# "What Share Do We Have in David?" (1 Kings 12:12–16): Identity, Alienation, and Civil Unrest in Israel and the Nigerian Socio-Political Context

*Joel Haruna Usman & Michael Paul Pilani*

**Abstract**
This study examines 1 Kings 12:12-16 in light of Nigeria's socio-political realities, exploring the relationship between leadership, identity, and civil unrest. The passage describes the critical moment when Rehoboam, heir to the Davidic monarchy, ignores the advice of experienced elders and responds harshly to the people's plea for relief from the heavy burdens left behind by King Solomon. This decision produces deep alienation, destroys communal trust, and ultimately fractures the United Kingdom of Israel. Using a historical-critical, literary, and contextual hermeneutical approach, this study analyses the theological, ethical, and socio-political dimensions of the narrative. It draws careful parallels with contemporary Nigerian governance, where leadership failures, institutional weaknesses, and perceived marginalisation have deepened public dissatisfaction, inflamed ethnic tensions, and fuelled calls for secession. The study concludes that attentive, just, and responsible leadership is essential for national unity, and that biblical narratives offer enduring insight into the human and societal consequences of alienation and poor governance.

**Key words:** Rehoboam, Nigeria, leadership, identity, alienation, civil unrest, Deuteronomistic History, 1 Kings 12, governance, contextual hermeneutics

## Introduction

Nigeria's political history since independence in 1960 reveals a troubling and persistent paradox. Despite the country's remarkable natural and human resources, governance has repeatedly failed to translate this enormous wealth into sustainable development and social well-being for ordinary citizens (Achebe, 2012). This paradox raises a fundamental question: how does a nation so richly endowed consistently produce leaders who appear unable or unwilling to govern with vision, competence, and genuine commitment to the common good? The recurring failure of leadership has not only slowed national development but has also deepened the sense of alienation that many Nigerians feel toward their own state (Osaghae, 2011). At the centre of this governance crisis lies the problem of corruption, which has systematically weakened the institutions designed to sustain good governance. The Executive, Legislature, and Judiciary, namely the three pillars intended to provide checks and

balances, have in many instances been compromised, producing a systemic breakdown that manifests in widespread socio-economic hardship, deteriorating infrastructure, chronic insecurity, and growing secessionist agitation in several regions (Suberu, 2001; Agbu, 2004; Kanu et al., 2025). Several analysts have described Nigeria as a fragile state in urgent need of structural reform to avoid deeper instability (Rotberg, 2004; Ilesanmi, 2001).

This contemporary situation bears a striking parallel to the biblical account of ancient Israel under King Solomon, widely regarded as a golden age of peace, prosperity, and international prestige. Solomon's achievements, especially the construction of the Jerusalem Temple, symbolised both religious devotion and national greatness (Campbell & O'Brien, 2000; Brueggemann, 2001; Cogan, 2000). Yet beneath this magnificent surface lay serious internal tensions. The prosperity of Solomon's reign was built upon heavy taxation and forced labour, burdens that fell most heavily on the northern tribes (Walsh, 1996; Provan, 1995). Administrative centralisation widened the gap between the ruling class and ordinary citizens, while Solomon's religious compromises gradually eroded the covenantal foundations of the nation (Sweeney, 2007). It is within this context that 1 Kings 12:12-16 becomes particularly significant. The passage recounts the encounter between the newly crowned Rehoboam and the assembled people, who request relief from the heavy burdens imposed by his father. Rather than responding with wisdom and compassion, Rehoboam rejects sound counsel and adopts a harsh and contemptuous posture, turning a moment of potential reconciliation into one of irreversible alienation. His failure to listen results in the decisive rupture captured in the cry: "What share do we have in David?" These are words that signal the permanent fracture of the united monarchy (Nelson, 1987; Gray, 1970; Brueggemann, 2001).

Although separated by centuries and very different contexts, the dynamics of this biblical narrative resonate deeply with Nigeria's socio-political realities. The issues of identity, alienation, and civil unrest evident in ancient Israel find clear echoes in contemporary Nigeria, where leadership failures, economic burdens, and perceived marginalisation continue to threaten national unity. This study, therefore, uses 1 Kings 12:12-16 as a hermeneutical lens through which to examine the relationship between identity, alienation, and civil unrest, offering both a critical theological engagement with the biblical text and a constructive dialogue with the Nigerian situation (Usman, 2020; Ukpong, 2000; Adeyemo, 2006; West, 2010).

**The Historical Context of 1 Kings 12:12-16**

The scene at Shechem in 1 Kings 12:12–16 is not a crisis, but rather the culmination of tensions that have been long in the making. Solomon's death left behind a kingdom outwardly magnificent but inwardly strained. His ambitious building projects and elaborate royal administration had been sustained through heavy taxation and forced labour, and these burdens fell disproportionately on the northern tribes (Brueggemann, 2001). What appeared to outsiders as a golden age of national achievement concealed the

quiet suffering of a people pushed to their limits (Wiseman, 1993). Into this tense atmosphere stepped Rehoboam, the young and inexperienced heir to the throne. Significantly, his coronation was not held in Jerusalem, the traditional centre of royal power, but in Shechem, a city laden with covenantal memory and historical significance in the northern territories (Gray, 1970; Cogan, 2000). This choice of venue was itself a signal: Israelite kingship was not absolute but relational, depending on the consent and cooperation of the people (DeVries, 1985). The gathering at Shechem was therefore not a mere formality but a negotiation, a test of whether the new king would govern wisely or simply repeat and intensify the injustices of the past.

Leading the people's cause was Jeroboam, who had earlier fled Solomon's hostility and now returned from Egypt as the voice of a restless and burdened population (1 Kgs 11:26-40). The demand he presented was straightforward and reasonable: lighten the harsh service your father imposed upon us, and we will serve you loyally. It was, at its core, a plea for justice, a call for a leadership that listened, that moderated power with compassion, and that understood the weight it placed on the people it governed (Sweeney, 2007). Rehoboam chose to consult before responding. The elders who had served under Solomon advised him clearly: serve the people today, and they will serve you faithfully forever. This counsel was rooted not only in practical political wisdom but in the Deuteronomistic vision of kingship, in which authority is sustained by justice, humility, and genuine accountability to the governed (Noth, 1991). Yet Rehoboam dismissed this experienced advice in favour of his younger companions, who urged him instead to assert dominance, increase the burden, and rule through fear. Their counsel reflected a philosophy of power as control rather than power as service (Provan, 1995).

When the appointed day arrived, Rehoboam's response destroyed any prospect of reconciliation. His declaration: "My father made your yoke heavy, but I will add to your yoke," communicated not strength but contempt, not leadership but a fundamental indifference to human suffering (1 Kgs 12:14). The reaction of the northern tribes was swift and final. Their cry was more than a political protest; it was the dissolution of a shared national identity and the formal end of the United Monarchy (Cogan, 2000). The Deuteronomistic editors present this rupture as simultaneously the result of Rehoboam's human failure and the outworking of divine judgment foreshadowed in earlier prophetic announcements (1 Kgs 11:11-13). This dual dimension, that is, human responsibility and divine purpose working together, gives the narrative its distinctive theological depth and moral seriousness (Römer, 2005).

**The Literary Context of 1 Kings 12:12-16**

The narrative of 1 Kings 12:12-16 occupies a pivotal position in the literary architecture of the Books of Kings, which form a central part of the Deuteronomistic History (Boadt, 1984; Noth, 1991; Römer, 2005). As a literary unit, the passage weaves together history, theology, and skilled narrative craft to explain not only what happened at Shechem but why it matters far beyond its

immediate historical moment (Nelson, 1987; Brueggemann, 2001; Brueggemann, 2001). Solomon's reign had produced extraordinary achievements in wisdom, wealth, and international diplomacy (1 Kgs 3-10). Yet the narrative consistently signals the social cost of this grandeur: forced labour, heavy taxation, and the concentration of power in the hands of a centralised royal administration (Walsh, 1996; Sweeney, 2007). By the time of Solomon's death, these accumulated grievances had ripened into a barely concealed dissatisfaction, waiting only for a moment of political transition to find full and dramatic expression (O'Brien & Campbell, 1998; Provan, 1995).

The coronation of Rehoboam at Shechem instead of Jerusalem is a carefully chosen literary signal. Shechem was a site of deep covenantal memory, specifically the place where Joshua renewed the covenant with the people (Josh 24), and choosing it as the venue for the new king's accession suggests that the northern tribes were asserting that this kingship must be renegotiated, not simply inherited (DeVries, 1985; Cogan, 2000; Brueggemann, 2001). The gathering is therefore not a traditional coronation but a test, and the narrator frames it as the moment when the new king's true character will be revealed (Boadt, 1984; Nelson, 1987). The narrative's deliberate three-day pause heightens the tension and creates space for the real heart of the story: the contrast between two completely different visions of leadership, embodied in two groups of advisors (Boadt, 1984; Walsh, 1996; Alter, 1981). The elders embody the Deuteronomistic ideal of servant kingship, with authority based on justice, attentiveness, and concern for the people's well-being. The young men represent a rival view of power as domination, maintained through severity and intimidation. The contrast is intentional and theologically meaningful: wisdom versus folly, service versus oppression, listening versus arrogance.

The recurring image of the "yoke" functions as a key literary and theological symbol throughout the passage (1 Kgs 12:4, 9, 10, 11, 14). In the ancient Near Eastern world, the yoke was a powerful metaphor for oppressive servitude and imperial subjugation (Walsh, 1996). Its repeated use by both the people and Rehoboam sharpens the central dramatic question: will this king serve or oppress? Rehoboam's declaration that he will make the yoke even heavier transforms a moment of possible covenant renewal into an act of deliberate communal rupture (Gray, 1970; Campbell & O'Brien, 2000). The cry of the northern tribes in verse 16, namely "What share do we have in David? We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse," is a recognised formula of political dissolution in the Hebrew Bible (Boadt, 1984; DeVries, 1985). It echoes a similar declaration in 2 Samuel 20:1 and links the Shechem crisis to earlier episodes of tribal fracture, suggesting that the unity of the Davidic monarchy had always been fragile. Theologically, verse 15 interprets the entire episode as the fulfilment of God's earlier word through the prophet Ahijah (1 Kgs 11:29-39), reflecting the Deuteronomistic conviction that Israel's history is always simultaneously a human story and a theological one.

**Critical Analysis of 1 Kings 12:12-16**

The pericope of 1 Kings 12:12-16 is one of the most theologically charged and narratively precise passages in the entire Deuteronomistic History. Structurally, the passage moves through five closely connected moments: the people's return, the indication of a harsh response, the rejection of wise counsel, the theological interpretation of events, and the declaration of national division. These moments do not merely follow one another in sequence; they build with intentional narrative momentum toward a single catastrophic outcome. The entire passage is shaped by the Deuteronomistic conviction that Israel's history is both a human story and a theological one (Noth, 1991; Römer, 2005).

The passage opens with Jeroboam and the assembled people returning to Rehoboam on the third day, exactly as the king had instructed (1 Kgs 12:12). The three-day interval is a familiar biblical narrative convention, marking a period of deliberation before a decisive moment (cf. Gen 22:4; Exod 19:11) (Alter, 1981; Walsh, 1996). The people return not in rebellion but in measured and hopeful expectation, giving the new king a formal opportunity to demonstrate that his reign will differ from the oppressive administrative policies of his father. Their appeal reflects genuine and long-standing socio-economic grievances rooted in Solomon's imposition of heavy taxation and forced labour, burdens carefully documented across the preceding chapters of 1 Kings (Boadt, 1984; Provan, 1995; Heater, 1992; Brueggemann, 2001). Scholarly engagement with this opening moment has consistently situated it within the Deuteronomistic framework, in which the Shechem gathering is understood as both a political test and a covenantal moment of reckoning (Noth, 1991; Brueggemann, 2001). The Deuteronomistic ideal of kingship, classically articulated in Deuteronomy 17:14-20, envisions the king not as an absolute sovereign but as a servant of the covenant community, accountable to God and to the people he governs. Rehoboam's subsequent failure to meet this standard is therefore not merely a political miscalculation but a profound moral and theological failure (Brueggemann, 2001).

The narrator reports with stark and unambiguous directness that Rehoboam "spoke harshly to the people" (1 Kgs 12:13) and deliberately abandoned the counsel of the experienced elders in favour of the advice of his younger peers. This choice is not presented as a neutral administrative preference; the narrative frames it as a fundamental moral failure and the direct inversion of the Deuteronomistic ideal of the just king (DeVries, 1985; Sweeney, 2007). Throughout the biblical wisdom tradition, attentiveness to experienced counsel is presented as the hallmark of wise leadership, while its rejection is the signature folly of those who mistake arrogance for strength (Prov 11:14; 15:22; 19:20) (Boadt, 1984; Longman, 2006). The young men's advice, which was established not in accumulated wisdom but in the insecurities of inherited privilege, reflects a vision of power as domination rather than service, and in choosing it, Rehoboam places himself firmly among the failed rulers of the biblical tradition: those who possessed the opportunity to govern justly and deliberately squandered it (Walsh, 1996).

The moral indictment reaches its sharpest expression in verse 14, which forms the chiastic centre of the entire passage and its theological pivot. Rehoboam's declaration: "My father made your yoke heavy, but I will add to your yoke; my father disciplined you with whips, but I will discipline you with scorpions" (1 Kgs 12:14), does not merely refuse the people's request; it deliberately inflames the situation by promising intensified suffering. The escalating metaphor from whips to scorpions, understood by most commentators as a reference to a particularly painful multi-tipped lash, vividly captures the movement from oppressive governance to calculated cruelty (Cogan, 2000; Gray, 1970). As Brueggemann (2001) observes, this moment exposes the fundamental contradiction at the heart of royal ideology: a king who governs through fear and coercion rather than justice and covenant fidelity cannot sustain the loyalty upon which his authority ultimately depends.

Verse 15 introduces a crucial theological reframing. The narrator attributes the king's refusal to listen to "a turn of affairs brought about by the LORD" in fulfilment of earlier prophetic pronouncements (1 Kgs 12:15; cf. 1 Kgs 11:29-39). Critically, this divine purposiveness does not dissolve Rehoboam's moral responsibility. The Deuteronomistic History consistently holds both dimensions in productive tension: God's sovereign purposes are accomplished through and not despite human decisions, including human failures, without those failures becoming any less culpable (Römer, 2005; Brueggemann, 2001). The division of the kingdom is simultaneously the inevitable consequence of Rehoboam's arrogance and the fulfilment of God's prior judgment on Solomon's unfaithfulness (1 Kgs 11:9-13).

The passage reaches its dramatic and irreversible climax in verse 16, when the people respond to Rehoboam's declaration with the formal cry of political dissolution: "What share do we have in David? We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse. To your tents, O Israel!" (1 Kgs 12:16). This is not an impulsive outburst but a legally recognised declaration echoing the language of 2 Samuel 20:1, linking the Shechem crisis to earlier episodes of tribal fracture and demonstrating that the unity of the Davidic monarchy had always been conditionally held (Campbell & O'Brien, 2000; Brueggemann, 2001). The northern tribes assert a separate identity rooted in their accumulated experience of marginalisation and exclusion, and the immediate outcome – the permanent fragmentation of the United Monarchy – illustrates a principle as relevant today as in the ancient Near East: governance systems built on systemic injustice and deliberate exclusion carry within themselves the seeds of their own dissolution (Osaghae, 2011; Suberu, 2001; 2023; Usman, 2025). The tragedy at Shechem is finally not merely a historical event but an enduring theological and moral warning about the inseparable relationship between justice, leadership, and communal survival.

**Identity, Alienation, and Civil Unrest: Nigeria in Light of 1 Kings 12:12-16**

The dynamics of 1 Kings 12:12-16 find striking and instructive resonance in the socio-political realities of contemporary Nigeria. Both contexts are shaped by

three interconnected forces: a crisis of identity, the experience of alienation, and the eruption of civil unrest. Reading these dynamics together across the biblical and Nigerian contexts illuminates enduring patterns in the relationship between governance, justice, and communal belonging.

***The Crisis of Identity***

In ancient Israel, the sense of national identity was bound up with participation in the covenant community centred on the Davidic monarchy. When Rehoboam's governance threatened to reduce that identity to a relationship of servitude without dignity or justice, the northern tribes were compelled to ask a fundamental question: do we truly belong to this kingdom, and on what terms? (Nelson, 1987; Brueggemann, 2001). Their cry was a declaration that identity cannot be sustained without justice. It asserted that meaningful belonging requires recognition, dignity, and fair treatment from those who exercise authority (Gray, 1970; Walsh, 1996).

Nigeria faces a directly comparable identity crisis, rooted in the colonial construction of a multi-ethnic, multi-religious state without adequate structural provisions for managing its deep internal diversity (Suberu, 2001; Osaghae, 2011). With more than 250 ethnic groups and profound regional and religious divisions, questions of national belonging have remained perpetually contested since independence (Ilesanmi, 2001; Usman and Paul, 2024). When governance is widely perceived as serving the interests of particular ethnic, regional, or elite groups at the expense of others, citizens begin to question their stake in the national project (Agbu, 2004; Maier, 2000). This is clearly evident in the resurgence of ethnic nationalism, the intensification of identity-based politics, and the multiplication of secessionist voices, most notably in the contemporary Biafra agitation in the South-East and persistent demands for restructuring from multiple regions (Suberu, 2001; Dike & Ajah, 2021; Kanu and Paul, 2024).

***Alienation as a Political Phenomenon***

In the biblical narrative, alienation is the direct and predictable consequence of leadership that ignores the legitimate concerns of the governed. Rehoboam's refusal to listen, his deliberate hardening of purpose against the reasonable appeals of the people, produced a rupture of trust so severe and so complete that formal withdrawal of allegiance became the only meaningful response (Walsh, 1996; Brueggemann, 2001). The alienation of the northern tribes was not an irrational or impulsive reaction but a measured and consequential response to experienced and ongoing injustice.

In Nigeria, alienation from the state and from the institutions of governance has become one of the defining features of citizens' political experience (Osaghae, 2011; Rotberg, 2004). Trust in government institutions remains chronically low across all regions and social groups. The sense that the political class is disconnected from the realities of ordinary Nigerians, that those who govern do so primarily for their own benefit, is widely shared and frequently documented

(Achebe, 2012; Agbu, 2004). The failure of successive governments to translate the country's extraordinary resource wealth into equitable development has reinforced the widespread perception that the Nigerian state exists primarily to serve elite interests rather than the common good (Suberu, 2001; Ilesanmi, 2001). This accumulated sense of structural injustice and deliberate exclusion deepens alienation and creates the social and political conditions in which civil unrest becomes not merely possible but virtually inevitable.

***Civil Unrest as the Consequence of Failed Leadership***

Civil unrest in both the biblical and Nigerian contexts is not an irrational or spontaneous eruption of violence but the cumulative and entirely predictable consequence of unresolved grievances produced by leadership failure (Agbu, 2004; Usman, 2025). In ancient Israel, the political rupture at Shechem was preceded by decades of systemic injustice under Solomon, which included forced labour, heavy taxation, and an administrative system that served the royal elite at the expense of the broader population (Provan, 1995). Rehoboam's harsh response did not create this unrest; it ignited tensions that had been building for a generation.

In Nigeria, civil unrest has similarly been the product of long-accumulated grievances rather than sudden provocations (Osaghae, 2011; Achebe, 2012; Dike & Ajah, 2021). Armed conflicts in the Niger Delta, the insurgency in the North-East, persistent violence in the Middle Belt, and the broader national agitation for structural reform all reflect the mounting frustration of communities that feel excluded from the benefits of governance and left exposed to its burdens without the protection that functioning institutions should provide (Ilesanmi, 2001; Agbu, 2004; Albert, 2019). These dynamics confirm what scholars of state fragility and governance failure have consistently argued: civil unrest is not accidental but is the structural outcome of governance that is systematically unjust, exclusionary, and unaccountable (Rotberg, 2004).

The theological insight of 1 Kings 12 therefore functions as a prophetic warning with direct contemporary application: leadership that refuses to listen to the people, that prefers the counsel of privilege over the wisdom of justice, and that mistakes the assertion of domination for the exercise of legitimate authority, does not merely fail to govern well, it actively fractures communities and nations. This warning speaks with equal force to Nigerian leaders and institutions today (Ukpong, 2000; Adeyemo, 2006; West, 2010).

**Theological and Ethical Implications for Leadership**

The theological reading of 1 Kings 12:12–16 offers significant resources for a constructive engagement with the ethics of leadership, particularly in the Nigerian context. Three implications deserve particular attention. First, the passage affirms that leadership is a moral and covenantal responsibility, not merely a political office. The Deuteronomistic tradition consistently presents the Israelite king not as an absolute ruler but as a servant of the covenant,

accountable both to God and to the people he governs (Deut 17:14-20) (Houston, 2008). Rehoboam's failure was not primarily strategic but moral: he refused to embody the justice and compassion that covenantal leadership demands. In the Nigerian context, this theological framework challenges leaders at every level to understand their office not as an opportunity for personal enrichment or the consolidation of factional advantage, but as a calling to serve the common good with integrity, humility, and genuine accountability (Adeyemo, 2006; Ilesanmi, 2001).

Second, the narrative demonstrates the inseparability of justice and national unity. The fracturing of Israel was not externally imposed but was the internal consequence of persistent injustice. As Brueggemann (2001) observes, governance systems that sustain themselves through the exploitation of the vulnerable carry within them the seeds of their own collapse. This principle speaks directly to Nigeria, where the persistence of corruption, the failure of redistributive justice, and the systematic exclusion of marginalised communities from political and economic participation continue to erode the foundations of national cohesion (Osaghae, 2011; Suberu, 2001; Achebe, 2012; Usman, 2025).

Third, the theological interpretation offered in verse 15 – that even Rehoboam's failure served a larger divine purpose – does not reduce or relativise human moral responsibility but places it within a framework of ultimate accountability. The Deuteronomistic tradition insists that human choices matter, that they produce real and lasting consequences for communities and nations, and that leaders will be held accountable for the harm caused by their moral failures (Noth, 1991; Römer, 2005). This affirmation of moral accountability at the very heart of political life offers a powerful prophetic counterweight to the culture of impunity that has too often been allowed to characterise Nigerian governance.

**Conclusion**

This study has examined 1 Kings 12:12-16 through a combination of historical-critical, literary, and contextual hermeneutical methods, bringing the biblical narrative into creative and critical dialogue with the socio-political realities of contemporary Nigeria. The analysis reveals a narrative of remarkable depth and enduring moral relevance. Rehoboam's failure to respond with wisdom and justice to the legitimate concerns of the people generated a crisis of identity and alienation so severe that it permanently fractured the United Kingdom of Israel. Although rooted in the ancient Near East, this narrative speaks with prophetic clarity to the dynamics of governance and communal life in any society where leaders prioritse domination over service and self-interest over justice.

In Nigeria, the challenges of leadership failure, economic inequality, ethnic marginalisation, and institutional weakness continue to shape the national trajectory in ways that mirror the dynamics at Shechem with uncomfortable

precision. The biblical narrative does not provide a political blueprint, but it offers something equally valuable: a moral framework within which the causes and consequences of governance failure can be honestly assessed, and within which the demands of just and accountable leadership can be clearly articulated and urgently pursued.

**Recommendations**
Based on this analysis, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Nigerian leaders at all levels of government must commit to genuine participatory governance, actively listening to citizens, especially those from historically marginalised communities, and responding to their concerns with concrete and measurable policy action rather than rhetoric. The example of Rehoboam demonstrates that the refusal to listen is not a sign of strength but of a weakness that ultimately destroys the authority it seeks to protect.

2. The strengthening of democratic institutions, including an independent judiciary, credible electoral bodies, and effective anti-corruption agencies, is essential if governance in Nigeria is to be made genuinely accountable and if citizens are to rebuild trust in the state. Institutional weakness is not merely an administrative problem; it is a moral and covenantal failure that leaves the vulnerable without protection.

3. Theological and ethical formation in leadership must be prioritised across Nigeria's religious, educational, and civic institutions. The biblical vision of leadership as service, accountability, and covenant responsibility offers a powerful and culturally resonant counter-narrative to the culture of impunity and self-enrichment that continues to undermine Nigerian governance and national cohesion.

4. Structural reforms that promote inclusive governance must be seriously pursued. Meaningful devolution of power, equitable distribution of national resources, and genuine protection of minority rights are not optional additions to good governance but its essential foundations. Without these structural changes, the underlying causes of alienation and civil unrest will persist regardless of electoral cycles or changes in leadership.

By and large, the ancient cry "What share do we have in David?" functions as both a warning and a challenge for every society that faces the tensions between governance and justice, between power and accountability, between national unity and legitimate grievance. It warns of the devastating consequences that follow when leadership ignores the people and fractures the bonds of communal life. It challenges every generation of leaders to build systems of governance that are just, inclusive, transparent, and genuinely oriented toward the common good. The witness of 1 Kings 12 invites and indeed urgently demands nothing less.

## References


Achebe, C. (2012). There was a country: A personal history of Biafra. Penguin Press.

Adeyemo, T. (Ed.). (2006). Africa Bible commentary: A one-volume commentary written by 70 African scholars. Word Alive Publishers / Zondervan.

Agbu, O. (2004). Ethnic militias and the threat to democracy in post-transition Nigeria. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

Albert, I. O. (2019). Rethinking the Boko Haram insurgency and peace efforts in northern Nigeria. Peace and Conflict Studies, 26(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.46743/1082-7307/2019.1563

Alter, R. (1981). The art of biblical narrative. Basic Books.

Boadt, L. (1984). Reading the Old Testament: An Introduction. New York: Paulist Press.

Brueggemann, W. (2001). 1 & 2 Kings. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Smyth & Helwys Publishing.

_____. (2001). The Prophetic Imagination (2nd Ed.). Minneapolis, Fortress Press

Campbell, A. F. & O'Brien, M. A. (2000). Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History. Minneapolis, Fortress Press.

Cogan, M. (2000). 1 Kings: A new translation with introduction and commentary. Anchor Bible (Vol. 10). Doubleday.

DeVries, S. J. (1985). 1 Kings. Word Biblical Commentary (Vol. 12). Word Books.

Dike, P., & Ajah, M. (2021). Leadership failure and national crisis in Nigeria: A socio-political analysis. African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 15(2), 44–58. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPSIR2021.1314

Dike, U. A. & Ajah, M. (2021). "Agitations for Restructuring in Ancient Israel and

Current Nigerian Experience," Ilorin Journal of Religious Studies (IJOURELS). Vol. 11.1. 15-28

Gray, J. (1970). I & II Kings: A commentary (2nd Ed.). Old Testament Library. SCM Press.

Heater, H., Jr. (1992). 1 & 2 Kings. In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), The Bible knowledge commentary: Old Testament (pp. 487–560). Victor Books.

Houston, W. (2008). Contending for justice: Ideologies and theologies of social justice in the Old Testament. T&T Clark.

Homer, H. (1991). "A Theology of Samuel and Kings" A Biblical Theology of the Old

Testament. Roy B. Zuck (Ed.) Chicago: Moody Press.

Ilesanmi, S. O. (2001). Constitutional treatment of religion and the politics of human rights in Nigeria. African Affairs, 100(401), 529–554. https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/100.401.529

Kanu, I. A., & Paul, P. M. (2024). "Semiotic hermeneutic of 'new wine, new wineskins': Symbols, philosophy of development, and Africa." *Dialogue and Universalism, 35*(2), 151–164. https://doi.org/10.5840/du202434225

Kanu, I. A., Pilani, M. P., & Louis, N. K. (2025). African Union's Peace and Integration Initiatives in the Light of Ecclesiastes (4: 12): Intersection of Politics and Biblical Wisdom. *Journal of African Union Studies*, *14*(3), 161-179.

Longman, T., III. (2006). Proverbs. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Baker Academic.

Maier, K. (2000). This house has fallen: Nigeria in crisis. PublicAffairs.

Nelson, R. D. (1987). First and Second Kings. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. John Knox Press.

Noth, M. (1991). The Deuteronomistic History (2nd ed., J. Doull et al., Trans.). JSOT Supplement Series 15. Sheffield Academic Press.

O'Brien, M. & Campbell, A. (1998). 1-2 Kings. The International Bible Commentary. Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press.

Osaghae, E. E. (2011). Crippled giant: Nigeria since independence (2nd ed.). Hurst & Company.

Provan, I. W. (1995). 1 and 2 Kings. New International Biblical Commentary. Hendrickson Publishers.

Römer, T. (2005). The so-called Deuteronomistic History: A sociological, historical and literary introduction. T&T Clark.

Rotberg, R. I. (Ed.). (2004). When states fail: Causes and consequences. Princeton University Press.

Seow, C. (1999). The First and Second Books of Kings: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflection. The New Interpreter's Bible, A Commentary in Twelve Volumes, Vol. 3. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Suberu, R. T. (2001). Federalism and ethnic conflict in Nigeria. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Sweeney, M. A. (2007). I & II Kings: A commentary. Old Testament Library. Westminster John Knox Press.

Ukpong, J. S. (2000). Developments in biblical interpretation in Africa: Historical and hermeneutical directions. In G. O. West & M. W. Dube (Eds.), The Bible in Africa: Transactions, trajectories and trends (pp. 11–28). Brill.

Usman, J. H. (2020). Making Peace in Kaduna State in the Light of Gen 13:8-9. Nigerian Journal of Religion and Society, 10 (September 2020). Pp 80-97.

_____. (2023). A Rereading of Amos 5:21-24 in Contemporary Nigerian Society. Nigerian Journal of Religion and Society, 12 (July 2023). Pp 188-200.

_____. (2025). From Division to Communion: Acts 6:1-7 and the Synodal Path to Peace building. Nigerian Journal of Religion and Society, 12 (June 2025). Pp 55-68.

Usman, J. H. and Paul, P. M. (2024) "Conflict Resolution Beyond Identity: Insights on Peacebuilding from Acts 6:1-7," *Journal of Religion and Society (JORAS)* 13: 58-73.

Walsh, J. T. (1996). 1 Kings. Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry. Liturgical Press.

West, G. O. (2010). Contextual Bible study in Africa: A resource for re-imagining and reconstructing community. Cluster Publications.

Wiseman, D. J. (1993). 1 and 2 Kings: An introduction and commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. InterVarsity Press.