

Journal of Interdisciplinary Academic Research

Volume: 1 Issue: 1

Published: 12 July 2018

Featured Article:

A Socio-historical Hermeneutical Analysis of Pauline and Lukan Pneumatological Traditions: A case study of the Apostolic Faith Mission in Zimbabwe
[Rev Chamburuka, Phillemon Munyaradzi](#)

Editorial Board:

Professor Charles Nherera (Editor-in-Chief)
Dr Tendai Nhenga-Chakarisa
Dr Muir Houston
Professor Francis Machingura
Professor Prisca Mugabe
Professor Nancy Phaswana-Mafuya



**Academic
Research
Centre**

Leading in quality research

A Socio-historical Hermeneutical Analysis of Pauline and Lukan Pneumatological Traditions: A case study of the Apostolic Faith Mission in Zimbabwe

Rev **Chamburuka**, Phillemon Munyaradzi (*University of Zimbabwe*)

Published: 12 July 2018

Abstract

Pneumatological traditions shaped the life and identity of the Early Church and has an impact on the pneumatological traditions in the churches today. However, most readers have a tendency of reading pneumatological passages in a linear sense (which some scholars like Dunn 1990 calls literal interpretation), therefore, this article seeks to apply a socio-historical hermeneutical analysis of the Pauline and Lukan pneumatological tradition. A socio-historical analysis brings to the fore the context of these pneumatological trends by assessing the intention of the author and establishing the purpose or the reasons which led to the development of pneumatological traditions. This article will focus on debates associated with the notion that glossolalia is an initial evidence of baptism in the Spirit. The selection of this pneumatological tradition has been inspired by the different interpretations of pneumatological passages in churches today especially among Pentecostals. We will have a case study of the Apostolic Faith Mission (AFM) which is the oldest Pentecostal church in Zimbabwe. The article concludes that most churches including AFM have a selective reading of pneumatological passages and lack depth on the socio-historical background of pneumatological traditions in the New Testament. The article demonstrates that New Testament pneumatological traditions developed independently of each other and served a specific purpose in each Christian community even though in essence we encounter unity and diversity in these pneumatological traditions. Hence churches, theologians, pastors, prophets, prophetesses, apostles and the laity must be exposed the socio-historical background of key pneumatological traditions in the New Testament to avoid manipulation of pneumatological passages for personal interest and pneumatological fundamentalism.

1 Introduction

This article endeavours to critically assess the usage of key New Testament pneumatological expressions in the Apostolic Faith Mission (AFM) in Zimbabwe from a socio-historical perspective. Our main objective is to ascertain whether AFM uses pneumatological passages selectively or not. Moreover, we intend to infer whether AFM pneumatological conceptions are continuous or discontinuous with those of the Early Church as portrayed in selected key New Testament pneumatological conceptions with special focus on *glossolalia* and prophecy.

1.1 Brief Background of AFM in Zimbabwe

The history of AFM is indebted to the famous Azusa Street Revival of 1906-1909, which ushered into the worldwide twentieth century Pentecostal revival (Synan, 1980:ix). The fires of revival at Azusa Street eventually spread over the next 100 years and into the third wave of Christianity. From the time of Constantine, the Catholic Church represented the first wave. Next, the Protestant reformation began and developed as the second wave. Then, at 312 Azusa Street, with an unlikely group of spiritually hungry saints, the beginnings of a tsunami of spiritual power and passion flooded every country of the world. Pentecostalism became the third wave, and it continues to impact nations worldwide (Liardon, 2006:10). It is important to note that the history of the AFM in Zimbabwe is traced back to the, Charles Parham, William Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles, and the work of John G Lake who pioneered AFM in South in South Africa. Hallencreutz (1998:111) asserts that though the Native Commissioner in Gwanda had not been able to get hold of the full story, his report on Zacharias Manamela, the very first written account about the AFM in Zimbabwe, gives a lively picture of what was going on in his ministry. This is attested by Kalu (2008:62), who argues that in 1915, an AFM evangelist Zacharias Manamela, initiated charismatization in Gwanda Reserve in Southern Rhodesia. The report states that “he has power to work himself up to a high pitch of frenzy and carries the congregation with him, whom he works up to a pitch of hysteria and tears. He has made many converts to his particular form of faith, and about 25 went to Transvaal and were baptized by a European missionary” (NAZ, File N 3/5/1/3. NC).

The AFM in Zimbabwe is one of the biggest Pentecostal churches in Zimbabwe. Most of the Pentecostal churches like Zimbabwe Assemblies of God Africa or Forward in Faith International, Apostolic Faith Mission Mugodhi had their founders emanate from the AFM in Zimbabwe. This is also

the same with some big African Independent Churches like the Johane Masowe and Johane Marange whose preachers were once initiated into AFM. Unfortunately no academic research or if not minute academic papers have been written about the AFM in Zimbabwe; besides commanding a biggest following (Machingura and Chamburuka, 2017:1)¹.

2 Brief Socio-Historical Background of the Lucan and Pauline Conception of Glossolalia

Spittler (1988:336) argues that *γλωσσολαλία* is derived from two Greek words *λαλεῖν* (to speak) and *γλωσσα* (tongues). The term is used in the New Testament meaning literally “to speak in or [“with” or “by”] tongues.” Dunn (1970: 148) describes *glossolalia* in psychological terms as the abandoning of the conscious control of the speech organs to the subconscious. The speech organs are activated to speak by some “force” other than the mind. This “force” is the source of the speech. However, Asamoah-Gyadu (2013:26) asserts that *glossolalia* is the Spirit-inspired utterance that Pentecostals believe must be accompany the baptism in the Holy Spirit following conversion.

Fee (1987:591) terms *glossolalia* (*γλωσσολαλία*) “the problem child,” and a “controversial gift” at the church of Corinth. The word *γλωσσα* (*glossa*) occurs four times in 1 Corinthians 12, the first two instances are found in 1 Corinthians 12:10 and the other two in 1 Corinthians 12:28 (Hui, 2010:46). Scholars have battled to ascertain the nature of tongues as portrayed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12-14. Firstly, some scholars, who include Schrage (1999), Dunn (1986) and Haenchen (1971), argue that Paul understands tongues to be a language inspired by the Spirit and not a non-cognitive, non-language utterance. Schrage (1999:161) views it as “not simply incoherent babbling in the Spirit.” This argument is based on the notion that *γλωσσα* is the normal term for human language, as evidenced by its use in Acts 2 (Hui, 2010:46). Following this supposition, therefore, interpretation of tongues as proposed by Paul is essential. Garland (2003:584) argues that the phrase “tongues of men and of angels” in 13:1 can refer only to some kind of language. In 14:21 Paul understands Isaiah 28:11-12, with its reference to “other tongues” (foreign languages), to be analogous to the tongues experienced at Corinth. Tongues consist of words (*λογοι*), which, though indecipherable, are not meaningless syllables strung together (1 Corinthians 14:19).

¹F Machingura and PM Chamburuka’s forthcoming paper entitled: Conversations in Contexts: An Analysis of Glossolalia in 1 Corinthians and its Understanding in the Apostolic Faith Mission in Zimbabwe

It can be argued alternatively that Paul understands those utterances to be addressed to God (14:2, 14, 28) and not to humans (14:2, 6, 9). *Glossolalia* in these verses is not a language of normal human discourse, but something mysterious and “other”, which may give it its appeal. It consists of “mysteries in the Spirit” that are unintelligible to humans (14:2) and that benefit the speaker (14:4) (Garland, 2003:584). It communicates with God through prayer and praise (14:15) in ways that analytical speech does not. Paul compares it to the indistinct sounds of a musical instrument that are garbled to the listener (14:8). The phrase “if I came to you speaking in tongues” in 14:6 recalls his description of his first preaching in Corinth (2:1, “and when I came to you”); the implication is that, had he come speaking in tongues, he would have had no success as an apostle. This, rules out the view that ‘tongues’ here refers to the miraculous ability to speak in unlearned languages or the ability to speak in one’s native language (Garland, 2003:584). This pneumatological phenomenon is commonly referred to as ξενολαλία (*xenolalia*): the miraculous ability to speak in a real language that one has not learned (Hyatt 1996).

Corinth was a cosmopolitan seaport with a transient, multilingual population; and so, if Paul came speaking in tongues (in a non-Greek or non-Latin language), he surely would have been able to communicate with someone. Since he makes reference to foreign languages, loosely quoting Isaiah 28:11-21, as an analogy to explain tongues in 1 Corinthians 14:10-11, he must have considered *glossolalia* not to be identical with a foreign language but only something akin to it, as suggested by Dunn (1975:244) and Fee (1987:598). Esler (1994:45) contends that it would have been odd for a first-century speaker of Greek to use γλωσσά (*glossa*) in the sense of a language or dialect without it being modified by an adjective meaning “foreign”. Esler (1994) also notes that since the interpretation of tongues is something that can be prayed for (14:13), it cannot refer to the ability to translate a foreign language, which is obtained through instruction and practice.” Paul does not urge the Corinthians to use *glossolalia* as a help in evangelism but expects it to arise only in their assemblies. He himself uses the gift only in private (14:18). Apparently, it offers no help to him in spreading the gospel (Garland 2003:585). Best (1975:57) labels *glossolalia* as an “idiolect”, (a language peculiar to one person), as opposed to a dialect, and Martin (1991:548) considers it as an “esoteric speech acts.”

It is important to note that because of the reference to “the tongues of angels” in 13:1, many think that *glossolalia* is something like angelic language. This view is supported by scholars who include Barrett (1968:299-30);

Dunn (1975:244); Ellis (1978:70-71); Fee (1987:598-99), Martin (1991:574); Witherington (1995:258); Collins (1999:456); and Schrage (1999:159). The evidence that tongues were understood by the Corinthians as some kind of angelic speech remains debatable, but if it was such, then speaking in tongues would be a sign of participation in higher spiritual realms (2 Cor 12:4) (Garland, 2003:585).

According to Mitchell (1993:270), *glossolalia* comes last in 1 Corinthians 12:28, and appears in no other list outside of 1 Corinthians, because, it is “the spiritual gift which has caused the most friction in the group, due to its public and separatist nature.” However, Fee (1987:572) rejects this supposition and argues that tongues is listed last only because it is at the heart of Paul’s argument and the Corinthian problem. We concur with Fee’s (1987) conclusion that “it is listed last not because it is ‘least’ but because it is the problem”. In Chapter 14, Paul gives specific instructions correcting the problem of too many tongues being spoken at one time and left uninterpreted; and he notes that they also disrupt unity of the body because they erect linguistic barriers. Moreover, those in the community who prized tongues had also sown seeds of division by exalting their gift as the all-important manifestation of the Spirit (Garland, 2003:600).

According to Luke, *glossolalia* first appeared in the Christian church at Pentecost, after the apostles and those associated with them became convinced, after much thinking and prayer (Acts 1:24), that the risen Jesus was God’s Anointed (Acts 2:36), that the messianic age had begun (Acts 2:29-33), and that they were the people of the new creation inheriting all the promises made to the people of the old covenant (Acts 2:16-17; 3:25) (Buttrick, 1962:671). Buttrick (1962:671) asserts that *glossolalia* seems to have been the sure, to many perhaps the surest, evidence of the Spirit’s indwelling. However, Bruce (1988:52) stresses that *glossolalia* or any other ecstatic utterance is no evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit, because in apostolic times it was necessary to provide criteria for deciding whether such utterances were of God or not, just as it had been in Old Testament times.

Kee (1962:306) argues that the miracle (Pentecost) of simultaneous translation described by Luke (Acts 2:5-11) is told in a manner which parallels the Jewish tradition about the marvellous manifestations of divine power that accompanied the giving of the law at Sinai. According to this legend, there were 70 tongues of fire on the mountain, representing the 70 languages of the 70 nations of the earth (Kee, 1962:306). Haenchen (1987) is more specific in his assertion that all rationalizing expedients are to be eschewed; the ‘miracle of tongues’ was a literary construction

built up out of reports of *glossolalia* as in Corinth and rabbinic legends of the law-giving at Sinai. In essence, scholars like Kee (1962), Fitzmyer (1981) and Haenchen (1987) conclude that the Pentecost was a Lucan construction to suit his theme of universalism in which his theological aim was to present the dramatic birthday of the church in terms symbolizing the universal embrace of Christianity (Dunn, 1975:150). Menzies (1991:246) stresses that it is often asserted that the collocation of repentance, baptism, and the promise of the Spirit in Acts 2:38 demonstrates that Luke viewed reception of the Spirit (proven by *glossolalia*) as a necessary element in Christian initiation. Haenchen (1971:184) argues that in most instances Luke maintains a tradition that water baptism is accompanied by baptism in the Spirit and that the few cases in Acts 8:16 and 19:2-6 when the reception of the Spirit is separated from baptism are just exceptions.

However, Dunn (1970), Haenchen (1971) and Menzies (1991) have seen a lack of consistency in the Lucan portrayal of the conversion of the Samaritans (Acts 8: 4-25) and Ephesians (Acts 19: 2-6) in the light of baptism in the Spirit. In Acts 8:4-25 Luke narrates that Philip preached to the Samaritans and they were converted to Christianity and were subsequently baptized (water baptism) but they received the Spirit only until Peter and John laid hand upon them (8:14-17). Like-wise Apollos, in Acts 18:24-19:7 was instrumental in converting the Ephesians but Luke complicates the narrative by saying that Apollos was only acquainted in the baptism of John the Baptist (18:25). Luke says that Apollos was introduced to Christian baptism by Priscilla and Aquila (Acts 18:26). Again, the Ephesians did not receive the Spirit until the arrival of Paul, who after teaching them about the Spirit laid hands upon them whereupon they received the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues and prophesied (Acts 19:6).

In both scenarios the preachers (Philip and Apollos) are presented as seemingly inferior to the apostles because their baptism (water baptism) is not accompanied with the baptism in the Spirit. In the case of Philip's missionary endeavours among the Samaritans, Luke says that the Samaritans only received baptism in the Spirit when Peter and John laid their hands upon them. This, questions whether baptism in the Spirit was confined to the apostles and not their co-workers. More so, Luke stresses that Apollos was an eloquent speaker/preacher but like Philip his missionary work was not accompanied by baptism in the Spirit because the Ephesians received baptism in the Spirit when Paul laid hands upon them.

3 Glossolalia in AFM

Murefu (2015:20) asserts that AFM strictly adheres to the pneumatological conception that "speaking in tongues is the initial physical evidence that a person has received the baptism in the Spirit." Machingura (2011) contends that this doctrine is drawn from Parham, who formulated the basic Pentecostal doctrine of *glossolalia* as an "initial evidence" of baptism in the Spirit, as attested in Acts 2:113 at the day of Pentecost when all those who were present in the upper room spoke in tongues. Madziyire and Risi-namhodzi (2015:149-150) further reiterate that one of the key qualifications for one to be a leader in AFM is that he or she "must be baptized in the Holy Spirit and be able to speak in tongues because the AFM is a Holy Spirit driven church".

At the AFM centennial celebration which took place in Chatsworth, Masvingo province, from 26-29 August 2015, the AFM in Zimbabwe Secretary General, Rev A D Madawo preached on a theme: Baptism in the Spirit (his Bible reading came from Acts 2:1-10). In his sermon he claimed that you could not be a Pentecostal if you did not speak in tongues. He stressed that in the old AFM tradition one could not be a church usher or a leader and let alone a pastor in AFM, without proving that one could speak in tongues. He asserted that: "*une nhamo kana uri pasi pemuvhangeri kana pastor asingatauri nendimi*" (you are in a "trouble" if you are under an evangelist or pastor who does not speak in tongues). He argued that pastors who do not speak in tongues were fraudulently enrolled in ministry, because it was against AFM tradition and doctrine (Madawo, 2015). When he was concluding his sermon, he asked those who did not speak in tongues and wanted to receive this precious gift to stand up. We were amazed to observe more than half of the multitude present stood up following the call by the preacher. They were eager to be baptized in the Spirit. This proportion of non-tongues speakers calls for a critical analysis of the conception of *glossolalia* in AFM. We have to ascertain the consequences of their hermeneutical approach towards pneumatological passages.

Many AFM adherents who were interviewed asserted that *glossolalia* is the identity of AFM and it appears *glossolalia* was synonymous to the Holy Spirit. However, it was evident that some adherents of AFM did not speak in tongues. Some pastors and members who were interviewed contended that many members tended to fake the tongues in order to be elected into leadership posts, or to save themselves from the embarrassment and shame of being labelled as unspiritual or unholy, and in worse cases castigated as sinners. It is interesting to note that two thirds of those who were interviewed agreed that those who did

not speak in tongues had the Holy Spirit in them. However, different responses were given on why people do not speak in tongues. One pastor argued that some people had received the Holy Spirit but they were not yet baptized in the Spirit. He claimed that those who had received the Holy Spirit did not speak in tongues but those who were baptized in Spirit were the ones who spoke in tongues (interview, 2/10/15).

Following the above conceptions, we can infer that most of the AFM members tend to subscribe to a pneumatological conception based on interpretation of Luke whereby everyone who received the Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles was able to speak in tongues. Moreover, they prescribed that all member should adhere to this pneumatological conception to the letter, citing verses such as Acts 2:4, 8:17ff, 10:44-46, 19:6. Anyone who did not speak in tongues was either encouraged to do so through what was commonly referred to as Holy Spirit sessions, conducted in most AFM assemblies in Zimbabwe. They usually take place at night at the usual church building or sanctuary, in house churches or in mountainous areas. According to some interviewees, members were urged to fast and pray for the gift of *glossolalia*, and in some cases a pastor would lay hands on members. One member who claimed anonymity stressed that in some cases during these Holy Spirit night vigils you were asked to open your mouth and just utter words as the Spirit led (Interview, 28/04/14).

According to Hwata (2005:112) the Holy Spirit sessions in AFM in Zimbabwe are also called 'tarrying services' where people are baptized in the Holy Spirit and speak in tongues. Up to the early eighties, even at conferences these were common features. Such tarrying services had results. People were "baptized by the Holy Spirit" and they spoke in other tongues (Hwata, 2005:112). However, Hwata (2005:112-113) observes that:

"Any such services today will be marred by 'slayings in the spirit'; where people who come to receive the Holy Spirit, fall when they are prayed for and they go back without experiencing much. This 'new' experiential phenomena of falling under the anointing has become very prevalent and is being taken as a norm of the demonstration of God's power. Unfortunately, nothing else happens besides falling in most cases. This practice though gaining momentum in AFM in Zimbabwe, has no biblical parallels and has got no spiritual value. It calls for a spirit of discernment to discover the source of such power. It is sad to say most adherents like miracles; they like signs and wonders; hence many have been

led astray by people who claim enablement when it is otherwise."

We concur with Hwata (2005:113) that the concept of "slaying in the spirit" is controversial and has no clear biblical evidence or parallels. We observed that the younger generations are obsessed with this approach, because they claim that it is a sign of demonstration of power of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 2:4). People who are said to have been slain in by the Spirit show no signs of spiritual renewal or transformation. Some fall uncontrollably, and others appear to be ecstatic. The question which has been raised concerns the source of power which is used to slay people. Some interviewees alleged that most pastors and evangelists who used this method used satanic powers to manipulate the masses (Interview, 16/03/16). This allegation has been exacerbated by a Ghanaian fetish priest Nana Kwaku Bonsam who claims that over 1 700 pastors and "men of God" from different parts of Africa have approached him for powers to perform miracles (nehandaradio.com). The talk about pastors and prophets who are using magic or fetish from the under-world and other non-Christian sources have left many Christians puzzled and doubting most forms of miracles. However, some pastors argue that those who despise the approach do not have power of the Holy Spirit, hence they should either pray or fast to be endowed with such powers. Our observation is that the approach is not unanimously accepted in AFM in Zimbabwe. Some are skeptical because the phenomena is not biblical, whereas others argue that you cannot limit the works of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, we noted that the link between slaying in spirit and *glossolalia* is rather accidental than universal.

An interviewee (24/09/15) claims that prophetess Gogo (Granny) Murape assisted her to speak in tongues. She testified that she fasted for forty days before she could receive the gift of speaking in tongues. She asserts that before she took the fast she had visited prophetess Murape, who asked her: "*Munotaura nendimi here idzo dzakazara kudai?* (Do you speak in those tongues that are so abundantly available?)." The same interviewee asserts that a day after forty days of fasting, she visited prophetess Murape who said to her, "*Zvekutsanya zvapera,*" (Fasting is over) and prayed for her and prophesied that at six o'clock in the evening God would speak with her. The interviewee attests that from six o'clock that evening she started speaking in tongues continuously for a week. This testimony and many others support the view that *glossolalia* is a charismatic gift which is cherished and experienced by some Christians in AFM.

However, the debate whether *glossolalia* is real is not part of our study but we are more concerned by the fact that AFM consider this phenomenon to be a *sine qua non* for

baptism in the Spirit, and that the gift is compulsory for all members of the church. It is imperative to note that this pneumatological conception tends to overshadow AFM conception of *glossolalia*. Murefu (2001:14) expressed a concise theological position that tongues were not the Holy Spirit but were only evidence of baptism in the Spirit. However, Murefu's assertion is not universally understood in AFM Zimbabwe because many adherents, including pastors, enthusiastically claim that *glossolalia* is synonymous with the Holy Spirit.

Be as it may, we have to ascertain whether this pneumatological tradition was universally practiced in the Early Church (30 AD to 90 AD). We note that the Pauline pneumatological tradition on *glossolalia* is explored in 1 Corinthians 12-14. However, it is important to note that, this pneumatological tradition is older than the Lucan account (Acts 2:1-13) from a socio-historical perspective. Pauline pneumatology can be dated to around 55 AD when Paul wrote his letter to the Corinthian church and the Lucan account can be traced to the time when the gospel of Luke-Acts was written between 85 and 100 AD). However, a conservative hermeneutical approach tends to date the Lucan pneumatological tradition to a period earlier than the Pauline letters on the grounds that they consider Luke to be a historian who chronicled the history of the Early Church. (This position has been disputed by many scholars, who include Fuller (1979:129).

Machingura (2011:1) asserts that there seems to be no distinction in AFM between the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues as *glossolalia* is sometimes taken as evidence that the Holy Spirit has come which finds biblical support in Acts. This position is exacerbated by Luke in Acts that whenever there is mentioning of the Holy Spirit; it is accompanied by speaking in tongues. *Glossolalia* is equated with the Holy Spirit; a position that is also assumed in Acts 1:8, 2:4, 8:17, 9:17, 10:44, 19:6. In Acts 19:1-6 Paul found some disciples at Ephesus who had been converted to Christianity by Apollos but had not received the Holy Spirit. They knew nothing about the Holy Spirit and had been baptized in the baptism of John (the Baptist). Verse 6 states that Paul laid hands upon them and they received the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues. This is the key verse which is cited by many Pentecostals, including adherents of AFM in Zimbabwe, that receiving Christ alone without being baptized in Spirit (being able to speak in tongues) is inadequate for a believer. One AFM member who claimed anonymity argued that Christians who did not speak in tongues lacked faith and needed a second touch with the Holy Spirit for them to speak in tongues like what witnessed by the Ephesians in Acts 19:6 (Interview, 16/03/16).

Yet, the Pauline conception is also evident in the AFM

in Zimbabwe's conception of *glossolalia*, as attested by a cross-section of members who argued that *glossolalia* is was but one of the spiritual gifts that were discussed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12-14. On the basis of 1 Corinthians 14:27-28, some members and pastors argued that *glossolalia* must be interpreted in church. For instance, an interviewee (17/05/15) asserts that if tongues are not interpreted in church they become irrelevant and meaningless. Another interviewee (21/09/14) stresses that tongues must be interpreted for the benefit of other members in the congregation. However, Murefu (2001:14) contends that "tongues as a gift needs interpretation, but tongues as evidence of baptism in the Spirit need no interpretation." His assertion seemingly attempts to streamline Pauline and Lucan conceptions of *glossolalia*. However, the problem is that not every member is able to come up with such a distinction. Some members who were interviewed claim that *glossolalia* confuses evil powers, quoting 1 Corinthians 14:2. This conception was also attested by Rev Madawo (2015) in his sermon (cited earlier on) at the AFM centennial celebrations in Chatsworth when he said, "no demon will interfere when I pray in tongues." Rev Madawo (2015) cited 1 Corinthians 14:2 which says: "For one who speaks in a tongue speaks not to man but to God; for no one understands him, but he utters mysteries in the Spirit." Notably, Machingura (2011:1) asserts that the belief that when one prays in tongues confuses the devil is shared by many Pentecostals. Another verse which is used to support this ideology is 1 Corinthians 13:1 which says: "If I speak in tongues of men and of angels. . . ." The assumption is that *glossolalia* is in a way a language of angels, hence the devil cannot comprehend it because he is a fallen angel. This premise has been used as one of the key reasons why everyone in the church should speak in tongues because those who pray in earthly languages their prayers may be intercepted by the devil.

However, this presupposition appear to be assumptive, and to be precise, not in line with the *sitz im leben* (life-setting) of Paul's message. It is important to note that in 1 Corinthians 14:2, Paul is not necessarily referring to *glossolalia* as a mystery for the devil, but for those who do not speak in tongues or even those who do not understand the glossolalic utterance, even though they themselves may speak in tongues. If the devil diverts or intercepts prayers, whether in glossolalic form or not, this defeats the Christian understanding of the image of God: that He is sovereign, immanent, omniscient, and transcendental (Macquarrie, 1977:203). This ideology appear to be drawn from an interpretation of the apocalyptic message of Daniel 10:12-13 which is interpreted literally by most Pentecostals, including some conservative AFM members. On the basis of Daniel 10:12-13 some AFM members assert

that prayers uttered outside *glossolalia* have a potential to be intercepted by the devil, like what in their view happened to the angel that was sent with a reply to the prayers of Daniel but was withheld for 21 days by the prince of Persia and was only released with the assistance of angel Michael (Dan 10:12-13). It is imperative to note that Daniel's message is apocalyptically oriented and should be interpreted within the context of apocalyptic, that is, coded language which needs to be decoded and not to be interpreted literally. We note the warning of with Pashapa (Interview, 24/11/16) who asserts that the approach of linking different genres which are not compatible (apocalypse and epistolary genre) is tantamount to eisegesis and is prone to syncretistic tendencies.

Moreover, many AFM adherents testified that most glossolalic utterances are not interpreted in church services. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of interviewees attested that there were no instances when *glossolalia* is interpreted in worship services. An interviewee (25/07/15) argues that the emphasis in AFM has been more on the *glossolalia* as an evidence of baptism in the Spirit. Over and above that, we also noticed that some preachers would burst into tongues in the middle of a sermon. We question the purpose of speaking in tongues in a sermon because Paul says: "I thank God that I speak in tongues more than you all; nevertheless, in church I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (1 Corinthians 14:18-19). Paul is very clear in 1 Corinthians 14:1 that tongues edify the individual and that, if there is no interpreter, one must keep quiet (vv 27-28). It appears that these preachers who spice up their preaching with glossolalic utterance are obsessed with demonstrating that they are filled by the Spirit; but such an art defies the general rules of homiletics which lays emphasis on being intelligible at all costs when preaching. Not all people present at a sermon are able to understand *glossolalia*. Yet this practice is rampant among young pastors.

Machingura (2010:1) also made an interesting observation that some glossolalic experiences may be linked to African traditional practices associated with spirit possession (*kupinda mumweya*). This process is linked with dance, followed by ecstatic utterances which is similar to *glossolalia*. A careful observation on most of the glossolalic experiences in AFM in Zimbabwe show that they take place after powerful singing or praise and worship sessions. This may explain why there is a strong emphasis on prayerful praise and worship teams which are backed by powerful public-address systems. It is assumed that the Holy Spirit will not manifest if powerful music is not involved. An interviewee (2/07/14) says: "*Mweya hausviki kana musina*

kuimba zvine simba" (The Holy Spirit cannot arrive if you have not sung powerfully). We have observed that the concept of linking the manifestation of the Holy Spirit and powerful singing is dominant among many AFM adherents. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility of an assimilation or adaptation of African tradition associated with spirit possession and ancestral worship. During the enculturation process, members may be either conscious or unconscious of cross-cultural borrowing.

Madziyire and Risinamhodzi (2015:154) argue that it is possible for one to fake tongues or speak the tongues of the devil. They argue that one has to test whether his or her tongues are genuine in three ways. Firstly, if you find yourself repeating the same few words over and over again, it may indicate that you are not yet completely filled. They assert that the same criterion can also be used to help us judge whether another person's tongues are legitimate. The proposed criterion has a potential to cause pneumatological challenges, because some members may end up judging others. There is a possibility of developing a holier-than-thou attitude in a cell group or an assembly. Ultimately, if the criterion is not monitored, some members may end up being haunted by pneumatics and this may lead to schism in the church. In extreme cases, some members may end up rehearsing tongues from available sources such as Youtube, tele evangelism channels or church related cassettes, CDs and DVDs.

The second criterion proposed by Madziyire and Risinamhodzi (2015:154) is that if you find yourself having to think about what sounds or words you will speak next, that is a good indication that you are not truly speaking in tongues. Thirdly, if you speak in tongues while living a sinful life, you have to review whether you are truly baptized with the Holy Spirit (Madziyire and Risinamhodzi, 2015:155). The last two criteria are equally controversial. For instance, the second criterion opens a can of worms because it is evident that many Pentecostals, including AFM Zimbabwe, think about the words and /or sounds that they speak during glossolalic utterance. Some even joke in tongues and others teach others the meaning of glossolalic utterances. Hence, *glossolalia* is subject to various abuses. Moreover, as we listen to various samples of glossolalic utterances, they tend to follow a common pattern, style and art. Some glossolalic utterances are common because they are routinely used in prayers, sermons, jokes and dramas. Since some Pentecostal churches teach or instruct members to speak in tongues therefore, it is evident that the glossolalic tutor (one who teaches candidates to speak in tongues) and the students or candidates of glossolalic utterance know the glossolalic sounds and choose which "words" to use. Therefore, there is a sense in which glosso-

lalic utterances are programmed, rehearsed and at times dramatized. If the second criterion is to be applied in the spirit and letter then a large percentage of what we have coined *glossolalia* in AFM in Zimbabwe could be classified as fake.

Regarding the third criterion, we encounter serious pneumatological challenges. This was echoed by the president of AFM International, Rev F Chikane (2015) in his sermon at the centennial celebrations of AFM Zimbabwe in Chatsworth. He lamented how careless some Pentecostals are in their pneumatological conceptions. Rev Chikane (2015) bemoaned how Christians were made to eat snakes, rats, human hair and grass in the name of God. He chronicled an incident which happened in 1979 at an AFM conference, where someone spoke in tongues and another interpreted. The interpreter said that the tongues meant, "God is going to punish those terrorists in Zimbabwe." The interpreter believed what he had said. Little did he know that Zimbabwe was going to gain independence the following year. In essence, this was a false prophecy if indeed it was prophecy at all. Rev Chikane (2015) reiterated that the biggest pitfall among Pentecostals was that they talked more about charismatic manifestations such as *glossolalia* at the expense of emphasizing the fruits of the Spirit. He stressed that it was meaningless to speak in tongues when you were in sin. The climax of his sermon was: "The most dangerous Christians are those who claim to be in the Spirit (speak in tongues) but live outside the Spirit (failing to have the fruit of the Spirit)." The message by Rev Chikane (2015) is to the point, because many people covet to speak in tongues but they live a sinful life. Moreover, AFM has appeared to have over-emphasized *glossolalia* at the expense of the core essence of the fruits of the Spirit which are summarized by Paul in Galatians 5:22: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control.

An honest application of the third criterion would disqualify many members, pastors, prophets, prophetesses, apostles and teachers, because many are struggling morally and living in sin. Cases of fraud, fornication and adultery, rape, murder, corruption and alleged vote rigging are common nowadays among Christians who claim to be baptized by the Spirit. For instance, a *Newsday* journalist (26/08/2016) reported that an AFM Harare pastor, Oliver Makomo, attached to an assembly at Springvale, Ruwa assembly, was charged with five counts of rape by magistrate Tendai Mahwe. He was accused of raping a 22-year-old congregant. *Glossolalia* should be a spiritual gift in practice associated with holiness. The separation of the two becomes a challenge for the church. We now move on to an analysis of prophecy and prophets in AFM.

4 Conclusion

This article has explored the influence of New Testament pneumatologies in the understanding of *glossolalia* traditions in AFM in Zimbabwe. We observed areas of continuity and discontinuity between Lucan and Pauline and AFM in Zimbabwe's pneumatological conceptions of *glossolalia*. Of interest is the seeming rehearsal and imitation of *glossolalia* in by some of AFM adherents as compared with Early Church glossolalic practices which were spontaneous in both the Lucan and Pauline traditions. We further observed that there is no unanimity among AFM adherents in Zimbabwe concerning the notion that *glossolalia* should be compulsory and that it is a mark which shows that one has been baptized in the Spirit. By making *glossolalia* compulsory, most churches including AFM demonstrate a selective reading of pneumatological passages and lack of depth on the socio-historical background of pneumatological traditions in the New Testament which developed independently of each other and served a specific purpose in each Christian community even though, in essence, we encounter unity and diversity in these pneumatological traditions. Hence churches, theologians, pastors, prophets, prophetesses, apostles and the laity must be exposed the socio-historical background of key pneumatological traditions in the New Testament to avoid manipulation of pneumatological passages for personal interest and pneumatological fundamentalism.

References

- Asamoah-Gyadu, J. K. (2013). *Contemporary Pentecostal Christianity: Interpretations from an African Context*. Oxford: Regnum Books International.
- Barrett, C. K. (1987). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: A and C Black.
- Best, E. (1972). *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. London: A and C Black.
- Buttrick, G. A. et al, (1962). *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Canty, G. (1987). *The Practice of Pentecost: A Handbook on Discerning and Developing the Gifts of the Spirit*. Hants: Marshall Pickering.
- Collins, R. F. (1999). *First Corinthians*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Dunn, J.D.G. (1970). *Baptism in the Spirit: A Reexamination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Dunn, J.D.G. (1975). *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Dunn, J.D.G. (1986). *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press.
- Ellis, E. E. (1978). *Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Esler, P. F. (1994). *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds: Socio-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. London: Routledge.
- Fee, G. D. (1987). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Fee, G. D. (1994). *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. (1981). *The Gospel According to Luke*. New York: Doubleday.
- Garland, D. E. (2003). *1 Corinthians: Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Haenchen, E. (1971). *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hallencreutz, C. F. (1998). *Religion and Politics in Harare 1890-1980*. Uppsala: Swedish Institute of Missionary Research.
- Hiu, E. (2010). *Regulations Concerning Tongues and prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14:26-40*. London: T and T Clark International.
- Kee, H. C. (1962). in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Keck, L. E. (2002). *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Volume X. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Liardon, R. (2006). *The Azusa Street Revival: When the Fire Fell*. Shippensburg: Destiny Image.
- Macquarrie, J. (1977). *Principles of Christian Theology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Madziyire, A. and Risinamhodzi, T. (2015). *Pentecostal Dawn in Zimbabwe: Tenets of AFM*. Harare: The Brand Guy and Associates.
- Mitchell, M. M. (1993). *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation into the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Murefu, C. (2001). *Biblical Foundation For Believers*. Harare: Faith Printers.
- Murefu, T. I. (2015). *A History of the Apostolic Faith Mission in Zimbabwe: Let the Fire of God Fall Again, A Centennial Edition, 1915-2015*. Harare: AFM Publications.
- Schrage, W. (1982). *The Ethics of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Synan, V. (1980). *Azusa Street*. South Plainfield: Bridge Publications.
- Witherington, B. (1995). *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Internet Sources

<http://nehandaradio.com/2013/07/01/pastor-alleges-prophets-makandiwa-and-angel-received-ritual-charms/> (Accessed 13/10/15).

Periodicals, Magazines and Newspapers

Newsday Newspaper, 26/08/16.

Sermons

Rev F Chikane, Sermon: "The Fruits of the Spirit, Chatsworth," Masvingo, 28/08/15.

Rev A.D. Madawo, Sermon: "Baptism in the Holy Spirit," Chatsworth, Masvingo, 28/08/15.

Interviews

Rev A.D. Madawo, Chitungwiza, 02/04/14.

Interview, Watsomba, 26/04/14.

Interview, Harare, 12/10/14.

Interview, Harare, 16/05/14.

Interview, Matopos, 18/08/14.

Interview, Masvingo, 16/08/14.

Interview, Bulawayo, 21/09/14.

Interview, Harare, 17/05/15.

Interview, Honde Valley, 25/07/15.

Interview, Mutare, 26/07/15.

Interview, Murehwa, 23/08/15.

Interview, Harare, 24/09/15.

Interview, Bindura, 2/10/15.

Interview, Bulawayo, 16/03/16.

Interview, 27/04/16.

Pashapa, N. Harare, 27/10/16.
