A POSTCOLONIAL STUDY OF LAND CONFLICT IN 1 KINGS 21:1-16: TOWARDS A THEOLOGICAL RESPONSE TO LAND CLASHES IN KENYA

BY

Koech Chepkirui Magdaline

This Dissertation is a Partial Fulfillment of Requirement for Award of Master's in Theology from St. Paul's University, Kenya.

May 2020

A POSTCOLONIAL STUDY OF LAND CONFLICT IN 1 KINGS 21:1-16: TOWARDS A THEOLOGICAL RESPONSE TO LAND CLASHES IN KENYA

By:

Koech Chepkirui Magdaline

This Dissertation is a Partial Fulfillment of Requirement for Award of Master's in Theology from St. Paul's University, Kenya.

Supervised by:

Prof. D.C. Chemorion & Dr. J.K. Kithinji

May 2020

DECLARATION

This Dissertation is a product of my work and it is not a result of anything done in collaboration. It has not been previously presented to any other institution for an award of a degree.

STUDENT NAME**: Koech Chepkirui Magdaline** STUDENT NO: **MTH/NRB/1227/16**

Signature: ……

29th May 2020

Date: ……

Word Count: 20,458

We confirm that the work reported in this dissertation has been done by the student under our supervision.

Supervisor 1: REV. PROF. CHOSEFU CHEMORION.

SIGNATURE ……

DATE ……

Supervisor 2: REV. DR. JULIUS KITHINJI.

SIGNATURE ……

DATE ……

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to Koech's family, A.C.K. St. Peter's Embakasi Parish and A.C.K St. Matthew's Membley Park Parish for their outstanding support and prayers during this period of my studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I am thankful to Almighty God for allowing me to study in good health and for all the provision of all the resources. I would like to appreciate my family, friends, and mentors for all their tirelessly support. I would like to thank my supervisors, Prof. Chosefu Chemorion and Dr. Julius Kithinji for the support, concern and inspiration they have given me.

ABSTRACT

This study uses postcolonial biblical criticism to read 1 Kings 21:1-16 as a theological response to land clashes. Land clashes are part of post-colonial injustices that need to be addressed using the postcolonial perspective. The guiding objectives are to provide a background of 1 Kings 21:1-16 as a basis to expose land conflicts and social injustices, to show how land clashes has affected the citizens, and how postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 can be used to respond to land clashes. The aim of this study is to produce a useful tool for responding to land clashes and intellectual reference for other scholars. The key question addressed in this study is how 1 Kings 21:1-16 can be read to deal with land clashes. It is a qualitative study that analyzes data from the library, books, journals, theses, online sources, and other relevant publications. The study is informed by the observation that there are few biblical scholars who previously dealt with theological responses on land clashes. It was hypothetical that land clashes can be addressed theologically. The researcher found out that perpetrators of land clashes should be prosecuted and justice delivered to the victims, capital punishment should be imposed on the perpetrators of land clashes, land laws should be revised to ensure that leaders do not misuse power to illegally relocate citizen in order to take their land. There is need for laws prohibiting leaders' spouses from accessing power functions for wrong use as did Jezebel. Finally, there should be laws ensuring that all foreigners get well rooted and grounded in the new religious and cultural heritage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ..... **i**

DEDICATION ..... **ii**

ACKNOWLEDGMENT ..... **iii**

ABSTRACT ..... **iv**

1.1 Introduction 8

1.2 Background of the Study 8

1.3 Statement of the Problem 14

1.4 Objectives of the Study 15

1.5 Research Questions 15

1.6 Justification 15

1.7 Limitation and Delimitation 16

1.8 Theoretical Framework 17

1:9 Methodology 18

1.10 Ethical Requirements 19

1.11 Conclusion 20

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW **21**

2.1 Introduction 21

2.2 The Analysis of Land Conflict in 1 Kings 21:1-16 21

2.3 Land Clashes in Kenya 26

2.4 Conclusion 32

CHAPTER THREE: LAND CONFLICTS AND INJUSTICE IN 1 KINGS 21:1-16 ..... **33**

3.1 Introduction. 33

3.2 Postcolonial Biblical Criticism 33

3.3 Postcolonizing 1 Kings 21:1-16 35

3.4 Structure of 1 Kings 21:1-16 36

3.5 Exegetical Analysis (1 Kings 21:1-16) 37
3.5.1 Land Covetousness and Tradition (1 Kings 21:1-4) 37
3.5.2 Murder Scheme (1 Kings 21:5-7) 42
3.5.3 Implementation of Murder (1 Kings 21:8-14) 44
3.5.4 Land Confiscation (1 Kings 21:15-16) 47
3.6 Theological Insights from 1 Kings 21:1-16 48
3.7 Conclusion 49
CHAPTER FOUR: THEOLOGICAL WAYS OF ADRESSING LAND CONFLICTS AND INJUSTICE 50
4.1 Introduction 50
4.2 Colonial Perspectives of Land in 1 Kings 21:1-16. 50
4.2.1 Covenantal Gift 50
4.2.2 Land as an Inheritance 53
4.3 Land in the Perspective of Torah. 55
4.4 The Old Testament Perspectives Prohibiting the Selling of Land 57
4.4.1 Hegemony in 1 Kings 21:1-16 58
4.4.2 Crime 59
4.4.3 Capital Punishment. 60
4.4.4 Intermarriage 61
4.5 Conclusion 62
5.1 Introduction 63
5.2 Summary of Findings 63
5.3 Recommendations 65
5.4 Conclusion 66
REFERENCES 67
APPENDICES: 73

ABBREVIATIONS

GEN.	Genesis
EXOD.	Exodus
LEV.	Leviticus
DEUT.	Deuteronomy
JOSH.	Joshua
JD.	Judges
SAM.	Samuel
CHRON.	Chronicles
PS.	Psalms
PROV.	Proverbs
ROM.	Romans

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provided the overall introduction to the study on land conflict in 1Kings 21:1-16 and its theological response to land clashes. This section consisted of background to the study, statement of the problem, the objectives, research questions, justification, limitation and delimitation of the study.

1.2 Background of the Study

Before Israel became God's people, they existed alongside their neighbors in the ancient Near East and were influenced by their culture and religion (Gen.11:27-12:1). Snell (1995:272) attested that in ancient Near East, land was controlled and charged by territorial gods before patrimonial overlords took over. It was permissible to sell it, inherit, give as a gift or dowry, lease or pledge. It was subjected to levies, dues and services to the king. Kings and temple gods owned land as private and corporate groups, families, or clans. The village community elders were in charge of land. Every village member or family head was entitled to a share in the communal land redistributed annually to the members of the community. The transfer of the land from one individual to another is attested by legal documents using the terminology of sales document. Any alienation was entitled to have consent of the village community representatives and the kings because he was entitled to dues and services. Greer (2018:93) claimed there were evidences of the ancient Near Eastern legal documents revealing social practices in matters of inheritance and commercial transactions.

It should be understood that the ancient Near East "encompassed of a great arc of land stretching from Mesopotamia to the fertile crescent (about 1200 miles) and was self sufficient culturally and economically, manufactured goods were traded for raw material of lands" (Gardener,

1981:50). Anderson (1986:33) argued that the ancient Near East dynasties formed commercial centres with promulgated codes of laws with subsequent jurisprudence influences to their neighbors and this included land issues. Greer (2018:92) backs the idea of these claims of the influences from the ancient Near Eastern cultural, philosophical thoughts of civilization. Snell (2011) in his introduction concurred with them on the influences to the Israelites from the ancient Near East covering the agriculture (land), daily life and religious beliefs with emphases on how religious ideas from this historical and cultural milieu continue to influence the way modern cultures and religions view the world. Some scholars give an "outline of the then ancient Near Eastern world" (Anderson, 1997:28; Snell: 2011:3).

The "Old Testament tradition and religions were rooted, shaped, and incomprehensible of the ancient Near Easter influences" (Beyerlin, 1979: xxv). Greer (2018:151) echoed this arguing that the Old Testament was easily understood in the context of the physical world, way of life and the world view of the ancient Near Eastern World. During the Old Testament times land was a central theme presented as God's property. As an owner, God gave it out as a gift; a gift to be value and care for at all times. In the Pentateuch as Alexander (2002:487) noted God is cast in the roles of creator and supreme landlord. The land owed its existence to him and he created its inhabitants, continually monitoring and supervising their behavior. He allocated land to people, Adam is placed in Eden (Gen 2:8), Canaan was promised to the Israelites (Gen 15:16-21) and there were references to the allocation of land to the Edomites (Deut 2:5), Moabites (Deut 2:9) and Ammonites (Deut 2:19). Conversely, Alexander (2002) added that God removed people from land when they did not behave in a worthy manner (Gen 3:23-24; 11:8, 15:16). He further argued that the sovereignty of God over land was revealed in the exodus of Israel from Egypt.

Alexander (2002:488) and Goldingay (2003:517) agree that land and people were portrayed in a close interdependent relationship. This relationship between land and its inhabitants was contingent on good relations between human and God. When humans were alienated from God there were significant repercussions because God used the land to punish his disobedient people. They further note that in the preparation for taking possession law was important. This law was as a result of rebellion and subsequent punishment that laws and regulations were given in Pentateuch. The Israelites were warned that the behavior will affect the land. The Israelites must treat the land with respect and not defile it with vile practices (Lev 18:25). Habel (1995:20) added that law was central to the gift of the land to Israel. This gift was explained in terms calculated to engender a sense of respect and humility. To remain in the land Israelites must subject themselves to God's will (Deut 4:40, 5:33, 11:2, 32:47). The law also made provision for the redemption of land (Lev 25:24). In case of injustice, Weinfeld (1993:23) noted that land and justice were clearly related, there were laws about bloodshed. In the event of accidental death, the perpetrator could escape the vengeance of the family of the deceased by taking refuge in the cities nominated for this purpose (Num 35:6-29). However, unpunished murder defiled and polluted land which required atonement, which could only be provided by the blood of the murder (Num 35:30-34).

The historical books gave an account of Israel as a nation. Arnold and William (2005:639) argued that these accounts present this nation as land of Israel. These books are called Deuteronomistic History which traced Israelites history primarily with the respect to the land. They stated that the book of Joshua described how the Israelites possessed the land through Yahweh's assistance, the book of Judges recounts various encroachments on the land that resulted from Israel's subsequent covenant disloyalty, the books of Samuel highlight how

Yahweh established his anointed as the king who brought rest to the land and the books of Kings described the apostasy that eventually led from territorial expansion to exile.

Like the Pentateuch, Davies (1998:50) noted that Historical Books emphasize not only the land's status as Yahweh's gift or inheritance to Israel but also the covenant responsibilities inextricably bound up with it. The Israel's possession of land was described as inheritance (Josh 11:23; Judg 2:6, 20:6). This inheritance as explained by Brueggemann (2000:87) was not tradable commodity but an inalienable inheritance. This inheritance was protected through the title deeds process. Brueggemann (2000:54) and Williamson (2005:640) argued that land belonged not to Israel or its kings but to Yahweh (Josh 22:19, 1 Kings 8:36, 2 Chron 6:27). This fact was further underlined by its description as a divine gift or inheritance (Josh 1:2, 11, 21:43) and the way in which it was distributed among the Israelites tribes was by divine lot (Josh 14:2, 18:1-10)

The issue of land in prophetic books has been linked by Brueggemann (2000:80) with loss and restoration. McConville (2012:491) noted that the prophets frequently referred back to Israel's historical traditions to remind the people of God's gracious dealings with them in the past. To call them to account for their current behavior and to offer hope based on memories. They referred to land as an inheritance (Jer. 3:18-19) which they emphasized to Israelites that the Israel's right to remain in the land was dependent upon their faithfulness to the Lord (Is 1:19). The "prophets often fought against the kings and corporate land grabbers in the defense of the family farm, for instance, the prophet Isaiah condemns the injustice of big landowners who are buying up small farm (Isa. 5:8, Mic. 2:2-3)" (Olson, 1986:18).

1 Kings 21:1-16 indicated that the view of land in Israel changed due to the introduction of the monarchy resulting to change of life from divine guidance to human control. Olson (1986:18) claimed that the major threat to the family land were from the kings. When the basic structure of

the family land was seriously threatened, then some form of Judgment was likely to follow (1 Kings 21:17-28). Monarchy introduced rules and regulations that created classes which conflicted theocracy and kingship whereby kingship made land property for sale. This increased power-hunger and greed to amass wealth by the kings. God's laws were undermined by the kings rather protecting them (Anderson, 1997:191). They violated and substituted them with laws suiting their interests forcing the Israelites to live double standard lives. Some were able to relate to power for survival while the rest became vulnerable and victims of power misuse relating to land. Among them was Naboth who held to the tradition that God was the ultimate land owner while Ahab believed he had its control. Bright (1972:184) noted that the formation of the monarchy system in Israel resulted in racism, political conflicts, oppression, land loss, unstable governance, Baalism, and foreign interference. These factors led to imperialism as proximity to powers offered unwarranted privileges.

The narrative of 1 Kings 21:1-16 recounted land loss, value, ownership, and laws. Initially Israel was a theocratic nation given land through patriarchs (Genesis 12). 1 Kings 21:1-16 related how the Israelites after establishment of monarch, lost land in the hands of the kings. This story portrayed a powerful empire in the northern kingdom misusing power and disrespecting institutions to acquire land. This shifted land ownership from Yahweh to the kings making it a commodity for sale. Ahab deviated from the initial land laws and subjected people to serve him for land and as an appeal for social justice. This text depicted land as belonging to the King. Rice (1990:36) argued that this text dealt with the theme of social injustices and abuse of authority by the powerful against the weak. It is a historical text that narrated the real community life contrarily to the life expected by divine guidance and rule. The king used state resources to rob the poor of their land.

Dube (2000:2) echoed Kenyatta (1938) who argued that missionaries came with the Bible but when they told the Africans to close the eyes in prayers they replaced it for their land. Land conflicts started with missionaries emphasizing that Africans should hold onto the Bible for all their answers. They became landless, lost their original existence and survival which was taken by the missionaries. Missionaries gained more power, invited foreign administrations that formed colonies and took more land from the Africans. This made gospel bitter herbs to the Africans for being used as a weapon of taking their land. Land conflicts extended beyond post-colonial era. Powerful Africans use Bible for power and land control. Christianity brought imperialism and inequality whereby few control the majority at their expense. The paradigm shift was from communalism to individualism.

The land conflict in 1Kings 21:1-16 mirrored land clashes in Kenya traced from the missionary and colonial era. While the missionaries came to spread the gospel in Kenya their intentions were short changed by economic development for they needed land. Christianity influenced and shaped social and political life positively and negatively resulting from the biblical interpretation as the sole guide. Proper Biblical interpretation can play a big role in addressing these land conflicts. There were claims linked to the argument from Kenyatta (1938:20-52) that the Bible has been misused to legitimize improper possession of land belonging to the poor through assassination by those in power as evidenced in cases whereby the Bible has been misused and misquoted in various situations from domestic violence to the political crisis. For example, during post-election violence some political leaders were suspects. Church leaders from these regions supported them by silencing the victims and praying for the offenders using biblical texts like (Ps 34:19; 1 Chron. 16:22; Rom. 13:1; John 8:7) which were wrongly interpreted. This exposes the church accepted double standard through favoritism.

Through postcolonial hermeneutics, this study aimed at analyzing 1 Kings 21:1-16 as an inquiry on how land conflicts can be addressed theologically. Initially, studies covered considerable grounds in addressing land conflicts in the perspective of those in power unfortunately the voices of the poor are not addressed. It has become clear that previous methodologies applied in interpreting 1 Kings 21:1-16 left out some gaps where this study is inserted by using postcolonial biblical hermeneutics.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

There has been a series of land clashes experienced in Kenya traced from the time of the missionaries and colonial era. While the missionaries came to spread the gospel in Kenya their intentions were short changed by economic development because they needed land. In relation to the claims by Kenyatta (1938:20-52) of how the missionaries took away the land from the Africans, the land conflict in 1 Kings 21:1-16 is a replica of the Kenyan situation. An understanding of this text can play a big role in addressing Kenyan land clashes. Both in the Old Testament and in the Kenyan situation, land is a powerful resource that everyone yearns for. This made some individuals to force their way into acquiring land even to an extent of taking away other people's lives that they may possess their land. The foreign influence led to the land conflict in 1 Kings 21:1-16 and similarly the long-lived land conflict in Kenya resulted from the missionary influence.

This study applied a postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 to address land clashes. Most of the occasions where land clashes had taken place, the targets had been tricked through power and misuse of biblical texts whereby even church leaders had lost moral authority by having double standards and silencing the victims by misquoting biblical texts. The article on land in the Kenyan Standard Magazine (2015:9) reported that there has been rampant illegal land acquisition

which is on the rise with decry from the victims leading to land clashes. A few examples are worth mentioning like the Lang'ata Primary School playground seizure for private development, the alleged snatching of Oljorai Ranch in Nakuru, the Waitiki Land saga in the coast among others. These examples make it clear that the efforts invested in resolving land clashes in Kenya have not yielded much. Reading 1 Kings 21:1-16 from a postcolonial perspective can address land clashes and deal with the systems of social injustices.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

i. To review 1 Kings 21:1-16 as a demonstration of how land clashes affect Kenyans.
ii. To evaluate background of 1 Kings 21:1-16 as a basis of exposing land conflicts and injustices in the Old Testament.
iii. To use postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 as a theological way of addressing land clashes in Kenya.

1.5 Research Questions

i. Does the review of 1 Kings 21:1-16 demonstrate how land clashes affect Kenyans?
ii. What does the background of 1 Kings 21:1-16 reveal about land conflicts and injustices in the Old Testament?
iii. Can postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 provide theological ways of addressing land clashes in Kenya?

1.6 Justification

According to the *Kenya Demographics Profile 2019*, Christianity has the majority confessing Christian faith in Kenya at 83%. The Christians should be guided by the Biblical scriptures. Unfortunately, instead of the Bible influencing their lives and institutions positively it is being used to fit their contexts and to achieve their goals.

This study focused on analyzing how the hegemonic practices affected the powerless in the society. The Biblical scholars on 1 Kings 21:1-16 concentrated more on Ahab and who took the center stage. Naboth was mentioned alongside Ahab but dropped immediately. His story was only revisited later by God through Prophet Elijah as he avenged on his behalf. The researcher chose 1 Kings 21:1-16 because it exposed hegemonic practices in the Bible by the mighty and powerful. In considering land issues in Kenya, this study aimed at using Postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 to suggest ways of addressing this problem. 1 Kings 21:1-16 was main text of this study. Traditionally, this text was interpreted as Jezebel's scheme to execute Naboth and hand over his land to the king. However, a critical reading of this text brought out the injustices of the empire to the poor in relationship with the land as the center of power during the monarchy period.

This study contributed to Biblical scholarship in Postcolonial studies in Kenya which was gaining roots. In some parts of Africa, the study of 1 Kings 21 has been approached through postcolonial lenses on land issues however in Kenya the researcher was not aware of any studies made on 1 Kings 21 through postcolonial lenses to exposed and addressed concerns relating to land issues. This study attempted to come up with ways of empowering Bible reading by individuals for a transformative thinking. Individuals would find new perspectives that would help them to question the use of the Bible which had been used as a tool to silence them and realizes the power in which the Bible had to address their concerns.

1.7 Limitation and Delimitation

Due to time constraints and limited budget, the study did not involve field work which would have enriched the findings; however the study utilized relevant, recent and credible literature sufficient to inform this study. While the entire of the Old Testament was very important to

Christians, the researcher had chosen to concentrate on the text 1 Kings 21:1-16 because it attracted the attention of the readers in connection to the topic addressed in it.

1.8 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework applied in this study was a postcolonial biblical criticism. This approach could be located under social scientific criticism which was a "quest for the social identity, perceptions of the world and cultural characteristics of the writer, readers or hearers and communities suggested by the text" (Gorman, 2010:14). It was a new approach among the diverse methodologies and perspectives that have developed over the years (Ukpong, 2002:10) explained that over the years biblical studies have experienced the paradigm shift from what was considered normal and official way of reading the Bible to reader-centered approach.

The most dynamic and continually expanding contribution to this development was the postcolonial studies. According to Sugirtharajah (2006:64), postcolonial criticism was derived from postcolonial theory that sought liberation from all forms of colonial and imperial entanglement. Sugirtharajah (2001:251) further explained that postcolonial criticism involved an inquiring into relationships of subordination and dominion, dependence and independence, slavery and ethic matters with the aim of liberation from oppressive structures and confronting it.

Postcolonial theory had its background in the rise of western empire and control of other peoples through colonialism. Dube (2000:15) argued that western imperialism forms the frame of reference for the term postcolonial which was an act of resistance against imperial ideologies (cultural, political, social-economical, psychological and religious) which were used to justify domination of foreign nation who were regarded inferior.

Owing to its interest and background, postcolonial biblical criticism was useful for this study as a tool for biblical interpretation that consider political, social and economic contexts that

influenced the author, reception and interpretation of the text, in which the voice of the *other* had been silenced (Rukundwa, 2008:338). It was also useful in that, as Punt (2003:62) argued, postcolonial biblical criticism went even further to address the silencing of 'the other'. It did not only expose the imperial policy but sought restoration and healing.

In this study, therefore the term postcolonial was used in the wider sense, as a tool for biblical interpretation in an attempt to find monarchy intentions that informed and influenced author in writing 1 Kings 21:1-16 to legitimized royal power. This was in the view of the fact that, the Deuteronomistic historian was writing within monarchy context. Further, it was useful in finding any monarchial influence in the interpretation and appropriation of 1 Kings 21:1-16 in the various imperial contexts. Postcolonial biblical criticism was useful for this study as it helped in exposing and addressing land conflict and injustices in 1 Kings 21:1-16 and in Kenyan context.

Postcolonial biblical interpretation as Punt (2015:150) explained broadens the hermeneutical lens allowing different exegetical methodologies. It allowed one to deal with the social historical and literally contexts of the text. In this study it allowed looking into the social historical context to retrieve meaning of the text, understanding the world of the author and literally context to analyze the text for monarchial characteristics, creating room for a shift in the interpretation which offered new ways of understanding 1 Kings 21:1-16. It helped develop ways to challenge the royal dominion and to empower and protect those who have suffered domination in the face of its normative reading.

1:9 Methodology

This study falls within the diaphragm of qualitative research. As Kombo (2006:9) explained, "qualitative research involves description and seeks to describe the culture and behavior of people and their groups from the point of view of those being studied". As a qualitative research,

the study explored literature on land conflict as well as land clashes in Kenya to expose the land conflict and social injustices in 1 Kings 21:1-16.

As a qualitative study it interacted with secondary data obtained from library sources through researching literature from books, journals, theses, online material and other related publications. This study employed postcolonial biblical criticism as an attempt to exposed land conflicts. The study considered both social historical context and literary context of 1 Kings 21:1-16, to understand the world of the author. The literary analysis was helpful in understanding the construction of the text and how the author tactfully utilized monarchial mentality to explained royal understanding on land in the text. The study also interacted with the interpretation and appropriation of 1 Kings 21:1-16 over years to exposed imperial impact. In reading 1 Kings 21:1-16, the study went beyond the context of the text and how it came to find its meaning from the context of the reader, reader centered approach for Kenya context.

The choice to focus on 1 Kings 21:1-16 was informed by an observation that the normative interpretation for many years continue to informed how the narrative was read and interpreted in Kenya today, that Naboth would have respected and obey the command from the king, for he was anointed of God therefore Naboth would have submitted to the authority. Considering the effects of land conflict evidence in the text, the study sought to reread this text using postcolonial lens with the aim of arriving at new interpretative ways that would speak to land clashes in Kenya.

1.10 Ethical Requirements

The study ensured that the researcher followed the laid down ethical requirements offered by St. Paul's University of privacy, sanctity of life. The researcher observed respect for human rights, will be honest, and free from bias, neutral, and being objective. Confidentiality was upheld

through and the expected ethical guidelines. The research also followed the expected rules of doing this kind of a research both inside and outside the University premises. Being mainly a library research, the researcher ensured there was acknowledgement and citations of all the information and ideas borrowed from other sources. The researcher hopes this research will benefits St. Paul's University and the society at large through proper use of the library and all other facilities and resources provided.

1.11 Conclusion

This chapter provided the overall introduction to the study forming the basis for which the rest of the work will develop in working out the objectives of this study. The introduction discussed the background of the study by discussing the perspective of land from ancient Near East and Old Testament periods, the influence of ancient Near East of land to Israelites. Using 1 Kings 21:1-16, this study analyzed land conflict and injustices within the text in addressing land clashes in Kenya. This chapter linked following chapter as it analyzed the interpretation of 1 Kings 21:1-16 by various scholars viz-a-vis land clashes in Kenya.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter contained preview literature articulating the survey of recent scholarship on the Book of 1 Kings, the analysis of land issues in the Old Testament, and the analysis of land clashes in Kenya.

2.2 The Analysis of Land Conflict in 1 Kings 21:1-16

1 Kings 21:1-16 attracted attention in the later period of monarchy as it exemplified fulfillment of the consequences of the Israelites demanding for a King (1 Sam. 8:10-16). The claim by Mays (1988:321) was that this text was not part of the story of the conflict between Ben-hadad and the King of Israel (1 Kings 20-22). However, Elijah's return to utter final condemnation of Ahab and his dynasty revisits Elijah-Elisha narratives. Gore (1928:264) on the other hand claimed that this story comes from another writer with Deuteronomistic characteristics due to the variants in the Septuagint-(LXX) and limited comments on this text.

Traditionally in Israel, land was not a trade property. Following this view, Mays (1988:321) argued that Ahab's personal denunciation is expanded in 1 Kings 21:21-22 to a condemnation of going against the traditions. This was associated with the condemned houses of Jeroboam (1 Kings 14:10-11) and Baasha (1 Kings 16:3-4). Jezebel played a prominent role through her contrivance of Naboth's unjust execution which suggested that Jezebel had acquired an extraordinary knowledge of Israelites law with its requirement of two witnesses (Deut. 17:6; 19:15). As Keck (1994:156) condemned supremacy idea of Ahab and his dynasty, he added that Israelite' laws stipulated that ancestral land should remained within the family with rights of inalienability (Num. 27:8-11; 36:1-12). The intentions were to preserve the territorial integrity of the original tribal assignment for example intermarriages were not allowed for such compromises

could in inevitably result in the laws of Israelite property influenced by the foreigners. This was to guard against the loss of Israelites territory for economic resources among other reasons. Thus, it was not merely for sentimental reasons that Naboth wanted to hold on to his inheritance for it was a religious obligation. To do so would be literal profanation of trading with land.

Newsom (1992:103) introduced feminine perspective by arguing that Ahab became a passive partner to Jezebel's unjustifiable use of royal powers by a childish king who went home resentful and sullen because Naboth refused to sell him his vineyard. As a Phoenician princess she was accustomed to the royal prerogative and not used to the democratic impulse in Israelite culture that regarded land as gift to each Israelite family from God rather than at the behest of the king. Thus, her brutal response to Naboth's refusal to sell his vineyard was understood from her point of view as an appropriate royal response to insubordination in contrast to Ahab's unconscionable weakness in leadership. Newson (1992:103) supported that hegemonic systems legalized misuse of power by those in authority. He claimed that for Jezebel it seemed right to abuse the office by taking away what rightfully belong to a person. Though Newson (1992:103) defended Jezebel's character which is influenced by her culture however this study disagreed because her action should have been dictated by Israel's culture which she should respect and maintain as she did to her own.

The attachment with an inherited land makes Naboth refused to part with his ancestral inheritance (1 Kings 21:3). This invoked a vision of land as a gift from Yahweh to all the people of Israel. According to Arnold & William (2005:631-32) 1 Kings 21:1-16 exposes a society which entailed a choice of serving Yahweh in sharp contrast to the type of the society that Ahab typically borrowed from of the ancient Near Eastern potentate craves. In his argument, Arnold & Williamson (2005:631-32) acknowledged that the two religions contradict one another. Israel's

religion states that ‘everyone has an entitlement by virtue of the gift to possess land’ (Deut. 15:4, Josh. 13-22) while the polytheistic religion introduced to Israel by king Ahab’s reign under the influence of the Phoenician wife-Jezebel puts in question Yahweh’s status in owning land.

Arnold & Williamson (2005:629-630) raised an interpretation of this text that perceived God as the owner of land whose voice come through Prophet Elijah as a bearer of God’s word. The presence of Prophet Elijah in this text signified that God’s speech through him showed His power to direct events and achieve His purpose. The foreign society which influenced Israel otherwise as clearly explained by Gray (1964:385-86) was supported by Arnold & Williamson (2005:629-30) who presented God through the prophet to speak out concerning his land. According to Freedmann (1992:829), the term ‘foreign’ referred to other nations with whom Israel came into contact. These nations were potential devastators or exploiters of Israel posing the danger of apostasy. The foreign nation as seen 1 Kings 21:1-16 had negative influence on the issues of deity, land and political control. Wallace (1995:152) perceived that 1 Kings 21:1-16 was the context of Theocratic and Baal power in play. He argued that the falsehood of Tyrian Baalism was fully exposed at Mount Carmel with its ultimate defeat ensured. Unfortunately, Baalism had obtained a deep foothold on Israel’s life but luckily with the coming generation it was utterly destroyed. 1 Kings 21 illustrated the devastating consequences of the influence of Jezebel and her religion on both Israel’s community life and Ahab’s personal life. It reminded us that God is ever present in the midst, watching, waiting and ensuring that justice will finally prevail.

As seen in 1 Kings 21:1-16, hegemonic system as described by Robinson (1997:235) was the powerful leadership. 1 Kings 21:1-16 reflected Ahab’s ruling style which raised fundamental issue about the relationship between the king and laws. Robinson (1997) condemned the

hegemonic system of ruling introduced by Ahab. He explained that the whole pattern of Israel's life as the covenant people was directed by laws and customs which declared how God wanted His people to live. However, Ahab was determined to change this significantly to mean that the king was the sole instrument of the divine will. Using the Yawhistic tradition, he added that Ahab's belief was that what the king willed was what God willed and people should obey it unquestionably. In conjunction with the above argument, the story of Naboth was a clear illustration of how the workability of this principle and the changes its acceptance make in the community affects the Theocratic tradition. While the old forms were kept as they are in Naboth's case, the law was corrupted and the spirit of the nation changed.

Naboth's principles on land catch the attention of Hamilton (2001:438) who argued that the strong rejection of the King's offer (1 Kings 21:3) had two important principles. First, it strongly affirmed that there was hope and rights to those oppressed for using law to challenge the oppressive system. Naboth represented the voice of the poor (Lev. 25:23-24). The kings and those in power could not compel their subjects to sell any part of their family estate. It was for this reason that the prophets played key roles in condemning these tendencies among the rich and powerful to foreclose on the land of their subjects. Examples are 'Ah, you who join house to house, who add field to field until there is room for no one but you' (Isaiah 5:8) and 'speaks of the wicked who covet fields and seize them; houses, and take them away (Micah 2:2)'. Secondly, it showed the importance of the land documents and awareness of the land boundaries.

Naboth knew his land through boundary markers addressed in (Deut. 19:14; 27:17; Prov. 22:28) 'You must not move your neighbor's boundary marker set up by former generation'. Hamilton (2001:438) exposed how the hegemonic agents tamper with boundary, crimes frequently committed nocturnally in secret and they also lack the means to defend their rights. He added

that Naboth's deep emotional issue addressed here is the attachment to the land inherited from the ancestors. Deuteronomy 19:14 is an expression of 'setting up by former generations' as did Naboth with 'what I have inherited from my fathers' (1 Kings 21:3). Carson (1994:361) supports the ideas of the author of 1 Kings 21:1-16 on hegemonic rule with its interpretation of law. For him, 1 Kings 21:1-16 introduced different interpretation of laws by Ahab's Phoenician wife-Jezebel who in a way empowered the position of the king. Israel's traditions clarified that all Israelites were equal, the new system introduced by Phoencians made the king powerful as could not. Hamilton (2001:438) was against Carson's (1994:361) interpretation which holds that Yahwist covenant still stands in Israel.

The interpretative emphasis of Soulen & Soulen (2001:138) exposed the hegemonic land practices using postcolonial interpretation by explaining that 1 Kings 21:1-16 brought out the context of hegemonic land practices in the world by demonstrating how the King Ahab and his wife are exemplified in the bible in ways that legitimated hegemony by oppressing Naboth. Barton & Muddiman (2001:247) challenged fundamental belief of hegemony that this text was a paradigm for the conflict between the demands of the state and the rights of the people. He argued that the state should protect its citizens. Selvidge (1996:110) agreed with him and added that this text sought to give voice to those silenced or ignored by defending the beliefs that Naboth hold pertaining land. It focused on the bible as a product of ancient cultural interpretation and the use of the bible today. By using postcolonial interpretation, Mckenzie's (2013:123) ideology informed this study on engaging in a work or retrieval by bringing to the fore the forgotten, sidelined and maligned biblical figures and texts like Naboth whom we hear him mention in 2 Kings 9:25-26 reclaiming their voices, justice and inheritance.

2.3 Land Clashes in Kenya

In chapter five of the Constitution of Kenya, article 61 (1) it explicitly states that land belongs to all citizens. The colonial government and the missionaries applied different views on land. They took land as belonging to all Kenyans. They coercively seized land for colonialists, missionaries and the powerful. Kanogo (1987:23) argued that establishing colonial rule in Kenya was an attempt to turn the country into a white settlement area. This had a profound effect on the local African population. The alienation of Kenyans' lands for European settler-occupation disinherited and dislocated Kenyans. The subsequent development of settler plantations and mixed farms subjected Kenyans slavery on their own land. The Kenyans were coerced and also lost sense of belonging.

Kenyan leadership after independence had a goal of land transfer from the colonial government to the locals. Land and freedom were the driving forces behind the mission of the Mau Mau-(Kenyan freedom fighters). While these two key factors were important, attaining political independence became the national leaders' major goal rather than ensuring that the Kenyans who had lost their land to the colonizers and the missionaries have gotten back their land. This was because the land taken by the missionaries and the colonizers did not get back to the legitimate owners but was taken by those who were in political leadership then (Kanogo, 1987:23; Lewis, 2007:41-5; Ochieng, 1995:42). Although "land was the most important objective, these leaders subjected the Kenyans to second colonization by taking their land, this became the genesis of land clashes in Kenya" (Kanogo, 1987:23). In support of this, Tarus (2019:1) argued that in Kenya, land clashes and political troubles were strongly intertwined.

During Jomo Kenyatta and Moi's time land clashes became the vehicle used by the powerful to seize positions and take land. During Kibaki's time O'Brien (2011:6) noted that many land

challenges were raised in the year 2003. President Kibaki came under significant public pressure to look into what was claiming Kenyan's land. In response he came up with the Ndung'u Commission of inquiry on illegal/ irregular land allocations to establish and examined on how these should be dealt with. The findings exposed that land crisis resulted from illegally or irregularly allocations of land to powerful individuals (Kieyah & Njoroge, 2010:6).

The Kenyan Land Commission observed that there was no transparency in the documentation of land due to hegemonic land practices which had reached its peak. Klopp (2014:15) perceived that this can only be rationally theorized as part of Kenyan's political operations since the days of colonial government. It is unfortunate that the protectorate and subsequent colonial Kenyan governments set up a system of land administration and governance that privileges access of land in terms of power and position against locals. Ogot & Ochieng' (1995:56) concurred with O'Brien (2011:31) that the major debate in postcolonial time was who to take the land previously occupied by the colonizers and missionaries in Kenya. The land clashes got fueled as the locals tried to regain their land as Kenyan politicians instigate violence as they claimed to defend people from their communities to get back their land. Although there have been national dialogues with the stakeholders, the Kenyan Government still wrestles with problem.

With land ownership, Bruce (2009:7-8) explained that during pre-colonial period, land belonged to the communities. Chiefs and community elders addressed arising land issues of inheritance and boundaries through clan representatives. The community respected family or clan land. Kanyinga (1996:3) and Bruce (2009:7) noted that colonial situation introduced new principles of land individualization. Kanyinga (1996) argued that since then the issues of ownership and control of land remained integral part of local and national political discourse. Bruce (2009:7) added that this brought conflict due to lack of justifiable reasons of how a public or community

land got into the hands of individuals. He also noted that the land policy establish during the postcolonial period was to regulate land ownership.

Land ownership had become a thorny issue in Kenya. Ogot (1976:36) claimed that land was closely intertwined with the form and composition of the whole social power structure and the distribution of land which never took place. Those in power and the chiefs were the government agents who illegally took Kenya land. West (1986:5) observed that power structure governed the access of land, shapes the incentive, opportunity, equity and reward patterns in land use since then. Kanyinga (1996:9) observed that the allocation and distribution of land remains a function of political patronage. The public land became the main resource used to maintain or construct patronage relations.

Kenya leaders suffer from dissatisfactions and were overtaken by the greed to acquire more land. Hermunen (2004:4) argued that Kenyans have maintained an emotional and psychological investment in land because land represents their link with the revered ancestors because for the Kenyan ethnic communities this is the reason of existence. Mwagore (2002: vi) argued that land use policy considered the way land was used and managed, placing issue of ownership secondary. Kanogo (1987:23) noted that establishing colonial rule in Kenya changed the perceptions of how land was treated. Land became a trade property with profound effects to the Kenyans. Evicting Kenyans from their land devalue them through the loss their identity. Wasserman (1976:2) explained that the Kenyan elites in power began different system of leadership whereby they had to protect the land they illegally acquired. Kenyans have continuously reacted to this which resulting to land clashes and loss of lives.

The narrative in 1 Kings 21:1-16 on foreign influence exemplifies Kenyan phenomenon. Gacheru (2005:6) exposed the reality of the colonizers in Kenya. They arrive with good

intentions however their presence made Kenyans landless, powerless and develop hatred among Kenyans. Like Jezebel in 1 Kings 21, colonizers applied a Divide-and-Rule law to control the Kenyans. While Sorrenson (1968), Wasserman (1976), and Gacheru (2005) believed that the colonizers applied the hegemonic land practices to take away land from Kenyans.

Ndung'u Report 2003 stated that this is a post-independence phenomenon which intensified in the 1990s driven by external and domestic factors. Kieyah & Njoroge (2016:1) argued that this was the failure of the government to manage public land. The method of direct grant that had operated successfully during the colonial period became the basis of massive illegal and irregular allocation of public land by post-independence governments. Leo (1980:21) argued that although land reforms were driven by economic factors, there were political overtones to disinheriting Kenyans who had left their communities to join in the Mau Mau revolt. Kanyinga (1996:13) noted that regime leadership exploited the primacy of the land to win and maintain support in ethnic communities. They used land as a patronage resource to help weave political relations, create class and ethnic hatred.

Bruce (2009:20) argued that Kenyan land clashes are addressed in a way the stakeholders were potentially and negatively affected by restitution by active and continuing political contention. These political tensions led to violence making it difficult to resolve the dispute because of illegitimacy. O'Brien (2011:31) and Medard (2009:31) claimed that Kenyan's land administration led to a mentality that from the colonial era the top leaders have land control. This domination makes Kenyans landless. Kenya had a hegemonic kind of governance and operational land system which Klopp (2000:15) noted that Kenya is a nation built on land crisis. Lack of transparency and addressing land problem has continued to be the campaign trail in every electioneering year in Kenya and has led to political violence which erupts between

communities. The best example is the Kenyan post-election violence that followed the national election in December 2007 that was rooted in the land issues in relation to hegemonic land practices phenomenon within the Kenyan communities. The most hit region was Rift Valley due to the belief that their land was taken away by the displaced indigenous communities who were moved to Rift Valley. The ethnic differences over land are longstanding and continue to emerge in every political and national dialogue.

The issues of land as property, ownership, and administration in Kenya from the year 2010 have generated vehement public debate driven particularly by the landowners. The Kenyan government continues to wrestle with the new national land policy which was approved in December 2009. The Kenyan constitutional referendum of the year 2010 had Kenyan's land question as the core issue. Those opposed to the passing of this constitution were labeled as 'No Campaigners' as they claimed that it will lead to nationalization of land. They linked constitution with fears of ethnic tensions relating to land. The then Kenya Assistant Road Minister Wilfred Machage (2010) claimed that this constitution will allow the government to reclaim ancestral land from the Kenyan citizens leading to evictions. He added that his own Kuria community would surely reclaim its ancestral land as this would be an action supported by the law-(https://www.bbc.com/news/10316297).

There was an article on land in the Kenyan Standard Magazine (2015:9) which reported that rampant land acquisition through illegal means was rising. These were acts demonstrating high levels of impunity by corrupt powerful individuals. This was in contrary to the reason as to why they were elected being to protect the rights and the interests of the citizens. The majority of Kenyans have decried and condemned alleged land clashes involving their land by the powerful land cartels. A few examples were worth mentioning like the Lang'ata Primary School

playground seizure for private development, the alleged snatching of Oljorai Ranch in Nakuru, the Waitiki Land saga in the coast among others. These examples made it clear that the Kenyan problem of hegemonic land practices was now a national pandemic.

The Kenyan National Land Commission was currently under intense pressure to solve the overwhelming land cases arising daily owing to the failure of the government to implement the Truth Justice & Reconciliation Commission-(TJRC) report on historical land injustices. Land offered people for their daily bread and economic power. This in return became a precious commodity for everyone and subsequently it gave people power to control those who lack it and it connected to the authority and administration.

The pick of land clashes in Kenya was in 1980s as observed by O'Brien (2011:31) it was due to the 42 laws without coherence and consistency created by those in power. These laws were strategies for hegemonic land practices to manipulate legal avenues for illegal land allocations. Through these means significant tracts of public and trust land is allocated to elites and members of political influence through illegal or irregular transactions. According to Primoz (2018:1) land remains a contentious and problematic issue in Kenya in relation to the land perceived as the traditional home of different ethnic communities.

The Kenyan land reforms set by colonialists in 1885 have evolved although the structures and methods have remained permanent. Hermunen (2009:12) argued that Kenyan communities were not fully educated about their rights to land leading to injustices. Primoz (2018:2) claimed that the Kenyan New Constitution promulgated in 2010 enhanced previous land reform efforts by establishing a legal framework for the administration, use and management of land in Kenya. The Kenyan government has since then enacted new land laws (Land Act 2012, Land

Registration Act 2012, National Land Commission Act 2012, and the Community Land Act of 2016) to addressed land issues.

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter articulated some previous studies done in the book of 1 Kings 21. It also gave an outline of land clashes in Kenya. This linked to chapter three which dealt with the exegetical analysis of 1 Kings 21:1-16 through postcolonial biblical criticism.

CHAPTER THREE: LAND CONFLICTS AND INJUSTICE IN 1 KINGS 21:1-16

3.1 Introduction.

The task in this chapter was to do an exegetical study of 1 Kings 21:1-16 to address land conflict. The major focus was centered on the translation and exegesis of 1 Kings 21:1-16 and how postcolonial criticism has been used to address land conflict. The aim was to bring out the land conflict demonstrated in 1 Kings 21:1-16. This chapter began with postcolonial biblical criticism, a translation and exegesis of 1 Kings 21:1-16, theological insights reflected in the text and finally a chapter conclusion.

3.2 Postcolonial Biblical Criticism

Sugirtharajah (2006:52) writing covered the background of the postcolonial biblical criticism locating its roots in postcolonial studies. He explained that postcolonial theory had its background in the rise of western empire and western domination of other people through colonialism. Sugirtharajah particularly noted that postcolonial emerged as an arm of literally studies scrutinizing the literature of commonwealth countries which were part of the British Empire as the colonized began to resist domination and subordination by the colonizer. In this study, Sugirtharajah (2006) ideology helped in acknowledging the strong principles Naboth had in fighting for his property

Postcolonial theory offered guidance in dealing with practices that affects humanity. Dube (2000:16) had defined postcolonial theory as an act of resistance against imperial ideologies which were used to justify domination of foreign nation who regarded as inferior. She developed her critique against the misuse of the Bible by the colonizers as they took African land. She argued that the Bible has been repeatedly used to authorize the subjugation of foreign nations. However, biblical texts have been proclaimed in colonial settings and therefore contain a voice

of justice that energized faith to challenge injustice committed against the poor. Her view on the Bible as containing a voice of justice guided this study in suggesting ways of addressing land conflict in 1 Kings 21:1-16 in a way that challenges those in power and social injustices while responding to land clashes in Kenya.

Mwaniki (2011:3) using postcolonial biblical criticism showed how the reading of 1 Cor 11:1-16, among other text such as 14:34-35, 1 Tim 2:11-12, Eph 5:22-24, 1 Cor 11:1-16 have reinforced the already existing gender-biased patriarchal attitudes in Kenyan context where gospel has been preached. Her writing had she elaborated on the above texts enabled this study to find what difference a postcolonial reading would make to the meaning and appropriation of this text. Her work was useful in this study due to its focus on the Kenyan context through postcolonial biblical criticism. It showed the possibilities of analyzing the Kenyan context and the influence of the Bible on this context using liberation approach.

Kithinji (2014) showed how the pre-critical reading of the Bible in Kenya has contributed to the culture of impunity. His work employed postcolonial biblical criticism to explore Mark's usage of *exousia* I 1:21-28. He argued that imperial ideology is constituted in the gospel's construction of the concept of authority *(exousia).* Through the study, it was possible to bring out the implications of a postcolonial reading of Mark 1:21-28 on the concept of authority and rarely use of 1 Kings 21:1-16 to address social injustices on land conflict.

Gora (2008:1) used the postcolonial biblical criticism to show how through the rereading of 1 Kings 21:1-29 Zimbabwe had struggled with the issue of land from colonization to liberation and to the present. He highlighted issues of injustices and abuse of power by those in positions and possession of power. According to Gora (2018), land injustices can be traced through land history. Similarly, this study seeks to find out how a postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 can

inform the Kenyan's context on land practices. His work informed this study in focusing on the Kenyan context on hegemonic land practices. This was done through the analysis of the Kenyan context and the influence of the Bible.

Though there is rising literature on postcolonial biblical criticism within Kenya scholarship, none had focused on 1 Kings 21:1-16. The aim of this study therefore was to focus on 1 Kings 21:1-16 to yield resources that can help in solving land conflict currently experience in sociopolitical and economic context in Kenya.

3.3 Postcolonizing 1 Kings 21:1-16

As stated, postcolonial biblical criticism was becoming popular tool for engaging the Bible. Engaging postcolonial hermeneutical in 1 Kings 21:10-16 revealed that the text was highly characterized with land conflicts. The author of Kings was influenced by Deuteronomistic historical context in which he wrote. The interpreters of this study had brought in the perspective of how land was viewed in Old Testament different to that of the author.

The aim of this study was not only to expose the monarchial power but to restore the dignity, power and equality of those othered. McKenzie (2013:123) rightly argued for the suitability for postcolonial biblical interpretation for 1 Kings 21:1-16, basing his argument on the fact that it was 'a text that strongly reflected land'. Rice (1990:175) argued that '1 Kings 21:1-16 was written from the perspective of kingship in Israel and not from the perspective of Torah'. Hanes (2011:4) and McKenzie (2013:124) agreed that postcolonial biblical criticism as a tool for biblical interpretation was relevant in reading 1 Kings 21:1-16 as it sought to bring fore those who have been oppressed and endeavored to examine and challenge the structures that abuse, silence and killed. Postcolonial criticism further allowed room for questioning author's view of royal rule and culture.

Using postcolonial biblical hermeneutics, the study has revealed that one cannot continue using pre-reading biblical approach as it could not allow the reader to recognize or resist unequal relationships and domination. The author of 1 Kings 21:1-16 used a monarchical language which appeared to be oppressive by silencing Naboth who was only mentioned twice, in 1 Kings 21:1-16-(relation to land principles) and in 2 Kings 9:25-26 (murder of Naboth and his sons). McKenzie (2013:125) questioned the author's motive for having used monarchical language in power relations and the way Naboth was mentioned to popularize the action of those in power. Through author's narration, Naboth was presented as disrespectful and arrogant person who challenged the king and later denied a chance of defending himself before execution. It also exposed the dominion and subordination, the powerful and powerless, showing how monarchial system emerges in Israel which conflicts theocratic principles of land.

Throughout this study it has emerged that those in authority used the power in order to silence and oppressed. In 1 Kings 21:1-16, Jezebel challenged Ahab of not using his authority to gain what he wanted. She further misused the Divine law to accuse Naboth of blasphemy. This study used postcolonial framework to reread 1 Kings 21:1-16 and found ways that inspires the story of Naboth and others like him 'to act on their principles'

3.4 Structure of 1 Kings 21:1-16

The study applied the structure below for exegetical analysis:

a. Land covetousness and tradition (1 Kings 21:1-4)
b. Murder scheme (1 Kings 21:5-7)
c. Implementation of murder (1 Kings 21:8-14)
d. Land confiscation (1 Kings 21:15-16)

3.5 Exegetical Analysis (1 Kings 21:1-16)

The analysis of this selected passage applied short exegetical comments to land conflict applied through characters and the theological significance in connection with God's principle of land using postcolonial criticism to understand land conflict.

3.5.1 Land Covetousness and Tradition (1 Kings 21:1-4)

1 Kings 21:1-4 (WTT)

1 וַיְהִי אַחַר הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה כֶּרֶם הָיָה לְנָבוֹת
אֲשֶׁר בְּיִזְרְעֶאל אֶצֶל הֵיכַל אַחְאָב מֶלֶךְ שֹׁמְרוֹן׃ 2
הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי
אַחְאָב אֶל־נָבוֹת לֵאמֹר תְּנָה־לִי אֶת־כַּרְמְךָ וְיִהְיֶה־לִי
וַיַּדַּבֵּר
כִּי הוּא קָרוֹב אֵצֶל בֵּיתִי וְאֶתְּנָה לְךָ תַּחְתָּיו כֶּרֶם
לִגַּן־יָרָק
מִמֶּנּוּ אִם טוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֶתְּנָה־לְךָ כֶּסֶף מְחִיר זֶה׃
טוֹב
3 וַיֹּאמֶר נָבוֹת אֶל־אַחְאָב חָלִילָה לִי מֵיהוָה מִתִּתִּי
אֶת־נַחֲלַת אֲבֹתָי לָךְ׃
אַחְאָב אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ סַר וְזָעֵף עַל־הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר
4 וַיָּבֹא
הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא־אֶתֵּן לְךָ אֶת־נַחֲלַת אֲבוֹתָי
אֵלָיו נָבוֹת
וַיִּשְׁכַּב עַל־מִטָּתוֹ וַיַּסֵּב אֶת־פָּנָיו וְלֹא־אָכַל לָחֶם׃

1 Kings 21:1-4 (Translation)

1 And it happened that after these things Naboth the Jezreelite had a vineyard in Jezreel beside the palace of Ahab king of Samaria. [2]Ahab said to Naboth, "Give me your vineyard that I may have it for a vegetable garden because it is near my house and I will give you a better vineyard for it or if it seems good to you, I will give you its value in money". [3]Naboth said to Ahab, "The LORD forbids that I should give you the inheritance of my fathers". [4]And Ahab went into his house vexed and sullen because of what Naboth the Jezreelite had said to him, "I will not give you the inheritance of my fathers". He lay down on his bed and turned away his face and would eat no food.

In an attempt to bring out the understanding of who Naboth was as in 1 Kings 21:1, Keck (1994:124) claimed that the phrase לנבת אשר ביזרעאל *(that Naboth the Jezreelite)* was a link with the origin of the person inhabitant. In Israel community families or tribes were known through their possession. Naboth's place indicated that as per the allocation of land, his family was given land in Jezreel. Although Pfeiffer (1962:336) argued that the name נבת was nowhere else referred to except in this text, he described Naboth as a God-fearing Jew, possessor of a

vineyard in Jezreel. As much as Pfeiffer argues that Naboth was not mentioned anywhere but he acknowledged that he existed as religious Jew and possessor.

The phrase ביזרצאל- *(in Jezreel)* showed the place where the vineyard was and gave an identity of the owner. Jones (1984:353) explained that ביזרעאל-*(in Jezreel)* denoted the location of the vineyard as it linked the vineyard to the royal family which gave the basis of narration in relation to Ahab. Jezreel was an important base in the days of the Omride Dynasty as the home of the Omrides used as a base against Damascus. Rice (1990:174) argued that Jezreel's stands for royalty and lineage. For him, Jezreel seemed to have been a favorite retreat place for the kings and their families. Rice (1990) seemed to indicate that Naboth is an intruder. To him, the description of Jezreel was a true reflection on the hegemonic society with distinction of their residences without neighbors.

In 1 Kings 21:1 Naboth was betrayed by his name explain by Comay (1993:281) and Jones (1984:353) to mean offspring related to the land. The Hebrew name נבת-*(Naboth)* means fruit as derived from Arabic root *nabata*-to sprout or grow, used of plants or men. As per the name, Naboth protected family's inheritance governed by the inheritance tradition and law.

In 1 Kings 21:2 the basis of **לי אתכרמך**- *(give me your vineyard)* reflected author's authoritative language of Ahab demanding for Naboth's vineyard. The text showed Ahab's use of authority to demand for the possession of the vineyard. Wallace (1995:152) and Dandala (2016:511) used **אתכרמך** to describe Ahab's monarchial mentality of obsession for land, wealth and ambitious plans to enlarge his palace in Samaria against divine landholding belief. Pfeiffer (1962:336) and Wallace (1995:152) supported Ahab of having legal and moral right to purchase the vineyard from Naboth. According to them, Ahab's proposal was acceptable by the

monarchial law. Ahab made a business proposition to his neighbor, offering to pay for the property in currency or to exchange vineyard for vineyard. Considering the acceptable law of proposal, Ahab was not erroneous of his request; he followed legal procedure and command of his position. However, as per the Israel's belief on land ownership, Ahab's portrayed digression from these traditions. Buttrick (1954:172), Dunn (2003:264) and Adeyemo (2006: 441) noted that the royal system and Divine system are in conflict in the possession of land. They argued that Naboth understanding of land as an inheritance and a birth-right in 1 Kings 21:3 differed from Ahab's view of land as a commodity. Naboth's refusal makes sense for he appealed to the principle that the land an Israelite inherits should not be alienated from the family (Lev. 25:23, Num. 36:7).

The laws in Israel intended to keep the ownership of farmland within a family. In case of extreme poverty, land could be leased, but it would be reverted to its original owner in the year of Jubilee (Lev 25:10-28). Keck's (1994:155) logic did not see the reason of inquiring ancestral land belonging to a kinsman because Ahab already had a place in Samaria and in Jezreel. According to him, Ahab coveted additional property (Isa. 5:8, Micah 2:1-2). The narrator did not show Ahab's intents of covetousness in mind but recounted that Ahab intended to convert the vineyard into לגנ־ירק- (*for a vegetable garden)*. This expression occurred only once in the Hebrew Bible (Deut. 11:10). This passage contrasted the land that God promised Israel's ancestors with the land of Egypt where people depended on irrigation to grow vegetable gardens. Vegetable gardens had significance in Israel community. Deuteronomy presents the Promised Land as a place where vineyard thrives naturally (Deut 6:10-12, 8:8-10). It was not a surprise that vineyards in the bible were viewed as signs of God's blessings (Hos. 2:15). This study observed that Ahab wanted to take away Naboth's divine blessing.

In 1 Kings 21:3, the words used for forbidden and inheritance are of interest. The word חלילה-*(forbidden)* referred to profanation by depriving something of its sacred character. Naboth's response informed this study on how the divine's authority preceded royal authority portrayed by Ahab who represents God. Jones (1984:353) supporting Naboth's tradition argues that Naboth's refusal is based on a religious conviction that God is proprietor of the land of Israel. For the word חֶלילה, Lange (1872:243) and Spence (1897:507) argue that the word נחלה revealed that Naboth was a worshipper of the Lord who considered alienation of his patrimony as an act of transgression that violates the law of Moses (Lev 25:23, Num 36:7).

The word נחלה-*(inheritance)* in 1 Kings 21:2, 4 referred to possession received or given by family member to his offspring which should not be sold. Robinson (1976:236) referred to נחלה as ancestral land. According to him, inheritance gave an identity and patrimony. Naboth's land gave him societal status in Jezreel. Another land could not give him status neither could money compensate him for its loss. Another possibility was that Naboth refused to sell his land because the tombs of his ancestors were situated on the ancestral family land. Selling it would have been a shameful act of impiety and betrayal. Jones (1984:354) and Wallace (1995:153) in their argument against monarchy beliefs claimed that the most sacred of the Lord laws was that 'no man could ever sell his land; land shall not be sold in perpetuity, for the land is mine-(Lev. 25:23)'. Lange (1872) and Spence (1897) explained that the preservation of נחלה was for covenant-keeping Israelite and keeping of religious sacred duties. Henry (1960:394) observed that Naboth foresaw that if their vineyard was sold to the crown, it would never return to its legal heirs even in the year of Jubilee. He could gladly oblige the king but must obey God rather than men.

In 1 Kings 21:4 the words סר וזעף- *(vexed and sullen)* are related. The word זעף-(*zevaah)* in royal context showed the lowering of King's position by a mere citizen. How would Naboth challenge the King's authority and command? Being in authority Ahab assumed that everyone and everything was under him. Being vexed and sullen expressed the King's humiliation by his subject thus demeaning his position and power (Henry, 1960:394). For Keck (1994:156) this was not the first incident Ahab was reacting in this manner. The statement in 1 Kings 20:43-*(Ahab returned home resentful and sullen)* resulted from the Lord's condemnation of Ahab's release by Ben-hadad (1Kings 20:43) but in 1 Kings 21:4 his return home resentful and sullen results from the rejection of his wish to purchase Naboth's ancestral estate. While Ahab sulked and acted peevish, he did not force the issue at this point, probably he knew the law. Henry (1960:694) in his view described Ahab's royal behavior of his proud spirit aggravated the indignity Naboth did in denying him. Naboth's behavior cuts him off although he pretended to consult peace and secretly meditated revenge in whichever way. Henry (1960:694) further argued that, Ahab committed the sin of discontent defined as a sin that arises not from the condition but from the mind. Ahab was discontent in a palace, with all the delights of Canaan, that pleasant land, at command, the wealth of a kingdom, the pleasures of a court, the honors and powers of a throne, yet all this avail him nothing without Naboth's vineyard.

Jones (1984:354) and Keck (1994:156) supporting Ahab's reaction explain that the phrase 'Ahab went into his house vexed and sullen' imply that he accepted Naboth's decision for if one having possession was unwilling to sell or exchange it he could not be forced to vacate it. They argue that there was no need to condemn Ahab for his religious ignorance because it appeared from the names of his sons that he was still Yahweh worshipper. However, Ahab's reaction was an indication of being unpleased with Naboth's decision especially being in the position of power

and later Jezebel's scheme in 1 Kings 21:8-9. When the wife later reported to him concerning the coveted land which belonged to Naboth after he had been stoned to death (1 Kings 21:15-16), Ahab went and confiscated that land.

3.5.2 Murder Scheme (1 Kings 21:5-7)

1 Kings 21:4-7 (WTT)

אֲלֵיו אִיזֶבֶל אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתְּדַבֵּר אֵלָיו מַה־זֶּה רוּחֲךָ
5 וַתָּבֹא
סָרָה וְאֵינְךָ אֹכֵל לָחֶם:
אֵלֶיהָ כִּי־אֲדַבֵּר אֶל־נָבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי וָאֹמַר לוֹ
6 וְיִתְּנֶהָ
-לִי אֶת־כַּרְמְךָ בְּכֶסֶף אוֹ אִם־חָפֵץ אַתָּה אֶתְּנָה־לְךָ
תְּנָה
כֶּרֶם תַּחְתָּיו וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא־אֶתֵּן לְךָ אֶת־כַּרְמִי:
אֲלֵיו אִיזֶבֶל אִשְׁתּוֹ אַתָּה עַתָּה תַּעֲשֶׂה מְלוּכָה
7 וַתֹּאמֶר
-יִשְׂרָאֵל קוּם אֱכָל־לֶחֶם וְיִטַב לִבֶּךָ אֲנִי אֶתֵּן לְךָ
עַל
אֶת־כֶּרֶם נָבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי:

1 Kings 21:5-7 (Translation)

5 Jezebel his wife came to him and said to him, 'Why is your spirit so vexed that you eat no food'? 6 He said to her, I spoke to Naboth to give me his vineyard for money or if it pleases him I will give him another vineyard for it. He answered, 'I will not give you my vineyard'. 7 Jezebel his wife said to him, "Do you now govern Israel? Arise and eat bread, let your heart be cheerful. I will give you the vineyard of Naboth.

In 1 Kings 21:5 the phrase אזבל אשתו- *(Jezebel his wife)* introduced Jezebel who affirmed the behavior of kingship which was foreign to Israel 91 Sam 8:8-10). She utilized her proximity to power to challenge the king who seemed reluctant with his authority. Her name derived from the Hebrew יזבל meaning 'Baal exalts' indicates an introduction of conflicting deity to one used to by Israelites. Jezebel is identified in the Book of Kings as the daughter of Ethbaal king of Tyre (Phoenicia) and the wife of Ahab king of northern Israel. Her background reinforced hegemonic system in Israel. (http://www.name-doctor.com/name-jezebel-meaning-of-jezebel).

Comay (1993:40) argued that Jezebel was a strong-willed woman who dominated her husband and used her position at the Samarian Court to promote Phoenician culture and religion. The Phoenician culture and religion allowed the exercise of power at all cost to benefit the royalty.

This contradicted the Israel's culture and religion but confirmed the nature of the kingship Israelites demanded in 1 Samuel 8:10-18. Keck (1994:156) supported this argument and added that Jezebel the Phoenician woman caused Ahab to patronize the Baal cult and she was not new in causing scandals in the Israel community. She tried to massacre the prophets of the Lord. When Ahab reported Elijah's annihilation of Baal's prophet, she threatened him. In 1 Kings 21 we saw Jezebel mocking Ahab for not exercising his royal power as (Deut. 17:14-20) suggested that Jezebel had no knowledge of or regard for such constraints that Israelite law places on the king. In this regard, Jezebel arrogantly promised that she herself will give Ahab the vineyard as if it is within her rights to do so. This is an indication of the fulfillment of God's instruction to Israelites at the conquest, Yahweh warned them against marrying the foreigners because they will turn their hearts to worship other gods (Deut 7:3-4) which Ahab dishonored by marrying a Phoenician woman

The phrase תעשׂה מלכה על ישׂראל-(*Dost thou now govern the kingdom of Israel?)* in 1 Kings 21:7 is significant as Jezebel introduces royal power in form of a question challenging the king who seemingly did not exercise his powers and disrespecting the divine authority over Israel. The word מלכה-(*melukah*) refers to power. The phrase above provoked the king who is in power. Jezebel challenged him of his position. Gray (1976:390), pointed out that Jezebel's answer was tolerant of a variety of interpretations. It may be interrogative, 'is thou…', or assertive, 'thou it is who …', or in the latter sense, it may be a sarcastic statement. The phrase כבל בתיו usually means 'be content', בל-*(leb)* having the connotation of mind. Gray (1976:390) rationale with Jezebel who did not see the reason Ahab was not using his authority as a king. Adeyemo (2006:441) supported Gray (1976) who described Jezebel as a Sidonian princess who was from a culture where all land belonged to a king. However, Devries

(1985:256) and Barton & Muddiman (2001:247) objected Gray and Adeyemo by explaining that through Jezebel, Ahab became autocratic and meticulously used king's power over the civilians to violate their rights.

3.5.3 Implementation of Murder (1 Kings 21:8-14)

1 Kings 21:8-14 (WTT)

סְפָרִים בְּשֵׁם אַחְאָב וַתַּחְתֹּם בְּחֹתָמוֹ וַתִּשְׁלַח
8 וַתִּכְתֹּב
[סְפָרִים] אֶל־הַזְּקֵנִים וְאֶל־הַחֹרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּעִירוֹ
(הַסְּפָרִים)
הַיֹּשְׁבִים אֶת־נָבוֹת:
בַּסְּפָרִים לֵאמֹר קִרְאוּ־צוֹם וְהוֹשִׁיבוּ אֶת־נָבוֹת
9 וַתִּכְתֹּב
בְּרֹאשׁ הָעָם:
שְׁנַיִם אֲנָשִׁים בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל נֶגְדּוֹ וְיעִדֻהוּ לֵאמֹר
10 וְהוֹשִׁיבוּ
בֵּרַכְתָּ אֱלֹהִים וָמֶלֶךְ וְהוֹצִיאֻהוּ וְסִקְלֻהוּ וְיָמֹת:
אַנְשֵׁי עִירוֹ הַזְּקֵנִים וְהַחֹרִים אֲשֶׁר הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּעִירוֹ
11 וַיַּעֲשׂוּ
שָׁלְחָה אֲלֵיהֶם אִיזֶבֶל כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב בַּסְּפָרִים אֲשֶׁר
כַּאֲשֶׁר
שָׁלְחָה אֲלֵיהֶם:
12 קָרְאוּ צוֹם וְהוֹשִׁיבוּ אֶת־נָבוֹת בְּרֹאשׁ הָעָם:
שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל וַיֵּשְׁבוּ נֶגְדּוֹ וַיְעִדֻהוּ אַנְשֵׁי
13 וַיָּבֹאוּ
אֶת־נָבוֹת נֶגֶד הָעָם לֵאמֹר בֵּרַךְ נָבוֹת אֱלֹהִים
הַבְּלִיַּעַל
וָמֶלֶךְ וַיֹּצִאֻהוּ מִחוּץ לָעִיר וַיִּסְקְלֻהוּ בָאֲבָנִים וַיָּמֹת:
14 וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ אֶל־אִיזֶבֶל לֵאמֹר סֻקַּל נָבוֹת וַיָּמֹת:

1 Kings 21:8-14 (Translation)

8 So she wrote letters in Ahab's name and sealed them with his seal and sent them to the elders and the nobles who dwelt with Naboth in his city. 9 'Proclaim a fast and set Naboth on high among the people'. 10 Set two base fellows opposite him and let them bring a charge against him, saying, 'You have cursed God and the king'. Take him out and stone him to death. 11 The men of his city, the elders and the nobles did as Jezebel had sent word to them and written in the letters. 12 They proclaimed a fast and set Naboth on high among the people. 13 The two base fellows came in, sat opposite him and brought a charge against Naboth, in the presence of the people. They said Naboth cursed God and the king. They took him outside the city and stoned him to death. 14 Then they sent to Jezebel saying Naboth has been stoned and he is dead.

Jones (1984:355) and Gray (1976:390) pointed out that the word ספרים-*(letters)* in 1 Kings 21:8 is in plural but takes singular connotation. It applied that Jezebel only wrote one letter of which Hezekiah's letter in (Isa. 37:14) may be cited as an analogy. Gray recounted that letters were usually written by a scribe or amanuensis in the name of a correspondent who was usually

depicted as speaking in the third person then sealed with clay or wax seal of the sender. This way, Jezebel acted in Ahab's position. The letter writing was a sign of authority acting as final orders given. It was not supposed to be questioned rather implemented. It is clear that from this argument Ahab abused the Israel's system by exercising power through foreign system that supported hegemony.

In 1 Kings 21:9 the word קרא-*(to call)* is used for public proclamation of a fast, solemn assembly, or general military levy (Lev. 23:24, Joel 1:4). The occasion of the fast was no doubt towards circumstances locally experienced or apprehended (1 Sam 7:6). One of the factors which kingship practices navigate was the schemes of assassination in order to control or take over. Agreeing with Roehrs (1979:234) Jezebel insinuated that a crime of such a grave nature had been committed to require the calling of a penitential general assembly (Jg. 20:26, 1 Sam 7:6) and since it was kingship scheme, possessing Naboth's land became automatic. Lange (1872:243), Buttrick (1954:175), and Gray (1976:390) argued that proclaiming fasting in Israel was a time of grave national emergency or calamities (Joel 1:14), after grievous defeats (Jg. 20:26, 1 Sam 31:13), after great sin (1 Sam 7:6, Joel 2:12), or for the turning away of apprehended misfortune (2 Chr. 20:2, 4). It signified penitence. Buttrick (1954:175) explained that the fast which Jezebel proclaimed was destined to prepare the people for the alleged approach of the deity, which in turn was due to a serious crime committed against him. Royal executors intelligently know how to fix the course to suit them. This text showed a successful plan perpetuating hegemony.

Instead of Naboth receiving honor, the text has double dimension of a King and Naboth defined by the tradition they shared. Buttrick (1954:175) noted that the text's placing of Naboth at the head of the people was ironically place of honor as at feast, but the place of the accused as two reprobates were set before him not to accuse but to support the accusation giving false evidence

ודהו-(*wi ‘iduhu*). Naboth was a tool of power, which the kingship tactfully used to justify his royal authority. On their shared tradition, this study agreed with Gray (1976:391) who noted that Naboth had a place of honor. His title ‘the Jezrelite’ suggested that he was a representative figure, the head of an influential local family perhaps the equivalent of the *mukhtar* of the place. In virtue of this status, he was given the place ‘at the head of the people’ equating Naboth with Ahab.

Royal system used disguising means to accomplish a mission. In 1 Kings 21:10, the words בנ־בליעל is a paraphrase used literally meaning *‘sons of worthlessness’*. The word ברכת-(*berakta*) refers to thou dist bless Yahweh which employs euphemism. Gray (1976:392) explained that anything related to a deity should be positive. The use of curse along with Yahweh is avoided in this text (Job 1:1). Lange (1872:243) and Jones (1994:356) argue that Naboth was accused of blasphemy or guilty of capital crime. Blasphemy was sin against God which was punishable by death (Lev. 24:10-16), and cursing the ruler was also regarded as an act of blasphemy, for he was God’s chosen representative (Exod. 22:28). According to Gray (1976:392) the conjunction of Yahweh and the king was interesting. In (Ps. 1; 110), the same ideology and language were applied to the king as to God. The king was God’s visible guarantee of his cosmic relationships and functions. The text of 1 Kings 21:11-13 repeats the content of the proceeding section and states that all happened according to Jezebel’s plan.

Lange (1872:243) and Keil (1982:271) argued that according to Deut. 17: 6; 19:15, every crime punishable by death must be testified to by at least two witnesses. The intentions were that from the onset there appear to be justice through a legal process instituted before all the citizens and the stamp of veracity impressed upon the crime of Naboth’s accusation. Pfeiffer (1962:337) and Keck (1994:156) indicated that the means applied by royal systems used was bribery. The two

scoundrels who committed perjury were always ready to sell their testimony for money and to alter it to suit the evil purposes of the one who hires them. This could be compared to the witnesses during Jesus' trial (Mt 26:60-61).

1 Kings 21:14 the phrase וישלח אל־איזבל לאמר *(then they sent to Jezebel)* is a subject given to a verb that lies as far back as the 'two base fellows' of 1 Kings 21:13a, but it is not to be assumed that they were responsible for the actions mentioned in 1 Kings 21:13b-14a. The council or court was responsible for the stoning in 1 Kings 21:13b and probably official messengers were sent to Jezebel by the elders and nobles in 1 Kings 21:14a. The task of the scoundrels had been completed when they acted as witnesses.

3.5.4 Land Confiscation (1 Kings 21:15-16)

1 Kings 21:15-16 (WTT)

כְּשְׁמֹעַ אִיזֶבֶל כִּי־סֻקַּל נָבוֹת וַיָּמָת וַתֹּאמֶר אִיזֶבֶל
15 וַיְהִי
קוּם רֵשׁ אֶת־כֶּרֶם נָבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי אֲשֶׁר מֵאֵן
אֶל־אַחְאָב
לָתֶת־לְךָ בְּכֶסֶף כִּי אֵין נָבוֹת חַי כִּי־מֵת:
כְּשְׁמֹעַ אַחְאָב כִּי מֵת נָבוֹת וַיָּקָם אַחְאָב לָרֶדֶתְ
16 וַיְהִי
אֶל־כֶּרֶם נָבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי לְרִשְׁתּוֹ:

1 Kings 21:15-16 (Translation)

15 When Jezebel heard that Naboth had been stoned and was dead. She said to Ahab arise and take possession of the vineyard of Naboth which he refused to give you for money. He is not alive but dead. 16 immediately Ahab heard that Naboth was dead. He arose to go down to the vineyard and take possession of it.

The text in 1 Kings 21:15-16 concluded the impressions given that the events recorded happened in immediate successions without any delay. Jezebel takes the initiative in 1 Kings 21:15 since it was assumed that the news of Naboth's murder reached her that fitful day. Ahab too acted promptly (1 Kings 21:16) and probably confiscated Naboth's vineyard consequently. Lange (1872:243) argued that this immediate seizure of Naboth's property appears in consequence of his execution. This clearly showed that the hegemonic system had effect and well calculated.

This study supported Douglas (1990:479) argument of condemnation that Jezebel's plot and Ahab's excitement did not lie in the legal aspect of property tradition rather in inhuman leadership. Ahab and Jezebel got the property through the use of the power of the throne. According to Robinson (1976:239) the law was to ensure right dealings in the society and the king was to uphold that law (Deut. 17:18-20) but not manipulating the law to his own advantage. In hegemonic view, Douglas (1990) argued that this act had serious adverse consequences to Israel's throne causing the conflict between the powerful and powerless. Adeyemo (2006:441) attested that instead of Ahab protesting that Jezebel had usurped his authority, broken the law, and killed an innocent man and his family, he accepted what Jezebel did by surrendering his conscience and his will to hers. He set out to enjoy his new possession.

Dunn (2003:264) gave close parallel-story of David and Bathsheba in 2 Samuel 11-12 arguing that in both stories the subject refused to go along with the king's plans but appealed to the fundamental principle of the Israelite way of life. Therefore, a plan was executed to conceal the reason for the subject's death. Barton & Muddiman (2001:247) suggested that 1 Kings 21:15-16 showed how unscrupulously the king's power over the poor rights could be misused. The queen (Jezebel) being the driving force behind this was a foreigner who did not respect Israelite ethics or perhaps does not know them.

3.6 Theological Insights from 1 Kings 21:1-16

The main theological insights drawn from the land conflict passage in 1 Kings 21:1-16 were among the following; the idea of the covenant (Heb. ברית- *berith*- Gen17:19) because land was at the epitome of the Old Testament. 1 Kings 21:1-16 focused on inheritance. Ahab commanding Naboth to sell his inheritance reflected a leadership that did not honour family history but aimed at destroying its lineages. There were issues of power play and land laws of which the

perpetuators of this conflict became adamant. The land conflict in 1 Kings 21:1-16 showed how Naboth's execution and the confiscation of his vineyard mirrored the dispossession of the Israelite poor of their land during monarchy. This kind of injustice required the administration of capital punishment. This study observes that the theology of intermarriage was present as a profane practice in Israel (Deut 7) as it influences Israelites religion and behavior in the land.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter covered the postcolonial biblical criticism, theme structure, translation and exegesis of 1 Kings 21:1-16. The exegetical discussion in this chapter enabled this study to use the postcolonial approach justifiably as it led to the study drawing themes that were keys to this study. These theological themes response to land clashes in Kenya. This chapter linked the following chapter which used postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 to respond to land clashes in Kenya theologically.

CHAPTER FOUR: THEOLOGICAL WAYS OF ADRESSING LAND CONFLICTS AND INJUSTICE

4.1 Introduction

This study sought to address land clashes in Kenya through theological ways. In its pre-critical reading, 1 Kings 21:1-16 had been used to suppress the poor it legitimized the action of those in power on land conflict. In this chapter the researcher had discussed some of the ways of dealing with the hegemonic land practices. Using postcolonial lenses, this study questions the narrator's monarchial influence and extend in which it affected Theocratic nation with the land issue.

4.2 Colonial Perspectives of Land in 1 Kings 21:1-16.

The colonial perspectives of land in 1 Kings 21:1-16 were employed in postcolonial criticism for analysis. Employing these perspectives in this study formed basis for understanding Israel community viewed land against how monarchial context informed the author in his writing on land issue.

4.2.1 Covenantal Gift

This study noted that land conflict in 1 Kings 21:1-16 was a digression and symbol of breaching the covenant between God and Israelites. The land no longer had meaning, divine ownership and respect of law, boundaries but being made tradable commodity and accessible by those in power. The colonial influence changed land perspective in Israel community which understood land as a covenantal gift from God.

The idea of the covenant, in Hebrew ברית-(*berith*- Gen17:19) was the theme at the epitome of the land issues in the Old Testament. Elwell (1984:276) defined covenant as a compact or agreement between two parties binding them mutually to undertakings on each other's behalf with an inclination to relationship with God. According to Botterweck & Ringgren (1975)

covenant implied the notion of obligation, liability, or commitment from bond. A biblical covenant is synonymous to law or commandment and commitment confirmed by oath-(Gen 21:22; 26:26; Deut 29:9). Fahlbucsh (1999:50) and Rowley (1951:110) claimed that the Old Testament covenant was a formal agreement between the Israelites and God, the Israelites were to worship God alone as His Chosen People that He gave Canaan as their Promised Land. This was in reference to the Sinatic Covenant between God and Israelites which was a loyal grant. Githuku (2011:131-2) and Elwell (1984:276) adopted the notions of commitment to covenant, oath, agreement, and swearing for compliance. They incorporated the idea of the ritual of covenant making which involved verbal statements for the undertaking, sacrifice, witness, and a shared meal. The study took the covenant to mean an agreement between God and Israelites. Conclusively, a covenant "is a solemn agreement held to be the basis of a relationship and commitment to God" (Stevenson 2011:330).

Anderson (1966:56) argued that Israel as a community was understood well in covenant relationship with Yahweh. In this relationship one could not divorce land from covenant as governed by the Sinatic laws (Ex. 19:5; 20:1, 12). This covenant was the basis of Israel's historical existence. It bound them to one another with its strong bonds. The nature of this covenant (Ex. 19:3-6) evoked a response from the people. Anderson (1966) and Bright (1972:164) agreed that Israel was a society founded in covenant and that covenant law was a central factor in Israel's life from the beginning. Dyrness (1979:114) and Drane (1987:55) asserted that the idea of covenant was a means of regulating behavior between one another especially in the socio-economic and spiritual life. It regulated all sorts of behavior in the Israel community. The covenant relationship was to guide them in the gifted land.

According to Brown (1996:283-293) covenantal land provided an integral link between God and Israel. The covenant was a bridge connecting the communal character and the constitution. It brought into a coherent whole the narrative of Israel's divinely established formation and the promulgation of a national constitution. The covenantal centre set its character upon the covenanting God while delineating the character of the covenant-engendered community. He added that the concepts of covenant were its theocentric origin and its corporate inclusiveness. The covenant between God and Israel was established by God for them to become His people. Covenantal ethic constituted a reciprocal orientation of love between God and Israel by which God's people embodied the ethical character of the Divine. Israel's distinctive covenantal identity was set in relief within the arena of God's land (Ex. 19:5b). Gregerman (2014:410-425) stated that the covenant relationship between God and Israel emphasized progeny, land and divine favour. In the mosaic covenant God placed conditions on Israel's right to enjoy possession of that which they owned (Lev. 26 & Deut. 28).

The land occupied by the Israelites as explained by Brueggemann (2000:49) was a gift from Yahweh and bound Israel in new ways to the giver. He further claimed that land was for satiation and listening. Land meant that the future for Israel was secured without anxiety. There were many issues of Israel involvement with land and with Yahweh. The land acted as an assurance, summon, nourishment, claim, symbol of family and Yahweh's peculiar listening partner in historical covenant. Brueggemann (2002:50) pointed out that the gifted land was the covenantal land and place. Israel's central task was to maintain and not to perceive it as a social or historical vacuum.

4.2.2 Land as an Inheritance

This study noted 1 Kings 21:1-16 destroyed the essence of inheritance. Ahab commanding Naboth to sell his inheritance reflects a leadership that does not honor family history but aims at destroying its lineages. Rad (1962:296) and Zimmerli (1978:66) argued that the term heritage or patrimony-(נהלה) initially designated the defined property of a clan or tribe and was extended in deuteronomic usage to refer to the patrimony of Israel-(נהלת ישׂראל). This term expressed Israel's right to occupy this land as own defined property. The land in this sense was the patrimony of Yahweh-(נהלת יהוה)-Yahweh's personal property.

The land as an inheritance from Yahweh had been explained by Marchadour (2007:1-57) who argued that inheritance symbolized intimacy between God and Israel that guaranteed continuity of belonging and harmony. It was a blessing for all generations (Gen. 12). Israel's land was a heritage-(מרשׁ) promised to the patriarchs (Ex. 6:8). He added that land as a gift and inheritance had its obligations (Deut. 30:16-20). The land obligations firmly linked Israel's status as a holy nation. In this context, Israel was reminded that the land belongs to God (Lev. 25:23). God gave Israel land for a special purpose and expected them to follow Torah religiously.

The ownership of land by God (Deut. 12:10) was a legal residual right as stated by Kitz (2000:601). According to him, this legal construct of inheritance (נהל) to Israel did not guarantee them the residual control (Gen. 24:7). Anderson (1997:250) and Kitz (2000:601) pointed out that Israel only had the privilege of owning the estate as stewards of Yahweh's property. God administered it for the welfare of the whole community in a way that ruled out confiscation and illegal allotment or allocation or possession.

Therefore, this study agreed with Anderson (1997:249) that Naboth's refusal to give out his inheritance expressed an attitude of the owner showing that land was unique to Israel. It was not a 'private property' to dispose of as he pleased. It belonged to the whole family or clan passed on from generation to another as a sacred inheritance. In this view, the real owner of the land was Yahweh (יהוה) and as Zimmerli (1978:50) puts it, the substance of the promise was the possession of the land which was sealed by a covenant. This covenant had two components that 1 Kings 21:1-16 reveals. First, it expressed that according to Naboth the possession of the land was a gift. Second, Naboth acknowledged that land was a special benefit not definable in terms of value materially but associated with the status of Israel as the 'people of Yahweh'.

Naboth's point of view represented the traditional covenantal language. Brueggemann (2000:88) supported Naboth's view that land was not owned in a way that permitted its disposal. It was an 'inheritance' which should have been held in trust from generations to generations. Naboth was responsible for the land but was not in control over it. He also perceived himself in covenantal relation. This relationship had a history of fidelity understood as a dimension of family history. Zimmerli (1978: 65) supported it by arguing that the possession of land was made conditional upon keeping God's law (Ex. 20:12, Deut. 11:8, 1 Chron. 28:8).

God's law was clear on land allocation which Naboth was aware of as a Divine means to allocate land, Kitz (2000:601-616) and Russell (2018:111-118) explained that the allotment of the land was determined according to the 'sacred dice' which revealed the divine will. The casting of lot was a 'sacred act' (Josh 14:2, 18:6. 8; Ezek 45:1) which demonstrated that God distributed the land Himself. This custom was a feature of God's right to bestow land as a gift. The divinely guided casting of lot established the region and dimension of tribal property. They added that the legitimate possession of the territory depended on individual tribal responsibility to dwell in it in

the context of the family inheritance which applied to the nation as whole. Heirs (1993:121) argued that the provision for transferring real property (land, fields, and houses) was centrally important in biblical law and tradition (Num. 27).

4.3 Land in the Perspective of Torah.

This study observed that in 1 Kings 21:1-16, land laws were abused by those who were expected to protect it rather they used law to possess illegal land. Ahab who was God's representative and his associates abused the entrusted office by confiscating and killing true owner of the land thus weakening the power of law moving forward. Schofield (1964:14) defined torah (תרה) as a 'guidance' or 'direction'. It was used for the instructions given by a mother, a priest, or a prophet, as well as God. Torah was God's instructions or guidance spoken of as His covenant. According to Anderson (1997:90) Torah was intended to be the social expression of the covenant bond. Israel's law was covenant law not 'secular' law. The whole of life was to be lived under Yahweh's demand within the covenant. He added that the laws in the Bible were not copied from the 'Code of Hammurabi' which presupposed an aristocratic class system that did not prevail in Israel. Israel did not accept the view that the state was the custodian of the law. In Israel's covenant faith, even the kings were subject to the law given at Sinai (Deut. 17:18-20).

This laws guided on how land is allocated to Israelites. Schmidt (1984:37) noted that land belonging to a given tribe was sub-divided by casting of lot among the families. Casting of lots for the division of land as in the Old Testament was a one-time act but not a regularly recurring ritual (Josh 14:2, 18:6. 8; Ezek 45:1). An inherited land/ property was inalienable according to the Israelite laws, but this differed from the Canaanite laws (Gen 23, 2 Sam 24, 1 Kings 16:24). Land was not to be disposed at will (1 Kings 21, Deut 27:17). Zimmerli (1978:67) added that God's laws were to prevent the gradual undermining of the Divine allotment. Possession of the

land was a benefit entailing certain responsibilities towards God. Like the case of Ahab, land should not have been treated as 'commercial property' rather a patrimony (1 Kings 21:3, Isa. 5:8, Micah 2:1).

As a patrimony, Yahweh had created a covenant community in which every person stood equal before the law, rich or poor, king or citizen. The nature of Sinatic Covenant was seen in the concept of law that succeeded it. The integral part of the covenant was the stipulations that the divine overlord laid upon his subjects. It defined the policy by which the members of the community must regulate their actions towards God and one another. This should have applied to the daily situation and life. The whole community was responsible to the sovereign will of Yahweh. This was expressed in the absolute laws and refined legal usage. In the case of individual downtrodden by the powerful, Yahweh intervened (Anderson, 1997:250).

Torah was meant to take back Israelites to a divine way of life. For Brueggemann, Torah (2000:54) explained that Israel was guaranteed an enjoyment of the given land and honoring torah led to success and prosperity. The link between torah and land was central to God. This was the reason to why the land of Israel had the year of Jubilee (Lev. 25) as a reminder that land was not from them but a gift to them. Jubilee was "the year of proclamation of liberty to the Israelites who had become enslaved for debts and a restoration of land to families who had been compelled to sell it out of economic need in the previous 50 years" (Freedmann, 1992:1025). Therefore, land had its own rights over against them and even its own existence. It was a covenant with them but not totally at their disposal. Brueggemann (2000:54) added that land was for sharing with all the heirs of the covenant as an opportunity also to administer justice (Deut. 24:17-18, Amos 5:10-12). Land was not intended to diminish the value or the presence of brothers and sisters.

The meaningless of land as explained by Brueggemann (2000:69) was brought by land management that Israel attempted through kingship. The Israelite kings presided over the organized life of Israel and were responsible for the land. Borrowed kingship ideas from the neighborhood of the Israelites made the Israel kings get inclined to the control of land as a possession. Initially the kings were to manage land as a gift entrusted to them but not as a possession. He adds that the central activity of an Israelite king was to read the torah which he was as well subjected to. The kingship institution was to serve the fundamental commitment out of priority and authority of king. The kingship power was put in the service of a special faith and a peculiar vision. The way to keep, preserve, and control land was guided by the reading of torah which reminded the king that he is a brother of the other brothers and sisters.

4.4 The Old Testament Perspectives Prohibiting the Selling of Land

This study noted that Ahab regarded land as buy and sell commodity. Brueggemann (2000:87) explained that Ahab's mentality of land perceived as a commodity demeaned a Divine gift 'I will give you a better vineyard for it or if it seems good to you, I will give you its value in money' (1 Kings 21:2). This contrasted the views of Naboth on land, for him land was not a commodity for trade rather an inalienable inheritance, 'God forbid that I should give you the inheritance of my fathers' (1 Kings 21:3). The above expressions raised two views on land. Schmidt (1984:37) concurred with Brueggemann (2000:47) that God was regarded as the owner of land (Lev 25:23) who gave it to Israel as an inheritance (Deut 12:10, Ps 78: 55). This land did not belong to them and they should not take it for granted.

The monarchy mentality of demeaning the Divine gift had been analyzed by Brueggemann (2000:54), Freedman (1992:102), and Schmidt (1984:37) as a symbol of overthrowing the Divine ownership of land. To them there were conflicts between the old Israelite property laws and the

prevailing interests of King Ahab. The former guaranteed Naboth's protection of selling or exchanging his inherited land, when the latter accommodated the expansion and consolidation of crown property. Ahab exploited the belief of the Ancient Orient that property could be freely traded, bought, exchanged, or mortgaged (1 Kings 21:2). His greed was thwarted by Naboth's implicit appeal to the Israelite law of property which prohibited sale or exchange of inherited land except for its transfer as an inheritance (1 King 21:3). This showed how Ahab employed the power of his loyal office to eliminate Naboth and his sons unlawfully and to gain possession of their land. This instance of might before right was a perversion of the king's role indicating that in some ways the Israelite monarchy borrowed from the Ancient Oriental despotism.

4.4.1 Hegemony in 1 Kings 21:1-16

Hegemony was a system by the ruling class which held that the interest of those in power was for the interest of all, showing the necessity for predominance of one class over the other. Hegemony had an alternative creation of challenging the desires for the unprivileged to occupy better social class (Williams: 1977:111). Ashcroft (2007:106) claimed that hegemony was the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests were the interests of all. It showed that it was natural for one group to dominate and as important for the sake of stability, social order and advancement.

Hegemony was demonstrated in the text through the narration. The text reflected the behavior of the king and those related to power, on how they perceived land and treated the powerless. Ahab offered to buy or exchange the land in respect to Israel's tradition of land. The reaction of Ahab endangered the life of Naboth to those executing King's orders. Naboth's beliefs which was also Ahab's beliefs were made as beliefs to be negotiated or compromised. In Ahab's world, land was land to others.

In failing to respect God's principle, this study concluded that Ahab was supportive of the hegemonic system, as Naboth was murdered; Ahab was happy and ready to possess the land. Ahab should not have advocated for foreign values over those of the Israel community. Ahab should have protected Naboth using God's law in Leviticus 23:25. As Comay (1993:206) rightly argued 'Ahab failure to accept and respect Naboth's belief played a role in maintaining inequality of power, an authoritarian and hegemonic society that meant to oppress the poor.

This study also found that hegemony was supported throughout in this text. Critical reading showed that the author presents Ahab and Jezebel as the most powerful and influential to the elders. Naboth was never given a chance to utter a word in his defense. The author assumed Ahab's authority over Naboth as he wrote. What happened in this case was that the author gave more power to Ahab and Jezebel compared to God's principles. Naboth was silent for his fate to be decided by those in authority.

4.4.2 Crime

This study observed that land conflicts revealed in 1 Kings 21:1-16 could lead to crime. In relation to crime as discussed by Elwell (1984:284), there were the codes formalized in existing laws for the protection of individuals and the lifestyles expected by the king and the deity. For him a crime was a rejection of deity. In close relationship, Stevenson (2011:338) defined crime as an action which constitutes a serious offence against an individual or the state and was punishable by law. The contemporary understanding of a crime entailed "illegal activities" (McIntosh, 2013:357).

Both Ahab and his Phoenician wife-Jezebel committed a crime that deserved capital punishment. The crime committed by Ahab was seen in his confiscation of Naboth's vineyard. This presented him as having consented to Naboth's murder. Comay (1993:40) argued that Ahab did not merely

tolerate Jezebel's activities but took an active part in them; therefore, he was as guilty as his wife.

The crime committed by Jezebel was carrying out the murder plan for Naboth and the scheming on how to get false witnesses against him for her husband to confiscate Naboth's vineyard. According to Freedmann (1992:848) these biblical texts presented Jezebel in a thoroughly negative picture of her as an undoubtedly powerful woman who contrived the legal death of Naboth the Jezreelite so that her husband could obtain his vineyard. This was indicated in her letters written in Ahab's name and the use of the king's seal which were her routine acts on her part rather than an illegitimate usurpation of authority. In support of these, Comay (1993:205) argued that Jezebel was a strong-willed woman who clearly dominated her husband upon Naboth's charges of blasphemy against God and the king to have him stoned to death. This judicial murder was carried out and the law stated that a condemned man's property was passed to hands of the king.

4.4.3 Capital Punishment.

In this study, God's justice should be administered in the land therefore God guided the prophets on how to administer through death sentence. Stevenson (2011:208) had defined capital punishment "as an offence or charge liable to death penalty". According to Weingreen (1989:113-40) the most serious criminal offence in the Ancient Israel was murder. Capital offence was construed as the deliberate killing of a human being following a preconceived plan. In the modern legal terms, it could be defined as premeditated homicide. Exodus 21:14, Deuteronomy 19:11, Numbers 35:16-21 described an act of murder as treacherous and cunning. The penalty for premeditated homicide was execution.

Capital punishment in 1 Kings 21:1-16 was manifested by the order of Jezebel which assumed the socio-religious relationship between Naboth and Israelites. Jezebel's scheme to execute and confiscate gives Ahab confidence of possessing the land. 1 Kings 21:8, Jezebel showed that Ahab's had authority being the king, as his authority was anchored on Divine law which punished whoever sinned against God (blasphemy) and the king. The study questioned Jezebel's claim for the divine. Dube (2000: 116) argued that there was need for postcolonial readers to be suspicious of the ideological motives behind such divine claims. In associating with Israel's law Jezebel showed Ahab had supreme authority that could not be questioned.

4.4.4 Intermarriage

This study observed that the intermarriage was a profane practice in Israel (Deut 7) as it influenced Israelites religion and behavior in the land. Intermarriage meant "a marriage between people of different races, castes, or religions" Stevenson (2011:741). According to Brueggemann (2002:88) the intermarriage between Ahab (Israelite) and Jezebel (Phoencian) introduced new ideas of perceiving land. It introduced the Canaanite kingship as an institution of ruling and manipulation, it introduced a mercantile view of land as a commodity to be secured by whatever means, it also introduced an alien view of torah that made the king immune from his demands 'sullen and vexed' (1 Kings 21:8). He added that in the speech and action of Jezebel covenantal view of kingship, land and torah were all called into question. Jezebel's presence embodied an alien view of kingship in relation to land and torah. To her the notion of land as an 'inheritance' directly contradicted the royal notions of land management. The royal notions of land knew no limitation but sanction confiscation and royal prerogatives. Brueggemann (2002:88) further argued that Jezebel's culture allowed the king to use his power in all circumstances.

Jezebel's language and culture had been nurtured in the commercial civilization of Phoenicia as Anderson (1997:250) argued that Phoenicia tradition had different conceptions of property. Her Baal religion placed no limitations on the exercise of royal power. He added that Jezebel's behavior caused an explicit conflict between the religion of the Baal and Yahwistic faith. Brueggemann (2002:54) introduced a similar idea by arguing that the most dangerous behavior and central temptation of the land was the worship of other gods which brought about the contradiction of torah as a key guideline of the life in the land. It contained the guidelines for land management which entailed the obedience to Yahweh and honouring covenant. Therefore, Naboth suffered because of the hegemonic culture.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter explained ways of addressing land clashes in Kenya mirrored in 1 Kings 21:1-16. Re-reading 1 Kings 21:1-16 using postcolonial lens led to questioning the author's intentions that informed his writing. In recognizing this ideology, the landless in Kenya were empowered to articulate their pain that had been infringed through structures that developed in leadership regimes. Further, 1 Kings 21:1-16 acted as a voice of transformation to challenge hegemonic structures in place.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter articulated the findings, recommendations and conclusion from this study on postcolonial criticism of 1 Kings 21:1-16 to address land conflict as a theological response to land clashes.

5.2 Summary of Findings

Postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 portrayed social injustices, equality, and also exposed the hegemonic power. Many scholars pointed at the place of Naboth in relation to land and like many Kenyans, suffered oppression and denial of accessing lands which rightly belonged to them. Most scholars argued that in 1 Kings 21:1-16, God was perceived as the owner of land. Brueggemann (2002) expressed that land was a gift from God who owned it. Israelites were temporal residents who should have lived in it guided by faith and law. In (Lev. 25:23) land belonged to God who gave it out as an inheritance. Israelites inherited land from God and this inheritance should have been shared and passed on within families. The distinct factor with this land was that God gave it freely to Israelites in a covenantal relationship. It was guided by the divine laws as Keck (1994) claimed that land should have remained in the family and if given to another person it was redeemable in the year of jubilee.

Postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 expressed how the text brought out the voice of a powerless oppressed sufferer who was made landless. In raising his voice to the understanding and perception of the land, May (1988) expressed that land was not for sale. Nothing amounted to the value of land. This could be equated to life which was not portable. The way life was treated was the way land should have been treated, for it gave identity, protection and voice. No

one had supremacy over land apart from God. Keck (1994) condemned the supreme idea that came with power elaborated by Newsom (1992) that if not used well it legalized abuse of office happening when the leader was weak in terms of jurisdiction and execution. Ahab was portrayed as a weak leader who allowed his associate (wife) to downplay him by using his power for unjustified benefit.

Postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 had exposed that the foreign leadership introduced in Israel destabilized God's community (1 Sam 8:8-10). It came with a new leadership structure. Kings became the owners and caretakers of land and administrators of Israel. Israel no longer heeded instructions from God through the prophets but rather the new leadership gave humanly instructions. As Arnold & Williams (2005) claimed, monarchy introduced polytheistic and intermarriages which God had warned them before possessing Canaan (Deut. 7:1-4). The context of 1 Kings 21:1-16 was within monarchy. Robinson (1997) explained that monarchial power was exposed. Hamilton (2001) added that it raised the voice of the powerless and that the confidence in which Naboth rejected the King's offer was an indication and hope that there was hope and rights of those oppressed. Naboth was empowered and aware of law as a tool to protect his property. Therefore, he used it to challenge the oppressive system. Being aware of the law of land as an inheritance for his family and had land document in terms of boundaries and witness he rejected the offer with the rights he held. Barton & Muddimann (2001) expressed that 1 Kings 21:1-16 was a text which empowered the silenced, ignored, oppressed and voiceless in the society.

Postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 exposed that those associated with power may have misused it to manipulate, abuse the law, and offices to achieve their goals. Jezebel being close to power indicated that there will always be conflict in power. Therefore, there should be clear laws

protecting the office and authority from the interference of spouses and relatives. Carson (1994) explained that Jezebel changing the law indicated that somehow Israel's law was at par with those in power. And whoever spoke meant the voice of the king which should be implemented.

5.3 Recommendations

The findings from the postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 had presented useful responses to land clashes. This study recommended a rereading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 through a postcolonial perspective which gave an opportunity to theologically respond to land clashes with enough resources, especially on God's perspective on land and how people should treat land.

Postcolonial reading of 1 Kings 21:1-16 proposed that all citizens be aware of the constitutional rights from human to property. This would enable them to protect themselves against any manipulations, harassments and threats. For instance, the Constitution of Kenya states clearly that 'land belongs to all Kenyans'. What that means to Kenyans may not be clearly understood. There is need to educate Kenyans through civil education which would be of great help. The land laws also should be revised. Many land laws were written during colonial time which suited their favors leading to land injustices. This affected Kenyans and benefited the post-colonial leaders and their associates. Revising laws would help in tracing historical land injustices and addressing them. This would mitigate the land clashes experienced every election period whereby politicians use land as a vehicle of wooing communities, creating tribal enmity to gain a wining vote.

In conclusion, the postcolonial insights gained in this study supported the proposals that the perpetrators of land clashes should have been prosecuted and justice delivered to the victims thereof. Capital punishment should have been imposed on the perpetrators of land clashes. The laws should be revised to restate the powers of a leader to ensure that a leader cannot use power

to illegally relocate citizens in order to take their land. There should be laws pulling away leaders' spouses from accessing power functions which is exemplified as used wrongly just as did Jezebel. Finally, there should be laws ensuring that all foreign citizens get well rooted and grounded in the new religious and cultural heritage.

5.4 Conclusion

In the postcolonial perspectives, the government should take necessary measures to address historical land injustices as Bruce (2009:15) claimed that lack of access to land by many was governance failure. The government should have established suitable legal and administrative framework with mechanisms for restitution, reparation and compensation of historical land injustices claims since 1895 and as Kanyinga (1996:13) claimed failure to do so significantly contributed to ethnic resentment and violence and redressing these injustices to one ethnic group created new injustices to another.

REFERENCES

Books

Anderson, B. (1966). *Understanding the Old Testament (1st Ed.),* London: Pretice-Hall International Inc.

Anderson, B. (1997). *Understanding the Old Testament (4th Ed.),* London: Pretice-Hall International Inc.

Arnold, B. & Williamson, H. (Ed.). (2005), *Dictionary of the Old Testament; Historical Books (3rd Ed.),* Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.

Ashcroft, D., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds). (2007). *Postcolonial studies: The key concepts (2nd Ed.),* London: Routledge.

Adeyemo, T. *et al.* (2006). *Africa Bible Commentary*, Nairobi: WordAlive Publishers.

Alexander, T. D. *et al.* (2002). *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch,* Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.

Alexander. P. *et al.* (1987). *The Lion Encyclopedia of the Bible,* Sydney: A lion book.

Barton, J. & Muddiman, J. (Ed.). (2001). *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Beyerlin, W. (Ed.). (1979). *Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament (2nd Ed.),* London: SCM Press.

Bright, J. (Ed.). (1972). *A History of Israel (2nd Ed.),* London: SCM Press Ltd.

Bromiley, G. *et al.* (1986). *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans publishing Company.

Botterweck, G. J. & Ringgren, H. (1975). *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Buttrick, G.A. *et al* (Ed.). (1952). *The Interpreter's Bible (1st Ed.),* New York: Abingdon Press

Brueggemann, W. (2002). *The Land*, (2nd Ed.), Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Carson, D.A. *et al* (Ed.). (1994). *New Bible Commentary (2st Ed.),* England: Inter-Varsity Press

Comay, J. & Brownrigg, R. (1993). *Who's Who in the Bible,* New York: Wings Books.

Dandala, M. *et al.* (Ed.). (2016). *Africa Study Bible,* Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers.

Davies, E. W. (1989). *Land: Its Rights and Privileges,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Devries, S. (1985). *Word Biblical Commentary*, Texas: Word Books, Publishers.

Douglas, J. D. *et al*. (Ed.). (1996). *New Bible Dictionary, (3rd Ed.),* England: Inter-Varsity Press.

Dube, W.M. (2000). *Postcolonial feminist interpretation of the Bible*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice

Dunn, J. & Rogerson, J. (Ed.). (2003), *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible (1st Ed)* Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Dyrness, W. (1979). *Themes in the Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.

Elwell, W. A. (1984). *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, USA: Bakers House Company.

Fahlbucsh, E. *et al*. (1982). *Liberty Bible Commentary*, Virginia: The All Time Gospel Hour.

Freedmann, D. N. *et al* (Ed.). (1992), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary (3rd Ed.)*, London: Doubleday.

Gardner, J. L. *et al*. (Ed.). (1981). *Atlas of the Bible 91st Ed.)*, Great Britain: Library of Congress.

Githuku, S. (2012). *Inculturation Biblical Hermeneutics*, Nairobi: Academic Press.

Goldingay, J. (2003). *Old Testament Theology*, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.

Gore, C. *et al* (Ed.). (1928). *New Commentary on Holy Scriptures (1st Ed.)*, London: Society for Promoting Knowledge.

Gorman, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Elements of Biblical Exegesis (3rd Ed.*), Michigan: Baker Academic.

Gray, J. (1969). *I & II Kings*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Greer, J. S. *et al.* (Ed.). (2018), *Behind the Scenes of the Old Testament (1st Ed.)*, Michigan: Baker Academic.

Habel, N.C (1995). *The Land Is Mine: Six Biblical land ideologies*, Minneapolis: Fortress

Hamilton, V. (2001). *Handbook on the Historical Books*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Hermunen, T. (2004). *Land use policy in Kenya*, Finland: Helsinki.

Henry, M. (1960). *Matthew Henry's Commentary*, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

Kenyatta, J. (1938). *Facing Mt. Kenya*, Nairobi: East African Publishers.

Jones, G.H. (1984). *1 and 2 Kings*, London: WM. B. Eerdmans Publication

Kanogo, T. (1987). *Squatters & the roots of Mau Mau*, Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.

Keck, L. *et al.* (1994). T*he New Interpreter's Bible,* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Keil, C. *et al*. (1982). *Commentary on the Old Testament*, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishers.

Kieyah, J. & Njoroge, M. (2010). *Ndung'u Report on Land grabbing in Kenya*, Nairobi: Legal and Economic analysis.

Kombo, D. K *et al*, (2006). *Proposal and thesis writing: an introduction.* Nairobi: Pauline Publications Africa

Lange, J. (1872). *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

Mays, J. *et al.* (1988). *Harper's Bible Commentary,* San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Mwagore, D. (2002). *Land use in Kenya- the case of a land use policy*, Nairobi: Printfast Kenya Limited.

McIntosh, C. (Ed.). (2013). *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (4th Ed.)*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

McConville, G. *et al*. (Ed.). (2012) *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets (1st Ed)*, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.

McKenzie, S. *et al*. (Ed.). (2013). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation (2nd Ed.)*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Newsom, C. & Ringe, S. H. (Ed.). (1992). *The Women's Bible Commentary (1st Ed.)*, London: SPK.

Ochieng, W. R. (1995). *Decolonization and Independence in Kenya*, London: Ohio University Press.

Ogot, B.A. (Ed.). (1976). *Economic and Social history of East Africa: Proceedings of the 1972 conference of the historical association of Kenya (1st Ed.)*, Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau

Ogot, B.A. & Ochieng', W. (1995). *Decolonization and Independence in Kenya*, Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.

Pfeiffer, F. (Ed.). (1962), *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, Chicago: Moody Press.

Rad Von, G. (1962). *Old Testament Theology,* London: Harper & Row Publishers.

Rice, G. (1990). *1 Kings; Nations under God*, Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Robinson, J. (1976). *The First Book of Kings*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roehrs, W. (1976). *Concordia Self-study commentary*, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House.

Rukundwa, l. (2008). *Postcolonial theory as a hermeneutical tool for biblical reading.* University of Pretoria.

Snell, D. C. (2011). *Religions of the Ancient Near East*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stevenson, A. & Waite, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Concise Oxford English Dictionary (12th Ed.)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Selvidge, M. J. (1996). *Notorious Voices: Feminist Biblical Interpretation*, New York: Continuum.

Spence, D. (Ed.). (1897). *The Pulpit Commentary (1st Ed.)*, London: William Clowes and Sons, Limited.

Schmidt, Werner (1984). *Old Testament Introduction,* New York: The Crossroad publishing Company.

Soulen, R. & Soulen, K. (Ed.). (2001). *Handbook of Biblical Criticism (3rd Ed.),* London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Sorrenson, M. P. (1968). *Origins of European settlement in Kenya: Memoir number 2 of the British Institute of history and archaeology in East Africa,* New York: Oxford University Press

Sugirtharajah, S.R, (2001). *The Bible and the third world: Pre-colonial, Colonial and Postcolonial encounters,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sugirtharajah, S.R, (2006). Voices *from the Margin. Interpreting the Bible in the third world,* London: SPCK

Tarus, D. K. (2019). *A Different Way of Being: Towards a Reformed Theology of Ethnopolitical Cohesion for the Kenyan Context*, Cumbria: Langham Monographs.

Wallace, R. (1995). *Readings in 1 Kings,* Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Wasserman, G. (1976). *The politics of Decolonization: Kenya Europeans and the Land issue, 1960-1965,* London: Cambridge University Press.

Weinfeld, M. (1993). *The Promise of Land: Inheritance of Canaan by the Israelites,* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature,* London: Oxford University Press.

Wright, C. (1990). *God's people in God's Land; Family and Property in the Old Testament*, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

The Constitution of Kenya, 2010, Kenya: National Council for Law.

Journals

Brown, W. (1996). *The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics*, Vol. 16 (1996), pp. 283-293,

The Character of Covenant in the Old Testament: A Theocentric Probe, Available https://www.jstor.org/stable/23559720, Accessed: 21-04-2020 10:34 AM

Bruce, J. (2009). *Kenya Land Policy: Analysis and Recommendations,* Burlington-globalprotectioncluster.org

Dube, W.M, (2000). *Towards a Postcolonial feminist reading of the Bible.* Semeia 78, 11-25

Gregerman, A. (2014). CrossCurrents, Vol. 64, No. 3, (2014), PP 410-425, Comparative Christian Hermeneutical Approaches to the Land Promise to Abraham, Available https://www.jstor.org/stable/24461542, Accessed: 21-04-2020 10:36 AM

Heirs, R. (2020). *Journal of Law and Religion,* Vol. 10, No. 1 (1993-1994), pp. 121-155, Availability: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1051171, Accessed: 22-04-2020 3:40 PM

Kitz, A. (2000). *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 119, No. 4 (2000), pp. 601-618, The Society of Biblical Literature. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3268518, Accessed: 22-04-2020 10:29AM

Marchadour, A. & Neuhaus, D. (2007). *The Land, the Bible and History*, Fordham University Press, Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1x76fwt.7

Olson, D.T (1986). Biblical Perspective on the Land, Vol.1, No. 1, UK. Langham Publishing Co.

Punt, J. (2003), *Postcolonial Biblical Criticism in South Africa: Same mind and road mapping.* Scriptura, 37 (1)

Russell, S. (2018). *Hebrew Studies*, Vol. 59 (2018), pp. 111-118, The legal background of the theme of land in the book of Joshua. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26557789.

Weingreen, J. (1989), *Irish Jurist, new series*, Vol. 24, No.1 (1989), pp. 113-140, Concepts in Ancient Biblical civil and criminal law. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/44027732, Accessed: 22-04-2020 2:20 pm.

West, H.W. (1986). *Land Policy and Agriculture in Eastern and Southern Africa*, 1-22. The United Nations University, Tokyo.

Unpublished thesis

Gora, K. (2008). *Postcolonial readings of 1 Kings 21:1-29 within the context of the struggle for land in Zimbabwe: From colonialism to liberalism, to present* Thesis, http://10413/998 ,February 2019

Kithinji, J. (2014). *Addressing Impunity in Keya through a Postcolonial Reading of 'Authority' in Mark 1:21-28.* Kenyatta University (PhD Thesis).

Lewis A. E. (2007). *A Kenyan Revolution: Mau Mau, Land, Women, and Nation,* (Unpublished Maters of Arts Thesis: East Tennessee State University).

Mwaniki, L. (2001). *God's image or man's glory?: A Kenyan Postcolonial feminist reading of 1 Corinthians 11:1-16.* University of Kwazul Natal (PhD Thesis)

Internet sources

Bruce, J. (2009). *Kenya Land Policy: Analysis and Recommendations,* Burlington-globalprotectioncluster.org

Kaiser, W. (2012). *Ownership and Property in the Old Testament Economy,* https://tifwe.org.

Kanyinga, K. (1996). *Struggles of access to land: The land question, accumulation and changing political in Kenya.* University of Nairobi, Available: KanyingaAdsWorkigPage No. 504.

Klopp, J. (2013). *Journal of African today. Vol. 47. No. 1 (Winter, 2000), pp 7-26: Pilfering the public: the problem of land grabbing in contemporary Kenya.* Available: https://www.jstor.org/ stable/4187305, Accessed 19/04/2020 12:05pm.

Klopp, J. & Lumumba, O. (2014). *Beyond the Hype: A critical analysis of the Global 'Land Grab'*. London: Zed Press.

Leo, C. (1989). *Land and Class in Kenya,* Nehanda Publishers.

Medard, C. (1974). *Land and Conflict in Kenya's Rift Valley,* Nairobi: East African Publishing House.

O'brien, E. (2011). *Irregular and illegal land acquisition by Kenya's elites: Trends, processes and impacts of Kenya's land-grabbing phenomenon.*

Primoz, K. *et al.* (2018). *A short note of land laws in Kenya, mappingnobigdeal.com*/2018/11/30/a-short-note-on-of-land-laws-in-Kenya.

Snell, D. (1995). *A Companion to the ancient Near East,* Wiley Publishers Indexmundi.com/Kenya/demographic-profile.html

BBC. (2010). *Kenya MPs Held for Hate Speech in Constitution Campaign-* (https://www.bbc.com/news/10316297)

Magazine

Ruto, J. (September 10, 2015). Land grabbing, a Kenyan disease, The Kenyan Standard Magazine.

APPENDICES:

1.1 Appendix 1: The Tentative Budget for Data Collection

No	Particulars	Cost per Unit	Total
	Transport	20000	20000
150	Printing	300	45000
9	Photocopying	300	2700
Total			67,700

1.2 Appendix 2: Schedule

Months	Activities
January- February	Correction, Editing and Submission
March, April	Data Analysis
May	Final Dissertation Writing
July, August	Final Defense of the Dissertation Corrections and Editing of the Dissertation Printing and Binding of the Dissertation