



Issue no: 1 | Vol no: 5 | August 2023: 249-257

Analysis of the incongruities in the ironical expressions in Kansiime's jokes

Christine Namayi⁽¹⁾ 

Monica Onyancha⁽²⁾ 

⁽¹⁾Kibabii University, Kenya; ⁽²⁾University of Nairobi, Kenya

Main author email: cnamayi@kibu.ac.ke

Article History

Received: 2022-04-22

Accepted: 2022-07-11

Published: 2023-08-07

Cite this article in APA

Namayi, C., & Onyancha, M. (2023). Analysis of the incongruities in the ironical expressions in Kansiime's jokes. *Editon consortium journal of literature and linguistics studies*, 5(1), 249-257. <https://doi.org/10.51317/ecjlls.v5i1.406>

Abstract

The objective of this study was to analyse the incongruities in the ironical expressions incongruities in her jokes. The interpretation of Kansiime's jokes was done as an expansion in Kansiime's jokes. This study was a pragmatic approach to the study of comedy. It looked at how one Ugandan comedian, Anne Kansiime, uses irony to create of the applicability of Relevance Theory in the interpretation of texts. In assessing Kansiime's sketches, an insight was drawn into how hearers can interpret texts to perceive them as humorous. Having adopted the relevance theoretical framework, which tries to give an account of how hearers interpret texts during verbal communication, it necessitated that we define the place of the hearer and, at the same time that of the speaker since the comedian endeavours to judge their minds. For a successful interpretation of a text during a given discourse, the hearer must be able to judge the intentions of the speaker, while the speaker must also be able to give sound context for the interpretation process. For this reason, this study alludes to these concepts by looking at how the speaker, who in this case is the humourist, is able to judge the minds of her audience and subsequently judge what the audience will attend to as relevant during a given discourse.

Key words: Audience, incongruities, ironical expressions, jokes.



This article is distributed under the license of a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/). It is permitted to be used, reproduced and distributed in line with Editon Consortium Publishing guidelines. The work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages

INTRODUCTION

Most studies on humour production and perception only pass with handling the concept of incongruity. For humour to be realised, there must be an element of incongruity. This paper will search for the incongruities in the ironic expressions identified in Kansime's jokes. The study assesses these ironic expressions by identifying the incongruities in them according to the classifications that have already been established, hence, find the incongruities in the ironies on norms and values of the society and the Incongruities in the ironies on what people have said before.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ruch (1988, p. 862) observes that recent theoretical humour models pay more attention to the processing of humour by considering two structural parameters that are important in any humour; the incongruity induced by the punch line and the resolution of the incongruity. The most powerful structure factor is the incongruity resolution humour, and this is easily established in the humour based on stereotypes. For the incongruous interpretations to be resolved, Cappelli (2003:4) observes that the hearer must be aware of the speaker's communicative intention. This is when the hearer will attain the intended cognitive effects. The speaker's task is to predict the interlocutors' capability to access certain cultural assumptions, allowing an experimenter to objectively establish whether or not incongruity was p. 41. Incongruity or incongruity resolution focuses on situations that lead to confusion or misunderstanding brought about by conflict of new information, requiring a re-interpretation of what we know about a particular situation. This re-interpretation involves a completely contrasting view of what happened or was described, which brings about the humour. Relevance theory is the main tool for analysis in this study. Therefore, side by side with the incongruity considerations, the study will establish what happens in the mind of the hearer for the humour experience to take place.

METHODOLOGY

Content analysis of published jokes by Kansime were analysed. This analysis was preferred since there were few studies carried out in this area in Kenya. There was also a need to justify the

recommendations for further research in this grey area. Many people (victims) have suffered quietly without enough knowledge on the steps to take.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study has established that there must be an element of incongruity, besides an element of sense. Kinuu (2013, p. 49) describes incongruity as the situation in which a hearer listening to a speaker, has the mind directed to a particular path of thought, which turns out to be a path that was misleading the hearer as the results turn out to be different from what was expected. This is the situation in the example below:

“Do you know that children are on holiday? That if you walk around, they might look at you and get hypertension? A young child can get a heart attack thinking they are seeing something like a ghosti (ghost)”.

This text explores facts about hypertension and the world's knowledge about hypertension and heart attack is explored. Kansime leads her audience to first assign a reference to the children who are on holiday when encountering the proposition about children being on holiday. The hearer is led to build assumptions on what implication this utterance has on the children, like what could possibly happen if children are on holiday. The hearer could probably think that Kansime is implicating that if Grace walks around, she might probably meet them playing out, distract their attention from doing their school assignment, or build any other cognitive effects on this proposition.

These seem to be relevant anticipatory hypotheses regarding the utterances. However, incongruity is registered when Kansime, in the subsequent utterance, talks of children getting hypertension and then getting heart attacks as they think Grace is a ghost. Kansime violates the world's knowledge that children do not usually have hypertension, nor do they have a heart attack. It is at this point that the hearer is led to reject the initial assumptions, and while relating to the context of interpretation, which in this case is the fact that Kansime wants to let Grace know that she is indeed very ugly, then humour is generated as the relevant contextual

implication is reached, which is Grace's ugliness and that Grace is being warned that her ugliness will give children the diseases that children have never got before; will make the children have hypertension and subsequently have heart attack.

"Please go, hide those things and let us live in peace. I am going to go home and wait for you! I would rather stone you when you are passing. Right now, you are going to cause a stampede; I am saving you. You might think I am your enemy, but I am saving you. I am telling you these things. I am being honest with you. Those are not legs to be exposed. "

In the text above, Kansiiime explores the world's knowledge about fashion and dressing hence, what leads girls to put on short skirts. This is an extract taken from Episode (1) in which Kansiiime meets Grace in a short skirt, and she gives Grace her opinion against the short skirt. When Kansiiime utters, 'Please go hide those things and let us live in peace,' the hearer activates the encyclopedic entry about things that, when exposed, would not let people live in peace. The hearer builds assumptions on this implicated proposition. The assumptions could be an example of scary images that put people off or anything that, when exposed, will disturb people's peace. Nevertheless, when the things that Kansiiime wants to be hidden finally turn out to be Grace's legs, an incongruity is perceived. To resolve this incongruity, the hearer is forced to reject the previous assumptions about 'the things' and re-interpret the implied constitution of the things, that they are Grace's legs and that Kansiiime is complaining about them because Grace is in a short skirt and Kansiiime is implicitly telling Grace to avoid putting on a short by the metaphorical exaggeration of the attributes of Grace's legs.

This is what leads the hearer to manifest humorous effects. By the perception that Kansiiime actually had the intention of demining Grace's legs. Someone would smile at the possibility of referring to someone's legs as things that are regarded as not fit enough to be put in a short skirt, as this seems an arrogant thing to tell someone. It makes Kansiiime sound arrogant, and the hearer gives in to the fact that he/she had chosen a wrong interpretation of 'things' to make out humour or ironical utterance,

hearers must be able to confirm the intention of the speaker. This is done if hearers are able to embed clashing propositions in a fourth-order metarepresentation. That is the ability to judge the communicative intention of the speaker. If there is a lack of metarepresentation, then there is a lack of ability or knowledge of communicative intention; the hearer is then likely to miss the joke.

"Husband: Can we share the mosquito net?
Kansiiime: For what? Husband: mosquitoes are too many Kansiiime: so, Husband: of course, they are going to bite me".

The humourist explores the knowledge of the use of mosquito nets. Kansiiime's husband has joined her in bed and has realised that Kansiiime has tucked in the net to herself. He requests that they share the net, which is usually normal, that since a husband and wife share the bed, they naturally will share the mosquito net too. So when Kansiiime's husband asks that they share the net and Kansiiime asks 'for what?' the hearer seeks to establish relevance on this question why and thus, the hearer is wondering why Kansiiime would ask this question. At this point, the utterance already creates an incongruity that should be resolved. This is because Kansiiime creates a picture that her husband should not ask that they share the mosquito net, which is a violation of the norm in society. When her husband gives the reason to answer her absurd question, she asks yet another question that creates an incompatibility. She answers that she still does not understand the reason why they both should share the mosquito nets despite the fact that there are many mosquitoes in the room. This ostensive communication does create an incongruity that prompts the hearer to search for relevance. In addition, as the hearer entertains this incongruity, which has, been manifested at the explicit level, another phase of utterances works on this perceived incongruity:

"Kansiiime: And what is going to happen if they are going to bite you? you will die? Have you ever heard anywhere where a mosquito ate a man? That it ate someone? That it can tear off a limb? It is not a lion. Why are you selfish? How much blood is that mosquito going to eat from you? How much? Litres? It is just a simple bite. Be brave. Stop being a

coward. Why are you selfish? Don't you... aren't you the one who likes eating meat a lot? Imagine if chickens, if cows, if pigs had human nets to protect themselves so that you cannot access them. You would not be eating meat. How would you feel? How would you feel? But they walk around freely for you to eat them”.

The rhetorical questions all communicate the implicit justifications as to why Kansiiime does not want to share the net with the husband. The hearer would have initially built assumptions on why Kansiiime does not want them to share the net; for instance, the hearer would create some hypothesis like, Kansiiime is asking the husband why he wants them to share the net because of some logical reason like, probably the net is small, and it can only fit Kansiiime, so she should get the priority because she is pregnant or maybe the husband refused to buy one, and she decided to buy and declared she would not share it with him. However, this does not turn out to be the case here. Her reasons for not sharing the net are, as it turns out, incongruous. This is perceived in what she justifies as the reason her husband should not use the net, and she explains that the husband should not fear mosquito bites, that mosquitoes are not lions to tear a humans limb, that mosquito bites are too tiny to make Kansiiime's husband worry over this. Humorous effects are manifested here when the hearer's encyclopedic entry is activated about three things:

- a) The mosquito in relation to the exaggerated explanation about what it is capable of doing.
- b) The mosquito and the human attributes Kansiiime is according to them that should they go out and find jobs for themselves like a man or should they plant and wait for the harvest like humans do
- c) The mosquito and humanity, that humans should have a kind heart towards mosquitoes as they could do to fellow humans.

It is here that the hearer is finally able to embed the clashing proposition of the already built assumptions on why Kansiiime does not want to share the

mosquito net and the implication of her utterance in giving these attributes to the mosquitoes in a first order metarepresentation. This is perceived as the hearer searching for relevance in Kansiiime's implied intentions when asking her husband these rhetorical questions. In RT, incongruity is perceived when the hearer tries to search for relevance. And because these utterances are the ostensive stimuli for this particular episode. The speaker has not maximised relevance through the anticipatory hypothesis, which will temporarily answer the questions that seem absurd. However, the subsequent utterances will lead the hearer to again search the encyclopedic entry on the norms about the intentions of using mosquito nets, which will create more incongruities as the speaker is explicitly giving the reason why she doesn't want to share the mosquito net while the husband does not marry with the expected norms the hearer has built in the encyclopedic entry. At this point, the speaker is awed by the implications of

Kansiiime's; here, the spite also comes out of the real irony. Therefore, a mosquito stings you a little bit. You, you make a fuss. Don't be selfish, please. So how do you expect them to survive? God created us so that we co-exist. Please co-exist with mosquitoes. What is that? So stop being selfish. Oh, so what do you want them to eat? Do you want them to go to the garden and eat greens? You want them to go to the garden and eat greens. Or you want them to go find a job, work to earn a living. Plant crops, wait for six months for germination, and harvest just like you. It is just a bite; toughen yourself. When it bites, do it like this (imitating a toughened face). Be tough, be a man. Stop being a coward. And you wake me up from sleep. Don't wake me up again. I am not the one who made myself pregnant. You be brave! Goodnight.

In the text, we see a violation of African knowledge about the place of the husband in a marriage. The husband is viewed as the stronghold of the family; they protect the family from dangers, so it is definite that the man is viewed as strong, and the contrary is perceived of the woman. It is incongruous when Kansiiime implicates that her husband is weak by the proposition, 'So a mosquito stings you a little bit. You, you make a fuss.' And she continues to make the incongruity salient when she explicitly utters, 'It

is just a bite; toughen yourself. When it bites, do it like this (imitating a toughened face). Be tough, be a man. Stop being a coward.' This implies that her husband was not behaving like a man should be, fearing mosquito bites. In comprehending the joke, the hearer will recover this fact of the societal norm about African men that they are supposed to be strong.

Therefore, the hearer will build assumptions on this fact, and when the hearer relates this to the context of interpretation as created by the humourist, the hearer sets to resolve the incongruity by establishing that the man in this context is weak because he fears just a mosquito bite. He fears a mosquito bite so much that he makes a fuss about it, and his wife is teaching him how to be strong in this case. The hearer will achieve humorous effects by registering how weak this husband has been depicted by the wife. The subsequent rhetorical questions that follow naturally implicate the answers. This communicates that the propositions in the answers would be relevant if true. And if in case they are true, then there lies the incongruity.

Yus (1998: 314) confirms that hearers interpret a stimulus first by identifying the logical form in the ostensive stimulus, which is the linguistic raw material in the case of verbal communication. This is what is enriched with contextual information that is necessary for reference assignment and disambiguation, thus working out the implicit content. In this approach, disambiguation is achieved by the use of the relevance-theoretic comprehension procedure, with the consequence that the first interpretation that is relevant in the expected way is the only satisfactory interpretation. The two crucial factors are (a) the accessibility of the possible senses of the ambiguous expression and (b) the accessibility of the possible contexts in which the resulting interpretation would satisfy the hearer's expectation of relevance. Notice that relevance theory does not claim to predict which sense or context will be most accessible. That is an empirical matter to be investigated by psycholinguists (though we'll see later that relevance theory does shed some light on this question). Relevance theory claims to explain how a certain combination of explicit content, context and cognitive effects is chosen, given the facts about the accessibility of senses and contexts. It

aims to answer question (4b) (about the acceptability of possible disambiguations. In the next example, this is what the humourist explores. This is a text that has been taken from Episode (4); someone has called Kansime erroneously, and from the conversation, a hearer can perceive that the caller has excused himself by indicating this was a wrong number.

Kansime is saying explicitly: 48 (5) Eeeh, it's not a wrong number; it is my number. My number is 0782800192. It is my number. It is not wrong.

The first part of the joke builds up a scenario in which Kansime has been called, and seemingly, the caller has implicated; it's a wrong number. However, the interlocutor in this text is guided to a different conversational path. When she goes on to state her number digit by digit in the second part of the joke, she creates a cognitive dissonance that contrasts with the scenario that had already been built. She contradicts the logical information and the contextual implication of the proposition 'wrong number.' This forces the hearer to a re-interpretation, which creates an incongruity. By resolving the incongruity, the hearer will get the intended humorous interpretation that the speaker had intended to fool the hearer into a misinterpretation. In comprehending what the above text is all about, the hearer is led to the understanding of the utterance hence the logical implication of the proposition 'wrong number' as it has been explicitly expressed by the speaker.

The hearer then builds assumptions on this proposition, that Kansime must have been called by someone erroneously or the person calling is not sure of the recipient as implicated in the next utterance, 'it is my number', but the strong manifestation of this proposition is contradicted when Kansime goes on to state and confirm her number making the hearer at this point to reject the initial hypothesis built on the proposition and build a new contextual assumption that the speaker was defending her number not to be called a wrong number. Given the context, this derives humorous effects as the hearer builds contextual implication that Kansime is actually trying to dismiss the fact that her caller is justified to call her number wrong number. To manifest humour here, the humourist knows that the interlocutors will follow different conversational paths. Without

noticing the intended contradictions. This is the case with the above text. The hearer will interpret that it is a wrong number as the norm is when one calls a wrong number because it was erroneously called.

However, the contextual implication makes it turn out that the interpretation is wrong as Kansime is insisting that her number cannot be wrong, and she is sure it is her number. This makes Kansime stupid as the hearer is mesmerised at how she cannot understand the meaning of the term wrong number. To be able to encode its logical form 49 3.3 Incongruities in the Ironies on What People Have Said Before When we look at the incongruities in the Ironies based on what people have said before. Then we expect that the cognitive dissonance realised at the end of it all is due to the inconsistency in the state of affairs that relates to what people have said before, either prior to the present discourse or in other related contexts and what the expectation is in the present situation. That which we will consider coherent with a former discourse that is related to the present utterance in the given context (5).

The only thing am doing now is just shaming the devil (pointing at Grace's shoes). Are they yours? Are they your shoes? Let's just speak the... This example has been taken from Episode (2). This utterance follows a scene in which Grace, a friend of Kansime, was lent shoes by Kansime, and they meet a girl who is unaware of this fact. The girl compliments Grace for having nice shoes. The girl, however, does not seem to note Kansime's shoes. This offends Kansime, who, in turn, decides to let the cat out of the basket. Kansime implicitly tells the girl that the shoes that Grace has on are not Grace's shoes. When the hearer seeks relevance in the utterances about shaming the devil, he is led to build assumptions on what would lead a speaker to allude to these words of the Bible.

In building the appropriate contextual assumptions, the hearer can conclude that people would normally allude to these words when an offence has been done. And that the words are meant to coax people who are not ready to admit their offences into doing the same. However, an incongruity is perceived when Kansime points to the shoes as the cause for the implied offence. Since both Kansime and the

audience know that the shoes Grace has are shoes, she had borrowed from Kansime. Since they are friends who were actually headed to Kansime's birthday party, Grace has committed no offence; thus, this interpretation becomes manifestly incompatible with standard assumptions about the world. Hence, given the context, this assumption contradicts the knowledge about the world.

This new contradictory premise leads to a manifestation of humorous effects. Incongruities in the Ironies on Implicated Thoughts This is the incongruities that are realised when there is a discrepancy between the state of affairs and the implicated thoughts evoked during a given discourse. In this case, the participant's thoughts are welcomed with a new stimulus, which is still cognitively acceptable, which leads to a re-interpretation of a new concept encoded about the thought. If the incongruity is resolved completely, no humour appreciation is ensured. And in a long discourse like that of the sketches of Kansime, in order to have humorous effects, the cognitive tension must be kept to some extent Forabasco (2008:50). This is the kind of tension that leads the audience to want to keep looking at the screen, which is what the humourist does by creating incongruity after incongruity. So that as one incongruity is solved, it leads to the creation of another. The cognitive tension has been kept long enough to generate humorous effects in the following example. (6) Grace: ooh, you don't know me? Oh, oh, I have actually remembered. You are Anne Kansime, right?

Kansime: Yea Grace: ooh... the maid, ha ha ha ha Kansime: (then closes the gate well) Wai... so wait. Wai... wa...i wai... am Kansime, the who? Grace: yes, the maid Kansime: And you are looking for who? Grace: I am looking for Filp (Philip) Kansime: ha ha ha . aiyayayaya..... Fiup (Philip), you have really dishonoured me to the bream now. So now your side dish has called you Filp (Philip) So he is now Filp. He is noronger Fiup. Ma... young girl. What is your name again? You said you are. called, who? Called what (what)? Has anyone ever told you that you are very ugly? Grace: eh? Kansime: Don't tell me I am surprising you. You don't have a mirror at home (home) what? Has anyone ever told you that

you look bad, you are ugly, and you have been walking in public 51 like that, exposing this? You are very ugly, my dear; you are very... and I don't think this is how you were born? I think you tried plastic surgery, and it went wrong, and you ended up looking like this. Why are you very selfish? Do you know that children are on holiday? Grace: but madam...

Kansiime: you know that children are on holiday, that if you walk around like that, someone might look at you and get hypertension. A child... a young child, can get a heart attack thinking they are seeing something like a ghost walking around. Grace: (sneering) Kansiime: hahaha, don't try those facial expressions. Those are very expensive facial expressions for beautiful people. Someone who looks the way you look (making ugly faces). I cannot manage to look... You don't make those expressions; they are expensive, my dear, make sure you smile. Ugly people smile so that the best runs off. Or others... You must be feeling pain (reaching out to touch her face while Grace moves her face away). You can't look like that and not feel pain. Madam, you are ugly! What was Fiup looking for when he was looking at you? What is it exactly? Exactly what is it? I cannot believe you walked in public... Are you sure there is no stampede outside... Grace: (shaking her head in negation).

Kansiime: people waiting to kill a ghost they have just seen. And you look like that, and you come here looking for Fiup, Fiup. My husband is called Firip Odede. Not Fiup, not Fiup, and he is my husband. Do yourself a favour. Go and find your own husband, Grace: but made... I didn't know that he is your husband he told... Kansiime: (intervening while dancing about) Next time, do a back-up, ooo, check. Check on everyone. Ask them. Can you just look at a married man? Firip is miserable? Married men are miserable? Can't you just look at someone and know that they are Married? So you wanted one? I walk with a posta, eh? Why don't you look for it? So you hehehe? Mmmh, so you wanted to tell me that there was a man who has his own big house, in a gate, single, waiting for you? Because you are special, I want you to take your ugly face out of here. You are very ugly! that should be the number one thing you know in your game. In this text, our focus is on

irony-based implicated thoughts. The incongruity in this example taken from Episode (4) is seen when Kansiime responds to Grace's remark that she is the maid. This is the proposition around which our humour revolves. Kansiime first admits that Grace already has information about her when she confirms that, indeed, she is the Kansiime.

The audience is led to believe that the information Grace has about Kansiime is correct. So contextual assumptions are built on this initial discourse. And the audience will find it relevant that Grace and Kansiime have built a good relationship in this introduction since Grace is not wrong after all. The hearer builds the contextual assumption that now Grace and Kansiime are in the process of knowing each other, and probably Grace will justify her mission of coming here. There is no cause for alarm. But Kansiime cuts this short when Grace says that she knows Kansiime 'as the maid'. As the speaker provides evidence to set off the context for the humour. Kansiime gets suspicious. She stops being the welcoming host and asks a serious question that actually a maid would not ask. The hearer is in suspense now and needs to create new premises about Kansiime's position in this context, as it turns out. Grace is so confident that Kansiime is the maid while Kansiime is furious.

The hearer then searches the encyclopedic entry about the maids who are naturally supposed to be naive and gentle as their position demands while relating to whoever could stand in the position of their superiors. This is not relevant enough to fit this context. The hearer is given the opportunity to determine. The tension is yet to be resolved as the sketch gets to an end. By how also continue. In the following Episode (1), Kansiime meets Grace, who is uneasy in a short skirt and tries to pull the skirt down. Kansiime stops Grace to question her why she left the house in a short skirt when she does not feel comfortable. She goes on to complain about the skirt when Grace decides to ask her the implication of her utterances. Grace: how is it your problem? Kansiime: the problem is not with the skirt; it is with your legs. The response Kansiime gives creates an incongruity to a hearer who has already built assumptions on the problem as being related to the fact that Grace is putting on a short skirt. Kansiime creates a new

perspective of the problem, that it is Grace's legs and not the skirt. The incongruity here is built when Kansiiime, who is expected to complain about the skirt, which is short as the norm is, changes the path of guiding the understanding from the skirt and says the problem is not with the skirt. The problem is Grace's leg. The hearer here rejects the initial hypothesis, which was built about the implication of putting on a short skirt, and is forced to build a new premise on what has made Kansiiime complain. This is what leads to humourous effects. That the kind of complaint that Kansiiime is launching is not the one that the hearer would expect in this case. And the hearer admits the fact that he /she was led to build wrong assumptions about the intended answer that Kansiiime would give Grace.

Kansiiime: (intervenes) Ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e.... why aint you seeing me? So am I naked? Am naked, am bare footed? (going round), and am not wearing Anything? I am just there. Just like (goes behind Grace as she speaks and lifts her arms up) am a backdrop, she is on stage and I am just a curtain that is behind. Is that what you are saying? The text above is taken from Episode (2). Once Kansiiime utters the words Nge Nge nge Nge nge, an incongruity with no logical base is perceived immediately since this is an ostensive stimulus with an implicit import from a previous utterance.

The explicit, in this case, seems to be irrelevant because it does not hold any proposition on which contextual assumptions can be built. So to achieve relevance, the hearer will have to yield cognitive effects from the implicit information. It is important to note that Kansiiime is reacting to the fact that the girl they have met while she is with Grace, her friend, gives compliments to Grace, that she likes the dressing of Grace. The girl's compliment directed to Grace seems to have offended Kansiiime. Given this context where the subsequent utterances which are actually presented in rhetorical questions lead the hearer to work on their background knowledge to activate the encyclopedic entry and draw the picture of a naked Kansiiime, a barefooted Kansiiime. And on a broader sense, extend this picture to include the use of a backdrop on stage. All this will turn out as manifesting humourous effects; see how it continues:

Girl: Noo, Kansiiime Kansiiime: Am naked? Girl: let me tell you something. You are also smart Kansiiime: ee... ee... eeh Girl: you have nice shoes, they are okay Kansiiime: eeeeeeh Girl: but she is really too hot. Kansiiime: Ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e... This example from the same episode above tends to coherently keep the flow in the incongruity posited by Kansiiime. Now that she did complain, that the girl had not seen her, and that is why the girl had not complimented her. The girl in question decides to mend fences and try and make Kansiiime happy as well. Therefore, the girl goes on to tell Kansiiime that she is actually smart too, but her opinion is that Grace is better in this sense. Kansiiime utters words that assert approval of what the girl is telling her. But when the girl reflects on her earlier opinion that Grace is really hot, Kansiiime repeats her earlier implied negative opinion about this fact by repeating the words nge nge nge nge nge nge and this time around in a slower motion. It is this turn of events that leads to the incongruity as Kansiiime signs approval when she is being complemented and rejects the compliments all in all because the girl does not refrain from her earlier implication that Grace is still smarter than the hearer to generate humourous effects.

In the next episode, Kansiiime does not want to go to school, so she decides to pretend that she does not know why her father is asking her to go to school Kansiiime: why? (Almost crying) Father: why? Are you asking? This has been taken from Episode (4), in which Kansiiime does not want to go to school, and decides to woe her father into believing the lie as to why she is not going to school, so she feigns to wonder why her father wants her to go to school. However, here, unfortunately, her father, too, 55, decides to wonder why she is asking the question. One would laugh at the poor turn of events that her father did not indeed fall for her lies; he instead threw Kansiiime back her question. By using the explicit to express the implicit. Here her father's explicit contradicts Kansiiime's implicit Grace: Kansiiime. How could you? Kansiiime: How could I what? The question right now should be, how couldn't I? Because I could do very many things. Right now, you should be asking me. How couldn't you? This example has been taken from the episode (7), in which Kansiiime has given out the

whereabouts of Grace, her friend, to the police for a reward of cash. She does this not because Grace is guilty but because she wants to gain money by having the reward for telling the whereabouts of Grace. Grace feels this is a betrayal from a friend and is here asking Kansiiime 'how could she? The hearer builds assumptions on what a good friend would do in this case and probably expect that Kansiiime would utter words that would probably show regret or Kansiiime would feign ignorance or do any other thing that a friend with good intentions would have done in such a scenario.

The standard assumption is that friends are there to protect each other if they are good friends indeed, But when Kansiiime implicates that she actually did this intentionally by the use of the rhetorical questions, an incongruity is perceived due to the fact

that the interpretation becomes manifestly incompatible with the intended standard assumptions as seen in the context. To achieve relevance, the hearer rejects the first assumptions on what was expected of Kansiiime. The hearer will find it humorous that Kansiiime admits that she did it. This, to the hearer, creates the picture of an arrogant friend who simply admits the mistakes a rational friend would have tried to hide.

CONCLUSION

The research looked at the incongruities in the ironic expressions that were identified in Kansiiime's jokes. We looked at the incongruities, which in their interpretation, manifest a violation of the world's knowledge about a concept or an idea that is shared by both the speaker and the hearer.

REFERENCES

- Cappelli, G. (2003). Expats' Talk: *Humour and Irony in an Expatriate's Travel Blog*, 1–21.
- Forabosco, G. (1992). Cognitive aspects of the humour process: The concept of incongruity. *International Journal of Humour Research*, 5(1-2), 45-68.
- Ruch, W. (1998). Humour measurements tools, in *The Sense of Humour: Explorations of a Personality Characteristic*, ed W. Ruch (Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter), 404–412.
- Yus, R. F. (1998). Relevance theory and media discourse: A verbal visual model of communication. *Poetics*, 25, 293-309.