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Abstract.

The intention of this investigation was to retrace the life, martyrdom and influence of Bernard Mzeki’s identity from the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe (1890 up to 2013). This study intended to establish the following objectives: tracing the history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe from its formative period leading up to the death of Bernard Mzeki; to establish the socio – anthropological, political and economic factors that might have contributed to the death of Mzeki; to establish the theological and biblical notion of martyrdom; to analyze the historical and religious life of Bernard Mzeki leading to his mysterious and controversial death, resultant commemoration and influence to the Anglican Church. And finally, the last objective was to give a critical examination of Mzeki’s martyrdom in light of contemporary African Christendom notion and the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. In terms of research methodology of the study, there were many forms from which historical data was obtained. Primary and secondary sources were used to gather information. Critical analysis was done using a tool of probability value. Furthermore, historical, comparative, socio-anthropological, theological, phenomenological and political approaches were considered and utilized in order determine specific information in this research work. The theoretical framework of post-colonial theory was used as water that flowed along the study since Mzeki was a character lived in the late eighteen hundred. Bernard Mzeki was traced from his childhood life history in Mozambique, his calling, education in South Africa and his journey to Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) through Beira Mozambique to establish a new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland with Bishop Knight Bruce as part of the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. Mzeki was murdered during the revolt on the 18th of June, 1896 due to his Faith as established by the Western historian who painted and claimed him a martyr. After the study, the researcher highlighted conclusively that the political, economic and socio – religious factors forwarded disqualified him to be named a martyr. According to the researcher, history was silent on the procedure that the Anglican Church took to confer the status of martyrdom on Bernard yet the church referred to him as a saint and martyr. This research work alluded to the fact that Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, CPCA and the Anglican Communion worldwide did not have a process or system put in place or a liturgy in its history that bestowed saintly/martyrdom status like the Roman Catholic Church did. Yet, Mzeki was being venerated as a martyr without no traceable criteria or public function sanctioned by the church to bestow martyrdom on him. And his name was in the lectionary of the Church to be commemorated in the Anglican Communion worldwide annually. This showed how significant and influential Mzeki was as part of the spirituality of the Anglican community in Zimbabwe, CPCA and the Anglican Communion when shrines, institutions and many more were named after him. The researcher raised Revd. Wagner and Mrs (Mbuya) Mandeya, Anglicans who were claimed to have died of their faith and there was a need to recognise them as contemporary martyrs of the twenty first century in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe but there was no procedure to do so. Recommendations were forwarded, one of them being an advocacy for the Anglican Church to establish a way of conferring martyrdom.
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Chapter One.  General Introduction of the study.

1.1 Introduction.

The formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe is never complete without mentioning the martyr and saint, African missionary, Bernard Mzeki. However, mist has to be cleared in areas pertaining his martyrdom, mysterious death and even the timing of his death which occurred at the beginning period of the first war of liberation of 1896 (the first Chimurenga) (Beach, 1986:125). Since the nineteen sixties, his life has been admired and celebrated by the Anglicans and others from different denominations all over the world. The Newsday newspaper reports that in the Anglican Diocese of Manicaland, in Bonda district, there is a Church named after him. Colleges in the Diocese of Harare (Marondera) and three shrines have been named after him also in Zimbabwe and Mozambique respectively (Newsday, 2013: 5). Yet not much has been written about Bernard Mzeki, the Anglican missionary who died in June 1896. The literature available especially Farrant portray a Mzeki whose life and ministry is punctuated by success throughout, apart from his assumed death at the hands of the Mangwende royal family in Mashonaland, Zimbabwe (Farrant, 1996: 205). Another important point to note as stated by Achiele (1995: 22) is the fact that much of the books in the academic scene have been penciled by West imperialist historians. This is so because the successes of Mzeki in religious circles are quite extra ordinary and strangely amazing. Hence, this research work attempts to scholarly penetrate to understand his socio-political and economic context which might have contributed to his demise.

1.2 Area of Investigation.

This investigation falls under the subject of African Church History and Polity. It is a broad subject but in this research, the researcher intends to deal with the historical events of the Anglican Church as it began in Zimbabwe starting from the late eighteenth century to date. And the identity of Bernard Mzeki is the major subject of study in this write up. The researcher would like to explore many different perspectives given as the identities of Bernard Mzeki. Posner (2005:138) writes that “all of the identities in a person’s repertoire are equally important components of who they are understood to be.” A critical focus of this research work is an attempt to explore academically the authenticity of Mzeki’s martyrdom.

According to the African Church historians of the West, it is controversially stated that Bernard Mzeki was murdered by pagans (Achiele, 2005: 22). Different dimensions do emerge if one considers that he was murdered during a tense period in which the political, social and religious lives were undergoing major changes in the face of the Zimbabwean people. The paramount questions however are: was he murdered because of his faith, was the motive of his murderers political, can we conclusively say that on the evening of his attack, Mzeki had been attacked for his belief and faith, thereby making him a martyr, can we read between the lines of the literature available and come up with other motive possibly socio-anthropological or economic?

If he was a martyr as portrayed by Farrant, would his death fit into the scholarly perspective of martyrdom, especially the martyrs emerging during the early apostolic age, the likes of Stephen, the first Christian martyr, St Ignatius of Antioch and many others (Farrant, 1996: 85).
In light of this argument, the research intends to critically compare Mzeki with martyrs mentioned above, in order to establish if his death conforms to the martyrdoms of the early church. There is need to align today’s Anglican Church’s theological comprehension of martyrdom with the early church if we are to understand the true identity of Mzeki in this regard. Mzeki started off and was regarded as a catechist which was a significant office at its own level. A catechist is a position in the hierarchy of the church which is not so high which means he was not a deacon, let alone a priest yet he attained a martyrdom status after his death. Frend (1965:01-09) states the procedure of declaring one a Christian martyr was clear: identification, arrest, persuasion to recant, trial and finally execution. This process can be understood as a qualification of martyrdom. Mzeki’s death would have to be measured in terms of such criteria in church martyrdom standards.

1.3 Problem Statement.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the circumstances and impact of the death of Bernard Mzeki in order to understand existing views on his martyrdom and to present a more comprehensive view than has been available hitherto. In its first three centuries, the Christian Church endured persecution at the hands of Roman authorities. This experience, and its resulting martyrs and apologists, would have significant historical and theological consequences for the developing faith (Latourette, 2000:81). Among other things, persecution sparked the cult of the saints, facilitated the rapid growth and spread of Christianity, prompted defenses and explanations of Christianity - apologies, and, in its aftermath, raised fundamental questions about the nature of the church and those that sacrificed their lives in its defense. The martyrdom call of Bernard Mzeki would have to be aligned to this bleak era putting martyrs of the first century to qualify for the title.

There are assumptions which have been forwarded to explain the mystical death of Bernard Mzeki. The church teaches that he was taken to heaven just like prophet Elijah of the Old Testament. The Mangwende people claim that he was eaten by lions on the night of his death whilst the general people maintain that his killers threw his corpse into the nearby river.

Bernard Mzeki was killed in the period of the First Chimurenga (the first war of liberation) of 1896. It would appear that no one has ever posed to question the relationship between the mysterious demise of Mzeki and the First Chimurenga war of 1896. The researcher intends to show that as much as the church may vehemently point to the religious reasons for the death of Bernard Mzeki, socio-anthropological, political and economic factors that ignited the First Chimurenga may have also contributed to the religious reasons that made the local people assassinate him. It shows that the environment of Mzeki was not only religious since he lived in a socio-anthropological, economic and political context too with the local people of Mangwende. This investigation therefore, intends to academically explore the authenticity of Mzeki’s martyrdom by revisiting the history of his life during the formative era of the Anglican Church in the diocese Mashonaland, the present day Zimbabwe.

1.4 Justification of the Study.

The martyr’s life is significant in the religious faith and spirituality of the Anglicans in Zimbabwe. It was during the episcopate of Bishop Paget, that he set a weekend of mid-June each year for the church to remember Mzeki from the late 1930s up to date. He is commemorated by the Anglican Communion especially; the CPCA, the Anglican Church in South Africa and the Anglican community from Mozambique where he was born (Newsday
Newspaper, 2013: 5). His devoted religious life and history does not only enthuse and inspire the faithful but is pregnant with meaning in the formation of the Anglican Church’s ethos - her faith, hymnal songs, liturgy and doctrine in Zimbabwe.

Much has been written about his religious identity in the church but there are many perspectives that require further scholarly and academic pursuit. There is no work that has critically looked at Bernard Mzeki’s identity in his social, political and economic context. Yet if all these factors are considered, a different identity of the person under study may result otherwise. This is indeed worthy and important to this investigation in order to know and understand how he identified with the politics of the day (as early as the 1890s up to 1896) where he was assassinated. It is noteworthy to mention that this was the period which is popularly known by the sons and daughters of the soil (Zimbabweans) as the First Chimurenga war (Farrant, 1996:85). It may be true that his religious identity was a contributory factor which led to his murder by the indigenous people. His assassination in 1896 was a result of conspiracy as well and remains a mystical experience.

1.5 Point of Departure.

This research work intends to investigate if, and in what ways, Bernard Mzeki’s social, political and economic identities might have contributed to his assassination too during the period of the First Chimurenga war of the 1896. It is significant to note that he did not come to Zimbabwe (formally known then as [southern] Rhodesia) to do missionary work in the 1890s alone. Neither did he come with other black or African missionaries for him to be identified as a missionary of the gospel. But he accompanied the white colonizers, known as the ‘British pioneer column’ whose aim was to ‘preach the good news’ and also to achieve social, economic and political gains (Farrant, 1996: 85). Baur (2000: 12) notes that this was the same period commonly known as the ‘scramble for Africa’ of the 1880s and 1890s where European nations were fighting to occupy the continent of Africa; hence, the religious identity of Bernard Mzeki and his calling to do God’s ministry was compromised if ever there was a calling. Coming into the country in association with such motives may have led to his assassination by the local people.

The research cannot avoid such questions as; was Mzeki a real preacher of the good news or bad news? Was he aware that his company was up to colonize Zimbabwe with the ‘bible’ and a machine gun (Knight, 2004: 7) Was he not motivated to accompany the colonizers by his faith and faith alone? This research seeks to provide answers to such questions. In many parts of the world, the gospel came as good news within their traditional beliefs, norms and cultures, as their forefathers were transformed to Christianity and civilization from their ‘primitive’ beliefs and ways of life. The Anglican Communion Magazine records that in definition and “etymologically, this is called enculturation or indigenization” (Anglican Communion Margazine, 2009: 12). In Zimbabwe, in the formative history of the Anglican Church, the gospel originally came sociologically, politically and economically as ‘bad news’, since it was brought by white colonizers and commended with violence and guns among the Zimbabwean people.

It is equally of importance to evaluate the reasons why Bishop Paget decided to celebrate and commemorate the life of the saint in the pre-independence era of 1960s (Newspday Newspaper, 21st March, and 2013: 5). Beach notes that this was the same period where the black pot of the Second Chimurenga war was being put on the coal fire (Beach, 1986: 125). Why was this day set aside for Anglicans to commemorate Bernard Mzeki forty years later? When the Anglicans met for the first time at the Bernard Mzeki shrine and years to come, did the white Anglican community attend the commemorations? In addition, the 1940s was the period were black political opposition parties namely ZIPRA), ZANU-PF and others were formed to fight the
ruling white regime of Ian Smith (Beach, 1986:120). This was also the same period where Black Consciousness was erupting in the United States of America and South Africa against black oppression, racism and apartheid (Beach, 1986: 124). Newsday Newspaper recorded that, “in the post-independence period from 1980s onwards, this gathering of the Anglican Zimbabwean community has been meeting at the rendezvous where he was murdered. The place is now called a Bernard Mzeki shrine. Adjacent to the shrine, a Bernard Mizeki College has been built in his remembrance” (Newsday Newspaper, 21st March 2013: 5).

Was his socio - economic and political identity worth having Mzeki religiously named a saint and martyr? Or was he not just a ‘victim of history”? Or was he not a traitor of his African people? Or was he not a liberator ‘Moses’ of all facets of the Zimbabwean people? The important question is why was he assassinated? And again, where they religious reasons alone that made Bishop Paget appoint this day to remember him or there were other socio - political and economic factors that need to be investigated in a scholarly manner?

The last question to be answered by this research is how worthy is it for the next generations of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe to continue to commemorate and celebrate the life of the martyr, Bernard Mzeki at the very shrine named after him.

1.6 Objectives of the Study.

This investigation seeks to establish the following objectives:

1. To trace the history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe from its formative period leading up to the death of Bernard Mzeki.

2. To establish the socio - political and economic factors that might have contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki.

3. To establish the theological and biblical notion of martyrdom.

4. To analyze the historical and religious life of Bernard Mzeki leading to his death and resultant commemoration.

5. To give a critical examination of Bernard Mzeki’s martyrdom in light of contemporary African Christendom notion and the Anglican church in Zimbabwe.

1.7 Research Methodology.

To begin with, the researcher notes that there are many forms from which historical data can be obtained. It is of paramount importance to consider primary and secondary sources in order to achieve the above mentioned. In addition, probability value and uncertainty shall be used as a tool to critically analyze the provided data from secondary and primary sources. Furthermore, historical, let alone, comparative, socio-anthropological and theological approaches are reliable to this study. The phenomenological analysis and political approaches are to be utilized and considered in this research work in order to determine some specific information in the research. The theoretical framework of post-colonial theory shall be highlighted.

1.7.1 The historical approach.
In this investigation, the researcher intends to analyze the causes surrounding the death and resultant identity of Mzeki during first Chimurenga uprising of 1896/7. Therefore, there is absolute need to consider the historical approach as a methodology. Chawarika (2012: 41) states that the historical approach takes stock of events as they occur as a way of tracing what contributed to a situation. It is worth noting that such a method of study in any inquiry will not be absolute and many other approaches are being used in conjunction. In this case, it is the history of Bernard Mzeki and his context. This history is pregnant with all sorts of constituent stories and events. While studying this history, the research investigation shall reveal all these variant elements without which no complete political and economic history that surround him has been told. Mzeki’s scene, the themes, the plot, the samples and character are historically and critically examined. The historical approach shall utilize quantitative and qualitative variables respectively in the gathering of historical information suitable for this investigation.

Musodza (2008:11) mentions that it is untrue to assume that all historical facts exist in written form or that all historical facts are accessible to the researcher. It became sensible for in this study to adopt this approach, which takes seriously oral history and oral traditions. Musodza mentions Jan Vansina’s work called, Oral Tradition as History, who suggests that oral history and oral tradition are a vital source of information for any meaningful historical research. In addition, oral tradition remains valuable since eyewitnesses bring useful resources for a historical research. Vansina (1961: 16) also suggests that although oral history and oral tradition, are important sources of historical research, they should not be seen as the same thing. For him “oral history includes reminiscences, hearsay, or eye witnesses’ accounts about events and situations which are contemporary, that is, which occur during the life time of the informants. This differs from oral traditions in that oral traditions are no longer contemporary. They have passed from mouth to mouth, for a period beyond the life time of the informants” (Musodza, 2008: 11).

Considering the period of the late nineteenth century of Mzeki, it is logical to rely on oral history and oral tradition as a way of collecting data. This information is not recorded but has handed over to next generations by word of mouth. This information, therefore, has become oral tradition. Such data is very reliable to this research investigation.

1.7.2 The comparative approach.

The comparative approach is being employed in this research work with the intent to compare and contrast the theology of martyrdom placed on Bernard Mzeki and the martyrdom credited to those who were persecuted in public because of their faith, the likes of Justin Martyr in the first few centuries of the Christian faith. It explores the dissimilarities and similarities of the identified persons. On the subject of this research investigation, this approach will be helpful to establish whether Bernard Mzeki qualifies to be called an African Martyr and therefore be canonized and be made a martyr. If he does not qualify, then the Zimbabwean Anglican Church might have to consider not to regard him as a martyr.

1.7.3 Socio – Anthropological Approach.

The researcher has come up with a methodological approach which he is calling a socio-anthropological approach. Even though these disciplines of sociology and anthropology are different, they share a commonality of an aspect of culture conflict theory.
Ritzer and Ryan (1974: 12) note that Auguste Comte was the founder of modern sociology. They state that sociology is generally connected with developments in the social world and changes in society. They define it as an attempt to describe different sets of social forces that develop in a society at different times and places, with different actors and results. As societies change, it is the nature of these changes that sociologists attempt to explain, and it is the changes themselves that lead to different explanations of these changes. And anthropology is, according to Green (2003: 13), a psychological tool used to comprehend culture and its role in the control of behavior. Its explicit processing therefore gives rise to the possibility of characteristically human social controls (e.g., bureaucracies, legal systems) and ideologies (religious beliefs, political ideology) that are able to regulate behavior within a particular historical context. The general definitions of sociology and anthropology, therefore, share a common ground, that is the aspect of culture. They both critically examine the dynamics and transmissions of cultures in a historical context and development. Gottward (2009:57) also points out that the socio-anthropological method includes all the methods of inquiry, proper social-sciences, that is anthropology, sociology, political science and psychology.

It is injustice in this proposed approach if the word culture here is not clearly defined. Culture refers to “information capable of affecting individuals’ behavior that they acquire from other members of their species through teaching, imitation, and other forms of social transmission” (Gottward, 2009: 57). Richerson and Boyd (2005: 8) and Sperber and Hirschfeld (2005; 40-46) define culture in a similar manner. They emphasize that the information characteristic of culture is of general relevance to group members and that it is represented in people’s minds and expressed in their behavior and interactions. On the mechanism for the production of culture, there is a greater understanding of the types of information that may be transmitted to others and a greater understanding of how this information may affect behavior in particular.

Therefore, the cultural conflict theory is derived from the historical context as Kurewa (2009: 18) puts it that the colonizers came with wrong perceptions about the indigenous people of Zimbabwe. For them, Africa was a dark continent. In 1918, Wilson Naylor and Lawrence College are on record as recorded by Kurewa (2009: 18) saying that the African people were of dark colour, they were also devoted to dark customs and practices; and that Africa was a land where even religion was a thing of darkness. Africa was considered as a continent of heathens, or a continent that was submerged by barbarism. Africa as a continent behind God’s face as they assumed it did not have the good things those other continents enjoyed the western civilized culture, religion, and so forth. At baptism the African converts were to be renamed either with biblical or western names (Kurewa, 2009, 18).

Hence, in collaboration with the colonialists, the church’s mission was to civilize the African people. The early missionaries sought to change the whole cultural outlook of those who had become Christian by Christianizing them and civilizing them according their national consciousness. Thus, the Africans were evangelised; meaning they were converted to a new faith–the Christian Faith. In addition, they were also civilized, but according to the national consciousness of the colonizers(Kurewa, 2009: 18).

The cultural conflict theory is, therefore, applied by the researcher to interrogate the classical paradigms of a socio–anthological inquiry. He intends to prove that it is the cultural conflict that contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki when the indigenous people resisted this cultural transformation to be ‘civilized’ the way Bernard Mizeki was. It must be pointed out that the relationship and interaction between the “stranger” who is in this case Bernard Mizeki and the “group” who are local people becomes a tragedy and clash of different cultures and orientation. And the local people’s resistance in the name of the First Chimurenga war of 1896 resulted in the death of Mzeki becomes who is assumed to be the tragedy of culture.
1.7.4 The Theological approach.

The researcher is of the option that this investigation is strongly premised on theological underpinning. It should be pointed out that a key question (which is theological) to be asked in this research work is: Why do people die for their faith?

This research, therefore, needs to state and put down the theology of martyrdom and identify it in relationship to the death of Mzeki. This approach will clarify the pregnant understanding of the theology of martyrdom in comparison with the martyrdom of Mzeki. Significantly, there is no way; therefore, this research work can be successfully done without poking into the annals of theology.

1.7.5 The Phenomenological Approach.

Husserl (1901: 63) defines phenomenology as a research word derived from Greek: *phenomenon* which means "that which appears"; and *logos* "study" is a philosophical movement (Husserl, 1901: 63). In Husserl’s conception, phenomenology is primarily concerned with the systematic reflection on and analysis of the structures of consciousness, and the phenomena which appear in acts of consciousness. In its most basic form, phenomenology attempts to create conditions for the objective study of topics usually regarded as subjective: consciousness and the content of conscious experiences such as judgments, perceptions, and emotions. This scenario suits well with the situation under study in this research work.

Phenomenology is understood by Cox (1998:16) as involving the use of epoche, eidetic intuition and empathetic interpolation. This is achieved by what he terms the step by step method that is performing epoche describing the phenomena, naming the phenomena, describing relationship and testing. Though many of the phenomenological methods involve various reductions, phenomenology is essentially anti-reductionist. On this regard, the reductions are mere tools used with the intent to understand and describe the workings of consciousness, not to reduce any phenomenon to these descriptions (Chawarika, 2012:46). The method describes what is happening in the settings and maintaining the original appearance of reality ensuring objectivity. It is loosely rooted in an epistemological device, with septic roots, called “epoche.” In this view, Husserl (1901: 64) writes that the method entails the suspension of judgment while relying on the intuitive grasp of knowledge which is free of presuppositions and intellectualizing. Sometimes phenomenological methods are depicted as the “science of experience.” Sokolowski (2000: 159) writes that, therefore, the phenomenological method is rooted in intentionality.

It is important, therefore, to mention that the researcher is a black priest in the Anglican Diocese of Harare. He has worked in the church for the past fifteen years. He has commemorated and has been at the shrines of Mzeki in Zimbabwe and in Mozambique for years now. Hence, it becomes significant for the researcher to exercise “epoche”. He should approach the investigation without religious spectacles and without being value judgemental.

1.7.6 The Political Approach.

Italian renaissance philosopher, Niccolò Machiavelli asserts that when the prince comes into power in a land that does not share either his culture or language, he has to do basically two
things: first, to reside within the land and second, to plant colonies that will divide the people making it easier to rule and maintain power. According to Machiavelli, “the other and better course is to send colonies to one or two places, which may be as keys to that state, for it is necessary either to do this or else to keep there a great number of cavalry and infantry” (Machiavelli, 1530: XIV). This may be related to the colonization of Zimbabwe, whereas the Prince is reflected by the Pioneer Column who, in a bid to maintain and lay roots to their power, appoint a colony to chief Mangwende’s homestead, a colony who in this regard manifest in the man and person of Bernard Mzeki, a black man with a devoted Christian faith.

The death Bernard of Mzeki is a cause for many controversies in the annals of the formative historicity of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. Despite the generally accepted and most common understanding that he died as a martyr, one may turn to political philosophy to present a fundamentally alternative rationale for how he died. Based on political philosophy, one can argue that Mzeki’s death had nothing to do with his faith but rather it was purely power politics at play. Mzeki came to Zimbabwe accompanied by the Pioneer Column, with a British culture and language that was not his own, preaching a faith that caused a dichotomy and threatened the very fabric of the local tradition practiced by the indigenous Shona and Ndebele ethnic groups marked the beginning of the colonization of the land of Zimbabwe

Mzeki goes on to marry the Chief’s niece and even build a home for himself, but his continued disregard for the native Zimbabwean traditions beliefs, customs, norms and way of life and preference and support for the colonizers in the period of the first Chimurenga struggle identifies him as an instrument of political socialization of the colonial culture.

Machiavelli (1530) defines political socialization as "the developmental process by which people acquire their political orientation and patterns of behavior" (Machiavelli, 1530: XIV). It is basically the process of teaching and learning about the aspects of the political system. It can also regard as a process by which political cultures are formed, maintained and transformed over time. As such political socialization becomes a developmental process through which people learn accepted attitudes and values of their political culture and those of others (Machiavelli, 1530, XIV).

This means that Bernard Mzeki was a black African missionary but British in his orientation, attitude, behavior and his understanding of a white pattern of political systems. This did not rest well with the local people. Mzeki was politically identified with authority which was derived from pursuing his interest which was to diffuse political structures of the local people. Subsequently, he is assassinated by his in-laws.

The researcher is of a strong conviction that the calling of Bernard Mzeki as a saint and martyr and shrining the place which he was murdered after him by Bishop Paget in the late 1930s was a political move. And the schism which took place between the former Bishop of the Anglican Province of Harare, Bishop Nolbert Kunonga and Bishop Chad Gandiya of the Anglican Diocese of Harare (C.P.C.A) in 2007 over the Bernard Mzeki shrine was more than a religious division; it was a political fight. Hence, this approach becomes valuable to this thesis. (See appendix 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

1.8 Research Gap of the Investigation.

The literature in the academic scene pictures a Mzeki whose religious life and ministry is punctuated by success throughout. A noteworthy point of importance is that much of these books have been written by Western imperialial historians, hence, his religious life and death are extra ordinarily mystified. Therefore, the research gap in this investigation is his identity in
the socio-anthropological, political and economic context which might have contributed to his demise besides the religious reasons given.

1.9 Theoretical Framework: Post – Colonial Theory.

In pursuit of understanding the identity of Bernard Mzeki in contexts locked into socio-political and economic upheavals, post-colonial theory is taking the lead among academics and research works. Hence, the researcher wishes to consider this theory as a methodology. Post-colonial theory is increasingly attracting greater interest in many tri-continental studies. Achiele (1995: 85) writes that this theory is concerned with the socio-political context in which the voice of the other is being silenced and whereby socio-political powers and identities are constructed. Post-colonial theory takes into consideration the situation of the colonizer as well as the colonized, in order to reconstruct a negotiating space for equity (Achiele, 1995: 85). In post-colonial theory, the researcher argues that the bible has been marked as a powerful rhetorical instrument of imperialism in colonial settings.

On the same note, Knight (2004: 42). says that the theory is an umbrella term that covers a multitude of practices and concerns of diverse races, empires, colonies, geographical centers, times and genres. It emphasizes the pervasiveness of imperialism and relates imperial expansion, impact, and response. Post-colonial theories situate all parameters of imperial and colonial currents of dominance and resistance. It challenges researchers to examine contextual practices for imperial and colonial currents of domination and suppression.

It is within this scope that this theory is applicable on this investigation of Bernard Mzeki’s identity. In the same manner in which Post-Colonial Theory identifies the Bible as a political tool, Bernard Mzeki is also identified by the locals as a political link between the colonizers and the indigenous people. Mbiti (1992: 41) notes that the Post-Colonial critics believe that the native African people were highly and notoriously religious. Therefore, the colonizers had to look for an instrument which was identifiable with them. In this case, the bible presents a decorated religious face. In the same manner, the missionaries for them to be accepted by the locals looked for a mediator who was identified with the blacks. And in this case, Bernard Mzeki was used as the instrument and tool. At first, the locals accepted the bible and Mzeki but later own, they rejected it and him. It is of paramount importance to mention that this theory shall follow like liquid throughout the study. It must be mention that the theory has a weakness in this investigation in the sense that the researcher shall look at the influence of Bernard Mzeki in the pre-colonial period.

1.10. Literature Review.

The centrality of literature review gives an outline on the field of inquiry of what has already been written about the life and death of Bernard Mzeki. It is important to mention that among the prominent historians that have researched about Mzeki, his interesting death is mentioned in passing as if it is a non-event. However, several articles written by missionaries and white settlers do not bring about the clarity anticipated of his death save for his religious exponential successes. This literature review shall highlight the martyrdom of the early church with an intention to compare and verify with Mzeki’s martyrdom. The literature that deals with the socio-anthropological, political and economic agenda of the colonizers for the scramble for Africa in the late eighteenth century shall be looked at critically in order to show the prevailing relevant ideas that are appropriate in this research work.
It becomes paramount to this research to go into much more detail here. Sources of data and materials available, where it is and how to access it should be highlighted and elucidated clearly.

1.10.1 Primary Sources.

The primary sources are usually first hand data. The researcher cites that for him to access first-hand information, there is need to consider interviews and questionnaires as a way of collecting primary information.

There are many people who are in one way or another connected to the person of Mzeki, either directly or indirectly. These people could shed some light on some topical and pertinent issues. Among these people is the son of the first convert of Bernard Mzeki, John Kapuya who is of the first generation. He is still alive. He is one person who can inform the researcher data handed over to him from his father who shared friendship with Mzeki. This is oral tradition which is very much considered as important to this study. Musodza (2008) claims that, “in fact oral tradition has become a powerful academic tool in historiographical study in the twenty first century” (Musodza, 2008: 13). He can shed much light ton many issues like the socio political context of his father and Mzeki in the late eighteenth century, the Shona-Ndebele relationship prior to the coming of the Whiteman and the uprising of the first Chimurenga that led to the assassination of Mzeki. The researcher hopes that John Kapuya will be able to refer him to other people of his generation and Mzeki’s relatives in Zimbabwe and in Gwambeni in Mozambique who can be helpful to this study.

The researcher has lined up other possible people for interviews who are the following: the Archbishop, the Most Reverend Father, Albert Chama and the episcopal bench of the CPC. The Anglican Dioceses which are in the Province are as follows: Zimbabwe, Malawi, Botswana and Zambia (Chawarika J, 2012: 1). It is worthy to note that the audio tapes will be used to capture the interviewees’ views. Other communication technologies available used to communicate will be used like skype, email, “whatsapps,” MP 3 and Facebook to reach out to respondents in order to reach them. This becomes easy to communicate with those outside Zimbabwe. It is very much important to hear their official and personal views on the issues raised in this research. There is need to also interview the members of the clergy in the Anglican Diocese of Harare where the shrine of the martyr is established and other Anglican Dioceses in Zimbabwe. It would be of interest to interview Reverend Father Mutukwa who is the vicar of St Peter’s parish in Dombotombo, Marondera where the shrine is. He is the priest in charge of the shrine. The interest of Marondera is coming from the fact that the parish has gathered the literature about the shrine of Mzeki. The laity of the Anglican Diocese of Harare and outside Harare is to be interviewed too in order to establish their understanding about Bernard Mzeki.

The researcher intend to interview bishops in the ACZ, CPC and others the borders of the Zimbabwean Church. Prominent historians of the History Department at the University of Zimbabwe like Ruziwi, Chitando and others shall be considered to collect information. The academic consultants were considered in order to also shed some light on some historical aspects of the Shona uprising of 1896/7. Although the above have been lined up for formal interview, the researcher intend to carry out some informal interviews with the wide spectrum of general members of other denominations to hear on what they generally know about Bernard Mzeki.

It is important to note that the questionnaires are useful to the respondents who are educated and illiterate. They are to be well knowledgeable with the life history of the person under study. For the questionnaires are also effective to the respondents who can read and write. The
objectives especially number four, that is to find out why the Anglican community continues to remember Bernard Mzeki each year and its significant can easily be achieved by questionnaires. The questionnaire can also be posted on the CPCA Facebook page through the internet and get responses of what the Anglican community says about Bernard Mzeki, the martyr. Questionnaires can also be given to selected parishes in different Dioceses in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and in the Church of the Province of Central Africa and hear responses. This will also include the members of the clergy in those Dioceses selected. It must be mentioned that the questionnaire will be translated to suit the local languages of the respondents to those who do not understand the international language of English in different nations in the Province respectively.

It is paramount to cite that beside the use of interviews and questionnaires to gather data on Bernard Mzeki, the researcher intends to make use of various archives to get more data. For the researcher has already pointed out from the beginning of this research that they are no books so far that has looked at the socio and political context of Bernard Mzeki. This however should not stand in the way of the research as an impediment as it becomes significant to use the archival data.

There are archives that have kept information about Mzeki and probably his contextual scene. The Zimbabwe National Archives and the United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (USPG), (which is now officially known as US) Archives at Partnership House in London. These are places where important information of Bernard Mzeki and any other persons who worked close to him are preserved. There are several fragmented articles here and there in the Archives which can be of help to the researcher’s study. Because of this, he has to make use of these sources as a way of gathering information. By perusing through articles and oral literature in the Archives, the researcher intends to come up with valuable information about the context of Bernard Mzeki.

1.10.2 Secondary Sources.

The local libraries and the one at the University of Pretoria are useful as sources of secondary resources for this study. It is from the libraries that the researcher is able to get books about Mzeki written by Western and African church historians, missiologists, sociologists, and political scientists in the area of research. Libraries are helpful in providing the researcher with text books or published materials, journals and unpublished manuscripts. The use of extensive bibliographical information, magazines, and newspaper articles are other sources which can provide background data to the research work of Bernard Mzeki’s sociological and political context that may have contributed to his death. Through the secondary sources, the researcher is able to reflect, examine and critically analyze the recorded history in a manner that will help the researcher to achieve his investigation.

1.11 The Religious Background of Bernard Mzeki.


The interest of the researcher in J. C. Farrant’s biographical book is clearly displayed. The book is a biography of Mzeki which highlights his religious history, starting from his original home in Gwambeni, Mozambique, through South Africa till his death in Mashonaland. This book’s focus is paramount to this investigation because it gives the religious identity of the person under study.
Born in Gwambeni, Mozambique, Mzeki was taken to Cape Town a young boy where he was baptism, taught and trained by Father Puller, an Anglican clergy from London. His education brings out several facts. Firstly, he was introduced to western education, culture, and the Christian faith and doctrines. Secondly, he further learnt several languages that enable him to communicate with both schoolmates and teachers (Farrant, 1996: 115). This educational exposure made him to begin to behave like a Briton in character and personality.

In 1891, he volunteered together with some of his colleagues to go on a Missionary work in a newly established Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland as a catechist in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) with Bishop Knight Bruce and the pioneer column. He was stationed at chief Mangwende’s home stand where he was viewed with greatest alarm with the local indigenous people (Farrant, 1996: 115). This is because he spoke the Whiteman’s language, dressed like a Whiteman and most of his characteristics were white apart from his skin.

It is of interest to cite that from this book, the researcher notes these similarities of behaviour between Mzeki and the whites that might have made the locals to develop negative attitudes. Close to the chief’s home stand, Bernard Mzeki attempted to establish a Christian community. This new community included both the local people and some members of the royal family. He eventually married Mutwa, a niece to the chief. However, other members of the royal family mistrusted and disliked him.

It becomes important to the researcher to note that as much as Farrant continues to give the impression that Bernard Mzeki was killed because of his religious beliefs, the following questions should be answered. Who influenced Mzeki to marry Mutwa from the royal family? Was it not a way of a diplomatic political alliance created by the colonizers for them to achieve their socio-political and economic agenda? And in addition, could all members of the royal family understand the idea of forming a new community outside away from the Chief’s Palace?

Furthermore, the biography records that Mzeki cut down *mikute trees* found in Mangwende’s graveyard which was the most holy and sacred place in the whole of Mangwende’s area. He went on to mark crosses on the stumps of these trees. This was offensive and was regarded as disrespect to the fabric religious norms and culture of the locals (Farrant, 1996: 85). Another question that the researcher may raise is: did he do this because he was just ignorant or arrogant or his religiosity just went too far?

And, again, Mzeki had come without relatives. He accidentally came across people in Mangwende whom he shared the same totem with. These people thus became his relatives as recorded by Farrant (1996: 86). Could some members of the royal family understand him now that he had relatives? Was it not a plot to overthrow the chief? Important, this book does not answer the above mentioned questions that are significant to this research work. The researcher, therefore, intends to embark on this investigation in order provide possible answers to the above rhetorical questions.

The author writes that Mzeki unwaveringly supported the Whiteman’s government and policies especially the hut tax, branding of cattle with rinderpest. The invasion of the locusts worsened an already bad situation (Farrant, 1996: 85). It is interesting to cite that Mzeki’s death followed these events. However, Farrant clearly points out that Mzeki was to be killed with every European, every black man who has concerted and cooperated with the European and every half caste child whose father is European.

Conclusively, Farrant’s book refers to the invasion of locusts that worsened Mzeki’s situation. This is relevant to his death. Even though Farrant mentions this in passing, this contributed to his death in the sense that Mzeki’s presence to the locals was a cause to the invasion of locusts.
This was used as a political reason for the cause of his assassination. Therefore, this book becomes valuable for a review to this investigation.


This newspaper article provides the researcher with Bernard Mzeki’s religious journey up to his death just as what Farrant attempted to do. What the above article adds up is that it provides one more empirical reason why Mzeki was killed by the locals. This article suggests that his death was merely instigated by the N’angas (witch doctors) around that time who saw ministry as a threat to their authority. At this period, the N’angas had religious and political powers (Anglican Diocese of Harare Supplement, Newsday 21st March, 2013: 5). Therefore, this may suggest a political reason why then Mzeki was killed because he was viewed by the N’angas as one who was attempting to take away political authority from them. The article also provides the significance of Mzeki’s martyrdom and his influence to the Anglican community in Zimbabwe today. Hence, this article is useful to this research work.

It records that Bernard Mzeki was born around 1861 on the bay of Inhambane, in Mozambique, south of Beira. At the age of 14, he went with a group of other young men to seek work in Cape Town in South Africa, and for the next ten years he worked for butchery. During this time, he came into contact with the Anglican Church, first by attending night school, then by going to the parish which was staffed by members of the society of St John the Evangelist, the Cowley Fathers. They made a deep impression on him and he was baptized and confirmed. His education in spite of the late start, made rapid progress and he became confident and cultured person with a Briton’s culture, with a particular gifts of music and for languages (Anglican Diocese of Harare Supplement, Newsday 21st March, 2013: 5). He devoted his time to the word of God and this became reflected in his character whose gentleness and gracious impressed all who met him. He was convinced that God was calling him to be a missionary.

His chance came in 1891 when Bishop Knight Bruce recruited him to join the party which was about to make the most difficult journey via Beira into Eastern Zimbabwe to form a new diocese. On arrival, Bernard Mzeki was given the task of living among the Chief Mangwende’s people near Marondera and to build up a mission school and church there (Anglican Diocese of Harare Supplement, Newsday 21st March, 2013: 5).

For the next five years, Mzeki worked hard. His aptitude in languages soon enabled him to communicate with the Shona-speaking people of Mangwende. He eventually became a key member of the small group which was given the task to produce part of the prayer book and the scriptures into vernacular. The criticism is often made of eighteenth century missionaries is that they were ignorant and looked down upon the culture and religion of those whom they were sent but this was never true of Bernard Mzeki. His identification with the Mangwende people became stronger after he married a young woman by the name Mutwa, who was related to the chief. When the rebellion against white people started in 1896, it was also targeting those who worked closed with them (Anglican Diocese of Harare Supplement, Newsday 21st March, 3012: 5). It was at this juncture that Bernard Mzeki was speared to death by two sons of chief Mangwende; Mutwa escaped and later gave birth to a daughter named Bernadine.

Empirical historiographical sources suggest that, his death was merely instigated by jealous N’angas around that time who saw his work and ministry as a threat to their authority and beliefs in the way they worshipped the local indigenous god, Mwari. This came as Mzeki had converted Shoniwa (late John Kapuya) to join him after convincing him that it was useless to rely for protection for making sacrifices to the spirits under the direction of a n’anga because the Holy Spirit of Mwari is available for this purpose (Anglican Diocese of Harare Supplement, Newsday 21st March, 2013: 5). Conclusively, this article becomes valuable to this research work.
in the sense that Mzeki’s religious life and death influence the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe today as mentioned above.

1.12 Conclusion.

The mysterious death of Bernard Mzeki can be an academic problem. With the aforementioned views from various angels, it remains task of the researcher to investigate whether Mzeki is a martyr or whether they may be other reason which may have contributed to this death besides religious factors. It is in the next chapters that the researcher intends to walk this scholarly journey to address issues raised in the objectives of this investigation.

1.13 Chapter outline.

**Chapter one**: This is where the general background of the thesis is highlighted. This shall include the introduction, Area of investigation, problem statement; objectives of the study and definition of terms are stated. This chapter shall deal with the theoretical framework of the post-colonial theory and the literature review. The literature review shall be grouped into four sub topics, that is, the religious historical background of Bernard Mzeki, the martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki, the socio-anthropological context of Bernard Mzeki, and finally the political context of Bernard Mzeki. This is the Research Methodology chapter. It shall include the following: primary and secondary sources, historical, comparative, socio-anthropological, theological, and phenomenological and finally the political approaches used in the methodology. The religious historical background of Bernard Mzeki shall be highlighted.

- **Chapter Two**: The formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe.
- **Chapter Three**: Martyrdom as precursor to the analysing of the death of Bernard Mzeki.
- **Chapter Four**: The Presentation of secondary data on Bernard Mzeki’s ministry, identity, martyrdom, commemoration and influence.
- **Chapter Five**: Presentation of primary data on Bernard Mzeki’s ministry, identity, martyrdom, commemoration and influence.
- **Chapter six**: Critical Analysis of primary and secondary data on Bernard Mzeki’s ministry, identity, martyrdom, commemoration and influence.
- **Chapter Seven**: Conclusion and Recommendation.
Chapter two  
Formative History of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe.

2.1 Introduction.

In this chapter, the researcher intends to trace the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe from the Church of the Province of South Africa (C.P.S.A) to the creation of the Diocese of Mashonaland, in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) from the early 1890s. For it is important to put Bernard Mzeki who is being investigated in this thesis in the right context and background of historicity. The researcher will trace briefly how the Shona people got into contact with early Christianity from the Roman Catholic Church and the early activities of the London Missionary Society. In addition, he shall closely look at the bishopric of Knight Bruce in Bloemfontein and first pastoral expedition of Bishop Knight Bruce to Mashonaland in the east via king Lobengula’s court of the Ndebele in the west, his findings and coming back to his Diocese. The researcher shall also closely look at the pioneer Column and its chaplaincy and its travel to Mashonaland. Furthermore, he shall focus on the Bishop resignation from the See of the Diocese of Bloemfontein and his travel with the person under investigation, Bernard Mzcki and other African catechists to Rhodesia to create and establish a new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland. Finally, the researcher shall look briefly at life history of Bernard Mzeki, the person under study from Gwambeni, Mozambique; his life in Cape Town, South Africa and his calling to ministry and finally, him volunteering with other African catechists to join Bishop Knight Bruce in his travel to Mashonaland to create a new Diocese.

2.2 Formation of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland.

2.2.1 General History of the Diocese.

The general history of the Diocese of Mashonaland in the period has been treated, somewhat briefly, by Evans (1945) and in more detail, by G.E.P Broderick (Unpublished, typescript, 1953). Both authors are deemed to have achieved this more by way of chronicle and anecdote than a clear critical analysis. However, and there are large lacunae in both narratives (Welch, P. 2008:2). Arnold (1985) who made a further attempt at writing the history ended up merely summarising the work of the two; Evans and Broderick.

There are biographies that have been published of the earliest figures who were involved at the very beginning like the catechist, saint and martyr; Bernard Mzeki and other missionaries, Arthur Shearly Cripps. Farrant’s biography of Mzcki (1966) although now rather outdated according to Welch, (2008:3) in approach and occasionally inaccurate in detail, it still makes sensitive use of sources and so offered considerable insight into the circumstances of the1890s and into the action of the first bishop, Knight Bruce. The narrow focus of those who have studied Cripps, however, Steere (1973) and Steele (1975, 2000) limits their contribution to an understanding of wider church, post-1901.

Since the 1960s, there were very large numbers of recorded Christian activities in colonial Zimbabwe, which were produced. These records, however also had their limits where the general history of the diocese was concerned, as they either ignored settler religious history or treat it in only one aspect, that of a (stereotypical) failure of settler Christians in their duty towards indigenous communities, whether Christian or not (Welsh, 2008: 1). There was furthermore, no study devoted to Anglican mission history alone, so even that history had to be extracted from general and comparative works of other researchers.
Only the historian John Weller seemed to offer some balanced study though much constrained by limitations of space. In 1984, Weller pointed out that the Anglican Church was, to an exceptional degree (in a racially – divided society), a bi-cultural institution. He also offered a fresh general historiography: in ‘Anglican Centenary’ (1991). Weller began the story in 1891, with the arrival in the diocese of Knight Bruce and five black catechists. Earlier accounts emphasise a journey of exploration made by Knight Bruce in 1888 and the entry of Francis Balfour, a white clergyman with the British South Africa Company’s pioneer column in 1890 (Welsh, 2008: 2).

Historical accounts of the Anglican activities, recited by Ranger T. in a variety of his publications since the 1960s, as he identify political overtones to missionary activity in Southern Rhodesia and to discern an indigenous response to that activity (Welch, 2008:3). He dawned, in particular, on one of the two main printed records of the diocese, the Mashonaland/Southern Rhodesia Quarterly Paper, a compilation of reports and letters, mainly from serving missionaries, published in England between 1892 and 1926 ( ibid, 2006: 3). Ranger employed the new historiography of the wide-ranging significance of religious practice, which scholars used to compliment the study of institutions in the study of the Makoni (1987) and Matobo (1999).

The principal sources used here were the published and unpublished records of the diocese itself, from the National Archives of Zimbabwe; those of the CPSA in the library of the University of Witwatersand; and those of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at Rhodes House, Oxford. A variety of other sources, not only used by previous historians, have also been consulted in this study. These sources shall include sundry records of the Church of England and the wider Anglican Church., many of them published, others to be found in the Record Centre of the General Synod of the Church of England and in Lambeth Palace Library.

This approach enabled gaps in the history of the diocese to be filled in and major events to be, not just chronicled, but explained. The new methods and approach of the historiography are also employed here tracing not just the development of an institution, with its staff, buildings and Synods but also the emergence of districts local religious identity. It was hoped, therefore, that this study will contribute both to the new generation of histories of church institutions, which were appearing world-wide, and also to that of the new historiography.

In the formative history of the diocese, it was important to examine the religious role of Knight Bruce, and the conflict inherent in the attempts of the bishop of the English church to establish missions in Mashonaland while distancing himself from the British South Africa Company’s activities. The evidence of rivalry between him and Cecil Rhodes (as pointed to by Fripp and Hiller in 1949) was considered in some detail and the starting point of the Anglican activity was once again taken as 1890. But with the entry of two, rather than one white clergyman to the territory with the pioneer column. Only one of these was a settler chaplain, however, Balfour’s presence is seen, not as an endorsement of company rule but as an attempt to smuggle a missionary into the area (Welch, 2008: 6).

2.2.2 The (CPSA) Anglican Church’s Contact with Mashonaland.

In 1891, the CPSA, a daughter church of the Church of England, moved into Central Africa. Sundkler, B. and C. Steed, make a very relevant comment on the trends taking place in South Africa during the 19th century and this was true not only of South Africa but also as we move into Central Africa as well. The two observe that “the 19th century history of South Africa was characterized by a series of north-ward bound movements. Economic, political and ethnic factors all played a part in these ‘treks’. These movements also involved missionaries”
It was recorded that Negomo Mupunzagutu was the first Munhumutapa to become a Christian. He was converted by a well-known Portuguese Jesuit missionary Dom Gonsalo Da Silveira (Musodza A, 2008: 36). During this period in history the Portuguese had established their trading posts in Mozambique as well as along the Zambezi River. Their major interest in Zimbabwe was to extract gold and ivory. Since this trade had long been established by Arabs as well as the Swahili people, a situation was set for clashes amongst these groups of people for economic reasons. This created a context within which Gonsalo Da Silveira was sent from Goa, to come and convert the Munhumutapa Empire. The strategy was to start conversion from the top so as to impact the bottom with the help of the top which could make the task very easy. In this way once the Munhumutapa was converted, it could mean that his subjects could embrace the religion of their King and so ensure that Portugal could become the sole power in charge of trade in this part of the world (Farrant J, 1966: 68). Despite the express effort by Fr. Gonsalo Da Silveira, Fr. Andre Fernandez, and Br. Andre Da Costa, their missionary endeavour could best be described as having been a flop. What started as a success story when the King’s mother and the King embraced the new faith, ended up claiming the death of Gonsalo Da Silveira (Mudenge S. I. G, 1986: 10).

There was some hatred that was brewed by the Arab and Swahili traders who saw the efforts by Portuguese missionaries as a threat to their economic enterprise. They concocted some lies against this mission team, and so accused them of being agents of the Portuguese government. This meant that they were now being viewed as spies. The holy baptism which had been administered with all its solemnity and efficacy was misinterpreted as a clear way of incapacitating the King and His mother (Musodza A, 2008: 37, Mudenge S. I. G, 1986, 10). On the other hand since Silveira was a man of his time, a time when relics were held in high esteem, he kept a human bone, presumably belonging to one of the martyrs. When the local people and particularly the enemies of the catholic faith saw this, they accused Gonsalo Da Silveira of being a witch, an accusation which was quite sustainable given the spirituality of the Mutapa people which did not see value in human skulls, other than that of being a clear sign of witchcraft (Musodza A, 2008: 36, Mudenge S. I. G, 1986: 3). It was suggested that his actions would stop the rains from coming and so that would automatically lead to hunger and starvation in the Mutapa Empire. Therefore, the only thing that the Mutapa people decided to do according to S. I. G Mudenge (1986) was to kill Gonsalo Da Silveira, a move that would relegate the Christian faith to irrelevance at that period. Mudenge maintained that Silveira was executed on the night of the 15/16 March 1561 (Musodza A, 2008: 37, Mundenge S. I. G, 1986: 3). Although there were further efforts by the Dominicans in the latter part of the 16th century, who managed to set up churches at Sofala, Sena and Tete and some Jesuits who also returned to give it another trial, such efforts did not yield much result (Farrant J, 1966: 68). Some of these missionaries were reported to be owning slaves whom they oppressed so much and others became soaked in the military onslaughts which were common during this period. As such, other than preaching the Gospel of salvation, some of them also became attracted to making money and so engaged themselves in gold panning. Both the Dominicans and the Jesuits of this era were accused of racial arrogance.
The LMS made efforts to make disciples in the western part of Mashonaland. On the other hand, the mission to the Ndebele people was set up in 1859 by Robert Moffat. He had previously worked among the Botswana people from 1821 to 1830 in addition to the several years spent in Kuruman in South Africa (Musodza A, 2008: 38). Moffat, therefore, was fairly accustomed to people of color and their traditions. He was the one who persuaded his son-in-law David Livingstone to come out to Africa in 1840. Moffat obtained a farm at Inyati from Mzilikazi and he team stayed among the Ndebele people with his team madding frantic efforts to evangelize and convert them, yet their efforts could not bear any fruits. It could appear that the Ndebele people were destined to remain adamant and remain closely soaked in the religion of their ancestors (Ibid, 2008: 38). On the other hand, their King Mzilikazi seemed to have given these missionaries space but without sufficient opportunities to convert his people. He was known to have put in place a mechanism to deal with those people who could give these missionaries an ear to their evangelization efforts (ibid, 2008: 38). It was within this context that Hildebrandt (1981) was right to say that “for thirty years the LMS, labored in Rhodesia without very many people making decisions for Christ,” (Hiderbrandt, 1981: 176).

Given this scenario and the warlike nature of the Ndebele King, certainly no meaningful progress could be made in this part of the mission field and so Robert Moffat and his team continued to stay hoping that one day a miracle would happen and a bumper harvest could be realized (Musodza, 2008: 39). Sadly as noted by Isichei, “one of the four pioneers Sykes stayed there until he died in 1887, and never won a single convert”(Isichei E, 1995: 114). Considering the time frame suggested by Hildebrandt above, thirty years is certainly a long time to labor in vain. The stumbling blocks seemed to have been too insurmountable and so one can therefore understand why most missionaries later on welcomed the overthrow of the Ndebele Kingdom (Hilderbrandt, 1981: 176). This Kingdom seemed to have been a serious impediment to the missionary enterprise in Zimbabwe as a whole and in Matabeleland in particular. Whereas the LMS was laboring in vain in the western part of the country the Anglican Church from the CPSA, was also beginning to take interest in the land north of the Limpopo River, particularly the eastern part (Musodza, 2008: 39).

This interest was shown through the religious ‘trek’ to the north which was initiated by Rev. William Greenstock, a priest from the Diocese of Grahamstown in South Africa. He made plans to travel to Mashonaland in 1874. According to records kept in the Cory Library at Rhodes University, Rev. William Greenstock was working in the Diocese of Grahamstown, where he had founded St Matthew’s Mission at Keiskammahoek close to King William’s Town, with twenty five years’ experience as a missionary, and knowledge of the Zulu language (Greenstock W, undated letter, MS16727/1). The background to this pioneering visit by Rev William Greenstock was that he had worked hard and deserved to go on furlough. Instead of sailing back to England which was done by his contemporaries he opted to spend that time in that land north of the Limpopo, and utilize it in establishing the possibility of opening a mission there. He therefore, resolved on this undertaking although he did not have the means and resources to do so. Since this was a missionary journey, aimed at spreading the Gospel, he turned to SPG for assistance (Musodza A, 2008: 39).

Farrant maintained that “the society responded generously with a contribution of 450 pounds to support this singular opportunity for opening mission work in a wholly new region,” (Farrant J, 1966: 69). It could appear Rev William Greenstock could not venture into the unknown lands all by himself, and so he looked for some people who were also interested in this new missionary field. In this regard, he enlisted a gentleman named Thomas Baines, who was an artist and an explorer who had always held some mining interests in Matabeleland. As fate could have it, Thomas Baines’ wish was never realized since he died in Durban and so that caused a setback in the whole plan of moving northwards.
However, Rev William Greenstock did not respond. Armed with an SPG grant and a desire to pioneer this new field for the Anglican Church, he finally set out on his own, and arrived in Gubulawayo (present day Bulawayo), in 1875, (Farrant J, 1966: 69). Upon his arrival and interview with Lobengula, he found him to be a sophisticated man whom one could do business with. Writing from there he says “Lobengula is an enlightened man, far in advance of his people. I had several interviews and he consents to having a mission in his country… we hope ultimately to evangelize not only the Matabele, but the Shona on the north and east, who have no missionary and whose language is unwritten.” (Musodza A, 2008: 40). Rev William Greenstock was happy to have reached Matabeleland and opened the possibility of the Anglican Church missionary activities and so when he returned home he wrote to the SPG, reporting on his achievements. In the report he also made a proposal to be allowed to return to Matabeleland and be the first Anglican Missionary in that part of the mission field. In his letter to the SPG, he says;

I have pleasure in reporting to the committee that I reached the Matabele country in September and obtained for your Society the leave of the country. My wife and I, offer ourselves for this work. We propose to leave our six children in England and return to South Africa if possible not later than September next. Till the desirableness of the site to be pointed out by the King has been proved, it will be well for us to labor alone, but when the work assumes a permanent character I might hope to have the help of an American engineer named Mr R. Browne who has been engaged as Reader under Bishop Macrorie. From what I saw of the Matabele I judge that Sisterhood would be very effective amongst them, but it would not be safe to attempt anything of that kind in the first instance. (Musodza A, 2008: 41)

Following such a glowing and exciting experience in Matabeleland, the SPG began to consider seriously the possibility of establishing a bishopric in this new region. The S.P.G. was making such plans in line with the report given by Rev William Greenstock and also convinced that Rev William Greenstock to be the pioneer Bishop of this new diocese of Mashonaland. However, these plans were stopped by the political developments in South Africa. The long history of strife between the Boers and the British seems to have caught up with progress in the Transvaal. Farrant J. wrote that “these plans had to be abandoned when serious political troubles arose in the Transvaal.” (Farrant J, 1966: 70). This posed a huge setback and disappointment for Rev William Greenstock whose attention was now focused towards the North. This mission enterprise never materialized and it was to take another thirteen years before the epic journey of George Hamilton Wyndham Knight-Bruce ensued. The reports produced by Rev William Greenstock must have influenced and inspired Bishop G.W.H Knight-Bruce, to take his own missionary journey in 1888. From this journey by Rev. William Greenstock the land lying north of the Limpopo was certainly never going to be the same again (Musodza A, 2008, 42).

2.2.4 The Diocese of Bloemfontein and its Vacant See.

The history of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland cannot be told in isolation from that of the Diocese of Bloemfontein since Mashonaland was an extension of the latter Diocese. The Diocese of Bloemfontein was the cradle which gave birth to the Diocese of Mashonaland. This was proved especially during the episcopacy of Bishop George Whydham Hamilton Knight-Bruce, a clergyman of astounding energy exhaling from England (Knight Bruce, 1888, Diary). In order to appreciate the role that Bishop G. W. H. Knight-Bruce, played in the formation of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, one has to look at the overview of the Diocese of Bloemfontein. This overview does not require one to give much attention to the Diocese of Bloemfontein, instead one needs to use such information and see it as a preparation for the missionary work that led to the foundation of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland.
The Diocese of Bloemfontein came about as a result of Bishop Robert Gray’s efforts to ensure that the Anglican Church took control of all the regions in Southern Africa. To achieve this, he ordained Mr William A. Steabler, whom he had come with from England in 1847, and sent him to the Orange Free State. Since this this part was under the Diocese of Grahamstown, it fell under Archdeacon Merriman (Farrant, 1966). With more people settling in the Orange Free State, there was need for more clergy, and so Mr Every, who was originally from Grahamstown, was sent to Bloemfontein in 1855 (ibid, 1966). Mr Every, served only for a while because he died in 1885, and so Bloemfontein was also left with the problem of clergy. There was basically no clergy serving this area, even though the local English people and the chiefs desired to have the church established in their area. Cecil Lewis and G. E. Edwards, argued that due to “letters from English residents and from native chiefs to Bishop Gray, pressing him to send clergy and promising their support” (Lewis C, & Edwards G. E, 1934: 393). Bishop Robert Gray was determined to ensure that this mission was put on a sound footing. It dawned on the Bishop’s mind that there was only one way to ensure stability and growth of this mission field, and that was if he found a Bishop for this huge region. It should be noted that politically this region was under the Dutch government. This could, therefore, meant having an English church missionary Bishop in a place which was under Dutch civil authority. However, this difficulty was weighed and discounted, by the South African Bishops when they met in Cape Town to consecrate Rev. Charles Fredrick Mackenzie to go and champion the Central African Missionary enterprise (Musodza A, 2008: 43).

The South African Bishops appreciated the urgent need for a Bishop for the Free State. Resources had to be mobilized, and so the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (S.P.G), voted a sum of five hundred pounds, for the support of this Bishop, and two hundred pounds for the stipend of two missionaries (Lewis C& Edwards G. E: 1934: 311). There was need to fix the boundaries of this envisioned Diocese had to be fixed, as a matter of urgency. Rev. H. P. Thompson suggested that “its limits were fixed only on the south by the Orange River and on the east by Drakensburg mountains, encircling here Basutoland … north and west it stretched indefinitely,” (Thompson G. P, 1950: 310). Such a way of setting boundaries for this new Diocese meant that the incumbent Bishop could stretch his missionary efforts as far as his energy permitted. It is in the north of this new Diocese that Southern Rhodesia, the soon to be formed Mashonaland Diocese lay in now called Zimbabwe.

Given that this was a new Diocese, which needed resources to establish its structures, and pay its personnel, it was important, to have a healthy relationship with the mother church in England. For this reason, it meant that its Bishop had to be sought from England. The man identified to fill this office was Rev. Edward Twells and was consecrated Bishop of the Orange Free State in Westminster Abbey in 1863 (Musodza A, 2008: 44). He persuaded three clergy and two school masters to accompany him to this new mission field. When he arrived in the Free State, he found Dr. Orpen, the only clergy in his diocese at the time, and decided to visit, Basutoland immediately with a specific intention to see Chief Moshoeshoe, and see the possibility of opening up a mission in his chiefdom (ibid, 2008: 44). Bishop Twells then undertook to visit the length of his Diocese, with a lot of pain, since some of the places were inaccessible. It appeared the greatest need for this new Diocese, like any other was personnel. There were a very small number of priests in this new Diocese. The mission field was vast and yet the laborers were few. The Bishop wrote to England, asking for priests to come and work as missionaries in his diocese, but that did not bring meaningful results. According to Rev. G. P. Thompson, “Canon Beckett, the chosen Superior, sailed from England with six men, to be followed later by others; so the Society of St Augustine’s was founded.” (Thompson G. P, 1950: 311). This society worked extraordinarily to establish the Diocese of Orange Free State. Bishop Twells over worked himself and became exhausted. In 1869, “he broke down and resigned,” (Ibid, 1950: 312). Interestingly, although he worked for a short time, he managed to put this new Diocese on its mark.
Rev. Allan Becher Webb succeeded bishop Twells, a young priest who at the time of his election was thirty one years old. He was consecrated in Inverness Cathedral in Scotland. He was a highly educated man, who had been Vice-Principal at Cuddesdon in United Kingdom (Musodza, 2008: 45). When he came he also brought along with him seven of his friends who wanted to support him in this new calling. There was still a great need for clergy in his Diocese, especially given the fact that there were new settlements coming up as a result of the new mining ventures such as Kimberly, where diamonds were discovered. On the other hand in Basutoland the mission which Bishop Twells had promised Moshoeshoe, had still to be fulfilled. Cecil Lewis and G. E Edwards suggested that “upon arrival in his new Diocese Bishop Webb, saw at once the immediate needs of the country – clergy for the diamond fields, education for the children, nursing for the sick, and then, building to be enlarged, repaired and put up” (Lewis C & Edwards G. E, 1934 : 409). This was certainly a tall order for a young Bishop like Bishop Webb. However he was determined to get things done, and as such he managed to call for the first Synod, of this new Diocese on the Feast of the Epiphany, in 1872 at which there were six priests, two deacons, and seven churchwardens (ibid, 1934: 412).

Bishop Twells had left the diocese with no structures, Bishop Webb, undertook to develop things and so the Diocese continued to grow. However, the difficulties associated with this Diocese continued to interfere with the new Bishop’s work. So many things remained unresolved; there was still anxiety about monetary issues, there was great need to organize ministry on the new mining areas on the whole the Bishop was overworking due to shortage of clergy. Cecil Lewis and G. E. Edwards maintained that all these difficulties “brought the Bishop to the verge of a breakdown” (Lewis C & Edwards G. E: 412). It must be appreciated that under such hardships, the Bishop also worked like a parish priest, and resulted in him being overworked. However during Bishop Webb’s time, there was a recruit who offered himself for mission work, named William Thomas Gaul. At the time, he offered himself and that time, he was still a Deacon, and he was a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. William Thomas Gaul became a very important person in this Diocese, serving as Archdeacon, of Kimberly and later became the second Bishop of The Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland (Musodza A, 2008, 46).

It is important to note that his courage, and faithfulness is remembered, everywhere where he worked. In the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, (now Harare) the only Anglican theological college has been named after him, including a major street in Harare. Many priests, currently serving in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe have received their Theological training from this seminary.

However, in the midst of all this growth and excitement in the Diocese of Bloemfontein, Bishop Webb was approached with a proposal to be translated to the Diocese of Grahamstown replace Bishop Merriman had died in 1882. This was a very complex situation for him given the massive progress which was going on in his Diocese. The elective assembly at Grahamstown had chosen him unanimously, and that was supported by the Archbishop of Cape Town and the Archbishop of Canterbury (Thompsom G. P, 1950: 315). With such backing from the Archbishops, Bishop Webb, could not resist the call. He resigned the See of Bloemfontein to the disappointment of his flock, and moved on to the Diocese of Grahamstown.

Rev. George Whydham Hamilton Knight-Bruce, who had studied at Erton and Merton College, Oxford, and who had been Priest in Charge of the parish of St Andrew Bethnal Green in London, accepted the See of Bloemfontein. He had worked very hard in Bethnal Green, to the point that this area was chosen to be the place where the Oxford House was to be located. H. ST. John T. Evans described George Whydham Knight-Bruce as “single – hearted, devout and able, strong and active, a good organizer, a thorough Churchman, and well-read” (Evans J. T, 1945: 10). This description seemed to fit him well, given the role that he played in taking the Anglican Church into Zimbabwe, a place then known for being unevangelized.

The consecration of Rev. G. W. H. Knight-Bruce took place on the Feast of the Annunciation, at St Mary Madfelon Church, Whitechapel. He was consecrated by the Archbishop of
Canterbury Dr. E.W Benson, assisted by the Bishops of London, Dr. Temple, Bedford, Dr. Walsham How, and Bishop of Bromby, a former Bishop of Tasmania. Bishop Knight–Bruce committed himself to missionary work in Bloemfontein, and the areas lying to the north which were yet to receive missionaries. Before embarking on this huge undertaking Rev. G. P. Thompson maintained that Bishop Knight–Bruce gained a promise from the S.P.G, to support him in exploring for possible missionary expansion, areas lying to the north (Thompson G. P, 1950: 316). Before leaving England for his new appointment Bishop Knight–Bruce decided to mobilize financial resources to enable him to deal with the huge debt which his new Diocese had incurred. He visited many Associations securing considerable resources to help towards relieving the Diocese of its monetary liabilities. Bishop Knight–Bruce finally left England for his new Diocese, on the 23rd July 1886, with his wife and little son and Rev. W. E. Jackson (ibid, 1950: 316). After arriving in Cape Town, he quickly made his way to his new Diocese arriving at Kimberley on the 21st August. He then reached Bloemfontein on the 22nd of August to a huge and flamboyant welcome. He was enthroned in the Cathedral on Sunday 29th of August, 1886 (ibid, 1950: 316). The new bishop was official welcomed in the Town Hall and then embarked on his first visitations of the Diocese in October 1886 just two months after his arrival. Bishop Knight–Bruce proved to be a zealous missionary and an indefatigable traveler. He traversed his Diocese, and quickly promoted William Thomas Gaul to become the Archdeacon of Kimberley (ibid, 1950, 316). Venerable Thomas Gaul accepted this appointment, which meant that he was now responsible for this huge Archdeaconry which included Griqualand West [Namibia], and the Crown Colony of Bechuanaland (Botswana). At a Chapter meeting held on 10th of October 1887, the Bishop then announced his intention to visit Mashonaland in 1888. He had not forgotten what he had promised the S.P.G, when he was made Bishop of Bloemfontein. In fact, Southern Rhodesia lay in his Diocese since there was no boundary to the north. From the onset, Bishop Knight–Bruce showed that his focus was beyond the confines of the areas which his predecessors had carved out and missionized. His grand plan was to reach Mashonaland and meet with the Universities Mission to Central Africa (U.M.C.A), which had been specifically set up and sent out under Bishop Charles Mackenzie to evangelize Central Africa (Musodza A, 2008: 48). It was this initial visit by Bishop Knight–Bruce to Mashonaland which was the beginning of the process of creating and establishing the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland.

2.2.5 Bishop Knight Bruce’s First Visit to Mashonaland.

Bishop Knight Bruce worked hard and the Diocese of Bloemfontein improved tremendously. He could leave the Diocese for a while to pursue his ambitions to create a new Diocese in the north. In 1887, he wrote a letter to Mr. Tucker of the S.P.G which was as follows; “… my wish is to do myself to the country north east of Shona, if I can get permission from the chief of the Matabele, not to visit the Matabele but the Shona, who have no missionary of any description among them I believe” (Broderick G, 1953: 16).

In response, the bishop was given 500 Pounds by S.P.G for this pastoral expedition (Farrant J, 1966: 70). In addition, the Bishop had to supplement with his own private resources. For the grant was not enough to meet all the expenses of the expedition. It is significant to note that there were a few white hunters and explorers who had been to this land where Bishop Knight–Bruce wanted to explore. One of the hunters was F. C Selous (Welch P, 2008: 8). What the bishop was to be informed by the hunter was going to be helpful to him in his preparation to travel to the North. Welch P recorded that Selous of great assistance to the Bishop. He sketched a rough map for Matebeleland and Mashonaland for the bishop to have an idea to where he was going to be travelling. He gathered all the necessary items which he needed for this journey which included food, wagons, and personnel. R. R. Langham Carter (1975) noted that the Bishop bought plenty of food items to barter trade with the local indigenous people, gifts for the chiefs and king Lobengula, two wagons and spares of the wagons, and enough cattle to give
him reserves for some time to take the place of those which could die on the arduous haul...he obtained a number of donkeys as they were thought to be more resistant to Tsetse than oxen were ...there were several dogs their function being to guard the outspans from pilferers. He prepared companionship of African servants who would accompany him, some driving the wagons and some translating for him when communicating with the local chiefs. (Carter R. R, 1975: 27, Welch, 2008: 8). Hinchliff P (1963) and Carter R. R (1975) are not in agreement on the numbers of the African servants whom the Bishop chose to accompany him. Peter Hinchliff wrote that there were six servants and Carter R. R noted that there were 10 servants (Hinchliff P, 1963: 167, Carter R. R, 1975: 116): But Bishop Knight-Bruce cited in his journal that “nearly all my servants were excellent, and they were nearly all Christians – two half castes, two Basuto, three Botswana, a native of mixed race and two others” (Knight Bruce, 1895; 59). Although R. R. Carter’s number was higher. Hinchliff P. was closer to the actual given the variation of the servants and their responsibilities of driving the wagons and translating from the Bishop English language to the Ndebele, Shona and Tswana local languages. His servants included as Carter R. R wrote that “two Griquas, two Basutos and four Botswanas, to whom he later added a Matabele and a Shona” (Carter R. R, 1975: 116). This showed that Bishop Knight Bruce knew that in order to reach out to the Local indigenous people of the North, it was paramount to be accompanied with Africans who could speak their language so as to communicate well with the local people in Mashonaland.

The Bishop Knight Bruce left Kimberley in February 1888 on his journey by road which was familiar to him on his journeys to Bechuanaland. The Bishop left Kimberley in the company of wife and Miss Jones both of whom had to go only as far as Shongshong before returning to Bloemfontein. The desire of the Bishop to embark on this journey was mainly for two reasons namely; to see what the country was like, north of the Limpopo and also to obtain permission from King Lobengula for missionaries to enter his country (Farrant J, 1966: 70, Welch, 2008: 8). In other words, this journey was a pastoral expedition, which was so critical in that it would determine whether or not the Anglican Church could be taken across the North. It was therefore, important for Bishop Knight-Bruce to make the journey in person as the Bishop of the Church in whose diocese of Mashonaland was viewed to lead.

The bishop was fully prepared to take up this pastoral expedition despite the challenges with the journey was posing. There were no roads and the whole region was infested with Tsetse fly which introduced the concern of getting ill with malaria. The wild animals and other hardships were before the Bishop, let alone, the war-like Ndebele tribe was unpredictable in the North. They travelled and arrived at Mafeking and continued with their journey. On the 1st of April, 1888, they reached Shongshong in Bechuanaland, In Shongshong, Bishop Knight Bruce obtained some a letter of introduction from the British Administrator, Sir Sidney Shippard dated the 29th of April, 1888 to show them to king Lobengula in order to seek permission to travel to the east. (Welch P, 2008: 8).

Rev. G.E.P Broderick captured the letter which was given to Bishop Knight-Bruce from Sir Sidney as follows; “The Bishop of Bloemfontein, who is the head teacher of the English Church in this part of Southern Africa, wishes to visit you and I am sending him a letter which he will either bring or forward to you. His only object is to benefit you and your people, and I trust you will be kind to him and help him” (Broderick, 1953: 12).

The intention of the letter was to introduce the Bishop to King Lobengula so that he could be welcomed to the Ndebele Kingdom and make his kind request to him to travel to the east. Bishop Knight Bruce proceeded to Palapye and crossed the Macloutsie River into the Ndebele kingdom known as Matabeleland. On the 23rd of May, 1888, they arrived at Bulawayo and were permitted to enter the capital (Farrant, 1966: 70). Snell M. (2001) wrote that Bishop Knight-Bruce arrived at a very bad time when a lot of foreign government representatives, Concession seekers and hunters were trying to get king Lobengulla’s attention. Notably, at his court, they was a sudden interest in his Kingdom of gold seekers who wanted to mine in his land. He feared
to lose his authority over his people. King Lobengula could not note the difference between a missionary and a hunter or a Government representative. He saw all white people as wanting to take over his kingdom, including the east of the Shona tribes. Hence, it took two full weeks for Bishop Knight Bruce to finally meet the King in his courts (Snell M. L., 2001: 7, Farrant J, 1966: 70). Bishop Knight-Bruce was eventually permission to travel to the east after a lot of question asked to him by the king Lobengula, (Knight Bruce, 1888: Diary, Welch, 2008, 8). Welch recorded that king Lobengula permitted the Bishop because had no interest in mining gold but mission work, let alone the letter from Sir Sidney was helpful. Already Sir Sidney and king Lobengula had a mutual relationship and relationship. The two weeks waiting to meet king Lobengula was worth it. (Welch, 2008: 8, Farrant, 1966: 70).

Bishop Knight Bruce left Bulawayo for Mashonaland, using the map which was drawn by Selous. The Bishop left Bulawayo with a mind that already set and at once the loved the beauty of the country, with its rugged granite hills and the valleys between them, let alone its inhabitants, the Shona people (Farrant J, 1966: 70). The team travelled exploring the country and interviewing chiefs and building up friendships in preparation for the coming of the church. On the 8th of June, 1888, Bishop Knight Bruce and his team arrived at Inyati, which was known to be the last outpost of Christianity towards the north. From Inyati, the Bishop proceeded and on the 28th of June, he arrived at Hunyani River, known presently today as Norton residential area, 40 km away from the capital city, Harare. Here the Bishop had to leave his wagons because of the ravage of tsetse flies and proceed on foot through Lomagundi with some of his servants and leaving one servant called Isaac behind. Isaac was left with an instruction to ensure that all was ready when the bishop and the advancing team came back. The Bishop herded towards the Zambezi. On the 6th of July of the same year, He arrived at Makonde. Rev. G. E. P. Broderick wrote that when Bishop Knight Bruce tried to hold mass there, the opening of the Bible caused alarm to local congregation and they all disappeared (Broedrick, 1953:19). Since the local people were seeing the white people and Bible for the first time, it was proper to ran way in order to protect themselves from magical charms or any suspected danger. On the 25th of July of the same month, Bishop Knight Bruce and his team proceeded and arrived at Kanyemba and he crossed the Zambezi to Zumbo, where he presented a letter which was sent by a Portuguese Consul in Cape Town to the Roman Catholic Mission in Zumbo. The mission was in almost in ruins. On the 15th of August of the same year, the Bishop started his journey back towards Hunyani. Here, they find Isaac waiting and ready to travel back. (Musodza A, 2008: 54). On the 28th of the same month, the party left towards Nyamweda, as they intended to investigate more about the eastern Mashonaland before reaching Bulawayo. As he moved south eastwards he made inquiries about the chieftainship of Mutasa and Manicaland, the eastern side of Mashonaland. He was told of the fertile lands of Manicaland and the bishop Knight Bruce set his mind to establishing missions and churches and seeking permission to place teachers and catechists in Manicaland first. The Shona people of Manicaland were untouched with the gospel, let alone the fertile lands were inviting (Farrant J, 1966: 71).

On the 10th of October, 1888, Bishop Knight-Bruce and his team arrived at Hope Fountain. Six days later, they were finally in Bulawayo at the ever busy King Lobengula’s courts. There the Bishop found Cecil Rhodes’ representatives trying to persuade the King to sign the Rudd Concession. In this instance, in the Bishop Knight-Bruce’s diary, he recorded that Matabeleland army was on the verge of war when he arrived back. Bishop Knight-Bruce wrote that “…they had got the idea that the white men wanted to take their country and they did not altogether wish it be civil to the white man” (Knight Bruce, 1895: 64). The Bishop further cited that as he passed through the huts of the Imbezu regiment, they shouted and yelled at him; “Here are the men who have come to take our country” (ibid, 1895: 64). Immediately, the Bishop Knight Bruce had to seek refuge from the British representatives at the King Lobengula’s courts. The Imbezu regiments were now impatient because pressure from many agents who were seeking mining concessions on the King Lobengula was intensifying each day (Welch, 2008: 9).
On the 1st of November in the same year, Bishop Knight-Bruce avoided getting entangled in trouble at Lobengula’s court and finally crossed the Shashi River into Macloutsie, in Botswana land. In Macloutsie, the Bishop rested for four days. In those resting days, he met Frank Johnson, a man who was vehemently involved in getting concessions from the Matabele King, Lobengula. In the meeting, he was informed of the influence and abuse which the Ndebele had over the Shona, in Mashonaland. This information was helpful to the Bishop who was preparing to establish missions and churches in the eastern side of the country (Knight Bruce. 1895: 66).

On the 20th of December of the same year, the Bishop and his team was finally back in Bloemfontein. His journey was very successful. He had managed to accomplish that which he had travelled for to Mashonaland. He had visited King Lobengula in Bulawayo and was permitted to visit the Shona people in Mashonaland and interviewed quite a number of chiefs, building relationships and persuading them to establish missions and churches and leaving teachers and catechists of faith in their villages. He had also experienced the terrain and the beauty of the country, let alone the nature of the local indigenous peoples whose customs and tradition were very strange to him. Bishop Knight-Bruce confirmed this when he cited in his diary that the native customs were strange (Welch P, 2008: 9, Farrant J. 1966: 68). It must be mentioned that this was the whole year of travel, experience and missionary work. R. R. Carter commented on the missionary journey of the Bishop Knight Bruce in this manner; “he ridden about 500 miles and walked about 2500 miles. He had trouble with his back, he had pneumonia and malaria and dysentery, but it was not long before he was proclaiming that the hardships of such travel had been greatly exaggerated” (Carter R. R, 1975: 36).

According to Carter; Knight-Bruce’s best character was his determination, energy and courage. He was not a believer in Lambeth Conferences, diocesan Synods, standing committee and council and executive meetings but he believed in faith in practicality (Carter. 1975:13). The other thing cited by Carter was that Bishop Knight-Bruce was not a theologian and academic. The reason was that in 1888, when other Bishops of the Anglican Communion were attending the Lambeth Conference in England, he decided to go for a one year missionary journey in Mashonaland. For Bishop Knight Bruce, it was practical issues of his faith that mattered most such as expanding the diocese of Bloemfontein to Mashonaland and reaching out to the Shona indigenous local people, establishing missions and churches.

Upon arrival, according to Farrant J, The Bishop prepared his full report for SPG which had sponsored this journey with great care. He was very careful not to give the information that was contrary to what the London Missionary Society was claiming to have achieved in Matebeleland. His report was focused on the Shona local people who needed to be converted to Christianity (Farrant J, 1966: 74). It must be mentioned that Bishop Knight Bruce’s report got huge publicity in England and S.P.G, unanimously resolved to allocate a grant of 7000 pounds to be spent on missionary work in Mashonaland within the following seven years. Bishop Knight Bruce also approached the Metropolitan, Bishop West Jones, who wrote to Dr Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, pleading for support from the Church of England for missionary work (ibid, 1966: 74). For the meantime, Bishop Knight Bruce attended to his Diocesan and Provincial matters. Although he travelled extensively in Bloemfontein Diocese, his attention and mind set was drawn, to the expansion of his diocese, north of the Limpopo, later to be officially known as Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). It is in 1890, two years later after Bishop Knight Bruce’s visit to Mashonaland, when the pioneer Column was met in Kimberley, Cape town with a specific intended task to cross the Limpopo and occupy Zimbabwe, Bishop Knight –Bruce dispatched some Chaplains to provide spiritual support to the pioneer Column. (ibid, 1966: 75).
2.3 The Pioneer Column and its Chaplaincy.

In Bulawayo, negotiations between King Lobengula and Cecil John Rhodes’ representatives which included John Rudd and Robert Moffat of LMS yielded the intended results when King Lobengula put his hand on the Charter which was popularly known as the Rudd Concession in by way of putting an ‘X’ against his printed name. This Rudd Concession gave the British Government through Cecil John Rhodes’s BSAC, formed in London to exploit and mine mineral resources in Mashonaland, east of Bulawayo, the land of the Shona people (Snell M, 2001: 7). The Charter which gave the British wider powers and authority to enter, occupy and develop the country was given on the 29th of October 1889. It is important to cite that any large missionary or ecclesiastical schemes were scaled by the politics of the day. And now Cecil John Rhodes held the keys to Mashonaland. The Rudd Concession marked the beginning of the Pioneer Column. The expedition of the Pioneer Column needed chaplains. Rhodes informed the Bishop of Cape Town that he was willing to subsidize handsomely the expenses of the journey, let alone the expenses of chaplaincy. The chaplains were to be chosen by him and Bishop Knight Bruce (Welch P, 2008: 17). It is important to cite that Bishop Knight Bruce was worried by King Lobengula’s bad behavior and his regiment. He felt that it was going to be impossible to establish missions and churches in Mashonaland due to the political control which the Ndebele people had over Mashonaland. For Bishop Knight Bruce, this was detrimental to progress. But he also convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that with the support of the British Government, the Rudd Concession and the Pioneer Column, the mission to spread the Gospel in Mashonaland was going to be a reality (ibid, 2008: 17).

Bishop Knight Bruce was quick to select and appoint clergyman who could accompany the Pioneer Column. In between January and June of 1890, Bishop Knight Bruce licensed three clergyman as chaplains to the forces of the BSA Company. Among the three chaplains was Canon Francis Balfour, who was the senior Chaplain to the police and armed forces and to the first European settlers in Zimbabwe. Bishop Knight-Bruce had already sent Canon Francis Balfour as Chaplain to the camp of the Botswana Boarder Police at Shongshong in preparation for the Pioneer Column occupation of Mashonaland in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) (Farrant J, 1966: 75). "He was a shy, humble and patient man who walked hundreds of miles, visiting isolated home stands, preaching in Native kraals …” the second chaplain according to Welch P. was Frank Surridge, an athletic young Englishman who had recently arrived in Cape Town. He was recommended to the Bishop and Rhodes as a suitable Pioneer. The third one was Wilson Trusted, a young Englishman and a recent recruit (Welch P. 2008: 17). It is of interest to note that Farrant (2008) did not mention Frank Surridge but noted that Frank Edwards who was a layman was licensed but failed to get a place in the wagons of the Pioneer Column. He walked from Cape Town to Salisbury, a distance of 2,000 miles. He became very popular and a familiar figure in the villages of Mashonaland where he preached the Gospel always. In every place he visited and preached, he could set up a rough wooden cross a sign that he had visited the place and that the Gospel had been announced to the native people (Farrant J, 1966: 77). The researcher wondered whether Frank Surridge and Frank Edwards were the same persons who were part of the Pioneer Column.

According to Bishop Montgomery as recorded as Welch P (Welch, 2008: 18), the journey of the pioneer column started in Kimberley, Cape Town to Mashonaland, Rhodesia, (Zimbabwe) in June, 1890. The journey was led by the hunter Selous. Canon Francis Balfour was senior chaplain to the pioneer column without pay. But Welch P recorded above that Cecil John Rhodes had declared to meet the expenses of the Journey, including the expenses of chaplaincy. All the same, given the challenges and hardships of the chaplaincy ministry, it was difficult to comprehend how any person could accept such a responsibility without pay. Welch P cited that Balfour was given a commission to the Bishop’s annoyance (Welch P, 2008: 18). Nevertheless, Evans T. J recorded that Canon Francis Balfour “was accompanied by the Rev. F. Surridge and Rev. Wilson Trusted, who was appointed to minister to the Police at Fort Tuli, where he
died of dysentery on October 23rd the same year” (Evans T. J, 1945: 12). Welch P. (2008) cited that Balfour was not a colonial clergyman at all but an experienced missionary with little aptitude for colonial work. Although he was accompanying the BSA Company’s Pioneer Column to Mashonaland in June 1890 his primary task was to begin a mission in Mashonaland. This notion was supported by Peter Hinchcliff that indeed Canon Francis Balfour was sent to accompany the Pioneer Column Bishop Knight-Bruce with a specific purpose. This was well recorded that “his Bishop had sent him north specifically to see what could be done about missions,” (Hinchcliff P, 1969: 61). Another perspective of difficulties now which Bishop Knight Bruce faced in his attempts to plant a mission in the North, Mashonaland was no longer the pure indigenous and native territory of the Shona which he had dreamt of; But his bishopric office had a serious spiritual responsibility to the white settlers (ibid, 2008: 18). On the 12th of September, 1890, the Pioneer Column reached the place they called Salisbury, (now called Harare). The three chaplains; Frank Surridge, Wilson Trusted and Canon Balfour represented the church at the hoisting of the Union Jack flag on the day of arrival. Following this occupation Frank Surridge had to go back to Cape Town within two months of occupation. Bishop Knight Bruce was pleased to have Canon Balfour in Salisbury, Rhodesia, Mashonaland (Zimbabwe) now. He could move a diocesan and provincial resolution the creation of a new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, north of the Limpopo. He could forward this resolution his Diocesan Synod, let alone the Provincial Synod of the Province of South Africa of 1891 (Snell L, 2001: 7).

It is of paramount importance for the researcher, to critically analyze the role played by the Pioneer Column’s the chaplains; Frank Surridge, Wilson Trusted and Canon Balfour in the historicity of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland in its formative stage. Church historians are of different views whether the chaplains were paid a stipend or a commission or it was voluntary ministry. All the same the decision to accompany the Pioneer Column’s expedition was courageous. Bishop Knight-Bruce’s desire and passion was to get the Good News across the Limpopo, in Mashonaland. It is of interest to this research that the Jesuits of the Roman Catholics in that had tried to spread the Gospel in the 16th Century had not made a successful mission. They had to retreat because of local wars (ibid, 2001: 7). In 1839, the LMS of Robert Moffat in the South Western part of the country had faced a lot of challenges and were struggling to make any converts. They opened a mission in Inyati in 1859 and had made only 12 converts in 30 years (ibid, 2001: 7, Musodza A, 2008: 60). Certainly, the Bishop took advantage of the presence of Canon Francis Balfour and other Chaplains in the Pioneer Column to forward his ambition and dream. However, it was never going to be easy to reach out to the local indigenous people with the Gospel considering the language barrier.

However, evaluating the ministry of Canon Francis Balfour to the indigenous local people, it seemed that there was a very thin line between the mission of the church and the Pioneer Column. “Canon Balfour was Chaplain to the column, virtually to an occupying force …” (Hinchcliff P, 196: 61). It is significant to note that this scenario was going to core foundation of the relationship between the ACZ and the colonial government in the future. Canon Balfour ministered to both the European settlers and the indigenous local people as for local black people started seeking for employment to work for the European first settlers. Some locals began to learn English which assisted him in employing some to be interpreters. According to Musodza A, Canon Francis Balfour travelled long distances on foot in order to interview local chiefs to build missions and churches. On one instance, he walked up to Kariba which was a very long distance by foot (Musodza A, 2008, 61).

The white settlers had a negative attitude towards Canon Francis Balfour on the issue of him ministering to the local indigenous people. Weller J. and Linden J. (1984) recorded that many of the white settlers saw Canon Ballfour’s ministry in those early days to the indigenous local people as fruitless and a shire waste of energy resources and time. It was regarded as a hopeless tack to Christianize the native. (Weller J & Linden J, 1984: 66). The Canon Balfour’s ministry was caught up between the African and European settler’s spiritual needs such that he was torn
in between. The duty imposed upon him to minister to the two races was a heavy burden on his shoulders. It seemed to have been an impossible ministerial task to preach to the hundreds of thousands of indigenous local people of Mashonaland who were scattered over an area the size of France and rooted in African Traditional religion(s) (ibid, 1964: 66). It must be argued that evidence on the ground proved that Canon Francis Balfour was progressive in his ministry in Mashonaland. He left a vivid and an indelible mark on the ACZ in its formative stage. Farrant J. (1966) cited that Balfour was the first to build the first mud church in Fort Salisbury (now Harare) with his own hands, furnished it with packing-cases and blue calico from a trader’s store. He left the Diocese of Mashonaland in August, 1892 and later became an Assistant Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Bloemfontein (Farrant J, 1966: 77).

Bishop Knight-Bruce wrote in his Memories of Mashonaland about the Canon Francis Balfour’s two years of great ministry (1890-1892) in the Diocese of Mashonaland. The Bishop noted that Canon Balfour did wonderful work and ministry everywhere he passed by. Bishop Knight Bruce did acknowledged that he was indeed the first priest to construct the first church in his diocese. He cited that he worked very well with the indigenous local people and that when he brought up a few native catechists from Cape Town, South Africa (which included Bernard Mzeki) in the early part of 1893, Canon Frank Balfour worked together with the team of catechist smoothly. They interviewed native chiefs, one after the other, establishing mission and churches in which Bishop Knight Bruce had no share in that ministry. All this very early success of ministry and the implantation in the diocese of Mashonaland, Rhodesia (Zimbabwe was credited to Canon Francis Balfour (Knight-Bruce, 1895).

In the Anglican Diocesan Synod of Bloemfontein held in 1890, there was a motion proposed and seconded for the Bishop of Bloemfontein to take to the Provincial Episcopal Bench in the following year to divide Bloemfontein and Mashonaland. It is therefore, important to look closely to the Diocesan Synod of Bloemfontein and let alone the Provincial Synod which gave way to the appointment of the new Bishop and the creation of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland in the early 1890s.

2.4 The Diocesan Synod of Bloemfontein of 1890.

According to Musodza A (2008), Bishop Knight Bruce called for a Diocesan Synod in his Diocese of Bloemfontein after his return from Mashonaland on the 20th of April, 1890 (Musodza A, 2008: 63). At the Synod, the Bishop delivered his Eucharistic Charge on his pastoral journey which he had undertaken to Mashonaland in 1888. He challenged the diocesan Synod to closely look at the possibilities of having the Diocese of Bloemfontein divided into two so the new missionary field of Mashonaland can be a Diocese by its own. In this charge Bishop Knight-Bruce suggested that;

Our first attempt to gain Mashonaland for the church was made a long time before the formation of this company … (BSAC) …it is my duty to send clergymen with the men. One clergyman has been entirely provided for, and most liberally by them. Another goes to the B.B.P. A third is at Elebe but very shortly I hope to hear of him crossing the border into Mashonaland, and becoming our first missionary in Mashonaland (Broderick G. E. P, 1953: 41)

In the Diocesan synod proceedings, Canon Bell moved a motion which was seconded by Rev. E. W. Stenson, that a new Diocese be created in Mashonaland. It was debated at length and a resolution was passed to have a new Diocese in Manicaland. The church was to meet the spiritual need of the new white settlers north of the Limpopo and also attempt to reach out to the local indigenous people of Mashonaland. The resolution was to be passed on to the Episcopal Bench of the Provincial Synod which was to be held in January of the following year (Broderick G. E. P, 1953: 41).
Musodza A (2008) raised the concern of the matters of resources which were discussed at the Diocesan Synod on how to finance such a huge task of creating a new Diocese of Mashonaland (Musodza A (2008: 63). It was mentioned that there was a considerable sum of money, which had earned interest from the Diocese of Bloemfontein which could be made available for the formation of a missionary Diocese of Mashonaland. In addition, there was also a sum of 7,000 pounds to be spent at the rate of 1,000 pounds a year for the next seven years given by SPG. This money was to be used for the recreation of the New Diocese in Mashonaland and also establishing missions in Griqualand West, Bechuanaland and the Baralong territory which were also going to be part of this new diocese (Farrant J, 1966: 75). What is of significant, therefore in this matter, was that at this Diocesan Synod, the motion of the creation of the new Diocese of Mashonaland was moved and was accepted. The elected delegates of the provincial Synod and Bishop Knight Bruce were given this task to forward this resolution to the Episcopal Bench, the PCSA. Farrant J. recorded that the Province was under the Archbishopric by the Right Reverend West Jones. (ibid, 1966: 75). This was because in the Anglican Church, such a crucial decision of creating a New Diocese is not a decision that can be made a Diocesan Synod alone. Hence, there was need to take the matter to the next level of the Provincial Synod. This Provincial Synod was very important for the new establishment of the new Diocese of Mashonaland.

It is of interest that Welch P, Broderick P. E. G and Hinchcliff P. are silent about the Diocese Synod of Bloemfontein of the 1890 and the proceedings that took place. They cite only the Provincial Synod. Probably, they valued it because it was the crucial meeting of the Episcopal Bench that had the final mandate to create the New Diocese of Mashonaland. It must be mentioned that this decision of the provincial synod was critical to the future on of the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, north of Limpopo. Weller J did not write any of the two; the Diocesan Synod, let alone the Provincial Synod. He is more focused on the events of the Church that took place in Mashonaland than in South Africa.

2.5 The Provincial Synod: C.P.S.A (1891)

The Provincial Synod met in February, in Cape Town 1891 with a major resolution to make, which was to create the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland. The Bishop of Bloemfontein, the Right Reverend Knight Bruce and his delegates forwarded their motion which had been proposed at their Diocesan Synod the previous year regarding the division of the Diocese of Bloemfontein and creating a new Diocese in Mashonaland. This motion was debated and finally, a resolution was passed under the influence of leadership and chairmanship of the Archbishop West Jones and the whole Episcopal Bench of the Bishops of the Province (Welch P, 2008: 23, Broderick P. E. G, 1953: 45, Farrant J, 1966: 75, Musodza A, 2008: 63, Knight Bruce, 1890: 94, Benson L. P. L, 1891: 79).

Broderick P. E. G (1953) captured the resolution in detail in this manner;

The Episcopal Bench at the Provincial Synod resolved that …

1. a) Missionary Bishopric be established for Mashonaland and the adjacent Territories; b) Full Authority be given to the Metropolitan, as soon as he shall judge it to be expedient, to choose on their behalf a Missionary Bishop for Mashonaland, and hereby undertake to accept the selection, and to send forth the person so selected, under the provisions of Canon 10.22.

2. The Bishops in Synod, believing in their hearts that it would be undoubtedly for the good of the Church at large, and especially for the best interests of the work in Mashonaland Diocese now to be formed for that region, do hereby express the hope that he may be willing to accept the call which they unanimously request the Metropolitan to address to him. (Broderick P. E. G, 1953: 45)
The Provincial Synod gave the Metropolitan, Archbishop West Jones to select and appoint, hence he chose Bishop Knight Bruce to be the new Bishop of the newly created Diocese of Mashonaland.

Notably, Peter Hinchcliff P (1963) captured something of interest to mention in this research work. He claimed that prior to the Provincial Synod, Bishop Knight-Bruce had already campaigned of his vested interest to all the Bishops of the Episcopal Bench and the Archbishop West Jones to appoint him to be the new Bishopric of the new Diocese in Mashonaland. He had already insinuated that upon the appointment, he could resign to be the bishop of Bloemfontein and go north of Limpopo to be the first See of the new Diocese of the white settlers and the local indigenous Shona people of Mashonaland. (Hinchcliff P, 1963: 170). It appeared to the researcher that Bishop Knight Bruce was very political and shrewd. The bishop’s passion was now for Mashonaland.

Welch P (2008) noted that indeed, Bishop Knight Bruce was the leading candidate, having travelled and initiated the work there and offered to serve without stipend. Cecil John Rhodes, now Prime Minister of the Cape, now owner of the BSAC, wished Knight Bruce to remain in Charge of the English Church affairs and ministry in Mashonaland (Welch P, 2008: 21). According to Benson (1891), Cecil John Rhodes believed he knew how to deal with Bishop Knight Bruce. The parishes in the Diocese of Bloemfontein was unlikely to protest. He noted that this was because Bishop Knight Bruce had not been popular in his Diocese. He had sent too much of his energy already to his ambition to create a new Anglican Diocese in the north of the Limpopo, Mashonaland (Welch P, 2008: 21).

Farrant (1966) recorded the resolution made at the Provincial Synod that the new created diocese of Mashonaland was going to include the whole of Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), that part of Portuguese East Africa which lied between the Zambezi and the Sabi rivers, and part of the Bechuanaland Protectorate that lied to the west of Matebeleland. The whole area which Bishop Knight Bruce was going to be bishop was more than 20,000 square miles (Farrant J, 1966: 75).

It must be cited that at the Provincial Synod, the representatives of SPG confirmed their offer of a grant of a thousand pounds a year for the first seven years and Bishop Knight Bruce became the first See of the new Mashonaland Diocese in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) (ibid, 1966: 75). Therefore, the new Diocese of Mashonaland was formally constituted and launched. For Knight Bruce, it was a dream come true, a dream with he had dreamt first. Now was time for him to pursue it. The Provincial Synod through the metropolitan, the Archbishop West Jones and appointed him to take this new responsibility. Knight Bruce accepted the office of a bishop of Mashonaland with enthusiasm. He was destined to become the founder of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland.

2.6 The New Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland.

The new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland was created by the Provincial Synod under the leadership of the Archbishop West Jones. According to Farrant (1966) Mashonaland and the surrounding territory, became one of the largest Anglican Dioceses in the world, as large as German (Farrant, 1966: 67). Today, the same area has been divided into five dioceses with five bishops of ACZ as follows; the Anglican Diocese of Bulawayo, Harare, Central Zimbabwe, Manicaland and Masvingo respectively (Chawarika J, 2012: 1).

Contrary to what Musodza A. (2008) claimed that Mashonaland itself was little known to the outside world (Musodza A, 2008; 189). Mashonaland was already known by the British, Boers, Germans and the Portuguese under the scramble for African theme. Mashonaland was eye marked because of the presumed mineral deposits, let alone, its general topography and the
distribution within it of Shona-speaking peoples. It was described as a healthy, beautiful country and at its centre was a large, high plateau, well wooded, watered and teeming with game (Farrant J, 1966: 67). To the north, the land stretched to the Zambezi River and to the east, in the region of the Manyika people rose a mountainous barrier beyond which lay the colony of the Portuguese East Africa. Much of the area was dominated by the two tribes, the Nguni people who originated in the Gazaland, in Umzila’s country to the south east, and the Ndebele people from the south west of the country.

Ndebele territory, which was well known as Matebeleland was itself bordered to the southern west, across the Ramokwebana and Shashe Rivers, by territory known as Khama’s country. Chief Kwama was the leading chief of a number of native polities which had come under British rule, as a Bechuanaland Protectorate, in 1885 (Welch, 2008:5). The Limpopo River ran from the southern east of Matebeleland and to the south west of Gazaland, which served as an ecclesiastical boundary between the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland and that of Pretoria the river also served as a political boundary between the country known as Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and the Republic of South Africa (ibid, 2008: 6).

2.7 Bishop Knight Bruce Heading to the New Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland.

In early 1891, Bishop Knight Bruce began the preparation to leave for Mashonaland. He began by recruiting people with an eye primarily to the establishment of mission stations rather than work among the English settlers who were already in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). Most of his recruits were laymen who wished to be missionaries. He also employed a young priest called J. R. Sewell for ministerial work. Let alone, he recruited two carpenters namely E Wilson and John Wilkins on a one year contract each, to work on the proposed mission buildings (Welsh P, 2008: 22). They were both carpenters of extensive experiences. Both were strategic persons in construction and building churches and mission houses and their skills were indispensable and critical. Farrant J. cited that indeed, Wilkins had worked with David Livingstone intensively in Central Africa, ending up acting as one of his pall-bearers at his funeral service in Westminster Abbey (Farrant J, 1966: 85). He also employed a Free State farmer, Mr Bennett, for one year so that he could manage mission farms. The Bishop also bought livestock for the mission farms with the intention for the mission stations to be self-sufficient. Welsh P (2008) records that Cecil John Rhodes had suggested to the Bishop to establish a hospital in Mashonaland. He therefore, recruited a doctor as well as three nurses from a church hospital in Kimberley (ibid, 2008: 22). Recruitment of personal marked the beginning of Bishop Knight Bruce’s journey to Mashonaland.

On the 17th of April, 1891 the Bishop left Bloemfontein for Cape Town on his way to the North. In Cape Town, he surrendered his resignation to the Metropolitan and Archbishop West Jones and received a send-off blessing form him (Langham Carter, 1975:43). In Cape Town, he also passed through the Zonnebloem College and asked for African volunteers for his missionary undertaking in Mashonaland. At the College, he asked the Cowley Fathers who were in charge of the college if he could have African volunteers to accompany him to Mashonaland where he was going to plant a new Diocese. Most important of all, as Welch P and Hinchliff P mention that he found five catechists willing to accompany him to the Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). For Africa, the Bishop believed that ministry in Mashonaland could only be won by Africans, who could understand and live besides their own people. The researcher noted that as much as he had high regards for the African Christians reaching out to their fellow lost African, Bishop Knight Bruce had an expectation of having the Mission stations being administrated by white clergy. Then around these stations, however, and in close connection with them, were to be African catechists, living with the indigenous local people (Welch P, 2008: 22, Knight Bruce, 1891: 1, Hinchliff P, 1963: 167, 171).
Among the African Volunteers, was Bernard Mzeki who volunteered for the missionary work as a catechist in the formation of the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). It is of importance to the researcher to cite that Scholars on the number of Africans who accompanied the Bishop to the North. R. R. Langham Carter suggested that there were five catechists (Carter L, 1975:43). Farrant J. suggested “six Africans” (Farrant J, 1966:85). It seemed Langham was referring to catechists and Farrant was referring to Africans which included catechists and workers. It is significant to cite that the names of some of the Africans were mentioned only by their Christian names in the Bishop’s diary as Samuel, Thomas, Edward, Charles, Frank and Bernard (Knight-Bruce, 1891). Interestingly, Frank was identified by Farrant as Frank Ziqubu, a Zulu by origin from Pietermaritzburg. Charles was identified as Charles Makolami. Thomas was another person who was mentioned by the Bishop in his diary but he seems to have been so quiet. Samuel was identified as Samuel Makosa. Samuel was a Zulu by origin, “a bit of a rascal, quite unsuitable for the work and quite unlike Bernard ….” (Farrant J, 1966: 86, 87).

According to G. E. P Broderick (1953), Bishop Knight Bruce set out two parties to head to Mashonaland. The first party was to travel by sea from Durban to Beira, and the other one was to go by the southern route from Mafeking (Bachuanaland - present day Botswana) with wagons, supplies and the livestock. One can reason out that in the Bishop’s mind, the second party traveled by land through Mafeking because it was going to be very expensive and bearing to transport livestock, supplies and wagons by sea. The second party as Broderick G. E. P pointed out Rev. J. R. Sewell, Mr. Jagger, who was a candidate for ordination, Mr. Bennett a farmer, Mr. Iback and John, and Bishop Knight’s colored servant who had accompanied him on his first fact-finding expedition in 1888 (Broderick, 1953: 34). The Bishop, however, joined the first party that travelled by sea from Durban to Beira which consisted of the majority African catechists.

Notably, before the Bishop left the Diocese of Bloemfontein, he made arrangements with three nurses as per Cecil John Rhodes’ advice from Kimberley hospital, and a medical doctor to follow his party by sea through Durban to Beira. These three nurses were Sister Blennerhassett, Sleeman and Welby and Doctor Doyle Glanville (ibid, 1953: 34). The doctor and the nurses were to follow Bishop Knight-Bruce’s route and travel only when informed to do so. The Bishop wanted to ensure that the route was safe first so as to avoid endangering the lives of these three nurses and the doctor who had shown their commitment and calling to missionary work in the ministry of healing (Welch P, 2008: 23). They were going to become the first to establish a hospital in the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe).

By the end of April 1891, Bishop Knight-Bruce and the first party comprised of African catechists which included Bernard Mzeki boarded the ship called The Roslyn Castle and set off for Durban. In Durban, they boarded a ship called Norseman and proceeded to Beira. They arrived in Beira on the 12\textsuperscript{th} of May 1981. Welch P recorded that Beira was then an embryo port on the Portuguese East Africa Coast, a few shacks on a spit of sand. On the 15\textsuperscript{th} of the same month, they boarded Agnes, a ship that could take them up to the Pungwe River to Mapanda (Welch P, 2008: 23, Broderick G. E. P, 1953: 35). It was a touch journey such that they foot journeyed to Mapanda because the ship was facing serious challenges of potential sinking. They reached Mapanda on the 20\textsuperscript{th} of May, 1891, tediously exhausted. And given the political context situation between the Portuguese and the British South Africa Company that they were fighting territorial wars, Bishop Knight Bruce could not find the Mapanda local people to carry their supplies. In the same region was also the problem of Tsetse fly. Bishop Knight Bruce had brought with him large supplies of food to feed his staff and building materials for his mission stations. He was forced to leave the supplies in Mapanda. He pressed on the journey and forced himself to walk again into the interior, once again with only African Christians companions, catechists and members of the mission, carrying whatever they could manage to carry. Their route lay through very difficult terrain, thick, semi-tropical vegetation and mountains. Because there were Portuguese posts along the way there was little fear of attack by lions or local people
who felt the intrusion of whites was a curse in their land (Welch P, 2008: 23, Musodza A, 2008: 76).

Farrant J wrote that walking from Mapanda to Umtali (Mutare) had its own challenges of Tsetse fly and diseases. Bishop Knight Bruce and the catechists walked from Mapanda to Mutacheri, then to Sarmento, then through Mandiga, Chimoio, Ruvue River, Masekesa and Sable Valley to Umtali. There was still a river to cross, and a tsetse fly infested region to traverse between Sarmento and Chimoio. All the way, the road was rotten carcasses oxen due to Tsetse fly. The road from Mapanda to Umtali and then back to Beira was gradually becoming popular because of trade of the hunters, British settlers in Rhodesia and Portugesees who controlled the port at Beira. They finally arrived in Umtali (Mutare) on the 1st June 1891 without any loss of life, though it was a tedious life threatening journey (Farrant J, 1966: 87). At Umtali, Knight Bruce celebrated mass in the camp on the next day upon arrival. For a while he suffered about of fever, then upon recover, he hurried on with his companions to Salisbury (Harare) and arrived on the 15th of June, 1891, they found out that the new city was still being laid down. In Salisbury, he Canon Balfour and was briefed of his ministry with the white settlers and a few local indigenous people he had attempted to reach out. Some few day later, Bishop Knight Bruce wrote to his Archbishop, West Jones and fellow bishops in South Africa, formally accepting the bishopric of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland (Welch P, 2008: 24, Knight Bruce, 1891). Formatively, his letter of acceptance marked the beginning of the new Diocese in Mashonaland in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe).

2.8 The Political, Socio – Religious Context of Mashonaland during the Formative period.

The Ndebele tribe from the west and south had an upper hand politically upon the Shona people in the east. In the first missionary expedition of Bishop Knight Bruce observed that the warlike Ndebele warriors raided the Shona constantly and pitifully. The Shona people were always terrified and terrorized. In their raids, they would forcefully take the young able bodied, women, cattle, and gain in the fields. They would burn huts and fields after the raids (Farrant J, 1966: 70). The Shona people had their own chiefs and kings like Makoni for example but King Lobengula of the Ndebele gave the impression to the missionaries, Cecil John Rhodes, let alone Bishop Knight Bruce that he was the overall King of the Shona and his people such that one had to get permission to travel to the east. When the Bishop kindly asked for permission to travel to the east, after waiting for two weeks the his court, he gave the King Lobengula a gift of a horse to acknowledge his political power and authority (ibid, 1966: 71)

The bishop observed that every principal chief he visited in Mashonaland quickly gave him grants of land for mission and churches and permission to place teachers and catechists in their villages. This was because they hoped to be protected by the white settlers and the church from King Lobengula’s raids (Knight Bruce, 1888. Dairy, Farrant J, 1966: 71)

Bishop Knight Bruce also noted that the African religion of the Shona indigenous people was based on belief of ancestral Spirit. As Magesa Laurenti expressed it across that “…by right of their primogeniture and proximity to God by death, God has granted the Ancestors a qualitatively more powerful life force over their descendants” (Magesa 1997: 47). For death was seen as a process whereby one moves to another state of existence of Ancestral Spirit. The dead were viewed as being alive ‘the living death’ and responsible for the welfare of the living. Furthermore, the Shona tribes believed in witchcraft charms and fetishes. Witchcraft was a source of great worry and dread amongst the Shona people. There was also a fear of vengeance Spirit (Ngozi). This was the visitation of the evil by the spirits of the dead relatives who may have died due to a ‘wrong cause.’ The Ngozi Spirit was called just that when it fought back by causing misfortunes in the families concerned. Bishop Knight Bruce cited that the Shona
people had to wear charms of numerous kinds on their bodies. This was done to protect the individual concerned (Farrant J, 1966: 59).

As observed by the Bishop, the Shona tribes also held the witchdoctor (n'anga) in high regard. Such a person had a political, socio religious authority to the chiefs and the local community. His/Her advice was to be taken seriously lest there would be misfortunes in the families or the community respectively. The n’ángas had other responsibilities; detecting the witches and sorcerers who were causing misfortunes in the families and the community, foretelling and forth-telling especially death and its causes. For in the Shona traditions, beliefs and customs, there was always a spiritual cause for each death. They interpreted visions and dreams. They had ultimate control over the hearts, minds and souls of families and communities. They were also herbalists and religious leaders. They officiated rituals at the altars and performed the rites of sacrifice and were intermediary between the living and the dead. They were extremely respected in the community and people believed whatever such a person told them, without questioning (ibid, 1966: 60).

The Shona people certainly believed in God, whom they called Mwari, the creator, musiki or musikavanhu. God was involved in their day to day lives. They believed that any communication with such a God had to be through their Ancestral Spirits. Hence, the Shona people believed in the hierarchy of spiritual beings, with God being per excellence and ancestors being the intermediary and the closest God and the living. God was supreme and had ultimate authority over humanity and ecology. He was the source of all, the giver of fertility and grain. The Shona people believed that God was omnipresent and existed before all creation and was all powerful. God was spirit and closely related to other spiritual forces (ibid, 1966: 59).

More so, they held their God in high esteem and revered their ancestors who could in turn communicate favorably with God. Given the deep respect which the Shona had for God, certain days were set aside as being holy and people were not expected to work. Those days were called ‘resting days’ (chisi). Socially, moral decadence of incest, murder, and failure to respect the elderly were taken as taboos and serious offences against the community and God. In such, God would punish those who opposed his expectations by sending national calamities, wars, pestilence or even lightning. There was also belief that God would withdraw from the people if the people who rebelled against Him. However, for the Shona people, God was accessible to the individual persons but could only be accessed through Ancestral Spirits (ibid, 1966: 59).

2.9 The Historical Life of Bernard Mzeki.

At this juncture, it is important to trace the historical life and background of Bernard Mzeki; from his birth place, Gwambeni-Inyambani, in Mozambique, him travelling and staying in South Africa. He shall also look at Bernard Mzeki’s educational life and how he later joined the “pioneer column,” from South Africa to Zimbabwe via Mozambique to do missionary work in the early 1890s.

2.9.1 Early Life of Bernard Mzeki.

Kawadza wrote that Bernard was born in Mozambique at the bay of Inhambane which lies between Lourenco Marques/Maputo and Beira. This place, currently, is now under the Anglican Diocese of Lebombo. His date of birth is considered to be about 1861 if scholarship considered that he was 35 years old at the time of his martyrdom on 18 June, 1896 (Kawadza,
Gowera B, a nephew of the third generation of the family of Bernard Mzeki present the real name of him. She wrote that the real name of Bernard Mzeki was Mamiyeri Guanbe Mitseka who was born on 8 March 1861 (Gowera, 2010:1). She argued that for Bernard to be called Mzeki was a failure for the English to pronounce his surname well. She informed that He was the fifth child out of eight. Bernard was born in Gwambeni village and of the Gwambeni tribe, in Inhambane South of Delagoa Bay Mozambique. He spoke Chopi and Portuguese. It is of paramount importance to mention that the two authors mentioned above and many other African church Historians did not dispute the fact that Bernard was from Mozambique and was born in 1861. But Musodza argued that Mzeka was not his surname per say. In fact, it was his father’s first name. Musodza was informed through an interview that it is customary in some parts of Mozambique to give the father’s name to the child. Isaias Ezekiel Chachine form Mozambique is cited by Musodza as he pointed out that ‘for most Mozambicans, the middle name was always the father’s name,’” (Musodza, 2008:11).

Snell, together with Farrant agreed on this point that Mzeki was born in such a poor village. Bernard Mzeki grew up as a village boy learning all the survival skills in the village and all the customs of the Gwambeni people. His initial encounter with the white people was in his village where he learnt that there was a white man who had opened a store. Bernard Mzeki had an opportunity to work for him. Bernard worked briefly as a storekeeper, standing behind the counter, fetching and carrying goods. Musodza suggested that this European man may have been a Portuguese, since Mozambique during that time was a Portugal colony. On the other hand when one considered the fact that when Bernard arrived in Cape Town at a tender age, a journey financed by selling a horse, one of the languages that he spoke fluently was Portuguese, he may have learnt this language from this Portuguese man (Snell. 1986:7).

According to Gowera, Snell, Farrant, and others, Bernard Mzeki left his village migrating to South Africa, advised by some cousins to get a job as many other boys at that time at a tender age of 14 years old (Gowera, 2010: 1). Kawadza wrote that Mzeki was about 12 years of age when he arrived in Cape Town (Kawadza, 2010: 1). This meant that scholars did not agree on the years he left Gwambeni, Mozambique. The researcher wondered at what age he worked as a storekeeper, standing behind a counter. The black Mozambiquean people were far looked down upon. And to imagine a Bernard Mzeki, standing behind a counter in a store may be an academic fallacy. This may be seen as a historical myth or legendary if one considered the context of the time. Probably, the imperial pen that painted a Mzeki who was born a hero and destined for greatness. The researcher questioned the historicity of this truth about Bernard’s childhood life. Furthermore, the researcher forwarded an academic inquiry on financing his travelling to South Africa by selling a horse. Bernard Mzeki could not have been a property owner of a horse when the researcher critically looked his tender age, let alone considering also the context of the time. Farrant wrote that Bernard Mzeki at “ten years of age sneaked away from his home on a “commandeered” horse to follow an elder brother to Beira. They sold their horses and sailed to Lourenco Marques, and from there to an unknown world, eventually reaching Cape Town” (Farrant. 1967: 18). It must be mentioned that the ideas of sneaking away from home with a ‘commandeered’ horse suggested him stealing a horse and secretly running away from home without letting anyone know of his life adventure. There was no historical proof whether he owned a horse after an intensive investigation. Therefore, the researcher suggested a historical reconstruction of Bernard Mzeki childhood life so that it could be more realistic and imperative.

Again, the researcher wondered why he had to leave Gwambeni at a very young age. Musodza provided a possible answer that Bernard Mzeki found himself without parents following the death of his father and the departure of his mother to her eldest brother, who according to their culture had to stay with her until the brother found another husband for her. This meant that life became horrible for Bernard at such a tender age. It was within this context that when he learnt of the flight of his relatives Ntinge, Sihayi and Masrai as political refugees from their villages, he took a horse and followed them. This was such an extra-ordinary thing to happen given Bernard Mzeki’s age. Farrant surmised that he could have been between twelve and
fourteen years of age. Upon arrival at Delagoa Bay the four sold their horses, and used the proceeds to pay for their voyage to Cape Town and to buy some few things that they needed for the journey (Farrant, 1996; 8). This journey was to be an opening into a new life for Bernard Mzeki and his colleagues. It was Bernard Mzeki’s first time to board a ship, let alone move out of his own country. No one knew what to expect in Cape Town. It was out of sheer courage and an immeasurable confidence in themselves that these boys preceded on their journey. During this period, the Cape had been under the British administration.

2.9.2 Bernard Mzeki in Cape Town, South Africa.

Farrant recorded that once Bernard Mzeki was in South Africa, he was lucky to find employment at his age as a house servant and gardener at a home of an English family in Rondebosch, in Cape Town (Farrant, 1966; 9). Farrant acknowledged that he was too young to be considered for employment. Was this not child abuse? One may ask. The researcher was of the opinion that racism and cheap labor was at play here. Kawadza was very much specific here. “Bernard Mzeki found work in Rondebosch working for a businessman as a houseboy polishing the floors and cleaning the silver and Cecil John Rhodes also stayed at the hill slopes of Rondebosch” (Kawadza, 2011; 2). Farrant wrote that Bernard proved to be an exceptionally faithful, obedient and trusted servant (Farrant, 1966; 9). Farrant continued to cite that it was in this period in Rondebosch that Bernard Mzeki first came into contact with missionary work done by the Cowley Fathers of St Philips in Zonnebloem. This was a religious Community of dedicated men. She claimed that Bernard was drawn to become interested about knowing God. He enrolled the night school which was being administered by Fraulein von Bloemberg. He loved school with excitement. He made tremendous progress in western education. When Bernard was allowed to join the scripture class Fraulein is quoted by Snell M saying, that “…the young man was suddenly quite different. He always listened with glowing eyes, drinking in every word as if a world, so far unimagined, was coming into existence before his spirit” (Snell, 1886; 9). Bernard was taught that God loved and cared for him. Farrant quoted Bernard Mzeki responding by saying:

This is something that I have not known. Nobody has ever told me this. I ought to have done something for God, working for him and serving him, if he cares for me so much. Do tell Him, Inkosazana, that I am very sorry that I have not done anything for Him, yet, but I didn’t know about him at all,” (Farrant, 1966; 23).

Bernard Mzeki’s desire for God grew noticeably. Therefore, Bernard started attending baptismal class for a year and on the 7th March 1886, the Feast of St Perpetua and her Companions, Bernard Mzeki and six of his indigenous colleagues were baptized by Father Puller, with Fraulein, the Baroness, a German lady worker, becoming their Godmother. As he could not kneel in the immersion Font because of his short stature, he stood and dipped his head under water three times. By accepting this Sacrament, he forfeited his family association from all heathen rights, and became an outcast (Farrant, 1967; 19).

It must be pointed out that this date on which Bernard was baptized when one considers the religious reasons for his death; one can conclude that there was something of martyrdom on this date as observed by Farrant. It is paramount to mention that it was the same date where first African martyrs were martyred when another African martyr Bernard Mzeki was baptized to be a Christian. On Easter Monday the following year after attending confirmation class, Bernard Mzeki was confirmed in St Philips Chapel by Bishop West Jones. (Farrant, 1967; 42). This meant that the western pen painted Mzeki as someone who was destined for martyrdom.
Notably, Bernard Mzeki, after his confirmation, decided to join the full-time ministry. Kawadza (2010) confirmed that Bernard gave up his very profitable employment at the Rondebosch to live in St. Columba’s hostel, to help the Fathers and the Fraulein with the night school, in religious teaching and to do the ‘works of mercy.’ He had heard that the missionaries were looking for a suitable person to do the cleaning of the house and other duties. This he offered to do entirely without pay. His striking remarks were, “This house does serve the Kingdom of God, and to serve God is what must do since I have become a Christian therefore this place is most suitable for me” (Kawadza, 2010; 2). His employer, whom he worked faithfully and honestly, was not happy to lose him but for Mzeki, he had already made up his mind to join full-time ministry. Farrant suggested that he performed exceptionally; everyone respected him and his ministry (Farrant, 1966; 57). Asked whether he was interested to bring the light of faith to those who were still living in darkness, as Kawadza recorded it, Bernard replied, “That of course, I would like very much for I do want to work for the Lord. If only I could manage the many studies. For you know that my brain works very slowly” (Kawadza, 2010; 3). He continued his studies at St. Philips, St. Columba and Zonnebloem College as a catechist and did extremely well. Farrant wrote that Bernard was very intelligent that he was awarded a ‘high’ prize for religious knowledge in one year, and it is possible that it was the ‘West Jones Prize’ (Farrant, 1966; 58). It should be cited out that Bernard had a special and unique gift of languages. He mastered local languages in Cape Town so that he could minister to the local South African people. He also learnt biblical languages that is Greek and Hebrew, let alone English and Latin intensively. This made him to be useful as an interpreter when the lady Fraulein went out there and there for mission work to the local Zulu and Thosa communities (Farrant, 1966; 58). The researcher questioned; if Bernard was this intelligent, why was he not made a priest? Such a question shall be attempted to be answered in later discussions. All the same, he had already entered into a new world of western civilization.

As soon he heard of plans to establish Anglicanism in the then Rhodesia, now called Zimbabwe by Bishop George Whydham Hamilton Knight Bruce, Bernard Mzeki, Charles Makolami and others offered themselves to do missionary work in the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, in Zimbabwe (Gowera, 2010; 2). They travelled through Beira as part of the ‘pioneer column’ to evangelize the Shona people in Zimbabwe. In 1891, he was left in Mangwende village by his Bishop Knight-Bruce after the bishop had negotiated with chief Mangwende to leave him to establish the Anglican Faith. Musodza was of the opinion that Bishop Knight-Bruce believed it to be essential that indigenous people should hear the gospel from their indigenous fellows, even though they may be men of another tribe or African country (Musodza, 2008; 14). One may wonder whether he had any choice or not, to accompany the Bishop Bruce after he had been schooled from a very young age and cared for by the church? Hence, the idea if him offering himself and others to ministry in Mashonaland is dubious and questionable.

2.10 Conclusion.

Conclusively to this chapter, the intention of the researcher was to give a critical look at the historiographical and formative narrative of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland in its context and period. This historicity becomes paramount to this study. It is the historical foundation to this investigation. In addition, it brings out the identity and person of Bernard Mzeki from a vacuum and ushering him into a context and background of his time. Bernard Mzeki cannot be separated from the formative history of ACZ. Hence, it was important to trace the history from Bishop Knight Bruce’s first pastoral expedition to the North of the Limpopo and coming back with findings on how he could create a new Diocese in Mashonaland. Significantly, to was critical to look the Pioneer Column and its Chaplains. Furthermore, his resignation from the See of the Diocese of Bloemfontein and his acceptance to be the first Bishop of the new Diocese after he had reached Salisbury in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) with African catechists who included
Bernard Mzeki was important to the study. Notably, the researcher closely looked at the life history of Bernard Mzeki, calling to ministry in Cape Town in South Africa and finally his travel with Bishop Knight Bruce to establish the new Diocese in Mashonaland. In the next chapter, the researcher shall, therefore, critically look and examine the biblical and theological understanding of Martyrdom of the Anglican Church.
Chapter Three. Martyrdom as Precursor to the Analyzing of the Death of Bernard Mzeki.

3.1 Introduction.

This chapter on martyrdom of the Christian Church is being written from the standpoint of setting clear parameters before looking at the martyrdom status of Bernard Mzeki. A concise exploration of the concept will allow the research to mark the boundaries and easily position the identity of this venerated African martyr of ACZ. It has been established in the previous chapter that the idea of his martyrdom arose more than 40 years after his death and at the instigation of one of the white clerics, Bishop Knight Bruce who came to create the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland in the country. Since the Church's founding, nearly 70 million Christians have been killed for their faith (Barrett and Johnson 2001:227). Even more remarkable than this statistic is that the great majority of these, nearly sixty-five percent, were martyred in the twentieth century alone (Barrett and Johnson, 2001: 229).

3.2 An Exploration of Martyrdom and its Early Use.

Generally, the word martyr simply means the one who suffers martyrdom (Attawatters, 1958: 309). It referred to those of the first centuries of the church, victims of the Roman Catholic persecutions. Specifically, the Greek word martus means a witness who testifies to a fact of which he has knowledge and faith in Christ from personal experience and suffering and dying due to his/her faith Cross, 2005, Attawatter 1958: 309). It is in this regard that the term martus first appears in Christian bible and extra biblical literature in the name of the Apostles who were witnesses of all that they had observed in the public life of Christ. Notably, in the Old Testament, specifically, Estes (2017: 181) brings the notion of martyrdom pictured in the suffering Servant in the book of Isaiah 53: 7. The suffering servant is a lamp to be slaughtered. The Hebrew word for “slaughter” in the phrase “a lamb that is led to the slaughter” (53:7) suggests martyrdom. According to Isaiah, martyrdom has to incarnate salvation and liberation. The suffering servant has been interpreted as Jesus Christ crucified as a hero willing to defend the oppressed people. The servant is a martyr bearing the burden of sin in order to eradicate it.

In the New Testament, in the book of Acts 1:22, Peter, in his address to the Apostles and other followers of Christ relative to the election of a successor to Judas, uses the term martus with this meaning: "Wherefore, of these men who have accompanied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day he was taken up from us, one of these must be made witness with us of his resurrection” (Acts 1: 22, Attawatters, 1958: 309).

From the beginning, the Apostles, faced grave persecution, until eventually almost all suffered death for their convictions and faith. Furthermore, within the lifetime of the Apostles, the term martus came to be used in the sense of a witness who was called at any given time to deny what he/she believed in, under the penalty of death. From this stage, the transformation to an easy understanding of the term, as used ever since in Christian literature: a martyr, or witness of Christ, was a Christian who was persecuted and suffered death rather than deny his faith. St. John, the writer of the book of Revelations, used the word with this meaning at the end of the first century Attawatters 1958:309).
It is important to show a distinction between martyrs and confessors who can be traced to the second part of the second century CE. Martyrs were those who only suffered the extreme penalty of death upon refusing to deny their faith in God. Whereas, the title of confessors was given to Christians who had shown their willingness to die for their faith, by bravely enduring imprisonment or torture, but were not put to death (ibid, 2014). Yet the term martyr was still sometimes applied during the third century to persons still living, for example, by St Cyprian used the term martus to quite a number of bishops, priests, and laymen condemned to penal servitude in the mines (Attawatters, 1958: 309). According to Bartlett (2013: 3), the origins of the cults of martyrs began in the second century CE when some Christians were regarded as more exceptional than others at the time of their death. These were the martyrs, a word of Greek origin meaning “witness.” Martyrs were those who died for their faith, tortured and killed in public typical of imperial Roman civilization. During this early period of the church, Christians prayed to the martyrs because they deemed to have the power to forgive sins. The local Christian communities gathered at the tomb of the martyrs in cemeteries on the anniversary of their death to celebrate the Eucharist and perhaps have a commemorative feast (Bartlett, 2013: 3). Medieval Christianity was concerned with the bodies of martyrs. Their bodies of martyrs would be cherished as enduring sources of supernatural powers. There were thousands of shrines in medieval Europe containing the dust, bones or the undecayed bodies of the martyrs. One church had a foot of Simon de Montfort, the martyr in their church. Christians came to these shrines, revered, asked favors from them and be cured of the illnesses. The churches that guarded these shrines gave the martyrs solemn liturgical commemoration. (Bartlett, 2013: 268).

3.3 The Semantics of Martyrdom.

The paramount question to this stage of study is; what is the semantic relation of martus and witness? In attempting to answer this question, the earliest attempts to define martyrdom and laying the foundation of the Theology of martyrdom was to trace the technical terminology on the basis of the etymological and semantic use of the term μάρτυς, which was transformed from their original meaning ‘witness’ to the technical term for a Christian martyr. Before going further, etymology and semantics are basically scientific disciplines used to closely look at the meaning of words and how they change with time and context (Ullmann S, 1963: 36). Middleton (2014: 120) noted that in the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, who is believed to be one of the first Christian martyrs, μάρτυς, μαρτύριον and μαρτυρεῖν are all found in the unambiguously technical sense of martyrdom. He quoted the account:

We are writing to you, brothers, an account of those who were martyred (τοὺς μαρτυρήσαντας) especially the blessed Polycarp, who put an end to the persecution as though he were setting his seal upon it by his martyrdom (μαρτυρίας) … Such is the story of the blessed Polycarp. Although he … was the twelfth person martyred (μαρτυρήσας) in Smyrna, he alone is especially remembered by everyone … He proved to be not only a distinguished teacher but also an outstanding martyr (μάρτυς) whose martyrdom (μαρτυρίον) all desire to imitate since it was in accord with the pattern of the gospel of Christ.” (Musurillo, 1972: 1.1; 19.1)

He continued to forward his argument that the earliest Christian Latin text, the Acts of the Scillitan, martyrs used the Latin transliteration martus as technical vocabulary. After being condemned, the early Christians announced that at that very moment, they were martyrs (martyres) in heaven; that the Latin writer could simply transliterate the Greek term in its technical sense indicates the Greek equivalent had acquired its technical meaning well before the end of the second century (Middleton, 2014: 121). Notably, prior to the mid-second century, it may be true that unambiguous technical martyr language was not found, the deaths of those
of Christian martyrs were recorded earlier on especially in the last book of the bible called Revelation. Μάρτυς Greek language was vividly and closely associated with death in Revelation 2:13, in respect of Antipas, the souls under the altar (Revelations 6.9–11) and finally, the two witnesses (Revelations 11.17). In the four Gospels, Jesus Christ predicted the unavoidability of demise following the confession of faith and the willingness to die for it. The decision whether to confess or deny Jesus Christ in the Gospel according to Mark (Mark 8.34–38) was in effect a choice to save or to lose one’s life (Middleton, 2014: 121).

Chilton B and Neusner J (2000) and many other scholars have pointed to Jewish antecedents of Christian martyrdom. In the Torah, the Hebrew words for giving one’s life for Jehovah God was made known as qiddush hashem. This meant the sanctification of the holy name of God which was an explicit acceptance of death for the sake of Jehovah, even if the death took the soul. Both Chilton B and Nersner J emphasized that martyrdom represented a very special kind of death, one that was public which showed witness to the martyr’s ultimate offering on God’s alter (Chilton B & Neusner J, 2000: 92). Frend (1965: 65) in his classic study of martyrdom, proclaimed that from the Torah, without the second and the fourth books of the Maccabees, and without Daniel, a solid biblical and Christian theology of martyrdom cold scarcely have been possible’ especially those found in Daniel and the second and fourth books of the Maccabees. He cited that while the three young men in Daniel were rescued from the finance of fire, namely Hananiah-Shadrach, Mishael-Meshack and Azarih - Abednego, their ultimate decision not to deny their faith before the king Nebuchadnezzar served as a model for the Maccabean martyrs. The Jews who refused to comply with King Antiochus’ decrees to abandon their ancestral traditions were executed (2 Macc. 6.1)

Ahluwalia (2006: 1) wrote that Martyrdom was a phenomenon also found in Semitic religions. In Indian predominant great religious tradition, Hinduism and Buddhism was a form of self-sacrifice to a supreme ideal - a God-given opportunity. It was also seen as a salvation of the soul, as much as for redemption of society and state. It should be mentioned that semantically, the term martyr is shares the same meaning with the Christian definition. The term martyr is rooted in the Greek word martyr which means witness, corresponding to its near-synonymous Arabic expression tushahid which gave rise to the expressions shaheedi, shahadatin Sikh parlance.

In other words, martyrdom was a self-sacrificing act, which stood witness to the truth that the martyr was committed to. It was a self-sublimating act which was a testimony to one’s upholding of the martyr’s faith in the midst of unbearable tortures leading to the martyr’s death. In Indian religious mythology, the role of a martyr stood taken over by Divine intervention in favor of the forces of goodness against those of evil. Martyrdom was seen as culmination of the conflict between good and evil. The persecuted communities interpreted and saw martyrdom as fulfilling a Divine mission of upholding truth, goodness, justice and freedom (Ahluwalia J, 2006: 1).

The year 1606 CE witnessed a saga of extraordinary sufferings, sacrifices and martyrdoms in the history of the Sikhs since the martyrdom of Guru Arjun Dev. It was followed by that of Guru Tegh Bahadur and of the four sons of Guru Gobind Singh. In the eighteenth century saw massacres of the Sikhs numerous committed Sikhs. They were beheaded, cut into pieces, scalps removed on the moving wheels. But they remained steadfast in their faith being brutally tortured to death. All the suffering the occurred in martyrdom was captured on page 966, according to the hymn in Sri Guru Granth Sahib and the daily Sikh prayer (Ahluwalia J, 2006: 3).

Martyrdom was also found in the religion of Islam. Interestingly, martyrdom shares the same Arabic semantic roots of the term and definition with other religions. Ingalls (2002: 1) wrote that the term for “martyr” in Arabic is shahadah, which has a semantic field very similar to the Greek term martur which means a witness or one who dies for his faith. Ezzati (1986: 1) wrote
in agreement of definition that the word *shahada* was derived from the Arabic verbal root *shahada*, which meant to see or to witness. It also means to testify or to become a model and paradigm. *Shahada*, literally means to see or to witness and to become a model. A *shahid* therefore was the martyr who saw and witnessed. This meant too that the martyr was the witness, as if the martyr witnessed and saw the truth physically and stood by it firmly. The martyr was prepared to struggle and fight and give up his life for the truth, and to become a martyr. By this, the martyr became a model, a paradigm, and an example for others. The martyr was worthy of being imitated, and worthy of being followed. In history, *Jihad* meant the way to establish the truth it lead to martyrdom.

Ingalls (2002) commented that the concept of martyrdom in Islam was distinctly different from that in Christianity. He wrote that those Christians who refused to worship Caesar were executed by the state as criminals in the early church. Christians were forced to submit to the government. When they would not obey the government, they were punished. In the religion of Islam, jihad included active and offensive military operations of conquest. Martyrs in Islam were those who were executed fighting Allah’s wars and not just those executed for their faith. Since martyrdom guaranteed eternal life (Q 3:157-58, 169-71), admission to the presence of Allah (Q 3:157-58), and great reward (Q 4:74, 95-96; 47:4), there was a tremendous and great motivation to die the death of a martyr (Ingalls, 2002: 1). The following quotations from the Quran are of paramount importance to martyrdom in Islam:

And if ye were slain, or died in the way of Allah, forgiveness and mercy from Allah were far better than all they could amass. [158] and if ye died, or are slain, lo it was unto Allah that ye were brought together. (Q 3:157-58) Think not of those who were slain in Allah’s way as dead. Nay, they lived, finding their sustenance in the presence of Allah Lord; [170] They rejoiced in the Bounty provided by Allah: and with regard to those left behind, who have not yet joined them (in their bliss), the (martyrs) glory in the fact than on them is no fear nor have they caused to grieve. [171] they glory in the Grace and the Bounty from Allah, and in the fact that Allah suffered not the reward of the faithful to be lost in the least distinguished above those who sited at home by a special reward, [96] Ranks specially bestowed by him and forgiveness and mercy. For Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful. (Q 4:95-96, Ingalls, 2002: 1)

It is noteworthy to mention that they are scholars who argue that there were differences between Jewish, Semitic religions, Islam and Christian Theological conceptions of martyrdom (Middleton P, 2006:110–115). They cited that the biblical and the Christian Theological understanding of martyrdom was not simply an extension of the Jewish phenomenon. The Christian martyrdom was also linked with the Graeco-Roman tradition of Noble Death which itself took many forms. Some from the Christian communities chose death rather than face capture or humiliation by the enemy. Some went on to commit suicide in the face of devastating misfortune of being ordered by the Roman State to worship and pay allegiance to the Emperor, let alone to their gods (Droge & Tabor, 1992: 17–51). Interestingly, these suicides were appreciated and praised by early Christian Apologetics as laying the foundation of the biblical and the Christian Theological understanding of martyrdom. This meant, therefore and respectively, that there was then no consistent ‘pure’ form of early martyrdom.

### 3.4 Martyrdom and Identity.

According to Latourette (2000: 81), the Christian church experienced persecution under the hands of Roman authorities, in its first three centuries. The experience of suffering and deaths resulted in making martyrs and apologists, would have significant historical and theological consequences for the development of the Christian faith. The persecution of Christians created
the canonization of the cult of the saints and martyrs. It facilitated the rapid growth and spread of Christianity and also prompted defenses and explanations of Christianity in apologies, let alone raised fundamental questions about the character of the church (Latourette, 2000: 81).

The reasons for persecuting Christians rose from the hatred. It also rose from a Roman philosophy and belief that proper piety to the Roman gods helped to sustain the well-being of the cities and their people. Persecution was also heavily motivated by the pagan sense that bad things will happen if the gods are not respected and worshiped properly, though much of the Roman religion was utilitarian the Roman believed that the neglect of the old gods who had made Rome strong was responsible for the disasters which were overtaking the Mediterranean world (Latourette, 2000: 82). It must be mentioned that this religious thinking rose again in the fifth century, when the destruction of Rome caused many to worry that the gods were angry at the Empire’s turn to Christianity. In addition, Christians were distrusted in part because of the secret and misunderstood nature of their worship. Christian phrases like ‘love feast’ and talk of eating Christ's flesh sounded understandably suspicious to the Graeco – Romans. They suspected of cannibalism, incest, orgies, and all sorts of immorality (Latourette, 2000:82). Lebreton J. and Zeiller J (1994: 315), confirmed some of the charges levelled against Christians were sacrilege-violation of the sacred, _lse majeste_ refusal to take part in the cult of the Emperor’s Divinity and crimes against common law like magic, incest or infanticide. A special legislature was the put in place - _Christianos esse non licet_, which meant that professing Christianity was forbidden. Therefore, the very name Christian was forbidden and condemned.

Ten major Christian persecutions were recorded by St Augustine which nicely paralleled the ten plagues of Egypt since the fifth century:

1. Persecution under Nero (c. 64-68CE). Traditional martyrdoms of Apostles namely Peter and Paul.
2. Persecution under Domitian (81-96CE).
3. Persecution under Trajan (112-117CE).
8. Persecution under Maximinus known as the Thracian (235-38CE).
10. Final persecution under Diocletian and Galerius (303-324CE) (Augustine, _City of God_. 18.52)

In all the persecutions mentioned above, generally Christian were martyred as objects of amusement. Some were clad in the hides of beast and torn to death by dogs and others were crucified Some Christians were set on fire to serve to illuminate the night when daylight (Bettenson & Maunder, 1999: 2, Lebreton J & Zeiller J, 1994: 309).

Middleton P (2014: 122) pointed out that it was difficult to elucidate precisely what constituted martyrdom. He argued that it could be more fruitful to examine closely how martyrdom narratives function in shaping identity. The moment where a martyr confessed to being Christian was the climax of most early Christian Martyrology. For example, in the early third-century _Passion of Perpetua_, the eponymous young heroine remained resolute in her confession that she was a Christian (Christiana sum; 3.2) in the face of her father’s pleading to renounce her faith, and then pressure from a State official to recant:

> Have pity on your father’s grey head; have pity on your infant son. Offer the sacrifice for the welfare of the emperors ‘I will not,’ I answered. Hilarianus asked, ‘Are you a Christian?’ And I answered, ‘I am a Christian’ (Middleton P, 2014: 122).
Middleton P (2014: 122) continued to mention that in most early Christian martyr acts, the main characters hold fast to a confession of Christ despite ill-treatment, torture and death. The Christian confession ‘I am a Christian - Ἰησοῦς Χριστός εμί - Christianos sum’ was a crucial element in early Christian martyrlogical accounts. Martyrdom narratives were composed in such a way as to make the confession the climax of the account. Interestingly, for example, in the Martyrdom of Cuprus, Pappylus, Aganthonice and Cuprus, on being asked their names, stated vehemently that their first and most distinctive about them was that of being Christians (Χριστιανός). They went on to loudly repeat many times that they were Christians in response to being asked to sacrifice to the Graeco-Roman gods (Ibid, 2014: 122). This affirmation of Christian identity is similarly found in respect of the martyrdom of Polycarp found in the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs, the Martyrs of Lyons, and most importantly of all in the Martyrdom of Saint Justin and Companions. It was during the reign of Marcus Aurelius that Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, was arrested and executed for martyrdom. Later own, there were new decrees of making it easier for Christians to be accused and have their property confiscated. In 177, 48 Christians were martyred in the amphitheatre in Lyons, modern France (Frend, 2000:7). It is paramount to mention that each Apologetic or writer constructed the martyrdom narratives in such a manner that each martyr individually confessed their Christian identity in turn (Middleton P, 2014: 122).

In addition to this argument, Bisbee (1988) noted that every Roman trial began by establishing the identity of the accused, the Christian confession was ubiquitous in these martyrs who acted to the point of cliché. Repeated confession in these martyr’s accounts crafted the Christian identity. Χριστιανός εμί, meaning – I am a Christian was ultimately and exclusively a martyr’s confession in primitive Christianity of the early first centuries. Christian identity, therefore, depended on whether one confesses or denies her/his Faith in a trial. If the Christians recanted and openly declared that they could worship the Greek gods, then were to be freed. Those who persisted, however, should be punished by execution (Middleton P, 2014: 22).

Significantly, martyrdom and the establishment of the Christian identity, attitudes to martyrdom became an important dividing line in the battle for Christian orthodoxy. This is because the earliest Christians were judgmental to those who persecuted people of the Faith, let alone they also criticized those who did not embrace martyrdom. The earliest Christians called them heretics. Justin, the Apologist, as recorded by Middleton P (2014: 174) ruled that those who followed Marcion and other heretical leaders of the day were not truly Christian because none of them had experienced martyrdom. Contrary, in the early Church, martyrdom was not an unproblematic category; only that the attitudes on the effectiveness of martyrdom varied. Surprisingly, not everyone who died for their Faith was universally accepted as a martyr. He noted that the earliest church became pre-occupied with qualifying and disqualifying martyrs, beginning with the late second-century Church Father, Clement of Alexandria (Middleton P, 2014: 123).

3.5 Misconceptions Regarding Martyrdom.

In the course of time several aberrant views of martyrdom have gained acceptance. Some in the Early Church and pre-Reformation times felt that martyrdom would result in forgiveness of personal sins. A related distortion, especially prominent in rabbinic Judaism, is the conviction that the martyr’s blood has atoning power for God’s people in general. It must be remembered that the martyrs died for the message of Christ as sin-bearers (1 Pet 2:24; Heb 7:27; 10:10). The idea that Christian martyrs were dying for their own sins or the sins of others contradicts the message which to defend they laid down their lives (Wolf, 1982: 419).

Another distortion, which originated in the Greek concept of the noble death, excessively glorified the martyr’s courage and perseverance, leading to veneration of the martyr. But the
nature of Christian martyrdom is such that perseverance unto death is in no way meritorious but naturally flows from faith. Persevering in suffering is simply acting consistently with one’s convictions concerning the promises of God – if they are really true, then they are worth suffering for (Heb 11:24-26; 2 Cor 4:17-18; Rom 8:18). The merit, then, is not in the martyr’s courage or fortitude, but in God’s faithfulness to his promises, which undergirds the martyr’s perseverance (Middleton P (2014: 128).

A proper attitude toward martyrdom also excludes the stoical idea that one must stand aloof from and be apathetic toward life as preparation for possible martyrdom in the future. The Bible affirms the goodness of life and man’s right to enjoy it (1 Tim 4:3-5). But when faced with the choice between compromise and death, the martyr valued his or her life with God more than this present life (ibid, 2014: 128).

In some traditions the martyr is afforded the role of a special intercessor before God or mediator of salvation’s blessings. But scripture is clear concerning the sole mediatory role of Christ concerning salvation (1 Tim 2:5; John 14:6; Acts 4:12). To ascribe an equal mediatory role to the Christian martyr would be idolatry, an act akin to that in defiance of which many martyrs died. However, some of us hold that those who have died in Christ may well be continuing in heaven a Christian intercessory ministry which they have already exercised on earth as any believer should. We agree that while we have this ‘cloud of witnesses’ and perfected martyrs around us, we should fix our eyes on Jesus, the originator and perfecter of our faith (Heb 12:1-2).

In some current theological streams Christian martyr terminology was indiscriminately applied to political martyrs and resistance fighters. The fallacy lied in making political resistance a more important criterion than Christian allegiance, and the agreement of political ideas with certain ideologies more important than with scripture. An extension of Christian martyr terminology to non-Christian political martyrs was rejected while the right of non-Christians to develop and express their own political martyr thinking was defended. However, martyrdom of Christians is at times caused by Christian ethical and political positions was acknowledged. (Middleton P, 2012: 128).

3.6 Criterion for Martyrdom.

The Catholic Encyclopaedia written by Attwater (1931: 78), recorded Clément’s teaching on Christian martyrdom. It was the earliest extended Christian reflection on the subject. Most importantly, it was the first attempt to distinguish between what could be called false and true martyrdom.

Now we too blame those who have rushed on death, for there are some who are really not ours but share only the name, who are eager to hand themselves in hatred against the creator, athletes of death. We say that these men take themselves off without witness (ἀμάρτρος), even if they are officially executed. For they do not preserve the characteristic mark of faithful witness, because they do not know the real God, but give themselves up to a futile death (Attwater, 1931: 78).

In his teachings, Clement argued that those who rushed into death unvalued life by demonstrating hatred God. It is significant to acknowledge that Clement did not deny that they looked like martyrs and shared the name as Christians. They were also arrested and were underwent public trials, and let alone, they were also killed officially (Attwater, 1931: 78). But, Clement in his teachings, vehemently and emphatically dis qualified them as true martyrs.
Rhee (2005: 42 - 44) challenged Clément’s teachings on true and false martyrdom. He argued that though many scholarly accounts of early Christian martyrdom tended to generally accept Clément’s point of view, using his canon as a means to establish a standard by which all other attitudes to martyrdom could be measured was problematic. Rhee continued to argue that before and after Clement, early Christian attitudes to and practices of martyrdom were varied. He viewed Clément’s condemnation of voluntary martyrdom as an island of criticism in the early church. What Clement could rudely condemn as self-killing was found throughout early Christian texts. Rhee closely looked at one of the most dramatic examples who was popularly known as lady Agathonice, While Agathonice was witnessing the martyrdom of two faithful Christians on a stake of fire, saw a vision of the glory of the Lord, which had a profound effect on her. She concluded in her mind that this was a call from God. She immediately raised her voice loudly, say before her was a meal that had been prepared for her. And she was ready to partake and eat of this glorious meal. The gathering gave her the go ahead and she suddenly took off her cloak and threw herself joyfully on the stake of fire. She died together with the other two Christians. It was recorded that the Christians secretly collected their bones and preserved them for the glory of Christ. They praised the lives of the martyrs, including lady Agathonice (τῶν μαρτύρων αὐτοῖ) (Rhee, 2006: 47).

Rhee (2006) was joined by Droge and Tabor (1992: 17 - 51) and others who supported him by writing that it could be academic suicide to remove lady Agathonice from the top list of true martyrs because it could over rule one of the earliest technical Christian uses of the term μάρτυς. They wrote that it was a common phenomenon in the earliest century of the beginning of Christianity in the enthusiastic manner in which lady Agathonice chose martyrdom. They reaffirmed their position when they forwarded another similar account entailed by Tertullian in his Scapulam 5.1. They showed a similar phenomenon in which they described how the Christians of Asia demanded to be martyred before the proconsul:

‘On ordering a few persons to be led forth to execution, he said to the rest, “O miserable men, if you wish to die, you have cliffs and nooses!”’ Tertullian clearly approved of the actions of these Christians, and indeed threatens the proconsul to whom he is writing with the same behavior. Your cruelty is our glory. Only see you to it, that in having such things as these to endure, we do not feel ourselves constrained to rush forth to the combat, if only to prove that we have no dread of them, but on the contrary, even invite their infliction. (Droge & Tabor, 1992:19–51).

Hovey (2008: 51) insisted and asserted that it was impossible to be ranked on the list of true martyrdom by voluntarily and willingly seeking it. It was publicly murdering one’s self or committing suicide but Rhee, Droge, Tabor and others still insisted that there was evidence in the early Christian texts that this was a common phenomenon and not contrary to the earliest Christian tradition. They all argued that even Tertullian did not regard these voluntary martyrs as different from those who were considered as ordinary. For Tertullian those who volunteered for martyrdom were equally acts of authenticity of true martyrdom. They further argued that even the Asian proconsul trails saw little difference between the action of the executed Christians and voluntary suicide. They said if one looked at many Christian martyr texts closely, one could see the eagerness to embrace martyrdom, and see little difference between those who gave themselves up willingly, those arrested and executed because they claimed to be faithful Christians and those who committed suicide (Droge & Tabor, 1992:19–51). Therefore, Clément’s position on Christian martyrdom was less accommodative. The unwavering position of Clément’s stance is recorded again in the Stomata when he said that anyone who presented himself for the judgment seat of trial for martyrdom voluntarily became guilty of his own demise, let alone, those who could not run away and avoid persecution, and presented themselves for capture. He becomes an accomplice in the crime of the persecutor (Droge & Tabor, 1992:19–51).
According to the two writers mentioned above, Clement removed many of those whose acts of devotion to Christ was shown through their willingness to undergo persecution and martyrdom from the roll call of true martyrs. He also looked down upon those who failed to avoid arrest. He accused them of complicity in the sin of the executioners. This position puts him at odds with Tertullian, who branded those who fled persecution as cowards. Droge and Tabor (1992) and others scholars raised that in history, it was recorded that during a period of persecution around 202 AD, Clement did precisely that and fled Alexandria. They said that Clement’s position on Christian martyrdom was to be elucidated by as self-justification and not of a Christian Theological stand point (Droge & Tabor, 1992:141–144, Middleton P, 2012: 123, Frend, 1965: 360).

According to Middleton P (2012) Like Clement, other Christian bishops also fled in the face of sustained persecution like Clement. Those who remained lapsed. He wrote that in this period, a class of Christians whom he called rigorists began to challenge the episcopal authority of a bishop who abandoned his church rather than remain and face martyrdom (Middleton P, 2012: 124). He pointed out that the Confessors became an alternative locus for authority at this fragile stage of the Church. Confessors by general definition were Christians who were arrested for confessing Christian faith, but were eventually released. Their status was slightly less than martyrs (Ibid, 2012: 131). Bishops like Cyprian for instance adopted a delicate balance between praising the martyrs, but at the same time limiting the ultimate value of martyrdom. Cyprian ran into hiding in exile rather than to face persecution. In exile, he wrote a Treatise called *On the Lapsed*, skillfully defended himself. He claimed it was an exile of a Confessor. What was outstanding on his treatise was his disapproval of the practices where confessors forgave the sins of those who had lapsed. He argued that God’s forgiveness could only be mediated through the Church through priests and bishops. He was careful not to criticize the martyrs or confessors (Middleton P, 2012: 125).

Furthermore, Cyprian in his treatise consolidated his position by declaring that confessors through their deeds were clergy without requiring ordination. He wanted to make them subject to his episcopal authority (Middleton, 2012:175–81). The free-lance of Confessors became a challenge that could be repeated several times, hence the appeal of martyrdom was diminished each time bishops had to re-establish their power and authority. Christian martyrdom was most valorized when the least number of Christians were called to undergo it. A large number of Christians, including priests and bishops lapsed, under the persecutions of the Emperors namely Decius, Valerian and Diocletian. They handed over bibles and Christian literature to be burned. Those who remained faithful began to question the lapsed with doubt. The questioning gradually created controversies which eventually lead to the Donatist schism (Middleton P, 2012: 125). Donatism made a vigorous stance that the priests and bishops who were guilty of co-operating with the persecutors could not be valid, hence were ex-communicated. Catholicism held that ecclesiastical office invested them with authority in contrast. Therefore, ex-communication was in the ecclesiastical office of the Pope. Interestingly, the Donatist movement employed the authority and the blood of the martyrs to exclude the Catholics from holding office. Contrary, the Catholics used the authority of ecclesiastical office (Pope) regardless of the holders of those offices committing apostasy to exclude the vigorous Donatists (Middleton, 2012:179).

Middleton (2012) and others recorded that for the first-time, Christians created other Christian martyrs in 317 when the Donatist movement suffered repression from the Catholics. Augustine of Hippo called the Donatist movement heretic. He argued that persecuting and executing the Donatist was very Christian. It was a way of correcting a dangerous heretical error. Hence, when a Donatist was killed in such a situation, he could not be enrolled in the ranks of Christian martyrdom (Middleton P, 2012: 125). According to Augustine’s early writings against the Donatist Movement, *Dictum non poena sed causa facit martyrem* as recorded by Middleton was written to fight strongly them. These writings were popularized in the fourth and fifth
centuries. St Augustine of Hippo’s argument was that the Christian martyrdom of the Donatist movement was driven not for the denial of the faith upon trials but by theological differences and ecclesiastical politics. Therefore, the execution of a Donatist was not Christian martyrdom but correction of a grave error. Middleton P justified the weaknesses of many theological accounts of martyrdom of simply adopting an Augustinian position on Donatism as authoritative and final by acknowledging two writers namely Wicker (2006) and Jensen (2010) who supported his critics (Middleton P, 2012: 126).

Eventually, the Catholic Church dealt with the challenge of the lapsed by continuously down-playing the pregnancy of martyrdom. The orthodox position on Christian martyrdom was, therefore, forged by failure rather than faithfulness by the fifth century. Middleton P (2012: 126) wrote that there was, hence, an inherent danger in testing the authenticity of martyrdom through using the canon of Augustinian eyes. Notably, the attitudes to martyrdom in the early Church were diverse. He commented, together with other scholars, that it was one of failure and apostasy if the prevailing Augustinian view of martyrdom was the culmination of a traceable trajectory.

Middleton (2012) strongly pointed out that it was significant to look closely and critically at Christian martyrdom during the era of the Reformation; for it could settle the argument on the subject of true and false philosophy and ideology of martyrdom if the Donatist controversy undermined ecclesiastical authority. This critique was important because the practice of making and unmaking martyrs became industrial in scale. Thousands of Christians were arrested and publicly executed in the Reformation era by other Christians in the two centuries which followed, outstandingly, the burning of a Reformer Jan Hus in 1415. The paramount question: ‘who controlled martyrdom?’ was one of the most significant battles in this war in the heart of the Catholic Church. Hus directly challenged the authority of both Church and State. He celebrated a Eucharist service for martyrs for three men who were arrested, publicly prosecuted and executed in Prague for burning Papal Bulls advocating the sale of indulgences. Jan Hus’s Eucharistic service in the face of the Catholic Church and the State provocatively declared and executed criminals to be written on the rank-roll of the list of true martyrs, Jan Hus was arrested prosecuted and declared a heretic by the Catholic Church and the State. He was publicly executed because of his actions. Jan Hus’s demise was a source of controversy between his supporters and detractors after his own execution for heresy (Middleton P, 2012: 126)

Notably, Jan Hus’ supporters declared and venerated him as a Christian true martyr to the extent that they celebrated his death in literature; poems, proverbs and songs. Contrary to his celebration of his death, the Catholics saw Hus as a heretic justly executed by the Church and State. In prison, awaiting execution, Hus wrote letters to his supporters, comparing his personal experiences of suffering in light of the Passion of Christ. He cited that Jesus Christ, the Son of God had been denounced as a blasphemer, arrested, prosecuted and excommunicated as a heretic and publicly killed at Calvary. He compared the evil committed against him by the priests of the contemporary church with the Jewish priests who mistreated Jesus (Middleton P, (2012: 126).

If, then, Christ supported such things from the priests … why should we be astonished that the ministers of the antichrist, who are more avaricious, more debauched, more cruel, and more cunning than the Pharisees, now persecute the servants of God, overwhelm them with insult, excommunicate, imprison, and kill them? (Hus, Letter 6 in de Bonnechose 1846).

Furthermore, Middleton P. added that later Protestants who came after Jan Hus who were to undergo imprisonment, public trial and finally execution, it was paramount to root their experiences of suffering in early Christian tradition. For Martin Luther, one of the eminent Reformers of his time said such persecution and martyrdom was a sign that the true church had
been reborn. Martin Luther claimed continuity with the past because the movement was also producing martyrs. As in the fourth century, obedience to the Church through the acceptance of ecclesiastical authority or martyrdom constituted two mutually incompatible ways by which to construct Christian identity, therefore was created by first obedience to the church through the acceptance of the ecclesiastical power and authority and second by way of martyrdom as from the fourth century (Middleton P, 2012: 127).

Gregory agreed with Middleton that the Christian Martyrdom became an increasingly important battleground as the Reformation era progressed. The religious and political propaganda control of martyrs’ accounts was very fierce. Deaths by martyrdom were remembered in songs and poetry. But, notably, the accounts of martyrdom were collected and put together, edited and printed in books from the mid-sixteenth century. For example, the *Swiss Brethren Hymnal* (1564), the famous *Menonnite Martyrs’ Mirror* (1660) and the *Martyrs Mirror*, the Anabaptist Martyrology were some of the books printed to capture the accounts of martyrs (Gregory, 1999: 270, Middleton, 2012: 127). The two writers agree that the printed martyrological books were a political ploy to paint the ecclesiastical authority of the Papal See and the Roman Catholic Church as evil and murderous in her participation in arresting, publicly prosecuting and executing Christians and eventually making martyrs. These martyrological books described in deeper detail; the investigations, arrests, the public humiliating trials, with torture and executions of the faithful. The political intention was to reinforce the sectarian divide between Protestant and Catholic. (Gregory, 1999: 270, Middleton, 2012: 127).

They both pointed out that the most enduring of these martyrologies was John Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, first printed and published in 1563. The Protestant movement popularized the *Book of Martyrs* in such a manner that three editions were produced in Foxe’s own lifetime. Each new edition added further accounts of martyrdom with a political agenda of reinforcing Protestant claims that they represented the true church. In the same manner, they were castigating the Papal See and the Roman Catholics in the tradition of the ancient persecutors. The Pope and his ecclesiastical authority was painted as a latter day evil Roman Emperor. Gregory (1999) and Middleton (2012) mentioned this in agreement that Foxe’s work was a highly effective propaganda tool against the Catholics. The reign of Queen Mary (1553 – 1558) in England added fuel to the fire by popularizing Fox’s martyrological book so as to frustrate Rome which wanted to rule England by remote after she had withdrawn from the Papal See’s authority during King Henry VIII (Gregory, 1999: 270 - 271, Middleton, 2012: 127).

In his book, Gregory captured the fierce responses of the Roman Catholics to Fox’s work. Robert Person’s, *A Treatise of Three Conversions of England from Paganism to Christian Religion* (1603–1604) and more than fifty responses and rebuttals against Fox’s work and the Protestant movement were written from the 1560s onward. Person in his critics claimed that Foxe was a creator of martyrs, attempting to dismiss his work and fighting the Protestant movement. Mitchell (2012: 76 - 77) joined Gregory in the discussion when he recorded Nicholas Harpsfield, a Catholic, reasoned that people from the Protestant movement who died were not true martyrs. He argued that they had not died because of their faith in Jesus Christ or for the Catholic Church. He vehemently argued that these Protestants were arrested, prosecuted and executed because they were heretics, employing the theological and logical standpoint of St Augustine of Hippo (Gregory, 1999:270–271).

After Mary, Elizabeth 1 ascended to the throne in England. Her rule was characterized by executing Roman Catholics in England who were fighting her in order to return the nation under the ecclesiastical authority of the Papal See. Elizabeth 1 charged and convicted them with treason. Catholics in the United Kingdom began to write martyrologies which emphasized that it was for a religious rather than a political cause for which they suffering. Gregory (1999) and Middleton (2012) analogized that it obviously mattered to the Protestant movement and Anabaptists that they were executed for the true faith rather than as heretics in the reformation
era; just as it was important for Catholics to understand their suffering as religious persecution rather than political prosecution in England (Gregory, 1999:270–271, Middleton, 2012: 127). The three writers pointed out precisely that the Reformation martyrology divided competing Christians into martyrs, persecutors and heretics. Christians sought to be connected to their own beliefs and practices with the early Church. Each account served to accentuate the boundaries between competing movements, reinforcing the religious convictions of the martyr’s group. Furthermore, it was significant to refuse martyr-status to those considered to be heretics so as to justify the use of ecclesiastically sponsored violence against them. (Gregory, 1999:270–271, Middleton, 2012: 127).

Constantly, the Roman Catholic Church and the ecclesiastical Papal See insisted that martyr-making was to be left to the official canonization processes. The Donatist schism undermined this view. As demonstrated before in this chapter, the Church approved and disqualified martyrs for factors and reasons which were situational, political, as well as religious. In his book, Budde shared the politics that surrounded the canonization of the late Oscar Romero as an example. He could hardly be remembered as a martyr. This was because some of the Church authorities viewed him suspiciously as a dangerous leftist and communist sympathizer. Regardless, Pope Francis opened Oscar Romeo’s path to sainthood and put his name on the path of martyrdom. This gave Romeo recognition of Christian martyrdom. Budde concluded that the Church could qualify and make martyrs as well as disqualify martyrs for situational, religious and political purposes on the acclamation of the martyr status (Budde, 2011:154–55).

Middleton P cited another unique example of martyrdom of the Rev. Robert J. Thomas, widely celebrated as the first Protestant martyr in Korea. He was killed in 1866 not as a result of his Christian faith, but because an armed American trade vessel called the General Sherman, on which was a passenger, entered Korean waters. This move was interpreted as imperialist aggression by the Americans. The vessel was gunned down and Thomas died along with all other members of the crew. There were no contemporaneous information about his death. However, Rev Robert J. Thomas had a full-blown martyr account by 1926. A mythical account was said that in the last few moments of his life he is said to have held out a Bible to his killer urging him to take and read. The soldier who killed him took the Bible and was converted to the Christian Faith (Middleton 2012: 128). Middleton commented that such accounts of martyrdom already existed in the Roman Catholic Church in the formative history of the subject under discussion. One thing is vivid and clear is that it was not Thomas’ death that made him a martyr. But it was the mythical accounts which were circulated much later which transformed him into the role of a martyr of significance of the nineteenth century (Ibid, 2012: 128).

Middleton P after closely analyzing the insights of the historiography of Christian martyrrology, further concluded that this undermined contemporary attempts to distinguish between false and true martyrdom. Those religious, political, and even academic theological accounts of martyrdom today functioned primarily as identity markers with an intention to reinforce religious, cultural, national and even trans-national group boundaries. He argued that the difference between a true and false example of Christian martyrdom was a difference between two accounts on the same person to be qualified or disqualified as a martyr. This was, indeed, the modern manifestations of the Donatist/Catholic or Reformation disputes over the meaning of particular deaths (Ibid, 2012: 128). Moreover, accounts of Christian martyrdom were circulated and popularized not simply to celebrate and venerate the deaths of brave individuals, but to inspire similar behavior. The aim, therefore, was to create a strong group boundary marker. Martyrologies still functioned as a means of creating group identity, through sympathy or rejection of particular martyrs. It demanded that people took sides, even where the possibility of martyrdom had disappeared. He argued that the quest for an objective definition of martyrdom by which to assess true and false philosophies and ideologies of Christian martyrdom was futile. There were too many instances of martyrs who transgressed one or more
of the disqualifiers involved in the processes of canonizing set in place to sift out false martyrs, whom the Christian group wished to remember and commemorate (Ibid, 2012: 128).

Middleton P strongly cited out that if any ecclesia - Church created canonization processes, they could focus on politically qualify martyrs more than showing spiritual concerns on how a martyr can influence the spirituality of the Church. After all, it was mentioned in clear terms that there was never a stable category of martyr even in the earliest church. Christian martyrdom was always a term associated with group definition and controversy, hence an appeal to an early ideal form or definition of martyrdom was problematic to sustain (Ibid, 2012: 128). This was because Christian martyrdom was appropriated or even constructed to legitimate religious or political causes. Importantly, this could be the case whether or not the martyr intended to die for a spiritual cause. Middleton supported the claim which so separated the martyr’s beliefs and actions from the construction of his Martyrology, in relation to several instances of modern canonization of martyrdom. Therefore, all quests to define objectively the meaning of Christian martyrdom was a pandemonium task (Ibid, 2012: 128).

3.7 Canonization of Saint and Martyrs.

The process of the canonization of martyrs is a religious phenomenon unique to the Roman Catholic Church. According to the Roman Catholic Church, Canonization of saints and martyrs was and is still defined as the “public testimony of the Church to the sanctity and the glory of one of the faithful departed. This testimony is issued in the form of a judgment decreeing to the person in question the honors due to those who are reigning with God in Heaven. By this decree he is inscribed in the catalogue of the Saints and invoked in public prayers; churches are dedicated to God in his memory, his feasts are kept, and public honors are paid to his relics. This judgment of the Church is infallible.” (Bowden C. H, 2012: 9). It is significant to look closely and consider several important things on the definition mentioned above. It should be noticed that canonization was and is an infallible religious act of the Roman Catholic Church; the above explanation shows that it is the public testimony of the Catholic Church that the person being canonized possessed great holiness and died because of his Christian Faith.

Another definition of canonization is as follows: “….a public and official declaration of the heroic virtue of a person and the inclusion of his or her name in the Canon (roll or register) of the Saints and Martyrs…Canonization involves that the saint not only may but must receive public honor; a day is appointed for his feast and a liturgical office composed therefore; his relics are publicly venerated, churches and altars are dedicated in his honor, statues or pictures displayed in churches, and prayers to him made publicly. This judgment of the Church is infallible and irreformable,” (Attwater, 1931: 78). Notably, the Roman Catholic Church acted in history and still acts infallibly, and that she commanded and still commands the veneration of the saints and martyrs. The Catholic Church and still calls those unworthy to be canonized as notorious public sinners, absurd and blasphemous. Hunter S (1898) explained further in detail the extent of the Church’s infallibility:

…infallibility extends to declaring that a certain Council is or is not ecumenical; that certain systems of education are, or are not, injurious to faith and morals; that the principles of certain societies are immoral; and that certain ways of life, especially in Religious Orders, are not merely free from moral evil, but are laudable. Unless the Church could judge upon these matters, she could not exercise her office of guiding and instructing her members…No writer of repute doubts that this last decree of Canonization is an exercise of the infallible authority of the Church, for where it mistaken, the whole Church would be led into offering superstitious worship,” (Hunter S, 1898: 310-311).
Northway and Silva (2011: 3 wrote that the Roman Catholic Church asserted that no one could be venerated as a martyr without its approval, beginning in the 10th century. Ulrich of Augsburg was the first recorded in history to be canonized a saint by Pope John XV in 993. Canon 1403 of its current Code of Canon Law of the Catholic Church regulated and still regulates the process of canonization of saints and martyrs. It must be noted that the process of canonization became a part of canon law in the Roman Catholic Church which developed into a tedious and complex process (Northway & Silva, 2011: 3). This process was simplified by Pope John Paul II through the Apostolic Constitution. Moreover, the Congregation for the cause of the Saints has its own norms and recommendations to regularize the processes (Pope John Paul II, 1983: 2).

The following sections are from the current Code of Canon Law; Canon 1403 of the Roman Catholic Church, outlining the whole process of canonizing saints and martyrs.

3.7.1 The Process of the Canonisation of Martyrs: Summary.

In the Roman Catholic Church, the primary purpose of canonization is to authorize officially veneration and intercession of a particular saint and martyr. The investigation process prior to canonization seeks primarily to ensure that the person lived an extraordinary life through the ordinary events of life, the person was executed due to his faith in Christ, that the person is in heaven and that God is working through him/her intercession bringing favors and granting petitions to the people of God.

Being canonized as a saint and martyr means the following:

- The saint's name is added to the catalogue of saints (meaning that veneration is authorized by the Pope).
- The saint is invoked in public prayers for intercession.
- Parishes may be dedicated in the saint's name.
- The Mass can be offered in the saint's honor.
- Feast and Patronal days are celebrated in the saint's memory.
- Pictures of the saint and martyr are made in which his or her head is surrounded by a halo.
- The name of the martyr and saint's relics (remains) are enclosed in vessels and publicly honoured.

The Roman Catholic Church, through the Apostolic Constitution Divinus Perfectionis Magister the Church expresses its awareness to this reality with the following words: “In all times and ages, God chooses from these many who, following more closely the example of Christ, give outstanding testimony to the Kingdom of heaven by shedding their blood (martyrdom) or by the heroic practice of virtues,” (Pope John Paul II, 1983: 2, Code of Canon Law; Canon 1403).

3.7.2 Steps to Recognition as a Saint and Martyr.

The process begins until at least five years after the candidate's death unless the pope waives that waiting period. It involves scrutinizing evidence of their holiness, work, signs and the way the person died that people are drawn to prayer through their example. Prior to the presentation of the cause to the Congregation for the Causes of the Saints and Martyrdom, the Diocesan See (bishop) in the ecclesiastical division of the person under investigation is under the obligation to conduct an investigation. It is therefore, done in order to establish the merit of the cause, fulfilling the following requirements:
a. Consult the bishops of his ecclesiastical region.
b. Inform the faithful regarding the petition and inviting them to tell what they know or heard about the cause.
c. Submit to study the possible writings of the person under investigation.
d. Appoint experts to study writings and other documents related to the examination.
e. Request kindly the nihil obstat from the Holy See.

"Blessed" Beatification is a statement by the church that it is "worthy of belief" that the person is in heaven, having come to salvation and is used when one has been made a saint, hence, the word beatification can be used interchangeably and reluctantly with the word, canonization. Furthermore, when a saint is to be made a martyr or a confessor, is under the ecclesiastical Papal authority and power (Pope John Paul II, 1983: 2, Code of Canon Law; Canon 1403).

3.7.3 The Ceremony (liturgy) of Canonisation.

Northway and Silva (2011: 3) wrote that the formal declaration of canonization of the saint into martyrdom was done and is done during a special Eucharist Service - Mass conducted by the pope himself. It usually takes place outdoors in St. Peter's Square before large crowds in the Vatican City, in Rome and not usually anywhere else. The two writers mentioned that in 2001, over a half million people attended the canonization of Padre Pío (1887-1968) in 2001 and Josemaría Escrivá de Balaguer was canonized before 300,000 faithful four months later.

The Canon 1403) shows how the canonisation ceremony of martyr was and is conducted. It was done and is done as follows:

1. The saint's life history is read aloud.
11) The pope chants the following in Latin:

In honor of the Blessed Trinity, for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith and the growth of Christian life, with the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and Our Own, after lengthy reflection, having assiduously invoked God's assistance and taken into account the opinion of many brothers of ours in the episcopate, we declare and define [name] to be a martyr [or "to be blessed"], and we enrol him in the Catalogue of the martyrs, and we establish that in the whole Church he should be devoutly honoured among the martyrs. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen (Pope John Paul II, 1983).

In conclusion to this process of canonization of saints and martyrs in the Roman Catholic Church, the person is officially recognized a martyr at this point. The picture of the martyr is unfurled before the gathering to admire and venerate. It must be pointed out strongly that the whole act of canonization is reserved to the Holy See in the Catholic Church both from the Western and Eastern Churches. Even though the beginning of the process occurs at the diocesan level following the regulations of Canon Law, the declaration of a martyr happens at the conclusion of a long process requiring extensive proof that the person proposed for canonization lived and died in such an exemplary and holy life worthy to be cannoned a saint and martyr. The Church implies that the persons are now in heavenly glory. She also implies that that they may be publicly invoked and mentioned officially in the liturgy of the Church, most especially in the Litany of the Saints and Martyrs. In the Roman Catholic Church, the process of canonization involves a decree from the ecclesiastical Papal See that allows veneration of the saints and martyrs in the liturgy of the Church throughout the world. (Pope John Paul II, 1983: 2, Code of Canon Law; Canon 1403, Northway & Silva, 2011: 4).

3.8 Importance of Martyrdom in the Early Christian Church.
According to Farkasfalvy (1999:12), the importance of martyrdom for the early Christians was demonstrated by the way it was interpreted in terms of major theological motifs. For the early Church, martyrdom was a baptism of blood, which brought forgiveness of sins to the martyr. According to Dassmann, it was valued as a Eucharist in which one drank the cup of sufferings of Christ. It was an anticipation of the eschaton, an orthodox version of radically realized eschatology, in which the martyr brought the events of the last days to immediate fruition for himself. It was a defeat of Satan and the demons through identification with the victory of Christ on the cross. Eusebius, as recorded by Farkasfalvy (1999) said that the martyr was filled with the Holy Spirit, who spoke boldly to the persecutors. The Christians to be executed saw visions of the other world. At that moment of death, they had supernatural strength to endure sufferings and deaths. Christian martyrdom was an imitation of Christ, in which one shared in the sufferings of Christ and was brought into direct contact with the Lord. The glory of Christ himself was manifested in the martyr upon death (Farkasfalvy, 1999:12). The importance of martyrdom also was further emphasized by relating it to divine election and providence. It was not for every Christian but God chose the worthy for martyrdom. God assigned martyrdom to some on account of their worth, and to others he gave it on account of his mercy. The doctrine that God chose his martyrs tempered enthusiasm for self-chosen martyrdom. It also highlighted the self-consciousness of the church about the importance of martyrdom (Farkasfalvy, 1999:12).

It should be noted that Christians were not unaware of the practical significance of the act. Tertullian's declaration that the blood of the martyrs was seed of the church and by their deeds the martyrs made other disciples become proverbial. Less well known is the claim of Apollonius, "The more they killed those who believed in God, so much the more their numbers grew by God's aid," (Farkasfalvy, 1999:12). Justin Martyr’s own conversion was influenced by the faith of martyrs. The martyrs thus truly demonstrated in their lives their title as witnesses. Their deed was a public testimony to unbelievers to the gospel. Again, their public executions to martyrdom in the Amphitheatre was the best way of preaching and proclaiming the Good news to those who had not believed yet. Ignatius might have focused on his own personal aspects of martyrdom, but others were aware of the community dimensions of the deed (Perlegrino, 1961:155). A faithful wideness confirmed others in the faith and prepared them to resist under similar pressure. Indeed the process of canonization into martyrdom served expressly to strengthen and train those who would come after. The compiler of the Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas in stating the purpose in writing explained that God always achieved what he promised, as a witness to the non-believer and a blessing to the faithful (Perlegrino, 1961:155). For the doctrine that martyrdom was within God's providence highlighted further that the act was a witness to the State of its subordination to God.

When Tertullian wrote in the 2nd century that the blood of martyrs was the seed of the Church implied that the martyrs' willing sacrifice of their lives led to the conversion of others. The lives of the martyrs became a source of inspiration for some Christians, and their lives were honored. Numerous crypts and chapels in the Roman Catholic Churches' catacombs were named after the names of the martyrs. It showed witness to the early veneration for those champions of freedom of conscience. Special veneration Eucharist services at which the holy Sacrifice were offered over their tombs. This gave rise to the time honored custom of consecrating altars by enclosing in them the relics of martyrs to strengthen the spirituality of the Church (Perlegrino, 1961:155, Eusebius, Church History II.21.7).
Cross & Livingstone (1997: 1444) wrote that in Anglicanism, the process is not canonization as it was done or is done in the Rome Catholic Church. The Anglican Communion and specifically the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe venerates, commemorates, celebrates or remembers the individual who would have been said to have died as the result of his Christian Faith. The approach was and has always been a bit more bottom up. Saints and martyrs were and are recognized generally first at the local level, as a particular community remembers someone and begins to venerate that person. As time goes by, the commemoration spreads and is adopted by other parishes in other places. Eventually, the entire national church officially recognizes the martyr, giving them their own patronal day to be remembered throughout the Province. Generally, the feast day corresponds to the day of death, the day when the saint and martyr entered into glory. Each province of the Anglican Communion has its own unofficial way of celebrating martyrs, though they all tend to share a common set of ancient saints from the Roman Catholic Church derived from the calendar in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, since she is a Protestant church which emerged from the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation (Cross & Livingstone, 1997: 1445).

The Lambeth Conference of 1958, a special meeting held in every 10 years in the Anglican Communion by all the bishops, chaired by the Archbishop of Canterbury, confirmed what is mentioned above that those martyrs recognized by the Roman Catholic Church before the 10th century and since the break with Rome in the 16th century are generally still considered both saints and martyrs in the Anglican Church. The Conference added Heroes and Heroines to be commemorated whom they referred as those holy people whom the church synod or an individual church praised as having had special benevolence who have lived and died since the split with Rome. It considered such muted terms a reversion to a more simple and cautious doctrine which emphasized empowerment and autonomy to all members and components of the church (Lambeth Conference, 1958). It must be cited that in the Church of England, King Charles I of England was the only person to have been treated as a new saint by some Anglicans following the English Reformation. He was referred to as a martyr and included briefly in a calendar of the Book of Common Prayer (Archbishop Council, 13 Dec. 2007). This celebration was, however, considered neither universal nor official in the Anglican Communion worldwide. Many Anglican Provinces listed him as a martyr and not a Saint, or as neither, especially Provinces in Africa. This meant and means that the Anglican Communion did not have and still do not was a system or a liturgy to use to religiously canonize or acknowledge martyrdom.

The Anglican Church in the United States of America (U.S.A.) known as the Episcopal Church has its own unique process of veneration and commemoration though not common in the Anglican Communion. Representatives of each diocese propose adding new saints and martyrs to the liturgical calendar of the Church in every three years at its General Convention. They could also propose to remove saints from the calendar in theory, but this almost never happens. If approved by both the bishops and the deputies, clergy and lay delegates sent by each diocese, the feast is adopted provisionally for three years and the martyrs’ name is added to the liturgical calendar of the church in brackets. During the three years that follow, the entire Episcopal Church is invited to receive the name of the saint and martyr, to celebrate the martyr’s patronal festival day, to look to the saint’s example, and to determine if the Church has made a wise decision or not in adding this name to the calendar (Cross & Livingstone, 1997: 1445). This is the only church that is more organized if compared with other provinces in the Anglican Communion. But of course, their process of veneration and celebration of their saints and martyrs is not a common phenomenon in all the provinces of the church and it is not official stance on how the saints and martyrs are to be recognized. Let alone, when compared with the Roman Catholic Church’s process of canonization as discussed above, the differences are far
more wide and unique. One thing that is common in the Provinces of the Anglican Communion worldwide, therefore, is that they all celebrate and commemorate many of the saints in the General Roman Calendar, often on the same days. It was noticed by the researcher, there are differences between the provinces' liturgical calendars where many times English saints and martyrs are more emphasized.


3.10.1 The Uganda Martyrs.

King Mwanga, kabaka of Buganda which is now part of Uganda, from 1885 to 1887 executed a group a group of 45 Anglican and Roman Catholic martyrs during the persecution of Christians. 22 African Roman Catholics from the total number of those killed were collectively beatified by Pope Benedict XV in 1920 as saints. Finally, they were canonized by Pope Paul VI on October 18, 1964 to be martyrs. The festival day in remembrance of these martyrs in the Roman Catholic Church in Uganda is June 3 each year (Attawatter, 1958:309).

It must be said that in Uganda, these martyrdoms totally changed the picture of Christian growth. The Christian Faith was introduced in 1877 in Uganda by a few Anglican and Roman missionaries. King Mutesa ordered the Christian faith to be preached only to the immediate members of the court. King Mwanga, his successor became increasingly angry as he realized that the first converts put loyalty to Christ and undermined the traditional loyalty to the king. Martyrdoms began in 1885. Mwanga first forbade anyone to go near a Christian mission on penalty of death: but he was unable to control the rapid growth of the Christian converts who turned to Christ. Hence, he resolved to wipe out Christianity and in 1885, martyrdom began (Kiefer, 1999: 2).

In October of the same year, King Mwanga killed the Anglican missionary, Bishop Hannington James and his colleagues. Joseph Mukasa, reproached the kabaka for the killings. On November 15, 1885, King Mwanga ordered Mukasa to be beheaded. Joseph Mukasa was an important member of the royal household and a Catholic. Word reached King Mwanga that the Roman Catholic Church had religious instruction the youth of the church to be baptized who were catechumens. The King ordered the youth to be arrested. Charles Lwanga, a Catholic catechist, then secretly baptized those youth. After, baptized, they were led away to the village of Namugongo. Firstly, three of them namely Pontian Ngondwe, and the royal servants Athanasius Bazzekuketta and Gonzaga Gonza were killed upon the arrest. All the survivors were imprisoned for a week. On the 3rd of June, 1886, they were burned alive. Ambrose Kibuka, Anatole Kiriggwajjo, Achilles Kiwanuka, Mugagga, Mukasa Kiriwawanvu, Adolphus Mukasa Ludigo, Gyavira, Kizito, Bruno Serunkuma, James Buzabaliawo, and Luke Banabakintu were martyred with them. King Mwanga continued his persecution, killing more Roman Catholic and Anglican missionaries. On the 27th of January, 1887, other victims who were killed were Matthias Molumba, assistant judge to a provincial chief; Andrew Kaggwa, chief of Kigowa; Jean Marie Muzeyi and Noe Mawaggali, a Roman Catholic catechist.

Opposite to Mwanga's intentions, the Namugongo martyrdoms produced a positive result entirely. All the martyrs who were killed, upon walking to their deaths sang hymns and prayed for their enemies. This indeed inspired so many Ugandans that they began to seek instruction from the few remaining Christians. Within a few years, the original handful of converts had multiplied many times and they spread far beyond the court. The Christian martyrs had left the indelible impression that Christianity was truly African and not simply a white man's faith (Kiefer (1999: 3).
The military dictatorship of Idi Amin renewed persecution of Christians in the 1970 which proved the vitality of the example of the Namugongo martyrs. Archbishop Janani Luwum of the Anglican Church of Uganda was assassinated among the thousands of new Christian martyrs, both from the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches respectively (Kiefer, 1999: 3).

3.10.2 Prayer in Honor of the Martyrs of Uganda.

O God, by whose providence the blood of the martyrs is the seed Of the Church: Grant that we who remember before thee the blessed martyrs of Uganda, may, like them, be steadfast in our faith in Jesus Christ, to whom they gave obedience even unto death, and by their sacrifice brought forth a plentiful harvest; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever (Kiefer, 1999: 3).

The martyrs from the Roman Catholic Church were recognized by the Pope through the process of canonization. They were made martyrs and listed on the martyr’s roll of the Church worldwide. In the Anglican Church in Uganda, the remaining missionaries who were killed, which includes the Archbishop Janani Luwum, who was executed much later is commemorated in the Anglican Church of Uganda and not in the Anglican Church of the Church of Central Africa which includes the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe.

3.11 Conclusion.

The intention of this chapter was to lay down a canon or a standard measure to test Bernard Mzeki’s life and death whether he can qualify to be listed on the martyr’s roll of the earliest centuries. It was paramount for the researcher to set and mark boundaries of Bernard proclaimed martyrdom and identity. It was of interest to look closely at the semantics of the word martyr which is the back bone of this research. It was also important to realize that martyr was not a phenomenon unique to the early Christians. But Christian martyrdom was a common phenomenon in the Hebrew life, let alone in other religions of the world. Furthermore, it was significant to trace the early persecutions of Christians during all the ten Graeco Roman Emperors’ persecutions and show how early Christian were made martyrs. It was also important to examine the behaviour shown by those martyred. The martyrology and apologetics were of important because it was a response of the Christians to persecutions. The examination on the religious politics around martyrdom was looked at on how some martyrs were disqualified because of political reasons. In addition, it was of interest to look closely at the glorification of martyrdom by the process of canonization of martyrs in the Roman Catholic Church Roman Catholic and how the Anglican Communion’s stance on martyrs and martyrdom. The picture given was that the Anglican Provinces seemed to come up with their ways of commemorating martyrs which was not universal to the Anglican Communion. Important to note was the Episcopal Church in the United States of America that seemed to be more organized as compared to the other Anglican Provinces, let alone the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. In fact, the Anglican Church worldwide did not and does not have a religious system or liturgy to canonize or acknowledge martyrs. Notably, the martyrs of Uganda were important to mention for they were Africans and Bernard Mzeki was an African too. They all shared the dynamics and characteristics of the continent. The importance of martyrdom of the early centuries was valuable to look closely at so as to execute an academic and comparative analysis of Bernard Mzeki’s importance of his life, death and influence thereafter. In the next chapter, it shall critically show mainly the secondary sources that have recorded the death and influence of Bernard Mzeki.
Chapter 4 Presentation of Secondary data findings on Mzeki’s ministry, identity, martyrdom, commemoration and influence.

4.1 Introduction.

This chapter presents a chronological history and religious life of Bernard Mzeki following his arrival in the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, (Rhodesia – Zimbabwe) drawing from various secondary sources from 1892 until 2013. The main secondary sources which the chapter shall draw from include Jean Farrant’s book entitled *Mashonaland Martyr: Bernard Mzeki and the Pioneer Church*, John T. Evans (1945), Musodza, (2008 and 2012), Kawadza (2010), L Snell (2001), T Ranger (1987), GEP Broderick (1953) and Dana Robert (2009), just to mention a few. Specifically, the chapter shall closely look at his catechetical ministry in the Mangwende Village and other areas he visited. Furthermore, it shall focus on the historical sources on Bernard Mzeki’s mystical experiences and controversies surrounding his death. The chapter shall also capture the influence of Bernard Mzeki after his death. This shall form the major part of this chapter. This is important in order to reconstruct the period and the life of the martyr whose fame continues to shape the Anglican ethos and Christian life of people many years after his death in Zimbabwe, in addition to the Anglican Communion.

4.2 The arrival of Bernard Mzeki in Mangwende Village.

Noll & Nystrom (2011: 23) wrote that George Wyndham Hamilton Knight-Bruce, the newly appointed bishop of the recently created Anglican diocese of Mashonaland, met Bernard Mzeki in 1891. Knight-Bruce was accompanied by African catechists for the new diocese in the North, including Mzeki. The British Empire and church in Mashonaland moved into African territory together. The Mashonaland region was inhabited by the Shona people which lay in the north of what is now Zimbabwe, a landlocked region between the Zambezi River to the north and the Munyati River to the south that included the Rhodesia’s capital, Salisbury, during Mzeki’s years. Salisbury is now known a Harare. The local Shona people had been brutally conquered by the Ndebele people from the west, but now both were coming under the British rule, in particular, the BSAC of Cecil John Rhodes (Noll & Nystrom, 2011: 24). This was, indeed, part of the scramble for Africa where Cecil John Rhodes and his company hoped to enrich themselves by trading, mining and settling in Mashonaland. He aimed to bring civilization and Christianity to the African population. Noll and Nystrom (2011: 24) pointed out that even though Bishop Knight-Bruce spoke out strongly against the political decisions regarding Cecil John Rhodes political control over Manicaland, there was little that the Bishop could do to hold back the tide of the British Empire.

Bishop Knight-Bruce sailed with Bernard Mzeki and other lay catechists from Cape Town to a port in Mozambique in April, 1891. From there, they trekked westwards overland, carrying their own loads into Mashonaland and particularly into Mangwende village (Noll & Nystrom, 2011: 25). The African catechists went with Bishop Knight-Bruce as he met various sub chiefs and discussed how they could accommodate the catechists in their villages and work with them. Bernard Mzeki eventually settled in a territory known as Theydon at that time. It was under Chief Mangwende who lived in stone buildings abandoned by Portuguese traders. The chief allowed Mzeki to build a large mission hut near his imposing stone structure after the Bishop had given the chief gifts of three pieces of calico and a few strings of beads (Noll & Nystrom,
2011: 25). Musodza (2008: 85) commented that the environment which Mzeki was left to minister Christianity and to establish Anglicanism was very different from the South African one which he had become so familiar with. It was also different from his childhood background form Gwambeni, in Mozambique. In the Mangwende village, in Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, the catechist was living among the indigenous Shona local people who had a different socio-anthropological way of life which the European missionaries had failed totally to comprehend.

The hut which Bernard built with the help of the chief and the local people soon came to serve as church, school and dwelling. It was located on the banks of a river Nyakambiri that supplied water for the garden Mzeki planted for growing his own food. At Mangwende, he was on his own, sixty miles from the only other native catechist who was Frank Zikiqu in Makoni district. Douglas Pelly was his only outside visitor. Pelly was one of Bishop Knight-Bruce’s few European colleagues. Noll and Nystrom (2011: 25) recorded the summary of Dana Robert who described Bernard Mzeki’s situation in 1891 with profound words: “Thus Bernard Mizeki, born in Mozambique, minimally educated in South Africa, and with little knowledge of either the Shona people or their language, was settled in the territory of Chief Mangwende.”

4.3 Missionary Work of Bernard Mzeki in Mangwende Village.

Importantly, Bernard Mzeki served under two bishops in his five year short ministry. Firstly, it was Bishop Knight-Bruce who brought him to Mashonaland and he left Africa on account of ill–health. He died in England in 1896 aged forty-four. He was followed by a new enthroned Bishop, Thomas Gaul, who was known to have been a brave and a saintly man. There are no secondary sources that show the Bernard Mzeki met Bishop Thomas Gaul in person. It is only recorded that by Snell (2001: 12 - 13) that both bishops respectively, had high regards for Bernard Mzeki and his calling, as well as did Archdeacon Upcher, a much loved and respected priest of the new Diocese of Mashonaland in those early years of ministry in Mangwende Village.

Upon arrival at Mangwende’s Village, Bishop Knight-Bruce and his team sent a message to Chief Mangwende that he intended to meet with him. When finally permission was granted, the Bishop had a long discussion with the chief negotiating for Bernard Mzeki to establish the Anglican Mission in the Village. The discussion resulted in the Bishop being given permission for Bernard to stay as teacher of Anglicanism to the indigenous local Shona people. Farrant (1966: 180) recorded that Chief Mangwende expressed himself very happy to have a teacher in the name of Bernard Mzeki. His joy was noted as he called out his head wife, Zvanda parira to hear this good news. After the negotiations were completed, a hut was built for Bernard. He was left in under the official care of the chief.

Interestingly, Bernard Mzeki learned the Shona language and was already speaking it without any trace of foreignness within a short period of time (Farrant, 1966:181). This was indeed his first task as Snell (2001:11) put it. It immediately became obvious that Mzeki had remarkable missionary gifts as he quickly leant the local Shona language. He demonstrated a quite remarkable intelligence particularly in the faculty of languages and linguistics. Bishop Knight-Bruce called him a master of languages. Within a year, he had mastered the Shona language. Officially, Bernard Mzeki could speak eight different African languages, as well as English, Dutch and Portuguese. He had also acquired some French, Latin and Greek whilst he was in South Africa, studying in Cape Town. Snell (2001:11) captured Mr Pelly’s personal experience with him when he said: “we have the most excellent linguist, and thoroughly understand the grammar of this most difficult language - English. As a companion, he was charming, and many a long walk has he made bright with his interesting talk of the native customs, thoughts, and legends.” Noll and Nystrom (2011: 25) observed that as Mzeki mastered the Shona
language, so too he grew close and closer to the Shona people. Because of this displayed ability, he immediately won the friendship of Zvandaparira, Mangwende’s head wife, who served as his patroness in the community. The young people were drawn to him by his ability to speak the Local Shona language, his beautiful singing and by his willingness to teach them. Europeans who learned of his work sometimes complained that he was wasting time on the Shona, who had a reputation for shiftlessness. But others were deeply impressed by how effectively Mzeki was reaching out through word, song and deed. Snell (2001: 11) shared the same sentiments with Noll and Nystrom 2011: 25) that Mzeki became a center of attraction to the community especially the young people. On the other hand, the Chief Mangwende was reported to have been a public admirer of Mzeki and his Chief wife Zvandaparira became one of Bernard’s devoted member of the Mission Church (Kawadza, 2010; 5). Noll and Nystrom added that besides his more impressive linguistic ability, he had many more practical talents - his amiability and his faithfulness. He had a productive garden by the nearby Nyakambiri River, he knew how to hunt and find firewood. He showed his fondness for animal life by keeping three pet klipspringers (small antelopes).

According to Snell (2001: 11), day by day Bernard recited the Anglican daily offices of morning prayers, matins, evening song, prime and compline. He rose early every day to spend time reading the Scriptures and in prayer. His life was rooted in prayer. He was raised in a tradition of Catholic practice based on personal austerity, self-discipline, penitence and the Sacraments. The quality of faithfulness was strong in him before he came to the Anglican Diocese Mashonaland. Significantly, after catechumens had gathered to live around his mission hut, he began regular instruction in the basics of the Christian faith (Snell, 2001:11, 12, 15. Farrant (1966:118) cited that the only exception was Mangwende’s son, Muchemwa and his close team of relatives who were arrogant and hated Bernard Mzeki and everything he stood for and everyone around him.

Farrant (1966:178) wrote that the impression given from the outset was that it could appear as if Bernard Mzeki’s task was going to be easy. This was because his hearers, the Shona people already had the concept of the godhead which was quite close to the biblical truth. Therefore, his task could have been to correct certain misapprehensions and misconceptions about God and bring that God closer to the people as a personal God as opposed to being the only god of a given tribal community. As soon as Bernard Mzeki arrived in Mangwende’s village, he witnessed two crucial and distinctive cultural beliefs among the indigenous Shona people. It was namely the belief in Ngozi avenging Spirit and the (Shave) alien spirit (Farrant, 1966:178). Notably strange to Mzeki was the custom which concerned the giving birth of twins which was considered to be an ill-omen. Upon birth of the twins, one of the two babies would be killed and thrown into the nearby Nyakambiri River. Furthermore, Farrant (1966:179) mentioned that deformed children or abnormal children had to be killed as well and thrown in the same river. The women who could not conceive and bear children were looked down upon. The catechist, Bernard Mzeki taught the Shona people in Mangwende Village that the deity they had acknowledged as Mwari the creator God Musikavanhu was the same Christian God. The local indigenous Shona people informed him of the activities of other local gods and spirits, who had the responsibilities of bringing the rains, managed the fertility of the land and control the unfolding of day to day lives. Mzeki responded by strongly insisting that it was the same God - Mwari, the Father and Creator of all creation who caused the rain to fall and compassionately provided individuals, families and the communities with the means for sustaining lives (Noll & Nylstrom, 2011:26).

The first catechumen to be converted to the Christian Faith and Anglicanism by Mzeki was Kapuya John. He was the son of a local n’anga, who was a traditional divine healer. Bernard cared for this young man diligently when he was seriously ill. When members of his family and the n’anga, Demha began persecuting him because of his association with Bernard, the
catechist had to stay with him. The second convert to the Christian Faith was Gawe Chigwada, who took the name Joseph upon his sacrament of baptism. Joseph’s young son became a special object of Bernard’s affection, although many observed that he had a strong fondness for all young people (Farrant, 1966:182, Noll & Nylstrom, 2011:26).

Musodza (2012:14) captured in more detail the conversion of Shoniwa from Farrant (1966:129) who later became known as Kapuya John after the sacrament of baptism. From this outstanding account of Shoniwa, one can begin to appreciate the catechist’s ministry in the Mangwende Village. In this story one can note how Bernard Mzeki came face to face with the Shona indigenous people engaging in their tradition of sacrificing to their ancestors. Farrant (1966) wrote the account from John Kapuya interview with her many years later after Bernard had already been murdered. The account was that there had been suspicion of witchcraft in Mangwende Village – Gomwe Kraal. The people consulted a n’anga named Chigariro concerning the suspicion of witchcraft. It is interesting to note that Chigariro had been trained by Mutambira who was Shoniwa’s father. He pointed at one of the family members as the one who called the misfortune and called Shoniwa to be ill (Farrant, 1966: 129). Chigariro took the woman to the Nyakambiri River and with her arms held behind her back. Following the local custom this woman was taken to the river, and with her arms held behind her back, forced to drink from a bowl that contained some medicated water, following the tradition and customs on such occasions. The whole community was to witness this.

Upon drinking the water, the condition was that if she retained the medicated water, then she could be found guilty and but if she vomited then she could be declared innocent. The woman vomited. This meant that she was innocent. The anger of the relatives of the accused woman community was turned to the consulted nánga, Chigariro who was publicly murdered in a rage because he had wrongly accused an innocent woman. Farrant (1966) recorded the account of illness of Shoniwa- Kapuya John when they met Bernard at the river whilst he was washing his clothes word by word as follows:

Shortly afterwards I became very ill, and my mother took me to Demha, the old female n’anga, who lived on the hill where the Shrine now stands. She agreed to a consultation and went into a trance. When she was possessed by her mudzimu, or family spirit, she began to shake started making grunting noises. Then she spoke with the voice of the spirit and my mother clapped her hands to greet the spirit. My sickness, said the spirit, was caused by the spirit of Chigariro, who was angry because my father’s faulty teaching had caused him to make the wrong diagnosis that had cost him his life. He wished to revenge himself by sending this sickness to me, Mutambira’s son.

Unless I carried out certain instructions, which Demha would give me, I was certain to die. The instructions were these. If I wished to recover, I must search for a black goat and sacrifice it to the spirit of Chigariro on the banks of Nyakumbiri River at the cascade, where the river made a great noise as it rushed over the stones. If the goat had even one white hair it would be an impure, unacceptable sacrifice…. My mother accompanied me to the river. It was a bright day of warm sunshine, and water flashed as it rippled over the stones at the cascade, making a sound like music. I placed the goat on the ground, and was preparing to sacrifice it when I saw a man at the shallow ford washing his clothes. ‘Who is that man?’ I asked my mother. “He is Bernard, the umfundisi, the teacher who has come to live here. He is Mangwende’s friend” I said to my mother, “Mother, I wish to speak to the teacher.” She gave me permission, and this was our conversation. “Good morning, Umfundisi”, I greeted him. “Good morning”, he replied. “What is your name and from whence do you come?” “My name is Shoniwa. I am a son of Mutambira and nephew of Gomwe. I come from Demha, the woman n’anga, whom I have consulted because I am sick.” “What did she tell you and what did she do?” “She cut my back and caught the blood in a horn. She rubbed in medicine
and her spirit told her that I must sacrifice a black goat, with no white hairs, to the spirit of Chigariro at this cascade. There is the goat, and here we are come, my mother and I to do this thing of sacrificing a goat” (Farrant, 1966: 130).

The same account was summarized by Snell (2001:13), Musodza (2008: 89) and many others writers. Bernard upon hearing this account laughed and told them that it was all lies and there was no need to sacrifice any goat to any bad spirit for protection. He began to minister to the Shoniwa and his mother about the spirit of Mwari - the Spirit of God and of the Holy Spirit that protected His own without any animal. Shoniwa began to be curious to learn more about this Mwari of Bernard Mzeki. He asked if his mother could permit to accompany him to his home and learn more about his God. For she was anxious about the sacrifice and the illness that was upon her child. But the catechist spoke to her gently to her and she finally agreed to allow Bernard to take Shoniwa to his home, abandoning the original plan. Arriving at home, Bernard began to teach Shoniwa about God and how to pray to him. When Shoniwa went home, he was beaten up by his father for not sacrificing the goat in order for him to get well. The following day, he went to the mufundisi Bernard Mzeki to be told about God again. Shoniwa was encouraged when he heard that Chief Mangwende had permitted his uncle Gomwe Chiguwada to stay with Bernard and learn about God. When he went home he was beaten again, this time more severely. After some few days, Mzeki came to look for him after he had failed to turn up and he was informed that he was seriously ill having been beaten up again by his father. (Snell, 2001: 13, Musodza, 2008: 90).

Bernard took him and bathed him severe wounds from the beating and from cutting by the woman n’anga, Demha. He treated his wounds and sickness with some medicine and soon, Shoniwa got better. It is important to mention that Bernard had an elementary knowledge of medicine and first aid. He was recorded by Farrant (1966:159 – 160) that he had his own small dispensary where he mixed honey, glycerine and the juice of mazoe, lemons, for the treatments of colds, coughs, and chest complaints. Indeed, honey was easily available in Mangwende village. The mazoe lemon was the rough-skin lemon of the Cape imported into the country so many years before the days of the Chartered Company that it was regarded as being almost indigenous. It was found growing in Rhodesia-Zimbabwe and beside many of the old ruins. Perhaps, he was taught this medicinal general knowledge by Fraulein Von Blomberg and he applied his knowledge to the ailments of the indigenous Shona people of Mangwende in times of illness. Simple standard remedies were brought to him by passing clergy. He did his best to their treat sores and cuts, coughs, fever and dysentery. Burns were also common in the village. This was because the village people wrapped tightly in their blankets and slept soundly too close to the fire at night. They were badly burned before they woke up. It was a great triumph for Bernard when Chief Mangwende allowed him to treat them, instead of calling the nängas as they had been accustomed to do. Chief Mangwende was even persuaded to try celery tea for his rheumatism. Bernard’s elementary knowledge of medicine and first aid, therefore, helped him to reach out to the Mangwende community for the furtherance of his catechetical ministry and calling.

Then came Demha, claiming her payment saying that Shoniwa was now feeling better. The woman n’anga was informed that the sacrifice had not been carried out and that it was the mufundisi Bernard Mzeki who had finally cured Shoniwa. Demha was furious with Shoniwa’s family for not carrying out her instructions. He was also very angry with Bernard for taking the responsibility of curing sickness and taking leadership in the community which was not expected of him. She spat and cursed him. She also claimed that she was going to inform what had just happened to all n dängas of the whole community of what the catechist had done. He told Bernard that she was going to tell Chief Mangwende, the authority of the Village (Farrant, 1966:131, Snell, 2001:13). Regardless, Shoniwa and Gowé Chiguwada lived with the catechist and were taught of the things of God. This marked the beginning of the Anglican Mission in
Mangwende Village. Bernard had two converts to the Christian Faith and Anglicanism in the name of Shoniwa – Kapuya John and Gowu Chigwada – James, a name given after his baptism. Chigwada James married Mayemu and they constructed a hut and lived with the catechist up to the time of his death as part of the community of pupils and catechumens surrounding the Mission Church. Their son was born at the mission and was named Shoniwa after John Shoniwa Kapuya. But Bernard baptized the Shoniwa and christened him as Joseph. Snell (2001: 13) declared that Bernard loved Joseph as if he was his own.

4.4 The characteristics of Bernard Mzeki: The Teacher.

When Bernard was introduced to the Chief Mangwende and all local indigenous Shona people, 'Farrant (1966:117) mentioned that he was introduced as a teacher – umfundisi. And Farrant (1966:130) showed that at Bernard's first meeting with Shoniwa and his mother at Nyakambiri River when they wanted to sacrifice a goat in order to cure Shoniwa who was ill, he was addressed as umfundisi. According to Farrant (1966:131) James Chigwada and John Kapuya became the first students of Bernard to be taught the Christian Faith and Anglicanism. Others joined in later on as the mission was growing bigger and bigger day by day. Snell (2001:11) wrote that great information about the profound catechist as he started on his catechist ministry was given partly to the number and quality of his friends, and also from his own exceptional gifts which made him to be an effective teacher – umfundisi. This brought him to the notice and attention of many indigenous local Shona people and the white community in Rhodesia – Zimbabwe who had come with the Pioneer Column. His first task as mentioned briefly above was to learn the local Shona language. Here he demonstrated a quite remarkable talent. Bishop Knight-Bruce called the teacher, Bernard Mzeki, a master of languages because for him to reach out to the indigenous local people he needed to learn their language for him to communicate effectively with them. He quickly learned the language of the Shona. Within a year, Bernard was speaking it perfectly, without a trace of foreign accent. He was soon known as the best interpreter of Shona into English and vice versa in Rhodesia.

Critically analyzing Mzeki’s capacity to learn the Shona language quickly, is significant to mention that in all the secondary data available, it was only Bernard Mzeki who seemed to have made an effort to learn alone. The information available did not show whether people like Bishop Knight-Bruce and his successors, archdeacon Upcher, other white missionaries and others from the Pioneer Column, let alone other black catechists from South Africa who came with Bernard made efforts to learn the Shona language. It was only Bernard who was exceptionally outstanding in grasping the Shona language so quickly. Hence, he became known throughout Rhodesia and beyond as an interpreter. Furthermore, Snell (2001:11) noted this important point that because of Bernard’s exceptional ability to grasp languages with the etymology and semantics of the Shona language, Bishop Knight-Bruce invited him together with Kapuya to join a committee of missionaries to do translation work in Umtali, now known as Mutare. Broderick acknowledged that the Translations Committee was consisted of Bishop George Wyndham Hamilton Knight-Bruce himself, Rev. A. Walker, Bernard Mzeki, Frank Ziqubu and John Kapuya who was the Shona referee. The translations were on some parts of the bible like the Ten Commandments, short bible stories, the 1662 Anglican liturgy and other religious materials such as the Lord’s Prayer and Creed. It is emphasized that Bernard Mzeki contributed greatly to this work and was a critical person in the process of establishing the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland from her genesis (Broderick, 1952:46, Hinchcliff, 1963:172).

As a catechist, he received the bare necessities for existence, clothing and small and irregular supplies of pocket money which he shared with his students at the mission. He led a busy life on the mission. He occupied himself and students by building a fairly suitable infrastructure. He made rough wooden furniture, but later he destroyed it because he was determined to live
as simply as the local indigenous Shona people to whom he had come to minister. In order to sustain the mission and his livelihood, he cultivated a garden and worked hard to grow the vegetables he needed for food. Every day, he said the daily offices of Matins, Prime, Evensong and Compline and spent much time in prayer together with his students. He continued to study the Shona language being assisted with his Students. In his spare time, he read books which were sent from Salisbury from Upcher or sent by friends in Cape Town and prepared lessons for effective teaching. Importantly, most of his lessons were done in the evening after many members of the community of Mangwende Village had finished their daily home chores; then they would come for lessons. In his spare time, he also grew some flowers, which was an unusual thing to do in those days because it was an English thing to do. In addition, he kept small animals as pets, even some small ducks which was very English too (Snell, 2001: 11).

According to Snell (2001:11), the catechist attracted the children and youth. At first the people hid their children from all the Europeans, and from Bernard because the indigenous Shona local people had a belief that all the white people wished to make slaves of their children and take them away as servants. But Bernard won their confidence and soon those who were not old enough to work in pastures or gardens became students at the mission. One of Chief Mangwende’s wives claimed many years later when she said, “Wherever he went, he was often followed by a pack of laughing children,” (Snell, 2001:11). The writer (2001:12) was also convicted that Mzeki also attracted many people by his invariable kindness and good temper and also his music. He successfully taught his students, to use the tonic-solfa system which he learned in Cape Town. He was a good singer himself and music was his great pleasure.

Snell (2001:12) was of the opinion that one could learn more about Mzeki’s the catechetical ministry when considering how he reached out in his friendships. First, was Llewellyn Meredith, a young white South African trader who later became a farmer and then a Native Commissioner or magistrate. Mr Meredith was musical too like Bernard. On Sundays, Mr Meredith brought his servants to the mission services and sometimes himself preached to the congregation, while Mzeki interpreted. They formed an orchestra. Meredith played the cornet, a trading partner who then lived with him played a concertina. Bernard played a banjo or sometimes played a flute which he had brought from South Africa. There were several mouth organs and the older boys from the mission community brought their African pianos, whistles, stringed instruments and xylophones. Hence, music became one of the ways which Bernard used to reach out to the Mangwende people.

Second, according to Snell (2001:12) was his friendship with Chief Mangwende. They both often sat together on the hilltop kraal of Matope and talked of the cities of the south or of the history of the Shona people before the white people came and of the African people of other regions. Bernard shared with Chief Mangwende about God Almighty who was the Father of all humanity, black or white. Upon such discussions, the Chief promised to build a large hut to serve as church and school across the valley of the Nyakumbiri River. The chief’s head wife, was also drawn to the catechist and the Christian Faith and Anglicanism. Zvandaparira attended the Mission mass regularly. Bernard Mzeki’s catechetical ministry enhanced his friendship with the Chief Mangwende to the extent that he declared every Sunday a chisi – a holiday or a resting day with an equivalence to a Sabbath day of the Jewish people where no one was not allowed to do manual work. The chief allowed those who wanted to attend Mass at the Mission to do as they wished. To prove his support of this move, he went on to allow his brother in law to live with Bernard and be taught the Christian Faith.

Third, according to Snell (2001:12) was his close friendship with Douglas Pelly who came to the Diocese of Mashonaland as a lay worker and was later ordained into priesthood. They both met in mid–1893. He acknowledged that Bernard Mzeki, “was a brilliant scholar and a most remarkable man. I could not have had a more charming companion, and his interesting conversation made the long walks tolerable.” The two met when Bishop Knight Bruce called
Mzeki to meet Pelly in Umtali now called Mutare for an assignment. They were both tasked by Bishop Knight-Bruce to attempt to draw the physical map of the Diocese of Mashonaland. Their friendship began with a journey on foot for weeks through the almost unknown parts of the country. The area they covered was Mutare itself, Makoni’s village and Fort Victoria now called Masvingo. It is important to note, according to Snell (2001:12) the acknowledgement of Douglas Pelly calling Bernard my very dear friend and fellow-worker in the ministry. When Pelly was ordained a deacon in 1895 by Bishop Gaul in Salisbury, Bernard and Frank Ziqubu were present. From the secondary data available, looking critically and closely at Pelly’s ordination into priesthood, he was not so well experienced in the ministry in Mashonaland than Bernard Mzeki. Yet he was ordained into priesthood and Mzeki was not considered as a man with such profound capacity and a contextualized Christian Faith. Was it because of color or race? Was it because of racism or were other factors that were considered for him not to be ordained; or perhaps the picture portrayed of Bernard from the secondary data available was false. This shall be discussed in other chapters that will follow.

In after years, the catechist’s teaching influence was on Kapuya John that he himself became a catechist after being trained at Penhalonga in Umtali – Mutare. After training, he worked with Bernard for a little while in Mangwende Village. Later own, he was sent to help Frank Ziqubu, a Zulu, who was stationed at Makoni’s village by Bishop Knight-Bruce. He was struggling with his ministry. Constantly, he retained his love for Bernard and they often met to share experiences of ministry (Snell, 2001: 15). Amongst other students of Mzeki was Mawhetu Munyavi, who was placed in the catechist’s care by his father, of the Makoni tribe when he was about twelve years old. Munyavi was later baptized and named Samuel. Again in after years, Munyavi Samuel's son, Munyavi Francis became a priest in the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland. Married couples were allowed by the catechist to live permanently at the Mission. According to Snell, (2001:15) Mutari Munengwe and his wife were a couple who came to live in the huts set aside for married catechumens.

Snell (2001: 15) recorded that at some point Bernard moved his mission with the permission of the Chief from the foot of Mangwende’s mountain across the Nyakambiri River to a new place, about two miles away from where the Bernard Mzeki shrine is now located. This was because the mission was rapidly growing. The mission was composed of aspiring Christians, some married, some bachelors and others young boys. Hence, there was need to create more space for the huts for the new converts and gardens for sustenance. Services were still held on Sundays and the people of Mangwende’s village would come down the hill and across the valley to join those staying at the Mission. It must be pointed out that according to Snell (2001:11), the catechist’s ministry was on only limited to the Mangwende were the Bishop Knight-Bruce had stationed him. No, far from it. Bernard travelled hundreds of kilometers, often to Salisbury as well as to Rusape, Macheke, and Marondera’s Kraal, Wedza, Chiota, Murewa, Mutoko and other places. His intention was to visit those villages and settlements in order to lay the foundation and establishment of Anglican Missions and promote the future Christian ministry and the Church.

Interestingly, Musodza (2008:90) mentioned that Bernard established a respected reputation as umfundisi, the teacher in the Mangwende Village. But he was also known as Mukiti which meant the one who stayed alone or the celibate one. In the face of local custom, it was very strange for a man like Bernard not to marry. But several years later and after much thought, he resolved to marry. He took as his bride a young woman who had been an eager student at the mission. Snell (2001:15) wrote that during 1894 and 1895 one of the most eager and faithful hearers of Bernard’s classes at the Mission in Mangwende and services was a young woman named Mutwa. She was a granddaughter of Chief Mangwende whose mother had passed away and now, she was under the care of the chief. Douglas Pelly and other friends of the catechist noticed that she was romantically attracted to him and were happy about it. But for Bernard, marriage presented difficult problems of ministry, tribal differences and of class. There were
of course, no girls who had received any education. He felt that a young woman taken right out of her normal setting, associations and traditions to become the wife of a Christian teacher would find herself very lonely.

However, with guidance from his friend Douglas Pelly, he was betrothed and solemnized to Mutwa at the end of 1895, with the consent of her father. Musodza (2008:94) commented that with this marriage between Bernard and Mutwa, Mzeki had entered into Mangwende’s own kinship network, a move that not only spoke of his identification with this people but also led to bitter resentment among other members of Mangwende’s large family. The information on how much he paid for lobola to her father and the Mangwende family was not recorded or found. In March 1896 Bernard and Mutwa were married at Makoni’s Mission in Rusape. The marriage was solemnized by Rev Father Mtobi, a Zulu who had just arrived from South Africa, Grahamstown, to join the staff in the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland. Douglas Pelly was still a deacon and according to Snell (2001: 16). It was very vivid and clear that it was he who wrote out the Marriage Certificate, No. 1 of the Rusape, district. It was indeed a great and happy occasion. The bride was given away Mr Williams, a Welsh farmer. The witnesses who signed the register included the Native Commissioner, Mr Ross, the other catechists Frank Ziqubu and Jacob Dyasi, and Bernard’s student and friend, Shoniwa Kapuya John. After the wedding, the married couple and their close friends sat down to a joyful celebration. (Evans, 1945:10). Critically analyzing this wedding, Mutwa was given away by a white man, Mr Williams and not her own people. This critical question shall be raised in other following chapters of this work.

4.5 Other Characteristics of Bernard Mzeki.

Bernard Mzeki was a very kind, gentle peacemaker, according to Snell (2001:15). Kapuya John recalled how he once rebelled at being expected to carry a very heavy load when they were travelling. But when Frank Ziqubu, the fierce Zulu would have struck him, Mzeki restrained his Ziqubu and removed his own blankets from the Kapuya’s load. It must be said that Frank Ziqubu himself, of the violent temper, once told to Kapuya in one of the journeys that, “Shoniwa, if you can be like your teacher Bernard, you will be a great man. The Holy Spirit of God is in him and he is a better man than I can ever be.” In addition, Bernard was a strong and a tireless worker. He walked so fast for many miles whilst he eat so little. The catechist’s habits were frugal and austere.

Snell (2001: 15) also recorded this account when Bernard and Douglas Pelly were travelling together for some missionary work. One night, they fell asleep round the campfire, very tired after a long day’s walk. During the night, a leopard walked over the sleeping Father Pelly, who failed to wake up because of fatigue. But Bernard drove the vicious animal away by thrusting a shouldering log from the fire into the leopard’s face.

Moreover, according to Farrant (1966: 160), Bernard Mzeki dealt with an outbreak of smallpox in 1895 in Mangwende chiefdom. The evangelist in charge of the Seventh Day Adventist mission on the Tsungwesi River had already died of the disease. The Native Commissioner, Meredith Lleweth was at Rusape. He brought a supply to Mangwende Village and after showing Bernard how to use it, left him to deal with vaccination in the valley. Bernard assisted over ten thousand people with vaccine sent by the government. Noll and Nystrom (2011: 25) summarized the story in this manner that when smallpox threatened the region in 1895, Bernard administered vaccinations and so expanded the basic medical care he had been offering since coming to Mangwende Village. Farrant (1966:160) claimed that the catechist’s participation in vaccinating the Mangwende Shona people was one of the crimes raised against Bernard later by the nängas that he had pierced the flesh of the people and rubbed in poison.
Furthermore, Musodza (2008:91) and Farrant (1966:118) wrote that the outstanding skill of languages and linguistics of Bernard Mzeki earned recognition to be a translator to the Chief Mangwende. He also earned attention of colonial officials who from time to time asked him to serve as an official interpreter during judicial court sessions in Salisbury. This meant that Bernard working as an interpreter in the courts, was no longer a missionary alone. He was also a civil servant who worked for the white government of the day.

Chief Mangwende had promised to build a bigger mission station across the Nyakambiri River as mentioned above. It was constructed near a sacred grove. The sacred place was a patch of swampy ground on which grew trees and shrubs not generally found in that countryside of granite rocks and *msasa* trees. Snell (2001:16) shared that belief that the place had certain lions called spirit lions which contained the spirits of former chiefs of Nhowe. The grove was used as a resting place of the living dead. The cool damp earth, the ferns, shrubs and the tall *mukuti* trees were held sacred by the lions and ancestral spirits. Traditionally, sacred groves were places which were not supposed to be occupied, let alone tampered with. But surprisingly, according to Snell (2001:16), Mzeki built his mission near to this place and cleared a portion *msasa* trees of this glove and planted seeds of wheat because food was now very scarce there.

A legendary story speculated in the Mangwende chiefdom later that the chief had craftily ordered Bernard’s death, raising an allegation that the catechist he had cut down some of the sacred trees of the clan. The chief had lied to Bernard in the sense that when he was looking for a new site Mangwende himself suggested the place beside the spring and its stream and pressed him to build there. He assured Bernard that a new sacred grove had been found for the Mangwende lions nearer to the Nyakambiri and the place where the tribal ceremonies, dances, singing and prayers for rains were held. No one had been near the grove for months and Bernard felt that he could safely cut down a few trees to make a place for his experimental sowing of wheat. This action must have sparked strong resentment among all the members of the Mangwende Village (Snell, 2001; 16).

Hinchcliff (1963:172) noted that Bernard Mzeki constantly suffered from loneliness like any other missionary. Although he was of the same color and very African, that did not make him less of an alien in Mashonaland than if he had been European. The fact remained that he was from Mozambique and a foreigner in Mangwende Chiefdom. The catechist remained an outsider from the religio-political and anthropological structures of the Mangwende people among whom he was sent to spread Anglicanism. Hence, being an outsider and a foreigner contributed also to his demise. The locals did not eventually care of what would befall him.

4.6 The mysterious death of Bernard Mzeki.

Ranger (1987: 87) recorded that the local resentment and hostility against Bernard Mzeki, in addition to British imperial expansion created the forces that resulted to his murder and the conclusion of his promising mission. In early 1896, Mashonaland joined a rebellion which had been initiated by the Ndebele from the West a few years earlier, against the Pioneer Column. The Ndebele’s resistance against the British rule through Cecil John Rhodes’ British South Africa Company inspired the Shona from the East although the Ndebele were once upon a time their harsh oppressors. It became a surprise to the white community in Rhodesia, including the Anglican missionaries when the Shona joined in the rebellion which was later popularly known in the 1950s as the First Chimurenga. Ranger stated that the Shona indigenous local people had also started resistance earlier own to the new colonial white rule. They expressed hatred against the burning of infested cattle and the collection of the hut tax which the white administrators imposed on them. In addition, the natural disasters were also blamed on the presence of the
whites and anyone who was associated with them. This included Bernard Mzeki. For in the mid-1890s, Rhodesia experienced a tumultuous period of drought, locust plagues, and new diseases for cattle and widespread famine. This indeed poisoned relations further between indigenous local people and the new imperial white rulers.

Ranger (1967:145-146) and the reprint of the British South Africa Company Reports on the Native Disturbances in Rhodesia, 1896-97 - The ’96 Rebellions, Rhodesian Newspaper (1975:5) captured the revolt. The two noted that the Ndebele revolt started two years after Bishop Knight-Bruce, Bernard Mzeki and other catechists arrived in Mashonaland. The revolt started in 1893 when King Lobengula and his Ndebele warriors rose against British imperial rule in the name of the Pioneer Column and the Cecil John Rhodes’ BSAC. The war ended with the death of King Lobengula and the occupation of the white settlers in Matebeleland in the West. Hence, Matebeleland and Mashonaland in the East was now officially under the imperial rule of the British. The whole area was named Rhodesia after Cecil John Rhodes. It must be mentioned that outwardly there was peace, but below the surface, the conquered Ndebele people secretly prepared for a revolt to return to their former glory of power. They intended to persuade the Shona from the East to become their allies in battle against the whites. The main aim was to militarily push white Pioneer Column and the Cecil John Rhodes’s Company across the Limpopo.

The Ndebele intelligentsia started to visit Chiefs in Mashonaland to stir up the Shona people to revolt against imperial rule. Cobbing (1977: 62), Beach (1998: 29), Isaacman, (1977:7), Shoko (2006:1) and Ranger (1967:145-146) agreed that powerful Spirit mediums like Kaguvi, Nehanda, Charwe, Mapondera and others also participated as spiritual and religious leaders in influencing the indigenous people to revolt. Their participation was integral to the uprising even though the historians mentioned above differ on the reasons of the rebellion; whether the revolt was as a result of the rise of the spirit of nationalism or it was localized grievances against the whites. The Chimurenga was a historical reality. They advocated for the destruction of anything that symbolized any form of imperial British colonial oppression. They encouraged the raiding of white farmers who had taken land from the locals, rural shops, Christian missions and all government posts. Anyone associated with the whites were killed too. Tax collectors were ambushed. Labor recruiters were attacked. Snell (2001:19) and others also mentioned that other circumstances of natural disasters also combined to help the above influences. The terrible disease of rinderpest swept through the cattle herds during the mid-1890s. The spirit mediums and nángas credited this to the presence of the British. The situation became worse when the government ordered the slaughter of healthy cattle in an attempt to check the disease. Furthermore, the ravages of drought were added to the destruction caused by clouds of locusts. Moreover, an outbreak of smallpox disease necessitated mass compulsory vaccination which was not understood by the local people. The hut tax levied by the government enforced on the indigenous people was in the absence of money payable in kind.

The Shona, fundamentally a loving people, according to Snell (2001:19) were reminded by the Ndebele that the British whom they regarded as temporary visitors to their land, intended to stay permanently. The land for the Shona, let alone for the Ndebele, according to Bakare S. (1993:46) was a place of connection with mother earth. It is where one’s roots are and where one’s umbilical cord would have been buried. The land is where one’s ancestors are deposited. It is a place of connection and orientation. To show how the Shona and the Ndebele gave importance to their land, Eliade (1961:22) wrote that, “…. when the individual is in his land, he is oriented in an orderly cosmos, he feels at home but if you take him out of his land, he is disoriented.” For Bakare (1993: 47), the land is sacred and it determines identity, history, and livelihood for the Shona people. Land is a repository of family ties between the living, the living-timeless, those who have died, but are still alive in the memories of their loved ones and those not yet born. Losing the land meant losing one’s father and the home of one’s childhood, hence, losing one’s livelihood, history and identity. The Shona people were reminded of a
series of wars of resistance against foreign invaders which occurred in 1572 against the Portuguese under Francisco de Barreto which they won in history (Fage, 1978:232, Beach, 1980:140). They could also fight the British imperial rule and win. Furthermore, they were reminded that the British had come with the intention of civilizing the Africans, forcing them to abandon their traditions, beliefs and way of life. During the first two months of 1896, the work of preparation to revolt was done secretly. In March 1896, the Ndebele revolted and killed white men, women and children throughout the country district. The Shona who were understood to be peace loving were still reaping their harvests. All the available government military forces were sent to the West to fight the Ndebele. But in June of the same year, they revolted in Mashonaland with sudden killing of white farmers and their families and anyone who were loyal to them. It was a time of war.

Snell (2001:19) stated that communication was made almost impossible by the absence of transport due to rinderpest and the cutting of telegraph wires by the natives. Food ran short and there was terrible suffering everywhere. The Ndebele surrendered in October, 1896 but fighting continued in Mashonaland for the whole year until one by one the chiefs gave in because of the rising number of troops who were ranged against them. Furthermore, their lack of food and young able bodied men to fight the white troops were contributory factors to surrender to the imperial rule. The first Chimurenga ended in October 1897. This means that the rebellion lasted for one year and four months.

In the Mangwende chiefdom, in Mashonaland particularly, during 1895, according to Snell (2001:19) Mzeki had overworked himself, with his tedious and frequent pastoral long journeys to Harare, Rusape and to Mutare for the translation and interpretation work. Moreover, the sudden change of Mangwende’s behaviour worried him. Therefore, Bernard Mzeki went at length to explain to the chief why the government was vaccinating people, collecting hut tax and killing infected cattle. He told chief Mangwende that the actions of the government were for the good of his people. Snell (2001) also highlighted that Bernard had known of the visits of the Ndebele intelligentsia in the Village and their secret meetings with chief Mangwende’s son, Muchemwa who hated Bernard to the last bone and his two uncles, Gatsi and Saridjgo, his own brother Bodjgo and a half-brother Ziute. This included the local nángas. Like Demha and others. These meetings preparation for the impending revolt (Snell, 2001:19).

According to Noll & Nystrom (2011:28), Muchemwa, one of Mangwende’s many sons had taken particular offence at Mzeki’s entrance into the Mangwende community. He did not appreciate the catechist’s marriage to one of Mangwende’s own grandchildren (Snell, 2001:18). Mchemwa was well known as a man of violence. He hated the white man and imperial rule, as well as Bernard and everything he stood for. He also hated his father for being soft and accommodative to the white community. Hence, he prepared for war by collecting guns and ammunitions and sharpening spears. The anger was fueled by the Ndebele spies and Spirit mediums and nángas who were advocating and influencing the locals to battle the whites. The Spirit mediums and nángas saw the Mzeki’s new Christian religion as an assault on their beliefs, customs and traditional worldview. The catechist’s pastoral ministry and position was challenging the religious and political authority they had exercised in the Mangwende chiefdom for centuries.

In mid–June 1896, secret messengers from Kagwui, the lion God and Nehanda the spirit medium came to Mangwende and called a meeting with the Chief and his chiefdom. The messengers brought news that the rebellion had started in Matebeleland and the Shona were to join in. The Shona had already started attacking Europeans in the nearby district. The news had an instruction from the Spirit medium and the nángas that they were to slaughter the whites and any associated with them. For the Bernard Mzeki’s local enemies, this communication prompted a decision for Muchemwa and his uncles to go after him. The local nángas like Demha took advantage of this news and began to stir up the Mangwende people against Bernard in particular as the white person’s voice and the umfundisi of Christianity. It must be
pointed out that in that meeting, the chief and some of the people did not want to participate in the Chimurenga war. Hence, they retired but Muchemwa and his team wanted to shed blood (Noll & Nystrom, 2011:28).

Early in June 1896, Father Foster, the priest in Manicaland had sent a messenger to all the catechists and teachers urging them to seek safety and protection in Penhalonga on the mission farm. This mission farm was later to be called St Augustine’s Anglican Mission School. Frank Ziqubu, John Kapuya, and some of their converts at Makoni’s village took heed of the order and travelled to Penhalonga for safety. The messenger reached Bernard Mzeki and was informed of the revolt that was to take place in Rhodesia. Bernard was placed at a terrible position in terms of making a decision. Firstly, his first concern was his wife Mutwa whom he had wedded three months earlier who was three months pregnant with their first child. According to Noll & Nystrom (2011:28 - 29) and Farrant (1996:119). Mutwa was Mangwende’s granddaughter and might be protected in any case. Mzeki’s second concern was his mission which had people, some of whom came a distance and were regarded as foreigners like him. In the mission, the catechist had hospitalized sick people against the Shona tradition that a sick person was to be cared by his relatives. Hence if one had travelled to his mission for care, meant that Mzeki was the last solution for ultimate care. These people were also a target of Muchemwa’s team since they were also associated with the British imperial rule. In simple terms, they were seen as friends of the white people. Reverend Pelly Douglas, now a Deacon, had been asked to be the British South Africa Company’s army chaplain in the Ndebele rebellion in Matebeleland and might have advised Mzeki. His third challenge was his faithfulness of canonical obedience to Bishop Knight-Brice who had instructed him not to leave the Mangwende chiefdom under any circumstance. The Bishop was in England during that year. He had told him to remain at Mangwende’s village so he could not leave. He felt bound by Bishop Knight-Brice’s earlier instructions to stay at Theydon. Bernard Mzeki responded by sending a messenger with a reply to Father Foster’s letter, “Mangwende’s people are suffering. The Bishop put me here and told me to remain. Until the Bishop returns, here I must stay. I cannot leave my people now in a time of such darkness.” (Noll & Nystrom, 2011:28, Snell, 2001:20, Farrant, 1966:207, Musodza, 2011:9).

Snell (2001:20) recorded that Mzeki kindly asked Reverend Father Foster’s messenger to accompany some of the boys under his care to be delivered to their homes on the way back to Penhalonga with his reply. But he remained at the Mission with a number of his converts. There was Chigwada Gawe who was the chief’s brother-in-law and his wife Mawhetu, with their little child Shoniwa. There was also Mawhetu Munyavi, from the Makoni district who was ready to be baptized as Samuel. He was a young boy of great promise who was later priested under the episcopacy of Edward Paget. He had refused to leave for safety at Penhalonga with Reverend Father Foster's messenger. Yet everyone who remained in the Mission was deeply disturbed. In fact, Bernard Mzeki’s wife, Mutwa had begged her husband to leave together with the messenger but he had vehemently refused.

4.7 The climax of the mysterious death event of Mzeki.

It was a cold winter Sunday morning, June 14th, 1896 when the catechist began to prepare for Morning Prayer - Martins. The bell was rung as usual. The noise of the bell could be heard on Mangwende’s mountain. The custom was when the bell was rung every Sunday morning, the chief Mangwende’s flag would be raised up on the pole beside his hut and an hour later, Morning Prayer would begin. Strangely on this particular Sunday, no flag appeared. No people from the village came for martins. This included even Mangwende’s head wife, Zvandaparira who never missed a service unless she was ill. The absence of the converts in the mission was shocking. They stayed in their huts, silent and afraid. Only Mutwa timorously afraid and in tears informed her husband that the local nánga, Demha and others were very angry with
Bernard, his mission and everything he stood for. The spirit mediums and the local nángas had declared Christianity as sorcery, dark and evil and Bernard Mzeki as the sorcerer. The evidence of this accusation was on his cutting down the sacred trees which was a sentence of death. In addition, Muchemwa was ordering the villagers not to set foot on the umfundisi’s mission. The bell for the Sunday evening song was rung as usual and to the catechist’s amazement, the villagers attended the service. The evensong went well and good but they seemed afraid. After the end of the service, the catechist asked two members of his mission community to escort them home (Snell, 2001:20, Noll & Nystrom, 2011:29).

Snell (2001:21) recorded that for the next two days that followed, no villagers visited the mission. Those from the mission community who went up to the Mangwende village came back with sad news. Muchemwa publicly and violently threatened to discipline all the villagers who had disobeyed the declarations made by the spirit mediums and nángas not to be associated with Christianity and Bernard Mzeki. Those who had attended the evensong were in serious trouble.

According to Snell (2001:21), Noll & Nystrom (2011:29) and Farrant (1966:215) on a very cold Wednesday the 17 June, 1896, the catechist and his wife decided to put up in the kitchen hut to warm themselves by the fire for the night. According to Snell (2001:21), Mzeki once went out to the other hut where the young man, Samuel Munyanyi and others were sleeping in order to comfort and encourage them. They were afraid of the violence which Muchemwa and his team of uncles had promised to those who were staying in the mission community. They had declared against with the umfundisi, the sorcerer. As he returned to his own kitchen hut to join his wife, Mutwa, Mzeki suddenly saw a strange light. The hills were blazed with bonfire, bursting into flame, one after another. This was a signal for trouble. Bernard knew something was seriously wrong. Noll & Nystrom (2011:29) and Farrant (1966:199) differ in the sense that before the couple saw the bonfire in the hills surrounding their mission, they had just taken in a stranger who arrived late and asked for lodging. On the cold midnight of 18 of June, Muchemwa and Ziute, chief’s son and two cousin brothers visited the catechist and his pregnant wife, Mutwa (Noll & Nystrom 2011: 29). There was a loud knocking at the kitchen door. Bernard made an enquiry as to who was visiting them at such an hour. They made an announcement that they had brought very urgent bad news to them. They lied to the couple that the European troops had killed Mangwende and that the matter needed their immediate attention. Mutwa tried to prevent him from opening the door but eventually Bernard Mzeki stepped outside. According to Snell (2001:21) Ziute, who used to attend Martins at the Mission with his mother, Mutwa’s other uncle Bodjgo and Saridjgo entered the kitchen hut and crouched by the fire after complaining about the cold winter weather of June. They repeated the false account of the attack on Mangwende by the British South Africa Company troops. Suddenly, they knocked Bernard over, dragged him outside, and Bodjgo stabbed him with a spear in the presence of Mutwa. The three men ran off into the nearby dark and dense bush of the hillside, thinking that they had left him dead.

According to Noll & Nystrom (2011:29) and Gowera (2010:7) gave an impression that as soon as the catechist opened the door of the kitchen hut, Bernard was immediately assaulted by three men, one of whom drove a spear deep into his side. Mutwa stepped out and attempted to prevent the assault throwing herself on top of Bernard. But the men dragged her back into the hut. When she emerged again after a little while, the three men had gone. Bernard Mzeki seemed to be dead. Farrant (1966:216) and Gowera (2010:11) wrote that when Mutwa heard the murderers depart, she crept outside. She saw Bernard lying there, bleeding, and ran to find Mayemu, Chigwada’s wife. He had already staggered up the hill behind his house and managed to wash his wounds at the second spring up the hillside and lay down at a small granite outcrop higher up the hill. Crouching in the bushes something told Mutwa that Bernard was still alive. She returned, accompanied by Mayemu and found out that her husband was no longer by the
The front door of the kitchen hut. They searched for him, calling softly. They found him by the spring washing his wound and trying to make a bandage with his shirt. He told them that he was very sick and weak. They helped him to crawl to the flat rock of the hill above the spring. It was a cave, a good place, because it was sheltered behind by other rocks. Bernard pleaded the two women and Kapuya to leave him.

Farrant (1966:216) and others recorded that the catechist managed to give a message to his wife, that even if he was dying, the work of God would continue with those who would follow him:

Your uncles have attacked me and I am dying right away. I wish you to be baptized both her and the baby in the womb. You shall call the baby Bernardina. If the Mangwende people trouble you, go St Faith’s Mission in Rusape for assistance. Do not think that your uncles have killed me, the work of the priests and teachers is ended, No, when I am dead but there will come many more priests in their numbers. And one day, all your people will be Christians. Find Archdeacon Upcher and tell him my words, Fr. Pelly will help you (Gowera, 2010:11, Noll & Nystrom, 2011:29, Snell, 2001:23)

Bernard Mzeki was exhausted. Therefore, Manyemu and Mutwa decided to prepare some food for him and a blanket to cover him since it was very cold on the hill. They crept down the hill and quietly went to the kitchen hut. There could hear some shouting from the distance since there was commotion in the mission; everyone running away, looking for somewhere to hide. They made a pot of thin porridge with milk quickly and collected some blankets to warm him and started to climb the slope again. They halted in terrified amazement, twenty meters away from the cave. They were almost blinded by a great and brilliant light like thunderstorm. The whole hillside was lit up, and there was a noise like many wings of great birds. The noise came lower and lower, and as they crouched on the ground, covering their eyes, the women saw through their eyes that in the center of the light, where Bernard lay, there was a strange glow. They were frightened and hid themselves, shaking from head to foot. After a long time, the noise ceased and looked up again. The light had gone, and they crept up the hill to the rock. Bernard had gone. They never saw him again. The huge rock had cracked, the bark of a big tree nearby was torn, and only smoke and blood stains remained in the cave, where Bernard Mizeki had lain. The writers wrote that the death of the catechist was indeed a mysterious death. Mutwa and her friend suddenly heard a rushing sound and a swirling, darting flame leapt down from the sky to the place where Bernard lay apparently dead. The writers confirmed that this phenomenon was also seen by the fleeing catechumens (Farrant, 1966:216, Gowera 2010 11, Noll & Nystrom, 2011 29, Snell, 2001 23).

According to the writers mentioned above, later in the night, Mutwa and Mayemu stood staring at the empty rock. They were still trembling from their ordeal of fear, and now it seemed the impossible had happened. Bernard had been very weak, yet he had disappeared. If he had dragged himself, he could not have gone far. Later in the morning, Mutwa saw Muchemwa, Mangwende’s son, ransacking everything he came across in the mission, killing Bernard’s goats, chickens, burning huts of the mission. She ran and hid herself in the bush for five days, and later went to her family. Bernard’s body was never found. In November Mutwa gave birth to baby girl. After three days her father wanted to give her to chief Mashayamombe as his wife. She remembered the words of her husband and escaped during the night and went to St Faith’s Mission in Rusape.

Broderick (1945: 78) related a different story of the death of the catechist. Whilst he agreed to a certain extent to some parts of the account, he posited that five days elapsed between the day of the attack and the death of Bernard Mzeki. Broderick’s account noted that Mutwa gave Mr Pelly the following account of his death as follows:

Very early one morning, while it was still dark, someone knocked at the door of the hut where she and Bernard were sleeping. She thought something must be wrong as it was still so early and she told Bernard to get out of another door and escape to the hills. But
he told her to let them in. On opening the door in came four men, two of them sons of Mangwende and one a nephew. They said they were cold and she made up the fire. Suddenly, they attacked Bernard and stunned him with an axe, they dragged him outside, stabbed him and left him for dead. Bernard became conscious, crawled away and hid himself under a rock.

His murderers, feeling sure he would die, did not trouble to search for him out, finding that the catechumens had escaped, contented themselves by taking Bernard’s wife prisoner. She escaped each night for five days and in company with one of the catechumens, washed and fed her husband on the fifth day, she came and found him dead. There is a story current among the natives today (1945) that the murderers were kept away from Bernard, as he lay hidden in the rocks by a white shining figure which, as it were, kept guard over him until he died (Broderick, 1945:78).

It is important to mention that there are commonalities and differences in accounts of the mystical death of Bernard Mzeki. Close data analysis shall be done at length in chapter six of this investigation.

4.8 Commemoration of Bernard Mzeki.

According to Noll & Nystrom (2011:29), the First Chimurenga as known by the local indigenous people and the Shona rebellion as known by the imperial British rule came to an end in the fall of 1897. Mutwa and the daughter born after Mzeki’s death were baptized. The child was called Bernardina by her mother, Mutwa, as she was instructed by her late husband. The ministerial work of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland moved slowly for several decades among the local indigenous Shona people. It is important to mention that according to Farrant (1966:210) that it was only Bernard Mzeki amongst all the five catechists who accompanied Bishop Knight-Bruce to Mashonaland, whose life and ministry is greatly remembered and commemorated. It is vivid and clear that he was hero of true faithfulness from the African perspective. His identify with the indigenous local Shona people which he demonstrated by speaking their language, marrying one of them and his spirituality must have created a deep impact to the Mangwende Chiefdom, whose second generation of Mangwende had to apologize to Mutwa for murdering her husband at the first public gathering of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland at the Bernard Mzeki shrine in 1938 under the bishopric of Bishop Edward Paget, the fifth bishop of the diocese.

Furthermore, Musodza (2008:95) wrote that the catechetical ministry of Bernard Mzeki was also cherished in that Shoniwa Kapuya his first convert to Anglicanism and to the Christian faith, was baptized by the successor of the Bishop Knight-Bruce, Bishop Thomas Gaul. He was baptized as John Kapuya a month after his death in Salisbury. The new bishop later sent him to Isandhlwana College in Zululand, in South Africa to be trained as a catechist and teacher just like Bernard Mzeki. After three years of training, he returned to his Diocese of Mashonaland and became one of the first Zimbabwean catechists and teachers in the Anglican Church.

According to Musodza (2008: 95), three years after the catechist’s death, in 1899, a white Anglican priest returned to where Mzeki had started his mission and established a shrine in his first year of his ministry in Mangwende Chiefdom and established a boys’ school. According to Farrant (1966:232) the shrine which was built where Bernard Mzeki’s hut had been, was named initially after Bernard of Clairvaux and not Bernard Mzeki. In the words of Farrant, this led to confusion and many people would think naturally that the mission was named after Bernard Mzeki. This puzzled the local people, although Bernard Mzeki eventually took precedence in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and in the region in years to come. Later missionaries identified the rendezvous of his death and planted a cross and memorialized his
death with an annual service on June 18 as a small gathering (Musodza, 2008:95). According to Snell (2001:79), St Bernard’s Mzeki Boy’s High School, Marondera, was founded by Archdeacon Upcher and carried on by Rev E. J Simpson, who was later followed by the Rev E. W J Crane. The first part of the shrine was built in 1936 by the Rev Crane. It consisted of a large slab of reinforced concrete 14 feet in diameter erected on pillars over the floor of Bernard’s kitchen hut; upon this the altar was built. The bricks of the pillars were taken from the altars of the two churches built previously at St Bernard’s Mission by the Rev E. Simpson. The floor of the kitchen hut was in a good state of preservation and was open to view under the concrete platform. The rest of the shrine was built by the Rev Robert Grinham and the staff of the Ruzavi School. The bricks for this part were given by the people of St Bernard’s Mission. In 1938, a notable commemoration took place at the scene of the murder on a high rock, where years ago Mangwende’s kraal had been situated. The high rock was where Muchemwa’s team had descended, the Rev Crane had elected a great cross. It stood 21 feet above the rock and was a 15 feet in length and 3 feet wide. The cross was made of gum poles fastened with bolts and whitewashed. It was visible two miles away and was clearly to be seen from the shrine built on the site of the hut in which Bernard was murdered. On the afternoon of Thursday, the 16 June, 1938, the cross was blessed at a small gathering by Bishop Edward Paget.

On a Saturday, the 18 June, two days later, Bernard Mzeki Shrine was dedicated by the Bishop. At this Eucharist service, there were 50 Europeans and over 1 000 Africans who assembled from all parts of the Diocese of Mashonaland. Ten Europeans and seven African priests were present. The Governor of Southern Rhodesia, Sir Herbert Stanley, was also present, accompanied by Sir Bougal Malcolm, the chairman of the British South Africa Company. After the dedication of the shrine by the Bishop, solemn Mass was celebrated. The Senior African priest of the Diocese, the Rev Samuel Muhlanga celebrated the Eucharist. He assisted by the Ven Edward, Archdeacon S. J Christelow who was the director of mission work of the Diocese. Fr Osmund Victor was the preacher of the gathering. The sermon was preached in English and was translated by the Rev Edward Chipunza into Shona. It should be mentioned that by 1949, the Bernard Mzeki Mission was the centre of a mission district under the charge of Rev J Pswarai with a sub center at St Anne’s Goto, under the Rev Oliver Mandihlare.

Musodza (2008:59) wrote with flavor that after more investigation of the site in the early 1930s, another white Anglican built a circular shrine, hence, the place was called the Bernard Mzeki Shrine. It has become a Shrine for the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe which is under the Church of the Province of Central Africa. Annually, the Anglican community in Zimbabwe from the five Dioceses, namely the Anglican Dioceses of Harare, Manicaland, Bulawayo, Masvingo and Central Zimbabwe respectively. A few from the Dioceses in the Province, Mozambique and South Africa also join in the celebration at Bernard Mzeki Shrine annually, the weekend nearest to the 18 June to commemorate and celebrate his life and ministry. The Shrine was later consecrated in June 1938 at a service attended by a hundred Europeans and a thousand Africans, including Joseph Chigwada Gawe. In 1946, on the fiftieth anniversary of Mzeki’s death, a larger crowd, which included Mutwa and her daughter, gathered for a celebratory service of Communion and to hear a message read from the governor of Rhodesia (Musodza, 2008:95).

Notably, from the mid-twentieth century onwards, Musodza (2008:95) recorded that the white Anglican community in Mashonaland Diocese sponsored commemorations of Mzeki’s death, recognizing him as a saint and martyr. The Cowley Fathers who spiritually raised him eagerly promoted Mzeki’s account wherever their missionary work spread throughout the world. The picture they painted was of the faithful African Christian, loyal friend and an inspiring Anglican. Commemorations slowly increased in the 1960s. By the time Farrant’s book was publicized in 1966, there were many kinds of memorials of the late Bernard Mzeki, chapels named after him, stained glass, reliquaries and murals. His commemoration was included on
provincial Anglican calendars in South and Central Africa, Swaziland, Botswana, South Africa and Rhodesia.

It must be mentioned, according to Musodza (2008: 95) that with the rise of an African spirit of renaissance, black consciousness and independence, the religious image of Mzeki dramatically changed like a diminishing light in the late 1960s. For during the anti-colonial war, called the Second Chimurenga that led to the transformation of Rhodesia into Zimbabwe, the meaning of his life in memory was almost dying a natural death. This was because the annual gatherings at the Shrine was stopped during the liberation struggle of the early 1970s. After Zimbabwean independence in April, 1980, the Bernard Mzeki Shrine gradually became an increasingly popular pilgrimage site. The Zimbabwean Anglican community, led by the first black bishop in the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, Bishop Ralph Hatendi, now led Mass on the weekend closest to June 18 from the 1980s onwards and pilgrimages to the Shrine in Marondera were considered by those who want to follow the conservative Anglican spirituality of the late catechist, Bernard Mzeki.

A contemporary African historian, Robert (2009:167) has written interestingly, a detailed account of what the annual commemoration of the late Bernard Mzeki was like by the early 2000s. The Zimbabwe Anglican community and others from the Province arrived on a Thursday prior to the 18th of June, each year, ahead of the main Communion service on Saturday. There was much ecstatic singing and dancing, as well as many fires because of the cold winter weather. On Friday, a choir competition takes place among the best parish choirs from Anglican dioceses in Zimbabwe. On Saturday, after a huge procession, the Zimbabwean bishops and the archbishop of Central Africa, if present, celebrated a two-hour Communion service, with much singing. The liturgy is spoken in the Shona, Ndebele, Sena and English languages respectively to consider many ethnicities who attended the Service from the Church of the Province of Central, Mozambique and South Africa. After the official service, healing sessions took place, usually led by Canon Nerwande who in the mid-2000s stepped out of the Anglican Church and formed his own church (Robert, 2009:168).

Robert (2009:170) recorded that on Saturday night, there was an all-night – *pungwe* and bonfires once again encircled the hills. During the whole night, there was sing, dancing and the ministry of the word mostly by laity. On Sunday, local Anglican priests from parishes in Marondera led a final Eucharist. It must be noted that throughout the whole weekend, pilgrims ascended to the place from where Bernard Mzeki’s kitchen hut was to the place where it is said to have disappeared. The stand of trees surrounding the place has once again become a sacred grove, with Shona religious traditions taken up into Christian remembrance.

Chawarika (2012: 72) captured a five year religious fight (2007–2012) that took place at the Bernard Mzeki shrine due to the schism of the Anglican Diocese of Harare (C.P.C.A). To give a brief background of the schism, the former bishop of Harare Diocese, Dr Nolbert Kunonga attempted to withdraw the Anglican Diocese of Harare and resigned from the Church of the Province of Central Africa on the 22nd of September, 2007. He cited the homosexuality issue as the main cause of his withdrawal. In his letter of withdrawing the Diocese of Harare from the church of the Province of Central Africa, he wrote stressing:

> The Anglican Diocesan Synod of Harare, standing committee, Diocesan Trustee, and the whole body of the church in the Diocese. By copy of this letter, the Diocese of Harare would like to formalize the exclusion from the church of the Province of Central Africa as minuted in the Provincial Synod of 2007 September the 8 which we trust you hold. You will appreciate our relationship with the Province has been indeed a long life one full with genuine authentic Christian sharing. This Province has been a source from which we have drawn our livelihood in terms of Christian virtue inasmuch as it is from us. Our
Communion has always been guided by nothing else than the moral doctrine of Christ which was one based on the premise that we hold primary, the fundamental Canons which are indeed in the Sacred Scriptures. It is our fear that and reverence of these that make us seriously weigh our susceptibility when faced with a threat of compromise and breach of the said in the face of what the Province was and is facing now viz HOMOSEXUALITY……. We, as the Diocese of Harare, would like it to be put on record that with effect from the 4th of August 2007 and as confirmed by the Provincial Synod, we are withdrawing from the Church of the Province of Central Africa. We have no hard feelings about our departure from the Province.” (Kunonga, 2007:1, Chawarika, 2012:72).

On the 4th of September, 2007, Bishop Nolbert Kunonga went on to form the Anglican Province of Zimbabwe (A.P.C.) and appointed himself the Archbishop of the new Church. Albert Chama, then Dean of the province and acting Archbishop refused totally that the Provincial Synod of 2007, ever gave a blessing and confirmed as stated in the letter to the formation of an Anglican Province in Zimbabwe. The Dean highlighted that it was a very long process. It needed the approval of a number of bodies to be allowed to form a Province of an Anglican Church in any given nation (Chama, 2007:1).

According to Chawarika (2012:74), the Constitution and Canons of the Province which govern the Church never allowed Bishop Nolbert Kunonga to form a Province. At worst, even the Provincial Synod of the 14th of September, 2007 did not give him permission for the formation of an Anglican Province of Zimbabwe. What this meant to the acting Archbishop Albert Chama then and the Episcopal bench of the Bishops in the Province was that Bishop Nolbert Kunonga had formed his own church (APZ). This marked the official beginning of the schism in the Harare Diocese.

On the 16th of October, 2007, Fourteen Bishops of the Province at the Ecclesiastical Provincial Court unanimously agreed to accept Bishop Nolbert Kunonga’s withdrawal letter as resignation from the See of Harare and was ex-communicated together with his followers. The acting Archbishop’s reply was as follows:

I would like to inform you that it is constitutionally and canonically impossible to withdraw the Diocese of Harare from the Church of the Province of Central Africa because a Diocese in accordance to the Constitution of CPCA forms an integral part of the said Province. Any act that purports to withdraw a Diocese is unconstitutional and un-canonical as this action is tantamount to alter the very structure and essence of the Province. The formal withdrawal of the Diocese of Harare from the Church of the Province of Central Africa is unacceptable and misleading. We, however, as the Dean of CPCA accept and acknowledge that you and your followers have by nature of your letter severed relationship with the Church of the Province of Central Africa. Therefore, I declare the See of Harare is with immediate effect vacant and in accordance with Canon 14, I shall appoint … (Chama, 2007:1, Chawarika 2012:77).

Chawarika (2012:77) showed that the reply highlighted above meant that Bishop Nolbert Kunonga’s withdrawal of the Anglican Diocese of Harare failed and the See (diocese) was declared vacant. This also meant that Bishop Nolbert Kunonga was no longer the authentic and rightful bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Harare, according to the CPCA. Furthermore, the excommunication communiqué written by the former Dean Albert Chama stated:

We ALBERT CHAMA, by Divine Permission, Dean of the Church of the Province of Central Africa, do hereby the Authority of Christ committed to us,
pronounce upon former bishop of Harare Dr Nolbert Kunonga and all those who support him the sentence of Greater Excommunication, thereby separating them from the Church of the Province of Central Africa and the Anglican Communion, by the action taken of withdrawing from the Church of the Province of Central Africa, forming another church, and casting aside the Constitution and Canons of the Church of the Province of Central Africa. And we do hereby make known this our sentence to all the Faithful in the Church of the Province of Central Africa, and the Anglican Communion, and exhort them to join with us in humble supplication that these erring brothers and sisters may speedily attain true repentance, for their own souls health and well-being of the Body of Christ (Chama, 2008:77).

Immediately, according to Chawarika (2012: 77), the acting Archbishop appointed a Caretaker Bishop, former bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Manicaland, the Right Reverend Sebastian Bakare to take the See of the Anglican Diocese of Harare in order to rescue the Diocese from Bishop Nolbert Kunonga who was attempting to run away with church property. Bishop Bakare served as a caretaker bishop in Harare Diocese for two years. End of 2009, Reverend Dr Gandiya Nicholas Chad was elected the new Bishop of Harare Diocese.

The commemorations of Bernard Mzeki at the Shrine had many challenges for the five years since the schism started in the Diocese of Harare. The battle was over who was eligible to use the Shrine between CPCA of Bishop Gandiya and APZ of Archbishop Nolbert Kunonga. The schism became politically motivated. The climax of the battle to control the Shrine took place on the following days of the 25th to 27th of June, 2010. Bishop Gandiya in his Pastoral Letter of July, 2010 wrote: “Home Affairs, Co-Minister of ZANU-PF of Robert Mugabe in the Government of National Unity Zimbabwe–GNU, Cde Kembo Hahadi, assured the members of the Anglican Diocese of Harare CPCA pilgrims that they would be allowed to worship at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine on the 25th to the 27th of June, 2010. This was in response to the threat which Bishop Nolbert Kunonga had made that he would not allow the CPCA – Diocese of Harare to worship at the Shrine” (Gandiya, 2010:2).

The Minister had said that the Government would assure the members of the Anglican Church of Harare CPCA that they were to attend their annual pilgrimage at the St Bernard Mzeki shrine and police would be on standby to avert any violence. To the surprise of the more than 20,000 Anglican pilgrims CPCA, on their way to the St Bernard Mzeki Shrine found that police had set up roadblocks on all roads leading to the Shrine; hence, they had to congregate at the Marondera Showground in that year. Furthermore, Bishop Nolbert Kunonga made an attempt to have the pilgrims removed from the Marondera Showground by complaining to Marondera City Council, citing a potential health disaster because the people who had attended the occasion were so many. The City Council did not capitulate. Among that massive crowd, were some Politburo members of ZANU-PF and their families and some Cabinet members and their families who are Anglicans (Chawarika, 2012: 96).

The Movement for Democratic Change headed by the Prime Minister, Mr Morgan Tsvangirai (MDC-T) noted the political support which Archbishop Nolbert Kunonga was getting from the ZANU–PF party in the Government of National Unity. The MDC –T party made a public press statement to share their concern over church leadership abusing their authority and being protected by the State just because they supported the ruling regime. The Zimbabwean Newspaper of the 16 of March, 2010 article entitled MDC-T Slams Abuse of the Church reported that the MDC-T was challenging ZANU-PF’s abuse of the church and religious leaders like Bishop Norbert Kunonga and others for political expediency. “This is a shameless way of trying to sanitize evil by confusing murder, tyranny, hatred for the poor and a plethora
of sins with the lofty practices and ideas of Christianity”, said the party statement on Friday (The Zimbabwean Newspaper, 2011:4, Chawarika, 2012:93).

The Party went on to proclaim that for decades, the church had stood firm on the need for social justice, fairness and solidarity with humanity issues that forced Zimbabweans to abandon ZANU-PF because of its dismal failure to respect these. It noted that it was an undeniable fact that the church had made a tremendous contribution to the spiritual and material well-being of the majority of Zimbabweans. It was an indispensable ally of the people in the Liberation struggle, providing health, education, and other forms of succor and sanctuary to tormented victims, heroes and heroines. In the article, MDC-T condemned ZANU–PF for targeting the church coercing its leadership and further inflicting harm on religious practices by constantly interfering with the operations of the house of God, said the statement. “We call for prayers against the abuse of God’s Church by the forces of darkness to prop evil. Impious and bloodthirsty political leadership must never be allowed to hide behinds the forces of light. The MDC-T appealed to bishops, pastors, priests and other religious leaders to stand against ZANU-PF’s evil deeds which have seen the country brought to the blink of collapse – corruption, intolerance and the Party’s unbridled assault on the poor- matters which invited the ire of the world and forced certain countries to impose a battery of restrictions on the perpetrators,” (The Zimbabwean Newspaper, 2011:4, Chawarika, 2012: 93).

The Legal Monitor (2011: 3) a newsletter for the Zimbabwe lawyers of Human Rights defenders showed concern when they recorded that the Harare Diocesan Anglicans organizing the 2011th year’s commemorations of one of the first local black martyrs, Bernard Mzeki, were jittery that the police and Bishop Nolbert Kunonga would combine forces again to stop the religious event. Kunonga, excommunicated by the Anglican Church of the Province of Central Africa (CPCA) in 2008, has over the past four years used his close political links to charm the police and prevent Anglicans of CPCA from commemorating Mzeki’s death. CPCA Bishop for Bishop Chad Gandiya told The Legal Monitor on Friday that the church would commemorate the event this weekend in Marondera. Kunonga, who enjoys little public following, held his commemorations this past weekend. Bishop Gandiya said he had informed the police about the commemorations, but was nervous because the same police had over the years sided with Bishop Kunonga. “Since our problems with Bishop Nolbert Kunonga started in 2007, we have been blocked from worshiping at the shrine. Last year the police stopped us from marching to the shrine. We hope that this year it is not going to happen as we have been having problems for the past four years with the Kunonga faction,” said Bishop Chad Gandiya. Mzeki, an early convert to Christianity, was one of the first black martyrs. He died in June, 1896. His annual commemoration draws between 15 000 and 30 000 worshippers from the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and across the region, according to Bishop Gandiya. The Bernard Mzeki commemorations were only part of the running battles between Anglican Church parishioners and Kunonga, who has on numerous occasions used mobs, thugs and the police to block Anglicans of CPCA from using the Shrine.

Therefore, the Bernard Mzeki Shrine, a place of commemoration of a hero of faith unto death became a battle of the two religious factions of the Gandiya and Kunonga factions. In addition, the Shrine also became a political battlefield for ZANU- PF and MDC–T parties in giving support to the Church they inclined to. In the same Newsletter of the Legal Monitors (2011:3), an announcement was publicized by Harare Diocese in the name of the Diocesan secretary that the Bernard Mzeki commemoration of 2011 was going to take place at the Marondera Showgrounds because the police had blocked the Anglican of CPCA to worship at the actual Shrine. Below is the announcement:

**Anglican Diocese of Harare (Church of the Province of Central Africa)**

**ANGLICANS TO GATHER IN MARONDERA FOR BERNARD MIZEKI COMMEMORATIONS 24- 26 JUNE 2011**
Harare - It is that time of the year again, when thousands of Anglicans in the Anglican Church in Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and South Africa gather in memory of the late Martyr Bernard Mizeki (1861 – 18 June 1896) who died at the hands of Mangwende villagers in Murehwa who felt threatened by his Christian teachings.

This year, from Friday 24 June through to Sunday 26 June 2011, Anglicans, led by Archbishop Albert Chama of the Church of the Province of Central Africa (C.P.C.A) will celebrate the life of Bernard Mizeki at the Marondera Show grounds, in the Mashonaland East Province, about 75 kilometers east of Harare.

The gathering has traditionally been held in Marondera at the Bernard Mizeki Shrine. However, the rebel grouping led by Dr Nolbert Kunonga has virtually made it impossible to hold the commemorations there. This has deprived Anglicans from visiting the place where the late Martyr lived and subsequently died.

The venue has been secured and all other necessary preparations have been concluded. According to the Bernard Mizeki Organising Committee, water is available and there would be sufficient security to safeguard everyone who wishes to be at the venue of the commemorations.

This year’s gathering is being held under the theme “MuKristu Usanete” taken from Romans 12 vs. 12 which urge Christians to be “joyful in hope, patient in affliction, and faithful in prayer”.

The programme for the pilgrimage will be released in due course. For any questions and comments relating to this information, please feel free to contact the undersigned or visit the CPCa Harare Diocesan Offices.

Thank you
15 June 2011

Diocesan Secretary, Reverend Clifford Dzavo
+263-4-308042

Website: www.hreanglicancpca.org.zw

The announcement publicized in the Legal Monitor Newsletter (2011:3) showed the following:

i) That the commemoration invites the Anglican community in the region, which is Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and South Africa.

ii) That the commemoration was in memory of the late Martyr Bernard Mzeki (1861 – 18 June 1896) who died at the hands of Mangwende villagers in Murehwa who felt threatened by his Christian teachings.

iii) That the dates of the festival was Friday 24 June through to Sunday 26 June, 2011.

iv) The celebrant of the Saturday Mass was the Archbishop of CPCa, the Most Reverend Albert Chama.

v) That the reason why the commemoration was done at Marondera Showgrounds was given that the Bishop Kunonga faction and the police had blocked to use the actual Bernard Mzeki Shrine.

vi) That there was a Bernard Mzeki Organizing Committee which was organizing the commemoration of the martyr.

vii) That the commemoration of 2011 was under a theme MuKristu Usanete from Romans 12 verse. 12 which urge Christians to be “joyful in hope, patient in affliction, and faithful in prayer”.

viii) That the 2011 commemoration had a programme that was to be released in due course.

Most important, the Schism finally ended in 2012 and the High Court of Zimbabwe granted Bishop Chad Gandiya the Anglican Diocese rightful ownership of Harare properties. This included the Bernard Mzeki Shrine (Zimbabwe constitutional Bench, 2012:1). (See Appendix 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

After the five year Schism with Bishop Kunonga, the programme for the Bernard Mzeki commemorations changed dramatically when compared with the programme recorded by Robert 2009). Below is the 2014 Bernard Mzeki programme:

Closely looking at the programme, one can note the front page had the picture of the late catechist Bernard Mzeki and that the programme had a national Church flavour of the Anglican
Church of Zimbabwe. The five Anglican Dioceses in Zimbabwe participated in preaching and singing. Interestingly, the Zimbabwe Anglican Youth Association and Mother’s Union, Wabvuwi and Bernard Mzeki Guilds were also on the programme. There was a new phenomenon of praise and worship teams using musical instruments like the popular musician Francis Juma participating in the programme. The aspect of healing and deliverance was on the programme on Saturday afternoon as mentioned before by Robert. In 2014, according to the programme, the healing and deliverance was led by the Order of St Luke’s Physician Chaplain, Canon Shambare and his team, Harare Diocese. Notably, on the programme, one can cite that there were a lot of slots allocated to prayer and intercessions. This may meant that the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe acknowledged the power of prayer probably because of the five year schism of the church. But it is significant that the commemoration festival still maintained the three days programme and at the Saturday main service, an appointed bishop preached a sermon based on the theme of that year. The theme for 2014, according to the program was a celebration of lay and skilled ministry as the late Bernard Mzeki was a lay minister.

4.9 Lectionary Recognition of Bernard Mzeki’s Martyrdom.

A lectionary is a table of psalms and readings from Holy Scripture authorized for use in public worship of the Anglican Communion and other churches worldwide. It carries a Liturgical Calendar for upcoming events with links to the Lessons for Sundays and major Holy Days from the Revised Common Lectionary. It was also adapted for use in Episcopal worship in the Anglican Church in the United States of America. The following details of lectionary proceedings relates what is allowed and anticipated in the commemoration of Bernard’s martyrdom in the Anglican Church. The webpage has been reproduced in its original form to show the authority bestowed on the commemoration of this African Christian Faith Hero. The researcher has thus maintained the form, font and everything as it appeared on the webpage. The lectionary on the webpage is printed below:

4.9.1 Lectionary Webpage for the Commemoration of Bernard Mzeki.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Lessons Appointed for Use on the Feast of Bernard Mzeki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catechist and Martyr in Mashonaland, 1896 June 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah 6:6–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation 7:13–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 12:2–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or [Common of a Martyr] [Common of a Missionary] [Of the Holy Cross] [For the Ministry III] [For the Mission of the Church Form I Form II]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preface of Holy Week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Collect

Almighty and everlasting God, who kindled the flame of your love in the heart of your holy martyr Bernard Mzeki: Grant to us, your humble
servants, alike faith and power of love, that we who rejoice in his triumph may profit by his example; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. 

Amen.

Old Testament
Nehemiah 6:6–11

In the letter was written, “It is reported among the nations — and Geshem also says it that you and the Jews intend to rebel; that is why you are building the wall; and according to this report you wish to become their king. You have also set up prophets to proclaim in Jerusalem concerning you, ‘There is a king in Judah!’ And now it will be reported to the king according to these words. So come, therefore, and let us confer together.” Then I sent to him, saying, “No such things as you say have been done; you are inventing them out of your own mind” — for they all wanted to frighten us, thinking, “Their hands will drop from the work, and it will not be done.” But now, O God, strengthen my hands.

One day when I went into the house of Shemaiah son of Delaiah son of Mehetabel, who was confined to his house, he said, “Let us meet together in the house of God, within the temple, and let us close the doors of the temple, for they are coming to kill you; indeed, tonight they are coming to kill you.” But I said, “Should a man like me run away? Would a man like me go into the temple to save his life? I will not go in!”

The Response
Psalm 124

Nisi quia Dominus

1 If the LORD had not been on our side, *let Israel now say; 2 If the LORD had not been on our side, *when enemies rose up against us; 3 Then would they have swallowed us up alive *in their fierce anger toward us; 4 Then would the waters have overwhelmed us *and the torrent gone over us; 5 Then would the raging waters *have gone right over us. 6 Blessed be the LORD! *he has not given us over to be a prey for their teeth. 7 We have escaped like a bird from the snare of the fowler; *the snare is broken, and we have escaped. 8 Our help is in the Name of the LORD, *the maker of heaven and earth.

The Epistle
Revelation 7:13–17

Then one of the elders addressed me, saying, "Who are these, robed in white, and where have they come from?" I said to him, "Sir, you are the one that knows." Then he said to me, "These are they who have come out of the great ordeal; they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. For this reason they are before the throne of God, and worship him day and night within his temple, and the one who is seated on the throne will shelter them. They will hunger no more, and thirst no more; the sun will not strike them, nor any scorching heat; For the Lamb at the center of the throne will be their shepherd, and he will guide them to springs of the water of life, And God will wipe away every tear from their eyes."

The Gospel
Luke 12:2–12
Jesus said to his disciples, "Nothing is covered up that will not be uncovered, and nothing secret that will not become known. Therefore whatever you have said in the dark will be heard in the light, and what you have whispered behind closed doors will be proclaimed from the housetops.

"I tell you, my friends, do not fear those who kill the body, and after that can do nothing more. But I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has authority to cast into hell. Yes, I tell you, fear him! Are not five sparrows sold for two pennies? Yet not one of them is forgotten in God's sight. But even the hairs of your head are all counted. Do not be afraid; you are of more value than many sparrows. "And I tell you, everyone who acknowledges me before others, the Son of Man also will acknowledge before the angels of God; but whoever denies me before others will be denied before the angels of God. And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven. When they bring you before the synagogues, the rulers, and the authorities, do not worry about how you are to defend yourselves or what you are to say; for the Holy Spirit will teach you at that very hour what you ought to say, "Optional parts of the readings are set off in square brackets. The Bible texts of the Old Testament, Epistle and Gospel lessons are from the New Revised Standard Version Bible, copyright 1989 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Church of Christ in the USA, and used by permission. The Collects, Psalms and Canticles are from the Book of Common Prayer, 1979.

PRAYER (Traditional Language)

Almighty and everlasting God, who didst enkindle the flame of Thy love in the heart of thy holy martyr Bernard Mizeki: Grant to us, thy humble servants, a like faith and power of love, that we who rejoice in his triumph may profit by his example; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever.

PRAYER (contemporary language)

Almighty and everlasting God, who kindled the flame of your Love in the heart of your holy martyr Bernard Mizeki: Grant to us, your humble servants, a like faith and power of love, that we who rejoice in his triumph may profit by his example; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever.

Psalm 116:1-8 or 124
Revelation 7:13-17

4.10 Conferment of Martyrdom on Bernard Mzeki.

History is very deaf and silent on the actual events that the Anglican Church took to confer the status of martyrdom on Bernard yet the church refers to him as a saint and martyr. This research work has discovered that the ACZ, CPCA and the Anglican Communion worldwide clearly does not have a process or system put in place or a liturgy in its history that have been held to bestow or confer saintly/martyrdom status. The reason for carrying out an entire chapter in this research on the canonization of martyrdom was to show the reader how the church catholic has instituted the event. The same is absent in the Anglican Church yet we have such figures as Bernard who are venerated as martyrs but with no traceable criteria or public function
sanctioned by the church to bestore the order of martyrdom. It must be said clearly that there is no trace whatever in the firsts Acts of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland in its establishment in the 1890s. There is also no trace in the rules and regulations of the church that is the Acts of the five Dioceses in Zimbabwe in their formations, let alone in the Canon Law of the Church of the Province of Central Africa.

Geoffrey Gibbson G. (1973: 29) wrote a biography of Bishop Paget in the early seventies. The book is entitled Paget of Rhodesia: A Memoir of Edward, the 5th Bishop of Mashonaland where he wrote interestingly on how the Bernard Mzeki Shrine came into existence. At this juncture, it is important to briefly look at who Paget was.

4.10.1 The Background history of Bishop Edward Paget.

According to Gibbson (1973: 29), there had been four Bishop before Bishop Edward Paget. The first of course was Bishop Knight-Bruce who had returned to England after three years of ministry of establishing the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland (1892 – 1894) and was ill then with fever. Bishop William Gaul came after Bruce and had in the 12 years of his bishopric established firm administration within the Diocese (1895 -1907). The third bishop was Powell who succumbed to sickness within two years and returned to London, UK. The fourth was Bishop Frederic Beaven, former Archdeacon in the Diocese from 1903. He was consecrated bishop in 1911 and served his bishopric up to 1925. Gibbson claimed that he was a loved man who led the Diocese in the spirit of humility and a friendly service (Gibbson, 1973: 29). After bishop Beavean, was Bishop Edward Paget from 1925 to 1957 where he was appointed Archbishop of the Province of Central Africa by Queen Elizabeth in his last year of his bishopric.

Gibbson (1973:29) wrote that Bishop Edward Paget’s first engagement in the Diocese of Mashonaland was a reception at which the Governor presided in Salisbury - Harare. In the Governor’s speech, he welcomed the new Bishop in the following words: “Rhodians will not look to you for nothing to maintain high standards in the relations with the Native. This is the most vital of all needs.” There was unconscious irony in that. For Bishop Edward’s very first clash with Rhodesians was on that very point. His consecration and enthronement was arranged for the Sunday October 11th, 1925. The Cathedral of St Mary’s and All Saints was predominantly a white community and was at that time used only by white people. Those appointed to organize the services did not think of inviting Africans to attend. When Edward discovered this, he insisted that Africans be invited. His own story was that when the Cathedral authorities demurred, he threatened to move his enthronement to St Michael’s and All Angels parish, Mbare which was an African parish and a primary school. After a battle of emotional words, he eventually won his point. It is important to mention that after his enthronement as the first bishop of the Mashonaland Diocese, Gibbson (1973:76) wrote that Bishop Paget was appointed by the Rhodesian Government to the post of Chaplain General of the Rhodesian Armed Forces and participated in the World War Two.

Bishop Edward Paget had an inclination for the blacks. For in 1926, four African deacons were made priests and three more deacons were ordained. In 1928, Edward Chipunza was made a priest of whom the Bishop made special mention. He was the son of a chief. He was saved in grievous illness by the prayers of Archdeacon Upcher in Makoni district whilst he was an infant. He grew up under Upcher’s care and guidance at the Epiphany Mission. He became a teacher and aged thirty was the youngest of the African clergy. The Bishop’s intention was to build up a strong African ministry. In 1933, he wrote the following:

“On the ministry side of our work as a Diocese, it is true to say that the African ministry to their own people must increase and we must decrease- that more and more an African ministry is to be the most efficient way of converting Africans to Christ.” To show his affection and regard for them, he defied the current ideas on social congregation. “It was
thought strange when I went to the African priest’s house, ate a meal with and stayed as his guest when visiting his district. I received unstamped and anonymous letters of abuse (Gibbson, 1973: 38).

According to Gibbson (1973:65 - 66), the Cathedral always had a very special place in the spiritual life of the Diocese because it brought Europeans and Africans together at the synod Eucharist and Ordinations in the late 1920s. Yet, most importantly, the great mass of the African people lived far away in the country districts and never saw and experienced these services. It was one of Bishop Edward Paget’s great inspirations to give them a new rallying point, a place of pilgrimage, where they could come in their thousands and camp and worship. Hence, the bishop created the Bernard Mzeki Shrine.

During the Shona Rising of 1896, an African catechist Bernard had been murdered near Chief Mangwende’s village between Marondera and Macheke, where Bishop Knight-Bruce had stationed him. Some years later, St Bernard’s Mission had been established near the site and two priest in Charge, Ernest Simpson and Edward Crane, had kept alive the memory of the catechist. They had searched for and eventually found the site of the hut in which his murderers had attacked him. Most significantly, in 1936, the 50th anniversary of Bernard’s baptism and the 40- of his death, Bishop Edward Paget had an altar built over the foundations of the hut where he died as the first step towards a shrine. It had a temporary shelter of poles and thatch, a kind of veld baldachino. On the June 18, 1936 was the anniversary of the catechist’s martyrdom the first pilgrimages were held at his Shrine named after him. There was a gathering of 500 Africans and 60 Europeans, including Sir Herbert Stanley who was the Governor of Salisbury. An African priest, Samuel Muhlanga, celebrated with archdeacon Christelow as Deacon and Edward Chipunza as sub deacon of the Mass. Bishop Edward Paget had this to comment on the first gathering of the Diocese at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine, “it was a real inter racial communion, the first, probably on a scale in this Diocese, Africans and Europeans receiving the Blessed Sacrament together from the hands of African and Europeans priests. It was a day of triumph and joy for which indeed we thank God and take courage,” (Gibbson, 1973:67). According to this biography, the process of Bernard Mzeki being designated as a martyr is very silent.

Furthermore, according to Gibbson (1973:98) in 1947, Rhodesia had a Royal visit by King George VI and Queen Elizabeth with the two Princesses who added Salisbury, Bulawayo and the Victoria Falls to their long South Africa tour immediately after the war. The King and Queen visited the Cathedral and Mass was celebrated by the Bishop. In Victoria Falls, there was an exhibition of African Art which was arranged at Government House, Salisbury, showing work done at Cyrene, St Faith’s and other Missions. Queen Elizabeth was so deeply impressed that she made time in a very tight programme to visit Cyrene while the Royal party was in Bulawayo. There was no mention of the Bernard Mzeki Shrine and his conferment of martyrdom to the Royal house. Conferment was only done to him which came three years later, in 1950, when he completed the 25- year of his episcopate. He was made a Companion of the Order of the British Empire.

Ranger (1987:158) gave a brief account as mentioned above in reference to how Christians at the time came back to commemorate the anniversary of the death of Bernard. The brief account was that in 1899, there was a foundation of a boy’s school called Bernard Mzeki College. At this college boys were educated within the Christian spirituality which Bernard Mizeki stood for. Later missionaries identified the site of the martyrdom, planted a cross and memorialized his death with an annual service on June 18. After more investigation of the site in the early 1930s, another white Anglican cleric established shrine. According to Ranger (1987:167), the ground of the Shrine was consecrated on the 18- of June, 1938 before a large congregation assembled and a cross was dedicated by Bishop Paget. In essence, one can cite these events to
be understood as to symbolize how the martyrdom was conferred to the late catechist, Bernard Mzeki but with no clear Anglican order of martyrdom conferment procedure being stated or played out on the occasion. Below is the picture of the late Bernard Mzeki.

**Bernard Mzeki from Musodza (2008: 81, Anglican Diocese of Harare Archives)**

**The St Bernard Mzeki tapestry**

The tapestry picture for the commemoration of Bernard Mzeki, Catechist and Martyr in Mashonaland, are published on the Lectionary Page website.

The tapestry depicted above was embroidered by the Marondera Women’s Institute. The central panel depicts Bernard catechizing the catechumens. The upper border depicts the scene of his martyrdom, while the lower border depicts pilgrims coming to the shrine later erected on the site of his kitchen hut. The motif to the left depicts the triumph of the Cross over the witchdoctor’s bones. The image is taken from the Rhodesian Tapestry website, together with the following collect. Below is the collect:

**The Collect**

Almighty and everlasting God, who kindled the flame of your love in the heart of your holy martyr Bernard Mizeki: Grant to us, your humble servants, a like faith and power of love, that we who rejoice in his triumph may profit by his example; Through Jesus Christ our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.

4.10.2 Naming of Institutions after Bernard Mzeki.

Church leadership have named institutions and Chapels after this illustrious Son of Africa to show the central place that Bernard Mzeki occupies in the life of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and indeed in the entire Anglican Communion. Farrant (1966:243) recorded a section of memorials of items, chapels, altars and institutions which are named in memory of Bernard Mzeki. There are as follows:

1) A shrine in Marondera on the scene of Bernard’s death.
2) A concrete cross on Mangwende Mountain, overlooking the Shrine, Marondera, Zimbabwe.
3) The Bernard Mzeki College on the site of the old Bernard Mzeki Mission.
4) A stained glass window in the Bernard Mzeki’s Chapel, Cathedral of St Mary and All Saints, Harare, Zimbabwe.
5) A reliquary in the St Philip’s Church, Chapel Street, Cape Town.
6) An Altar in St Cyprian’s Church, Langa, Cape Town, inscribed, ‘Bernard Mzeki sitandaze, meaning, Bernard Mzeki, pray for us.’
7) A reliquary in St Michael and All Angels, Mbare, in Harare, Zimbabwe.
8) A Parish of Bernard the Martyr in Atteridgeville, Pretoria, South Africa.
9) A Parish of Bernard Mzeki the Martyr in Phokwane, Botswana.
10) A small stained glass window, part of the greater window, in St George’s Cathedral, Cape Town, South Africa.
11) A carved candle-stick, one of the pair in the Lady’s Chapel in St George’s Cathedral, Cape Town (one candlestick represents Bernard Mzeki, the Martyr of Mashonaland and the other represent Manche Masemola, the fifteenth year old girl martyr of Sekukuneland, 1928, who was also raised up under God by the Cowley Fathers.
12) A mural painting of Bernard Mzeki done by Canon Edward Peterson in the Parish of St Cyrene, near Bulawayo, Zimbabwe.
13) The Bernard Mzeki School in Esizibeni, Usuthu, Swaziland.
14) A stained glass window in the Parish of St Patrick’s and All Saints, in Kadoma, Zimbabwe.
16) A carved head of Bernard Mzeki by Job Kekana in Rhodesia House in London, UK
17) The inclusion of Bernard Mzeki’s name in the Church Calendar of the Church of the Province of South Africa and of the Church of the Province of Central Africa.
18) The acceptance by the Dean and Chapter of St Paul’s Cathedral, London of Bernard Mzeki’s name for the new Modern Martyr’s Chapel planned as part of the work of restoration.
19) 65 photographic slides in colour of Bernard Mzeki made by Roy Creeth, Nigel Morgan and Father Robin Burnett.

Ewbank (1991:13) recorded the dedication of the side chapel on the 16- of June, 1991 which was named the Chapel of Bernard Mzeki in the St John’s Cathedral, Anglican Diocese of Matebeleland in Bulawayo. (See the picture in Appendix)
In addition to all that, Robert (2009:168) wrote that Anglican men in South Africa also founded a fellowship of men which is also named after Bernard Mzeki. This group was also introduced in Zimbabwe especially in the Diocese of Harare and is growing phenomenally. The fundamental ethos of the group is to live out the values espoused by Bernard Mzeki which is a life of love, integrity and service as well as a life that is Christ centred.

4.10.3 The Bernard Mzeki Men’s Guild.

In South Africa, Anglican leaders founded a Bernard Mzeki Guild in 1973 (Nolly and Nystrom, 2011:27). The purpose of the Guild was to provide an Anglican meeting place for migrant workers coming into South Africa who found Anglican worship confining and so were drifting off to Methodist or African Independent or initiated Churches (AICs). The guild, with its lay-led, informal, worker-friendly environment, spread rapidly. The founding principles of the guild can be summarized below as contained in the guiding objectives. The same aims and objectives are similar to those of the same Guild in Zimbabwe. The aims and objectives of the Guild are highlighted below:

1. To promote and encourage the participation and nurturing of men’s leadership in the life of the Anglican Church;
2. To proclaim the Kingdom of God as manifested in Jesus Christ, by:
   2.1 Encouraging the participation and nurturing of boys in the life of the Church;
   2.2 Encouraging Bible studies and faith sharing;
   2.3 Practicing stewardship.
   2.4 Doing visitations, seeking out the sick and practicing the ministry of healing.
   2.5 Being involved in the affairs of the community.
   2.6 Promoting fellowship amongst the Anglican communities.
   2.7 Imitating Christ daily (Roberts, 2009:168).

4.11 The Bernard Mzeki Shrine as a Tourist Attraction.

(zimfieldguide.com/mashonaland-east/bernard-mzeki-shrine) highlights the historic and cultural and wildlife in Zimbabwe. This includes the Bernard Mzeki Shrine of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and the region. It traces the history of the shrine and up to date in this manner for the purposes of Tourism; The Mzeki Shrine was built after Manzondera along the Harare-Mutare road which was constructed for the purpose of commemorating the life of this
great African Christian icon. Below are the details pertaining its religious and tourist relevance that draws people to the place every year.

4.11.1 Why the people visit the Shrine?

- The place of Bernard Mzeki’s death has become a focus of great devotion for Anglican Community in Zimbabwe and other Christians and one of the greatest of all Christian festivals in Africa takes place there every year around the feast day that marks the anniversary of his martyrdom, June 18.
- The shrine reminds us of the conflict between traditional culture and Christian beliefs which led to the death of this now-famous martyr in June, 1896.
- His legacy is the Bernard Mizeki College which has educated and instilled good qualities of character and leadership in thousands of young men since its establishment in 1959. Today the College stands close to where he lived and the Mangwende's kraal, above the village, is crowned with a large cross to commemorate Bernard Mzeki.

4.11.2 How to get to the Location of the Shrine.

Take the Mutare Road from Harare, drive through Marondera and continue along the A3 Mutare Road for 15.5 KM. Turn left into Theydon Road signposted Davis Granite and Bernard Mzeki 10 KM; 16.9 KM cross the railway line and turn right at the signpost - Tsindi National Monument 11.5 KM. At 25.6 KM reach the Bernard Mizeki Shrine on your right.

GPS reference: 18°06′23.75″E 31°41′21.99″E

4.11.3 Brief History of Bernard Mzeki.

(zimfieldguide.com/mashonaland-east/bernard-mzeki-shrine) captured a brief background of the Bernard Mzeki for the purposes of the Tourists to have a better understanding and appreciate his life ministry, death and influence today, In January 1891, Bernard Mzeki accompanied the new Bishop of Mashonaland, GWH Knight-Bruce, as a lay catechist among the Shona people in Zimbabwe (then Rhodesia) He began ministry in the Marondera district among the Nhowe people, and settled in the kraal of Mangwende Mungati. He built his home there and took people into his home to teach them the gospel. In March 1896, the catechist married Mutwa (later named ‘Lily’), an orphaned granddaughter of the Mangwende and a Christian convert.

Although he had the chief's permission to move to a sacred grove believed to be inhabited by spirits of the tribe’s ancestors; he angered the local religious leaders, the níngas when he cut some of the trees down and carved crosses into others. Although he opposed some local traditional religious customs, Mzeki was very attentive to the nuances of the Shona Spirit religion. He developed an approach that built on people's already monotheistic faith in one God, Mwari, and on their sensitivity to spirit life, while at the same time he forthrightly proclaimed the Jesus Christ. Over the next five years (1891-1896), the mission at Mangwende produced many converts.

Meredith (1866-1942) who led Theodore Bent (author of Ancient Ruins of Mashonaland) and his wife to Great Zimbabwe in 1891 and then Beira wrote the following when they arrived at the village of Chief Mangwende:

The kraal of Chief Mangwende was situated on top of a high hill. At the foot of the hill was a mission station of the Church of England run by a Delagoa Bay native named Bernard Mizika Maniyele, a man I was to see a lot of later. There was also a trading station belonging to the British South Africa Company and being run by a British South
African policeman named James Bennett, a big and rather rough chap who I was also to see a lot of later. The mission station was only two huts of pole and dagga. It had belonged to the notorious Portuguese trader Goveya who had fled on the advent of the British South Africa Company’s forces (zimfieldguide.com/mashonaland-east/bernard-mzeki-shrine).

Despite Mzeki’s approach, many African nationalists regarded all missionaries as working for the European colonial governments and during the First Chimurenga of 1896/7, Bernard was warned to flee. He refused because he did not regard himself as working for anyone but Christ and he would not desert his converts, or his post. Below are two pictures of where Bernard washed his wounds after he was speared and the other one is the location where he disappeared. Bernard Mzeki’s work among the Shona people bore fruit and the first Shona convert to be baptized was one of the young men whom Bernard had taught: John Kapuya. Kapuya was baptized only a month after Bernard’s death, on 18 July 1896 and his grave is close to the shrine. Bernard Mzeki is revered as a hero of the faith in Africa. His anniversary day, 18 June, is regarded as an important day in the Christian calendar. Over 30,000 pilgrims are known to make the journey to his shrine along with the Church hierarchy from Zimbabwe and in the region.

In 1891, Bishop Knight Bruce pegged a large area near the shrine area including Chief Mangwende's kraal in the name of the Mashonaland Diocese. In 1899 Archdeacon Upcher built an office and an Anglican boarding school for African boys. In 1936, Father Edwin Crane who was the priest in charge of Marondera Anglican Churches, found the site of Bernard's martyrdom and the collapsed ruins of his hut. He was assured by elders in the area that this was indeed the hut that Bernard Mzeki, the catechist was sleeping in on the night he was assassinated. It had a hole in the floor where he used to keep his money beneath his sleeping mat which can still be seen today.

Canon Robert Grinham, then headmaster of Ruzawi School, was asked by Bishop Paget to build a permanent shrine. Father Edward Crane built a suspended floor above the original floor of the hut. The building of the shrine was organized by R.J. Saunders, then Estate Manager at Ruzawi School. Canon R. Grinham supervised the whole project. Father Crane made the bricks and they were given as a gift to the people of St. Bernard's Mission. Pillars were made from gum trees and wings added to the hut to improve the design and to screen the area behind the shrine. Construction was completed in 1937. The shrine was consecrated by Bishop Paget on Bernard’s Day on 18th June 1938, with Governor Sir Herbert Stanley and many guests present. Below is the picture of the Shrine and the Caretaker Mr Lauden Geoffrey.

On the hill across the valley where Bernard Mizeki's assassins had lighted a fire on the night of 17th June 1896 as a sign that the time to kill the catechist had come, a white cross was erected by Father Crane made of iron sheets and painted white. In 1946, the year of the fiftieth anniversary celebrations, this was replaced by a new cross of reinforced concrete which was carried to the top of the hill by Father Stowell and dominates the valley to this day. The new cross can be seen from the shrine. After the Zimbabwe's independence in 1980, pilgrimages to Mzeki's Shrine became popular attracting large crowds and consistent with the Shona tradition of travel to sacred places. Below is a picture that shows how the interior of the shrine which was built on top of the kitchen hut of the late Bernard Mzeki.

4. 12 Conclusion.

The intention of this chapter was to put together all academic secondary sources that recorded the life ministry of the catechist, Bernard Mzeki, his mystical death and his influence after. From the secondary sources available, it was important to trace his arrival in Mangwende Chiefdom together with other catechists and Bishop Knight Bruce. His catechetical ministry was closely examined, especially his ability to associate himself quickly with the Shona people in terms of learning to speak the Shona language. He proved this further by marrying one of
the local girls Mutwa who was a relative to the Chief. He established a mission and converted a reasonable of the local catechumens. His first convert was John Kapuya. He was called umfundisi, which means teacher. He used his gifts of music and medicine to reach out and because of his effectiveness in ministry, he created enemies with the local indigenous religious authoritarianism who saw him as a threat to the fabric ethos of the African people. Muchemwa, one of the Chief Mangwende’s sons hated him to death. They plotted to kill him. It was important to show in this chapter that Bernard was murdered in 1896/7 the same time of the Chimurenga War. He was murdered on the 18th of June, 1896. His corpse was never found which made his death very mystical and controversial. It was paramount to show that his commemorations started officially under the bishopric of Bishop Edward Paget. Importantly, the main issue of the study, the issue of conferment, history is very silent. Since then the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe converges annually to celebrate his martyrdom. There are shrines, institutions, parishes and chapels named after the historical figure of Bernard Mzeki. It was significant to report that the Bernard Mzeki Shrine became a place of a religious battle during the five year (2007 – 2012) period of schism in the Anglican Diocese of Harare between CPCA of Bishop Gandiya and APZ of Archbishop Kunonga. It was a fight for control and political power. It was of interest to trace how the programme of the Bernard Mzeki commemorations have changed over the years. Contemporary historians’ sources were very helpful in offering contemporary secondary data on this issue. It was important too to reveal that the Bernard Mzeki Shrine has been commercialized and is now a tourist attraction. In the next chapter, the researcher shall focus on the primary sources of this investigation.
Chapter Five  Presentation of Primary Data Findings on Mzeki’s Ministry, Identity, martyrdom, commemoration and influence.

5.1 Introduction.

The intention of this chapter is to present primary source findings on the person of Bernard Mzeki and his ministry in the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, (Rhodesia – Zimbabwe) from the period under study as mentioned before (1892 up to 2013). Basically, the chapter shall present primary data from questionnaires which were distributed to the seminarians at Bishop Gaul Theological College, priests from the five Diocese in Zimbabwe and the local parish at the Bernard Mzeki College, Marondera. Interviews were done with key informants who are Anglican Bishops in Zimbabwe, Vicar Generals, Deans of cathedrals of Dioceses, priests and the laity from the five Dioceses in Zimbabwe, and beyond the borders of the nation who are officially known as custodians of the ethos of Anglicanism, its beliefs and traditions. A few academic consultants were interviewed too as key informants. In particular, the Diocesan Bishops are the custodians of the canons and Acts of their Dioceses which are the rules and regulations of the church respectively. Primary data was gathered around the same sub topics which are also used in gathering secondary information; which is on the catechistical ministry Bernard Mzeki in the Mangwende Village, the controversies surrounding his death, his commemorations at the shrine and finally, his influence after his death.

5.2 Analysis of the findings from the questionnaire respondents.

Table 5.2.1 Questionnaire respondents by number and location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theological seminarians</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bishop Gaul Theological College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Priests</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Zimbabwean Anglican Dioceses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laity from local Parish</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bernard Mzeki College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows how the research questionnaire was distributed. The questionnaire was distributed to a total of 100 Anglicans. They were all in different locations and categories. First, 20 questionnaires were distributed to seminarians. Seminarians are student priests in training and are all from different Dioceses in Zimbabwe. The seminary is called Bishop Gaul Theological College which is located in Mt Pleasant in Harare, the capital city. It is an Anglican institution. Second, 50 questionnaires were distributed to 10 priests/clergy from each Diocese which includes the Anglican Dioceses of Harare, Manicaland, Matebeleland, Central Zimbabwe and Masvingo. This was done so, in order to get representation from all the Anglican Dioceses in Zimbabwe who have knowledge regarding Bernard Mzeki. Last, 30 questionnaires were distributed to the laity/parishioners of St Bernard College. These were assumed to have had information because of their proximity to the Shrine and the College. They are also well informed of the life and history of the late Bernard Mzeki. Furthermore, they are knowledgeable of the legendary and mythical stories which are still being shared orally in the communities which are established near the Bernard Mzeki Shrine.
The above figure highlights the gender of all the 100 respondents who participated in the questionnaire primary data collection. Four quarters of the total number of respondents were male and one quarter were women. This is because all the seminarians and priests in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe are males. It is important to mention that the Church of the Province of Central Africa has not allowed women to participate in the ordained ministry of priesthood as in other provinces worldwide. The 20 respondents were mainly women from the local parish at the Bernard Mzeki College.

The above figure shows the ages of the respondents. 40 were the majority of participants who were mainly from the clergy from different dioceses who were from between the ages of 41
and 50 years. 30 respondents were those who were between the ages of 18 to 40. They were much from the seminarians and a few were from the priests/clergy. Twenty were from the ages between 51 and 60 years old who were from the members of the clergy and a few from the local parish of Bernard Mzeki College. The remaining 10 respondents were mainly elderly women who are parishioners from the local Anglican Church at the Mzeki College.

TABLE 5.2.2 Years of being a full member in the Anglican Church.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period in years</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above is a table that illustrates the years of respondents’ period as full members in the Anglican Church. Five participants were more than 61 years old in the church. Fifteen respondents were between 51 and 60 years old as full members of the church. Ten were between the ages of 41 and 50 years as full parishioners of the Anglican Church. Between 31 and 40 were 16 respondents. Nine participants were between the period of 11 and 20 years old as full members of the church. The majority of respondents who were 25 were between 10 years old as full parishioners of the Anglican Church.
The above is a figure that highlights the knowledge of the respondents of the life and history of Bernard Mzeki. All 100 participants responded in the questionnaires and demonstrated that they were generally knowledgeable about the life and history of the late Bernard Mzeki, the person under study.

**Table 5.2.3 Respondents’ Knowledge and appreciation of the death and martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ awareness of the mysterious death of BM</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of cause of the death of BM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ appreciation of martyrdom in the Anglican Church</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was he fit to be a martyr?</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can he be compared with other martyrs in the Church?</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above demonstrates the respondents’ knowledge and appreciation of the death and martyrdom of the late Bernard Mzeki. On the respondents’ awareness of the mysterious death of Bernard Mzeki, 10 showed unawareness and 90 showed that they were aware. Fifty-five participants showed ignorance on the knowledge of the cause of the death of Bernard Mzeki. But 45 respondents demonstrated that they were aware of the cause of the figure under investigation. All the respondents showed in the questionnaire that they appreciated the theological understanding of martyrdom of the Anglican Church. When asked whether Bernard Mzeki fulfilled the qualifications for martyrdom four over five respondents agreed and one over five disagreed. Ninety participants of the questionnaire concurred that Mzeki could be compared with other martyrs of the Anglican Church but 10 respondents showed that he was incomparable with other martyrs of the church.
Table 5.2.4 What Qualifies One To Be A Martyr?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priest or non-priest who dies while on church business</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest or non-priest who is killed because of their belief</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest who refuse to denounce Christianity</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to cooperate with the political government</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table highlights the qualifications of one to be a martyr. 80 respondents that if a priest or non-priest who dies while on church business can qualify to be a martyr. And 90 participants showed that if a priest or non-priest is killed because of their belief, he/she may qualify to martyrdom. Fifty agreed that one be a martyr if he/she is killed because of refusing to denounce Christianity. Twenty-five respondents showed that one can qualify to be a martyr when he/she is killed because he/she has resisted to cooperate with the government of the day.

Table 5.2.5 Knowledge of The authority of who conferred the martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you know who conferred the martyrdom on BM</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table illustrate the respondents’ knowledge on the authority of who conferred the martyrdom of the late Bernard Mzeki. Ninety-five participants showed that they were totally ignorance of the issue of conferment of Bernard Mzeki and who had the authority to do so. Only 5 respondents demonstrated that they had knowledge on the subject of conferment of Mzeki.

Fig. 5.2.4 Respondents’ Knowledge Of Institution Named After Bernard Mzeki.
The above figure illustrates the respondents’ knowledge on the institutions which have been named after the Bernard Mzeki. There was hundred percent of the respondents who demonstrated the knowledge of institution named after Mzeki.

Table 5.2.6 Knowledge of the other contributing factors to the Death of Bernard Mzeki.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think were contributing factors to Bernard Mzeki’s death</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was caused by early political uprisings in the period he operated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was a victim of the social conflicts in his time</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was a victim of the economic challenges and disgruntlement</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above is a table that shows the respondents’ knowledge of other factors that contributed to the death of the Bernard Mzeki. Fifty-five participants agreed that the early political upraising of the 1st Chimurenga contributed to the death of Mzeki but 45 respondents did not agree. All 65 respondents concurred that Mzeki was a victim of the social conflicts of his time and day. 35 participants thought otherwise. On the factor of Mzeki being a victim of the economic challenges and disgruntlement of the late 1800s, 73 respondents agreed that he was indeed a victim but 27 disagreed.

Table 5.2.7 Can we say the Bernard Mzeki shrine in Marondera has been very influential on the spirituality of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, the Province and the entire Anglican Communion, worldwide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows is an answer of the question whether Bernard Mzeki and the shrine named after him have been influence to the spirituality of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe,
Province and the Anglican Communion, worldwide. All the respondents in total agreed without any reasonable doubt that indeed Bernard Mzeki has influenced the spirituality of the Anglican community in Zimbabwe, Province and in the Communion.

5.3 Findings from the interviews from key informants.

5.3.1 Onset of Bernard Mzeki’s religious and social activities in the Mangwende Village.

The Anglican Church in Zimbabwe confirmed that Bernard Mzeki was a real historical figure and not a mythical or legendary person. Outstandingly, Rev Gowera, (interview, Marondera, 18/06/2016, 11:35), a woman priest, a Zimbabwean, currently serving in the Anglican Diocese of Limpopo, South Africa, who is one of the granddaughters in law to Bernard Mzeki said proudly in an interview that he originated from Mozambique, Inyambani – Gwambeni region, about 80 miles away Maputo, the Capital city of Mozambique. She also added that “Bernard was born in Mozambique and it is not questionable like what some Americans questioned whether president Obama was American or not in his second term of presidential office.” It is important to cite that there was no one who questioned his origins in any quest for that information. Everyone agreed without any reasonable doubt that the man under study was indeed a born in Mozambique. The researcher, by observation had an opportunity to visit Gwambeni – Inyambani twice in Mozambique in 2009 and 2012 where the Anglican Community in Mozambique has also established a Bernard Mzeki Shrine in the rural area where he was born. It was a privilege to meet his relative of the third generation sharing the oral stories of their relative passed on to them by their grandparents. The researcher, therefore, had a personal experience of observation as he attempted to dig deep on the person under study. It is important to cite that the remaining 4% from this inquiry were mainly from the African Initiated Churches and Pentecostals who revealed that they had no knowledge of Bernard Mzeki’s birth place. They only declared their knowledge about the Shrine named after him in Marondera, Zimbabwe and that in June annually where Anglicans visit to worship. This shall be discussed later in this chapter.

All the key informants confirmed that he travelled to South African in the company of an elderly person at the age of twelve years and started working some piece jobs. After some few years, he joined an Anglican night school where he eventually received his calling to serve God. After graduating as a catechist from the Anglican school in South Africa, he accompanied Bishop George Wyndham Knight-Bruce to Mashonaland, in Zimbabwe, formerly known as Rhodesia through Mozambique together with other black catechists. They affirmed that he came to work as a lay catechist and a medical worker. Outstandingly, Anglican academic consultants, Mzembe P (Interview, Harare, 11/01/2016, 12:25) and Gunda M (Interview, Harare, 12/01/2016, 10:00) in separate interviews, reiterated that in 1891 the bishop assigned him to Nhowe, the village of paramount-chief Mangwende- Mungati, in Marandellas, now present day Marondera district and there he built a mission-station. Rev Dzawo (interview, Harare, 21/02/2016, 14:30), the Diocesan secretary in the Diocese of Harare, drawing from the archival section of the Diocesan offices confirmed that Bernard prayed the Anglican hours each day. He also tended his subsistence garden, studied the local language, Shona which he mastered better than any other foreigner in his day in a very short period. This was not a surprise since he was a linguistic in languages in South Africa. Because of this, according to Gunda, he said “his ability to speak Shona earned him two things. Number one – Bernard would travel to Mutare where the Diocesan Mashonaland offices were established by Bishop Bruce upon arrival and help out with translations of English religious materials into the local Shona language. Number two – he sometimes served as an official translator in the civil and high
Bernard Mzeki started his ministry by cultivating friendships with the villagers. According to Rev Dzawo, he eventually started teaching about religious Christian life, and won the hearts of many of the Shona through his love for their children. Notably, he said, “Mzeki won John Kapuya who is well known as one of his best students and catechumens.” All the respondents from the Anglican community in Zimbabwe agreed that he also took children who wanted to learn into his home to teach them the gospel, Bernard threw himself wholeheartedly into efforts to convert the villagers to Christ. The Mangwende people were peace loving people who enjoyed singing, dancing and a variety of games. Bernard is said to have built a mission complex near Nyakambiri river in Mangwende. He learned to speak Shona and became friends with the villagers; children loved him. He used his skill of singing, music and instruments to woo people to the mission. In addition, he taught people the Word of God, subsistence farming, rearing animals, singing, music and instrument playing. Such qualities were believed by the by the same respondents mentioned above to have been Bernard’s major strengths among the locals at the time. The Chief and his family also used to attend the prayers which were held at the mission morning and afternoon according to revelations from retired and former Bishop of the Diocese of Harare, Zimbabwe, the Right Rev Peter Ralph Hatendi, (Interview, Harare, 26/03/2016, 9:00)

With eloquent teachings and possibly coupled with ability to sustain a stable life for his followers from the earnings he received from translation work at courts and texts, he was able to grow a reasonably large followership within a short space of time according to the Right Rev Eric Ruwona (Interview, Mutare, 13/04/2016, 12:05), Bishop of the Diocese of Manicaland, Zimbabwe.

According to Rev Dzawo, Mzeki’s efficiency in languages can be traced to his time in South Africa. He became good with languages which included English, French, Dutch, and at least 8 local languages. He said Bernard was a linguist who proved invaluable in assisting to translate the Anglican Church’s text into African languages. Bernard is also credited with assisting von Blomberg with church work, mainly teaching and interpreting the sermons. He worked diligently and with all his might that his work was noticed and as a result a recommendation was given for him to join Zonnebloen College, even though he lacked education, was slow and shy.

5.4 Factors that contributed to Bernard Mzeki’s death.

The researcher observed that most of the Anglican laity were found wanting in the factors that may have contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki. All of their responses all alluded to the general assumption that Bernard Mzeki died because of his religious faith in God. Yet other respondents from the top leadership of the church and the academics thought otherwise. Other factors including political, social, religious and economic that might have contributed to his mysterious death were raised. These factors shall be looked at below.

5.4.1 The Political Factors.

A question was asked to inquire whether there was a political factor which contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki. According to the Right Rev Erick Ruwona, the current bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Manicaland, Zimbabwe, said Bernard Mzeki lived at a time when Africa
was undergoing colonization. The indigenous people resented the intrusion of foreigners. During this period, the gospel of Jesus Christ was being preached alongside white people who had many interests. One of them was the political imperial interest. It was difficult to make a clear distinction between the roles of missionaries as part of the colonization agenda or as a team with a completely different motive who had coincidentally just arrived at the same time with colonizers under the banner of the Pioneer Column but with clear desire to serve Christ and not the Queen of England. Missionaries claimed that their purpose was the provision of education to enhance evangelization of the Africans in Africa. The education was intended to enable Africans to read the scriptures for themselves. Yet, an interrogation of missionary activities revealed that their activities went beyond mere evangelization. They were also political. The question that arose was then is; how did Africans respond to Christian missionaries’ activities. Importantly, the African communities in Zimbabwe were guided by the political philosophy of the Rev Mbiti of *hunhu/Ubuntu* which means we are because I belong. It was this political philosophy that informed Africans’ political and educational institutions.

The Right Rev Sebastian Bakare (Interview, Harare, 13/04/2016, 14:05), former bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Manicaland, Zimbabwe, agreed with bishop Ruwona in that there were many factors, one being political, that contributed to Mzeki’s demise (See Appendix 3). Bishop declared that Bernard Mzeki was a foreigner and therefore he was a white man incarnate. He vehemently said, “They saw Bernard Mzeki as a political messenger representing the white people… therefore that spirit of nationalism could not be ruled out because he was seen as an Uncle Tom representing whites.”

The very Rev Austin July (Interview, Gweru, 10/05/2016, 11:00), Dean of the Diocese of Central Zimbabwe, also agreed that by saying, Yes, indeed the political factor cannot be ruled out considering that human beings are political by nature. They don’t think outside the politics of today. So I believe the political situation of the day had influence to the native people and I remember those were those were the very times of colonizat...
also murdered during the same period. The locals had become anti-white establishment due to the loss of their lands being taken by whites by force. Any African and foreigner associated with the white establishment including missionaries was targeted as political enemies and the sentence was a painful death. Canon Makwasha reiterated:

As an academic, I think the Church played politics to some extent and contributed to his death. Why do I say so because Bernard Mzeki is coming in Zimbabwe during the same time with the Pioneer Column. Coming in as a missionary the people who brought him were whites who accompanied him to Murehwa District. If you look at it now when the pioneer column came, the church was at the upfront to evangelize but they came with the pioneer and one could not separate the evangelical activities from the activities of the colonizers. We can describe them as two sides of the same coin. The coloniser’s activities were also different from the church’s activities. The church was going on its direction and so was the pioneer column. But they finally came together simultaneously. Now, if you look at that the Shona black people may have mistakenly described Bernard Mzeki as one of the colonisers even though the missions of the missionaries and colonisers were different. Even though he was not on the colonising side some local people could not understand that except for the chief because we heard that he won the heart of the chief, his family and few individuals in the community. The other people took him as a person who did not come for the gospel but for other reasons. Hence, they murdered him.

According to the Very Rev Mutamiri (Interview, Harare, 28/04/2016, 09:10), Dean at the Cathedral of St Mary’s and All Saints in the Anglican Diocese of Harare, Zimbabwe, had this to say:

We cannot rule out that during which is around 1896 and the years that followed, anything that had a colonial flavour would be regarded as against all fabrics of life of the Zimbabwean people. So one would not rule out the fact that it had something to do with the political situation. This contributed and led to his demise.

The Right Rev Chad Gandiya (Interview, Harare, 11/03/2016, 10:00), Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Harare, Zimbabwe argued from a different political perspective. He claimed that Bernard Mzeki was actually a political victim. He said that Mzeki was a good person, but he was a victim of the political environment that he lived in (See Appendix 3). Furthermore, his argument was that for nationalists and those who had independence or anti-imperialists agenda, Mzeki was the epitome, if not the representative of the white colonial interests. For the natives, so to speak, could not distinguish the difference between missionaries and colonialists or imperialists, and what they saw was the colour of the skin in what they were doing. In this particular interest, Bernard Mzeki was brought into their midst by none other than the same white missionaries, Bishop Knight Bruce in particular. Obviously because of canonical obedience and many others Bernard Mzeki reported directly to the same missionaries and if he were to choose between the community and the missionaries, he would prefer what the missionaries do. On the other hand, you can never understand properly the death of Bernard Mzeki if you do not put it in the context of the Shona uprising 1896 and 1897, when the Shona really attempted the first uprising against the imperialists resulting in the death of Mbuya Nehanda and Sekuru Kaguvi. Therefore, according to Bishop Chad Gandiya, Mzeki’s death could not be separated from the first Chimurenga of the late eighteenth century.

Bishop Erick Ruwona attempted to describe the political context of the day in these words, “So suddenly you have somebody in your village who represents the very whites, whether they are missionary or imperialists and to the community, Bernard Mzeki was ‘white.’ He represented the whites and it was the whites they were fighting. You cannot dissociate that from his death. Generally, how could our people refuse God as Professor John Mbiti says, this Anglican from East Africa, ‘Africans are notoriously religious,’ and their notoriety for religion is well documented. How could they say no to God? They were saying no to a God who came to annex
their land, a god who came to look down upon them, look down upon their leadership structures and polity and look down upon everything they believed in. I think we can safely say I suspect the Shona felt compromised by the arrival of these missionaries. I cannot blame these missionaries because according to David Livingstone who was really influential in defining the missionary agenda and colonial agenda which were difficult to separate because they were promoting the three C’s; Christianity, Commerce and Civilisation. What did civilisation mean? It meant imposing a superior culture, a superior belief system, a superior everything and it necessarily meant that the Africans were backward and uncivilised and so forth. It is that view that irked the locals of Mangwende to resist. What surprises me is that chief Mangwende was not as critical of Bernard Mzeki as his sons who turned others and his team, he was more accommodating and more understanding. It begs the question, are we dealing with a chief here who sold out or a chief who did not understand the political situation of his time? Or are we dealing with somebody who was too old to comprehend these things? I am not sure but it is something worth pursuing to see why there were these divergences in terms of views. A fact that can never be disputed is the fact that the politics of the day played a major part in the death of Bernard Mzeki. That is why even after his death it took weeks before information reached his superiors because of the war that was raging that time. So did Bernard Mzeki purely die because of his religious work or religious beliefs or he was a victim of a political conflict that was brewing? That I cannot say, but I think a bit of both.”

In support of the political influence that resulted in the death of Mzeki in Mangwende village, the right Rev Clopus Lunga, (Interview, Bulawayo, 11/05/2016, 12:30), bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Bulawayo, Zimbabwe, said that they were mixed views that had been expressed about the death of Bernard Mzeki. As alluded to earlier views, one extreme and outstanding political view which he subscribed to was that Bernard was seen as a collaborator, traitor, a sell-out and an accomplice in the colonisation of Zimbabwe in the eyes of the indigenous people. Hence, there was no need to blame them when they ultimately decided to kill him.

According to the Right Rev Ralph Hatendi, after being asked whether Mzeki died because of a political reason, he responded by declaring that paradoxically, it was yes and no. He started by saying that the late eighteenth century was an interesting period, extremely interesting. According to him, a lot of political turmoil was evident about that time 1895/96/97 (See Appendix 3). There were things that were happening which in his own opinion caused the death of Bernard Mzeki. He said

The thing that caught my attention according to my assessment of the situation was that this was not the First Chimurenga War as the propaganda of one political party say it this time around. Historically, this has to be corrected. Again history has to be rewritten. The First Chimurenga War was in the west in Bulawayo by the Ndebele tribe in 1893. This was the first upraising, a direct opposition against white settlers which brought up the death of Lobengula. This therefore is the First Chimurenga War I am now talking within the context of Bernard Mzeki. This actually marked the beginning of the events that contributed to the death of the Bernard. The Ndebele people were defeated and crushed because of poor weapons and so forth. The king of the Ndebele, Lobengula was murdered but the political spirit which caused his death did not die. It was a physical defeat but not a spiritual defeat. Communication of the upraising as from the west flew as it were by the wind, going to the North of Bulawayo. It was that wind of change which grew into what became the revolution.”

In Bishop Hatendi assessment of the matter under discussion, the whole feeling and understanding was land issue which had been annexed by the white settlers which was never to be returned again was part of the wind of transformation. Therefore, to get back the land, the Ndebele and the Shona had to join together and fight for it. The wind grew amongst the Shona as well. According to Hatendi;
But we should have not forget that the first fighting of the land began in the west and this is why am saying you have to convince me to call the 1895-96 the First Chimurenga War. It was a continuation of a wind of change and as you are aware the first fights and so forth also came from the west towards the north and Bernard Mzeki was not spared. As I said before, mid-1890s was a strange time, it was not only that the political wind of change there are other phenomena which makes me wonder why one of them was a political disease. There was a political cloud hovering over this country about the same time and Bernard Mzeki was caught up in that as well.

Gunda strongly noted that the respect afforded to whites, the desire to see them settling comfortably on the basis of Ubuntu/hunhu which meant - I am because I belong - was misconstrued as an opportunity by ignorant westerner’s desire to grab an opportunity to politically control the African people. However, in response there were some natives who treated the white intruders with political suspicion. They felt that the missionaries and the colonisers were one party, seeking one objective, to subdue the local Shona people. They felt their objective had to be achieved peacefully through preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ to gain political mileage. The white missionaries placed emphasis on exaggerated Futuristic Eschatology to solicit voluntary submission to the whims of the slave masters preaching on the New Testament biblical verses like Ephesians 6:5 and exegetically interpreting it out of context to the African people who could neither read, write nor interpret scriptures of an alien religion of Christianity. And Mzeki was quote up in this political web of grabbing all that belonged to the African people of the Soil.

According to Gunda, it was a historical fact that Bernard Mzeki had come to work alongside the white missionary and if the whites were the enemy of the people at that time chances were that Bernard could have also been declared an enemy alongside the people that he worked with but that does not conclude the fact that he was preaching in Mangwende and that his murder may also have been because of his preaching. There was a very strong possibility that one could argue for either Bernard being exclusively was killed for preaching or that he was one of the victims of the political upheavals of the 1st Chimurenga or the he may have been killed because of a bit of both.

Musodza (Interview, Harare, 19/01/2016, 18:20) had this to say:

The death of Bernard Mzeki is closely intertwined with the first Chimurenga. I say this because Bernard Mzeki was seen as a threat by the local people who were on the verge of losing their land and animals to the European settlers who were colonizing the country. As a polyglot missionary, history has it on record that he was hired by the colonial masters to interpret in some trials that took place at Salisbury. That may have been interpreted as collusion with the colonizers. His close relations with the white missionaries was also not well understood by the local black people as they could not differentiate between colonialists and missionaries. For most of these local people every white man was evil and was to be mistrusted. Therefore, any black person who was seen to be aligned to these whites was not trustworthy. In this sense when the First Chimurenga broke out and Bernard Mzeki became a scapegoat. I believe that Bernard Mzeki was killed more for political reasons than religious. Given what I have stated above his death can therefore not be equated to that of the first century since his death was more about his association with colonizers as mutengesi – sellout, rather than for religious reasons. Of course there are stories about him cutting down trees in the Mangwende grove which is purported to have angered the Mangwende people, but on deeper analysis, there was more to his martyrdom than just religious reasons.

All the respondents and informants to this inquiry whether Bernard Mzeki’s death was fueled by the politics of the day concurred that the missionaries came in the company of the colonizers
and so they were regarded as the enemy, and Bernard Mzeki associated with the enemy of the local people in the perspective of the Chimurenga and so the issues that arose there are issues that affected governance, the whites taking over the established black cooperative governance.

5.4.2 The Social Factors.

An inquiry was made by the researcher to ascertain whether the death of Bernard Mzeki was contributed to by socio-anthropological factors. It is important to cite that much of the responses were made by the top leadership of the church and the academics who had a better understanding and were knowledgeable informed of the sociological context of the person under study.

Bakare noted that Mzeki was a foreigner to the cultural - social fabric of the Shona people of Mangwende in Zimbabwe. He was from Mozambique, assimilated and civilized into the English – British culture in South Africa. And all of a sudden, he was in a different social set up all together in Mangwende. According to Bakare, it was worse when he began to date a local Shona girl, Mutwa who was far younger to him. Bakare had this to say, “I think for me, the real social reasons were two. Firstly, one was the cutting of the sacred tree.” Bishop Bakare cited that chief Mangwende’s totem was Shumba which means Lion. The groove of sacred trees was the grove where the lions would come, rest, drink water and ‘speak’ with the local Shona people, addressing their needs and concerns. The grove was a shrine. The sacred grove of trees was part of a way of life, a social - anthropological system of the Shona Mangwende people. Bernard cut the sacred trees in in the watery grove in order to create space for the new Christian community to plant seeds of rice. According to Bakare, he had no choice. The grove was watery and so very convenient for planting rice. This was also because mid 1890s was a period of famine and hunger. He felt he could assist in alleviating the drought by cutting the trees and planting rice. The Shona people of Mangwende were furious and flabbergasted at Bernard Mzeki’s arrogant behaviour. Bakare claimed that this could have been true in the sense that he had heard the ‘cutting down of the sacred trees story’ from Samuel Munyavi who was Bernard Mzeki’s load carrier at Bernard Mzeki High School in the mid-1940s whilst he was a young student there. Munyavi would visit the school and share his adventures with Bernard Mzeki and other white missionaries which he carried their loads on missionary journeys.

This story was also confirmed and seconded by Magada S (Interview, Mutare, 13/04/2016, 17:05), who was born some few hours later on the day Samuel Munyavi died in Epiphany in Rusape, west of St Faith Mission, Madetere. He was given the name of his uncle on that very day he died. Samuel Magada was told the story by his grandfather, brother to the late Samuel Munyavi that he had tried to discourage Bernard Mzeki to cut the sacred trees but he had vehemently refused. Mzeki had make the sign of the cross and began to remove the trees from the grove, the Shumba - Lion shrine. According to Magada, it was not only his uncle Munyavi who tried to stop him from cutting the sacred trees but it was also John Kapuya, his favourite student, Mutwa, his wife and a few catechumens who tried to stop but he refused to listen to their advice. He had declared that God was on his side and nothing wrong would not happen to him. Magada, interestingly said that Mzeki was stubborn, foolish ignorant and disrespectful to the social fabrics of the local Shona Mangwende people. As Bakare and Magada expressed it: this was a grave mistake he made by cutting the sacred trees. This angered the local people. ‘Down with Mzeki’ became a slogan of the day because he had disrespected the totem of the chief and his people by cutting the sacred trees. This therefore contributed to his death from a social point of view, let alone his foolishness and ignorance.

According to Bakare, Bernard Mzeki’s marital relationship with the local girl Mutwa was the second reason why the local Mangwende decided to murder him. It was against the Mangwende
people’s social setup, culture or tradition for a foreigner to marry a local young woman in Mangwende village. Bakare claimed that the chief’s sons, Muchemwa and others were against the relationship of Mutwa, their sister and Mzeki. In the Shona way of life, there is a proverb that says *Rooranai Wematongo* which means that one should marry in the same community in which she/he was brought up. The main reason why this was encouraged was that one would know better the family he/she is marrying, the good and the bad. In addition, knowing the background of the family and their relatives one was marrying was very vital in the decision-making process to marry. Marrying foreigners was strongly discouraged for the fear of marrying a stranger who might have been chased from another community for practising witchcraft or for other reasons. Mzeki was a stranger and a foreigner who was yet to be known fully according to the Chiefs’ sons. Bakare claimed that “no one knew Bernard Mzeki’s character and personality except the white community who had come with him and placed him in the Mangwende Village. This made him more like a stranger and foreigner to the local Shona people. Mzeki was disliked by the Chief’s sons. Mzeki was dating Mutwa, their sister he was a foreigner which was a sudden change to what the social fabric had informed the local community for centuries. Mutwa’s brothers felt angry and furious because Mzeki was taking advantage of his relationship with chief Mangwende. Furthermore, they felt that he was a representative of white imperialism who had come to change the social way of life of the local people – from the cultural dressing, language and so forth up to forcefully taking the African lands from the African people in the name of civilisation. Bernard was dressed up like a white person. He was ‘white,’ according to Muchemwa and his brothers and uncles. Again, they disliked Mzeki because of the new religion of Christianity which he was preaching and which they refused to accept. The new religion was coming to transform the social – anthropological structure of the local Shona people and making it ‘English.’ They hated him beyond any measure. Hence, they resorted to kill him. Bakare had this to say:

This kind of killing was motivated by his mission for the Mangwende people to become Christians and English. So there’s a mixture there, the motivation to kill him were twofold. Why is he going around with our sister? After all we don’t like what he is preaching, we don’t want it. He is attempting to change our social way of life. He is cutting our sacred tree. He is provoking the traditional shrine. For them, it was a desecration of the shrine, so they killed him for that. On the other hand, the sister was another issue, they did not want her to marry Bernard Mzeki.

The very Rev Madhidha, (Interview, Bulawayo, 11/05/2016, 09:30), Dean of the Diocese of Matebeleland said:

We have the situation were the colonizers were saying that Africans were uncivilized and therefore looked down upon the Africans and considered every African beliefs as satanic and demonic. The failure to use enculturation as a tool to evangelize at that time contributed to the tensions that was leading to Bernard Mzeki’s death.

5.4.3 The Religious Factors.

It must be mentioned that in the section of the religious factor that may have contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki, the investigation was much centred on the religious conflicts of Bernard Mzeki’s teachings on Christianity versus the African traditional religious beliefs and customs - ATR(s). All respondents, non-Anglicans and Anglicans, (bishops, priests and laity) in Zimbabwe and a few outside the borders of the Anglican Zimbabwean Church who participated in the religious inquiry made a contribution to the death of Mzeki. This is what they had to say below:
To begin with, Makwasha made this contribution concerning the clash of religious tradition of
the locals and the new religion of Christianity which Bernard was introducing, together with
the white missionaries. He had this to say:

In my reading and research of Mzeki, the story is that Bernard had become so popular
as an Evangelist and healer in the Mangwende village. Consequently, he became a
threat to the survival of the local n’angas also known as spirit mediums, whose
livelihood depended on healing the locals using traditional methods. To Convert to
Christianity, meant loss of business for the traditional healers. Unfortunately, 1896/7
was a year of famine and drought. In addition, there was also a rinderpest crisis in the
land. All this was blamed on Bernard Mzeki and his new religion. The spirit mediums
argued that all these challenges were religious. The gods of the Land - the Loins Shumba
were angry because of Mzeki’s presence and his white friends. The n’angas tried to
convince chief Mangwende to get rid of Bernard Mzeki and his new religion but failed.
They only succeeded to convince his son, Muchemwa and a few others to eliminate
Mzeki. Muchemwa and his brothers and uncle went ahead and murdered him on the
cold night of June 18/19 in 1896.

Makwasha continued to say that the African religious culture and traditional values were the
cornerstone of African life. Anything that denounced the African traditional religion amounted
to drowning and destroying the very identity and personality of African people. The reaction
of the Africans was to fight for their values. According to him, Mzeki and the white settlers
were bringing African identity to extinction.

According to the Right Rev Jonathan Siyachitema, (Interview, Harare, 17/ 04/2016, 09:16)
former bishop of the Diocese of Harare, Zimbabwe, Bernard Mzeki was a holy man in the sense
that he stood out to go on a mission journey in a community he knew was hostile. He went into
fire. Maybe in his attempt to evangelise the Mangwende people, he experienced confrontation.
This kind of ministry was new for him. He was a black man and unlike Bishop Knight Bruce,
a white man who was feared because of the colour of his skin. The white settles had superior
weapons like guns. Siyachitema had this to say on a lighter note about Bernard Mzeki:

When Mzeki came to do catechistical ministry in the Diocese of Mashonaland,
Zimbabwe, he was getting into a religious conflict burning fire without an extinguisher.
So from that perspective I would like to believe that he was inspired to hang himself.
You and I have not done it, he was inspired to say come what may God is with me. I
will continue to preach the word of God and it is through that evangelical confrontation
that he met his fate. He challenged the religious beliefs of the unconverted people of
Mangwende. He touched the nerve of their anger. They were very angry that he was
interfering with their religious customs, tradition and culture; a black man for that
matter. He had no protection and he knew it. Was Mzeki wise to do this? Were the
white missionaries preaching the same confrontational gospel of publicly challenging
African Traditional Religion (s)? When a priest decides to do a confrontational
ministry, then he must be prepared to face the genre of sungura music that can never be
written on paper.

Gunda declared that Bernard was in danger from fellow blacks because he taught a foreign
faith-the Gospel of Christ, and he had angered local witchdoctors by cutting down some sacred
trees, to make way for his field to grow wheat and thus disturbing the groove inhabitants,
Shumba dzaMangwende.

Revd. Basvi, (Interview, Gweru, 10/05/2016, 13:30), the director for the theological education
by extension in Zimbabwe and a priest in the Anglican Diocese of Central Zimbabwe added
that when Mzeki relocated his growing community of several families, as well as young boys
he was teaching, to settle across the river in a fertile area with a spring. This area created in a
sacred grove which was believed to be inhabited by spirit mediums of the Mangwende people. In order to prepare a field to plant wheat, Mzeki made the sign of the cross in the air, felled trees and carved crosses on the few that were left. Making the sign of the cross in the eyes of the nängas saw him as a sorcerer and a witch. This was also a great sign of disrespect and a spiritual challenge to those who still believed in the divine powers of ancestors for survival. This re-enforced the perception by spirit mediums, that Bernard Mzeki was promulgating teachings that undermined their belief systems and introducing other religion which was non-African and strange. Basvi claimed that Muchemwa was included in this group of the spirit medium, the first born of chief Mangwende who later played a key role in the death of Bernard Mzeki.

Makwasha declared the fact that Mzeki angered the religious leaders, spirit mediums, and Mangwende’s son Muchemwa led to the mission and target of the murdering of Bernard Mzeki and white community in Zimbabwe which was Rhodesia by then. Makwasha had this to add:

The great spirit medium Nehanda and Kaguvi Shumba Huru approached Mangwende and meetings were held to rid off Bernard Mzeki whom was persived as the ‘front’ or “instrument” of the white colonialists and the whites themselves. They took it upon themselves to plot Bernard’s death.

Notably, all the respondents and the academic consultants alluded to the fact that generally the Western missionaries frequently believed that African traditional religious beliefs and practices were inferior to theirs. Civilisation in African meant getting rid of the African traditional religions and customs and introducing a new religion of Christianity. Outstandingly, Ruziwo, an academic in the African Church History in Zimbabwe said in this period of study of the early 1890s, part of the white domination was imposing Christianity which was to become the new faith and belief in the African people. Moyo A. (Interview, Harare, 01/11/2016, 08:30), an academic consultant at the University of Zimbabwe remarked that the mistake which the white missionaries made was a religious ideological thinking that if one was to become a Christian, African people were to leave the traditional religions. They were to reject the indigenous culture before converting to Christianity. Njaya, a priest in the Anglican Diocese of Masvingo pointed out that this did not happen without resistance. And the first resistance was the first Chimurenga war in Zimbabwe which resulted in the death of Mzeki. The very Revd. Gonde A. (Interview, Bulawayo, 11/05/2016, 15:30), the vicar General of the Anglican Diocese of Matebeleland cited that from a scholarly point of view the resentments held by some traditional leaders of the Mangwende could have fuelled anger among local Shona people to murder Bernard Mzeki. He went further to say that Mchemwa, a son of the Mangwende was actually influenced by the spirit mediums and the nängas and became an ally. He was found directly responsible for Bernard Mzeki’s murder and removal of his body. He was also responsible for destroying the mission settlement. This suggests that Mzeki’s death was a result of his failure to respect the traditional beliefs and not necessarily that he was a Christian.

Musodza said that this conflict refers to the 1896-1897 Ndebele-Shona revolt against colonial rule specifically the British South Africa Company. Mlimo, the Matabele spiritual/religious leaders in Matebeleland and the Nehanda and Kaguwi in Mashonaland are credited introducing the hurt that led to this uprising. They convinced the Ndebele and Shona that the white settlers were responsible for the drought, locust plagues and the cattle disease rinderpest ravaging the country at the time. The spirit mediums’ call to resistance was appropriately timed. Musodza called it a religious opposition, for the early anti-colonial up-risings in the late 1890s were led by religious leaders who were strongly opposed to colonial rule. And Mzeki was not spared because of his association with the whites in Mangwende village.

The very Revd. Mbona, (Interview, Mutare, 13/04/2016, 08:45), the dean for the cathedral of St John the Baptist in the Anglican Diocese of Manicaland added that the missionary attack on
traditional religion and despising of African tradition and culture contributed very much to the murder of Mzuki. As such, upon arrival in Africa, the white missionaries did not bother to understand who the true African was but went on to try to mould a ‘white human being’ out of an African.

Haatendi, when asked whether there were religious reasons that may have contributed to the death of Bernard Mzuki, commented:

Up to a point yes I would like some research to be done on what was really at the heart of the four man who visited Mzuki in those little hours of the morning. I would have loved to hear them saying what they had in their minds but definitely they knew that spirit medium were behind them. Chief Mangwende himself was sort of natural and had a sympathetic approach to Bernard but definitely his spirit mediums felt that Mzuki was working against their work.

Gunda also cited the accusation which was levelled against Mzuki which may have contributed to his death. He was accused of rubbing poison by the religious leaders during the outbreak of chickenpox crisis which took place around 1985-6. According to Gunda,

It is a historical fact that Mzuki was asked by the health department to assist in vaccinating all the people in the Mangwende village. The religious leaders, the nángas did not understand what was happening in the Mangwende and around about the disease and how it was being dealt with. Hence, they accused the white settlers of bringing the chickenpox. This accusation was also levelled against Bernard Mzuki. Specifically, his participation in the vaccination of all the indigenous local people without involving them in their capacity as the religious leaders was an unforgivable crime levelled against him.

This accusation was concurred in by many Anglican Church leadership in Zimbabwe and academic consultants that this incident contributed to the death of Bernard Mzuki.

Bishop Hatendi viewed Mzuki simply as a catechist with a calling from his God in Mangwende Village. He was there to evangelise and to make new believers to his God. According to this perspective in the words of Bishop Haatendi, “Mzuki was murdered because of his faith. This is what is generally accepted from the Europeans historians of the Faith. Why not? Bernard Mzuki was their boy.”

5.4.4 The Economic Factors.

One of the factors that may have contributed to the death of Bernard Mzuki were economic as raised by all the respondents. All the key informants agreed that the land issue was one of an economic factors that made the local Shona people in Mangwende and in other parts of Rhodesia/Zimbabwe to rise against the colonial rule. The white settlers’ primary intention was to take over the land as all the Europeans were rushing in Africa to grab her land under the banner of the scramble for Africa. This process as acknowledged by the respondents was marked the Berlin Conference in the early 1880s. They also agreed that the Concessions which were drawn during the early stages of the establishment of the colonial rule were land based. They anonymously agreed that outstandingly the Rudd Concession was primarily focused on the land and her minerals. All the respondents acknowledged that Europeans nation’s economies were to be sustained from resources which were to come from Africa which seemed to be a virgin land not exploited. The African lands were seen as to be rich in minerals and fertile for agricultural activities.
Notably, Ruwona succinctly spelled out from an academic point of view how the situation of Mzeki’s murder could not be totally blamed on the local Shona people. Ruwona said that the economic issue of land grabbing by white settlers made the Mangwende people furious. And in response, his led to the death of the man who came in between the white settlers and the locals. Ndyabayika, an academic consultant in African contemporary Church history, Uganda, in an interview had this paramount question. “Was Bernard Mzeki aware of the Charter which was offer by the Queen of England which permitted Cecil John Rhodes to occupy Southern Africa Rudd Concession and its condition which was signed between the white settlers through the British South Africa Company in order for England to gain an economic advantage? Was he knowledgeable that the payment of the participants in the Pioneer Column was in the form of land upon arrival in Mashonaland in Zimbabwe? Was he aware of the intention of the church which was to cement colonization of Southern Africa? If Bernard Mzeki was aware of all this, I do not think he was going to join Bishop Knight Bruce to preach in Mashonaland, Zimbabwe.” Ndyabayika opined that if Mzeki knew that the occupation of Mashonaland was to cripple the economic freedom of the Shona local Mangwende people which they got from the land and left them desperate and vulnerable, then he was never going to commit himself in a scenario like that. The survival of the African people was land based. Kurewa J (Interview, Mutare, 14/04/2016, 14:05), an academia in missiology at the Africa University, added that the Concessions gave white settlers what they considered was a right to fight the indigenous Africans if they refused to accept the terms laid down in the Concessions. These concessions gave permission to the white land grabbers to explore mineral resources and settle permanently in Mashonaland, Zimbabwe.

Madega, (Interview, Mutare, 14/04/2016, 14:05), a consultant in the area of African studies at Africa University, Zimbabwe, alluded to this fact; that Cecil Rhodes invaded Mashonaland and divided the country among the Pioneer Column’s participants after placing the Union Jack in Salisbury in Rhodesia, a nation which was named after him after occupying it. Rhodes promised them that they were privileged to choose any piece of land which was fertile which was already occupied by the African people. Rhodes called the land public land. He went on to say that in the period of early occupation the whiter settlers took more land while Africans were evicted and forcibly settled in lands that were not fertile. Non-fertile lands were called reserves. Importantly, he mentioned that the lands the new white community was given were given favorable economic advantages over the black indigenous population in what was called Rhodesia.

The very Revd. Madhidha, (Interview, Bulawayo, 10/05/2016, 12:30), Dean at the cathedral in the Anglican Diocese of Matebeleland had this to say about the economic significance of the land. He claimed that the land was the economic backbone of the livelihood of an African people and still is. Land was viewed as an economic mother who had the ability to sustain the very source of life. Bakare went to his home in his reference to one of his publications on My Right Land: Zimbabwe. He argued that in Africa the land was the economic umbilical cord tied to families, communities, villages, kingdoms and the African continent. Specifically, he added that when the Shona local people greeted each other, used the expression of Mwanawevhu, sons of the soil, meaning that the very economic survival of the African people was in the Land. Land meant an economic livelihood, history and identity. Furthermore, he further said that the Shona people were small scale peasant farmers just like any other community or kingdom in the African continent. The economic custodianship of the Shona was on the land. He claimed:

…as soon as the white settlers arrived in Mashonaland they gradually began to remove the local indigenous people from their lands and divided it among themselves. They now did not have access to their land. The Shona peasants gradually became landless and the economic prosperity which they had enjoyed for so many years came to end by the arrival of the new Settlers. You see to be a peasant farmer was bad enough, but to be a landless peasant was worse. The other challenge was that the white settlers never
understood, or wanted to understand, the resentment, bitterness and the hardships which they had created by the gradual land dispossession. Hence, the indigenous people felt the need to fight in order to take back their land. Between 1896 and 1897 were marked by uprisings and revolts by the unhappy Zimbabweans who had been deprived of their land. Bernard Mzeki was caught up in this first Chimurenga war because in the understanding of the local Shona people, he was part of the land invaders.

Ruziwo (Interview, Harare, 12/01/2016, 12:00) an academia at the University of Zimbabwe had this to say that it was not only the land that affected the economic context of the local indigenous people in Zimbabwe in 1896/7 which resulted in the first Chimurenga war. He pointed out that from 1890s onwards, the white settlers came up with all sorts of policies: animals control and agriculture that economically disadvantaged the already poor indigenous people. He added that during the rinderpest crisis, the white administrators ordered for all the cattle affected to be burnt away in order to control the disease. This was very strange to the indigenous people who had never burnt cattle because they were affected with a disease. Many cattle and goats were destroyed. The Shona were furious and concluded that the best was to retaliate by resistance.

5.5 The mystery of Bernard Mzeki’s death.

Bishop Hatendi chronicled his experience and observations in 1936 in an attempt to ascertain the death of Bernard Mzeki:

Well, I happened to go to the shrine earlier on after its erection 1939 and I did listen to some of the comments that were made by the pilgrims. It’s difficult to explain or to talk about that mysterious disappearance of Bernard Mzeki of which I personally also searched in Mangwende to find out if there were any signs or just the skull in that hill that belonged to Mzeki. Searches were made and there were no discoveries. So, in short, Bernard Mzeki disappeared. That’s the first thing that he is ever said true about what I have heard on the search I also joined that there are no remains of Bernard Mzeki anywhere in the hill that he was said to have stayed for some three up to five days or shorter. After the care of his wife Mutwa, some feeling is that after having heard from Mutwa herself because I did meet Mutwa at St Faith’s Rusape where she had remarried in the Nyangadzo family and my impression is that there is a mystery about his death and it’s difficult to say more than that but Bernard Mzeki indeed was killed and that he disappeared.

In a way the evidence from Hatendi served to confirm that the death of Bernard was mystical and answers to whereabouts of the remains of Mzeki story are still to be found concerning his demise.

The researcher had to ask the bishop about the legendary stories in Mangwende area and some circles that say the murderers of Bernard Mzeki might have taken his body and threw it into the Nyakambiri River and eventually he was eaten by crocodiles. Another story dispelling the death mystery was that the area of Mangwende was infested with a lot of lions and probably the body was eaten by the lions. The researcher sort for the comments of the Bishop on these two legendary stories that attributed to the disappearance of Bernard Mzeki besides the mystical disappearance what will be your comment?

Bishop Hatendi answered elaborately as follows;
This story with regards to the crocodiles in the river Nyakambiri, is most unlikely because it’s not a big river to support the habitation of crocodiles again I know the river we are talking about and there are not big pools which would accommodate the crocodiles. Under normal circumstances I would really say that the story is fictitious. … again I said in 1936, I was part of the pilgrims who went searching for his skeleton; we suspected that if he had been killed they would normally not eat the skull and so what we were searching for were primarily the skull, and some bones of the skeleton of Bernard Mzeki would be in the area and as I have said earlier on we failed to find anything that resembled a human being having been eaten up on the hill were he said to have died. So I would still dismiss that again to be fictitious; it’s a human imagination, it’s a figment of imagination to fill in the gaps were we can’t find something tangible and scientific.

Bishop Eric Ruwona, the current bishop of Manicaland concurred the mystical death of Bernard. In response to the question “Do you have any ideas on how he died and what mystical happenings are associated with his death”? The Bishop answered;

Yes. The death of Bernard Mzeki is shrouded in all kinds of mysteries and allegations. What is known is that Bernard Mzeki was attacked by people instigated by one of the sons of chief Mangwende with the support of some group that had really come from Matabeleland in what came to be known as the Shona uprising. So, I think the death of Bernard Mzeki should be understood in that context of the Shona uprising, rebelling against the white imperialism and white supremacy. I think that’s how I understand the death of Bernard Mzeki but there are then stories that are told that after his death, his wife Mutwa saw some dazzling shining white light. These are some things that cannot be scientifically verified but the fact that he had a religious experience as the phenomenologists of religion say I think is a fact that has been spoken about.

Bishop Gandiya made a contribution towards the mystery of the death of Mzeki:

What I know about his death is what has been passed on by our forbearers as well as what was written that he was murdered towards the end of the 19th century during the uprisings that were taking place in the then Rhodesia and that he was killed by the Mangwende people and when he was killed his body sort of disappeared rendering the belief that God carried him. God alone knows where the body went. I think for me the issue about the whereabouts of his remains is not as important as what he died for. Even if we were to find his remains today it won’t change anything in terms of my belief, in terms of the place of honor which he has in the church. To say he was taken to heaven, it might be pushing it a little bit hard. There are those who would like to compare his death to that of Moses but I personally am open to possibilities. One, that maybe wild animals devoured the body, I don’t know; maybe an angel of the Lord took the body and buried it somewhere, I don’t know; maybe God just made it disappear, I’m open to miracles. For me, that doesn’t take away the importance of Bernard Mzeki, what he stood for, what he died for in Mangwende. That’s what’s important, not the whereabouts of his body”

The researcher put it to the retired bishop Siyachitema of Harare Diocese to comment on the link and significance of the mythical death of Mzeki to which the respondent said;

In trying to explain what had happened after the subsequent stabbing and the events that occurred in-between 3 and 5 days there are a lot of stories of even a man in white clothes visiting him but all these are stories about what happened after the stabbing by the murderers. We only go by his wife’s story and I would like to say that it is history fictitious but I listen with great intent to try and decipher to whether she was making it
up from her understanding of characters occurred in the bible or whether this is history. It’s an area that haven’t been able to come to a conclusion.

Bishop Bakare also gave a very interesting dimension to the mystery of the Bernard’s death. He gave a crude account that he obtained from one Samuel Munyavi who claims to have been an eye witness. His account recounts vividly the events that happened on the night of the death of Bernard. According to Samuel, when these men had left Bernard Mzeki crawled up the hill, how he did it nobody knows. The following day it is said that Samuel went to report this to the police camp in Marondera. The white police personnel at the camp came to look for Bernard Mzeki on the hill, they were searching for his body, and they couldn’t find it. The night before this happened, according to Munyavi, the whole mountain was full of light, it was brilliantly clear. So whether he was seeing this hiding behind a bush, we do not know but whatever happened Bernard Mzeki disappeared to the point that those who tried to look for his body the following day, could not find him. Five days, I don’t remember this being mentioned by Samuel Munyavi but what we know is that Samuel was extremely frightened to go back fearing that he too will be victimized by these two brothers. That is what Samuel Munyavi used to tell us as an eye witness. The introduction of Munyavi, an unknown figure in all the other existing literature prompted the researcher to probe the Bishop to elaborate. Bishop Bakare then made another interesting revelation when he stated that:

Yes we were boys in the early 1940s, he used to talk to boys at boarding school from Bernard Mzeki School. We used to walk from the school down to the shrine and Samuel would come in the evening to talk to us as a group giving testimony about Bernard Mzeki’s life and how he was murdered. We were very fortunate to be talked to by Bernard Mzeki’s carrier. He was a carrier. He carried Bernard Mzeki’s stuff wherever they went, cooked for him. He was almost a houseboy, taken from epiphany to accompany him on his tracks.

Gunda had this to say concerning the mystical death of Mzeki that,

I think what we have about Bernard is a narrative that has been constructed over years the fact is that Bernard was killed during the 1st Chimurenga War in 1896. The circumstances are not particularly clear whether he was killed for being a Christian whether or for working with the white colonial system. I think there are still grey areas on the death of Bernard Mzeki. What we know for a fact is that he was killed by the Mangwende people but the reasons behind the killing for me remain unclear. There are two ways of looking at it, it could be true am one to discredit the narratives that have been constructed on Bernard Mzeki it is possible that his body was never found. The fact that his body was never found could mean one or two things, the first could be indeed that God, as he is capable of anything may something with the body of Bernard Mzeki. Secondly, it could also suggest that maybe he did not die that maybe he walked away because as long as the body was not found there is a possibility that either he died and God hid his body; there are narratives also in the Bible of individuals who died but whose bodies were never recovered; for instance Moses, Elijah, Enoch and so on who went to heaven alive. It’s clear that after he was attacked they left him for dead but he was not yet dead which is why when they came back for him they observed that Bernard had actually moved from the place where they attacked him and so the disappeared body may suggest either something mysterious happened which may be interpreted as him having been taken to heaven but also that maybe he had revived and gain strength to walk away.

Musodza also confirmed briefly that the mystical story surrounding Bernard Mzeki’s death that following his stabbing and his walk up the hill next to his homestead and mission station, there appeared some lightning suddenly with thunderstorms. Meanwhile his wife Mutwa and her friend had gone back to make some porridge for him but upon their return they found out that
he was no longer where they left him. Instead they were confronted with the aftermath of the thunderstorm in the form of a damaged tree and a cracked stone.

Bishop David (Interview, Harare, 07/01/2017, 10:05) from the Diocese of Rochester in the Church of England, a Diocese linked to the Anglican Diocese of Harare Zimbabwe, had this to day about Bernard Mzeki’s mysterious death:

A few years ago I was here for the festival and I preached at the showground in Marondera for the Bernard Mzeki Festival; yes I know something. I have heard accounts of his death and clearly from what I remember from his story, he came to Mozambique from what we now call Zimbabwe and he was teaching, setting up a school and ministering to the new Christians as well. Eventually one of the chiefs took notice of what he was doing and with hate arranged for him to be murdered. There is a story that his body was not found in the place he was murdered. The idea of his body not found can it be likened to Old Testament biblical story of Elijah. Well, we believe that Elijah was taken direct to heaven don’t we, and perhaps he did not see death as we do. I think martyrdom has been something shown to existence down the centuries in the church and there Is something special and important about being a martyr.

Madhidha had this to say concerning the mythical death of Bernard Mzeki. He said, “Bernard Mzeki was stabbed with a spear. After having been stabbed his wife helped him crawling out of the hut that they were in and went to look for help but when she came back his body was nowhere to be found. Legendary tradition says that a light was seen giving an assumption that his body was assumed to heaven. Mr Mwanza, the Diocesan secretary of the same Diocese concurred to this disappearance of Mzeki into heaven by arguing that “the Old Testament in the book of 2 Kings 2: 1-12 recorded three people whose bodies were taken up into heaven. One was Enoch who was said he walked righteously with God and then Enoch was no more, then there was Elijah who was taken up in a well wind and then there was Moses. In that light, there is precedent of many being taken to heaven.” When bishop Christopher Chassen, (Interview, Harare, 18/04/2017, 12:46) of the Diocese of Southward, England, was asked about the mystics that surrounded the death of Mzeki, he confessed that he did not know about the mystical stories in detail, but he knew that there was a mystery surrounding his death and his body and the sense of him being received into heaven by God in a special way.

5.6 The martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki.

The recognition of Bernard Mzeki as a saint and most importantly as a martyr in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, in the church of the Province of Central African (CPCA) and in the Anglican Communion was one of the major research questions in this investigation. Primary data was gathered and the following are the primary information which were gathered.

5.6.1 Conferment of martyrdom.

A question was asked ‘Is Bernard Mzeki a saint or a martyr? And who gave him that status? The researcher asked this question to the key informants since it was one of the major research questions in the study. Bishop Hatendi gave his views as did other informants. In his initial response Haatendi said that officially Bernard Mzeki is not recognized as a martyr in the Anglican Church. He stated that the Church has no means of canonizing a person.

There is no machinery so when we are talking about that area I would say he is not a martyr because he has not been recognized by the Church of England as a martyr
because it hasn’t the machinery. Well that’s my assumption about the whole situation. If it had the machinery of investigating his death I think we would have come to a conclusion which would border on him being declared a martyr.

The very Revd. Austin J. (Interview, Harare, 10/05/2016, 15:30), the Dean of St Cuthbert’s Cathedral in the diocese of Central Zimbabwe weighed in on the canonization of martyrdom in the Anglican Church and specifically in the case of Bernard Mzeki. He stated that;

As far as I know within the province I have not come across any document which states how one can be canonized to be a martyr in our church worldwide but what I know which happens is, an issue is discussed at a diocesan level and if accepted during the Synod the issue is taken to the Provincial Synod as well as the CAPA Synod and if it’s taken at that level then it goes to the Anglican communion. We are using already existing channels to deal with issues of the church not directly involved in the canonization of an individual. However, from your question, I believe it would be proper to have grassroots committees that deal with these issues every day and make the necessary recommendations so it would not be coming from individuals but from people who would have done through research and understanding of the person concerned and in conferring of the martyrdom or sainthood depending on the works of the person who would have died. I have not come across any document but the use existing structures within the church to articulate and discuss these issues leading to decisions such as conferring martyrdom to a person.

Bishop Ruwona critically views the conferment of Bernard Mzeki as something that was done outside the rules and regulations of the church. He clearly stated that;

Yeah, many people really accept Bernard Mzeki as a martyr, but really as far as I know, there was no formal process to do that. All my readings only show that Bernard Mzeki just appeared on the church calendar from nowhere with no formal process. He just appeared on the church calendar and I suspect one of the reasons why he appeared was that he was one of the guys who was sympathetic to the white missionary cause. So as one of them it was not difficult for them to enroll him on the church calendar and ascribe to him the honor of being a saint and martyr. What began as really local commemorations of his death, ended up being enrolled on the calendar of saints and martyrs.

Commenting whether Mzeki was a martyr, Gunda had this to say:

It is difficult to tell whether Bernard is a martyr in the sense that we do not as of now possess the complete story of Bernard. A martyr is somebody who has been killed specifically for their faith, people who are being killed for prophesying their faith in Jesus or God and if they are killed because they have prophesied their faith they become martyrs. In the case of Bernard I think there are quite a number of things that are plain; it could be true because this is the early stages of evangelisation where he is proclaiming a new faith in Murehwa region where obviously adherence of the old faith may lead one to attack and kill those that bring new faith for fear because faiths in general are competing for human allegiance, so the arrival of a new faith is a threat to the old faith because that the people that once belonged to the old faith may choose to belong to a new faith and because of that it could be true that Bernard was killed because he was proclaiming a new faith which would make him a martyr but then let’s not forget also that this is the time when the colonial regimes are beginning to show their true colors that they are not passing through this land but they are here to stay because of that all white men were naturally considered enemies and not only the white but also the black men who worked with the whites in which case if Bernard was categorized as a political and economic enemy in my thinking would therefore not be a martyr but one of the
people who died in the process of indigenous people seeking to get rid of the white people who had come into their land. So I am not one to give an absolute answer on whether Bernard is a martyr or not but there is a possibility that he could be a martyr and also that he is not particularly because of the time he was killed which is the time when there is a general war that’s ongoing between the dispossessed blacks and possessing whites in which case Bernard would have fallen on the side of the whites and he possibly could have been attacked as an accomplice of the white man systems in which case he wouldn’t be a martyr. Depending on the evidence before us he could be a martyr and he also could not be a martyr.

Gunda added,

It’s very possible because faiths are not political so even in the 1st century you find both elements of politics and religion intertwined; it’s happening possibly in our context where people try to separate politics and religion but in the ancient times and I think also in the time of Bernard these two are closely related and so the existence of the political dimension does not necessarily eliminate the faith dimension it could be a combination of both that Bernard became so to say a double enemy for bringing a new faith and for working with the white regime. In the 1st century of the Christian movement the Christian church people are killed again almost for the same reason, they are proclaiming a new faith, threatening an old faith, rejecting certain practices and customs that were considered normal and acceptable mainstream society but being Christians meant they had to reject such so-called normal practices and so you could compare Bernard’s situation and that of the 1st century but it comes down to that key question what was the role of the proclamation of the Christian faith in the death of Bernard because for me that is the question that will make or break Bernard’s martyrdom.

Bishop James of Rochester, (Interview, Harare, 06/03/2017, 11:30), England, one of the key informants, was asked whether Bernard Mzeki was a martyr in the correct meaning of the word. He responded by generally defining the word martyr. In his words he said:

The Greek word for the word martyr simply means witness but in English language, it means someone who bears witness through giving their lives to death because of their faith. Certainly, yes he is a martyr according to the account of his death as we have heard it. We know about many other people who were martyrs before him and after him. For Bernard Mzeki, that was his calling of faithful witness to God and he was prepared to stay where he was even if he knew it was danger and that calling of martyrdom continues to our century as well.

Bishop James went further to say that martyrdom was from the scriptures as Jesus talked about his willingness to give his life up as the church often understood that to be a spiritual exercise of self-denial. He added again that in the history of the Church, there were people who were willing to give up their lives for the gospel. In that sense, Bishop James declared that Bernard Mzeki was a martyr. Asked the same question, Musodza had this to say that as far as he knew the Anglican Church as he knew it now as a former Canon Theologian in the Anglican Diocese of Botswana, the Anglican Church worldwide had no means of canonising anyone. He claimed that most of all of the saints that the church celebrated today were part and parcel of our Catholic baggage which the Anglican Church carried with them when she broke away from Rome. He added that those who were remembered and are remembered now in the Anglican Church today are remembered not as saints per se but simply as people who lived an exemplary life in the Christian church especially the Anglican Church.

An inquiry was made by the researcher on the names of the people who might have gathered to confer him as a saint and martyr. The question was as follows: Who could have confirmed
that martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki; do we have specific names? On this question Bishop Ruwona did not give specific names in his response:

I can’t say that offhand but I think if you research on the development of the calendar Church of the Province of Southern Africa, you will identify exactly who, which Bishop or in particular which Archbishop presided or superintendent over the inclusion of Bernard Mzeki into the church calendar. I can’t say that offhand but I know that is exactly what happened. You are not going to find a meeting where Anglicans met to decide on Bernard Mzeki becoming a martyr, some guys just woke up one day and included him on the church calendar. According to the book by Jean Farrant and others, they write about how the cult of Bernard Mzeki grew and how the commemorations began some decades later and how the very small local observances grew to be major things.

Bishop Bakare was of the opinion that the church that was there at that time was the Church of England. So it was the bishop Knight Bruce who represented the Church of England although he was also coming from the diocese or CPSA. It was after this event of the death of Bernard that he must have narrated the story to Canterbury to say this is what had happened. Bakare declared:

There was no committee from Zimbabwe that was there, there was no synod as it was in 1896 by the way. Knight Bruce never had a synod in Zimbabwe. So conferring of martyrdom on Bernard. It might have been a story which was told to the archbishop of Canterbury and his council at that time and there was a move to say since even a finger could not be found on that hill, he disappeared. This is not impossible with God, He took His own people like Elijah and Enoch. He disappeared, there was no evidence to say a bit of his flesh was found on the hill. If people wanted to argue about it, it was up to them but I must say that whoever reported this, which was Knight Bruce of course, he must have been very convincing to Canterbury. Maybe Knight Bruce died before he narrated the story to Canterbury, we don’t know whether it is bishop Beaven or bishop Gaul, his successors. Powell was not here for a long time, he died very shortly. Maybe it was Beaven.

The Bishop of Central Zimbabwe, Ishmael Mukwanda, (Interview, Harare, 10/05/2016, 16:30), agreed with his Dean, Austin July, about the canonization of martyrdom in the Anglican Church. The absence of clear documentation that can be followed is the central point in the whole debate. He clearly stated that;

I think that is a difficult question and important because in my 17 years I don’t believe I have seen a documentation that talks about making somebody or talks about a committee whether diocesan, provincial or communion level that says OK this is what makes someone qualify to be a martyr you know some years ago I think it was this early part of this century just after I think it was when one of my clergymen called Rev Canon Peter Wagner was murdered in his church in Masvingo and the church wardens came to me and say I think we need to declare this man a martyr and I said I don’t believe that we are qualified enough to be able to declare anybody a martyr but we need to ask because even our canons they don’t talk about martyrdom but my assumption all along was that, that is done at universal level. I think they have to recommend and they got to justify that this person is worthy to be conferred because of his or her faith. He must be declared a martyr but I have not seen any documentation that talks about that and it’s not one of those things even when one is made a bishop after consecration, it’s not one of those subjects that you are informed of. I have not seen any documentation pertaining conferment of martyrdom. I think I will be very excited to see that document if it exists at all.
The provincial Chancellor of CPCA, Mr Chigoore, (Interview, Harare, 03/08/2015, 14:10) who is the Provincial legal Lawyer of the Province categorical declared that the Province did not have a legal framework to confer martyrdom. Mrs Knyemba (Interview, Harare, 05/09/2015) and Mr Mutungura, (Interview, Mutare, 16/08/2015) the Diocesan registrars for the Anglican Diocese of Harare and Manicaland concurred. (A Diocesan registrar is the lawyer of the Diocese).

The bishop of Masvingo, the right Rev Godfrey Tawonezvi, (Interview, Masvingo, 27/06/2016, 10:30), concurred with bishop Mukwanda on the late Canon Peter Wagner in that:

The murder case of the late canon Peter is still pending in the high court of Zimbabwe still now even if he was killed in the early 2000. He was killed whilst he was having his morning prayers-martins. The four bvumawaranda young boys came in the cathedral of St Michael’s and All Angels one morning and he was killed and placed in a side chapel. The church has tried to make follow up but with no avail because we are informed by the provincial public prosecutor, Mr Chivarika and the executive assistant national prosecuting authority officer, Mrs Chibhamu that all the records dating up to the early 2000 were all burnt and the high court caught fire due to an electricity fault. We also tried to pursue the matter with the police but the investigating officer, Mr Gwande was always unavailable. The door was never opened for the church to make inquiries. The lawyer of the case Mr Mwonzora transferred to Harare to get into politics. It is unfortunate that he was murdered during the time of land grabbing by the war veterans. He died a foolish death yet he was an angel on earth who was dedicated to do God’s work with all his strength and love.

In an interview when Gunda was asked how martyrs are conferred, he expressed ignorance:

I didn’t know that Bernard is a martyr, let alone saint for that matter. I would have accepted the martyr narrative reluctantly because that’s the common narrative that we hear but that Bernard was inducted into sainthood may not be true. I must say In the Roman Catholic Church they have a procedure on how saint and martyrs are made. Recently Mother Theresa was conferred into martyrdom and sainthood. They have such a process but I have never come across in the Anglican tradition a time when the process has been triggered to consider somebody a martyr and a saint that’s something that I haven’t witnessed; it’s not something that I have read also about the Anglican Church. I always wonder how Mzeki became one. I have always thought there is a possibility that we could have on paper a process laid down for that kind of development but whether it was applied to Bernard or to anybody else am not sure about that.

Asked whether the Anglican Communion had a process of canonizing martyrdom, bishop James of Rochester, England had this to say:

We are not like the Roman Catholic Church which has a process of canonizing saints and martyrs. The saints and martyrs we have in the Anglican Church today were inherited from the Roman Catholic before the reformation period. The Roman Catholics have clear mechanisms for recognizing those who are saints as well as martyrs and that continues today. Just this week Mother Theresa have been canonized. So they have a process to do that. In the Anglican Communion, we do not have anything like that. Our whole way of doing church is different. We do not have a centralized authority like the Roman Church. Considering the way the Church of England does it, it recognizes outstanding figures only through liturgy and through the agreement of the church’s calendar. In the Church of England, we have included in the calendar of the church each year people who over process of time have come to be regarded as godly examples of Christian living and some of those are martyrs, reformers, spiritual writers and so on.
We now have found our own way in England to recognizing our own people who have been clear examples of godliness, sacrifice, service, and Bernard Mzeki is one of them. Officially, there is no special committee of names put aside in the Anglican Church worldwide that sit done and qualify anyone to be a martyr.

Bishop James had this to add that in England the Church Calendar had challenges too. He mentioned a particular case where a former bishop who died 19 years ago had been recognized in the Church calendar and certain stories emerged about his behavior which were difficult stories. So the Church had to reconsider him and had to be removed from the Calendar.

Bishop Christopher Chassen of the Diocese of Southwark, England agreed with Bishop James:

Mzeki is a special figure in the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe because his blood was shed for his faith. That is undeniable and the history of the Anglican Communion, going back to the Church of England, breaking away from Rome is that we do not have a canonization process that the Roman Church has of recognizing miracles and attesting and testing the veracity of a tradition or of a cult, a happening of a holy man and woman who have been faithful to Christ. June 18 annually is a day for Bernard Mzeki in the calendar of the Anglican calendar in Zimbabwe and in England. This is how far the Church has gone. That is a very good thing. I think actually, that might be a more satisfactory procedure than relying on evidence as the Roman Catholic, which sometimes does seem to be a little problematical, but it also shows that the Church of England, the Anglican provinces claim to be part of the one holy catholic and apostolic church, we are still awaiting a recovery of structural unity when things like a common procedure for the canonization of Saints would again be practiced with the uniformity across the whole of the Church. I can explicitly say that as the Anglican Communion, we don’t have a unified structure of governance and the Anglican consultative council doesn’t extend its authority to these matters, provinces have to declare those they consider to be martyrs and then to place them in the calendar.

So we have a rather fragmentary process, it is a satisfactory process but it reflects the governance of the wider Anglican church an communion, it is not a rigorous unified process, but there is an understanding between the provinces of the communion to recognize the local special persons like Bernard Mzeki. That means we have a bigger calendar now than we had before. So those of us who are concerned about the unity of the church would say that this is a very fruitful area for some work as to how our prayers might actually be allowed more formally declare people Saints and martyrs rather than the procedures at the moment that they are simply put them in the calendar.

Bishop James David, former bishop of the Diocese of Rochester, claimed that the Anglican Communion did not make martyrs in the sense that it did not call him Saint Bernard Mzeki. What the Anglican Communion does is recognize certain people as clearly being special and holy. He further said that he was glad that the church did not canonize martyrs like that Roman Catholic Church did. He was comfortable to have the list of such special people like Bernard Mzeki on the church calendar. He was surprised when the researcher said during the interview that Bernard Mzeki was referred as a saint and martyr in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. He had this to say:

Let’s begin with this, the Church of England does not have a process by which it turns people into Saints. It has taken a view that when we revised our list of Saints and special holy people, very particularly in the 1970s and the 1990s as we produced first of all the Alternative Service Book and common worship, that a great deal time was spent on considering who should be remembered in our calendar. Bernard Mzeki is one of the people who went in our calendar in the 1980s, but we don’t have a process by which we call those people saints and as I said earlier, I am quiet glad about that because the little bit that I know about the way the Roman Catholic Church does it through a sort
of legal process and having to claim miracles and that sort of stuff, I don’t find that very tasteful. I didn’t know Bernard was called a saint.

Another question in this whole matter put forward to the interviewees was to ascertain whether CPCA have the mandate to canonize anyone if they wish. In actual fact one would say, if they wished to canonize him would they do it since Bernard Mzeki was African? The question which was raised regarding this matter was as follows: In the C.P.C.A, what would be the official steps to be taken by any committee or responsible people to officially declare Bernard Mzeki as a martyr? Bishop Ruwona clearly stated:

It doesn’t make sense, it’s not even necessary to officially declare Bernard Mzeki a martyr. Things in Africa are not as formal as you are suggesting, people just wake up and everyone agrees without writing anything, without following any protocol regarding who is a martyr. People are in agreement. I am yet to see anyone who doubts the martyrdom and the beatification or the status of Bernard Mzeki. It is not disputed, it is a given; it is by public acclamation. What you are proposing is some foreign, Western, idea of doing things. If we consider a person like Herbert Chitepo who was not only a prominent politician who shaped the justification for the struggle for independent Zimbabwe, who in spite of being a political activist, remained the provincial chancellor and the lawyer for the C.P.C.A whilst in exile in Zambia. We might not need to convene any formal meeting to do that but once a person is a hero, you don’t need people who will go to town to establish processes”. Right away we have conferred the order of epiphany on some prominent lay persons who have conferred the office of canon of the province on an outstanding clergyman in the church. There is no formal process; what is required is somebody who comes up and proposes that we have so and so who has done this outstanding work and we recommend him for that position and provincial synod accepts. Once provincial synod accepts, there is no other authority beyond that in our church. It is done. Our province accepts it and it’s up to other provinces to follow suit.

Bishop James of Rochester concurred with Bishop Erick Ruwona when he said that this may have been spontaneous. He said the local Shona people were so moved by his story that here in Zimbabwe people began somewhere special where he lived and died and converted it into a place of pilgrimage and of gathering for prayer. And so it appeared in time that Bernard Mzeki came to be recognized as one of the people who was of great significant in the story of Christian faith in Zimbabwe. According to James, the hierarchy of the church began to respect what the people were doing and what was emerging in the spirituality of the people and so it is like the annual commemoration began to take place and Bernard Mzeki began to acquire a national and indeed an international status as an exemplarily Christian. This was indeed spontaneous and not official.

Out of curiosity, the researcher made an inquiry from Bishop James of Rochester to found out whether Bernard Mzeki was part of the Anglican spirituality in England. He shared:

Bernard Mzeki is part of the spirituality in my Diocese because we have a partnership with the Anglican Diocese of Harare and not in the Church of England. He is not known by many even though his name is in the church Calendar. But in my Diocese, the spirituality of the late Bernard Mzeki speaks to us and we reflect in our diocese. So he becomes part of our lives because he is part of your life. The rest of the church in England will never hear about Mzeki because there did not really have a particular relationship with him. Bernard Mzeki would be important in the Church of England to some people who really have some connection with Zimbabwe, family connections, church connections. The bulk people in England do not know him unless they organize a big study. But I think that is what is interesting about the way Anglicans do their things. We have people who are special for that particular context and also our local
commemorations for people who have interest or connection with those in a particular context because that is part of their story. For instance, in Harare in Zimbabwe Bernard Mzeki is part of a story their faith. He becomes important to you. In my diocese, we have some people who are special to us but will not be remembered elsewhere.

Bishop Christopher Chassen made a recommendation that it could be an interesting matter to be tabled at the episcopal bench of the Church of the Province of Central Africa and see if it can be taken further up. He said, it would be significant to make sense of the governance, canon and constitution of the province. He added, “It would be a very good and fruitful subject to be discussed at Lambeth conference because I think it has something to do with what the archbishop said when he invited people to the Lambeth Conference in 2020. It is rather more interesting than the things people discuss about. It might unite the Communion.” Bishop James David concurred and added that probably the Anglican Consultative Council which would meet in the next three years could be the first Council to discuss this matter. He suggested that this matter be on its agenda. Bishop Bakare suggested that if the Province of Central Africa was to establish the process of making martyrs, then the only thing the Church could do was to ask the provincial senate to set up a process whereby people can be declared martyrs. He continued to say:

It could be down to each province to decide what would happen in the same way in each province and the degree to which they have the ordination of women and happily, the Anglican Communion is about dispersed authority, it’s not run from Canterbury, not by the archbishop of, Canterbury and therefore it’s up to each province. They have to work these things out for themselves, of course they have to consult with one another, they can learn from each other. When push comes to shove, it is up to each province to make up its own mind about what it wants to do with these things.

Bishop Hatendi asked the same question; in his response he came back to the process of canonization to say that the Church of England in CPCA does not have the authority to canonize anybody. He claimed that the authority of canonization rested with the Roman Catholic Church and at the Reformation the Church of England lost it. As far as he was aware no one had worked in that area to come to the conclusion that it is the way we could look at it or that is the way we could have the machinery to declare a person a martyr.

It was important that key informants were asked the bold question “Is Bernard Mzeki not a martyr because he has not been canonized or that he died a death of a martyr but he is not a martyr because he is just not canonized”. Bishop Hatendi responded by saying that;

there are two authorities that I am talking about here; the first is that the church of England hasn’t got the machinery so whether he qualifies to be a martyr or not it is unable to canonize anybody, that is the first impediment and that’s what makes it difficult for the Church of England, or almost impossible, to go into the process of canonization. And the rest the story about the canonization of this particular Christian that he was killed have no doubts because the Mangwende people also later on not only went on and confirmed him as a historical figure who once upon a time lived amongst them. It is important to say that I also taught at Bernard Mzeki school as a teacher and so I lived amongst the Mangwende people themselves, that they acknowledge that Bernard Mzeki was stabbed to death so that’s the historical side of it and then there is the impediment I am talking about; the Anglican world that machinery does not exist and as I said it lasted at the Reformation. He could fit if there was the machinery in the Anglican Church to declare any him a martyr. I think Bernard Mzeki would qualify.

Musodza made the following contributions when he was asked whether the church had a process or a committee that made Mzeki a martyr. He responded in this manner,
As far as I know B. Mzeki was never canonized. Those who call him a saint do so out of ignorance since there is no such thing as canonization in the Anglican Church. I can simply say that calling Mzeki a saint is wishful thinking. It’s what those who think highly of his would want him to be called. But he is not a saint. This however is not to say that he did not have the qualities to be recognized as such. It’s simply unfortunate that he found himself in a denomination which has no notion of sainthood.

But Musodza acknowledged that Mzeki was not only a Zimbabwean and provincial figure of significance, but a person who is remembered in the Anglican Communion as someone who lived an incredibly illustrious life of dedication, commitment and obedience to Christ. Although he was not an ordained person, he achieved much more than ordained people of his age and after. He added that;

some of his sacrifices are regarded now as having been reckless, especially when one hears of the fact that he was told to leave the mission station and go to St. Augustine’s Mission where all Anglican Missionaries were to stay under protection and he refused citing his abhorrence of the idea of leaving behind his few converts especially Kapuya who was not feeling too well.

Madhidha agreed with the above that the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, the Province, and the Anglican Communion worldwide did not have any process to declare one a martyr even though he is generally referred as one. He said,

Yes I do know that we have always referred Bernard Mzeki as a martyr but am not sure how the process was taken for Bernard Mzeki to be declared a martyr the Anglican Church is not like the strategized Roman Catholic Church were they have their canons in which one is confirmed a martyr. The Anglican Church in Zimbabwe have so many unofficial saints and martyrs especially the late Canon Wagner and more recently the late Mbuya Mandeya who have not been conferred that title because we do not have the body to do that but I do not remember in history whether the Anglican church have conferred the martyrdom to Bernard Mzeki.

Unfortunately, these are some of the pitfalls of being in a communion where we say that each province basically takes care of itself although recognizing the Anglican Communion and in which Archbishop of Canterbury. Yes, he is the first among equals but his power is limited. Each province can actually do as it pleases. So in that way it is not that easy for us to have a board for people to consider the conferment of what is called canonization whether it’s martyrs or saints. So that is the downfall for us as an Anglican Communion because we don’t recognize the good work we are doing within our communities. We don’t recognize the sacrifices that people have made for their faith and in the end it impacts negatively on the Christians who are alive because we don’t have a role model. We can look at historically the saints that we now adore are saints as we mentioned in the first century are saints whom the Roman Catholics has canonized and so as Anglicans we have nothing holding us and linking us spiritually with those saints practically. Well I know that Mbuya Mandeya has a contemporary personality and I have seen her living and I know how she lived I can emulate her because I can relate with her and her situation whereas it is not as easy to relate with Mother Theresa as an example or to relate with Steven or St Thomas or St Perpetua going further back because of the time period in between. It would have been easier for Anglicans setting up a board to look at the canonization of saints and martyrs; it is long overdue. I believe that there are a lot of people that also qualify for martyrdom but they will go unrecognized for as long as we do not have that board.
Madhidha concluded his argument that specifically in his Diocese of Matebeleland there were many people especially the time of liberation who were killed for their faith. Unfortunately, he acclaimed:

These faithful were not recorded. And like if the Church does not make the effort to remember then now then the generation which still remember their contribution will die soon. In this diocese we have people who died for their faith like the late Canon Sakonda who was very instrumental in the planting of churches in the part of the world. I would want him to be recognized as a special person in this Diocese.

5.7 Commemoration and Significance of the Bernard Mzeki Shrine.

All the Anglican informants confirmed that the first pilgrimage took place at the present-location in the late 1930s. Those were the years that the Anglican community began to meet at the shrine to commemorate Bernard Mzeki’s life. It was also concurred that a few Anglicans gathered at the location 50 years down the line, quiet a long time after the death of Bernard for people to begin to gather up gradually and pay respect to a departed Mzeki as it has turned out to be. Notably, Bishop Hatendi was one of the few persons who witnessed the first meeting at the shrine events because he was there serving as a teacher at the Bernard Mzeki school. He said that the story of the death of Mzeki was carried on repeatedly by his wife, Mutwa. Hatendi shared:

She became the first witness of this death so we are all talking about this martyrdom and because she kept on narrating this story to people who lived with her at St Faith, Mission Madetere in Rusape. It got to the ears and eyes of the white missionary that it remained in their hearts that such a figure deserved to be remembered in a special way. It was not until the erection of the shrine of Bernard Mzeki which took place about 1935-39 that the then the priest in charge, Rev Crane if I remember correctly namely it St Bernard mission. Rev Crane was not referring to the Bernard Mzeki the ‘martyr’ we are talking about but St Bernard, the saint in the Anglican books. The mission was called St Bernard mission after the historical Bernard the martyr later own by Bishop Paget. These are two separate people two separate areas of events according to Bishop Haatendi. St Bernard the saint in the book has nothing to do with Bernard Mzeki as it is now.

Bishop Hatendi continued vehemently saying:

The ACZ don’t know this history. History needs to be rewritten, you see, it was never Bernard Mzeki in the first place, it was this English St Bernard. I know this very well. I was teaching there. I tell you, the English St Bernard and Bernard Mzeki are two separate people. The history is very complicated because with the founding of the mission close to where Bernard Mzeki was martyred and the mission which grew into St Bernard mission are two separated places. When I was at the St Bernard Mission in 1935, the Bernard Mzeki shrine was outside the missionary boundary”. It has stood on its own as a small area of the village and then we had to cross Nyakambiri to go into the mission. The creation of St Bernard mission was a result having identified by agreement with chief Mangwende an area were evangelization would take place and this had been granted by chief Mangwende. Alongside this and at the same time as places like St Augustine’s Mission, places like St Faith’s Mission, places like St Mary’s Mission were identified as missions for evangelization by permission of the local chiefs. At St Mary’s Hunyani was by chief Seke and the St Bernard was by Mangwende and
St Faith Rusape was by chief Makoni while St Augustine’s was by Mutasa. These are the missions that were created at the request of the first Bishop of Mashonaland, Knight Bruce.

Musodza concurred that indeed that these were two separate places, the mission and the shrine being named after two different people. The shrine later on later named by Bernard Mzeki is adjacent to the former St Bernard’s Mission on the southern side of the river Nyakambiri. A further inquiry was made to Musodza to find out on how the shrine was inaugurated and when was the place where Bernard Mzeki was killed began to be used and recognized as a shrine at which people would come to gather every year in commemoration of the figure of Bernard. He responded by sharing this:

Concurrence is that at about 1935-36-37 a missionary called Edwin Crain working as priest in charge at St Bernard’s mission, Marondera became the one who got the shrine going. He is the one who identified the place where he had been killed because skeletons of his kitchen hut was still there and even to this very day the foundation of those huts are still there. He is the one who built up the wall at the shrine and that is how it came eventually to a point of identifying it as a shrine by the Bishop of Mashonaland not Bishop Night Bruce. But it was the bishopric time of Bishop Francis Paget. It was his time because he came in 1925-26 as Bishop of Mashonaland. It was his time that the first pilgrim was made to the shrine after the construction of the wall by Edwin Crain who was priest in charge at St Bernard mission.

At the first gathering at the shrine, in the late 1930s one could ask, ‘was it because of religious reasons, was it because they wanted to celebrate Bernard Mzeki’s life or there were other reasons?’

In the response of interviewed key informants, it was felt there was no other reason except the feeling that Bernard was a person who had come over into Mashonaland to do one specific function that is the planting of the gospel among the Shona and the story kept on being retold by his wife and as an eye witness this grew until the Anglican Christians became interested in establishing a shrine named after him. Quite honestly, the respondents acknowledged that at first, there were in terms of numbers very few at the beginning of the first attendance at the shrine. Interestingly, according to the key informants, the white Anglican community attended the shrine gathering at its inception since they were largely the ones that had commissioned the inaugural commemoration. In the words of Bishop Hatendi, “For the opening of the shrine even the governor went to the shrine for the opening which is why the road was tarred from the turn off from the Mutare road on right then up to the shrine then it ends there. Crane popularized it. But whether the shrine meetings had the white support, I am not sure. Nothing has changed. The white communities are still the same. We run a parallel church in terms of color. He continued to say that witnesses to the annual event however could testify that no whites from the Anglican low density parishes went to the event probably after the inaugural events.” This once again puts to test the martyrdom of Bernard if there is divided allegiance on the basis of color a question the Bishop responded by saying; “as I said we run a parallel in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and to one monolithic structure as we run a parallel church on racial ground. It was so then as it is today”.

Bishop James David gave a very important testimony on his first experience on the first celebration service in his words:

Bishop Paget then celebrated the mass and it was a very special experience and in 1968. When I came to what was then Rhodesia, I was visiting my wife who was then my fiancée that time. I had come out from England she was here and she was teaching at Rusawhe as well in 1967-68. We went on a visit when we just got engaged to meet Jean Farrant who was a relation of my wife and she gave us a book about Bernard Mzeki
that she had just written. Since she wrote in, it so was one of our very special possessions. One other thing I wanted to tell you is the strange connection in the book about Bernard Mzeki and one of the people who Bernard worked with, a man named Douglas Pelly. Pelly went back to England and he had a number of sons but I can’t remember how many, but he called one Bernard and he had another one who was called Peter who was in the royal navy in England and who ended it up as church warden in my father’s church in London. So, Douglas Pelly one of his sons not Bernard ended up and I knew him really well and so did my wife.

The researcher made an inquiry to find out the political context of the late 1930 to find out why the establishment of the shrine had a possible political influence. Bakare had this to say:

The post - colonial period was a difficult time for the black people in Zimbabwe. During the 1930s Zimbabwe was in the political rule of the white and Anglican was the state Church. Racial discrimination was the main devil which the black people suffered most. You see, race became the key determinant factor in many aspects. Even in the church blacks were not allowed to worship together in the cathedral and other parishes, especially in the low density areas. One cannot help to think that probably the establishment of the Bernard Mzeki shrine was meant to be the black cathedral for blacks. Probably unknown to all of us the meetings at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine became a place for blacks to share silently the black consciousness of liberating themselves from the white oppressive rule. If this is true, then Bernard Mzeki shrine became another cathedral of liberation. Think seriously about it.

Gunda concurred that the discussion of the establishment of the Mzeki was not done in a political, social and economic vacuum. He declared:

The whites dominated the political and economic set up by putting racist and oppressive rules to an extent of denying the blacks the freedom of assembly and the freedom but at least they were allowed to meet at the Bernard Mzeki shrine for the only purpose of worship. During this period, the black Zimbabweans had limited access to basic social services such as education and health. Development was also racially driven in favor of the whites and it is from this political background that resulted in the formation of black political parties like the ZANU-PF and (ZAPU to fight the colonial regime.

Ruwona agreed when he acclaimed that if the governor of Salisbury attended the first celebration and other government officials, then the meeting was political.

A question was asked on what could have been the reasons why it took a long time for the Anglican community to begin to commemorate and gather to celebrate his life? In response, Bishop Erick Ruwona: Manicaland was of the view that he was not sure what the reasons were but, he stated: I suspect as time went on some of these stories about the miraculous happenings grew and the Shona people, being people who are spiritual in the sense that they believe in miraculous signs in the traditional religion fact, to be told that somebody died and there were dazzling lights and all these things is one thing that was attractive to them”. Another possible reason, from another point of view and from a scholarly perspective, if for example, you read your history well, you will know that the ministry of Bernard Mzeki when he was alive and working, I would call a total failure because in his lifetime he had only one convent baptized, John Kapuya was his only success story”. It is a story of somebody who was really interesting in the sense that he tried to go against the tide and things that were meaningful to the community. It is against that background that people would not accept what he was talking about. Imagine somebody coming to denounce a people’s religious and health delivery system, the only health delivery system they know about and he comes and castigates it and does not propose an alternative.
Largely, Ruwona felt the ministry of the man was a failure and hence the delay in recognizing his work.

5.8 The Influence of Bernard Mzeki in the Anglican Church.

Gunda was asked whether he knew of any Shrines and institutions named after Bernard Mzeki. He had this to say:

Besides the Bernard Mzeki College and the shrine I am not aware of any other place, church named after him and when I look at the shrine and the college I see two institutions where the choice of name is more geographical than the ritual. I think because of the proximity of the college to the place where Bernard was killed as well as the shrine which is the place where he was killed so that could be the reason choosing that name for that school. It would have been more spiritual if say Bonda or St Faith in Manicaland was named after Bernard Mzeki that could change the dynamics but the fact that it’s the school that’s very close to the place where he was killed gives me the impression that there were some geographical considerations in choosing a name for this school. Secondly, it also suggests that the Anglican Communion in general and the Anglican church in Zimbabwe particular is very clear that Bernard Mzeki holds a special place in the spirituality of the Anglicans in Zimbabwe as one of the first black persons to proclaim the gospel within the Anglican Community in Zimbabwe so I think for that reason it does not make Bernard perfect and a saint but it’s an acknowledgement of a critical role that Bernard played. I think when we name even our children we sometimes look at people that have done so much for us and we name our children after them not because we are saying they are perfect but because we are saying that through their imperfectness they still did wonderfully well for us. I think the naming of these places may have had some spiritual significance but I think the geographical consideration was much more and the acknowledgment that whatever he did was critical in setting up the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe.

Madhidha had this to say when asked about the influence of the late Bernard Mzeki to the Anglican in Zimbabwe. He declared that in the cathedral of the Diocese of Matebeleland, there is a side chapel named after him beside the Shrine named after him in Marondera in Harare and more recently in Mozambique, Gambeni, established by the former bishop Singulani. Furthermore, he said, “he was an African and he is an unconfirmed martyr. Africans can identify and see that it is possible to save God as an African. Secondly the influence of Bernard Mzeki is that he has been a uniting person in the church in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and in South Africa respectively.” He added:

I know that parishes in Matebeleland make the pilgrimage without fail to the shrine in Marondera. Every year around 18 June people will be going to Bernard Mzeki. When bishop Cleopas of Matebeleland was the chairman of Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, there were even a large number of people going there with him. Yearly people make a long journey to Marondera. It is a long journey and it’s expensive and it is also uncomfortable because Marondera in this time of the year it will be very cold and without fail it will be drizzling in the night and people will be outside and so it’s a great sacrifice for people to make that journey and for this Diocese, we have to come back and be able to celebrate mass on Sunday. Just these factors which are uncomfortable and we still have people going there. This shows you the conviction that the people of Matebeleland has that Bernard Mzeki is part of the spirituality of the Diocese and let alone the Anglican community in Zimbabwe.
The bishop of the Diocese of Southwark in the Church of England, the right Rev Christopher Chassen in an interview, appreciated the prayers which are made in the prayer Stone Mountain which was still respected. He said, “If the lord spares me, I hope to come once more to the Bernard Mzeki festival in 2018, 12 years after I came the first time. I am bringing my new colleague, Bishop of Woolwich. He is a Nigerian priest and has served all his ministry in the diocese of London and I have nominated him as bishop of Woolwich designate and I would like him to experience the Mzeki festival and learn about something that is foundational to understanding the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe.”

The importance of the shrine was seen when the Church of the Province of Central Africa – Harare Diocese of bishop Chad Gandiya and the Anglican Church Province of Zimbabwe of bishop Nolbert Kunonga (APZ) fought for the ownership of Bernard Mzeki shrine in 2007. This momentum of the schism of the Harare Diocese was witnessed a year before by the bishop of Southwark in the Church of England, the right Rev Christopher Chassen who said:

On my first visit to Zimbabwe as the guest of Bishop Sebastian Bakare in 2006, I went to the Mzeki festival. It was a difficult experience because Bishop Kunonga said that he had apparently said before, falsely, that Bernard Mzeki was a racist. The festival was wonderful though and I was serving with the priest from Manicaland diocese and there was an episcopal division at that time. The dean of the St John’s cathedral in Mutare was Eric Ruwona who is now the undoubted bishop of Manicaland. What impressed me was that there was a very strong sense of people gathering for the prayers, very large numbers of members of Mothers’ Union. The festival took place because of my concern that Bishop Kunonga had been excommunicated. I didn’t want to rob, but the Bishop of Libombo, Bishop Denis Singulani, had been invited to preach, he was a friend of mine and he said he always carried a spare set of Episcopal robes and he asked me to robe, gave me a mitre and I sat with him, then I left soon after. From that, I have read about Bernard Mzeki from Mashonaland, his life, training, his love for the Lord in South Africa, then coming to Zimbabwe and his death in Mashonaland and it’s on the blood of martyrs that the faith of the church is made strong, so I rejoiced that Mzeki was a national holy man who continued to inspire spirituality of this nation.

According to Musodza, the Schism eventually broke out in 2007 and continued for the next eight years. The shrine became a battling field for the two groups of churches (See Appendix 5, 6, 7, 8).

It was important for the researcher to note the concern which was cited by many respondents over the issue of commercialization at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine in Marondera. They argued that even though we gather as a national church in our thousands, there was too much of buying and selling of items. One informant who refused to have his name revealed said:

I think we sometimes shoot ourselves in the foot at the Bernard Mzeki. The celebrations at the shrine have been too commercialized in my opinion and so it’s all about people selling this and that. It has turned to be a market place like Mbare. The emphasis is no longer put on the spirituality of the person gathered for but people want to travel from Matebeleland to Marondera that long journey not to go buy staff at the shrine but to be fed spiritually and experience the spirituality of the shrine.

In response, the Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Masvingo had this to say, “De-commercialization of the Shrine is needed to preserve the essence of the place. It was mentioned in our last ACZ but I think that ACZ has to take that seriously”. One mother’s union member from the Diocese of Manicaland had a contribution in this manner:

I am told that they actually selling the sermon. Now how can you sell the sermon before the preacher can even preach it defeats the whole purpose of the sermon if it
leaks before someone stands on the pulpit? So these are the concerns. We are concerned about the commercialization of the celebration. It should come to an end. Rather let us just worship and it ends there and then that staff they will do it somewhere else and it will bring the glory and dignity of celebration.

The vicar general of the Diocese of Matebeleland, Revd. Father Amon Gonde shared another concern of the dynamics of the shrine service:

Bernard Mzeki shrine is a national shrine because it involves all Anglicans in Zimbabwe. The national board is ACZ which must be responsible for the service on the 18 of June each year. Those from the north we feel like we are sort of marginalized by those who are closer to the shrine. Matebeleland feels this is their thing and that could cause the shrine to have less significance in the rest of the country. It comes down to what happens in the service of worship. Is everybody being catered for in terms of the language, music, the liturgy and the choice of language used because worship is something of the heart and it should be inclusive and if I do not worship in my own language I feel as if I have not worshipped asking an African to pray they will pray in their mother tongue. This should be looked at seriously to that we are all on board.

He concluded in a lighter note that the Bernard Mzeki Shrine was an integral part of the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. He said that shrine was an African phenomenon which was good for the church because Africans could easily relate to shrines.

Bishop James from the Church of England was curious why the Diocese of Harare did not have a parish named after Bernard Mzeki if he was that special to the diocese:

I know of the school named after him. In fact as I was praying through the list of clergy today and yesterday, I thought isn’t it strange that there is no church dedicated in his honor in this diocese. That was my reflection. On a positive note. And all the happenings as a result of Bernard Mzeki’s death, the church of this country has grown astonishingly. It is indeed true that the blood of those dedicated to Christ’s service, is the seed of the church.

The president of the Bernard Mzeki Guild (BMG), Mr Dangirwa (Interview, Harare, 15/07/2016, 10.08), had this to say about him that Bernard has drawn men in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe to follow his footsteps of sacrifice, love for the poor and prayer:

Even though the guild is still growing rapidly in many parishes in the Diocese of Harare, other dioceses feel they want Men’s Fellowship than Bernard Mzeki Guild. But Harare is different because now we have partnership links with Mozambique and South Africa BMG guilds which are more organized to the level of having sets of uniforms and solid constitutions.

The chaplain to the guild, Father Changoza (Interview, Bindura, 02/11/2016, 10:17) concurred with Dangirwa.

5.9 Conclusion.

In conclusion, the above chapter has focused on gathering primary data by using observation, questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaire was distributed on 100 targeted respondents from the seminarians at Bishop Gaul Theological College, from 10 priests each from each five Anglican Dioceses in Zimbabwe. The age and period of full members in the Anglican was captured. The knowledge on the life, history and matters that contributed to the mystical death of the late Bernard Mzeki was noted. Graphs and tables were drawn to illustrate data in the
possible clear manner. In addition, key informants were approached for interviews for an inquiry of the life history of Mzeki life, history, ministry in context, his death that resulted in martyrdom and influence to the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe’s spirituality. These were the Anglican Bishop in the Anglican church of Zimbabwe, deans of cathedrals and priests who are custodians of Anglican ethos of the church. Other few bishops outside the borders of Zimbabwe were interviewed to get insight on what they knew about Bernard Mzeki’s life and history and matter that surrounded his martyrdom and influence. Few academic consultants - historians were interviewed too in order to appreciate Bernard Mzeki’s life, history and his mystical death and martyrdom as part of the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe from a scholarly point of view. The next chapter will present a critical discussion of secondary and primary data collected in chapter four and five respectively.
Chapter 6  Critical analysis of primary and secondary data on Bernard Mzeki’s ministry, identity, martyrdom, Commemoration and influence.

6.1 Introduction.

The aim of this chapter is to examine critically the secondary and primary data gathered on the late Bernard Mzeki from the period under investigation (1892 – 2014). Critical analysis shall be done on the both sources on the life and history of the person under study. The information gathered on his catechetical ministry at Mangwende village in the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, Zimbabwe, and his controversial and mystical death (martyrdom) from both sources shall be examined closely. The chapter shall critique critically and scholarly the data presented on the influence of the late Bernard Mzeki after his death in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, the Anglican province, and in the Anglican Communion worldwide. It is important to mention that it is in this chapter that a critical comparative analysis of primary and secondary information is going to be done to see whether the data available tally or differ so as to get closer to what may be truthful and what may constitute what is real and acceptable in the historical, contemporary and scholarly arena of the late Bernard Mzeki. The researcher is aware that in doing this, there may be conflicting opinions and options in the discussion and debate where the available information from secondary and primary sources many be incomplete and inconsistent. This, therefore, may raise the issue of uncertainty and the phenomena of probability value, hence the need to deconstruct and analyze the information available explicitly. Therefore, critical analysis shall be under the same sub topics given in the last two chapters, that is chapter four and five respectively.

6.2 Early life history of Bernard Mzeki.

Both secondary and primary sources agreed that Bernard Mzeki was born in Gwambeni – Inyambani in Mozambique. Secondary source was very clear that he was born in 1861. The early life of Bernard is described in chapter two where the researcher struggled with the idea that he left Mozambique at the age of 14 after he had worked in the store of a Portuguese trader. And for him to leave Gwambeni, he had to sell a horse to finance his trip to Cape Town, South Africa. The impression painted specifically by the imperial writers was that the late Bernard Mzeki was destined for greatness yet the information available is quite divorced from the socio political context of the 1860s where horses were owned by whites alone. A paramount question could be: Could 14 year old boy buy a horse? Another inquiry concerns the maturity of a 14 year young man to just leave and enter an unknown world. Interestingly, writers did not agree on the age on which he left Gwambeni and the reasons why he had to leave. This therefore, showed inconsistence and lack of coherence which made Musodza raise the probability that perhaps, the young Bernard Mzeki found himself without parents following the death of his father and the departure of his mother to her eldest brother, who according to their culture had to stay with her until the brother found another husband for her. This meant that life became horrible for Bernard at such a tender age. Hence, he had no other choice than to leave. The logical conclusion would be that the imperial European historical pen from secondary sources wanted to paint Bernard Mzeki as someone whose life was predestined to be a hero in foreign lands; that is South Africa and Zimbabwe respectively. Unfortunately, the primary sources were informed by the available secondary sources. Hence, from primary data, all the informants showed that generally they had information of the early livelihood of the late Bernard Mzeki from Mozambique. It is important to mention that the researcher undertook two visits to rural Gwambeni, Mozambique. That was in 2009 and 2012 respectively. The researcher using observation as a research tool, gained first-hand information by visiting his home stand in
Mozambique which has been consecrated as a shrine and named after him. The researcher had an opportunity to meet his relatives from the third generation and listened to oral stories about Bernard Mzeki which were influenced by western views. This meant that the primary sources were informed western secondary sources which was a disadvantage or weakness for the primary information. Therefore, the researcher was of the opinion that a specific historical reconstruction of Bernard Mzeki’s childhood life from an African historical perspective was penned so that it can be more realistic, imperative and scholarly acceptable.

Both primary and secondary data confirmed that Bernard Mzeki travelled to South Africa to find green pastures even through secondary sources gave details than the former. In South Africa, he was employed as a house servant and gardener in Rondebosch, in Cape Town (Farrant, 1966: 9). Was this not child abuse? One may ask. The researcher is of the opinion that racism and cheap labor were at play here. More specifically, secondary data showed that it was in this period in Rondebosch that Bernard Mzeki first came into contact with the Cowley Fathers of St Philip’s in Zonnewbloem, where he was drawn to become interested about knowing God. He enrolled at the night school administered by Fraulein von Bloemberg. He was baptized on the 7th March 1886, the Feast of St Perpetua and her Companions, and was confirmed in St Philip’s Chapel by Bishop West Jones. He later decided to offer for the full-time ministry and was made a catechist. Furthermore, secondary and primary sources confirmed that Mzeki was very intelligent and had a special and unique gift of languages of Greek and Hebrew, let alone English and Latin, which he studied intensively. The researcher questions; if Bernard was so intelligent, why was he not made a priest and not just a catechist? The probable reason may be that of the socio-political and religious reasons of the day that did not allow Africans to be made priests. Yet the picture portrayed specifically by secondary sources is of a Bernard who was extremely intelligent.

Notably, secondary and primary information confirmed that Rev Whydham Hamilton Knight Bruce was a historical figure who was part of the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe together with Bernard Mzeki. Both sources agreed that Bishop Bruce was the first bishop in the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland and Mzeki was one of the few catechists to offer himself for ministry in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). The researcher wonders whether Bernard Mzeki had any choice or not to accompany Bishop Knight Bruce after he had been schooled from a very tender and young age and cared for by the church? Hence, the idea if him offering himself for ministry in the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland is dubious and questionable. The logical probability value from the researcher’s point of view is that the church, therefore had already prepared him for work in new ministry adventures in Mashonaland, Rhodesia-Zimbabwe. Hence, both sources concurred that it was a historical fact that Bernard Mzeki, Bishop Knight Bruce and other catechists travelled through Beira as part of the ‘pioneer column’ to evangelize the Shona people in Zimbabwe as secondary and primary data affirm. In 1891, he was left in Mangwende village by his Bishop Bruce after negotiations were completed with chief Mangwende to leave him to establish a new church in the new Anglican Diocese.

6.3 Ministry work of Bernard Mzeki in Mangwende village.

Concerning the ministry of Bernard Mzeki in the Mangwende Village in the new Diocese of Mashonaland, Rhodesia-Zimbabwe, both secondary and primary sources agree on the activities of ministry which Bernard Mzeki exercised. The only difference was that secondary sources were more detailed than the primary sources. In terms of space, time and context, both sources concurred that this was indeed the period of the scramble for Africa and the church and the British Empire colonised Zimbabwe in the name of the British South Africa Company (BSAC)
led by Cecil John Rhodes in which Zimbabwe was originally named Rhodesia after him. Furthermore, they both agreed that the context of the Shona indigenous people was different from where he had come from, the South African context, let alone his childhood background in Mozambique. In Mangwende village, the catechist was living with a different society whose people, the Shona indigenous local people had a different socio-anthropological and polititcal way of life which the British themselves had failed to really understand.

Notably, both secondary and primary sources agreed that the late Bernard was left by his bishop under the care of Chief Mangwende – Mungati, in Nhowe, Marondera. He was given a place to stay which was near the Nyakambiri river where he was to establish a mission for the Anglican Church. Near the river, he established a subsistance garden for sustainance as both sources confirmed. All sources pointed out that Bernard Mzeki was officially a lay catechist and this office did not change until he was murdered even though Mr Pelly who joined the ministry after him was priested and Mzeki was not considered for ordainment. The probable logical conclusion to this treatment was because of racism and a superiority complex on the part of the British who looked down upon black people as being incapable of ordained ministry. Both sources cited that as a lay catechist, Bernard Mzeki was faithful to his daily offices of devotions, quiet times, meditations, morning and evening prayers, prime, compline and reading the scriptures. In detail, secondary sources added that he was raised in a tradition of catholic practices which was based in self-discipline, penitence and sacraments. Snell agreed that it was one of the major factors of a good quality of faithfulness that was too strong that motivated him to join the party of Bishop Knight Bruce to establish the new Anglican Diocese of Mahonaland (Snell, 2001: 12). But the researcher still insists that Bernard Mzeki had no choice because he had been schooled at a tender age for him to refuse to join his Bishop Bruce. Western education had already brainwashed him not to refuse. The church was, therefore, thinking on his behalf.

In addition, both sources affirmed that he had some knowledge of medicine and application. The researcher shall cite two example where Bernard Mzeki demonstrored him knowledge in medicine. Closely looking at the secondary sources, first Mzeki showed how he cured John Kapuya - Shoniwa who was seriously ill. when the local nanga Demha had asked Kapuya to slaughter a goat for the avenging spirit; instead Bernard Mzeki took him against the wishes of his parents and cured him using his medicinal knowledge. (Noll & Nystrom 2011: 26). Both sources agreed that John Shoniwa Kapuya became the first convert to become a follower of Bernard Mzeki and followed by Gowe Chigwa da. Secondly, according to Farrant (1966: 160) and Noll & Nyström (2011: 25), Bernard Mzeki dealt with an outbreak of small pox in 1895 in Mangwende chiefdom. The minister for the Seventh Adventist mission on the Tsungwesi River had already died of the smallpox. The Native Commissioner, Meredith Lleweth brought medical supplies to Mangwende Village for Bernard Mzeki to vaccinate the village. He vaccinated over ten thousand people with vaccine sent by the government.

Interestingly, both secondary and primary data noted that Bernard Mzeki had a special and unique talent and ability to master languages. This was because he learned the indigenous local Shona language and was already speaking it without any trace of foreignness within a short period of time. Secondary information detailed how Mzeki had remarkable missionary gifts as he quickly learned the local Shona language (Farrant, 1966:181). This demonstrated that he was very intelligent, particularly in languages and linguistics which meant he could speak eight languages comfortably. Bishop Knight Bruce called him a master of languages. He spoke English, Dutch, Portuguese, French, Latin, Greek, Zulu and Shona. Both sources observed that Mzeki’s abilities to speak the local Shona language, made him grow closer to the Shona people in the Mangwende village and beyond the borders of the village. In addition, he could teach, sing and compose songs. Furthermore, both primary and secondary sources concurred that he was invited to do translation of church materials into local languages; in addition, he was an
interpreter in the civil courts in the land and of chief Mangwende when needed. He was an exceptional man. It is important to question this consistently: if Mzeki had these displayed abilities that were acknowledged by the bishop Knight Bruce himself and everyone in the land in his day, why was he not ordained into the priesthood? Besides racism as mentioned before, probably, the leadership of the church was jealous of him not to elevate to a promotion because of the color of his skin. The researcher is of the option that if Bernard had lived in the twentieth century, the sky was the limit for him with such commitment and abilities. He could be the first black Archbishop of York, John Sentamu. Or another probability option may be that Bernard Mzeki was not as intelligent as portrayed by western history writers. They may have wanted to paint him as an intelligent fairy tale figure in a Hollywood movie; like Tarzan, a little white boy who was lost in the jangle and was raised by apes until he became of age.

6.4 Analysis of factors that contributed to Mzeki death

In this sub-section, the researcher shall critically analyse the factors that were raised in secondary and primary data that may have contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki. The factors raised were political, social, economic and religious. It is of interest to show in the primary data collection, fifty five out of hundred showed that there were other reasons beside religious that contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki. These were from the top leadership of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and a few from the academic consultants. The remaining forty five displayed ignorance of not knowing if there were other factors that contributed to Mzeki’s death. All this shall be scholarly looked at below.

6.4.1 The Political factors.

Both secondary and primary information gathered concurred that the politics of the day contributed to the demise of Mzuki. Interestingly, secondary sources, oreso, Farrant gave an impression that even though Bernard Mzeki lived in an environment which displayed the political fabric and dynamics of the day, that did not matter to him. She constantly wanted to paint a Bernard Mzeki who was divorced from the political context of his day. Her main objective was to depict a ‘white’ Bernard Mzeki whose conscience was so religiously connected to his God as if one of his legs was already in heaven and the other one was hanging in between heaven and earth.

All the informants who participated in the collection of primary data vehemently declared from an African understanding that Bernard Mzeki could not have lived outside his political context. They all agreed that Mzeki came to do ministry in Rhodesia – Zimbabwe with his Bishop Knight Bruce and others during the time of the scramble for Africa – the colonisation period, the same period with the pioneer column. The British and the Church occupied Mashonaland at the same time. For Bernard Mzeki came into Mangwende village after the British in the name of Cecil John Rhodes had already placed the Union Jack at the market square in Salisbury – Harare as a sign that the British Empire had officially colonised Zimbabwe. During this era, the Gospel was preached from a political imperial perspective. Primary data revealed that it was difficult to distinguish between the role of the missionaries and that of the colonisers. Critically examining the activities of the missionaries which included the missionary activities of Bernard Mzeki, the establishment of missions in villages in Mashonaland by the church was to provide education that would enable a political agenda to be achievable. The missionary and coloniser’s agenda was based on three Cs, Christianity, Commerce and Civilization. In particular, Bakare said Bernard Mzeki was a whiteman incarnate, an uncle Tom, who who was a political messenger representing the white coloniser agenda. Furthermore, primary data showed that the death of Bernard could not be separated ot
the First Chimurenga of 1896-7 that took place during the same time he was murdered. This war was meant to kill the white colonisers and whoever was connected directly or indirectly to them. This included Bernard Mzeki. His death can only be understood when it is associated with the First Chimurenga which was a political war of liberation. Hence, his death was not merely for his religious faith; it was a political death.

Critically examining this, one may wonder if the person under investigation could not see the bigger picture of what was happening politically around him if he was such an intelligent person as portrayed by the imperial writers of history. The political dominance which the white colonisers demonstrated to the local indigenous African people was very clear for Mzeki to see and make a decision to disassociate himself by going back to South Africa where he belonged. It is of paramount importance to mention that Bernard Mzeki was never on record from primary and secondary sources for speaking against the white imperial political agenda of dominance, let alone the participation of the church in the politics of the day. What is on record from the secondary data is the failure of the Bishop Knight Bruce to address the Cecil John Rhodes’ South Africa British company’s political abuses towards the local African people which he had already noticed whilst he was still in South Africa before he started his bishopric in Mashonaland (Knight Bruce, 1895: 64). Or if Bernard Mzeki was not brainwashed by his notorious faith, education and white philosophy whilst in South Africa, he could have joined the first nationalist movement that initiated the first Chimurenga war.

From another political point of view, primary data, outstandingly, mentioned Gandiya, Ruwona and Gunda in their interviews respectively noted a different political perspective of seeing Bernard Mzeki as a political victim of his day. It is significant to cite that this perspective was not found in the secondary sources available. It was mentioned that Bernard Mzeki was an epitome of white people’s expectation of an obedient black person in the eyes of the indigenous local Mnagwende people. So his loyalty and canonical obedience to the church made him a political victim. In addition, the researcher is of the opinion that his participation in civil and high courts as an interpreter might have made him unpopular with the local people. The service he gave in the courts helped the white judges to persecute the local indigenous people. This gives an impression in the academic arena that Bernard Mzeki was a political tool and was naïve of it until he became a political victim.

The above scenario can be likened to a political philosophy theory from the faculty of political science which was used mentioned as a methodology in this investigation in chapter one. It is important to put this theory to the test. This philosophy was asserted by Niccolo Machiavelli, an Italian renaissance philosopher who promoted this political argument in this manner:

When the prince comes into power in a land that does not share either his culture or language, he has to do basically two things: first, to reside within the land and second, to plant colonies that will divide the people making it easier to rule and maintain power. The other and better course is to send colonies to one or two places, which may be as keys to that state, for it is necessary either to do this or else to keep there a great number of cavalry and infantry (Machiavelli, 1530: XIV).

With critical analysis, the researcher, therefore has liken this political theory to the colonization of Zimbabwe in the late eighteenth century. The Prince represents the white colonizers. In their attempt to maintain power, they appoint a ‘colony’ which in chief Mangwende’s village represented by Bernard Mzeki who eventually became a political victim in his death. The researcher is of the view that despite the accepted and most common understanding that he died a religious death, one must turn to political philosophy to present a fundamentally alternative rationale on a political factor that contributed to his death. Hence, based on Machiavelli’s political philosophy, the researcher argues that Mzeki’s death was purely power politics at play. In this political theory, Machiavelli went further to elucidate a character that is found in this
theory which is called political socialization. He defined this political socialization as "the developmental process by which people acquire their political orientation and patterns of behavior.” It is regarded as a process by which political cultures are formed, maintained and transformed over time. As such political socialization becomes a developmental process through which people learn accepted attitudes and values of their political culture and those of others(Machiavelli, 1530, XIV).

From the above character of political socialization as part of the Machiavelli’s political theory, Bernard Mzeki became an instrument of political socialization of the imperial colonial culture. For he was a black African catechist, British in his orientation, attitude, behavior and his understanding of a white pattern of political systems. Therefore, the indigenous local people defined Mzeki as political authority of socialization which was to diffuse political structures of the local people. Subsequently, they murdered him because of the politics of the day which was meant to say no to Bernard Mzeki to a god who was worshipped by him and the white colonizers who were annexing their lands and looking down upon their political leadership structures and polity.

The available secondary sources painted Bernard Mzeki as a holy saint and martyr. But primary data gathered, especially Musodza, and Lunga respectively from a deep analysis strongly pointed out that Mzeki was a strong political collaborator, a traitor, a sellout - Mutengesi and an accomplice in the eyes of the indigenous local people. Hence, there was more to his martyrdom than the obvious reasons. The researcher, interestingly concurs with Musodza and Lunga’s point of view that Mzeki was Mutengesi, making him a political treat to the local people. Therefore, the only way to deal with collaborators, traitors, sell-outs and vatengesi was not to bring them before a chief and pronounce a judgement against them. Far from it. The only way was to murder him in cold blood. And this had to happen in the names of Muchemwa and others who killed him.

Absent in the primary sources available was the strong relationship between Bernard Mzeki and chief Mangwende as noted by Snell (2001: 2). Critically analyzing their relationship, the researcher is of the opinion that this may have been interpreted as a political relationship from the eyes of the family and the Mangwende community that may have contributed to his demise in the hands of the chief’s sons and relatives, making Mzeki’s death a family domestic matter. The close relatives may have thought and concluded that Mzeki wanted to take over the chieftainship away from the Mangwende family. For as soon as Mzeki was introduced to the chief by the Bishop Knight Bruce, they automatically became very close. They both often sat together on the hilltop kraal of Matope and talked together many times. In addition, Mzeki was an interpreter to the chief Mangwende when whites visited the Mangwende kraal (Farrant, 1966: 118). This meant that Mzeki was now an advisor to the chief. In return, the Chief promised to build a large hut to serve as church and school across the valley of the Nyakumbiri River. Interestingly, the chief head wife, Zvandaparira, was also drawn to the catechist. She attended the Mission mass often. Furthermore, Mzeki’s friendship was cemented further when Chief Mangwende declared every Sunday a chisi – a holiday or a resting day with an equivalence to a Sabbath day of the Jewish people were forbidden to do manual work. The Chief allowed those who wanted to attend Mass at the Mission to do as they wished. To prove his support for this move, he went on to allow his brother-in-law to live with Bernard and be taught the Christian Faith.

Adding to the opinion mentioned above was his marriage with Mutwa who was a niece to the Chief. It must be mentioned that during these times, even in the old ancient near east times, relationships to royalty were enhanced by marry in the family of the chieftainship. This may have been viewed as a political move by chief Mangwende’s son, Muchemwa who felt that Mzeki was diplomatically taking over power and authority of the village away from his father.
That may be the reason why Muchemwa was very bitter with Mzeki. They hated him so much that they wished to have him removed from the Mangwende community. Was chief Mangwende preparing his successor in Bernard Mzeki considering that he was given a respected appellation of mufundisi – the teacher in the village with was equivalent to the chief? The answer to this question may be one of the possible reasons why the family hated Mzeki. The family disrespected their father Chief Mangwende who had given Mzeki a vast piece of land to establish a mission – ‘a small kingdom within a kingdom’ in the Mangwende village. Hence, from a political point of view, considering this examination of Mzeki and chief Mangwende’s relationship and friendship, Mzeki had to be eliminated by the family to protect their chieftainship.

Close analysis of this possible suspicion of the family that Mzeki may have wanted to take political power away from chief Mangwende can logically make sense when it is compared with the legendary story from the secondary information available when looked at from another political perspective (Snell, 2001: 16). This is in the view that it was chief Mangwende after possibly realizing that Mzeki was politically becoming powerful, craftily ordered Bernard’s death, rising an allegation that had cut down some of the sacred trees of the clan. The chief had lied to Mzeki in the sense that when he was looking for a new site Mangwende himself suggested the place beside the spring and its stream and pressed him to build there. He assured Bernard that a new sacred grove had been found for the Mangwende lions nearer to the Nyakambiri and the place where the tribal ceremonies, dances, singing and prayers for rains were held. No one had been near the grove for months and Bernard felt that he could safely cut down a few trees to make a place for his experimental sowing of wheat. This action must have sparked strong resentment from all the members of the Mangwende Village, resulting in killing him for committing such a political crime. Mzeki was easy to kill because he remained a political outsider, politically uncared for and a foreigner to the Mangwende village. Therefore, his death can be identified as a political death.

6.4.2 The Social Factors.

It must be noted that both secondary and primary data available showed that the socio-anthropological factors contributed to the death of the late Bernard Mzeki in the late nineteenth century.

Both sources concurred that Mzeki was a foreigner to the cultural-social fabric of the Shona people of Mangwende in Zimbabwe. He was from Mozambique and was civilized into the English – British culture in South Africa. And all of a sudden, he was in a different social set up all together in Mangwende. The white colonizers considered the social way of the Africans as uncivilized. Therefore, they looked down upon the Africans. They argued that the social-anthropological way of life had satanic and demonic tendencies. Hence, there was an urgent need to assimilate and civilize the African population through the missionaries’ activities. The researcher is of the opinion that one of the reasons why Bernard Mzeki was murdered was African social resistance to a social transformation to a British cultural and social way of life.

As much as Mzeki tried as possible as he could to live like the local people, he remained with English cultural character. This was noted specifically from the secondary sources that he grew flowers and kept small animals as pets like small ducks and pigs which was unusual to the Mangwende villagers (Snell, 2001: 11). This was very English. One might think that because of this strange behavior, the indigenous local people identified him as a witchdoctor from Mozambique who had been hired by the white colonizers to bewitch them. ‘Kill him’ became the song of the village.
In addition, both secondary and primary sources agreed that the cutting down of the sacred trees of Msasa was one of the social reasons that contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki. The sacred grove of trees was part of a way of life, a social-anthropological system of the Shona Mangwende people. Chief Mangwende’s totem was Shumba – Lion (Snell, 2001: 16). The grove was where the lions would come and ‘speak’ with the indigenous local Shona people. The grove was a shrine. Mzeki cut the sacred trees in the watery grove for agricultural purposes. The grove was watery and so very convenient for planting rice. This was because mid 1890s was a period of famine and hunger. He felt he could assist to alleviate hunger by cutting the trees and planting rice. Critically examining this account, Mzeki was warned by his wife, Mutwa and two of his student, namely Kapuya and Chigwada, not to cut the sacred Msasa tree but he did not heed to the warning. It is important to note the authenticity of this account. For this is a story which was handed over to the Munyanyi family to the third generation of Magada. According to both sources of secondary and primary data confirmed that Munyanyi was a load carrier for Mzeki who travelled with him for pastoral and missionary work. Primary sources declared that the cutting of the sacred tree by Mzeki was the most foolish this to do. Primary sources available painted Mzeki as stubborn, ignorant and disrespectful to the social fabrics of the Mangwende people. This is contrary to the picture of a very intelligent Mzeki painted in the secondary data presented. He vehemently refused to listen to the advice. And before the cut down the sacred trees, he declared that God was on his side and nobody would touch him. He had given the impression that he was challenging the local community to asocial battle. Cutting the sacred trees also meant that he was challenging and disrespecting the totem of the chief and his people. He had made the sign of the cross the same as the witch would do before they perform a ritual. This was a grave mistake for Mzeki. Mangwende villagers were furious, angry and flabbergasted by Bernard Mzeki’s adamant behavior. Therefore, the researcher is of the option that Bernard Mzeki was murdered because of his foolishness in his failure to respect the social fabric of the local people. This contributed to his death from a social-anthropological perspective.

Although, the marriage of Bernard Mzeki has been critically discussed from a political point of view, the primary sources available cited that it was also a social reason that contributed to his death. Secondary and primary sources presented agree that it was a historical fact that Mzeki married Mutwa in the early 1896. Secondary data revealed that as much as the catechist was popularly known as umfundisi – Teacher, he was also well known the Mukiti – the celibate one, who later decided to marry (Musodza, 2008: 90). Critiquing this marriage account, the data available did not show whether Mzeki married Mutwa customarily first. The payment of lobola was not recorded at all. Primary information showed, notably Bakare that Bernard Mzeki’s marital relationship with Mutwa was one of the social reasons why he was murdered. Mutwa was far younger than him.

Furthermore, primary information presented pointed out that it was against the social–anthropological setup for a foreigner to marry a local woman in Mangwende village. Rooranai Wematongo – which means marry from your community, was one of the Shona proverbs which constructed the social fabric of earlier time. Marrying foreigners was discouraged yet Mzeki, a stranger, broke this traditional fabric. This made the villagers resent him, especially the chief’s sons who were presumed to have thought that he had gone too far, in terms to disrupt the cultural ethos of the local community. This was a sudden change from the social philosophy which had informed the Mangwende community for centuries. The researcher is of the view that one can understand why Muchemwa and his uncles were very bitter, angry and furious with Mzeki. The chief’s sons, Muchemwa and others were against the relationship of Mutwa, their sister and Mzeki which may have been a disgrace to the royal family. Mutwa had brought a curse, shame and reproach to the royal family of the chief by marrying the catechist. After all, Mzeki represented the ‘English’ in the way he dressed and the many languages he was able to speak. Close analysis of the wedding ceremony as recorded in the secondary sources
revealed that the wedding invitational cards were not extended to the Mangwende royal family and the community as a whole. Interestingly, it may have been a very private wedding ceremony. For the event, according to the secondary sources available, took place not in Mangwende village but in Rusape. The marriage was solemnized by Revd. Father Mtobi, a Zulu (Snell 2001, 18, Evans, 1945; 10). Mutwa was given away not by his guardian, chief Mangwende. Instead, she was given away Mr Williams, a Welsh farmer. The witnesses to the wedding were the Native Commissioner, Mr Ross, the other catechists Frank Ziqubu and Jacob Dyasi and Shoniwa Kapuya. It must be said, according to the researcher that this wedding in Rusape may have been the Sarajevo (1914, which led to the First World War) social incident - the immediate factor that contributed to his assassination in June in the same year of 1896. He was killed three months after his wedding when Mutwa was two months pregnant. Hence, Bernard Mzeki’s failure to fully enculturate, to comprehend the social–anthropological dynamics, fabrics and ethos contributed to the social tensions that led to his death.

6.4.3 The Religious Factors.

Critically analyzing the information presented from both secondary and primary sources, they all alluded to the historical fact the Barnard Mzeki was killed because of religious reasons. They both agree that the religious reason why he was murdered was because of the religious conflicts of Bernard Mzeki’s teachings of Christianity versus the African traditional religious (ATRs) beliefs and customs –. Closely looking at the secondary data available, it presented a Bernard Mzeki who was merely killed because of purely religious factors but primary sources brought in new dynamics that challenged the existing thinking that he dead due to his Faith. The researcher is of the probability option that it may have been that the pen which wrote about Mzeki was an imperial white pen which had to paint his death as a ‘Christian Faith’ death qualifying him to be a holy man, saint and martyr.

Secondary sources, especially Farrant (1966:178) noted that the impression given was Mzeki’s task was going to be easy. The Shona people already had the concept of God. Therefore, his main objective was only to correct misapprehensions and misconceptions about the ‘African’ God and bring the ‘English’ God closer to the people as a personal God. For example, distinctively, the religious beliefs of the indigenous local Mangwende people in Ngozi - avenging Spirit and the Shave - alien spirit was evident. The catechist taught that the deity they had acknowledged as Mwari the creator God Musikavanhu was the same Christian God. Secondary sources highlighted that it was from Mzeki’s Christian teachings that was resisted by the Mangwende village that caused his religious death. Primary sources concurred but it went deeper than the secondary sources presented. Primary sources revealed that the catechetical ministry of teaching a foreign faith - the Gospel of Christ, was very confrontational. He challenged the religious beliefs of the people of Mangwende. The researcher poses two questions at this juncture. The first question is as follows: Was Mzeki wise to do this still he was known to be a very intelligent catechist trained to do ministry? Where the white missionaries preaching the same confrontational gospel of publicly challenging African Traditional Religions in acts and deeds? From the primary sources, Gunda declared that when a priest decides to exercise a confrontational ministry, then he must be prepared to face any result that follows. From a critical point of view, one wonders if Mzeki was aware that the gospel he was teaching was meant to show that the African traditional religious beliefs and practices were inferior to the new western religion of Christianity. Was he aware in his mind that the western civilisation in African meant getting rid of the African traditional religions and customs and introducing Christianity and a western way of life? If Africans were to become Christian, they were to leave their traditional religions, in the process losing their very identity and personality. In the context of the Mangwende village, Bernard Mzeki was promulgating teachings that undermined their belief systems and introducing
another religion which was non-African and strangely unique. In all this, Mzeki was getting into a religious conflict which was like burning fire without an extinguisher according to the available primary data.

Contrary to the secondary sources mentioned above, primary sources available presented a different perspective all together. They presented Mzeki who was identified as a healer in the Mangwende Village. He had healed Shoniwa Kapuya who was very ill by using his first aid knowledge. One of the local female nángas, Demha had given an instruction to have a goat slaughtered and sacrificed to please the ancestors for the cure of the Kapuya. Demha got very angry and declared that he was going to inform all the spiritual mediums what he had done. Mzeki had taken the sick to his home and applied some medicine and he got cured. Critiquing this account, according to the researcher, this meant that consequently, he had become a threat to the survival of the spirit mediums, whose livelihood depended on healing the village using traditional methods. Seeking healing from Mzeki, meant loss of business for the traditional healers. This also means, according to primary data that Mzeki was killed not necessarily because of his faith but more so, because of his identification as a new healer/witchdoctor in a new Mangwende community which had its own healers – the spirit mediums. He was murdered because of his actions and not his faith. In addition, his further actions included his participation in vaccination of the Mangwende village during the outbreak of the chicken pox in 1895. Secondary data alluded to his participation that it was one of the crimes levelled against him by the spirit mediums; that he had pierced the flesh of the people and rubbed poison. (Farrant, 1966: 160). This was an unforgivable sin, according to the nángas of the day Furthermore, his cutting of the Msasa trees in the sacred groove was one of the actions that caused his death. This was the sacred groove where the gods of the land – Shumba dzamangwende – the lions of Mangwende dwelled. The grove was a shrine, a place of religious worship of the Mangwende people. The catechist had cut down the sacred trees, to create a field to grow wheat. Before he began to cut the trees, Mzeki had made the sign of the cross in the air which was very strange to the spirit mediums. The sign of the cross identified him as a sorcerer and a witch. This was also a great sign of disrespect to the chief, his people and the spiritual leadership of Mangwende Village. The sign of the cross was also perceived as a spiritual challenge to the spiritual mediums.

Both secondary and primary data alluded that the spirit mediums in return began to fight Mzeki by blaming all natural disasters of 1896/7 on him and his new religion. There was famine and drought, cattle disease, rinderpest, and chicken pox crises in the land of Bernard Mzeki and his new religion. The spirit mediums argued that all these natural disasters were religious and were caused by Mzeki and the white colonizers. The spiritual leaders were furious with him. Their first attempt was to ask the chief to get rid of Mzeki kindly but it did not work out. Hence, they concluded that Mzeki had bewitched the chief to like him. They only succeeded to convince his son, Muchemwa, to lead a small group of people to murder him.

From the primary information, Gonde mentioned that the spiritual leaders (Nehanda and Kaguvi) of the Mangwende fuelled anger among local Shona people to support the murder Bernard Mzeki. According to Gonde, Muchemwa, a son of the Mangwende, was influenced by the spirit mediums and became an ally. He was found directly responsible for Mzeki’s murder, removal or disappearance of his body and the destruction of the mission. Critically looking at the same primary sources, showed that the First Chimurenga of 1896-7 was a religious uprising was led by spiritual mediums. And Mzeki was not spared because of all the religious reasons mentioned above. Notably, Hatendi commented in an interview that what was generally accepted by the western writers of history was that Mzeki was murdered because of his faith. This was so because he was the colonists’ ’boy’, according to him. This means that his faith did not kill him but something more religiously deep than his faith caused his death.
Both secondary and primary sources alluded to economic factors contributing to the death of Bernard Mzeki. They both showed that the land issue was one of the causes of the First Chimurenga of 1896/7. But it is important to highlight that the African church writers of the history of Bernard Mzeki like Farrant and others did not really come into the open about the land issue being a contributory factor to the death of the catechist when compared to the primary sources available. This may seem so because the pen that wrote his history was a white imperial pen that wanted to paint him more as a hero of faith. They lightened the economic context of the day that was centred on the land. Historians like Cobbing and others recorded that the Ndebele intelligentsia started visited Chiefs in Mashonaland in the early months of 1896 to stir up the indigenous Shona people to revolt against imperial rule. The Shona had regarded the British as temporary visitors to their land. The Ndebele, therefore had come to remind them that they had come to stay permanently (Snell, 2001: 19). The cause of the revolt was the land. They encouraged the raiding of white farmers who had taken the land from the locals, rural shops, Christian missions and all government posts. Anyone associated with the whites were to be killed too like Bernard Mzeki. Tax collectors and labor recruiters were also to be killed (Cobbing, 1977: 62).

Primary sources penetrated the issue of land by beginning to set up a right context by mentioning that the scramble for Africa was land based. All respondents from the primary sources concurred that the Berlin Conference in Berlin in 1884-85 marked the beginning of the scramble for Africa. This was followed by concessions like the Rudd Concession particularly for Zimbabwe which allowed Cecil John Rhodes through his company to have the right to explore the land and her minerals. In addition, the African continent was fertile for agricultural activities. Notably, Ndyabayika, in an interview raised important questions. Was Bernard Mzeki aware of the Charter which was offered by the Queen of England which permitted Cecil John Rhodes to occupy Southern Africa as a result of the Rudd Concession and its conditions which was signed between the white settlers through the British South Africa Company in order for England to gain an economic advantage? Was he knowledgeable that the payment of the participators of the Pioneer Column was in the form of land upon arrival in Mashonaland in Zimbabwe? Was he aware of the intention of the church which was to cement colonization of Southern Africa? If Bernard Mzeki was aware of all this, I do not think he was going to join the bishop Knight Bruce to preach in Mashonaland, Zimbabwe.

The researcher agrees with Ndyabayika that if Mzeki knew that the occupation of Mashonaland was to cripple the economic freedom of the Shona Mangwende people and forcefully grab their land, then he would not have joined Bishop Knight Bruce, for the Shona were left landless, desperate and vulnerable. And because Mzeki joined the Bishop to Mashonaland, he was caught in this economic revolt of 1896-7.

Primary sources revealed that the Pioneer Column’s participants after occupation were given fertile land as part of their payment. The locals had occupied these lands for centuries. And now they were being forcefully removed from their lands for their livelihood on which they depended on economically. It is significant to note this as mentioned by the primary sources that it was bad enough to be a peasant farmer but it was worse to be a landless peasant. The pregnancy of meaning of the land issue to the Mangwende people was highlighted. The land for them meant economic livelihood, history and identity. For when the indigenous local people greeted each other, they used the expression of Mwanawevhu, meaning sons of the soil. This meant that the very economic survival of the African people was in the Land. And now they were landless. It is important to mention that from the same sources acknowledged that the
taking of the land from the Shona people by the white colonizers made them to be bitter and angry. The land dispossession had caused economic hardship to the African people.

Again, both primary and secondary sources pointed out that from 1890s onwards, the white colonisers designed economic and agricultural policies that economically disadvantaged the already poor indigenous people. During the rinderpest crisis, the white administrators ordered for all the cattle affected to be burnt in order to control the disease. This was very strange to the indigenous people who had never experienced this before. Many cattle were destroyed. Notably, we learn from the secondary sources that Snell went at length to show how Bernard Mzeki explained to chief Mangwende on the reasons why the government, collected hut tax and killed infected cattle. He told chief Mangwende that the actions of the government were for the good of his people in his village (Snell, 2001: 19). Critically analyzing the discussions of the catechist with the chief concerning the actions of the white colonizers collecting tax and burning infected cattle meant that he was more than a missionary. Here he sounded like a government official placed strategically in the village to brainwash and justify the actions of the British imperial rule. Hence, he was identified as a ‘mediator and voice’ of the colonizers to the local Mangwende people. This meant that he was helping the white settlers in disempowering the locals and empowering the colonizers economically. In this, the indigenous people were furious and concluded that the best was to retaliate this bad treatment by the colonizers by resistance. Both sources agreed that the First Chimurenga of 1896-7 was a historical event and a historical fact. In this war, the Shona and Ndebele advocated the destruction of anything that symbolized any form of imperial British colonial oppression. Therefore, they fought to recover their land. And Bernard Mzeki was caught up in this economic first war meant to kill anyone who represented the white colonizers and the colonizers who had economically disabled the indigenous local people by dispossessing them of their land. Mzeki was murdered during the revolt on the 18th of June, 1896.

6.5 The critical analysis of the mystery of Bernard Mzeki’s death.

Significantly to this investigation, both secondary and primary data made available confirmed that there was something mysterious about the death of Bernard Mzeki. It is important to cite that even though they all agree without any reasonable doubt that there was something mysterious about his death, they all offer different accounts of this death and different perspectives of interpreting the mystics of the Mzeki’s death.

Firstly, the secondary sources managed to establish the background of the events prior to the death of Mzeki. It showed that the 14th of June, 1896 was the day that mark the day of the journey of the mysterious death of the catechist. The community was expected to attend the morning prayers but they strangely did not. They only attended the evening song in their few numbers, filled with fear. The Spiritual leadership had declared that Christianity was sorcery. Bernard Mzeki was the sorcerer and his sentence was death, (Snell, 2001: 20, Noll & Nystrom, 2011: 29). Muchemwa publicly threatened to discipline all the villagers who continued to disobey and associate themselves with Christianity and the catechist. It is of paramount importance to mention that Mzeki had been warned of the danger of a potential war that was coming and that he was to seek protection at St Augustine’s, Penhalonga, in Mutare. Mzeki had refused saying: “The Bishop put me here and told me to remain. Until the Bishop returns, here I must stay. I cannot leave my people now in a time of such darkness,” (Musodza, 2011; 9). Interestingly, critically analyzing this profound statement that made Mzeki a very popular committed catechist in the spirituality of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, it is important to look closely at the above statement in a while. It is noteworthy to mention that the Bishop Knight Bruce who had told him to remain had already resigned two years before due to sickness and was already in England in October, 1894 (Welsh, 2008: 37). Notably, there was already a
new bishop who had replaced Bishop Knight Bruce, Bishop William Thomas Gaul, who was already in Rhodesia – Zimbabwe who had assumed a post of a chaplain in the Ndebele revolt in the early months of 1896. Hence, the researcher is of the opinion that to put his reasons to stay on Bishop Knight Bruce is too simplistic. A paramount question would be: Where was a black catechist not privileged with the information regarding the resignation of his Bishop and appointment his successor? Or this may mean that Bernard Mzeki was just faithful to his faith and to his Bishop. The researcher, therefore, leaves this open for further inquiry in another investigation.

Two days later, on the evening of the 17th of the same month. Bernard Mzeki and Mutwa were in their kitchen preparing to sleep. They both knew that something was seriously wrong. Muchemwa, Ziute and two cousin brothers visited Mzeki’s family at midnight. It is significant to mention that secondary sources here differ in the way the account is recorded. Noll & Nystrom (2011: 29) wrote that after knocking they informed Mzeki that they had visited to inform him that chief Mangwende had been murdered by a troop of the British South Africa Company. And when Mzeki opened the kitchen door, he was suddenly stabbed with a spear and was left half dead in the absence of Mutwa. Contrary to Snell (2001: 21), Mzeki was murdered in the kitchen in the presence of his pregnant wife, Mutwa. Furthermore, secondary sources namely Farrant, Gowera and Snell agreed to the fact that when Mzeki was stabbed, he staggered up the hill behind his house whilst bleeding and washed his wound at the spring up the hillside. He laid down at a small granite outcrop higher up the hill after Mutwa and gone to seek help from Chigwada’s wife, Mayemu. The two women came back and searched for Mzeki. They found him the spring washing his wound and trying to make a bandage with his shirt. He told them that he was very sick and weak. They helped him to crawl to flat rock of the hill above the spring. It was a cave, good place, because it was shelter behind by other rocks. Bernard pleaded the two women and Kapuya to leave him. Farrant (1966: 216) and Gowera (2010: 11). Closely looking at this account, it is important to for the researcher to mention that the return of the two women is noted here but all of a sudden there is a male figure Kapuya who is present in this mysterious death account but is silent.

Mzeki managed to give a message to his wife, that even if he was dying, that the work of God was going to continue. He instructed his wife to seek assistance from St Faith’s, Rusape, or from Father Pelly, or Archdeacon Upcher. His daughter was to be called Bernardina. The name Bernardina is very feminine. How did he know that the baby was going to be a girl? In addition, the impression we are given by the writers from the secondary sources was that Mzeki was more concerned with his work than anything else. This was because on his journey to his death, he displayed his commitment to God’s work. He also surrendered his family to the church something which was very unusual, strange and unique in such a circumstance. Mzeki was exhausted. Therefore, the two women decided to go down the hill to prepare food and to collect a blanket for Mzeki since it was very cold. Interestingly now Kapuya’s presence is not mentioned here. One wonders whether he had accompanied the two women to prepare food or he had remained with the wounded Mzeki in the hill. If he had remained with Mzeki, then he was going to be a good eye witness to the mystery that happened when the women were returning to give Mzeki food.

The writers note that when they were returning, they suddenly stopped in terrified amazement. They were almost blinded by a great and brilliant light. The whole hillside was lit up, and there was a noise like many flapping wings of great birds. The noise came lower and lower, and as they crouched on the ground, covering their eyes, the women saw through their eyes that in the centre of the light, where Bernard lay, there was a strange glow. They were frightened and hid themselves, shaking from head to foot. After a long time, the noise ceased and looked up again. The light had gone, and crept up the hill to the rock. Bernard had gone. They never saw him again. The huge rock had cracked. The big tree near the bark was torn. Only smoke and blood stains were discovered in the cave, where Bernard Mzeki was lying. The writers agreed that
the death of the catechist that it was indeed a mysterious death. Mutwa and her friend suddenly heard a rushing sound and a swirling, darting flame leapt down from the sky to the place where Bernard lay apparently dead. The writers confirmed that this phenomenon was also seen by the fleeing catechumens (Farrant, 1966: 216, Gowera 2010: 11, Noll & Nystrom, 2011: 29, Snell 2001: 23). It is significant to mention that even though secondary sources went to great lengths to explain this mysterious death in a way that suggested a divine visitation, it does not emerge concretely that Mzeki was taken to heaven. By comparative analysis, this only came up from the primary sources though some opposed the idea.

At this juncture, primary sources broke the silence. This was because the respondents were not interested in the background events but the actual event that led to the controversial and mysterious death of the catechist. Primary sources concurred with secondary sources that indeed the death of Mzeki was very mysterious. In an interview, notably Hatendi declared that he and met Mutwa himself at her new home of the Nyangadzo family at St Faith’s Mission, Rusape. He had listened to her story of mystery and the disappearance of Mzeki’s body. This was an opportunity for Mutwa to reaffirm the mysterious account of the death of her husband to Bishop Hatendi as she had told the writers in the secondary sources. It is important to cite that Hatendi had also joined the search party in 1936 that he had attempted to look for the skeletons of the remains of Mzeki. And there were no discoveries. Hence, according to Hatendi, Mzeki disappeared. It is of vital significance to mention say that primary sources dismissed the legendary stories that suggested the body of the late catechist was either eaten by lions since the Mangwende area was infested with them. Or this body was thrown in Nyakambiri River and was eaten by crocodiles. These two legendary stories were dismissed as fictitious and regarded as more of human imagination to fill the gaps where we cannot find historical and archeological, tangible and scientific evidence.

Primary sources in the name of Ruwona and others in interviews alluded to the fact that before the body of Mzeki disappeared, there was some dazzling white light although they also confirmed that such a mystery could not be scientifically verified. But they also cited that in the faculty of phenomenology of religions, such mysterious accounts were facts of reality. Primary sources alluded to the probability option that he may have been taken to heaven by God like Moses, Elijah or Enoch, hence Mzeki attained the status of a martyr and a saint. Contrary, some like Bishop Gandiya said in an interview that it was just pushing it too far to say God took him to heaven. He was open to the probability that an angel of the lord had buried Mzeki. In other ways, he was contained by the possible idea that God knew where his body was. And the fact the Bernard Mzeki remained significant in the spirituality of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe due to his commitment to God’s ministry. This, therefore, remained a mystery too, according to him.

Gunda, in an interview suggested that Mzeki might have gained strength, became revived and walked away as an attempt to fill the gap of possibilities to answer the mystery of the disappearance of his body, yet the damaged trees probably from the thunderstorm and the cracked stone remained controversial. Importantly, it was recorded both secondary and primary information that early in the morning, Mutwa saw Muchemwa killing Bernard’s goats, chickens and burning huts of the mission. Gonde, in an interview, declared vehemently that Muchemwa was found directly responsible for Bernard Mzeki’s murder and the removal of his body. He was also responsible for destroying the Mission settlement. Hence, if one really wanted to know where the body of Mzeki was, then Muchemwa could be asked if he was alive today. The dazzling like might have been his creation. Mzeki might have had a diary where he wrote his daily activities, challenges and his inner thoughts in his life in Mangwende Village. This might have helped researchers today to answer certain questions that cannot be answered today. This is because it was recorded and was a historical fact that Muchemwa destroyed everything that was associated with Mzeki. This may also have included the corpse of the late catechist Bernard Mzeki.
It was very important to this investigation to mention that the mysterious death of Bernard Mzeki was recorded so differently by one historian, Broderick (1945:78) who claimed to have heard of the death story from Pelly who had direct contact with Mutwa, the wife of the catechist. Though the historian agreed to a certain extent to some parts of the account, he posited that the day of the attack and the death of Bernard Mzeki to have had five days in between. He recorded that Mutwa visited Mzeki after he had been stabbed in the hill for five days and in company with one of the catechumens, washed and fed her husband on the fifth day, she came and found him dead. The historian went further to acknowledge that there was a story current among the native today in 1945 that the murderers were kept away from Bernard, as he lay hidden in the rocks by a white shining figure which, as it were, kept guard over him until he died.

It seemed that there were commonalities and differences in accounts of the mystical death of Bernard Mzeki. Close data analysis showed that there were differences in the mysterious death narratives of Bernard Mzeki. All writers claimed that they had received the death accounts from the same person who was Mutwa, the wife of the catechist. Yet they were recorded so differently. The probability may that other imperial writers wanted to avoid to write that there was the shining light that made the death of Bernard Mzeki divine. Some other writers also struggled to attempt to answer for the disappearance of the corpse of Mzeki. The researcher, therefore is of the opinion that in the academic arena, there was a need to reconstruct the mysterious death account of Bernard Mzeki in his context in order to have a better and truthful account that is scholarly accepted. This could be done in another study.

6.6 The critical analysis of the martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki.

It is important to critique the martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki within the parameters clearly established and compare that with what emerged of secondary and primary data presented. This is a very significant process to engage in to measure Bernard Mzeki whether his death deserved martyrdom and recognition, commemoration and celebration in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and Anglican Communion world-wide.

To recap, a martyr, the Greek word *martus* meant witness - a person who testified his faith to death (Attawatter 1958: 309). It was pointed out before that the apostles in the early centuries faced heavy persecutions until all suffered death for their convictions and faith. During this period, the term *martus* came to be used in the sense of a witness of Christ who was put under the penalty of death because of his/her faith. Hence, martyrs were Christians who suffered the extreme penalty of death upon refusing to deny their faith in God. In further setting the parameters, the definition and the laid down foundation of the theology of martyrdom was presented in order to have a scholarly understanding of martyrdom versus the death of Bernard Mzeki. This was done by tracing the technical terminology on the basis of the etymological and semantic use of the term *μάρτυς*, which was transformed from their original meaning ‘witness’ to the technical term for a Christian martyr. The martyrdom of Polycarp, was mentioned as one of the Christian martyrs which was a very special kind of death, one that was public which showed witness to the martyr’s ultimate offering on God’s alter.

With the definitions of martyrdom in semantics and all mentioned above in comparison with the death of Bernard Mzeki, the researcher is of the opinion that Mzeki can be disqualified as a martyr by definition when religious political, economic and social factors that contributed to his death are considered. Generally, a martyr had to die specifically because of his faith and not any reason or reasons attached to it.

6.7 The conferment of martyrdom on Mzeki.
Critically looking at both secondary and primary sources available showed clearly and vividly that the Anglican in Zimbabwe, the Church of the Province of Central Africa and other provinces, as well as the Anglican Communion worldwide does not have machinery to canonise anyone in the way the Roman Catholic Church does. This means that the Anglican Church does not have anyone or committee to confer the martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki.

Notably, Hatendi from the primary sources, highlighted that the Church in England did not recognize him as a martyr: yet in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, Bernard Mzeki was well recognized as a martyr, and saint. He added that the Anglican Church did not have a formal process of investigating the death of Bernard Mzeki to conclusively declare him as a martyr. Closely looking that the same sources, it is noted that there was no document in any Anglican Diocese in Zimbabwe and in the Province which stated how Bernard Mzeki or anyone could be canonized as a martyr in the Anglican Church worldwide. They were no meeting at which Anglicans met that could be traced to find out how he was made a martyr. Mzeki was never canonized. Those who call him a martyr did so out of ignorance since there is no such thing as canonization in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. This was a wishful thinking. It was those who think highly of him who called him a martyr. But officially, he was not a saint and a martyr. It was unfortunate that he found himself in a denomination which has no notion of martyrdom. Some people in the church woke up one morning and decided to place Mzeki’s name on the calendar. It was added that Bishop Knight Bruce did not have any synod during his bishopric to set a procedure for one to be made a martyr. It was suggested that probably the story of Bernard Mzeki’s death must have been shared with the Archbishop of Canterbury and his council by bishops who succeeded Knight Bruce who may have been Beaven, Gaul or Powel. Primary sources were not sure of this. But eventually his name was found in the Church calendar of the Communion service. Secondary sources confirmed that the lectionary of the Anglican Communion worldwide had acknowledged Bernard Mzeki as an Anglican martyr from the African continent. His Feast was celebrated on the eighteenth of June each year. There were readings and the appointed psalm on the day of the feast. There was also a prayers (collects) drafted in remembrance of him.

It was important to cite that there was a wonder as revealed by primary sources on how Bernard Mzeki ended up on the church calendar with no formal process again. The possible reason which was given was that probably Mzeki was sympathetic to the white missionary agenda. Hence, it was not difficult for the Anglican Church in England to put his name on the church calendar. From the primary sources, it was noteworthy that the religious cult of Bernard Mzeki grew and that the commemoration began some decades later in the late 1930s and the small local observances grew to be major gatherings of thousands of pilgrims.

Secondary data revealed too that there was no process or mechanism or liturgy to confer martyrdom especially on the issue of the catechist. Gibson showed that it was Bishop Paget who established first the commemoration of Bernard Mzeki but not conferment of martyrdom status. The Anglican bishops worldwide did not have the authority to confer martyrdom according to the Canons (rules and regulations) of the Provinces. Gibson cited that the Anglican Cathedral always has a very special place in the spiritual life of the Diocese because it brought Europeans and Africans together at the synod Eucharist and ordinations in the late 1920s when Edward Paget was bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland. Yet the great mass of the African people lived far away in the country districts and never saw and experienced these services. Importantly, it was one of the Bishop Edward Paget’s great inspirations to give them a new rallying point, a place of pilgrimage, where they could come in their thousands and camp and worship in an African way (Gibson 1973: 65 - 66).

Critically analyzing the secondary information available, the researcher has noted that from this biography of Bishop Paget that he was responsible for the creation of the Bernard Mzeki
shrine. According to the Memoir of Paget of Rhodesia written by Gibbson, the process of conferment of Bernard Mzeki as a martyr was very quiet. This meant that both primary and secondary sources agreed that there was no conferment of Bernard Mzeki to be a martyr. Addition, the researcher is of the other probable option that the establishment of the Bernard Mzeki shrine by Paget may have been a political move to have a place where the African Anglicans could meet by themselves in numbers and worship. Was it not perhaps a racial issue more than anything else? One may be forced to think that because racial discrimination was eminent in this period of the late 1930s. The whites could not worship with black people. During this time, the parishes in the low destiny areas could not associate with blacks. The whites would have mass in the morning and the blacks could worship in the afternoon. Blacks were not allowed to attend mass at the cathedral. From his background, it meant that Paget wanted to create a place, a shrine where they could meet and worship as a black Anglican community. African Anglican Christians could easily identify themselves with such a shrine since it was a borrowed phenomenon from African tradition religion which had characteristic of shrines.

It was bishop Mukwanda, who categorically pointed out that in his seventeen years of being a bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Central Zimbabwe, he had not seen any documentation that talked about making someone a martyr or saint. Once, the bishop had a conversation with his wardens which was very helpful in this study to determine how the church might qualify martyrs in the future when she did not currently have any processes and mechanisms for making martyrs. Mukwanda shared that one of his priests, Revd. Canon Peter Wagner was murdered in his church in Masvingo. The church wardens came to him and expressed their desire to have him declared a martyr. The bishop responded that he did not believe that he was qualified enough to be able to declare anyone a martyr. The canons of the province was silent on the matter under discussion. They did not provide anything on martyrdom. The bishop was frank enough to admit that there was no documentation that conferred martyrdom of anyone who had died whatever the circumstances. He was open to say that it was not one of those matters talked about even when one was made a bishop after consecration. It was not of the subjects that a new bishop was informed of. Such did not exist at all. Bishop Godfrey Taonezvi and many others concurred that Wagner died for his faith for he was murdered whilst he was having his morning martins. Another person who was raised in the primary data available was an old lady Mbuya Mandeya was said to have been murdered during the time of the schism with the former bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Harare in 2008. It was argued that she deserved to be declared a martyr in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. In fact, primary data showed that there was already a declaration that Wagner and Mandeya were unofficial saints and martyrs on whom the title had not been conferred because the church in Zimbabwe did not have the legal framework in its canons to do so. It was important to mention that Wagner and Mandeya were contemporary personalities and both lived amongst the church. They could easily be emulated and related to unlike Mzeki who lived in the eighteenth century who was from a different context with the dynamic church of today. The Anglican Church was challenged to create a board that could look critically at the canonization of saints and martyrs. This was indeed long overdue for it was believed that there were many people that also qualified for martyrdom but were unrecognized because there was no procedure.

The conversation of Mukwanda and his wardens was essential to this study. Surely Bernard could not only be the first and last ‘martyr’ to be recognized in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and in the Province alone. Peter Wagner could be the second among many others in the land. A paramount question is: if the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe was to make Wagner and Mandeya martyrs, how can the church qualify them if she does not have a process of canonization? Can Mzeki remain as the only celebrated martyr from the eighteenth century who is presumed to be the only one who died because of his faith? The Anglican Church has these questions to answer.
Primary data available acknowledged that there was need for the Anglican Church world-wide to work on a recovery of structural unity where issues like a common procedure for the canonization of saints and martyrdom could be advocated and practiced with uniformity across the Anglican Communion. The church did not have such a unified structure of governance. She had a fragmentary process which was not rigorous. The church was concerned about its unity and the process of canonizing martyrs was a very fruitful area for some work as to how the church could be allowed formally declare people saints and martyrs rather than the procedures at the moment that they are simply place them in the calendar. The same sources noted that the authority of the Anglican Consultative Council did not extend its authority to the matter of canonizing martyrs to persons like Mzeki who was presumed to have died because of his faith. But it was mentioned that it was time the Anglican Consultative Council to begin to table such matters as a matter of urgency. In addition, it was recommended that it was important to have the matter tabled at the episcopal bench of the Church of the Province of Central for them to take it up to the Lambeth Conference of 2020. Another recommendation given from the primary information was for each province to suggest processes to declare martyrs because the Anglican Communion through the Archbishop of Canterbury had a dispersed authority. He was the first among equals but his power was limited. Hence, each province could actually do what worked for them. This meant that it would not be easy for the Communion to come up with a Council that could consider the conferment of what is called canonization whether it is martyrs or saints. Some of the primary data respondents saw it as a weakness in the Anglican Communion because the church could not recognize the good work which was being done within communities in dioceses and provinces. The church had failed to recognize the sacrifices that people had made for their faith. This reflected negatively on the Christians who were still alive because the church did not have contemporary spiritual role models. From another angle, it was significant for the provinces to share ideas and consult amongst themselves and learn from each other on the way forward on making martyrs. The example given which the provinces had already moved forward was the ordination of women in provinces. Hence, each province could make up its mind on the way forward regarding martyrdom in each individual province in the Anglican Communion. Primary data presented also revealed that on the issue of the church to come up with a process of canonization of saints, she could use the existing leadership structures and polity on how issues are raised. It was suggested that canonization of saints in the Anglican Church could be tabled at a diocesan level. If accepted the issue could be taken to the Church of the Province of Central Africa (CPCA) Provincial Synod as well as the Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa Synod (CAPA). If it is taken at that level then it was to be taken to the Anglican Communion through the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was significant to use already existing channels to deal with issues of the church involving the canonization of individuals. It was proper to have grassroots committees that dealt with these issues and make the necessary recommendations. The recommendations were to be done upon research and understanding of the person concerned and in conferring of the martyrdom or sainthood depending on the works of the person who would have died.

The researcher is of the view that if the issue of the ordination of women has succeeded in some Anglican Provinces, then probably the matter of having provinces to come up with procedures of declaring martyrs in the individual provinces may be the best way forward. But it must be pointed out that this remains problematic and detrimental to the unification of the Anglican Church worldwide. It would give power to some provinces to do likewise but to some would be reluctant to deal with the issue under discussion as some provinces are still failing to recognize the ordination of women, like the Church of the Province of Central Africa which the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe is part of this province (CPCA). If the province has failed to allow women to celebrate mass at the altar of God at the moment, can they come up with a structured process of canonizing martyrs? This paramount question becomes an inquiry whether the Province the capacity and ability to do so.
After looking closely at the available primary sources, the researcher noted that contrary to this, there were some respondents who showed that they were glad that the church did not canonize martyrs like the Roman Catholic Church. For them it was distasteful. They were comfortable to have a church calendar and people like Mzeki on it. Furthermore, they were surprised to know that Mzeki was referred to as a saint and martyr in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe since the church did not have a procedure to declare one.

Contrary to that fact that the church did not have a process for making martyrs, there are some from the primary sources who argued that he is a martyr because Mzeki died according to the account of his death and his faith. They further argued that in the first century, matters of faith were not political because both elements of politics and religion were intertwined. In the twentieth century, the church was trying to separate politics and religion but in the first centuries, the two could not be separated as it was in Bernard Mzeki’s time. The existence of the political dimension did not necessarily eliminate the faith dimension. Hence, it could have been a combination of both that Bernard was murdered but ultimately, he died because of his faith. In the 1st centuries, Christians were killed for the same political and religious reasons. They were proclaiming a new faith as Mzeki was, but at the same time threatening an old faith. This could, therefore, be compared with Mzeki’s situation and that of the 1st century. The aspect of Mzeki dying because of his faith was outstanding to this group from the primary sources. They further argued that it did not make sense and was unnecessary to have a procedure to declare Mzeki a martyr, let alone a saint from an African point of view. There was no need for a protocol in the case of the declaration of martyrdom of Mzeki. The idea of coming out with a procedure, they argued was a western idea. They vehemently declared that there was nobody in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe who doubted the martyrdom of the catechist. An example of the conferment of the order of epiphany was given without consultation.

Looking critically at this group’s view that Mzeki is a martyr by merits of the people opens up a pandora’s box especially when the Anglican Church wants to declare martyrs in the present and future without a process of qualifications. Canon Peter Wagner and Mbuya Mandeya are already under discussion as persons who are also presumed to have been murdered due to their faith. Primary sources furthermore added that that Anglican Church was so different from the Roman Church which had a clear process of canonization. The Church of England in particular where the church began did not have a centralized authority like the Roman Catholic Church. Primary sources cited that the Church of England only recognized outstanding figures only through liturgy. In the Church of England, they included in the calendar of the church each year people who over process of time have come to be regarded as godly examples of Christian living and not necessarily people who could have died of their faith. The Church of England only recognized its own people who were clear examples of godliness, sacrifice, service and Bernard Mzeki is one of them. One wonders where the idea of martyrdom of Mzeki came about.

From another perspective, according to both secondary and primary data presented concurred that it may not have meant that Bernard Mzeki did not have the qualities to be recognized as such. It was simply unfortunate that he found himself in a denomination which has no notion of martyrdom. It was acknowledged that Mzeki was not only a Zimbabwean and provincial figure of significance, but a person who was remembered in the Anglican Communion as someone who lived an incredibly illustrious life of dedication, commitment and obedience to Christ. Although Mzeki was not in the ordained ministry of priesthood like Revd. Pelly, he achieved much more than ordained white priests of his age and even after. It was pointed out that some of his sacrifices were regarded now as having been unwise, but were not when one hears of the fact that he was told to leave the mission station and go to St. Augustine’s Mission where all Anglican Missionaries were to stay under protection. He refused citing his abhorrence of the idea of leaving behind his few converts especially Kapuya who was not feeling well. After all in the primary data statistics available, eighty respondents confirmed that Bernard
Mzeki was fit to be a martyr. Twenty informants refused to have Mzeki to be recognized as a martyr in the Anglican Church.

6.8 Commemoration and significance of the Bernard Mzeki shrine.

Concerning the commemoration and significance of the shrine named after Bernard Mzeki, both secondary and primary sources agreed that the celebration of the late catechist was officially in motion in the late 1930s. Commemorations were rightly taking place the place where the hut of Bernard Mzeki was built in the Mangwende village in Marondera, Zimbabwe. Both sources concurred on the establishment of the shrine by Revd. Edward Crane even though secondary sources highlighted that Revd. Ernest Simpson who kept the memory of the catechist alive after they had listened to the story of the death of the catechist from his wife Mutwa many times for so many years. Secondary sources mentioned Musodza and Farrant that in 1899, archdeacon Upcher and Revd. Simpson established a boys’ school across Nyakambiri River named after Bernard of Clairvaux and not Bernard Mzeki, the presumed martyr. In fact, the shrine was named after Bernard of Clairvaux too. Primary sources in the name of Hatendi concurred with this development and acknowledged that the Anglican Church in this young generation did not know this complicated history. Hatendi was a truthful informant since he confirmed that he was teaching at the Bernard of Clairvaux school in the early 1930s (Musodza, 2008: 95, Farrant, 1966: 232). Both secondary and primary sources showed that this led to confusion and many people could think naturally that the mission and the shrine were named after Bernard Mzeki. This puzzled the local Mangwende people. But eventually, both the shrine and the boys mission after the catechist, Bernard Mzeki.

One may wonder why archdeacon and Revd. Simpson named the boy’s mission school and the shrine after the Bernard of Clairvaux. According to archdeacon Upcher and others, the catechist was not of any value to the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland at that time. How could the church have a great mission boy’s school and a shrine, a distinctive place of worship named after a black catechist from Mozambique who was murdered by his own. During this time white dominance was high even in the church? They preferred to call the two institutions after a white martyr and not Bernard Mzeki who had died on the very land of the shrine. This was a very shameful thing to do.

Secondary sources presented gave greater details than primary sources. The first part of the shrine was built in 1936 by the Rev Crane and consisted of a large slab of reinforced concrete 14 feet in diameter erected on pillars over the floor of Bernard’s kitchen hut. On this concrete slab, an altar was built. The bricks of the pillars were taken from the altars of the two churches built previously at St Bernard’s Mission by the Rev E. Simpson. The floor of the kitchen hut was in a good state of preservation. It was open to view under the concrete platform. The rest of the shrine was built by the Rev Robert Grinham and the staff of the Ruzavi School. The bricks for this part were given by the people of St Bernard’s Mission. It must be mentioned that the part which was constructed by Grinham was confirmed by primary sources, notably Bishop James David who visited Mzeki’s wife to be during this period of further development of the shrine. Secondary sources went further to elucidate that the high rock was where Muchemwa’s team had descended, the Rev Crane had erected a great cross. It stood 21 feet above the rock and was a 15 feet high and 3 feet wide. The cross was made of gum poles fastened with bolts and whitewashed and was visible two miles away. It was clearly to be seen from the shrine built on the site of the hut in which Bernard was murdered. On the afternoon of Thursday, the 16th June, 1938, the cross was blessed by Bishop Edward Paget with a small gathering, two days before the big event to commemorate the catechist, Bernard Mzeki (Musodza, 2008: 95, Farrant, 1966: 232).
Both secondary and primary sources concurred that the commemoration of the catechist was done after more than forty years in the late 1930s. A primary source said that one of the reasons why it delayed was that his ministry was a failure. He only had the successful story of one convert, Kapuya. But Secondary sources available was clearer on tracing how the commemoration came about. It mentioned that on the June 18, 1938 the commemoration of Mzeki’s martyrdom the first pilgrimage took place at the Shrine named after him. There was a gathering of 500 Africans and 60 whites. Sir Herbert Stanley, the Governor for Salisbury attended the event and he was accompanied by Sir Bougal Malcom. The Revd. Samuel Muhlanga, celebrated the Mass. Archdeacon Christelow and Revd. Edward Chipunza were sub-deacons of the Mass. Fr Osmund Victor was the preacher. The sermon was preached in English and was translated by the Rev Edward Chipunza into Shona. Bishop Edward Paget commented on the first gathering of the Diocese at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine that this was a real inter-racial communion, the first in the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland; Africans and Europeans receiving the Blessed Sacrament. It was only secondary sources that alluded to this fact that it was only Bernard Mzeki amongst all the five catechists who accompanied Bishop Knight-Bruce to Mashonaland, whose ministry life was commemorated in 1938. The Mangwende had to apologize to Mutwa for murdering her husband at the first public gathering of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine in 1938 under the bishopric of Bishop Edward Paget, the fifth bishop of the Diocese (Gibbson, 1973: 67, Farrant, 1966: 210).

According to the researcher, at such big Anglican Church events since time memorial, the tradition of the Church was that it was the bishop of the Diocese who was to celebrate the Mass. But in this case, it was a black priest who celebrated the Mass. The researcher was probably of the idea that this may have been a way of showing that this was indeed an African event meant for the African Anglican community in the Diocese of Mashonaland. One wonders whether the whites received the communion from the hand of the black clergy present. In the biography of Paget, the picture painted may not have been a true picture of what happened at the event. This may be so because it was a challenge for whites receive communion from the black priests in this period. Gibbson could have written the biograph of Paget with aim to paint a picture of him as a good bishop who had officially established a shrine for the Anglican black community in the Diocese of Mashonaland. But his refusal to not to celebrate mass on this particular day of the 18th of June, 1938 was a wrong decision. He could not even preach at such an important event. In addition, the presence of the politicians in the persons of Sir Herbert Stanley and Sir Bougal Malcom made this day a political event as much as a religious event.

Secondary sources went further to show that the shrine has become a venue for an annual commemoration in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe which has five dioceses, namely the Anglican Dioceses of Harare, Manicaland, Bulawayo, Masvingo and Central Zimbabwe. A few Anglicans from Mozambique, Zambia and South Africa also joined in the celebrations at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine to celebrate his life and ministry. In 1946, on the fiftieth anniversary of Mzeki’s death, a larger crowd, which included Mutwa and her daughter, gathered for a celebratory service of Bernard Mzeki, recognizing him as a martyr. The commemorations of Mzeki grew quickly in the early in the 1960s. By the time Farrant’s book was publicized in 1966, there were many institutions, places and items named after him which are chapels, stained glass, reliquaries and murals.

It must be mentioned that both primary and secondary sources alluded to the fact that the rise of the African spirit of renaissance, black consciousness and independence was due to the post-colonial period, a difficult time for the black people in Zimbabwe. During the 1930s Zimbabwe was under the political rule of the British and the Anglican Church was the state church. Racial discrimination was the main challenge from which Zimbabweans suffered most. Primary sources highlighted white domination, the political and economic set up by implementing racist and oppressive rules to the extent of denying blacks freedom of assembly. But at least the black Anglicans were still allowed to meet at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine only for the purpose of
worship until the late 1960s. During this period, the black Zimbabweans had limited access to basic social services such as education and health. Development was also racially driven in favor of the whites. And it is from this economic political and socio-religious background that the formation of black political parties like the ZANU-PF and ZAPU emerged to fight the colonial regime. From interviews with Bakare and Gunda, they were of the opinion that the establishment of the Bernard Mzeki Shrine was probably meant to be the black cathedral for blacks. Probably unknown to the white government and the state church, the Bernard Mzeki Shrine became a place for blacks to share silently the black consciousness of liberating themselves. If this was true, then the Mzeki shrine became another cathedral of liberation. Secondary sources noted that the image of Mzeki dramatically changed like a diminishing light in the late 1960s. The annual gatherings at the Shrine were stopped during the liberation struggle of the early 1970s. This was because of the Second Chimurenga (second liberation war) of the late 1960s that led to the transformation of Rhodesia into Zimbabwe (Musodza, 2008: 95).

Secondary sources available showed that after the Zimbabwean independence in April, 1980, the Bernard Mzeki Shrine gradually became an increasingly popular pilgrimage site. The Anglican community in Zimbabwe, led by the first black bishop in the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, Bishop Ralph Hatendi, now led mass on the weekend closest to June 18 from the 1980s onwards. The pilgrims who visited the Shrine in Marondera annually were those who wanted to follow the conservative Anglican spirituality of Bernard Mzeki. Anglicans in Zimbabwe and from the Province (CPCA) arrived on a Thursday prior to the 18th of June, each year, ahead of the main communion service on Saturday. There was much ecstatic singing and dancing, as well as many fires because of the cold winter weather. On Friday, there was a choir competition. The main service took place on Saturday. Usually it was led by the Archbishop of the Province. During the main service, languages from many different ethnics were accommodated. After the official service, the whole of the afternoon was devoted to healing sessions. They were led by gifted priests in the area of healing and deliverance. On Saturday night, there was an all-night pungwe full of songs, dancing and the ministry of the word. On Sunday morning, local Anglican priests from parishes in Marondera led a final Eucharist. Robert (2009:167 - 168).

6.9 The influence of Bernard Mzeki in the Anglican Church.

Concerning the influence of Bernard Mzeki in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and beyond, both secondary and primary sources showed that indeed that the catechist has had an influence in the Church. Sources confirmed that one of his close friends, Revd. Douglas Pelly in the Mangwende village was influenced heavily by the catechist. When Pelly went back to England, he had a number of sons. He called one Bernard after his friend from Mashonaland to show just how close they were to the catechist. It was important to cite that both sources alluded to the fact that, John Kapuya who is claimed to be the only one whom Mzeki converted to Anglicanism and to the Christian faith, was influenced to follow the footsteps of his teacher. Kapuya was baptized by Bishop Thomas Gaul a month after Mzeki’s death in Salisbury (Harare). He was sent to Isandhlwana College in Zululand, in South Africa to be trained as a catechist and teacher just like Bernard Mzeki. He returned to his Diocese and became a catechist and teacher in the Anglican Church after three years of training.

Sources also acknowledged the simultaneous influence of the spirituality of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe and beyond her borders. Zimbabweans were moved by Mzeki’s story which touched many people. Hence the place he lived and died became a shrine of pilgrimage and prayer. The shrine was named after him and a boy’s mission school was built and was named after him too. Mzeki came to be recognized as a person who was of great significant in
the story of Christian faith in Zimbabwe. The leadership of the church began to respect what was emerging in the spirituality of the Anglican community in Zimbabwe. Annual commemorations began to take place. Mzeki began to acquire a national and indeed an international as the status of martyrdom and sainthood was conferred on him. The Bernard Mzeki Shrine is now an integral part of the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. The shrine was an African phenomenon which was good for the church because Africans could easily relate to shrines. Mzeki was recognized as an exemplarily Christian in the church. Notably, primary sources in the name of bishop James of Rochester noted that Mzeki was part of the Anglican spirituality in his Diocese in England.

It was not only the boy’s mission school and the shrine that were named after Mzeki. This showed how far Mzeki had influenced the Anglican community in Zimbabwe and beyond. These were:

1. A shrine in Gwambeni at his home stand, Mozambique named after Bernard Mzeki and dedicated the Bishop Senguolane of the Diocese of Libombo.
2. A stained glass window in the Bernard Mzeki Chapel, Cathedral of St Mary and All Saints, Harare, Zimbabwe.
3. A reliquary in the St Philip’s Church, Chapel Street, Cape Town.
4. An Alter in St Cyprian’s Church, Langa, Cape Town, inscribed, ‘Bernard Mzeki sitandaze, meaning, Bernard Mzeki, pray for us.’
5. A reliquary in St Michael and All Angels, Mbare, in Harare, Zimbabwe.
6. A parish of Bernard the Martyr in Atteridgeville, Pretoria, South Africa.
7. A parish of Bernard Mzeki the Martyr in Phokwane, Botswana.
8. A small stained glass window, part of the greater window, in St George’s Cathedral, Cape Town, South Africa.
9. A carved candle-stick, one of the pair in the Lady’s Chapel in St George’s Cathedral, Cape Town (one candle stick represent Bernard Mzeki, the Martyr of Mashonaland and the other represent Manche Masemoia, the fifteenth year old girl martyr of Sekukuniland, 1928, who was also raised up under God by the Cowley Fathers).
10. A mural of Bernard Mzeki done by Canon Edward Peterson in the Parish of St Cyrene, near Bulawayo, Zimbabwe.
11. The Bernard Mzeki School in Esizibeni, Usuthu, Swaziland.
12. A stained glass window in the Parish of St Patrick’s and All Saints, in Kadoma, Zimbabwe.
15. The inclusion of Bernard Mzeki’s name in the Church Calendar of the Church of the Province of South Africa and of the Church of the Province of Central Africa.
16. The acceptance by the Dean and Chapter of St Paul’s Cathedral, London of Bernard Mzeki’s name for the new Modern Martyr’s Chapel planned as part of the work of restoration.

17. 65 photographic slides in color of Bernard Mzeki made by Roy Creeth, Nigel Morgan and Father Robin Burnett.

18. A side chapel on the 16th of June, 1991 which was named the Chapel of Bernard Mzeki in the St John’s Cathedral, Anglican Diocese of Matebeleland in Bulawayo (Ewbank.1991: 13).

Primary sources revealed a concern in the name of Bishop James David who wished to have at least one parish in Harare Diocese named after Bernard Mzeki. He wondered that if the catechist had this influence that shocked the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, especially in Harare Diocese, there was need to have a parish named after him. The researcher concurred with such a concern why Harare did not have a St Bernard Mzeki Parish. The researcher, therefore hopes that with the development of new residential areas rapidly coming up in Harare, one of the parishes in those areas shall be named after him.

It must be mentioned that both secondary and primary sources alluded to the fact that the Bernard Mzeki Shrine once became a battle field for the Church of the Province of Central Africa – Harare Diocese of bishop Chad Gandiya (CPCA) and the Anglican Church Province of Zimbabwe of bishop Nolbert Kunonga (APC). The battle that started in 2007 and ended up in 2012 was about the ownership of Bernard Mzeki shrine. Both groups wanted to be identified with the shrine and the catechist, Bernard Mzeki. This began when Kunonga attempted to withdraw Harare Diocese from the Province, accusing the church for practicing homosexuality. This allegation was unfounded. This was taken by the episcopal bench as resignation from the See. Kunonga was eventually excommunicated but he continued to hold on to the properties of the Diocese including the Mzeki Shrine. This became a battle for the control of properties between Kunonga and Gandiya who was consecrated Bishop for Harare Diocese after Kunonga’s excommunication. This battle became political in the sense that Kunonga was allied to Mugabe’s ZANU-PF and Gandiya was presumed to be MDC–T allied. The Mzeki Shrine also became a political battle field for ZANU- PF and MDC–T. It has to be mentioned that it was this period of schism when (Mbuya) Mrs Mandeya was murdered. This battle came to an end when Gandiya was permitted to use the church properties after a High Court judgement to do so. Kunonga lost the case with penalties. (Chawarika, 2012: 72) (See Appendix 5, 6, 7)

Sources confirmed that there was an aspect of commercialization of the Bernard Mzeki Shrine. Secondary data presented showed that the shrine was now a religious tourist attraction, a historic and cultural and wildlife location in Zimbabwe. The details pertaining its religious and tourist relevance was that the shrine of Mzeki was now a focus of great devotion for Anglican Community in Zimbabwe and other Christians from other denominations. Annually, it had become one of the greatest of all Christian festivals in Africa. In addition, the shrine reminded the tourists of the conflict between traditional culture and Christian beliefs which led to the death of this now famous martyr in June, 1896. Lastly was his legacy was enshrined at the Bernard Mzeki College which was built close to where he lived and died. (zimfieldguide.com/mashonaland-east/bernard-Mzeki-shrine). Contrary to religious tourism, primary sources raised the issue of commercialisation at the Bernard Mzeki Shrine in Marondera. One informant said, “I think we sometimes shoot ourselves in the foot at the Bernard Mzeki. The sources revealed that there was too commercialized that it had turned to be a market place like Mbare (musika)” . A recommendation was put forward that there was a need to de-commercialise the Shrine in order to preserve its ethos.

Critically looking at the commercialisation of the shrine for religious tourism was a new phenomenon. If shrines were designed for tourism then they could lose their essence. This was
the concern of the researcher upon finding out that the Mzeki shrine was a religious tourist attraction from a secondary source point of view. The place was meant to worship and not to do business, hence the need to de-commercialize the shrine.

Concerning the formation of the Bernard Mzeki Guild (BMG), both primary and secondary sources agreed that indeed in Zimbabwe and South Africa, there were pastoral groups named after Mzeki which was founded in 1973. It was a group that was growing rapidly, calling men to serve God by following the footsteps of Mzeki. These pastoral groups had objectives which were to promote and encourage the participation and nurturing of men's leadership in the life of the Anglican Church, to proclaim the Kingdom of God as manifested in Jesus Christ by encouraging the participation and nurturing of boys in the life of the Church (Roberts, 2009:168). The primary source highlighted that Bernard Mzeki Guild had drawn men in the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe to follow his sacrifice, love for the poor and prayer. Mr Dangirwa said the pastoral group had partnership links especially Harare Diocese with Mozambique and South Africa BMG guilds which were more organized to the level of having uniforms and constitutions. Hence Mzeki had influenced men in the Anglican community in Zimbabwe and outside her borders to follow Christ through the footsteps of Mzeki.

6.10 Conclusion.

This critical analysis was done on the secondary and primary sources presented on the late Bernard Mzeki from his childhood history from Gwanbeni, Mozambique to Mangwende village, Mashonaland, Zimbabwe. In some instances, both sources agreed while some disagreed on some of the sub topics mentioned in the comparative analysis. Probability value and uncertainty were also used as tools of examination of the sources available from secondary and primary sources. In addition, one source could provide more data when compared with the other or vice versa. Analysis was done on the childhood life of Bernard Mzeki and it was proposed that there was a need to reconstruct his childhood life so as to come up with a childhood which could be logically and scholarly acceptable. Socio– religious, political and economic factors were raised concerning the mysterious death of Mzeki, hence, dismissing the already standing position of the church that Mzeki was murdered because of his Christian faith. Martyrdom of the catechist by definition was challenged by examination from both sources. It became very clear after critical analysis that the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, the Church of the Province of Central Africa (CPCA) and the Anglican Communion worldwide did not have a process or mechanism that canonized or recognized martyrdom when compared with the Roman Catholic Church. A recommendation was proposed to canonize martyrs so as to recognize people like Wagner and Mandeya as contemporary martyrs of the twenty first century in Zimbabwean Anglican Church and in the Province. Regardless of the critics raised regarding inconsistences and incoherencies in Mzeki’s ministry, and his mysterious death in Mangwende village, it was concluded that Bernard Mzeki of Gwambeni had an influence and significance in the life and spirituality of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe, province and Anglican Communion worldwide respective.
Chapter 7 Conclusion and recommendations.

7.1 Introduction.

The aim of this chapter is to offer conclusive premises on all the sub topics raised on the findings upon critical analysis on primary and secondary data from the previous chapter. Conclusions shall be raised from the childhood life history of Bernard Mzeki in Mozambique, his calling and education in South Africa and this journey to Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) through Beira Mozambique to establish a new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland with Bishop Knight Bruce as part of the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. In addition, conclusive remarks shall also be drawn from his catechistical ministry in Mangwende village, his mysterious death which was contributed with political, economic, socio religious factors raised which dismissed Mzeki’s martyrdom. Furthermore, the position of the Anglican Church on the process of martyrdom shall be considered. Moreover, conclusions shall be drawn on the influence of Bernard Mzeki on the spirituality of ACZ, CPCA and the Anglican Church Worldwide.

7.2 Conclusion

First, the researcher grappled with the childhood history of the Bernard Mzeki. The idea that before Mzeki left Gwambeni, Inyambani for South Africa, he worked in a Portuguese store sounded very unrealistic. Let alone his leaving for Cape Town, South Africa at the age of fourteen. Furthermore, the fact that he financed his trip by selling a horse seems fanciful. The impression given by the imperial writers was that Mzeki was destined for greatness. Yet the sources available, especially from the secondary data, were quite divorced to the socio political context of the 1860s where racism was evident. Interestingly, horses were owned by the whites alone in this period. It must be pointed out that nobody would purchase a horse from a fourteen year old boy in this period. In addition. The young boy of fourteen’s capacity to travel from Gwambeni to Cape Town, South Africa was questioned. Surprisingly, the imperial writers did not agree on the age at which he left Gwambeni and the reasons for his departure. This therefore, showed that the childhood life of Bernard Mzeki lacked consistency and coherence. A probability was raised that perhaps, Mzeki found himself an orphan. Hence, he had to leave at that tender age. One could not ignore the imperial European historical pen which presented Bernard Mzeki as someone whose life was predestined to be a hero in foreign lands. But it was a historical fact that indeed Bernard Mzeki was from Mozambique. And that he travelled to South Africa to seek employment.

In South Africa, historical evidence was presented that he was employed as a house servant and gardener in Rondebosch, in Cape Town. Bernard Mzeki met the Crowley Fathers of St Philip’s in Zonnebloem and became interested about knowing God. He joined the night school which was being administered by Fraulein von Bloomberg. He was baptised on the 7th March 1886, the Feast of St Perpetua and her Companions, and was confirmed in St Philips Chapel by Bishop West Jones. Thereafter, he decided to join the full time ministry and was made a catechist. It was noted that Mzeki was very intelligent and had a special and unique gift of languages. The researcher wondered why he was not priested if he was so intelligent. The researcher, therefore, concluded that the socio-political and religious context of the day did not allow Africans to be made priests.

The researcher acknowledged that the late 1890s was, indeed, the period of the scramble for Africa. The British Empire colonised Zimbabwe in the name of the BSAC led by Cecil John Rhodes. The Church of England also moved in in the name of bishop Knight Bruce and five
African catechists who included Mzeki. Both bishop Knight Bruce and Mzeki were historical figures who were part of the formative history of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe. Bishop Bruce was the first bishop in the new Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland, Zimbabwe and Mzeki was presented as one of the few catechists who offered himself for ministry in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). The researcher dismissed that idea that Mzeki offered himself for ministry. The reasons were that Mzeki did not have any choice but to accompany Bishop Knight Bruce. The church had schooled him from a very tender and young age. It was a historical fact that Bernard Mzeki, the Bishop Knight Bruce and other catechists travelled through Beira as part of the ‘pioneer column’ to evangelise the Shona people in Zimbabwe. In 1891, Mzeki was left in Mangwende village under the care of chief Mangwende in order establish a new Anglican Mission in the new Anglican Diocese.

Notably, the cathechist was faithful to his daily offices of devotions, quiet times, meditations, morning and evening prayers, prime, compline and reading the scriptures. He was raised in a tradition of catholic practices which were based in self–discipline, penitence and acraments. It was acknowledged that he had knowledge of medicine and its application. He demonstrated this when he cured Kapuya. The researcher noted that his ability to master languages made him able speak the indigenous local Shona language without any trace of foreignness. This ability enabled him to cultivate relationships with the Shona people in Mangwende village. In addition, the bishop Bruce invited him to do translation of church materials into local languages. Speaking the local language fluently led to him be invited also to the civil and high courts in the land to work as an interpreter. Chief Mangwende also used him in the village courts as an interpreter when he was visited by the whites who could not communicate using the local language.

After critically analysing other factors that may have contributed to the death of Mzeki, the researcher concluded that it was not only religious factors that killed him. The factors that contributed to his death were political, social, economic. On the political factors, the researcher noted that Mzeki was not divorced from the political context of the late 1800. During this period, colonisation of Zimbabwe moved together with the establishment of the church. It was very difficult to separate the two. And the Gospel was being preached from a politico-imperial perspective. The three Cs were highlighted - Christianity, Commerce and civilization. This enabled Mzeki to be seen by the locals as a whiteman incarnate, an uncle Tom, who who was a political messenger representing the white coloniser agenda. The researcher revealed that politically, the death of Bernard Mzeki could not be separated ot the First Chimurenga of 1896/7. He was killed during the same time. This war was meant to kill all the whites and who ever was connected directly or indirectly to the colonisers. Bernard Mzeki was not speared. He was seen as a political victim. In addition, Niccolo Machiavelli’s political philosophy fitted very well on the political reasons for Mzeki’s death. Furthermore, in the eyes of the locals, he was a strong political collaborator, a traitor and a sell–out – Mutengesi. Moreover, his relationship with Chief Mangwende was questionable. The researcher considered his marriage to Mutwa as a political and social uproar that was detriment to his death. The impression given was that Mzeki wanted to diplomatically take over the chieftainship of the village. Hence, his death could only be identified as political when it is associated with the First Chimurenga which was a political war of liberation.

The researcher concluded that Mzeki’s failure to understand and respect the socio-anthropological values of the locals contributed his death. It was noted that Mzeki was a foreigner to the cultural and social fabrics of the Shona people of Mangwende in Zimbabwe. In addition, the white colonizers saw the social way of the locals uncivilized. And there was a need to transform them through the missionaries’ activities. As much as Mzeki tried to adopt to the local social way of life he remained English in personality. He kept small animals as pets. The indigenous local people identified him as a witchdoctor who had been hired by the white colonizers to bewitch them. Furthermore, he cut down the sacred trees that were in the grove of the Shumba - Lion shrine for agricultural purposes. He was advised not to but he went
ahead and did it out of foolishness, stubbornness, ignorance and disrespect for the social fabric of the Mangwende people. Mzeki had declared a social war. Hence, when the first Chimurenga broke out, Mzeki was killed because of social reasons.

The researcher concluded on the obvious historical fact that religious factors contributed to Mzeki’s death but from a different perspective. To begin with, the obvious reason he was murdered was due to the religious conflicts of Bernard Mzeki’s teachings of Christianity versus ATRs. The researcher noted that this was so indeed, because the imperial pen painted his death as a Christian martyrdom qualifying him to be a holy man, saint and martyr. But after the investigation, it was cited that Mzeki’s ministry was very confrontational. He showed the locals that the western religion of Christianity was superior to ATRs. For one to be a Christian meant that he was supposed to leave his traditional ways of life, thereby losing his identity as an African. Furthermore, this study showed that Mzeki was known to be a healer in the Mangwende village. The spirit mediums felt threatened by Mzeki who had replaced them by taking over their healing role. In response, they raised accusations of all the misfortunes of famine, drought diseases, caused by Mzeki’s presence in the village. The spiritual leaders like Kaguvi and Nehanda organised his death. Religious factors from a different understanding of Christianity, contributed to the death of Bernard Mzeki.

After raising the economic factors as contributory to the death of Bernard Mzeki, the researcher concluded that the land issue was one of the major causes of the First Chimurenga of 1896-7. The locals had regarded the British as temporary visitors to their land. But the Ndebele intelligentsia came to inform them that they had come to stay permanently. (Snell, 2001: 19). The cause of the revolt was the land. They spread the propaganda of raiding white farms, Christian missions, government institutions and anyone like Mzeki who was associated with the colonizers. Conclusively, the researcher questioned whether Mzeki was aware of implications of land grabbing which the colonizers had engaged in. If Mzeki was as wise as he was portrayed, then he was never going to join this mission to establish a Diocese of Mashonaland which was based in colonization. It was showed that for the locals, it was bad enough to be a peasant farmer. But it was far worse than to be a landless peasant. The land for them meant economic livelihood, history and identity. For when the Shona people greeted each other, they used the expression of Mwanawevhu, meaning sons and daughters of the soil. This meant that their economic survival was land based. Hence they revolted in killing anyone and everything that was white, including Bernard Mzeki. Moreover, the agricultural policies of the early 1890s economically disadvantaged the locals like the hut taxes and so forth contributed to the revolt of the 1896-7. Furthermore, the rinderpest crisis of the same period, which made the white administrators order all the cattle affected to be burnt away in order to control the disease had economic effects. Many cattle were destroyed. This had never happened before in their entire life history. To make things worse, Mzeki had told chief Mangwende that the actions of the government was for the good of his people in his village. The locals were furious with Mzeki. They identified him as one who was there to disempower them economically. Hence, they resorted to killing him. Mzeki was murdered during the revolt on the 18th of June, 1896.

After the investigation, the researcher highlighted conclusively that the political, economic and socio-religious factors further disqualified Bernard Mzeki to be named a martyr. These factors mentioned above showed that there were other factors that contributed to his death beside Mzeki dying because of his Christian faith.

On the murder of Bernard Mzeki, there was something mysterious and controversial about his death. The researcher, conclusively, noted that it was a clear that Mzeki’s death was mysterious. For when the Mutwa and Muyemu’s returned after they had gone down the hill to prepare some food for Mzeki whom they had left there, suddenly stopped in terrified amazement. The two women were blinded by a brilliant light. The whole hillside was lit up. There was a noise like many wings of great birds. The noise came lower and closer. They crouched on the ground with fear. After sometime, the noise stopped. They looked up and the
light had gone. Bernard had disappeared. What remained was the huge rock which had cracked. The big tree near the bark was torn by what may be interpreted as a divine visitation. There was no one who could account for the whereabouts of the corpse of Mzeki which had disappeared even though some said that he was taken up to heaven. This could not be academically verified because there was no archeological and scientific evidence of the disappearance of Mzeki’s body.

There were different accounts of his death. Furthermore, there was also different interpretations on the circumstances of Mzeki death. Some accounts say that Mzeki was murdered in the kitchen but some say outside in the open. In other accounts, Kapuya was present with the Mutwa and Chigwada’s wife, Mayemu on the hill as they tried to nurse Mzeki after he was wounded. But in yet other accounts, he was not present. Conclusively, all the accounts agreed that Mzeki was murdered on the evening of the seventeen of June, 1896 by the relatives of his wife, let alone, of his friend, chief Mangwende.

Muchemwa, Ziute and his two cousins were historical figures who were directed involved in the murdering of Mzeki. Muchemwa was chief Mangwende’s son who hated Mzeki. Mzeki was warned that the first Chimurenga war of 1897 was about start and he was to seek protection at St Augustine’s in Penhalonga, Mutare. But he refused to move citing that the Bishop Knight Bruce had instructed him to remain until he returned. Even though this showed his commitment to his calling, the researcher concluded that Mzeki was not privileged to information of the church leadership changes that already taken place two years before his death. Bishop Knight Bruce who had told him to remain had already resigned two years and was already in England in 1894. Bishop William Thomas Gaul was now the new bishop and was already in Rhodesia – Zimbabwe.

Mzeki’s faithfulness to his calling was very evident when he managed to give a message to his wife, that even if he was dying, but the work of God was going to continue. He instructed his wife to seek assistance from the church for her survival. His daughter was to be called Bernardina. This revealed that Mzeki was more concerned with his ministry than anything else. This was because on his journey to his death, he displayed his commitment to God’s work. He also surrendered his remaining family to the church. This was something which was very special considering his satiation he was in at that moment of breathing his last breath.

An argument was raised to qualify Mzeki’s martyrdom on the merits of semantics and etymology. It was important for the researcher to critically look at the foundation of the theological understanding of martyrdom in relation to the death of Bernard Mzeki in terms of definition and semantics. For during the period of the Apostles in the early centuries when the church began, the term martus was used in the sense of a witness of Christ who was placed under the penalty of death because of his/her faith. Martyrs suffered the extreme penalty of death upon refusing to deny their faith in God. The Martyrdom of Polycarp, was mentioned as the first Christian martyr which was a very special kind of death, one that was public which showed witness to the martyr’s ultimate offering on God’s alter. With the definition of martyrdom in semantics and the comparison of the death Bernard Mzeki with martyrs of the first centuries, the researcher conclusively disqualified Mzeki as a martyr by definition, let alone, the consideration of the religious political, economic and social factors mentioned in this study further dismissed Mzeki to be on the list of martyrs.

The Anglican Church history in Zimbabwe was not clear on the conferment of the status of martyrdom on Bernard yet the church refers to him as a martyr. This investigation showed that ACZ, CPCA and the Anglican Communion worldwide did not have a process or system put in place or a liturgy in its history that could be used to canonise or bestow or confer saintly/martyrdom status as the Roman Catholic Church did. It was very significant to this study to note that Bernard Mzeki was venerated as a martyr but with no traceable criteria or public function sanctioned by the church to bone the order of martyrdom. The Anglican Church did not have person or committee to confer the martyrdom of Bernard Mzeki. There were no processes for f investigating martyrdom. There was no document in the ADZ, CPCA
or in the Anglican Communion worldwide that stated how Bernard Mzeki or anyone could be
canonized as a martyr. There was no trace legally in the Acts of the Anglican Diocese of
Mashonaland since its establishment in the 1890s and from the five Anglican Dioceses in
Zimbabwe in their formulations, let alone in the Canon Law of CPCA. Such did not exist at
all. Calling Mzeki a martyr was wishful thinking. This was being done officially out of
ignorance. Yet a biography of Bishop Edward Paget revealed that the Bernard Mzeki shrine
was created in the late 1930s as a place for black Anglicans to meet and worship freely without
restriction. It was this shrine that created this ‘martyrdom’ of Mzeki. African Anglican
Christians could easily identify themselves with such a shrine since it was a borrowed
phenomenon from the ATR(s) which had characteristic of shrines. During this period, racism
did not allow the whites to worship together in any given parish in the Diocese of Mashonaland.
This showed that the creation of a martyr figure of Bernard Mzeki and the sacred shrine was
done by one bishop without an episcopal bench to do so. This showed that this was more of a
political, than religious, move by Bishop Paget to have the black church to meet at one place
once per year.

There were some who felt that there was no need to have a process for making martyrs but this
was to be done unofficially by any congregation that believed that if anyone died because of
his/her faith, then he/she was to be recognized as one.

This investigation pointed out that it was claimed that Revd. Canon Peter Wagner and Mrs.
Mandeya were murdered because of their faith. Wagner was murdered in his church in the
Diocese of Masvingo whilst he was having his morning prayers and Mandeya was killed in
Murehwa in the Anglican Diocese of Harare during the period of the schism of the church
(2007–2012) respectively. Some faithful Anglicans wished to have these two recognized s
 martyrs in the ACZ and CPCA but as mentioned above and proven in this study, the Anglican
Church did not have the provisions for making martyrs. The study showed that there was
already a declaration that Wagner and Mandeya were unofficial saints and martyrs on whom
that title had been conferred because the church in Zimbabwe did not have the legal framework
in its canons to do so. The argument presented was that Wagner and Mandeya were
contemporary personalities who could be easily be emulated and related to unlike Mzeki who
lived in the eighteenth century who was from a different context
with the dynamic church of
today. The research declared conclusively that Mzeki Bernard could not only be the first and
last ‘martyr’ to be recognized in the ACZ, CPCA and in the Anglican Communion worldwide
alone. It was argued that Wagner and Mandeya could be considers to be made martyrs if the
church was prepared to come up with a procedure to do so.

Notably, the researcher concluded that even though Bernard Mzeki did not have a clear
mechanism on how he was canonised, he had significant influence on the spirituality in the
Anglican Diocese of Harare, ACZ, CPCA and the Anglican Communion worldwide. The
influence and importance of Mzeki started officially from the late 1930s when Marondera
Mzeki shrine was established during the bishopric period of Edward Paget. It was noted that
the political consciousness of liberation from colonisation gradually grew from the same period
when political parties were created like ZAPU and ZANU – PF in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). This
was the post-colonial period. Ever since, the shrine has drawn the Anglican community from
Zimbabwe which has five Dioceses, namely the Anglican Dioceses of Harare, Manicaland,
Bulawayo, Masvingo and Central Zimbabwe. A few from Mozambique, Zambia and South
Africa also join in the celebrations at Bernard Mzeki Shrine to celebrate his life and ministry
annually. In addition, near the shrine, a Bernard Mzeki boy’s mission school was established
in honour of the catechist even though the school was primarily named after Bernard of
Cairvasux, a Roman Catholic martyr. But the name of the Mzeki eventually took over as part
of his commemoration.
The annual celebratory service of Bernard Mzeki recognized him as a martyr. The commemorations of Mzeki grew quickly in the early 1960s. By the time Farrant’s book was publicized in 1966 as per the request of Bishop Edward Paget which presented Mzeki was a martyr, there were also other institutions, shrines and items named after him which included parishes, chapels, stained glass, reliquaries and murals in ACZ, CPCA and the Anglican Communion worldwide. It must be pointed out that many articles and books about Mzeki were written about him especially from the western historians which painted him as a great martyr of faith in the southern African Anglican Church and the Anglican Communion.

Furthermore, the importance and influence of Mzeki was revealed when his name and influence were co-opted in the period of the schism (2007 – 2012) that took place between CPCA and APZ. This battle turned to be political when APZ was seen have an inclination towards ZANU–PF and CPCA was associated with the opposition party of Tsvangirai Morgan of MDC-T. To date, the researcher pointed out that the Bernard Mzeki shrine was commercialised. The Bernard Mzeki shrine is a tourist attraction and destination. Moreover, since 1973, there was a men’s fellowship group founded in South Africa that emulated the life of Bernard Mzeki. This group was also formed in the Zimbabwean Anglican Church especially in the Harare Diocese. It must be mentioned that this group is rapidly growing in ACZ, CPCA and in the Anglican Church in Mozambique.

The name of Mzeki was placed in the lectionary even though it was questionable how it appeared on the church calendar. The history of this development was traced whether the first bishop of the Diocese of Mashonaland had a synod to declare his name to be put on the lectionary. It was noted that bishop Knight Bruce never held a synod during is bishopric period. Later own, the bishops that followed after him never set a procedure to make martyrs and advocated to have his name to be placed in the lectionary. It was only suggested that probably the story of Bernard Mzeki’s death must have been shared with the archbishop of Canterbury and his council after the independence of Zimbabwe. Eventually, his name appeared in the Church calendar and the lectionary of the Anglican Communion worldwide acknowledging Bernard Mzeki as an Anglican martyr from the African continent. The possibility may have been that he was sympathetic to the colonial church agenda, hence, it was not difficult for the Anglican Communion to put his name on the church calendar. His Feast was celebrated on the eighteenth of June each year. There were readings and the appointed psalm on the day of the Feast. There was also a prayers (collects) drafted in remembrance of him.

7.3 Recommendations.

The childhood life and history of Mzeki in South Africa and eventually in Mashonaland in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) was problematic. Western historians painted a Bernard Mzeki as destined for greatness. This sounded factious. Therefore, the researcher recommends an African reconstruction of Bernard Mzeki’s historical life from childhood in Mozambique and his mysterious death in Zimbabwe.

The researcher noted that there were many accounts on the mysterious death of Bernard Mzeki. A reconstruction of these accounts is urgently needed in order to get a better scholarly account which is closer to the truth of what really happened on the winter evening where he was murdered and his corpse disappeared.

The researcher recommends that a study be carried out to find out what happened to his body. In this investigation, it was noted that Muchemwa was found directly responsible for Bernard Mzeki’s murder. He was also responsible for destroying everything that was associated with Mzeki, including the Mission settlement. This may also have included the corpse of the late
catechist Bernard Mzeki. Hence, there was need to make an inquiry from the Mangwende family. There may have oral secret stories of what may have happened to Mzeki’s corpse.

Since the ACZ, CPCA and the Anglican Communion worldwide did not have a procedure to recognize martyrdom, the researcher recommends that there is a need to create a process of canonizing martyrs. This study revealed that Mzeki was called a martyr without any process of recognition in the church. Furthermore, he was called a martyr without qualifications. Therefore, the researcher recommended for the Anglican Church to establish or create a board that could critical look at the canonization of saints and martyrs.

The researcher, conclusively, recommended that canonization of saints in the Anglican Church could be forwarded to a diocesan synod. If accepted during the synod, that the issue could be taken to the CPCA Provincial Synod as well as the CAPA. Then it was to be taken to the Anglican Communion through the Archbishop of Canterbury, the chairperson of the Anglican Communion. It was significant to use already existing channels to deal with issues of the church involving the canonization of individuals.

There was a need for the Anglican Church worldwide to establish a structural unity where issues like a common procedure for the canonization of Saints and martyrdom could be advocated and practiced with uniformity across the Anglican Communion. At the moment, the church did not have a unified structure of governance. The researcher recommended that this matter to be tabled in the ACC. In addition, it was recommended that it was important to have the matter tabled at the episcopal bench of the CPCA for them to take it up to the Lambeth Conference of 2020. Another recommendation was that each province was to come up with processes to declare martyrs because the Anglican Communion through the Archbishop of Canterbury had a dispersed authority. He is the first among equals but his power was limited. Hence, each province could actually do what worked for them. Anglican Provinces could share ideas and consult amongst themselves and learn from each other on the way forward on making martyr. The researcher was of the view that since the issue of the ordination of women was successful in some Anglican Provinces, then the researcher recommends that Provinces to come up with procedures of declaring martyrs in the individual provinces one of the best way forward.

All the recommendations mentioned above were noted in order to advocate for the Anglican Church to officially recognize martyrdom in the present and future of the faithful departed who may have died because of their faith. Canon Revd. Peter Wagner and Mrs. (Mbuya) Mandeya were claimed as contemporary unofficial martyrs to have been murdered due to their faith were mentioned for consideration for recognition as martyrs if the procedure was officially laid down by the Anglican Church. the researcher surely noted that Mzeki could not only be the only to be recognized but Mandeya and Wagner if recognized as martyrs in the twenty first century, then the today the Anglican Church could easily be identified with the contemporary Christian martyrs. The researcher pointed out that providing a procedure for recognizing martyrdom in the Anglican community in Zimbabwe, CPCA and the Anglican Communion worldwide was indeed, long overdue.

In conclusion, the researcher forwarded a recommendation on the need to de-commercialize the Bernard Mzeki shrine since it was pointed out that there were many business activities taking place annually at the sacred place. There is an urgent need for the Anglican community at the shrine to remind her followers that the pilgrims were to attend the commemorations of Mzeki at the shrine specifically to enrich their spirituality in remembrance of the catechist’s footsteps and not any other reasons of buying and selling.
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Appendix 1

THE QUESTIONNIRE AND INTERVIEW COVER LETTER

The University of Pretoria
Faculty of Theology
Lynnwood Road
Hatfield
0083

24th April, 2013
Dear sir/madam

My name is Revd. Father Chawarika John, an Anglican priest in the Anglican Diocese of Harare, Zimbabwe. I am a doctoral student under the department of Church History and Polity in the faculty of Theology at the University of Pretoria (UP), South Africa. I am currently conducting a research on the topic below:

"THE IDENTITY OF BERNARD MIZEKI FROM THE FORMATIVE HISTORY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN ZIMBABWE (1890 - 2013): RETRACING HIS LIFE, MARTYRDOM AND INFLUENCE.

My promoter in this study is Professor Duncan Graham. This study is an academic requirement for my Doctorial studies. I kindly ask you sir/madam to answer my questionnaire/be my Interviewee for the study. It is paramount for you to know that your information that you shall give shall remain private, secret and confidential.

Your kind response will greatly appreciated. Attached to this letter are the questionnaire and interview questions.

Yours faithfully

Chawarika John (13396936)

CONSENT FORM

I __________________________ hereby understand and consent to participate in the research.

(NB: if you so wish to withdraw from participating in this research, please, feel free to withdraw at any given time.)

DATE: __________  NAME(S); ___________________ SURNAME; ______________________

SIGNATURE; ______________________

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF CHURCH HISTORY AND POLITY

RESEARCH TOPIC:


STUDENT: Chawarika John (13396936)

QUESTIONNAIRE
1. **GENDER:**  Male       Female    (tick the applicable)

2. **AGE:** 18/40 yrs. old  41/50 yrs old  51/60 yrs. old  61/70 yrs old  71/80 yrs old
   (tick the applicable)

3. How long have you been an Anglican?

   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Have you heard/read anything about Bernard Mzeki?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Do you have ideas on how he died and what mystical happenings are associated with his death?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. Who was involved in his death if you know any?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. How was Bernard Mzeki given the status of a martyr?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. What do you understand about martyrdom?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. Does Bernard Mzeki fit to be called a martyr according to the points you have raised?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Can he be compared with other martyrs of the first century of the church like Justin Martyr, St Stephens', St Perpetua etc

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. What qualifies one to be a martyr?
12. Do you know who conferred his martyrdom? If yes, can you give us the names/committee that did so?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. Are you aware that they are institutions which are named after him?
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

14. Knowledge of other contributing factors that contributed to his death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think was the major contributing factors to Bernard Mzeki’s death?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that his death could have been caused by early political uprisings in the period mentioned? (1896/7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was a victim of social conflict of his time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was a victim of the economic challenges and disgruntlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Can we say the Bernard Mzeki Shrine in Marondera has been very influential in uniting the Anglican Church in the Province and the entire Anglican Communion, worldwide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 2
THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW COVER LETTER

The University of Pretoria
Faculty of Theology
Lynnwood Road
Hatfield
0083

24TH April, 2013

RE: DOCTORAL RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Dear sir/madam,

My name is Revd. Father Chawarika John, an Anglican priest in the Anglican Diocese of Harare, Zimbabwe. I am a doctoral student under the department of Church History and Polity in the faculty of Theology at the University of Pretoria (UP), South Africa. I am currently conducting a research on the topic below:

"THE IDENTITY OF BERNARD MIZEKI FROM THE FORMATIVE HISTORY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN ZIMBABWE (1990 -2013): RETRACING HIS LIFE, MARTYRDOM AND INFLUENCE."

My promoter in this study is Professor Duncan Graham. This study is an academic requirement for my Doctorial studies. I kindly ask you sir/madam to answer my questionnaire/be my Interviewee for the study. It is paramount for you to know that your information that you shall give shall remain private, secret and confidential.

Your kind response will greatly appreciated. Attached to this letter are the questionnaire and interview questions.

Yours faithfully

Chawarika John (13396936)
CONSENT FORM

I hereby understand and consent to participate in the research.
(NB: if you so wish to withdraw from participating in this research, please, feel free to withdraw at any given time.)

DATE: 9/8/17

NAME(S): PATONY

SERNAME: MUSENDO

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF CHURCH HISTORY AND POLITY

RESEARCH TOPIC:


STUDENT: Chawarika John (13396938)

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. GENDER:  Male [ ] Female [ ] (tick the applicable)

2. AGE: 18/40 yrs. old [ ] 41/50 yrs old [ ] 51/60 yrs old [ ] 61/70 yrs old [ ] 71/80 yrs old [ ] (tick the applicable)

3. How long have you been an Anglican?

THIRTY YEARS

4. Have you heard/read anything about Bernard Mzeki?
5. Do you have ideas on how he died and what mystical happenings are associated with his death?
YES. I HEARD THAT HE WAS KILLED BUT NO-ONE THEN SAW EXACTLY WHERE HE DIED. A TREE HAS A PERMANENT STAR.

6. Who was involved in his death if you know any?
SOME NATIVES WHO DID NOT AGREE WITH HIS PHILOSOPHY. HE WAS CHALLENGING LOCAL TRADITION.

7. How was Bernard Mzeki given the status of a martyr?
A. THE CHURCH SEEMS TO BE WITHOUT A CRITERIA OF CONCEIVING MARTYRS.

8. What do you understand about martyrdom?
A PERSON WHO DIES FOR HIS FAITH.

9. Does Bernard Mzeki fit to be called a martyr according to the points you have raised?
FROM WHAT HAS BEEN PASSED TO US THROUGH ORAL TRADITION YES, HOWEVER I AM NOT SURE OF ORAL TRADITION. I AM NOT SURE OF DECLARING HIM A MARTYR.

10. Can he be compared with other martyrs of the first century of the church like Justin Martyr, St Stephens', St Perpetua etc.
11. What qualifies one to be a martyr?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priests or non-priests who dies on church business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests or non-priests who is killed because of their beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest who refuses to denounce Christianity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to cooperative with the political government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you know who conferred his martyrdom? If yes, can you give us the names/committee that did so?

I just know it is the church

13. Are you aware that they are institutions which are named after him?

Yes

14. Knowledge of other contributing factors that contributed to his death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you think was the major contributing factors to Bernard Mzeki’s death?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that his death could have been caused by early political uprisings in the period mentioned? (1896/7)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was a victim of social conflict of his time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was a victim of the economic challenges and disgruntlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 can we say the Bernard Mzeki Shrine in Marondera has been very influential in uniting the Anglican Church in the Province and the entire Anglican Communion, worldwide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3
Pictures of some of the bishops in C.P.C.A who were interviewed
Bishop Sebastian Bakare (CPCA)  Bishop Chad Gandiya (CPCA)

Archbishop Albert Chama (CPCA)

Bishop Ralph Hatendi (CPCA)  Bishop Nolbert Kunonga (APZ)
Appendix 4  The excommunication statement for Bishop n. Kunonga

THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF CENTRAL AFRICA
THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN ZAMBIA, BOTSWANA, NAMIBIA AND SWAZILAND

The Dean of the Province of Central Africa and Bishop of Northern Zambia, The Rt. Rev. Albert Chma

IN THE NAME OF GOD. Amen.

We ALBERT CHMA by Divine permission, Dean of the Church of the Province of Central Africa, do hereby the authority of Christ committed to us, pronounce upon former Bishop of the Diocese of Harare Dr. Nolbert Kunonga and all those who support him the sentence of Greater Excommunication, thereby separating them from the Church of the Province of Central Africa and the Anglican Communion, by the actions taken of withdrawing from the Province of Central Africa, forming another Church, and casting aside the Constitution and Canons of the Church of the Province of Central Africa.

And we do hereby make known this our sentence to all the faithful in the Church of the Province of Central Africa and the Anglican Communion, and exhort them to join with us in humble supplication that these our erring brothers and sisters may speedily attain true repentance, for their own souls health and the well-being of the Body of Church.

Given under our hand and seal
This Twelfth day of May in the Year of our Lord Two Thousand and Eight and in the Sixth year of our Consecration.

Appendix 5  A Letter From D. Mutasa (ZANU-PF) To Rev F. Fundira(CPCA)
Zimbabwe African National Union
Patriotic Front (ZANU PF)

HEADQUARTERS
P.O. Box 4150
Harare
Tel: 770712
Fax: 774827

Re: ONGOING DISPUTE IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN ZIMBABWE

I wish to acknowledge receipt of your document dated 29th October 2010 and titled "Let the Truth be Known on the Dispute between Bishop Kumonga and the Anglican Dioceses of Harare in the Church of the Province of Central Africa: from 21 September 2007 to 13 July 2010". Kindly please accept, foremost, my profound apologies for this very belated reply.

While most sincerely appreciating the depth of thought underlying your decision to write to us on this important matter, I regret to convey that the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU PF) cannot align itself with either side, precisely because it has active members on both sides of this dispute. Further, it would equally be remiss for the Party or this office of the Inclusive Government to take a position supporting or against either side at this juncture, especially while this matter is in the courts of law. ZANU PF's official position, therefore, is one of absolute indifferent neutrality in the hope that the law must be allowed to take its course or time, in God's divine design, will ultimately heal this rift in your Church.

I hereby accept from the President and First Secretary of the Party, from ZANU PF, and from myself in my personal and both my official capacities as the Secretary for Administration of the Party, and the Minister of State for Presidential Affairs, heartfelt wishes for a Merry Christmas, a Happy New Year and a Prosperous 2010 to yourself, your family and the entire flock of the Anglican Church in Zimbabwe.

May the Lord bless the troubled flock of your Church to find the necessary wisdom that will bring this dispute to a responsible, amicable and sustainable end in 2010.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

HONOURABLE DANIE MUTASA, MP
SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

[Logo and stamp: PAMPERE ZANU PF]
[Logo and stamp: PAMPERE ZANU PF]
[Logo and stamp: FORWARD WITH ZANU PF]
THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF CENTRAL AFRICA
THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN ZAMBIA, BOTSWANA, MALAWI, AND ZIMBABWE

The Dean of the Province of Central Africa and Bishop of Northern Zambia: The Rt Rev Albert Chama MA

Tel: 260 312 313682
Off: 260 312 313683
Fax: 260 312 223477
Cell: 260 966 99766
Email: cpe@zamnet.com

P.O. Box 22174,
Nico,
Zambia.

BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF CENTRAL AFRICA
STATEMENT ON THE DIocese OF HARRARE ISSUE

We the undersigned:

Bishops of the Church of the Province of Central Africa at the Extraordinary Episcopal Synod held on 20th December, 2007, at the Lusaka Hotel, Zambia, state that: we were consulted by the Dean of the Province of Central Africa, the Rt Rev. Albert Chama in connexion with the contents of the letter of the 21st December 2007 addressed to the Archbishop of the Church of the Province of Central Africa (C.P.C.A) concerning the withdrawal by Bishop Kunonga of the Diocese of Harare from the C.P.C.A.

We unanimously concurred that:

1. The Fundamental Declarations, Articles of the Constitution, Canons and laws of the C.P.C.A. do not permit the unilateral withdrawal of a Diocese from the Province even if, as alleged by Bishop Kunonga, but challenged by many, the Synod of that diocese unanimously expressed a desire no longer to be associated with the Province.

2. Bishop Kunonga was, inter alia, expressing his personal attitude and intention to sever all ties with the Province and was himself withdrawing from the Province.

3. In the circumstances, we accepted his personal resignation and withdrawal from the body of the C.P.C.A.

We desire to record that following the resignation of Bishop Kunonga;

1. The Diocese of Harare continues to form part of the Province.

2. Dr Kunonga, having severed his ties and allegiance and cast aside his canonical obedience to be bound by the laws of the Province, which includes the Diocese of Harare, has ceased to be a member of the Diocese and:

2.1. is no longer the bishop of the Diocese; and

2.2. His licence as a clergyman in the Anglican Communion is automatically revoked, and

2.3. He is no longer authorised or permitted to have any authority or control whatsoever over the Diocese, nor to represent it in any way, nor to use the funds and assets of the Diocese.

2.4. His act of schism has been notified to the Anglican Communion worldwide.

3. The faction of priests known to support Dr Kunonga in his action, in whatever Diocese(s) they may be, has chosen to step outside the Province and the Diocese. Their licences have been revoked as they are no longer members of the Diocese and the Province.
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We decree that all persons presently in office in the Diocese in any of the above positions shall be deemed to have resigned but shall be eligible for appointment at the discretion of Bishop Bakare.

Property

In terms of Articles of the Constitution and the Canons and other laws of the Province and the Acts of the Diocese all property, moveable and immovable and all monies within the Diocese are beneficially held by the Diocese but are owned by the C.P.C.A. We have called upon Dr Kunonga to deliver to the Province all these assets. We now order him to deliver or cause them to be delivered into the possession or placed under the control of Bishop Bakare immediately.

EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

In view of the exceptional circumstances arising from the unlawful acts of Dr Kunonga in withdrawing from the C.P.C.A., a situation not within the contemplation of and not fully addressed in the Canons and other laws of the Province, we have, after due discussion and consideration, decided in terms of Canon 32.2 to grant approval to the Dean of the Province to deem the Canons to have been varied, but only to the extent necessary to encompass and make permissible all those decisions, acts and omissions of the Dean and ourselves, the Provincial Standing Committee and Episcopal and Provincial Synod and Bishop Bakare, that have formed, and will continue to form, the process and procedure required to deal with the withdrawal of Dr Kunonga from the C.P.C.A. and the Diocese, his removal from the precepts of the Diocese and the Anglican Church, and relinquishment by him of all Diocesan moveable and immovable property, the taking over by Bishop Bakare of the Diocese of Harare (C.P.C.A.) in a caretaker capacity, the election of a new bishop and all things ancillary thereto which may be necessary or desirable.

Finally, for the avoidance of doubt, we hereby ratify all that has thus far been done by the Dean of the Province.

The Rt. Rev Albert Chama
Bishop of Northern Zambia
And Dean of the Province of Central Africa

The Rt. Rev David Njovu
Bishop of Lusaka

The Rt. Rev William Muchombi
Bishop of Eastern Zambia

The Rt. Rev Derek Kamukwambwa
Bishop of Central Zambia

The Rt. Rev. Robert Mumbi
Bishop of Luapula
RT. REV. Ishmael Mukwanda  
Bishop of Central Zimbabwe

RT. REV. Godfrey Tawonezvi  
Bishop of Masvingo

RT. REV. Wilson Sitshobo  
Bishop of Matabeleland

RT. REV. Sebastian Bakare  
Bishop of Harare

RT. REV. James Tengatenga  
Bishop of Southern Malawi

RT. REV. Christopher Boyle  
Bishop of Northern Malawi

RT. REV. Bernard Malingo  
Bishop of Upper Shire

The REV. Canon Michael Mloko  
Vicar General Diocese of Lake Malawi

The RT. REV. Trevor Mwamba  
Bishop of Botswana

Apologies received but concurring

Apologies received but concurring

Apologies received but concurring

Apologies received but concurring

Apologies received but concurring