


Chapter 5

Post-colonial preaching in a township: Discovery and critical reflection on an African sermon

W. Wessels 

Post-doctoral Research Fellow, Department of Practical and Missional Theology,
University of the Free State 
Bloemfontein, South Africa
wesselgp@ufs.ac.za

1. Introduction

Two critical points are focal for researching preaching in the township context in South Africa. Firstly, research on preaching in the township context has received very little attention. In this case, the mere attention towards such a specific context opens potentially new avenues of perspectives, insights, and enhancements for Practical Theology. Thus, my emphasis is on *discovery*.

Secondly, the insights of post-colonial thinkers have brought forth the necessity of empirical research on lived experience, which has been expounded by such thought. By the choice in this chapter for post-colonial thought, I postulate that the *post-colonial* has become synonymous with a liberated South African context, already indicating methodological markers of interest for this context, notwithstanding other possibilities.

With these two focal points, I align myself to two of the reflective questions of this volume. What can one learn from conducting research in a township context? What is the role of congregational leadership in terms of the

relationship of preaching in a township context and the post-colonial theory? I will return to these questions in the conclusion.

That being said, using post-colonial as a theoretical framework is not an endeavour in homogenous thought, and a myriad of research possibilities can be proposed. One such possibility is a post-colonial research paradigm espoused by Linda Smith (2008). In my reading of her proposal, the limits of representation and the benefactors of research are fundamental to the shift between colonial and post-colonial research (Smith, 2008:2-3). I mention her insights because my attempt in this chapter of researching preaching in the township context is not without these limitations. However, I posit that this chapter is an incremental step towards future research that could more rigorously contend with the limits of representation and benefaction. To clarify, to solve the limits of representation, the particular preacher will have to be more central to the research on their own sermon, which is not true in this chapter. As an antidote to who benefits from the research, there should be more proof that research of this sort will actually benefit the community where the research has taken place. As much as I wish this research would benefit the community where the data has emerged, any such proof would be mere speculation.

However, despite these limitations, I opine that it is still vital to research a township sermon as a preliminary discovery. My focal question is whether post-colonial thought is indeed prevalent in a sermon in a context such as a township. Importantly, I argue that the township itself is a context on the margins of society and is thus most viable in finding the forms of knowledge that Walter Mignolo (2007:453) espouses as post-colonial. Secondly, I consider an individual sermon rather than a system of thought within a myriad of sermons, as others have proposed for empirical research on sermons in South Africa (Pieterse, 2020). Finally, as I am interested in post-colonial thought within the said sermon, the means of exposing thought from the data is theory-driven and, therefore, consists of theoretical thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006:88). These are methodological choices that I have made which will inevitably be wanting, but does indeed address the central question of this chapter.

To thematically analyse the sermon in question, I will first propose three focal images of post-colonial thought as theory. Secondly, I will look at the sermon itself and use direct quotations from the sermon within the framework of the post-colonial theory. Finally, I will reflect on the interaction between the world of the sermon and the post-colonial theory. Again, my reflection on the sermon will be weighted towards the theory of a post-colonial vision and not the intended meaning of the sermon. This research is not meant to be a final word on preaching in the township, post-colonial preaching, or the interaction between theory, preacher, and context. This research is instead a preliminary discovery into the lacuna of such research and necessitates further research and contemplation, including from other methodological and theoretical perspectives.

2. The post-colonial vision

I have elsewhere (Wessels, 2021:4) made the claim, notwithstanding the larger complexity of post-colonial thought, that three themes are important for an understanding of post-colonial thinking: epistemology, the positionality of the centre, and identity. I argue these themes as follows. Firstly, regarding epistemology, that post-colonial epistemology “is the deconstruction of any totalitarian ideology” (Wessels, 2021:6). The argument is hinged around three interlocutors, Walter Mignolo (2007), Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o (1993), and Frantz Fanon (2004). At first glance, it may seem that my interlocutors promote the deconstruction of the West in itself, as Douglas Murray (2022) acutely showcases in his book *The War on the West*. However, given the context in which post-colonial thought came to the fore under Western ideological imperialism, which undermined the epistemologies of alterity, I would posit that the correct interpretation of post-colonial deconstruction is not the unsophisticated and blind deconstruction of the West but rather a sophisticated deconstruction of any and all totalitarian ideology. This does not mean that an unsophisticated and even unethical war on the West in the name of post-colonial and decolonial endeavours is not taking place. It certainly is, and is especially visual in the student protests in South Africa, where only some identities, which are counter to whiteness, maleness, and Western, are allowed to shape the discourse, whilst other identities are to keep quiet (Urbaniak, 2019).

Nonetheless, I believe that my interpretation of the post-colonial is in alignment with important books on the post-colonial, such as Ngugi wa Thiong'o's (1993) *Moving the Centre* and Homi Bhabha's (1994) *The Location of Culture*, where it is pretty clear that the replacing of one ideological centre or identity does not solve the problem of coloniality and may itself become totalitarian. Homiletically speaking, the post-colonial preacher will be acutely capable of locating, naming, and deconstructing any totalitarian ideology. However, the possibility exists that no totalitarian ideology is at play in the contextual situation. Thus, the post-colonial preacher should be as acutely aware of totalitarian absence as they are of its presence. This brings forth one more question: the legitimacy of a totalitarian ideology as espoused within the sermon. A viable argument for the legitimacy of totalitarian thought would be to look at the internal logic of the sermon itself and determine whether what is espoused as totalitarian is indeed totalitarian. The internal logic of the sermon will then have to convince that what is espoused as totalitarian is indeed so.

From this post-colonial deconstruction, the post-colonial preaching will have to reconstruct a new way of knowing, which comes to the fore through repositioning the centre of thought. This is the second theme. However, and this is quite an unexpected development, post-colonial positionality does not replace one centre with another centre, for that would bring forth merely a new totalitarian epistemology or form of epistemological colonisation. Using the insights of Ngugi wa Thiong'o, I have claimed (Wessels, 2021:7) that Europe can no longer be the positional centre of thought, but neither should any other geographic position replace Europe as the only legitimate centre of thought. This claim applies similarly to any individual epistemological centre. Rather, as Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1993:26) proposes:

But it did point out the possibility of moving the centre from its location in Europe towards a pluralism of centres; themselves being equally legitimate locations of the human imagination.

This moving of the centre towards plurality is an antidote to the problem of subjectivity, for the individual's own subjectivity is upheld as legitimate but not universalised. At the same time, this movement opens the possibility of dialogue and mutual learning from other centres of thought, each

from its own subjectivity, towards something akin to mutual influencing of each other. It must be mentioned that this line of thinking is partly descriptive of the best type of interaction between others in the historical reality of existence (Volf, 2002:9). Furthermore, this type of cooperation with the other is also the best possible endeavour when encountering the epistemological other, compared to separation or violence (Kapuściński, 2018:87-90). I conclude thus (Wessels, 2021:8):

A person or community can, therefore, legitimately think and theorise from their specific centre of thought, with the caveat and responsibility to conceptualise how their centre relates and dialogues with other centres of thought.

Homiletically speaking, the post-colonial preacher will be well located within the contextual realities of their congregation, albeit from their own subjectivity. This implies further that the post-colonial preacher is both confident in their own subjectivity and aware that their epistemological centre is not absolute but in need of interlocution with others. Furthermore, post-colonial preaching will not incorrectly equate subjectivity with the biblical text but explicitly treat the biblical text as a centre of epistemological alterity. Post-colonial thought does not, however, engage with a hierarchy of meaning, which implies that the biblical text does not enjoy a position of authority, as Brueggemann (2007:36-40) has proposed. Therefore, the ethics of post-colonial thought rejects authoritative direction and proposes something akin to struggle for meaning. Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986:108) articulates such an ethics as follows:

[This book] is a call for the rediscovery of the real language of humankind: the language of struggle. It is the universal language underlying all speech and words of our history. Struggle. Struggle makes history. Struggle makes us. In struggle is our history, our language, and our being.

Thus, the relationality between differing epistemological centres finds its greatest ordeal in the struggle for meaning as the epitome of the epistemological creative endeavour. However, the struggle for meaning as an epistemological concept does not thoroughly contend with the ethics of struggle, and much contemplation is still lacking on the relation between ethics and post-colonial thought.

Thirdly, using Homi Bhabha as his interlocutor, I contend that the post-colonial understanding of identity rejects identity markers, which are “sign(s) of differences - be it class, gender, or race” (Bhabha, 1994:313), opting rather for a conception of identity which corresponds to themes of fragmentation, decentring, and hybridity (Wessels, 2021:9). This implies, firstly, the rejection of group identity towards polarisation (Wessels, 2021:10). And secondly, the embrace of “becoming the other of themselves and living into the (post)colonial identity” (Wessels, 2021:11). I conclude as follows:

But the point is even more precarious, for the myth that there exists such a thing as a fixed identity is unveiled. And herein, the (post) colonial identity showcases the human condition, that identity is constantly in flux and negotiated, decentred, and fragmented. (Wessels, 2021:11).

Homiletically speaking, the post-colonial preacher will be wary of any identity fixed in time and space concerning individual and group identities. This does not disregard the reality of identifying with groups, including religious communities, but such identification cannot be correlated to identity as written in stone. Furthermore, the representation of God’s identity becomes similarly open to flux and negotiation. A greater awareness of the myriad representations of God’s identity in the biblical text can mitigate the temptation of concluding that God’s identity is fixed in any one gaze. Furthermore, the post-colonial preaching will be aware of her own fragmented and hybrid identity. In its essence, the awareness of a post-colonial identity is the awareness of identity fluidity within the lived experience of the individual and community as time and space, thought and interaction play out on the lives of people.

3. Post-Colonial Preaching? Reflections on a Township Sermon

As I have mentioned in my introduction, I have chosen a theoretical thematic analysis as the methodological grounding of engagement with the data. Braun and Clarke (2008:88) articulate theoretical thematic analysis as follows:

[A] 'theoretical' thematic analysis would tend to be driven by the researcher's theoretical or analytic interest in the area, and is thus more explicitly analyst-driven. This form of thematic analysis tends to provide less a rich description of the data overall, and more a detailed analysis of some aspect of the data. [...] cod[ed] for a quite specific research question.

Thus, using the post-colonial vision that I have proposed in the preceding section, I will analyse a sermon preached in a township congregation. The sermon was delivered on the 26 September 2021. The congregation in which the sermon was delivered is of the Mainline Christian tradition. The township is in Bloemfontein. The sermon was delivered in English, and all quotations are verbatim. The preacher's identity is kept anonymous. Finally, once again, this sermon only represents itself and not all sermons in this congregation or the township. Thus, I am under no impression that what comes to the fore in this reflection is representative of all township preaching or should by any means be a theory of preaching within the township context. Furthermore, I make no claim that my choice of post-colonial theme, nor my theoretical framework within the post-colonial theme, is representative of the intentions of the preacher or the larger tradition of post-colonial and decolonial thought.

3.1 Epistemology: Deconstructing Division and Discrimination

Four times in the early part of the sermon, attitudes and actions that bring division are deconstructed as ideological visions that, according to the preacher, are alive and well in the community where the sermon takes place. Considering this deconstruction on closer scrutiny, it is clear that a parallel is drawn between the actions of the disciples in Mark 9:38-41 and the congregation:

Indirectly, what [the disciples] were doing is what many of us are engaged in today. And that is dividing the body of Christ based on a certain set of things we think we know towards certain things we are privileged to and others are not privileged to. [...] We are engaging in the very same behaviour which the disciples were engaging in. And that is to bring division and discrimination within the church of God.

[...] We live in a time where people and the church itself can take and act on certain decisions to bring division between itself within the church itself (Anonymous, 2021).

The particularity of the actions and attitudes - that is, the totalitarian ideology within the context of the congregation - which the preacher deconstructs revolves around the concepts of division and discrimination. To the largest extent, these divisions and discriminations are located within what the preacher calls "the church of God". The concept of the church of God is not readily apparent in its meaning, whether it is an institution, a community, or the congregants in their interaction with the greater community. However, the preacher is thoroughly intent on deconstructing any actions and attitudes which bring forth division and discrimination. Furthermore, the word "privileges" plays an important role, for it brings forth connotations of hierarchies of positions, which may deepen division and discrimination. In another part of the sermon, some light is shed upon the exact locationality where these attitudes and actions come to the fore within the context:

Jesus Christ is not interested in what distinguishes these other people. Listen, he does not begin to ask them: "Are you sure these guys are from that other party? The one that was green and black and gold? Or the one that wears red and black? Or the one that wears blue?" He doesn't begin to ask those questions (Anonymous, 2021).

The references to colours in this quote are the colours of prominent local and national political parties in South Africa, with differences in their political visions. This concrete representation of contextual realities sheds light on what the preacher is essentially trying to deconstruct: the divisions and discriminations within the political sphere of human existence. Nowhere in the sermon is reference made to the actions or attitudes of role players within these political parties. One possibility is that the preacher implies that the political sphere is under the same scrutiny as the congregation. Still, it is also possible that this silence is a silence of scrutiny. Notwithstanding, it seems that the hearers are implored to let go of any natural divisions and discriminations which are part and parcel of the political game.

Finally, it must be mentioned that the preacher also showcases the prevalence of division and discrimination between differing Christian denominations (Anonymous, 2021). Thus, the preacher directly deconstructs two spaces where the hearers may find themselves: the political sphere and the church denomination, as particular iterations of the Christian tradition. The deconstruction of division and discrimination finds its climax in the words of Jesus, as proposed by the preacher:

[Jesus] says: “What are they doing? They are using my name, let therefore, let them be” (Anonymous, 2021).

Thus, in deconstructing the attitudes and actions of division and discrimination in the spheres of the political and ecclesial, the preacher directly links the actions of these other role players as equal to the unknown group in Mark 9:38-41, insisting that their legitimacy is located in the name of Jesus. This does, however, leave much to the imagination of the hearers. For one, is the implication that scrutiny of political actors should be set aside to avoid division and discrimination? Does this mean that dialogue between religious communities must only occur on grounds of acceptance rather than rigorous debate?

A further important question is whether the preacher’s proposed deconstruction could legitimately be called post-colonial preaching. On the one hand, it could indeed be deemed post-colonial in the sense that these attitudes and actions of division and discrimination bring forth the destruction of the well-being of the community. This is indeed what the sermon is implying. However, post-colonial thinkers are quite contrarian in their proposals and do not shy away from principles that could be divisionary. Consider, for instance, Ngugi wa Thiong’o’s (1986:6-7) contrarian stance towards the languages of Europe as a platform for unification:

In some instances these European languages were seen as having a capacity to unite African peoples against divisive tendencies inherent in the multiplicity of African languages within the same geographic state[...] See the paradox: the possibility, of using mother-tongues provokes a tone of levity in phrases like ‘a dreadful betrayal’ and ‘a guilty feeling’; but that of foreign languages produces a categorical, positive embrace.

Similarly, Walter Mignolo (2007:450) calls upon contrarian epistemologies to be brought to the foreground as the post-colonial endeavour, whether or not they are divisive: “other epistemologies, other principles of knowledge and understanding and, consequently, other economies, other politics, other ethics.” Furthermore, Frantz Fanon (2004:141) proposes a contrarian understanding of development that does not favour political ends but the development of the consciousness of the people within the local community.

Granted, from the preacher’s perspective, it may indeed be the case that the text from Mark 9:38-41 is interested in undermining division and discrimination. Indeed, as Robert Stein (2008:446) showcases in his commentary on the text, it is indeed “best to see [the exorcist in verse 39] as a follower of Jesus who carried out his ministry outside the circle of the Twelve.” However, Stein (2008:446) makes the caveat: “Ministry, such as that of this exorcist, that brings glory to the name of Jesus should not/must not be hindered, even when it ignores ‘we/us’”. Stated differently, bringing glory to the name of Jesus is an important virtue of the legitimacy of this ministry, which certainly cannot equate all political and ecclesial actions being equal to such a high ideal of bringing glory to the name of Christ.

This brings me to the second point of discussion, the positionality of the centre.

3.2 *Positionality: The Name of Jesus*

The preacher themes his sermon as “The name of Jesus” (Anonymous, 2021). This central theme is also the positional centre around which the sermon revolves. Regarding the interaction between Mark 9:38-41 and the context, there is a clear decentring of the disciples, who essentially become the antagonists at odds with Jesus. This being said the preaching associates the disciples with the hearers and they, by implication, also become antagonists.

Indirectly, what [the disciples] were doing is what many of us are engaged in today. [...] [But, Jesus] says that [the exorcists] were doing these miracles in my name, therefore leave them alone. If they are calling in that name, they are for us, and therefore, they are not against us[...] He says: “What are they doing? They are using my name; therefore, let them be” (Anonymous, 2021).

It is important to note that the centrality of the disciples is moved because of the presence of the name of Jesus. This is a significant movement towards a post-colonial positionality, dislocating the universal positionality that the disciples presume. However, as per Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1993:26), the post-colonial positionality is interested in a plurality of legitimate centres and not merely replacing one universal centre with another. And it is at this point that the preacher falters. "The name of Jesus," as the decentring concept for the disciples' position, becomes the sermon's universal centre. But it becomes even more conspicuous, for this central theme's exact meaning is elusive. Whether or not the elusiveness of the meaning of "the name of Jesus" is intentional leads the preacher into two important avenues regarding positionality.

Firstly, the centrality of the elusive "name of Jesus" brings forth a supernatural, almost magical, power. The power of this theme breaks down, almost automatically, the divisions and discrimination that the preacher has it against as totalitarian ideology and brings unity. Furthermore, the name of Jesus is envisioned as an antidote to seemingly every ailment and tragedy in human existence:

What is in this name? We want to know. That this name can bring us together. [...] He says, in that instance, you know what this name does: it heals the sick, it brings out demons, and it is effective, in other words. It is powerful. He says it sets free the captives (Anonymous, 2021).

Secondly, the elusive theme, quite ironically, locates the agency of this supernatural power squarely in the hands of the person who can somehow use this power through faith and awareness:

But if we are not aware, we can be rendered asunder; we can be torn apart if we do not realise the centrality and importance of this name. [...] This is the power of this name when appropriately appropriated by a person who knows what is in it and why they have the right to use it (Anonymous, 2021).

Three movements can be discerned concerning the preacher's positioning of the centre. Firstly, he moves the centre away from the hearers, decentring their own centrality in the Christian narrative. Secondly, the name of

Jesus as an elusive concept becomes central and represents an attempt by the preacher to unite and heal the greater community around the Divine. However, and this is the third move, the elusive nature of the centre of the Divine actually recentres human agency with the caveat that the human agency must be an ideal equal to someone who knows how to implement the elusive power of the Divine. Therefore, the sermon's positionality moves from the non-ideal human to the Divine and then to the ideal human. This movement, to my mind, does not reflect the post-colonial centre of plurality, but rather two tendencies in preaching which Johan Cilliers (1996, 2004) has pinpointed: the elimination of God from the pulpit and moralisation, which find their climax in the final movement where the centrality of the Divine name is replaced by an idealised human agency.

3.3 Identity: Transcendental Righteousness in the Name of Jesus

Closely related to the centre of the sermon is the identity of both the Divine and the hearers. It must be noted that the elusiveness of the name of Jesus still transpires regarding identity, but there is also a transcendental nature to it. Let me first consider the Divine identity as portrayed in the sermon:

And this name is the same as his personhood. When you call in the name of Jesus Christ, it is the same as calling Jesus Christ himself (Anonymous, 2021).

The elusive nature of the name is thus transposed onto the personhood of Jesus Christ and, therefore, the person of the Divine. Once more, this elusiveness may point to a supernatural identity as it has pointed to supernatural power, but much is left to the imagination of the hearers. When it comes to the hearers, however, identity is formed to a much greater extent:

So, what is it that sets us apart as a people? I said, it is this name. When we are baptised in the church here, we mark you with the sign of Christ. We make you into a people or a person of Jesus Christ. From that day onwards, you carry this name within you, the name of Jesus Christ (Anonymous, 2021).

The first critical understanding of identity is found in baptism, where a former, unnamed identity is transcended to an identity aligned with the

Divine name. However, this identity seems to be fixed almost automatically from the moment of baptism.

And I dare say this morning, I venture to say, I think, this morning, that you are the righteous. You are the righteous, not because you did something good, but because of your faith in the Lord, Jesus Christ. That's what puts you right with God (Anonymous, 2021).

But baptism is not the only caveat for this transcendence, that is if an identity aligned with the Divine name has the same meaning as being righteous. The second caveat of this transcended identity is the importance of faith, which puts one right with the Divine. Faith itself is not defined, and it may be possible that the hearers automatically understand its meaning, making such a definition redundant. It may also be possible that the elusiveness of the name is transposed onto faith. It is unclear why the preacher does not clearly define many of the important thoughts in the sermon. He goes on:

It is in the same way that God regards us when he sees us covered by the blood of Jesus. When he sees us, he sees that righteousness, that robe of righteousness, that Jesus Christ has clothed us in, that he has put on us. He sees us as righteous, pure, blameless, and deserving of his mercy and favour. [...] When you have righteousness and know what God has done for you, you are as bold as lightning. Not your own righteousness, but the righteousness of God (Anonymous, 2021).

In these final thoughts on the identity of the hearers, the Divine transcends the identity of the hearers. The identity of God, which is equated with the elusive supernatural power of the Divine name, is transferred to the hearers. They are overwhelmed by that identity to such an extent that the Divine gaze can only see the Divine identity bestowed upon them, but not without the caveat that the hearers must know the secrets of what God has done. Thus, the divine identity becomes the identity of the hearers when they know it correctly.

One could argue that the sermon represents some post-colonial tendencies with identity, especially regarding the change of identity within the sermon. However, the nature of the Divine identity is problematic, for as much as it may represent supernatural power, it may also merely cloak incoherence

of thought in the sermon. Instead, I would argue that there is no identity change for the hearers. The preacher is merely pointing towards a baptismal identity where a fixed identity is given to the hearer, ending with the appeal that they should live into that identity through correct faith and correct knowledge.

4. Preliminary Discovery: Linear Progression

Considering the description of the sermon around the three post-colonial themes of epistemology, positionality, and identity, I posit that three discoveries can be made revolving around a linear progression of thought. Firstly, the preacher is deeply interested in conceptualising a way of existing in the world which conceptualises a vision of unity. Therefore, in epistemological terms, the congregation, as individuals and a group, is encouraged to move from division to unity in their consciousness and actions within the political and ecclesial realms. The progression of this epistemological vision is without complexity and does not contemplate the possibility of transgressive thought or action in the world.

Secondly, regarding positionality, the linear progression moves from the non-ideal human centre to the elusive Divine centre and finally to the ideal human centre. The elusive Divine centre of the name of the Divine merely functions as a temporary positionality within the sermon until the deeper intention of the preacher is revealed, a moral enticement to become the ideal human being. This is an especially unfortunate conclusion to which the preacher arrives, for the possibility of a plurality of positionalities, is waved aside for the ideal human being, who seems to be beyond and above the struggles of human existence.

Finally, the preacher's contemplation on identity is similar in its linear progression. At first, identity seems to revolve around baptism, and it certainly does. However, baptismal identity is not sufficient as it is the divine choice for human beings above their natural realities. Instead, the baptismal identity must progress beyond God's acceptance towards a more rigorous baptismal identity augmented by correct knowledge and correct faith. To a certain extent, one may argue that there is some hybridity in identity, for the baptismal identity changes the identity of the human being

from non-righteous to righteous, but this also seems to be only a temporary placeholder, for the final baptismal identity righteousness is to be found not in the complexity of identity vis-à-vis existence, but correct knowledge and right faith. The progression of identity is thus this: from non-being to baptised in Divine righteousness, to baptised in Divine righteousness on the condition of correct knowledge and correct faith.

5. Conclusion

At the beginning of this chapter, I asked two questions for the post-colonial paradigm of preaching: What can one learn from conducting research in a township context? And, what is the role of congregational leadership in terms of the relationship between preaching in a township context and the post-colonial theory? Although some post-colonial insights were discovered within the sermon, the linear progression of epistemology, positionality, and identity in the flow and content of the sermon has showcased shortcomings in overall post-colonial thought. Indeed, this discovery has limitations in its methodological framing and the fact that only one sermon was analysed. That being said, one would have hoped that the marginal geographic location of the township would have brought forth ideals of post-coloniality. The first thing one can learn from this finding is that spaces of marginalisation are by no means an automatic conduit of other ways of thinking, being, and exposition of Christian thought but that the prevalent forces of thinking in society are just as much present in these spaces as more central spaces. Stated differently, post-colonial theory is not as prevalent as either academia or the proponents of post-colonial thinking will have us believe.

The question regarding congregational leadership and their role in this context would revolve around at least two aspects of thought espoused on the pulpit. Firstly, congregational leaders must engage with the narratives on the pulpit, shaping and directing congregations in the township, especially asking whether such narratives are conduits of liberation and hope for a better future. Secondly, leaders will have to engage more deeply with the possibilities of other ways of thinking towards local particularities, which reflect better possibilities for communities to take responsibility for

their lives, well-being, identity formation, and the prevalence of abusive ideologies which may abound.

From a more critical perspective, if the sermon interpreted in this chapter is indicative of a larger culture of leadership within the township context, the foundational directives of leadership towards the community can be conceptualised as demanding obedience for unity, moral indignation against the community's actions, and a call to orthodoxy, all aspects of a strict colonial leadership.

Bibliography

- ANONYMOUS. 2021. *The Name of Jesus: Sermon Preached in the Township Context [Transcript]*.
- BHABHA, H.K. 1994. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- BRAUN, V. & CLARKE, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- BRUEGGEMANN, W. 2007. *The word militant: Preaching a decentering word*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- CILLIERS, J. 1996. *Die uitwissing van God op die kansel. Onstellende bevindingse oor Suid-Afrikaanse prediking*. Cape Town: Lux Verbi.
- CILLIERS, J. 2004. *The living voice of the gospel*. Stellenbosch: Sun Press.
- FANON, F. 2004. *The wretched of the earth*. (2nd ed.) New York: Grove Press.
- KAPUŚCIŃSKI, R. 2018. *The other*. (2nd ed.) London: Verso.
- MIGNOLO, W.D. 2007. Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of decoloniality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 449–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162647>
- MURRAY, D. 2022. *The war on the west*. New York: Broadside.
- PIETERSE, H.J.C. 2020. The grounded theory methodology to conduct content analysis of sermons and interviews: Critique and response. *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, 76(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i1.5851>
- SMITH, L.T. 2008. *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London and New York: Zed Books Ltd.

- STEIN, R.H. 2008. *Mark (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- URBANIAK, J. 2019. Decolonisation as unlearning Christianity: Fallism and African religiosity as case Studies. *Black Theology*, 17(3), 223–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14769948.2019.1688088>
- VOLF, M. 2002. Living with the “other”. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 39(1/2), 8–25.
- WA THIONG’O, N. 1986. *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
1993. *Moving the centre: The struggle for cultural freedoms*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- WESSELS, W. 2021. (Post)colonial theology in South Africa? A conversation with recent South African theology at the forefront of the decolonial turn. *Stellenbosch Theological Journal*, 7(1), 2–26. <https://doi.org/10.17570/stj.2021.v7n1.t3>