected and respected. In Zambia, the political institution's rules are enshrined in the republican constitution in which human liberties and rights are well tabulated. According to Zoro Dube (n.d.), these political institutions have a responsibility to ensure that citizen's rights and freedoms in a democratic society are protected. For example, in societies where these rights and freedoms are protected and respected, no citizen is disfranchised or denied a right to vote or contest in an election. Furthermore, in a society where such freedoms and rights are respected it cannot amount to criminality for a citizen to express him/herself over matters that they are not satisfied with. Thus, in such a society disputes among citizens are supposed to be arbitrated in a fair and transparent manner by those appointed to

adjudicate on matters of justice (Judiciary). However, in Zambia this has not been the case. In an event that there is an outcry on the any perceived unfairness or flaws the in electoral process, instead of resolving such matters through the courts of law those in power and pro-ruling-party church leaders are quick to thwart such assertions. They conveniently claim that “the choice of the people is the choice of God and God chose and appoint leaders, those calling for court processes are being led by the devil.” Such statements from both political and church leaders undermines the principles of rule of laws. That is why it is one of the objectives of this study to find how such appropriations and understanding of God’s will are arrived at and their consequences to the wellbeing of the country.

6.10 CONCLUSION

The interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 by African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia is informed by their enchanted worldviews rather than the context of the text. From the discussion above we can see that these preachers are more skilled in their context than the text. Furthermore, we have seen that in enchanted worldview terms, the reader of scriptures and their utterances conform to the context and cognitive environment that shape them. And field consciousness has revealed that the Zambian preachers’ cognitive environment plays a significant role in their process and claim that they have found the right meaning of Romans 13:1-7.

Additionally, in this Chapter we have seen the consequences of rereading and interpreting texts like Romans 13:1-7 in the light of enchanted worldviews. It has been established that such interpretation creates a field consciousness that suggest to the hearers that it is wrong to criticize leaders who have been appointed by God.

In the next chapter, we draw conclusions and recommendations that arrived at by taking the Zambian political and religious context seriously and engaging it in a dialogue with the text in question in its context. To this end we highlight the praxis that such a dialogue could facilitate.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This study set out to answer the question: *How do African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia understand and interpret 'submit to the governing authority' as found in Romans 13:1-7?* Through an analysis of how African Pentecostals use and interpret Romans 13:1-7, we have looked at how such interpretation shapes and influence the political landscape in Zambia. Furthermore, we have sought to find ways by which African Pentecostal preachers can use social scientific criticism in their interpretation and use of Romans 13:1-7. We argue that the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 using social scientific model, rather than the enchanted worldview model, will enable these preachers to contribute meaningfully and truthfully to the democratic dispensation of Zambia. In this last chapter, we offer a synthesis of the findings and summary of the study. We also highlight new questions that have emerged herein.

In Chapter 1 we introduced the research topic. The chapter outlines the background to the study, the problem statement, research questions and objectives, and research methodology and methods. In short, the chapter provides the research design of the entire study.

In Chapter 2, we discuss Pentecostalism and the history of interpretation of Romans 13:1-7. In this discussion, we firstly discover that extensive studies have been done on the phenomenon Pentecostalism. However, no mention is made of the mode of interpretation employed by African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia in the quest to get messages from Romans 13:1-7. Second, this chapter has shown that an interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 has been done extensively from different approaches and perspectives. However, not many scholars, except Draper, seem to have interpreted the narrative from a social-scientific perspective and appropriated it in an African society. Moreover, we have discovered that no study has been done in the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 among African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia.

In the first part of Chapter 3 we describe social-scientific criticism and highlight how it operates as an exegetical approach. Through this description, we highlight the

different models embedded within the theory that are used in analysing biblical texts. We also affirm that social scientific analysis of any given text helps to unlock the social world behind the text.

In the second part of the Chapter we consider the possibilities of combining enchanted worldview and field consciousness in the quest to find a theoretical perspective that helps to analyse how African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia interpret scriptures. We conclude there that the combination of the two models is not only feasible, but essential. Both models bring to the fore the question of how people interpret reality through maps of meanings that emanate from their experiences.

Chapter 4 presents the social, cultural and political milieu of the first-century Mediterranean society. In this chapter, we establish that the first century Mediterranean society was an advanced agrarian community, which was divided between the “haves” and “the have nots”. It is a society where honor and shame were held as pivotal values of society; patron-client relationship governed the way people related to each other; Dyadic personality shows that people in this society lived in groups. The kinship style of living highlights how politics permeated life and living in the first century Mediterranean society.

Furthermore, in that chapter, we discuss “Romans and politics” extensively. Through this discussion, we establish that the Roman Empire was governed by the emperor who was both the head of state and the patron, and that the citizens were his clients. In this imperial governance system power was bestowed upon the leader through inheritance. Through imperial cult policy systems, a belief emerged that the emperor and the leaders were selected or appointed by Roman gods such as Zeus. In this discussion it was established that Christians were allowed to worship their own God. We also assert there that Christians in the city of Rome comprised of Jews and non-Jews.

In the second section of the chapter, we attempt to read Romans 13:1-7 in light of the social and political environment of the first century Roman Empire. We have established there that when Paul advised his audience to be subject to the governing authorities, the authorities he had in mind are the aristocrats or civic leaders of Rome.

Furthermore, we infer that Paul wrote the exhortation in Romans 13:1-7 purely for his personal expedience. This is because Paul sought to advocate for a good relationship between government officials and Christians in Rome in order not to put his missionary journey westwards (Spain) in jeopardy. Paul saw Rome as a launch pad for the mission he envisaged to undertake to Spain. Because of this, we infer that Paul had good reasons for advocating for a good relationship to exist between the state and the church in Rome. The fact that the Roman government was remarkably tolerant to Christians, problems about paying due allegiance to the ruling elites due to their belief system, ensued later.

In Chapter 5 we discuss the background and growth of global and African Pentecostalism. We establish that the growth of Pentecostalism in many African societies and particularly in Zambia, has been necessitated by many factors, namely, changing social atmosphere in many African societies, the poor economic situation and others. Thus, African Pentecostalism's stress on the role of the Holy Spirit and prayer as means for dealing with challenges has attracted many Africans to this brand of Christianity. The chapter also attempts to analyse the presence, role and impact of Pentecostals in the Zambian political arena. In that regard, we establish that African Pentecostals' engagement with politics in Zambia has been fuelled by the declaration of the country as a Christian nation by President Chiluba. Since the declaration was made, uncritical loyalty to the government of the day by Pentecostals has increased exponentially. This has greatly impacted on the country's democratic dispensation.

Chapter 6 demonstrates how the interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 by African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia is informed by their enchanted worldviews rather than the context of the text. From this discussion we establish that African Pentecostal preachers are more skilled in their context rather than the context of the text. Furthermore, we consider the enchanted worldview in terms of the reader and their utterances and highlight the context and cognitive environment that shape them. Field consciousness has revealed that the Zambian preachers' cognitive environment has played a significant role in their process and claim that they have found the right meaning of Romans 13:1-7.

Additionally, in that chapter we explicate the consequences of rereading and interpreting texts like Romans 13:1-7 in light of enchanted worldviews. It has been established that such interpretation creates a field consciousness that suggest to the hearers that it is wrong to criticize leaders who have been appointed by God.

7.2 POSSIBLE FUTURE STUDY EMERGING FROM THE STUDY

In this study some new questions have emerged which will call for further research. First, through social scientific scrutiny and analysis it is demonstrated that the political context in which Paul wrote the letter to the Romans was Empire governed. The emperor was both the head of state and the patron, and citizens were his clients. In this governance system, power was bestowed upon leaders through inheritance. Through the imperial cult policy systems, a belief was held that the emperor and the leaders were selected or appointed by the Roman gods such as Zeus.

Thus, when Paul advised the recipients of his letter to “submit to the governing authority” the authorities he had in mind were aristocrats and civic leaders in Rome. The entire Pauline exhortation in Romans 13:1-7 was written for Paul’s sake. This is because Paul advocated for a good relationship between government officials and Christians in Rome in order not to put his missionary journey to the westwards (Spain) in jeopardy. Paul saw Rome as a launch pad for the mission he envisaged to undertake in Spain. And because of this, we can infer that, Paul had very good reasons to advocate for a good relationship to exist between the state and the church in Rome. The fact that the Roman government was remarkably tolerant to Christians, the later was having problems in paying due allegiance to the ruling elites due to their belief system. This suggests that when Paul wrote his letter, he did not have 21st century democratic societies like Zambia in mind where leaders are elected into office through an electoral system. There is therefore need to raise questions about what bearing or relevance, if any, the text should have in a democratic society like Zambia. In other words what does Romans 13:1-7 have to say in a democratic society like Zambia? Given that in Zambia the authority of leaders to govern is based on the provisions of the constitution and that people are the ones who have authority to choose leaders: “democracy is a rule of the people, by the people and for the people.”

The second lesson learnt is that in Africa, enchanted worldviews influence people's beliefs and faith practice. And in this worldview, there is a strong belief in the hierarchy of power – ideas concerning charismatic leadership – ordinary life that is infused by the divine, -a strong sense of reward and punishment, - and the spiritual world. In the Zambian context, African Pentecostals internalize some of these elements and they have become a “field of consciousness” through which they make sense of the political reality in Zambia. They carry this reality into their day to day use and interpretation of scriptures in the light of the political situation in the country. As such, they interpret scriptures like Romans 13:1-7 literally with the enchanted worldview as the imbedded frame of reference without necessarily probing the world behind the text. They also interpret texts in a concordance manner, that makes literal connections with other biblical texts that have similar key words like “authority” and “submit” without realizing that different scriptures speak to different contexts. For them it is all sizes fits all. Since “it is a general rule of proper textual interpretation that a text should be read for what its author meant to say and what its readers or hearers would have heard it say” (Spohn 1995:6) before it is appropriated in another context, this fact, raises a lot of questions: Do African Pentecostals¹⁹ preachers in Zambia either ignore this fact or they have no tools for unlocking the context behind the text like social scientific criticism, before appropriating it to the Zambian political context? If that is the case, one may ask why? This situation, suggests that there is a need to come up with a biblical studies pedagogy that will be attractive to African Pentecostals who seem to abhor theological education (especially the one offered in secular universities) on the basis that it neglects the inspiration of the Holy Spirit by emphasizing intellectualism (Kangwa 2017). Furthermore, this raises questions about the mode of study and curriculum used in Bible schools and Pentecostal/evangelical universities where most of the Pentecostal preachers/pastors are trained.

This study has achieved its objective of interrogating Zambian preachers' understanding and interpretation of 'submit to the governing authority' as found in Romans 13:1-7. The study has demonstrated that African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia, are influenced by enchanted worldviews in their use and interpretation of

¹⁹ Some of the preachers this researcher interviewed and whose materials he read are theological graduates and two are PhD holders in Biblical studies (New Testament and Old Testament).

Romans 13:1-7. This is necessitated by the Pentecostal “field of consciousness” inculcated from the time the country was declared Christian by president Chiluba. The Pentecostalisation of Zambia has advantages and disadvantages for the political scene. It is therefore imperative that African Pentecostal preachers couple their enchanted worldviews with biblical scholarship tools like social scientific criticism to deepen their interpretation of scriptures.

Bibliography

- Abamfo O. A., 1993, *The rise of the Charismatic movement in the mainline churches in Ghana*, Asempa Publishers, USA.
- Adeyepo, David, 2000, *Riding on prophetic wings*, Dominion, Lagos.
- Adjottor, K. J., 2012. 'Be subject to governing authority: A Ghanaian Christian Understanding', *JETEMS* 3(5): 485-490.
- Adogame A. U., 1998, *Celestial Church of Christ: The Politics of Cultural Identity in a Western African Prophetic-Charismatic Movement*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt-German.
- Afful, S. S., 2011, 'Authority in Romans 13:1-7: Its relevance to chiefs and people of Gomoa traditional area in the central region of Ghana', MA thesis, Department of Religious Studies, Kwame Nkrumah University, Ghana.
- Anderson, A., 2000, *Zion and Pentecost: The Spirituality and Experience of Pentecostal and Zionist/Apostolic Churches in South Africa*, University of South Africa Press, Pretoria.
- Anderson, A., 2007, *An introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*, Cambridge Press, Cambridge.
- Anderson, A., 1999, 'Global Pentecostalism in the new millennium' in Allan Anderson and Walter Hollenweger (eds.), *Pentecostals after a century: global perspectives on a movement in transition*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.
- Arthur, C. J., n.d., *Pentecost or Pretence? an Examination of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements.*, North-western Publishing House, Milwaukee.
- Asonzeh, Ukah, 2004 'Pentecostalism, religious expansion and the city: Lessons from the Nigerian Bible belt', in P. Probst & G Spittler (eds.), *Between resistance and expansion: Explorations of local vitality in Africa*, pp. 415-441, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.
- Balch, L. D., 2004, 'Rich Pompeiian Houses, Shops for Rent, and the Huge apartment building in Herculaneum as typical spaces for Pauline house churches', *JSNT*, 27.
- Banja, Madalitso, Khulupirika, 2009, *Faith of many colours: Reflection on Pentecostal and Charismatic Challenges in Zambia*, Mission Press, Ndola.
- Barrett, A. A., 1980, *Caligula: The corruption of power*, Simon & Schuster, New York.

- Batten, A., 2009, 'Brokerage', in Neufeld, D. & DeMaris, R.E., (eds.), *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament*, New York, Routledge.
- Barton, S.C., 1997, 'Social-scientific criticism', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of New Testament*, pp. 277-289, Brill, New York.
- Bechtel, L., N., 1991, 'Shame as sanction of control in biblical Israel: judicial, political and social shaming', *JSOT* 49, 47-76
- Benko, S., 1969, 'The edict of Claudius of A. D. 49 and the instigator of Ghrestus', *ThZ* 25.
- Berger, P., Berger B. & Kellner H., 1974, *The homeless minds: Modernization and Consciousness*, Random house, New York.
- Blanche, T. M. & Durrheim, K., 1999, *Research in practice. Applied methods 298 for the social sciences*, UCT Press, Cape Town.
- Boesak, Allan "What belongs to Caesar? Once again Romans 13" in Boesak, A., A. (ed.) *When prayer makes news*, Westminster, Philadelphia.
- Boissevan, J., 1974, *Friends of friends: Networks, manipulators and coalitions*, St. Martin's press, New York.
- Bompani, B., 2016, 'For God and For My Country: Pentecostal-charismatic Churches and the Framing of a New Political Discourse in Uganda,' in A. V. Klinken & E. Chitando (eds.), *Public Religion and the Politics of Homosexuality in Africa*, pp. 19–34, Surrey, Routledge.
- Borg, M., n.d, *A portrait of Jesus*, viewed 29th September 2018, from www.apotraitofjesus.org/social.shtm/
- Borg, M., 1972, 'A New Context for Romans', XIII', *NTS*, 216-17.
- Botha, J., 1992, 'Creation of new meaning: Rhetoric situation and reception of Romans 13;1-7', *Journal of Theology of Southern Africa*, 79, 24-37.
- Bruce F., F., 2007, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary* (9th ed.), InterVarsity press.
- Burgess, R., 2012, 'Pentecostals and Political Culture in Sub-Sahara Africa: Nigeria, Zambia, and Kenya as Case Studies', in M. Wilkinson (ed.), *Global Pentecostal Movements: Migration, Mission, and Public Religion*, pp. 17–42, Brill, Leiden.
- Calvin, J., 1960, 'The epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians', (trans) by Ross Mackenzie, ed. by D. W. Torrance & T. F. Torrance, MI: William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

- Carney, T. F., 1975, *The shape of the past: models and antiquity*, Coronado press, Kansas.
- Carson, D.A., 1987, *Showing the spirit*, Baker book house, Grand Rapids.
- Carter, T. L. 2004, 'The irony of Romans 13', *Novum Testamentum* 46(3), 209- 228
- Cheyeka, A., 1998, The Proclamation of Zambia as a Christian Nation: The Islamic Dimension, *African Christian Studies*, 14,55–72.
- Cheyeka, A., 2008, 'Towards a history of the Charismatic churches in post-colonial Zambia', in, J.B. Gewald, M. Hinfelaar and G. Macola (eds.), *One Zambia, Many Histories: Towards a History of Post- Colonial Zambia*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 144–63.
- Cheyeka, A., 2016, Zambia, a 'Christian nation' in Post Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) Era, 2011–2016. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 6: 159–72.
- Colin, Kruse, 2012, *Paul's letter to the Romans*. Wm & B Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Craffert, P., 1992, 'More on models and muddles in social-scientific interpretation: The sociological fallacy reconsidered', *NeoTestamentica*, 26(2), 217-239.
- Dairy Mail, 2014, PF reconciles: Lungu files, viewed 15th November 2018, from <http://www.daily-mail.co.zm/pf-reconciles-lungu-files/>
- Dairy Mail, 2015, National house of prayer board appointed, viewed 15th November 2018, from <http://www.daily-mail.co.zm/national-prayer-house-board-appointed/>
- Dairy Mail, 2016, Lungu creates religious ministry, viewed 8th November 2018, from <http://www.daily-mail.co.zm/lungu-creates-religious-ministry/>
- Dairy Nation, 2015, Faith and politics: Towards a Pentecostal political praxis in Zambia, viewed 15th October 2018, from <https://www.zambiadailynation.com/2015/10/30/on-faith-and-politics-towards-a-pentecostal-political-praxis-in-zambia/>
- DeSilva, D.A., 2004, 'Embodying the Word: Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament', in S. McKnight & G.R. Osborne (eds.), *The faces of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, pp. 118-129, Baker Academy, Michigan.
- Diggers, 2017, 'Sumaili explains are plan for religious ministry', viewed 3rd September 2018, from <https://diggers.news/local/2017/04/09/sumaili-explains-her-plan-for-religious-ministry/>

- Draper, J. A. 'Humble Submission to almighty God' and its biblical foundations: A contextual exegesis of Romans 1, *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 63, 30-38.
- Du Toit, A., 2009, *Focusing on the message: New Testament hermeneutics, exegesis and methods*, Protea Book House, Pretoria.
- Du Toit, A., B., 1995, 'Die funksie en waarde van agtergrondstudies van die Nuwe Testament,' *Skirfen Kerk* 16, 310-33.
- Dube, Z., [n.d.], 'Consequence of enchanted religious worldview over governance and institutions in Zimbabwe and Africa' (unpublished article)
- Dunn, G. J., 1986, 'Romans 13:1-7: A charter for Political Quietism?' *ExA*, 2, 55-68.
- Duncan, B., 2012, *Individual community in Paul's letter to the Romans*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen-Germany.
- Earl, D., 1968, *The age of Augustus*, Crown, New York.
- Ehrman, B. D., 2013, *A brief introduction to the New Testament*, Oxford university press, New York.
- Elliott, J. H., 1987, 'Patronage and clientism in early Christian society: a short reading guide', *Forum* 3(4), 39-48.
- Elliott J., H., 1988, 'The fear of leer: the evil eye from the bible to Li'l Abner', *Forum* 4(4), 42-71.
- Elliott, J.H., 1986, Social-scientific criticism of the New Testament: More on methods and models, *Semeia* 35, 1-33.
- Elliott, J.H., 1991, *A home for the homeless: A sociological exegesis of 1Peter, its situation and strategy*, 2nd ed. Fortress press, Minneapolis.
- Elliott, J.H., 2011, Social-scientific criticism: Perspectives, process and payoff. Evil eye accusation in Galatia as illustration of the method, viewed 26th March 2018, from <http://www.hts.org.za/DOI:10.4102/hts.v67i1.858>.
- Ellis, S, Ter Haar, G., 2015, *Worlds of Power: Religious Thoughts and Political Practice in Africa*, C Hurst and Co., London.
- Engelsma, D., 2001, Pentecostalism: Spirit-filled blessing or dangerous heresy? viewed on 26th November 2017, from <http://www.cprf.co.uk>
- Fee, Gordon D., 1976, 'Hermeneutics and historical precedent – a major problem in Pentecostal hermeneutics', in R. Spittler (ed.), *Perspectives on the new Pentecostalism*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids.
- Feinberg, P. P., 1999, 'The Christian and civil authorities', *TMSJ*, 10(1), 87-99.

- Fiensy, D. A., 1991, *The social history of Palestine in the Herodian period: the land is mine*, The Edwin Mellen Press, New York.
- Forster, E., M., 1961, 'The plot', in R. Scholes (ed.), *Approaches to the novel: Materials for poetics*, pp 219-232, Chandler Publishing house, San Francisco.
- Freston, P., 2001, *Evangelicals and Politics in Asia, Africa and Latin America*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gale, H., M., 1952, 'Paul's view of then state: A discussion of the problem in Romans 13:1-7', *ZNW*, 44, 223-36.
- Georgi, D., 1991, *Theocracy in Paul's praxis and theology*. Trans. D. E. Green, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Gifford, P. 1998. "Chiluba's Christian Nation: Christianity as a Factor in Zambian Politics 1991-1996", in *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 13(3), viewed on 27th September 2018, from <http://www.msm.nl/EBSCOhost/academicsearchelite/Chiluba>
- Gifford, P., 1990, 'Prosperity: A new and foreign element in African Christianity', *Religion* 20, 373-388.
- Gifford, P., 1998, *African Christianity: Its Public Role*, Hurst & Company, London.
- Gifford, P., 2001, 'The Complex Provenance of some Elements of African Pentecostal Christianity,' in Cortén, Andre and Marshall-Fratani, Ruth (eds.), *Between Babel and Pentecost: Transnational Pentecostalism in Africa and Latin America*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Gifford, P., 2015, *Christianity, Development and Modernity in Africa*, Hurst & Company, London.
- Gifford, P., 2016, *Christianity, development and modernity in Africa*, Oxford press, New York.
- Gottwald, M., (ed), 1979, *The tribes of Yahweh: a sociology of the religion of liberated Israel*, Orbis, New York.
- Green J.T., 1989, *The role of the messenger and message in the ancient near east*. Atlanta Scholars. Atlanta.
- Griffin, M. T., 1984, *Nero: The end of a dynasty*, Yale University Press, New Haven
- Haar G.T., 1998, *Halfway to paradise: African Christians in Europe*, Cardiff academic press, England.

- Haynes, N., 2012, 'Ambitious Obligations: Pentecostalism, Social life, and Political Economy on the Zambian Copperbelt', PhD thesis, University of California, San Diego.
- Henriot, P., 1998. *Being a Christian in a Christian Nation*, Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection Press, Lusaka.
- Henriot, P., 2003, 'Romans 13: Obey, don't resist', *JCTR Bulletin* 2(56), 1-6.
- Hexham, I., and Hexham, P., 2003, "South Africa", in Burgess & van der Maas, *The new international dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement*, pp. 227-238.
- Hinfelaar, M., 2009, 'Legitimizing Powers: The Political Role of the Roman Catholic Church, 1972–1991', in J.B. Gewald, M. Hinfelaar & G. Macola, *One Zambia, Many Histories: Towards a history of post-colonial Zambia*, pp. 129–43, Lembani Trust, Lusaka.
- Hodge, C., 1972, *A commentary on Romans*, Banner of Trust, London.
- Hollenweger, W., 1972, *The Pentecostals*, S.C.M. Press Ltd, London.
- House of Chiefs. "On Religion and Leadership." accessed on 16th October 2017 from <http://www.houseofchiefs.com/2009/08/on-religion-andleadership.html>,
- Imakando, J. 1991. "Zambia be Declared a Christian Nation", *Times of Zambia newspaper*, Feb 24, 1991, p. 1
- Isaak, J., 2003, 'The Christian community and political responsibility: Romans 13:1-7, *Direction-a Mennonite Brethren forum*, 32(1), 32-46.
- Isichei, E., *A History of Christianity in Africa from Antiquity to the Present*, SPCK, London 1995.
- Jewett, R., 2007, *Romans: A commentary. A critical and historical commentary on the bible*. Fortress press, Minneapolis.
- Judge, E.A., 1984, Cultural conformity and innovation in Paul: Some clues from contemporary documents, *TynB* 35
- Kachikoti, 1991, "Chiluba the next President", *in Times of Zambia newspaper*, 9 March, 1991, p. 2
- Kalu, O., 2008, *African Pentecostalism: An Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kangwa, J., 2017, *Mainline, charismatic-Pentecostals and theological education: Case of the United Church of Zambia*, St. Paul's Press, Dallas-Texas.

- Kangwa, J., 2006, 'Pentecostalisation of mainline Churches in Africa: The Case of the United Church of Zambia,' *The Expository Times*, 1–12.
- Kaunda, C, J., 2015, Denial of African agency: A decolonial theological turn. *Black Theology: An International Journal*, 13, 1–23.
- Kaunda, C, J., 2017, 'From fools for Christ to fools for Politicians: A critique of Zambian Pentecostal theo-political imagination,' *International Bulletin of Mission Research*, 41, 296–311.
- Kaunda, C, J., 2018. 'The altars are holding the nation in captivity: Zambian Pentecostalism, nationality, and African religio-political heritage,' *Religions*, 9, 145.
- Komakoma, J., (ed.), 2003, *The social teachings of the Catholic Bishops and other Christian leaders in Zambia: Major pastoral letters and statements (1955-2001)*, Mission press, Ndola.
- Komakoma, J., 2008, 'The anointed one', in Hinfelaar, D., *The best of fr. Joe Komakoma's ruminations (1999-2004)*, pp.112-15, Mission press, Ndola.
- Kyambalesa, H., 2010, Declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation, viewed 15th November 2018, from <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2010/01/20/the-declaration-of-zambia-as-a-christian-nation/>
- Lampe, P., 2003, *From 'Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the first two centuries*, transl. M. Steinhauser, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Leach, E., 1976, *Culture and communication: the logic by which symbols are connected*, Cambridge press, Cambridge.
- Lendon, J. E., 1997, *Empire of honour: The art of government in the Roman world*, Clarendon, Oxford.
- Lenski, G. J., 1966, *Power and privilege: A theory of social stratification*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Leon, J. H., 1995, *The Jews of ancient Rome*, Hendrickson, Peabody.
- Lim, U. S., 'A double -Voiced reading of Romans 13:1-7 in the right of imperial Cult', *HTS Theologies studies* 71 (1), Art. #2475, 1-10.
- Lusaka Times 2015, HH's name appears on the register of the freemasons, Bishop Chomba tells court, viewed 3rd November 2018, from <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2015/01/09/hhs-name-appears-register-freemasons-bishop-chomba-tells-court/>

- Lusaka Times, 2014, I am not a drunkard, Lungu, viewed 20th October 2018, from <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2014/11/19/im-drunk-edgar-lungu/>
- Lusaka Times, 2015, President Lungu declares October 18th, a public holiday of prayers, viewed 20th September 2018, from <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2015/10/18/president-lungu-declares-october-18th-a-public-day-of-prayers/>
- Lusaka times, 2015, Zambia Observes National Day of Prayer and Fasting. October 18, viewed 20th October 2018, from <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2015/10/18/zambia-observes-national-day-of-prayer-and-fasting/>
- Lusaka Times, 2016, 'Christians for Lungu' group defends its open support for PF, viewed 20th August 2018, from <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2016/03/03/christians-for-lungu-group-defends-its-open-support-for-pf/>
- Lusaka Times, 2017, Police stop prayers for HH, summons pastor Kangwa Chileshe, viewed 5th November 2018, from <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2017/08/24/police-stop-prayers-hh-summon-pastor-kangwa/>
- Lusaka Voice, 2016, UPND set to petition results, viewed 26th July 2018, from <http://www.lusakavoice.com/2016/08/19/upnd-set-to-petition-election-results/>
- M'fundisi, N., 2014, 'Pentecostal and Charismatic Spiritualities and civic engagement in Zambia (1964–2012)', PhD thesis, University of Birmingham.
- Maier, O. H., 2005, 'Barbarians, Scythians and imperial iconography in the epistle to the Colossians', in A. Weissenrieder, A. et al. (eds.), *Picturing the New Testament. Studies in ancient visual images*, pp. 385 – 406, WUNT 193, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Malina B.J. & Neyrey J., 1991, 'Honor and shame in Luke-acts; pivotal values of Mediterranean world', in J. Neyrey, *The social world of Luke-Acts: Models for interpretation*, pp. 25-66, Peabody, Massachusetts.
- Malina B.J., 1981, *The New Testament world: insights from cultural anthropology*, John Knox, Atlanta.
- Malina, B & Neyrey, J., 1988, Patron and client: The analogy behind Synoptic theology, *Forum* 4(1), 2-32.

- Malina, B., 1983, Why interpret the Bible with the social sciences? *America Baptist Quarterly*, 2, 119-133.
- Malina, B., J., & Pilch, J., J., 2006, *Social-scientific commentary on the letters of Paul*, Augsburg fortress, USA.
- Malina, B.J., 1979, 'The individual and the community: personality in the social world of early Christianity', *BTB* 8, 62-76.
- Malina, B.J., 1986, *Christian origins and cultural anthropology: practical models for biblical interpretation*, John Knox, Atlanta.
- Malina, B.J., 1988, 'Patron and client: the analogy behind synoptic theology', *Forum* 4(1), 2-32.
- Malina, B.J., 1989, 'Dealing with biblical (Mediterranean) characters: a guide for U.S. consumers', *BTB* 19(4), 127-141.
- Marshall, R., 2009, *Political spiritualities: The Pentecostal revolution in Nigeria*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.
- May, D., 2012, 'Context is key to Interpreting Romans 13;1-7' viewed 2nd January 2018, from, <https://www.ethicsdaily.com>
- Menzies, W., 1985, The methodology of Pentecostal theology: An essay on hermeneutics, in P. Ebert (ed.), *Essays on Apostolic Themes*, Mass Hendrickson, Peabody.
- Moxnes H., 1993, 'Honor and Shame', *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 23(4), 167-176.
- Moxnes, H. 1988, *The economy of the kingdom: Social conflict and economic relations in Luke's Gospel*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.
- Moxnes, H. 1991, 'Patron-client relations and the new community in Luke-Acts', in J.H. Neyrey (ed.), *The social world of Luke-Acts: Models for interpretation*, pp. 241-270, Peabody, Hendrickson.
- Muchemwa K., and Muponde, R., 2007, 'Introduction', in Muchemwa K., and Muponde, R., (Eds) *Manning the Nation, Father Figures in Zimbabwean Literature and Society*, Weavers Press, Harare.
- Mukuka, D.M., 2014, 'A theological critique of the declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation and the response of the Roman Catholic Church (1991 to 2001)', MTh thesis, dept. of Ministerial studies, University of KwaZulu Natal, Pietmaritzburg.
- Mumba, N., 1991, 'Zambia Should be Declared a Christian Nation', *Times of Zambia newspaper*, 24 Feb 1991, p. 2.

- Munshya, E., 2015, After We Have Said “Amen”: Towards a Pentecostal theology of politics in Zambia, viewed on 2nd July 2018, from <http://www.eliasmunshya.org/>.
- Mutungu, D., 2015, ‘A rare crowning moment’, Chief Ngabwe News Letter August 29th, 2015, 1–3.
- Mwebantu.news 2017, 40 days countdown to national day of prayers, viewed 16th November 2018, from <https://mwebantu.news/40-days-count-national-day-prayer/>
- Nanos, M., 1996, *The mystery of Romans: The Jewish context of Paul’s letters*, Fortress Press,
- Neufeld, M., 1994, ‘Submission of Governing Authorities: A study of Romans 13:1-7’, *Direction Winnigeg-MB*, 23 (2), 90-97.
- Neyrey, J., 1991, *The social world of Luke-Acts: Models for interpretation*. Peabody, Massachusetts.
- Njovu, D., 2002, The Religious Implications of the Declaration of Zambia as a Christian State, MA thesis, UNISA, Pretoria.
- Oakman, D. E., 1986, *Jesus and the economic question of his day*, The Edwin Mellen Press, New York.
- Olsen, T., 2001, ‘One African Nation under God’, in T. Olsen (ed.), *Christianity today*, viewed 23rd July 2018, from www.Christiantoday.com]
- Phiri, C., 2018, I am coming into politics to serve the president, viewed on 7th July 2018, from [https://zambiareports.com/2018/07/07/coming-politics-serve-president -Sampa/](https://zambiareports.com/2018/07/07/coming-politics-serve-president-Sampa/).
- Phiri, I, A., 2003, ‘President Frederick J.T. Chiluba: The Christian nation and democracy’, *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 33 (4),401-428, viewed 24th October 2018, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/158175>
- Pilch, J. J., 2007, *Introducing the Cultural Context of the New Testament*, Wipf & Stock Publishers.
- Rutgers, V. L., 1998, The hidden heritage of diaspora Judaism, *CBET 20*, Peeters, Leuven.
- Schafer, P, 1997, *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the ancient world*, Harvard university press, Cambridge.
- Shoko, T.,2007, *Karanga Indigenous Religions in Zimbabwe: Health and Wellbeing*, Ashgate, England.

- Shorter, A. & Njiru, J., 2001, *New religious movements in Africa*, Pauline's publications, Nairobi.
- Slingerland, C., 1997. 'Policymaking imperial repression of Judaism at Rome', *SFSHJ 160*. Scholars Press, Atlanta:
- Spohn, W.C., 1995, *What are they saying about scripture and ethics*, Paulist Press, New York.
- Steele, J., 2012, 'Romans 13- contextually- appropriate reading', Cedarville University (unpublished).
- Stegemann E. & Stegemann W., 1999, *Jesus movement: A social history of its first century*, Augsburg Fortress, Augsburg.
- Stronstand, R., n.d., Pentecostals and the Issue of Subsequence, viewed on 1st January 2018 from http://enrichmentjournal.ag.org/200501/200501_heritage_pt1.cfm
- Sumaili, G., 2018, 'Role of ministry of national guidance and religious affairs', PowerPoint. paper presented at National Symposium, *Equipping people of faith to face the challenges of today*, Lusaka, Zambia, March 20.
- Sze-Kar, W., 2008, 'A proposed re-reading of Romans 13:1-7,' in C. K. Aitken & J. A. Draper (eds.), *Reading the Signs of the Times: Taking the Bible into the Public Square*. Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Tembo, M. S., 2012, *Satisfying Zambian hunger for culture: Social change in the Global World*, IN: XLIBRIS, Bloomington.
- Toews, J. E., 1986, 'Peacemakers from the start: The Jesus way in the early church, in J. E. Toews & G. Nickel (eds.), *The power of the lamb*, pp 45-55, Winnipeg.
- Tumfweko, 2017, There's no crisis in Zambia, Catholic bishop challenges Mpundu's statement, viewed 16th November 2018, from <https://tumfweko.com/2017/06/19/theres-no-political-crisis-in-zambia-catholic-bishop-challenges-mpundus-statement/>
- Ukah, A., n.d, African Christianity: Features, promises and problems, Universität Bayreuth, German
- Uldhoven, B., 2010, 'Churches/Christian Communities in Bauleni Compound- Lusaka', viewed 20th September 2018, from http://www.fenza.org/docs/ben/churches_in_bauleni_compound.pdf,

- Ukpong, D.P., n.d, 'the presence and impact of Pentecostalism in Nigeria', viewed 28th July 2018, from <https://www.scribd.com/document/342369207/Presence-and-Impact-of-Pentecostalism-in-Nigeria>
- Uzukwu, E. E., 1996. *A Listening Church: Autonomy and Communion in African Churches*, Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York.
- Van Eck, E., 1995, *Galilee and Jerusalem in mark's story of Jesus: A narratological and social scientific reading*, Kital, Pretoria. (HTS Supplementum Series 7.)
- Van Eck, E., 2011, When neighbours are not neighbours: a social-scientific reading of the parable of the friend at midnight (Luke 11: 5-8), *Hervormde Teologiese Studies*, 67(1): Art. #788, 14 pages.
- Van Klinken, A, 2014, Homosexuality, politics and Pentecostal nationalism in Zambia. *Studies in World Christianity*, 20, 259–81.
- Vonck, P., 1984, 'All authority comes from God: Romans 13:1-7- A tricky text about obedience to political power', *AFER*, 26, 338-347.
- Wariboko, N., 2012, Pentecostal Paradigms of National Economic Prosperity in Africa, in K. Attanasi & A. Yong *Pentecostalism and Prosperity: The Socio-Economics of the Global Charismatic Movement*, pp. 35–59, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- White, L. J., 1999, *The Apostle of God: Paul and the promise of Abraham*, Hendrickson Peabody.
- Yin, R. K., 1984, Case study research. Design and methods, SAGE Publications, Beverly Hills.
- Yoder, J., 1980, *The politics of Jesus*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
- Zambia Reports, 2016, Church rejects ministry of religious affairs, viewed 16th November 2018, from <https://zambiareports.com/2016/09/21/church-rejects-ministry-religious-affairs/>
- Zambia Reports, 2016. Pres. Lungu wins tight presidential election; ECL 1, 860, 877 Hichilema 1, 760, 347. August 15, viewed 20th October 2018, from <https://zambiareports.com/2016/08/15/pres-lungu-wins-tight-presidential-election-ecl-1-860-877-hichilema-1-760-347/>
- Zwanyika, M., 2013, '*An ethical assessment of the relationship between the mainline churches and the state in Zambia*', MA thesis, dept. Philosophy and ethics, University of Zambia.

Bishop Kaunda Lemba-Lemba

Bishop Kaunda Lemba-Lemba is a senior pastor of the eleventh-hour ministries in Zambia. He was born in 1948 in Luwingu district of Zambia, at Kalundu mission of the Brethren Christ, from parents who were members of the Brethren church. He grew up in the same church. Upon completion of education, he joined the mines where he worked as a senior staff before he stopped to enter politics. He served as a Cabinet Minister, Government Chief whip in parliament and Member of Parliament for fourteen years in the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) government in Zambia.

Bishop Lemba-Lemba understands himself as someone who was born to become a servant of God. In infancy he was sickling. He recounted that as he was growing up, he suddenly developed a bloated tummy. He remembers that during that time that 'Mum was crying and praying, asking why God did you give me this son with such a condition. The devil really wanted me to die. God sent a white missionary to the hospital who operated on me'.

It was at the age of ten that he started winning souls for Christ. At the age of twenty he studied for a Certificate in Christian Gospel Studies by correspondence with the University of London. In 1990, Bishop Lemba-Lemba saw that things were not going well in the Christian Brethren Church. Around that year, he recalls how on a particular day, as he was reading the bible, he heard the voice of God telling him to form a ministry. He asked God what he could call the church; the word of God said to him that the church shall be called Eleventh hour ministry. He proceeded to register the church, which, of course, he acknowledges was accomplished by a miracle. At that time, the government of the republic of Zambia had stopped registering churches. However, Bishop Lemba-Lemba had a break through. The Bishop has undertaken theological studies to master's degree level with an American Evangelical University. However, Bishop Lemba-Lemba strongly asserts that "despite all these studies I have in religious studies, I think all these [studies] do not matter in God's work. I solely depend on God to give me a word to preach. One day when I went to church with a written sermon, I lost the sermon and God talked to me to preach out of Isaiah 43; I stood and preached. Wahoo! It was amazing how God used me and touched lives." Bishop Lemba-Lemba believes that the Lord circulates from his throne messages that people ought to hear on the particular day.

Good afternoon, my Bishop! How are you today?

I am very well, thank you, sorry for arriving late, I had a challenge with transport. And again, I was unable to meet you last week as arranged as there were a lot of things that I was attending to. By the way, I have read through the passage you gave me.

(Breaks)

(silence for a few seconds)

Haaaaaaa! (Takes a deep breath, as he thinks of what to say next)

First of all, do not record this, hold on! By the way, why did you choose to do a research on this kind of topic and this text in particular? What do you intend to achieve? How did you choose on me as one of your interviewees?

I chose this topic as you can read from the letter I gave you, basically to find out how different African Pentecostal preachers can interpret the text in the light of the general view that is held in our country that whoever ascends to a position of authority, he/she is appointed by God.

Oh ok! We can now go ahead then with our assignment (looks jittery and non-confident). I thank you firstly for having chosen to come and interact with me. There are so many Pastors and Preachers in Lusaka, later in the country Zambia, but you have chosen to come and have [an] interaction [with me] and I am very much ready to outpour what the Lord has put upon us as [our] guardian, especially in line with the topic that you want us to exercise, I eeh (humming), I am a very primitive person - primitive in the sense that am not like any other Pastors; I am so primitive, primitive in the sense that I depend upon the Lord to tell me what to preach or say when it comes to the interpretation of the word of God as contained in the Bible. I am not a self-styled person.

Good to hear about that Sir, that sounds wonderful and very inspiring. I think we can begin where we ended last time when you said

(Interrupts) Yes! Yes! eeh.

The topic of my study is a critical analysis of submitting to the governing authority from Romans 13:1-7 among some African Pentecostal preachers in Zambia so, as I said, earlier I chose you because you are one of those prominent Preachers in Pentecostal circles to whom I have personally listened.

Yes! Yes,!

You touched many lives in this country through your “end time messages” which used to be televised on our national broadcaster sometime ago.

(Interrupts) Oh yah..... (laughs) good

Bishop, suppose you were given the task of interpreting Romans 13:1-7, how would you interpret it?

Ooh yah (he laughs) thank you.

Humm (thinking) I have not, I have not (repetition), I have not, preached a message about the same scripture of Romans 13:1-7, but I have explained extensively, you see what, when I became a Christian there was a time when I had eeh eeh eeh, we grew, grew [up] in days when there was a lot of discrimination in this country, where we were not allowed to buy anything that we wanted from the shops, especially [shops] where white Europeans were shopping from, eeh.... so [this situation] infuriated us citizens, we saw that we were being discriminated in our own country, so it was not about politics, it's not about anything... it was about looking about yourself, someone is saying you are not, you are not (his repetition) a real human being and it made most of us to be very annoyed ,eeh with the system that was there, not against any person who was there but it was the system. When I grew [up] I had a very high position eeh in the Mines and I had 400 whites under me, later on about eeh 2000 Zambians. But if you look at the salary that I was given [it couldn't correspond with my Junior European workers], eeh one day, don't tell me that the Christian went to steal, one day we told the eeh changers attendant to go and eeh steal the pay statements [for] one or two eeh eeh whites so that we can have a look at it. When we looked at it, the money that the boss was getting was [too little compared to the European junior workers under his supervision], eeh this disparity was as a result of certain allowances which were given for expatriates' house servant's allowance and that allowance was equivalent to my salary, and that made us [African workers] to join partisan politics

That is what made you become a Politician, right? So how would you interpret Romans 13:1-7?

Yah, I would love you to listen very carefully. Romans 13:1-7, [when you read it from the] starting, that is from verse 1 to the end, to 7, the background to [text] is that, for Paul to write that, he saw the misconception, the misconception which was there among the Israelites at a time they were expecting the Messiah to come who was going to redeem them [from Roman rule]. Their understanding was that, the, the Messiahship of the expected Messiah was to come and redeem them from the powers of the Romans.

Then, ok! and eeh.

This is what they expected Jesus Christ to come and do, when he comes, when he comes (his repetition) aah comes as a Messiah. Although they didn't know that this Messiah will be named as Jesus, they expected one [Messiah] who was going to redeem them from the powers of Politicians, yes politically yes. Now, when Jesus Christ came, remember when he said aah they are going to crucify me? Simon Peter was very annoyed. We! We! (his repetition) [we expect that] the twelve of us are going to be cabinet ministers

(He laughs)

When he takes over from the Romans, what have you, and they had a lot of questions, negative questions about him and at some point, they might have thought that he was an imposter, because all they knew is that when he comes, (digresses); he was telling them that, telling them that (repetition) he was the Messiah, ati iwe!²⁰ No! No! [The disciples spoke among themselves and wondered that if he was truly a Messiah] he could have dealt with all these people: the Romans. So, that was the impression they had at that time, and some of them started refusing to honour those who were in government. That is [why] Paul wrote this message eeh because now they had realized that he was a Messiah [who] will not rule now, in round one, [but he] is going

²⁰ "Ati iwe" is a bemba phrase that literally translates as "that you".

to rule when he comes back again. They came to know this after Jesus had gone. Because he had explained to them that I go [and] I shall come and collect you bra! Bra! Bra! things like that. He [Jesus] talked about the end of the world and that he was going to come and be the ruler. I think let us get it from there.

My dear Paul's word is applicable today, especially during our time, if someone talks of Romans 13 it is a very authentic text, aah aah it has spelled out the role of politics in a given place. Now today what the Israelites had [prevailing situation] then even the Zambian and most of the African People have the same situations.

Help me understand what you mean here; do you mean the context?

To explain, come again!

I mean, are you saying that the situation existing in Paul's time, is the same situation that is prevailing in Zambia?

Yes! Yes! (smiles)

When we come to the books of Jude I think it is eeh I think it should be eeh eeh 4:4 or 6 where is [the text] saying there a people who have clipped in the, in the (repetition) Christian faith, people who have clipped in the faith, and these are the people who were telling people not to respect the authorities, not to respect the authorities (repeats calmly). They are people who, who (repetition) have clipped in, people who are not speaking the true gospel of the Lord and the mind of the Lord. And he [Jude] called them names that they are clouds eeh rains, things like that so, so, to be honest with you this is an eye opener, and once we have a people who are God fearing once we start eeh fearing the authority we will grow, probably some more 20 steps upwards and we are not going to be what we are, we are going to be the real children of God, the Lord God almighty.

Suppose one asked you that what does this passage mean?

Sorry! Come again!

(listens attentively)

If someone asked you what is the meaning of this passage, what would you say?

What it means?

Yes!

It is like any other instructive scripture or chapter that we have in the Bible where they tell us, [for instance] like what we have in [the book of] Exodus where they say eeh eeh do not allow a witch to live; it is an instruction so, even ourselves this is an instruction that we need to submit to those in authority or rather that we should start respecting those in authority. Now, let me add something [here] although we are now in what is called, what is called democratic dispensation [era in Zambia] eeh people have stopped respecting the Heads of state, and that is very! very! bad. Yes, when people are campaigning especially these who have some funny ee eeh chilli in their mouths they can say whatever they want to against their fellow candidates but, if those people were Christians, they cannot manufacture a lie or insult an opponent. However, when one has been chosen, whether you like him/[her] or not, give [him/her] respect. This is what this Bible is saying (holding a Bible in a hand), let us know that they [those in authority] are not put there; you can stand for an election in some cases nine or ten times, you can have a lot of money, you can be educated, you can be whatever you want to be, but if you are not chosen by the Lord [God] you cannot come to the throne. So, eeh take for instance, here in Zambia the person [Republican President] who is there personally, I know him, but I have to! to! respect him. This is the fact that I spent some good 14year in Government [as Cabinet Minister and Member of Parliament] I know that they [current government] are making some mistakes, but you won't stand on the pulpit and insult them but if need be I can say [advise that] if my brother did this and this we can be a better nation, but so many people have chosen a very different path. Hence, I am not very comfortable with the word politics, because people think by politicking one has just to open a mouth and start insulting anybody; to manufacture lies against [opponents], that is wrong and in the same vain those of us who go to the extent of insulting the Heads of State; [it is] not only the current one, all of them, [past Republican Presidents] were insulted right, left and centre. But, we don't know that we have been insulting the Lord who had chosen [them].

Now, suppose you were given to preach on this passage in the church what can you tell your congregants?

Uhm, eeh First of all I can talk about, I can talk (repetition) about eeh the fact that the Lord puts rulers in place for our good. Today when one becomes the Head of State, they will call them names and names but note, what is obtaining now, it is something that has been there. We have to tell people that the Lord put rulers in place. I can tell you something as an example. When I was deputy Minister of Mines in the Government of [President Dr. Fredrick] Chiluba, the President called me to State House at about 21hrs; listen to what he said by that time, although I was eeh eeh a Minister in his Government. I did not forget about my Jesus. In fact, it was very very (repetition) good that, I had a little bit of money, the little money that I had I spent it paying for the radio [air time] to preach the word of God. You know, to sacrifice for the Lord is so good. So, when he [President Chiluba] called me, listen to what he said, because of my preaching [on radio] and what have you, the President said to me that so many people have come to tell me of how you carry yourself as a man of God. And I believe that, and we have a vacant position, so I am going to make you a full Cabinet Minister responsible for this ministry where you have the widows,

Community Development?

Yes! Community Development. [President Chiluba went on to say] and I am going to make an announcement on Tuesday, and I said thank you Mr. President. When I went home I started making preparations for me to go in churches like United Church of Zambia (UCZ), Catholic, Anglican and what have you, to go and tell people that we are expected to help the poor and most of these young people in the streets are your brothers but you have allowed them to go in the streets and so on. I tell you I was excited. Why? Because it was in my blood stream, (laughs) but I said earlier on, the devil being what he is eeh this exercise went wrong, things went wrong within 2 days. The President called me and said that I have information that you had a meeting with the opposition [political party] that they were even crowding you that you were going to be the President. Then I said, Sir, that is a big lie and [I told him that] I know people who were saying all that, they are afraid of me, because of they were very afraid of me. And after some few weeks, the President removed me from my position. And the person who poisoned me was appointed into Cabinet. I knelt down and I thanked the Lord for one thing; the Head of State being comfortable and being happy with the way

I was carrying myself as a Christian that was not a small thing. I knelt down and said, Lord you know the past, today and tomorrow. May your name be blessed? I lifted the phone and called my brother [the one who poisoned me to the President] and said Congratulations and what have you, congratulations Mune ubombe bwino (my dear, all the best in your new assignment) I went to bed the same day. I was nearly in bed eeh for ten minutes when I heard the voice which said; do not worry I shall make you a Minister again in another ministry. There was a man who was discharged from work in ZESCO²¹. He fasted for a week, he fasted for two weeks and when he fasted for three weeks he heard a voice; do not worry, you will resume work when we put our man goes to the ministry where ZESCO falls under; we shall put our man and God mentioned my name Kaunda Lemba-Lemba. Now that was between 1999 to 2000. In 2001 we had a new President. When on the 4th of January, 2001, the day the new President was making the cabinet, the incoming President said I would love to have the man of God pray before I make a Cabinet and I prayed, a big big prayer. And when he started announcing his cabinet, Ministry of Energy he mentioned me. Now, because of the time factor, I had forgotten about the revelation of the gentleman at ZESCO. I went to the Ministry of Energy offices, later on I came to recall the revelation. What I am trying to say is that we [the human beings] do not know that the Lord God Almighty has a hand, has a stake in the running of a country.

OK!

Yes! he has a very big stake but we do all these things that we do, not knowing that that the Lord is seeing and he is trying to to to, Now you will find aah some people say no! no! You are a man of God, you cannot be in Politics or you cannot be a President [of the Republic]; you cannot be like this, what about David? King David was a prophet and at the same time a king. What about this other person who was a prophet and yet he was a king – Melchizedek. He said he was a prophet of the Lord and at the same time he was eeh he was eeh eeh he was a king yes so, so, so, where people have taken taken (repetition) the stand to speak bad about politics, personally, I fail to understand.

²¹ ZESCO is an abbreviation for Zambia, Electricity, Supply, Corporation Limited company. It is a state-owned company which is the sole producer and supplier of Electricity in Zambia. The company is overseen by the ministry of Energy on behalf of the state.

So, in your own understanding, would you say that God appoints leaders therefore we should give them respect and submit to them?

It's not in my own understanding. it's in the, it's in the (repetition) scripture. The scripture says, not my understanding, my understanding can be wrong but, the scripture [gives us] all instructions from the Lord that we should be respecting those in Government. Since eeh I left Government eeh, sorry since I ceased to be a Deputy Minister of Mines, Cabinet Minister for Community Development, Energy and a Government Chief whip, you have never heard me say a word against the government, against the President. He is the chosen man of the Lord at that particular time. All those who stood [against him], all those who were vying for the position of [Republican] President [in the last elections], in one way or the other they were not fit in the eyes of the Lord. And He [God] chose this gentleman [President Edgar Lungu] to be the President, so let us give him the respect, up to the time the Lord will say it ends [your mandate] here and someone will take over.

Sure!

So, Bishop what would you say about Adolf Hitler, Idi Amin, Mobutu Sesseko and other tyrants? Would you also say even those leaders were actually installed by God and ordained by God?

(laughs)

(followed by a clap)

That is a very important question. Aah uhm the problem we have as a nation is that although we call ourselves eeh eeh a Christian nation, very few people follow the trends of the Christian nation, that is by asking; Who are we going to be? What are we going to be? Sometimes we are just dictated by the monetary aspect of political dispensations at the expense of morality and spirituality. We do not even look at that person [vying for political office] aah if he [/she] can be the better person or rule, does he[/she] have the fear the Lord? In countries like that [where they are ruled by tyrants] is countries where people have said [chosen] eeh politics is for savages, so it is survival of the fittest. They can tell all sorts of lies and insinuations and what have you. And everybody will just vote anyone who tell more lies than the others; anybody who

sends more money bribing than the others and so forth. But if we became real Christians we can analyze who can rule this nation in the fear of the lord.

Ok.

People like Hitler and what have you

(pause)

I will tell you one thing, let me tell you one thing, eeh Daniel, Daniel prayed to the Lord for whatever he wanted to. The Bible says the Lord sent an angel to come to give him the answer, after he had been given the answer, that he was this and that in the presence of the Lord, and this is what he said, the same day when you knelt to come and seek the face of the Lord I was sent to come and give you the information by the king of Persia, the king of Persia, these countries had kings who rule, most of these countries have satanic kings who rule, who rule; the the the the (repetition) Bible in one way or the other has said that the king of this world is the devil so he will look at his own and use them as his minions. God can as well put a person who is not a Christian in the position of authority, so that he can do bad to the Christians. So, I cannot say that not all those people were put by God, I don't know eeh eeh how Mobuto Seseseko came into power, yes, I had an idea, no I have forgotten a little bit. But these others I am very sure that they were put in their positions by the devil to do havoc to the Jews, eeh eeh to those with Christian motives.

In that case, now can you say God influences elections? Suppose we are electing somebody - if it is God appoints leaders - can GOD influence an election?

(pause)

(Deep breath)

If the Lord said to me, I am going to put you [in the Cabinet], he didn't say I will tell the President to put you there. He said I am going to put you in that position

Ok!

eeh eeh If he[God] can do that [to me] why should I doubt that the Lord especially in the country where people are calling themselves Christians, then, eeh ee you know, to call ourselves Christians; did you know? I think I might be wrong, correct me. In this world Zambia is the only country which stands on a certain rock, through the declaration that President Chiluba made and gave this country to God? I was reading and I was listening to the radio [then-after the declaration], there was no time when the Lord said no! nakana (I refuse) [to accept the declaration]. In other words, the Lord accepted what that man [President Chiluba] did and today after he is gone eeh eeh constitutions [reviews have] come and yet people still maintain that Zambia as a Christian Nation [declaration] must be put in the constitution. And the Lord knows that this country is mine. Israel did not choose God but God chose Israel. God did not choose Zambia, but Zambia chose God. That is a big plus to ourselves and I can eeh eeh rest assure you that we have given this country to the Lord eeh in truth and the Lord has a big! big! stake in eeh eeh choosing leaders who can be rulers of this country.

Now, thank you very much it was a pleasure talking to you.

I will be very happy to add this one small thing to my submission.

Yes, you are welcome

When I was in full time politics, I was the Provincial Chairman of the Copperbelt Province. It was a very powerful eeh provincial committee which they never had before, and no any other [political] party penetrated the Copperbelt during our days. I, as Provincial Chairman I was given eeh power to recommend some people who wanted to stand as Members of Parliament before the national Executive committee which was chaired by the [party] President. There were two people who frequented my house who were looking for an opportunity to be adopted as candidates for parliamentary portfolios: a man and a woman. Now, when they came in my house, man of God, they prayed long prayers, long prayers (his repetition) making me believe that these were indeed the children of the living God. And I recommended both of them to the President. And when I said it before national executive committee [of the MMD party], they [NEC] said yes, the Chairman has said it. Now, why did I recommend

them? we wanted the reigns of the government to be entrusted in the hands of Christians, [for Christians] to have a big stake in the governance system [of Zambia], as opposed to what was obtaining were most of the people who were there [in authority] were either pagans or half-baked Christians, but when I listened to the prayers of those two people, the long prayers. Their alleluias and amen! Amen! the Lord is great the Lord! I said, I said yah! [now] we have the people here. And I recommended them and they went through. Three months after elections, I went to Parliament Motel to collect my laundry. At Parliament Motel there is a corner I do not know if it exists now, it was called a drinkers' corner; that is where people who were drinking and what have you used to sit. On that day when I went there, I found one of the two gentlemen that I recommended on the basis of being very good Christians; he saw me and he stood with the bottle of whisky and started calling ba Bishop look (laughs) and he was drinking to show me that, you were mistaken, I was baffled.

This is one example of the character of the man[/woman] who cannot call himself a Christian, who can claim that he [/she] was put in [this position of authority] by the Lord. So, it is very very (repetition) important to know that eeh if we are going to pretend to know God and probably to think that the Lord chose us, while we know that behind [that pretense] there is something that we can do that is anti-God, eeh they [such people] do not stay long in power. Even this gentleman [I am talking about] it was only one term [of office he served] and the other term no one even looked at his name and myself I kept quiet when it was time to eeh eeh to eeh to select candidates. So, we need Christians who are real Christians with or without politics, still they can remain Christians, with or without any emoluments that comes from the government, they should remain Christians.

So, you are you meaning God cannot appoint any other person to the position of authority, say from another faith, like a Muslim?

Come again!

I mean, in your opinion God cannot allow a non-Christian to become a leader. Is that what you insinuate?

Now, there are times when God will punish us as Christians, there are times when someone I know I have a lot of experience. Someone is not a true believer, and the

Lord may know that this one is going to cause a lot of havoc. He may allow that person to go through knowing that if he doesn't go through there will very big trouble. But, [in such situations] the Lord knows how he does. He knows how he deals with situations like that. But at a given time he brings someone who he thinks is much better, just like eeh eeh just like he did to Saul and David.

So, in that case what one is supposed to do is just to respect and continue praying, that is what you are saying?

Yes! Yes! This is what the Bible is saying we pray for our leaders, continue,

Does it say you are not to critique or criticize those in authority?

(laughs) Oh yah!

No! no! no! Here again no! no! no! It is not a matter of criticizing, it is the way you criticize. Criticize as a human being, but not when something has gone wrong you start insulting and blaming the leader.

Pastor Gerald Muyawala

Pastor Gerald Muyawala is one of the youth pastors in the Winners Chapel- Zambia church. He is the pastor in charge of Kaunda square Winner's Chapel church in Lusaka-Zambia. He was brought up in a Roman catholic family where he served as an altar boy. He had a desire of becoming a priest in the Catholic Church and mother. According to his while pursuing his thought he had an encounter with the Holy Ghost which ministered to him that you cannot become a priest. On 13th of October, 2010, he attended Pastor Adeyepo's (Nigerian-founder of Winners Chapel) crusade which was held in Lusaka-Zambia;

When the man of God was ministering, he ministered and ministered. One of the words he said, he said that you can be coming to Church but if you are not aligned with Jesus if you have not received Jesus as the Lord and your personal Saviour, there is nothing that you get out of it. So, give your life to Jesus. If you are a sinner, in as such as you come to Church there is nothing that God can hear from you, it is only a prayer of repentance that you need, come! to him you need to submit. I said God this word I have never heard before and he said that if maybe if you are doing wrong things, you are doing wrong to your wife, and to your parents to your siblings it doesn't count as long as you are doing it wrong to God

is a sin you must repent. On the same night I gave my life to Christ on the same night 13th of October, 2010. I then came for believer's foundation class-Winners chapel-Lusaka on Monday that was on the 17th of October, 2010. Then On the 18th October 2011, I was for baptized at adventure city.

Pastor George was trained at the Word of Faith Bible Institute (WOFBI). It is during his time at the Institute that he was convinced that he was called to ordained ministry, he recounts that;

During my days in the Bible Institute I was seeking God, I wanted to know more about God, I wanted to know more about God (repetition). Our resident pastor Kinsley Mweneumo, during the service, preached a message which made me see something God was showing me in a room, a very big room there were a lot of people. There was a very different type of people, different types of people lame, white, black, then I was asking myself God what is this thing? Why are you showing me these things? And then Behold I heard something in my heart, this is your ministry by one man's disobedience many were made sinners but by one man's obedience many will be made righteous. So, you must preach the word of God, the word of obedience to people the more you preach it the more people will be turned to righteousness. People will obey God, the more they obey God they will reach their destined place their glorious place. So that's how I came to understand Gods calling me to minister his word. The specific word called me to preach was the word obedience. And he gave me a scripture Romans 5:19.

Pastor George is confident that the word he heard from God is still being fulfilled in his ministry. He has served in three branches of Winners chapel in Lusaka; Mandevu (under a senior pastor), Chelston and now he is in charge of Kaunda Square.

Good evening, how are you? Thank you very much for accepting to take part in this study?

(he laughs)

Good evening too my brother, I am sorry for having kept you waiting, throughout this month we have been having prayer and fasting as the all church, so the days I promised you to come and interview me, I was assigned to preach in my local congregation.

It is ok, I understand you are quite a busy person, let us go straight into our assignment. I hope you had time to go through the letter I gave you and it is my prayer that you read through the text of our discussion today.

(he smiles) yes! Yes! Yes! I did

First things first,

Yah! Yah! Yah! (nods his head in affirmation)

How would you interpret Roman 13: 1- 7?

Romans 13:1- 7; that scripture contains very very encouraging words, I can say, its better I read them through again.

(He takes the Bible and reads through the scripture using Kings James Version)

In my interpretation [of] Romans 13 firstly and foremost I would like to begin by saying that, God is not the author of confusion and in anything that God does there is a purpose. Anything that God does there is a purpose, anything that God does there is a purpose (his repetition), you can't contradict the wisdom of God because his wisdom is greater than our wisdom. God knew that the earth without leadership or rulership, it (the earth) was going to be something else, that is why he instituted a government or authority to guide and help people. This is the reason why we must submit and obey the governing authority. Why? Because it was initiated by God. God is the one who established the Governing authority. The person who love God love what God loves. We cannot say we obey God, when on the hand we fail to obey the governing authority, then that will be tantamount to be lying to us and God. We must first love what God loves, if we don't love what God loves, then we cannot obey our Governing Authority, but by being obedient to the governing authority, our submission to it, it is (stammering) showing to God that indeed we love God and we are in support of everything that God does. This is because authority never came by itself it was God who instituted. It is for this reason that we must obey it. God is the one who established the governing authority, the person who loves God must do it! Must obey. No one can claim to love God if she or he does not recognize the governing authority which was appointed by God. Anyone who rebels to the governing authority, he is doing it to the Lord. He is not doing it to the government but he is doing it to the Lord, because the governing

authority is subject to the Lord. Without the Lord, this thing (governing authority) was not going to be there. God knows that man without guidance, without someone ruling or seeing over him can go wild [astray]. They can do any sorts of things, they can do anything they want. Even us, we are being given ten Commandments by God, therefore, we are guided by them, in how God wants us to move [be], there is a way in which God wants us to move things per time. That is why those commandments have those restrictions that you must stay in righteousness, you must stay in obedience, you must submit to the things and rules of the Lord. That is why God thought of putting the governing authority. And we are told that every delayed obedience is disobedience. So, if the government is telling us to do something, by way of instruction to obey some rules and if we fail to abide by those instructions, that is a sign of disobedience. And disobedience in this case amounts to committing crime and thereafter a penalty follows. There is a penalty for everything we do. If you do not obey or submit to God, there is a reward, there is a reward which one must get. In the same way when the governing authority gives an instruction somebody must carry it out and failure to do it, surely one has to face punishment. God does not hold punishment for the people who do the right thing. But those who do wrong things. This is the same way with the government, the governing authority they cannot do anything against anyone who is doing the right thing. They can only do something, something (his repetition), that is punishing someone who is not doing the right thing. Once we move hand in hand with the government, follow its instructions, abide by the calls of the government, the government will support whatever we do. The government will be there for us, the government will not not (his repetition) do anything will, it will not do any harm to us, but once we chose the contrary, we shall see, see the other part of the government.

Praise the Lord! (laughs)

The same with the governing authority, they can't punish anyone without establishing the wrong he/[she] has done, unless he/[his] is found doing wrong things. And they [governing authority] bring punishment upon an individual in order to bring the culprit to his senses, they don't just do things anyhow, they do that, even God if we, if we (his repetition) misbehave there is (murmuring or humming), God says that if any man says he is not a sinner is a liar. The truth is not in him 1 John 1: 8-9, the truth is not in him

but maketh God a liar, so if we disobey God, if we go against God, there is something that we should expect. There is, you know - there is hell and heaven, there is heaven (his repetition). So those who do not do what God wants them to do will go to hell definitely. Those who do what God wants them to do, they will go to heaven, as simple as that. So, anyone who does not follow what the governing authority wants surely will face punishment. In fact authorities are there to pave way for us. Authorities are there to guide us, to help us, to help us.

Praise the Lord!

Thank you for that interpretation. If you were asked to preach on this particular text what would you say? What would you tell your hearers?

Uuhmmm (humming and he smiles) If I was asked to preach on this..... (searching for words to say- scratches the head)

I would encourage people to acknowledge the governing authority because they are servants of God. As in, as in (his repetition) knowing that no one plans to become a leader and he ends up being one. No one wakes up and I will be a leader today, no, even me I never knew I would become a pastor, until a certain time came.

How?

(laughs) I was called by God.

Ok, go ahead

So, if one or if people do not plan to become leaders, one should realize that they are instituted by God, they are initiated by God therefore failure to recognize them, it is also, it is also (his repetition) failure to recognize God. So, in short, in my preaching I would encourage and I must encourage people to acknowledge and support the governing authority. I would encourage people to acknowledge the authority because the more they acknowledge such authority, the more they are acknowledging God.

What do you understand then by the statement 'submit to the governing authority'?

Submitting? I can say 'submitting to the governing authority', it means that we cannot submit to the Lord if we cannot submit to the governing authority. We must submit with everything that we have because, 'submit' in my own understanding [as used in the statement- 'submission to the governing authority'] also means submitting to the Lord.

You cannot manage to submit to the Lord [who you do not see] if you fail to submit to the governing authority which you see. So, you must first submit to the governing authority, our submitting to the Lord is never complete if we do not submit to the governing authority. This is because we are able to see those in authority, but we are not able to see God, we see God via the word. So, it is much easier for us to submit to the people that we see, to the governing authority that is in place which we can see because it is an obvious thing, it is an obvious thing (repetition)

Praise the Lord!!!!

In that case, if you say all authority comes from God how about dictators, we hear of Adolf Hitler, Idia Amin and others how they ascended into the office of authority would you say they were also appointed by God? Are we to submit even to tyrants like them?

(laughs)

One thing I can say is that, no one is made a leader by himself. There are people who God has appointed to be leaders but because of disobedience to God they come out of the way of God. So, we must notice that those persons are not aligned with God. The simplest example I can give is when [Michael] Sata became [the] President [of the republic of Zambia] said ‘we shall rule this nation by the ten Commandments.’ But he ended up abandoning that promise. When Edgar Lungu came he said “We shall rule this nation with God's guidance.” I remember he is the one who introduced National Day of Prayer and fasting, this and that. However, all these leaders mentioned in their roles as head of state, have ended up coming out of the things of God. So, we [the Church] must, we must (repetition) notice [such short comings], we must ask for wisdom from God to be upon the leaders so that they don't swerve away from Christian principles. If we notice that this person is not in line with God and if we observe and we know that what they are doing is not in line with God, we cannot obey them, we cannot submit to them. Unless if we truly see and know that this thing that they are doing is in line with the scripture, is in line with the scripture (emphasis). This is because the Bible says God does not call them to leadership in order to persecution people, to lead people to starvation, to stagnation, no, they are called to do something to help people.

So, in this case what you are saying is that God only appoints leaders who are Christians and not Muslims, Hindu?

(Laughs and takes a deep breath)

No, there are leaders who are called [appointed] by God who are not Christians but they are called [appointed by God]; they may not necessarily be Christians but they are called [appointed by God] to be leaders. God puts in them some level of leadership. Remember the Bible says many are called but few are chosen. So, God does not only call those who are Christians, God can call even those who are not Christians, from any generation, from any family, from wherever, that is how God operates. The wisdom of God surpasses our wisdom. So, we cannot contradict God, so whosoever God calls, whosoever he chooses to lead us, we must support [him/her], but if they are doing wrong things we must not support them.

Thank you very much. Now if that is the case, if God is the one who appoints leaders, can God influence an election?

Aah (take a deep breath) the influence of an election?

Or should I say does God have an influence towards a person who should be ordained as a pastor or who should be appointed as a leader?

Aah (deep breath) God bless you.

I think God has got a part in that, I think God has got a part in that (repetition) because it is God who calls people to whichever office, first, the Bible says before we are born Jeremiah 1: 5, says that 'before we were born God knew us.' He destined something for us. So, in as much as we are born as unique human beings, God knows that this person will be a pastor, this person will be a what, so God can influence an ordination, God can influence an election. Yes! Yes! (repetition and laughter) that is my belief.

I think I will end here, thank you for your time and input

Ok that is good. thank you very much for an interview and thank you very much for giving me this time to come and share this word with you. May God bless you.

Amen!!

Bishop Dr. Edwin Silavwe

Edwin Silavwe is the Bishop of Eternal Glory Church. Before he became a Bishop, he was called into ministry a long time ago. Background is that of a school teacher. He first trained as a primary school teacher and later upgraded to secondary school after studying for a diploma in Mathematics and Geography at the University of Zambia in 2000. He later pursued theological studies with the Monrovia church's Theological College in Tanzania from 2002 to 2006. During this period, he graduated as the best student and in the same year of his graduation he was elected as the General Secretary of the Moravian church in Zambia-synod. He was General Secretary from 2006 to 2010 and later he was appointed as Chairperson of the Monrovia Church and worked from 2010 to 2011. While he was serving as Chairperson, wrangles over leadership came about in the Church. According to Dr. Silavwe, a group of people wanted to be in leadership rather than him. Thus, he gave up leadership. As a result of such issues and misunderstanding, Dr. Silavwe left the church, with people who were interested in his ministry as way of setting himself free. He narrated that;

That's how I left the church, as a family and with my family and with the people who were interested in my ministry, we started Eternal Glory Church in 2013. For I to start the people whom we started with 5 pastors who were with me, from there after a year we had election where they elected me as a Bishop of the Church. So, from 2013 up to today we have 5 branches in Lusaka, we have 2 branches in Kabanana and also Kabangwe where we are. We also have a branch in Chipata, we have a branch in Kitwe and also in Nakonde. As at now we have a membership of close to a thousand, we are registered and we are under Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia, our mother body.

Dr. Silavwe is fully convinced that his calling is from God; "God calls us so that we can serve his people. And in my background before I became a Pastor, I experienced a call of God and I saved people of God in different capacities." His calling is from God, God called him to serve people. He served in many positions in the Moravian church. And he later received a calling to serve as minister of the word and sacrament in full time ministry.

Thank you very much for accepting to take part in this study, Bishop. So, coming to our assignment now. Given the chance, how would you interpret Romans 13:1-7?

I am equally grateful

Takes a deep breath (smiles)

In the first place we have to realize that Romans 13 especially verse 1 - 7 is a component dealing with submission to governing authorities, we realize that everyone you, are subject to the governing authority because there is no authority except that which is God given. And also, the authorities that exist are established and that whoever rebels against the authority is rebelling against the institution that God has instituted and those who do that they bring themselves on judgment. And also, we are able to realize that rulers who do not tailor for those who do the right thing but for those who do the right thing and all of us are comfortable before God. Now as the matter of fact we have to realize that whatever is given on earth realizing that before we were born in Jeremiah chapter 1: 5 the Bible says, before we were born God knew us that we should be leaders or not, whether will be leaders that everything that we do is planned by God. So, as we grow whether in the church or other government institutions. It is given by God and that's why because of those institutions we pay taxes so that some systems can go on and in Churches we pay tithe so that the system of Churches and para Churches can go on. And that's why we have established institutions going on and on from the beginning because of that on. So, we realize that we have to respect the authority and for us we have to respect the government that is before us, and we have to make sure that we give (humming) realization and recognition to the authorities. Now, as leader in the Church we have also to realize that we have to institute discipline, people should be disciplined so that they follow the laid down procedures and also arrangements in whatever system. For example, for me as like at now am Bishop of the Church at the same time am also doing eeh lecturing at our University, am doing that one because for me to be where I am, I had to follow the system the due dates they prepared us to be disciplined so that even as we approach because you can't be a Professor in a University if you had not had experience from teaching so that you give in tithe, you give direction you give also reverence to whoever is in that system, and therefore preparing people and their minds, their attention, their attitude because remember that royalty is more important

than sacrifice and obedience be that sacrifice because it's from neat gratis that we realize that somebody is capable and is worthy to follow because if you don't respect and pay allegiance to authorities just know that also when you will be there, people won't and it then and its circle which is very vicious. We should be mindful and we should encourage people.

Thank you very much Doc. What would you say is the meaning of this passage in a nutshell?

In the first place we have to realize that in life God has given the orders and arrangements for people to follow the pathway for someone to follow. It is now something that was meant for today but it is from the beginning realizing that when God called Abraham in Genesis chapter 12, he called him and gave him the direction. When he went he found people and everything according to the arrangement of God was flowing like that. From Abraham there we see Isaac followed, Jacob followed, the patriarchs followed and so on, its an order that's set so this is the standard which is there eeh for us to submit and give allegiance to the governing body.

So, this standard you mean is set for all generations to come?

If we follow coz the standard is the Bible. If we follow that standard it will help us and it will shape the generation to come, it will shape families to come it will shape eeh aah the communities. So, in any community there are leaders there you find that even when we have young ones playing, there will always be an identity for leadership somebody will come and say me like in our culture me am a goat aah am a cow but again there will somebody who would be a shepherd boy who would be able to show leadership (laughs). That is ordained leadership from the beginning like that and then people grow with the experience so that we able to exert and also follow in that order in that pattern.

Given this particular passage and you are told to preach on it, can you share some of the things that you would say, you would put in the set homily.

I would put 3 things there;

One, we have to realize that any, any (repetition) order, any arrangement that we have is ordained by God. And from which ever direction there will always be leadership. Whatever arrangement whether it to be in group work they will be people there or lead

and to be led. They will be a chairperson, a secretary so that they can organize that setup in that order.

Two, we need to know that at any given time there shall be leaders, and there shall be subjects; leaders shall give directions in whichever pathway that an organization or group choose to follow.

Three, in order to avoid injustices that obvious in our society today, we need to put the right [kind of] leadership and the right people who will avoid [indulging into] in issues [injustices] that confront humanity. For example, if we fail to have people with authority we shall be confronted with life threatening issues like diseases, whereby you do not have any [authority] to tell people to uphold cleanliness. People will be leaving everything [dirty] anywhere, you see, in this case there is need to have somebody to organize the community, to organize groups so that such issues can be addressed. And people should know where to report to, and they should know their boundaries, and they should know their connections-, their arrangements-, their movements and they should know their limitations in a congregation, in a church set up there is a pastor, he[/she] is there to give leadership there, he[/she] is there to guide [people] using the leadership skills, just as elders, the deacons, the parish council or congregational council have their functionaries. In that way, [all these] they also give directions to the whole flock so that everything is going in order. Now, if somebody revolt against [these systems and leaders] it means he[/she] is against the right meaning of the word [authority] and in this case, it is like disturbing the movement of something that is moving. For instance, let us say in a [human] body one part says me because I am the mouth am not going to do the work and the head will say me I won't move and also the eyes will say I won't see; this is a disorder and that is why there is that flow, eeh every part should do it's component eeh it is needed activity that is supposed to be. So, leaders are supposed to do their part and us followers, the members must also do their part by following the laid down procedures. So, for the three parts that I have talked about these are ordained issues that God has put for us to follow in order to achieve the intended results.

So, what do you understand by the phrase 'submit to the governing authority' in Romans 13:1?

(deep breath) What it is, is that, when Paul says let everyone be subject to the governing authorities, for there is no authority than that one which is established by God. Authorities that exist have been established by God. So, it means aah in Paul's context he meant that as we reach there will be leaders, and there will be followers. So, as followers we should always obey what the leadership but not in impunity or in a punitive way, but as an ordained system which is there. It is like a wheel and a tyre. These things are different components but they are fitted together so that the vehicle or an automobile should move and this is the way it is. When the authorities do their part, then it means the members will also do their part. For example, when the Bible is talking about marriage set up it says a woman should submit, before submission there should be love, so when there is love then there will be submission. If there is no love there will be no submission. And in this case when the authorities do what is expected of them they execute their plan, they organize people, they give people what is due to them, then members will also submit, and they will actually follow what the authorities are talking about.

Then in the case that they are not doing anything, what happens especially that you put it in your preamble that every leadership is ordained by God?

God has a way of doing things, realize that when God has put a system there is a reason that everything is there for a purpose, when the children of Israel saw that the leadership that God had put for them, was not pleasing for them, they wanted their own leadership in the name of King Saul, what were the results, their programs were so disorganized and disoriented. And we saw the collapse of the kingdoms later on, until God put the right leadership. So, when somebody is not doing his part God has a way of removing such people. Because God sees in the future, God sees what is expected of them. For every leadership is for a purpose.

If every leadership is ordained by God what you would take for the tyrants for instance Hitler, Idi Amin mention them. Would you say God instituted them?

Ok ! ok!

All those people realizing that in every situation, whether political or church leadership, God has a purpose for a particular group of people, and a purpose for a particular time. One, we need to realize that certain leadership is there to rebuke, remembers, there is leadership meant for teaching, for rebuking, for correction. Maybe a particular

situation harsh situation may occur and God will look at the right people to be there so that they are sharpened to handle the situation. For example, in our country [Zambia] we had the leadership of [Dr. Kenneth] Kaunda who was our first [republican] President and when things were not going on well we brought in [Dr. Fredrick] Chiluba to revive the economy and liberalize the economy. So, everything has a purpose at that particular moment as long as we follow our laid down procedures realizing that we do not have to bring in selfishness. You follow the constitution of the particular country like in our country its five-years and another five years [term of office for political leadership] somebody else is elected depending on the will of the people, because God speaks to his people in that way according to the context which is there.

So, in that case can you say God influences the outcome of an election?

Not really, God has ordained it. If God has ordained a system, God is omnipotent, he has all the powers. He is omnipotent; he knows our minds and he knows what is before us. So, he will look at the situation and because he is God you may try to argue here and there but he has a way of doing it. Because he is God. For example, if you were born in Africa, you could not say why was I not born in the United Kingdom? Or maybe from such and such a family? God saw it fit that we should be there for that particular purpose and direction and the dimension in which we do it. He has a program for that.

Thank you very much Doc and I really appreciate this time that we have spent together and I promise that we shall share some of the notes after I do the write ups.

I also thank you for involving me in this, but I would add that it is necessary to submit to the Governing Authority not because of the possible punishment, but also for the matter of conscience. Because that is how these things work we should not say this and that has happened, no! It is because it is the way it is ordained to be. For instance, if you do not obey [you should realize that] suppose you are the one who is there what will happen. So, you have to look at those reactions which can come out of that. And once we do our part God will do his part.

Thank you very much I really appreciate.

You are welcome

Pastor Elizabeth Dunamis Fire Impact Pastors

Pastor Elizabeth is one of the senior pastors of the Dunamis Fire Impact Church in Zambia. She is currently the chief administration officer of the entire Church. Currently she is the minister in charge of the Lusaka main branch. The interview with her was done in two phases. The first day I introduced the study to her. She showed willingness to participate, but due to her busy schedules, she opted to give answer in the written form and below is the exact response that the researcher collected from her.

How would you interpret Romans 13:1-7?

This passage addresses everyone as long as they are breathing that there were created by higher powers and that there were created by higher powers and that power is God Almighty, and therefore believe in him because he has ordained all the powers. We, see, we feel and we operate under, in the earth or under the sea, we feel and we operate under, in the earth or under the sea. A fool says in his heart that there is no God (Proverbs 10:18), for the kings, the chiefs, the Presidents, the Government name it, are all ordained by the Almighty God, whether good ruler or bad or tyrant. We therefore should all recognize earthy headship for it all comes from above. Ezekiel 26:7 says “For thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, a King of Kings from the north, with horses, and with chariots and with horsemen and companies and much people.” In this passage, we see the Lord speaking through his prophet Ezekiel warning the children of Israel over their sin that he is going to bring a leader over them to punish them for their sin against the Lord whom there were supposed to believe, and fear, as the word of God states that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.

If you were asked to preach on this particular passage what would you say to your hearers?

If I were to preach on this text, I would say as it is said in Hebrews 11:6 – “But without faith, it is impossible to please HIM for he that comes to God must believe that he is and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” As believers, today, we look at the surroundings around us and if the conditions are too tough, we tend to deprive those in leadership, not even acknowledging the fact that leadership is from the LORD in whatever form the word of God commands us to pray for those in leadership. But as a believer, we have to exercise our faith by pleasing God by

honoring those in leadership, because if we despise those in power, and disobey the law they have put in place the result will be punishment. Jeremiah 28:14 – “for thus Saith the Lord of truth, the God of Israel, I have put a Yoke of Iron upon the Neck of all those nations, that they may serve Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and they shall serve him, and I have given the beast of the field also”

What do you understand by the statement of ‘submit to the governing authority’
Paul’s statement, “Submit to the Governing authority” means acknowledging any form of leadership, be it the community, the country, the province, the Chiefdom, the Church, the cell²² and many more. In some cases, no matter, how ruthless this type of authority maybe or in short, dictators are also included in this plan. When the LORD Jesus walked the earth and the tax collectors (governing authority) came to him asking him whether he was paying tax to Caesar. In the book of Matthews 17:27, we hear that He instructed Peter and his disciples to go and fish in the river and the first fish they were to catch, they were to remove the coin and pay the tax collector. This is a big example of what submitting to the governing authority means; “give to Caesar what belongs to Caesar and give honor to who honor is due.” In 2 Kings 5:1 the bible says; “Now Naaman, Captain of the host of the King of Syria was a great man with his master and honorable because by him, the Lord had given deliverance into Syria, he was also a might man of valor, but he was a leper.” If we pause a bit here and critically analyze what is at play in this passage, if for one minute, you forget the lepers, look at how much authority the LORD gave to this man of valor and how he won the battle for the LORD serving NOT Israel but Syria. It is evident that, the Lord’s ways are higher than our ways, therefore, the simplest thing to do therefore is to submit to the Lord and automatically to the governing authority.

Can God influence the outcome of an election?

Yes God always influences leadership, we see in the book of 1 Samuel 10:1, when King Saul sinned against the Lord and the Lord tore the Kingdom of Israel from him and he instructed the Prophet Samuel to go and anoint the next King of Israel and they lined up the children of Jesse, starting from Eliab whom even the prophet Samuel

²² A cell is a small Christian community drawn from the larger congregation that is usually led by an elder or elders. In the Dunamis fire impact church a cell is one part of the entire church structure.

thought was worthy to be a King, but the Lord rejected him, and all his other brothers except one who was not even on the line, but was out tending his father's sheep in the bush, and yet the prophet said they were not going to rest until he comes, but David was chosen by God as evidenced by his coming and the anointing ceremony was successfully conducted. Yes, even in the case where a nation is at war, the Lord God Almighty will always influence the outcome of leadership. Yes, even in today's elections God always as a hand in them, not only in country's elections, but even in branch elections, the Lord ordains leadership.