

Analysis of Incongruity in Kadie Jolie's Comedy Series

**¹MODUPE BEATRICE ADEYINKA, ²MUTIAT OLABISI
JOKANOLA & ³OLAYODE BABATUNDE AJAGBE**

¹Department of French, Federal College of Education, Osiele, Abeokuta,
Ogun State
modupeade1966@gmail.com

²Department of Languages and Communication
The Polytechnic Ibadan, Oyo State
olabisi3656@gmail.com

³Modern European Languages
University of Ilesa,
Ilesa. Osun State
olayode_ajagbe@unilesa.edu.ng

Abstract

This paper is an analysis of Kadie-Jolie's humorous comedies. Humor is a common phenomenon in the daily interaction of many people; however, this study is particularly interested in humor as used by Kadie-Jolie. This seminar discovers that Kadie-Jolie comedies are characteristic of thematic issues of commodification of romance, racism, deception, corruption, moral decadence and the belief in superstitions. It must be noted that these issues are mostly used to show the major concerns of Kadi-Jolie comedy. The commodification of romance is to condemn commercialisation of romance, racism lambasts how racial discrimination is deployed in the comedies, corruption is portrayed as the bane of developed society, and belief in superstitions is African based. All these thematic issues are deeply rooted in African society and they show the rate of decadence of many African nations.

Keywords: Kadie Jolie, Comedy, Incongruity, humour

Introduction

Humour is a widely attested and intuitively grasped aspect of human social communication. Since the point of language is initially to communicate successfully with other speakers, it is evident that the ability to appreciate and to engage in humour is part and parcel of human language behaviour. Humour, in particular linguistic humour, presupposes a highly developed intellect and can only exist within the framework of specific sociolinguistic conditions, the most important among these being a love for the mother tongue and the aesthetic pleasure derived from its use. In general, two types of humour may be distinguished: situational humour and linguistic humour. Situations capable of eliciting a humorous response are innumerable. This work sets out to describe, localize and explain language mechanisms of humour as used by Kadi-Jolie in her comedies.

Humours

Humour is culturally universal. It exists in every human culture and society (Oring, 2003). According to Schwarz (2010), it is present in every human conversation and behavior. There is no society that is devoid of humour. Humorous acts exist in laughter, gaiety and feeling of happiness (Berger, 1995). It must be noted that a humorous act is considered humorous when its perlocutionary effects generate laughter. Attardo (2001) asserts that humour is humorous when it is funny, amusing, and laughable.

The study of humour is found in several disciplines such as linguistics, literature, history, psychology, philosophy, sociology, cognitive neuroscience, physiology and so on (Adesoye, 2018). Being a phenomenon that is present in very many cultures, humour has been studied in so many cultural contexts, and its cultural peculiarities are revealed in these different situations. Within the Nigerian context, humour has been studied in situation comedies (Bamgbose & Ehondor 2021; Sunday & Bamgbose 2021), stand-up comedies (Filani 2016; Soneye 2019), computer-mediated communication (Inya 2016), comedy skits (Adesoye 2018), literature (Alabi 2021) and even music (Bamgbose 2016). While some scholars consider laughter to be the basic prerequisite for humours, others contend with the notion. This is because laughter is culture-dependent and ambiguous. Laughter may signify different meanings. These are the major reasons some scholars assert that laughter could be viewed from the notion of competence and performance. According to Attardo and Raskin, humour is dependent on the native speaker. Thus, humour is explicated in the monolingual society. By

performance, humour is generated by actual use and explicated in the bilingual society. Thus, humour can be defined from competence or performance points of view. According to Filani (2016), humour as a competence is situated within monolingual and mono cultural setting thereby explicating that humour takes place within the native speakers. Humour as performance implies that humour takes place in a multilingual setting. Humour, whether competence or performance, is socially generated (Lin and Tan, 2010).

Linguistically, humour cuts across various sub-disciplines such as applied linguistics, cognitive linguistics, conversational analysis, gender discourse, language learning, translation studies and so on. These disciplines focus on humour because it is explicated through language thereby focusing on meaning. Implicit or explicit meanings are attached to humours because the language of humour has been the focus of linguistics researchers. Researchers are interested in humours by investigating the purpose of humours, the strategies deployed in humour as well as speakers intended meanings. Humours may perform various functions such as satirizing, ridiculing, lambasting, lampooning, eulogizing, and so on. The basic facts remain that humour must generate laughter which must perform functions depending on context. In the multilingual context like Africa, humours are not used for “art for art” but art for life’s sake. The art for life functions of humour satires the socio-political, religious, cultural and economic happenings in every society. It is pertinent to examine the satirical tendencies and instances in Kadie Jolie humours.

Theories of Humour

Humor has been examined by scholars from different disciplines. Linguists have not been left behind in the conceptualisation of the theories of humour. Many theories and approaches have appeared. Three of the most prominent traditional theories to humor include the incongruity (cognitive) theory, the superiority (aggression) theory and the relief (release) theory (Raskin, 1985; Attardo, 1994; Ritchie, 2004; Krikmann, 2006). Contemporary humor scholars agree that these three major theories of humor are conterminous and they are interconnected and share the same concepts. Attardo (1994: 47 cited in Filani (2016) tabulates the classes of humour theories as follows:

Table 1: a table showing theories of humours according to Attardo (1994:47)

Cognitive	Social	Psychoanalytical
Incongruity	Hostility	Release
Contrast	Aggression	Sublimation
	superiority	Liberation
	Triumph	Economy
	Derision	
	Disparagement	

It must be noted that, in humour theories, one theory is not rated above or over others. This is because data and orientations of disciplines determine the theories of humour to be employed. For instance, a linguist interested in jokes may employ incongruity theory, while a sociologist may use superiority theory. In this study, incongruity theory is employed because of its ability to account for sociolinguistic strategies by both Kadi-Jolie and Jennifa. Each of these three theories is expatiated below:

Incongruity Theory

This is the most influential of all the theories of humour even though superiority predated it. Though incongruity theory was associated with Aristotle, the first major proponent of incongruity theory of humour is Kant (1724–1804). According to Kant (1951:177), humorous laughter is an affection arising from the sudden transformation of a strained expectation into nothing”. This simply means that “the things we laugh at are all very much like garden path stories in which arouse our expectations and peek our curiosity as we try to work out the (logical) conclusion of the tale, joke or happening.”

The theory focuses on “suddenness of the transformation and to the fact that the expectation is turned into nothing” (Attardo, 1994:48). This theory is hinged on the juxtaposition of ideas, objects, and events (Bardon, 2005). According to Filani (2016), incongruity theory centred from the “conflicting or opposing meanings.” When there are conflicting situations, humour is considered (Ruch, 2008, as cited by Marfo, 2015). Krikmann (2006) avers that humours are created when two different planes of frames, schemas, scripts or isotopes. According to Boss (2012) and Purzycki (2011), the term humour comes from one situation or idea having multiple meanings or senses. It must be noted that these two planes which are mutually incompatible include a common part which makes the shift

from one to another possible. This simply suggests that recipient of humorous works help to juxtapose the textual and contextual information of an utterance. The implication of this is that there is a contradiction between semantic and pragmatic meanings. When there is an incongruity, then humour is derived. The ability to understand the semantic and pragmatic ambiguity is what causes laughter.

It is noteworthy to examine the meaning of the term “[incongruity]”. Drucker (2015) defines the “incongruity” as “a discrepancy, a dissonance, between what is and what ‘ought’ to be, or between what is and what everybody assumes it to be.” According to Schopenhauer (1883:76), the central themes of incongruity humour are surmised as thus:

The cause of laughter in every case is simply the sudden perception of the incongruity between a concept and the real objects which have been thought through it in some relation, and the laugh itself is just an expression of this incongruity

This simply suggests that incongruity is concerned with conflicting ideas between a concept and the real object. Ability for these conflicting ideas to elicit laughter results into humorous utterance. Additionally, Schopenhauer (1883) lists the following as the basic tenets of the incongruity theory: difference (between an object and a concept of that object); codes/myths/scripts/roles (depending on disciplinary terminology); multiple sets of codes presentation of the joke narrative (the stem); presentation of the falseness of the narrative’s congruity (punchline) and rapidity of the realisation of the incongruity.

Two scholars who have contributed to the incongruity theory are Koestler (1964) and Apter (1982). While Koestler proposed the term “bisociation”, Apter used the term synergy. Bisociation is a term that describes the mental process in the perception of incongruity humours. According to Koestler, bisociation is “a situation or an event whereby an idea is simultaneously observed from the perspective of two self-consistent but normally unrelated and even incompatible frames of reference; for instance, in puns, two different meanings of a word are brought together simultaneously”.

Apter (1982) uses the term “synergy”, which refers to juxtaposing two images which are held in the mind of a speaker. This simply means that the synergy refers to the cognitive notion. Thus, synergy relates to the

state of mind. There are two states of human mind namely; paratelic and telic. The paratelic is concerned with a playful and non-serious mode, while the telic is serious and result-oriented. Apter opines that human beings have ability to switch from one mode to another. It must be noted that humours take place in the paratelic mode.

Despite the strengths of incongruity theories, these are noticeable weaknesses. One of such is the fact that incongruity theory is centered on joke. This is because it cannot address who is telling a joke, how it is told and who laughs at it and how. Because of its conceptualisation of an all-encompassing theory of humour, incongruity theory cannot and does not address instances of humour, which do not demonstrate the incongruous joke structures (Rutter, 1997:20).

Furthermore, Ritchie (2004) posits that some key terms in incongruity theory is not explicitly defined. Krikmann (2006:27) mentions the term “the planes of contents” which have been given different terminologies in literature. Such terminologies associated with scholars include isotopies (Attardo, 1994), scripts (Raskin 1979 and 1985), frames of reference (Koestler, 1964), informativeness (Giora, 1991) and schemas (Krikmann, 2006). Another weakness of incongruity theory is humorous and lack of humorous. This is because of the fact that humorous is not an essential feature of incongruity. This is because there are many situations that are humorous but not incongruity. Bardon (2005) argues that humans laugh at situations that are not incongruous and those not all incongruous situations or utterances create humour. Some incongruous utterances may warn, alert, or create fear or awe in the recipients; for instance, the maxim-wolf in sheep’s clothing will not elicit laughter, rather, it cautions its recipients.

Regardless of these weak points, scholars have argued that incongruity is vital to humour. Martin (2007) opines that incongruity seems to characterise all forms of humour. Krikmann (2006) argues that incongruity has to be perceived and resolved in humorous texts. It is the resolution of the incongruity that is attended by an emotion of surprise and satisfaction. Tsakona and Popa (2011) observe that it is the enjoyment of incongruity that leads to humour. Attardo (2009) notes that the following features are important for incongruity to lead to humour:

- a. The incongruity must be non-threatening
- b. The incongruity must not be too complex or too simple
- c. Available scripts/knowledge: The recipients must have sufficient knowledge to be able to process the scripts and identify the incongruity

- d. The incongruity must be unexpected and surprising
- e. The participants should be in a playful mode: the situation must be framed or keyed as humour. It should reflect suspension of disbelief.
- f. Co-presence of the opposed scripts: two scripts should be available and accessible at the same time, and/or be activated closely.

Summarily, it can be observed that the theory of incongruity considers two oxymoronic ideas, events, and actions that are incongruous. When these events and actions elicit laughter, the joke is said to be incongruous and humorous. This simply means that the theory of incongruity is deployed mostly in social sciences and humanities to examine the how humours are elicited through juxtaposition of events.

Methodology

The research design adopted for this study was both descriptive and interpretative. The data used for this study were derived from the comedy series of Kadie Jolie. The series are available in video compact discs (VCD) and on the Internet. The producers made the series available here so that they could gain popularity and be easily accessible to the interested viewers. For the purpose of this analysis, this study adopted John Searle's Speech Acts model as well as relief, superiority and incongruity theories of humours as theoretical framework. The analysis, basically, accounted for verbal humorous acts which are projected in the jokes of Kadie Jolie's Diary. The essence for the selection of the theoretical framework is aimed to analyse the intended messages Kadi-Jolie's comedy plays and the strategies deployed in carrying out the messages.

Incongruity acts in Kadie Jolie's comedy plays

Four incongruity acts are identified and explained in Kadie Jolie's comedy play namely: sentencing, praying, accusing, and affirming.

Sentencing as incongruity act

Sentencing is an act of passing judgment on a person or thing. In some instances, character may pass judgments on their fellow characters. Sentencing is deployed to sanction, approve and prohibit respectively characters in the discourse of Kadie-Jolie's comedy a good example is explicated in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 1:

David: Toi Kadie Jolie, tu m'énerve, ça t'étonne, un jour parce que j'ai pris de l'argent chez toi et je n'ai pas remboursé tu m'as fait souffrir, tu crois que j'ai oublié, je n'ai pas oublié. Si l'enfer existe je te souhaite

David: You, Kadie Jolie. You irritate me. You're surprised? One day, because I came to your house to borrow money and I couldn't pay, you made me suffer. You think I forgot. I didn't forget. If hell exists, **I wish you hell.**

(Our translation)

Excerpt 1 showed incongruity act of sentencing, which incorporates condemnation and abusing. Incongruity humour is created by the utterance of David who wishes Kadie Jolie hell in her pregnancy. Both Kadie and David were lovers. This made Kadie to borrow David some money. On the expiration of their agreement to pay, Kadie did not even inform him that his agreement has expired but rather seeks for law enforcement officers to arrest and prosecute him. David was not happy about this and prayed that Kadie should be sentenced to hell fire because her deeds were evils and hell is the abode of the evil people.

Hell is a place of punishment for evil deeds by individuals. Kadie was wished to go to hell as a place of receiving her punishment because her actions were devilish. The inference is that both Kadie and David know that there is hell fire where Satan and cohorts lie and that are looking for punishments of their errant children and messengers. It must be noted that the reference to hell is incongruously deployed to create jokes.

Another incongruity act deployed in the comedy play of Kadie Jolie is praying. Praying as an incongruity act means an act of making supplication to God. In this context, praying is a wish or desire made to unknown spiritual being. It is a wish, a request, a bid, an aspiration, and a hope. In the discourse of Kadie Jolie, praying is portrayed as a strong desire. It is a wish that is supposedly brought to the fore by contrasting a small monkey with a baby. It is expedient to exemplify praying as incongruity acts:

Excerpt 2:

David: Toi Kadie Jolie, tu m'énerve, ça t'étonne, un jour parce que j'ai pris de l'argent chez toi et je

n'ai pas remboursé tu m'as fait souffrir... je te souhaite
ue tu fasses un petit singe que tu mise au monde

David: You, Kadie Jolie. You irritate me. You're surprised? One day, because I came to your house to borrow money and I couldn't pay, you made me suffer....
I pray that you have a small monkey as a baby.
(Our translation)

Excerpt 2 above illustrates the incongruity act of praying in the discourse of Kadie Jolie comedy. It must be noted that the arrest and suffering that made David to wish her that her baby should be monkey. The metaphor "monkey" is deployed to animalise the unborn baby of Kadie-Jolie. Animalisation of the unborn is employed to show that the baby would be unacceptable thereby signifying the fact that as Kadie Jolie is evil so will her child is. It is expedient to say that the metaphorisation of monkey is a tactical way of dehumanising the unborn baby and ridicule Kadie Jolie thereby explicating that she is evil.

It must be noted that humour is created through the incongruity act of praying by contrasting monkey to baby. It is the expectation of pregnant women to give birth to babies. Anything devoid of that is regarded as anomaly. However, the statement of having a small monkey as a baby spurred humour acts because it is against expectation of human beings.

Another incongruity act performed by discourse participants in the comedies of Kadie Jolie is accusing. By accusing, it means the act of charging with an offense and pointing unfair treatment meted on someone because of its behaviour. To accuse means to charge with a fault or blame judicially. It implicates declaring to have committed a crime or an offense. Another meaning of accuse is to level an offense against someone who is the accused. The accuser points out unfairness, while the accused may be innocence of accusations levelled against him or her. This implicates that mostly an aggrieved person, who bears the consequences of untold punishments, carries out accusing. In the discourse of Kadie-Jolie, it means that David accused Kadie Jolie of unfair treatment despite the fact that they were both lovers. It is expedient to say that David was arrested but could negotiate his freedom through financial inducement. This is explicating in the excerpt 34 below:

Excerpt 3:

David: Toi Kadie Jolie, tu m'énerve, ça t'étonne,
David: You, Kadie Jolie. You irritate me. You're surprised?
(Our translation)

Excerpt 3 demonstrates the use of incongruity acts of accusing in the discourse of Kadie Jolie's comedies. Reference is made to the time when he borrowed money from Kadie-Jolie but he could not pay back at the right time. David was arrested by policemen. Along the line, he negotiated his arrest and was released immediately. David paid in instalment and used the remaining money to bribe the police who came to arrest him. He negotiated his freedom by bribing the police officer. It could be inferred that David hated Kadie-Jolie because of this incidence and he has been looking for opportunity to revenge against her. The sentential element "you are surprised" is not interrogative but to accuse Kadie-Jolie of foul play despite the fact that they are lovers. Kadie-Jolie went ahead to seek for his arrest because he was unable to pay back the money he borrowed at the appropriate time. This occasioned why he hated Kadie Jolie with perfect hatred.

Lastly, the incongruity act of affirming is explicated in the discourse of Kadie Jolie. This is done to show similitude between fire and hell fire (INF). It can be observed that fire is a basic feature of hell fire. It is expedient to examine the excerpts 34 and 35 below:

Excerpt 4:

Marabout: Prends lunette chez Harune. On ne part pas au paradis
avec des lunettes
Marabout: Take the glasses to Harune's house. We don't go to
paradise with glasses.
(Our translation)

Excerpt 5:

Marabout: Quoi? le feu c'est l'enfer directe!
Marabout: What? Fire is a direct way to hell. (Our translation)

Excerpts 4 and 5 illustrate the incongruity act of affirming explicated in lexical verb "don't" and intensive verb "is". This brings the fact that the Marabout agrees that there are both paradise and hell. While the paradise is meant for righteous people, hell is meant for ungodly and

wicked. The inference is that only good people would inherit heaven and paradise, while hell is meant for wicked people. In every society, while the good is encouraged, evil is frowned at. In excerpt 4, the practice of affirming is established and performed. It can be observed that “we don’t go to paradise with glasses” means that glasses are already placed in heaven; thus, it is a waste of energy to go to heaven with glasses.

It can be surmised that incongruity acts deployed in Kadie Jolie’s comedy plays include sentencing, praying, accusing, affirming. These incongruity acts are deployed to explicate jokes and humours in the discourse of Kadie Jolie. These acts are employed implicitly to create humorous acts in selected Kadie Jolie’s comedy plays.

Incongruity strategies employed by Kadie Jolie’s comedy plays

The incongruity strategies employed by Kadie Jolie’s comedy plays include the following: dehumanization, translation, hyperbole, antithesis, and voicing.

Dehumanisation

Dehumanisation is the process of denying humanness and a motivated phenomenon that enabled the release of aggression or removing the burden of moral qualms or vicarious distress (Haslam, 2006). Dehumanisation is a major incongruity strategy deployed in the discourse of Kadie Jolie in the explication of humours and jokes. This is exemplified below:

Excerpt 6: Naturellement, il va le rendre domicile comme un mouton, il va te suivre partout peee, peee. Attend, elle m’a juste demandé de transformer leur copain un homme domicile c’est tout.

Naturally, he will make him **domicile like a sheep**. He is going to follow you everywhere. **Peee peee**. Wait. They just asked me to turn their boyfriend to a domicile man. That’s all. (Our translation)

Excerpt 6 above illustrates the fact that dehumanization is an incongruous strategy deployed by marabout. Kadie’s friend in Excerpt 6 said the charm to be used on Ahmed would make him domicile and goes everywhere like sheep. To be domicile contextually means to be unreasonable, indecisive, wavering, uncertain, unsure, compromising, and

less human. It means that Kadie-Jolie wanted to be in control of his man who is Ahmed. In the African context, men are the head of the family and control the affairs of the home. However, there are instances whereby women particularly influential ones may dictate the affairs of their family on their wealth. This is the major reason why Kadie Jolie consulted Marabout to dominate Ahmed. Ahmed too consulted Marabout in order to control his woman. This means that both Ahmed and Kadie wanted to be in charge of their spouse and this is the major reason they consulted Marabout. This means that sheep here mean that are docile and ignorance and unwise. It is expedient to say that simile is a way of creating humour in Kadie Jolie comedy. It can be said that simile is among linguistic way explicating humour and comedy in Kadie Jolie's discourse.

In another instance, possible suitors of Kadie Jolie were forced to bark before they could marry her. This is explicated in excerpts 7 and 8 below:

Excerpt 7:

Kadie Jolie: Aboie d'abord avant que tu prennes les deux enveloppes
Kadie Jolie: **Bark** first before you take the two envelopes.
(Our translation)

Excerpt 8:

Kadie Jolie: Mes chers amis comme si aboies très bien chacun a droit
aux deux enveloppes
Kadie Jolie: My dear friends, as the **barking** is really good, each of
you has a right to two envelopes.
(Our translation)

Excerpts 7 and 8 show that there is incongruituous strategy of dehumanisation. This is because human beings were made to bark like animal before they could be given two envelopes. It can be observed that, in excerpt 7, the contestants were commanded to bark before they could be given two envelopes, while they really barked in excerpt 8. The excerpts show that dehumanisation has taken in the excerpt. Humuorous jokes are created through the dehumanization strategy in the excerpts.

Translation

According to Ajunwa (1991:13 cited by George Mounin), translation is defined as "the passage from one cultural world into another" and it is "the

rendering in writing of a source language text into the target language with a view to preserve as much as possible the source message and style". This means that translation helps in the cross-fertilization of languages and unifies cultural context of source context between source and target contexts. It is expedient to exemplify translation as humour in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 9:

David: Comment vous dite en Japonais « Je suis enciente »
Il m'a tout mis... comment dit-on je suis enciente et j'attends un jumeaux ? Il m'a tout net... vous voyez que ça marche vous empruntez l'argent ou non ?

David: How do you say in Japanese, 'I am pregnant'? il m'a tout mis...
How do we say, 'I am pregnant and I'm waiting for twins'? Il m'a tout net...
You see. That works. Will you lend me money or not?
(Our translation)

Excerpt 9 above illustrates the fact that translation is an incongruity strategy in discourse of Kadie Jolie. For instance, Davis intelligently asked Kadie and Noura the translation of the sentence "I am pregnant". This is deployed to say that translation is strategic in the creation of humours. After this utterance, Kadie and Jolie burst into uncontrollable laughter. This is because they were surprise that David who is a chronic debtor still goes ahead to borrow more monies so as to be able to settle some need. Noura and her friend told David he should pay the money in three months. David was contempt with the agreement with the two ladies on the payment modalities of the borrowed monies.

It must be noted that David started the translation strategy with the sentence I am pregnant and further continued by saying "I am pregnant and I am waiting for twins". The irony of this statement is that David was the one informing Kadie and Noura that he is pregnant. It can be noted that David, who is a man, informed his friend that how do we say I am pregnant and waiting for a set of twins.

In another instance, Kadie told David to translate hoe do we say "a lady is pregnant and "wash the plates" in Japanese. This is exemplified in excerpt 32 below:

Excerpt 10:

Kadie: Dis-nous Davide comment une femme enceinte en Japonais ?

Kadie: Tell us David. How do you say, 'A lady is pregnant' in Japanese?
(Our translation)

David: Il m'a tout mis...

Noura: Comment dit laver les assiettes en Japonais ?

Noura: How do we say, 'Wash the plates' in Japanese? (Our translation)

Excerpt 10 illustrates the fact that translation is a tactical way of creating humour in the discourse of Kadie Jolie text. It is necessary to say that David is the only one who could understand Japanese in the scene, while Kadie and Noura could not. Translation is deployed by David as a means of eliciting comedies. For instance, David implicitly informed Kadie and Noura that he is pregnant and he is expecting twins. It is to say that David uttered this statement so say to get the approval of Kadie and Noura to get loan to buy motorcycle. In another instance, Noura asked David on how to translate how to wash plates. Translation is employed not only to exclude speakers but to amuse the audience and listeners also. It can be inferred Japanese is a language that is rarely used in the Nigerian context. It can be observed that translation is an incongruity strategy deployed in the creation of humour and jokes in the comedy of Kadie Jolie.

Antithesis

Antithesis is a tactical deployment of contrast in idea. It is a way of creating humour in the comedy of Kadie Jolie. The use of antithesis as incongruity strategy is explicated in excerpt 11 below:

Excerpt 11:

Cousin: Moi je suis là, manger du piment est très dur, mais faire un enfant est très facile

Cousin: I am here. **To eat pepper is very hard, but to have a child is very easy.** (Our translation)

It can be observed from excerpt 11 that humour is created through juxtaposing the opposing statements in excerpt 11. To eat pepper and to have a child are two different entities, while very hard and very easy are antithetical. It can be noted that the situations took place when Kadie

discussed why they have not heard a baby let alone having a husband. Incongruity strategy of antithesis is deployed by Kadie Jolie to create humorous jokes.

Contradicting stereotypes

One of the means by which humour is created is by contradicting shared cultural knowledge through stereotypes. Stereotypes are fixed notions that people have about someone, something or a concept. Gruner (1997), Martin (2007) and Neria (2012) observe that stereotypes are tools, which are deployed by Kadie Jolie to create humour. Stereotyping works as a source of humour in that comedians make manifest a number of assumptions that are deeply rooted in their stereotypical frame and which may or may not be shared by the audience. Mostly, for the stereotypes to have the intended effects, the audience recognises them to be part of their storage of cultural information. These stereotypes are then subverted or reinforced by Kadie Jolie in their comedy play. Let us exemplify this in the excerpt 12 below:

Excerpt 12:

Arrêter, arrêtez, arrêtez, c'est une poison d'avril par Kadie Jolie
Stop stop stop! This is April Fool by Kadie Jolie!

Excerpt 12 above showed that the expectations of the contestants for barking were to get some money in the envelop. However, their expectation was not met because they could not meet anything in the envelop. The shared knowledge is that in any contest, when envelop is shared money will be put in the envelop but in the case of Kadie Jolie nothing was put in the envelop. This is the strategy use by Kadie Jolie to create humour.

Incongruous representations of everyday realities in Kadie Jolie's comedy

No writer writes in a vacuum. Every writer writes with the sole intention of projecting thereby satirising the socio-economic, political and religious realities of their era. In the discourse of Kadie Jolie comedy, it can be observed that the comedy series of Kadie Jolie mirror socio-cultural, economic, and religious realities in Burkina Faso. For instance, marriage, family and wealth are social issues that are represented comedy series. Both Noura and Kadie want to get married and settle down with their

respective husband. This is the utmost. However, both ladies could not get suitable suitors to marry them not because of not beautiful but men too are afraid of family responsibilities. This is the major reason Ahmed and David rather prefer to have “girlfriends”. Romance among young ladies and men is an issue that is recurrent in Burkina Faso context. It is within family and marriage context that pregnancy surfaces. It is expedient to know that consulting marabout is the order of the day in Burkina Faso. This is explicated in the comedy series of Kadie Jolie. The comedy series is deployed to lambast corruption among political office-holders who are supposed to make laws for the betterment of the masses but violate and break laws in order to enrich themselves.

Conclusion

This paper has examined incongruous acts in comedy series of Kadie Jolie. Situated within incongruity theory, the study discovers that four sociolinguistic acts are identified namely: sentencing, praying, accusing, and affirming. Sentencing as incongruous sociolinguistic act is deployed to implicitly condemn incongruous acts of fire and hellfire, while praying is a wish for dehumanisation of hell, accusing as unfair treatment of wrong doing and affirming as existential realism of heaven and hell. Sociolinguistic strategies in the comedy series of Kadie Jolie include dehumanisation, translation, antithesis and contrasting stereotypes. Dehumanisation is deployed through animalisation of human beings. Translation evinces multilingual tendencies of the comedy series, antithesis is employed through juxtaposed statement and contrasting stereotype compares culturally induced statements. Humor is a common phenomenon in the daily interaction of many people. This study discovers that Kadie-Jolie comedy series are representation of socio-economic, religious, and political realities through the social issues such as family, marriage, wealth, romance, law and order and corruption.

References

- Apter, M.J. 1982. *The experience of motivation: the theory of psychological reversals*. London: Academic Press.
- Attardo, S. 1994. *Linguistic theories of humor*. New York: Mouton.
- 2001. *Humorous texts: a semantic and pragmatic analysis*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bamgbose, G.A. 2016. Mock-impoliteness as a discursive practice in draught playing. *Ife Studies in English Language (ISEL)*, 12.2: 91-103.

- Bardon, A. 2005. The philosophy of humor. *Comedy: a geographic and historical guide*. M. Charney. Ed. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 1-21
- Berger, A. 1995. *Blind man and elephants: perspectives on humor*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Filani, I. 2016. Humour strategies and acts in Nigerian standup comedy. PhD. Thesis. Dept. of English. University of Ibadan.x+189pp.
- _____. 2015. Stand-up comedy as an activity type. *Israeli Journal of Humor Research* 4.1:73–97.
- Inya, O. 2016. Pragmatics of humour in a Nigerian university's departmental chat rooms. *Analyzing language and humor in online communication*. R. Taiwo, A. Odebunmi and A. Adetunji. Eds. Hershey PA: Information Science Reference.190-206.
- Koestler, A. 1989. *The act of creation*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lefcourt, H. M. and Thomas, S. 1998. Humor and stress revisited. *The sense of humor: explorations of a personality characteristic*. W. Ruch. Ed. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.179–202.
- Lin, T. T. C. and Tan, P.S.W .2010. How cultural and linguistic pluralism shape humor: social construction of Singapore's humor industry. *Intercultural Communication Studies* 19.1: 60-70.
- Martin, R.A. 2007. *The psychology of humour: an integrative approach*. Burlington: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Oring, E. 2003. *Engaging humor*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Raskin, V. 1985. *Semantic mechanisms of humour*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Ritchie, G. 2004. *The linguistic analysis of jokes*. London: Routledge.
- Rutter, J. 2000. The stand-up introduction sequence: comparing comedy comperes. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 23:463-483.
- Schwarz, J. 2010. Linguistic aspects of verbal humour in Stand-up Comedy. Ph.D dissertation. Saarland: University of Saarland.iv-451pp.
- Tsakona, V. and Popa, D. E. 2011. Humour in politics and the politics of humour: an introduction. *Studies in political humour: in between political critique and public entertainment*. V. Tsakona and D.E. Popa. Eds. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.