INMRJ
International Nexus Multidisciplinary Research Journal
https://inmrj.org
Impact Factor: 5.0 - **Vol:** 4 **Issue:**1, 2026

THE PRINCIPLE OF OKPALA AND INHERITANCE IN IGBO TRADITIONAL SOCIETY: AUTHORITY, RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY PROPERTY

Rev. Fr. Dr. Vincent Azubuike Obidinnu
Nwafor Orizu College of Education Nsugbe, Anambra State

Abstract

Inheritance in Igbo traditional society is a legal, social, and cultural process through which property and responsibilities pass between generations. In a number of Igbo communities, the institution of Okpala—often associated with the first son or senior male descendant—has been connected with family leadership and the administration of inherited property. Yet the precise rights attached to this position vary by community, property type, and applicable law. This conceptual and doctrinal article examines the relationship between seniority, custodianship, ownership, and distributive justice in Igbo inheritance. Drawing on scholarship on Igbo property law, African communitarian philosophy, and Nigerian judicial authority, it argues that customary leadership should be evaluated in relation to its obligations and legal limits rather than seniority alone. The discussion also considers the constitutional implications of discriminatory succession practices, particularly in light of Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014). The article recommends context-specific interpretation of custom, transparent family-property administration, accessible legal education, and dispute-resolution processes that respect the rights of all beneficiaries. It concludes that culturally meaningful inheritance institutions can remain relevant when their operation is accountable, legally compliant, and attentive to human dignity.

Keywords: Okpala; Igbo inheritance; customary law; family property; primogeniture; social justice

1. Introduction

Inheritance is an important institution in many societies because it governs the transmission of property, status, obligations, and family identity across generations. In Igbo communities of southeastern Nigeria, inheritance may involve land, houses, personal possessions, and interests connected with the family's ancestral home. These assets can have economic value, but they may

also carry historical and social meanings: they can signify continuity with earlier generations and provide resources for the livelihood of descendants. An adequate analysis of inheritance therefore needs to attend to both property rights and the relationships through which those rights are understood and exercised.

The institution commonly described as Okpala or Diokpala is often associated with the first son or senior male descendant in a family. Historical accounts of Igbo property law discuss primogeniture and the special position sometimes accorded to the eldest son, including in relation to the deceased father's dwelling house (Obi, 1963). However, the word 'Okpala' should not be treated as a uniform legal category that has identical consequences in every Igbo community. Customary practices differ, and the rights connected with the first son's position may depend on the nature of the asset, the community's custom, the ownership arrangements made during the deceased's lifetime, and relevant legislation and judicial decisions.

The central question is whether the position of Okpala is best understood as an entitlement to exclusive ownership, a responsibility for administering certain property, or a combination of rights and duties that must be established in each context. Confusion between these possibilities can intensify family disputes. Where a person treats a customary leadership role as unrestricted authority over property in which other people have legal interests, disagreements may arise about occupation, use, leasing, sale, or distribution. Conversely, treating every first son as a mere custodian would also be inaccurate where the applicable custom or law recognises a proprietary interest.

Contemporary legal principles make the question especially significant. In Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014), the Supreme Court of Nigeria held unconstitutional an Igbo customary rule that excluded a female child from inheriting her deceased father's estate on the basis of sex. The judgment does not abolish every customary inheritance rule or determine every question about the Okpala institution. It does, however, demonstrate that a custom cannot prevail where it conflicts with constitutional protections. Edu (2016) similarly highlights the need to scrutinise customary inheritance rules that disadvantage female beneficiaries.

This article examines the Okpala institution through cultural, philosophical, ethical, and legal lenses. Its argument is that the institution's legitimacy should be assessed not by seniority alone, but by the purposes it serves, the responsibilities it imposes, and its compatibility with the rights of all beneficiaries. The article also considers the implications for education and policy, particularly the value of culturally informed legal literacy and transparent property administration.

2. Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed here concerns uncertainty about the scope of the Okpala's authority and its relationship to the rights of other family members. In some customary settings, the first son may have a recognised position in the family and may receive particular property or responsibilities. Yet popular accounts sometimes conflate family leadership, administration, custodianship, and ownership. These are distinct concepts. A right to represent a family in certain matters does not necessarily entail a right to dispose of all family assets; equally, a person's role as administrator does not by itself prove that the person has no beneficial interest.

The uncertainty has practical and ethical consequences. If the scope of authority is not clearly understood, family members may dispute who can occupy a house, cultivate land, collect rent, approve a sale, or represent the family in dealings with third parties. A second problem concerns the recognition of women and other beneficiaries. Some historical accounts of patrilineal inheritance describe restrictions on women's succession rights (Obi, 1962, 1963). Such descriptions must be read in their historical and local context, and any particular rule must be tested against contemporary law. Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014) makes clear that an exclusion based on the sex of a child cannot be sustained where it violates the Constitution.

A third problem is how to preserve the culturally valuable purposes of family inheritance without defending every historical practice. This article therefore asks how the Okpala institution may be understood and administered in a way that recognises custom, clarifies property interests, supports family continuity, and respects the legal rights of all beneficiaries.

3. Objectives and Research Questions

The main objective is to critically examine the Okpala institution in Igbo inheritance, with attention to authority, responsibility, and the distribution of family property. The specific objectives are to: (a) explain the cultural and philosophical significance of the institution; (b) distinguish seniority and family leadership from ownership and administration; (c) evaluate the institution in relation to distributive justice and the rights of beneficiaries; (d) consider the implications of relevant Nigerian legal principles; and (e) recommend practical approaches to accountable, lawful, and culturally informed inheritance administration.

The article is guided by five questions: What cultural and philosophical purposes are associated with the Okpala institution? How should the first son's role be distinguished from exclusive

ownership of inherited property? What ethical issues arise where family leadership affects the distribution or administration of assets? What limits does contemporary Nigerian law place on discriminatory customary rules? And how can education and policy support fair inheritance administration while respecting legitimate cultural diversity?

4. Methodology and Scope

The article adopts a conceptual and doctrinal approach. It interprets selected scholarship on Igbo property law and African philosophy alongside Nigerian judicial authority concerning customary inheritance and constitutional equality. It does not report interviews, surveys, or original field observations. Accordingly, it does not claim to establish how frequently a particular practice occurs or to describe every Igbo community. The analysis uses general descriptions only where supported by the literature and treats local variation as a necessary qualification.

The article's philosophical framework draws particularly on Menkiti's (1984) account of person and community and Gyekye's (1997) moderate communitarianism. These authors offer different perspectives and should not be treated as expressing one uniform African worldview. The legal discussion uses Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014) as a key authority and draws on scholarship concerning customary inheritance in Nigeria (Edu, 2016; Obi, 1962, 1963). The analysis distinguishes historical accounts of custom from the question of present legal enforceability.

5. Conceptual Clarification

5.1. Okpala

Okpala is commonly used in Igbo contexts to refer to the first son or senior male descendant, although terminology and social functions vary by community. The position may be associated with family representation, seniority, customary ceremonies, or responsibility for certain family matters. The specific property rights attached to the position cannot be inferred from the title alone. They must be established by reference to the relevant custom, the nature and ownership of the property, any valid will or inter vivos transfer, and applicable law.

5.2. Inheritance and succession

Inheritance refers to the transmission of property interests following a person's death. Succession rules determine who receives particular interests and how those interests are administered. The applicable rules may be affected by whether the deceased made a valid will, whether the property

was individually or jointly owned, the relevant state's legislation, and any valid customary rule that applies. It is therefore necessary to avoid treating all property associated with a family as though it were part of one undifferentiated estate.

5.3. Family property and individual property

Family property may be held for the benefit of multiple members or administered under customary arrangements that differ from individual ownership. Property personally owned by a deceased person may be subject to different succession rules. The legal character of a particular asset is therefore central to any inheritance dispute. A family's customary understanding of an asset is important evidence, but the applicable law and the circumstances of acquisition and ownership must also be considered.

5.4. Custodianship, administration, and ownership

Custodianship ordinarily refers to a responsibility to preserve or protect an asset; administration concerns the management of property or an estate; ownership involves legally recognised rights in property. These concepts can overlap, but they are not interchangeable. The article uses them as analytical distinctions rather than asserting that the Okpala is always a custodian or never an owner. Whether the first son has a beneficial share, a particular inheritance entitlement, an administrative function, or some combination of these depends on the relevant facts and applicable law.

6. The Cultural and Philosophical Significance of Okpala

6.1. Family continuity and ancestral heritage

Inheritance in Igbo society may carry meanings beyond the transfer of economic resources. Land and the ancestral home can connect a family with its history, its obligations to previous generations, and its hopes for descendants. A designated family representative can, in principle, help maintain records, coordinate collective decisions, and preserve assets that have shared significance. These potential functions help explain why seniority may be culturally meaningful.

However, cultural significance does not itself establish the legal scope of an office. An institution may serve a valuable purpose while particular claims made in its name remain open to scrutiny. The preservation of heritage is most defensible when it protects the interests of the family over time, rather than placing the interests of one individual above those of all others.

6.2. Communitarian philosophy and personhood

Menkiti (1984) emphasises the social and communal dimensions of personhood in African traditional thought. His account helps illuminate why duties to kin and community may be understood as integral to social life rather than as optional additions to individual identity. Applied to inheritance, this perspective draws attention to obligations that may accompany family authority: protecting shared assets, maintaining relationships, and acting with concern for the wider family.

Gyekye (1997), while also recognising the importance of community, argues for a moderate communitarian position that preserves the moral significance of individual agency. His account is particularly useful for analysing inheritance because it resists the idea that communal interests automatically erase individual claims. Family membership may create obligations, but it does not follow that every person's interests can be disregarded in the name of unity.

Read together, these perspectives support a balanced interpretation. The Okpala's role may be meaningful because it links authority with communal responsibility, but it should not be taken to justify arbitrary control or the exclusion of beneficiaries whose rights are recognised by law. Nor should communitarian philosophy be used as direct proof of a specific customary rule: philosophy provides tools for ethical interpretation, while the content of a community's custom requires appropriate legal and ethnographic evidence.

6.3. Authority as a responsibility

Authority is ethically stronger when it is exercised for a legitimate purpose and under conditions that allow its use to be questioned. Within family-property administration, responsibility may include preserving assets, explaining decisions, keeping appropriate records, and seeking agreement where the interests of multiple beneficiaries are affected. These are normative recommendations, not claims that every community has historically imposed identical duties on the Okpala.

A senior position should not be understood as an exemption from accountability. If the institution is intended to support family continuity, the person occupying it should be expected to act in ways that sustain trust. Decisions made without explanation can weaken family relationships even where the decision-maker believes that seniority grants authority. By contrast, transparent

communication can help reconcile customary leadership with contemporary expectations of fair administration.

7. The Okpala and the Administration of Inherited Property

7.1. Primogeniture and variation in customary practice

Historical literature on Igbo property law discusses primogeniture and the special position of the eldest son in some patrilineal communities. Obi (1963) provides a substantial early account of Igbo property law, while Obi (1962) specifically discusses women's property and succession in modern Ibo law. These works remain useful historical starting points, but their descriptions should be contextualised rather than treated as a complete statement of current law throughout Igboland.

Variation is important. Communities may differ in the rules governing land, the family home, movable property, and succession where there is no son. The legal consequences of customary practices may also have changed through legislation and judicial decisions. Therefore, any research or legal advice concerning a particular inheritance dispute should identify the relevant community, establish the applicable custom with evidence, and consider the property's ownership history and the governing legal framework.

7.2. The distinction between authority and ownership

The central conceptual issue is whether a position of family leadership necessarily entails exclusive ownership. It does not follow as a matter of logic that the person who represents a family owns all assets over which the family leader has influence. Nor does it follow that a first son can never receive a particular asset as his own inheritance. Both claims require evidence.

The sound analytical procedure is to ask separate questions: Who owned the property before the deceased's death? Was it family property or individually owned property? Was there a valid will, gift, settlement, or other transfer? What does the relevant customary rule provide? What statutory or constitutional provisions apply? Which beneficiaries have legally recognised interests? Separating these questions reduces the risk of turning a cultural title into an unsupported conclusion about property rights.

Where a family leader administers property for several beneficiaries, the role should be exercised consistently with the interests and rights recognised by the applicable law. If the first son has an individual proprietary entitlement, that entitlement should likewise be described accurately and

not confused with an unlimited right over every other asset. This distinction is particularly important in scholarly writing, where broad generalisations can misrepresent local custom.

7.3. Accountability and property records

Inheritance disputes may arise because families lack reliable information about title, boundaries, rental income, prior transfers, or agreements among relatives. Written records of family decisions, inventories of assets, and clear accounts of income and expenditure can help reduce uncertainty. Where appropriate, families can seek professional assistance to clarify title or document arrangements. Such measures should complement, not replace, the legal requirements applicable to the property.

Transparent procedures can also reduce the burden placed on family members who might otherwise be excluded from important information. When decisions are explained and records are available, it becomes easier to distinguish legitimate disagreement from misuse of authority. Accountability should not be presented as an alien idea imposed on tradition; it can be understood as a practical means of protecting family assets and relationships.

8. Gender, Inheritance, and Constitutional Rights

8.1. Historical exclusion and its limits

Some historical accounts of patrilineal Igbo inheritance describe rules that restricted women's access to certain categories of inherited property (Obi, 1962, 1963). Edu (2016) examines the broader problem of customary inheritance rules that disadvantage women and children in southern Nigeria. Such scholarship is important, but its findings should not be converted into a claim that every Igbo community applies the same rule. Local practices and the legal status of particular rules must be investigated separately.

The ethical concern is whether a beneficiary is excluded from property solely because of sex, despite a legal entitlement. Such exclusion can affect economic security, social standing, and the ability to participate fully in family life. The issue is therefore not only a debate about tradition but also one about equality, dignity, and lawful treatment.

8.2. Ukeje v. Ukeje and the constitutional framework

In Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014), the Supreme Court of Nigeria affirmed that an Igbo customary rule excluding a female child from inheriting her deceased father's estate was inconsistent with section

42 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999. The case concerned a daughter who sought to participate in the estate of her deceased father. The Court's decision is a key authority against sex-based exclusion from inheritance.

The significance of the decision should be stated precisely. It does not invalidate all Igbo customary inheritance practices, and it does not determine every question about the Okpala's rights or the division of every kind of property. It does establish that customary rules must comply with constitutional protections and that a discriminatory rule of the kind at issue cannot be enforced. A family leader cannot legitimately rely on such a rule to deny a female child a right protected by the Constitution.

The case also shows why it is important to distinguish customary description from legal validity. A practice may be reported as historically customary without remaining enforceable in its original form. Contemporary analysis must therefore consider both the evidence of custom and the superior legal norms that govern its application.

8.3. Equal dignity and culturally informed reform

Respect for equal dignity need not require the rejection of every culturally meaningful institution. Instead, it requires careful separation of valuable functions from discriminatory practices. Family leadership, preservation of the ancestral home, and intergenerational education can be retained where consistent with law and fairness. Exclusion of beneficiaries on a prohibited ground cannot be defended merely by describing it as traditional.

This approach is neither an uncritical defence of custom nor a blanket dismissal of cultural institutions. It asks whether a practice can be justified in its present legal and ethical context, and whether reform can preserve defensible communal values while protecting the rights of those affected.

9. Justice, Family Harmony, and Dispute Resolution

9.1. Fairness in distribution

Justice in inheritance includes recognition of valid claims, clarity about the applicable rules, and protection against arbitrary deprivation. It does not necessarily mean that every beneficiary must receive an identical share of every asset. Distribution may depend on the ownership of the property,

a valid will, the relevant succession law, and other legally material circumstances. The core requirement is that decisions be lawful and that beneficiaries' rights not be ignored.

Unclear or contested distributions can have consequences beyond the immediate economic loss. They may damage sibling relationships, intensify conflict between nuclear and extended family members, and encourage prolonged litigation. A process that identifies the assets, explains the applicable rules, and allows legitimate claims to be heard is more likely to support durable family relationships.

9.2. Communal welfare and individual rights

Gyekye's (1997) moderate communitarianism helps explain why family unity should not be purchased by silencing an individual member's legitimate claim. The community and the individual are not necessarily enemies. A family may preserve shared identity while recognising that different members possess legally protected interests. Where a family leader acts impartially, the institution can support collective welfare; where authority is used to exclude others without lawful justification, it may undermine the very unity it is supposed to protect.

9.3. Traditional mediation and access to courts

Family meetings and community-based mediation can be useful for clarifying misunderstandings and resolving disputes before they escalate. Such processes may be especially valuable where the parties wish to preserve relationships. However, mediation must be fair and voluntary where required, and it must not coerce a vulnerable beneficiary into surrendering legal rights. Nor should it prevent a party from seeking a judicial remedy where that is appropriate.

The choice of dispute-resolution process should depend on the nature of the dispute, the interests involved, and applicable law. Questions about title, estate administration, validity of a will, or constitutional rights may require legal advice or court determination. Traditional processes can contribute to reconciliation, but they should operate within the legal framework.

10. Educational and Policy Implications

10.1. Cultural education without romanticisation

Educational institutions can help learners understand the historical significance of customary inheritance while encouraging critical evaluation of its contemporary operation. Teaching should

distinguish between describing a practice, explaining its cultural meaning, evaluating its ethical consequences, and determining whether it is legally enforceable. This distinction reduces the risk of presenting custom as either beyond criticism or inherently unjust.

10.2. Legal literacy and civic education

Accessible legal education can help families understand succession rules, property records, constitutional equality, and available remedies. The discussion of Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014) can be used to show how constitutional law interacts with customary practices. Such education should avoid offering generic advice as a substitute for legal advice in a particular dispute; the applicable state law and facts may be decisive.

10.3. Community-based awareness and policy

Community organisations, legal-aid providers, educational institutions, and traditional leaders can cooperate in providing accurate information about inheritance. Awareness initiatives should acknowledge local variation and avoid assuming that one rule describes every Igbo community. They should encourage families to document assets and decisions, include relevant beneficiaries in discussions, and seek appropriate professional advice where ownership is uncertain.

Policy development should protect constitutional rights while recognising the role of customary institutions in social life. A useful approach combines culturally informed dialogue, legal literacy, accessible dispute-resolution options, and consistent protection against unlawful discrimination. The aim is not to impose uniform cultural practices but to ensure that all practices operate within applicable legal standards.

11. Discussion

The analysis identifies three connected dimensions of the Okpala institution: cultural meaning, the distribution of property rights, and the legal limits of customary authority. Cultural accounts help explain why seniority and family representation may be important. Property law requires a more specific inquiry into the character of each asset and the interests attached to it. Constitutional law establishes that customary practices cannot be enforced where they conflict with protected rights.

African communitarian philosophy offers a way to understand why family leadership may involve obligations to the wider group. Menkiti (1984) highlights the social dimension of personhood, while Gyekye (1997) recognises both communal relations and individual agency. These

perspectives do not themselves settle the legal status of a customary rule, but they provide ethical resources for asking whether authority is exercised for the common good and whether individuals are treated as persons with legitimate interests.

The distinction between custodianship and ownership remains central. It would be too broad to assert that every Okpala is merely a custodian; it would be equally broad to claim that every first son exclusively owns all property associated with the deceased. A sound analysis requires evidence about the particular custom and property, along with attention to statutes, constitutional provisions, and judicial decisions. The legal and ethical analysis should proceed together without confusing one for the other.

Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014) demonstrates the practical importance of this method. The case does not abolish customary law as a whole. It establishes that a discriminatory rule excluding a female child from inheritance cannot override the Constitution. The broader lesson is that cultural continuity and legal reform need not be treated as mutually exclusive. Defensible practices can be preserved, while rules that violate constitutional protections must be changed or not enforced.

For educational and policy purposes, the implication is that cultural knowledge should be paired with legal literacy and critical thinking. Communities can preserve family history and customary leadership while using clear records, inclusive communication, and fair procedures. These practices can reduce conflict and strengthen trust without assuming that every family must organise property in exactly the same way.

12. Recommendations

12.1. Establish the applicable custom before making broad claims

Researchers, families, and practitioners should identify the specific community and establish the relevant customary rule before drawing conclusions about the Okpala's rights. Historical literature is valuable, but local evidence and contemporary law should be considered.

12.2. Distinguish leadership from proprietary rights

The first son's role as family representative or leader should not automatically be equated with unrestricted ownership. Equally, any individual entitlement should be recognised where supported by the applicable custom and law. The nature of the property and the legal interests of all beneficiaries should be clearly identified.

12.3. Promote transparent administration

Families should, where appropriate, maintain inventories of assets, document significant decisions, keep records of income and expenditure, and communicate decisions to affected beneficiaries. Such practices can reduce uncertainty and make it easier to resolve disputes.

12.4. Protect constitutionally recognised rights

Customary practices should be applied consistently with the Constitution and relevant legislation. The principle in Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014) should be reflected in legal literacy initiatives and in the treatment of female children's inheritance claims.

12.5. Support fair and accessible dispute resolution

Family mediation and traditional dispute-resolution processes may be encouraged where suitable, but they should be fair and should not prevent access to legal remedies. Parties should be able to seek appropriate legal advice where rights, title, or estate administration are disputed.

12.6. Integrate cultural and legal education

Schools, universities, community groups, and legal-aid providers should develop educational materials that explain the cultural context of inheritance alongside contemporary legal protections. Teaching should encourage informed evaluation rather than either romanticising or dismissing customary institutions.

12.7. Conduct community-specific empirical research

Future researchers should use interviews, document analysis, and case studies to investigate how the Okpala institution operates in selected communities. Research should include diverse perspectives, including those of first sons, younger sons, daughters, widows, elders, traditional leaders, and legal practitioners. Findings should be reported with clear limits and should not be generalised beyond the evidence.

13. Limitations and Further Research

Because this article is conceptual and doctrinal, it does not measure the prevalence of particular inheritance practices or determine how families in different communities interpret the Okpala role. The sources discussed include foundational scholarship that may reflect historical legal and social

conditions. Further research should assess the continuing relevance of these descriptions in specific communities and examine how legislation and judicial decisions have affected customary practice.

A community-based study could compare selected Igbo localities and ask how the first son's position is understood in relation to the ancestral home, agricultural land, movable property, and the estate of a deceased parent. Interviews and document analysis could explore how families settle disputes, how women and younger family members experience inheritance decisions, and what role legal education plays. Such research should secure appropriate ethical approval where required and report participants' views accurately.

Comparative research could also examine the relationship between customary leadership and property administration in other Nigerian communities, while avoiding the assumption that similar titles have identical legal meanings. These studies could clarify which elements of the Okpala institution are locally specific and which ethical questions recur across inheritance systems.

14. Conclusion

The Okpala institution is an important subject for understanding the relationship between inheritance, family leadership, and cultural continuity in Igbo traditional society. In some communities, the first son or senior male descendant occupies a recognised position in family affairs and may have particular responsibilities or entitlements concerning inherited property. The precise content of those rights, however, varies and must be established by reference to the relevant custom, the nature of the property, and applicable law.

The central argument of this article is that seniority, custodianship, administration, and ownership should not be treated as interchangeable concepts. Neither the claim that every Okpala exclusively owns family property nor the claim that every Okpala is merely a custodian can be accepted without evidence. A sound analysis must distinguish cultural description, ethical evaluation, and legal determination.

African communitarian philosophy helps explain the importance of social relationships and collective responsibility, while moderate communitarian thought highlights the continuing moral significance of individual agency. These perspectives support an account of family leadership that is responsible and attentive to the rights of beneficiaries. Nigerian constitutional law also establishes limits on customary practices, as demonstrated by Ukeje v. Ukeje (2014), which invalidated a sex-discriminatory rule excluding a female child from her father's estate.

The institution's contemporary relevance therefore depends on its ability to support family welfare, preserve cultural heritage, and operate consistently with the law. Transparent administration, community-specific interpretation of custom, inclusive communication, and accessible legal education can help preserve defensible cultural values while addressing practices that undermine justice and human dignity. The aim should be neither uncritical preservation nor indiscriminate rejection of tradition, but a careful and evidence-based approach to cultural continuity, responsibility, and lawful inheritance.

Conflict of Interest

The author should disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest in accordance with the journal's current requirements. If there is none, the author may state: "The author declares no conflict of interest."

References

Edu, O. K. (2016). A critical analysis of the laws of inheritance in the southern states of Nigeria. Journal of African Law, 60(1), 141–155. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855315000133

Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1999). Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended).

Gyekye, K. (1997). Tradition and modernity: Philosophical reflections on the African experience. Oxford University Press.

Menkiti, I. A. (1984). Person and community in African traditional thought. In R. A. Wright (Ed.), African philosophy: An introduction (3rd ed., pp. 171–181). University Press of America.

Obi, S. N. C. (1962). Women's property and succession thereto in modern Ibo law (Eastern Nigeria). Journal of African Law, 6(1), 6–18. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855300004137

Obi, S. N. C. (1963). The Ibo law of property. Butterworths.

Ukeje v. Ukeje, (2014) 11 NWLR (Pt. 1418) 384 (Supreme Court of Nigeria).