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ABSTRACT

This thesis reports on qualitative and a phenomenological study exploring contesting spaces in the understandings regarding the alienation of black outstation congregations for a policy (Canon, Acts of the Diocese) change in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa and reasons for such understandings, with reference to the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal. A Foucauldian concept of genealogy has been used to trace the history of outstation congregations practice in the Anglican Church, in the Diocese of Natal. Another Foucauldian concept of development has been used to review the discourse of Canon and Acts of the Diocese of Natal (policy) in both local and international literature. Qualitative data were produced through in-depth interviews with six leaders of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal as policy-makers. Interviews were used to generate a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data, which would be making policy (Acts of the Diocese) decisions and choices at Diocesan policy level. In addition, document analysis was also used to generate qualitative data. The insights gained from this study have significance for mission, ministry and worship.

The study makes two unique contributions to the field of the alienation of outstation congregations inquiry. The methodological contribution lies in the six categories of research participants to illuminate the politics of a large parish and the Anglican Diocese of Natal’s Acts of the Diocese (Diocesan policy). The exploration of the contesting spaces in the understandings regarding alienation of outstation congregations extends the conceptual definition of politics of the Anglican Church in general and pushes the boundaries of the debate in policy (Canons and Acts of the Diocese of Natal) in mission, ministry and worship. One critical finding is that different people perceive the value of a policy differently, reflecting the politics of the policy (Canon, Acts of the Diocese) at an ideological level. Another critical finding is that the perceived value of a policy (Canon, Acts of the Diocese) may inadvertently mask its theological contributions and supposedly ‘real’ value. Previous studies have not been undertaken, therefore, this study avails a body of knowledge based on the alienation of outstation congregations for a policy (Canon, Acts of the Diocese) change or re-visitation, as its original contribution.
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Key Terms

**Large parochial structure model**
It is a pastoral charge (large parish) with a number of different congregations under the supervision of a rector, saving all ordinary rights to the bishop. The number of congregations varies from one to thirty-five at most.

**Main parish centre**
It is a pastoral charge or parish under the care of the incumbent (priest). Historically referred to as mission or mission station. These were centres of mission activity in particular regions. They served a number of smaller outstations congregations which did not have a resident minister.

**Outstation congregations**
Historically referred to as outstations. This term was used to describe marginal congregations that have emerged within a particular region, associated with a Main Parish centre. Lately, referred to as ‘congregations’ without a resident priest.

**Acts of the Diocese of Natal**
Resolutions and proceedings of the synod of the Diocese of Natal, within the Anglican Church of Southern Africa. ‘Acts’ when passed by that synod is intended to have a mandatory effect. Resolutions of synod can be understood as the judgment or opinion of the synod. It is intended to have advisory, not a mandatory effect.

**Parish Manual**
It is a guide to all parishes to regulate the process and procedures for the administration of church policies, procedures and positions. It incorporates among other things, the lease and other property procedures, amendments to the Acts of the Diocese of Natal. It also deals with the duties of churchwardens, parish councils, finance and legal matters.
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Chapter One
Introducing the Study

1.1 Introduction
Maintaining peace and unity in a large parochial structure in any Diocese was an inescapable duty of any rector. Ordinarily, in South Africa, a large parish had a main parish centre where the rector resides and “three, four, or a dozen, or twenty” congregations. When the priest was “needed he was not there; sought him with difficulty and people must act without him” (Paton, 1960: 166). Japha, Japha, Le Grange and Todeschini liken the main parish centre to a mission station because, like a mission station, it serviced “a number of smaller outstations which did not have a resident minister” (1993: 4). The “outstation” was a colonial invention which denoted “a branch in every station” (Hinchliff, 1968: 35). This ecclesiastical model was introduced by Bishop Colenso as early as 1854 when he sought to establish “congregations away from the main mission station” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 373).

In postcolonial South Africa, the average priest was faced with the task to align both areas of operation through “working as a team with the rector and other Parish leaders (including outstation congregations) to further the mission and ministry of the Church” (Diocese of Natal, 2002: 1). This understanding of parish ministry was reflected in the Constitution and Canons. Canon 24 states, “The Incumbent shall work together with the Parish Council in the task of enabling the community of the people of God to exercise the ministry of the Body of Christ” (Anglican Church of Southern Africa, 1994: 60: 3).

To that effect the relationship between a main parish centre and its outstation congregations in theology, mission, ministry and worship, was structured to promote unity and peace throughout the parish. Yet, despite such good intentions, the status of outstation congregations in a large parish remained a hotly contested issue (Apple, 2004) and a “battleground for competing influences and ideologies” (Kelly, 1999: 167; Cochrane, 1987: 31-36), that reflected ongoing contestation over ecclesiastical practices and theological teaching.
This chapter, by means of introduction, sets out to propose, frame, describe, deconstruct and analyse policy (Canon or Acts of the Diocese) so as to expose the theological contradictions and perceived value. The study explores the contested position and status of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure, such as that of the Diocese of Natal. The aim of this study was to illuminate the contested position, and legacy experience of the outstation congregation, with the view to inform a canonical or an act of the Diocese policy that was consistent with the democratic and religiously diverse society of South Africa.

The term “outstation congregations” was used to denote a marginal part of a large parochial structure. I used this term to give expression to the continuing marginal status of former missions and outstation—generally attended by black parishioners—that still characterise the relationship between parent church and marginal congregations. However, for the purpose of clarity, the word parish “shall be deemed to include any constituted unit of Pastoral Charge, by whatever name it may be known” (Anglican Church of Southern Africa, 1994: 59). As early as 1964 all missions and mission stations within the Anglican Church of Southern Africa became parishes, but old practices and associations remained intact. “All Mission Districts acquired parochial status” (Diocese of Natal Synod, 1964: 22-23, 26-29). At the time, the term “mission” was understood to refer to “an urban or rural institution, or one with a long established congregation, as opposed to one which was setting out to recruit new converts, came to apply to an institution which catered for black people rather than whites” (Japha, Japha, Le Grande and Todeschini, 1993: 3). Although some churches (particularly Anglican churches) had dropped the term altogether on the grounds that it was patronizing—they are now referred to only as parishes—the differentiated status central to marginal parishes remained widely practiced.

In terms of ecclesiology, this study interrogates the practices and policies which sought to regulate and validate the conduct of the large parishes in the Diocese of Natal, with special attention directed toward their administration and treatment of marginal
congregations. This thesis claims that it was through the understandings and analyses of
the status of outstation congregations that we might more critically understand the role
and status of the main parish centre in the Diocese of Natal. I contest that, like Olseen,
Codd and O’Neil’s observation, “today, educational policies are the focus of considerable
controversy and overt public contestation” (2004: 2), and the Anglican Church’s policies
(canons and acts of the diocese) were facing similar challenges and likely revisions.

However, recognising that Canon or Acts of the Diocese (policy) carried different
meanings for different people, whether in origin or practice (Ball, 1994), this empirical
study deliberately sought to understand the opinions and experiences of six categories of
participants from across the Diocese of Natal. They included diocesan leadership and
regional leadership (policy makers), parish leadership (both outstation congregations and
main parish centre) as well as ordinary members affiliated to associations. This made
possible a critique of the 1964 Act of the Diocese’s decision to change mission station to
parishes as more than a bureaucratic necessity but as a charge to take seriously the
theological and pastoral contributions of outstation congregation.

Theoretically, the study had described, analysed and theorized contested understandings
regarding the status of outstation congregations. In particular, it told a story of outstation
congregations in pursuit of policy change. In this case, the study illuminated the
particular challenges of these congregations when negotiating a theological policy in the
Diocese of Natal.

In general, the study provides some answers to questions about Church politics of the
Diocese of Natal. The relevance of these questions extends beyond the specificity of
status of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal, into the wider challenges of
negotiating theological policy change in the Province.

This study demonstrates a conceptual understanding of the complexity of church canons
(policy). The findings indicate different understandings about the perceived status of the
1964 decision to recast missions as ‘parishes’ and asset while the status of ‘outstations
congregations’ remained as they were in the nineteenth century, which is a liability for the Diocese of Natal and this thesis has wider implications. The missionary and ministerial value of the policy of the Anglican Church had been obscured and undermined by its contradictory effect in implementation. This was, and continues to be, related to the marginal status afforded to outstation congregations. This negation created a need to conceptualise outstation congregations’ status and practise within a large parish in a manner that did not promote theological contradictions.

The rest of this chapter is organised under the following sub-headings: context of the study; rationale and motivation; stating the research problem; research focus; researcher’s position; and an outline of thesis chapters.

1.2 Context of the Study

This study is based on the status of outstation congregations in a large, black parochial structure in the Diocese of Natal, as part of the Anglican Church of Southern Africa. The story of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa “began in April 20, 1749, when a Church of England chaplain, on his way back home to England from India, landed at the Dutch East India Company of the Cape of Good Hope, and conducted there his first Anglican service ever held in those parts” (Page, 1947: 1). For the next one hundred years the only English services in the colony were those conducted by naval and military chaplains.

The founder of the Church of England in South Africa who “laid the foundations of the English Church” was Bishop Robert George Gray, in 1848 (Suggit and Goedhals, 1998; Page, 1947: 7). He had an imperative of taking the gospel to indigenous people and was “to absorb the energies of local government” (Hinchliff, 1963: 31). The colonial Governor proposed that “Christian mission stations should be used to assist in the policy of civilization and pacifying the eastern frontier” in the hope that the establishment of mission stations would prevent frontier wars (Hinchliff, 1963: 45-47).
In Natal, the Anglican Church prospered during the tenure of bishop Colenso, from 1853 to 1863. Mission stations grew both in urban and in rural areas. Although outstation congregations were initiated, the Diocese of Natal was now getting to the stage when its history might settle down into records of parishes for whites and missions for blacks. Local converts, William Gcwensa and Mbande Mpengula, were endorsed by Rev. Callaway as “fit for ordination,” and they spent several months in training before they were assigned to a mission (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 363). Born into the Gwala clan in Griqualand East, Mpengula would as a young adult leave his family in 1857 and accompany Callaway to his mission at Springvale where he rose in the Anglican Church. Callaway ordained him as the first indigenous Anglican priest in South Africa and would conduct Sunday services, teach Sunday school and confirm converts. Some years later he was installed as a deacon of the church and he served the Anglican Church at Springvale until his death in 1874 (Chidester, 2014). William Ngcwensa was ordained 1871 at St Saviour’s Cathedral (Natal) together with Mbande Mpengula, and Ngobese. Ngcwensa and Mpengula assisted Callaway with the translation of the bible into Zulu and they offered account and interpretation of Zulu myths and cosmology to their missionary counter-parts. Ngcwensa would later leave Natal and follow Callaway to Umtata where the latter became Bishop in 1873.¹

The end of the eighteenth century saw the development of a chain of mission outstations with the help of indigenous clergy and catechists. It was through the missionary work of black clergy and catechists that large parishes were developed in both urban and rural areas. This marked the beginning of the large parochial structure model in black parishes, in the Diocese of Natal.

This model of the large parish which consisted of a mission station or church and a number of outstations lasted until 1964 when the Diocese of Natal “closed the status of the missions” and declared that all mission and mission stations should acquire parochial status. “This meant that each former mission would now have an Incumbent,

¹ See appendix 8 for table containing names of black pioneers of ministry within the Anglican Church, their years of ordination and period of ministry.
Churchwardens and Parish Council. However, Mission Districts now became Pastoral Charges with each a rector who resides in a rectory” (Diocese of Natal, 1964: 22-23, 26-29). This meant that a large parish consisted of a main parish centre and a number of outstation congregations. This Act of the Diocese which declared all missions and parishes as supposedly equal in status lies at the heart of this study. I looked at the inconsistent ways in which this Act of the Diocese was implemented, through taking as its starting point, the legacy, membership and leadership of outstation congregations.

Thus, in the context of the Diocese of Natal, this study is an empirical exploration of the understandings of status of outstation congregations, canonically. It seeks to interrogate “the dynamics of policy-Canons across and between levels” (Ball, 206: 17). Drawing on the experiences and opinions of Anglicans, from the Diocesan leadership down to the congregational leadership on the issue of policy change in a large parochial structure model, it made a critical contribution to theological and pastoral inquiry about the status of outstation congregation.

### 1.3 Rationale and Motivation for the Study

Several considerations underpinned and drove this study covering issues ranging from the status of outstation congregations, ecclesiology (mission, ministry and worship) in the Diocese of Natal and theological, pastoral and theoretical imperatives. First, the contextual consideration: the democratic dispensation beginning in 1994 had created expectations for change in the Diocese of Natal’s governance, which controlled, directed and facilitated the activities of its members.

There were aspects of this large parish system that constrained outstation congregations from being engaged in mission, ministry and worship. Status of outstation congregations needed to be identified and addressed so that campaigns, such as “Growing the Church-Provincial Programme” (Southern Anglican, 2008 vol.16: 54), “Masisukume Sakhe” or “Arise and Build” (Diocese of Natal, Clergy Synod, 2006) could flourish. Gibbs and Coffey argued that though the national goal of ‘growing the church’ was synonymous
with “the new wine which must be poured into new wineskins…those new wineskins could not simply be freshly made versions of the old models” (2001: 11).

To that end, this study explores and theorizes the implications of the status of outstation congregations in the post-Apartheid South Africa.

The second consideration is related to the challenges associated with the status of outstation congregations in relation to policy - Canons or Acts in the Anglican Diocese of Natal. There had been a shift in 2000 from hierarchical leadership in the Diocese towards more inclusive leadership. It was left to the parishes, both single and large, to share information, ideas and discussions with lay-leaders in a team-ministry (Diocese of Natal, 2002: 1; Anglican Church of Southern Africa, 1994: 60). Given the fact that no study has been undertaken since the introduction of the Parish Manual in 2002 in the Diocese of Natal, there is a need to explore the status of outstation congregations in the light of team – ministry as from 2000, in parishes. This study highlights the theological and pastoral motivations of the “Regional-Shared Leadership towards Growing the Church,” a document produced in the Archdeaconry of the Pinetown Region towards team-ministry. Sadly, the discussion ends with the retirement of the archdeacon in 2011 (Regional Development Document, 2011). Such an initiative has had difficulty getting through the policy - Canon or Acts of the Diocese - changes for implementation or practice (Darling-Hammond, 1998). This regional document also sheds some light on the different meanings that the policy has carried for different players in the Church, from its conception to its implementation (Marriner-Tomy, 1992; Reaves, 1992). Thus, from a phenomenological perspective, this study explores the understandings and legacy of the status of outstation congregations in team-ministry in the parishes.

Thirdly, Hewitt (2012; Nkomazana and Tanner, 2007) observed that theological scholars could and must undertake research that speaks to the pressing public issues related to social concern, community outreach and other organisations. Theological and ecclesiastical research could and must be in the public interest, constituting a possible basis for social justice, action, and policy. Thus, I explore the challenges of status of

The fourth consideration is academic, and relates to previous work I did for my Master’s degree on the controversy surrounding the self-supporting priest. I looked at the Anglican Church of Southern Africa’s structural location of self-supporting priests in the Ordination of Deacons and Priests, with the aim of determining whether they were ‘first-class’ or ‘second-class’ in their ordination to the priesthood (An Anglican Prayer Book, 1989: 574-91). Although it addresses the scarcity of clergy in large parishes, there were sectors of the Anglican Church that would view them as ‘second class’ clergy and will not accept their ministry. Likewise, this study is pointed towards institutional practices that facilitate the status of outstation congregations in a large parish. Since the advent of outstation congregations, no study has interrogated their value in terms of theological and pastoral contribution. In a sense, the present study has given me an opportunity to participate in the regional debates about the status of outstation congregations.

A fifth consideration is related to the silence in academic work and in both local and international literature on the status of outstation congregations in policy and practice. Therefore, if such literature had been produced, it would have mainly highlighted the debates on what interventions should be applied to address the challenges in status of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal, especially their “history from below” (Sharpe, 1991: 29; Tuck, 2001; Porter, 2001; Wesseling, 2001). Focus has largely been on the main parish centre, illustrating that “history offers a view from above” only (Burke, 1992: 4). This indicates that literature does exist in both main parish centre and on marginalised people (outstation congregations), in a large parish. Furthermore, some studies on the main parish centre are based on settings outside Africa, and generally focused on white parishes, with little attention to black parishes (Paton 1960; Gibbs 1972). This empirical study addresses all six archdeaconries in the Diocese of Natal on
the subject of status of outstation congregations in policy and practice, where congregations have no services and are without the oversight of a priest for five to ten months.

The sixth consideration is closely related to my own journey to become a priest in the Diocese of Natal. From 1973 to 1983, I was actively involved as an assistant priest and rector of large parishes. In 1984 I applied to be a self-supporting priest while working at the YMCA in Durban as a manager. This was from 1984 to 1999, and in 2000 to 2011 I returned to the Anglican Church as a fulltime clergy in the Diocese of Natal, as rector of various large parishes, till my retirement in 2011. I was motivated to enhance my professional development and competence as a teacher and priest, between 1984 till this day. As a teacher, priest and a scholar, I gained knowledge and understanding about the status of outstation congregations. As such, the study has a direct bearing on my situation and partly stemmed from my career and exposure to the situation. As Denscombe observes,

as far as social research is concerned, decisions about what to investigate frequently reflect the personal interests of the researcher. Particularly with small-scale research, it is evident that past and present experiences good or bad, often act as a major influence on the choice of topics. They can generate the incentive to investigate specific things rather than others. (2002: 34)

2 Self-supporting clergy was formally known as “Community Ordained Ministries” (Diocese of Natal 2003: 19). Special synod of October (2003) proposed revised Acts of the diocese of Natal. Formally was Community priest. “Voluntary clergy are men who earn their living by the work of their hands or of their heads in the common market and serve as clergy without stipend or fee of any kind”. (Paton, 1960: 147), nowadays it includes women. The Case of Voluntary clergy by Allen Rolland, 1960a. “Dioceses of Swaziland and Zululand is calling its ministry self supporting, in order to distinguish it from the diocesan stipendiary clergy” (Vilakazi, 2002: 85). The priests receive stipend from the Diocese and are full time. “The priests are recognised as leaders, ordained and set apart by God and his Church for the oversight of the Pastoral Charge to which they are appointed, under the authority of the Bishop” (Constitution and Canons of the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, 1994:59).
The seventh consideration was how to contribute to the debates related to the status of outstation congregations in a way that takes account of the democratic and pluralistic society in KwaZulu Natal. The study could be of benefit to both large parishes and Diocese administrators and leadership in status outstation congregations. This research, therefore, is timely for the current debate about the status of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal.

The eighth and final consideration was the need for a multi-level approach to the understanding of outstation congregations’ policy. Some studies on policy in general (Edwards and Whitty, 1989; Whitty, Power and Halpin, 1993) have used a multi-level approach to trace the developmental formation and realisation of policies, from the context of influences, through policy text production, to practices and outcomes. Ball (1994) described this approach as a policy trajectory perspective. Generally, the policy “trajectory perspective attended to the ways in which policies evolve, change, and decay through time space and their incoherence” (Ball, 2006: 17). Here, policy-making and implementation were seen as processes taking place within spaces of contestation over meaning (Taylor, 1997). Yeatman (1990) described this as the church politics of discourse. Thus, the study had sought to explore, within a framework of church politics, the various meanings that status of outstation congregations’ policy (Canon or Acts of the Diocese) change had for the archdeaconry, main parish centre and outstation congregations’ leaders. In this phenomenological study I hope to illuminate the essence of such meanings (Sarantakos, 2005).

1.4 Stating the Research Problem

The problem with which this study is concerned is related to the apparent theological contradictions embedded in the status of outstation congregations. The contradictions were apparently created by ecclesiastical status and financial implications. Each space had a different ontology, epistemology and methodology. By ontology, I mean the ways in which the nature of teaching and learning of theology were conceptualised. In the main parish centre’s space, theology was based on one supposedly accepted missionary legacy while in the outstation congregations, theology was produced and validated through their
experience of many religions as valid in their own right, and lastly of being the Church in the Diocese of Natal. Epistemologically, theology in the main parish centre’s space involved acquiring knowledge of Church theology, while the outstation congregations promoted acquisition of knowledge about many theologies. Methodologically, the main parish centre promoted exclusivist and closed methods of teaching and learning while the outstation congregations promoted open, inclusive, and pluralistic methods of teaching and learning. Thus, the mono-theological and multi-theological orientations created contradictions in terms of the ecclesiology. These contradictions created a problematic situation about the role of theology in the public arena.

Furthermore, the study draws on the opinion of some theological philosophers that the inclusion of any “Canon” or “Acts” in the Diocese of Natal must be justified on theological grounds. This notion implied that the subject must make a unique and worthwhile contribution to the aims of the Anglican Church by developing critical thinking and understanding as well as initiating the large parishes into worthwhile and unique sites of discourse (Hirst and Peters, 1970). Any large parish should contribute to making the community a better place in which to live. However, this contribution excluded learning activities such as catechism, instruction, training and preaching. The claim here was that the large parishes should espouse the ethos of social justice and unity in diversity.

One of the assumptions of the study was that the contradictions embedded in status of outstation congregations had the effect of minimising its theological value. On this assumption, the findings of the study indicate that the challenges to the status of outstation congregations’ policy represented a case where the perceived ecclesiology inadvertently serves as a smokescreen for its theological contributions and the supposed ‘real value’. The claim was that the status of outstation congregations could be justified more by Church politics than on theological grounds. Church politics were serving church’s need of promoting peace and unity among people of different theological ideologies, convictions and interests at the cost of creating theological contradictions.
It was in view of this problematic situation that I felt there was a need for a fine-grained exploratory study of the contested understandings regarding challenges of status of outstation congregations’ policy. Based on the research findings, the central argument is that the essence of the contesting spaces created by the Diocesan leaders, the main parish centre and the outstation congregations’ leadership tend to foreground the theological value of the status of outstation congregations’ policy change without acknowledging its theological contradictions. The theology of the Church’s political value was also glossed over. Yet the theology seemed to be more politically than theologically correct. This observation has matured into the thesis of the study which posited that the received value of any theology may inadvertently mask its ecclesiastical contradictions and supposed ‘real’ value (see Chapter 8).

1.5 Focus of the Study

The focus of the study is the contested spaces in the understandings regarding the challenges of status of the outstation congregations’ policy change for the Diocese of Natal, from the perspectives of Diocesan, main parish centre and outstation congregations’ leadership. The aim was to illuminate the essence of such contested spaces within the overarching theoretical framework of Church politics and theology.

Key Research Questions

Having considered relevant and significant scholarly opinions and debates associated with the area of status of outstation congregations’ theory and practice, I found it worthwhile to use qualitative method of triangulation to conduct phenomenological research; exploring contested space in the way that status of outstation congregations’ theological policy (Canon or Acts of the Diocese) change for the Diocese of Natal was understood. The exploration was conducted by investigating the following central research question:

What does being a church mean for the outstation congregations, in a large parochial structure model, in the Diocese of Natal?
To facilitate a deep exploration of the above central research question, the following sub-questions guided the study:

1. What is the Anglican Church’s understanding of a large parochial structure model?
2. How do parishioners and church leadership, in both the parent parish, and the outstation congregations understand their congregation’s role and position in the large parochial structure?
3. What are the socio-cultural ideologies that influenced the subordination of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal?
4. What are the experiences of outstation congregations?
5. How do the Anglican Church’s Constitution and Canons legitimize the status of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure?
6. What appropriate theologies can help the Diocese of Natal to effectively engage with outstation congregations?

1.6 The Researcher’s Position

Positionality and reflexivity in research critically influence how one looks at a phenomenon under study, especially when personal involvement extends over four decades. Patton (1990) describes positionality in research as a form of self-reflection and self-examination which allows the researcher to gain clarity from their own perceptions. Thus, I admitted my assumptions upfront. My first assumption was that different people always seek to influence the theological discourses in their parishes according to their ideologies (Cochrane, 1987). As such, I view the challenges in status of outstation congregations to be a reflection of certain ideologies, ones based on power construction of the main parish centre that reflects the theoretical construction underpinning the call for the Canon Acts as the Diocese to be changed.
Secondly, I assumed that any theological policy had contested positions reflecting people’s disagreement about its perceived value. As such, I did not hold the view that because something was church policy it had no critics. Lastly, I held the view that different understandings and disagreements about canonical challenges or change rendered the canon a hotly contested space, and difficult to get beyond bureaucracy into practice (Darling – Hammond, 1998).

As a scholar of congregation theory and practice, and as a black cleric in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, I strongly subscribed to the approach advocated in the “Transformation of Congregations for the Future” (Mead, 1994; Freeman, 1994). This approach aimed to help the parishes develop critical knowledge and understanding of mission, ministry and worship as social phenomena, leading them to a commitment to the Christian gospel. It espoused the dogmatic approach (Brennan, 2007; Gibbs and Morton, 1968). As a teacher and priest, I have been involved in training and developing parish leaders in both outstation congregations and main parish centre, and I have been in a leadership position in ministry, mission and worship in the Diocese of Natal from 1972 until 2011.

Thus, my overarching position is that challenges of the status of outstation congregations needed to be engaged in theological and policy discourses in all the corners of the Diocese of Natal. It is my conviction that the Church must reflect the democratic and pluralistic society in which it finds itself. I believe that the Church is a space vital to the teaching of Christian values to organisations and families. Thus, with a Christian background as a priest and educator, my position is that churches (parishes) should be spaces for promoting dialogue between main parish centres and outstation congregations.

Furthermore, my position in this study was influenced by my various positions as a priest and a rector. I worked as an assistant priest in large parishes from 1972 until 1973 and as a rector in large parishes from 1973 until 1983. I also worked as a teacher in an adult education centre while being a self-supporting priest in a number of large parishes from 1984 until 1999. I served as an archdeacon of Pinetown archdeaconry from 2008 until
March of 2011. Between 2008 and 2011 a small sub-committee of regional clergy produced “Shared Leadership towards ‘Growing the Church’,” a policy document aimed at regional development with a focus on the status of outstation congregations. They also “had to work as a team with the rector and other parish leaders to further the mission and ministry of the Church” (Diocese of Natal, 2012: 1). This view is supported by Canon 24, which states that the “incumbent shall work together with the Parish Council in the task of enabling the community of the people of God to exercise the ministry of the Body of Christ” (Church of the Province of Southern Africa, 1994: 60).

My interest in the issue was shaped by the bishop’s request that I, together with Archdeacon Thami Tembe, develop a new parish at Umbumbulu, which would be comprised of four outstation congregations from Umbumbulu. Much work was done in this respect and outstation congregations’ aspirations were aroused. However, this momentum faded when I retired in 2011. The last parish in which I worked was Umhlathuzana, which I started in 2002 and composed of four outstation congregations formally under the Parish of Clermont (Pinetown). This creation of a new parish out of outstation congregations also motivated me to conduct this study.

It was these challenges related to the status of outstation congregations that inspired me to undertake this study. I approached the study with theological and ideological lenses, drawn from Church politics, policy change and theology to theorise the contested understandings regarding the challenges in status of outstation congregations.

Considering my history and position in the Church, issues of credibility, dependability and transferability must be regarded as critical in evaluating research, just as issues of validity, reliability and generality are in the discourse of quantitative research (Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle, 2006). Credibility refers to whether the participants’ perceptions of the phenomenon under analysis matched up with my portrayal in the research report. This aspect was taken care of by using research methods that yielded accurate and significant research settings and participants.
I had to manage participants’ understanding of my position of power by allowing the discussions to flow without my interference. I also intervened when the discussions were overboard, that is, bringing in unrelated matters to the subject under discussion. I had also to manage my biases about outstation congregations by providing a recorder, so that I could refer back to the discussions in my analysis. There was no space to bring in my biases about outstation congregations as the questions had been prepared prior to the interviews. The discussions were held in the language agreed upon by the participants, IsiZulu. I translated the recorded speech into English at different intervals. This also offered an authentic interpretation of the interviews. Lastly, I transcribed both interpretations to include in the data.

For thematic analysis I utilised a bottom-up approach, inducing themes from specific instances. This meant dividing the data into small units of meaning and systematically naming each unit. These units were then coded accordingly. In coding the data I broke down a group of words to classify and categorise them as they related to the research questions, concepts and themes. Multiple codes were applied to units that related to more than one theme. I used a highlighter, paperclips and staples for texts, so as to be sure where each came from. The coding of categories was a means of sorting descriptive data, so that the material bearing on a given topic was separated from the data. It was worth noting that the codes should never be regarded as final and unchanging. Keeping this in mind, I developed core-categories to the common structural unit. However, I discarded totally unrelated categories unless I could find a way of building them to the core.

Verbal quotations from participants which would bring the reader into the reality of the situation studied were captured (Coolican, 1990). The themes needed refinement and to this end I produced positive and negative thematic categories understandings regarding the challenges of the status of outstation congregations and for policy change. Each thematic category has themes representing the understandings toward each category of the research participants.
After generating and reviewing a satisfactory list of six themes from data, I labelled and defined them to be presented as research findings. I also analysed the data within the themes to ensure the internal and external homogeneity of themes. I organised them into coherent and internally consistent accounts, with accompanying narratives. The final step was to produce a written account of the phenomenon I studied with my interpretations. I checked my interpretation thoroughly and tried to fixed weak points.

This was also a good opportunity to reflect on my own role in collecting the data and creating the interpretation. None of my colleagues expected me to be completely objective, and it was expected that I should give some indication of how my personal involvement might have coloured the way I collected and analysed the data. I tried as much as possible to be objective throughout the research study. The themes are presented in a manner appropriate to the data with all interpretations and conclusions supported by the data as well as literature. Efforts were made also to minimise my personal biases through being mindful of my objectivity in the research analysis and findings.

The issue of transferability “refers to the degree of similarity between the research site and other sites as judged by the readers” (Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle, 2006: 275). Thus, although qualitative research findings could not be generalised to other settings, it was possible that lessons learned about outstation congregations could be useful in other settings. This study attempts to provide a full description of contested understandings regarding the challenges in status of outstation congregations within the Diocese of Natal; this extends beyond my own personal interest in the aspirations of outstation congregants and the Church in general.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is comprised of eight chapters that are divided into two main sections. The first section comprises chapters one through five, dealing with the contextual, theoretical and methodological framing of the study. The second section consists of chapters six
through eight with the presentation, discussion and interpretation of the research findings. A brief description of each chapter is presented below.

**Chapter One** introduces the study by briefly discussing its orientation and background. The discussion revolves around the following themes: context of the study; rationale and motivation; stating the problem; research focus; key research questions and the researcher’s position; and the structure of the thesis.

**Chapter Two** presents the research design, methodology and methods used in the study. It foregrounds a general phenomenological perspective, discussing first the data-production process and then progresses to data-analysis process. The discussion is divided into the following sections: qualitative triangulation (phenomenology); research participants and sampling; data production and analysis process; limitations of the study; and ethical considerations.

**Chapter Three**, which is literature review employs a Foucauldian approach of genealogy “concerned to trace historical process of descent and emergence by which a given thought system or process comes into being and is subsequently transformed” (Olssem, Codd, and Neill, 2004: 45). It traces the status of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal through its historical and socio-political context. Literature review of text related to the theoretical framework are categorised thus: history of the Church; oral history; mission, ministry and culture; institutionalized structure of the Church; literature related to methodology, paradigm shift and transformation; and future Church.

**Chapter Four** examines the ecclesiology and the status of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal. Here I foreground trends and debates related to outstation congregations.

**Chapter Five** maps out the analytic route to theorize understandings regarding outstation congregations. An overarching theory of the Church theology is foregrounded and supplemented by an eclectic amalgam of policy change and public theology.
Chapter Six captures the legacy of the status of outstation congregations in black parishes. The chapter presented provisional discussion of participants’ contestations about outstation congregations within the framework of Church politics. More specifically, Chapter Six discusses and analyses the understandings that portray policy change as an asset.

Chapter Seven pushes the analyses and interpretation into a higher mode of abstraction and theorisation. I employ a deconstructive approach to unmask the ideological assumptions underpinning participants’ understandings regarding the status of outstation congregations. I also present the findings portraying the status of outstation congregations’ policy change as a liability for the Diocese of Natal.

Chapter Eight offers a synthesis and integrated interpretation within the overarching framework of the ecclesiology of outstation congregations for the Diocese of Natal. Here, I seek to demonstrate how the contested understandings of challenges regarding the status of outstation congregations were pushed to the fore by the theological and ideological orientations within the Church’s ecclesiology.
## Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Church of England chaplain – first Anglican service at the Cape Colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>First occupation of the Cape by British naval and military chaplains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827-1834</td>
<td>Bishops James, Turner, and James visited the Cape Colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>The first bishop, Robert Gray, comes to lay the foundations of a properly organised Church of England throughout the colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Sir George Grey arrived at the Cape as governor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Bishop Colenso arrives to oversee the Natal Diocese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Bishop Colenso saw his first Zulus at the port of Durban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Bishop Colenso decided to make Ekukhanyeni the headquarters of his new mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>A Zulu class was formed by bishop Colenso’s crew, in his chartered Ship to his new Diocese of Natal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Robertson found Umlazi, the second time, it was the second Mission station in the Diocese of Natal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>The first Church Council, 1858. Bishop Gray drew up the rules and dealt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the formation of parishes and the registration of parishioners who, having declared themselves members of the Church of England, needed no further qualification.

1859 Dr. Callaway took up legal possession of his grant 3,000 acre plots and called it Springvale. The first service was held under a Mimosa tree.

1861 Bishop Colenso spent eleven thousand pounds on the establishment of the first Anglican mission in South Africa - Ekukhanyeni.

1866 Robertson organized the Umlazi station. Later Europeans bought and fenced the land near the mission house, and the natives moved to Enwabi Mission.

1870 Dr. Callaway writes against the effects of European colonisation on the Bantu.

1871 At Synod, Callaway stated that there were pressing needs and that natives were better teachers of their race then foreigners.

1874 John Khumalo and his friend Charles were first to be admitted as catechists.

1875 Native missions began at Estcourt under John Khumalo.

1880 Rev. Daniel Mzamo was placed in charge of St. Faith, and Rev. Francis Magwaza was a great worker under European supervision.

1887 The Rev. A.P. Troughton appointed to Estcourt, mission work widely developed and new stations were formed in Weenen and Hlathikhulu.

1895  Rev. F. T. Green, son of Dean Green, with the help of devoted clergymen and catechists developed a chain of outstations.

1909  Mr. Markham sent Mkhize and Khema, his helpers, to St. Alban’s College in Estcourt for training.


1912---1923  Canon Robinson stated that “the appointment of Bantu Priests-in-charge of missions is an important step in the development of an indigenous ministry.” This marked the beginning of large parish.

1914  Chad’s Training College for teachers erected at Moddespruit, Ladysmith.

1923  Walter Mzamo was succeeded by Rev. Samson Dladla at St. Luke’s, Enqabeni.

1932  Blue bank and Enkunzini missions flourished under priests A. G. Moloi and P. J. Africa.

1964  Diocesan Synod, Act XVIII, resolved that “all mission Districts acquired Parochial status. This meant that each former mission would now have an Incumbent, Churchwardens and a Parish Council. Mission Districts became Pastoral Charges.

1994  Pastoral Charges-Canon 23. Constitutions and Canon of the Anglican
Church of Southern Africa.


2006  Church of the Province of Southern Africa changed to Anglican Church of Southern Africa.

2007  The Diocese of St. Mark the Evangelist: Ad Clerum,

2008  Archdeaconcy of Pinetown: Regional Development-Shared Leadership.

2008  Anglican Church of Southern Africa: Official Launch Planned and Growth within, Growing the Church.

2011  Diocese of Natal: Number of outstation congregations grows to 169.
Chapter 2

Research Methodology

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present and discuss the research design of this study, focusing on methodology and methods employed to produce and analyze the data. This is a qualitative study aimed at, “describing and establishing rather than, the explanation and prediction of human behaviour” (Babbie, Mouton, Vorster, Boshoff and Prozesky, 2001: 53). To this end, the mode, method and plan of research enabled me to capture the views, perceptions and opinions of the participants.

2.2 Research Design

The qualitative method used in this study consists of three methods of data collection: in-depth interview; direct observation; and written documents (Patton, 1991:10; Merriam and Simpson, 1995). The selection of these methods was based on the principles of research design, which were for collection and analyses of data in a manner that aimed to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure (Terre Blanche, Durrheim, 1999). Bell argues that

methods were selected because they provided the data you required to produce a complete piece of research. Decisions had to be made about methods that are best for particular purposes and then data-collection instrument was designed to do the job. (2005: 115)

Commenting on pragmatism in social research, Denscombe observed that

there has been a growing tendency to combine the use of different methods and different research strategies within individual investigations
to achieve the most robust and valuable findings that are possible under the circumstances. (2002: 22).

Terre Blanche and Durrheim refer to mixed methods of generating data as “collecting material in as many different ways and from as many diverse sources as possible” (1999: 128; Sarantokos, 2005; Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter, 2006; Maxwell, 2012). In my research I chose to incorporate a mixed-method design to improve practice.

The chapter has been organized under the following sections: qualitative and phenomenological method; delimitation of the study; research participants and sampling; data production: process and methods; data analysis: process and methods; methodological limitations; ethical considerations; analysis and interpretation of research findings.

2.3 Qualitative and Phenomenological Methods

This study employs qualitative, empirical and inductive methods directed at ‘life experiences’. Bless, Higson-Smith and Kagee, refer, to it as concerned with “human experiences” (2007: 44), which for my purposes involved the contested understanding of the position and the plight of outstation congregations. From the onset, it is important to distinguish research methodology from methods (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000; Swann and Pratt, 2003). The term ‘methodology’ is employed here to denote an approach to data production or analysis whilst the term ‘method’ is used to denote a way or technique of data production or analysis (Swann and Pratt, 2003). There is, therefore, a marked difference between methodology as an approach and method as a technique. Despite recent observation by Swann and Pratt (2003) that the term methodology is sometimes, and rather confusingly, used in place of method, for the purposes of this study I maintained that difference, using the term methodology for approach and method for technique.
This study used qualitative methods to understand and elucidate a particular phenomenon: outstation congregations. This was achieved by gathering facts and information which enabled existing theories to be challenged and new ones to be developed. The motivation for this study was to assist in understanding a particular problem facing a particular community.

Constas (1993) observed that researchers made all sorts of choices in creating research studies and methods, but that generally qualitative researchers failed to share these decisions and the rationale for the presentations of their work. One of the goals of this study was to avoid the method-reporting deficit by discussing and justifying the choices made with regard to the research design, methodology and method of data production and analysis. Mouton and Marais (1994) contend that qualitative research tends to be reported in a fluid, rich, and redundant style which emphasizes the importance of personal perspective and interpretation, sometimes at the expense of the procedure.

This qualitative, empirical study aims to achieve an understanding of how people make sense of their lives through meaning-making and how they interpret outstation congregations’ experience. Thus I chose fieldwork as a qualitative umbrella.

I also made use of a phenomenological method (Creswell, 2003; Henning, van Rensburg and Smith, 2004) to explore the contested understandings regarding the position of outstation congregations as a social phenomenon. Phenomenology, here, refers to a person’s perceptions of an event, as opposed to the event as it existed external to the person. It attempts to “understand people’s perceptions, perspectives, and understanding of a particular situation” (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001: 153).

Phenomenology helps to illuminate how research participants perceive social phenomena, in this case the status of outstation congregations. It illuminates how they “describe it, feel about it, remember it, make sense of it, and talk about it with others” (Patton, 2002: 104). Pollio, Henley and Thompson (1997) observed that, in general, phenomenological inquiry is concerned with understanding how people’s subjective world is constructed
and how people come to interpret their actions and those of others. Commenting on the justification for a phenomenological method, Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle note that:

wanting to understand the human experience and how experiences are interpreted differently by different people would certainly be an appropriate reason to conduct a phenomenological study. (2006: 271)

For Harambos and Holborn, “the end product of phenomenological research is an understanding of the meanings employed by members of the society in everyday life”, (1991:20). It is for this reason that this methodology was employed to explore the contested understandings of the position of outstation congregations in the Anglican Diocese of Natal.

2.4 Delimitation of the Study

This study was restricted to the Anglican Church of Southern Africa and to the Diocese of Natal in particular. It focuses on the black parishes, although other Anglican Dioceses and parishes were included for the purpose of referencing or comparison. The Diocese consists of thirty-one (31) black parishes and approximately five thousand (5000) parishioners (Diocese of Natal, 2011-2012. Statistical Information Document).

Currently, the Anglican Church of Southern Africa operates under a six-tier leadership model, defined in the church’s Constitution and Canons (Anglican of Southern Africa, 1994). These categories are: (1) Bishop-1, (2) archdeacons-7, (3) Parish Church councillors-7, (4) outstation congregations’ church councillors-7, (5) leaders of guilds and organisations groups -7, (6) rectors (clergy), (7) and mothers’ union-7. Mothers unions form two focus groups with rectors (clergy) of fourteen, and a total of forty-three in my study. These categories of persons and associations form the basis of my research inquiry.
In this study ‘black parishes’ refer to those parishes that could be categorized as: (1) large parishes (that include outstation congregations) with a colonial or missionary legacy, (2) or parishes that were formerly outstation congregations with neither a colonial nor a missionary legacy (see appendix 5).

2.5. Research Participants and Sampling

This section describes categories of research participants, selection criteria, and how the sampling was done. Guided by the key research questions, the sample of the study is compromised of, and informed by: (1) those in leadership, i.e. the bishop, archdeacons, church councils for both main parish centre, outstation congregations, guilds or organisations and mothers union and rectors. Mothers union and rectors formed two focus groups in the research. The selection of these participants was based on the pastoral and administrative leadership positions in the Anglican Diocese of Natal; (2) their ability to contribute to the understanding of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model of the Anglican Diocese of Natal.

Prior to the actual fieldwork, I sent a letter to the bishop requesting permission to conduct research in his Diocese. The letter explained the purpose of the study, described the anticipated research participants expected to be involved, and the methods of data production to be used. It also outlined the expected benefits of the study for the Anglican Diocese of Natal, in particular, and the wider Anglican Church communion in general.

Later, similar letters were sent to the Diocesan bishop, seven archdeacons, seven parish church councillors, seven outstation congregations’ councillors and seven lay leadership of organisations of churches (guilds, organisations or portfolios), and fourteen focus groups (made out of seven rectors and seven members of mothers’ union, to form two groups). The Diocesan mothers union and rectors (which provided the two focus group
participants) were also sent letters. The participants, with the exception of the bishop, came from two categories of black parishes (see appendix 5)\(^3\).

Finally, apart from seeking their voluntary participation and providing them with information about the study, the packet of letters also included informed consent documents. (See Appendices 1, 2, 3). The fieldwork was conducted between July and October of 2012.

The six categories of educated and semi-educated research participants included: (1) the Bishop of Natal, (2) archdeacons, (3) outstation congregation councillors, (4) parish church councillors, (5) guilds or organisations and (6) focus groups (rectors and mothers’ union).

The Bishop of Natal

The bishop was included because of his strategic position as the administrative and spiritual leader in the Diocese. The Anglican Diocesan bishop was in a strategic position to explain why outstation congregations are marginalised and their concerns seldom heard in the Church. Secondly, as policymaker, the Diocesan bishop was deemed to be a rich source of information on the theology and history underpinning the policy on outstation congregations.

Archdeacons

Interviews with seven archdeacons were carried out. These seven were purposely selected because they represented two types of black parishes in their regions (see appendix 5). They were deemed to be possible sources of information on the contestations regarding the position of outstation congregations for a policy change. As a stakeholder, in the affairs of the Anglican Church in his/her region, an archdeacon has a particular interest in the pastoral provision of the church in that area. That interest in outstation congregations

\(^3\) Although the core elements of intersectionality research are visible in my research, the study was on ecclesiology not race, gender or class. I acknowledge the evidence of intersectionality however, intersectionality theory was not deliberately used as a framework in my research.
was informed by the need to provide leadership and propagate ministry and mission among clergy and laity in his/her region. Letters of permission and informed consent were obtained and they represented those second-tier leaders who participated in the research.

**Parish Church Councillors**

I interviewed seven parish church councillors, as local leaders who were elected to oversee the affairs of the parish. They were elected in seven regions and the selection had gender sensitivity. For the purpose of this study they were selected as representatives of the people because they were part of the local community, and they serve the parish at grassroots level. Parish councillors had also participated in the consultations that led to the introduction of outstation congregations.

**Outstation Congregations Councillors**

I also conducted interviews with seven church councillors who were leaders of the outstation congregations and were either elected or nominated to oversee their affairs. Gender was given priority in their election or nomination and they were elected in seven regions. For the purpose of this study they were selected as representatives of the people as they were part of the local community. They serve outstation congregations at the grassroots level.

**Guilds and Organisations**

Interviews were conducted with seven guilds and organisations that were also selected from seven regions. Most of the members of these groups were young people, split evenly between males and females. All parishes had these organisations or guilds. The Third Provincial Conference (2000) stated that, “Small Groups will allow Communion members and seekers to be drawn into a relaxed, safe and informal group in which they will discover and experience to reach out to touch the lives of other people and bring them into the love, life and the light of God” (Document, Sunday 17 November 2002. Aubrey Moatsi). These guilds and organisations had interest in the mission, ministry and
development of black parishes. They were also from grassroots of parishes and outstation congregations. Parish councillors, outstation congregation councillors, guilds and organisations came from both parishes with and – without colonial or missionary legacy (see appendix 5).

Focus Groups

Focus groups comprised the last category of fourteen participants. In-depth interviews were conducted due to their positions in leadership and administration, and two focus groups were convened individually. These were comprised of seven clergy (rectors) and seven Mother’s Union members.

The sample was both representative and purposive. It was purposive in that the bishop-appointed rectors served as leaders in managing the parishes and making decisions at the parish level, in so far as it impacted the religious and social lives of parishioners. Mothers’ Union organisation, although seemingly autonomous, were directly under the leadership of the bishop of the Diocese in which they operate. They felt a strong calling to the mission and ministry of young people and Christian care for families. Mothers Unions are also organised regionally, with a diocesan president. They operate in every black parish and as a result were grassroots members.

Focus groups were a sample comprised of grassroots leadership and administration. These groups were understood to have an interest in the mission and development of black parishes.

The research was completed with a total sample of forty-three participants - participants from the six categories of leaders through in-depth interviews. There were: one Diocesan bishop, seven archdeacons, seven parish church councillors, seven outstation congregation councillors, and seven guilds and organisations or portfolios. All participants were interviewed in the Diocese, either in parish halls, Sunday school rooms, or at the back of the Churches after Church services.
To safeguard the anonymity of the research participants, I used code names. For the leaders representing Diocesan bishop, abbreviated as HOD – 1. I used codes ranging from AOR – 7 to GS – 7, for MPC – 7, OC – 7, and FG – 14.

2.6. Data Production: Process and Methods

The study employs two main methods of data generation: in-depth interviews and review of documents (document analysis). These methods were used selectively, although not every method was used with each category of research participants. I conducted in-depth interviews with the Diocesan bishop and the leaders of the main parish centre and outstation congregations. The focus groups were facilitated using unstructured interviews. Document analysis was also used to generate qualitative data to complement the data from the in-depth interviews.

Methods were mixed “on the assumption that collecting diverse types of data best provided an understanding of a research problem” (Crewell, 2003: 21). Employing a mixture of methods was deemed “useful to capture the best of both quantitative and qualitative approaches” (Creswell, 2003: 22). In support of the notion of mixed methods, Bell argues,

methods are selected because they will provide data required to produce a complete piece of research. Decisions have to be made about methods that are best for particular purposes and then data-collecting instruments are designed to do the job. (2005: 115)

Commenting on pragmatism in social research, Descombe observed,

There has been a growing tendency to combine the use of different methods and different research strategies within individual investigations to achieve the most robust and valuable findings that are possible under the circumstances. (2002: 22)
Informed by this rich discussion, I selected and employed a mixture of methods to capture participants’ understandings about the position of outstation congregations. This enabled me to produce data about participants’ interpretations regarding the institutionalized “marginalization of their voices” (Meintjes, 2008: 52-53; Gibbs and Morton, 1968; Baatjes, 2003: 179). The use of mixed methods has often been described as a triangulation of methods (Sarantokos, 2005; Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter, 2006).

This triangulation of methods was done by generating data through interviews with six categories of research participants: Diocesan bishop, archdeacons, rectors of parishes and mothers union (focus groups), parishes and outstation congregational leadership, and guild and organizational leadership. This data was then overlaid with data acquired from Diocesan archival records, as well as other published and unpublished literature related to the ACSA. Laws, Harper, and Marcus (2003) observed that the justification for triangulation was to see the same thing from different perspectives.

What follows is a discussion of how and why each method was used to produce the data.

2.7. Rationale for Research Method

Two semi-structured interview schedules (see appendix 4) were used to conduct the interviews: one with the Diocesan leadership, leadership of parishes and guilds, organisations or portfolios (see, appendix 4a), secondly, with outstation congregations (see, appendix 4b), and thirdly, with focus groups (see, appendix 4c). Marshall and Rossman observed that, through in-depth interviews, the “researcher explores a few general topics to help uncover the participants’ views” (2006: 101). Thus, the interviews enabled me to explore the participants’ understandings regarding outstation congregations.

The in-depth-interview method was based on the assumption that the participant’s perspective on the social phenomenon under study should unfold as the participant viewed it (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). In anthropological studies this has been
described as an *emic* perspective of the social phenomenon (Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter, 2006). The interviews were conducted on the basis of some predetermined response categories covering six general direction and flow of the interviews (see appendix 4). These included the following six topics:

1. *The significance of outstation congregations in a large parish*
2. *The role of outstation congregations in a large parish*
3. *Progressional development strategy and training to achieve competency of outstation congregations*
4. *Acknowledgement and appreciation of outstation congregations in a large parish*
5. *The challenges facing outstation congregation in a large parish*
6. *A vision for outstation congregations*

These predetermined response categories were composed *a priori* and reflects my perspective as a researcher. This is described as the *etic* perspective in anthropological studies (Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter, 2006), calling for an understanding of the phenomenon from the point of view of the researcher. Thus, the in-depth interviews for this study combined the *emic* and *etic* perspectives. While following predetermined sets of questions the interviewees gave expression to their own understandings regarding the plight of outstation congregations, using their bounded perspectives (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). This situation could also be described as co-production of data between the researcher and research participants, the interviewer and the interviewees (Roulston, de Marrais, and Lewis, 2003).

I found the use of a semi-structured schedule appropriate because I wanted to get participants’ interpretations based on the issues selected. Although each interviewee gave the interpretation from their own perspective, the issues covered in the interviews were similar. By so doing, the interviews enabled me to generate data quickly in sufficient
quantities. In addition the interviews provided me with the opportunity to understand the various meanings that outstation congregations had for the interviewees and why.

The interview guide provided the basis for that systematisation (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). It enabled me to explore the six general topics with the research participants while respecting how they framed and structured their responses. Kahn and Cannell describe this kind of interviewing as “a conversation with a purpose” (1957: 149).

To get the interviewees to describe their understandings, I explained and assisted them to understand that their views were valuable and useful for an understanding of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal. The participants were given the option of conducting the interviews in their local language, IsiZulu, or in English. All participants opted for conducting the interviews in IsiZulu. This preference for IsiZulu over English was mainly because everyone would understand.

The interviews took place on Saturdays and Sundays after church services, at either Church halls or in a vacant room at the Church, where there were no halls to accommodate research participants. The participants seemed excited to participate in the study and none of them asked to withdraw from participation. They even proposed that I should come again and have the same discussion on the topic of outstation congregations. None declined to participate. I received several calls asking for my return to their parishes in order to have further or more in-depth discussions on the subject. On average, the interviews lasted for a period of between one and a half hours to two hours. I obtained written permission with informed consent to audio record all interviews.

Robson describes focus groups as, “an approach which [allows] people’s views and feeling to emerge, but which gives the interviewer some control” (1997: 241). The focus group interview enabled me to explore the research participants’ understandings regarding the plight of outstation congregations.
Each focus group interviewed gave the interpretation from their own perspective and the issues covered by both groups in the interviews were similar. The focus group interviews enabled me to generate data qualitatively. In addition, they provided me with the opportunity to understand the meaning of the plight of outstation congregations from the perspective of selected groups.

The focus group interview was conducted with semi-structured interview schedules. An advantage of this technique is that “there is an opportunity for the whole group to explore the disagreement in detail, thereby producing a much deeper understanding of the problem” (Bless, Higson-Smith, Kagee, 2007: 123). I also recorded the debate between participants, which gave me deeper insight into the topic than would have been gained from interviewing all the participants individually.

The focus groups were made up of the Diocesan mothers union and rectors of parishes. The Diocesan mothers union is a force in the black parishes, reflecting the interests of women in majority of parishes. This group is a purposive and representative sample of the black women in mothers union and was requested to participate in the semi-structured interview schedule. Their interest in outstation congregations was viewed as important for the research.

Several rectors were invited to the second focus group session because they were in charge of large parishes and as such had intimate knowledge of the plight of outstation congregations. Furthermore, they had interest in, and believed the research to contribute to “Growing the Church” in their respective regions (Pearce, 2008).

Like the in-depth individual interviews, the focus group interviews sought to bring to light the participants’ understandings regarding the following five general topics:

1. The significance of outstation congregations in a large parish
2. The role of outstation congregations in a large parish
3. Progressional development strategy and training to achieve competency of outstation congregations.

4. Acknowledgement and appreciation of outstation congregations.

5. The challenges facing outstation congregations in a large parish.

Patton (1990) notes that through focus group sessions the researcher is able gather information from multiple participants, instead of only one. It provides quality control and facilitates data collection because participants tend to ‘weed out’ false or extreme views. Positions of power were taken into consideration when organising the clusters to participate in the focus groups, with the intent to make lay participants feel at ease to express themselves freely. Finally, Patton reminds us that “the focus of focus group is indeed, an interview. It is not a discussion, problem-solving, decision making, but an interview” (1990: 335).

Just as in the individual interviews, to get the interviewees to describe their understandings, I explained that their views were valuable for an understanding of the plight of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal. The participants were typically and relatively homogenous as a group of participants, and all spoke IsiZulu as a medium of communication. The focus group semi-interviews took place either at church halls or vacant rooms in the church, just as with the individual interviews. The mothers’ union focus group was also held on a Saturday, 9th of June 2012 at the Cathedral of the Holy Nativity in Pietermaritzburg. This was at their quarterly meeting, just before their meeting commenced. The clergy or rectors’ focus group was also conducted in Pietermaritzburg, at St. Martins Church-Edendale, during the same week. It was their monthly meeting and I was given a chance after the meeting. Permission to record the interviews was obtained according to protocols of informed consent from all participants.

Review of Documents

Document analysis of both primary and secondary sources was another method used to generate qualitative data. The documentary data was particularly valuable in answering the question about the historical and socio-political context regarding the position of
outstation congregations. Marshall and Rossman observe that “for every qualitative study, data on the background and historical context are gathered” (2006: 107) to understand the social phenomenon within its context. Thus, the documentary data generated was used to construct an ecclesiastical and socio-political history of outstation congregations within which the research participants’ perspectives were to be understood.

Primary Sources

Some of the documents consulted as primary source of data include the constitution and canons of the Anglican Church of Southern Africa (ACSA) and Acts of the Diocese of Natal. These articulated the positions of bishops, archdeacons and rectors, as well as the expectations and limits of responsibilities of the various offices and councils. The Acts of the Diocese brought another dimension of the pastoral charges in relation to a large parish.

Regarding the change to the status of missions in the Diocese of Natal, I consulted the policy document (Acts of the Diocese of Natal); “All Mission Districts Acquired Parochial Status” (Diocese of Natal, 1964: 22-23, 26-27) because it had far-reaching repercussions for the organization of the church. I also consulted records of Special Provincial Synod (2006) related to matters of changing the name of the province, how the archbishop was to be elected, the canonical authority of Suffragan bishop of Cape Town, and the development in the Communion.

Significant Secondary Sources

A number of secondary source documents were reviewed for this study. These included, among others: (1) the Diocese of Natal archives, Synod of Bishops’ Document, Diakonia’s archive, South African Council of Churches, records of Provincial Synod; (2) The Southern Anglican Magazine (circa 2007) was a valuable source of information on the multiplication of parishes; (3) newspapers; (4) the 1958, 1968, 978 and 1988 Lambeth Conferences; (5) documents; (6) as well as published books and journal articles such as
Africanisation of Christianity and Theology (Mashau 2003), The Place of the Past in Theological Construction, (Vidu: 2007); God’s Church: one but broken, (Tillard 1982).

One of the challenges of document analysis was that information relevant to the research topic and questions were few and not easily identified. This, therefore, required much time and effort to locate and discriminate among sources. Furthermore, access to documents was, in some cases, difficult to procure. For example, at the Diocese of Natal archives, some of the documents catalogued were not available on the shelves. Despite all these limitations, I managed to get access to the sources described above.

The documentary evidence generated has been used in this research to construct a narrative about outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal, South Africa. It also enabled me to frame the contested understandings regarding the plight of outstation congregations within a historical, ecclesiastical and socio-political context.

2.8. Data Analysis: Process and Methods

In this section I discuss and justify the data analysis process and the methods employed. Data analysis is described as a transitional process in which raw data is transformed into insights about a social phenomenon under study (Wolcott, 1994). In this study, the social phenomenon comprised contested understandings regarding the plight of outstation congregations in the Anglican Diocese of Natal, South Africa. As an interpretive study, inductive thematic analysis was employed to report the participants’ interpretations of categories or themes generated from (and grounded in) the data.

Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data generated through interviews and document analyses.\(^4\) Thematic analysis is widely used in analysing qualitative data, though it was not always acknowledged as a method in its own right (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Those scholars who do not recognize it as a method in its own right argue that

\(^4\) For detailed description and discussion of the processes of thematic analysis conducted for the study (see appendix 6: a, b).
thematic analysis only provides core skills, such as “thematic meanings” (Holloway and Todres, 2003: 347) and the process of thematic coding (Ryan and Bernard, 2000). It is, therefore, the foundation of other qualitative methods that search for themes or patterns, such as conversation analysis, interpretive phenomenological analysis, discourse analysis, and narrative analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Despite the concerns noted above, Braun and Clarke argue that thematic analysis “should be considered as a method in its own right” (2006: 78). They observe that the only difference between thematic analysis and other qualitative methods was that these other methods stemmed from, or had been tied to, particular epistemological or theoretical positions, while thematic analysis was not (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Despite that difference, thematic analysis has a clear theory and procedure of analysing qualitative data.

Siedel (1998) contends that qualitative data analysis is as much of an art as it is a science, since the data generated must be presented in a way that makes sense and responds to the research question. As such, data analysis is not simply a matter of revealing structures and patterns but rather is a creative and personal process, yet guided by a rigorous analytical procedure (Siedel, 1998).

Thematic analysis has also been described as “an inductive, thematic analysis” (Roulston, de Marrais and Lewis 2003). It is inductive because themes are generated from the data. In this study, themes have been generated from the participants’ understandings of outstation congregations, and therefore the themes have not been imposed on the data.

In conducting inductive thematic analysis, I rigorously followed the analytical procedure proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006), and Marshall and Rossman (2006) as summarised in Figure 2.7 below.
Thus, from Figure 2.7, it could be argued that although Braun and Clarke (2006) describe six phases of the thematic analysis when Marshall and Rossman (2006) list seven, both procedures are quite similar. In fact, if “familiarising with the data” from Braun and Clarke’s procedure was taken to include “organising data” and “immersion in the data” from Marshall and Rossman’s procedure, the two procedures would correspond phase by phase.

As noted in the debate surrounding thematic analysis, the phases are generic to all qualitative data analyses (Holloway and Todres, 2003; Ryan and Bernard, 2000). Irrespective of recognition of thematic analysis as a method in its own right, the
procedure is unaffected. It was along this generic procedure that I conducted thematic analysis of the qualitative data of this study (see appendix 6a).

These phases should not, however, be taken to imply a linear process of data analysis. Like any other qualitative data analysis method, thematic analysis is iterative. Here, Braun and Clarke point out that thematic analysis involves a constant moving back and forward between the entire data set, the coded extracts that you are analysing, and the analysis of the data that you are producing. Writing is an integral part of analysis, not something that takes place at the end, as it does with statistical analyses. (2006: 86)

2.9. Methodological Limitations

Since every study design had its own limitations, it was important to consider beforehand the methodological limitations of this study. There were always trade-offs to make in designing a study, due to limited resources, time, and the inevitable difficulty “to grasp the complex nature of the social reality” (Patton, 2002: 223).

The first limitation is related to the scope of the study. Phenomenologically, this study was limited to the contested understandings about the position of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal. To this end, the study only used perspectives from leadership of six categories of research participants: (1) Bishop, (2) archdeacons, (3) parish church councillors, (4) outstation congregations’ councillors, (5) focus groups (mothers union and rectors of parishes) and (6) guilds and organisations. It was a wide and diverse range of research participants, from the bishop down to outstation congregations. The scope and limits of the sample left out other voices of ordinary congregants in the Church. These voices might have added another dimension to the study and are possible areas for further inquiry.
Secondly, using a phenomenological method limited the study to an interpretive paradigm were particularisation, not generalisation, of research findings was a concern. However, qualitative data allowed for naturalistic generalisations, extrapolations, and transferability of research findings (Patton, 2002), “fuzzy generalisations” (Swann and Pratt, 2003: 201), or text-bound generalisations (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). Thus, the findings of this study could only allow context-bound generalisations.

A third limitation was gaining access to the research participants. Since my research participants were leaders of the church, they had usually busy schedules and were operating under time-demanding situations. Gaining permission to address archdeaconry clergy was particularly difficult. I had to visit the archdeacons concerned at their offices more than four separate times to arrange a suitable date for interviews. Securing a gatekeeper’s letter from the Diocesan bishop for the study in his Diocese delayed for five months. Times set for clergy interviews frequently changed and in some key parishes I had to abandon efforts to get an interview altogether, although their contribution would have been valuable to the study.

Another difficulty faced during interviews was the tendency by some interviewees to divert from the interview questions. While the semi-structured interview schedules (see appendix 4a, b, and c.) enabled me to avoid questions that would evoke long narratives, some research participants still gave long and sometimes off-the-point narratives. Nonetheless, in the process I was able to generate valuable data about contested understandings of the plight of outstation congregations.

There were also instances in which participants did not fully understand the issues covered in the interview. Elaboration and exemplification of the issues covered in the interview helped to clear the vague spaces in participants’ understandings. Some of the interviewees even commented that the interview was an eye-opener regarding the plight of the position of outstation congregations.
2.10. Ethical Considerations

There are a variety of scholarly opinions on ethical issues in social research. For instance, Sarantakos advocates making social research more systematic and accountable vis-à-vis ethical considerations by introducing “laws which regulate the access to information as well as the behaviour of investigators” (2005: 16). The ethics also “ensure that inquiry is conducted according to professional and ethical standards” (Sarantakos, 2005: 16). For Wassenaar, the “essential purpose of research ethics is to protect the welfare of the participants” (2006: 61). On the other hand, Adler and Lerman (2003), in their theory of relational ethics, pointed out that the researcher must actively care about and care for the researched and their rights, to ensure that the research participants are not adversely affected in any way by the research or publication of its findings.

Apropos of the considerations presented above, the protection of the research participants from any harm was a principal concern of this study. Sarantakos (2005) identified three types of harm that could be experienced by the research participants: physical, mental, and legal. It is also acknowledged that research ethics go beyond “the welfare of the research participants and extends into areas such as scientific misconduct and plagiarism” (Wassenaar, 2006: 61).

Although the views on research ethics are varied, there are four widely accepted ethical principles to which I refer: nonmaleficence, autonomy and respect for the dignity of research participants, beneficence, and justice (Wassenaar, 2006). In conducting this research, every effort was made to comply with these principles where applicable.

First, the principle of nonmaleficence states that research should “ensure that no harm befalls the research participants as a direct or indirect consequence of the research” (Wassenaar, 2006: 67). In keeping with this principle, the present study did not involve any physical harm (Sarantakos, 2005) on the part of the research participants. There was no instrument or procedure that could injure the participants. Furthermore, the study did not directly or indirectly subject the research participants to any mental harm. There was
no procedure that would cause the participants “discomfort, stress of some kind, anxiety, loss of self-esteem or embarrassment” (Sarantakos, 2005: 19). For instance, although the research was in the area of outstation congregations, I did not ask the research participants questions that would upset their private spaces of spirituality. In addition, personal questions relating to the research participants or significant to others were avoided. The questions were not formulated in a demeaning manner and research participants were treated with respect. Thus, there was no treatment that might have motivated the participants to harm themselves during or after the study (Sarantakos, 2005).

Furthermore, even with regard to the outstation congregation leaders, the study did not infringe on their private spaces of spirituality. It probed into the influence of public theology on public policy (see chapters five and eight). Public theology refers to an engagement between theology and politics in specific locations (de Gruchy, 2007). As such, asking for the outstation congregations leaders’ understanding was not of significant ethical concern, given that outstation congregation leaders were embedded in the public sphere. Furthermore, the outstation congregations did influence or contest what should be taught in their congregations. The interview schedules used were in the local language, IsiZulu. Though the participants were given the choice of language, the decision to conduct interviews in IsiZulu was made unanimously.

Second, in keeping with the principle of autonomy and respect for the dignity of persons, the research avoided any legal harm which could occur when the researcher violated any rights of the research participants, “such as their right to privacy, anonymity and confidentiality” (Sarantakos, 2005: 19). In observing these ethical requirements, I avoided deception or misrepresentation in my dealings with the research participants. Permission and informed consent were obtained from Diocesan bishop, archdeacons, rectors and individual research participants (see appendix one to three). I explained to all participants the purpose of the research and the importance of their participation. They were also informed of their freedom to choose whether to participate in the research or
not, to omit some questions they were not comfortable with, or to withdraw from the research at any time without any negative consequences on them or their parishes.

Third, in keeping with the principle of justice which “in general requires that people receive what is due to them” (Wassenaar, 2006: 68), the study safeguarded the research participants’ confidentiality, anonymity and interests (Denscombe, 2002) by not disclosing their identities. Anonymity was achieved through use of code names when referring to or quoting research participants. The following codes were used: HOD (bishop), AOR (archdeacons), MPC (main parish centre), OC (outstation congregations), FG (focus group leaders) and GO (guilds and organisations).

Fourth, the notes and tapes were kept under lock and will remain under lock for a minimum period of five years. To safeguard the interests of the research participants, I was mindful of the fact that participation in research can be both intrusive and obtrusive, involving personal interaction and requiring cooperation between the researcher and the research participants (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). In one case, the archdeacon had agreed to do the interview in the morning. However, on the day of the interview, the archdeacon had an urgent meeting to attend at the same time as the interview. This necessitated rescheduling the interview to the afternoon on the same day, but when time came for the interview in the afternoon, the archdeacon was not yet back from the meeting. After about an hour of waiting, the archdeacon arrived, called and told the researcher to postpone the interview to another day, as he was going to yet another urgent meeting. Thus, I finally cancelled it and did not make another appointment with him.

The example above demonstrate how obtrusive and intrusive research can be in general, since it interfered with the official and personal operations of the participants. Thus, I was ethically bound to respect the participants by behaving in a way that did not upset their

---

5 Also see Appendices 2 and 7 for further detail on how notes and tapes are kept.
private and public spaces. Commenting on the need for sensitivity to the adverse effects research can have on the research participants, Denscombe observes that,

social researchers need to be sensitive to the likely impact of their work on those involved. Whether research is done on people or whether it is done with them, there is the possibility that their lives could be affected in some way through the fact of having participated. There is a duty on researchers, therefore, to work in a way that minimizes the prospect of their research having an adverse effect on those who were involved. (2002: 179).

The fourth ethical consideration related to what Wassenaar describes as “scientific misconduct and plagiarism” (2006: 61). One way in which these ethical issues were avoided in writing the thesis was by disclosing my research motivation, research design, methodology, methods and their logic. In addition, I acknowledged all the information used in this study directly or indirectly.

Finally, the principle of beneficence (Wassenaar, 2006) states that research should benefit in some way the research participants or the society. This study may not directly benefit participants, but the Anglican Church of Southern Africa in mission, ministry and worship in general. The study has implications for negotiations with the Diocese of Natal’s Acts (Diocese of Natal, 1995). The contribution, therefore, is to the understanding of Diocesan administration policy on outstation congregations’ theory and practice appropriate for a democratic and diverse society.

2.11. Analysis and Interpretation of Research Findings

“The key to doing good interpretive analysis was to stay close to the data, to interpret it from a position of empathic understanding” (Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter, 2006: 321). To this end, I have presented themes reflecting the contested spaces in the understandings regarding the plight of outstation congregations, supported with data
extracts. The data extracts are used “to portray the participants’ perspectives” and “insiders’ point of view” (Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle, 2006: 265). The extracts were drawn from the interview data generated with the Diocese of Natal’s leadership. Some extracts are from the analysis of documents such as Diocesan Synod, the Anglican constitution and canons, as well as magazine and journal articles regarding the multiplication of parishes (Breytenbach, 2007; and correspondence (Houston, 23rd February 2008 Letter).

For mainly academic and not sentimental reasons, I employed a seemingly ‘staccato’ approach in analysis and interpretation from the six research participants’ categories. The aim was to allow the voice of each category to be heard separately. Such an approach also enabled me to respond to the key research question in a balanced manner. More specifically, the study’s key research question formulated as follows: “What does being in a large parochial structure model mean to outstation congregations in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, whose distinctive mark is freedom of choice in matters of faith and ministry according to the principle of priesthood of all believers?

To facilitate a deep exploration of the key research question, the analysis corresponds to the following sub-key questions:

*What is the Anglican Church’s meaning of a large parochial structure model?*

*What is the experience of being Church for outstation congregations?*

The following major objectives will guide the study.

. To document the experiences of outstation congregations from their perspective as well as the large parochial structure model’s perspective.
. To critically analyze how patriarchy as an analogy has influenced the role and position of outstation congregations in Church and society, that is; the ideo-
theological and socio-cultural beliefs and practices that legitimize the subjection of outstation congregations.
To propose appropriate theologies of liberation for outstation congregations and,

To develop practical suggestions for equipping outstation congregations becoming God’s agents of grace and liberation in their own right.

I drew extensively on literature in theorising about contested spaces in the understandings regarding challenges in the status of outstation congregations, to illuminate the various aspects of politics and theology of Church policy. The subsequent discussion in Chapters Six and Seven has been organized under the following sections and subsections:

What is the self-perception of large parochial structure model in general and outstation congregations in particular, and how does this contribute to their role and position in the Church?

*How do the Anglican Church’s constitution and canons legitimize and relegate the silence and subjection for the outstation congregations in the context of a large parochial structure model?*

*What are the socio-cultural ideologies that influence the subordination of main parish centres in general, and outstation congregations in particular, within the large parochial structure model, in the Diocese of Natal?*

*What appropriate theologies can help the Diocese of Natal effectively engage with issues of insignificance or discrimination of outstation congregations?*

Chapters Six and Seven present first level analysis and interpretation of the data, giving prominence to themes discovered therein. In Chapter Six I begin presenting the findings of the analysis of the contested spaces in the understandings regarding the plight of outstation congregations. In doing so, I utilise the overarching theoretical framework of politics of the Church. It was also the theorising of the different understandings portraying the plight of outstation congregations as an asset for the Diocese of Natal.
Chapter Seven theories had the different understandings portraying policy change as a liability. Chapter Eight pushes the theorisation into a higher mode of abstraction and postulates the thesis of the study.
Chapter Three

Literature Review

3. 1. Introduction

The previous chapter contextualized the study, clarifying my interest in the topic, its historical relevance and importance, critiquing particular ecclesiastical practices.

This literature review would, “determine what has already been done and to be studied or improved” (Bless, and Higson-Smith, 2000:25). Merriam and Simpson went further to suggest that a literature review “sets the stage on which the study will be presented” (1995:32). Anthony Balcomb in Missinallia reviewed that “it is not what our theology says about mission that is most important; what matters most is how people who have been on the receiving end of missions understand and respond to that mission” (2008:29). It was thus important to note that this literature review sought to enrich Anglicanism’s origin, mission, ministry and development in South Africa. It went further to discover connections of traditions or other relations between different results, comparing various investigations in the study. Hart also conceded that literature review “is important for an understanding of the topic of study in terms of what has already been done on it, how it has been researched, and what the key issues are” (1998:1). Furthermore, literature review serves, “to summarize and integrate previous work and to offer suggestions for future inquiries” (Merriam and Simpson, 1995:31). It was my submission that literature review identified gaps in knowledge as well as weaknesses in previous studies and also found out what had already been done. Using mission as an example, Balcomb’s observation that “In the history of mission there has been unintended consequences of Christian mission, these are probably more important than the intended ones” (2008:29), could be pointing to an issue requiring further studies.

A sample of both local and international literature was reviewed to analyze the discourse of a large parochial structure model’s mission and ministry. Literature reviewed would
“determine what has already been done and to be studied or improved (Bless, Higson-Smith,” 2000:25, Welsby, 1984).

Merriam and Simpson went further to articulate that literature review “sets the stage on which the study will be presented” (1995:32). It is important to note that the literature reviewed enriched our Anglican’s origin, mission, ministry and development. It went further to discover connections of traditions or other relations between different results, comparing various investigations in the study. Hart also conceded that literature review is important for an understanding of the topic of study in terms “of what has already been done on it, how it has been researched, and what the key issues are” (1998:1).

Much has been written on the Anglican Church of Southern Africa. Ironically, little has been written about outstation congregations’ experience in mission, ministry and faith. The literature under review would cover key issues as it pertains to the study. These are: re-writing Church history in South Africa; Anglican Church in South Africa Diocese of Natal; methodology

3. 2. Re-writing Church history in South Africa

A historian from Africa, JNK Mugambi in ‘From Liberation to Reconstruction’ added his voice in the body of literature that, “agreeable as it is to know where one is proceeding, it is far more important to know where one has arrived. And while there, will always be resistant to accepting what has come to exist” (1995:52)

Echoing the anxiety of Adonis Vidu (2007) in, ‘The Place of the past in Theological Construction,’ Cady elaborated as she suggested that “since we are bound to bring our commitments to the interpretation of the past, what we should do is, by using the best knowledge we have today, so interpret the past as to make it the best it can be.” She pointed to the limits of a traditional paradigm, which regarded history as essentially concerned with politics. However, ‘history is past politics: politics is present history” (Burke, 1992:3).
However, : Francis Robinson Phelps, Archbishop of Cape Town, at the time wrote in the forward that “History is a cure for despondency” (cited in Lewis and Edwards, 1934:xii). Cady encapsulated the tension between ‘backward’ and ‘forward’ looking as beautiful was captured, ‘in the best possible light’. She suggested that since we were bound to bring our commitments to the interpretation of the past, what we should do is by using the “best knowledge we have today so as to interpret the past and to make it as best as it can be” (1993:204).

From an oral history perspective, I drew on Philippe Denis 'Oral History’ (2003, 2008) wherein he investigated ways in which we made sure that collectively we did not forget the experiences of the past, but that we comprehended their significance for the future. Using a narrative participatory action model, his study challenged institutional structure of the Church through using narratives of pain, and survival, and collaboratively presented ways of caring and supporting marginal congregations.

Oral history, as a tool, was able to analyze the study because of its emphasis first, as a discipline. Oral history could no longer just be generalized as only a record of facts or narrative of events, but rather as a ‘history from below.’ Peter Burke in ‘New Perspectives on Historical Writing’ clarified this by explaining that this referred to “the views of ordinary people with the experiences of social change” (2004:4; Hamilton, 2002:216, Sharpe, 2001). Furthermore, in looking at Christianity as one area of historical research, I concurred that the history of Christianity had a lot to do with the views of ordinary believers who had experienced change in a number of ways.

There was a need for documenting ”history from below” (Burke, 1992:4) and Lenta has argued that the concept of oral history has become a government policy. Documents of the national experience were neglected by archives which were “repositories in the past” (2003:209). There was a need to heal the wounds of the past from outstation congregations. While some critiqued oral history of being self-indulgence. These
critiques reflected either a prejudice against history from below or feared that since oral history was uttered in the scale of the individual’s perceptions (Prins, 2001).

History from below reflected a new determination to take ordinary people’s views of their past more seriously. Traditional ecclesiastical records tended to view outstation congregations “as having no history” (Burke, 1992:4).

Gary Okihiro in ‘Oral History and the Writing of Ethnic History in Christianity in South Africa’ asserted that, “it is not only a tool or method for recovering history, it is also a theory of history which maintains that common folk have a history and that history must be written” (1996:99-214).

Philippe Denis (2003) in ‘Oral History in a Wounded Country,’ argued that in a way, oral history helped us to remember the past in order to make sense of the future. “History from below” (Burke, 1995:4) reflected a new determination to take ordinary people’s views of their past more seriously than before.

It is my view, however, that oral history here is best utilized in combination with other techniques of historical investigation to develop about the past. It is important to take cognizance of Vansina’s argument or distinction between reminiscence and oral tradition. Oral history “is seen as being a conversation between interviewer and the interviewee.” It is my contention that this is based “on the latter’s personal reminiscence and oral tradition being a record of the past events, transmitted from generation to generation” (1985:12-13). A Counter argument is advanced by Elizabeth Jonkin who warned against “the apparent simplicity of this distinction”, and posed a question, “what after all is generation.” It is important to note that she argued from the premise that, “a message can pass through successive generations of the tellers during the life of an interviewee. What this person will have witnessed is in fact the result of a chain of transmission” (1991:87).

Generally, main parish centre’s history was documented. Traditionally, these accounts offered a ‘view from above,” in a sense that “it has always concentrated on the great
deeds of great men, statesmen, generals, or occasional Churchmen” (Burke, 1992:4). Therefore, the central parish records represented ‘the great deeds of the great men or Churchmen.’ I would assert that these were missionaries during the missionary era who established “missions and mission stations” (Gibbs, 1972:158, 160; Japha, Japha., Le Grange and Todeschini, 1993:4; Hinchliff, 1968:66), ’new stations’ (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:372), ‘main station’ (Mugambi, 1995:39). It is my view that there were mission stations and missions until 1964, when the Diocese of Natal scrapped them (Diocese of Natal, Synod, 1964:22-23, 27-29).

3. 3. Anglican Church in South Africa

De Gruchy has contributed to the body of literature on the Anglican Church in South Africa and argued that, “with regard to this missionary policies, Colenso was convinced that the way forward was not to reject African religious traditions and customs out of hand, as other missionaries tended to do, but to leaven African culture and its social system with gospel. What was required was the transformation of the African society, not the detribalization of individuals by turning them into black Europeans” (2004:17). Page’s contribution to literature on the Anglican Church in South Africa asserted that, “the main task set before this body was the formulation of the constitution in accordance with which it was proposed that the church should be governed” (1947:18). Burnett’s contribution to the body of literature on the Anglican Church in South Africa was that, “Shepstone backed up his bishop. He pointed out that missionaries had often misunderstood the nature of the native marriage ‘lobola’, with duties and privileges” (1953:64). He had reflected extensively on the historical background of the Anglican Church of Southern Africa. There were also international authors like Welsby who commented on comparative study of outstation congregations and stated that, “if Clergy and Laity were attempting to meet the situation where people lived, there was also a task to be done in the places where many of them worked” (1984:35).

Lewis and Edwards in Historical Records of the Church of the Province of South Africa has given a historical account of the Anglican Church from 1749 to 1819, during the
English settlement in South Africa. “Nothing official was done for teaching religion in the settlements of the English colonists until the reign of Charles I, when an Order in Council was passed, this put all foreign congregations of British subjects within the limits of other Anglican Dioceses under the jurisdiction of the bishop of London” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:3)

Likewise, According to Hinchliff there were “no attempts to create Anglican Churches or congregations and Anglican missions were not even considered” (1968:15) and suggested that Anglican chaplains, who were also clergymen, in the Cape at the time were under stringent rules confined strictly to the garrison and to British officials. Ministry to the indigenous people of the colony was understood to be out of limit by the Anglican Church in South Africa (Lewis and Edwards 1934).

Lewis and Edwards reminded us that in 1797 that “a native of Africa, who is at the years of maturity and freedom, whose wish it is to be baptized according to the Church of England” (1934:5). D. J. Omer-Copper in History of Southern Africa reminded us of the collusion of the church with a racist colonial administration. He wrote that, “when the colony was first established there can be no doubt that the company’s servants brought with them some of the attitudes of superiority towards persons of darker skin that was developing in Europe. Open discrimination on grounds of race alone was not however, the policy of the company” (1989:307).

In their article ‘Combating Spiritual and Social Bondage,’ Elizabeth Elbourne and Robert Ross concluded that, “first British missionaries were most often members of the upper classes, especially in newly industrialized areas where the power of the Anglican Church was weak” (1997:32).

Richard Elphick and Rodney Davenport in ‘Christianity in South Africa’ contended that “the first missionary in South Africa was the Moravian Georg Schmidt, who started a mission station called Genadendal - the Valley of Grace” (1997:34). The mission station, had become the “model for other Churches” (Hinchliff, 1963:47). Whether it was a good
model or not is debatable, but most scholars are in agreement with Elphick and Davenport about its role in ecclesiastic and missionary practice. Page (1947:2) observed that, this period up to the middle of the eighteen century, “was one of intense missionary activity in South Africa as well as in other parts of the world, again, the Anglican Church was slow in making its presence felt in the frontier missionary context.”

Kevin Ward in ‘The Development of Anglicanism’ conceded that “the major problem was, the presence of conflicting interests between Churches which were largely concerns of settlers of British origins who dominated; and the ’mission’ Churches, in which the needs of indigenous people were, or should have been, paramount.” (1998:18).

Robert Gray became the first head of the Anglican Church, known as the ‘colonial bishop of the Church of England, in the Cape. However, “no mention of such powers appear in the letters of appointment” (Hinchliff, 1963:10). Nevertheless, appointed bishop Gray was charged with laying the foundations of a properly organized Church throughout the colony. Peter Hinchliff asserted that, “the bishop seems to have decided that mission to the heathen must wait until the work of the Church among settlers, where a start has been made, was in proper order” (1963:35; Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002:183).

However, his action was equal to the point of dividing the Church, racially. Lewis and Edwards concurred that, “the new governor, in 1844, said that his chief motive in accepting the appointment was that he might be able to improve the spiritual and temporal conditions of the natives” (1934:27).

During his roadshow to white settlers, Gray “was confronted by indigenous leaders to start missionary work in their areas. Chief Mhlali made a rather pious speech saying that he wished to have a school and be taught about God” (Hinchliff, 1963:39).

Although the bishop was confronted by indigenous leaders for mission, this did not move him from his plan for the colony. His expedition convinced him about the size of his Diocese, mission work that had to be started and that the Church needed to be self-
governing. He anticipated implementing the second job description too, once the Diocese was divided. The Anglican Church at the South African frontier saw the establishment of two new Dioceses of, Natal and Grahamstown headed by Colenso and Armstrong, respectively.

3.4. Diocese of Natal

Lewis and Edwards added on literature review on bishop Gray’s roadmap in South Africa that, “the bishop and itinerating clergy who followed him also found scattered flocks of Churchman on farms and in tiny dorps (towns) far from the main road. And administration goes out to a shepherd whose keen sense of duty constrained him never to rest until to anyone of the flock who had strayed returning to the flock” (1934:37)

Hinchliff added his voice on the body of literature on the first bishop of Natal (Colenso) that, “the bishop utterly failed to maintain constant cordial relations with any considerable section of Church people. He began by quarrelling with the missionaries, then with the laity, then with the clergy of his Diocese, and finally with his brother bishop” (1964:54).

Recent studies had exposed the arrogance, paternalism, deviousness, and at times, cruelty of Sir George Grey and his politics (Pieres, 1989). Commenting on the challenges faced by the early church leaders in Natal, B. B. Burnett in his book Anglicans in Natal noted of bishop Colenso:

one of the important decisions he had to take was the fixing of the master mission station that he had planned for the Diocese. Furthermore he had hoped to find at Umkhomazi Drift work progressing sufficiently for him to have taken over. Regrettably, he expected to find Zulus gathered there for instruction, and some headway being in tilling the ground which had been allocated to the mission (1953:39).
Regarding the impact of mission on indigenous communities, T.R.H. Davenport in *South Africa, A Modern History* viewed “mission as a breaking up of the powers of the chiefs by converting their communities to European habits and Christian religion” (1978:38). Similarly, Nosipho Majek in *The Role of Missionaries in Conquest* pointed out that, “the mission station itself was the spearhead of that attack on the authority of the chief, for there the Christian converts put-up their dwelling and were separated off from the rest of the tribe” (1986:25).

Martin Prozesky in *Christianity in South Africa* concurred that “Christianity and colonization were viewed as one and the same and missionaries encouraged the British invasion of Zululand in 1877” (1990:17, 19). Likewise James Cochrane in *Servants of Power* pointed out that, “the way in which colonial missionaries engaged with indigenous people: their hand in subjugation of chiefdom; their relation to the forces of economic expansion and to the creation of labour, all these came to the fore” (1987:21).

Anthony Ive in *The Church of England in South Africa* asserted that “bishop Colenso sailed alone for Natal on a preliminary Ten weeks’ visit of inspection to his Diocese. He returned back to England and conducted a successful campaign to arouse interest and raise funds” (1966:19).

Burnett concluded that missionary bishop was able to “fix the site for his master plan mission; he had planned for the Diocese” (1953:39).

Peter Hinchliff in *John, William Colenso* drew attention to the fact that, “mission at Ekukhanyeni was to be the real centre of all missions. The bishop would be the director of immediate as well as ultimate, of all mission works. From Ekukhanyeni, the tentacles would spread out till they have covered every native reserve. Ekukhanyeni was the model mission” (1964:48).

It was not surprising that Colenso took his mission station out of town, but to where the
indigenous people were. According to Burnett, bishop Colenso “felt that he could effectively oversee both the European work in Maritzburg, and the missionary institution, he hoped to erect on the mission farm” (1953:39). It was equally important for him to make acquaintance with chiefs and also to see for himself how tribes lived. An important contribution in this regard was when Theophilus Shepstone placed himself at the bishop’s disposal (Page, 1947).

Lewis and Edwards reminded us that, “the [colonial] government proposed to make ten locations and the bishop’s plan was to arrange an institution for each like the Moravian missions” (1934:316). Thus the Ekukhanyeni mission station became a replica of the Diocese of Natal.

Jeff Guy in *The Heretic* asserted that despite the challenges, “Colenso was sustained by his Christian belief. His religion not only supported him but provided the framework and contours of his life” (1983:8). Furthermore Draper, (2003) and Guy, (1983) tended to focus on Colenso’s controversy with Bishop Gray in the Diocese of Natal.

Toulmin and Goodfield (1965) argued that Colenso’s views were essentially shaped by his liberal theological and scientific education in Europe during his earlier years in life. B. B. Burnett concluded that “bishop Colenso belonged to the liberal wing of the broad church group, while Bishop Gray and Green, both championed the high doctrine of the Church, as the body of Christ” (1953:168).

In a further development and recognition of Colenso’s sympathies with indigenous traditions, Norman Etherington in ‘Kingdom of this World and the Next: Christian Beginnings among Zulu and Swazi’, he argued that, “Colenso like Gardiner, had seen parallels in Zulu culture to many elements of Christian belief and practice, The Zulu acknowledged a ‘High God, whose name, UNkulunkulu, Colenso promptly incorporated into his own service” (1997:96, Guy, 1983).
Elphick and Davenport suggested that “Colenso was immediately stimulated by theological discussion at his mission with African who brought a fresh perspective to the old problem. A spiritual commentary on St. Paul to the Romans in 1861” (1997:96; Annals de la Propaganda de la foi, 1867: 39, 463; Burnett, 1953:70).

Peter Hinchliff in his literature review contribution brought in a new dimension in Colenso’s new translation that, “St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans: newly translated and explained” (Hinchliff, 1968:67). It was written from a missionary point of view. Colenso appeared to have been indigenizing the Bible, by taking seriously the comments of the indigenous people in his missionary work. Furthermore, Hofmeyr and Pillay attested that “his name, however, is most closely associated with his innovative Biblical criticism, his trial for heresy and ensuing schism in the Anglican Church in Natal” (2002:134-135).

**Review of Literature Related to Methodology**

In the literature review that follows I discuss texts related to empirical qualitative research, methods of data collection, analysis, design and other related issues.

Merriam and Simpson in their book titled, *A Guide to Research for Educators and Trainers of Adults*, commented that it allowed us to, “Uncover the meaning of phenomenon for those unsolved, well suited for investigations in applied fields because you want to improve practice” (1995:97). Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate particularly outstation congregations and also the main parish centre, for the improvement of the practice which would come from understanding the experiences of those involved. I would argue that applied fields often lacked well developed theories from which hypothesis can be deduced and tested. Furthermore, qualitative research was an inductive strategy which allowed the researcher to develop theory.

Fraenkel and Wallen, in *How to Design and Evaluate Research*, maintain that, “qualitative researchers go directly to the particular setting in which they are interested to
collect their data” (1990:368). It is however, significant to acknowledge that this was a field work research, where I physically went to the site, (group of people) to collect data. This exposed the researcher to learn about people and made the researcher familiar with the phenomenon under study. Guba and Lincoln concurred that “the researcher, as a primary instrument, is able to consider the total context of the phenomenon rather than a particular segment” (1995:98). Another supporter of this view was Bogdan and Biklen when they pointed out that, “the researcher goes to this particular setting of interest because he is concerned with context (1992, Fraenkel and Wallen 1990:368). I would also concur that it is where the activity can best be understood.

Qualitative data were collected in the form of words rather than numbers (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990). However, the data collected included interview transcripts.

Blanche and Durrheim in Research Design, elaborated that, sampling “involves decisions about people, settings, events and or social processes”. (1999:44)

It is worth noting that, without doubt, if one wanted to collect accurate information about objects, or a Church, or a group of persons, the best strategy is to examine every single member or an element of that group either in Church or society. Therefore, as a researcher, I had access to the entire institution, which was defined as all possible elements of a certain kind. In addition, to the points made above, Bless, Higson-Smith and Kagee concurred that “the subset of the whole population which is actually investigated by the researcher and whose characteristics will be generalized to the entire population, is called the sample” (2007:98, Bless and Higson-Smith, 2000:84). In my view, however, sampling involved decisions about people, and therefore what was sampled in this study was influenced by the unit of analysis. The objective was to select a sample that would be representative of the population, about which the aim was to draw conclusions.
However, “the entire set of objects or people which is the focus of the researcher and about which the researcher to wants to determine some characteristics is called population” (Bless and Higson-Smith, 2000:84). Therefore, as a researcher, I access to the entire universe, which is defined as all possible elements of a certain kind. Population is defined as “the portion of the universe to which the researcher has access” (Fox, 1969:63).

Therefore, my population in this study was the Anglican Diocese of Natal, especially black parishes. There were specific values or properties that related to the population, such as the average age of parishioners, which are called population parameters.

Claire Bless, Craig Higson-Smith and Ashraf Kagee in their discourse, *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods*, asserted that, “sampling theory is in fact the study of the relationship between population and the sample drawn from it. Since the aim of research is to determine some characteristics of a certain population, one of the objects of sampling is to draw inferences about the unknown population parameters from the known sample statistics” (2007; 98). However, the main practical issues I perceived was that these were achieved by collecting data from the sample. Furthermore, Bless and Kathurea in *Fundamentals of Social Statistics* (1993), espoused that the process of generating findings is based on the sample of the population called statistical inference. I would argue that this is feasible if a properly selected sample could provide meaningful and accurate information about the entire population.

Claire Bless and Craig Higson-Smith propounded in *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods*, that, “sampling means abandoning certainty in favor of probability, because a large part of the population has not been investigated. Statements made about the population on the basis of what has been found to be true for the sample are of necessity, probability statements” (2000:84). In any view, therefore, the main concern in sampling was representativeness, in order that I might draw random samples. Therefore, random or probability occurred when the probability of including each element of the population could be determined. My contention with this view is that it was thus possible to estimate
the extent to which the findings were based on the sample and were likely to offer from what would have been found by studying the whole population. It was clear to me that it made much more sense that a sample is randomly selected when each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected into the sample.

Fox in ‘Identifying the Population and Invited Sample’ attested that, “it is obvious that in some ideal research world, we would consider the relationship of universe to research problem and decide how large a portion and which portions of the universe should be included in the population” (1969:64).

I would argue that a very small random sample may be quite unrepresentative. The above extract alluded to the fact that the research problem decided or dictated what the size of the sample or type of study conducted should be. The study encompassed thirty-one black parishes in the Diocese of Natal and this was a requisite for a large representative sample.

Bless, Higson-Smith and Kagee acceded that, “a large sample size alone does not guarantee a representative sample. A large sample without random sampling or with a poor sampling frame, is less representative than a smaller one with random sampling and an excellent sampling frame” (2007:107). On the contrary, Terre Blanche and Durrheim clearly pointed out that, “The researcher must ensure that the sample is large enough to allow inferences about the population”. However, a large sample should depend on the type of the study conducted. Often sample size, “is determined in part by the researcher who has access to, how much money and time is available for the study” (1999:45). Another supporter of this view was Fox as he argued that, “the researcher is permitted access only to parts of the population. There is no implication intended here that this is necessarily an attempt to thwart researcher, or prevent discovery of the truth” (1969:65).

It was clear to me that large sample was needed if one wanted high accuracy, as the population had a great deal of variables in the data analysis simultaneously. In my view, however, it would be absurd to save time and money through sampling if the data to be obtained would be illegitimate or not genuine.
Therefore, Claire Bless and Craig Higson-Smith stated that, “the purpose of data collection is to demonstrate the construction tools necessary to collect data and the way the information should be recorded” (2000:103). The techniques of data collection, according to Terre Blanche and Durkheim (1999) are interviewing. I believe, however, that techniques for collecting data, as a measurement procedure, are to produce trustworthy evidence, relevant to the research question being asked. Merriam and Simpson pointed out that, “the choice of the techniques should be based upon the research problem, depending upon emphasis of the study (e.g. rational/empirical, intuition, historical, or philosophical) appropriate procedures and techniques merge during the planning of the research” (1995:141).

I concur that the most frequently used method of gathering information for research problem, was by directly asking respondents to express their views. Therefore, the emphasis was placed on the interview. In A Realistic Approach for Qualitative Research, Maxwell argued from a realist perspective that, “there is no way to mechanically ‘convert’ research questions into methods, as means to answering your research questions, not a logical transformation of the letter” (2012:104).

I would argue that selection of techniques for data collection is not only based on research questions, but on the actual research situation. Furthermore, what would work most efficiently is the situation which would give the researcher the data he needed. Conversely, it does not mean that I conceal my research questions from the participants. Carol Gilligan, in A Different Voice (1982) concurred and emphasized the value of asking your interviewees real questions with genuine interest in the answer rather than contrived question designed to elicit particular sorts of data. The prospect of going through this route is that participants are able to bring their own knowledge to bear on the questions in a way that the researcher might not have expected.

Fielding and Fielding (1986) asserted in their work, Linking Data, that it is however significant to acknowledge that collecting information using a variety of sources and
methods is one aspect of what is called triangulation. It is my view that it allows yet again a broader and more secure understanding of the issues under investigation.

Generating an interpretation of some one’s perspective is a permanent attribute of the research. However, as a matter of conclusion, Maxwell argues in *Understanding and Validity in a Qualitative Research*, that the data is derived from interviews, or some other source data, such as written documents. It is worth noting that information can be elicited from periodicals, print media and so on.

Triangulation entailed collecting material in as many different ways and from as many diverse sources as possible. This could help researcher to ‘home in’ on a correct understanding or a phenomenon by approaching it from several different angles (Terre Blanche and Durrheim, 1999). It is my view, however, that interviewing is often an efficient and valid way of understanding perspective.

It is however, significant to acknowledge that interviews provided additional information directly from participants. (Bless and Higson-Smith, 2000). Interpretive researchers had given answers typically that one should not disturb the context indirectly, but attempt to become a natural part of the context in which the phenomenon occurred. This could be achieved “by entering the research setting with the necessary care and engaging with research participants in an open and empathic manner.” (Terre Blanche and Durrheim, 1999:128).

It is my view, however, that the strategy of triangulation reduced the risks that researcher’s conclusions would reflect only the systematic biases or limitation of a specific source or methods. It is worth noting that it used a variety of sources or methods.

In their work, *Finding Your Way in Qualitative Research*, Henning, van der Rensburg and Brigette Smith succinctly asserted that, “interviewing has become a way of life in our society. It is but one of many types of interview, all of which assume that the individual’s perspective is an important part of the fabric of society and our joint knowledge of social processes and of the human condition” (2004:57). Merriam and Simpson elaborated this
view that, “interview adds a dimension of data that is not provided by the questionnaire, that is, the interviewer ensures a face-to-face encounter with the research participant.” (1995:150).

It was my contention that there were many possible ways of gathering information directly from participants. The purpose of open-ended interviewing was not to put things in someone’s mind, but to access the perspective of the person being interviewed.

Patton propounded that, “we interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe.” (1991:278). It is my view, however, that observation is often shallow because it fails to dig deeply enough to provide a true picture of the opinions and feelings, thoughts and intentions. The interview participants are free to expand on the topic as they saw fit to focus on particular aspect, to relate to their own experiences. Furthermore, the prime concern is for the interviewees’ perception within a particular situation or context (Robson, 1997:231). Merriam and Simpson stated that, “there are two methods of interview approach, and are “structured and unstructured interview” (1995:150), whilst Colin Robson refers to them as “fully structured and semi-structured interviews” (1997:230), while, Lovell and Lawson name them “standard and non standard interviews” (1970:117-118).

Bless and Higson-Smith articulated that, “scheduled structured interview is the way of getting information directly from respondents and is based on an established set of questions with fixed working and sequence of presentation, as well as more or less precise indications of how to answer each question” (2000:105). It should be noted that to some extent, it is referred to as questionnaire. It is a widely held view that it is the one in which the procedures to be followed are determined in advance of the interview (Lovell and Lawson (1970). It could be executed by distributing the questionnaire and collecting it once it has been filled by respondent or mailing it back to the interviewer.

It is my view, however, that in order to be useful and reliable, a questionnaire should satisfy a range of criteria and be used without direct personal contact with respondents. I
would argue that in order for it to be useful and reliable, a questionnaire should satisfy a range of criteria and be used without direct personal contact with respondents.

Robson stated that through semi-structured (unstructured) interview, “is where the interviewer has worked out a set of questions in advance, but is free to modify their order based upon perception of what seems most appropriate in the context of the conversation” (1997:231). Another supporter of this view is Merriam and Simpson who stated that unstructured interview “only guide the researcher through areas for investigation. It is the responsibility of the interviewer to elicit pertinent information in the investigation” (1995:150). It is worth noting that the approach is more flexible.

It is my contention that this approach is especially useful if the studies are to be carried out at some length. However, the chief advantage of the unstructured approach is that the data gained in this way could not be easily compared and generalized.

Robson in ‘Real World Research’ observed that, “an approach which allows people’s views and feelings to emerge, but which gives the interviewer some control. “(1997:240-241). It is my view, however, that essentially, this kind of interview was being used more and more commonly and could be used where I wanted to investigate a particular situation. “It was developed in recognition that many of the consumer decisions that people made were made in a social context, often growing out of discussions with other people” (Patton, 1990:335). It is my submission that the focus group participants were carefully selected according to explicitly stated criteria.

According to Patton in. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (1990) “the focus group interview is indeed, an interview. It is not a discussion, problem-solving nor decision -making but an interview” (Patton, 1990:335). Furthermore, it demands considerable experience, skill and great flexibility on the part of the interviewer. The focus group is an instrument or semi-structured way that would draw up a list of broad
questions, topics or themes. They are used to develop interview questions to the group (Bless, Higson-Smith and Karee, 2007).

Henning, van Rensburg and Smith in *Finding Your Way in Qualitative Research* focused on data analysis and maintained that, “the true test of a competent qualitative researcher comes in the analysis of the data, a process that requires analytical craftsmanship and the ability to capture understanding of data in writing” (2004:101). I would add that the aim of data analysis is to transform information (data) into an answer to the original research questions. Patton observed that, “the challenge is to make sense of massive amounts of data, reduce the volumes of information, identify significant patterns and construct a framework for communicating the essence of what the data reveal” (1991:372). Robson also reminded us that, “qualitative data analysis emphasizes the importance of an on-going analysis during data collection” (1997:384). In my view, however, the process of analyzing and interpretation began to take place as soon as I made a start on collecting data. It is worth noting that during the initial phases of the research, I found myself making decisions about what to record and which questions to ask first in interview, and so on.

It was interesting that in a sense these decisions were a preliminary form of analysis, as one began to identify potentially important concepts and hypothesis which would aid later analysis and explanations.

Terre Blanche and Durrheim in *Research practice* advocated that, “in interpretive study, there is no clear point when data collection stops and analysis begin. Rather, there is gradual fading out of the one and falling in of the other, so that at first you are mainly collecting data towards the end, you are mainly analyzing what you have collected” (1999:139). It was clear to me that scholars supported the above view that it started on the first day of conducting research. It was also important to note that as soon as I began to collect, I also started to explore, although the picture would probably keep changing, as I collected my information. However, during this phase, I began to formulate preliminary hypothesis about what the data might mean.
Terre Blanche and Durrheim drew from their work that,

A key principal of interpretative analysis is to stay close to the data, to interpret it from a position of empathic understanding (1999:139).

Clifford Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures* (1973), concurred that the purpose is not to collect bits and pieces, but to place real life events and phenomena into some kind of perspective. In *Understanding Research in Education*, Lovell and Lawson espoused that “the replies and respondents have to be recorded by some means” (1970:119). Fortunately, I would make use of a recorder, which was undoubtedly, the most convenient way of recording the whole of the interview. I might have to revisit the questions used and check whether they overlapped or not, and made notes while the interview was in progress. However, I might omit those questions that overlap. It was my view, however, that it did have the advantage of being complete and accurate record of the respondents, reference could be made after the interview. Therefore, I would argue that it removed one source of bias in what was recorded.

Henning, van der Rensburg and Smith articulated that, “the researcher has many options on how to convert the raw data to finish patterns of meaning- analyzed data” (2004:102). It was my contention that I might go the conventional straight forward qualitative coding and categorizing route (Merriam, 1988; Merriam and Simpson, 1995). Eventually, this meant that the data were divided into small units of meaning which were then systematically named per unit, coded according to what a unit of meaning signified fore, as a researcher. Furthermore, they were grouped together in categories that contained platted codes. It was also clear that each category, therefore contained codes that were semantically related.

Maxwell (2012) defined coding as a symbol applied to a group of words to classify or to categorize them. I would assert that coding were typically related to the research questions, concepts and themes. Therefore, codes were retrieval and organizing devices
that allowed the researcher to find and then collect together all instances of a particular kind.

Formally, this was essentially the same task as that of developing a category system in content analysis. David J. Fox in *The Research process in education* expatriated and defined content analysis as "a procedure for the categorizing of verbal data for the purpose of classification, summarizing and tabulation" (1969:646). Patton concurred that content analysis was the “process of identifying, coding and categorizing the primary patterns in the data” (1990:381). It was equally important, as a researcher, to accept that it was the beginning of organizing the data into topics and files, coming up with topics like constructing an index or labels for a file system.

M.B, Miles and A.M. Huberman, in *Qualitative Data Analysis* (1984), distinguished between first levels coding, being concerned with attaching labels to groups of work and the second-level being, pattern coding groups and initial codes into a small number of themes or patterns. On the other hand, Terre Blanche and Durrheim reiterated that “the researcher needs to try and find an optimal level of complexity. Just by having two or three themes is probably not enough to do anything with data. On the other hand, if you have ten or fifteen themes, you should.” (1999:142). Evidently, I would prefer to have at least fifteen themes, which is sizable number for interpretation. Coding is where the data is segmented into discrete units, referred to as “featuring the data” (Maxwell,2012:111). Bogdan and Biklen explains further in *Qualitative Research for Education*, that coding categories are a means of sorting descriptive data the researcher has collected, so that the material bearing on a given topic can be physically separated from the data. An important contribution in this regard began by listening to recorded interviews, and making comments in the margins or even attaching pieces of paper with staples or paper clips that many notions about what I could do with the different parts of the data. Furthermore, this was the organizing data phase into topics and files for a book or labels for filing system. Inevitably, as a researcher, I would have to look at what was there and given it a name or a label.
Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999) reminded us that, during the activity development in coding, themes should also be coding your data. I would advocate that this entailed marking different sections of the data as being instances of, or relevant to, one or more of the themes. It was worth noting that the text might refer to separate or distinct idea, explanation or events and any textual bits, might be labeled with more than one code, if it referred to more than one theme. It was my view, however, that the advantages of this procedure could easily change which section it should go under the category, or even, do away with some categories or added new ones. It was needless to say that differences between instances and establish coding boundaries relationship among categories were gradually classified.

Coding of categories in the data tried to discover genuine categories and gave them a (provisional) name. I would relate these categories as changeable as possible to the context in which it occurred, for example, conditions, and consequences. Relating categories to each other, so as to construct sub-categories was appropriate. Eventually, I had to do this on the bases of specific data underlying or high-lighted each occurrence, reference frequently giving pages and line. According to Straus, *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists* (1987). The researcher had to develop core-categories, resulting in all categories and sub-categories to the common structural unit. Ultimately, discarded totally or largely unrelated categories, unless the researcher could find a way of building them to the core.

The Open University document titled, *Professional Development Methodology Handbook*, advocated that, “you can use pre-specified categories which others have used and published before you” (1995:101). Contrary to this view, Terre Blanche clearly argued that “this is a top-down approach, where you would use readymade categories” (1999:141). It was my view, however that the categories produced in this data analysis were bottom-up approach, because It would look at the data and try to work out what the organizing principles naturally underlying the data are.
Coolican stated in *Research Method and Statistics in Psychology*, that “the final report of qualitative findings will usually include verbatim quotations from participants which will bring the reader into the reality of the situation studied” (1990:235-236).

I would comment that the quotes have to be ‘tell it like it is.’ It is my contention that it would have much impact for a long time, even if the latter did make important points. I tried to be as objective as possible, although I knew that my personal involvement in the research may had coloured the way I collected and analyzed the data. Talking about interpretive analysis as a technique, however, as it has been done in this data analysis, was useful, but could easily make it seemed like a highly technical matter.

### 3.5. Literature on Anglican Church of Southern Africa after Apartheid

From Oral history perspective, I focused on Jim Sharpe, *History from Below* where he argued that, “it is a historical conception that analyses people, and religions, if people, could be a working class or women” (Sharpe, 1991:1-2, Denis, 1995:20). Outstation congregations have history and the ACSA must respond to their marginalisation.

However, Eddie Gibbs and Ian Coffey in *Church Next* propounded that, “the longer a person lives, the more he or she tends to dwell on the past rather than live in dynamic interactions with the present or be inspired by the hope of the future responsibilities” (2001:17). I would assert that it is true for institutions that inherited corporate culture, reinforced through each succeeding generations, to discern the signs of time in challenging mixed congregations, in so called predominantly white Churches, to transform it.

Comments by Mike Regele in *Death of the Church* propounded that, “issues of culture were a wake-up call to Christians, in which Church leaders face up, as they minister in a world out of control, characterized by stress and uncertainty” (1995:15). The cultural dynamics of the ACSA need transformation in the twenty-first century for it to survive and be relevant to society.
Donald McGavran agrees with this view in *Understanding of the Church Growth* when he observed that, ‘Christianity cannot stand apart from society and keep on inviting people to come to them on their own terms, rather, Churches go to people and communicate in terms that will make sense to them” (1990:163). I would reiterate that the ACSA had a programme of “Growing the Church-GTC” (Southern Anglican, March 2008, vol. 16, p.54), which was missionary strategy and needed to be monitored and evaluated per Diocese. This would give a new impetus to mission and ministry in the ACSA.

In his book, *Mission Shaped Church*, Graham Cray reflected greatly on ‘Mission- shaped Church’ and made a contribution on the “importance of small groups for discipleship and relational mission. They related to a particular network of people at work-place Church, cell groups and house Church” (2004:43). However, this was a wake-up call to the ACSA to be involved in a variety of ‘fresh expressions of the Church,’ as outreach for mission. This view was supported by Steve Gladen, in *Small Groups with a Purpose*, when he stated that, “we live in a fractured society. It is common for families to be scattered across the country, because of the demands of their jobs” (2011:100).

T. Polzer reminded the ACSA, in *Population Movements in and to South Africa*, that, “since the end of apartheid, millions of refugees from their war-torn and politically unstable parts of Africa, had poured over the boarders into South Africa” (2014:175). This created a challenge to the state and Church. However the situation deteriorated when South Africans migrated also. As Newman and De Lannoy puts it in *After Freedom*, “People move to areas with high employment opportunities, infrastructure, services and stronger community organisations” (Newman and De Lannoy, 2014:176).

Archbishop Tutu in the late twentieth century sounded a warning to ACSA that the seminaries needed to change their way of training priests and deacons and focus on ministry to informal settlement and slums. The transformed training clergy received up to then could not be a solution to ministry to refugees and informal settlements. I would
concur with the archbishop that the training I received was directed to urban and rural areas only.

Wessel Bentley in ‘The Place of the Church in New South Africa’ attested that, “ministry takes a new meaning that the Church has the responsibility to be a beacon of hope in transforming society” (2012:98). Therefore the Church (ACSA) was a new community which pledged its support to individuals in their walk of faith and diverse people were brought together around the unifying nature of Christian gospel and affirming the communal responsibility of the Body of Christ. The ACSA was the new community in its role in establishing a community of peace and equality in a democratic South Africa and should not be undermined.

3. 6. Conclusion

This chapter framed the history, marginalization and development of outstation congregations, and for a policy change in the Anglican Diocese of Natal. Using oral history analysis, a trajectory of the hegemony has been discussed from the time the Christian missionaries started establishing Western form of Christianity or the Church, in the nineteenth century, to the present time. The outstation congregations were now challenging the status quo of the Church for a paradigm shift, for their liberation. It had been argued that the Christian missionary concept of Christianity was viewed as agent of evangelism and conversion. With that understanding, the Christian faith monopolized the gospel, translating it into the hegemony of the Christian faith in society. Therefore, that hegemony started as separation into mission stations under the control of the Christian missionary and became exclusive when the Church was under the government. It has been argued that even after 1964, outstation congregations never enjoyed change, which was the cause of this research study, in black parishes. Main parish centre, in a large parochial structure model, continues to accommodate a privilege space in the Anglican Church and much to the continuity of her hegemony in a large parochial structure model.
The following chapter configures the terrain of outstation congregations in their understanding and expectation of the role and position in the Diocese of Natal (and main parish perspective as expressed during the data collection stage of the study).
Chapter 4

Historical background of the Diocese of Natal from beginnings to-date

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter was informed by one major concern: to contextualise the study within the existing body of writings about the ACSA at large and about outstation congregations in particular. The intention was to analyse and understand the cutting-edge debates about ACSA’s ecclesiastical mission and ministry. Secondly, it sought to identify the silence in the literature about outstation congregations.

This chapter describes and maps the historical forces and discourse that shaped the Diocese’s particular ecclesiastical model – the large parish structure. Thus the chapter had been organised under the following headings: The historical background of the Diocese of Natal; the emergence of the Diocese of Natal; the ecclesiastical position of outstation congregations.

4.2 Historical background of the Diocese of Natal

Mission and ministry in the history of the Church (Robinson and Smith, 2003) has presented itself as the best way to analyse the historical issues, debates and trends that shaped the discourse of large parochial structure model, and the position of outstation congregations. Historians of the Church were beginning to increasingly examine its history from below as well as from above, based on documents, narrative sources, based on official records emanating from archives.

Therefore, it is not easy to discuss the historical background of the Diocese of Natal without referring to the colonial government, land, racism, missionaries and the Church of England, especially in the eighteenth century (Hinchliff, 1963, 1964, 1968; Burnett, 1953; Lewis and Edwards, 1934; Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002; de Gruchy, 2004). The
development of English Churches in the nineteenth century in South Africa has their origin in the Colony of Cape of Good Hope. This was an era of uncertainty which was ravaged by military occupation from 1795-1803 and also from 1806-1815 (Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002). John de Gruchy (2004) has shown that throughout the nineteenth century, British administrative influence at the Cape was strengthened by the growing numbers of British immigrations. The life of the Church and its witness of the gospel existed within a social-political context which helped to shape its theology and practical Christianity. Lewis and Edwards (1934) pointed out that these were not static.

The role of the Church, and more particularly the missionaries, in South African history has come under great criticism. The historical accounts of the Church and missionaries has been critiqued and missionaries described as collaborators in imperialism (Majeke, 1952; Etherington, 1978:28). Saayman called this ‘entanglement’ of mission and colonialism (1991:23). The development of Christianity and the Church in Southern Africa did not happen in isolation. Hofmeyr and Pillay reminded us that “there was constant interaction between the growth of Christianity on the sub-continent and the matrix of that growth in Britain itself” (2002:38).

Unlike the Dutch Church’s mission to convert the indigenous people, the British Churches came to the Cape colony to serve the needs of the colonial administrators and the 1820 settlers. Occasional services were permitted for Congregationalist and Presbyterian but Methodists were less fortunate. Methodist ministers often had to spend long periods waiting for their licenses from the colonial government before exercising their duties.

Davenport holds the view that the arrival of the 1820 settlers was “part of the British to convert the Cape into a British colony in spirit as well as in law” (1977:317). Yet some scholars concluded that “in spite of being the established Church of England, the Anglican Church was slow to institute services and ministry at the Cape” (Hofmeyr and Pillay: 2002:79). Initially the Anglican Church had made no attempt at direct missionary work to the indigenous people (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:22). However, other Churches
like the Presbyterian Church of Southern Africa although separated from the Church of Scotland, was able to make some inroads. Shepherd argued that “the Scottish missionary work in the Eastern Cape decided not to join the newly formed and autonomous Presbyterian Church of South Africa” (1940:342). Similarly the “Roman Catholic Church has continued to grow steadily in its work in Southern Africa despite the fact that independent Churches had broken away from it” (Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002:79).

**Pioneer ‘Anglican’ Missionaries in Natal**

Allen Francis Gardiner

Hinchliff wrote that the “first attempt of missionary work before 1848 in Natal land was made by Captain Gardiner” (1963:21). Lewis and Edwards suggested that Gardiner’s missionary zeal came from “the nature of his work which took him to the most distant parts of the globe” (1934:303) and as such he was described by Burnett as a “missionary pioneer” (1953:4). His ambition was to take the gospel to the remote parts of the world. This passion drove him from the Cape colony to Natal.

Most writers tend to focus on the encounter between Gardiner and Dingane. Burnett stated that the Zulu king was more interested in the missionary’s promised gift (1953:4). However, Lewis and Edwards (1934:303) state that the king was given a ‘cloak of red baize” and by exchange, Gardiner was given permission to preach among the Zulu people. Hinchliff contended that Dingane’s implicit interest was “in establishing relationship with white man and his hope was that this might give him access to the supply of guns and ammunition” (1963:21).

Despite having been forewarned about the settlers’ tactics, the king was prepared to hear extracts from the Bible. The king before he gave Gardiner a place to build his hut had to seek wisdom from his indunas, and turned down Gardiner’s request. Gardiner returned to the Port Natal where inhabitants appealed to him to establish a mission or a Church of England but he insisted that he would also “start work among the native refugees at the
Port” (Burnett, 1953:5). Soon an extradition treaty between Dingane, Gardiner and settlers was entered into, which stated that:

Dingane promised to secure the lives and properties of all in Natal. The king was to waive all claims to the persons and property of every individual now residing in Port Natal and full pardon for the deserters. The British settlers promised to return any deserters from Zululand to the king (Burnett, 19553:6).

This resulted in the king allowing Gardiner for the second time to remain and teach the Christian message among the indigenous Zulu. The clergyman of the Church of England was to be provided with funding by the Church Missionary Society, and plans for hospital and school sites were given. There was a violation of the treaty ‘by the settlers in Zululand’ and Gardiner had to make an urgent appeal with Dingane. Since Gardiner had no legal control over the settlers he sought counsel from Cape Town and England about how to deal with the issues in Natal. Gardiner’s position as missionary was further weakened by his appointment in 1837, as British magistrate in charge of British subjects outside British territory. This led to Gardiner loosing both the Zulus and the settlers at Port Natal (Hinchliff, 1963)

Francis Owen

In March, 1837 the Cape Church Missionary Association was formed and undertook to support Gardiner’s assignment. Reverend Francis Owen was appointed and sent to work among the Zulus. Gardiner obtained permission for Owen to settle at Dingane’s kraal. Lewis and Edwards wrote that Gardiner felt that “it was a great advantage in having a white man close to the king’s kraal” (1934; 22). In his book The Church in South Africa, Hinchliff contended that Shaw planned “to place a missionary with each important African chief” which he managed to do while settlers still had an appetite for mission
Dingane gave Owen a hut further away from his kraal, and allowed that ‘his people might go to this hut to hear the word of God’ (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:304), provided that the induna gave consent. Owen encountered challenges in persuading the king to listen to his preaching and instead he was instructed to teach children first and only about twenty of them came daily.

Unlike Piet Retief and Maritz who were crossing into Natal around the same time to gain land (Burnett, 1953; 14), for Owen it was the preaching of the Gospel. Elphick and Davenport observed that “missionaries were important elements in colonisation” (1997; 51) while Mostert argued that “the missionaries were regarded as the vanguard of government” (1992; 1186).

Admittedly, British settlers received trekkers with joy, thinking that they would make common cause against Dingane and Gardiner. According to Owen’s Diary (1926) “Retief was worried about the inconsistency of behaviour and pointed out that the territory he promised the Boer had already been given to others” (van Riebeek Society).

Despite Natal being incorporated to the Cape and becoming a province of the Cape, no clergy was sent by the Church of England to minister to the Europeans or Zulus.

The Emergence of the Church of the Province of Southern Africa under Bishop Robert Gray

Page in his studies had shown that “the first service ever held in the Cape was by a Church of England chaplain, who was on his way back home from India, in 1749.” (1947:1). After the first British occupation in 1795, there were naval and military chaplains who conducted the only services held there (Page, 1947:1). Reverend Griffiths,

---

6. “Shaw was a Methodist missionary who insisted on retaining an itinerant ministry in the missions men where moved frequently from one station to another to provide stability and continuity. He still to be recognised as a great figure in South African missionary history.” (Hinchliff, 1968:35)
the naval chaplain procured the permission from the Dutch minister to use his Church building for Anglican Church services. During the early 1800s the colony was visited by a number of missionaries and bishops travelling between England and India (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:18-21).

By 1840, the Reverend Geo Hugh, the chaplain at St. Georges’ Church in Cape Town, began a series of services. Hugh supported the principles of the Oxford Movement (Kearns 1913), and advocated the teachings of the Tractarianism. It espoused to re-establish the Church of England of the nineteenth century and of the Church of the early Fathers (Hinchliff, 1963: 49), and it sought to articulate an ecclesiastical understanding of the church as “a spiritual body and not a department of state” (Page 1947: 15).

The context under which the new bishop, Robert Gray, was to work was quite different from that of England. There were issues of land, racism and colonisation, which developed into “frontier wars” (Omer-Cooper, 1989; Davenport, 1977; Majeke, 1952; Hinchliff, 1963; Kirk, 1999; Mostert, 1992).

Robert Gray was amongst the four bishops that were consecrated in 1847. Many studies had pointed out that ‘they were sent by the Mother Church (England) for pastoral oversight at some of her far-distant children, in the newly founded Sees of Adelaide, Melbourne, Newcastle and Cape Town (Lewis and Edwards, 1934; Page, 1947). Hinchliff (1963) in his book The Anglican Church in South Africa encapsulated the dynamics under which bishop Gray was consecrated, that is, by ‘virtue of Letters Patent’ issued by the Crown. Certainly, his Diocese was defined by the patent, decreeing that:

the colony of the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies together with the Island of St. Helena to be a bishop’s See and Diocese, under the style of the bishopric of Cape Town, and the Church of St. George, Cape Town, and bishop’s See; also constituting the whole of Cape Town, a city, nominating and appointing Robert George Gray to be called and known by the name, or title of Lord Bishop of Cape Town (Chronicle, Vol. I)
Therefore the bishop was commissioned as an officer of the state. However, he believed that the ‘image of the Church has to be a spiritual body, not a department of the state’. This impacted on his future episcopate and conflicts. It was important in view of the above decree; that the bishop’s authority did not extend to the republics (which were formed by the trekkers).

Bishop Gray arrived at the Cape with his family and a handful of people to, ”lay foundations of the Anglican Church in South Africa” (Lewis and Andrews, 1934; Page, 1947). Kearns (1913) concurred that among the clergy was Merriman (afterwards the archdeacon and subsequently bishop of Grahamstown) and Revd. James Green (afterwards dean of Maritzburg, Natal). After six months, the bishop wrote to the Secretary of Society for the Promotion of the Gospel (SPG) that “the Diocese stretched out beyond Cape Town, and also has undefined boundaries.” (Page, 1947:8)

Robert Gray's arrival in 1848 really marked the beginning of growth for the Anglican Church in South Africa. The bishop had to prioritize his progressional development strategy, as he was charged with the task of “laying the foundations of a properly organised Church throughout the colony” (1947:7; Lewis and Edwards, 1934:37- 68; Hinchliff, 1963:37-45). Thus Hinchliff argued that ‘the bishop seems to have decided that mission to the indigenous people must wait until the work of the church among settlers was started and also in proper order” (1963:35). However, for the bishop to put a master plan into practice he had to have an active co-operation from the clergy, for which he called a private synod of clergy. The diverse population being ministered to and competing theological positions frustrated Gary’s plans and thus required much of him during his early years.

Pastoral work of Bishop Robert Gray
It is important to re-visit the bishop’s mandate of ‘laying the foundations’ for a properly organised Church throughout South Africa. His pastoral road-map took the form of visiting the Diocese.

The first visitation took the bishop together with James Green to Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown, where the level of Church life was uniformly low. The bishop came to the conclusion that:

as the pastoral clergy increase, these missionary institutions ought to be and will be broken up. They keep whites and coloureds population too widely apart, and, the capital and land, or the country are deprived of the labour essential to the prosperity of the colony (Hinchliff, 1963:39).

During this trip the bishop was able to see eleven churches along the way and at Grahamstown he ordained William Long, a man destined to come into serious conflict with the bishop in later years (Page, 1947). The bishop met with chief Mhala, his first exposure to the leader of the indigenous leaders, which resulted in an agreement to provide “schools, a missionary and promised to send him teachers” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:40, Hinchliff, 1963:39).

Although the bishop did not prioritise mission in his initial plan, the indigenous leader pushed him to implement it. This scenario was working against the directive from the master plan the bishop had presented to his Diocese when he arrived in 1848. Lewis and Edwards in their book *Historical Records Of The Church of the Province Of South Africa* concur that “the Anglican Church had made no attempt at direct missionary work to the heathen in South Africa” (1934:22). Hinchliff reminded us that the sentiment at the time was that “missions to the heathen must wait until the work of the Church amongst the settlers, had been made and was in proper order” (1963:35).

During the bishop’s later visit to St. Helena he attended to concerns about Episcopal functions, the problems of changing churches and congregations being part of the
Diocese. During his six-week stay he arranged for two Churches and a school to be used for Church services, at which time a large number of candidates were presented to him for confirmation” (Page 1947:10).

After the St Helena Visit he proceeded to Natal, and later to Mauritius with Seychelles (SPG. Report, 1849). In the same year, 1849, the bishop was on a tour for two months which took him to Caledon, Swellendam, George, Knysna and back by Worcester.

The third visitation was in 1850. After he visited the Southern, Eastern Cape and St. Helena, the bishop set off again for the distant outpost of his Diocese to the Northern part of Natal's. There were twenty five communicants and the bishop confirmed 44 candidates, prepared by James Green. During the six week stay in Natal Bishop Gray was ‘deeply concerned about spiritual needs of the colony’. He had seen villages springing up in every direction but he had no means to supply pastors and thus Burnett argued that for Gray “the heathen, however, had no prospect of this exposure, and Gray at once begun to prepare his missionary plan of campaign” (Burnett, 1953:30-31).

Once again the bishop met the indigenous leader, but no substantive discussion took place (Lewis and Edwards, 1934). However, this exposure enhanced the need for mission work among indigenous people. The bishop had no alternative but to stick to his original plan of ‘laying the foundations for the Anglican Church in South Africa’. He was able to listen to complaints from the Lutheran Movement of “unsound teaching of English missionaries about baptism” and about the ‘evils resulting from the variety of sects in South Africa” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:53).

On his way back to The Cape, the bishop baptised thirty seven and confirmed twelve on the outskirts of Bloemfontein. This was the third encounter for the bishop with indigenous leaders, and despite request for mission interventions and support he stuck to the initial plan he had made for his Diocese.
At George, he was met by Mr. Welby the rural dean and he was given a progress report about ministry among the coloured people. The bishop consecrated an English Church and also instituted Mr. Welby as archdeacon of George. Two priests and a deacon were ordained. In addition, he confirmed eighteen persons and thirty five communicants. The bishop engaged in space pastoral work at both Riversdale and Caledon before he finally reached Cape Town

The fourth visit was in 1855 to the remote south Atlantic island of Tristan d’Acunha to where he carried letters for priests in his possession since 1851. He heard a report of starvation and resolved with the Cape government to transfer them to the colony. Also on the Island the bishop found Revd. Tailor living in a small cottage which served as a living room, as well as a school and church. Here he confirmed thirty two people. Some moved to the Cape colony but others resisted.

For Gray these pastoral visits were a key to building the church on foundations of undoubted orthodoxy both in Order and Discipline, as “our constitution as a Diocesan Synod” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:74). Undoubtedly, under his pastoral oversight the Anglican Church was gradually becoming organised into a living entity instead of an association of isolated chapelries.

**Ecclesiastical Organisation**

The bishop, during his first visit, “held a synod of the Eastern Province and discussed the formation of a Church society, the working of the Church Ordinance, the marriage law and the educational questions” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:41). He had another meeting with Church people and it was resolved that the Church and the Churchyard should be immediately conveyed to the See. Throughout the region the bishop met with congregation and government official to facilitate the church taking ownership of property for ecclesiastical purposes. In January 1849, the bishop was engaged with the question of general ‘Church Ordinance’ which would give an established legal status to the parishes without giving the state the right to interfere in Church affairs. The clergy
resolved not to proceed ‘with a general Ordinance on grounds that they believed the state should have no control over the internal affairs of the Church’ (Hinchliff, 1963:141).

The first provincial synod of the Church of the Province of South Africa was held at Cape Town in 1870 and the name was “Church of the Province of South Africa.” (Cox, 1888:226; Hinchliff, 1963:114) and was attended by bishops, clergy and significantly by lay representatives. It was convened to draw up the constitution and canons for the new ecclesiastical Province. Furthermore, in terms of this constitution, each diocese was to be governed by a Diocesan synod, presided over by the Diocesan bishop. (Page, 1947; Hinchliff, 1963; Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002). Ultimately, future bishops were going to be elected by an assembly of clergy and laity of the Diocese.

In the process Bishop Gray fought for the independence of the Church of South Africa to decide on its own affairs, and eventually won. This led, after many legal battles, to the formation of two separate autonomous Churches - CPSA (Gray’s Church) - and the Church of England in South Africa. When Robert Gray died in 1872, he left behind a well-organised Church, rapidly growing among all races of the land. In addition, despite the divisions his church was recognised by Canterbury as the Anglican Church in South Africa (Hinchliff, 1963:91; 1964; Lewis and Edwards 1934).

**Administrative Division of the Diocese**

In 1852, Bishop Gray had to return to England, in order to arrange for the division of the Diocese. Therefore it was incumbent on him to: (1) raise funds for two envisaged Dioceses, (2) also for mission work among the indigenous populations. Hinchliff asserts that, “it was not humanely possible for one man to be bishop of the whole of South Africa”. (1963:43) and as such the new Sees were Grahamstown and Natal, respectively.

Bishop Gray asked Mr. Armstrong to be the first bishop of Grahamstown and he offered the position of bishop of Natal to Mr. Colenso. Furthermore, Colenso was recommended by the bishop of Norwich as ‘zealous’ in missionary matters (Lewis and Edwards,
Both of these Sees were constituted under ‘Letters Patent’ in 1853. “A fortnight later Bishop Gray received fresh Letters Patent as bishop which reduced See of Cape Town and Metropolitan of the Province of South Africa” (Hinchliff, 1963:44-45). Furthermore, in July, 1853, the order in council granting Representative Government to the Cape of Good Hope had taken effect, and Privy Council judgement in 1865:

we apprehend it to be clear, upon principle, that after the establishment of an independent legislature in the Settlements of the Cape of Good Hope and Natal, there was no power in the Crown by virtue of its Prerogative (for these Letters Patent were not granted under the provisions of any statute) to establish a Metropolitan See or Province, or to create an Ecclesiastical Corporation, whose status, rights, and authority the Colony would be required to recognise. The United Church of England and Ireland are not part of the constitution of any colonial settlement, nor can their authorities claim to be recognised by the law of the colony otherwise than as the members of a voluntary association (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:66)

It was clear therefore that the decision of the Privy was a landmark in colonial Church history. Armstrong and Colenso were consecrated at Lambeth by the bishop of Oxford, Cape Town, and others on St. Andrews Day 1853 (Hinchliff, 1963:44). A lot of evidence suggest, therefore, that both bishops took the usual “oath of Canonical Obedience to their Metropolitan. Undoubtedly, the main object of the bishop’s visit to England was accomplished. Interestingly ‘these Letters Patent stated that the Bishops were sent out to maintain the doctrines of the United Church of England and Ireland, in those parts of Her Majesty’s Possessions” (Kearns, 1913:22).

Diocese and Bishop of Grahamstown

Armstrong had been an old acquaintance of Gray’s. Formerly, he had given a great deal of his life to work amongst unmarried mothers and was a real missionary endeavour in England (Hinchliff, 1963:44). His Diocese was never torn by controversies such as those which afflicted Natal or even Cape Town; but he had his own troubles. Many studies had
identified challenges that he also encountered, (i) one of his priests reported to him for laziness and refused to acknowledge his jurisdiction, and, (ii) a dissident congregation came into existence in protest against the bishop’s high Church policies. His arrival coincided with the tragic ‘cattle- killing’ episode in South African history. Page still contended that, “there was more progress in spite of some setbacks” (1947:25). According to Hinchliff bishop Armstrong’s Diocese was extremely well organised with missions and new Churches” (Hinchliff, 1963:44), which according to Page was the result of an emphasis on “evangelism, education and skills- training” (1947:24). He died in 1856, two years after being appointed bishop of the Diocese.

Bishop Armstrong was succeeded by bishop Cotterill, who continued to grow Eastern Cape missions. He was appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury, who failed to consult Gray in Cape Town (Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002:84; Varley and Matthew, 1953: 12). This was precisely the kind of conflicts which Bishop Gray wanted to overcome as he developed the institutional life of the Church.

Diocese and Bishop of Natal

Further to the east, in the Diocese of Natal, John William Colenso agreed to become the first bishop of Natal. His early episcopacy saw the founding of Maritzburg and also the setting up of an independent republic. In spite of all this, it was short lived when Natal became a Crown colony (Page, 1947:26). What struck Colenso’ relationship between the colonists and the indigenous people of Natal. Page specifically stated that the “Church was bearing witness to the old truths, adapting itself to new circumstances and keeping alive something of the spirit of devotion” (1947:27). Bishop Colenso displayed interest in indigenous people’s language, customs beliefs and he viewed them with appreciation, and valued the work being done amongst them by missionaries.

The mission station at Ekukhanyeni, near Maritzburg, was a centre of his missionary operation. Page reiterated that “the bishop emulated such an interest in the indigenous people that he translated and printed some Biblical books in vernacular” (1947:29).
The bishop was prepared to transform his Diocese and in 1858, he summoned a Diocesan conference. The conference was the beginning of dissension in the Natal Diocese which was to last many years. The seeds of dispute were already there when the Durban delegates were told to protest against the formation of a constituted synod with voting by Orders-bishops, priests, and laity- each forming one house, counting as one. They wanted clergy and laity to sit and vote as one house. They thought this would give the laity a majority. This resulted in differences of opinions that surfaced between the clergy and laity. From this conference grew the “Church Council” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:116) in which lay influence was strong and which gave its support to Colenso in the constitutional struggle. However there was an opposition from Revd Green of Marirzburg and archdeacon Mackenzie of Durban, who were among those opposed to the constitution of this body. This was one of the tensions which for several years impaired the work of the Church in Natal Diocese

**Gray’s Approach to Mission**

In addition to the establishing a clear ecclesiastical structure, the two Dioceses of Grahamstown and Natal facilitated the growth of mission work in South Africa. A meeting of the Society for the Promotion of Church Missions (SPCM) held in Cape Town in 1856 emerged as critical in the development of Anglican mission. As part of the meeting, Bishop Gray took the delegates around the Diocese in order to show great work that has been accomplished in mission (South African Magazine, 1857, Lewis and Edwards, 1934:73). The bishop also raised a discussion about the question as who should rule the mission stations. It was worth noting that many options were proposed, for instance:

> to be ruled by a chief, exerting compulsory service or whether it should be run as an ordinary native village, maintaining its priest, and school (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:70)
Likewise, this provoked a discussion about the creation of missionary Dioceses (Synod 1885), which implied that not all ecclesiical institutions (mission stations) ought to be perpetuated by the bishop. This was important in view of Hinchliff’s observation about the Moravian mission models as:

self-contained and self-supporting communities. Their converts lived on the stations and though some of them might be forced to go elsewhere to look for work. It is the Moravian ideal that they should live together for the better preservation of church discipline (1963:45).

In the final analysis, the policy was to ‘convert the indigenous people out of their culture’ into a ‘new Christian community’, of mission stations. I would concur with Lewis and Edwards that a different character model was needed for the missionary work to be successful and sustainable.

In 1862, Gray tabled a motion to council about the successor to the bishop of Orange Free State that the incumbent must fund and establish an English school, an orphanage, a training school and also begin building part of the new Cathedral. Thus in early 1863 the bishop of Canterbury, South Africa and Oxford consecrated ‘two missionary bishops’. This consolidated Gray’s approach to mission. Gray asserted that:

it is seen and felt very widely in Africa that without a bishop there is not much hope for progress in any work. The episcopate is seen to be a foundation-stone needed for the effectual building up of the Church (Page, 1947:31).

Ultimately all of this reflected Bishop Gray’s mission to the indigenous people as secondary to the establishment of the church. It is worth noting the reason put forth was that, there were so many things that bishop Gray needed to do urgently, but he made some attempt to place them in order of priority. Hinchliff alluded to the fact that the bishop “seems to have decided that missions to the heathen must wait until the work of the
Church amongst the settlers, where a start had been made, was in proper order.” (1963:35). Sir George Grey when he assumed the position of being a new governor wanted to assist in the “establishment of mission stations to prevent the recurrence of further frontier wars.” (Hinchliff, 1963:49). Undoubtedly it was this zeal that made him so anxious for the Diocese of Grahamstown to organise missions in Kaffraria.

Coming back to missionary policy, Gray did not approve of the Moravian mission stations in totality. He viewed the Moravian policy as callous to the culture of the indigenous people. The bishop states that:

needed, but of different sort. I should see mission springing up, in which the coloured people may become possessors of the soil. I believe they are prepared to make exertions for their own advancement and that the prospect of acquiring property would act as a stimulus to steady labour and of sober habits (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:70)

This was a paradigm shift from the Moravian mission stations’ model which was seen as having “outstanding contribution to the ecclesiastical history of South Africa for quite sometimes, and it became the model for mission stations in general” (Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002:23). The powers of the chiefs were reduced. Hinchliff reminded us that the real issue was “how far the Christian gospel can be communicated by people of one culture to people of another culture” (1968:65).

After the division of the Diocese into the Dioceses of Natal and Grahamstown, the then Governor, Sir George Grey, declared that the Church had now an opportunity for retrieving her character, of recovering lost ground. Bishop Gray similarly announced that the time had come to back-up the bishop of Grahamstown and four mission stations were established (Hinchliff, 1963:48). However the death of the bishop Armstrong disrupted Bishop Gray’s plans but despite Gray’s anxieties the new bishop, Cotterill, continued the policy of his predecessor.
In Natal, bishop Gray had discussions about missions as early as his first visit in 1850. Captain Gardiner and Owen Francis, as pioneers, could not do much mission work due to frontier wars. However, bishop Gray had proposed creation of the mission with government assistance. Hinchliff noted that, “a government commission had recommended in 1846, that the Zulus should be settled in ‘locations’ ruled out for them and equipped with hospitals and schools” (1963:48). This policy could not materialise because of the opposition from the colonists and the governor’s lack of interest. Despite the failure of the scheme, Gray was able to send a missionary, Methuen, to start a ‘settlement at Umkhomazi Drift’. However by the time Colenso arrived as the bishop of Natal, the missionary at Umkhomazi Drift had already left. Bishop Colenso had his own ideas about the planning of missions in his Diocese (Infra 48,61pp). This would be discussed at length below.

Although, bishop Gray was faced with controversies as well as a huge administrative burden, he was able to achieve his objective of “beginning of growth for the Anglican Church in the country” (De Gruchy 2004:16). I could not sufficiently emphasize the importance of the bishop as the ‘chief shepherd in the Diocese, every priest exercises pastoral oversight of the parishioners entrusted by the bishop to his charge” (Wilson, 1980:162) and his critical role in the establishment of not only the Anglican Church in South Africa, but also ecclesiastical models and practices that shaped Church identity and practices well into the postcolonial period.

4. 3 The Emergence of the Diocese of Natal

Bishop Colenso undertook the survey of his new Natal Diocese on the twenty-third January 1854, before taking up this position. He spent three–months in his experience of Diocese and returned to England on the same year. He published a book about his impressions of Natal entitled Ten Weeks in Natal (1964:64). I would argue that the book was an initial attempt by Colenso to set out his mission theologically. In planning for his Diocese, he decided to centralise his Diocese in Maritzburg, the then capital of Natal,
from where he would effectively oversee both the European work in Maritzburg and the mission stations he hoped to establish on the mission farm.

Bishop Colenso returned to Natal in 1855 with his missionary team, including his new archdeacon of Natal, Charles Frederick Mackenzie (Hinchliff, 1964). The Episcopal residence was built at Ekukhanyeni. It was through this passion of the bishop for his Diocese that he managed to raise enough money not only to carry on the work begun but to expand it among the Zulus (Lewis and Edwards, 1934). Hinchliff wrote that Colenso’s discussion with Armstrong agreed that the Diocese decided “to establish four stations in a country districts, and a Church and a school in the locations, in the town itself” (1963:48).

Hinchliff further asserted that “from Ekukhanyeni mission station tentacles would spread out till they covered every native reserve in Natal “(1964:68). The mission station was to be the real centre of all missions under the directive of the bishop. Brookes and Webb in their book, A History of Natal stated that from the outset of his episcopate, it was clear that Colenso looked upon his missionary work among the Zulus as his most important duty (1987:106). Hinchliff suggested that Colenso’s life as a missionary was based on precisely the same theology and principles as “his life as a controversialist” (1963:64). Thus the bishop transferred the mission to the centre of the plan for the Diocese (Hinchliff, 1964).

**Colenso: Missionary bishop of Natal**

There was plenty of evidence that the bishop went around questioning, ‘Africans about their history, religion and culture’ (Hinchliff, 1964:63). While Brookes and Webb wrote that, “Colenso looked upon his missionary work among the Zulus as his most important duty” (1987:106), Page went further to argue that “the bishop had shown keen interest in the language, customs and beliefs” (1947:28). Equally important was the fact that as a missionary bishop, Colenso was not content to oversee the port and the capital, but he wanted to make the “acquaintance of chiefs and see for himself how tribes lived”
(Burnett, 1953:39). Others suggested therefore, that the bishop ‘was impressed by the people as a whole, but was also shocked by some of his statements. For example, according to Cox, he said:

be firm with the natives’ attitude to most of the white settlers, but ready to be taught by Shepstone, that too much familiarity did make mischief in making it part of the past and presuming (1888:58).

He was excited by the possibility of using African religious custom as a foothold for Christianity, and according to Hinchliff (1963, 1964) the bishop refused to accept that every custom of the heathen must be regarded as evil. For Colenso therefore, he placed his confidence in the premise of ‘natural goodness of man’ and therefore ‘the reliability of human reason.’ Many studies have pointed out, like Hinchliff, that bishop Colenso protested against the “hell-fire preaching of most missionaries of his age. They pretended the natives have a clear choice between conversion and damnation” (1963:67). Anxieties about Colenso’s position thus emerged during Bishop Gray’s third visit in 1850 to the Church in Kaffraria, Natal, the Free State, and Eastern Province, where, he was confronted by the Berlin Society’s mission at Bethany where they:

complained of the unsound teaching of some of English missionaries who taught that baptism was only a ‘sign or mark’ which seemed to be like a cattle-brand. They also talked with them of the evils resulting from the variety of sects in South Africa, then about twenty (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:53).

In the twenty-first century, there were some religious sects complimenting each other in this discourse. It is worth noting that Colenso’s concern was with “how far can the Christian gospel be communicated by people of one culture to people of another” (Hinchliff, 1968:65) and became a bone of contention by the theologians and missionaries (Ndlanzi, 2003:105; Hesselgrave, 1991:104; Hinchliff, 1963:46; 64; 1968:65; Mugambi, 1995:43; Musindi, 1998; Ong, 1998:172). Traditionally, missionaries
approach local customs, culture and religion as irredeemable and that Christianity could only be built from the “wreckage of the heathen tribes” (Hinchliff 1968:38).

This attitude together with the problems of ‘entanglement between missionaries, colonialism and land” (Saayman 1991) was unavoidable that missionaries would come to be seen by the colonised people as the agents for the economic and land exploitation. Despite missionary society instructions not to get involved in local political matters, this was impossible to observe because during this era they were ‘paid by the colonial government’ (Hinchliff 1968: 49). Thus Bishop Gray would write in 1876, “two courses only seem open to us – their conversion, or their entire subjugation” (Gray, 1876: I, 271).

This attitude raised so many adverse implications. Hofmeyr and Pillay in their book *A History of Christianity in South Africa* observed that “because missionaries were generally in the vanguard of white settlement and many of them approved of white annexation and political control’ (2002:87). Furthermore, I would assert that British civilization and Christianity were almost identical. The missionaries were said to have advocated that “African culture is heathen, the work of the devil, to be rooted out as soon as possible. Individuals were converted out of tribes and into missionary settlements” (Hinchliff, 1963:67; 1968:67). Colenso reacted sharply to this kind of sentiment by emphasizing that,”he strove to convert not individuals, but tribes and Christianise the whole culture and society of the Zulu, rather than to make men within that society conform to the patterns of the society of the Church” (Hinchliff, 1963:61-62)) and that the savage was noble and the missionary ought to build upon the elements of nobility in African religion (Hinchliff, 1963; 1968).

Colenso identified key members for the development of his mission. Callaway, was a doctor of medicine, with “a temperament that suited him for missionary work” (Burnett, 1953:41). Robinson and Balcomb, agriculturalists, were transferred to ‘lay the foundations of the new mission station at Ekukhanyeni.’ Robinson was ordained as a deacon and put in-charge of Ekukhanyeni. Callaway would later break away from
Colenso and head for Ixopo to start a mission station with the assistance of two Zulu converts Mpengula Mbanda and William Ngcwensa (Burnett 1953: 49).

Reverend Robinson and his wife Henrietta set out to start a mission at Umlazi, near Durban, in 1856. Robinson, already fluent in Zulu and was called upon to lay foundations of the mission assisted by Samuelson, a catechist and an expert in linguistics and carpentry who made an important contribution.

Controversies surrounding Colenso

During Colenso’s episcopacy there arose controversies between the bishop and local clergy, and also between Colenso and bishop Gray of Cape Town. This scenario hindered the mission work in the Diocese of Natal, as Colenso “faced unpopularity and alienation of friends in the interest of what he held to be justice for certain of the native people” (Page, 1947:29). Among the theological concerns levelled at Colenso were his position on (1) polygamy and (2) his teaching on the Eucharist

Eucharist

Colenso was charged by the Anglican Church and he maintained his innocence by stating that, “Christ was present in the eucharist in exactly the same way as other times and the sacrament itself was little more than an aid to devotion” (Hinchliff, 1968:67). Colenso had been influenced by his friend and theologian, F. D. Maurice’s theology. Maurice had alluded to the fact that doctrine of real presence in the eucharist was such an exclusive application which could not be mode, “as it referred to commemorate the feast-eucharist, which assured them of real presence, could not possibly signify that He was habitually absent, and only appears in those elements or when they strove to bring His image before them” (Maurice, 1855:132).

I would argue that the above did not by any possibility signify that he was absent and only appear in the elements. Maurice expressed his disappointment with Colenso over the
Two Sermons. Burnett asserted that, “in 1858, Maurice dissociated himself from Colenso’s preaching, as he agreed with every point except two, ‘Christ’s presence in the sacrament-transcends all other modes of the intercourse with God’ (1953:74).

I would contest further that Colenso’s comments showed that he misunderstood a great deal of what Maurice was saying and had a “lop-sided view of the atonement and placed too much reliance upon the value of natural religion” (Cox, 1888:22, 27). According to Ian Darby, “it was the language that provoked the controversy in 1858” (2003:191). The identification of the Eucharist’s presence of Jesus Christ with every act of true faith was a remarkable application of sacramental understanding of life in the world. Colenso was formally impeached for heresy by three clergymen and the court, with three bishops, found him guilty. This was the cause of the split of the Diocese of Natal.

Polygamy

Jeff Guy asserted that the American Zulu Mission (AZM) had a pre-condition that, “a man had to put away his wife or wives, but one as a prerequisite for baptism” (1983:49). Livingstone Ngewu argued that “they do not seem to have taken pains to find out why Zulu man took multiple wives” (2003:295). The first AZM missionary Aldin Grout was one of the missionaries who worked in Natal in 1930s. He had expressed negative views about polygamy. AZM made assumptions about Zulu culture and custom.

Colenso was not in favour of polygamy as such. His argument was that it was immoral to put away extra wives. The bishop tried to “draw a line between first and second generations’ model, “while most missionaries drew it at conversion, when Christianity makes itself upon one’s life.” (Hinchliff, 1963:68). Colenso argued that “polygamist man when already a Christian is not allowed to marry more than once” (Hinchliff, 1968:66).

I would contest that there was a misunderstanding about marriage and family relations which included social roles and practice. According to Ian Maclean, the missionaries’ conflict over the practice of polygamy, “revealed not only the missionaries’ perceptions,

The paradox was when the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) told the missionaries that, “they were overstepping their bonds, mere imposing American cultural norms and failing to create autonomous Zulu National Church.” (2003:268). The AZM head-office was against the missionary’s behaviour in a foreign country.

There was nothing Colenso said about the women who were also in polygamy. However, on the question of polygamy, he was ultimately exonerated by his Church but impeached on the eucharist conflict. He was found guilty in 1863 and was “deposed from the office of the bishop, and prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the Metropolitical Province of Cape Town” (Burnett, 1953:72-73).

**Rebuilding the Diocese – the Transition**

Due to the controversies surrounding Colenso and his subsequent excommunication from the Church, Natal society was ripped apart by intense hatred. “Old friends cold-shouldered each other at public functions; civil servants from the governor downwards to the meanest bottom-ring clerk warily guarded his actions from any appearance of partnership” (Gordon, 1973:1). Page concurred that “the Diocese was divided into opposing camps and the main energies of the three successive bishops had to be devoted to the task of reconciliation” (1947:120).

Bishop Gray on 16th April 1864 travelled from Cape Town to Durban to take charge of the Diocese, attend to constitutional business and to be in the Diocese for the ’dethronement of Colenso’ to deal with possible tensions.

William Macrorie was consecrated as the bishop of Maritzburg in 1869. Brunett (1953:78) argued that “this new beginning was made possible by a small endowment
from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG)” and which allowed Macrorie to administer his divided Diocese tactfully and patiently thus earning him the respect from all sections of Church. Though regarded as a courageous man, some have argued that he under-estimated the depth of the situation in Natal.

Gordon noted that the “Secretary of State asked Gray to satisfy himself that the new bishop would be supplementary to Colenso to serve a voluntary congregation, that is, Diocese for the Church of South Africa and not for the Church of England, in South Africa” (1973:6). The Diocese rallied their support around the new bishop.

Bishop Macrorie in his rebuilding efforts geared the Diocese of Natal into, “the Provincial machinery of Church governance” (Burnett, 1953:83) set up by the first Provincial Synod of 1870. Undoubtedly, the ‘Constitution and Canons’ enacted in Cape Town, was accepted as binding on the new Dioceses. Equally important was a general sense of relief that the Church ‘had emerged from the controversies of the proceeding decade. Similarly, the position of the Church in South Africa had been defined as the ‘necessary ecclesiastical framework when provided for its ordered development,’ as such, the first two Synods covered an astonishing amount in “re-affirming the faith of the Church in Natal’ (Burnett, 1953:83).

Revd Callaway during Macrorie’s episcopacy set his heart on preparing some of the better-educated Africans for the ministry. Dr. Callaway had already trained ‘two African catechists’. The bishop recognised that a failure to make an attempt would be a sign of weakness. Some scholars like Burnett had argued that the diocese lacked the funds required to staff the Diocese with European missionaries and, in any case, African clergy would be in closer contact with their own people” (1953:97). So, two Africans, Mpengula Mbanda, William Ngewensa were ordained for the ministry at St Saviour’s, cathedral in 1871. Despite such indigenising efforts Burnett offers evidence that “Macrorie found the chiefs to be nowhere favourable except the Hlubi” (1953:14).
Macrorie resigned in 1891 when he had been persuaded that his resignation might bring peace to Natal and it was said Macrorie “felt that he had done all he could to draw people together” (1947:120).

**Configuration of the Diocese**

Since the two contesting bodies within the Diocese were unable to resolve the matter of ecclesiastical leadership in the diocese, the Church Council and the elective assembly in 1892, came to a common understanding that they have to delegate the choice of a bishop to the archbishop of Canterbury (Burnett, 1953). Page argued that the ongoing ecclesiastical tensions were reflected by “the two aspects of native and European works symbolised in Natal by two centres of Durban and Maritzburg” (1947:123). There had been a discourse between Archbishop Benson and Shepstone and the solution was to “cause the new bishop to sign the constitution and to take the oath of canonical obedience to the bishop of Cape Town,” and in the end, ”the archbishop planned to send the new bishop to South Africa as the head of the two distinct and independent bodies of the Church of England in Natal and the Diocese of Maritzburg in the Province of South Africa” (Hinchliff, 1963:107-108).

Similarly, Burnett noted that,

> the elective assembly of the Diocese of Maritzburg and the Natal Council asked Archbishop Benson to appoint and consecrate one would be Bishop of a united Diocese (1953:112).

Arthur Hamilton Baynes, formerly the archbishop’s chaplain, was nominated for the formidable task of uniting Natal (Burnett 1953: 112). The new bishop set in motion a chain of events and among them was a request that, “all controversy should cease for at

---

7. “But Maritzburg is the more natural centre for Native work” Page: 1947:123. It is this which will increase in importance as the years go by and which requires closer supervision.“In Durban stands the great Church of St. Paul,” Page, 1947:123. Previously one of the ‘rebel churches’, now the largest parish church in the Province.
least one year, a suggestion heartily received” (Gordon, 1973:17). In an effort of reconciliation, Baynes was enthroned in St. Saviour’s Cathedral, “accompanied by the dean, who had not officiated in the Church of which he had been the first incumbent since his exclusion from it twenty years before” (Burnett, 1953:112).

In the light of ‘bringing about Union in the Diocese’, the understanding had been reached that each Church should retain its organisation until both agreed to unite. However, bishop Baynes had taken a position of exerting pressure on the Diocesan organisations of the Church of England ‘to the idea of becoming part of the on special terms approved by Provincial Synod.” (Hinchliff, 1963:109; Burnett, 1953; Page, 1947).

Thus the warmth and enthusiasm towards the new Bishop did not survive long, and the Church Council attempted to secure its continued ecclesiastical authority and the perpetuation of the division. Furthermore it demanded from the new bishop to sign declaration that would preserve intact its Constitution, but Baynes refused (Burnett, 1953). Hinchliff asserts that,

Baynes was willing to allow the Church of England Churches to stand outside the Provincial organisation, for a time at least, but he was not prepared to administer two quite distinct Diocesan systems. [Archbishop] Benson had also told Shepstone that, he expected each side to retain its own organisation, until both agreed to unite (1963:108, Benson 1900: II, 507).

Baynes was in an impossible situation and naively did not expect both sides to retain their own organisation. The dubious nature of his task was reflected in Archbishop Benson’s remarks his task was precisely that of “bringing the Church of England in Natal into the Province” (Benson, 1900:501). The Church Council thus refused to come to any agreement with the bishop, and gave no sign of fulfilling its pledge in connection with the payment of the bishop’s stipend from funds in its custody. Thus the refusal stood as a rejection of his ministration, despite the fact that this did not reflect the sentiment among ordinary church members (Burnett, 1947; Hinchliff, 1964).
Reconstruction and Development

The Anglicans were profoundly grieved by the rift in the ranks of the faithful. “Bishop Baynes felt that he could do no more, and then, he resigned” (Hinchliff, 1963:109). Bishop Baynes was succeeded by his archdeacon, Baines, as the bishop of the Province pure and simple. It was worth noting that Baines had first used the title, ‘bishop of Maritzburg and Natal’, but had dropped the ‘Maritzburg’ in the course of time. Many studies have pointed out that Baynes was from the first known as ‘bishop of Natal’ (Hinchliff, 1963:109)

Bishop Baynes followed through with his plan of mission in the Diocese. Hinchliff succinctly executed the plan that, “Colenso Churches had to come into the Province. Diocesan trustees were to be the administrators of Church of England property in Natal” (1963:109). Thus de Gruchy concluded that:

this permitted separation which was not allowed simply for racial reasons. Social pressures found an ally among missionary strategists such as Andrew Murray, Jr. in line with such 19th century European Protestant Missionary Strategy, this separation was regarded as a way of facilitating mission work (2004:8).

However, this found expression in Baines’ mission for the Diocese as it sought to focus on white parishes first, then Coloureds, Indians and lastly indigenous people. Within a short time all but one of Colenso’s Churches, St. Paul’s, Durban, “voted for union on conditions not similar to those already granted to St. Thomas’ and St. Peter’s.” (Burnett, 1953:122). Legislation was introduced into Natal parliament in 1903-1910, to “give the bishop legal control of the Church property in succession to Colenso” (Gordon, 1973:18). This effectively ended a half century division within the Anglican Church in Natal.

Subsequently, Churches that still remained outside the Church of the Province became a priority. For many dissidents, the choice of Baines, as bishop, was a move in the right
direction because ‘he has been the archdeacon in Durban during his term of office and acted twice as Vicar-General during the bishop’s absence in Britain’ (Burnett, 1953:122). I would emphasise that he was one of the clergy of the Diocese, rather than somebody from outside the Diocese. He was acquainted with critical Diocese’s dynamics and brought innovative strategies for the purpose of reconstruction and development.

It is worth noting that besides setbacks, great developments were carried on, in St. Saviour’s Cathedral in Maritzburg, following his preaching in Durban that, “diversity in unity, rather than a rigid uniformity in things which are not essential, a characteristic of the Church into which all men of every type and character and nationality are to be brought that they may be saved through Christ forever.” (Burnett, 1953:122) I would call this ‘unification of a divided Diocese of Natal’.

Many studies have pointed out that although the bishop’s episcopate had an unsuspicious beginning, the Diocese grew steadily, and is now at peace. The Diocese experienced significant growth which saw the emergence of different racial Churches and schools for future structures and administration of the Church.

The last on the bishop’s road map for reconstruction and development-- was mission to the indigenous people. Although mission to the indigenous people had always been on the agenda, had not been a priority for the Diocese, except for Callaway’s mission at Springvale and under the episcopacy of Dr Colenso. Some scholars had suggested that the greatest challenge to the Christian missionary in Natal were living in locations and reserves, and “ignorance of Zulu language” (Burnett, 1953:146).

Hofmeyr and Pillay in their edited volume Christianity in South Africa reiterated that mission to the indigenous were inaugurated by bishop Colenso when he tried to “graft the gospel into the existing society and culture” (2002:84). In the years after Colenso, we saw the steady emergence of native clergy, for example Revd. A.G. Moloi and P. J. Africa. And the development of mission dedicated to Zulu settlements with European missionaries conversant in the local language.
The policy of placing a native priest under the supervision of European priest was further adopted by bishop Baines. Many studies have reiterated that ‘in each instance when the higher responsibility has been conferred on a native priest of the Diocese, the policy so far, has been entirely justified by results. This view was further supported in Callaway, Troughton and others. In 1923, Revd. Mzamo was succeeded by David Dladla for St. Luke’s Church at Nqabeni as priest in charge. “The appointment of Bantu priests in charge of missions is an important step in the development of an indigenous ministry which is the ultimate goal of all European missionary efforts in South Africa.” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:373).

An intervention was undertaken by the bishop when he appointed Roach as an assistant bishop to be in charge of black mission work. His work was ‘coordinating and forwarding the work of mission with no intention of destroying the unity of the Church” (Burnett, 1953:146). When bishop Roach died in 1922, a crisis arose in the Diocese, when a proposal was made at Synod for another assistant bishop. However this was not accepted as it was viewed as the “creation of a separate organisation for the native Church within the Diocese” (Page 1947:122). Burnett, (1953:147) affirmed that,” the oversight of the Diocesan missions fell to especially appointed Superintendents.”

The dean in Maritzburg commissioned his mission congregation ‘to choose among them men to be sent two by two to preach in the district’ and thus saw the beginning of the ‘developed a chain of outstations.’ (1934. 365)

**Stabilization of the Diocese**

By the 1920s the Diocese of Natal had been transformed from a Church led by a missionary bishop at Maritzburg to the bishop of Natal who sought to bring together historical factions within the church.
Revd Leonard Noel Fisher in 1928 was enthroned in St. Saviour’s Cathedral, Pietermaritzburg, in 1928. This followed a short period as bishop of Lebombo. It is significant to note that the new bishop was familiar with both Natal and South Africa in general. He had previously held a position at St Paul’s Theological College at Grahamstown and at one point during bishop Baines absence in England, he assumed limited Diocesan duties in Natal (Natal Diocesan Archives: New Bishop of Natal Appointed, p.2).

The aftermath of the First World War impacted negatively on Fisher’s episcopacy and this was made more challenging by the local Church being divided between native and European work. A major challenge for the bishop was to unite native Christian members of the Church of England who remained aloof from the Church of the Province, and mission work among people of colour. The increasing secularisation of the nation’s life was causing great concern,

because change came overt. Sundays were increasingly becoming festivals dedicated to various gods of sport. New standards were developed for the world in matters of divorce and there was a falling away of Church attendance (Bishop Fisher 1928 p. 1- Natal Diocesan Archives).

The injunction depicted signs of deterioration in race relations, and during the late twenties there were liberal ideas and movements abroad among the African people, which finally found expression in the urban riots of 1929. The implication of this was that the Churches were empty as they were experiencing what the “historian Lacourette has described as a recession” (Burnett, 1953:158).

The bishop proposed an intervention concerning the ecumenical unity with the Christians of other traditions which gained popularity after the bishop addressed the clergy of his own and other Church denominations in both Durban and Pietermaritzburg on the subject of ‘reunion’ unity. However, by 1933 there were several native members of the Church of England who remained separated from the Church of the Province of South Africa until
the dead of Colenso in 1883 and officially emerged as the real centre of the Church of England in South Africa” (Hinchliff, 1963:106). Ive captured the sentiment of dissent of the Zulu members of the Church of England that,

they were not aware of the issues involved in this controversy and were determined to continue worshipping in genuine conformity to the Book of Common Prayer, realising the unscriptural character of the Anglo-Catholic teachings found in the Church of the Province of South Africa (1966:44).

They were known as the ‘SOBANTU’ Church or Church of England in South Africa, even during this century. They had remained under bishop Colenso’s supervision during the time of controversy. Anthony Ive pointed out that, “in 1901 bishop Baynes resigned, having completed the seven years’ service he had promised of bringing the Church of England in Natal entirely under the control of the CPSA” (1966:42). I would argue that this was not possible with the African members because even in this century they were in existence and independent. Colenso’s theological teachings were continued by his daughters long after his death (1883). Equally important was the fact that “the Church Property Act of 1910 made Umlazi available once more for development by the Anglican Church in Natal” (Burnett, 1953:152). However, this was not a deterrent but motivated them in continuing to meet regularly for worship in the open air.

Although they were brought up in the Anglican Church traditions, the Sobantu Christians were without a bishop’s oversight and ministry (Burnett 1953). There were also continual pressure on the Zulu clergy, catechists and congregations to join the Church of the Province of Southern Africa.

by the Sobantu congregations who had, given notice to their own superintendent The Revd Taight, in 1931, that they wished to place themselves under the bishop (Burnett, 1953:159).
A great many Sobantu people disapproved of certain non-episcopal ordination that had taken place in St. Mary’s Church in Maritzburg, the implication of which was that many objected to their ministry and were perturbed by some developments in Sobantu mission. Nevertheless, nine congregations defected to the Church of the Province of Southern Africa.

Thus Fisher’s first Synod met under very difficult financial times largely due to economic depression (Bishop Fisher, p.1, Natal Diocesan Archives). The financial position became so desperate that parishes were instructed to pay into a central fund for clergy stipend and at the same time clergy were ‘asked to drop ten percent in their stipends and the bishop urged his people to think of almsgiving as something sacramental’. However, the bishop’s approach to the Church finances was,

reminding his people that the Church’s capacity for spiritual work was limited by the sacrifice they were prepared to make in offering of their substance for the work of God” (Burnett, 1953:157).

One significant implication of that decision had been that the financial stability was restored to the Diocese. It was worthwhile to remember that it was still the policy of this Diocese for the stability of finances over the years.

I had already alluded to the fact that the two aspects of native mission and European parish development work were symbolized in Natal by two centres of Durban and Maritzburg. Durban had increased so greatly in population and wealth that some suggested that the centre of the Diocese ought to be moved there, while others held that “Maritzburg is a more natural centre for native work” (Page, 1947:123). Thus despite the economic challenges faced by the church in the aftermath of the war, the Diocese of Natal continued to be haunted by the competing ecclesiastical orientations between parish or mission station.
During those years throughout the Diocese missionary work had been steadily pressed forward (Burnett 1953: 160). The imperative of this undertaking was the development of new congregations and new Churches. The most notable among the new congregations and churches were those built at Chesterville in Durban and Edendale (St. Martin’s), in Maritzburg, Emalizayo and Newcastle. Evidently, the character of missionary work had ‘changed’ considerably from the more heroic pioneering men of the previous century.

However, my observation was that during Fisher’s episcopacy (1928-1951) the missionary work of the Church in Natal appeared to be producing a replica of the European parish in town or country’ as it ‘touched the lives of a second and third generation of African Christian also (Burnett, 1953:162)’. Therefore many studies come to the conclusion that by the 1950s “there were rather ten thousand baptised Anglican Africans in the Diocese, of whom over eight thousand were communicants” (Burnett, 1953:162) and one can draw the inference that many African Christians had lost their appetite and zeal for the church.

There appeared to have been a school of thought that advocated the policy which sought to ‘encourage the Bantu to build the Church among their own people with Europeans only in Church educational institutions, and exercising general supervision’ (Burnett, 1953:162). At this stage the Diocese had stabilised and by 1960 there were only five Europeans fully engaged in missionary work compared to twenty one African priests and deacons, and thirty catechists—all advantage of knowledge of the customs of their own people. During the subsequent years a good deal of “financial responsibilities had been shifted to the African shoulders” for new several missions (Burnett 1953: 163).

The consolidation of the Diocese was further strengthened when in 1930, bishop Ferguson-Dave, who had retired from the Diocese of Singapore with ‘a particular interest in the Indian work in Natal’ became the superintendent of Indian missions in the Diocese (Burnett, 1953). Under his administration the Diocese saw the building and running of medical services at St. Aidan’s Hospital. The hospital was the property of the Diocese of
Natal and the bishop was the chairperson of the governing board. In addition several Church schools were established throughout the Diocese.

During this period mission endeavours among coloureds and Indians flourished. Like coloured clergy who took charge of their parishes of St Thomas’ on the Berea and later St John’s:

> the Indian clergy has full responsibility for the missions at St. Paul’s in Maritzburg, St. Aidan’s in Durban, Christ Church in Sydenham and St. Michael’s Rossburgh (Burnett, 1953:166).

The success of St. Monica’s home for Coloured girls was an indication of the steady growth in the Diocese.

The steady development was evident in the expansion projects at St. Paul’s and Michaelhouse. Episcopal support for parish Churches in Durban and Maritzburg were all indication that the Diocese was working together and not drowning in conflict. This may have been because the conflicts were obscured by the politics of racial segregation that was now fully entrenched in the Church as was the case in the South African society at large.

Despite the popular belief that the work of evangelisation had almost exclusively relied on white missionaries, it was the indigenous missionary workers (catechists, lay preachers, deacons and priests) that were the backbone of the missionary enterprise (Burnett, 1953). Thus a minority of clergy, like their controversial predecessor, Colenso, were convinced that the ordination of indigenous clergy was a prerequisite for any further missionary work (Chidester, 2013).

However, Bishop Fisher’s concern for the future was expressed in his inauguration of the ‘Centenary Ordination Candidate’s Fund’ when he raised the training of ordination candidates during its first hundred years blessing for the work of the Diocese. Similarly,
mission hospitals, schools, colleges and other mission oriented welfare centres among the various races were regarded as a visible expression of the fact that the church had succeeded in its mission (Burnett, 1953:161).

Finally, at the first Synod in 1940 it was decided that it should no longer look to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) for financial help, but must meet the grants formerly by SPG (Burnett, 1953:168). The fact that the Diocese was expected to contribute to the Natal Diocesan Fund was indicative of the drive towards being pastorally and in mission work, self-supporting. ‘Thus at the end of his episcopacy bishop Fisher had, despite numerous challenges, restored relative stability to the much embattled Diocese of Natal.

**Transformed Diocese of Natal**

This was an era when the Anglican Diocese of Natal was not engaged in conflicts of any kind and all the systems of a fully-fledged Diocese were in place. The bishop would have to be engaged in fund-raising, ministry and mission. It is important to note that after the resignation of Bishop Fisher in 1951, an Elective Assembly of the Diocese of Natal in Pietermaritzburg elected Vernon Inman as the sixth bishop of the Diocese of Natal. He succeeded in changing the status of the mission Districts and acquired parochial status. In addition, the Vicars of existing parishes would now be called Rectors who reside in the rectory and not the Vicarage (Diocese of Natal- Act XVIII: 22-23, 26-29). It is worth noting that the changes applied to all missions, not only African missions.

Following the retirement of Bishop Inman in 1974, He was succeeded by Bishop Phillip Welsford Richmond Russell from 1974 to 1981 during whose episcopate, there was almost no significant changes in ecclesiology. However, Bishop Michael Nuttall, who succeeded him in 1981 characterised his Episcopal tenure with three achievements:

Women deacon and priesthood, self supporting deacon and priesthood, and multiplication of the Diocese
The ministry of community priests and deacons was introduced in the Diocese in 1993. Eventually, this was the direction in which the Diocese moved. However, it is important to define it:

As raised up in their local parish setting and set apart through an appropriate discernment process for an ordained ministry in that setting. This ministry will always exist alongside active lay ministers, in fact where no active ministry, there cannot be local ordained ministry, because the one arises from the other. In addition, will function alongside stipendiary or church-supported clergy, who will exercise a particular role of leadership and oversight in our parishes (Diocese of Natal: Synod, 1993:4-5)

Furthermore, there were dangers and risks involved in this new development. Although it was entirely new, however, there was more self-supporting clergy already in the Diocese than stipendiary clergy. Most of the self supporting clergy were promoted to be rectors of parishes, Canons and Archdeacon of the cathedral chapter. This was a high position in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa which required a high standard of experience in parish administration and parish work. Their training was on parish–based level and the key purpose of these ministries would be to meet the needs of a burgeoning and often bleeding society from the scars of colonialism and apartheid, in a local parish. Initially this is,

a parish-based cleric, but may be required to enter into an agreement with the Bishop or her/his nominee, as is appropriate to the role and function assigned to that cleric by the Bishop. (Diocese of Natal; Synod, 25 October2003)

It is worth noting that Act Eleven of Self-Supporting had also an ‘Introduction: 2’ which stated that, “Any matter addressed in, or omitted from this Act may therefore be addressed by further enactment of Synod, or by Episcopal Bylaw and/or by Episcopal Bylaw and/or by administrative guidelines.” New Christian communities would emerge,
fostered and nurtured by duly ordained and authorised men and women held energized by the Church’s apostolic tradition.

Women’s ministry was also promoted during bishop Michael Nuttal’s episcopate. However, the bishop’s views on the ordination of women had been well articulated and Synod was faced with the question as to whether it was opportune to expand this participation further to include the priesthood and, by implication, the episcopate. This ministry was later accepted by Anglican Church of Southern Africa.

The Diocese of Natal was wide and large geographically, and the bishop contemplated its multiplication or division. Furthermore, it was after a year of consultations, discussions, and parish and regional (archdeacon) visioning conferences that took place in the Diocese. This culminated at its conference and Synod, of which was unable to produce a vision. The central vision that emanated was that the “Diocese will remain as one; with time, energy and resources being channelled into developing an effective regional ministry and administration” (Diocese of Natal, 1993:3).

Equally important was that the Diocesan bishop will be enabled to give himself what I call ‘bigger picture of the Diocese, in development, mission matters, development of leadership, social matters, Church of the Province of Southern Africa matters and the development of our vision as one Diocese. Finally, multiplication or division of the Diocese fell away and the bishop retired in 1999.

Rubin Philip succeeded in 2000 as the bishop of Natal. It was worth noting that he had been the archdeacon of Pinetown and also the rector of the Parish of Westville some years back, being black. Bishop Colenso had questioned “communicating the gospel by missionaries to a people of culture different from them.” (Hinchliff, 1963:66). However, Christians had been divided on this issue.

Although the bishop had not been exposed to predominantly black parishes, except as archdeacon, he understood the context of South Africa. Kevin Ward added into the

It is significant to capture bishop’s years at the Seminary as active in “Black Consciousness Movement,” as de Gruchy defined the Movement as “a spiritual re-awakening which drew its resources from Christianity, but discovered new meaning in African culture which for many was closer to Christianity than European culture.” (1986:152).

Rubin’s achievements were in Parish Charter, which was, “an organisation’s capacity to bring change into the parishes in a short and longer term, pursue standards of excellence in twelve key areas of: leadership, vision, spirituality and prayer, discipleship, finances, stewardship, preaching and teaching, evangelism, compassion and caring, prophetic witness, and youth development” (Diocese of Natal: Parish Charter, 2004:1). Secondly, it was, ‘Arise and Build/Masisukum sakhe’ (Diocese of Natal, 2006), equivalent to the ACSA (Provincial) “Growing the Church (GTC)” Southern Anglican, 2009:56-57). Arise and Build was built on the Parish Charter. These were for mission and ministry. Furthermore, he was able to send back black clergy to predominately white parishes, as rectors.

The Diocese of Natal was old in the faith of Christ, young in the Holy Spirit. Furthermore it is committed through all the changes and trial of history to live by and witness to Christ who had overcome the world. The Diocese of Natal looked on her past and on her future with thanksgiving, patience and re-dedication.
4.4. The Ecclesiastical Position of the Diocese of Natal

Outstation Congregations or Stations

The term stations or outstations congregations was “used historically to make distinction between missions. The smaller number of outstations did not have a resident minister. They were serviced by missions or missions stations” (Japha, Japha, Le Grange and Todeschini, 1993:4)

It is interesting to note that the Diocese of Natal understands, and expectation remained on canonical level as expressed in the Pastoral Charge:

The Incumbent licensed to any Pastoral Charge shall have power, if the bishop approve, to establish chapelries within his charge, where separate congregations assemble for Divine Worship; such chapelries remaining under his own jurisdiction, saving all ordinary rights of the bishop.


This view expressed is that the authority of the bishop was delegated to the ‘rector’ as articulated in the ‘Institution of a Priest to a Pastoral Charge, to “receive the cure of souls which was both mine and yours, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” (Church of the Province of Southern Africa, 1993:16). This indicates that the bishop was also the rector of parishes, and had delegated his power to the rector. Therefore the rector could ‘establish congregations’ without the permission from bishop. The bishop might not even know how many outstation congregations in each pastoral charge. However, it was only in 2011 that I appealed to the bishop to have outstation congregations also reflected in the Natal Diocesan Directory as per pastoral charge. Furthermore it was in preparation for the interviews that I would be conducting at the outstations, as part of my thesis.
Main Parish Centre

Formally, ‘mission’ which was ordinarily “it could be expected to denote an institution with an evangelising function, but in South Africa’s usage it has come to refer to a rational distinction. ‘mission stations’ were used to describe historically distinctions between missions and stations, were the centres of mission activity in particular region.” (Japha, Japha, Le Grange, 1993:3). However, it was only in 1964 that status changed to pastoral charge-parish “Diocese of Natal 1964)

The perceptions of main parish centre varied. There was a question during the interviews to the leaders which asked, ‘Do you think the outstation congregations deserve any say in the administration of a large parochial structure model? Many respondents from the main parish centre viewed them as having no say and even their structure of the outstation congregation’s church council was not recognised. They had to request the parish church council even for repairing of window panes. However their representatives to the parish church council had no say and in some cases they were appointed by the rector. The outcome of this scenario was that they did not have the mandate from their congregation to take forward their needs to the parish church council. They were overpowered by the majority members from the main parish centre and resulted in their reluctance to attend these meetings. It was very seldom that they were appreciated and acknowledged their participation in these forums. It also became very clear that the main parish centre could not pay the needs of the parish without their contribution and on the contrary, some main parish centres felt they could do without them. It was essential to note that a number of outstation congregations felt they could survive on their own. More findings would be revealed when all views from the interviews were collated.

4.5 The Anglican Church of Natal under apartheid

Bishop Thomas, George, Vernon Inman (1951-1974), became the sixth of the spiritual leaders in the Anglican Church of Natal. This was just two years after the Nationalist Party won the election in South Africa.
De Gruchy articulated that, “there was a distinction that could be identified, that was, apartheid policy under that year” (2004:51). In my view, however, colonialism and apartheid “differed in degree and in direction, rather than in kind, from the policies which had gone before” (Davenport, 1978:254). It displayed “a strange relationship between Europeans and natives, which was becoming more and more clear” (Elphick and Davenport, 1997:363).

Thompson concluded that, “the Nationalist Party used its control of the government to fulfil Afrikaner ethnic goals as well as white racial goals” (1990:188). However, ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church “were warned not to protest against apartheid legislations or embarrass the government (Hofmeyr and Pillay, 2002:269). It was very surprising that the Anglican Church was not unanimous in opposing apartheid.

Alan Paton in ‘apartheid and the archbishop’ was surprised that the Metropolitan of Cape Town was concerned that, “the Church as an institution, and especially priests, should not actively engaged in politics” (1973:151). I would argue that the primary implication was that, “the Churches themselves are sites of the struggle. The struggle in Churches was parallel to that in society as a whole” (Bonino, 1975:159). The Church was in society.

Bentley argued that, “society needs the state for its structural coherence, and the Church for reinforcing its notion of spiritual belonging. Similarly, the Church and state need each other, and society in order to find their identity and mission” (2012:96). Father Trevor Huddleston stated that, “it was insufficient to pass resolutions, since the white minority was illegitimate” (1956:94ff).

Although bishop Inman ushered a ‘new phase’ (Burnett, 1953), but the mere fact that he came to South Africa as a youth, did put him on the position of “white privileged” (Cochrane, 1987:68). More racial laws of segregation were tightened. During bishop Inman’s bishopric there were atrocities at Sharpville 1960; Bantu Homelands Act of
1971; Land Act; and Bantu Education Act and so forth that were enacted. The Diocese was never engaged openly to the struggle of resistance.

However, bishop Inman did “invade a secular space” (Robinson and Smith, 2003:107), through a new paradigm in Synod 1964 which, “changed the status of missions of the Diocese of Natal to Pastoral Charges” (Diocese of Natal, 1964:22-23, 27-29). The blacks had a very hard time at the hands of the missions and paradigm shift had been “fresh expressions of the Church” (Cray, 2004:43-82). It did not go enough to address the plight of outstation congregations.

During Inman’s time, “Zulu-speaking Canons and archdeacons were appointed, regional Council introduces and stipend of clergy was given parity” (Diocese of Natal: Document, 2013:2).

Bishop Philip Welsford, Richard Russell (1974-1981) took over bishopric and the height of resistance to apartheid, which was marked by 1976 Soweto Uprising, state of emergency and the creation of Tri-Camera Parliament (whites, Indians and Coloureds) and blacks were excluded. Resistance groups formed United Democratic Front (UDF) to oppose the government. His stay in the Diocese was very short because he was elected to be archbishop in Cape Town.

His main achievements were, “in unifying of the two city parishes in Pietermaritzburg and as well as building of the cathedral of Holy Nativity” (Diocese of Natal-Document, 2013:2). There was a resistance to the building of the cathedral and amongst them was Father Michael Lapsley (Society of the Sacred Mission-SSM). He was deported and joined ANC in exile and only returned when all exile where allowed to come back.

Michael Nuttall’s (1982-2000) episcopacy was an era when, “the Church’s response to the struggle to achieve democratic rule in our country. The Diocese was considered to be the most violent in the world” (Diocese of Natal: Document, 2013:3-4). The Diocese played a role in bringing about such a transition through the KwaZulu-Natal Council of
Churches. Father Victor Afrikaner became a victim when he was killed during this period and Father Mcebisi Xundu was greatly involved through Diakonia Council of Churches. Several parishes, Church schools and United Churches were formed.

In 1999, he was succeeded in the episcopacy of the Anglican Church in Natal by Rubin Phillip and worked closely with KwaZulu Council of Churches. A team of Church members had to break a standoff between the National government and the House of Traditional Leaders (Ad Clerum, May 2001, 4/2001.

The Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal worked closely with other Churches in KwaZulu-Natal Council of Churches and the Synod of Bishops of ACSA.

4.6. Conclusion

This chapter has been able to construct a perspective of the background history of the Anglican Diocese of Natal from its inception to be part of the Church of the Province of Southern Africa. Indeed, it could be argued that the Diocese of Natal depended on its local funding rather than from foreign help and had become indigenous.

In this chapter I have sought to illustrate that when the Anglican missionaries came to establish the church at the frontier they did not come to serve the whole population. This resulted conflicts over whether to white churches members and the black population. The contestation of ecclesiology had repercussion for how the church was structured in 19th century. In other words, there were two approaches to mission, (a) to focus of mission on white settlers, or (b) to convert the black population – a contestation continued well after the end of such segregationist approaches to mission. Finally, I sought to argue that such a discussion of 19th century church mission is important to illustrate that the history of the Anglican Church in South Africa was significantly shaped by the history of colonialism, not only in terms of mission and ministry but it shaped the very ecclesiology of the church.
Chapter Five would unmask and focus on the outstation congregation’s experiences. In addition, their understanding of their role and position in a large parochial structure model. A special focus would be on examining how the Diocese of Natal’s expectations of outstation congregations and main parish centres has shaped their perceptions.
Chapter Five

Bishop Gray’s Imperial Model and Underdeveloped Black Parishes

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter reflected on competing influences and ideologies related to the historical emergence of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa, in the Diocese of Natal. I paid special attention to how the large parochial structure came into being with the accompanying establishment of (black) outstation congregations. Additionally, the previous chapter sought to tease out the historical roots of the structural tensions between the main parish centre and outstation congregations in the context status and policy changes. The concern of this chapter is to map the analytical route of the study. I discuss the theoretical and conceptual framework deployed to describe, analyse, and theorise the understandings regarding the challenges in the status of underdeveloped black parishes generally, and outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal, specifically.

The framework is used to refer to a structure of theories or concepts, which provide guidance for research. Some scholars, like Leicher and Smith (1999) attempt to make a distinction between a theoretical and conceptual framework. A conceptual framework is described as a structure of concepts and theories which are pulled together as a map for the study, while a theoretical framework is described as a structure of theory or theories which already exist in literature, a ready-made map for the study. Ball describes a theoretical and conceptual framework as “a set of responsibilities for thinking with” (2006: 1). I use the term ‘theoretical framework’ when referring to theory and the term ‘conceptual framework’ when referring to the concepts filling my ‘analytical toolbox.’ My contention here is that, whatever the distinction, the fundamental function of a theoretical or conceptual framework serves as an analytical toolbox in describing, analysing and theorising a phenomenon under study. Proceeding from this perspective, I have employed an analytical toolbox based on the following theory and concepts: (1) Contestations between settler church and parish; (2) The imperial model of Bishop Gray
and other role-players; and (3) the Diocese of Natal's underdevelopment of black mission stations.

The overriding focus driving this study was one of Church politics resulting from the Diocese of Natal’s Acts and Constitutions and Canons of the Anglican Church of Southern Africa. With this in mind I argue that the understandings regarding status of outstation congregations were theorised as a reflection of Church politics, as outcomes of the acts of the Diocese of Natal. Through a critical conceptual consideration I propose to unmask and critique church policy change under the three themes identified below.

5.2 Contestation between Settler Church, Mission and Parish

By 1832 it became clear that supporting seemed to have been regarded as one of the duties of the colonial administration (Hinchliff, 1963), and as such, the colonial government made more money available for the payment of the clergy. However, an earlier ordinance in 1832, which had provided the salaries of clerks, organists, bell-ringers in the English and Dutch Churches from the estimates of the colony, was repealed and the money saved was appropriated for additional clergy. The congregations were therefore expected to find money for their lay employees out of their own funds (Hinchliff, 1963).

As the Cape colony expanded during the eighteenth century, so the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) grew, but, “its growth was totally confined to white settler congregations” (De Gruchy, 2004: 2). Presumably, all missionaries from the beginning had it in the back of their minds that, as a result of their labours, churches would sooner or later come into existence. Commenting on missions, Neil observed that “these bodies, much sooner, or later, acquired all the characteristics and qualities that are subsumed under the term Church” (1966: 510).

Missionaries were hesitant about venturing into new expressions of the churches in regions where they were previously not found. De Gruchy argues that “the teachings and practice of George Schmidt was not regarded as a threat to the theology and authority of
the Church. It was also seen as a threat to the social life of the settler community to which the Church ministered” (2004: 2). The context was the contestation on the conflict between the settler church and mission church.

Missionaries were uneasy about the development as they did not want to be under the administration and policies of the Church. During this period church policy was used to guide and shape operations in society and Church through “the conduct of conduct” (code of conduct) (Gordon, 1991: 2). The claim here was that missionaries had enjoyed almost complete freedom and were compelled by force of circumstances to make their “own decisions right or wrong, in the light of the situation as [they] saw it” (Neill, 1964: 510). In some instances the missionary had to refer matters to his own board or committee. However, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) saw itself as an extension of the church and, as such, was at pains to emphasize that “those supported by society were agents of the Church” (Sykes and Booty, 1988: 432).

The Church Missionary Society (CMS) historically enjoyed a great deal of independence. Where the SPG placed primary emphases on church planting, the CMS stressed individual conversion into the Church, but not church planting.

At the World Mission Conference at Edinburgh in 1910, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Randall David) came out with a statement that, “the place of mission in the life of the Church must be central” (Sykes and Booty, 1988: 437, Moorhouse, 1973), thus demanding from all missionaries a new degree of thought and honour. According to Hewitt, “the missionary is a member of the Church in the area where he works and his loyalty and service actually belongs to the Church” (1971: 422).

However, in the colonial Cape Robert Gray who came to the new Diocese was of the opinion that “he was sent by the Mother Church with the task of laying the foundations of a proper organised Church throughout the colony” (Page, 1947: 7). Therefore, he came as an imperial bishop and embodied its model of mission. Hinchcliff concludes that “some of the clergy and probably more of the congregations, rather, resented the attention of the
new bishop. They were accustomed to running their own affairs and depending upon their own exertions for any money they needed, that seemed to them an entirely unnecessary luxury that the crown should suddenly wish a bishop on them” (1963: 35).

5.3 The Imperial Models of Bishop Gray and other Role-players

Bishop Gray

Bishop Gray’s “authority did not extend to the republics, when these had been constituted, so long as that authority was believed to be derived from the Queen as Supreme Governor of the Church. He had to look after Cape colony, British Kaffraria and Natal, Island of St. Helena, and, so long as it remained British territory, the Orange River Sovereignty” (1963: 34).

However, A. J. Hewitt alludes to the fact that the governor defined his own authority as including “the power of collating to benefices granting licences for marriage and probates of will, commonly called: the office of the Ordinary” (1887: 12ff). Nevertheless, this was not the same as granting full coercive jurisdiction of England ordinances. The governor, in practice, continued to use and exercise much authority, even to the use of the style. Likewise, the rules of the colony spoke of the governor as ‘ordinary’ in the absence of the bishop. The governors continued to use this title even after a bishop was appointed.

Notwithstanding these administrative tensions, the stage had been set, and the bishop had to make up his mind as to whether the Church’s mission would be to the indigenous people or to the white churches and congregations that were already in existence. Bishop Gray’s imperial model tended to take him to the places where, “the work of the Church among settlers, where a start had been made” (Hinchliff, 1963: 35).

During his fourth roadtrip to the settler churches, Bishop Gray was confronted by the indigenous chiefs (Sandile, John Chatso, Macomo and Umhala) at Kingwilliamstown. They asked for services for their subjects and, according to historians, “the bishop offered schools and missionaries, send him teachers and to be taught to know God” (1963: 41;
Lewis and Edwards’ 1934: 40). Furthermore, outside of Bloemfontein, the bishop baptised “thirty seven and confirmed twelve, all Eurafrican\(^8\) except two emigrant girls and an aged slave women” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 62).

The bishop continued on his road trip to Swellendam and Beaufort, where “there were several Eurafricans and one Bantu who had walked forty miles to be confirmed” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 62). The Bishop also visited the chief in Philip polis, the capital of Koks country, where the London Missionary Society (LMS) had a large station.

Although Bishop Gray had prioritized his work to the settlers as an imperial model, the indigenous people challenged this by insisting on his ministry to them. Also, the mission that he was given by the bishop of England was a priority to him. This directed his mission because he had to report back as an imperial officer of the state. Page argued that, “but there were other claims on the Church besides those of the handful of Anglican colonists. There was the imperative duty of taking the Gospel to the surrounding heathen” (1947: 9).

“Gray was conscious of this duty from the first” (1947: 9). He had signed Canonical obedience to the bishop of Canterbury and stayed faithful to that. He was consecrated by virtue of letters patent issued by the Crown, and his Diocese was defined by the patent. Therefore, as an officer of the British government “which had ceased to be a mere ‘occupation’, it had become a “colonisation”, had to adhere to the Mother /church as well as to the Crown” (Hinchliff, 1968: 18).

Four years earlier Bishop Gray had written to the secretary of the SPG concerning the problem of the “bloody and destructive wars which have so frequently taken place between colonists and these noble savages,” articulating his concern that the conflicts tended to alienate the natives from the Church and from Christianity. He went on to say that consequently he saw only two courses of action that could be taken: “their

\(^8\) The term ‘coloured’ was at one time used in South Africa for the Bantu as well as for Eurafricans, Hottentots, Malays, and Indians” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:70).
conversion, or their entire subjugation,” the latter of which he rejected (Hinchliff, 1963: 47).

Therefore, the bishop undertook also to resolve ‘frontier wars’ as much as he sought the conversion of the indigenous people. As such, the Bishop pursued a number of mission initiatives that reflected the extent to which he was pulled between his imperial mission model mandated by the mother church on one hand, and a more organic mission model determined by local conditions on the other hand.

_Umkhomazi Drift Mission Initiative_
During Bishop Gray’s third road trip, which took him to Natal in 1850, he consolidated his white Diocese and investigated the possibility of starting a mission in a territory designated by the government to be for occupation by the indigenous people. His mission station model was “to plant in each of the existing locations, or in as many of them as funds and labourers placed at any disposal enable me to do, institutions similar, in many respects, to those of the Moravian and some other Missionary bodies in South Africa” (Page, 1947: 22). The institution embraced the following objectives: (1) the conversion to the faith of Christ; (2) the education of young people as the formation of industrial habits; (3) and the relief of the sick. To achieve these “objectives an effort was made to include within each institution a Day -School, boarding school, Boarding School, Home for Orphans, and the germ of a hospital (Page, 1947: 22-23). Fowler and Fowler define ‘germ’ as “a portion of an organism capable of developing into a new one” (1990: 493).

Although Bishop Gray did send a contingent of experts to Umkhomazi Drift it had not yet attained much success by the time bishop Colenso arrived in 1854.

_Malmesbury Mission Initiative_
In 1858, Bishop Gray bought a farm for Coloured people near Malmesbury in the Cape, called Abbotsdale, which “was divided into plots which the coloured families paid in instalment until they had made up the purchase price and became full owners of the
property. This system is whereby mission stations were converted into communities of property owners” (Hinchliff, 1963: 46).

This approach was never the universal practice in Anglican missions as it was among Moravian missions. “The Moravian model was an ideal for a mission station, was: catering for education, trade, agriculture, and medicine, as well as for the preaching of the gospel” (Hinchliff, 1963: 46-47). However, it remained the pattern upon which most Anglican mission stations were modelled. In my view, however, mission stations for the indigenous people differed from place to place. Those who came to attend school remained and lived on the station for as long as they were pupils, and later returned to their society (Hinchliff, 1963). Consequently, there were those settler Christians determined to maintain the church on foundations of orthodoxy, both in order and doctrine, who thought they had grounds for suspicion and complained about this departure from traditional Anglican mission approaches.

First Synod (1856-1857)

The aim of this Synod was to determine the proper status and the best method of organisation of the Church in a new land. Bishop Gray’s early plan was for an independent Church and this was seen as in the form of declaration of Church Membership, which he tried in 1849-50 to enforce upon candidates for Confirmation, as well as upon Churchwardens (Kearns, 1913). The format of the declaration was, “I do declare that I am a member of the Church in the Diocese of Cape Town in communion with the Church of England, and I will conform to the doctrine of discipline of the Church” (Kearns, 1913: 24).

However, it would have been difficult for any bishop to try and secure self-independence of the Church so early in his episcopate. Hinchliff exclaims that “the members of the old independent congregations were sensitive about the loss of their rights” (1963: 49). None of the reasons given by the bishop were able to convince them.
In his first year of residence the Bishop consulted his clergy about the prospect of obtaining a Church Ordinance to give a legal status to all churches. His intention was to raise the parishes to the level of the Mother Church. Hinchliff states, “the bishop was convinced, too, that a new Church in a part of the world where heathen were to be found in great numbers must be free to take decisions for itself, to adapt what it had inherited from the English Church to the new conditions, and to be flexible in the face of the new challenge” (1963: 49). Based on the letters patent merits given to Bishop Gray, I would argue that it was impossible to frame a general ordinance without at the same time giving the state the right to interfere in Church affairs. The proposal was dismissed by the clergy.

In 1856 Bishop Gray formulated the Rules and Regulations for his church, which affected the Constitutional rights of the Church of England in South Africa. However, the bishop did this without obtaining any authority from the legislature, Crown or laity, which comprised the Church. Strangely, some parishes were finding it difficult to choose a lay delegate to attend the first Synod. However, Kearns points out that “Trinity Church (Cape Town) and five other parishes refused to be represented at this Synod” (1913: 25-26). Eventually, the Rules and Regulations were praised by the first Synod, and whether a church approved of them or not, they were called upon to conform.

**Provincial Missions**

In 1858, Bishop Gray proposed to establish a missionary Diocese for Zululand and he was convinced that missionary expansion could be achieved primarily by making it a provincial responsibility (Hinchliff, 1963). However, for this plan to succeed Gray had to send a team of missionaries led by a bishop from the very start. One of the chief concerns was whether mission stations would be “ruled by a missionary as by a chief, exacting compulsory service or whether, it should be run as an ordinary native village with its headman in charge, the people maintaining its priest and school” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 70; Synod, 1885).
It seemed quite likely that developing mission through designated territories was bound to lead to conflict because other denominational missionaries might well resent finding themselves within the boundaries and under the jurisdiction of an Anglican Diocese.

Archdeacon C. F. Mackenzie quarrelled with Bishop Gray about the proposed plan, and Bishop Colenso gave a recommendation for Zululand, but withdrew it. Although Bishop Colenso’s recommendation was for Mackenzie to be a bishop and head of the mission, Colenso ultimately ended up going to Zululand as a missionary bishop and was supported by the SPG. On the recommendations of the indigenous chief the scheme was withdrawn and Bishop Gray’s imperial mission plan had been put to practice in Central Africa’s Zambesi bishopric.

Ecclesiastically, missionary bishops presented challenges for both the church and for the Crown, “as it could not issue a mandate for consecration, especially those Dioceses that did not belong to it [the Crown]”. Secondly, the English archbishop could not consecrate a missionary bishop without a mandate. Hinchliff argues that “competition to sell rival brands of the Christian faith was the great curse of the nineteenth century missionary expansion but it did not really make itself in South Africa until late 1850s” (1968: 130). It appeared that missionary bishops envisaged their ministry as directed to the indigenous people, who “were to be converted out of one kind of society, culture, and life into another” (Hinchliff, 1968: 12).

It seemed that the missionaries and Bishop Gray viewed ‘conversion’ in quite different terms. On the other hand Bishop Gray, as De Gruchy suggests, “transplanted the system and organisation of the Church of England to this land” (2004: 16). In a similar vein Ward quotes the SPG’s Charter, saying, “to minister to English people overseas, and to evangelize the non-Christian people who were subject to the British Crown” (1998: 15). Therefore, the SPG understood conversion in strictly theological terms and this was confirmed by Bishop Gray’s report to the SPG that “two courses only seem open for us: their conversion, or their subjugation. We know how this last course would terminate. I
would issue with them as with other tribes who have been brought under our yoke. They would fade away before us” (Hinchliff, 1963: 47).

He was declaring a kind of “holy war,” as he had done with other tribes. The gospel was to be forced on the indigenous people. But Gray did not condone the strategy of cattle-killing in the 1850s, which sought to break the power of the traditional leaders and created a socio-economic and political vacuum that provided a foothold for missions and colonial administrators in indigenous territories.

The imperial missionary strategy was founded on the pretext of evangelism. This was the entanglement between the colonisation administration and Christianity that was waged upon the indigenous people, and was ultimately the cause of frontier wars in South Africa. Indigenous people’s resistance to white missionary interests and to oppression from the colonial government meant that Bishop Gray “was forced to plan his work carefully. There were so many things that needed to be done urgently” (Hinchliff, 1963:35). Nonetheless, recent historians of the Church acknowledge Gray’s pioneering work as a founding bishop, which resulted on the rapid institutional expansion of the Anglicanism in Southern Africa (De Gruchy, 1979; Chidester, 1992; Hofmeyr and Pillay, 1994).

Sir George Grey’s Imperial Model

The arrival of Sir George Grey in 1854 coincided with the division of the metropolitan Diocese into two: the Diocese of Grahamstown and the Diocese of Natal. Sir George Grey came with an imperial mandate to counteract the “Native Question (Frontier Wars) continued to absorb the energies of the local government” (1968: 44, 1963: 31).

However, it is important to note that Sir George Grey worked well with bishop Gray to implement the imperial model and to solve native problem in South Africa. Together, they implemented a number of initiatives that gave expression to Grey’s imperial mandate.
**Approach to Mission and Station Missions**

Hinchliff suggests that in the collaboration Grey took a very instrumentalist view of mission and concludes that “the new governor proposed to assist in the establishment of mission stations to prevent the recurrence of further frontier wars” (1963: 47-48).

I would argue that in this approach mission stations were created in collusion with the colonial government in conquest of indigenous people towards full colonisation. Japha, Japha, Le Grange and Todeschini attest that the term, ‘mission,’ whether it referred to an urban or a rural institution, or to one with a long established congregation as opposed to one which was setting out to new converts, came to be applied to an institution which catered for black people rather than white” (1993: 3).

In other words, the use of the word ‘mission’ was here diametrically used, not as Bosch defined it as “presupposes a Sender, persons sent by the Sender, to those whom one is sent and an assignment” (2011: 8), but rather as strategy to contain of the indigenous. It presumed that that one who sends had the authority to do so.

However, in this frontier the term ‘mission’ was used as more than ‘conversion’ to the Church and served to undermine the authority of indigenous leaders and ways of existence. Japha, Japha, Le Grange and Todeschini define it as being used in different way to the historical meaning that “it is used to refer to missions which consist only of ‘mission nuclei’ and which were therefore not centres of permanent settlement” (Japha, Japha, Le Grange and Todeschini, 1993: 4). The strategy was to convert men out of their native, heathen community and be settled in mission stations.

The architects of mission stations understood that “they were to be converted out of one kind of society, culture, and life into another, and in these new communities, these ecclesiolae, they were to remain for the rest of their days” (Hinchliff, 1968: 12). This was not dissimilar to the Moravian model of mission. The missionaries were willing to co-operate in the Christianization and pacification of the frontier. Although, it is also worth
noting that missionaries were pressing for the extension of British rule in the interests of peace and justice.

The strategy of these missions and mission stations were to divide indigenous people between believers and non-believers, which was thought to weaken the power of indigenous chiefs (Mostert, 1992). However, Bishop Gray sought to build his mission stations close to respected, but troublesome, chiefs. The bishop identified the Chiefs as: “Mhala next to St. Luke’s mission; Fingo (Mfengu) next to St, Matthew’s mission station; Sandile and Ngqika next to St. John’s mission station; Gcaleka under Kreli in the Transkei with St. Mark’s mission station” (Hinchliff, 1963: 48). The strategy behind this approach was made evident because “Shaw was anxious to place a missionary with each important chief” (Hinchliff, 1968: 34). Thus, such statements show that mission stations were doing significant damage in breaking down family life and authority of the chiefs. They furthered the imperial objective that, “the British administration of the Cape had ceased to be a mere ‘occupation, it had become a colonization” (Hinchliff, 1968: 18). However, the objective of the imperial missionary model was that “British occupation might mean the conquest of Africa for Christ” (Du Plessis, 1911: 233).

Approach to African Chiefs

Grey soon found that the ‘native problem’ in the South Africa was more complex than those associated with New Zealand and Australia. African tribes lived outside the British territory and whites were in the minority. However, Hinchliff asserts that Sir George Grey produced a plan of coercion which was “to lure African chiefs into voluntary retirement by promising them pensions and to introduce magistrates gradually to take their place” (Hinchliff, 1968: 45).

Furthermore, he had hoped to accomplish this through the use of schools, missions and hospital institutions to provide relief and ‘development’ to those under the chiefs’ care, in order to further his imperial model and regulate African areas. This strategy largely failed because the indigenous people were reluctant to accept white settlers in their areas and settlers never really accepted the proposal.
However, through Sir George Grey, Bishop Gray was able to develop his plasmic idea of, “a school for the education of the sons of chiefs and headmen who had submitted to the British Government as suzerain. Without the consent of the chiefs it was impossible to start missions in their territories, or, if such were started, to make converts against the will of the chiefs (Lewis and Edwards,” 1934: 81).

Both the ecclesiastical and the colonial leader in the South African colony thought of gathering the sons of chiefs and herdsmen and introducing them to European ways to ultimately convince them to accept an imperial model of government. Although the numbers of students increased, their objective was not achieved (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 81).

Although the first Synod of 1856 to 1857 discussed other matters “the important question whether mission stations should be ruled by the missionary as a chief exacting compulsory service, or whether it should be run as an ordinary native village with its headman in charge” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 70). It appeared that this was a strategy aimed towards the subordination of the indigenous people and, above all, would be the mixing of converted and unconverted. The indigenous people refused to accept the offer and it fell by the wayside.

It is worth noting, however, that Sir George Grey wanted to pacify the indigenous people by all means available at his disposal. The governor began at once to persuade the Church to assist in tackling the political and diplomatic problems on the South African frontiers. He declared, “the Church has now an opportunity of retrieving her character of recovering lost ground. She will embarrass my government if she does not rise to her duty. Now is the time or never. The SPG ought to back up the bishop of Grahamstown more largely than any bishop” (1947: 23).

Thus, as governor Grey saw understood it as part of the imperial Church’s role to Christianize Africans through using mission stations, with a view to pacify the eastern
frontier. Mission stations were settlements where the church was the communal building, and where elementary education, instruction in manual buildings, as well as instruction in manual crafts, was integral part of the missionary endeavour.

It was surprising that Bishop Gray never made any cautionary or contending statement to this directive from the governor. The silence suggested that Gray was at least relatively happy for the church to submit to the native pacification programme of the government.

_Cattle-Killing Strategy_

The 1857 Cattle-killing crisis which marked a national disaster of the Xhosa people.9 I would submit that this crisis was borne in response to British incursion into Xhosa territory, and that Grey subsequently exploited the situation, resulting in the decimation of Xhosa resistance. It was striking that the churches remained silent before and after this tragedy. Comments about the tragedy from the bishop were nowhere to be found in the archives or annals of the Church, which was a testimony to the Church-state collusion.

Davenport argues that Sir George Grey’s imperial strategy in the eastern province was, “to penetrate tribal territory with white owned farms and military roads, which was widely rented as if his was plan to substitute Europeans for traditional and cultural values. This resentment erupted in the cattle-killing of 1857” (1991: 122).

The tragedy was made all the more dreadful by the collaboration of Church and state, which led to the conquest of the indigenous people. The cattle-killing incident was primarily a millenarian movement of genuine passion and intensity to see the colonists expelled from Xhosa territories. Cameron argues that “recent studies among

---

9“Under the Xhosa prophets many Xhosa destroyed their corn and their cattle in preparation for the anticipated return of the spirits of their ancestors who were to aid them in driving the white man into the sea. A devastating famine was the result. Thousands starved to death, and survivors were forced to leave their land and seek help where they could. Help came readily from missionaries” (Page, 1947: 24).

“They were harassed by the post wore settlement, by mounting of population in the British Caffraira, by white settlers as potential claimant of further ancestral land, by missionary as a breaker of traditional custom, by new labour relations, and by the great lung-sickness epidemic of 1856, the Xhosa resorted to desperate remedies.” (Cameron, 1972, 165).
anthropologists, particularly in the Western Pacific, have shown that this phenomenon of ‘millenarian’ or total belief in a super-natural route to the attainment of a better world in the future, was usually associated with the rapid disintegration of tradition for societies under server pressure” (1992: 165).

The enormity of the colonial pressure on Xhosa traditional society was made all the more evident because, for the indigenous people, “life itself was inextricably bound up with their cattle [as] expressed by a Xhosa saying, inkomoluhlanga, zifile luyakufa uhlanga (Cattle are the race, they being dead the race dies)” (Mostert, 1992: 1187). Thus the decision to remove cattle from their lives must be interpreted as the radical eschatological event that it was. Regardless of the contestations over the motivations and interpretation of the event, it remained “a unique event in the traumas that accompanied European expansion and its impact was upon the indigenous people’s cultures and societies whose submission is sought” (Mostert, 1992: 1223).

Ultimately, the cattle-killing phenomenon did remove a major obstacle to Grey’s plan for the white settlement in the Eastern Cape, as well as broke the resistance from, and authority of, traditional leaders. Missionaries received starving blacks in their mission stations and colonists got more labourers. Hinchliff notes that “some missionaries rejoiced that good had come out of evil, the chiefs’ powers had been one of the obstacles in the way of their work” (Hinchliff, 1968: 49).

5.4 Dioceses of Natal and Grahamstown and the Imperial Model

The two Dioceses of Grahamstown and Natal were constituted in 1853 under the leadership of the incumbent Bishop Armstrong for Grahamstown, and Bishop Colenso for Natal. When Bishop Gray came to the Cape Town Diocese he had a two-tier plan for the mission and growth of the Church, insofar as “he seems to have decided that mission work to the heathen must wait until the work of the Church amongst the settlers, where a start had been made, was in proper order” (Hinchliff 1963: 35). During Bishop Gray’s several road trips he was often confronted by the indigenous people and leaders seeking
ministry, but he stuck to his imperial plan. The new Bishops for Grahamstown and Natal were key role-players in the colonisation and imperialist orientation of the Church, which would ultimately lead to the underdevelopment of black parishes.

**Bishop Colenso**

Colenso arrived in the Diocese of Natal on 23 January 1854, and spent ten weeks conducting reconnaissance. During this time “he protested against the hell fire preaching of the missionaries of his age, who presented the heathen with a clear choice between conversion and a graphically described prediction. He refused to accept that every custom of the heathen that it must be evil, just because it was their custom” (Hinchliff, 1968: 65).

However, according to Colenso’s theology the indigenous people must find glory of the Christian message and the light to all humanity. He refuted the notion that African culture must be intrinsically evil. This was the legacy of cultural imperialism that “every imported denomination has brought with it the trappings of the culture of the people who brought it. Christians of every culture must mutually appreciate the heritage of one another’s race, without prejudice” (Mugambi, 1995: 50).

Bishop Colenso used his position as the first Anglican bishop of Natal for the defence of Zulu independence and culture against aggression from the imperial missionaries, and this has been widely recognised today. Hinchliff asserts that Maurice had a significant influence on Colenso’s thinking that “Maurice was the great apostle of freedom. He fought for the economy of the poor, for the freedom of men within the Church to speak the truth and freedom of the Church from the pressure of outside authority and interests” (1963: 15).

During his controversy over eucharist. Maurice wrote a letter to Mrs. Colenso, asking her to “tell the bishop, with my kindest love, that the battle over missionary methods, he is fighting is ours also: nothing less than the battle whether the devil or the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is God” (Cox, 1888: 91). Throughout the controversy, Colenso continued to be influenced by Maurice’s ideas.
Bishop Colenso went to investigate the only mission station at Umkhomazi Drift, which had been founded by Bishop Gray, where he discovered that no work that had yet been started (Burnett, 1953). Furthermore, Colenso was keen to see the mission station operational and thus transferred Umkhomazi Drift mission station to a new location to be started at Ekukhanyeni, and to be “one of the catechists from Umkhomazi Drift, and left him in charge of the wild, unbroken site of the future Ekukhanyeni. Robertson was to become the great missionary to the Zulus” (Hinchliff, 1964:63).

According to Burnett, Colenso “[regarded] himself as a missionary bishop and wanted to make the acquaintance of the chiefs and see for himself how the tribes lived” (1953: 39). He wanted to convert whole tribes, rather than individuals. That was why he placed himself before the leaders of the indigenous people and their subjects. This would not allow misconceptions to prevail when he presented his plan of action, as he came to settle in his Diocese. It took a person of conviction to visit the indigenous chiefs at a time of tension, when local populations were referred to as “blood thirsty” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 303).

However, Bishop Colenso reported that “the savage was noble and that the missionary ought to attempt to build upon the elements of nobility in African religion. The missionary ought to use that knowledge of African” (Hinchliff, 1968:66). Furthermore, Bishop Colenso refused to regard the heathen African as a wicked savage, as they knew a great deal about God.

Bishop Colenso met Theophilus Shepstone, who was secretary for Native Affairs. He accompanied the bishop, as an interpreter, wherever he went. Shepstone’s imperial policy was to “[retain] Zulu customs and institutions, where they could be reconciled to Western standards, coloured the bishop’s approach to missionary work. He regarded the missionary’s task as that of leavening the social system of the African with the light of the gospel and not merely converting detribalised individuals and turning them into black Europeans” (Burnett, 1953: 40).
Shepstone’s policy fits well with the new Bishop Colenso. Shepstone was “criticized because his policy kept the Zulu and the settler apart while doing very little to raise the level of civilisation amongst the tribesmen (Hinchliff, 1963:62). Bishop Colenso, of course, was not innocent because he knew that Shepstone was carrying forward the agenda of colonisation and imperialism, and the ultimate end was the subjugation of the indigenous people.

Furthermore, Colenso had been an advocate of political and social justice, and encouraged Africans to make use of such political rights insofar as the law allowed. I already alluded to the fact that he was influenced by Maurice’s theory of the poor who need freedom. Other missionaries had undertaken the responsibility of delivering the Christian message across cultural boundaries, and found that the responsibility for achieving this undertaking, and initiating the process of contextualisation, rested on their shoulders. Hesselgrave argues that the “missionary cannot communicate without concerning himself with culture, because communication is inextricable from culture, just as Christ became flesh and dwell among people, so propositional truth must have a cultural incarnation to be meaningful. In the second place, the missionary cannot communicate Christianity without concerning himself with culture, although, Christianity is super-cultural in its origin and truly, it is cultural in its application” (1991: 1).

Taylor frankly admits that “during the eighteenth to the twentieth century’s, the missionaries of the Christian Church have commonly assumed that Western civilization and Christianity were two aspect of the same gift which they were commissioned to offer to the rest of mankind” (1963: 68, Ojikivuosa, 1977: 1).

Most missionaries focused on conversion and changing people in their respective culture. Although Colenso had a different view of indigenous culture and values, the overall purpose of the missionary enterprise was to aid the transformation of a people (whether individually or as an entire tribe) who would then automatically work for the transformation of that culture.
Ekukhanyeni Mission Station

All references so far are related to “white parishes where the congregations were predominantly English settlers in the colony. The other half of the Church’s work was the missions, which was different” (Hinchliff, 1963: 139). Therefore the mission stations were managed by colonial priests up to the middle of the eighteenth century. The indigenous missionary workers, catechists, lay-preachers, deacons and priests were in the background of the missionary enterprise. Historian, Philippe Denis argues that “without them the missionary would have achieved almost nothing” (1995: 9). This was the situation that Bishop Colenso confronted in his years in the Diocese.

The main task before Colenso was to establish a new centre for his mission in the Diocese. Adjacent to his residence, he established the Ekukhanyeni mission station, which was the real centre of all missionaries. From Ekukhanyeni the reach of the Church was expected to spread until they covered every native reserve in Natal. The station contained “a printing-press, a school, a theological college, a farm, a smithy, a carpenter’s shop, a brick-field and a Church” (Hinchliff, 1964: 68).

Bishop Colenso’s attitude towards native development, education and leadership was evident in his “missionary writings in the establishment of the Ekukhanyeni school at bishopstowe” (Lieta, 2003: 243). He was determined to establish a single centre from where he “planned to oversee both mission and the normal parochial work of the Diocese” (Burnett, 1953; Colenso, 1860; Hinchliff, 1964: 62). This was the start of what was, for a time, the most famous settlement in Southern Africa.

Bishop Colenso’s ideas emphasized reason rather than revelation, accepting indigenous culture and was oriented towards a liberal rather than orthodox theology. He sought to Christianize the whole culture and society of the Zulu, rather than make men within that society conform to the pillars of the society of the Church. “He had made his debut as an ambassador of Christ” (1964:63, Natal Mercury, 1866:66).
Bishop Colenso advocated the idea to “use what already existed in the religious ideas of the Zulus, as a foundation for the preaching of the gospel” (Hinchliff, 1963: 62). He asserted that the African already knew a great deal about God. Therefore, the missionary ought to use that knowledge. It was this positive attitude which led him to listen to the Africans and to learn about their way of life. Lieta notes that, “Colenso was excited by the possibility of using African religious custom as a foothold of Christianity” (2003: 245). However, Hinchliff goes further to state that, “he even thought the idea officiating at a Zulu feast of the first fruits, and, thereby, converting it into a harvest festival” (1964: 63). Bishop Colenso’s thinking was to observe similarities with the Christian festival of “harvest thanksgiving” (Deuteronomy, 26: 1-11).

The bishop went further to advocate for the Zulu word for God in translating the Bible, instead of a word “which seems to have been coined by the missionaries on the eastern frontier, of uThixo” (Smith, 1950: 98 ff, 102 ff). The Zulus “used the name ‘UNkulunkulu,’ and Xhosas used ‘uTixo.’ Use one word which appeared to be closest to the Christian concept of God“ (Burnett, 1953:62 - 63).

The Ekukhanyeni mission station contained the facilities that alluded to above, which were necessary to reach every part of Zulu life in the reserves. He believed that the mission station had to develop an approach that would give the indigenous people the glory of Christian message and the light in all humanity, rather than the imperial model of “preventing the reoccurrence of further frontier wars” (Hinchliff, 1963: 47-48). Furthermore, the mission stations should not be used “to assist in the policy of civilizing and pacifying the frontier” and he saw the role of the mission as “remaining until they [the natives] had become sufficiently civilized to take their place as full citizens of the colony” (Hinchliff, 1968: 45)

It was not always clear to me that mission stations were created to develop, empower, uplift, and evangelize, what Superintendent Philip referred to as “places of refuge” (Hinchliff, 1968:27). The model of Bishop Colenso was to “replace the conventional message of darkness, division and damnation” (Guy, 2001: 22) to offer at Ekukhanyeni a
model that offered practical training, industrial skills, as well as religious training (Lieta, 2003). Hence, there was a carpenter’s shop, forge, brickyard, as well as a printing press. Bishop Colenso planned later to include various levels of schooling, a theological college and a hospital. Guy affirms that “Ekukhanyeni was to be the centre from which light would be taken to other areas” (1983: 50-51).

This went a long way to demonstrate that bishop Colenso respected indigenous people, and the school and its pupils, not as faceless ‘kaffirs’, but as people with names, like Mkhungo ka-Mpande (King Mpande), Undiane and Ushume (Magena Fuze). The bishop refused to use biblical or European names for the baptismal candidates and wanted to use their parents’ names. The missionaries were up in arms about the way Colenso conducted his mission to the Africans (USPG, Archives, C/AFS 16).

Clearly influenced by Colenso’s approach to Zulu culture, Callaway, once he felt his medical services were no longer required at Ekukhanyeni, was determined to buy a farm well populated with Africans in the country in which he would build up a community.

He started a mission at Springvale, on the western frontier of the colony of Natal. “He set himself to learn the language of the natives and so study their customs, ultimately becoming an authority in these matters” (Page, 1947: 30, Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 357). Callaway had a development plan for the Africans which also motivated self-reliance. Callaway spent good deal of his time daily “writing down accounts given by Zulus of their customs, traditions and beliefs” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 359; Page, 1947: 30). Therefore, with the printing press he was able to make translations from the Bible and a prayer book in Zulu. “I have a committee of natives on the translation and we should try to develop Christianity among the natives in their own homes” (Page, 1947: 30). Two leading native converts, Mpengula Mbanga and William Ngcwensa, were members of this committee (Burnett, 1953).

Callaway went further in 1870, and wrote to the effect of European colonisation on the Africans, saying, “we are getting a congregation of whites around us, and they take up the
land so that the natives have no place to herd their cattle. We tax the natives, make them pay rent, interfere with their customs by our laws, and we do not give them much in return, they can appreciate” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 364-365).

Robertson too went to “open a new station at Umlazi, as missionary tentacles spread out from Colenso centre at Ekukhanyeni” (Hinchliff, 1963: 63), where a young African man, Usajabula, joined Robertson’s household and eventually became a catechist. Robertson was already fluent in Zulu and he was laying foundations at Umlazi for a mission. By 1859 there was a little village at Umlazi and the first outstation at Enwabi (Burnett, 1953: 54). He was assisted by Usajabula and Mr. Samuelson, a catechist, expert linguist and carpenter.

Following the removal of Robertson a few years later, the Umlazi mission deteriorated and remained neglected for many years. In 1927, the most important development of the mission was with its five outstations and medical work. The Anglican Trust Board lent money for building a ‘real’ church at Umlazi. The Umlazi mission was taken over by whites and they fenced it. This resulted in parishioners moving to worship at Enwabi as the first outstation congregation at Umlazi. However, the mission had deteriorated and had to be rebuilt because those whites had left. It became a real mission and five new outstation congregations were created.

Theophilus Shepstone
The administration of Natal was largely in the hands of Shepstone. He was a son of a Methodist missionary in the Eastern Cape. He had visited Natal in 1838 and in 1845, as a diplomatic agent to the Slambie, Congo and Fungo Tribes (Bird Annals of Natal, 1988: 473. Shepstone was appointed because of his past record, both in Congo and the Eastern Cape (Davenport, 1991: 101).

Due to internal wars of chiefs of the period saw an “influx reached flood proportions during a series of Disturbances in the Zulu kingdom” (Thompson, 2001: 95). In 1852 Theophilus was appointed to be in a committee whose functions were mainly for the
benefit of land-owning colonials and for the creation of a native-location system. It was the “location policy” which drew the bulk of the settlers’ criticism about native settlements (Brookes and de Webb, 1987). Thompson states that “the Natal colonial government tried to place the Africans in reserves which it called ‘locations,’ leaving the rest of the colony available for white settlement” (2000: 95).

Shepstone followed the imperial model of colonisation. Hatlersby asserts that, “as in most colonies with a settler population, there existed in Natal during the nineteenth century a perpetual controversy between the officials who desired to protect the native population and settlers who desired to exploit them as cheap labour” (1946:1 25-126; Brookes and de Webb, 1987: 57). This was a tension that was felt at the heart of the colonial government.

It was no accident that Bishop Colenso very soon made a tactical alliance with Shepstone. His ‘location’ policy or imperial model was, “to rule and civilize the Zulus by accepting the tribal structure, laws and even strengthening them, to make governor of the colony the ‘great chief,’ the centre of loyalty for the people and lesser chiefs. In practice, this made Shepstone himself the almost absolute ruler of the Zulu people in Natal” (Hinchliff, 1963: 62). It is my view, however, that this policy kept the Zulu and the settler apart and simply added to the underdevelopment of the indigenous people.

It is my submission that the imperial policy was deposing the chiefs of their authority and power, leaving their subjects vulnerable to exploitation.

In 1851, Shepstone fought hard to retain the establishment of mission stations in the reserves. However, he believed that these missions should not teach denominational Christianity, because the indigenous people could not be expected to understand subtle theological differences. Despite the ideological difference between Shepstone and Grey, there was a sense in which both men believed that mission stations might be an important factor in solving the native problem.
Imperial model was that there were those who believed that separation of blacks from whites was the only way to secure justice for the farmers or safety of the settlers. After the victory of the Nationalist Party in 1948, South Africa consolidated its power by systematically “eliminating every vestige of black participation in the central political system” (Thompson, 1990: 187). This was the beginning of an era characterized by apartheid laws.

There were those who believed that races must live together because it was essential for white land owners’ labour, or because they honestly believed that peaceful cohesion was right, and was the way forward for South Africa. However, the advocates of the imperial missionary model of the eighteenth century believed that the right thing was to convert men out of their native and heathen culture and community, and settle them in a context where they could absorb civilization and Christianity (Hinchliff, 1963).

Shepstone and Colenso made a pact to persuade the chiefs and principal men living in reserves in the Table mountain district, “to send their sons to school at Ekukhanyeni. He intimated that Colenso was a great missionary, and gave him the name, Uyise wabantu-Usobantu” (Burnett, 1953: 44). Bishop Colenso wanted to give skills and education to the boys to help the future chiefs “to absorb the tide of civilization that was to sweep over their land, might be so willing to be ruled by European methods, above all, to learn and practice it” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 80-81). It is my view, however, that this was a strategy of empowering the underdeveloped indigenous people, unlike the one executed by Bishop Gray, which was a strategy of conquest.

Shepstone also coined the name “Usobantu” (Father of the people) for Colenso so, that the chiefs and principal men in the reserves would allow their sons to come to Ekukhanyeni. Elsewhere, Sir Harry Smith in the Eastern Cape also referred to Bishop Gray as, “the great Inkosi of the Christians, the chief minister of the Church, which was the religion of the Queen,” when he introduced the bishop to the chiefs (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 40). These gestures lowered the importance of the chiefs and elevated the bishop to a higher position.
Indigenous Clergy

The importance of Colenso’s defence of Zulu independence and culture against colonial aggression was widely acclaimed in the twenty-first century. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) began work as early as 1838 among the Zulu people, but made little success in obtaining conversions or building indigenous leadership in the Church. Colenso did not ordain a single Zulu priest, but he contributed in empowering the indigenous people (Lieta, 2003).

The term ‘indigenous clergy’ was used “to denote those members of the Church set apart for the purpose of work of ministry, and who belong to the inhabitants of the land. The setting apart is usually marked by the service of ordination” (Lieta, 2003: 242). It is my view that any reflection on indigenous clergy would be incomplete without due consideration to the sacrifices of early converts and helpers in ministry and mission of the Church. They played a major role as the forerunners and guides for the next generation of believers, from whom the first ordained indigenous clergy came (Lenkoe, 1994).

There was great contestation among missionaries about the role and status of native converts. Some felt that evangelization was the domain of white missionaries, while others “believed that converts to Christianity should be left in their own native community. They should be encouraged to go out as missionaries, among their own people, and that African tribes and the African way of life should be Christianized as a whole” (Hinchliff, 1968: 47).

These were indicators that during bishop Colenso’s tenure some of the colonial agents were beginning to see the need for the indigenous people were participating in the development of mission station model. Consequently, Callaway, at Springvale in 1869, wrote to the SPG about evangelisation by the natives themselves. He wrote:

We do not contemplate making Highflats into a ‘missionary compound’ to receive native professing Christianity. There is a danger of such stations
becoming refuges for characters of the worse description. We must try to develop Christianity among natives in their own homes and not separate them (as soon as they believe) from their relatives to form a distinct class. As Christians, they become the salt of the earth, and should be encouraged to use their new power to bring friends to Christ. We hope Highflats may be a centre where native lads may be taught and trained if they seem fit for the ministry. Here too, young Englishmen wishing to become missionaries might learn the language and the rudiments of medicine. (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 363)

The practical issue of evangelisation by indigenous people received impetus to go further and suggested the need for a theological college for young indigenous boys as candidates for ministry. Lewis and Edwards recorded that “Revd Baugh at his death in 1876 left a sum of money to the bishop of Maritzburg in trust for the training a native ministry in Natal” (1934: 375). Callaway’s ideas, unfortunately, could not reach fruition because he became bishop of Kaffraria. His desire was to train intelligent natives for the ministry because he believed that “Natives are better teachers of their race than foreigners.” However in 1871 Synod suggested that “a high standard of education for native ordinands could not be reached, but that simple, earnest men could often teach the heathen” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 363)

Denis argues that “the making of an indigenous clergy in South Africa, was an attempt to answer that need” (1995: 9). Therefore, the indigenous ministry were initially not to be sent to theological colleges, but Callaway in 1871, believed that “the best training was a life of devotion and action” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 363).

In light of the above discourse, two helpers, William Ngcwensa and Mpengula Mbanda, were nominated for ordination and the bishop’s approval, but they were instructed to spend more months in training. In 1871, Ngcwensa, Mbanda and Ngobese were ordained (Lewis and Edwards, 1934).
I contend that in spite of the lack of an explicit reference to black clergy, Colenso and his team demonstrated their support for an indigenous clergy through their positive attitude to mission work among the Zulus. “Colenso attitude and motivation were evident in his writings, in the establishment of the Ekukhanyeni school at Bishopstowe, as well as his relationship with William Ngidi and Undiane (properly Ndiane) Ngubane” (Lieta, 2003: 243). It was suffice to say that “William Ngidi” was one person who was at one point “put in charge of Ekukhanyeni” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934: 335).

Three of the four deacons ordained in 1871 came from Natal and Zululand (Ngcwensa, Mbanda and Ngobese), where they had been trained by Callaway. The other denominations ministering during this era also ordained indigenous ministers. The Presbyterian Church ordained Tiyo Soga, who made a great impression on those who were sceptical of the African’s aptitude for pastoral work. The Methodist Church in 1871 ordained four Africans as their first ministers. They were Charles Palma, James, Lana and Bruce Mama (Lieta, 2003: 253). The advent of indigenous clergy also saw more outstation congregations springing up in African rural and urban areas. By 1880 Reverend Daniel Ngidi Mzamo was in charge of the Springvale mission station (Lewis and Edwards, 1934).

In 1874 John Khumalo and his friend, Charles (no recorded surname available), were the first indigenous people to be presented to the bishop to be admitted as catechists\(^\text{10}\) (Ngcwensa and Phungula mentioned earlier in chapter one were the first deacons) (Lewis and Edwards, 1934). In 1875 John Khumalo worked and found a mission near Escourt where he was appointed under the supervision of SPG.

The self-supporting priesthood did not end with the ordination of blacks in 1871, but it continued in the Diocese of Natal up to the twenty-first century. However the next class of blacks were those who had been trained as catechists, and they established many outstation congregations under the leadership of the rectors. They were discontinued in\(^\text{10} \) In the Anglican tradition, the catechist is different from a deacon and a deacon is different from a priest
the nineteenth century and those that were in employment were upgraded to the priesthood. They had to be sent to theological college for almost a year, so as to be exposed to the theological dynamics of the church. The last of the catechists was Reverend M. T. Mkhize, who was stationed at the Parish of Umzimkhulwane, outside of Portshepstone. He was trained by Reverend T. J. Vundla at the Parish Enwabi (Umlazi).

I would argue that it would be regretted to ordain professionals only. The Lambeth conference stated that “they may not have a high standard of education but have enormous amount of experience, their theological training may be college-based or parish” (1958: 2103). It was a system which allowed priests to improve their qualifications while they continued to work.

This model was based on the Anglican Communion of the “ordinary person who would remain in secular employment and support himself, but serve the Church in some capacity” (Wilson 1980: 164). The objectives were: (1) ministering to often widely-scattered congregations and (2) ministering in places of employment as chaplains. Kraft (1990) concurs that it would have provided additional staff for large parishes and parishes with many outstations. This line of thought has been confirmed by other scholars, (Paton 1960: 166-167; Barry, 1958: 160; Wilson, 1980: 164).

Although the Diocese of Natal was the first ordain a black priest in 1871, the same principle came alive during Bishop Inman’s tenure (1951-1974), when he gave permission to John Pender Smith to be ordained as deacon and priest for a white parish. He had never been engaged in studies for the self-supporting priesthood. Professor Brookes and Neville Nuttall (head of the teacher training college in Pietermaritzburg) had not undergone any theological training course but were ordained together with Smith. Both Brookes and Nuttall were highly experienced and dedicated Anglican lay persons and sub-deacons. However, training had not been initiated in the Diocese. These were directed to white parishes and none among black parishes.
Furthermore, self-supporting ministry received new impetus through bishop Nuttall who defined it as, “raised in their local setting and set apart through and appropriate discernment process for an ordained ministry and arises from lay-ministry, function alongside this stipendiary or Church supported clergy who will exercise a particular role of leadership and oversight in parishes” (Diocese of Natal. Synod Charge, 1993: 4).

Self-supporting clergy had challenges of attending clergy schools and retreats because they had fulltime jobs. They could not be chaplains at work places, as envisaged. Some were ordained before academic training had been covered, rendering the clergy inadequately trained. “Some of them became rectors and archdeacon in the Diocese of Natal” (Diocese of Natal, 2003: 21.4). I would argue that they did not achieve the objective of ministering in widely- flanged outstations in rural areas, as envisaged.

By the end of the twenty-first century self supporting clergy system would be unable to solve the challenges of outstation congregations. Significantly, black priests were now appointed to some white parishes and to black parishes supervised by black rectors. The mission stations were often under a black priest-in-charge, while he would be supervised by a white priest. This practice continued until 1964 when the Diocese of Natal Synod scrapped the practice. Priests-in-charge and superintendents all became rectors and mission stations became parishes (Pastoral Charges).

It was through bishop Colenso’s motivation and his confidence in indigenous people that the bishops that followed were able to take ecclesiastical transformation forward until black archdeacons and bishops were appointed in the Diocese of Natal.

5.5 Conclusion

The Church’s attitudes towards indigenous clergy added to the foundations of the marginalization of outstation congregations within the church structure. Mpengula Mbanda died suddenly of malaria and William Ngcwensa followed Callaway to Umtata, where he became a bishop of St. John in 1873. The division was already there in the
Church because of the existence of outstation congregations. Self–supporting clergy were not only naïve, they were regarded as second class clergy within the Church structures. The differentiation continued despite the ruling in the 1964 that declared all parishes equal, and in the 1970s the parity of clergy stipend. There is more recent evidence that the majority of black churches’ members were allocated to the margins of the very institution they made up.
6.1 Introduction

I will be using Diocese of Natal leadership and the experiences of members and leaders of outstation congregations as lens, through which I examine the different understandings about the alienation of outstation congregations. The research problem under consideration aimed to see how the different understandings of this alienation reflected positions and disagreements about the prevailing value of Canons and Acts of the Diocese. Thus, at the theological level, the research participants were asked to reflect on the position of outstation congregation and the prospect of a change in policy. In this chapter such different perceptions and views are examined and discussed.

As an interpretive study, a thematic approach was used with the view to giving a thick description of the research findings. To do that, emphasis was placed on theorising and conceptualising the various contested understanding by the Diocese of Natal leadership, main parish centre leadership and outstation congregations’ leadership as it related to the status of outstation congregations. To that effect, a thematic approach provided an empathic descriptions and interpretation of the understandings with multiple perspectives in one space. Such approach had the potential to enable comparison, contrast, analysis and insight on the phenomenon under study.

The analyses also interrogated the value attributed to outstation congregations and the prospect for policy change, as expressed the Diocese of Natal leadership, main parish centre leadership and guilds or organisations’ leaderships. The essence of the views about status of outstation congregations reflected different meanings that the Church politics had for the research participants. Such differences were examined in this study as a reflection of politics of the Church. As observed by Olssen, Codd, and O’Neill,
The meaning of policy texts, do not reside problematically in the text itself as something to be ‘discovered’ or rendered ‘visible,’ but in the relationship between the text and the social structure. The meaning and significance of policy at any particular historical juncture is something that must be rendered intelligible through a process of interrogation, by ascertaining the way that discursive contexts inherit within the social and historical processes manifest themselves in and through textual production, formulated and articulated (2004:3).

Thus, the study interrogated the contested understandings regarding the status of outstation congregations to render their meaning intelligible. An understanding of such meanings could have implications for negotiating Diocesan policy, in general, and about the status of outstation congregations, ministry mission and worship, in particular. This study is premised on the idea that prevailing views on the status of outstation congregations remain intact because due to a failure to interrogate it’s ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions and both theologically, and ecclesiastically sound. These contradictions create ambiguity about what the outstation congregations seek to achieve in missionary and ecclesiastical terms, rendering its theological justification problematic.

All in all, the overarching contention of this chapter, as well as the subsequent chapters, is to reflect and analyse the different understandings regarding the status of outstation congregations and the contestation over a Diocesan policy change.

6.2 The Perceptions of about the status of Outstation Congregations

This section specifically considers and discusses the contestations over a policy change related to the status of outstation congregations, as an asset. Different themes had been considered about this during interviews with the four categories of research participants, namely, Diocesan leadership, main parish centre leadership, outstation congregations’ leadership, and guilds or organisations leadership. These are presented below.
Overall the Diocese of Natal clergy and leadership tended to support a policy change on the status of outstation congregations, as a matter not only of policy but also for practice. The leadership did draw attention to factors that might affect a possible policy implementation at a large parochial structure level. For the main parish centre leaders, the emphasis was placed on the value on policy change, reflecting their need for a space to discuss policy in the Diocese of Natal, where knowledge about their perspective parishes could be promoted. Thus ideologically, the contested understandings about the status of outstation congregations reflect the various interests of the research participants.

During interviews on the value of such a policy change to the Canons and Acts of the Diocese in accommodating parishioners of outstation congregations the following themes were identified: (1) Interdependency and Autonomy, (2) Canon or Acts of the Diocese; (3) Growth and Empowerment.

6.2.1. The Diocesan Leadership

The leadership of the Anglican Church in the diocese portrayed the possible change of status for outstation congregations as being in line with the ethos of democracy in religiously diverse society. The policy change was understood as meeting the democratic aspiration of the Diocese of Natal, where parishioners of different pastoral charges needed to feel accommodated within the ecclesiological system. To this effect, the policy change was viewed as promoting tolerance of differences as well as ecclesiology cohesion. The possible policy change was viewed as fair to the different pastoral charges in the Diocese of Natal.

One leader of the Diocesan leadership (HOD-4) had this to comment:

Outstation congregations in a large parish is very alienated and marginalised. Therefore, policy change was perceived within the Diocese of Natal’s historical and socio-political context (See Chapter Four). Thus, while the Anglican Church had initially scrapped the system of missions and mission stations, in 1964, and replaced it with
pastoral charges (parishes). Contestation to this had been there before but it came to the front after 1964. The legacy of mission system persisted up to the twenty first century. There were those born at missions or mission stations who said ‘Born at the Anglican mission, gives me pride’ (MPC-4a).

Another had this to say:

The transformation did not give the alienated outstation congregations any relief from their marginalisation. It is financial obligation. Outstation congregations come from vast distances and it is difficult for members in the rural areas to worship in the centralised main parish centre (Interview, HOD-4a)

Here reference was made to the attempt by the Diocese of Natal to accommodate outstation congregations into the traditional and centralised parishes. This was an attempt to portray the ecclesiological value of the policy change in promoting unity in diversity.

**Interdependence and Autonomy**

On interdependency, one diocesan leader has this to say:

To be a member of the Diocese, is to trust one another and has dependency in culture. It means developing spiritually. The Diocese equips them by providing training. There will be monitoring of identified project. It means a lot in enjoying ministry in the Diocese. In terms of language, culture, and diversity, the Diocese provides theology and liturgical expression (Interview, HOD-4a).

They are interdependent and retain interdependency. They are connected to one another (Interview, HOD-4a)
This leader portrayed the understanding of the outstations as promoting equity for parishioners from different places of worship in the locality. This was expressed as the justification by the Church.

Leaders of Natal Diocese (HOD-4) reflected on whether outstation congregations deserve a say in administration of a large parochial structure model and had to say:

They do, as they are part of the large centre. Their delegates to parish council are expected to give a report to outstation congregations. They are allowed to submit their needs although they are not attended to quickly. (Interview, HOD-4a)

The above views reflect on the policy change as an attempt to accommodate underprivileged blacks, in ecclesiology at the status outstation congregations. In this regard he said:

They are all involved in God’s mission. They hold the large parish together financially and in other ministries. They are all accountable to the parish council. They are involved in administration. There is a need to allow independency and empowerment for accountability and provide ownership, which is the goal.

Many parishes see outstation congregations in terms of bringing in monies to the main parish centre. They are being abused by the main parish centre. (Interview, HOD-4a)

Reflecting on why outstation congregations who chose not to work within the large parochial structure model continue to feel undermined, the leader of the Diocese made the following observation:
Canons for chapelry council and chapel council do exist, but there is no mention of the outstation congregations’ statue in a large parish. When they are at parish council, they feel as strangers. They are inferior (Interview, HOD-4a)

They did not see any need to be part of the large parish. “The rector comes to them rarely, at times after three months” (HOD-4). There was no prompt attention to the needs of outstation congregations.

Had continued:

The rectors need to be empowered to develop outstation congregations. If the rector does not have skills, the bishop has to do that. The strategy will have to be reviewed. It is the responsibility of the rector (Interview, HOD-4a).

Leaders of guilds and organisations are not having regular trainings at the outstation congregations. The rector marginalises the outstation congregations. Home visits are not done by the rector and this resulted in not knowing parishioners at outstation congregations (Interview, HOD-4a).

**Canons and Acts of the Diocese**

One of the leaders of the Diocese of Natal (HOD-4) pondered over the role of outstation congregations in a large parish and its policy implications. The Diocese of Natal leadership (HOD-4) perceived that the possible policy change has a positive value. Ecclesiology and theology justified the coverage of outstation congregations on the premise that they were major traditions in history of the Diocese of Natal (Burnett, 1955). Thus, the policy change represents the opening up of space activities in a large parish. He had the following to say:
In terms of the Canon and Acts of the Diocese, chapel council, that is, mother church and branches, reach out to pastoral care. In terms of the chapelry, there exist chapel councils and chapel wardens, not dependent to mother church, but extends the church, expected to develop outstation congregations involved in God’s mission (Interview, HOD-4a).

Here the policy change was viewed in terms of promoting access to ministry, mission and worship. The claim was that because outstation congregations were poor, then, they would receive ministries to them very seldom and be arrested in a dependency mode.

In connection with promoting co-existence with the main parish centre, some of the leaders of the Diocese of Natal (HOD-4) went as far as to view what were the conditions of engagement for outstation congregations towards being part of a large parish. He observed that:

- In terms of the Canons and Acts of the Diocese, the Chapelry exists and this is the condition of engagement. Although these are not read out when outstation congregations join the main parish centre, they exist on the shelves of the main parish centre. In terms of the Canon, “Chapel wardens do not depend on the mother Church, but to go on and extend the Church. The main parish centre was expected to develop congregations” (Interview, HOD-4a).

The above views were framed within the context of the alienation of outstation congregations. There were no conditions of engagements between outstation congregations and the main parish centre. This view was also captured by one of the leaders of The Diocese of Natal (HOD-4) and had this to say:

- There is no empowerment of outstation congregations. There is no freedom to exercise their ministry freely, without intimidated either from the rector or main parish centre. There is no visible relationship
between the rector together with main parish centre and the outstation congregations. The visible ones are Holy Communion and finances. The Canon speaks of a space of interaction of equals and to reach out to one another for the sake of pastoral care. This does not happen (Interview, HOD-4a).

It was against this background that tension arose. The need for the policy of change became urgent, in relation to ministry, mission and worship. However, some of the leaders of the Diocese of Natal (AOR-4) critically considered the conditions of being in a large parish for outstation congregations, as opposed to being an outstation congregation. He commented that:

They are Mothers Union; St. Agnes guild; ‘Iviyo lika-Kristu’; youth forum; lay ministers; St. Bernard Mizeki; Sunday school teachers; confirmation class teachers; lesson readers and servers guild. These ministries are performed at outstation congregations as well (Interview, HOD-4a).

The activities of the outstation congregations are a backbone for keeping the large parish viable and alive. They became the power of strength to take the large parish to higher places. The independence of the outstation congregations rest with the rector and his parish council. The activities of outstation congregations promoted co-existence with the main parish centre in participating on large parish engagements.

**Growth and Empowerment**

In terms of the training and development towards the independence of outstation congregations leadership of the Diocese of Natal (HOD-4) had the following to say:

The outstation congregations required equality which would be a progressional strategy. The rector would need to be retrained in management and team work. Leaders need to be trained regularly. The
archdeacon had to monitor and evaluate progress and report to the bishop. “Involvement is for the growth of the parish” (HOD-4).

He continued:

There has to be trust for one another. Independency has to be installed in the outstation congregations. They have to be developed spiritually. They have also to be equipped by providing training. Monitoring and evaluation of identified programmes and projects has to be frequent (Interview, HOD-4a).

In terms of empowerment the leader of the diocese had this to say:

Outstation congregations have to be developed in all directions as a preparation for their independency from the main parish centre. They also need to conduct regular training workshops for all organisations. The new parish need not be very large. Monitoring and evaluation strategy has to be exercised by the archdeacon or the Diocese on regular basis, so as to regulate challenges and successes (Interview, HOD-4a).

6.2.2. Diocesan Regional Leadership

During the interviews with the regional leadership of the Diocese of Natal (AOR-4), The researcher explored the same set of three themes as they related to the status of outstation congregations: (1) Interdependency and Autonomy, (2) Canon and Acts, (3) Growth and Empowerment, viewed what it meant for you to be a member of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal, on the theme,
**Interdependence and Autonomy**

When asked a series of questions related to what it means to be a member of the Anglican Church, and how it may relate to an appreciation of other parts of the church, one participant had this to say:

> Worshipping God is for spiritual development, as part of the parish. I am in a team which is equal before the throne of God. It is to belong to the body of Christ (Interview, AOR4a)

He continued with a comment on church structure:

> The large parish together with other parishes receive occasionally workshop trainings from the Diocese to retrain the rectors and wardens on what is expected of them in their pastoral charges. There is a document ‘Parish Manual’ that is produced by the Diocese to empower the parishes. The bishop is the spiritual head of the Diocese. There has to be training for spiritual upliftment within the outstation. These congregations are in the process of development. There has to be independency and free communication between the rector, Diocese and among outstation congregations. The rector as a manager has to recognise all these interventions, for the growth of new parish. Team work is very vital between the rector and the outstation congregations. (Interview, AOR-4a).

**Canons and Acts of the Diocese of Natal**

Upon reflecting on those factors and policies that account for the current, marginal status of outstation congregations, the Diocesan Regional leader had the following to say:

> Canonically, they are part of a large parish. Main parish centre and Outstation congregations retain their dependency. They are to function
as a team, but they are not treated equally in a team. Main parish centre does not regard outstations congregations as part of the large parish. Then, their role is very minimal (Interview, AOR-4a).

For this regional leader, the value of the policy change was articulated in terms of promoting access to ministry, mission and Eucharist conducted by local lay ministers. On this, he had this to say:

To be enabled, not to be cared for. There is no budget for this, but bringing in offering, led by their leaders. Outstation congregations are perceived as in poor conditions, but they need information in the form of workshops. They are financially viable and need a priest to be scheduled to take up services (Interview, AOR-4a)

The regional leader commented on the conditions of engagement for outstation congregations towards being part of a large parish and had this to say:

In terms of the Canons and Acts of the Diocese, the Chapelry exists and this is the condition of engagement, although these are not read out when outstation congregations joins the main parish centre. They only exist on the shelves. In terms of the Canons, chapel wardens do depend partially on the mother church, but go on to extend the Church, and are not expected to develop outstation congregations, but it is the responsibility of the main parish centre (Interview, AOR-4a).

And commenting on the ambivalent position of outstation congregations noted:

The conditions of being in a large parish for outstation is, Canonical, except for financial contribution to the large parish. The rector is not embracing the outstation congregations, but treats them as outsiders, instead of being treated equally and it becomes very difficult for
outstations to have a say in the administration of a large parish. There is a sign of resistance to the main centre. Outstation congregations have to multiply into parishes in order to have a say in administration in their parishes. There is a need to rotate festival celebrates so as to demonstrate that equality and the uniqueness of a large parish, for example, Palm Sunday, confirmation services, and so on. Through elections, so as to elect all structures of the outstation congregations, so as to be recognised (Interview, AOR-4a).

The Regional Leader when reflecting on the role of outstation congregations in a large parish also made the following observation:

It means nothing because it is business as usual. Main parish centre sticks to the rules of the Canon laws of the Church. They are to extend the Church and are expected to develop it. There are no discussions and it is a one-way communication. For outstation congregations the condition is financial, to be in a large parish (Interview, AOR-4a).

**Growth and Empowerment**

When asked to reflect on matter of growth and development, the Regional Leader of the Anglican Church (AOR-4) had this to say:

Outstation congregation are not treated equally compared to the main parish centre by the rector and this requires protection from the bishop. The whole leadership will have to undergo intensive training, as a preparation to start a new parish. There had been no training for outstation congregations. It is high time old traditions and legacy of the missions have to be stopped. Gradually the outstation congregations can become a parish (Interview, AOR-4a).
He continued,

They need empowerment and developmental strategy in the outstation congregations. They should have a dream-like of being a parish. There has to be a sense of development and capacitation to be exercised. Strong independency, ownership and sense of belonging have to be instilled in outstation congregations (Interview, AOR-4a)

Speaking specifically on empowerment, he had this to say:

There is a need to train and empower all the leaders of the outstation congregations. If the rector does not have management skills, then, the bishop has to do it. It is the responsibility of the rector to approach the bishop for those skills he or she does not have. The strategies for the empowerment have to be reviewed regularly (Interview, AOR-4a).

And he continued:

Each and every member of a large parish has to be involved in stewardship drive, in all its totality. The rector has to unearth talents and skills from the parishioners. Self supporting priest’s vocation has to be encouraged (Interview, AOR-4a).

6.2.3. Voices of Main Parish Centre Leaders

In addition to the interviews conducted with Diocesan leaders, I also interviewed the leaders of the main parish – to which outstation congregations are attached. Under this category of participants, outstation congregations were viewed as an asset, on the premise that it was an ecclesiologically correct response. They appeared to articulate frustration about the ambivalent status of outstation congregations. Thus the policy change is
understood as a challenge over the tensions that arise between the outstation congregations and the main parish centre.

There appeared to be a sense that it was duty of any Diocese to strategies with the rector and the parish to address the new challenges facing the Church. These strategies were to be achieved through close alignment with the Diocesan policy and vision. From the participants’ perspectives, the Diocese of Natal had to align itself with the integration of outstation congregations with the view to maintain peace and unity in a large parish.

Commenting on the ecclesiology justification of the policy change, some main parish centre leadership (MPC-4) focused on what it means for you to be a member of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal, under the following themes,

**Independence and Autonomy**

With regard to interdependence between the main parish and outstation congregation, the leaders had this to say,

> We are God’s family. The culture of the Church was fascinating; in the way things were done in mission, ministry and worship. There was diversity in worship. Spirituality was through the unity in praise and worship. (Interview, MPC-4a).

Some of the main parish centre leaders had this to say:

> It is a platform where all parishes are equal. The large parish belongs to the extended family. It is a means of development in Christ (Interview, MPC-4a)

Another member of the main parish centre observed that:
It is a challenge to the large parish, as a member or part of the Diocese, to identify needs of the Diocese and promote them. Large parishes need to be motivated. (Interview, MPC-4a).

The Church’s value of the policy change was in pursuing a seemingly win-win situation between outstation congregations and main parish centre – a matter which was played down by the Diocese of Natal. One of the leaders of the main parish centre observed that:

It is a challenge as members, because you need to identify the needs of the outstation congregations at outstation congregations and take them to council. The council does not want to deal with these needs (Interview, MPC-4a)

Other leaders of the main parish centre noted that:

Yes, outstation congregations deserve a say in administration of the parish because of their financial contribution to the main parish centre. They are involved, as they are a part of the parish. This will help outstation congregations to know what is happening with their monies and how it is used. There is inequality in representation to parish committees. Needs of the parish are discussed in the absence of the outstations and if present are shut down immediately. It is the voice from main parish centre that is recognised. The matters from outstation congregations are not even put on an agenda or sometimes forgotten to be included. Outstation congregations have no space in a large parish to state their views. They end up being appendix to the top-down structure of a large parish. ‘You know nothing’ or ‘you just listen’ (Interview, MPC-4a).

Another main parish centre leader noted the frustration of outstation congregations at their lack of autonomy. He went on to state that:
Outstation congregations are angry of being always directed and cannot take decisions on their own. ‘Once a window pane has been broken in the church building, when parishioners fix it, they are reprimanded’ by the main parish centre. They are not allowed to open any savings account at any bank. All monies are kept by the main parish centre. They are strangers when they go to the main parish centre. When layministers from outstation congregations go to the main centre to conduct a service, congregations are very cold, as a sign of not being accepted. As such they were frustrated and chose not to work within a large parish as a protest against denial (Interview, MPC-4a).

**Canons and Acts of the Diocese**

Commenting on the status of outstation congregations, some main parish centre reflected that:

Canonically, outstation congregations are within the large parish and such have an obligation to fulfil (duties) in the large parish, for example, mother and branches. It is top – down approach (Interview, MPC – 4a)

Justifying the introduction of policy change, some of the main parish centre leaders had this to say:

Outstation congregations are conditioned to be in the large parish but seemingly have no role to play, as they are alienated and marginalised. The only role they have is financial. Although main parish centre forces the outstation congregations to stick to Canonical rules, they are expected not to depend on the mother Church. This is one way
communication which is not accepted by the outstation congregations (Interview, MPC-4a).

Another leader of the main parish centre observed that:

Outstation congregations are always reminded that you are subordinate to the main parish centre. All what is outstation conditions’ role is financially to the main parish centre. However, worshipping together with main parish centre is a challenge to the outstation congregations, because of marginalisation. They are against being told now and again what to do in their outstations, as if they were children. Outstation congregations play a pivot role at the large parish which is seen as not important. Outstations are supposed to develop and support the main centre parish. (Interview, MPC-4a).

Agreeing with the observation, one of the main parish centre parish leaders (MPC-4) had this to say:

Outstation congregations are involved in the following activities, St. Agnes Guild; Iviyo lika-Kristu; Anglican Women’s Fellowship; Bernard Mizeki Guild; lay minister; abashumayeli (probationers-lay ministers). What is frustrating outstation congregations is that some of these ministries are received at main parish centre without any warmth. Therefore, resort to serve their own congregations. (Interview, MPC-4a).

Another leader of the main parish centre asserted:

Outstation congregations are canonically within the large parish. It is a symbiosis interaction between outstation congregations and main parish centre. However, it appears that it is a top-down
communication, of which outstation organisations are against (Interview, MPC-4a).

And continued:

Outstation congregations are conditioned to be in the large parish. This is informed by financial contribution to the main parish centre. Main parish centre ensures that outstation congregations actually feel their inferiority. They are expected not to depend on mother Church but be involved in the mission of God. The only condition of being in a large parish was through the Canons (Interview, MPC-4a).

**Growth and Empowerment**

Further to the contestation over the status of outstation congregations, I asked participants questions about the prospects for growth and development. Main parish centre leaders (MPC-4) offered the following views:

Outstation congregations lack leadership skill. They are not motivated and [are suffering from a] dependency syndrome. There is neither fund-raising nor stewardship campaign. Parish activities are centralized. They have a low esteem and need encouragement in whatever they are engaged in. There are no proper training and management skills. Rector visits the outstation congregations in a rush and it is impossible even to attend to some challenges that may have come out (Interview, MPC-4a).

Another main parish centre leader made this comment:
They are supposed to work as equals as they are equal in Christ. There has to be a workshop on Parish Manual and Parish Charter for all outstation Congregations. Treasurers need also training on finance management skills (Interview, MPC – 4a)

On empowerment one leader of the main parish centre had this to say:

The outstation congregation will have to establish fund to repair church buildings. Leadership will have to be trained (Interview, MPC-4a).

Another leader of a main parish centre observed that:

Financial management has to be engaged in training workshops. Teamwork and transparency has to be the heart of the Church. Stewardship campaign and community development, the Church will have to be involved. Organisations or guilds will have to be revived (Interview, MPC-4a).

6.2.4. Voices of Outstation Congregations’ Leaders

The fourth category of participants that I interviewed was the local leadership within outstation congregations (OC – 4), to ascertain their experiences and opinions about the position and status of outstation congregations.

**Interdependence and Autonomy**

When asked a series of questions about interdependence and autonomy, leaders of outstation congregations had the following responses:
You become a role model in the community of the Anglican Church. It links people of all walks of life, for example orphans, poor, unemployed, to this universal body of Christ. You become knowledgeable with procedures and Canons of the Church. There is unity from the person on the pew to the head of the Diocese (Interview, OC-4b).

Another leader of the outstation congregations had this comment to make:

As a member of the outstation congregations, in the Diocese of Natal means not much, and still fill not empowered. Main parish centre has a sense of independence, but not for the outstation congregations. There is joy but also less empowerment. It is a pleasure belonging to the Anglican Communion; however, outstation congregations are still marginalised and alienated by both the main parish centre and the Diocese of Natal (Interview, OC-4b).

Another outstation congregation leader had this to say:

There is a sense of independency as they feel less empowered. It means worshipping nearer to one’s home. It means working hard to extend the growth of the Church, for example visiting the sick and the bereaved. Needs and challenges are easily identified. It means also to bring joy to the members of the church. There is lack of support as compared to the main parish centre, for example, rare Holy Communion services (Interview, OC-4b)

From these responses it is clear that outstation congregations were despondent because of the marginalisation by the main parish centre and thus many responses resonated with anger and frustration.
Canons and the Acts of the Diocese

Reflecting on the canonical position of outstation congregations a local outstation congregation leader made this comment:

There is none because church wardens present the needs of outstation congregations to parish council and the rector, but very seldom that they are attended to, forgotten. Even if put on the agenda of the meeting, it is delayed to the end when most of the members either left or tired. This frustrates outstation congregations from playing a role in a large parish. Their subordination has made them refrain from some of the roles they were engaged in. (Interview, OC-4b).

Another leader of the outstation congregations (OC-4) observed that:

The activities or ministries they are involved in are only to the outstation congregations. There is no rotation of lay ministers or any other ministry. However, it is the duty of the rector to rotate lay ministers to demonstrate unity of the large parish. People engaged in these ministries or activities are in favour of rotation. There are no workshop trainings done in a large parish so as to update them on new innovations from the Diocese. We are told now and again about stewardship but nothing has been done to analyse what it entails. The buzz- word is ‘money.’ (Interview, OC-4b).

Reflecting on the range of ministries in the diocese and its relation to outstation congregations, one leader of the outstation congregation had this to say:

It is only in Mother’s Union, St. Agnes Guild, Bernard Mizeki Guild and servers’ guild [are] that training is given. Although training is offered for lay ministers but there is no subsequent training following
to upgrade, discuss their challenges and successes. There is no regular training. This also applies to wardens who are not given any training except when they are admitted by either the bishop or archdeacon (Interview, OC – 4b).

Another leader of the outstation congregations noted:

As a member of the Church council or parish council; church council decisions at outstation congregations are not taken seriously by the rector and the parish council, as having no authority. Parish council meetings in their agenda only discuss the matters from the main parish centre and matters from outstations are not taken seriously. This gesture encourages absenteeism at meetings. (Interview, OC-4b).

In a sense, the large parish ecclesiology contradicts and suggests a theological ambiguity which negates or minimizes the “mission and ministry” contribution by the initiatives and campaigns such as ‘Arise and Build’ or ‘Masisukume Sakhe’ or ’Growing the Church’ which ordinarily occur within outstation congregations.

As such another leader of the outstation congregations’ commented that:

The large parish must appreciate and acknowledge at every congregation openly, the work being done at the outstation congregations. In most large parishes nothing is done (Interview, OC-4b)

Continued to say that:

Although we are one body, as a large parish, in principle, but actions of the main parish centre does the opposite. The outstation congregations, although in one body, are marginalised and alienated. (Interview, OC-4b)
Growth and Empowerment

Some of the leaders of outstation congregations also understood the need to respond to the pressure that came from the status of outstation congregations. As such when outstation congregation leaders were asked about development they had the following comments:

There has to be development in numbers in all congregations. Evangelism and visitation have to be the culture of the new parish. (Interview, OC-4b).

The outstation congregation leadership also had this to say:

It is to have a rector. It is also to identify skills in the congregations from people who are motivated for a new parish. Church growth had to be physically and spiritually. Powers will be decentralised. The vision is to develop financially through stewardship campaigns. Develop independence. (Interview, OC-4b).

6.2.5. Voices of the Guilds and Organisations’ Leaders

Commenting on the interdependence between outstation congregations and main parish centre a leaders of the Guilds and organizations (GO-4) made the following observation.

You belong to a universal body of the Anglican Communion (Interview, GO-4a).

In this discussion the leader noted the sharing in theological and liturgical enlightenment. The current policy stipulated that outstation congregations and main parish centre were
united. However, this fragile unity cannot be sustained because the outstation congregations were alienated and marginalized (GO-4)

Outstation congregations felt that they were marginalized. They did not enjoy that fullness because when the bishop comes for confirmation service, was always at the main parish centre. Reflecting on these concerns, a leader of the diocesan guilds and organization had this to say:

Church growth is because of outstation congregations and is projects driven by outstation congregations. It is to assist in God's work. Your services are conducted at outstation congregations (GO-4a)

Therefore, outstations congregations were very important for Church growth. The main role of outstation congregations is contribution to the main centre. Members of the guilds and organizations reflected on canons (policy) potential to promote mutual tolerance and one of the leaders noted:

The role of outstation congregations is financial contribution to the main parish centre. They are supposed to assist to the care of the priest but as they are subordinate to mission centre is very minimal. The church wardens of outstation congregations are supposed to take the needs of outstation congregations’ parish could but are frustrations because at times not on the agenda paper main parish centre sees itself as the custodian of the needs of outstation congregations. Lay ministers and Abashumayeli under training to become lay ministers have no teaching sessions from the rector, and there, it is after three to six months. It is the way they are treated by the rector and main centre as school children (Interviews, GO-4a)

Another said that:
They have a role to play at their congregations. Their activities or ministries are: Mother’s Union, Sunday school teachers, Confirmation Class Teachers, Lay Ministers, Abashumayeli, Bernard Mizeki Guilds, Youth Guilds, St. Agnes Guilds, Servers Guilds, Iviyo lika-Kristu, Anglican Women’s’ Fellowship and Church Wardens (Interview, GO–4a).

The above views reflect the potential contributions the alienated outstation congregations could make to overcoming differences among parishioners even at main parish centre. For them t was an asset to the large parish and as such be treated in humanely way. The contribution here was that this view represented a contested position on policy changes and in aspect of politics of the church. However reflecting on this relationship between outstations and the parish centre another said:

There are no engagements. Yes, to contribute financially to the main centre. No engagements, except for mother church, being an umbrella for covering the outstation congregations. The only engagement with mother church is only that you are told and cannot argue. You not very cared for except that you are part of a large parish any conditions to be in a larger parish (Interview, GO-4a).

Another noted:

However, the only conditions are canonical, between mother and branches. Outstation congregations have to ensure that they stick to the rules and cannons outstation congregations and us being appendix of the main centre. They need to be involved in the affairs of the large parish (Interview: OC 4a).

However, responding to questions about growth and empowerment one leader from the guilds and organizations noted the following:
The identified problems are that there are no training workshops for all the ministries at outstation congregations… Rectors are to be retrained to manage large parishes. …The rector lacks skills on progression development of the outstation congregations. The rectors have lost trust from the outstation congregation.

There has to be training of financial administrators at the outstation congregation. Transparency and accountability has to be the centre of the large parish. The church councilors need regular workshops, so as to strengthen in their performances of being oversees of their parishes. (Interview, GO – 4a).

The points raised here are based on the above views. Firstly, the challenges facing outstation congregations in a large parish involves the rectors to be re-trained to be able to treat all congregations equally.

Secondly there was a conception of policy change in the larger parish has been criticized on the premise that it was the duty of the parishioners to promote unity and trust but the rector as a manager has to promote unity and trust in a large parish. Another noted that:

They have to manage their own finances and stewardships congregation will have to be cultivated. Human and material resources including church buildings have to be stepped up. Embark on church growth by being involved in “Growing the Church” - Arise and Build – Masisukume Sakhe as a program and regular monitoring on evaluation strategy (Interview: GO- 4a).

A rejoinder to the above view could be the opportunity for a wide understanding of mission, ministry and work in a parish because of its multi - projects approach. However, the main parish centre lacked a wide understanding of ecclesiology because of its tradition legacy approach. It is only in a new parish where misconceptions could be
cleared while promoting peace, trust and harmony among parishioners. New parishes promote a space for dialogue across differences.

6.2.6. Focus Groups

To the focus groups the policy was understood as shaping and guiding the provision of Acts and Canons of the Diocese of Natal. That people with different theological identities lived and worshipped within the same geographic or physical space reflected the position of the ecclesiastical leadership. The claim here was that the positions of outstation congregations reflected the theological diversity of the church. For the focus group leader this is how the alienation of outstation congregations was understood.

Interdependence and Autonomy

Commenting on what it means for you to be a member of the Diocese some of the MU and focus group leaders (FG- 4), noted the following

Proud of being a member of the Anglican Church & was not the member of the Anglican. It is well organized and church with transparency. It is an opportunity to be a member of God’s Universal Church. It gives us a relationship with God. It has made us grow spiritually. It is organized in worship, Eucharist and procedures you become part of the people of God. You enjoy ministry and liturgical expression. It raises in terms of language and culture in its diversity different theological positions (Interview: FG-4e)

However another observed that:

The outstation congregations are sensitizing the problems they are facing. In the parish council outstation congregations delegates are not given outstation congregation delegates are not given any chances in the deliberations. They are not seen as parts of the members.
Outstation congregations are taken as a second to class in a large parish. There is exclusion of the outstation congregations. Training workshop is not done for the outstation congregations. They have no say, recognition and ownership. (Interview, FG-4c).

The above understanding was framed within the context of the controversy that arose in change over from missions and mission stations to pastoral charges (parishes) [see chapter three]. On the one hand, the alienation of outstation congregation would be introduced as a promise to be accommodated in main parish centre, yet on the other hand, this inclusion was simply understood in terms of growing the church.

What was clear, however, was that the introduction of outstation congregations was in line with the Diocese of Natal’s desire to create large parishes for the cultivation of critical knowledge and understanding of mission, ministry and knowledge and worships among parishioners.

Another leader from the focus groups noted:

They are against the main parish. They are not treated equally; the main parish centre is not satisfied with what is contributed by outstation congregations. They feel marginalized because they are not part of the decision making. They are free subordinates even if they have valuable facts to contribute. They have their inferiority complex when compared to the main parish centre. It is only their financial contributions that are needed by main centre. Information does not reach out to outstation congregations easily as they feel neglected. They are part of the large parish, but frustrated and not motivated (Interview: FG – 4c).

Similar sentiments were expressed by some of the Diocese of Natal leaders (FG- 4) who understood the policy change as an attempt to accommodate all people in the context of
an ecclesiology plurality and freedom of worship. However because of the alienation of outstation congregations, one leader concluded that:

Ministry to outstation congregations is not adequate. Less lay ministers and training to develop their shill professionalism. Outstation congregations are growing for ownership purposes, [but] church councilors and church wardens do not have letters of authority from the bishop. They resent the parish council resolutions (Interview: PG – 4a)

Finally another stated:

Outstation congregations need recognition and need to be instilled motivation so as not to be overpowered by the main parish centre. There has to be motivation strategy as ongoing. There is less of training workshops and recognition by both rectors and main parish centres (Interview: FG – 4c).

For focus group leaders and the leaders of the MU the unequal status of main parish church and outstation congregations – in terms of independence and autonomy - undermined the mission and ministry of the Diocese of Natal.

**Canons and Acts of the Diocese**

In relation to current policy one of leaders interviewed in the focus groups had this to say:

If there are networks in the main parish outstation congregations must be involved Main parish centre prevents the outstation congregations if they want to build a church. It is not practical that parish wardens are elected from the outstation congregations’. Church wardens from the branches cannot make announcement from the main parish centre. The only role outstation congregations they have to demand finances from
them, with limited services from the rector and the main parish centre members of the outstation congregations are not members of the parish council they are not recognized as part of the large parish. Outstation congregations have no role and main parish centre need to be taught “ubuntu” (I am a person because of you). Church growth “Masisukume Sakhe” – arise and build program is led greatly by outstation congregations in their contest. The roles of outstation congregations are invisible (Interview: (FG-4c).

Along the same views, another focus group participant (FG-4) noted that:

According to Canons, the outstation congregations are given power to play a role a large parish fully. They feel [un]accepted. They are not given opportunity to decide about their ideas or needs, even in their congregations. They do not have a voice in the main parish centre liven if in the parish council they are in the minority and easily vetted. Main centre dominates (Interview: FG – 4c).

And commenting further, another of the leaders of the Diocese of Natal had this comment to make:

They are supposed to support the vision of the large parish but they are not involved. They have no important role. They need to be independent and retain independency although they are not connected to the main parish. Even services at outstation congregations are not vibrant as in the main parish centre (Interview: FG – 4c).

Thus the alienated outstation congregations were understood as asset to ecclesiological diversity in the Diocese of Natal. And yet another noted:

The Diocese concentrates on the main centre canonically. The rector and the parish council can establish outstations not the Diocese. The
Diocese knows about them when it receives annual returns. The rector needs to empower the members of the outstations so as to enhance knowledge and skills possessed by the outstation congregation (Interview: FG – 4c).

**Growth and Empowerment**

Recognizing the under-development of outstation congregations some of the leaders of the MU and the focus group interviews had the following to say about the challenges faced by outstation congregation. One observed that:

> The parish council members of the outstation are not involved in whatever is discussed and do not accept resolutions. There is exclusion of outstation congregations and deprived of a regular visit of the rector. They are taken as second class congregations to the main centre. Training of outstation congregations in whatever form, does not happen. They have no say to the main parish centre in a large parish, not recognized and ownership. There has to be training workshops and development strategy. Rectors need management skills and team work. There has to fund raising drive (Interview: FG – 4c).

For these leaders trust has to be restored and be continuous. There has to be leadership training including guilds or organizations to instill motivation and a sense of independence from the main Parish centre.

On the matter of empowerment another had the following to say:

> [The] Outstation vision is empowerment and development towards being a parish. There have to be a sense of belonging and capacitating. There has to be independence, ownership and strong teaching workshop and investment in youth (Interview: FC – 43).
Furthermore, on alienation of outstation congregations one leaders from the focus group interviews (FG – 4) had this to say:

assessment and evaluation of outstation organizations need to have set objectives to accomplish being a parish. Finance committees have to be established which invest monthly at the end of the month to process income and expenditure, all wardens had to be present (Interview: FG – 4c)

In the end one leader noted that:

Outstation congregation need to be developed and the community around it. They have to grow spiritually engage in evangelism promotes organizations or guilds in the new church. Outstation congregation has to take care of their own responses, that is, finances and material as well as human. Identity skills and leadership potentials within the church assess whether members are pledging according to their capacity (Interview, FG – 4c).

Here, apart from upholding the rights of alienation of outstation congregations, their value was understood from the perspective of maintaining ecclesiatical diversity (main parish centre and outstation congregations) different convictions. However, the criticism could be that the alienation of outstation congregation have had a negative effect on growth and empowerment in a large parish.

6.3. Conclusion

The chapter has analyzed and theorized the contested understandings over the status and alienation of outstation congregations. Perspectives of the wide range of diocesan leaderships, outstation congregation and main parish centre leaders as well as relevant
guilds and organization were explored. The voice of each of the six categories of research participants has been presented and heard separately to illuminate contestation over the position of, and policy about outstation congregations. Many regarded outstation congregations as an asset but recognized the limits of church policy to fully effect this. Outstation policy emerged as a compromise between the needs of outstation congregations and main parish centres. Some misunderstandings by outstation congregation’s leaders reflected the competing demands and needs between the main parish centre and outstation congregations with regards to autonomy and interdependence.

Thus, with regards to the Diocese of Natal’s church politics and South Africa’s sociopolitical context, the outstation congregation policy would be perceived as strategy by the Diocese of Natal to be fair to the claims for the large parochial structure model. One insight here is that the alienation of outstation congregations seemed to have created “religious apartheid” (Summers: 1996; 11) in the Diocese. The competing demands for outstation congregations and main parish centre in a large parish could create a fractured ecclesia, rendering the large parish as a battle field of competing theologies and ideologies (Kelly: 1999; 167). The overarching argument of the study was that such contestations in a large parish structure, reflects the contested politics of the church.
Chapter Seven
Discussion and Analysis

7.1. Introduction

The three themes discussed in this chapter are a product of data analysis and they are identified as, Interdependence and Autonomy; Constitution and Canons and Acts of the Diocese; Growth and Empowerment. These themes are relevant because they depict the voices and views of the respondents during interviews. They will be relevant for understanding the debates or challenges related to outstation congregations by the leaders of the Diocese of Natal (Head of the Diocese, Archdeacons of the regions, Main parish centre, Outstation Congregations, Guilds and Organisations, Focus Groups). It is worthy of note that the analysis carried out in this chapter is both theoretical and comparative, based on the provided in chapter.

Inadvertent smokescreen: An Analytical Lens

To crown the theorizing of the study, I employed the metaphor of inadvertent smokescreen to analyse my data. The findings of this phenomenological study indicated that the essence of the contestation over the alienation of outstation congregations lies in a consideration of it as an asset and/or liability. In both cases, the understandings pre-grounded the theological value of the policy change without articulating its theological contradictions. The perceived positive and negative ecclesiastical value of the policy was fore-grounded by theological and political interests.

A smokescreen is said to be a way of hiding your real findings, intentions or activities (Macmillan: 2005). However, I used the expression, “inadvertent smokescreen” here to expose and discuss the real feelings, intentions of the various stakeholders. Employing this as a metaphor, I contend that the understandings by the Diocese of Natal officials, bishops, archdeacons, main parish centre, outstation congregations, guilds or organizations and focus groups is fore-grounded by the perceived theological value afforded the status of outstation congregations.
Commenting on the value of metaphors, Lefrancois observed that a metaphor is useful in giving expression, through comparison, about an issue which, cannot be described very precisely, and in short has to be inferred rather actually seen, hence the need for metaphors, which are simply a comparison. Metaphor does not say “This is that’ instead they say “It is interesting, or amusing or useful to look at this through it were” like that. Hence, a metaphor cannot be judged in terms of whether it useful, interesting or amusing (1997: 157).

My thesis was that the perceived value of the outstation congregation policy may have inadvertently smoke-screened the inherent theological contradictions therein. In the case of this study, the perceived theological value of the status of outstation congregations obscured not only its theological and ecclesiastical contradictions but also the lived experiences of parishioners in the main parish centre and within outstation congregations.

A critical examination of the alienation of outstation congregations have exposed the ontological epistemological and methodological contradictions embedded in the split nature of a large parish policy. Through this thesis I have sought to explore how such contradictions negates or minimize it perceived ecclesiastical value as it relates to mission and ministry. From this perspective, its ecclesiastical value of the outstation congregation policy could be justified more on political than theological grounds. It provided a modus vivid for people with two different conceptions of mission, ministry and worship to co-exist within the same parish. It accommodated the main parish centre different demands for policy change respectively, and the outstation congregation desire for development.

Thus, an attempt to align a political vision of accommodating conflicting demands was made at the cost of combining the outstation congregation to the main parish centre. In a sense it was a politically motivated policy, oriented towards maintaining peace and unity among congregations with different and competing demographics within a large parish.
This created an ecclesiastical ambiguity about the role of a large parish in a Diocese of Natal. Figure 9.1 below attempts to summarize aspects of the metaphor of inadvertent smokescreen as conceptualized in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Perceived, theological value of the policy</th>
<th>1. Supposedly real, political value of the policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Good for the Diocese of Natal’s goods of education, democracy, canons and Acts of the Diocese and parish cohesion.</td>
<td>• Creating a win-win situation between main parish centre (mother church) and outstation congregations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Effect of the perceived theological value</th>
<th>2. Effects of the real (political) value.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Masking the theological contradictions and political value of the alienation of outstation congregations.</td>
<td>• Creating theological contradictions due to main parish and outstation congregations’ space of the alienation of outstation congregations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An alienation of outstation congregations failing to promote a large parish with capacity to celebrate differences through one policy space.</td>
<td>• Alienation of the outstation congregations maintaining peace and unity among congregation with different demands for a large parish at a cost of theological congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recipe for division in a long run.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9.1: THE METAPHOR OF INADVERTENT SMOKESCREEN**

The contention here was that the contested understanding about the status of outstation congregations did not render the policy change beneficial on theological grounds. Instead, it create ecclesiastical contradictions about the nature and role of a large parish in the Diocese of Natal. Both understandings portray the alienation of outstation congregations as an asset and/or liability. The argument here was that while the political vision of
maintaining peace and unity was achieved, the created ecclesiastical contradictions which negated and minimized the policy’s potential in terms of developing a large parish’s capacity to overcome congregational differences.

Thus, in the short term, the position of outstation congregations may seem valuable and providing a win-win situation for those who wish to be part of a parish. In the long run, this policy could be seen as a recipe for the division of large parishes. Ultimately, the provisional findings of this thesis is that the policy reflects Diocesan failure to come to come up with a parish model that would promote congregational cohesion and dialogue across difference.

7.2 Theme One: Interdependence And Autonomy Of Outstation Congregations

My observation of the above theme depicts the outstation congregations’ status in a large parish and the environment they endure. I hope this debate will be able to arrest the status of the outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal. The church leaders too will show their position on the theme. I am bringing into the conversation the views of the leader of the Diocese of Natal and comment on what it means to be a member of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal. The Diocesan leader had this to say:

It means a lot for the Diocese. We enjoy the ministry of the Diocese, in terms of diversity, in terms of language and culture. My observation of the above theme depicts the outstation congregations, status in a large parish and the environment they endure in a large parish. I hope this debate will be able arrest the aspirations of the outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal. (HOD – 4)

My reflection on this statement is that while it may be true at parish and diocese level, but for large parish it is a different story. Outstations congregations are marginalized by the large parishes. Some of the ministries of the Diocese do not filter to outstation congregations. There is no line of communications that may be identified. In this regard one regional leader had this to say:
We are together for spiritual development as part of the parish and the Diocese. We are in a team which is equal before the throne of God. It is to belong to the Body of Christ (Interview, AOR-40a)

My observation on this view is therefore, although outstation congregations are on the margins of the main parish centre, they are nonetheless perceived as belonging to the wider Anglican Communion. Because they do not receive resources from the Diocese, especially the annual vision given to parishes, the outstation congregation's interdependence on the main parish is compromised. Notwithstanding this state of affairs, the head of the Diocese of Natal remarked:

We are all involved in God’s mission; many parishes see outstations in terms of bringing in monies to the main parish centre. Outstation congregations are abused by the main parish centre even if we are in the same parish and under the umbrella of the Anglican Church (Interview, HOD-4).

My reflection on the above view is that within the Diocese of Natal as both the main and outstation congregations are viewed as one unit, but in that unity there exist an inequality within God’s Church. The outstation congregations are marginalized and do not enjoy that equality and independence. Furthermore, apart from the monetary contribution from outstation congregation, they noted that there is little training that is cascaded to the outstation congregations.

My observation is that however, not everyone held this Unitarian view of the church. For example one main parish leader noted that:

There is unity but not dominance belonging to an extended family (interview, MPC-4a)

This participant noted that there was a relationship of interdependence but from my research I found that their independence was only in mission, ministry and worship. This model thus frustrated the outstation congregations desire to grow and become a self-administering and self-sustaining parish. That unity would be best when it is in action. N.
Barney Pityana had this to say in this discourse that as he reflected on his own history within the church:

In 1957 I was confirmed by Archibald Howard Cullen, Bishop of Grahamstown in the little church at farming district of Kleinpoort, dedicated to St. George, one of the extensive outstation to St. Anne’s Church (Document, Port Elizabeth, 6 September 2014, p1).

My reflection is that unity was demonstrated even at outstation, at a farming district. This would send a clear message that in a large parish all congregations are equal. The impression given here was that they had to work together and fulfill their roles in mission, ministry and worship. Many were skeptical about the benefit of working together since they are on parallel terrains. Some of the leaders of the Diocese of Natal (HOD-4) observed that:

In terms of Canons and Acts of the Diocese, parish council, that is, mother Church and the branches, reach out to pastoral care. There also exist Chapel Council and Church wardens, not dependent on mother Church, but extended the Church council and is expected to develop outstations congregations. They have to be involved in God's mission (Interview, HOD-4a).

The various interpretation of the church policy about the status and role of outstation congregation became the central issue of contestation between outstation congregations and the main parish centre. The backward and forward movement of the Canons referred here was that main parish centre (mother Church) would reach out to the outstation congregations and vice versa. "Outstation congregations feel discriminated by the main parish centre” (FG-44). They need to be developed on their own and become autonomous the bishop has to ensures that the rector supported the outstation congregations in their journey of development. A regional leader of the Diocese of Natal (AOR-4) had this to say:

Canonically, outstation congregations are part of the large parish. Main parish centre and outstation congregations retain their dependency. They are to function as a team. Main parish centre does not regard
outstation congregations as part of the large parish. The outstation congregations’ role is minimal (Interview, AOR-4a)

My reflection on this view however, is that teachings from the Diocese of Natal main parish centre does not cascaded to the outstation congregations. The Canon stated categorically that, “The Incumbent licensed to any Pastoral Charge shall have the power, if the bishop approves, to establish Chapelries within his charge, where separate congregations assemble for Divine Worship, such Chapelries remaining under his own jurisdiction, saving all ordinary rights of the bishop” (ACSA, 1994:58(4); 65(1); 67(3); 68(8); 69)

The ongoing contestation rests within the fact that there was nothing said in the Canons about “pastoral Charges with many congregations” (1994:65(1). This was the context of the contestation in my study. The outstation congregations were mentioned only in passing in the Canon and they have no power except the Chapelries. The Canon made it clear that those outstation congregation that have gained status as Chapelries were set on a progressional process towards becoming a parish. Thus regular outstation congregations were at the mercy of the rector and parish council for recommendation of a change of status to be made to the Diocese.

The large parish receives guidance and procedures from the Diocese and these are not passed on to the outstation congregations. Nobody takes the trouble to conduct workshops on the Canons and Procedures on Pastoral Charge (HOD-4) which would mark the first step toward changing the congregation’s status. The contestations were becoming critical as some sentiments were expressed by main parish church leaders (MPC-4) as follows:

    We are against being empowered on what to do in our outstation congregations, as if we were children (Interview, MPC-4a).

My reflection on this view is that this view was the cause of resistance from the alienated outstation congregations and not prepared to perform any role out from their congregations. All in all, the lack of adequate teaching about Canons in certain congregations was the cause of a call for a policy change related to the status of outstation congregations. The leader of the Diocese of Natal noted that:
the activities which outstation congregations in a large parish were involved included “They are lay ministers, mother's union Anglican women's fellowship, St. Agnes guild, Iviyo likaKrestu (Legions of Christ), Bernard Mizeki guild, Sunday school teachers, confirmation class teacher, youth forum and servers' guild” (Interview, HOD-4a).

My research reflected a sentiment that that the outstation congregations were not prepared to perform services to the main parish centre, but to their outstation congregations. Although one of the regional leaders of the church still advocated the large parochial structure model to be a member of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal. He stated that:

It is belonging to an extended family of the Anglican Communion
and is to be part of the Church where worship and praise is spiritual (Interview, (AOR – 4a)

To maintain this current practice meant that outstation congregations would not embrace this sentiment because they feel marginalized by the main parish centre. Many feel that praise and worship is vibrant at the outstation congregations and they are not prepared to change. This sentiment is echoed by Neo Motlhabane when argued that, “Time to change the status quo? After all, it was in colonial times that the Anglican Church was introduced to Africa; when indigenous Africans had no say” (Southern Anglican, April 2008, vol. 28, pp. 50-51).

However some leaders of the focus group felt that outstation congregation desire for autonomy instead sowed division. He noted that:

Outstation congregations are nuisance to the main parish centre and are not treated equally, with the main parish centre. Outstation congregations do not attend the events like confirmation because they do not feel that they belong. (Interview, FG – 4c).
My observation on this comment is that it reflects the mistrust between the main parish centre and the outstation congregations. The solution to this problem would be to identify viable and with strong ministry outstations on probation or developmental strategy for some years. It should not reach a stage where parishioners move to other distant parishes or other churches. However outstation congregations find that nothing has been sent to them to implement. Therefore, there can be no spiritual development when relations are sour. The quoted vision of the Diocese does not reach down to outstation congregations. My observation is that attacks from the outstation congregations do not go well with the leadership of the Diocese of Natal. That was why some respondents were a bit emotional when this was discussed and others were disgruntled with the system of a large parochial structure model, in the Diocese of Natal. The leaders of the outstation congregations (OC – 4) had this to say:

None of the outstation congregations are involved as members of the finance committee, but the main centre. We are only involved during counting and banking, but at some parishes monies are given to the rector as well as banking. There are no feedbacks to what was paid for and the monies received. We do not even know what assessment is and how much it was. There is no transparency and accountability. That is why our vestries are never held in time because books have not been not been done well (Interview, OC – 4b).

Furthermore the leader of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal.

Made this comment:

Outstation congregations are large and needs to be cut down so as to be manageable (Interview, HOD-4a)

Most participants suggested that there has to be more workshop trainings done so as to help the parishioners understand financial and administration management. Most of the information that came out from the respondents was new to the leaders of the Diocese. There was a feeling of no transparency and accountability from the main parish centre, as they were the custodian of the large parish. Some respondent felt that the Diocese has to
identify prospective outstation congregations and put them on probation of about three years, while monitoring their progress.

My general observation about the views expressed by regional Diocesan leaders is the unity of the Diocese as the family of God. This unity is disputed by the outstation congregations as they are marginalized and their priority is to be the Church in the world - pastoral, rather than be the universal Church. There is evidently a difference in their understanding of ‘what it means to be a Church’. These are indicators that interdependence and autonomy are seen as more than mere buzz words but an expression of aspiration to become autonomous parishes or “multiplication of Parishes” as envisaged by the Diocese of St. Marks the Evangelist. (Ad Clerum, 21 June 2007, pp.3-4). Neo Motlhabane argues that “The Anglican Church is (has) to be open to embracing this apparent leaning towards change” (Southern Anglican, April 2011, vol. 28, pp.51) and it is precisely this change that is needed in a large parish with contestations over autonomy.

It would appear that outstation congregations feel that the Diocese was aware of their frustration but that the Diocese never intervened. A case cited was the Parish Manual and Parish Charter which were never used in most black parishes, and even less so among outstation congregations. This was well articulated by a focus group participant who said that:

Outstation congregations are appendix of the main centre parish.
Feeling minor and not part of the decision- makers. They feel subordinated by the main parish centre. The rector is always at the main parish centre (FG-4c).

Outstation congregations developed and supported the main parish centre, although finances and offerings were not the only means of supporting the main parish centre. They also assisted parish centres through lay ministers and treasurers. Furthermore, when reflecting on the activities of outstation congregations, the parish leaders (MPC-4) observe that:
They assist in home-cells. There are confirmation class teachers and members of parish guilds. Others are engaged in being treasures, church wardens, Sunday school teacher, youth forums, and mothers’ union. Others are visiting the sick, evangelism, and training of probationers, as to be lay ministers. They motivate members to understand what tithing, pledging and thanks giving were in Church. Some are member of the Anglican Women’s Fellowship (interview, MPC-4a).

Any reflection on the current state of ecclesiastical relation suggests that the morale of outstation congregations was very low and there were no pastoral structures developed to change this. The large parochial structure existed because it was the rector and the parish council who established the merger between main parish centre and outstation congregations.

For example, the names and numbers of outstation congregations were not included in the Diocesan Directory, until 2011 (Diocese of Natal, 2011). It became a liability because of additional pressure outstation congregations put on everyone in the Diocese.

My reflection on the views of the main parish centre is as a result of these challenges to the large parochial structure model, they had to be problem–solving mechanisms that are directed toward the challenges in the Diocese of Natal in order to work out a solution with those concerned. These would be in the form of Acts of the Diocese, first on policy change to the status of Chapelry, but also on a progressional development strategy (FG-4). I have already mentioned that outstation congregation where establish by the rector as the large parish and they would be the first to initiate a policy change.

Furthermore, my observation is focused on the paradigm shift or the mind set from the main parish centre and the rector. Opening verses, “we are in a storm buffeting the churches”. The storm is so serious that it marks an end of business as usual and mark a
need for us to begin again building Church from the ground up” (Mead, 1994:1). This was also echoed by the bishop of Natal when he argued that, “I have no interest in presiding as a bishop over a dwindling and this dispirited Church, but over one which is energetic and positive, with a sense of vision and purpose” (Document on Parish charter, 11 November 2003 :1)

We are challenged to take imaginative and courageous action that might include alternative model on ministry, mission and Episcopal oversight. We agreed that we must be willing to take risks, in faith (Anglican Churches of southern Africa Document: To the Laos, February 2012:1)

Therefore, my observation is for the Diocese of Natal to face these challenges on the relationship at the large parish remedy the situation, the outstation congregation needs to progress on development and training strategy, for mission, ministry and worship. There is also a need:

They had to empower leaders to develop the congregations. If the rector does not have skills, the bishop has to do that (interview, HOD- 4a)

My observation is that the bishop also has an urge for the outstation congregation to develop and become autonomous parishes. This would be in the progressional development strategy. I would argue that this policy change should maintain peace and unity in the Diocese because, if not, “we would all sink” (Mead, 1994:1).

My general observation on the views and prospective of main parish centre is that independence that will lead to autonomy of outstation congregations may be a solution.
This has to be looked into in depth by the bishop before parishioners move to other parishes or other churches.

These are the views and perspectives of outstation congregations’ leaders as they reflect on interdependence and autonomy, in the context of a large parish. Reflecting on what it meant to be a member of the Anglican Church in Natal, a leader of the outstation congregation (OC – 4) had the following to say:

It means unity, and role model the main parish centre must be exemplary in visiting the sick, the unemployed in order to boost their spiritual confidence. We had to bring children to Church and be one with God. We need to reach out to the community. It means to be knowledgeable with procedures of the Anglican Church and Canon of the Diocese of Natal. (Interview, OC-4b)

My observation on the above view is that the outstation congregations have put, as their priority, pastoral work to the community and also to be knowledgeable to the procedures of the Anglican Church, then later on, the unitary Church. There after outstations are able to enjoy the wider fellowship and also with other congregations outstation congregations are then exposed to the Diocesan dynamics of the Anglican Church. They are able to participate in the Diocesan anniversaries. New innovative programmes, like Masisukume Sakhe or Arise and Build. The large parish will then form a link between parishioners and the Diocese.

Some outstation congregation leaders of (OC-4) also discussed what it meant to be a member of an outstation congregation in a large parochial structure.

One had this to say:
It means [being] less empowered in the large parish. It also means we are in the fellowship within outstation congregations on services and with main parish centre in ceremonies of Easter and confirmation. Outstation congregations have a syndrome of dependency to main parish centre. There has to be rotation of services like Palm Sunday and Easter to reflect unity. Wardens feel threatened and humbled as they face outstation congregations for monies to the main parish centre. (Interview, OC-4b)

My observation on these views is that it was a mixture of ill feelings because of marginalisation of outstation congregation by the main parish centre, as they evaluate their oneness with the main parish centre. Although being in a large parish did instil a sense of belonging but was dented by inequality. It became worse when the rectors too, instead of developing outstation congregation gave more attention to the main parish centre.

One outstation congregation leader had the following to share:

Outstation congregation’s take decision from the main parish centre and are not allowed to do anything as they wished. The outstation congregation develop main parish centre whilst outstation congregation are deteriorating. (Interview, OC-4b)

My reflection on these views is therefore, the understandings about the role of outstation congregations was mixed and caused division in a large parish. Chapelries are recognised structures by the Canons but outstation congregations are not. Therefore, Chapelries are parishes on progressional strategy to be become a parish, but outstation congregations are not.
My reflection on the arguments in the Diocese that the name ‘outstation’ should be dropped. This argument does not hold water because even a single congregation in white parishes is called a congregation. “Outstation congregations that did not have a resident minister while stations (main parish centres) were centres of mission activity in particular regions” (Japha; Japha; Le Grange; Todeschini, 1993:4). David, M. Paton has argued that, “outstations can seldom be reached and the more distant ones never. There are large areas into which itinerant clergy have never been with any regularity” 1960:167 – 169). Therefore it would be wrong to refer to outstation congregations as ‘congregations’ only.

My reflection furthermore is that one could detect that there was a gap that had been created by the rector, by refusing to recognise outstation congregations, as not being financially viable. But this had been undisputed and argued that outstation congregations were “financially viable” (Interview, AOR-4a)

Reflecting on activities or ministries and training in outstation congregations, one local leader of the outstation congregations (OC – 4) had this to say:

There was training of Abashumayeli (for one year as probationers) preparing to be licensed by the bishop or archdeacon as lay ministry at the main parish centre. There were engaged to evangelist and stewardship. There are Mothers Union; lay ministers, St. Agnes Guild; youth; Bernard, Mizeki Guild; Serves Guild (interview, OC-4b)

My reflection on this view is that the activities or ministries were only performed at outstation congregational level because at the main parish centre, they did not feel accepted. My observation on this view is also that lay ministers were alive and active at their outstation congregations. This was also indication of self imposed independence of outstations congregations from the main parish centre.
My further reflection on the above view is that it became evident that training programme were not done regularly and this was one of the many challenges that outstation congregation had. The Diocese provided programmes but it all depended on the manager (rector). The Parish Charter was supposed to be done by the whole Diocese but to my surprise very prominent and viable parishes did not know anything about it. It was developed for implementation as for the liturgical resource for Sunday worship.

However, the other reflection on the alienation of outstations’ challenge for policy change would be a steep hill to climb. The bishop has to come to the party and remedy the situation.

The leaders of the outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal (OC – 4) expressed similar sentiments when they viewed what were the most positive experiences you have had in your ministries.

Had this to say:

Feel good when the Church grows spirituality is quality not quantity. It is when their ministry is acknowledged by parishioners at intervals. Visiting the sick, child-headed homes and teaching a confirmation class and Sunday school (Interview, OC – 4b)

My reflection on this view is that this is sign of vibrant congregations. Their ministries are now performed at the outstation congregations. Their ministry are spread over the congregations and varies. They are right now independent and are able to fulfil their calling. This is the first step towards autonomy.
Despite a positive attitude towards participation in the larger parish, leaders of the outstation congregations (Interview, OC - 4b) also viewed the challenges that ministries have experienced from parishioners, a member of the church councillor or parish council and a member of the ministries they are involved in.

Noted that:

Negative attitudes from the main parish centre and the rectors, then you begin to lack confidence; this is because of inequality with the main parish centre. After confirmation children do not come to church. There are drop-outs from the ministries and blame is to the ministries (Interview, OC – 4a).

My observation on these views is that negative utterances made by parishioners make the ministries involved feel inferior and depressed. Some of them take it personally and results in not coming to Church any longer. It is worse if bad remarks come from their fellow worker in the ministry of Christ. This is very serious and the bishop needs to give this a priority and intervene. The only way to solve these utterances is by making outstations congregations independent and progress towards a developing parish as stipulated in the Acts of the Diocese.

The focuses of the outstation congregations are on the pastoral work to the community, rather than unitary Church. They would like to be knowledgeable about the procedures of the Anglican Church. Most members who join the Anglican Church at outstation congregations come from other churches or sectors with no knowledge of the procedures of the Anglican Church and as such do need training.
They also view unity as something that has to be open like rotation of important services or ceremonies even to outstation congregations. The sense of belonging is dented by inequality exercised by the rector and the parish council.

My observation is that the bishop needs to have intervention at large parishes. The movement of the people from the Anglican Church is very serious, especially if it can be avoided (Book Reviews, March/April 2008:148-149). This view is echoed by Loren, B. Mead when he commented that,

There is a declining membership and surveys on worship attendance (which) suggest that the church is no longer a source of hope or a compelling resource to deal with the turmoil of today’s changing world. The storm is so serious that it marks the end of ‘business as usual’ (1994:1).

My reflection is that I call upon the Diocese and congregations to transformation from traditional functions as transformation is underway already in countless congregations. “The Anglican Church clergy have to undergo significant changes” (Theology Reviews, November/December 2007:433-440). Most of the challenges in a large parish are through the clergy (rector) who often is not prepared to transform.

The guilds and organisation gave experiences regarding interdependence and autonomy. “Guilds and organisations are the backbone of the large parish, especially at outstation congregations. The philosophy of divide and rule does not applied to voluntary organisations. There is a lot of work to be done in this respect” (Interview, OC – 4b). Steve Gladen has articulated that, “People who come to our Small Group Conferences desire to learn and get answers to their questions. If they are on the church staff, it is likely they are trying to lead the small group ministry while directing also directing a different ministry” (2011:13 – 14). There is progression from house church to parish
church, new parish church eventually gets planted (Houston, 23rd February 2008, Mokoatsi, 17 November 2002:10). Outstation congregations were started from guilds and organisations in neighbourhoods (villages, townships, rural arrears).

The main parish centre does not allow diversity in worship and is still stuck to the traditional way of the missionaries. This was echoed by Jonathan Meintjes when he argued that,

> In many ways, our traditional Anglican approach to church government is constraining us in our task. In so many ways, the church is stuck in a nineteenth century rut. It is killing us and we do not even realise it (Southern Anglican, July 2008, vol.17, P.52 – 53).

My observation is that in a large parish there is little diversity in worship and while there are many people who join the Anglican Church at the outstations and they are not accommodated. The Holy Communion Service of the Anglican Prayer Book of 1989 accommodates everyone in the congregation, “The Prayers, D section states that, The Priest or another minister leads intercessions and thanksgiving in which the congregation may be invited to join” (Church of the Province of Southern Africa, 1989:115).

My reflection on this view is that outstation congregations do not see that unity within the large parish because they are marginalised. Ivor Baatjes has defined marginalisation as,

> The silencing of lived experiences in discourse through legislation and policies created by the dominant culture, which either ‘commatizes’ or ‘negates’ the political, economic, historical and social realities of those living in the margins of society (Journal of Education, 2003, no. 26:179).
It is my view that the experiences of outstation congregations are that of feeling downtrodden by the main parish centre and this scenario renders the unity as useless. The only time they will enjoy that belonging is when they are independent and progressing to autonomy.

My observation is that nobody cares about outstation congregations except for their finances. This syndrome should be discarded and be treated with dignity, as people of God. Mark Gibbs and T. Ralph Morton argued that, “These are God’s frozen people (1968:1). Outstation congregations are frozen by both the main parish centre and the Diocese.

Unity in the large parish is not visible to the parishioner on the pew. This is because the main parish centre is ‘silencing lived views and experiences in discourse. Active outstation congregations need encouragement from the main parish centre and the Diocese. The diocese can also come to capacitate organisation and guilds, at the outstation congregations. Viable outstations must be identified which will be a motivation for progressional development strategy which will lead to autonomy.

My observation is that outstation congregations have to be given ownership, development and participation as equals in a large parish. Visitation by bishop to a large parish must acknowledge the presence of the leader of outstation congregations equally with the main parish centre leaders, so as to restore unity and recognition. The bishop has to reinforce what previous bishops did to the outstation congregations. Ultimately, there has to be independence, progressional strategy and autonomy.

The focus groups gave their experiences regarding interdependence and autonomy. These are leaders in the Diocese of Natal who meet either monthly or quarterly to discuss the challenges and solutions of parishes.
The leaders from our focus groups in the Diocese of Natal (FG-4) reflected on what does it mean for a member of the Diocese of Natal in the Diocese of Natal in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa.

Made the following comment:

You feel threatened when you come from outstation congregations, at the large parish. It means that you have to work together as one, in church growth. The main centre also depended upon the outstation congregations. Lack of support from the main parish centre fuels discontent (Interview, FG – 4c).

My observation on this view is reflected in the ambivalent relationship. There are muted feelings of dissatisfaction because although the outstation congregations were supposed to be nurtured by the main parish centre, they are largely neglected. The main parish centre needs to be a role model for the outstanding congregation. The effects of the lack of direction discouraged outstation congregations’ members and leadership. Thus with regard to these concerns, one of the leaders of the focus group noted that

No, it is a branch of a tree (main parish centre). Whatever you do, you need to report (Interview, FG – 4c).

My observation on this view is that it is degrading the outstation congregations and this is the cause of contempt and ill feeling. There is no appendix or branch in the Church of God. Some members of the focus groups in the Diocese of Natal pondered on what could be done to acknowledge and appreciate the outstation congregations for the work/service they do in a large parish. One member had this to say:
The bishop has to avail himself to the outstation congregations. The parish
wardens too have visit outstation congregations regularly (Interview, FG – 4c).

My observation on the above statement is that the leader of the Diocese of Natal should
also be visible at outstation congregations to show support and recognition, which will
boost their unity as the family of the Diocese. The bishop will be able to monitor as to the
number of conformant in each outstation congregation so as to have a clear picture in
mission ministry and worship. This also shows interdependency and growth towards
becoming a parish. The parish wardens too must do likewise to cement unity and
recognition of a large parish.

Furthermore, finally the research indicated that it was undisputable that outstation
congregations play a major role in the large parish. The Diocese needed interventions that
would promote inclusively and oneness of the large parish. One such suggestion is that
there should be a rotation of significant services to outstation congregation.

My own account is based on reflection from participants on why outstation congregations
do not so easily gain autonomy and independence. The parish council and rector have to
recommend to the bishop about their mobility to become a parish. In most large parishes,
outstation congregations are the pillars of support, financially. That is why the parish
council and rector will not recommend them. It has been said in the interviews that there
is lack of training and information to outstation congregation which is an asset to the
large parish, so as to keep them dependent.

I would also argue that the status of outstation congregations is not similar to chapelries
canonically; Canon 29 stated that “the parishioners of any chapelries within a pastoral
charge established as lay down in Section 4 of Canon23 of pastoral charges, shall elect
two chapel wardens at a meeting in terms of section 3 of Canon 27 of Vestries, such
meeting shall take place each year not later than six Sunday after Easter (Church of the Province of Southern Africa, 1994:58-59; 63-65; 66-68).

This has tremendous consequences for transformation. Tracy Bell’s address ‘towards a transformed society’ had this to say that “transformation has to do with change, especially change towards something better. The theological term for this change is to convert” (Document. 19 June 2011). The outstation congregations have had this pain since the era of missionaries up to this century. South Africa has transformed and the large parish has to transform for the better-multiplication of parishes (Ad Clerum: Winter 2007, 21 June, pp 3-4).

### 7.3 Theme Two: Canons and Acts of The Diocese: The Status And Implications For Outstation Congregations

The Constitution, Canons and Acts of the Diocese of Natal are the laws of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa, the other provincially and locally to the Diocese of Natal. They are maintaining the current situation in large parishes.

The two key policies relate to the outstation congregations (Acts of the Diocese of Natal which stated that “In terms of Act XVII of the Diocesan Synod of 1964, all Mission Districts acquired parochial status” (1964: 22; 23, 26-27). This meant that each former mission would now have an Incumbent, church wardens and a parish council. Therefore, from the 1 October all mission districts became pastoral charges, each with the rector who resided in a rectory. In addition to vicars of existing parishes would now be called rector, who would reside in the rectory and not the vicarage. It is worth noting that, “by this time Rev. F. J. Green in 1895 had developed a chain of outstations” (Lewis and Edwards, 1934:366) and in 1866 Mr. Bough built a mission house and a wattle church (outstation of Umlazi station which was dilapidated. The new real church at Umlazi was
in 1927 and Enwabi became an outstation. The outstation congregations were left out in 1964.

The Acts of the Diocese (revised) stated that, “the bishop shall have the power, where he deems necessary so to do for better development of the Diocese, to constitute any area of the Diocese as a Development District. In order to do so, he shall have the power to exercise any portions of any Pastoral Charges adjacent the same, to enable the creation of a unified geographical area –subject to rules (1995:3). This would fit well for the aspiring outstation congregations for progression.

The impression given by the head of the Diocese (HOD-4) was that they had to work together and fulfill their roles in mission, ministry and worship. He had this to say

   In terms of Canons and Acts of the Diocese, parish council, that is, mother Church and the branches, reach out to pastoral care. There also exist Chapel Council and Church wardens, not dependent on mother Church, but extend the Church council and are expected to develop outstations congregations. They have to be involved in God's mission (Interview, HOD-4a).

This observation reflects the contestation between outstation congregations and the main parish centre. The backward and forward movement of the Canons to refer here was that main parish centre (mother Church) would reach out to, and develop the outstation congregations and vice versa. The bishop ensures that the rector supported the outstation congregations in developmental strategy.

In terms of the canonical status of outstation congregations, one regional leaders of the Diocese (AOR-4) had this to say:

   Canonically, outstation congregations are part of the large parish. Main parish centre and outstation congregations retain their dependence. They are to function as a team. Main parish centre does not regard outstation congregations as part of the large parish. The outstation congregations’ role is minimal (Interview, AOR-4a)
However, this view does not accurately reflect the position of the Diocese of Natal. The Canon states that, “The Incumbent licensed to any Pastoral Charge shall have the power, if the bishop approves, to establish Chapelries within his charge, where separate congregations assemble for Divine Worship, such Chapelries remaining under his own jurisdiction, saving all ordinary rights of the bishop” (ACSA, 1994:58(4); 65(1); 67(3); 68(8); 69). The implication of this is that every time an outstation is established, the bishops’ consent must be sought.

According to the Constitution and Canons no clear position exists on the matter of “pastoral Charges with many congregations” (1994:65(1). Thus outstation congregations were mentioned only in passing in the Canon and have no power. Outstation congregations represent those ‘new’ congregations who are expected to mature into Chapelries. The Canon made it clear that Chapelries are considered congregations on a progressional path or process of being a parish. However, many black congregations have been arrested at the stage of outstation congregations for a long time, because their progression was at the mercy of the rector and parish council. The head of the Diocese of Natal made this comment:

The large parish receives guidance and procedures from the Diocese and these are not passed on to the outstation congregations. Nobody takes trouble to conduct workshops on the Canons and Procedures on Pastoral Charge (HOD-4).

This head of the diocese’ observation is confirmed by the view of one of the Main Parish leaders (MPC-4) who stated that:

We are against being empowered on what to do in our outstation congregations, as if we were children (Interview, MPC-4a).

My reflection on this is that this kind of view was the cause of much resistance from the outstation congregations who then refused to perform any role in the large parish. Thus the head of the Diocese (HOD-4) observed that:

There is visible relationship between the rector and the main parish centre, but none with outstation congregations. The most visible one is Holy Communion and
finances. The Canon spoke of interaction of equals and to reach out to one another for the sake of pastoral care. There were no conditions of engagement signed with the rector and the outstation congregations (Interview, HOD-4a)

My reflection on the views is that the Canons state clearly that it has to do about finance and Holy Communion but the pastoral and developmental aspect are largely neglected. Furthermore the participant’s reflections suggested that the incorporation of outstation congregations into a large parish caused more harm –resulting in tense relationships. Expressing similar sentiments, one regional Diocesan leader (AOR-4) reflected on whether outstation congregations deserve a say in the administration of the large parochial structure model, noted:

The rector is not embracing outstation congregations but treats them as outsiders, instead of being treated equally. It is very difficult for outstation congregations to have a say in the administration of a large parish (Interview, AOR-4a)

Furthermore, one of the leaders of the main parish centre (MPC-4) had this to say:

Yes, outstation congregations deserve a say because of financial attachment with outstation congregations. This will help outstation congregations to know what happens to the monies that come from them and how it is used. It is also important for them to be involved as a learning curve. (Interview, MPC-4a)

My reflection is that there was nothing exciting for outstation congregations to have had a say about, but they largely felt that they would have been shut down by the members of the main parish centre, as they were in the majority. Some leaders of the region in the Diocese of Natal (AOR-4) had this to say:

It means nothing because it is business as usual. Main parish centre sticks to the Rules of the Church. There is no discussion between the rector and outstation congregations. It is a one way only (Interview, AOR-4a)
One of the leaders of the main parish centre (MPC-4) offered a critical observation about the way in which the canon are interpreted and applied. He had this to say:

Once a window pane is broken at the outstation congregations' Church building, we are not allowed to repair it without first getting permission from the main parish centre. They are reprimanded and it becomes a serious matter at parish council where representatives from the outstations have to account. Outstation congregations are not allowed to have a bank account and we are told that we are not a mission, yet (Interview, MPC-4a)

My reflection on the above view is that it needed to be pointed out that outstation congregations serve God under very difficult conditions, in a large parish. They had no say in their own building. The Canons are used by the main parish centre as a way to undermine the autonomy of outstation congregations. The main parish centre needs to be educated on the Canons so as to have a deep interpretation of it. Main parish centre have a duty to develop the outstation congregations. This was a good gesture of towards ownership and independence, which main parish centre was suppose to applaud them and then work together for a new Church building.

Participants noted that the main parish centre is the only people allowed to take decisions at the parish council. It is aptly captured by this statement: “You know nothing, you just listen” (MPC-4a). This statement was directed to outstation congregations at the parish council meeting and the reason why outstation congregation delegates decided to withdraw from these meetings

One of the main parish leaders (MPC-4), in reflecting on the autonomy of outstation congregations commented that:

Each and every outstation congregation has churchwardens who watch over finances and church buildings. Yes, they deserve a say for the development of their outstation congregations. Yes, they are not just
part of the main parish centre but are for the togetherness and ownership of the large parish (Interview, MPC-4a).

Firstly, there is the observation that they do deserve a say in administration in a large parish. This encouraged dependency of outstations congregations to the main centre. Therefore, I would argue that all wardens are allowed to make their congregations announcements when the whole parish came together to worship at the main centre.

Secondly, the above discussion supports the view that outstation congregation are joined to the main parish centre (mother church). However, it would appear that adequate sensitizing training must be done with stakeholders before establishing a large parish, with its outstation congregations.

Thirdly, some might argue that the current policy emerged as part of a broader Church strategy to accommodate outstation congregations from the point of view of financial demands for Diocese. It would appear that the pastoral, missiological and ministerial motivation for integrating outstation congregations, was a secondary concern.

The main contention is that the main parish centre does not reflect the position of the Diocese because outstation congregations are established by the permission of the bishop. Therefore, the bishop is very much involved what happens at the outstation congregations. The outstations have been held at ransom by the main parish centre and the rector with regard to its mobility.

The Canon states clearly that the relationship between the main parish and the outstation has to do with finance and Holy Communion. My own reflection is that outstation congregations serve God under very stringent conditions when they have no say with their own church buildings and nor able to keep their finances. The fact that they have to seek permission from the parish council every time they want to do anything locally,
cultivates a negative dependence culture. Main parish centre do not understand the Canons and they need help understanding on them.

My reflection in this view is that, evidently, the diocese has no strategy for the development of the outstation congregations. The archdeacon has a duty to develop and monitor all parishes including outstation congregations (CPSA, 1994:50-51). The initiative was to be taken by the rector to report to the Diocese that such out outstation congregations needed to be developed. So, the rector was given this particular responsibility to the main centre parish so as to develop and give assistance to outstation congregations, as well (Diocese of Natal, 1995:3). There after that priest was there to develop outstation congregations and prepare a strategy for them.

My observation about Acts of the Diocese of Natal and Canons are cornerstone and the apparent reluctance to change the current policy on the status of outstation Congregations.

They have implications for large parish in that the friction in the large parish renders the large parish to be divided and this hinders the work of the Church in worship, mission, and ministry. The outstation congregations will suffer most because of the Canons and the Acts of the Diocese which suppresses their development and autonomy. The Canons and Acts of the Diocese are applied to exclude outstation congregations as early as the nineteenth century, even when missions were freed to be parishes. Outstation congregations remained up to this era.

Furthermore, my observation on the Diocese will also suffers as this will impact negatively on the vision of the Province and the Diocese on Masisukume Sakhe/Arise and Build Growing the Church). The Acts of the Diocese can be used for aspiring outstation congregations to be on the developmental strategy, as a start to address the imbalances in a large parish.
My observation about the letter of the Canons versus Acts of the Diocese is of interest when dealing with outstation congregations. The Canon makes it explicit that “where separate congregations assemble for Divine Worship; such chapelries remaining under his own jurisdiction, saving all ordinary rights of the bishop” (CPSA, 1994:58(4). This means that at the end of the day the bishop plays a central role in breaking the impasse. It was done for missions; it could be done for outstation congregations using Acts of the Diocese.

7.4 Theme Three: Growth and Empowerment of Outstation Congregations

The outstation congregation has an appetite for growth and empowerment and their activities in mission and ministry in their congregations reflect this. Most of the parishioners from outstation congregations are professions and capable of being skilled towards taking their parish to autonomy (parish). Since 1994 more people from the rural areas are moving to the outskirts of big cities and towns and they need places of worship. For this changing demographics, outstation congregations are the answer.

Growing only will not make them a prosperous parish but need empowerment. Once people have been skilled are able to use also their skills for the empowerment of other parishioners, these congregation will grow. Training will be the key factor in an aspiring congregation. Many types of ministries would be developed to empower the people of God. They become vibrant parishes which will attract many people in the community. The leader of the Diocese of Natal reflected on his vision for outstation congregations in a large parochial structure and their future development. In this regard he noted,

There has to be training workshops to capacitate leaders in the parish. All outstations congregations need to be developed spiritually. There has to be monitoring and evaluation of all identified projects.

Developmental parishes are a priority and will have to be progressional development strategy. There has to be team work management including all the leadership in a large
parish. Similarly, participants felt that stewardship and evangelism have to be promoted. Division of a large parish into manageable parishes can be put on developmental strategy, as a beginning.

May participants indicated that training is vital at all levels. The archdeacon has to have a monitoring team for the region, which reports to the bishop directly. The team will identify what skills they need for their congregations. The Diocese has resource material would then be utilized for the empowerment of outstation congregations. On the issue of empowerment of a leader one outstation congregation noted that:

The culture of commitment has to be accelerated. The use of talents and skills has to be given a space (Interview, HOD-4a)

My reflection on this view is that outstation congregations, according to the head of the Diocese, has to start re-training rectors for new challenges presented by the large parochial structures. Furthermore, the culture of independence will be cultivated. They have to strive towards viable, financially, stability and missionary Church. New parishes should not be very large. Finally, team ministry has to be strong and meet frequently (as alluded by the Diocese of Natal and said, “work as a team with the rector and other Parish leaders to further the mission and ministry of the Church” (2012:1; CPSA, 1994:60; Document, 2011).

Similar sentiments were expressed the other regional leaders (AOR-4). He had this to say:

They have all to be equal in a large parish in all respects. They have to be motivated as soon as there is transparency and accountability from the leadership as a large parish (interview, AOR-4a)
My reflection on this view is apparently, the policy of a large parish may have been introduced as a Church policy and strategy to accommodate the competing demands for a large parish by the rector and parish council of the main parish centre, without foreseeing the challenges that might arise. Thus when reflecting on the vision for outstation congregation, one regional leader observed that:

The clergy has to be well trained to manage the change. The rector has to identify skills among members of the church. Community priest’s vocation has to be accelerated, to serve God in his vineyard. (AOR-4a)

Therefore, my observation is that, it would appear that outstation congregation policy could not be implemented without proper orientation and teaching workshop focused to a new parish.

In this regard main parish leadership is “still stuck in a nineteenth century rut. It is killing us and do not even realise it” (Meintjes, 2008:52). This has been alluded to by The Lambeth Conference that, “with the continuing changes in historical circumstances, the functions of the Churches change too. The Church when alive, has constantly adapted its activities to the needs of the times” (1978:167). The main parish leadership has to transform from the traditional legacy of the missionaries to the new challenges of the twenty first century. However, one of the leaders of the main parish centre had this to say, “born and bred in the mission and proud of that” (Interview, MPC – 4a). It is such utterances that have blind-folded the main parish centre.

My reflection is that the Church has a challenge, as has been cited by Wilson when he commented that, “if the Church is to meet the challenges of the new situation, steps must be taken to promote well informed discussion and debates on all the important issues. The discussion is unlikely to be well informed unless steps are taken to bring together and disseminate as widely as possible the thought and ideas of the Church” 1980:138). The
information gathered will require more teaching and discussion at all levels of the main parish centre church life.

Furthermore, my reflection is that those in leading positions in the Church who do not accept the challenge, the time will certainly come when the general public will cease to care what they think, and the Church will then over the brink into the darkness of utter irrelevance. If the Church is to advance in the decades ahead, must foster a new attitude of mind which will be ready to discuss, and will welcome the views of ordinary lay members on all important issues.

One such main parish leader (MPC-4a) has this to say:

Outstation congregations had to multiply into new parishes. Continuous training for growth has to be accelerated in order for a parish. Management training for the leadership of outstation congregations and team work has to be undertaken. Training for parish wardens and rectors has to begin as soon as possible. (Interview, MPC-4a)

Therefore, my observation is that in terms of the future leaders generally seemed positive about the policy change. This was largely as a result of the confrontation between the outstation congregations and the main parish centres. For this one leader, cited above, the purpose of outstation congregation was the “development in the creation of other congregations, (interview, HOD-4a). There had to be, “situational management, tools, others readiness and implementation” Another view expressed was that outstation congregations were too hastily integrated into large parishes, and thus lacked proper consultation with stakeholders.
On the matter of empowerment of outstation congregations, one main parish leader had the following to say:

If the clergy is well trained will be able to identify the skills from the members of the Church, Community priest to serve Gods people and has to be utilised. They had to be good stewards and use personal talents and skills of the parishioners. (Interview, MPC-4a)

My reflection on this view is that one insight from above understanding was that outstation congregation would become a Church in a large parish. It will be empowered through a progressional strategy. Rahner asserted that, “opium planning for the future Church, Is necessary for pastoral planning was derived from the key factors. Today a world Church does not exist to circular planning, for the world’s future is now taking place” (Theology, Digest, 1982 Springs no1). Therefore, it would be imperative for the Diocese of Natal not to forget that the future is always full of surprises. Avis reminds us that “the more we have life in a new paradigm therefore we notice that we are seeing the world with new eyes” (Avis, 1989:218).

However, reflecting the views and perspectives of outstation congregations’ leaders, one such leader remarked:

They are looking for independence, to have a reasonable church building. Members [have to] be motivated and be committed. There has to be growth then develop the parish. Training will allow for independence. There to be development in members from all organisations (interview, OC-4b).

My observation is that the vision of outstation congregations was to multiply into parishes. This would be a policy change which may take long because it involves the formal policy-making processes and mechanisms of the church. Diocese of Natal in its Acts of the Diocese of Natal and Canons states: “the bishop shall have the power, where
he deems necessary so to do for the better development of the diocese to constitute any area of the diocese as a development district” (Diocese of Natal, 1995:3(3).

However, a statement by the Synod of Bishops of ACSA stated that, “We are challenged to take imaginative and courageous action that might include alternative models of ministry, mission and Episcopal oversight. We need that we must willingly take risks, in faith” (Document, February 2012:2). The archbishop urged the bishop to plunge into a situation in faith. This is a critical situation in the Diocese of which ‘to take risk.’

Furthermore, my observation is that outstation congregations are the worse in feeling the frustration of marginalisation, alienation derogatory remarks. The outstation congregations have long endured such a situation but, as Pityana states “community has to be modelled on the life of Christ” (Document, 6 September 2014:6). The outstation congregations had this over years as the pillar of strength in their faith in the Anglican Church.

With regards to empowerment, leaders of the outstation congregations (OC-4) had the following to say:

Would like to have a rector for envisaged parish or a self-supporting priest Church. Church growth has to be spiritual and physical. Have to be engaged in evangelism and

Large parish has to be decentralised. There has to be independency from main parish centre and be equipped by providing training. (Interview, OC-4b)

.

However from the above remark, my observation is that we can assume that outstations congregations’ leaders would like to move to the next level of development, but this would have to be a progressional strategy facilitated by the bishop (FG-4). There was still
a lot of work to be done, depending on how they would be engaged in stewardship campaign. However, Rahner stated clearly that, “we should not forget that the future is always full of surprises. The Church moves from uncertainty into the future’ (Theology Digest, volume 30, 1982 Spring no. 1). Evidently some of the leaders of the guilds and organization (GO – 4) were less confident about change and empowerment prospect for outstation congregations. One had this to say:

It was so difficult to force somebody to change. The Diocese of Natal did not have competent rectors. The materials (outstation congregations) were nearly there but the rectors are not yet another leader of the Diocese of Natal (Interview, GO – 4a).

My observation is that change is a process that require that large numbers of persons are engaged in group activities and relationships that are different from those in which they or their parents were engaged previously’( Document, January 2002:250). Change is very painful if one clings to traditional way of doing things. However, Rahner allay fears that, “we should not forget that the future is full of surprises, hence full freedom must be our sovereign concern” (Theology Digest 1982:60). The call to the Anglican Church in Natal is that we ‘must be developed to close this gap” (Theology Digest 1982:60).

My reflection is that outstation congregations look forward in being a fully–fledged parish. This is the community that is “a life lived daily engagement in the midst of struggling with its faith, perplexes about the answers that come their way” (Document, 6 September 2014:5). Their advent is challenging because apartheid was also embedded in the Church.

On empowerment another leader of the guilds and organisations (GO – 4) had this to say:

Ensure that outstation congregations develop to become a parish with its rector on progressional develop strategy. Ownership and independency
has to be the goal. Spiritual development and growth of the Church has to be a great concern. Sensitising, orientation of the outstation congregation has to be a priority (GO-4c)

The Acts of the Diocese of Natal state that, on “Pastoral Charges” and especially on ‘Developing Districts” (Diocese of Natal, 1955:3), would be a progressional priority for the new Church. This was a recipe for a new Church, chapelry or parish. Since ownership and self-administration forms a big part of the progressional process, one of the Church leaders in the focus groups (FG – 4) discussion noted that:

There has to be strong teaching and investment in youth. There has to be a trust spirit and developmental training, evangelism and evaluation of objectives that would lead to self sufficient. Our outstations congregation have to grow spiritually and financially. They will be able to manage their assessment and have their own banking. Stewardship workshops are important for growth, team work between the rector and all leaders at the outstation congregations (Interview, FG-4).

Outstation congregations refuse to support the large parish financially because they are not told what their finances have been utilised especially in the outstation congregations. This is very disturbing because everyone expects value for your money. What becomes obvious to is when outstation congregants see the main parish centre doing renovations and nothing for the outstation congregations. Outstation congregations are demotivated and reduced their giving to an endless pit.

There has to be a paradigm shift to outstation congregations to ownership. Marie Therese Morin has defined “the shift as one’s worldview is a profound experience, and an individual or a collective must reach a state of readiness in order to accept such a shift, conversion experience. Sudden revelation of a new universe” (1998:62). The new
universe is the envisaged progressional strategy to a parish. Therefore a dramatic change will be a motivation for outstation congregation to rally behind the new universe and it for everyone in the outstation to develop it. Paradigm shift is necessary to construct an effective viable parish.

Therefore the vision was defined as “act or faculty of seeing seen in a dream, mental picture” in *Imaginative in sight* “(Branford, 2000:1089). Therefore it was imperative for the outstation congregation to plan for their future. The Diocese of Natal in its Parish Charter had among the twelve theme, vision as, “we seek to be a congregation which clearly identified its ministry priorities and which has a firm sense of its mission within our particular community” (2004:2)

My observation on the integration of outstation congregations in a large parish is for it to be meaningful, the diocese would to sensitise the stakeholders and have a discourse in the whole large parish including the archdeacon of the region. There has to be rules of engagement and conditions of being in a large parish. There has to be a timeframe agreed upon during the stage. This is the “embryonic stage” of a large parish (Simpson, Southern Anglican, April 2006:32).

My reflection is that Acts of the Diocese could be implemented by the bishop of the Diocese, without going to Synod because there is a clause that permits him to do that.

What goes to Synod is something that is not provided in the Acts of the Diocese, for example, self-supporting ministry had to have a Special Synod to incorporate it into the Acts Act of the Diocese as, “Act Eleven of Self-Supporting Clergy” (Diocese of Natal. 2003:19) The bishop has the power to improving the current procedure through the Acts of the Diocese.
The option of policy one is not possible because it does not involve the Synod of Bishops or Provincial Synod but it is for the Diocesan bishop to act on this.

Option two allows the bishop through the Acts of the Diocese, subject to the following Rules, No; new Pastoral Charge shall be created until the Finance Committee has signified its approval of the assessment to be paid by the proposed new Pastoral Charges. Before directing any change to take place under this Act, the bishop shall first take counsel with the Incumbent and Churchwardens of the Pastoral Charge or Charges directly concerned with such change” (1995:3a (1-2).

Most of the participants used the above Act of the Diocese but specifically to Development Districts,

The bishop shall have the power, where he deems necessary so to do for the better development of the Diocese, to constitute any area of the Diocese as a Development District. In order to do so, he shall have the power to exercise any options of any Pastoral Charges adjacent to the Development District, to be used to constitute the same, to enable the creation of a unified geographical area, subject to the following rules that (1) Such Development District shall be under the care and authority of a priest holding the bishop’s licence. (2) The provisions of section 3(a) (1) and 3 (a) (2) of this Act shall apply to the establishment of a Development District. (3) The provisions of the Acts of the Diocese regarding Annual Vestry meetings shall mutatis mutandis apply to a Development District. (4) The progress towards becoming a self – supporting Pastoral Charge shall be evaluated by the area bishop within whose area the Development District falls, not less than three years from the date of creation of the Development District, and regularly thereafter(Acts of the Diocese, 1995:).
The four critical areas for developing outstation congregations are: (1) training of clergy in managing largely parishes to facilitate the progression of outstation congregations, (2) Financial management and development towards autonomy, (3) Training of outstation congregations and parish leaders on the Acts of the Diocese, (4) Clear leadership and strong strategy from the bishop with regard to identifying congregations for progression on an annual basis. This will be the model for empowerment of outstation congregations towards being a parish.

7.5. Conclusion

Another insight was that the use of historical interpretation to legitimate progressive exclusive large parish was contesting space in the alienation of outstation congregations’ policy change. Although the formulation of theological policy was now under the Diocese of Natal, some Christians still favour the Christian missionary, tradition of using large parishes as a tool for evangelism. This situation resonated with observation that historical traditions and experiences of each country were likely to influence how the large parish policy changed the dimension of Christian and social life. This limited alienation resulted from its parish centre approach. Outstation congregations were influenced, to some extent by history of the Diocese of Natal.

The leaders of the Diocese of Natal wrestled with three identified themes, as Interdependence and Autonomy; Canons and Acts of the Diocese; Growth and empowerment.

Interdependence and autonomy emanated from this questions they were faced with is ‘what it means to be a member of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal’. There were mixed reactions but strongly from the leaders of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal (head of the Church, archdeacons of the regions and main parish centre). The understanding of the above was unitary Church (universal) but the outstation
congregations interpreted it as pastoral to society. This indicates differences in interpretation. Outstation congregations’ implication is on service than money. The bishop is less on service but money. Observation at the end is consequences for politics versus transformation, in terms of theology and mission.

Autonomy is but specifically a letter of policy versus the policy, that is mission versus the Canons and when some of this is fully applied neglected pastoral and development. This hinders the autonomy of outstation congregations.

Canons and Acts of the Diocese are used by the main parish centre to undermine the outstation congregations. The Canons are about pastoral ministry and Acts of the Diocese are about status. It appears that the responsibility of transformation is versus spirit of the law (policy) which is the burden carried by outstation congregations. However, the burden affecting outstation congregations without the law (policy) will be no way of pushing the law. Pastoral and development are lacking in the policy of both the Diocese and the Province. It appears that the leaders of the Diocese of Natal brought more negatives than positive effects in the discourse.

The last themes are growth and empowerment which are the visions of the outstation congregations and supported by most leaders in the Diocese of Natal. Outstation congregations’ growth has to be physical and spiritual. The Diocese has to re – skill the leaders of outstation congregations. The rectors have to be skilled and identify the most critical areas of growth for development. Training, finance spirituality and managements are important for growth of outstation congregations towards being a parish.
Chapter Eight

Towards a Synthetically and Integrated Interpretation: Thesis and Conclusion

8.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the thesis and conclusion of the study, showing insights gained from the research. Moves to define, understand and apply the Diocese of Natal’s policy related to outstation congregation occurred within highly contested terrain. Thus the different understandings regarding the position of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal as articulated by the leadership, which included the bishop, archdeacons, main parish centre (mother church) leaders, outstation congregation leaders, as well as guilds or organizations leadership. All these were interrogated to reflect on the contested terrain of policy making and its impact on the mission, ministry and worship of the church.

Furthermore given the contested terrain of policy in mission, ministry and worship, I was mindful that the thesis and conclusions presented here were likely to be controversial, it was not the intended aim of this study to reach consensus, nor a convergence of interpretation concerning policies related to the position of outstation congregations. Rather the intention was to illuminate how contestations in the status of outstation congregation expose the politics of the church. Counter arguments to the thesis and conclusions were inevitable and should be seen as a natural reflection of the highly contested terrain of ecclesiastical policy-making. The presentation was organized in four parts. The first part postulate the thesis of the study, employing a metaphor of inadvertent smokescreen. The second part synthesizes and integrates politics of the church policy. The third part states the contribution of the study to knowledge while the fourth part outlines concluding reflections of the study.

8. 2. Mission, Missionaries and the production of Anglican Ecclesiology in SA

The summary of relevant chapters is as follows:

The emergence of the of the Diocese of Natal had a great impact on bishop Gray because Bishop Colenso had his own way of starting his ministry first, by spending almost three
months on the physical study of the Diocese, especially ministry to the indigenous people. The question bishop Colenso faced with was, "how far can the Christian gospel be communicated by people of one culture to people of another" and also, wherever he went he questioned Africans about their history and their religion” (Hinchliff, 1968:65, 1964:63). This position represented a markedly different approach to that of Bishop Robert Gray, when he came in 1848. His strategy was “to transform the Anglican Church and transplanted the system and organisation of the Church of England to this land or marked the beginning for the Anglican Church in the country” (De Gruchy, 2004:16). The Constitution of the Province was formed earlier than the Dioceses and thus is very significant for understanding the Anglican Church in South Africa. He had decided that missions to the heathen must wait until the work of the Church amongst the settlers, where a start had been made, was in proper order. The colonial administrator George Grey gave instruction that, “Christian mission stations should be used to assist this policy of civilizing and pacifying the eastern frontier and also mission stations to prevent the occurrence of further frontier wars” (Hinchliff, 1968:, 1963:47-48).

Colenso also had to lay his foundation for the Diocese of Natal differently, as he took his mission to the indigenous people until he was excommunicated. Colenso’ views on missions and Church government were quite different from that of the establishment. He was surprise to find that little work had been done among the indigenous people. The contestation over colonial policies of mission and ministry set the scene for the emergence of outstation congregations for indigenous people which would later inform the current policy and the differentiation between mission stations (main parish centre-parishes) and later the outstation congregations. There are critical links between the colonial mission stations, which from 1964 were re-named parishes and the traditional colonial outstation congregations which have not been re-named.

My argument in this regard is that Synod never made a change to the concept of mission, but just imposed the designation of parish, without consideration or consultation. This ultimately led to an unfortunate differentiation between various kinds of black congregations. Although many changed in name, the status of such congregations (colonial and mission legacy) remained the same as it was in the nineteenth century. Except that it enhanced the mission and ministry of the Diocese. For many black
congregations acquiring the designation of chaperly was the first step towards becoming a parish.

The policy of 1995 had to do with the status of outstation congregations in a large parish. This dealt specifically with the development of new parishes and outstations on progressional development (developmental districts). It is focused on enhancing the church in mission and ministry, being partially in a large parish but engaged in self development. Despite the transformation agenda of the policy, it is very rare to hear that an outstation or outstations have been declared developmental districts.

Both of these policies were directed to black mission and outstation congregations. These colonially inherited mission contradictions would in the post-apartheid era have the effect of creating ecclesiological ambiguity about the role of a large parish in the Diocese of Natal. Thus in an effort to have a politically correct policy, policy – makers ended-up with a policy with internal theological contradictions which resulted in the alienation of outstation congregations. Ultimately one of the issues that I sought to demonstrate in this thesis was the fact that contemporary ecclesiastical policies are deeply rooted in colonial, missiological ambivalences towards the indigenous people.

8.3. Policies of the church: Putting together the scattered threads

The two central policies under consideration are those of 1964 and 1995 which shaped the experience of Anglicanism in the black context as they engage in mission and ministry of the Church.

The 1964 policy brought freedom to the colonially established missions, which were largely managed by white Vicars and Superintendents of large parishes. After this policy change blacks became rectors and had pastoral charges called parishes. They now stayed in rectories and was able to bring direct mission to the black people who made up these parishes. Although intended to primarily enhance the mission and ministry of the Church, these became large parishes with their outstation congregations. The failure of the Diocese to deal with these changing conditions, instead further perpetuated under-development of black parishes.
The 1994 policy was an intervention by the Diocese to further develop mission and ministry. At the time several outstations became chapelries and were set on progression to become parishes. The outstations could also be placed as developmental districts, also on progressional strategy, to become a parish. This is primarily done by the bishop. However, it is very seldom for an outstation to progress to the level of progressional District because parish centre preferred to enjoy the financial and numerical benefits of having an outstation congregation(s). This too has also led to underdevelopment of black outstation congregations and alienated them.

While both policies went some way to enhance the Church in mission and ministry of the church, bit inadvertently led to the underdevelopment of black parishes and the alienation of outstation congregations.

The substantive claim here was that, the centre of the controversy reflected contested understandings about the in the alienation of outstation congregations in church policy and politics of the church. The contested spaces had been presented in two thematic categories; positive and negative categories portraying the position of outstation congregations as an asset and a liability for the Diocese of Natal.

For Foucault (1991), governmentality (Cononicality) referred to a “form of activity aimed to guide and shape conduct (Olssen, Codd and Naill, 2004:25). On the other hand, Gordon defined governmentality as the “conduct of conduct” (1991:2). For this study, governmentality denoted the activity of formulating and implementing policy to guide and shape of the conduct of the Churches. It can provide the lens through which to view the politics of the Church policy as reflected in various ways in which the alienation of outstation congregations has been understood by the research participants.

The study was premised on the following key research questions:
What is the Anglican Church's meaning of a large parochial structure model and what is the experience of being a Church to outstation congregations, in a large parochial structure model?

One thread running through the findings indicated the essence of the contestation over the governmentality of outstation congregations. Some views attributed value to policy change while others negated or minimized its value. The pattern of administration of church policies was noticed across the six categories of the research participants was the fact governmentality in the Diocese of Natal, which reflected the sustained alienation of outstation congregations.

However, the primary concern was different from one category of the research participants to another.

Firstly, the primary concern of the leadership of the Anglican Church was how to legitimate the outstation congregations and get it beyond bureaucracy into mission, ministry and worship. Their positive understandings fore-grounded the policy's value as a way of portraying it as an asset for the Diocese of Natal. On the other hand, their negative understandings focused on factors hampering the process of getting the policy change beyond merely being an idea.

Secondly, the large parish (main centre parish and outstation congregations) primarily focused on positive understandings of theological value of the policy for a large parish, in the Diocese of Natal. Apparently, the mention was probably to justify the policy on theological grounds. On the other hand, the negative understandings pointed out the adverse effects of the alienation of outstation congregations on the parishioners, in particular, and the Church administration, as a whole.

Thirdly, the guilds or organisations and focus group leadership understandings seemed to be primarily concerned with challenging the alienation of outstation congregations as a space for the promotion of knowledge and understandings about their brand of
Christianity. The history of theology in the Diocese of Natal was used to justify this concept of a large parochial structure model. The policy's value was portrayed both positively and negatively depending on whether the policy was perceived as enhancing certain interests.

Furthermore, the findings had also indicated that the change of status of outstation congregations was introduced as a compromise between competing ideologies within a large parish. The outstation congregations supported the main parish centre (Mother Church) while the Diocese of Natal was in favour of a large parish. Thus, while it was the mandate of the Diocese of Natal to formulate and implement policy change, the formulated policy would be subject to contestation by parishioners. The policy would be introduced against a background where a main parish centre monopolized the current space in outstation congregations.

That socio-political context of South Africa created demands on church policy-makers to re-conceptualize the sustainability of large parishes. The substantive claim made here was that the different understandings regarding the status of outstation congregations were contextually determined. They looked upon the policies as marginalisation to their aspiration of acquiring the status of a parish or Development Districts (progressional development). The main parish centre used the policies as a means to stop their development because the recommendation has to be made by them to the bishop. This inhibited the development of outstation congregations.

On the other side leaders of the outstation congregations saw an opening on the Acts of the Diocese as an avenue towards autonomy and full parish status (Diocese of Natal, 1994:3b).

Large parishes saw the policy as a recipe for a large parish division. Firstly, it reflected failure to have a policy by privileging one congregation the main parish centre over the outstation congregations. Secondly, it promoted a form of hegemony in Church policy
where orthodoxy dominated the policy space. As such, the policy's potential to develop to a diverse community that can thrive on toleration of differences, and mutual appreciation, is negated. Yet, these were necessary skills in a parish of diverse and pluralistic parish. With such alienations and privileging, it was had for the alienated outstation congregations to promote a dialogue across difference. As such their contribution to curbing bigotry and prejudices was compromised.

8.4. Understandings Outstation Congregation Experiences

The research had indicated lack of a clear articulation of the theory of theological underpinning the alienation of outstation congregations. For one thing, its theological contradictions rendered the policy ambiguous in terms of ontology, epistemology and methodology of a large parish. As such, it was not clear to what it sought to achieve at the level of theology through its main parish centre (mother Church) and outstation congregations' space of a large parish. As Fullan put it, any theological reform must state clearly what it sought to achieve at the level of theology in terms of mission and ministry. The contested understandings regarding the position of outstation congregations did not clearly interrogate and problematise its theological mission, ministry and worship. Except for its perceived theological value and masked political value, its theoretical mission was ambiguous.

This ambiguity has been theorized from three perspectives: Ontological, epistemological and methodological.

Ontological, the policy embraced two contradictory concepts about the nature of a large parish. In the main parish centre (mother Church), large parish was based on one congregation while in the outstation congregations' space was based on many congregations' space; large parish was on many congregations. The ontological opposition between outstation congregations and main parish centre was not articulated in the understandings by the Diocese of Natal leadership: bishop, archdeacons, main parish centre, outstation congregations, guilds or organisations, focus group.
Epistemological, the alienation of outstation congregations promoted two contradictory ways of acquiring knowledge about Christianity. In the main parish centre it was only knowledge and understanding of one congregation while in the outstation congregations' space, it was knowledge and understanding of congregations.

Methodology, the policy promoted two oppositional approaches to the theology of congregations, in the Churches. In the main parish centre, the approach was closed and limited to one congregation while the outstation congregations' space, it was open and free to relate and compare congregations. Outstation congregations had the potential to promote dialogue across difference, while main parish centre promoted exclusivism in the knowledge and understanding about congregations.

The claim here was that all six categories of research participants supported or contested the alienation of outstation congregations on theological grounds though with different nuisances, without problematising or acknowledging its ontological, epistemological and methodological contradictions. Even the view that the policy was apparently, more political than theological work, was not articulated.

8.5. Contribution of the Study of Knowledge

Whilst a lot had been said on the large parish mission, ministry and worship, this study had made a unique contribution to the theory of politics of the Church policy. Its main claim was that the perceived value of a policy may mask its theological contradictions and supposedly real value. The various contestations regarding the alienation of outstation congregations had been theorized as a manifestation of the politics of the Church policy.

Thus, in terms of theoretical contribution to knowledge, the study had extended the conceptualization of politics of the Church policy beyond contesting and influencing conduct of theology in the Church, to include various understandings, that parishioners may have heard about the value of the policy and the various understandings that people may have about the value of the policy and the reasons for such understandings. It was
the claim of this study that the different understandings that policy carried for different people, should also be seen as part of politics of the Church policy.

Furthermore, the theorization of the various understandings regarding the position and status of outstation congregations was a contribution to policy of mission, ministry and worship, in the context of a large parish model. While most studies were based on the main parish centre or outstation congregations, this study had contributed to a body of knowledge based the experiences of outstation congregations. The claim of the study's original contribution to knowledge, with Descombe's notion that, “the researcher can meet the demand for originality through choosing a new topic-one that had not previously been studied,” (2002:88).

Thus, the study had made a unique contribution to knowledge in the field of policy of mission, ministry and worship in Christian theology. While previous studies had foregrounded (Can, 2007) main parish centre and outstation congregations' contributions of inclusive and exclusion of a large parish, in the Diocese of Natal. This study had pushed the debate to include another perspective based on the alienation of outstation congregations in the Diocese of Natal. This new perspective had shown that, in policy of mission, ministry and worship, it is possible to have the perceived value of a policy making its theological contradictions and supposedly, real value. The alienation of outstation congregations contained oppositional ontology, epistemology, and methodology because of the large parish' space. However, the Diocese of Natal introduced it mainly as a politically correct compromise in the midst of contortionist by alienated outstation congregations and main parish centre.

The design of the study was also part of its original contribution. Methodologically, the study had made a contribution by using phenomenology in exploring contested understandings regarding the alienation of outstation congregation and the reasons for such understandings using a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data. In terms of research participants, the use of six elite categories and their perspectives to ultimate contesting spaces in policy change was also part of the study's original contribution. Through such a sign, the study had produced a body of new information on the politics of the Church policy and large parish mission, ministry and worship.
8.6. Concluding Reflections

The interpretation of the phenomenon of policy change varied according to the situation of the viewer. As such, there was no objective interpretation of policy change. Parish policy change can be obtained. In this study, such varied interpretations or understandings had been described, analyzed, and theorized as policy of the Church. Much of the theory of politics of the Church related to how different Anglican Church leadership contest, influence, or seek to influence, the conduct of Christianity in the Church. However, this study had argued for an extension of this conceptualization of politics of the Church's policy to include the various interpretations or understandings that parishioners had about the value of a policy. At the level of interpretation, parishioners differently perceived the value of any policy change. It was argued here that such varied evaluative perceptions gave rise to contesting spaces in policy change and were a reflection of Church politics.

One reflection was that the varied contested understandings regarding the alienation of the outstation congregations, had implications for the negotiations of theological policy with stakeholders. For one thing, there was need for clarify about the conception of the policy of mission, ministry and worship, in a Christian diverse and pluralistic Diocese of Natal. Such clarity could help to resolve the tension between the secular and sacred conception of the large parish in theology. This study had illuminated such tension as reflected in the varied understandings by the six categories of the research participants.

Firstly, the Diocese of Natal leadership seemed largely to understand the alienation of the outstation congregation on theological grounds, aimed at accommodating different demands for a large parish. The policy change was meant to accommodate especially those Anglican parish actors pressing for the main parish centre and outstation congregations in a large parish, respectfully. The Diocese of Natal leaders fore grounded the theological justification of the alienation of outstation congregations and the challenges faced in getting the policy change beyond bureaucracy into mission at the level of the parish.

Secondly, the large parish (outstation congregations and main parish centre) seemed to a largely understand the alienation of outstation congregations on theological grounds,
aimed at helping parishioners to develop knowledge and understanding of Christianity and the role it played in personal and social life. Their understandings illuminated the policy's value for parishioners and its challenges for Churches.

Thirdly, the focus group and guilds or organization, leaders seemed to largely understand the policy change aimed at promoting knowledge about their respective Christianity among the parishioners. Their understandings illuminated factors impacting their use of the large parish policy to promote mission ministry and worship.

These contradictions were discursively produced with the Diocese of Natal's theological and ecclesiology context. However, they were not interrogated in the varied understandings. The claim was that such contradictions made it easy to describe the value of alienation of outstation congregations’ policy change as more ecclesiology than theological. Nonetheless, the alienation of outstation congregations could be justified as a response to the Diocese of Natal's ecclesiological and theological context. While responding to the need to provide a large parish as an ecclesiological activity and it contributes to the Diocese of Natal's vision of mission, ministry and worship. The policy also attempted to provide a win-win between the demands for main parish centre and outstation congregations. More specifically, the conception of a large parish as theological activity was in conflict with the conception of a large parish as an ecclesiastical activity.

Furthermore, since theology of religion can influence the conception of large parish there was need for a paradigm shift in the Anglican Church public theology and a democratic society required promoting the common good by witnessing to the care values rather than seeking privileged for one particular religion (de Grunchy, 2007). The other stakeholders in theology should, therefore be committed to build alliance for justice and constructing dialogical space in which knowledge and understanding diverse Christian traditions can strive. There should be no attempt to privilege one congregation over other congregations. All Christian actors influencing the conduct of theology in the Church should deconstruct their own complicity in the practice of exclusivism in large parish and recognise the need to open up new policy spaces where dialogue across Christianity can be cultivated.
The need for conceptualising large parish becomes more critical in the contest of the theological contractions embedded in the alienation outstation congregations and lack of awareness of such contractions. The conceptualization should be based on theoretical constructions with the potential to translate policy into concrete theological actions at Church without theological contradictions. And in a manner that promotes not minimizes the set Diocese goals of mission and ministry. Another point to be noted here was that there was need to acknowledge that in any large parish, some bodies actions beliefs, values and experiences were legitimatized as normal and acceptable, and others as abnormal deviant and unacceptable (Carry, 2006)

The large parish contestation of the outstation congregations could be seen as a form of legitimizing main parish centre against outstation congregations. Thus, there was need to reconceptualise the large parish policy as a space that thrives on the different theology, with that view, outstation congregations can be negotiated while looking out of any inclination towards discrimination on the bases of differences between congregations. The conceptualization should be driven by the need to help congregations change their expectations of a large parish in Churches. It should aim at preparing parishioners for a diverse aim at array of contents, both local and Diocese of Natal, to that effect, the value of large parish should be judged on how well it prepared parishioners for a world that had become interconnected, pluralistic and was increasingly espousing a democratic ethos.

Any form of exclusivism in a large parish should be seen as a structural barrier in the Anglican Church and a poor reflection of politics of the church policy. The claim here was that barriers to alienation of outstation congregations rendered hollow the whole rhetoric of the Diocesan vision, aiming at promoting in parishioners ethical and socio-cultural skills suitable for a democratic and pluralistic large parish. The theoretical and practical implications of alienation of outstation congregations mismatch rhetoric about promoting in parishioners skills such as greater understand of self and others.

Situational management, stewardship, team work, situational appraisal, problem analysis, decision making, handling conflict and disagreement, performance appraisal, point problem solving theological and tolerance of differences. It’s to free large parish from being conceptualized as a Christian activity. It also continued to privilege one
congregation over other congregations in the Church policy. Such privileging reflected hegemony in Christian which was not a recipe for parish cohesion but divisiveness. More specially, Diocese of Natal would support the policy to be largely based on one of the following reasons; Missiology and Development. While these reasons were important in themselves, they would not be sufficient to justify large parish in theology where the inclusion of a team work had to be justified on management inclusion of a team work had to be justified on management developmental grounds. This meant that each workshop had to contribute in a unique way to the fulfilment of the aims the vision of the Diocese of Natal.

For the Diocese of Natal, the Diocesan vision expressed this aspiration and all team work development included in the school policy had to make a unique contribution to the realization of such Diocesan vision. Large parish is no exception however, the alienation of outstation congregations (as understood by the Diocese of Natal leadership, bishop, archdeacons, main parish centre, outstation congregations, guilds or organization and focus group) fell short of making that unique contribution. This was mainly because the large parish policy was not conceptualized only as theological activity, informed by a theologian ideology.

Furthermore, while the view of Christianity teaching would be tenable from a perspective of public theology of exclusivism in a large parish, it would be difficult to justify in public theology serving a democratic and pluralist Diocese of Natal. It was for this reason that theologians and policy makers felt the need for a large parish policy. The presence of biblical knowledge in a large parish was a space of exclusivism in the Diocese of Natal. In that sense, the alienation of outstation congregations failed to fully respond to the Diocese of Natal’s pluralistic nature.

As such, there is a need to find ways around the hegemonic forces and institutional obstacles that limit the development of critical knowledge and understanding of Christianity as an important dimension of human and social life. The teaching and learning of Christianity as a religion in public theology reinforced prejudices. It also disconnected the understanding of a large parish from the perspective of a global
Anglican Communion with the common objective of promoting the Communion of parishioners, capable of negotiating meaning and promoting dialogue across difference.

Finally, although the alienation of outstation congregations was still in its early stages of implementation, since its introduction in the middle of the nineteenth century, some general conclusions could be drawn about its impact on mission, ministry and worship of a large parish in the Diocese of Natal. Given the political and social imperatives facing policy developers in the pluralistic Diocese of Natal, the alienation of outstation congregations’ policy change, was seen as a politically correct approach to take. In the short run, the policy change would manage to resolve the controversy that had arisen over the replacement of the main parish centre with an outstation congregation. However, in mission as well as in ministry, the policy had led to a progressive exclusivism and hegemony in the large parish while creating theological contradictions in terms of ontology, epistemology of a large parish.

Furthermore, the alienation of outstation congregations’ policy change demonstrated failure by policy-makers to make a complete paradigm shift in a large parish from main parish centre to a large parish policy. It also illustrated that sometimes theological policy change may be justified on grounds that were not theological in intent. For instance, the Diocese of Natal need for maintaining peace and unity in a large parish may play an important role in shaping a policy. The alienation of outstation congregations could be understood from this perspective. It was meant to accommodate the competing demands to the main parish centre and a large parish policy. However, by foregoing the policy’s theological value, either as an asset or liability, the contested understandings by the Diocese of Natal leaders: bishop, archdeacons, main parish centre, outstation congregations, guilds or organisations and focus group, tended to mask its mission and ministry value and its contradictions.

In a way, the position of outstation congregations seemed to acknowledge the Diocese of Natal’s diversity in parishes and a need to be fair to all congregations in a large parish’s policy of mission and ministry to be practiced. The main parish centre and outstation congregation’s spaces seemed to be an attempt to achieve a balance between two different conceptions of a large parish. In so doing, however, it had only managed to paper over the
fundamental differences so as to search a thin consensus on a large parish. However, that consensus promoted theological contradictions in a large parish policy. The policy change and sensitizing might promote a constructive dialogue across congregations from different and diverse background, in a large parish. Yet, the congregations should be one of the spaces where such dialogue would be promoted.
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APPENDIX I: Samples of informed consent letters

CONSENT FORM FOR CHURCH LEADERS TO BE INTERVIEWED.

Study topic: Critical analysis of contemporary large parochial structure model for black parishes in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, with reference to the Diocese of Natal.

Investigator: Mlungisi Johann Vilakazi, D.Th, B.Th (HON), M.Th, M.Adult Education.

Affiliation: Anglican Church, Diocese of Natal. P. O. Box 47439, GREYVILLE. 4023, School of Religion and Theology, University of Kwa Zulu – Natal, Private Bag X 01, Scottsville, Pietermaritzburg.

Purpose

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this research study designed to explore and analyze the role of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model, in the Anglican Church.

Before giving your consent, I outline below the procedure, risk and benefits that will help you to make a decision as to whether or not you wish to go ahead and be part of this research study.

Description of Procedures

If you decide to participate in the study, you will be required to be interviewed by myself as a researcher. I will be asking you questions and writing the answers you will give. I will read to you the answers for any clarification before typing the notes. I will arrange with you the suitable time and place for the interviews, which may take about one and a half to two hours.

The questions will be about what the Church understands to be the role and position of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model. You will therefore, be expected to provide information to all the questions asked. You will also be free not to answer if you do not feel like doing so.

Risks and Benefits

The study involves giving information about the role and position of outstation congregations in a parochial structure model and you may feel uncomfortable. I also realize that the study will take some of your valuable time. I will therefore make sure I adhere to the agreed time. If, for any reason we fail to meet, I will try to reschedule for another meeting.
Your participation in this study will also be a learning process for you. You will be sensitized as to how issues of our mission and ministry impacted on people’s attitudes towards outstation congregations. You will receive feedback on the research findings. Your contributions will assist the Diocese of Natal to acknowledge the role and position of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model.

**Confidentiality**

Since the study involves giving information about the role and position of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model, I will make every effort to keep your responses confidential. No name, except the name of your parish, will appear on the forms. You will also be expected to keep strict confidentiality about any information you share or come across during the interviews.

**Voluntary Participation**

Please note that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are, therefore free to decline to participate, or to withdraw your participation at any time for any reason without feeling bad, and that our relationship will continue to be friendly.

**Questions**

For any queries you may contact Mlungisi Johann Vilakazi at School of Religion and Theology, University of Kwa Zulu-Natal, Private Bag x 01, 3201, Pietermaritzburg. Cell 0820446634. Email vilakazimj@telkomsa.net or R 800 Umlazi, P.O. Umlazi, 4066, Phone (h) 031 9071740, P.O. Box 32044 Mobeni 4060

**Agreement to Participate**

I………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….Hereby confirm that I have read and understood the contents of this document and the nature of the research study, and I agree to participate in this study.

**SIGNATURE**…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..DATE………………………………

N.B: for academic purposes I have presented the consent forms and the questions (Appendices 1-4) in English but will translate them into the vernacular language, IsiZulu, when using them.
APPENDIX 2
Consent form for outstation congregations to be interviewed.

Study Scope: Critical analysis of a contemporary large parochial structure model for black parishes in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, with reference to the Diocese of Natal.

Investigator: Mlungisi Johann Vilakazi, D.Th, B.Th, (HON) M.Th. M.ADULT EDUCATION.

AFFILIATION: Anglican Church, Diocese of Natal / University of Kwa Zulu-Natal.

Purpose

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this research study designed to explore and analyse the role of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model, in the Diocese of Natal.

Before giving your consent, I outline below the procedure, risks and benefits that will help you to make a decision as to whether or not you wish to go ahead and be part of this research study.

Description of Procedures

If you decide to participate in the study, you will be required to give your story about what you understand to be your role as parishioner of outstation congregations in a parochial structure model: what are the successes and challenges you have experienced. I will record your story and write some notes as well. Following research ethics, I will not use your real name but the one that you will invent yourself. I will ask you questions during the interview for clarification before typing the notes. I will arrange with you the suitable time and place for the interviews, which may take about one and a half hours.

Risks and Benefits

The study involves giving information about yourself and you may feel uncomfortable to share your private life. You will be free to give whatever information you wish. You may also withdraw your participation at any time and you will not be blamed for it, and should that happen you will have to inform me in good time so that I will look for replacement. I realize that the study will take some of your valuable time. I will therefore, make sure I adhere to the agreed time. If, for any reason we fail to meet, I will try to reschedule for another meeting.

Your participation in this will also be a learning process for you. You will be sensitised as to how issues of our mission and ministry impact on people’s attitudes towards outstation congregations. You will also receive feedback on the research findings. Your
contributions will assist the Diocese of Natal to acknowledge the role and position of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model.

Confidentiality

As mentioned above, the study involves giving information about yourself; I will therefore make every effort to keep your story confidential. I will keep all the notes and tapes under lock. We will use substitute names to your stories for confidentiality purposes. You will also be expected to keep strict confidentiality about any information you share with me or come across during the interviews.

Voluntary Participation

Please note that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are therefore, free to decline to participate, or to withdraw your participation any time for any reason without feeling bad, and that our relationship will continue to be friendly.

Questions

For any queries you may contact Mlungisi Vilakazi at School of Religion and Theology, University of Kwa Zulu, Private Bag x01, Scottsville, 3201, Pietermaritzburg. Cell 082 0446 634, Email vilakazimj@telkomsa.net or R 800 Umlazi, P.O Umlazi, 4066 Phone no (h) 031 907 1740, P.O. Box 32044 Mobeni 4060

Agreement to Participate

I …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Hereby confirm that I have read and understood the contents of this document and the nature of the research study, and I agree to participate in this study.

SIGNATURE…………………………………………………………..DATE………………
APPENDIX 3

CONSENT FORM FOR REGIONAL CLERGY AND MOTHER’S UNION FOCUS GROUP

STUDY Topic: Critical analysis of a contemporary large parochial structure model for black parishes in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, with reference to the Diocese of Natal.

Investigator: Mlungisi Johann Vilakazi, D.Th, B.Th (HON), MTh, M.Adt. Ed.

AFFILIATION: Diocese of Natal / University of Kwa Zulu –Natal

Purpose

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this research study designed to explore and analyse the role of outstation congregations in a parochial structure model, in the Diocese of Natal.

Before giving your consent, outline below the procedures, risks and benefits that will help you to make a decision as to whether or not you wish to go ahead and be part of this research study.

Description of Procedures

If you decide to participate in the study, you will be required to be involved in group discussions led by myself as a researcher. I will be asking you questions and writing the answers you will give. I will read to you the answers for any clarification before typing the notes. I will arrange that we hold our discussions during our scheduled monthly meetings for the month of January and March 2012.

The questions will be about what you understand to be the role and position of outstation congregations in a parochial structure model. You will, therefore, be expected to provide information to all the questions asked: you will also be free not to answer if you feel like doing so.

Risks and Benefits

The study involves giving information about the position and role of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model in the Diocese of Natal. I also realize that the study will take some of your valuable time. I will, therefore, make sure I adhere to the agreed time.

Your participation in this study will also be a learning process for you. You will be sensitized as to how issues of our mission and ministry and the Bible impact people’s attitudes towards outstation congregations. You will receive feedback on the research
findings. Your contributions will assist the Diocese of Natal to acknowledge the role and position of outstation congregation in a large Parochial Structure Model.

Confidentiality

Since the study giving information about the role and position of the outstation congregations in a parochial structure model, I will make every effort to keep your responses confidential. If you so wish, no name will appear on the forms. You will also be expected to keep strict confidentiality about any information that is shared during the discussions.

Voluntary Participation

Please note that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are, therefore, free to decline to participate in the discussions for any reason without feeling bad, and that our relationship will continue to be friendly.

Questions

For any queries you may contact Mlungisi Johann Vilakazi at School of Religion and Theology, University of Kwa Zulu-Natal, Private Bag X01, Scottsville, 3201, Pietermaritzburg. Cell no 082 0446 634, Email Vilakazi@telkomsa.net or R 800 Umlazi, P.O. Umlazi, 4066, 3600. Phone no (h) 031 9071740, P.O. Box 32044. Mobeni 4060

Agreement to Participate

I……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
Hereby confirm that I have read and understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research study, and I agree to participate in this study.

SIGNATURE………………………………………………………DATE……………………
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RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

(A) FOR CHURCH LEADERS

Name of Church .................................................................Date.................................

Position held in the Church.................................................................

Male/Female of interviewee.................................................................

1. What does it mean for you to be a member of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal?

2. What does it mean for the large parochial structure model to be a member of the Anglican Church in the Diocese?

3. What do you think is the role of outstation congregations in your large parochial structure model?

4. What are the activities in which the outstation congregations are involved in a large parochial structure model?

5. What are the conditions of engagement for outstation congregations towards being part of a large parochial structure model?

6. What are the conditions of being in a large parochial structure model for outstation congregations?

7. Do you think the outstation congregations deserve a say in administration of a large parochial structure model?

8. What are the reasons for your answer to question 5 above?

9. What would you say to outstation congregations which choose not to work within the large parochial structure model?

10. What are the reasons for you answer to question 7 above?

11. What can be done to acknowledge and appreciate participation of the outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model?

12. What do you think are the problems that the outstation congregations face as they serve the church in a large parochial structure model?
13. What would be the appropriate way to solve the problems identified in question 10?

14. What is your vision of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model?

15. What is your vision of being a Church for outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model?

(B) RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR OUTSTATION CONGREGATIONS

Name……………………………………………………………Date………………………

Age ……no of years as a parishioner………………

Educational Qualifications………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Theological Training……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Name of Church………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

1. What does it mean for you to be a member of a large parochial structure model in the Diocese of Natal (Anglican Church Southern Africa)?

2. What does it mean for you to be members of the outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model in the Diocese of Natal?

3. Please tell me your story about what you think is your role in an outstation congregation within a large parochial structure model?

4. In what activities /ministries are you involved in, both at the outstation congregation and at large parochial structure model?

5. What training have you received to prepare you for those activities / ministries mentioned in
question 4?

6. What are the most positive experiences you have had in your ministries?

7. What challenges have you experienced as?

   7.1 A Parishioner?

   7.2 A member of Church council / parish Church council?

   7.3 A member of the ministries you are involved in?

8. Has the large parochial structure model given you any job descriptions of the ministries you are involved in?

9. What do you think should be done to acknowledge and appreciate your involvement in the outstation congregation for the mission and ministries they are doing?

10. In what way do the biblical teachings of your large parochial structure model guide you in your outstation congregation ministries?

11. What is your vision of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model?

12. What is your vision of being in a large parochial structure model in the Diocese of Natal?

(C) RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

DATE…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

1. What does it mean to you to be a member of the Diocese of Natal in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa?

2. What does it mean to be a member of outstation congregation in a large parochial structure model in the Diocese of Natal?
3. What do you understand to be the role of outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model?

4. Why do the outstation congregations do what they do in a large parochial structure model?

5. Why does the Diocese of Natal establish a mother Church (parish centre) and not also, progressional development strategy for outstation congregations in a large parochial structure model?

6. What can be done to acknowledge and appreciate the outstation congregations for the Work/service they do in a large parochial structure model?

7. What are the challenges that you see outstation congregations facing in a large parochial structure model?

8. What is your vision of outstation congregation in a large parochial structure model?

9. What is your vision being in large parochial structure model in the Diocese of Natal?
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LARGE PARISHES WITH COLONIAL ROOTS BACKGROUND

LIST OF LARGE PARISHES

Durban (St Faith’s Parish)
Enqabeni (St Luke’s Parish)
Estcourt (St Barnabas-St Alban’s Parish)
Imbali (St Mark’s Parish)
Klip River (St Chad’ Parish)
Steadville (St. Johan’s Parish)
Pholela (St Mary’s)
Springvale (St Andrew’s Parish)
Tonga (St John’s Parish)
Umlazi (St Augustine’s Parish)
Sobantu (St Christopher’s Parish)
Dundee (St Phillip’s Parish)
Emadadeni (St Andrew’s parish)
Emagabheni (St Bride’s Parish)
Edendale (St Martin’s Parish)
Hammersdale (St Mary’s Parish)
Greystown (St Phillip’s Parish)
Port Shepstone (St Lawrence’s Parish)
Enwabi (St Phillip’s Parish)
kwaMashu (Ekuvukeni)
Stanger (St Phillip’s Parish)
Stoffelton (St Augustine’s Parish)
Mpophomeni (The Good Shepherd’s Parish)
Total number of large parishes is Twenty Eight.

Parishes that were Outstation Congregations and started by being Developing Paishes and became fully-fleshed parishes are six.

Inanda (Prince of Peace Parish-single parish)
Cato Crest / Manor
Kwa Makhutha (Ezimbokodweni Parish)
Ntuzuma (Kwa Msindisi)
Osizweni (Ekubonakalisweni)
Pinetown (Umhlathuzana)

There were fifteen archdeaconries (regions) and only thirteen had outstation congregations (large parish). Seven will represent archdeaconries to form Church leaders

The Archdeaconries are:

Durban (North East)
Durban Ridge (North East)
Durban (South)
Ingagane (North West)
Uthukela (North West)
Lovu (South)
Msunduzi (South)
North Coast (North East)
North Durban (North East)
Pietermaritzburg (South)
Pinetown (South)
Durban (Central)
Umkhomazi (South)
Umngeni (North west)
Umzimkhulu (South)
APPENDIX 6

The Mother’s Union, which had four regions, would also have seven members representing them in a Focus Group. The Regions are:

South Coast
Durban and District
Midlands (Pietermaritzburg and District)
Northern Natal

Twenty nine rectors were from twenty nine large parishes, as identified above. I had identified seven only from different archdeaconries to form a focus group, with Mother’s Union group of seven participants.

APPENDIX 7

DESCRIPTION OF THEMATIC ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Here, I would give a description and justification on the method and procedure of data analysis that I followed in analysing the qualitative data of the study.

Familiarising myself with the Qualitative Data

I started analysing the in-depth interview data by transcribing and typing the tape-recorded on forty-two participants in groups plus the Diocesan bishop interviews, on the six categories in the Diocese of Natal. I also typed the qualitative data that I had generated including the bishop of the Diocese of Natal although he belonged to the leaders of the Diocese of Natal, as a participant. Transcribing and typing were part of the process of familiarising myself with the data. Here Riessman (1993) observed that although the process of transcription may seem to be time-consuming, frustrating, and boring at times, it was one excellent way of starting familiarising yourself with data. Commenting on the importance of transcribing as an aspect of the thematic analytic phase, Bird argued that transcription should be regarded as “a key phase of data analysis within the interpretative qualitative methodology” (2005:227). It was also further argued that the process of transcribing tape-recorded interviews would be recognised as an interpretative act where meanings are created, and not simply as a mechanical act of putting spoken sounds on paper (Braun and Clarke, 2006, Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999).

After transcribing and typing the data, I edited the transcripts by checking them back against the recorded tapes. The aim here was to ensure that the transcripts had retained the information from the verbal accounts of the interviews in a way which was true to their original nature. Transcribing and typing of the qualitative questionnaire data were important tasks in familiarising myself with the data and helped me to develop a far more
thorough understandings of the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Following the transcribing and typing, another aspect of familiarising myself with the data was what Marshall and Rossman (2006) described as immersion in the data, which involved reading and re-reading through the data. Thus, I read and re-read through the data corpus, consisting of the transcriptions, typed copies of the six participant groups of the Diocese of Natal’s open-ended responses. This enabled me to become intimately familiar with the qualitative data.

General Codes

After familiarising myself with qualitative data, the next phase was data coding. Coding data was the process of transforming raw data for the purposes of analysis. Based on my immersion in and heightened awareness of the data resulting from my familiarisation with the data. I started open coding manually this was otherwise described as manifest content analysis (Sarantakos, 2005), where the data were opened for ideas, themes, categories, or patterns emerging from the manifest content. Open-Coding was conducted “to identify first-order concepts and substantive codes” (Sarantakos, 2005:349). I coded the data by using highlighters writing notes in and on the margin of the text, to mark ideas. Coding involved reading and re-reading, coding and re-coding the data. This was done to identify segments (codes) of the data that reflected some ideas about the understandings regarding alienation of outstation congregation’s policy change for the large parish in the Diocese of Natal.

The importance of generating codes as an aspect of thematic analysis was acknowledged by Braun & Clarke (2006) who observed that, codes identify a feature of the data; be it semantic (manifest) or latent content that appeared interesting to the analyst. Boyatzis described codes as “the most basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon” (1998:63). Miles & Huberman (1994) acknowledge coding as an important part of data analysis, whilst Tuckett (2005) argued that coding helped the analyst to organise the data into meaningful groups. Thus, coding was a critical aspect of thematic analysis since it finally led to the development of themes in the next phase of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Commenting on codes, Siedel (1998) differentiated between codes as heuristic tools and codes as objectivist, transparent representations of facts. Heuristic codes were used as tools to facilitate discovery and further investigation of the data. As Siedel observed, in “a heuristic approach, code words were primarily flags or signposts that pointed to things in the data” (1998:14). On the other hand, objectivist codes were condensed representations of the facts described in the data and “can be treated as surrogates for the text, and the analysis can focus on the codes instead of the text itself” (Siedel, 1998:14). In the study, the coding and codes had been used as heuristic tools about the understandings regarding status of outstation congregations as they challenge the
Anglican Church on policy change. To that extent, the codes had helped me to organise and develop themes from the data.

Furthermore, Braun & Clarke (2006) differentiated two types of coding: data-driven coding and theory-driven coding. The former led to the development of themes that “depend on the data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006:89), and this can also be described as inductive or grounded coding. Theory-driven coding was done “with specific questions in mind that you wish to code around” (Braun & Clarke, 2006:89), and can be described as deductive or theoretical, or a priori coding. The coding employed in this study was data-driven, inductive or grounded coding in the sense that the codes were generated from and not imposed on the data.

It could be argued that coding was one phase of the research process where my role as a researcher and analyst was critical as co-producer and manipulator of knowledge. This was because what got coded as interesting features of the data depended on my personal curiosity and creativity. The data set was coded inductively by generating codes that had relevance to the key research question within my limited and bounded perspective. Thus, the same data could have been coded differently by different analysts.

Three guidelines according to Braun & Clarke (2006) were borne in mind when coding data. Firstly, I tried to code the data for as many potential interesting features as possible. Secondly, I coded the data inclusively by keeping a little of the relevant surrounding data as a way of remaining true to the context of the data and avoiding the common criticism of losing the context in the process of coding (Bryman, 2001). Thirdly, I code individual extracts of data in as many ways as possible and as relevant, so that some parts of text were encoded, others were coded once or many times. At the end of this phase, all data extracts were coded and collated together within each code.

Generating Initial Themes

Generating themes could be likened to the second level of coding by Sarantakos described as “axial coding” (2005:350). At this level of coding I interconnected the codes generated under open-coding to construct higher-order concepts called themes (patterns or categories). Sarantakos (2005) also described this phase of generating initial themes as theoretical coding or latent content analysis. It was a more advanced level of coding than open-coding, since it involved interconnecting “first-order concepts to construct higher-order concepts” (Sarandakos, 2005:350). Whilst open-coding just opens data to theoretical possibilities, axial-coding found relationship between the first order concepts (codes) to reach a higher level of abstraction. This task was called generating initial themes since it involved identifying relationships between and among the generated codes to come up with themes on the ecclesiological phenomenon under study.
The generation of initial themes was based on the generated codes, which led to the development of a thematic map on the understandings of the status of outstation congregations as they challenge the Anglican Church on policy change. This was done by sorting the codes into potential patterns or themes and collating all the relevant coded data extracts within the identified themes. In keeping with my key research questions and title of the study, I engaged the codes to generate the themes reflecting contesting spaces in the understandings regarding status of outstation congregations as they challenge the Anglican Church on policy change.

Whilst constructing the themes, I searched for those themes that had internal convergence and external convergence (Guba, 1978). Internal and external convergences imply that the themes had to be internally consistent but distinct from one another. It should be noted, however, that I did not search for the exhaustive and mutually exclusive themes, but identified salient themes of the understandings by each category of the research participants.

Patton differentiated between themes as “indigenous typologies” (2002: 457-458) and themes as “analyst – constructed typologies. Indigenous typologies were those themes created, expressed and used by the research participants whilst the analyst-constructed typologies were of those themes created by the researcher and grounded in the data but not necessarily used by the research participants themselves (Patton, 2002). Using the notion of themes as analyst – constructed typologies, I constructed an initial thematic map on the understandings regarding the status of outstation congregations as they challenge the Anglican Church on policy change.

However, as Patton (2002) warns, the use of analyst-constructed typologies had the limitation of running the risk of imposing a world of meaning on the participants that better reflected the analysts’ world than that of the research participants. To mitigate this limitation, I used, for each theme, data extracts with adequate detail, to remain true to context of the study and perspectives of the research participants. As Terre-Blanche, Durrheim and Painter pointed out, the “key to doing an interpretive analysis is to stay close to the data, to interpret it from a position of empathic understanding” (2006:321). I ended this phase with a list of themes for all categories of the participants, as summarised in Appendix 7b, I below.

After generating an initial thematic list, I tested the themes within the data to see whether they had the explanatory power they were supposed to have about the understandings regarding the status of outstation congregations as they challenge the Anglican Church on policy change. I first applied each theme to a small area of the qualitative data, then to a large one, and finally right through the whole data set, within each of the six research participants’ categories.
Reviewing Themes

Reviewing themes involved the refinement of the initial thematic map (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Through this task, some of the themes generated for the initial thematic map could no longer stand as main themes and had to collapse into sub-themes. In the end, I came up with two main thematic categories, namely, positive and negative understandings regarding the status of outstation congregations as they challenge the Anglican Church on policy change. The guiding principles followed here were Patton (2002) twin constructs of ‘internal homogeneity’ and ‘external heterogeneity’ of themes. These constructs respectively denoted that data “within the themes should cohere together meaningfully, while there should be identifiable distinctions between themes” (Braun & Clarke 2006, 91). Each thematic category had themes representing the understanding to each category of the research participants as summarised in Appendix 7b, Figure 7b.2 below.

I reviewed the themes at two levels. The first level involved all coded data extracts. This was done by reading and checking all collated extracts for each theme, for a coherent pattern. Once that was done for all the themes, I moved on to the second level, which involved my entire data set for each category of research participants. At this level, I considered the validity of individuals themes in relation to my data set, and also checked whether the generated thematic map actually reflected “the meanings evident in the data set as a whole” (Braun & Clarke 2006:91). This was done by re-reading my entire data set with two purposes in mind. The first was to check for coherence between the themes and data set. The second was to code, where possible, any additional data within the themes that I might have missed in the earlier coding phase. Braun and Clarke asserted that, the re - coding of the “data set is expected as coding is an organic process” (2006:91).

Defining and Naming Themes

This was a phase of refining the themes. After generating and reviewing a satisfactory list of themes from the data, I defined and named them in a way they were to be presented as research findings. I also analysed the data within the themes to ensure the internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity of themes. This entailed “identifying the ‘essence’ of what each theme is all about (as well as the themes overall) and determining what aspect of the data each theme captured” (Braun & Clarke, 2006:92). However, I tried to avoid getting a theme to do too much or to be too diverse or complex. This was done by going back to my collated data extracts for the themes, identifying what was of interest about them according to my research questions, and organising them into a coherent and internally consistent account, with accompanying narrative as presented in chapter Six and Seven.

Therefore, refining themes is related to what Sarantakos (2005) described as, selective coding, which denoted the selecting of higher-order categories or themes with theoretical
saturation and high explanatory power. In the main, this phase consisted of thinking about the relationship between the codes, themes, and different levels of themes such as thematic category and the themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In the end, I had a final thematic map as shown in appendix 7b, Figure 7b.3 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings / Themes</th>
<th>Head of the Diocese (Bishop)</th>
<th>Regional (archdeacons leaders (archdeacons)</th>
<th>Main Parish Centre (parent Church)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enjoy Diocesan ministries</td>
<td>Family of God</td>
<td>Worshipping in diversity, versatile organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belonging to extended family</td>
<td>Being in a family</td>
<td>Networking, challenge and growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Historical and financial reasons</td>
<td>Function as a team</td>
<td>Financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All ministries and Activities for mission</td>
<td>activities or ministries informed about needs of Church and society</td>
<td>Support mission of parent Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canons-parent Church and branches</td>
<td>Bringing in finances.</td>
<td>In terms of Canons-parent Church and branches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In terms of Canons, but not dependent on parent Church.</td>
<td>Need information.</td>
<td>Expected to depend on parent Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hold large parish together.</td>
<td>Yes, deserve a say in finances.</td>
<td>To what was done to Finances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In terms of Canons.</td>
<td>In terms of Canons.</td>
<td>Guided by the Canons of the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>in terms of Canons and Underlying factors</td>
<td>Rector – to be treated equally</td>
<td>Angry to be told, cannot take decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Development and creation of other parishes</td>
<td>Leaders of the large parish to involve everybody in mission ministry</td>
<td>There to be equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bishop’ visit to the parish, procession to include all wardens</td>
<td>Wardens to visit outstation congregations to appreciate and acknowledge their work in the large parish</td>
<td>One visit done by bishop and archdeacon to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control on the part</td>
<td>Not allowed to develop</td>
<td>Demotivated, even if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the rector</td>
<td>into future parishes</td>
<td>trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Develop and create other congregations</td>
<td>Training, development and accountability</td>
<td>Recognition and involvement for the growth of the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If rector has no skills, the bishop has to do that-empower leaders to develop congregations</td>
<td>Continuous training for Church growth, become parish</td>
<td>Growth and development to reach future vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Independency, and equip by providing progressional development</td>
<td>Develop skills among all members of a large parish</td>
<td>Independency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7b 1: Initial Thematic Map.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings/ Themes</th>
<th>Positive Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Understandings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interdependency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying ministry in whole Diocese. in terms of language, culture and diversity in theology and liturgical expression.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Archdeacons of the Regions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activities are informed by the needs of the Church and society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Main Parish Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worshipping is diverse and always attracting many people. Spirituality means unity with God in praise and worship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Outstation Congregations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It means unity, role model and to be exemplary in visiting the sick and unemployed in order to boost their spiritual confidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Guilds and Organisations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It means developing and unity in Christ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Focus Group:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is with transparency and organized in the form of worship and eucharist procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td><strong>Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In terms of Canons and Acts of the Diocese, Parish Council, is mother Church and branches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td><strong>Archdeacons of the Regions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstations Congregations should not depend on the parent Church to develop, but are to extend the Church through, mission, ministry and worship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td><strong>Main Parish Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It ensures that outstation congregations sticks to Rules and Canons, as the laws of the Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td><strong>Outstation Congregations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedbacks from Parish Council to outstation congregations are not done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td><strong>Guilds and Organisations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No conditions of agreement between main parish centre and outstations congregations, except by verbally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td><strong>Focus Group:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation service, outstation congregations are involved and some duties are delegated to them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3. Underlying Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td><strong>Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, outstation congregations deserve a say in administration because of their financial obligation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td><strong>Archdeacons of the Regions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, they all have a say to develop, as they are part of the parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td><strong>Main Parish Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, they are not just part of the parish but are for the togetherness and ownership of the large parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td><strong>Outstation Congregations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstation congregations must be given full support in training for leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td><strong>Guilds and Organisations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate the functioning of the whole parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td><strong>Focus Group:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rector and parish council establish outstation congregations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Autonomy of the Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</th>
<th>b) Archdeacons of the Regions:</th>
<th>c) Main Parish Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstation congregations need to be cut down so as to be manageable.</td>
<td>Outstation congregations have to be involved in all activities or ministries of a large parish.</td>
<td>Outstation congregations require recognition from the rector, parish council and the Diocese.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Outstation Congregations:</th>
<th>e) Guilds and Organisations:</th>
<th>f) Focus Group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unity of a large parish was in sharing responsibilities in mission, ministry and worship.</td>
<td>There is a need to develop training strategy.</td>
<td>It will be impossible for focus group to give positive understandings because they are dealing with challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Trust, Training, Management and Teamwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</th>
<th>b) Archdeacons of the Regions:</th>
<th>c) Main Parish Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There has to be trust created in the large parish which is a process.</td>
<td>It is training for uplifment for the outstation congregations.</td>
<td>It would be difficult to comment on this theme because there were positive understandings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Outstation Congregations:</th>
<th>e) Guilds and Organisations:</th>
<th>f) Focus Group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be impossible for the leaders to comment on positive</td>
<td>It would be impossible for the leaders to comment on positive understandings.</td>
<td>It would be impossible for the leaders to comment on positive understandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings / Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Understandings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Interdependency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</th>
<th>b) Archdeacons of the Regions:</th>
<th>c) Main Parish Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worship is centralised at the main parish centre.</td>
<td>The role of outstation congregations in a large parish is vital in team ministry and also in parish growth. These interventions are not possible because of alienation.</td>
<td>There is no equality of outstations in comparison to the main parish centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Outstation Congregations:</td>
<td>e) Guilds and Organisations:</td>
<td>f) Focus Group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was not easy for the leaders to focus on the positive as they looked forward to the future.</td>
<td>It was not easy to focus on the positive but on the future.</td>
<td>Leaders to focus on the positive as they were engaged on the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although being in a large parish did instil a sense of belonging but was dented by inequality.

Decisions taken by the main parish centre are not accepted by the outstation congregations.

You feel minor if you are not part of the decision-making, feel subordinated even if you have valuable contributions to make.

### 2. Canons and Acts of the Diocese of Natal

#### a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:
No body takes trouble to conduct workshops on Canons and Procedures on Pastoral Charge.

#### b) Archdeacons of the Regions:
Outstation congregations are not empowered. Verbal agreements are not taken seriously and are easily forgotten.

#### c) Main Parish Centre
There is no equality between outstation congregations and the main parish centre.

#### d) Outstation Congregations:
Lay-ministers have agreements from the main parish centre, not written down but verbally.

#### e) Guilds and Organisations:
Outstations congregations and main parish centre cannot work together.

#### f) Focus Group:
Outstation congregations have no recognition from the main parish centre.

### 3. Underlying Factors

#### a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:
It was of historical and financial reasons for the formation of the large parish.

#### b) Archdeacons of the Regions:
Main parish centre sticks to the Rules of Church and there is a discussion between the rector and outstation congregations.

#### c) Main Parish Centre
Yes, they deserve a say for the development of outstation congregations but they marginalised.

#### d) Outstation Congregations:

#### e) Guilds and Organisations:

#### f) Focus Group:
Parish wardens felt strengthened and humbled as they face outstation congregations for monies to the main parish centre.

Outstation congregations are actively involved in the main parish centre.

The rector needs to empower outstation congregations but the hindrance was the status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Autonomy of the Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstation congregations should be enlightened about assessment given to the Diocese.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) Archdeacons of the Regions: |
| There is nothing to demonstrate the unity of the parish because all important services are only held at main parish centre. |

| c) Main Parish Centre |
| They were deprived of the priest as he served the outstation congregations very irregular. |

| d) Outstation Congregations: |
| There is no visibility of one body In-Christ. |

| e) Guilds and Organisations: |
| Outstation congregations lack self-esteem, recognition, ownership and no training strategy from the main centre. |

| f) Focus Group: |
| Some members of the outstation congregations are not involved in parish council discussions. They are excluded by the main parish centre. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Trust, Training, Management and Teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no trust created between the large parish and outstation congregations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) Archdeacons of the Regions: |
| The rector must recognise the presence of outstation congregations and develop them into a parish. |

| c) Main Parish Centre |
| Main parish centre does not give outstation congregations charge of their Church buildings |

| d) Outstation Congregations: |
| e) Guilds and Organisations: |
| f) Focus Group: |
Outstation congregations will be always inferior and dependent on large parish.  
The skills among the members of outstation congregations have not been used.  
Outstation congregations don’t have a dream of being a parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **a) Head of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal:**  
It was not easy for the leaders to comment on the negative understandings because they are focused on the future. |
| **b) Archdeacons of the Regions:**  
It was not easy for the leaders to comment on the negative understandings because they are focused on the future. |
| **c) Main Parish Centre**  
It was not easy for the leaders to comment on the negative understandings because they are focused on the future. |
| **d) Outstation Congregations:**  
It was not easy for the leaders to comment on the negative understandings because they are focused on the future. |
| **e) Guilds and Organisations:**  
It was not easy for the leaders to comment on the negative understandings because they are focused on the future. |
| **f) Focus Group:**  
It was not easy for the leaders to comment on the negative understandings because they are focused on the future. |

Figure 7b. 2 Initial Thematic Maps.

One insight from the final thematic map was that there were more positive than negative themes across the six categories of the research participants. This may indicate that the policy change was understood more as an asset than liability to the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Natal. This final thematic map had formed the basis of the presentation and discussion of the research findings of thesis dealing with Chapters Six, Seven and Eight.
## APPENDIX 8: BLACK PIONEERS OF MINISTRY IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Ordination</th>
<th>Period of ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gcwensa William (but also Ngcwensa)</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1871-1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mpemgula Mbanda (but also Umpengula)</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Died shortly afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mzamo Daniel</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1877 - 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Magwaza Francis</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1879 - 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Radebe Richard</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mchunu John</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Masiko Petros</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mzamo Walter</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mabaso Simeon</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Molefe Elijah, Stoffel</td>
<td>Became curate 1884</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>