
The New Verdict: Deconstructionist Reading of Ola Rotimi's *The Gods are Not to Blame*

Taiwo A. Stanley Osanyemi

Department of English Studies, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

taistanley@yahoo.com / taiaustin2020@gmail.com

Abstract

There is an avalanche of hermeneutic interpretations of a literary text as postulated by deconstructionists and postmodernists, this has paved way in this study for the new evaluation of Ola Rotimi canonical text, The Gods Are not to Blame whose previous critical analysis has prologuized the overwhelming and inevitable influences of the gods in the affairs of the mortals. In spite of the over reliance on the supernatural tendencies of the gods in human affairs orchestrated by the extant scholarly views on the text, this paper depicts that the actions of the gods are inconsequential to the affairs of humans. Inspirations are drawn from Roland Barthe's model of Deconstruction as an offshoot of literary Poststructuralism. The essence of Deconstruction is to investigate the weaknesses of the gods and prioritize the strengths of the protagonist in the text; it is also used to privilege human struggles above the mere predictions of the gods. The primary text is subjected to critical textual analysis, our research instrument is the library both the conventional and the internet. It is discovered that the gods are not all-knowing as claimed in the text. It is significantly discovered that the gods are weak and wantonly avaricious in their interventions in human affairs. It is notably found out that the author writes in Aristotle's convention of tragedy where the gods abrogate supremacy over the humans to create pathos and catharsis in order to portray man as a mere toy in their hands. Succinctly, deconstructing the text avails the depiction of a new verdict that incriminates the gods as against the old verdict that exonerates the gods in human tragic fate.

Keywords— *Verdict, deconstruction, supernatural beings, humans, fate.*

Introduction

The deconstructionist's axiom, 'how we see is what we see' (Barry, 2002) informs the crux of this paper. It scholarly points out the analytical approach that will critically undergird the area of concern of this study. It is the view or perhaps the belief of deconstructionists like Jacques Derrida and Roland Barthes that there is an assertion of the independence of the literary text and its immunity to the possibility of being unified or limited by any notion of what the author might have intended or crafted into the work (Barry, 42). This deconstructive view has provided the scholarship leeway to the reading of our primary text, Ola Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame*. It can be adjudged that the author's verdict or preoccupation in the text is that the gods are endowed with an indisputable power, are superhuman and capable of twisting the destinies of human beings for the sake of their avaricious demands. This is the thematic centre the text

conveys to millions of its readers. With the deconstructionist's idea of decentralization of the mind of the authors as espoused by Roland Barthes in his essay "The Death of the Author", this verdict can be challenged, thus, a corollary of the author is the birth of the reader (Barthes, 56).

It is pertinent to know that a deconstructive reading must always aim at a certain relationship, unperceived by the writer, between what he commands and what he does not command. It attempts to make the not-seen accessible to sight (Barry, 46). This portends that a reader or audience can be anti-author in his or her view about a particular text. This is further buttressed by Cuddon:

A text can be read as saying something quite different from what it appears to be saying ... it may be read as carrying a plurality of significance or as saying many different things which are

fundamentally at variance with, contradictory to and subversive of what may be seen by criticism as a single “stable” meaning. Thus a text may ‘betray’ itself (52).

A deconstructive reading however does not stand to condemn the author or the text but attempts to expose what might be thought of as the “textual subconscious”, where meanings are expressed which may be directly contrary to the surface meaning (Barry, 47). It is succinct to assert that deconstructionist provides an avalanche of hermeneutic tendencies that are intrinsically inherent in a text, it also stimulates the avant-garde outlooks to a particular text that has been established or adjudged to conform to a particular writing convention or tradition. Literary deconstruction usually peeps up texts by improvising various critical and analytical interpretations within and outside the texts.

The major thrust of this study is an attempt to deconstruct Rotimi’s *The Gods Are Not to Blame* and decentralize the popular conceived verdict of the inevitability of the wishes of the gods on human affairs. It will be lustrous and imperative to critically examine some previous scholarly engagements on the text. Conradie (1994) sees the text from creation of myth perspective. He categorizes the playwright as a creative giant who wants the literary world to appreciate the myths surrounding the prowess of the gods and goddesses in his society. He eulogizes Ola Rotimi for the astute adaptation of Sophocle’s *Oedipus Rex* but he emphasizes the externalization of his grown culture and belief in the mythology of gods like Sango (the god of thunder and revenge), Obatala (the god of creation and fertility) and Ogun (the god of iron and war) for the literary world to behold and commend. This view is apt because it is made manifest in the title of the text as it extols the seemingly inevitable deeds of the gods. Conradie’s view portrays the playwright as cultural nationalist and maker of myths.

Adeyeye (2000) in an article, “Sociolinguistic, Aesthetic and Functionalization in African Literature”: A Case Study of *The Gods Are Not to Blame*” depicts the sacred connection between the ancestors and the descendants or offspring in African culture and society. He asserts that the unalloyed controls of the ancestors over the offspring through the mediation and intermediary of the gods are the seasons that spice up the survival of the society. The society often disdains and condemns any aberration or act of disobedience to the dictates and commands of the ancestors. This view is almost similar to Conradie’s view except in the area of myth making. Adeyeye appears plausible in his view; nonetheless, it fails to address culpable and physical realities. Though, it may be difficult

to detach the strong affinity that Africans have with gods and their daily existence and lives, yet it remains an edifice of surrealism.

Okafor (2009) bases his critical view on the strengths and weaknesses of Odewale, the hero of the play. He sees his strengths as admirable and imitable qualities of man that is endowed with greatness. However, he sees pride as the innate weakness that paralysed or truncated his endowed greatness. He remarks:

The ultimate lesson of this tragedy is that even we readers can easily fall into Odewale’s error. His tragedy was not only that he suffered the improbabilities of murdering his father and marrying his mother – though both are serious mistakes; the tragedy was that having murdered his father and married his mother, he made the fully responsible mistake of finding it out. He was an upright and self-confident man, but proud; and the gods punished him for that (374).

This view is tenable, however the tragedy could have been averted or perhaps milder if not that the gods deliberately want it so.

Moreover, Oladele and Eke-Opara (2015) work on the ethnography of communication of the text. They discover that the frequency of the acts, actions and interactions in the play suggests that it is not only dramatic but also informative with a preponderant melancholic mood, thereby attesting to the tragic and thematic preoccupation of the text (22). This view appears fascinating but its melancholy and tragedy are deliberately purported by the gods. In congruence with Oladele and Eke-Opara, Apuke (2016) adduces the cause of the tragedy in the play to mistaken identity, ignorance and price of disobedience. Apuke may be right but it is succinctly glaring that the gods want it so and that the playwright artistically wants to elevate the magnitude of the gods’ power, control and influence above human and realities, this is part of the thrust of this study - interrogating the authority of the gods and exposing their weaknesses that are inherent in the play.

The playwright has succeeded in producing a cultural play suitable for his people and tribe. Oguntuase (2020) opines that in spite of the fact that the play is an adaptation of Sophocle’s play, the playwright has achieved culturally and artistically to show that there are echoes and reverberations of the events leading to the actions in old Greece from where Sophocle sourced his material and facsimile events in the Yoruba world of Ola Rotimi, the

playwright (13). Another interesting critical work on the text focuses on the conversational strategies. The study embraces the manner of the conversation and interactions among the chief characters, the use of proverbs, anecdotes, beating of the drums and songs (Jegede and Adesina). They argue further that the sonorous and symphonic use of sound and embroidered language in the text ought to have synergized a mild tragedy unlike what showcases at the end of the play. In tandem with Jegede and Adesina, Odeunmi highlights the pragmatic use of proverbs as an accoutrement of the tragic nature of the text.

From the review of the extant scholarly engagements above, it appears obvious that the playwright aesthetically profiles and explicates the activities and involvements of the gods above human characters in order to project the cultural belief of his society. The premium projection of the gods may justify the author's verdict that the gods are not to blame. However, in the new verdict, the critical lacuna this study attempts to address, there is no exoneration of the gods through critical interrogation of the actions and activities of the gods. This is done to lay glare the literary writing tradition the playwright employs that significantly supports or stimulates the supremacy of the gods. This study will be influenced by Roland Barthes' model of literary deconstruction as the theoretical framework, the essence of this theory is to expose the internal warring forces of signification within the text and it will also undergird our analysis.

Before textual engagement, it will be expedient to situate the text or to have a glimpse of its synopsis. The play begins with the birth of a prince, Odewale to King Adetusa and Queen Ojuola of Kutuje land. As custom demands, the destiny of the boy must be known, the gods through their mouthpiece, Baba Fakunle, the seer predict that the boy will kill his father and marry his mother. The future must not happen; therefore he becomes a sacrifice for the gods. The king's guard that is ordered to kill him has pity on him and leaves him at the evil forest where a hunter whose wife is barren from a neighboring town, Ijekun Yemoja picks the boy and subsequently becomes his foster father. He grows up happily with his foster parent until a brother of his foster parent calls him a bastard. In a bid to know who is, an elderly man tells him the wishes of the gods that he will kill his father and marry his mother. He leaves Ijekun Yemoja unannounced to avert the prediction of the gods, thinking the hunter and his wife are his biological parents. He settles in another town and becomes a successful farmer. On one fateful day he meets a stranger who claims to be the owner of the farmland, he accidentally kills the stranger. Unknowingly to him, the stranger is his biological father, and this brings the fulfillment of the first prediction of the gods. He becomes a fugitive and a

wanderer, he gets to Kutuje land and champions the war against her attackers and he prevails, in appreciation of this great feat, they make him king without consulting the tradition. As a new king, he must inherit all the properties of the late king including his wife, Queen Ojuola and this brings the fulfillment of the second prediction of the gods.

The foregoing, in brief, is the phantom machination and involvement of the gods in the affairs of men Rotimi explored in the play. It is important, however, to examine areas where the play should not exonerate or applaud the gods on its unpalatably harsh tragic nature and the need to examine the literary condition or tradition that propels the playwright to escalate the utility or functionality of the gods aesthetically. The argument is that the gods should not rejoice and claim the sole responsibility of the tragedy in the text. The first point to be considered is the gods and custom of Kutuje land. In Kutje land, it is customary that the gods should make known the destiny or future of a new born child because of the firm belief that the gods are "all-knowing". This is expressed in the prologue of the play:

Then they call

a Priest of Ifa

as is the custom

to divine

the future that this boy

has brought

with him (2)

This custom extremely upholds the supremacy of the gods over the affairs of the living. It shows that the gods are authoritarian and nobody dares to question their injunctions and dictates. In an ideal situation, an unpleasant prediction or revelation from a superior being like the gods in the text should be discharged with extreme caution, it can even tarry a bit for possible appeasement or propiation, but in the text, *The Gods Are Not to Blame*, the gods are hasty to announce the future of the innocent baby Odewale. Similarly, the gods hastily pronounce the killing of the innocent Odewale in order not to fulfill the bad destiny. Failure to give room for possible appeasement or atonement by the gods and their agents depicts the gruesome cruelty, callousness and unscrupulous dictatorship on the part of the gods. From this scenario, the major interest of the gods is to kill for the gratification of their avarices:

The bad future must not happen
the only way to stop it
is to kill
kill the unlucky messenger
of the gods,
kill the boy (3)

It is apparently obvious that from the opening of the play, the gods appear melancholic and blood-thirsty. The idea of consulting the supernatural about the future is culturally normal but the custodians or representatives of the supernatural or even the gods should be cautious and avoid hasty delivery of unpleasant messages. The Priest, and by extension, the gods in the text fail to embrace caution, the Priest arrogantly pronounces that the boy will kill his father and then marry his mother and the only remedy is to instantly kill the innocent child. This is deliberately done by the gods to instill fear into the hearts of the boy's parent and entire people of Kutuje land. It is arguable that if the message is delivered in a subtle or mild manner, there could be an overt remedy or alternative which the gods seem to abhor. To kill an infant because of the gods' wishes can be appeased.

Axiomatically, a desperate condition requires desperate attention or action. If it is actually the will of the gods that Odewale must be instantly killed to avert the impending tragedy or a cultural taboo, the gods would not have chosen a character like Gbonka to execute the killing. The playwright artistically creates a feeble, coward and sympathetic Gbonka for reasons, perhaps to relieve the tragic wheel of the play and also to delay the harsh will of the gods. Interestingly, Gbonka cannot withstand the sight of shedding blood, so he has pity on him by leaving him untouched by the death in the evil forest. This is not a win for the 'all-knowing' gods! The gods should have known the behavioral attitudes of Gbonka who is saddled or commissioned to kill Odewale, they should have chosen a bolder character, a stooge that will dance instantly to their whims and caprices. If this might have been done the harsh tragic end would have been lessened if not averted. Surprisingly, Odewale, the tragic hero questions Gbonka, and by extension the gods at the climax of the revelation that incriminates him of committing patricide and incest in the excerpt below:

ODEWALE: *[matchet raised]* Old One,
you provoke me with your delays!
GBONKA : *[subdued]* Pray have

mercy, I meant you no wrong, I only tried to
spare your
life, my lord, I meant no harm. They ordered me
to kill you in the
bush, but I took pity and gave ... (18)

The delay in the killing by Gbonka is orchestrated by the gods and it is to show that their decision cannot be thwarted by man's effort.

In addition, the gods are contradictory and inconsistent. At infancy when Odewale is fully innocent of the intrigues and hullabalos of the world, the gods appear to show their inevitable control and influence over man's activities as they honour the societal invitation or summon:

It is their first baby

so they bring him for blessing

to the shrine of Ogun

the God of

War, of Iron (2)

It can be said of the gods in the text that they are very tactical, they often attack their victim when the victim is either unconscious or subconscious of prevailing circumstance. When Odewale is doubtful of who he is or his real parent at Ijekun Yemoja, the gods surface to re-echo their wanton prediction of many years ago, "you cannot run away from it, the gods have willed that you will kill your father, and then marry your mother!" (60). The gods are self-centred here. It is noteworthy that the protagonist, Odewale is yet to accustom to the struggles of life at Ijekun, so, he is naïve to the intrigues that perpetrate the world. If he is matured mentally and emotionally, he would have known the different categories of people that inhabit the world where there are pokenosers, gossips, busy bodies, etc. so he might have ignored the brother that calls him "the butterfly thinks himself a bird" (59) and continued his life there. The gods sees his immaturity at his foster parent's as a weakness and they utilize it for their selfish purpose.

In the playwright's Yoruba culture and belief, a king hardly leaves his domain without a due consultation of the oracle or gods that they believe to be their guardian and guiding spirit of their kings. It is flabbergasting that King Adetusa leaves his kingdom for his mother land without consulting the gods. if he has consulted the gods or oracle of the gods, the danger ahead might be revealed to him and his untimely death might have been averted. From the journey, he meets cold murder from his own blood and the gods rejoice that their first prediction has come to pass at the detriment of Odewale who is unconsciously used as a

prey in the hands of self-centred gods. The silence from the gods or non-involvement of the course is quite unusual and it is for a purpose because they (the gods) detest to see any human impediment standing against their wishes. This unfathomable scenario contradicts the attribute of “all-knowing” of the gods. It can also be deduced that the gods are feeble-minded as they often attack their victims at the time of triviality and weakness. It is observable that the gods are inactive whenever their victim is mentally and physically alerted or strengthened, the gods intervened in his (Odewale) affairs as an infant to define his destiny, as a little boy in Ijekun Yemoja to remind him of his bad future but the gods are nowhere when he is a successful farmer and is even imminent that trouble is lurking. When Odewale eventually commits patricide and incest, the gods appear as agents of vengeance.

It succinctly glaring that whenever the gods are inactive, the protagonist progresses. Through his strength, he owns a farm, through his strength, he champions a noble and gallant expedition in Kutuje by dealing militarily and ruthlessly with Ikolu attackers. The unusual strength of Odewale earns him, a stranger great repute as he becomes the most suitable for the position of a king. He (Odewale) narrates the event:

We attacked the people of Ikolu
freed our people,
seized the lands of Ikolu ...

Ikolu is no more,
but Kutuje prospered

In their joy
the people
made me

KING
me, of Ijekun tribe.

They broke tradition and made
me
unasked,
King of Kutuje (6-7).

It is highly saddening that when the new king, Odewale is to be enthroned, the most crucial and critical time the custom or tradition should be judiciously observed and the

consultation of the gods should be sacrosanct that the gods and custom disappear. The gods deliberately do this in cowardice because they know if the custom is not broken their selfish aim will never come to fruition. Odewale may end up to be an influential chief but not the king, this would have prevented the fulfillment of the second prediction – marrying his own mother.

The playwright has aesthetically adapted Sophocle’s *Oedipus Rex* in the play. The old Greek tradition and myth has been artistically transplanted to African culture, especially Yoruba culture that has the similitude of a firm belief in the unpreventable powers and controls of the gods in the affairs of mortals. The gods are considered immortal and once they speak, it cannot be altered (Tobalase, 2017). In the text, the gods have given their verdict that Odewale will kill his father and then marry his mother. They (the gods) make the audience to feel that the only remedy is to kill the boy. The attempts and situations surrounding the delay in killing Odewale eventually metamorphose to an unpalatably deep and perhaps bloody tragedy. It is the view of this study that the wishes of the gods may not be prevented or altered but it can take a new dimension that will reduce the harsh tragic nature of the play. The new dimension of tragedy that will also soften and make mild the tragic elements of the play will artistically materialized.

It is a matter of uttermost tragedy to kill ones father, either the killing is physical or psychological, The gods have destined that the protagonist will commit patricide and incest with his mother, this verdict appears to be irrevocable. However, under close surveillance and control of his anger and temperament, the killing may not be physical and as such the tragic nature of the play will be drastically minimized. It is a popular belief that it is only a bully and a child with unusual unruly tendencies that often gives the parent both physical and psychological trauma and unrest. If later in life, Odewale’s character is found to be unruly or perhaps he becomes a truant, then it can slowly and mentally affect his father, King Adetusa. When King Adetusa will be grossly distressed by the perpetual stubbornness and devastating rascality of his son, Odewale, it may result in health hazard that may eventually snowball to critical ailment and untimely death. In a suggested scenario above, the manifestation of the first prediction would have come to pass in a milder way than the physical killing of ones father because this scenario can be adjudged that Odewale has killed his father.

Another possible mental or psychological scenario that can cause the killing of Odewale’s father and produce mild tragedy from the text can be tagged indirect or influential

death. This may surface when there is a sudden announcement or message of a sad news that intimately concerns the hearer, and the sad news instantly or eventually occasions the death of the hearer. This can also work out in the text. Assuming the parent of Odewale ignores the prediction of the gods and declines the suggestion of killing their first male child by rearing him with utmost care and caution, Odewale might be a good man. If he becomes uncontrollable behaviorally and peradventure he becomes a victim of a melancholic act outside the palace and by the time the sad news gets to the father, the father becomes unconscious and dies. Then, it can be said that he has killed the father. This type of indirect patricide is ubiquitous in human society. It even happens in the Bible. Eli, the prophet has two unruly sons, Hophni and Phinehas who died on the same day in a war, when the news of their death reaches their father, he slumps and dies instantly (I Samuel 4:11-13). Unlike what the gods perpetrate in the text, if the playwright has chosen the plot structure similar to Eli and his sons in the Bible, the tragic nature of the text would have been lessened.

Furthermore, marrying one's mother is an incestuous act that is abominable in every clime. It is a great taboo in Africa, especially among Yoruba people and heavy penalty awaits any one guilty of it. Any incestuous offence requires exorbitant appeasement or atonement and cleansing of the land, so that the wrath of the ancestors or gods will not be incurred. It is possible that Odewale may not directly marry his mother as the gods predicted. After the untimely demise of his father, King Adetusa, he (Odewale) may vehemently revolt against the idea of his mother to be remarried to any man. He may violently attack any suitor or man he finds around his mother at the utmost chagrin of the mother and neighbours. If this persists, it will become a popular gossip around the town that Odewale has married his wife. To a very large extent, this is a tragedy that might have settled the second prediction of the gods. The knotty hullabaloo of bedsharing and invitation of a seer to pinpoint killer of the king would have been put to rest, if the course of the tragedy is crafted in a subtle manner. However, a certain writing tradition might have informed the pattern of tragedy that Ola Rotimi chooses.

Under close examination of Rotimi's stylization of the text, it is germane that he aesthetically produces his own version of Sophocle's *Oedipus Rex* with heavy reliance on Aristotle and Elizabethan Drama's conception of tragedy. The playwright's dramaturgy is in conformity with Aristotle's convention on tragic plays and Shakespearean characteristics of a tragic hero. According to Barry (2002), writers write in line a particular structure or tradition, items or resource materials that will artistically turn to

literary texts are structuralized or they are contextualized by structure (31). Bearing Barry in mind, it is observed that in Aristotle's *Poetics* famous definitions of tragedy are offered but Rotimi fraternizes, explores and employs 'reader-centred' concept. Reader-centredness refers to how tragedy affects the audience. Aristotle believes tragedy should stimulate emotion, pity and fear. Aristotle calls the idea of purgation of emotion, pity and fear 'catharsis' (Baldick, 2001). The emphatic emotions that greeted the untimely death of King Adetusa in the hands of his own son are accentuated by the employment of Aristotle's catharsis as an essential part of tragedy. If the killing of King Adetusa is not directly physical, the catharsis may not be utilized prominently and this may negate the writing tradition Rotimi is showcasing to his audience.

Similarly, the rise and fall of King Odewale epitomizes the replica of Aristotle's catharsis. Seeing a man that rises from nowhere to an enviable position of a king in spite of opposing tendencies, must definitely invoke heavy doses of pity and empathy. The playwright's feeling may be that without the presentation of the gods as "all-knowing" and superhuman, the tragic end of his fictional hero may not conform with Aristotle's concept of tragedy and the adaptive expedition of Sophocle's play will become a placebo. With the use of Aristotle's concept of tragedy, the protagonist or hero, Odewale has no option other than to acknowledge the workings and effects of the inevitable influence and control of the gods over his strengths and weaknesses. This is what Aristotle's and Shakespearean tragedies attempt to achieve and Rotimi uses that as a dramatic instrument. The last conversation between Odewale and Aderopo confirms the state of helplessness of man in the hands of the supernatural which is the playwright's preoccupation as he toes the line of Aristotle notion of tragic plays:

ODEWALE: Did I hear the voice of my brother Aderopo?

ADEROPO: [prostrating himself] Your ... Highness

ODEWALE: My brother, I have done you much wrong with my grave suspicions!

ADEROPO: Is nothing your highness... It is the way the gods meant it to happen

ODEWALE: No, No! Do not blame the Gods. Let no one blame the powers. My people, learn from my fall. The powers would have failed if I did not let them use me

(70-71).

It is suffice to say from the above that the powers of the gods would have failed if the playwright does not project

the gods and their activities in conformity with Aristotle's catharsis as an integral part of the text, *The Gods Are Not to Blame*.

In a similar vein, Rotimi pitches his dramatic idiosyncrasy with Shakespearean / Elizabethan Drama's notion of who is to be a tragic hero. Shakespeare often presents a tragic hero of a noble birth such as a prince, king, war lord, governor, etc. This can be found in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV* and others. To Aristotle and Shakespeare, nobility is a key factor in determining a tragic hero. It is from this background that Rotimi aesthetically creates the text, in the text Odewale is presented as a prince and king, his tragedy preaches a great lesson to leaders and the led, as Aristotle and Elizabethan dramatists believe that the tragic fall of a great man provides more didactic instructions than that of an ordinary man.

Conclusion

In spite of the emphasis on catharsis and nobility as distinguishing attributes of a tragic hero, Rotimi can as well produce a tragedy with fewer molecules of Aristotle's catharsis and without the elevated applause of the gods. The deconstructive stance on *The Gods Are Not to Blame* is that the over prioritization the gods enjoy is a product of the writing convention or tradition the playwright adopts. If the same dramatic materials or resources are placed on the hands of Arthur Miller who authors the play, *The Death of a Sales Man* and whose works always embrace individualism unlike the nobility of Aristotle and Shakespeare, it is certain that a contrary tragedy that is mild and less empathic will emerge.

It is of an immense benefit to consider the emergent interpretations and literary approaches that can emanate from deconstructive analysis of Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame*. A feminist critic will condemn how the gods treat and disgrace the womanhood and motherhood of Queen Ojuola, a well-respected mother and wife who is later condemned as a result of the selfish involvement of the gods. A moralist stands to interrogate the feebleness and gullibility of King Adetusa and Queen Ojuola for their instant acceptance of the wishes of the gods on their first male child. Similarly, a literary Marxist critic who upholds utilitarian values and dignity of labour and hard work will also condemn and criticize the ignoble treatment of Odewale. Conclusively, Rotimi has excellently projected his Yoruba culture and belief in the play and he has aesthetically fused the old Greek tradition on the significance of the gods in the affairs of man with what is obtainable in his society. However, the texture of the tragedy is significantly too heightened with hyperbolic emphases to the powers and controls of the gods. It is

evident in this study that a new verdict that the gods are to blame is analytically asserted.

References

- [1] Adeyeye, O.O. "Sociolinguistic, Aesthetic and Functionalization in African Literature: A Case Study of *The Gods Are Not to Blame*." *Ibadan Journal of Humanistic Studies*. 6, 2000 pp. 1-5.
- [2] Apuke, O.D. "Thematic Analysis of Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame*." *Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2016, pp. 11-14.
- [3] Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- [4] Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. 3rd ed., Manchester University Press, 2002.
- [5] Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, 1988, pp.166-172.
- [6] Conradie, P.J. "The Gods Are Not to Blame, Ola Rotimi's Version of the Oedipus Myth." *Akroterion* XXXIX, 1994, pp. 27-36.
- [7] Cuddon, J.A. *Dictionary of Literary Terms*, Wiley, 2012.
- [8] *The Holy Bible*. King James Version, Praise Publisher, 2005.
- [9] Jegede, O.O and Olukemi Adesina. "Conventional Strategies of Communication in Ola Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame*." *Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2020, pp. 64-75. www.cscanada.net
- [10] Oladele, Idowu and Cynthia Eke-Opara. "Ethnography of Communication in Ola Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame: A Pragmatic Study*." *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 2015, pp. 13-19.
- [11] Odebunmi, Akin. "Pragmatic Functions of Crisis-Motivated Proverbs in Ola Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame*." *Linguistik Online*, 33 (1), 2013, pp. 33-37. doi.org/10.13092/10.
- [12] Oguntuase, Adebayo. "Sophoclean Echoes in Ola Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame*." *Journal of Humanities and Social Policy*, vol. 6, no.1, 2020, pp. 8-13. www.iiardpub.org
- [13] Okafor, J.N.I. "Strengths and Weaknesses of Ola Rotimi's Adaptation of *Oedipus Rex* for the African Theater in *The Gods Are Not to Blame*." *African Research Review*, vol.3, no.5, 2009, pp. 22-30.
- [14] Rotimi, Ola. *The Gods Are Not to Blame*, University Press, 2000.
- [15] Tobalase, Adegbite. *Drama the Basics*, Emaphine Reprographic Limited, 2017.