

An Intercultural Appreciation of Nontransferable Kinship Inheritance and Widowhood Care among the Israelites And Nigerian Yoruba

¹ Abiola Ayodeji Olaniyi ² Prof. S.G.A. Onibere Ph. D,
*Department of Religious Studies, Faculty of Arts, Obafemi Awolowo University,
Ile-Ife, Nigeria.*

Abstract: *This paper compared ancient Israelite practices with Yoruba traditions of kinship inheritance and widowhood care. It advocated a return to caring for widows through kinship inheritance as a duty or responsibility of the initiates of a clique. It employed intercultural interpretive approach in sustaining a kin's family and property as a communal duty saddled upon every member of a covenanted group. However, the paper noticed that the concept was fast losing its communal value owing to the reaction of the church against some African cultural viewpoints of practicing the concept. The church relegated the African communal idea of *ivo ati ebi re* (you and your kin) that saddled every member of a household with the duty of sustaining allotted patrimony to rescue a member from the adversity of an enslaving debt, widowhood and being an orphan. Consequently, caring for the brotherhood as a responsibility was substituted with begging for charity.*

I. Introduction

Kinship inheritance was a viewpoint highlighting the necessity of sustaining the kinfolk. It emphasized reciprocal care among blood relatives and within a circle of initiates in general. It was summed as the virtuous principle of readily offering help when one heard about the sufferings of or noticed the agony of kinfolk that one was in bond or oath with. The concept was viewed as 'being a brother's keeper,' or 'being one another's keeper,' within the kinship. Hence, it assumed 'being a kinsman redeemer' or 'being the helper of a next of kin' within a communal household. The allotted inheritance of the clan that a person belonged used to be employed in sustaining his widow and children by the household at his demise. This view assumed that kinship existed to help a distressed member during misfortune (Proverbs 17:17). The concept included a sharing of goodwill among neighbours and kinfolk for orderliness (Lev. 19:9-18). It was termed *ebi tabi ile ni aawo ki ato so omo ni oruko* (kinship or lineage dictates the name that a child is christened with) among the Yoruba. This viewpoint was also shared because of Yoruba appreciation of "Africans concern for social networks, communal living and orderliness in the society."¹

However, advent of Christianity in Nigeria considered this patrimony as primitive owing to challenges of polygamy attending it. The Mission planted churches² and Pentecostal churches³ celebrated individualism of salvation experience to advocate personal independence and eccentricity. Kinship system of religious contribution among the Israelites as clan-gate tithe (Deut. 14:22-29) celebrated periodically and eaten by the kin contributors was turned into voluntary and anonymous financial donation in the churches. Consequently, the practice of caring for one's affinity (clan tithe) as the duty of every member of a clique was no longer acknowledged by the churches. It was no longer treated as the responsibility of every member of the holding, to his partner or to the care of his partner's survivors. The church adopted canvassing for charity donations from anonymous donors to place peanuts in the hands of the distressed member without making anyone responsible for the care and protection of the distressed. The practice of caring after one's kinfolk that used to be a duty among the Yoruba was replaced with informal begging for donations from members of the church by distressed individuals. Some churches required formal soliciting for funds by the distressed in writing from the benevolent committee of the church before any assistance was rendered.

Church tradition continued to promote private ownership of properties among its members based on imaginary fear of polygamy (problem of sharing the properties of a polygamist) even where it was no longer having any influence in marital relations among the Yoruba in the late twentieth century. The church neglected the sustenance of lineage owned provisions and ancestrally bequeathed resources. Clan centred socializations were relegated for monogamous matrimony that promoted the right of a wife to inherit her dead husband's private possessions before remarrying outside the family of her deceased husband. The church ignored the benefit of allotted inheritance that was provided for the widow and dependants of the deceased that were not interested in leaving the family of the deceased in the kinship structure in both Israelite and Yoruba cultures.

The church did not access the right of its member that had allotted properties that were inheritable by patrimony within a clan in settling the debts and poverty confronting the survivors and dependants of its deceased member. So, the church neglected African communal responsibility of repossession of land and other properties of its deceased member by his survivors at death. Yet, provisions for these three communal duties were provided in the adage *akii fi ojuse itoju omo-inu-ebi se itore aanu ti ako ba fe ko parun* (care of the kin is not handled as a charity but saddled as a responsibility to enhance its sustenance). The implication of neglecting the seriousness of being a brother's keeper as a duty were spelt out in the cliché *awo nigbe awo ni gbonwo bi ako ba gbe awo nigbonwo awo yio gba ete awo yio si ya* (sworn clique must guard the initiate away from disgrace; to prevent his betrayal of the trust entrusted to him). Widows of deceased members that were unemployed, underemployed, seasonal or casual workers, and low income earners were gossiped of becoming casual concubines of some male members of the benevolence committee of the church and some well to do church members that they were patronizing for donations from time to time. This was because the church despised the right of a widow that did not wish to leave or remarry outside her deceased husband's family; to take possession of the allotted portion of the inheritance that belonged to her deceased husband as a member of the kinfolk.

Hence, this paper employed intercultural⁴ interpretive approach in addressing being a kinship care as a communal duty in Israelite tradition and African communal idea. Intercultural method provided "contextualized hermeneutic approaches" of telling and re-telling sacred stories in the way that Africans enjoyed their oral traditions. Intercultural approaches are known as "Folkloristic and Intercultural Hermeneutics." They are concerned with "methods that are culturally informed and yet faithful to biblical tradition." These approaches employed wherewithal and events in Africa as focus of exegesis in order to make African social environment the decisive factor of evocative consideration of biblical texts. As a "Folkloristic Approach," it salvages the principles found in worldviews that are supplied by customs and "traditions handed down to posterity through folktales, poems, hymns, proverbs, riddles and art" for communal instruction and improvement of next generation. Its fundamental procedures consist of using the point of a biblical text as a genuine address of God within enlightening values of the addressees of the biblical writer that can be weighed against traditional practice of the readers of present-day African exegete (since both addressees are special peoples of God existing in disconnected ages and milieu).⁵ So, the Israelites referred to kinship care as *Gö'el* (kinsman redemption) of *hä|'aHáwâ* (the brotherhood) from anguish of an enslaving debt and burden of widowhood, by *lä'tët 'et-hä 'ä'rec BünaHälâ Bügôräl* (allotted inheritance or patrimony within the household).⁶ Nigerian Yoruba termed it as rescuing *owo ati ebi re* (you and your lineage) from the adversity of *fi'fi eni ya ofa* (an enslaving debt) by *sisu eni ni opo* (widowhood care of levirate marriage), and *pipin ogun fun eni* (sharing of patrimony with an orphan). So, kinship care of being a brother's keeper assumed and is loaded with many interpretations.⁷

Old Testament View of Kinship Care in Being a Brother's Keeper: Kinship care of being a brother's keeper was a duty or responsibility that was to be done by a (*Gö'el*) close relative so as to (*yig'al*) redeem and a kinsman (*gü'alTik*) act of sustenance by redemption⁸ with the help of a next of kin or kinsman redeemer (Ruth 3:13). Refusal to perform the duty of helping out the name of a brother from extinction from the family line, or out of poverty, shame, slavery, etc had the punishment of walking barefooted with spit of the widow of a deceased brother on the face of the recalcitrant (Deut. 25:7-10).

The concept was severally referred to among the Hebrews and Israelites as 'preserving the brotherhood' (*šömër hä|'aHáwâ*), 'guarding of my brother' (*šömër 'äHî*), 'seeking the welfare of a man from his brother' (*'edröš 'et-ne'peš hä|'ädäm miyyad 'iš 'äHîw*), or 'preserving a brother's life or name' (*šömër 'et-ne'peš 'äH*).⁹ Originally, the term *'äH* (brother) or *hä|'aHáwâ* (the brotherhood) emanated from the idea of being a "particle" or an infinitesimal fraction and segment of a lineage/kinship. In that light, the *'äH* brother could be a poor person (Deut 15:1-11), another member of the community whose property is jeopardized (Deut 22:1-4), or one's deceased blood brother and his surviving widow (Deut 22:5-10)...reflecting a practice known as *levirate* marriage (*levir* is Latin for a husband's brother), that both protects and provides for the widow and the possibility of male lineage.¹⁰

There were two versions of kinship care from the awareness of interdependence, interrelatedness, and interconnection of existence and measure of ethnic or communal relationship. Kinship among the Israelites was not necessarily being a brother from the same lineage or family. There was also the kinship of all Israelites, of just being an Israelite and of just being a neighbour of or with other Israelites (Deut. 22:1-4). There was first the kinship of covenanted group (*'aHáwâ*) or socialization also averred as "the covenant of brothers." The identity of a relative in this sense referred to "a member of the covenant family, and as such, means fellow Israelite or fellow citizen." There was a second adaptation of being a kinsman or a relative and countryman. This was the sense of being the "uncle" or "nephew" as well as "blood brothers, half brothers, family relationships, kinsmen, and members of the same tribe." The relevance of it as a tribal or clan kin was discussed in virtue of goodwill

narrated in the story of Joseph, son of Jacob-Israel (Gen. 37-50). In this case, Joseph as the brother (*'uH*) was "the means of his brothers' survival from starvation." However, it could also be regarded as "a term for a larger family group."¹¹

In view of kinship of a covenant fellow, a member of an oath and generally as an Israelite citizen, there were laws scattered throughout Deuteronomy that detailed how one should treat one's kin. For instance, no usury or interest should be charged on a loan borrowed by an Israelite from another Israelite (Deut. 23:19&20). This care forbade dispensing of false testimony against one's kin/brother by another (Deut. 19:18&19). Fairness and justice were demanded in any resolution of conflict within the kinship especially with regard to caring for the poor, widow, or fatherless (Deut. 1:16; 24:17-22; Zech. 7:9&10). Above all, there was also a provision for cancellation of debt and term or duration of slavery during the Sabbatical year (Deut. 15:1-3, 12-13; cp. Lev. 25; Jer. 34:9). This sense of being a helper or keeper during a misfortune supported the assertion that "all laws about brother relations in Deuteronomy are ones that urge compassion and concern."¹²

Other passages of the Old Testament on social ethics and the need to protect and preserve the life or dignity of a next of kin was also expounded in Lev. 19:9-18; Deut. 19:1-21; 22:1-4; and 23:19. Kinship care was also a duty saddled and based on the assumption that brotherhood of close relatives connoted the idea of being set apart for moral abstinence and spiritual exclusivity (Lev. 18:5-20; 20:19-24). A biblical reference to this custom at a time of hardship was the duty of preserving the name of a relative from being left in extinction by 'sandaling' the living kinsman of a deceased person to marry the surviving widow and raise children in building the family line of the deceased (Deut. 25:5-10; Ruth 4:10). This levirate custom was denied in the marriage of Tamar (widow of Er, son of Judah) to Onan, a relative of Er (Gen. 38:6-9) in spite of the care custom that forbade a surviving widow from being married to anyone that was not a blood relative of her deceased husband (Deut. 25:5). The allotted farm land of the deceased relative among other lands in the clan was regarded as nontransferable to anyone that was not a blood relative of the clan (Num. 36:7&9). This provision allowed the daughters of Zelophehad to take possession of the allotted land of their father by inheritance (Num. 36:2). However, wives and daughters of a deceased person were permitted to take possession of the allotted lands of their deceased husband and father, provided they remained (unmarried as Naomi or married as daughters of Zelophehad) within the tribe of the deceased because allotted lands were nontransferable and could not be permanently sold out of the clan (Num. 36:6&8; Ruth 4:3&9). There was also a provision for redeeming back any inherited land that a deceased sold out by the surviving kinsman as the kinsman redeemer (*gä'al* or *göl'älö*) even when the allotted land (Num. 36:2) of the deceased had been sold to take care of anguish of poverty (Lev. 25:23-28). This was because the land of the deceased was mandated to be retained in the family hectares; for the observance of ancestral rites at the gate of the clan (Ruth 4:10). The land of the deceased was only inheritable and purchasable by a kinsman as done by Boaz for the family of Elimelech (Naomi's husband) and Naomi's sons Chilion and Mahlon (Ruth 4:3&9). Another biblical reference was on the case of how to punish an Israelite that was judged guilty of a dispute. The judgment of a guilty fellow by flogging was made minimal to preserve the dignity of the Israelite that was regarded as a relative whose life, dignity, family, and property or inheritance should be preserved and protected (Deut. 25:1-4).

Yoruba View of Kinship Care in Being a Brother's Keeper: The concept of kinship care (*itoju omo-ebi*) in being a brother's keeper (*jije oluso arakunrin*) had basis in African cultural principle and myth of patriarchy and patrimony. This was because; communal life in traditional African society was based on "the kinship system" that considered marriage and family life as an enlargement of the kinship system.¹³ In this sense, socialization was built around giving birth to a male child assumed to serve as hunter of prey, farmer and gatherer of food, and military protector/security officer of the community. In Yoruba oral traditional myth of basic custom (*isese-isedale*), civilization was believed to have begun with people roaming as nomads in periodic migration from one settlement to another. The nomadic experience demanded institutionalization of both (i) a system of defense of the congregation with security of life and property against external aggression and (ii) a scheme of conservation of food, management of domestic chores, procreation and child care, and preservation of family health. These demands were shared between the females and males in the nomadic congregation at their sedentary phase. Male members of the movement were called *okunrin* (solid and impenetrable sinew) believed to possess higher blood coagulation necessary for speedy curative of injuries sustained during migration. Hence, males were saddled with roles like vigilante, hunting of games, settler-guards, farmers, territorial defenses etc. Female members of the movement were called *obinrin* (fatty verve breeder) believed to possess blood antibodies necessary for sharp and persistent prevention of contagion that multiplied at sedentary time. Hence, females were saddled with roles like cooking of food, procreation and lactation, vegetable gardening, management of domestic chores, mixture of herbal medicine etc. Unfortunately, males were few in number compared to female population necessitating special attention and concern for the care and preservation of males in the congregation. Higher respect and value were placed on males and their ability to hunt games for food and combat external invasion in defense of life and property towards accretion of patriarchy and patrimony. Subsequent to this experience, the inheritance of properties and resources of a patriarch (male

household leader) was appended to giving birth to and rearing a male-child, being the brother of a patriarch (kinsman), and marrying the brother of one's father who was an uncle or a cousin by the surviving female (daughter or wife) of the deceased patriarch.¹⁴

Kinship care in African household relationship was also taken as dutiful cares exchanged among "a family of allegiance" where "true wealth was measured on the basis of those who you cared for or for whom you took responsibility or even who your followers were." It demanded socially saddled responsibilities like ethical faithfulness, virtuous practices, unsullied customs, pious abstinence and religious exclusivity from bonded people or stakeholders of a partnership on behalf of a distressed member.¹⁵ It compelled a surviving kin of a deceased to inherit the assets of the deceased in order to cater for and protect the widow and the fatherless child within the ambit of the lineage.

There were two derivatives of kinship care in Yoruba land. First, this care referred to being saddled with the responsibility of sustaining and protecting the well being of a member of a bond or an oath (*omo-awo* or *omo-imule*). It was severally termed being a brother's guard (*jije oluso arakunrin*) and helping or guarding the initiate away from disgrace to prevent his betrayal of the trust entrusted to him (*awo nigbe awo ni gbonwo bi ako ba gbe awo nigbonwo awo yio gba ete awo yio si ya*). The concept was assumed as the basis of every law, moral code, and customary practice of good neighbourliness among the Yoruba. With the descent of Christianity, allusions were made to biblical passages that discussed case-laws of good human relations in its encompassing influence.¹⁶ This helping or guarding the initiate (*awo nigbe awo nigbon wo*) was based on reciprocal principle and adaptive interdependence of members of a holding (land producing products as properties and investment that others were connected to) in accessing the problem solving values of the holding and the network of participatory stewardship of the members as subsets. In such a context, members of the bonded clique (*imule*) rallied around an initiate that was confronted with inability to settle an enslaving debt (*fifi eni ya ofa*) by offsetting the debt.¹⁷

In view of the foregoing, the Yoruba people of southwestern Nigeria avowed that kinship care is not handled as a charity but saddled as a responsibility to retain its continuity (*akii fi ojuse itoju omo-inu-ebi se itore aanu ti ako ba fe ko parun*). In other words, the care of a kin was assumed as a duty binding on every member of a caucus, clique, household or clan, and homestead (*egbe, agbo-ile, kaa tabi akodi, aba*).¹⁸ Second, it was also localized as a care network of extended family, ancestry, and blood relatives (*omo-ebi, omo-inu-ebi, or omo-ile-ibi*) engaged in relationships "based on home towns and villages, underpinned by systems of apprenticeships and credit unions that spread using family contacts."¹⁹ This was because; the kinship (*ebi*) system referred to "extended and large families living in clusters" as "a rich source of life skills" with "many stimulating competencies that the extended family provided" like "its diversity of people, its competing aspirations, and its framework of reciprocal relationships and the sharpening of values."²⁰ So, the first male child of the family/kinship (*ebi*) was accorded special attention as the initiator of care, "responsible for everyone in the family" under the philosophy of "our wealth lay in how many people we took responsibility for."²¹

Comparative Analysis of Kinship Care between the Israelites and Yoruba: The concept of kinship care in being a brother's keeper was practiced as rescuing an initiate during adversity. It existed within the philosophy of shared/mutual responsibility among the Israelites and Nigerian Yoruba. It exposed the provisions and resources of caring for and guarding the continuity and sustenance of lineage owned properties or allotted inheritance in a kinship. So, kinship care targeted the sustenance of patrimony or allotted clan inheritance known as *naHâlâ Bûgôrâl* among the Israelites and *pipin ogun* among the Yoruba.

Kinship care in the two traditions also involved the recognition of value of the bond existing between the society (that gave birth to, reared and socialized, and sought to perpetuate the sustenance of survivors and properties of its members) and the initiated member under an oath of conformity and duty of loyalty in both Israelite and Yoruba traditions. It advocated reciprocity of a good service by the beneficiary to the benefactor in both traditions.

This ideology included the purpose of marital union as the basis or foundation and smallest unit of the kinship system in the myth of origin and creation, between the Yoruba and the Israelites (Genesis 1:1-2:25). In the myth of origin in both traditions, God was believed as the creator of the universe and guarantor of human life and its continuity. Humans were regarded as the beneficiaries of benefits that God as the benefactor made available in the universe. God was in Genesis 1:1-2:25 the benefactor of the wherewithal of continuity and survival available to humankind. The beneficiaries of providence as human beings were expected to return the good gesture in obedience to the directives of God both by (i) safeguarding the no transference of clan land for ancestral rites to God²² and (ii) caring for one another in form of community service like patrimony, care of the pregnant wife, taking of child delivery, naming of a child after its household, (rearing of children within a household that in turn would repay back the care to their parents both at old age and in ancestral veneration at life after death), care of a surviving widow that determined to reside within her husband's family and siblings, and performance of kinsman redemption of the dignity of a brother during a time of deprivation and disability.²³ This ideology extended to include rising up to rescue a drowning member of a family, household, lineage, clan,

or tribe from shame of inability to perform a role or social responsibility. Consequently, in both Israelite and Yoruba traditions, social and public approval of conjugal union between a man and a woman for reciprocal companionship and procreation was strongly upheld and regarded as the responsibility of the kinfolk.

II. Conclusion

This paper expounded ancient Israelite and Yoruba traditions of kinship care. It identified the inadequacies in church tradition of begging anonymous members to donate into benevolence box for distribution to the distressed member and the formal demand placed on the distressed member to beg church's benevolence committee to rally round his or her adversity. It also considered the caring for and guarding of relatives from agony of an enslaving debt and burden of widowhood through the administration of allotted patrimony within the household.

Therefore, this paper suggested that the understanding of kinship care as a duty should not be allowed to fade away. The church should rejuvenate kinship care as a duty or responsibility of the initiates of a clique. The church should introduce the kinship based tithe that the Israelites practiced in catering for the widows, orphans, and destitute within their clan gates. It was a tithe eaten by the clique of contributors (kin) at the worship centre (Deut. 14:22-29). Christianity of the early church had household socialization of gathering resources together in households. There were even house-churches "the church in ...house." This kinship sense should serve as checks on subtle and informal encouragement of widows that were unemployed, underemployed, seasonal or casual workers, and low income earners from becoming casual prostitutes and concubines of some male members of the benevolence committee of the church and some well to do church members that they were patronizing for donations from time to time. The morale of orphans of the deceased would also be elevated when they discovered that the contribution(s) of their deceased father to men's fellowship in the church had recognition.

Endnotes

¹ Matthews A. Ojo, 1998, "Sexuality, Marriage and Piety among Charismatics in Nigeria" in James L. Cox (ed.) *Rites of Passage in Contemporary Africa* (Fairwater, Cardiff: Cardiff Academic Press), p. 194.

² These churches were established in Nigeria between 1792 and 1910 from long historical traditions of the "Great Century of Protestant Mission" of Catholicism, Methodism, Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, Baptist Congregationalism, Qua Iboe, and ECWA (SIM and SUM). See Deji Ayegboyin & F.K. Asonzeh Ukah 2008, "Taxonomy of Churches in Africa: The Case of Nigeria" in *Ogbomoso Journal of Theology*, Vol. xiii, No. 1, p. 4.

³ These prophetic, revivalist, and charismatic movements emerged in Nigeria from 1920s, 1950s, 1970s, 1980s and 1990s with emphasis on sanctification, baptism with Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues, spiritual renewal, healing, exorcism, spontaneous services, prosperity etc. See Deji Ayegboyin & F.K. Asonzeh Ukah 2008, "Taxonomy of Churches in Africa: The Case of Nigeria" in *Ogbomoso Journal of Theology*, Vol. xiii, No. 1, p. 8-15.

⁴ "Folkloristic and Intercultural Hermeneutics" expounded "methods that are culturally informed and yet faithful to biblical tradition" in expounding "traditions handed down to posterity through folktales, poems, hymns, proverbs, riddles and art" for communal education and development of succeeding generation." See Abiola Ayodeji Olaniyi, 2012, "The Gebira Role in the Ancient Israelite Royal Cult and Women Leadership in Ile-Ife Zone of Cherubim And Seraphim Churches" in *AFRICANA* Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 264-265.

⁵ C. U. Manus, 2003. *Intercultural Hermeneutics in Africa: Methods and Approaches* (Nairobi, Kenya: Action Publishers), pp. iii, iv, 2, 20-41.

⁶ John Joseph Owens, 1999, "Num. 36:2" in *Analytical Key to the Old Testament Volume 1(Genesis-Joshua)*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House), pp. 746-747.

⁷ B.O. Bateye, 2013. "Local Relevance and Global Appeal: Nigerian Female Religious Leaders in London: A Case Study of Lady Evangelist/Prophetess Lizzy Adedamola a.k.a. Alhaja Jesu, Founder of Gospel Light Evangelical Ministry" in Afe Adogame & Shobana Shankar (ed.) *Religion on the Move: New Dynamics of Religious Expansion in a Globalizing World* (The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill), p. 455.

⁸ M.S. Bushell and M.D. Tan. 2003. "Ruth 3:13" in *BibleWorks Version 6.0 of BibleWorks*, contracted with HERMENEUTIKA™ Bible Research Software, and Whittaker's Revised BDB Lexicon entry, pp. 145, 251, 510.

⁹ M.S. Bushell and M.D. Tan. 2003. "Gen. 4:9; 9:5;cf. Zech. 11:14" in *BibleWorks Version 6.0 of BibleWorks*, contracted with HERMENEUTIKA™ Bible Research Software, and Whittaker's Revised BDB Lexicon entry, pp. 25-26,27, 206, 209, 1036.

¹⁰ V.P. Hamilton, 1997. "üH" in W.A. VanGemeren (ed.) *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Volume I*, (Michigan: Zondervan), p. 348.

¹¹ V.P. Hamilton, 1997. "üH" in W.A. VanGemeren (ed.) *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Volume I*, (Michigan: Zondervan), pp. 345-348.

¹² V.P. Hamilton, 1997. "üH" in W.A. VanGemeren (ed.) *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, Volume I*, (Michigan: Zondervan), p. 348.

¹³ Matthews A. Ojo, 1998, "Sexuality, Marriage and Piety among Charismatics in Nigeria" in James L. Cox (ed.) *Rites of Passage in Contemporary Africa* (Fairwater, Cardiff: Cardiff Academic Press), p. 191.

¹⁴ Olawale Olaniyi, was interviewed on oral tradition about the culture of Asangbe People and their rural life at Isangbe-Alara on 11/09/2003. His narration was preferred among the Ooye-Isangbe people owing to his educational status as a Ph.D Religious Studies degree holder of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife in 1990.

¹⁵ Adewale Ajadi, 2012. *Omoluwabi 2.0: A Code of Transformation in 21st Century Nigeria* (Ibadan: Bookcraft), p. 74.

¹⁶ Olawale Olaniyi, supported the assertion with references like Leviticus 25; Deuteronomy 1:16; 15:1-3, 12 & 13; 19:18 & 19; 23:19 & 20 on 11/09/2003.

¹⁷ Michael Omitibayo provided this addition. He was a co-pastor with his father at the Ethiopian Church of Christ, Ido-Osun, Moore, Ile-Ife, on 04/05/2013.

¹⁸ Alufa Omitibayo supplied this clarification of Yoruba version of *itoju omo-ebi* or *itoju-molebi* (caring for the brotherhood) at the Ethiopian Church of Christ, Ido-Osun, Moore, Ile-Ife, on 04/05/2013.

¹⁹ Adewale Ajadi, 2012. *Omoluwabi 2.0: A Code of Transformation in 21st Century Nigeria* (Ibadan: Bookcraft), p. 120.

²⁰ Adewale Ajadi, 2012. *Omoluwabi 2.0: A Code of Transformation in 21st Century Nigeria* (Ibadan: Bookcraft), p. 26.

²¹ Adewale Ajadi, 2012. *Omoluwabi 2.0: A Code of Transformation in 21st Century Nigeria* (Ibadan: Bookcraft), p. 24.

²² Victoria Olasoji, an eighty-nine years old matriarch of *Ile-Ijaroa* (Ijaroa Household) in *Iremo* Community, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria provided this illustration of reciprocal relationship in the nontransferable inheritance of land, female ownership and inheritance of properties of the deceased member, public approval of marriage and care of the wife as the duties of members of a household and widowhood care on 03/05/2013.

²³ Chief Isola Odunlade, a ninety-four years old vice patriarch of *Ile-Ijaroa* (Ijaroa Household) in *Iremo* Community, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria provided this illustration of reciprocal relationship in the nontransferable inheritance of land, patrimony, and widowhood care on 03/05/2013.

References

- [1]. Primary Sources
- [2]. Isola Odunlade, a ninety-four years old vice patriarch of *Ile-Ijaroa* (Ijaroa Household) in *Iremo* Community, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria was interviewed on 03/05/2013.
- [3]. Olawale Olaniyi, was interviewed on oral tradition about the culture of Asangbe People and their rural life at Isangbe-Alara on 11/09/2003.
- [4]. Victoria Olasoji, an eighty-nine years old matriarch of *Ile-Ijaroa* (Ijaroa Household) in *Iremo* Community, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria was interviewed on 03/05/2013.
- [5]. Secondary Sources
- [6]. Adogame, A. & Shankar, S. (ed.), 2013. *Religion on the Move: New Dynamics of Religious Expansion in a Globalizing World* The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill.
- [7]. Ajadi, A. 2012. *Omoluwabi 2.0: A Code of Transformation in 21st Century Nigeria* Ibadan: Bookcraft.
- [8]. Ayegboyin, D. & Asonzeh Ukah, F.K. 2008, "Taxonomy of Churches in Africa: The Case of Nigeria" in *Ogbomosho Journal of Theology*, Vol. xiii, No. 1, 1-21.
- [9]. Bateye, B.O. 2013. "Local Relevance and Global Appeal: Nigerian Female Religious Leaders in London: A Case Study of Lady Evangelist/Prophetess Lizzy Adedamola a.k.a. Alhaja Jesu, Founder of Gospel Light Evangelical Ministry" in Afe Adogame & Shobana Shankar (ed.) *Religion on the Move: New Dynamics of Religious Expansion in a Globalizing World* The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill.
- [10]. Bushell, M.S. and Tan, M.D. 2003. "Ruth 3:13" in BibleWorks Version 6.0 of BibleWorks, contracted with HERMENEUTIKA™ Bible Research Software, and Whittaker's Revised BDB Lexicon entry.
- [11]. Cox, J.L. (ed.) 1998. *Rites of Passage in Contemporary Africa* Fairwater, Cardiff: Cardiff Academic Press.
- [12]. Hamilton, V.P. 1997. "āH" in W.A. VanGemeren (ed.) *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, Volume 1, Michigan: Zondervan.
- [13]. Manus, C.U. 2003. *Intercultural Hermeneutics in Africa: Methods and Approaches* Nairobi, Kenya: Action Publishers.
- [14]. Ojo, M.A. 1998, "Sexuality, Marriage and Piety among Charismatics in Nigeria" in James L. Cox (ed.) 1998. *Rites of Passage in Contemporary Africa* Fairwater, Cardiff: Cardiff Academic Press.
- [15]. Olaniyi, A.A. 2012, "The Gebira Role in the Ancient Israelite Royal Cult and Women Leadership in Ile-Ife Zone of Cherubim And Seraphim Churches" in *AFRICANA* Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 264-265.
- [16]. Owens, J.J. 1999, "Num. 36:2" in *Analytical Key to the Old Testament Volume 1 (Genesis-Joshua)*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.