

**A LINGUISTIC-STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF
HUMUOR IN OPA WILLIAMS' "NITE OF A THOUSAND LAUGHS"**

BY

**ABE, NATHIE AONDONA
MA/ ARTS/ 02799/2008-2009**

NOVEMBER, 2014.

**A LINGUISTIC-STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF
HUMUOR IN OPA WILLIAMS' "NITE OF A THOUSAND LAUGHS"**

BY

**ABE, NATHIE AONDONA
MA/ ARTS/ 02799/2008-2009**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE
STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF A
MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

NOVEMBER, 2014.

DECLARATION

I declare that this research has been conducted and written solely by me. It has not been presented in any previous application for a degree. All the sources of information used to enhance this research are duly acknowledged by means of reference.

.....
Abe, Nathie Aondona
(MA/ARTS/02799/2008-2009)

.....
Date

CERTIFICATION

This thesis titled A Linguistics-stylistic Analysis of the Language of Humour in Opa Williams’ “Nite of a Thousand Laughs” by Abe, Nathie Aondona has met the standards and regulations governing the award of a Master of Arts Degree at Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. It is considered satisfactory and therefore approved.

.....
Prof. G. S. Ibileye
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

.....
Date

.....
Dr J. Amodu
Member, Supervisory Committee

.....
Date

.....
Dr A. Liman
Head, Department of English and Literary Studies

.....
Date

.....
Prof. H. Zoakah
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

.....
Date

DEDICATION

To the Almighty God on Whose power and grace I climbed up to this height.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I specially wish to deeply appreciate the central roles different people played in helping to lift me up to this height. Let me first express my gratitude to God for the overwhelming grace of protection and provision, which culminate into this achievement.

I am particularly grateful to my first supervisor, Prof.G.S.Ibileye, for the uncommon intellectual, academic contributions he afforded me to attain this height. He painstakingly and patiently read and corrected this work. I am grateful. I also show high level of appreciation to my second supervisor, Dr.J.Amodu, for the unusual willingness to meticulously read this work and reshape it for the better. I am thankful to Dr.K. Odiwo for showing absolute concern for my work.

I really wish to register my profound appreciation to Mr. and Mrs. Rotimi for spiritual, moral and material support I got from them. I equally acknowledge the contributions of my colleagues Briska Solomon, Terdo Zawua, John Ogunlade and Oladimeji O. Jamiu. I do not forget the vital contributions of Felicia Onah-Pev and Manfred Abakume.

Finally, I am grateful to my parents, siblings, cousins and friends for their prayers, which resulted into this attainment.

ABSTRACT

One of the most intriguing things about language is its redeployment to accomplish a multiplicity of functions by different people in different places at different times. One of such functions of language is humour-making. People often make use of humour in social, political and cultural interactions through the skillful manipulation of diverse structures of language. Underlining the manipulative skills of a speaker or language user are peculiar and unique choices that are made. These choices are explainable by studying the linguistic style of the language user. To do this, stylistics, therefore, is an instrument with which style can be effectively studied. As a result, this research sets out to examine how and whether syntactic items can be used stylistically to achieve humour. Since analysis must be based on a particular linguistic theoretical construct, this study adopts functional linguistics as a theoretical mainstay for analysis. Since this theory offers a broad spectrum for analysis, the study further narrows down specifically to transitivity as presented in Halliday (1985). Terminologies such as “participants, processes, circumstances” and their sub-types are used in classifying syntactic items. At the end of the analysis, it is discovered that interactants make a predominant use of “processes- the material process” to create humour. This is because an entity has to do something on another for humour to be possible. However, the “processes”, which usually contain “participants”, are complimented by different “circumstances” to contextualise the utterance for humour. The completeness of the humour lies with the relationship between shared knowledge and the lexical choices of interactants. This shared knowledge connects the syntactic choices a speaker makes to context, resulting into humour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	i
Declaration	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgments	v
Abstract	vi
Table of contents	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION												
1.0 Background to the Study	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
1.1 Statement of the Research Problem	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6
1.2 The Research Questions	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7
1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Study	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8
1.4 Significance of the study	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8
1.5 Scope of the Study	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW												
2.0 Preamble	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11
2.1 Review of Related Literature	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11
2.2 The Concept of Stylistics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	18
2.3 Some Approaches to Stylistics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21
2.4 Language and Style	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	25
2.5 Language and Humour	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	27
2.6 Humour and the Nigerian Pidgin	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28
2.7 Authorial Review	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	30
2.8 Nite of a Thousand Laughs	32
2.9 Transitivity and Stylistics	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	34
2.9.1 Material Process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	34
2.9.2 Mental Process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	36
2.9.3 Relational process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	37
2.9.3.1 Intensive Attributive Process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	38
2.9.3.2 Intensive Identifying Process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	40
2.9.4 Verbal Process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	41
2.9.5 Behavioural Process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	42
2.9.6 Existential Process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	43

2.9.7 Circumstances	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	44
2.9.8 Circumstance of Extent and Location	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	44
2.9.9 Circumstance of Manner	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	46
2.9.10 Circumstance of Cause	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	47
2.9.11 Circumstance of Accompaniment	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	48
2.9.12 Circumstance of Matter	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	49
2.9.13 Circumstance of Role	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	50
2.10 Theoretical Framework	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	51
2.11 The Relevance of Transitivity Framework to the Analysis of the Language of Humour	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	53
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY										
3.0 Preamble	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	55
3.1 Source of Data	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	55
3.2 Sampling Procedure	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	56
3.3 Data Collection Method	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	57
3.4 Data Transcription	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	57
3.5 Qualitative and Quantitative Presentation	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	58
3.6 Analytical Procedure	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	58
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS										
4.0 Preamble	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	65
4.1 Presentation of Analysis	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	65
4.1.0 I GO Dye	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	65
4.1.1 A.Y	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	71
4.1.2 Klint De Drunk	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	78
4.1.3 Basket Mouth	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	84
4.1.4 Lepacious Bose	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	90
4.1.5 Gordon	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	97
4.2 Presentation of Frequency Tables	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	104
4.3 General Discussion	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	109
4.4 Findings	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	110
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION										
5.0 Preamble	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	111
5.1 Summary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	111
5.2 Conclusion	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	115

Bibliography

Appendix

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Study

Natural language contains systematic variations on all levels of its structure, such as phonology, morphology, lexicology and syntax. These variations offer the widest possibilities of language use to fulfill different communicative functions in various contexts. To identify, describe and analyse special and unique linguistic expressive means lies at the core of stylistics. This implies that certain language units bear stylistic markers, as they appear in particular contexts of human linguistic interaction.

Humour represents perhaps one of the most genuine and universal speech acts within human interaction. People often make use of humour in social and cultural interactions through the skillful manipulation of language. This manipulation is at diverse linguistic levels, such as lexis, phonology and syntax. In order to investigate these linguistic levels and other perceived extralinguistic factors at work in humour, stylistics is a useful tool. This is because this social activity uses the expressive means of language. Lawal (Olusegun and Adebayo 2008:66) recognises not just the various categories of language but also their use and usage in social functions. To him, “variety and variability are inevitable features of language which is a unique human attribute employed in widely differing circumstances for performing multiplicity of social functions”.

Humour being one of the social functions, is realized, using the variety and variability of language. These affect different categories of language, including the syntactic. To explain how and why certain structures of language can effectively be seen as marking out in terms of meaning, stylistics must be used as an inevitable basis for analysis. This is because it deals with the description of the technical aspects of language, such as the technicalities used in

achieving humour. The question of technicality comes into focus as people do not interact in a one-dimensional way.

Humans interact with one another in divergent ways and these ways include information sharing, emotional exchanges, thoughts and feeling exchanges. People choose diverse means of communicating their thoughts, feelings and emotional concerns to others. Through the instrumentality of language, humans can pass information by means of humour. Therefore, it is a natural phenomenon for humans to laugh at jokes, exchange humorous stories for entertainment and information, tease one another and trade clever insults for amusement on a daily basis. Raskin (1985:2) opines that:

Responding to humour is part of human behaviour, ability or competence, other parts of which comprise such important social and psychological manifestations of homo sapiens as language, morality logic, faith e.t.c

To Raskin, humour is an inextricable part of human nature. This goes further to suggest that no human society exists without humour, since it is a part of human behaviour. This behaviour (humour) is manifested in different forms to different people, settings and situations. This is true because what becomes humorous may be highly restricted to a particular group, culture and possibly experience. Raskin (1985:16) buttresses this point by positing that “it seems to be generally recognized that the scope and degree of mutual understanding in humour varies directly with degree to which the participants share their social background”.

Raskin’s position shows that humour is, for example, steeped in and shaped by culture. What may be interpreted as humour in one cultural setting may be capable of eliciting anger and violence in another. The sum total of the experiences we commonly share as unified members of a homogeneous culture is the conducive premise for jokes, humorous observations, puns, e.t.c.

Equally important in Raskin's position is the social background which may take into account other variables like social situation and social setting. A given utterance, which may be celebrated as humorous in one situation, is likely to be taken with scorn in another situation. Similarly, the setting serves as a strong determining factor as to what makes up humour. Even within one culture, different settings may emerge with specific linguistic demands, curtailing one utterance from being taken as humour. This implies that humour, though a universal phenomenon, is realized differently in different cultures according to experience, setting, situation and it is knowledge specific and bound.

The intersection between humour and language is rife with complex cognitive, cultural and social variables that all work together to create a specific sort of understanding among people. The expressive possibilities of humour rest with the instrumentality of language. Humour is, therefore, transmitted or communicated with recourse to linguistic features that are carefully and sometimes deliberately chosen or selected to achieve this effect. The array of choices (linguistics) that interlocutors make is what is captured in the term "stylistics".

Asher and Simpson (1994:378) give credence to the above position by saying that "stylistics is concerned with variation in language use and thus with analytic choice". Abrams (Ekpe 1977:114) also toes the same path. To him, "stylistics is how a speaker or writer says or writes whatever it is that he says or writes. The characteristic style of a work of a writer may be analyzed in terms of its diction or choice of words";... The rendition of humour, whether spoken or written, planned or accidental is passed across through language by means of the choices that a speaker or writer makes.

The choices that are made affect a number of categories, levels or units of language use. To achieve a humorous result, a speaker or writer appeals to one or all of these language categories or levels intuitively or consciously. A speaker's leaning mainly on a particular or

specific feature is what defines his or her stylistic biases. In humorous language, for instance, one may rely heavily on a phonological, morphological, lexical, semantic, or syntactic level. The question of what linguistic choices are made becomes paramount in the quest to identify the stylistic peculiarities of a speaker or writer.

Turner (1973:1) substantiates the above position when he opines that:

Our knowledge of our language is immensely complex; we carry with us not only a knowledge of a vast intricate patterned code, but also an experience of its varying surrounding circumstances. This guides in making choices from approximately similar items in the code to fit particular occasions.

Tuner's position serves as a good ground for understanding why a language can be humorous, as it gives indisputable insights into the linguistic armory of a speaker. For instance, he mentions very important points relating to language generally, which can be narrowed down to the language of humour. He makes reference to knowledge of a vast intricately patterned code. This means that a speaker is, first and foremost, armed with an adequate linguistic code. This code gives the individual a variety of linguistic options from which he or she can select. Little wonder this linguistic leverage of selection an individual possesses guarantees various applications of this code in different situations, places and times with the aim of achieving a number of purposes. One of such purposes is to achieve humorous effects.

Additionally, Turner makes mention of "an experience of its varying surrounding circumstances". This means that the speaker is not ignorant of diverse circumstances in which language has to be used. To be equipped with the code alone does not amount to the effective use of the code except one is equally enriched with the knowledge of circumstances that require the use of a particular item from the code. To attempt to create humour, for instance, at a funeral gathering may not always yield the desired result. This is why Turner points out

that the experience of the surrounding circumstances “guides in making choices from approximately similar items in the code to fit particular occasions”.

To create humour, therefore, one has to make choices with recourse to the occasions. This implies that the individual peeps outside the linguistic content of a language (the extralinguistic) to arrive at effective language use. Because of this important factor of pragmatics, interactants are found to draw from a variety of linguistic options, which are targeted at achieving a peculiar and specific aim. As multifaceted as there are reasons for language use, so are a number of categories and levels of language. Stylistics seeks to provide a theory and a model for analysing the sum total of the peculiarities inherent in the selections interactants make.

It is against this background that Turner (1993:31) postulates that “stylistics is that part of linguistics which concentrates on variations in the use of language; often but not exclusively with special attention to most conscious and complex uses of language in interaction”. Turner suggests that language is, sometimes, used in a peculiar way. This peculiarity is what brings about variation; and this variation serves as a resource for stylistic analysis. Also, this variation is informed largely by the deliberate and conscious efforts interactants make at achieving their aims. In language of humour, for instance, deliberate linguistic choices are made to elicit laughter.

This being the case, it will be consistent with linguistic practice to undoubtedly establish that even the language of humour, in its own right, is unique. Its uniqueness stems from the peculiarities of the selection interlocutors make to result in a humorous effect. The embodiment of this uniqueness goes further to define its variation. Moreover, since stylistics, according to Turner, concentrates on variations in the use of language, the language of humour equally lends itself for analysis. It is against this backdrop that this study seeks to

investigate the language of humour and its linguistic manifestation, using “Nite of a Thousand Laughs”.

1.1 Statement of the Research Problem

Language has attracted a lot of research. These different shades of investigations are stimulated by the fact that language is a social activity; therefore, it can be used in various ways to perform a multiplicity of functions. One of such functions, which language can be deployed to perform, is to serve as a vehicle for humour. People rely heavily on the anchorage of language to exchange humour. In recognition of the role of language, Yule (1995:116) describes linguistic items as “containers” or as fulfilling “roles”. Yule’s position further suggests that the items do not only contain semantic property but also contain effects, which include humorous ones. What is termed humour can result from the lexical items a speaker carefully selects in the course of interaction.

It, therefore, implies that syntactic elements can fulfill a humorous role among others. This result is achievable when lexical items are blended with other linguistic categories and some shared experiences or knowledge in the world of the interlocutors. This potentially means that the formal linguistic properties of a language in themselves are insufficient to always result into humour. What speakers know in terms of their social and cultural background determines the success of humour to a large extent. This explains why Akmajian et al, (Olusegun and Adebayo 2008:66) say:

No human language is fixed, uniform or unvarying: all languages show internal variation. Actual usage varies from group to group; and speaker to speaker, in terms of the pronunciation of language, the choice of words and the meaning of those words, even the use of syntactic constructions.

But more worrisome is the fact that in spite of this array of choices made by speakers and this knowledge they share to arrive at humour, the linguistic and non linguistic intricacies are most times taken for granted. Many people do not make efforts at considering how

speakers make lexical choices and the influence of the shared experience on humorous meaning. To a reasonable number of listeners, such unique ability resulting in humour is interpreted as intelligence or eloquence. Admissible as this may seem, it is more proper for efforts to be made at not only describing but also explaining the linguistic basis of this language expressive ability.

Underlining speech communication is the linguistic and extralinguistic features of language. These features vary systematically according to the communicative biases of an individual. While speaking, an individual may select more from a particular feature of language more suitable for his or her communicative needs in different contexts. To identify these linguistic features or categories and analyse them systematically underscores the essence of stylistics. The language of humour is equally a variation geared towards a specific goal. Stylistics, therefore, helps in explaining and describing the linguistic peculiarities, which necessitate the humour. These special attributes of a humorous language can reflect at the lexical and syntactic levels.

1.2 The Research Questions

The differences that syntactic items present in meaning can equally be utilised for humorous effects. As a result, this research is geared towards eliciting answers to the following questions.

- (i) How and to what extent do syntactic elements form a style in the language of humour?
- (ii) What is the linguistic or extralinguistic relationship between the syntactic choices a speaker makes and the humorous effect he or she achieves?
- (iii) Do speakers make conscious syntactic choices to achieve humour?
- (iv) Can syntactic elements in themselves elicit humour?

The above questions are considered in order to ascertain the syntactic items speakers or writers appeal to and the extralinguistic as well as linguistic relationship between syntactic selection and humour.

1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to do a linguistic stylistic analysis of the language of humour. The language of humour, just as other aspects of language, has its unique features at different linguistic and non-linguistic levels. This uniqueness sometimes can rest with the lexical items. Turner (1973:31) makes this categorization of language levels into syntax, phonology, lexis and morphology. His own categorizations are centered on the linguistic features of language. He looks at distinct attributes of language at these levels, as they are contributors to stylistic features of a language. Worthy of interest is his mention of the lexical level as an instrument of stylistic importance. This means stylistic analysis can be hinged on the lexical level, which is believed to be found in the language of humour.

This research is aimed at achieving the following objectives:

- (i) To describe how the syntactic items used in an utterance contribute to or help in defining style in the language of humour.
- (ii) To examine the linguistic and non-linguistic relationship between syntactic selection and the resultant humorous effect.
- (iii) To determine how syntactic elements serve as an instrument for humour
- (iv) To investigate the centrality of syntactic elements in interpreting “Nite of a Thousand Laughs” as humorous.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The stylistic investigation of language has permeated multiple dimensions of linguistic application. These areas of application may be approached from a variety of linguistic structures and categories. For instance, language may be applied in social, political

and academic contexts among other areas. To do this, a speaker or writer alludes specially to certain or all the categories and structures of language. These include phonology, morphology, lexicology, syntax and semantics. The application of these levels of language may be geared towards achieving diverse aims. For instance, it may be to inform, educate, socialize or even create humour. It has been discovered that one of the numerous instantiations of peculiar language expression is to create humour. Many attribute this uniqueness to the speaker's intelligence neglecting the underlining linguistic choices. But those endowed with this ability are relentless in its usage.

This aspect becomes so pronounced that some people earn a means of livelihood from it. This suggests that they have acquired some mastery of and skills in how to manipulate some of these linguistic structures. Those in this business themselves may not be able to give the satisfactory linguistic explanation and description of their venture. For a proper understanding and appreciation of those underlining skills and defining them, as well as describing them in linguistic terms, a conscious investigation must be made into some or all of the underpinning structures. In the light of the foregoing, therefore, this research is significant because it contributes to the study of the language of humour, and will serve as reference material for scholars who may wish to undertake further study on the language of humour.

1.5 Scope of the Study

Stylistics focuses on the analysis and description of the linguistic features of a text whether written or spoken. Leech and Short (1981:56), who speak specifically about linguistic stylistics, emphasise that it is "the linguistic study of style". They opine that style is hardly studied for its own sake. This implies that style is studied because one wants to explain or describe something. But the nature of description or explanation varies with

researchers. A lot of interest usually stimulates the engagement of researchers into a stylistic investigation.

Understanding the broad nature of this area of linguistic study, it becomes necessary to restrict one's study to a particular scope of interest within the frame of this field. It is against this backdrop that in this research an attempt is made to consider only the language of humour. Since humour can be made possible in different situations and places, the research focuses on the language of humour in Opa William's "Nite of a Thousand Laughs", a comedy show produced in Nigeria. Only volume 11 of the comedy show is considered for investigation. In it, emphasis is placed on the humorous effects of language.

Given the numerous levels of linguistic investigations, the point of interest is restricted to the syntactic elements, such as "processes, participants and circumstances", which abound in the work and help to define its stylistic features. The elements are, however, not considered in isolation. Efforts are also made to capture the extralinguistic factors, which facilitate the resultant humour. This is in order to ascertain to what extent the elements, together with extralinguistic features, are of humorous importance.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Preamble

This chapter reviews some literature and explains the concept of stylistics as a linguistic theoretical model that focuses on the study of style in a written or spoken event. And since stylistics has been approached from different theoretical leanings, efforts are equally made at explicating some approaches to it. The unit further explains the relationship between language and style, considers language and humour and provides an authorial review, among other things.

2.1 Review of Related Literature

Humorous effects are hardly achieved without the creative manipulation of linguistic codes. This manipulation, whether consciously or unconsciously handled, affects different categories of language. Stylistics, therefore, delves into the relationship between linguistic forms and functions. The function of language in both the literary and linguistic spheres much rest on the intuition, personal judgment and shared experiences of the interactants. This implies that a linguistic form resulting into humour is balanced against intuition, personal judgment and shared experiences.

The form of language, which a speaker or a writer gives more prominence to and how they are applied in a linguistic event, accounts for a style. Leach and Short (1981:11) also add to this view. To them, “style refers to the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person for a given purpose, and so on”. To talk about how language is used implies commenting on its categories. A speaker or writer employs lexical items among other structures of language in a communicative event. But there must be where, when and why these lexical items are used and who makes use of them as embodied in context.

This explains why Coulthard (1975:62) opines “the production of isolated sentences without a context is a pastime only of the linguist and not characteristic use of language”. This makes particular mention of sentences, which should not be considered, using formal properties alone for meaning. They are strung together to form sentences. Moreover, to comment on how syntactic elements are applied means one is explicitly or implicitly delving into stylistics. Whatever methods of application one makes use of linguistic structures, the ultimate goal, whether directly or indirectly, is to make meaning and the effect of the meaning is at times humorous.

To explain the linguistic structures and their usages, which contain humorous undercurrent is the domain of stylistics. Leach and Short (1981:13) put it that “stylistics, simply defined as the (linguistic) study of style, is rarely undertaken for its own sake, simply as an exercise in describing what use is made of language. We normally study style because we want to explain something”...The unique nature of language features applied in different contexts by different writers or speakers informs the curious need for the study of stylistics. While commenting on stylistics, Prasad (2008:269) claims “stylistics is the study of style and the methods used in written and spoken languages. It is the manner of linguistic expression in prose or verse. It is the way a speaker or writer expresses whatever he wants to say”.

It follows from the above, therefore, that the language of humour has its method and manner of expression. This is explicated in the fact that language is deliberately manipulated to result into humour. If it is so manipulated, it is predisposed to stylistic analysis. However, there are a number of categories of language that are given to analysis. Prasad (2008:269) exposes these categories when he says that “stylistics is the study of the linguistic features of literary text-phonological, lexical, syntactical which directly affect the meaning of an utterance”. Though the statement seems to be leaning heavily on literary texts, it is a fact that nonliterary texts can equally be analyzed stylistically. Also, paramount in Prasad’s positions

are the categories of language. The mention of phonological, lexical and syntactical levels is a clear exposition of the possible analytical structures of language. The embodiment of the analysis may be streamlined to cover whole or part of these levels. This goes further to validate an analysis that may seek insight only into the syntactic elements, as it is the case with the language of humour in this study.

To illuminate on the lexical level of language, Prasad (2008:122) puts it simply that “lexis is the total number of words that exist in a language”. From this array of words, a speaker or writer selects those appropriate for the communicative purpose at hand. However, the words are strung together into other syntactic units, just as the language of humour would equally deploy some syntactic items for its use. These use and purpose would be to make humorous meaning. Meaning is central to language. No wonder that, Prasad (2008:136) concretizes this by saying “meaning is the soul of a language. Every language is the expression of concept either through words (sounds) or sentences, which are built up from the combination of words”. Prasad’s view does not only emphasize the centrality of meaning but the syntactic items, which are the kernel of meaning. Stylistics, therefore, is attracted to syntactic items.

To Leech and Short (1981: 14) stylistic investigation goes beyond literary appreciation. It captures other domains such as the speaker’s or writer’s linguistic identity.

This they say:

Some of the more rigorous statistical studies of style have had the purpose of discovering the author of works of doubtful attribution. Such investigations have tended to concentrate on linguistic traits, which may not necessarily be artistically relevant, such as range of vocabulary, sentence length or frequency of conjunction...

Even as the goal here is to mention another important function performed by an aspect of stylistics, cognizance must be taken of their mention of the different categories of language for investigation. The tools for the investigation of an author’s identity fall within the purview of stylistics. This further strengthens the validity of humorous rendition as a

worthwhile material for investigation. Leech and Short (1981:13) earlier mention that from a linguistic angle the stylistic question has been “why does the author here choose to express himself in this particular way?” In the language of humour, the question of the way the author chooses to express himself is pertinent because he has undoubtedly chosen to express himself consciously or unconsciously in a particular way to create humorous effect. The choices he makes are linguistic, these linguistic choices affect different structures or levels of language with lexical items inclusive.

While expatiating further on how the choice of words influences various types of meaning, Leech and Short (1981: 75) give evaluative parameters thus: is the vocabulary

- (i) Simple or complex?
- (ii) Formal or colloquial?
- (iii) Descriptive or evaluative?
- (iv) General or specific?
- (v) How far does the writer make use of emotive and other associations of words as opposed to their referential meaning?

To clearly understand the syntactic choices a speaker makes and the resultant humorous meaning, recourse must be made to some, all or more of the parameters set by Leech and Short. If their position is to be subscribed to, it can be plausibly interpreted that syntactic elements are an indispensable category of language for stylistic analysis. However, it must be inevitably noted that unless the focal point of an investigation is syntactic, it may be ignored in the process.

Pivotal to any analysis of style is an attempt to find the principles underlying a writer’s or speaker’s choice of language. In order to substantiate this claim, Wales (1989: 437) declares that:

The goal of most stylistic studies is not simply to describe the formal features of texts for their own sake, but in order to show their functional significance for the

interpretation of the text, or in order to relate literary effects to linguistic “causes” where these are felt to be relevant.

Wale’s position no doubt mentions an important point that formal features of language are used for conveying meaning. If only formal features of a text are described without any bearing on the functions they perform, the core of language, which is meaning, will be ignored. For instance, it is grossly inadequate to say a speaker or writer makes a predominant use of certain nouns, verbs, adjectives, or simple sentences, complex sentences and so on without reference to what they are used to achieve. A complete linguistic analysis must encapsulate what role the categories of language play to achieve what meaning. In the language of humour, the syntactic items, which fall in different “processes, participants and circumstances”, are used particularly to result into humorous effect. Any analysis, therefore, will be more justifiable to lay bare this function. Intuitions and interpretative skills are important devices in stylistics.

The bulk of what embodies interpretation surpasses the purview of the formal features of language. It encompasses the knowledge and shared experience of the interlocutors at a given time, in a particular place and situation; this implies that one linguistic token may mean different things to different people at different times and places. Therefore, one particular formal feature of language, for instance, a syntactic element, will not contain a universal value of applicability. Little wonder that the same linguistic token, which will resultantly be humour in one context, will potentially be chaotic in another. This accounts for why the interpretation of language is most accurately located within the armpit of context.

Asher and Simpson (1994:4378) while buttressing this point say that there are groups of stylistic analysts “who find ways of furthering their understanding of for example, a text’s literary meaning and a writer’s preoccupation, personality, and intentions, as well as developing greater awareness of the circumstances and context of production of the text”. Although Asher and Simpson are concerned about literary meaning in this point, this study

again is confronted with the inevitability of context as a tool for analysis. What constitutes the language of humour, therefore, cannot be found to exist in total isolation from context. Formal features of language, therefore, enter into an inseparable pact and alliance with context in order to sharpen interpretation and understanding. What is humorous depends on the anchorage of the formal and non formal attributes of language. To substantiate this, Asher and Simpson (1994: 4375) say:

What characterizes stylistics as a discipline concerned with the theory and analysis of style, are quite different theoretical and methodological motivations that determine which of those linguistic features in a particular text are considered worth analyzing and which ones are best left alone.

The implication of the above is that in a text, certain features of language do lend themselves for analysis while others do not. This is determined from the significant role they play. Their significance lies in the informed choices a speaker or writer makes of them, how they are manipulated to convey meaning in the context within which they are used. To this end, certain linguistic features are found to be worthy of analysis in the language of humour. Their worthiness is informed by their skillful manipulations, which result into humour. The syntactic elements are in many respects selected carefully and used in order to create a humorous effect. This selection, therefore, attracts stylistic attention.

When commenting on the linguistic perspective to the study of stylistics, Crystal (1996:71) opines that “when an author uses language ingeniously, we instinctively relate the special features to our own spoken norms, and any explanation of the effect ultimately depends on our awareness of these norms, and how we relate to them”. This is a further proof that people individualize their manipulation of linguistic features, which is consequently linked to their ingenuity. In a humorous communicative event, it is believed that language is handled ingeniously. This can be so interpreted because it is not every instantiation of language use that results into humour. Additionally, as Crystal (1996:71) explicitly mentions, before certain features of language elicit a humorous effect to the target audience, “we

instinctively relate the special features to our own spoken norms”. Sometimes, it is even the deviation from the norms or the consistency with the norms, that creates the humorous effect that we feel. In other cases, when we assess a feature of language as used by an individual vis-a-vis the norms,, the result becomes offensive.

The crux of stylistics, therefore, is to investigate, describe or analyse these ingenuities of a speaker or writer, which are equally found in the language of humour. The pillar that holds these ingenuities are the features of language. These are categorized, according to Leech and Short (1981:70-9), into lexical categories, grammatical categories, figures of speech and context and cohesion. Their classification, however, does not mention phonology, which also gains currency in phono-stylistics. Crystal (1996:71) who mentions these categories points out “minimal contrasts of sound, grammar, or vocabulary” as a central point to linguistic analysis. In the language of humour, the speaker appeals to these categories of language in order to pass across these humorous effects. Therefore, it is not out of place to consider the syntactic items, which immensely contribute to this humour.

Lyons (1981: 290) looks at stylistic variation and stylistics. To him “one way of approaching the phenomenon of stylistic variation is by considering the fact that a language system frequently provides its users with alternative means of saying the same thing”. This is undoubtedly correct because two people can hardly express one idea using exactly the same linguistic mechanism. Renditions of humour are informative, educative and at the same time humorous. A simple information can be passed by manipulating syntactic elements or other structures of language in a humorous way. Lyons calls this “a matter of choice between lexemes”. These alternative choices speakers make define their style. The language of humour is also rife with alternative choices. To describe and analyse these choices fall within the emblem of stylistics.

Pursuant to this point, Akmajian et al (Olusegun and Adebayo 2008:66) opine that:

No human language is fixed, uniform or unvarying: all languages show internal variation. Actual usage varies from group to group; and speaker to speaker in terms of the pronunciation of language, the choice of words and the meaning of these words, even the use of syntactic construction.

This further concretizes the assertion that humour is passed through a language, and the language has variation. Because of these variations, choices are made in the actual usage to pass across humorous effects. These choices affect different categories of language with syntactic items inclusive. They are used specifically to result into humorous meaning. Stylistics, therefore, comes in to provide a model for the description, explanation and analysis of these peculiar choices that result into humour.

2.2 The Concept of Stylistics

According to Leech and Short (1981:13), stylistics is simply defined as “the linguistic study of style”. To clarify on style, Leech and Short (1981:10) refer to it as “the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person for a given purpose, and so on”. This definition explains why language can be used to achieve different things at various times. The context in which language is used largely influences its outcome. For instance, in a solemn context, it would be difficult for language use to create humorous effect.

The concept of stylistics to Leech and Short (1981:13) subsumes a number of analytical foci or perspectives. One of such is what is termed “literary stylistics”. To them, “it has implicitly or explicitly, the goal of explaining the relation between language and artistic function.” The underpinning of this perspective concentrates on the more distinctive forms of literary expression such as figures of speech and other forms of literary appreciation. Leech and Short put it that “the motivating questions are not so much what, as why and how.” The second dimension, which they refer to as the “linguistic angle”, has as its preoccupation the question “why does the author here choose to express himself in this particular way?”. It implies that one has to take a look at how language has been used before the emanation of this question; and how the puzzle is resolved goes a long way in addressing a lot of linguistic

issues. For instance, mention must be made of who use that language, where, why and on what occasion. To appreciate the language of humour for instance, recourse must be made to the issues above. The third viewpoint has as its centrality the question, “how is such and such an aesthetic effect achieved through language? “This assesses language evaluatively”.

Asher and Simpson (1994:4378) view stylistics as concerned with “variation in language use and thus with analytic choice”. This also acknowledges the various ways in which humans manipulate language and the diverse methodological patterns with which such variations can be accounted for. They equally rest their view of stylistics on a tripod. The grouping is as follows:

First, analysts who find ways of furthering their understanding of, for example, a text’s” literary meaning and a writer’s preoccupations, personality, and intention, as well as developing greater awareness of the circumstance and context of the production of the text. The second produces analyses, which are designed to classify texts, genres and literary periods more formally by attributing authorship and provenance through linguistic, literary, and rhetorical means, often involving explicit statistical and computational analysis. The third involves analysts who use linguistic variation as exemplification for the development of a more theoretical understating of language as system in virtual time rather than as actual communication in real time.

Wales (1989: 437), who takes an etymological approach to stylistics, begins by defining it as “the study of style”. Wales (1989:435) earlier defines style as “the manner of expression in writing or speaking just as there is a manner of doing things, like playing squash or panting”. It can be surmised that stylistics is the study of the manner of expression in writing or speaking. She is of the view that stylistics in the twentieth century replaces and expands on the earlier study of elocution in rhetorics. Following the publication of a two-volume treatise on French stylistics (*stylistique*) by Bally (1909), a pupil of the structuralist,

Saussure, interest in stylistics gradually spread across Europe via the work of Spitzer (1928,1948) and others. It witnessed an insurgence and flourishing in 1960s in Britain and the United States, given impetus from post-war developments in descriptive linguistics, grammar in particular. According to her, “traditional literary critics were suspicious of an objective approach to literary texts”.

Wales (1989:483) seemingly disparages the interchangeable use of literary stylistics and linguistic stylistics and others. To her, stylistics is sometimes called confusingly literary stylistics or linguistic stylistics: literary, because it tends to focus on literary texts; linguistics, because its models are drawn from linguistics. Many scholars fail to distinguish in clear terms what literary stylistics and linguistic stylistics represent. To further refine this perspective, Wales (1989:438) posits that “linguistic stylistics can refer to a kind of stylistics whose focus of interest is not primary literary texts, but the refinements of a linguistic model which has potential for further linguistic or stylistic analysis”.

To totally alienate linguistic stylistics from literary stylistics is quite a difficult task. The two are symbiotically intertwined. Literary stylistics draws much of its analytical methods and descriptive intuitions from linguistics; just as much of the resources for linguistic analysis are literary texts. Stylistics has a special bias for both a descriptive and analytical approach to the factors of language use. It is concerned with the analysis and description of the linguistic and extra linguistic features of texts in relation to their meaning. Leech and Short (1981) capture the interwoven nature of the literary and linguistic perspectives by defining stylistics as “the study of the relation between linguistic form and literary function”. This means that stylistics is both formal and functional in nature. But to further delineate linguistic stylistics from literary stylistics, Turner (1973:7) defines it as “that part of linguistics, which concentrates on variation in the use of language often but not

exclusively, with special attention (paid) to the most conscious and complex use of language in literature”.

What then constitutes linguistic stylistics are the theories and methods of linguistics that are used for analysis. Little wonder Olusegun and Adebayo (2008:70) put it that:

Linguistic stylistics is a branch of applied linguistics concerned with the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of texts of all categories, whether literary or non-literary constructed with the verbal apparatus of language, from the perspective of stylistics.

This again pulls linguistic stylistics further away from the notion of literary stylistics. But whatever ideological persuasion about stylistics, it remains as a tool for analysis and description of texts of any kind from literary to non-literary perspectives. Against this background, it is safe to say that the language of humour as used in the “Nite of a Thousand Laughs” is a text. And because it is a text, it can be analyzed from the stylistic angle. Additionally, to pass humorous information, the speaker specially appeals to certain categories of language which are better appreciated when analyzed from a stylistic notion.

2.3 Some Approaches to Stylistics

Different movements and theoretical persuasions in the study of linguistics have inevitably determined the various profiles and practices of stylistics. Some theories are scientifically motivated while others are socially and politically motivated. Asher and Simpson (1994:4378) put it that “the result has been a theoretical tension which argued either that linguistic structures are motivated internally by the principles of grammar or that they are motivated externally by social and cultural forces”. What Asher and Simpson call “the tension between this internalized (psychological) and externalized (Sociological) orientation” has divided the study of language and consequently these ideological leanings. However, efforts are made at explaining only three of these theories beginning with structuralism.

According to Wales (1985:434), structuralism describes an intellectual discipline, which gradually developed momentum during the twentieth century, influenced by formalism

and the Prague School. The theory is particularly attributed to a group of French scholars writing after the Second World War. Scholars such as Claude Lévi-Strauss (Anthropology), Roland Barthes (literature and semiotics) and Michel Foucault (History) are associated with this theory.

As it is symbolic of the term, structuralism centres on the structures of language such as words, phrases, clauses, sentences. It also involves other systems of knowledge and cultural behavior, such as kinship system and myths. The model is particularly attributed to the ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure (1916). Structuralism and its apostles emphasize arbitrariness of the relation between signifier or form and the signified or concept. They also stress the importance of difference between signs as a determination of meaning. As it applies to text analysis, structuralism centres not on the evaluation of individual texts but on their structural patterns or interpretative codes. It considers particularly the formal properties and conventions of text. To structuralists, especially, Sinclair (Asher and Simpson 1994:4380), “certain levels of meaning exist within language particularly at grammatical and syntactic levels, which can be described quite independently of evaluation”. Structural stylistics is concerned with uncovering hidden meaning in the structural relations of a text by pairing surface structure “signifier” with deep structure “signified”, in order to understand the message.

To the structural stylistician, analysing the language of humour, for instance, would entail considering the formal grammatical structures of language within the text. The interpretation of the text would be dependent on the meaning of structures of language, such as words, phrases and syntactic structures within the text. This makes no recourse to any other factor of language outside the text. This approach is visited with heavy criticisms. One of such is the fact that it is too formalist, consisting of only formal features of language. It is also accused of studying texts as closed systems, outside of their social and historical

contexts. For instance, in the language of humour, it is grossly inadequate to read meaning from only the formal features of the language without consideration of social, political and cultural issues, which help in shaping the meaning. In showing the inadequacy of structuralism, Crystal (1994:79) puts it that “language is seen not as a static structure existing regardless of social, historical, or personal considerations, but as a system whose values shift in response to these factors and whose meaning is too complex to be demonstrable by structuralist techniques”.

This again serves as a further proof of the inadequacy of structuralism, hence transformational grammar. The transformational grammar, variously known as transformational generative grammar and generative grammar gained currency particularly from the late 1950^s and 1960^s onward. The school is associated with the work of Noam Chomsky (1967:1965). Generative grammar aims at describing and producing (generate) all and only the grammatical sentences of a language. The production of sentences relies on transformational rules, which are rules for transforming one syntactic element or constituent or string into another. Wales (1989:435) opines that Chomsky was influenced by the work of his teacher, Zellig Harris (1952) in his work on text structure. With the introduction of deep structure and surface structure in 1965, T-rules enabled conversion to take place between deep and surface forms. This means that simple sentences could become compound or complex sentence by T-rules of conjunction or embedding. There are also rules for negation, deletion, nominalization and optional T-rules (called stylistics) for more surface operations such as thematisation.

The stylistic implication of transformational grammar is seen in the works of Ohmann and (1964), Hayes (1966). Using T-rules (transformational rules), they consider the stylistic implication of the choices of different kinds of transformations in respect of identifying idiolects, the style of different writers. They also seek to demonstrate stylistically

the difference between a poet's grammar and underlying grammatical norms usually seen to be simple kernel sentences in a basic declarative sentence. The writer's style becomes describable in the particular transformational options selected from the underlying base (deep structure). This theory is, however, seen to be inadequate since it is sentence-based. It does not effectively account for other structures of language in a text. It again does not capture other plains of language, such as meaning in a proper way. It fails to account for social, cultural and political factors, which may influence meaning.

As a result, other scholars focus on the function language performs looking at sociological, political and pragmatic issues surrounding it. The functionalists stress on the pragmatic function of language in its communicative context. This approach views the stylistic function or effects or thematic significance of linguistic features in texts where various grammatical models are adopted. This aimed at correlating language with social and political assumptions, which help in shaping meaning. To Asher and Simpson (1994:4381), stylistics under functionalism is "about understanding social realities rather than determined truths which are thought to pre-exist in language".

Central to the position of this school is that, as language users, people are socially and culturally constructed not as a single unique subjectivity, but as many different subjects. This is made possible by discursive means of making meanings. Analysis of text, therefore, is analysis of all these linguistic and non-linguistic functions shaping meaning. To further buttress this point, Asher and Simpson (1994:4381) say:

Whenever a person uses language, therefore it is useful to imagine that there is a set of quotation marks around the utterance which signal that this is not original to a unique individual, is part of a historical, social/cultural process of making meaning which involves a dialog between other discourse, other texts other persons, times and places, other sites of producing meaning.

To this school, therefore, to effectively analyse a text, cognizance must be taken of not just the formal features of language but also historical, social and cultural issues, which

may contribute to the meaning of the text. The notion of a text free from context becomes untenable. It is determined by the functions it performs, and those functions are determined ideologically.

Functional grammar or systemic functional grammar is highly associated with the work of Halliday from the late 1960s onwards. It is built on the ideas of J.R Firth. Halliday, according to Wales (1989:450), establishes the major units of linguistic (morpheme, word, group, clause, sentence) and theoretical categories (unit, structure, class, system), which enable the analyst to deal thoroughly with any text. What is foregrounded in systemic linguistics is the notion of system, but seen as a network of options or choices. Each major aspect of grammar can be analysed in terms of a set of options, each option dependent upon the context or environment.

This goes on to say that in the language of humour, for instance, analysis must be made with recourse to the context and the environment within which the language is produced in order to arrive at appropriate interpretation of meaning. Formal features alone cannot effectively account for meaning. There are certain historical, cultural and political underpinnings of some of the syntactic elements used and to fairly interpret them as humorous, one must share in the knowledge of the history, culture and politics so mentioned. Any analysis therefore should embrace all these factors.

2.4 Language and Style

Sapir (Crystal 1994:396) defines language as “a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols”. To Trager (Olusegun and Adebayo 2008:1), language is “a system of arbitrary symbols” by means of which members of a society interact in terms of their total culture”. It is obvious from the definitions that language is an instrument of expressing one’s thought. Style, on the other hand, is the way humans make use of language to express their thought.

Wales (1981:435) puts it that “style refers to the manner of expression in writing or speaking, just as there is a manner of doing things, like playing squash or painting”. This goes on to show that how an individual manipulates language in expression becomes the style. Stylistic features are basically features of language, so style is in a sense synonymous with language. Language and style are better compared to a chicken and an egg. One can hardly do without the other. The choice one makes to express ideas, emotions or thoughts are from language. Style as choice may exist at the level of form. Style as choice implies that a language provides alternative ways of saying one thing; and the writer or speaker selects from these options. There may be at the phonological level, lexical or syntactic levels. It may also be at the sociolinguistic level. The language has a variety of dialects, which may include the standard and the non-standard. Within those dialects, there are formal and informal usages, as well as the technical and the non-technical. All these are resources of language from which choices can be made by speakers. Another angle may be the idiolects and sociolects from which speakers can select.

The style of a writer or speaker is also defined from the perspective of style choice within the boundaries of a system of rule, which constitutes a language. This style as deviation from the norm makes a comparison between what occurs and what should have occurred. A writer or speaker might choose a language that is unconventional to express ideas, thoughts or emotions. This may happen by deviating from the grammatical, semantic and orthographic norms of a language. Here again, what becomes style is the language. Style does exist particularly because certain features of language are seen to be “repeated on a reasonably consistent, iterative basis (Asher and Simpson 1994:4376). One of the style features always thought to be characteristic of language of science is the regular use of passive constructions with deleted agent in preference to active constructions. This shows

that what particularly passes for a style is the consistent use of a particular feature or features of language for expression.

The centrality of language to style is further confirmed in what is termed the authorial style. What accounts for that are the linguistic features of language that are found to be typical of an individual writer or a speaker. The famous statement, “style is the man, style, C’est l’homme même”, shows the writing equivalent of an author’s fingerprints. Another dimension to the notion of authorial style particularly affects literature. Here one’s language can be seen as loose, abstract, baroque and so on. Each author draws upon the general stock of the language for expression. What makes styles distinctive is the choice of items and their distribution and patterning in communicative events. Style is, therefore, the management of language to achieve different effects, as can be seen in the language of humour.

2.5 Language and Humour

Humour exists across all languages and cultures as an essential human characteristic. The need to express amusement and lightheartedness in life makes humour central to human interaction. Humour can be used as a marker of solidarity and bonding in specific social contexts. But humour is not separable from language. What constitute humour are the linguistic manipulations a speaker makes. The choice of funny or silly words, grammatical patterns, pronunciation and tones of voice greatly determines the effect that language has on interactants. Speakers temper with several of these linguistic features to create humour. Crystal (1994:62) gives an example of a case of tempering with a word to create humour where a speaker creates false gender, saying a custom officer-ess.

Some cases of humour result from the deviation from language norms. When the linguistic expectations of a listener are broken, the result is likely to be humorous. This affects different levels of language. In phonology, it may be a mispronunciation of a word that can result into humour, some linguistic incongruities, which may result from idiomatic

shifts, jokes, which may result into humour are based on word-structure and word-class. Others, which may result into humour, are sometimes considered within the context in which they occur, the attitudes and expectations of the people who use them. Equally important are the conventions that listeners follow while a joke is being told.

In the “Nite of a Thousand laughs”, for instance, the language use has a lot of local colouration. A listener has to be conversant with the Nigerian culture in order to arrive at the humorous effect. In some cases, the jokes are tailored around political issues in the country; one must have some knowledge of political events in the country to understand the linguistic features selected as having a humorous effect. In essence, language is used as a tool for humour. Nevertheless, the completeness of the humour goes beyond the formal features of language use. Other shared knowledge in culture, politics and Nigerian society help to create the humorous effect.

2.6 Humour and Nigerian Pidgin

Humour-making has permeated the Nigerian society. There has been an increase in the use of humour as a means of livelihood among certain Nigerians. As a result, desperate efforts are being made by comedians to sell their enterprise in a language that would easily be understood by the people. Nigerian pidgin, therefore, lends itself as a ready communication tool for this business purpose.

Nigerian pidgin emerged because of contacts with the Europeans. It is an English based language that borrows sparingly from indigenous languages. In an attempt to explain what pidgin means, Todd (1974:1) says it is “a marginal language, which arises to fulfil certain restricted communication needs among people, who do not share a common language”. Though Todd’s definition raises an important point by portraying pidgin as a language of people of diverse backgrounds, the definition is not watertight. Pidgin fulfils all the communication needs of a people, it is not subject-bound and it does not fulfil only

“restricted communication needs of a people, as presented by Todd. Also, even people who share a common language may resort to pidgin as a social language, as can be seen among Yorubas in Lagos. However, in the language of humour, pidgin, according to Todd, has been used to fulfil communication needs among people who do not share a common language. A lot of Nigerians come together to listen to humour renditions conducted mostly in pidgin English.

To Romaine (1988:224), pidgin is “a language, which has been stripped of everything but the basic essentials necessary for communication”. Romaine’s position seems to give pidgin away because of simplicity of its structure. Pidgin, though simple, has its grammar, tense and lexicon, among other things. It is as a result of the rules of tenses that comedians can make renditions referring to the past, present and the future. To say pidgin is stripped of everything.... is an over-statement.

No wonder that Rodman and Hymes (2007:437) say “although pidgins are in some sense rudimentary, they are not devoid of rules, the phonological system of the language is complex and rule governed as in any human language”. Rodman and Hymes emphasise the position of pidgin as a rule-governed language like any other language. However, the above statement emphasises the issue of phonology while deemphasising other aspects of language, such as grammar. What remains true about the above statement is that in some aspects of humour rendition, what is manipulated to become humour is the phonology, an area not included in this study. Nigerian pidgin is an English-based language tuned in line with Nigeria’s indigenous languages. It develops because of heterogeneous language contacts in urban areas. Mafeni (1971:98) supports this area by saying that:

Nigerian pidgin is essentially a product of urbanization while its origin lies historically between Europeans and Africans on the coast. Its development and spread is as a result of contact between Africans

Mafeni's position reflects on the history of pidgin as a contact between Europeans and Africans on the coastal areas. The spread of this language has made it central to the communication needs of Nigerians. It is used by Nigerians from all the domains of interaction, such as politics, education, trade, entertainment; a reason the Greene (1973:14) opines that "even at the university, the preferred linguistic lowest common denominator of students among themselves is pidgin".

The language has permeated even the mass media. Akinligi (1966:46) reasons that "various broadcasting compositions in Nigeria have in recent years done much to popularize their pidgin programmes". These programmes also include rendition of humour. Pidgin plays an important social role in Nigeria. It is used as a social language, an informal language for humour rendition. It is as a result of this that much of the data used for this study are rendered in pidgin.

2.7 Authorial Review

This unit reviews some authorial perspectives or ideologies about the language of humour. Authors have made various efforts at explaining the use of language stylistically to make humour. Berlyne (1972:56), while writing on language of humour, opines that "humour is accompanied by discriminative cues, which indicate that what is happening or is going to happen, should be taken as a joke". Berlyne's opinion can only be effectively applied to the premeditated language of humour. A planned language of humour may give these cues. However, a spontaneous humour situation may not give these cues. As it relates to this research, Berlyne makes a valid point, as comedians preplanned their humour and presented to the audience who sat in readiness to laugh.

McGhee (1972:74), who thinks that language of humour stylistically uses context to give meaning, says, "of course, in most humour situations... various external cues are readily available leaving no doubt that the situation is not to be construed in serious manner". It is

agreeable that external factors of language help in explaining a language event as a joke and should not be taken seriously. However, McGhee does not mention the possibility that these “external factors” may give a cue to a listener of mockery, insult and even criticism, which may provoke vexation. As it applies to this study, McGhee’s comment remains true because the audience use the external factors as enhancers of humour.

Neuliep’s (1991:354) authorial posture on language of humour is “its effect as a relaxing, comforting and tension reducing device, its humanizing effect on teacher image and, its effect of maintaining/increasing students’ interests and enjoyment”. Neuliep pedagogically explains the importance of humour in teaching and learning. However, he fails to state that the over-application of humour in a class may impede effective learning. In this study, humour is seen making people relax, comfortable, and reducing tension as postulated by Neuliep. Veatch (1998:164) writes on language of humour thus, “humour occurs when it seems that things are normal while at the same time something seems wrong. Or, in an only apparent paradox, humour is (emotional) pain that does not hurt”. Though humour may be created from weighty and painful issues, Veatch seems to make an overbearing statement. Some cases of humour are not necessarily stemmed from emotional pains or hurt but happiness. In this study, some renditions of humour are stemmed from light issues.

In addition, Schmitz (2002:15) makes a pedagogical authorial view about the language of humour. To him, “classroom exposure to humour prepares students to understand and react to this pervasive and authentic element of discourse during communicative language”. Schmitz fails to mention the kind of reaction, which may emanate from the students. A negative reaction may hamper learning instead. However, reacting to humorous language transcends the classroom, as this study looks at language of humour outside the classroom. Triezenberg’s (2008:538) authorial view recognizes the importance of shared knowledge and extralinguistic events in the language of humour. He says, “a humour

enhancer is a narrative technique that is not necessarily funny in and of itself, but that helps an audience to understand that the text is supposed to be funny”. This position, no doubt, relates to the study in question. What enhances the humorous result is the knowledge of the social, political, cultural, religious and economic environments with which the audience is armed.

Meanwhile, Chovanec and Ermida (2012:1), who write on language of humour and the media, reason that “from cartoons and comic strips through internet gags and humorous adverts, to sitcoms and funny remarks in editorials and opinion articles, the media do thrive in linguistic manipulation of humour”. Chovanec and Ermida’s pothole is the credit they wholistically give to the linguistic manifestation of humour. There are some extralinguistic factors of language, which help in polishing what is presented in the media. In this study, what brings humour is not just the language but the political, cultural and social factors of the language.

As authors talk about language of humour in diverse perspectives, Marszalek (2012:90) hammers on the cognitive angle. To her, “in order to be amused by humorous language, the hearer must be even briefly, in a humorous state of mind-suspending some of the everyday problem-solving mechanisms, which may inhibit humour reception”. It is too strong for Marszalek to say “the hearer must be, even briefly, in a humorous state”... language of humour, as stylistically applied, has the motivating power to make a hearer amused even in a bad mood. This accounts for why the comedy show “Nite of a Thousand Laughs” under study began in a hospital ward.

2.8 Nite of a Thousand Laughs

Opa Williams’ humour is called “Nite of a Thousand Laughs”. Ironically, the idea for this comic business emerged from a tragic scenario. According to Thisday online/Nigeria News/African views on global news, Williams, the movie producer, had gone with his crew

to the orthopedic Hospital, Igbobi, Lagos to shoot a scene for one of his movies, and there they met a Nollywood actor who had been on admission after a car crash. The cast and crew thought of humour as having a therapeutic effect and decided to crack jokes in order to make the actor laugh and be relieved of his pains. These jokes made other patients in the ward also laugh.

A nurse soon came to ask them to leave because the doctor was about to come for his ward round, a phrase for doctors' visits to the wards to attend individually to patients. But unknown to the nurse, the doctor was already in the ward, laughing heartily at the jokes. He asked the nurse to leave them and the joke continued. When Opa Williams got home, he thought about what happened at the hospital, and at that moment, it occurred to him that laughter could be a "healing balm". He started thinking about how the idea of laughter could be used to touch lives. William's initial plan was to organize comedians to visit hospitals and prisons to take laughter to the people and thus lighten the yoke of pains and confinement on charity grounds.

He, therefore, sought for sponsorship and organized the maiden edition of "Nite of a Thousand Laughs" on October 1, 1995 at the University of Lagos, urging the audience to be part of the healing fun. This maiden edition in terms of financial returns was a colossal loss. His partners vanished but he kept on with this vision. Today, a huge number of people pay yearly to watch the event called "Nite of a Thousand Laughs". Opa Williams has made comedy a business. Before, comedians were mere jesters and clowns used at intervals of serious shows and events and paid a pittance.

Now many comedians have been enlisted into the services of Opa Williams. Without doubt, he has created the comedy factory and set up the industry to feed people. In keeping with the initial plan, part of the proceeds from the project goes to charity. But at the back of this profiting business is the instrumentality of language. The mainstay of this comedy

industry is language. It provides the raw material that is refined into humour in form of categories, such as phonology, lexis and syntax. Humour can only be made by manipulating all or some of these categories in a special or skillful manner. It is, therefore, pertinent to investigate and describe the categories.

2.9 Transitivity and Stylistics

Transitivity can be alluded to for stylistic effects. Transitivity, as explained by functional linguistics, contains processes, participants and at times circumstances. The skillful manipulation of these structures of language can be useful in defining a style. In explaining the transitivity model, major process types and their sub-classifications are introduced first. Having discussed the processes, the participant roles that are directly involved in the processes are also explained. Transitivity processes are categorized into the material, the mental, the relational, the verbal, the behavioural and the existential, in accordance with their representation of the processes of doing, sensing, being, saying, behaving and existing.

2.9.1 The Material Process

To Halliday (1985:103), “material processes are processes of “doing”. They express the notion that some entity “does” something-which may be done “to” some other entity”. This implies that the material processes contain two inherent participants. The first of these participants is referred to as the “actor”, which is necessary an obligatory element. Obligatory because it must be present implicitly or explicitly in the structure of a clause. The function of this actor is to express the doer of the process. The second of these participants is called the “goal”, which is an optional element in the process. It is optional because it may or may not be present in the process. Its function is to express the person or entity affected by the process. This element (goal) may be animate or inanimate. These two categories of elements (actor and goal) are realized in nouns or nominal phrases.

There is an additional element called circumstance, which may be present to provide added information on the “when, where, and why of the process.” The realization of circumstantial meaning is not in nouns or nominal phrases but rather in adverbs, adverbial phrases or prepositional phrases. It is subsidiary in status to the process. The function of the circumstance is to express supplementary information, which has to do with place, time, extent matter, duration, condition and means and so on. The material process may be exemplified in verbs or verb phrases, such as kill, build, kick, drive, and read, and so on. Some examples of the material process; the process of doing in sentences are:

- | | | | |
|-------|-------------|------------------|-----------|
| (i) | The butcher | kills | the goat |
| | Actor | process-material | goal |
| (ii) | The Mason | built | the house |
| | Actor | process-material | goal |
| (iii) | Drogba | kicks | the ball |
| | Actor | process-Material | goal |
| (iv) | Our friend | drives | the car |
| | Actor | Process-material | goal |
| (v) | Students | read | books |
| | Actor | process-material | goal |

It should be noted that it is possible to transpose or reverse Actor + Goal in a passive form. This means that the goal can be placed at the initial position of the sentence while the actor at the final position of the sentence. This can be seen in:

- | | | | |
|------|-----------|------------------|----------------|
| (i) | The goat | is killed | by the butcher |
| | Goal | process-material | actor |
| (ii) | The house | was built | by the mason |
| | Goal | process-material | actor |

Worthy of note, however, is the fact that the material process can be further sub-classified in accordance with whether the process is performed intentionally or spontaneously. It can also be classified in accordance with whether it is an animate or inanimate actor that is involved.

2.9.2 The Mental Process

Mental processes, according to Halliday (1985:107), are grouped into “feeling, thinking and perceiving”. This implies that the mental process encodes the meanings of feeling, thinking or perceiving. The mental processes are distinguished from the material processes, which express concrete, physical processes of doing. To Simpson (1993:91); mental processes are “internalized” processes, in contrast to the “externalized” processes of doing and speaking. To further distinguish material processes from mental processes, Halliday (1985:108) states that “in a clause of mental process, there is always one participant who is human; this is the one that “sense” feels, thinks or perceives”. But in a material process, the participant may or may not be human. To Halliday (199:117), grammatically, all mental processes involve two participants where as the material process may just be one participant. The participants in the mental process are:

- (i) The senser: this is the “conscious being who is involved in the mental process and can feel, think or perceive”
- (ii) The phenomenon: this is that which is felt, thought or perceived by the conscious senser. Halliday (1994:118) categorizes mental process verbs into “cognition (verbs of thinking, knowing, understanding), affection (verbs of liking, loving, fearing, hating), and perception (verbs of seeing, hearing)”. Below are some examples of mental process according to different types of verb categories:

- Verb of cognition

The students	do not understand	the lecturer
Senser	process: mental	phenomenon

- Verb of affection

They	hate	the plan
Senser	process: mental	phenomenon
The people	heard	the sound
Senser	process: mental	phenomenon

From the above explanation, it is obvious that the mental process contrasts with the material process in that the former is a process of feeling, thinking and perceiving. It is not a kind of doing, and cannot be probed or substituted by do; the latter on the other hand, is a process of 'doing', which can be probed and substituted by the verb do (Halliday 1985:110-111).

2.9.3 The Relational Process

Halliday (1985:1120) states that "if material processes are those of doing and mental processes those of sensing, the other main categories, relational processes, are those of being". This suggests that relational process expresses a state of being. For example, "John is talented". The central meaning of clauses of this type is that something is. Relational processes are concerned with the process of being in the world of abstract relationship. An abstract relationship that exists between participants associated with the process is considered, but unlike the case of the material process, a participant does not affect the other participant in a physical sense. Some examples are:

"The man is kind", "the students are unserious". For the purpose of this study, two major relational processes types are identified; the attributive mode in intensive processes and the identifying mode in the intensive processes. An intensive is one of the three main relational types namely, the intensive, the circumstantial and the possessive. An intensive expresses an "x is y" relationship. For example, "The people are nice". Circumstantial expresses an "x is at y" relationship. For example, "The football match is on Tuesday". The

possessive denotes an “x has y” relationship. For example, “The students have some books”.

Halliday (1985:11) sums up the processes this way:

- (1) Intensive “x is a”
- (2) Circumstantial “x is at a”
- (3) Possessive “x has a”

Each of these comes in two modes:

- (i) Attributive: ‘a is an attribute of x’
- (ii) Identifying: ‘a is the identity of x’

Since only the attributive and the identifying mode in the intensive processes are of particular importance in this study, efforts are only made at explaining them.

2.9.3.1 The Intensive Attributive Processes

In intensive attributive processes, an attribute is ascribed to some entity as a quality. This process suggests the relationship of “x carries the attribute Y”. In this process, a quality classification or adjective is assigned to a participant. The quality, classification or adjective ascribed to an entity is referred to as an attribute. In addition, the participant in this process is referred to as a carrier. The relationship between the participant (carrier) and the attribute is commonly expressed by the verb ‘be’. The carrier is often realized by a noun or nominal phrase. The attribute, on the other hand, is realized by an adjective or a nominal phrase. Below are some examples.

(i)	Obasanjo	was	cunny
	Carrier	process: relational	attribute

	The lecturers	are	friendly
	Carrier	process: relational	attribute

(ii)	James	is	useless
	Carrier	process: relational	attribute

In English, the verb ‘be’ is typically used as an intensive verb. However, there are other various intensive attribute synonyms; these are static verbs, such as seems, appears, looks, becomes, and so on. Some examples of their usages are:

(i)	The lady	seems	hurt
	Carrier	process: relational	attribute

(ii)	The boys	appear	criminal
	Carrier	process: relational	attribute

(iii)	Soldiers	become	civil
	Carrier	process: relational	attribute

(iv)	The parent	looks	pale
	Carrier	process: relational	attribute

One of the important characteristics of the intensive attributive process is that it cannot be passivised; the subject commonly coincides with the carrier, and rarely with the attribute. The reason why an attributive clause is not reversible in this way is that the intensive attributive mode virtually involves “only one independent nominal participant, the carrier, with the attribute functioning to encode the ascription assigned to the carrier” (Eggins 1994:257). For example, it is impossible to reverse the following intensive attributive sentence:

“John becomes friendly” to “Friendly is become by John”.

2.9.3.2 The Intensive Identifying Process

The intensive identifying process in the relational process contrasts with the intensive attributive process in two ways. The first is the semantic sense. In a semantic sense, according to Eggins (1994:258), the identifying process is not concerned with “ascribing or classifying but defining”. So the intensive identifying process can be expressed as x “serves to define the identity of Y”, as in “John is the president.” The second is the grammatical sense. Halliday (1985:115) explains that unlike the attributive process, which includes only one independent participant (carrier), the identifying process contains two independent participants; first, a token, that is a holder, form or occupant that stands to be defined; second, a value that defines the token by giving it “meaning, referent, function, status or role.” In other words, both the token and value are expressed by a noun or nominal phrase. Some examples are:

The professor	was	a vice chancellor
Token	process: relational	value
The woman	is	a nurse
Token	process: relational	value
Judges	are	lawyers
Token	process: relational	value

Unlike the attributive process, the identifying process is reversible. This is because the identifying process involves two independent nominal participants as against the attributive process, which contains only one participant (carrier). In the case of a reversed clause such as:

Musa	is	a tailor
Token	process: relational	value

A tailor	is	Musa
Value	process: relational	Token,

a semantic judgment suggests which part of the clause is a token or value.

2.9.4 The Verbal Process

Halliday (1985:129), while explaining the verbal processes, says “these are processes of saying as in what did you say? I said it’s noisy in here”. Unlike the mental processes, the verbal processes do not require a conscious participant. “The sayer can be anything that puts up a signal”,...verbal process is simply the process of saying, and it exists on the borderline between mental and relational process. To Halliday (1994:107), “the verbal process expresses the relationship between ideas constructed in human consciousness and the ideas enacted in the form of language”. The speaker in a verbal process needs not necessarily be a conscious being, as it is in the case with sener in a mental process. A verbal process, therefore, includes any kind of exchange of meaning, such as “the watch says it is 10 oclock, the book tells you how to find help”.

In a verbal process, the participant that speaks is referred to as the sayer. The addressee to whom the process is directed is known as the target. What is said on the other hand is called the verbiage. Some examples of the verbal process are:

- | | | | | |
|------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| i | The man | told | the boy | how to be careful |
| | Sayer | process: verbal | the target | verbiage |
| ii. | The book | tells | students | how to use libraries |
| | Sayer | process: verbal | target | verbiage. |
| iii. | The council | announced | that the date was late | |
| | Sayer | process: verbal | verbiage | |

2.9.5 The Behavioural Processes

According to Halliday (1985:128), behavioural processes “are processes of physiological and psychological behaviour like breathing, dreaming, smiling, and coughing”. In the behavioural process, the behavior is typically a conscious being like the sener but the process functions more like one of doing. This process mediates between material and mental processes. In most cases, the behavioural process contains only one participant. Some examples are:

The people	laugh	loudly
Behaver	process: behavioural	circumstance (manner)
The boy	sighed	deeply
Behaver	process: behavioural	circumstance (manner)

To further expatiate on behavioural process, Halliday (1994:107) states that it “represents outer manifestations of inner workings, the acting out of processes of consciousness and physiological states”. The participant who is behaving is called the behavior; for example.

- (i) Musa is listening
Behaver process: behavioural
- (ii) God watches secretly
Behaver process: behavioural circumstance (manner)
- (iii) Joy laughs
Behaver process: behavioural

There is a thin line of distinction between behavioural process and material or mental processes. Little wonder, Halliday (1994:139) gives examples of behavioural processes according to their relationship with mental and material processes, thus:

“sit, dance, sing, lie (down) (near material process), think, watch, look, listen (near mental process), talk, gossip, grumble, chatter (near verbal process), smile, laugh, cry, frown (physiological processes expressing the state of consciousness), sleep, breathe, cough, yawn (other physiological processes)”.

2.9.6 The Existential Processes

The existential process, as the name suggests, is processes of existing and happening. The existential sentences typically have the verb be. The word “there” is also necessary as a subject of the sentence, although it has no representational function. In the existential processes, the object or event that is being said to exist is called existent. An existent, however, can be any kind of phenomenon. For instance, a phenomenon in an existential process may be a thing, person, an object, institution or abstraction, action or event.

Halliday (1985:130), while giving some examples of existential processes, says “these represent that something exists or happens, as in ‘there was a little guinea-pig, there seems to be a problem, has there been a phone call’? From the examples given by Halliday, it is noted that the word ‘there’ is obligatory in the subject positions of the sentences. In other words, it is an obligatory element in the sentence. Halliday further states that the word “there”, in such clauses, has no representational function; it is required because of the need for a subject. This means that “there” cannot be assigned to any functional representation such as participant, process or circumstance. Halliday (1985:130) states that “the existent may be a phenomenon of any kind, and is often, in fact, an event, as in ‘there was a battle, there followed an angry debate’”. He equally adds that... the existential clause contains a circumstantial element, as in “there was a picture on the wall”.

Some examples of existential processes are:

- | | | | | |
|----|-------|----------------------|----------|---------------------|
| i. | There | was | crisis | last year |
| | | Process; existential | existent | circumstance (time) |

- ii. There seems to be a problem in school
 Process: existential existent circumstance (place)
- iii. Has there been any plan?
 Process: existential existent

2.9.7 Circumstances

Processes in language are most time complimented by different a combination of circumstances. The circumstances give additional information concerning the processes. This additional information is centred on when, where how and why of the processes. The circumstantial meaning is realizable in adverbs, adverbial phrases or prepositional phrases. The function of the circumstance is to express supplementary information concerning the process. This supplementary information borders on time, place, extent, matter, manner, duration, condition, and means and so on. Halliday (1985:137) classifies the circumstantial elements of English into the following principal types: “extent and location in time and space, including abstract space; manner (means, quality, and comparison); cause (reason, purpose and behalf); “accompaniment; matter; role”.

2.9.8 The Circumstances of Extent and Location

The circumstantial element of extent expresses spatial distance and temporal duration. Halliday (1985:137) explains that “extent is expressed in terms of some unit of measurement, like yards, laps, rounds, years,”... some examples of extent are:

- (i) The people ran ten hours
 Extent: spatial, distance
- (ii) The students have been reading since yesterday
 Extent: temporal, duration

To Halliday (1985:137), “the interrogative forms for extent are how far?, how long?, how many (measure unit)?, how many times?. The typical structure is a nominal group with

qualifier either definite, e.g. five days, or indefinite, e.g. many miles, a long way...” From Halliday’s explanation, these examples are derived:

- (i) The protesters trekked two miles
Extent: how far?
- (ii) The troupe has been dancing since morning
Extent: how long?
- (iii) The fight goes for two rounds
Extent: how many? (Measurement)
- (iv) The aptitude test holds two times
Extent: how many times?

The circumstantial element of location, on the other hand, expresses where and when a process takes place. To Halliday (1985:138), “the interrogatives of location are where?, when?”. The typical structure of circumstantial element of location is an adverb, an adverbial group or prepositional phrase. It follows from the above explanation therefore, that the examples below would pass for circumstance of location:

- (i) Children play here
Location: where?
- (ii) The competition ends before sunset
Location: when?

Halliday (1985: 138), however, acknowledges the fact that there are close parallels between temporal and spatial expressions. He points out that both incorporate the notions of extent and location. This is because extent and location are both not only recognized in space but also in time. In addition, in both time and space, extent is measurable in standard units: hours, years, and inches and miles; both extent and location may be either definite or indefinite. Hallidy (1985:138) captures this notion in the table below,

	Spatial	Temporal
Extent	definite five miles	five years
	indefinite along way	a long time
Location	definite at home	at noon
	indefinite near	soon

2.9.9 The Circumstance of Manner

The circumstance of manner comprises three sub-categories: Means quality, comparison.

- (i) Means “refers to the means whereby a process takes place; it is typically expressed by a prepositional phrase with the preposition “by” or “with”. The interrogative forms are how?, and what with’ (Halliday 1985:139). Some examples of sentences with circumstances of means are:

Those travelers came by bus
Means

Fathers scold children with words
Means

- (ii) Quality is typically expressed by an adverbial group, with -ly adverbs as head; the interrogative is how? Or how...? Plus appropriate adverbs” (Halliday 1985:135).

Some examples of circumstance of quality in sentences are:

Students study seriously
Quality

Students are involved in examination malpractice too much
Quality

- (iii) Comparison is typically expressed by a prepositional phrase, with like or unlike, or an adverbial group of similarity or difference... The interrogative is what ...like?”, Halliday (1985:139). Some examples of sentences containing circumstantial element of comparison are:

The president behaves like God
Comparison

My friend talks unlike his brother
Comparison

2.9.10 The Circumstance of Cause

The circumstantial elements of cause are equally subcategorized into three known as reason, purpose and behalf.

- (i) While explaining the circumstantial expression of reason, Halliday (1985:340) states that it “represents the reason for which a process takes place – what causes it”. Most processes do not just take place they are stimulated by certain reasons. The circumstantial element of reason is to account for what could have necessitated a particular process. The circumstantial element of reason is expressed by a prepositional phrase with “through” or a complex preposition, such as “because of, as a result of, thanks to, for want of”, and so on. Some examples of sentences containing circumstantial elements of reason are:

Students read their books because of examinations
Reason

As a result of strike, there is no work
Reason

- (ii) Another subcategorization of the circumstantial element of cause is “purpose”. Halliday (1985:140) explains the circumstantial element of “purpose” as that which “represents the purpose for which an action takes place-the intention behind it”. This talks about what is intended to achieve as a result of carrying out a particular process. The circumstantial element of purpose is typically expressed by a prepositional phrase with “for” or with a complex preposition, such as “in the hope of, for the purpose of, in order to”, and so on. Some examples of sentences containing circumstantial elements of purpose are:

Politicians campaign in order to win elections
Purpose

People are educated in hope of a better future
Purpose

- (iii) The third subcategorization of circumstantial element of cause is referred to as “behalf”. “The expressions of “behalf” represent the entity, typically a person on whose behalf or for whose sake the action is undertaken-who it is for”, (Halliday 1985:140). This goes to show that some processes are carried out on behalf of other person(s). The sentences containing the circumstantial element of “behalf” show that the action expressed by the process is for the sake of another person. “Behalf” elements are expressed by a prepositional phrase with “for” or with a complex preposition, such as “for the sake of, on behalf of.” The usual interrogative is “who for?”. Some examples of sentences containing the circumstantial element of behalf are:

The warring parties sheath their swords for the sake of peace
Behalf

Parents work for their children
Behalf

The deputy came on behalf of the boss
Behalf

The circumstantial element of “behalf” can be said to include the principle of the beneficiary; the person to whom something is given or for whom something is performed.

2.9.11 The Circumstance of Accompaniment

The circumstantial element of accompaniment represents the meaning ‘and’ ‘or’ ‘not’ as circumstantial; it corresponds to the interrogative “and who/what else? but not who/what?” (Halliday 1985:141). To put it simply, the circumstantial element of accompaniment shows that a particular participant carries out a particular process with or without the company of another. Some examples of accompaniment are:

John arrived with Jane
Accompaniment: commutative; positive

The examination held without invigilation
Accompaniment: commutative, negative

My brother came as well as his wife
Accompaniment: additive; positive

The wife danced instead of her husband
Accompaniment: additive, negative

From the examples above, it can be understood that the circumstantial element of accompaniment is subcategorized into two known as commutative and additive accompaniments, respectively. Each of these commutative and additive accompaniments can be expressed both in the positive and in the negative as shown in the above examples.

Therefore, it can be said, as Halliday (1985:141) puts it, “the commutative represents the process as a single instance of process, although one in which two entities are involved”. The additive, on the other hand, “represents the process as two instances; here both entities clearly share the same participant function, but one of them is presented circumstantially for purposes of contrast”. This point can be seen in the sentence “The man came as well as his wife” instead of “The man and his wife came”. Similarly, it can be said that “The wife danced, her husband did not. However, the wife danced instead of her husband” makes it clear that the husband was expected to dance not the wife.

2.9.12 The Circumstance of Matter

The circumstantial element of matter appears mostly in verbal processes. It is expressed by prepositional phrases with prepositions, such as “about, concerning, with reference to, and sometimes “of” (Halliday 1985:142). The circumstantial element of matter corresponds to the interrogative “what about”? Some examples of sentences containing the circumstantial element of matter are:

The students talk about the lecturer
Matter

People are telling stories concerning the party
Matter

A theme can also be underlined by expressing it as a circumstance of matter, an example is:

“As for the students, they cannot pass the examination”
Matter

In the above sentence, “students” is first presented as a circumstantial element “as for the students”, which makes it thematically marked and, therefore, prominent.

2.9.13 The Circumstance of Role

The idea of circumstance as a role tries to explain the fact that the circumstantial element stands in a position of discharging a function: playing a role. The circumstantial element of role, to Halliday (1985:142), “corresponds to the interrogative “what as?; and represents the meaning of “be” (attribute or identity) in the form of a circumstance; for example; “as a friend” in “I come here as a friend”. In the above example, the circumstantial element of role expressed by “as a friend” performs a role. It shows the capacity in which the participant(s) in the process (come) has acted. To express the circumstantial element of role, the preposition “as” is mostly used. However, other complex prepositions that can also discharge this role are: “by way of, in the role /shape/ guise /form of” some examples of such usages are:

The mob killed the thief by way of stoning
Role

The uncle stands in the role of father
Role

Professors are acting as electoral officers
Role

In this analysis, a prepositional phrase has been referred to as something that expresses a minor process and it is also interpreted as “a kind of a mini-verb” (Halliday 1985:142). This

is because the preposition itself has some qualities of a verb. In many instances, it is possible to find a non-finite verb that is similar in meaning, and thus to express the relationship in the form of a dependent clause.

He cleaned the floor with a mop – using a mop

They care for some money – wanting some money

Considering the above examples vis-à-vis the circumstantial element of role, it becomes clear why Halliday (1985:145) refers to it as a miniverb or “minor process”.

It can, therefore, be noted that the language of humour is equally woven together by the transitivity process. In other words, it contains processes, participants in the processes and of course different circumstances. What is really worthy of interest and analysis is the choices that the speaker makes of various process types and diverse participants in the processes to convey humour. These processes are given special meaning by the additional information supplied to them by divergent categories of circumstances. Present in the processes, participants and circumstances are different types of part of speech, such as nouns, verbs, adjective and adverbs, among others. The choices speakers make of these words classes do not only contextualize the discourse but also elicit special meaning which results into humour.

2.10 Theoretical Framework

In stylistic analysis, linguistic items and structures are isolated and described or analysed, using terminologies and descriptive framework drawn from whatever school of descriptive linguistics found most useful for a given purpose. In this research, the theoretical framework adopted is that of functional linguistics. This is because it is suitable in showing how and why a text means what it does in a particular context of use. This study looks at the relationship between linguistic structures and socially constructed meaning in the language of

humour by employing Halliday's (1985:101-144) transitivity model as captured in "clause as representation".

This study focuses on the use of major word classes for stylistic effects but explains them in functional linguistic terms as it is in "clause as representation". The transitivity theory provides a useful linguistic framework for uncovering the main linguistic features of the language of humour. This is because, according to Halliday (1985:53), transitivity is part of the ideational functions of the clause. It is concerned with the "transmission of ideas". Its function is that of "representing processes or experiences: actions, events, processes of consciousness and relation". While elaborating further on the term "process", Halliday (1976:159) points out that it is used in an extended sense "to cover all phenomena...and anything that can be expressed by a verb: event, whether physical or not, state or relation". All the processes mentioned are expressed by verbs or verb phrases in sentences, which may contain nouns or nominal phrases, verbs or adverbial phrases and adjectives. The processes expressed through language are products of our conceptions of the world or point of view. It is our knowledge, experiences, feelings, thoughts that are encoded in these linguistic features, such as lexical items. It is in recognition of this fact that Halliday (1985:101) opines that:

Our most powerful conception of reality is that it consists of "goings-on":of doing, happening, feeling, being. These goings-on are sorted out into the semantic system of the language, and expressed through the grammar of the clause...The clause evolved simultaneously in another grammatical function expressing the reflective, experiential aspect of meaning. This...is the system of transitivity. Transitivity specifies the different types of process that are recognized in the language, and the structures by which they are expressed.

This is a further proof that linguistic choices are made to encode different semantic shades from the world of our experiences or knowledge. In the language of humour, for instance, specific choices are made from linguistic items to give humorous results. These choices are not in isolation from the experiences of the world surrounding the interactants. Therefore, to consider the lexical items used in the language of humour efforts are also made to link them

with the ideational function they perform. The ideational function is concerned with the transmission of ideas or experiences of the world around us. In transitivity, the semantic processes expressed by language through clauses contain three components. These are:

- i The process itself, and it is expressed by the verb or it is expressed in a clause
- ii The participants in the clause, which refers to the roles of the entities that are directly involved in the process: the one that does, behaves or says together with the passive one that is done to, said to and so on. The participants are not always or necessarily humans or even animates. Nouns or noun phrases in the clause usually express the participant entities.
- iii The circumstances associated with the process, which, to Halliday (1985:101-102), “are typically expressed by adverbial and prepositional phrases”.

Transitivity is an important semantic concept in the analysis of the representation of reality because it enables us to analyse and represent the same event and situation in a number of ways. For instance, an utterance in a particular situation, which results into humour, may be considered to see if it will yield the same in another situation

2.11 The Relevance of the Transitivity Framework to the Analysis of the Language of Humour

Transitivity refers to the relationship between the actions of an actor and its effect upon the goal. Unlike in traditional grammar where transitivity is purely a syntactic description, in functional grammar, it is used more as a semantic concept, referring to who or what does what to whom or what. One of the important issues in the semantic consideration of transitivity is whether there is an implication of an animate individual (actor/agent) intentionally doing the action to another entity (goal). Relating this to the language of humour, different processes types containing different participants' types and circumstances types are used for humorous effects. In other words, the linguistic features

in renditions of humour are built the on features of transitivity, such as processes, participants and circumstances. What creates humour is the action and inaction of certain participants on others under different circumstances. Transitivity becomes relevant in analyzing the language of humour in that it helps in classifying the different lexico-grammatical features that are involved in humour- making. Equally important is the fact that different transitivity patterns (participant types, process types, circumstances types) are also subject to social, political and cultural factors, as well as individual mind-set. While concretizing this view, Fowler (1986:27) points out that:

Linguistic codes do not reflect reality in neutrally; they interpret, organize and classify the subjects of discourse. They embody theories of how the world is arranged: worldviews or ideologies. This suggests that transitivity patterns also encode worldviews and ideologies; these worldviews and ideologies are socially, culturally and politically oriented.

CHAPTER THREE:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble

In the use language, interactants make specific choices to mean what they mean. However, to effectively investigate how and why language has been used in a particular way to result into humour, there must be a methodology. It is against this background that this chapter discusses different methods used, such as sources of data, sampling procedure, data collection method and transcription. It also talks about qualitative and quantitative presentation and finally, analytical procedure.

3.1 Source of Data

The central point in this research is to investigate the use of language to elicit humour. However, to get enough body of data that would reflect humorous use of language in normal unplanned human interactions proves difficult. Therefore, the data for this research are sourced from a comedy show titled “Nite of a Thousand Laughs”. In this show, the focus is not only to entertain people with humour but also to source for funds for charity work. As a result, conscious efforts are made at packaging a collection of humorous rendition. Moreover, since this research has a practical purpose of finding out and showing how the levels of language are used for humour, it finds the show resourceful. Equally important is the fact that this premeditated humour is sourced to find the stylistic principles underlying a speaker’s choice of language to elicit humour.

“Nite of a Thousand Laughs” is an initiative of Opa Williams. He manages both the production and organization of this comedy rendition. The humorous show holds at intervals at different locations in Nigeria. The packaging of the comedy is in different volumes reflective of different times and locations the event takes place. Underlining this humour is

the instrumentality of language; a reason the comedy serves as a veritable source of data for stylistic analysis.

3.2 Sampling Procedure

Obviously, there are a number of comedy-based efforts in Nigeria. Most of these efforts are individualistic. These comedians are known in the comedy business and are invited on individual bases to occasions for humorous rendition at intervals. On the other hand, there are groups of comedians who come together to form the comedy industry, such as the “Nite of a Thousand Laughs”. From this array of comedy renditions, the “Nite of a Thousand Laughs” is selected for analysis. The humorous rendition is produced in different places at different intervals, and has many volumes in circulation. From among these numerous volumes being circulated, only volume II is chosen for the purpose of this research. The choice is because it offers the syntactic data needed for this research. The essence of this study is to investigate how the language used in creating humour has a stylistic significance. Volume II becomes useful for its presentation of humour in a simple, clear language and its richness in humour. This is against other volumes, which have a lot of use of songs in them.

Even in volume II, however, there is the use of a background musical rendition, which also adds to the humorous atmosphere. In any case, the analysis centers only on the utterances or speeches of the comedian, leaving out the musical renditions. In this volume, different comedians are featured numbering up to six. Each of these comedians gives a story as part of this rendition of humour and all these stories are analyzed. In addition, the paralinguistic features of communication are highly employed in this volume to convey humour. However, in this analysis, those paralinguistic features are not represented. Worthy of note are the responses of the audience in forms of laughter, comments and making different signs. The analysis, however, does not account for the responses of the listeners.

The comedians that are used in this volume are I Go Dye, Klint De Drunk, A.Y., Gordons, Basket Mouth and Lepacious Bose.

3.3 Data Collection Method

In the conduct of researches, different ways or methods are used to obtain data. The nature and purpose of a particular research undertaken determines the method a researcher employs to obtain data. This suggests that there are multiplicities of approach to data collection methods. The diversity in approach usually takes cognizance of the suitability of the method to arrive at the result orientation of the research. Also, important is the convenience of a method to a researcher. In this research, data are collected by obtaining a video-recorded cassette of the humour. This is done by purchasing some of the cassettes, which are already on sale for public consumption, watching them and selecting the one that is considered suitable for this analysis.

3.4 Data Transcription

Since the primary source of the data used for this research is a video record of unwritten speech, the data have to be transcribed. In order to avoid errors or mistakes in the course of the transcription, the cassette is played repeatedly, carefully listened to and transcribed. In the process of this transcription, efforts are also made to present the stories in their sequential order. The transcription begins with the first humorous rendition to the last. In addition, from the beginning to the end, the utterances of humour are transcribed chronologically and sequentially according to the order in which they are uttered. Though the paralinguistic features of the comedians contribute immensely to the humorous effects, they are not represented in the transcription. Also absent in the transcription are the responses of the audience which are in form of laughter, clapping and even signaling.

3.5 Qualitative and Quantitative Presentations

In the analysis of these data, efforts are made at looking at the quality of syntactic items that are used to convey humour. The qualitative analysis, as applied to stylistics, according to Leech and Short (1985:139), “refers to the special act of interpretation which we make in order to make sense of what would otherwise appear strange and unmistaken”. Therefore, it goes to say that in our analysis, the syntactic elements that are used by the comedians are interpreted in order to expose why they are humorous. It is believed that the choice is geared towards making a particular sense to listeners. Leech and Short (1985:139) say “each qualitative foregrounding implicitly begs a question: what should have led the author to express himself in this exceptional way?” To answer this question, each group of syntactic elements is linked with the special interpretation, which stimulates the humorous effect.

Also, in the course of analysis, efforts are made to bring together a selection of qualitative data by which the stylistic analysis of the language of humour is hinged. The quantitative data are presented in tabular forms with each table accounting for a particular syntactic element. This is to show how much of the use of each particular set of syntactic items to create humour. It is believed that how much the syntactic items are used accounts for their stylistic significances.

3.6 Analytical Procedure

The data collected for this study are analyzed using Halliday’s transitivity terminology presented in Halliday (1985:101-144) as “clause as representation”. While analyzing clause structure, Halliday makes use of such terminology as participants, processes and circumstances as participants encode nouns or nominal phrases, processes encode verbs or verb phrases and circumstances contain adverbs or adverbial phrases and prepositional phrases that perform the functions of adverbs. The focus of this research, however, is

on the clause structural analysis, particularly, those structures that encode the major word classes. Therefore, the analysis accounts only for “processes, participants and circumstances” with major word classes, ignoring aspects of lexical items that are not encapsulated in the phraseology “major parts of speech.” However, the relational process is represented by the use of the “be, have and do”. The syntactic elements are captured in the terminological application of Halliday in “clause as representation”. The syntactic elements are presented in their sets in accordance with functional linguistics. They are presented under the headings below:

- Participants: the participants are divided into the following.

1. Actor – Goal
2. Behaver
3. Senser – Phenomenon
4. Sayer – Target
5. Token – Value
6. Carrier – Attribute
7. Existent

- Processes: the processes are classified into the following:

- (1) Material: action, event
- (2) Mental: perception, affection, cognition
- (3) Behavioural
- (4) Verbal
- (5) Relational
- (6) Existential

- Circumstances: the circumstances are further subcategorized into the following:

- (1) Extent: duration (temporal), distance (spatial)
- (2) Location: time (temporal), place (spatial)
- (3) Manner: means, quality, comparison
- (4) Cause: reason, purpose, behalf
- (5) Accompaniment: commutation, addition
- (6) Matter
- (7) Role

To make clearer the syntactic categorization of participants' types and processes' types, Halliday (1985:131) gives this table:

Process Types, their Meaning and Key Participants

Process type	Category meaning	Participants
Material	'doing'	Actor, Goal
action	'doing'	
event	'happening'	
Behavioural	'behaving'	Behaver
Mental	'sensing'	Senser, phenomenon
perception	'seeing'	
affection	'feeling'	
cognition	'thinking'	
Verbal	'saying'	Sayer, Target
Relational	'being'	Token, Value
attribution	'attributing'	Carrier, Attribute
identification	identifying	Identified, Identifier
Existential	Existing	Existent

The analysis of each participant types, process types and their classification is based on the tenets of the above table. In the course of analysis, the utterances are presented chronologically according to the sequential order in which they are uttered. The analysis excludes renditions of humour that are in forms of songs or musical tracks. Also excluded

from the analysis are the reactions and responses that emanate from the audience. Having arranged the syntactic items according to their categorizations, they are linked to the ideational function of language (the world of shared experience and knowledge), which enhances the resultant humorous effect.

The Use of Square Brackets

The analysis of the data collected has been done in stages. The first stage uses square brackets. The brackets contain the description or classification of the processes, participants and circumstances. This can be found in the appendix. An example can be seen in the sentence below:

John (actor) kicked (action) the ball (goal)

The description of the type of process involved is done in accordance with sub-types of processes; action, event - material; cognition perception, affection-mental, and so on.

The second stage presents the general analysis. The third stage presents the syntactic content of each of the six comedians by picking them out from the body of the data and classifying them according to types of participants, processes and circumstances involved in a tabular form and presenting the frequency distribution these items-participants, process and circumstances.

Efforts are made at accounting for each syntactic item that would have fallen into the classification of open class words. However, in order to represent the relational process, the verbs “be, have and do” are used. Since the description of the syntactic items is based on “clause as representation”, some of the syntactic items uttered in isolation are difficult to be described. To account for such items, the researcher uses intuition. Though the work is centered on open class words, the auxiliary verbs acting as main verbs are also accounted for.

This is in order to effectively represent relational and existential processes, which are mostly found in the verb ‘be’.

Adverbial Phrase

The circumstantial elements that are realized in prepositional phrases are accounted for as single entities. This is because the whole element in these phrases work together to express individual semantic functions of time or place. An example is: I saw (perception) Linda (phenomenon) in the kitchen (place). In this research, the syntactic elements making up the adverbial phrases are considered as a unit instead of individually describing them.

Attribute and Value

The terms “attribute” and “value” have wider application in this research than their functions in “clause as representation”. An example is:

The tall (attribute) man (carrier) is (relational) friendly (attribute).

However, in “clause as representation’ the above sentence will be analyzed as:

The tall man (carrier) is (relational) friendly (attribute)

For the purpose of this research, ‘attribute’ applies to any word or group of words, except the noun, used to perform the descriptive function. On the other hand, the term “value” applies to any “noun” performing the function of an adjective, irrespective of its position of occurrence.

Phrasal Verbs

A phrasal verb is a group of words including a verb and one or two other words usually a preposition or an adverb that together act as a verb. Such groups of words are treated as single syntactic elements. No separate accounts of the verb and its particle ‘adverb’ or ‘preposition’ are given.

Verbiage

In “clause as representation”, a structure that is made up of a “verbal process” may contain what is called verbiage. However, since in this research the aim is to dissolve the data

into processes, participants and circumstances, the individual syntactic elements making up the verbiage are accounted for. Verbiage is not considered. An instant is:

David told me John is reading the book.

In a “clause as representation”, this sentence would be analyzed thus:

David (sayer) told (verbal) Dan (target) John is reading the book (verbiage).

For the purpose of this research, the sentence is analyzed thus:

David (sayer) told (verbal) Dan (target) John (actor) is reading (action) the book (goal).

The research does not follow the methods of ergative analysis.

Nigerian pidgin

The data used in this research are heavily uttered in Nigerian pidgin. Knowledge of it is vital to the understanding of the content of the data. However, the data are pervaded with code switching from pidgin to standard Nigerian English.

Anaphoric and Cataphoric References

In the cause of analyzing these data, it was imperative to refer in some cases to statements uttered before (anaphoric) and in others, statements uttered after (cataphoric). This is because the description of certain syntactic elements is predicated on what has gone before or even what comes subsequently.

Infinitives

In most analysis using “clause as representation”, infinitive verbs are not analyzed. However, in this research, the infinitives are also accounted for. This is because the essence of this work is to account for the syntactic items, which infinitives also contribute to the syntactic density of the data. The data are presented in their original form without alteration. This means that even where errors of grammar and expressions are noted, efforts are not made at pointing them out or correcting them. The research does not include error analysis.

Appendix

The text used for analysis in this research is attached at the end of this work as an appendix for more careful perusal.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Preamble

In any work of stylistic analysis, efforts are made at finding the artistic principles underlying a writer's or speaker's choice of language. All writers and speakers have their individual linguistic qualities or attributes. The uniqueness of these attributes serve as a basis for investigating stylistically relevant features of language. Therefore, analysis tends to expose these linguistically relevant peculiarities. It is for this reason that this chapter presents the analysis of the language use among the six humorists; it also presents the syntactic content in the humour rendition of each comedian and, finally, it presents the frequency tables of different features of language, such as "processes, participants and circumstances."

4.1 Presentation of Analysis

In trying to create humour, humorists make recourse to different linguistic features, which may or may not be overtly known to them in most cases. They make assiduous efforts at rendering humour but underlying these humour are syntactic categories that facilitate the accomplishment of this task. These can be identified in the use of language among the six comedians below.

4.1.0 I Go Dye

While trying to elicit laughter from his audience, I Go Dye relies on different syntactic groups, such as "participants, processes and circumstances". They are used not only to evoke contextualization but also to tap on shared knowledge of the audience to elicit his humour.

4.1.0.0 Participants

I Go Dye draws heavily from a number of participant types to create his humour. For instance, he makes use of the “participant of goal” for about one hundred and five times.

Instances are captured in the renditions below:

But when (location-time) you get (material-action) money (goal), woman (actor) go dey pursue (material-action) you.

As presented above, the comedian selects from the participant stock of “goal and actor” to express the entity affected by the “process-get” and the entity that carries out the “process-pursue”. In the first clause, the “goal-money” is affected by the “process-get”. He ridicules women as lovers of money who go after men because of money. The audiences reflect on the reality around them and laugh.

Again, the comedian continues with his humour and uses the same set of participants, as indicated below:

I dey pursue (material-action) money (goal), so that (cause-purpose) women (actor) go pursue (material-action) me.

Here again, “money” is used as the affected “participant-goal” to show what one has to get to draw women close. On the other hand, “women” is used for the second time as an actor; an entity carrying out a “process-pursue” when money is already gotten. He says money (actor) brings (material-event) maturity (goal).

Similarly, the comedian uses “phenomenon” for about sixteen times. An instance is presented below:

All these babes (phenomenon) wey I dey see (mental-perception), very (manner-quality) easy (attribute) to get (material-action) them.

The word “babes” is used as a “phenomenon” because it is the entity affected by the “process- see” in the rendition. The comedian shows how easy it is to “get them” by using “very” to modify the “attribute easy”. The comedian continues to toe this line of thought in the rendition below:

If (condition) you no get (action) money, (goal) babe (senser/behavior) no want (mental-affection) look (behavioural) your face (location-place).

The rendition introduces other participant types, such as “senser” and “behavior”. The word “babe” plays a dual function of “senser and behavior” because of the mental and behavioural processes, “want and look” involved. The audience has to reflect on its social and economic milieu, and burst into laughter.

The “behavioural process” features about five times. This is seen as the comedian further pursues this point, he says:

Na so (manner-quality) this our presidents (behavior) dey talk (behavioural) before (location-time)? Na when (location-time) they become (relational) president (value) and governor (value)

The word “president” is used as a “behavior” because it carries out the physiological process of “talk”. The words “president and governor” are used as “value” as they appear in a “relational process”-process of being. The comedian uses this to express a state of being and the behavioural process that follows. The participant of “value” appears for about fifty-four times. I Go Dye uses the participant of “carrier” for about six times. An instance is presented below:

All my body (carrier) is (relational) for you (cause-purpose)

The comedian uses “body” with its modifiers “all my” to ridicule women. He presents money to a woman who then says all her body is for him. The participant of “existent” is used minimally in the rendition; an instance is indicated below:

There is (existential) time (existent)

“Time” is used as the entity that exists. Other participants such as “target and sayer” have about five and six items, respectively. The comedian predominantly uses physical and concrete participants to create context, taps from shared knowledge and then elicit humour.

4.1.0.1 Processes

To achieve his humour, I Go Dye relies most heavily on the use of “processes”. Among “processes”, the “material process, the “process” of doing, dominates with about two hundred and fifty-three entries. For instance, while talking about the influence and power of money, he depends on the “material process” as seen below:

Money (actor) brings (material-action) maturity (goal)

The process “brings” is classified as “material-event” because the entity, which carries out the process is inanimate. “Money” carries out a process of “brings”. Given the number of times the material process is used, it can be said that in creating humour, one entity has to do something to itself or another entity.

Not only does the comedian use the “material process,” but also he uses the “behavioural process” for about thirty-one times. He captures the process in the rendition below:

Na so (manner-quality) this our president (behavior) dey talk (behavioural)
before (location-time)?

The comedian expresses change that takes place in the speech behaviour of the entities “president and governor” by using the physiological process of “talk”. As they get money, they change. The audience then reflects on the fact of the general behavioural changes associated with the rich and laughs.

Pursuant to his view that money brings changes to a man, the comedian uses a “process” that comments on the state of being, the “relational process”, for about thirty-one times. An instantiation is presented below:

Na when (location-time) they become (relational) president (value) and
governor (value)

The comedian’s selection of the relational process of “become” is significant because it expresses a change in a state of being, “become” president and governor. The participants of

“president and governor” define the new state of being, which brings about a change in behaviour-manner of talking. The comedian mentions president Obasanjo as an example of change in speech. The familiarity of the audience with Obasanjo’s speech habit elicits humour.

Additionally, *I Go Dye* reflects on the “mental process” for about fifty-three times to convey psychological or emotive feelings that are accompanied with money. An instance is indicated below:

When (location-time) you get (material-action) money (goal), you can spend (material-action) it the way (manner-quality) you want (mental-affection)

Earlier, the comedian mentions the constraint that accompanies lack of money, as pursuing women; the comedian uses the emotive process of “want” to express feelings that one that has money shares. The “material processes” of “get and spend” are polished up by the “mental process” of “want”. This feeling of liberty with money is heightened by the use of a circumstance of manner-“the way”, which modifies “want”.

Also, used by the comedian is the “verbal process”, the process of saying. This appears for about forty-nine times. The rendition below captures one instance of his application of the “process”.

I want (mental-affection) tell (verbal) you, if (condition) you no get (material-action) money (goal) you go dey pursue (material-action) women (goal)

The comedian uses “tell” as a preparatory linguistic token to introduce his subject matter, which comes in the subsequent clauses. By using, “tell” in “I want tell you”, the audiences prepare their minds for what comes next. This expectation makes it easy for the subsequent information to be seen as humorous. The comedian uses more process than participant items. Under process, he uses more mental processes than others do. He also uses more action words than events. This shows that the process of eliciting humour rests upon one entity doing something to itself or another entity.

4.1.0.2 Circumstances

Generally, I Go Dye uses about one hundred and twenty “circumstantial elements”. In his application of the elements of circumstance, that of “location” dominates with about thirty-nine entries. The construction below demonstrates an instance of circumstance of “location” in time:

Na so (manner-quality) this our president (behave) dey talk (behavioural)
before (location time)

The element “before” is used, as location in time, to express or modify the attitudinal change of “talk” that accompanies the change of status. The comedian juxtaposes the notion of time above with another rendition below:

Na when (location-time) they become (relational) president (value) and governor
(value)

He shows a change in their “talk,” speech habit, “when” they become president and governor. “When” is used to express the notion of time of the “process”. The comedian uses the element of time because for the notion of context to be properly created, for humour, time must be mentioned.

Also, the comedian uses some instances of “circumstance of cause” for about six times. One of such occasions is presented below:

I dey pursue (material-action) money (goal) so that (cause-purpose) women (actor) go
dey pursue (material-action) me.

The comedian enlists the service of the element of cause, “so that”, to tell his audience the purpose for which the “process-pursue” is carried out. This is because understanding the purpose for which some “processes” are carried out enhances understanding for humour. He reveals the purpose of pursuing money. This is in order that women will pursue him. In the elicitation of humour, the manner in which “processes” are carried out is central. The

comedian, therefore, uses the circumstance of “manner” for about fifty-nine times to tell his audience how certain “processes” are accomplished. An instance is cited below:

You go see (mental-perception) my papa (phenomenon behavior) self dey look (behavioural) my mama (location-place) well (manner-quality) with love (manner-means)

In the above rendition, the element “papa” serves dual purposes as “phenomenon” because it is the entity affected by the “process-see”, and as “behavior” because it is the entity that carries out the “process-look”, which affects the entity-mama.

The comedian shows a contrast between what was called love in the olden days and what love is nowadays. He uses his parents who represent the older generation. He portrays them as lovers even without money, as against what happens these days. By so doing, he makes recourse to the circumstance of manner. He modifies the process of “look” with the circumstances of manner-“well and with love”. The comedian succeeds in impressing on the minds of the audience a positive behaviour from his parents by using “well” and with love to modify “look”. These elements tell how the process of “look” takes place. The audiences laugh at this positive behaviour in spite of lack of money.

To further ridicule women for his humour, the comedian uses the circumstance of condition for about twelve times to express the condition in which women can pursue a man.

This is cited below:

If (condition) you no get (material-action) money (goal), babe (senser) no want (mental-affection) look (behavioural) your face (location-place)

In the above rendition, “if” expresses the condition a man who does not get money find himself. Women despise at him. The comedian therefore, uses “circumstances” to modify processes, giving them proper context of meaning for humour.

4.1.1 A.Y

A.Y exploits shared knowledge of the audience to elicit humour. He draws his humour from sports, religion, political instability and insecurity in Nigeria. He portrays a

Nigerian woman as crude and barbaric in terms of child discipline. He, then, uses pastors, Chris Okotie and Chris Oyakhilome, as football commentators. He exploits their linguistic habits in an absurd context of football for humour. He later switches over to the political instability during Obasanjo's regime for humour.

4.1.1.0 Participants

While creating his humour, A.Y uses different participant elements. For instance, while trying to show that children are treated differently according to the level of civilization of their mothers, he says:

Pikin (token) is (relational) pikin, (value) issue (token) is (relational) an issue (value)

The participant, "pikin" appears two times in the first clause of the rendition above. The first "pikin" is classified as token because it is the entity modified by the second "pikin"; while the second "pikin" is used as a means of modification, "value". Similarly, in the second clause, "issue" is classified as "token" because it is modified by the second "issue", "value". As can be seen, there are two participants as "token" and two participants as "value" and these are pikin and issue. To him, "pikin" is a child that comes from an uncivilized mother, who can handle children carelessly. On the other hand, he portrays an "issue" as a child who comes from a civilized mother who pampers it. The audiences reflect on the uses of these two names in their surrounding and feel it is true. Therefore, they laugh. The comedian uses token and value about nine and fifty times, respectively. Similarly, A.Y. uses the utterance below to introduce other participant types, such as "senser" and "carrier":

One lady (senser) now (time) saw (mental-perception) me... my son (carrier) is (relational) here (location-place)

The words "one lady" are classified as "senser" because it is the entity that carries out the mental process of "saw", while the words "my son" are a "carrier" because it is the entity that its state is expressed. "Senser" is used four times and "carrier" twelve times. He uses the

above utterance to show how a woman was eager to let her son meet him. However, a son who is referred to as an issue later did not respect the mother.

A.Y. further portrays the mother as telling the child about his presence, but the child cared less and nothing happened. This is seen in the sentence below:

Junior, (senser) guess (mental-cognition) who we have (relational) here.
(location-place)

The word “Junior” is classified as a “senser” because it is the entity that carries out the process of “guess,” a mental process. Again, we are confronted with the humorist’s use of “senser” as participant type. The name “junior” is commonly associated with people who claim to be civilized. Reflecting on this, the audiences laugh. More so, the comedian uses the participants of “actor” and “goal” for about thirty and fifty-eight times respectively. A.Y introduces the sentence below to expose the audience to the child’s carelessness and the mother’s helplessness:

Give (material-action) me a break (goal) mum (actor).

In the above sentence, A.Y uses yet another set of “participants” such as “actor- mum and goal”- break .The word “mum” is used as “actor” because it is the entity that is to carry out the process of “give”, while “break” is the entity affected by the process “give”; and this is a “goal”. The use of “mum and break” in the sentence above smacks of civilization. The audience laughs at the attitude of the child. Meanwhile, the humorist portrays the child’s mother as urging the child to meet with A.Y., a person the child loves so much, as indicated below:

Just (manner-quality) look (behavioural) around (location-place) Junior (behave)

The above sentence also introduces us to another “participant type” called “behave”, as can be seen in the word, “Junior”. The comedian uses this “participant type” while trying to ridicule acclaimed civilized people for his humour. The participant of “behave” has been used for about twelve times.

4.1.1.1 Processes

A.Y. uses about two hundred and seventy items of different “process types”. The “material process”, however, dominates his rendition. He uses it to show how one entity does something to another entity for humour. Some constructions contain more than one “material process”. This can be seen below:

One day (location-time) I come (action) go (action) silverbird galleria (location-place)

The utterance above contains two material processes, as can be seen in “come and go”. The words “come” and “go” are material processes because they denote the process of doing. However, they are used intransitively. Similarly, he uses several “material processes” below:

Just (quality) hold on (action), let (action) me go (action) get (action) my son (goal) for an autograph (cause-reason)

The comedian uses the above sentence to tell the audience where the woman, who wanted her child to see him. He also shows how she requested him to wait for the child but the child did not care. However, “material process” is triply used, as in “hold on, let... go and get”. These terms denote the process of doing. The material process has been used variously for about one hundred and thirty-two times.

Other “process types” are also used, for instance, in the sentence below, the comedian introduces an “existential process” to inform his audience that there exists a difference between “pikin” and “issue”:

There is (existential) major (attribute) difference (existent) between pikin and issue (location-place)

The word, “is” is used existentially to introduce an entity that exists, “difference”. Before the comedian shows the difference, he uses the existential process “is” to create consciousness and awareness of the difference between the two beings, “pikin and issue”. The audiences look

at the peculiarities of the use of these words and laugh. This “process” is used minimally for about five times.

The “relational process” has also been used variously to complement entities in the subject position for the audience to understand who and what an entity stands for. For instance, in the sentence below, the “relational process” is used to introduce complementation”:

Pikin (token) is (relational) pikin, (value) issue (token) is (relational) an issue (value)
The word “is” has been used relationally to express a state of being of “pikin” and “issue”. To even ponder at a construction of this nature is humorous to the audience. The relational process is also used to show not only possession but also the presence of certain entities. For instance, in the sentence below, the comedian uses the relational process to show the presence of a surprise:

I have (relational) a pleasant (attribute) surprise (value) for you here (location-place)
The statement is credited to the mother, who wanted to introduce A.Y to her child. Even with this proper negotiation of language, the child did not care. The audience, again, laughs at this. This process is used for about forty-eight times.

Similarly, while Pastor Chris Okotie wanted to yield the microphone to Pastor Chris Oyakhilom for football commentary, the “relational process” was used possessively to introduce the next speaker as can be seen below:

I have (relational) my brother (value) here (location-place) pastor Chris Oyakhilome (value)
The “relational process” of “have” is used to introduce the presence of the second pastor. Here, again, the audiences reflect on the ironical context of pastors as football commentators and humour is elicited. Meanwhile, Pastor Chris Oyakhilome was asked to comment on a goal the Nigerian team scored. The comedian uses the “behavioural process” to comment on the attitude of the goalkeeper through pastor, Chris Oyakhilome, as indicated below:

Oh, my God! The goalkeeper (behave) was just (manner-quality) sitting down (behavioural) and the ball (actor) went through (material-event)

The phrasal verb “sitting down” connotes a physiological process. The behavioural process has been used for about thirty-two times. The “behavioural process” of “sitting down” combined with the “circumstantial element” of “manner-quality-just”, presents the goalkeeper as very helpless. The audience again uses the shared knowledge of football activities to build an image of the scenario for laughter.

4.1.1.0 Circumstances

The comedian does not just make use of his “processes”, he combines them with some “circumstantial element” to explain when, where and how the “processes” are carried out. For instance, he uses the “circumstantial element of time and place” to show location in time and place of the event talked about in the sentence below:

One day (location-time) I come (material-action) go (material-action) silverbird galleria (location-place)

Looking at the circumstance of “one day” within the structure of the sentence, it shows a particular time, possibly in the past. The mention of “one day” prepares the minds of the audiences to hear the experience of the time. In addition, the mention of the “circumstance” of “silver bird galleria” predisposes the audience to expect an exciting experience since it is a place for fun-catching, wearing away time, among other things. The circumstance of location has been used for about eighty-six times.

Additionally, the comedian uses the circumstance of “manner-quality” to heighten and amplify feelings. This is shown below:

He likes (affection) you so much (manner-quality)

The comedian ascribes this statement to the woman, who wanted her child to meet him. The “circumstance” of “so much”, as used to modify the “process” of “likes”, shows to what extent the boy likes A.Y. What becomes humorous however, is the boy who is portrayed as

liking A.Y “so much” but does not care to see him. The audiences have to consider “so much” and “likes” in relation to the boy's attitude. The circumstance of manner is used for about fifty-nine times.

To tell the audience why the woman needed her child to meet A.Y, the “circumstantial element” of “cause-reason” is used as indicated below:

Just (manner-quality) hold on (material-action) let (material-action) me go
(material-action) get (material-action) my son (goal) for an autograph (cause-
reason)

The element, “for an autograph,” expresses the reason for the processes,” hold on, let...go, get.” The humour is heightened by the use of the circumstance of “cause-reason” because the audiences negotiate the meaning, using shared knowledge of the world. People get autographs of personalities they hold to high esteem and respect very well. The boy's mother presents A.Y., as highly respected by the child. However, the child proves otherwise, and this irony becomes humorous. The circumstance features about five times.

More so, A.Y uses the circumstance of “matter” to reemphasize the subject matter to the audiences for his humour. For instance, he presents Pastor, Chris Okotie, who is the first commentator, as handing over the microphone to Pastor, Chris Oyakhilome by asking this:

What do you have (relational) to say (verbal) about this goal (matter)

“About this goal” is a unit that directs the speaker on what to talk about and the audience on what to expect. By the above question, which also connotes what Oyakhilome should talk about, the audience is keen to listen to him. The “circumstance of matter” does not only remind the audience of what is going on but also directs the next speaker on what to talk about. This ensures that the audience is still tuned up to context. This element features about seven times. A follow up from the above context makes audiences laugh at what Oyakhilome says:

Oh my God! The goal keeper (behavior) was just (manner-quality) sitting down (behavioural)

There, again, the behavioural process of “sitting down” is complemented by the circumstance of “just”, connoting effortless from the part of the goalkeeper. The audience laughs at the weakness of the goalkeeper and Oyakhilome’s involvement.

4.1.2. Klint De Drunk

This comedian also centres his humour on the subject matter of poverty, a familiar topic to Nigerians. He makes jest of someone, who uses Nokia 3310, as a camera phone and another who has been using one particular shirt to different “shows” for two years. He goes further to use the occasion of “Sallah” celebration for humour. He says many Nigerians cannot afford food, therefore, fast every day and not a religious obligation.

4.1.2.0 Participants

To achieve his humour, the comedian uses different “participant types” for about one hundred and forty-two times. For instance, while making jest of someone, who uses Nokia 3310, as a camera phone, he makes use of “behavior” and “actor” as shown below:

My dear (behavior/actor) is squatting (behavioural) to snap (material-action)

The words “my dear” serve as both “behavior” and “actor” because they carry out the behavioural process of “squatting” and the material process of “snap”. The “participant of behavior” is used, as an entity that carries out the physiological behaviour of “sitting down”. Because the process is “behavioural”, the participant has to be “behavior”.

Similarly, he goes further with his joke but this time, he uses an “actor” as a “participant” type. The structure below shows this example:

I heard (mental-perception) the phone (actor) can snap; (material-event) wonderful (attribute)

The participant is classified as an “actor” because it undertakes the “material process” of “can snap”. To the audience, who knows about Nokia 3310, it is obvious that it is not a camera

phone; but the comedian says he knows it can snap. This statement elicits laughter for its lack of truth or sincerity. “Actors” feature about eleven times.

To further pursue his jokes on hunger in Nigeria, the comedian reflects on the “behavior” again by saying:

How many (extent) people (behavior) fasted? (behavioural)

The word, “people” is a “behavior” because it carries out the behavioural process of “fasted”. When the audience responds by raising of hands, he chooses one person from the audience to lunch his humour.

Bring down (material-action) your hand (goal)

He introduces another participant by asking one man to bring his hand down because he says it is not a religious obligation he performs but it is his normal life he lives. He does not have food, and this elicits humour. The “participant” is classified as a “goal” because it is the entity affected by the “material process, “bring down”. This participant features for about twenty-four times.

The comedian continues by using more participants of “actors” and “goals” thus:

Oga (actor) don’t ever (extent-duration) raise (material-action) your hand (goal) near (extent-distance) me

In the above construction, “participants”, such as “Oga” and “your hand” are classified as an “actor” and a “goal” because Oga is a “doer” and hand, the affected entity in the “material process-raise”. In the context of language usage in Nigeria, the word “Oga” is associated with people who are well to do. However, the comedian uses the word on a man he claims cannot afford food; this irony creates humour. The participant of “value” is used in the construction below:

You are (relational) a corper (value)

The word “corper” is a pidginized form for a corps member who is on National Youth Service programme. The comedian accuses the corps member of using one particular shirt for a number of years. The participant of “corper” is used to identify the person in this linguistic context. The word “corper” makes people wonder why he cannot afford another shirt, and they laugh. “Value” appears for about twenty-nine times.

4.1.2.1 Processes

The comedian makes use of different “process types” for about one hundred and ninety-two times. The material process has the highest number of entries. This “process” expresses doing, while the mental process expresses sensing, as can be seen below:

I heard (mental-perception) the phone (actor) can snap (material-event)

In the above construction, the material process of “can snap” is used intransitively. However, it denotes doing, the phone doing the event of snapping. The knowledge of the word, “snap” as applied to a phone, which cannot do it, elicits laughter. The material process appears for about seventy-three times.

Similarly, the “material process” features in the construction below:

Bring down (material-action) your hand (goal) Oga (actor) don'tever (extent-duration) raise (material-actor) your hand (goal) near (extent-distance) me.

The material process of “raise” is used transitively, mentioning what should not be raised, hand. The audience wonders why this man in particular is asked not to raise his hand. The comedian then continues that his fasting is not religious but lack of food. This elicits laughter. Furthermore, the “mental process” is used for about thirty-one times. An occasion of the application of the mental process is presented below:

I have heard (mental-perception) about it, Nokia 3310 (matter)

The mental process of “heard” helps to create the auditory imagery in the minds of the audience for humour. Additionally, there is a repetition of the above process as seen below:

I heard (mental-perception) the phone (actor) can snap (material-event)

Attributing the quality of snapping to a nokia,3310, in the second sentence, creates humour for it does not have the facility for snapping. There is also another occasion in which the “mental process” and the “material process” are used. The construction below indicates it:

It takes (material-action) him five minutes (extent-duration) to think (mental-cognition) that is (relational) to start (material-action) thinking (mental-recognition)

The mental processes of “think” and “thinking” are used cognitively to form a mental picture.

The comedian uses this to ridicule a man he says he takes a towel to the office because he cannot think fast. The audiences conjure a mental picture of one taking a towel to the office and laugh.

Moreover, for the comedian to express the physiological behaviour of the characters in his story, he equally uses the behavioural process for about twenty-seven times. For instance, he says:

My dear (bahaver) is squatting (behavioural) to snap (material-action)

The behavioural process of “squatting” creates another mental picture. The audience imagines a man taking a squatting posture to use a phone, without a camera, for snapping, and this creates fun. While commenting on lack of food in Nigeria, he makes use of another “behavioural process”, as shown below:

How many (extent) people (behavior) fasted (behavioural)

This word, “fasted”, makes people heighten their expectation of another piece of joke. This expectation makes them laugh, as the joke is told. The comedian uses a “verbal process” of “told” to talk about the coups member thus:

You told (verbal) me you were (relational) in school (location-place) around (location-place)

In the above sentence, both the “verbal” and the “relational” processes are used. The “verbal” is seen in “told”, while the “relational” is seen in “were.” The “verbal process” is repeatedly

used for about twenty- one times, while the “relational” is used for about thirty nine times. Another case of “relational process” is seen below:

You are (relational) a copper (value)

The comedian uses the “relational process” in order to introduce a complementation of the subject. This helps in describing what entities are for humour.

4.1.2.2 Circumstances

The use of circumstantial elements also contributes immensely to the humour. Klint De Drunk has used about one hundred and twenty-eight different items for “circumstance”. For instance, the comedian uses the circumstantial element of “location” about fifty-six times to locate actions and events in the context of time and place for proper understanding. A point at issue is the sentence below:

Last year, (location-time) I was (relational) here (location-place)

In the above sentence, the comedian tells the audiences where he was at a particular point in time by “last year” and “here”. These elements are used to modify the process of “was” for the purpose of contextualization. Similarly, there is a repetition of the same elements of “location” in the utterance below:

You told (verbal) me you were (relational) in a school (location-place) around (location-place) here (location-place)

The locative adverbials are used to explicate on the “process-were”. The comedian uses these elements, while insinuating that he takes particular note of a man in the audience, who has been using one particular shirt to the “show arena” for the past two years. This ridicule creates humour.

The circumstantial elements of “manner” have equally been appealed to for humour on about fifty-nine occasions. This is indicated below:

This man (behavior) that just (manner-quality) stood (behavioural)...

The comedian uses the expression above, while trying to introduce a man he claims he does not think fast. He ever went to office with a towel on his shoulder. In the expression above, the process of “stood” is modified by the circumstance of “just”. With the introduction of “just”, the “process of stood” shows aimlessness, confusion and even carelessness. This element of “manner” prepares the hearts of the audience for laughter by painting the picture of aimlessness, confusion and carelessness.

The comedian continues with his rendition by introducing more elements of circumstance, as seen below:

Honestly (manner-quality) the other day (location-time) he went (material-action) to the office (location-place) with a towel (accompaniment-addition)

In the above linguistic token, the circumstance, “honestly”, positions the comedian, as expressing a candid opinion about the person in question. He further introduces the circumstance of location, “the other day” and “in the office”, which define when and where this honest opinion he expresses takes place. The humour, however, is made complete by his addition of the element of “accompaniment-with a towel”. What becomes humorous is the audience’s imagination of one going to the office “with a towel” on his neck.

The comedian appeals to the circumstantial elements of “extent” while making his humorous rendition, as seen below:

Oga, don’t ever (extent-duration) raise (material-action) your hand (goal) near (extent-distance) me.

In the above construction, the comedian uses the power of “circumstance of extent” to elicit his humour from the audience. Before using the immediately above construction, he had earlier asked how many people fasted. It was in response to his question that the man he addressed raised his hand. However, the comedian pretends to be serious and hard on the man by using “ever and near” to modify the “process-raise” in the sentence. By the time the comedian added that the man was fasting for lack of food and not a religious duty, the

audience understood why the elements “ever” and “near” were used to modify “don’t raise”, and this elicited humour.

4.1.3 Basket Mouth

Basket mouth tailors his humour around the topics of poverty, insecurity, drunkenness and foolishness, among young men. He uses his personal experience of poverty to create humour concerning lack of food. He goes further to discuss insecurity on the subject of robbery in a bank. He later changes to how he behaves stupidly in a club having got drunk. He ends with young men’s foolish exploits with young women concerning recharge cards.

4.1.3.0 Participants

In the course of his rendition of humour, Basket Mouth appeals to different “participant types”. He uses about one hundred and ninety-eight items of different “participants”. However, he uses the participant of “actor” on twenty-six occasions. One of the occasions is seen below:

Madam (actor) can you just (manner-quality) make (material-action) it fast (manner-quality)

In the above expression, “madam” has been used as an “actor” because it is made to carry out the “process-make”. He uses this expression while talking about his experience in the bank. He presents a woman, as cashier, who delayed paying him his money until arm robbers entered the bank. The participant of “goal” features more than of “actor”; some instances are”:

They attack (material-action) Oceanic Bank (goal)

Oceanic Bank is presented as a “goal”, having affected by the process of “attack” in the expression. The audience balances the mention of the “goal”, Oceanic Bank, with the world of reality, having had the knowledge of the bank. In addition, the comedian makes use of “goal” below:

I’m trying (material-action) to confirm (material-action) your cheque (goal)

In the above expression, “your cheque” is classified as a “goal” because it is presented as the entity affected by the process of “confirm”. The word “cheque” takes the audience to the real banking world, where cheques are used for withdrawals, enhancing understanding of the joke for laughter. This participant features for about forty-four times. More so, basket mouth makes use of the participant of “sayer” for about six times to report “processes” carried out by others, for an instance:

My papa (sayer) dey tell us make we go (material-action) eat (material-action) for dream (location-place)

Because of lack of food, his father will ask them to go, sleep, and eat in the dream. He uses his father to create humour. The audience imagines how a father will behave this way and laughs.

The comedian pursues this line of humour by using yet another “participant type”, as seen below:

Godwin (senser/actor) wetin you want (mental-affection) chop (material-action) for dream? (location-place)

“Godwin” is presented above as the entity undertaking the process of “want” and “chop”. To imagine the comedian asking his brother what he would want to eat in the dream elicits laughter. “Senser” is used for once. The participant of “carrier” also features in Basket Mouth’s humour for about nine times. An instance is presented thus:

Those days (carrier) those days (carrier) bad (attribute)

He presents the participant of “those days”, as carrying the attribute of “bad”. The word “bad” complements “days”. The audience looks at his present economic status relating it to what he suffered in the past and laughs. The participant of “phenomenon” has equally featured in Basket Mouth’s humour below:

I see (mental-perception) midget, (phenomenon) I like (mental-affection) her height (phenomenon)

Looking at the participants of “midget,” (dwarf) and “height”, relating them to the processes of “see” and “like”, it is clear that the comedian was out of his senses. However, it is possible to like a midget, but he has already said it is not good to go to a club and be drunk. To present himself, as being drunk and admiring the height of a midget, creates laughter.

4.1.3.1 Processes

Just as other comedians, Basket Mouth uses more items of “material process”. Out of about two hundred and sixty-eight items of different “processes” types, the “material process” carries one hundred and fifty-six. An example of his use of “material process” is presented below:

You dey craze, (attribute) go (material-action) Sleep, (behavioural) eat, (material-action) eat (material- action) better (attribute) food (goal)

In the above construction, the “material process” has been repeated as can be seen in “eat, eat”. It also appears in “go”. Because of this repetition of the “material process” in a single construction, it appears more than other processes. The repetition of “eat” is humorous because the audience wonders at the emphasis placed on the word when in actual sense; the process is to be accomplished in the dream and not in reality.

Similarly, the comedian makes recourse to the “behavioural process” for about thirty-four times in the course of his humour. One of such occasions is indicated below:

No come (material-action) wake up (behavioural) in the morning (location-time) and say (verbal) hungry (actor) dey catch (material-event) you.

The comedian attributes the above statement to this poor father who would ask his children to go and eat in the dream instead of providing food for them. In the above sentence, he uses the “behavioural process” to express a physiological behaviour of “sleep and wake up”. The father urges the children to go and sleep early enough to eat in the dream very well, so as not to wake up and complain of hunger. This tactics to make up for his inability to provide food elicits laughter.

Furthermore, the comedian polishes his humour with the use of the “verbal process” for about twenty-six times to report statements by his brother and father. An example is below:

My brother (sayer) go say (verbal) I chop (material-action) fried-rice (goal) yesterday (location-time)...

In the above rendition, the comedian uses the “verbal process” of “say” to introduce his brother’s response to a question.

Godwin (senser-actor) wetin you want (mental-affection) chop (material-action) for dream? (location-place)

The two linguistic tokens above typify the helpless condition of the children. Their acceptance of the condition as presented above gears the audience to laughter. In addition, the construction above exemplifies the comedian’s use of the “mental process of affection”. The word “want” has been used to reflect the wish of Godwin, his choice of food if he has a way in real life. To make a choice of food to eat in the dream, using “want” expresses a pitiable and funny condition for which the audience laughs. Similarly, the “mental process” is captured below:

I see (mental-perception) midget, (phenomenon) I like(mental-affection) her height (phenomenon)

On this occasion, the comedian expresses the fact that alcohol influences him negatively. He uses a word of sight, “see”, to show the audience that alcohol actually tempers with his senses. He sees but unable to make proper judgment, therefore, “likes” a midget in a club. The audience laughs at his inability to judge. This mental process is used for about twelve times.

More so, the comedian has used the “relational process” for about twenty-four times. The comedian uses the process to express a state of being or complement certain entities in the subject position as indicated below:

I’m (relational) late (attribute)

He used the above construction while trying to hasten the cashier in Oceanic Bank, who delayed until arm robber came in. Similarly, the construction below expresses a state of being:

Don't ever (extent-duration) get (relational) drunk (attribute) in a club (location-place)

He begins his joke of picking a midget in a club by making the above statement. It shows a state in which one should not be. In the two examples above, the comedian uses "is" to introduce the attributive word, "late", which complements the subject "I"; and "get" to introduce "drunk", which complements the entity in the subject, not mentioned. The comedian uses the "relational processes" to complement entities for a vivid picture, which subsequently create humour.

4.1.3.2 Circumstances

The use of circumstantial elements in Basket Mouth's humour is comparatively similar to the earlier comedians. He uses the "circumstance of extent" for about fourteen times. One instantiation of his use of "extent" is indicated below:

Don't ever (extent-duration) get (relational) drunk (attribute) in a club (location-place)

In the above construction, the comedian makes recourse to "circumstance of ever" to express what extent one should not be "drunk" in a club. His mention of "ever" emphasizes the degree to which the "process of get" with its "attribute of drunk" should not be undertaken. This word shows regret, and prepares the minds of the audience to hear what he so regretted.

In the same sentence above, the "circumstance of location" has been mentioned to contextualize where one should not be drunk. "In a club", as used here, creates an image in the mind of the audience for humour. People, who are familiar with club life, form the image of the environment and feel what goes on there. This knowledge enhances the power of the humour. A man who gets drunk in his house is different from the one in a club.

In a similar vein, the comedian makes more use of the “circumstance of location” to contextualize his humour in time and place. This is exemplified in the rendition below:

Early morning, (location-time) you go see (mental-perception) am collect (material-action) toothpick (goal) day come (material-action) meat (goal) for him teeth (location-place)

The comedian uses this rendition to express the behaviour of his brother, Godwin. Their father told them to go, sleep, and eat in the dream, as there was no food. And true to that, Godwin showed he had eaten in the dream. The comedian uses “early morning” to tell when the process of “see, collect and cannot” occur. As a follow up from his father’s directive, Godwin gets up in the morning, collects a toothpick and begins to pick out pieces of the meat he ate in the dream. This vivid picture painted by the “circumstances” creates humour.

Furthermore, in the rendition above, the circumstance of the “location-place” equally plays a role. The “process” of picking out meat from the teeth is made more explicit by the use of “for him teeth”. Imagining the truth of having pieces of meat eaten in the dream removed early morning elicits laughter from the audience. The “circumstance of location” has been used for about sixty-five times. To further, strengthen his humour, Basket Mouth touches on the use of the “circumstantial element of” “manner”. This helps in expressing the way or how the “processes” are carried out. This “circumstance” appears for about twenty-four times. An instance of this circumstance is indication below:

Madam (actor) can you just (manner-quality) make (material-action) it fast (manner-quality)

This rendition was made when the comedian went to Oceanic Bank to withdraw some money. He claimed he would not have been a victim of a robbery attack in the bank if the cashier was fast. The construction above expresses how he was urging the cashier to be fast. He uses “just” to modify “make” and “fast” to modify “make”. All these elements help in

giving more details about the process of “make”. The element of “manner”, therefore, contributes in making clearer to the audience how the “processes” are undertaken.

While mocking women for infidelity, the comedian selects from the circumstances of “cause” and “accompaniment” as indicated in the utterance below:

You know (mental-cognition) say some people (actor) dey hang out (material-action) with ugly girls (accompaniment) for security (cause-purpose)

The comedian uses the “accompaniment of commutation” to modify the material process of “hang out”. It is “with ugly girls” that tells who people hang out with. The comedian goes further to tell us the purpose of hanging out with ugly girls by introducing the circumstance of “cause”. The cause element, “for security”, explicates on hang out. He explains that ugly ladies have less patronage from men. If a man hangs out with an ugly lady, he is likely to be the only man around the lady he uses accompaniment for about three times. The audience reflects on these “circumstantial elements” vis-à-vis social realities about women and laugh. It can be plausibly said that circumstantial elements of “location” and “manner” are more needful in humour. They help to tell when, where and how a “process” is carried out.

4.1.4 Lepacious Bose

Lepacious Bose uses her size to create humour. The very name she bears is ironically humorous. “Lepa” means slim and tall, but the bearer of the name looks obese. She exploits her size for humour by mocking and ridiculing herself.

4.1.4.0 Participants

Like the other comedians, Lepacious Bose relies on the power of different syntactic elements to achieve humorous results. She uses about eighty-eight different “participants”. Unlike the other comedians, however, Bose uses the “participant of value” more than other elements, as can be seen in an example below:

Just (manner-quality) tell (verbal) me I’m (relational) beauty (value)

She uses the above construction to complement the entity in the subject position, “I”. The participant of “value” is used predominantly because she complements herself mostly for the humour. She tells the audience who she is and what she looks like.

Similarly, she uses the participant of “value” in the sentence below:

They started (material-action) to sing (behavioural), we are (relational) family (value), me and elephant (token)

She uses the above sentence while talking about her depressive state, which takes her to the zoo in search of acceptance. She was rejected because of her size but when she got to the zoo, the elephant accepted her and sang the song, which wordings are written above. She uses the value of “family” to explain how the elephants see her as their family member because of her size. This becomes humorous. To further complement entities in her humour, Bose uses a number of attributive elements. About eighteen elements of “attribute” are used, some cases are indicated below:

As the elephant (senser) saw (mental-perception) me, they were (relational) so (manner-quality) excited (attribute)

Bose uses the attribute of “excited” together with its modifier “so” to express the state in which the elephants were on sighting her. Presenting the animals, as celebrating her presence, using the word “excited”, creates humour. Another instantiation of her use of “attributive” element is indicated below:

He say (verbal) is (relational) good (attribute)

The comedian claims that when God created her, He added extra quantity of sand. It was this sand God added to make her obese that God said it was good. “Good” is used attributively to express a state of being. This “attribute” makes the audience wonder how God can make an individual so obese and it would be good. To also hear such comment from Bose, who is affected by obesity, elicits humour. The comedian’s use of words includes evaluative terms, such as “good, emotive or psychological words, such as “excited” and so on.

The participant of “goal” closely rivals “attribute” by featuring for about seventeen times. A case in point is conveyed by the construction:

He add (material-action) more, (attribute) add (material-action) add (material-action) another sand (goal), add (material-action) sand (goal)

In the above sentence, the participant of “goal” is used, as “sand”. It serves as an entity affected by the process of “add”. The comedian uses the goal to tell what has been added, which makes her obese. Presenting sand, as what is in excess quantity to affect her size, becomes humorous. To make her humour possible, Bose uses some amount of “actors” for about seven times. One point at issue is presented below:

My boy friend (actor) left (material-action) me because (reason) every time (extent-duration) he wants (material-affection) to hug (material-action) me, he has (relational) to borrow (material-action) other people’s hands (goal) to join (material-action) so that (cause-purpose) the hand (actor) can go around (material-action)

The construction above, presents the element, “boy friend”, as the “actor” to show the entity that performs the “process” of “left” on the speaker, “me”. Also, the element, “hand”, is used as the “actor” to indicate what is involved in the process of going round. The comedian uses more concrete and physical terms as “actors and goals”. This visible imagery helps to enhance understanding for humour.

Bose uses both the participants, “sayer” and “token”, in the rendition below:

You know (mental-perception) that the bible (sayer) say, (verbal) the earth (token) is (relational) the lords (value)

Bose uses “sayer-bible” to report a statement and indicate what the statement is ascribed to. In addition, the “token-earth” is used to indicate what belongs to the lord. This allusion to the bible for humour, enhances the understanding of her humour. The token appears three times and the sayer, three times. Finally, Bose equally touches on the “senser” and “phenomenon” for her humour rendition:

I saw (mental-perception) snakes (phenomenon) I saw (mental-perception) monkeys (phenomenon) I saw (mental-perception) baboon (phenomenon) as the elephant (senser) saw (mental-perception) me....

Here again, Bose still makes use of the physical and the concrete items for her humour. She uses “snakes, monkeys, baboons” as “phenomenon” and “elephant” as “senser”. This buttresses the fact that concrete participants are easy to imagine and contextualize for humour. She claims she sees all this animals but they ignore her, it is the elephants, who accept her.

4.1.4.1 Processes

The use of different “process types” enhances Bose’s humour a great deal. She uses about one hundred and thirteen items of “processes”. The “material process” has the highest entry of forty-one items. This domination stems from its repetition in some utterances, as presented below:

He add (material-action) more (attribute) add, (material-action) add (material-action) another sand, (goal) add (material-action) sand (goal)

In the above utterance, the comedian uses the material process of “add” three times. This reduplication of “add” is used for emphasis. She uses the process of “add ” repeatedly to show how much sand has been used by God to create her. She shows the audience that this addition makes her obese. Looking at her size in relation to the process of “add”, the audience laughs.

The “relational process” follows the “material process” by featuring about thirty items. While trying to use the “relational process”, the comedian says:

He say (verbal) is (relational) good (attribute)

She introduces the relational process of “is” to introduce a complement, “good”. Similarly, the “relational process” features in the rendition below:

I went (material-action) to the zoo (location-place) out of depression (manner-means) and wanted (mental-affection) to become (relational) one (value) with the animals (accompaniment-commutation)

The comedian selects the element, “become”, in order to buttress her frustration. She is rejected and not loved because of her size. The “commutative” of “with the animals” helps in explicating on the process of “become”. Looking at her desire to seek company of animals because of her size, the audience laughs. “stative processes”, such as “is, become” and so on, dominate the “relational process”. These are used to express a state of being, which enhances humour.

The “mental process” minimally contributes with about twelve items. For instance, in the sentence above, the comedian uses the mental process of affection, “wanted”, to expose her emotive conception. She “wanted” to become as an animal. The audience imagines a human wanting to become an animal, and they laugh. Further, the construction below is another instantiation of the application of the “mental process” for humour:

I saw (mental-perception) monkeys, (phenomenon) I saw (mental-perception)
baboons (phenomenon)

The comedian uses “saw” to create an image of sight and vision in her audience. She reports that she “saw” those animals but they ignored her, as the elephants saw her, they were excited. The audience connects her size with that of elephants and burst into laughter. The “mental process” is repeated in terms, such as “saw” and “want(ed)” on many occasions.

The “behavioural process” equally contributes to this humour, but for about eighteen times. Bose uses it to express the physiological behaviour of the elephants as presented below:

They started (material-action) to sing; (behavioural) we are (relational) family
(value)...

To personify the action of the elephant, ascribing “sing” to them, adds to the humour. Presenting elephants, the fat animals, as singing on sighting an obese woman, pushes the audience to uncontrollable laughter.

Lastly, in reporting statements ascribed to other persons or things, Bose makes use of the “verbal process” for about eighteen times. “Say” is frequently used. Some points at issue are applied in the construction below:

He say (verbal) is (relational) good (attribution).

It is the “process of say” that makes the statement ascribable to another person. Using “say”, the comedian reports that God created her, added more sand to make her obese and said it was good. In addition, “tell” features in the rendition below:

Just (quality) tell (verbal) me I’m (relational) beauty (value)

The comedian says that given her looks, one does not need to “tell” her she is beautiful, but one should just say she is “beauty”. The audience looks at the contradiction presented by the word “beauty” against the ugly looks of Bose and burst into laughter.

4.1.4.2 Circumstances

To make her humour more effective, Bose depends on the modifying power of “circumstantial” elements”. More pervasively used is the element of “location”. It appears about twenty times. Some instantiations of her use of “location” are presented below:

When (location-time) Good (actor) created (material-action) me, He was (relational) in good mood (manner-quality)

The comedian tells the audience the mood God was in when creating her, using “when” to not just make the first clause subordinate to the second, but also to modify “was” in the clause.

Similarly, she uses the circumstance of manner, “in good mood”, to modify the process “was”. They combined to express the state of being at the time Bose was created. This Bose claims the good mood accounts for why God uses a lot of sand on her.

To further use “circumstance of location in place”, Bose uses the rendition below:

I went (material-action) to the zoo (location-place) out of depression (manner-means) and wanted (mental-affection) to go (material-action) and become (relational) one (value) with the animals (accompaniment-commutation).

The comedian uses the power of circumstance of location to paint the picture of a serious condition of frustration because of her size. For instance, “to the zoo” is used to tell the audience where she went. The audience began to wonder why she would go to where animals are kept. She adds another modifier to the process of “went” by using, “out of depression”, manner-means. This expresses the level of frustration she feels about her size. She further polishes her idea by introducing “with the animals”, the circumstance of accompaniment-commutation”. This she uses to modify the process of “become”. Because of rejection by her boy friend, Bose uses “location” to tell where she went; “Manner” to express how she feels and “accompaniment” to express what she seeks companionship with.

The circumstance of” manner” features about eighteen times, while “cause” features seventeen times, “extent”, four and accompaniment, three. In the rendition below, Bose uses some of the circumstances:

My boy friend (actor) left (material-action) me because (cause-reason) every time (extent-duration) he wants (mental-affection) to hug (material-action) me, he has (relational) to borrow (material-action) other people’s hands (goal) to join (action) so that (cause-purpose) the hand (actor) can go round (material-action)

In the above rendition, Bose uses “because” as circumstance of “cause” to express the reason for which her boy friend left her. Similarly, she goes further to use the circumstance of “extent-duration” to express to what extent, in terms of duration, the process of “want to hug” and “has to borrow” take place. This gives a picture of a tiring exercise, going to borrow hands always to hug a girl friend. Bose uses this to state why her boy friend left her. By so ridiculing herself, the audience has to laugh.

In the same rendition above, Bose uses the circumstance of “cause-purpose”, as can be seen in “so that”, to express the purpose for which her boy friend has to borrow extra-hands from other people; “so that” the hand can go round”. With the aid of the “circumstances”, the audience has to appreciate the level, extent, how, why and where the

“process” occurs, which results into humour. Bose equally talks about the circumstances of “matter and comparison, as noted below”:

So, you people (actor) should do (material-action) something about this apartheid (matter) against lepacious people (location-place) like (comparison) me.

Bose captures the “circumstance of matter” in “about this apartheid”. This, she uses to express the subject matter in the humour, and wants something to be done about it. She says she steps in a security door in one bank and the alarm of the door says the facility is only for one person. She uses the “circumstance of comparison” to introduce an ironical situation. She describes herself as “lepacious”, meaning slim when in actual sense, she is obese. This unlikely and ironical comparison elicits laughter.

4.1.5 Gordon

This comedian uses his personal experiences to comment on economic and social ills. He uses different subject matters, such as poverty, hunger, disease, corruption, religious hypocrisy and discrimination to create his humour. He takes advantage of the social, economic and religious needs familiar to his audience for his humour.

4.1.5.0 Participants

Among the six humorists considered, Gordon has the most voluminous speech rendition. Like other comedians, he depends on the use of different “participant types” for his humour. For instance, he opens his speech with the use of a “phenomenon”, as indicated below:

You don see (mental-perception) poverty (phenomenon) before (location-time)

The “mental process of see” affects the entity, “poverty”. He uses a familiar “phenomenon-poverty”, making his audience to expect what follows on this familiar subject. This “participant” is used variously for about eighteen times. However, the “participant-existent”

appears just for about three times. The comedian uses it to portray the existence of levels of poverty as presented below:

There is (existential) difference (existent) between poor and pole (location-place)

The “existent-difference” is what the comedian uses to emphasize the point of levels of poverty in the minds of audience. The audience laughs at the mention of poor and pole, which have phonetic relationship. The humorist continues by using “poor” attributively, as presented below:

If (condition) you are (relational) poor (attribute), once in a while, (extent-duration) you fit (attribute) dey get (material-action) something.

“Poor” and “fit” are used attributively to complement entities “you” for humour. The comedian uses “attribute” because audience have to know how entities are for the humour to be effective. He uses items of attribution for about eighty-three times for complementation. Additionally, the comedian introduces other “participants”, such as “value” and “goal” in the rendition below:

“But if (condition) you are (relational) pole (value) you go dey take (material-action) pawpaw (goal), take (material-action) dey soak (material-action) garri (goal)

The comedian uses the “value-pole” to complement “you,” expressing what “you” will be. He uses “pole” as a higher level of poverty. This semantic shift of the term in relation to poverty becomes humorous.

Similarly, “pawpaw” is used as a “goal” because it is affected by the “material process-take”, just as “garri” is used as a “goal” because it is affected by the “material process-soak”. Those two items of “goal” help in creating humour because the audience look at the mixture of “pawpaw” and “garri” as foods, which do not correlate and laugh. The comedian uses “value and goal” variously for about forty-eight and eighty-four times respectively.

Furthermore, “actor”, which denotes an entity carrying out a “process” has been used on different occasions. An instance is cited below:

My papa (actor) born (material-action) twelve children (goal)

To present “papa” as an “actor”, the comedian uses it as an entity that carries out the “material process-born” which affects the entity “twelve children-goal”. He uses this statement to launch into why poverty so affected them. They were many to one father. This number also creates humour to listeners. More so, the humorist makes use of the “behavior” as a participant type in his rendition of humour. He uses the “behavior” to denote an entity that carries out a psychological or physiological “process-behavioural” in his humour. An example is presented below:

My papa (behavior) and mama (behavior), we dey stay (behavioural) one room (location-place)

The comedian uses “papa and mama” as entities that carry out the “behavioural process-stay”, which takes place in “one room”. What becomes humorous is the single room with twelve children and two parents. He also uses another rendition showing a “token” as a “participant” below:

That ceiling fan (token) was (relational) also (manner-quality) our alarm (value).

The comedian describes or complements the entity “ceiling fan” as an alarm, because any time there was power cut, it would make a loud noise because of its poor mechanical state. The token “ceiling fan,” which turns into an alarm elicits humour to listeners. A fan should not be making a noise. This noise paints a picture of abject poverty. “Token” has been used variously for about ten times. Just as other comedians, Gordon makes use of concrete or physical items predominantly. These concrete items help in building images in the minds of listeners, which enhance understanding for humour.

4.1.5.1 Processes

Gordon makes use of “processes” more than “participants” and “circumstances”. About five hundred and thirty-five items are used for different “process types”. However, Gordon depends heavily on the use of the “material process”, the process of doing for his humour. Some instances of the “material process” are presented below:

Once (location-time) five o'clock (actor) don reach (material-event), NEPA (actor) don cease (material-event) light (goal)

In the rendition above, the “process reach” is used as “material” because it denotes doing an action. However, “reach” is classified under “event” because the entity, which carries out the “process”, is inanimate. The “process” is also used intransitively because no second entity is named as being affected by the “process-reach”.

Similarly, the process, “cease”, is used as “material” in that it also denotes doing an action. However, the process is named as “material-event” because the entity “NEPA”, which carries out the “process” is inanimate. “Cease” is used transitively because “light” is the entity affected by the process. The “material process” features about two hundred and ninety items. Additionally, the comedian uses other “process types” in the linguistic token presented below:

For lack of grease (cause-reason) when (location-time) the fan (senser/actor) want (mental-affection) stop (material-event) e go dey say (verbal), “hoo, hoo”.

A reader encounters the use of the “mental process-want, the material process-stop and the verbal process-say”. “Want” is a mental process because it encodes the meaning of sensing-feeling, “stop”, on the other hand, is a “material” because it encodes the meaning of doing, while “say” is “verbal” for it is a process of saying. The comedian plays on those “processes” to elicit his humour. The mental process has been used variously for about seventy-five times, while the material process is used for about fifty-one times.

In continuation of his rendition, Gordon introduces the “behavioural process”. Because of the noise the fan makes, it becomes difficult to sleep. The comedian puts it this way:

O boy! Even if (concession) you they sleep, (behavioural) that time,(location-time) you must wake up (behavioural)

The items “sleep” and “wake up” are used as “behavioural processes” because they express a physiological behavior. He uses “sleep and wake up” side by side to express how discomfoting the noise, emanating from the fan, was. This goes further to express the level of poverty they suffered. Listeners, then, laugh at the situation or the point. The behavioural process has been used for about sixty-four times. While trying to express the state of being of certain entities for his humour, Gordon makes use of the relational process variously for about forty times. An instance is cited below:

We be (relational) the rug (value) for the house (location-place)

The comedian uses “be” relationally to express what they were in their fathers house. They were lying and sleeping on the floor. He puts this humorously that “we be the rug for the house”. The audience reflects on how twelve children would lie on the floor in a single room and laugh”.

Earlier in his rendition, Gordon touches on the existential process to express the existence of a difference between poor and pole. This, he puts it this way:

There is (existential) difference (existent) between poor (location-place) and pole (location place).

The word “is” shows that the “existent- difference” exists between the two words “poverty” and “pole”. The existence of these non-related concepts as brought together by the comedian creates humour. He uses the existential process for about four times. To follow up the above utterance, he introduces the “relational process”. He puts it thus:

If (condition) you are (relational) pole (values) you go dey take (material-action) pawpaw (goal) take (material-action) dey soak (material-action) garri (goal).

In the above rendition, he uses “are” to express a state of being. In addition, the “material process” is repeated in “take”, this makes it feature more than other processes.

4.1.5.2 Circumstances

Gordon, just as other humorists, enlists some circumstantial elements to modify or qualify “processes” to express how, when, where, why and to what extent the “processes” are carried out. In the rendition presented below, Gordon applies the power of circumstances of location, “time”, extent and “distance” for his humour.

That time (location-time) na him you go know (mental cognition) how far (extent-distance)

“That time” refers anaphorically to an utterance he makes earlier. He says if you are “pole”, you will take pawpaw and soak “garri”. It is these occasions of “take” and “soak” that the element refers to. Also, he uses “how far” to modify “know”. The comedian uses those elements to polish the meaning of the processes. “Extent” has been used for about twenty-one times.

More so, the element of location, “place”, has been applied thus:

Papa (behave) and mama (behave), we dey stay (behavioural) in one room (location-place)

Again, Gordon appeals to the “circumstance of location” to express to his audience where the “process-stay” takes place; in one room. What creates humour is the audience’s imagination of how twelve children and their parents will stay in one room. This element therefore, enhances the meaning of the “process-stay” for humour. The circumstance of location has been used variously for about one hundred and thirty-nine times.

Further, the humorist enhances his humour with circumstances of “cause”, as an instance is below:

That ceiling fan (token) was (relational) also our alarm (value) because (cause-reason) once (location-time) five o’clock(actor) don reach (material-action) NEPA (actor) don cease (material-action) light (goal), for lack of grease (cause-reason), when

(location-time) the fan (senser/actor) want (mental-affection) stop (material-action), e go dey say (verbal) hoo! Hoo!

The comedian uses the element of “because” to introduce why the fan “was also” an alarm. Also, he uses “for lack of grease” to tell why the fan makes a noise when stopping. The comedian uses the elements of “cause” for about nineteen times. Nevertheless, Gordon uses “condition”, as a “circumstance”, to express the conditions in which certain processes (will) take place, an instance is shown below:

You dey take (material-action) pawpaw, (goal) take (material-action) soak (material-action) garri (goal).

The processes of “take”, which affects pawpaw, and “soak”, which affects “gari” are said to be possible only on the conditions that you are very poor. The circumstance of “condition” has featured for about twenty-eight times. Therefore, it can be said that the use of circumstantial elements emphasize the activities of the “processes”. This goes further to impress clarity of meaning on the audience, resulting into humour.

4.2 Presentation of Frequency Tables

This unit presents the frequency distribution of syntactic items among the six comedians.

Figure 1.1

The Frequency Distribution of Participant Types Among the Six Comedians

	I GO DYE	AY	KLINT DE DRUNK	BASKET MOUTH	LEPACIOUS BOSE	GORDON	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANT
ACTOR	41	30	11	26	07	70	185	14.2%
GOAL	105	56	24	44	17	84	330	25.2%
BEHAVER	05	12	08	03	01	09	38	2.9%
SENER	06	04	03	01	03	06	23	1.8%
PHENOMENON	16	02	17	05	05	18	63	4.8%
SAYER	06	01	02	06	03	21	39	3.0%
TARGET	05	0	01	04	0	05	15	1.1%
TOKEN	06	09	04	01	03	10	33	2.5%
VALUE	54	50	29	36	27	48	244	18.7%
CARRIER	06	12	05	09	03	15	50	3.8%
ARRIBUTE	38	35	37	59	18	83	270	20.7%
EXISTENT	04	04	01	04	01	03	17	1.3%
TOTAL	292	215	142	198	88	372	1307	100%

The table above shows the distribution of each participant type among the six comedians. The first vertical role on the table indicates the names of the six comedians, the total and the percentage of participants. The first column on the table indicates the names of each participant type. Against each participant types, are six horizontal columns containing the number of times each participant type appears. The 7th and 8th columns contain the total and percentage of participants. To get the total for each variable, the number of times each comedian uses a particular participant type is summed up: for example, the total for the variable “ actor” is equal to $41 + 30 + 11 + 26 + 07 = 185$.

To get the grand total, all the totals for each variable are summed up, for example;

$$185+330+-----270+17=1307$$

The percentage of participant =

$$\frac{\text{Total of each variable}}{\text{Grand total}} \times 100$$

For example, $\frac{\text{total of actor}}{\text{Grand total}} \times 100 = \frac{185}{1307} \times 100$

14.2%

Figure 1.2
The Frequency Distribution of Process Types Among the Six Comedians

	I GO DYE	AY	KLINT DE DRUNK	BASKET MOUTH	LEPACIOUS BOSE	GORDON	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF PROCESS
ACTION	232	118	63	147	39	245	844	47.0%
EVENT	21	14	10	09	02	45	101	6.0%
PERCEPTION	13	10	12	11	07	19	72	4.0%
AFFECTION	14	14	01	12	04	12	68	3.8%
COGNITION	26	09	18	06	11	20	90	5.0%
BEHAVIOURAL	31	32	27	32	10	64	196	10.9%
VERBAL	49	20	21	26	10	75	201	11.2%
RELATIONAL	31	48	39	24	30	40	212	11.8%
EXISTENTIAL	04	05	01	01	-	04	15	1.8%
TOTAL	421	270	192	268	113	585	1799	100%

The table above shows the distribution of each process type among the six comedians.

The first vertical role on the table contains the names of the six comedians, total and percentage of the process. The first horizontal column on the table contains the names of the process types. Against each process type, are six horizontal columns below the names of comedians, containing the number of times each process type appears. The 7th and the 8th columns contain the total and the percentage of the processes. To obtain the total for each process type the number of times each comedian uses the process type is summed up. For

example, the total for action is equal to $232+ 118+ 63+147 + 39+245=844$. To obtain the grand total, the totals for each process types are summed up, for example: $844+101+-----$
 $-----212+15= 1799$.

The percentage of each process is obtained thus:

$$\frac{\text{Total of each process} \times 100}{\text{Grand total}}$$

For example:

$$\frac{\text{Total of action} \times 100}{\text{Grand total}} = \frac{844}{1799} \times 100$$
$$= 47\%$$

The table shows that the comedians use more action words than other variables. This explains the centrality of action for humour.

Figure 1.3

The Frequency Distribution of Circumstance Types Among the Six Comedians

	I GO DYE	AY	KLINT DE DRUNK	BASKET MOUTH	LEPACIOUS BOSE	GORDON	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF CIRCUMSTANCE
DURATION	14	5	12	11	4	20	66	7.4%
DISTANCE	1	-	7	3	-	1	12	1.3%
TIME	39	37	30	25	7	55	193	21.5%
PLACE	39	49	26	41	16	84	255	28.5%
MEANS	7	5	3	-	3	3	21	2.3%
QUALITY	42	31	22	22	13	29	159	17.7%
COMPARISON	10	2	2	2	2	13	31	3.5%
REASON	3	2	11	3	11	14	44	4.9%
PURPOSE	3	1	1	3	4	1	13	1.5%
BEHALF	-	2	1	2	2	4	11	1.2%
COMMUTION	-	5	6	2	3	-	16	1.8%
ADDITION	-	1	-	1	-	-	02	0.2%
MATTER	-	7	3	-	5	-	15	1.7%
ROLE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
CONDITION	12	1	3	7	5	28	56	6.3%
CONCESSION	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	0.2%
TOTAL	170	148	128	122	75	253	896	100%

The table above shows the distribution of each circumstance type among the six comedians. The first vertical role on the table contains the names of six comedians, total and percentage of the circumstance. The first horizontal column on the table carries the circumstance types. Beside each circumstance type are six horizontal columns indicating the number of times each circumstance type has been used. The 7th and the 8th columns show the total and percentage of circumstances. To obtain the total for each circumstance type, the number of times each comedian uses the circumstance type is summed up. For example, the total for “duration” is equal to $14+05+12+11+4+20=66$

The grand total is obtained by summing up the total for each circumstance type, for example:

$$66+12+193 +----- 56 +2= 896.$$

The percentage for each circumstance type is obtain thus:

$$\frac{\text{Total of each process}}{\text{Grand total}} \times 100$$

For example: $\frac{\text{total of duration}}{\text{Grand total}} \times 100 = \frac{66}{896} \times 100$

$$=7.4\%$$

Figure 1.4
Summary of Frequency Distribution of Process, Participant and Circumstance Among the Six Humorists.

	PROCESS	PARTICIPANTS	CIRCUMSTANCE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
I GO DYE	421	292	170	883	22.0%
A.Y	270	215	148	633	16.0%
KLINT DE DRUNK	192	142	128	462	12.0%
BASKET MOUTH	268	198	122	588	15.0%
LEPACIOUS BOSE	113	88	75	276	7.0%
GORDON	535	372	253	1160	28.0%
TOTAL	1799	1307	896	4002	100%

The table above shows that the six comedians use “processes” more than “participants” and “circumstance. I Go Dye has 421 for process, 292 for participant and 170 for circumstance in that descending order. This applies to all the comedians. The “participant” type comes second among all the comedians and circumstance has the lowest entry. This is so because the comedians use the process to express actions. These actions are humorous. However, the actions are undertaken by certain participants. This becomes necessary for “participants” to follow the “processes”. The number of the “participants” is less than the “processes” because the comedians, in some cases, use one “participant” to carry out multiple actions since the humour is in the act.

Though the circumstances are used to show when, where, why and how an action takes place, the comedians use them less because in most cases, the process-action is sufficient to elicit laughter not necessary with when, where how and why it takes place. The table also shows that though all the comedians use “processes” more than “participants” and “circumstances”, Gordon has the highest entries for all the variables, followed by I Go Dye, A.Y. comes third, Basket Mouth takes fourth on two variables, while Klint De Drunk has more “circumstances” than Basket Mouth. Lepacious Bose carries the lowest in all the variables. All the comedians depend heavily on “processes” for their humour, knowing that the humour is in the processes-action. However, they lack the linguistic ability to complement all their processes with “circumstances”, which would have enhanced the quality of their humour.

4.4 General Discussion

From the foregoing, it is observed that syntactic items, to a large extent, do form a style in the language of humour because the six comedians use the syntactic group of processes more pervasively than participant and circumstance. Their specific choice of more processes defines their style. It is also noted that under processes, the material process dominates others because the process of doing mostly expresses humour. One entity does something to another for humour and this is captured in material process. The six comedians only used participants necessarily as linguistic elements acting in the processes. This is why in their humour, participants featured more than circumstances.

The comedians also make use of circumstances. In order to effectively elicit humorous result, the extralinguistic factor of context must be clear to the audience. This is why the circumstances of “time” and “place” are used more frequently than other “circumstances” to explain when and where an action takes place. Additionally, humour

cannot be complete without a clear picture of the manner in which the “processes” occur. The comedians use the “circumstance” of manner to express how processes occur for the clear picture, which enhance humour. Therefore, syntactic items are blended with extralinguistic factors for interpretation and a resultant humour.

It is further noted that speakers whose target is to create humour, make conscious syntactic choices largely to elicit humour. This is because they effortfully select syntactic items, which would convey the meaning they intend to pass across for humour. Despite this conscious choices made by comedians, syntactic items in themselves may not always convey the desired effect without a shared knowledge of the social political, cultural economic and security environment in which the interaction takes place. This is why most syntactic items used by the comedians are drawn from popular event to provoke shared knowledge for humour.

4.5 Findings

The following findings are made from the study:

- i. Syntactic structures do form a style in the language of humour as the six comedians make predominant use of material processes.
- ii. The extralinguistic factor of context must be clear to the audience for syntactic elements to elicit humour.
- iii. Speakers make conscious choices of syntactic elements, such as processes, participants and circumstances to make humour.
- iv. The syntactic elements in themselves may not always elicit humour. The shared knowledge of the interactants about social, political, cultural and economic environments helps for humour.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Preamble

The language of humour, just like other different instantiations of language use, makes appeal to certain categories of language. It is in order to establish which linguistic feature has been relied upon to create humour that the research is embarked upon. In order to render a comprehensive account of how language has been used creatively to achieve humorous result, using transitivity in systemic functional linguistic, this work has been segmented into introduction, literature review, research methodology, analysis, summary and conclusion. This chapter, therefore, summarises the different segments of the work and draws a conclusion.

5.1 Summary

It is a common linguistic phenomenon to manipulate language skillfully and creatively to make humour. To achieve this, a speaker uses diverse linguistic facilities. In order to ascertain these facilities, this work presents a preamble. The preamble discusses the importance of language as a tool for communication. The unit explains that while communicating, humans make use of different levels of language that consequently define their style.

Stylistic features of a language are embedded in the choices speakers make from the levels of language. A speaker may select more of a particular level, which may also define his style. These choices present language even as a means of making humour. Humans interact with one another based on humour. At the height of this interaction, however, are the choices speakers make of linguistic structures. Beside the structures are the shared knowledge and cultural values, which facilitate the resultant humour. This shows that humour may be culture specific.

Attempts are made to consider whether syntactic elements can form a style in humour, what linguistic and extralinguistic factors can contribute to humour. Also, considered is whether there is a possibility of conscious linguistic choices to make humour and the possibility of syntactic elements to create humour. Furthermore, this study contains aim and objectives. This focuses on how the syntactic elements used can define a style in the language of humour. It also looks at the possibility of blending non-linguistic factors and syntactic selection in order to enhance humour. It is discovered that syntactic units are very central to the creation of humour because they constitute an important category of language.

The significance of the work is also mentioned as contributing to the study of the language of humour. The importance of this work lies in the fact that it serves as a reference material for further study on the language of humour. It also states that the research focuses strictly on the language of humour. It selects only one volume of a comedy show produced in Nigeria under the title “Nite of a Thousand Laughs”. Nevertheless, the research reexamines analyses and reviews some related literature on stylistics, language and humour. This examines different scholarly postulations about the concept of language-the different facets of language. It also explains that language is a phenomenon whose its meaning relates to the context in which it is used.

Additionally, the study discusses the concept of stylistics from the perspectives of different scholars. It touches on the argument that surrounds the way literary and linguistic stylistics are used. To further discuss stylistics, the study also looks at different approaches to the study of stylistics. It observes the fact that different theoretical persuasions are used as tools for the study of stylistics. Mentioning some of these theories, structural stylistics, transformational generative stylistics and functional stylistics are discussed. Also, captured by this study is language and style. This defines language from diverse opinions of different scholars. Again, from all these opinions, it is observed that language is seen as an instrument

with which information is passed from one person or group to another. Equally, style is considered by different scholars but the connection they have is that it is the manner in which a speaker expresses himself or herself. To relate style with language, they agree that the choices that define an individual's style are from language.

Furthermore, language and humour also feature in this study. While discussing this, it is maintained that humour exists across all languages and cultures as an essential human characteristic. The study emphasizes the inseparability of humour from language. It observes that what constitutes humour is the manipulation of language. More so, the study captures the historical background of the comedy entitled "Nite of a Thousand Laughs". It is explained that what has become a highly developed and organized comedy industry started in a hospital ward. The intention was to bring relief to an actor who was lying critically ill at the hospital. It was later discovered that the humour could be better organized. This little beginning expanded to become a comedy industry.

Additionally, transitivity as a linguistic concept has been looked at from the point of view of functional linguistics. This concept is related to stylistics. The research explains that the skillful manipulation of variables of transitivity, such as "processes, participants and circumstances" can define the stylistic feature of a speaker or writer. Efforts are also made at explaining the theoretical framework adopted for the research. It specifically adopts transitivity in systemic functional linguistics as the theoretical framework. The reason for the choice of this school of thought as a means for analysis is that it shows how and why a text means what it does in a particular context of use. The theory asserts that as language users, people are socially, culturally and politically constructed. It shows that understanding meaning is about understanding social realities rather than determined truths, which are thought to pre-exist language.

The study goes further to explain the relevance of transitivity as a framework to the analysis of language of humour. The concept is used as a semantic one rather than a syntactic description. It shows whom or what does what to whom or what. It is observed that different “process types” containing different “participant types and circumstances” are used for humorous effects. The rendition of humour is built on features of transitivity. The methodological aspect centres on the sources of data. This reveals that the data used for this research are sourced from a comedy show entitled “Nite of a Thousand Laughs”.

Another segment of the chapter is sampling procedure. This shows that there are a number of comedy-based efforts but only “Nite of thousand Laughs” is selected for analysis. More so, it states that there are many humorous renditions under the name “Nite of a Thousand Laughs”, but only volume II is considered for analysis. Even in it, the use of musical renditions, response of the audience and other paralinguistic features are not included in the analysis. Nevertheless, in this research, data are collected by obtaining a video-recorded cassette of the humour. The cassette used is a rendition of an unwritten speech. For that reason, the data are transcribed.

The study equally makes use of qualitative and quantitative presentations. The qualitative analysis refers to the special act of interpretation. It shows that syntactic elements are linked to special interpretation for humour. The quantitative analysis focuses on tabular presentation of data, with each table accounting for a particular syntactic group. Also, not left out is the analytical procedure. It shows that the data collected are analysed using transitivity terminologies presented in Halliday (1985:101-144) as “clause as representation”. The study uses participant types, process types and circumstances”. It explains the use of square brackets, adverbial phrase, attribute and value, verbiage, phrasal verbs, Nigerian pidgin, infinitives, among other things. It is stated that the data used are attached at the end of the research as appendix.

The analysis of data presents the data collected and analyses them according to “participants, processes and circumstances.” This begins with I Go Dye and ends with Gordon. The last part of this includes the tables of frequencies of each element. The table includes percentages for “participants, processes and circumstances” according to each comedian. It ends with the general discussion and findings, emanating from the analysed. The last chapter of the work, which is five, focuses on the summary of all the preceding chapters. It also draws a conclusion on the findings of the research.

5.2 Conclusion

Making humour is an integral part of every human society. To produce humour, a speaker or writer relies on the instrumentality of language. However, language as a facility alone may not be very effective for humour making. The linguistic elements are complemented by the additional factor of language. This has to do with the shared experience of the interactants. It implies, therefore, that for humorous results to be achieved easily, a listener has to reflect on the environment within which the discussion takes place. The environment may be political, social, cultural, economic and religious, among other things.

Little wonder, in trying to create humour, the six comedians make recourse to a lot of these factors. Their choices of syntactic units largely cast the minds of the audience back to extralinguistic factors. An instance is seen in how I Go Dye uses “woman, mama, money”, among others to buttress his point that women like money. He opines that when a man has money, women run after him. This makes the audience reflect on the economic and social situation in Nigeria to appreciate his point, and this is an ideational function of language.

Similarly, A.Y. makes use of such concrete participants to evoke different contexts in order to enhance his humour. He uses Chris Okotie and Chris Oyakhilome to create a religious context. Again, he uses J.J Okocha, Wilson Oruma, Ghana and Nigeria to elicit sporting context to make his points. Putting a religious leader into a sporting context of

running a football commentary enhances his humour. He mockingly comments on the state of security, politics and religion by using different participant elements.

Klint De Drunk uses the participant “one shirt” to show the level of poverty in Nigeria. Someone uses one particular shirt year in, year out. Nevertheless, this context is achieved, using concrete participants. He uses Dbanj, De Koko and 2face, among others, as concrete participants to ridicule the level of incompetence in the entertainment industry. Basket Mouth also uses participants, such as “food, bingo, dog, thief, fan”, among others to create the context of economic depression in Nigeria. It is this shared knowledge of poverty in Nigeria that enhances his humour. Lapacious Bose uses participants, such as “boy friend, hand, bank, cage”, among others, to talk about her size. The humour becomes effective because people consider the negative feeling men have over very fat women. This again is shared experience.

Gordon also draws extensively from concrete participants for his humour. He uses “Naija, police, mama”, among others, to create different contexts, such as environment of corruption through the “police” and “mama” for family context. He uses much more concrete participants than any other groups of syntactic elements. It, therefore, means that what enhance the humorous result are the syntactic choices a speaker makes. They help in bringing to the mind of the listeners particular contexts. This knowledge of context, this shared knowledge is what effectively elicits humour. Therefore, humour is highly context bond.

Another important feature of language of humour is the use of items that will effectively show cause and effect. To properly arrive at humour, there must be a situation where one entity does something to another entity or to itself. This is why action processes predominate throughout the rendition of humour. In other words, the material process is the strongest factor in the determination of humour. To elicit humour, a speaker must rely heavily on the use of the elements of “doing”. This is why the six comedians considered have

material process appearing most frequently than other processes. It shows that in some cases, the “doer” does more than one action or event at a time. This is why “process” is more than even the “participants” in the “process”. Apart from the “material process, participants” in the “processes” are more than the “circumstances” of the “processes”.

One interesting thing however is that under “circumstance” the elements of “time and place” appear more frequently than other variables. This is because they support the idea of creating a context. The notion of context is more conspicuous when time and place are also captured. The language of humour, therefore, makes use of these facilities very well. Closely rivaling the “time and place” is “manner”. This element modifies the “actions or events” and other processes in the language. To elicit humour, how something happens is important, which is why “manner” has been used frequently.

In conclusion, the language of humour is interestingly and stylistically woven. It makes frequent use of different “processes” to create cause and effect. This effect becomes humorous. These “processes” are complemented by different “circumstantial elements”. However, the completeness of a humorous rendition lies in its relationship with the shared knowledge of the interactants; the ideational function of language holding between the interactants. This shared knowledge connects the syntactic choices a speaker makes to the variables of context. This interaction between selection of syntactic elements and the ideational function of language is what results into humour.

Bibliography

- Akinluyi, T.O. (1977). *The Place of Pidgin in Nigeria: Its Educational Implication*. Unpublished M.A Thesis. Institute of Education, University of London.
- Anderson, M.A. (ed) (1991). *The Linguistic Encyclopedia*. London: Rutledge.
- Asher, R.E. and Simpson, J.M.Y. (ed) (1994). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Asher, R.E. and Simpson J.M.Y. (Ed) (1994). *The Encyclopedia of Language and linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistics Theories of Humour*. Berhim: Mount de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (2001). *Humorous Texts: A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Berlyne, D.E. (1972). *Humour and its Kin*. Cambridge: C.U.P
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Blackmore, I. (2005). *Understanding Utterances*. Blackwell: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bucaria, C. (2004). "Lexical and Syntactic Ambiguity as a Source of Humour". *Humour*. Vol. 10.
- Chiario, D. (2010). *Translation, Humour and the Media*. London: Continuum.
- Chovanec, J. and Ermida, I. (2012). *Language and Humour in the Media*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Coulthard, M. (1975). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Dynel, M. (2009). *Humorous Garden-Paths: A Pragmatic-Cognitive Study*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Printer.
- Ekpe, S.I. (ed) (1997). *Aspects of Rhetorics*. Nigeria: Glad Tiding Press Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1997). *Linguistics and the Novel*. London; Methuen.

Halliday, M. K. A. (1976). *System and Function in Language*. Ed. G. Kress. London: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hymes, D. (ed) (1971). *Pidginisation and Creolisation of Languages*. London: C.U.P.

Kurk-Greene, A. (1971). "The West African Languages and English". *The English Language in West Africa*. London: Longman.

Leech, G. N. and Short, M. H (1981). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.

Lucas, T. (2004). *Deciphering the Meaning of Puns in Learning English as a Second Language. A Study of Triadic Interaction*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Florida: Florida State University.

Lyons, J. (1994). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.

Mafeni, B. (1971). "Nigerian Pidgin". *The English Language in West Africa*. London: Longman.

Marszalek, A. (2012). *Humorous Worlds: A Cognitive Stylistic Approach to the Creation of Humour in Narratives*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Glasgow: University of Glasgow.

Martin, J. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McGhee, P.E. (1972). *On the Cognitive Origins of Incongruity Humour. Fantasy Assimilation Versus Reality Assimilation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Neuliep, J.W. (1991). "An Examination of the Content of High School Teachers Humour in Classroom Humour". *Communication Education*, 40, 343-355.

Olusegun, A.O. and Adebayo, A.A. (2008). *University English Courses*. Ilorin: B. Concept Printing Press.

Prasad, T. (2008). *A Course in Linguistics*. New Delhi: Prentice hall of India Private Limited.

Raskin, V. (1994). *Semantic Mechanisms of Humour*. Dordrecht. D. Reidel Pub. Co.

Romaine. S.C. (1988). *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman.

Schmitz, J.B. (2002). "Humour as a Pedagogical Tool in Foreign Language and Translation Course". *Humour*, 15, 89-113.

Todd, L. (1974). *Pidgin and Creoles*. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.

Triezenberg, K.E. (2008). *Humour in Literature*. Berlin: Manton de Gruyter.

Turner, G.W. (1973). *Stylistics*. England: Pergium Books.

Veatch, T. (1998). *A Theory of Human Humour*. Berlin: Manton de Gruyter.

Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford: OUP.

Wales, K. (1989). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. New York: Longman Inc.

Watts, R.J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H. (2004). *Text, Context, Pretext. Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

www.thisdayonline/nigerianews/africanviewsonglobalnews

Yule, G. (1995). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

I GO DYE

Now, (time) you are(relational) welcome,(attribute) the V.I.P.(carrier) I dey always (duration) tell (verbal) people,(target) the speed(goal) wey we dey take(action) pursue(action) woman,(goal) if(condition) we take (action) that speed (goal) take (action) pursue (action) money,(goal) we go get(action)) am. I want(affection) tell(verbal) you, if(condition) you get,(action) if(condition) you no get(action) money,(goal) you go dey pursue(action) woman,(goal) but when(time) you get(action) money,(goal) woman(actor) go dey pursue(action) you. And you know(cognition) wetin I dey pursue?(action) I dey pursue(action) money,(goal) so that(purpose) woman(actor) go pursue(action) me. Why?(reason) All these girls(phenomenon/carrier) wey I dey see,(perception) very(quality) easy(attribute) to get(action) them. How(quality) you no go shout,(behavioural) eeh? What(token) is(relational) love?(value) Do you know(cognition) what they called(action) love?(goal) What(token) is(relational) love?(value) When(time) you the look(behavioural) the time(phenomenon) of our papa(value) and our mama,(value) you go see(perception) love,(phenomenon) you no dey see(perception) their picture(phenomenon/goal) wey them dey take?(action) Deep(attribute) love.(value) You go see(perception) my papa(phenomenon) self dey look(behavioural) my mama(place) well(quality) with love.(means) That na love.(value) Now,(time) Nigerian(attribute) girls(actor) don turn(action) am to money.(place)

If(condition) you no get(action) money,(goal) babe(senser/behavior) no want(affection) look(behavioural) your face.(phenomenon) I dey always(duration) tell(verbal) people,(target) “hustle(action) well”(quality) na all these English;(value) if(condition) you no get(action) money(goal), you dey speak(action) English(goal) dey toast(action) woman.(goal) All these girls(actor), they no send(action) am; English,(goal) grammar.(goal) Say you are(relational) the apple(value) of my eyes(value) this 2006.(time) The only(attribute) elastic(value) in my pants(place) this time.(time) No try(action) am with Warri girl.(means) Oh, you are(relational) the elastic...(value) “I go soon(time) cut(action) o”. When(time) you get(action) money(goal)-actually,(quality) if(condition) somebody tells(verbal) you say money(token) is(relational) not everything, slap(action) that person.(goal) Do you know(cognition) what they call(action) money?(goal) Money(actor) brings(event) maturity.(goal) Na so this our president(behavior) dey talk(behavioural) before.(time) Na when(time) they become(relational) president(value) and governor,(value) their talk...(actor) The millions(value/actor) you have(relational) control(action) your speech.(goal) Talk(behavioural) small,(quality) talk(behavioural) small.(quality) You must understand.(cognition) But some time,(duration) all these guys-(actor) get(action) the other time,(goal) I follow(action) my president(goal) Obasanjo(goal) dey talk,(behavioural) e want(affection) intimidate(action) me with the voice.(means) And e get(existential) the way(existent) wey you go talk(behavioural) sharp,(quality) sharp(quality) follow(action) them, they go know(cognition) say you be poor(attribute) man.(value) Position(action) yourself. The only(attribute) thing(phenomenon) wey I hear(perception) na my name(value/goal) wey Obasanjo(actor) call(action) “I Go Dye.”(goal) Me I be Warri boy.(value) Warri boy(actor) no dey carry(action) last,(goal) as if(quality) I just(time) say,(verbal) eeh, I fuck up(action). We just(quality) sit down,(behavioural) him just(quality) look(behavioural) me say(verbal) “I Go Dye”. Na him I use (action) level (goal) “my president”.

When(time) you get(action) money,(goal) you can spend(action) it the way(quality) you want.(affection) I dey say(verbal) Nigerian(attribute) money(token) no get(action) value,(goal) na Ghana money(value/carrier) worse(attribute) pass.(quality) I don't know.(cognition) Someone called(action) me, “is(relational) that comedian(value) I Go

Dye?"(value) I say(verbal) "yes". "You have(relational) a show(value) and we are paying(action) you 1.5 billion cedes".(goal) My phone(actor) fall(event) comot(event) for my hand.(place) I say(verbal) "men, I don hammer".(action) Quick(attribute) quick,(attribute) I don dey call(action) my mama.(goal) I never even(quality) see(perception) money.(phenomenon) I say(verbal) "melle, burn,(action) we don comot(action for poverty,(place) money(actor) don show".(event) I come(action) go(action) do(action) show(goal) finish.(action) Na him they pay(action) me the money(goal) 1.5 billion cedes.(goal) Na two Ghana-must-go(value) they take(action) carry(action) am give(action) me. From Ghana(place) I begin(action) call(action) my friends(goal) for Naija,(place) "O boy, make una dey drink,(action) I dey come.(action) If(condition) I come,(action) I go clear(action) the bill.(goal) Warri boys(actor) dey drink(action) say "O boy, we dey Manya".(action) I say(verbal) "continue".(action) When(time) I reach(action) Nigeria,(place) na him I go(action) meet(action) all these Mallams.(goal) Na him I give(action) them 2.5 billion cedes(goal) make them change(action) am. Na him they come (action) bring (action) N35, 000.(goal) Na him I look(behavioural) the 'aboki',(place) I say(verbal) "aboki,(actor) don deceive(action) me. This is(relational) 2.5 billion cedes".(value) E say(verbal) " kai, na the price(value) be that.

I go (action) meet(action) another(attribute) Mallam(goal) again,(duration) that one self come(action) even(quality) short(action) the money(goal) with N200.(means) Na him I say(verbal) "yes, our Nigerian(attribute) girls(actor) na them go suffer(action) with this money,(means) because(reason) they know(cognition) foreign(attribute) money(phenomenon) but na when(time) they convert(action) am then dey know(cognition) the original(attribute) amount.(phenomenon) Na him I say(verbal) "give(action) me back(place) the Ghana-must-go".(goal) Na him them carry(action) Ghana-most-go(goal) give(action) me. I carry(action) go back(action) come(action) put(action) am for corner(place) of my house,(value) zip(action) am make girls(senser) dey see(perception) am. Any one I carry,(action) we just(quality) play.(action) I just(quality) give(action) am 1.5 million cedes.(goal) "You are(relational) wonderful".(attribute) I go chuk(action) hand,(goal) put(material) again(duration) another(attribute) 5000 cedes.(goal) "Oh, my God! all my body(carrier) is(relational) for you.(purpose) I love(affection) you". Na when(time) the girls(actor) them go(action) mallam place,(place) they come(action) give(action) them like(comparison) three hundred naira.(goal) They come(action) call(action) me, "hello, is(relational) that I Go Dye?(value) Do you know(cognition) you are(relational) useless?(attribute) Upon all the kisses,(means) upon all the hugging"(means)... Area girls(senser) too(quality) like(affection) money.(phenomenon) Now,(time) when(time) you get(action) money,(goal) do you know(cognition) that you can actually(quality)control(action) the world?(goal) I dey tell(verbal) people(target) o, age(token) is(relational) just(quality) a number(value/actor) that represents(event) figure.(goal) What make(event) a man(goal) are(relational) the millions(value) you have.(relational) Person(actor/behavioural) wey get(action) dey waka(behavioural) like(comparison) this.... Get(action) six million,(goal) his waka(actor) go change.(event) Do you know(cognition) that e get(existential) how(quality) you go poor(attribute) reach(action) e go come(action) be like(comparison) say you no get(action) sense?(goal) You know(cognition) say poverty(actor) dey, make(event) you humble,(attribute) dey make(event) you greet(action) people(goal) anyhow.(quality) Good afternoon, sir. Do you know (cognition) what?(phenomenon) I come(action) tell(verbal) myself say, how(quality) can I break(action) this yoke?(goal) Na to hustle.(action) The first(attribute) time(time) wey they call(action) me I Go Dye,(goal) I Go Dye,(goal) if(condition) you see(perception) my mama(phenomenon/behavior) shout(behavioural) for people(place)"don't ever(duration) call(action) him I Go Dye.(goal) What is(relational) the meaning(value) of that?" The

day(time) I dash(action) my mama(goal) 200,000 naira,(goal) na she come(action) say(verb)al “I Go Dye,(actor) where(place) you dey go?”(action)

Now,(time) the first(attribute) time,(time) when(time) I dey travel,(action) I dey tell(verb)al people(target) e get(existential) the way(existent) you go poor(attribute) reach,(action) you no go know(cognition) wetin dey happen(event). The first(attribute) time(time) when(time) I want(affection) travel(action) go(action) abroad,(place) for my life(place) I never believe(cognition) say I go go(action) Ghana(place) before.(time) So, when(time) the first(attribute) call(actor) call(event) me say “hello, is(relational) that comedian(value) I Go Dye?”(value) Poverty(actor) go make(event) you dey talk(behavioural) fast.(quality) “Is(relational) that comedian(value) I Go Dye?”(value) I say(verb)al “yes, na I Go Dye(value) be this, “a tutupololo.) I say(verb)al “yah”. “We just(quality) want(affection) you to come(action) and do(action) a show(goal) in Germany”.(place) The phone,(goal) I off(action) am put(action) say “all these 419 boys(actor) don start;(action) make I come(action) do(action) show(goal) for Germany(place) where(place) we dey crack(action) joke(goal) here(place) wey I never go(action) Abuja(place) here(place) na Germany,(value) abeg”. The phone(actor) come(event) ring(event) again(duration) kparaaaa. When(time) God(senser/actor) want(affection) open(action) your way,(goal) e go be(relational) like(comparison) say na joke.(value) They come(action) call(action) me again.(duration) I say(verb)al “those people(carrier) serious(attribute) o. I come(action) pick(action) the phone.(goal) I say(verb)al “yeah, this is(relational) I Go Dye.(value) They say(verb)al “well, you are coming(action) to Germany(place) with all night contract(purpose) in T city(place) before four.(time) When(time) I pick(action) am again(duration) as the guy(actor) call,(action) na him I say “ebi like(comparison) say these people(carrier) serious”.(attribute) Na him the guy(actor) ask(action) me “do you have(relational) passport?”(value) Mumu, I say(verb)al passport(token) na black(value) and white.(value) I no know(cognition) say na Nigerian(attribute) passport.(value) I say(verb)al “yes, sir. I have(relational) four:(value) two black(value) and white,(value) two coloured.(value) Na him the guy(sayer) say(verb)al “it is(relational) not possible”.(attribute) Na him I talk(behavioural) say “na you get(action) am?” na him my friend(actor/sayer) come(action) tell(verb)al me say na normal(attribute) Nigerian(attribute) passport.(value)

Straightaway,(quality) they send(action) money(goal) come(action) make I take(action) go(action) do(action) passport.(goal) ten thousand naira.(goal) First(attribute) time(time) when(time) I go(action) receive(action) money(goal) for Western Union(place). I enter(action) dey collect(action) money,(goal) ten thousand naira.(goal) You know(cognition) say the first(attribute) time(time) wey I get(action) ten thousand naira,(goal) I no sleep(behavioural) well?(quality) Anybody wey dey shake(behavioural) me, I dey suspect(action)) am. No, I am telling(verb)al you, your poverty(actor) will be making(event) you acting stupidly.(quality) If(condition) I want(affection) hug(action) you, na like(comparison) this . I want (affection) sleep,(behavioural) na like (comparison) this I dey take(action) sleep.(behavioural) When(time) I wake,(behavioural) I dey check(action) whether(comparison) the thing(carrier) still(duration) dey. Me and one girl (behavior) dey talk,(behavioural) she dey dress(action) close(place) to the pocket,(place) I begin(action) dey suspect(action) the girl.(goal) I say(verb)al “I understand”,(cognition) but again(duration) that is(relational) the past,(value) if(condition) you do not turn(action) the past,(goal) you no go fit(action) think(behavioural) of the future.(matter) Kpaa, passport(actor) show(event) come(event) reach(event) there.(place) Before(time) I even(quality) get(action) the visa,(goal) I don dey call(action) my family.(goal) “Hello, I want(affection) turn(action) Jandon(place) oo”, come(action) reach(action) embassy,(goal) that one na another(attribute) problem(value) again(duration). Mumu, they say(verb)al “bring(action) your passport”.(goal) I give(action) them black(goal) and white.(goal) They say(verb)al “not this”. I give(action)

them that other one. The woman(sayer) say(verbal) “two minutes”.(duration) I just(quality) waka(behavioural) go back.(action) She give(action) me back. I no even(quality) know(cognition) reject(phenomenon) and stamp.(phenomenon) I just(quality) dey go.(material) The woman(sayer) say(verbal) “you didn’t even(quality) say(verbal) thank(action) you”. I say(verbal) “thank(action) wetin?” She say(verbal) “you are going(action) to Germany”.(place) Na that word(value/phenomenon) wey I hear(perception) make(event) me sweat(behavioural) first,(time) open(action) the Germany thing.(goal) I come(action) dey form(behavioural) like(comparison) say I know.(cognition) I come(action) say(verbal) “madam,(actor) pin(action) them”.

Where(place) come(event) fool(attribute) me pass,(quality) na people(value) wey come(action) make(action) mistake(goal) come(action) put(action) me for first class.(place) See(perception) how(phenomenon/quality) I come(action) suffer(action) myself. Foods (token) dey my front,(place) I no know(cognition) say na me get(action) them. Hungry(actor) wey dey beat(event) me, I just(quality) sit down.(behavioural) One man(behavior/actor) just(quality) spread(behavioural) dey chop,(action) dey drink(action) wine.(goal) I dey hungry.(attribute)They put(action) my food,(goal) I no even(quality) know(cognition) say na my own. I come(action) dey beg(action) the man;(goal) “sir, can I have(relational) wine?”(value) The man(actor) self come(action) dey package(action) for me say “no problem,(existent) take”.(action) E come(action) dey even(quality) collect(action) my own. The man (actor) come(action) ask(action) me “are(relational) you the one that bought(action) the ticket?”(goal) Because (reason) if (condition) na me buy(action) am, I suppose(cognition) know(cognition) wetin I buy.(action)

E Say(verbal) “ok, ok, bring(action) those things”.(goal) Na him I dey give(action) the man.(goal) I come(action) dey pack(action) all my wine(goal) dey give(action) the man.(goal) The man(actor) go chop(action) small(attribute) kpof, kpof,(goal) e go say(verbal) “do you want(affection) some too?”(quality) Mumu! Later,(time) when(time) I dey go(action) piss,(behavioural) na him I come(action) dey see(perception) the tables.(phenomenon) People(actor) come(action) they chop,(action) come(action) dey chop.(action) One small(attribute) girl,(actor) if(condition) you see(perception) how(phenomenon/quality) she dey open(action) wine(goal) puf, puf , I nearly(distance) beg(action) the girl(goal) self. Na him one guy(actor/sayer) come(action) tell(verbal) me say “man! you dey fuck up.(action) You no know(cognition) say na you get(action) those things?”(goal) I say(verbal) “what! na him I dey beg(action) that man,(goal) e come(action) even(quality) pack(action) all my own?” As a Warri boy(role) now,(time) na him I come(action) go back(action) sit down;(behavioural) come back(action) to position.(place) Warri boy(actor) no dey carry(action) last.(goal) Na him I look(behavioural) the man.(place) I no call(action) am sir again.(duration) I say(verbal) “what is(relational) your name?”(value) The thing(senser) shock(cognition)) the man.(goal) I say(verbal) “what is(relational) your name?”(value) Na him the man(sayer) say(verbal) “Mr. Thompson”. (value)I come(action) say(verbal) “Mr. Thompson(actor) give(action) me my wine,(goal) idiot.(value)

As I enter(action) abroad(place) like(comparison) this, Germany(place) “kpuwa”, na him I give(action) oyibi man(goal) camera(goal) say(verbal) “take,(action) take(action) me picture”.(goal) Oyibo man(sayer) say(verbal) “there is(existential) time”.(existent) For my mind(place) I say(verbal) “take(action) me now(time) before(time) dey repatriate(action) me, how(quality) I want(affection) come(action) tell(verbal) Nigerians(target) say I don travel(action) abroad?(place) Even(quality) Warri boys(senser) self den go see(perception) picture(phenomenon) wey you don take(action) for abroad,(place) they go say(verbal) “for where?(place) Na computer”.(value)

A.Y

Ooh. There is(existential) a major(attribute) difference(existent) between pikin(place) and issue.(place) Pikin(token) is(relational) pikin,(value) issue(token) is(relational) an issue.(value) Now,(time) talking(behavioural) about pikin(matter) and issue,(matter) the way(quality) they take(action) bring(action) us up e different.(attribute) One day,(time) I come(action) go(action) silver bird galleria(place) all in the name of(purpose) say person(actor) don dey package.(action) One lady(senser) now(time) saw(perception) me and say,(verbal) “oh my God, A.Y ,whao, my son(carrier) is(relational) here,(place) he likes(affection) you so much.(quality) Just(quality) hold on,(action) let(action) me go(action) get(action) my son(goal) for an autograph”.(reason) See(perception) me, autograph?(reason) I dey wait(behavioural) make them go(action) call(action) pikin(goal) come.(action) “Junior,(actor) Junior,(actor) guess(cognition) who we have(relational) here”.(place) See(perception) wetin pikin(actor) answer(action) o.”Give(action) me a break,(goal) mum”.(actor) “Junior,(actor) come on,(action) I have(relational) a pleasant(attribute) surprise(value) for you here.(place) Just(quality) look(behavioural) around(place) Junior”.(behave) “Mum,(actor) give(action) me a break”(goal) All this while,(duration) one thing(actor) happened.(event) one Warri woman(actor) dey find(action) him pikin.(goal) E come(action) enter(action) silverbird galleria(place) at that point(time) in time.(time) The woman(senser) don see(perception) the pikin.(phenomenon) So, herself and the pikin(senser) see(perception) everything wey dey happen.(event) This woman(behavior) don dey boil,(behavioural) “hee, ogeme , me, give(action) me a break.(goal) My pikin(goal) wey me born(action) , a go call,(action) e go say(verbal) give(action) me a break,(goal) mum(actor) .”Whuum, hee ,ogema kewe ,ma. Hee” ,you see(perception) wetin happen(event) now(time) ,now?”(time) “ I see(perception) am”. “Ham, whuum. The day(time) wey I go call(action) you, you come(action) tell(verbal) me say give(action) me a break,(goal) mum,(actor) you say(verbal) give(action) me a break,(goal) na that day(value/time) I go break(action) you, break(action) you into pieces.(quality) God(actor) go punish(action) you. No run (behavioural) o, no run (behavioural) o, come(action) here”(place)).Haa, pako(token) is(relational) pako(value) for life.(duration)

You know,(cognition) they say(verbal) the difference(carrier) between plantain chips(place) and pekere(place) na packaging,(value) yes. You know,(cognition) we just(quality) dey, thirteen generals(behavior) just(quality) die(behavioural) like(comparison) that. They say(verbal) even(quality) for war,(place) they no dey lose(action) up to(duration) thirteen generals(goal) just(quality) at once.(time) But for Naija,(place) e happen(event) just(time) before(time) it become(relational) forty six.(value) And this thing(actor) come(event) make(event) me understand(cognition) say wetin we need(affection) for this country(place) na prayers,(value) we need(affection) to pray.(behavioural) Na him we dey pray.(behavioural) E get(existential) where(existent/place) Bible(sayer) say(verbal) just(quality) wait(behavioural) upon the lord,(means) fast.(behavioural) Na him thirteen pastors(actor/behavior) come(action) dey pray.(behavioural) These same(attribute) thirteen pastors,(senser) they want(affection) travel.(action) They don dey airport.(place) They come(action) make(action) boarding(attribute) announcement.(goal) As they want(affection) enter(action) plane,(goal) na him the senior(attribute) pastor(actor/behavior) come(action) pause;(behavioural) “Brethren, I just(time) got(action) a revelation(goal) from God”.(place) They say(verbal) “aha, pastor, what?” “We need(affection) to pray(behavioural) right now.(time) You remember(cognition) there is(existential) something significant(attribute) that is(relational) evil(attribute) with the number thirteen.(commutation) If(condition) you remember,(cognition) we just(time) lost(action) thirteen generals,(goal) and today,(time) we have(relational) thirteen pastors(value) that are about(time) embarking on(action) a trip.(goal) So, we need(affection) to pray”.(behavioural) Na him they say(verbal) okay make them pray.(behavioural) The senior(attribute) pastor(actor) led(action) the prayer:(goal) “father, in

the name of Jesus,(means) father, in the name of Jesus,(means) every demonic(attribute) factor(actor) that is attached(event) with the number thirteen,(commutation) we cast back(action) in Jesus name.(means) Father,(token) lord,(token) God,(token) you are(relational) the same(value) today,(time) tomorrow(time) and forever.(duration) Father, even(quality) in your word,(place) I remember,(cognition) there was(existential) turbulence(existent) in the middle (place)of the water,(place) and the disciples(carrier) were(relational) at the middle(place) of the water(place) and your son(carrier) Jesus Christ(carrier) was(relational) with them(commutation) making(action) them the number thirteen.(goal) And you gave(action) your son(goal) that spirit(goal) and the ability(goal) to move(action) on the water(place) and on the water,(place) that same(attribute) spirit,(goal) we pray(behavioural) that you will instill(action) into us, now,(time) in Jesus name(means) we pray”.(behavioural) Bro Nnamdi,(actor) you can lead(action) the brothers,(goal) I will join(action) you by tomorrow.(time)

No be we want(affection) play(action) match,(goal) we come(action) dey find(action) commentators,(goal) we no see,(perception) so it was(relational) necessary(attribute) to go(action) and beg(action) pastor Chris Okotie(goal) because(reason) him dey stadium.(place) “Man of God,(value) the match(carrier) that is(relational) about(time) to commence(action) is(relational) between Nigeria(place) and Ghana;(place) can you please help(action) us just(quality) run(action) commentary?”(goal) Grammar(actor) start(event) from there.(place) “Your request(carrier) is(relational) quite(quality) equivocal,(attribute) but I am going(acion) to proceed(action) to your paramount(place) and oblige(action) you with just(quality) that”. Na him they give(action) am mic,(goal) na him him start;(action) “ladies(value) and gentlemen,(value) I like(affection) to welcome(action) you to the stadium(place) that is engulfed(event) with different(attribute) cacophony(goal) of supportive(attribute) voices.(goal) You do not need(affection) the Holy Ghost(phenomenon) to tell(verbal) you that this match(carrier) is(relational) between Nigeria(place) and Ghana.(place)

All right,(quality) that is(relational) kanu Nwanko(value) the boy(value) with a fragile heart.(commutation) A little(attribute) bit(attribute) shaky(value) like Adam(comparison) at the thought(place) of eating(action) the forbidden(attribute) fruit.(goal) What does he do(action) now?(time) He gives(action) the ball(goal) to Wilson Oruma.(place) Talking(behavioural) about Wilson Oruma,(matter) this is(relational) one boy(value) from the Niger Delta region(place) whose natural(attribute) resources(value/goal) have been squandered(action) to build(action) high(attribute) edifices(goal) in Abuja,(place) which include(event) this stadium(goal) where(place) the match(actor) is taking place .(event) Are(relational) you still(duration) here?(place) Let(action) me hear(perception) you say(verbal) ohum ohum. All right,(quality) taking(action) advantages,(goal) I want(affection) to believe(behavioural) that both(attribute) coaches(carrier) are (relational) in the process(place) of making(action) some changes.(goal) And talking(verbal) about change,(matter) the only(attribute) thing(token) that is(relational) constant(attribute) in this world(place) is(relational) change,(value) and that is(relational) why(reason) God(behavior)) has spoken(behavioural) to me personally(quality) to run(action) for 2007.(time)

The ball(carrier) is(relational) back(attribute) to the field(place) of play(value) now.(time) Who got(action) the ball(goal) now,(time) this is(relational) Taye Taiwo,(value) he reminds(cognition) me of Taribo West.(matter) What does he do?(action) Trying(action) to beat(action) a Ghanaian(attribute) player(goal) and the Ghana player(behavior) is looking(behavioural) at him eye ball(quality) to eye ball(quality) as if(quality) to say(verbal) Satan,(actor)) get(action) behind(place) me. What does he do(action) now?(time) He gets(action) the ball(goal) now.(time) What does he do?(action) This is(relational) Wilson Oruman(value) to J.J Okocha.(place) Oh, my God! he beats(action) one,(goal) he

beats(action) two;(goal) this young(action) man(token) is(relational) but a revelation(value) of the game(value) of soccer.(value) It is(relational) a goal(value) for Nigeria,(behalf) everybody say(verbal) “ohum, ohum”. Goal(value) for Nigeria.(behalf)

I have(relational) my brother(value) here,(place) pastor(value) Chris Oyakhilome,(value) what do you have(relational) to say(verbal) about this goal?”(matter) “Oh, my God! The goalkeeper (behave) was just(quality) sitting down,(behavioural) and the ball(actor) went(event) through.(place) Suddenly,(quality) the stadium(actor) turned out(event) to be an atmosphere(value) of a miracle.(value) And as I speak(behavioural) to you right now,(time) there was(existential) a woman(existent) on the other side(place) of the stadium(value) about(time) to enter(action) here.(place) You have(relational) this stomach pains,(value) the stomach pains(actor) has left(event) you. Give(action) the lord(goal) a big(attribute) hee.

We also(addition) have(relational) our brother(value) here(place) Obando(value) from Anambra.(place) Mr Obando, what do you have(relational) to say(verbal) about this goal?”(matter) “ Nwannem, me I don’t have(relational) much(quality) to say(verbal) about this goal(matter) now.(time) All I know(cognition) is(relational) that this goal(goal/carrier) that was scored(action) right now(time) by J.J Okocha(actor) is(relational) already(quality) available(attribute) on this C.D.(place) grab(action) your copy(goal) now”.(time)

Oyibo(actor) come(action) here?(place) Hello, how(quality) are you doing?(action) Where(place) are(relational) you from?(place) From china(place) to... ” night of a thousand laugh?... see?(perception) We... I say(verbal) make I tell(verbal) una this one.

I dey wonder(behavioural) why some people(actor) dey waste(action) the time(goal) dey go(action) sit down(behavioural) for one place(place) dey say(verbal) who wants(affection) to be a millionaire.(value) They go dey ask(action) them big(attribute) time(value) question.(goal) Some no dey fit(action) answer;(action) while(time) in Niger Delta(place) is(relational) very(quality) easy(attribute) for us to become(relational) a millionaire.(value) All you need(affection) to do(action) is(relational) that catch(action) some Oyibo.(goal) Oyibo, you are listening(behavioural) to me right now?(time)

All right,(quality) eh, hem! You might be(relational) the next(value) on the line(place) now(time) just(quality) laugh,(behavioural) keep on(action) laughing,(behavioural) go on.(action) Oyibo,(goal) catch(action) one Oyibo.(goal) When(time) we catch(action) Oyibo,(goal) finish.(action) No be small(attribute) thing.(value) Na only(attribute) we begin(action) call(action) the company(goal) to ask(action) for who get(action) Oyibo.(goal) We call(action) chevron,(goal) “pro, pro, pro, hello is((relational) this chevron?(value) Una Oyibo(actor) dey lost?”(action) “Our Oyibo(actor) no dey lost”.(action) “Pro, pro, is(relational) this Shell?(value) Una Oyibo(actor) dey lost?”(action) “Young(attribute) man,(value) as a matter of fact,(role) our Oyibos(carrier) are(relational) intact”.(attribute) Ah! ah! na him we vex(behavioural) go(action) meet(action) Oyibo,(goal)come(action) talk(behavioural) to Oyibo;(place) “Oyibo, come(action) first,(attribute) which kind(attribute) Oyibo(value) you be? Will you come?(action) We don call(action) all the company,(goal) no body want(affection) come(action) claim(action) you. Which kind(attribute) Oyibo(value) you be?” Na him Oyibo(behaver) pause,(behavioural) Oyibo(behaver) look:(behavioural) “that is(relational) what I have been trying(action) to explain(action) to you people,(place) eeh, I am(relational) one of you people,(value) I am(relational) the owner(value) of silver bird(value). My name(token) is(relational) Ben Bruce. (value)

Klint DE Drunk

Sorry,(attribute) are(relational) you slow(attribute) in thinking?(place) You say?(verbal) That is(relational) an old(attribute) question.(value) Don’t ask(action) that kind(attribute) of question.(goal) Ask(action) a better(attribute) question.(value) Now,(time) ask.(action) Can

you ask(action) one more(attribute) time?(duration) Do you know(cognition) what is surprising(event) me? The way(quality) all of you from this angle(place) are sounding,(behavioural) it is(relational) not different(attribute) from psychiatric(attribute) hospital.(quality) You see,(perception) even(quality) one(actor) is still(duration) repeating(action) herself. My dear(behavior) is squatting(behavioural) to snap.(action) Wait;(behavioural) let(action) me squat(behavioural) to receive(action) it. Snap(action) because of balance,(reason) balancing.(reason) Come,(action) how many(distance) things(goal) are you using(action) to snap(action) me? Next(attribute) thing,(value) this girl(actor) will snap(action) me with her wedding ring.(means) Sorry!(attribute) Is(relational) that the new(attribute) phone?(value) I have heard (perception)of it, Nokia 3310 I.(matter) I heard(perception) the phone(actor) can snap-(event) wonderful.(attribute) Please, how many(distance) people(actor) here(place) came(action) to win(action) something? So you people(token) don't have(relational) TV(value) at this stage?(time) Nobody has(relational) TV.(value) You that say(verbal) don't mind(action) them, you bought(action) four(value) tickets(value) for one person,(purpose) only(attribute) you, and you came(action) here(time)... This man(behavior) that just(time) stood,(behavioural) I don't understand(cognition) his life style.(phenomenon) Honestly,(quality) the other day(time) he went(action) to the office(place) with a towel.(commutation) How?(manner)Why(reason) are you asking(action) me? Are(relational) you not the person(value) that did(action) it? You should be asking(action) yourself. It takes(event) him five minutes(time) to think;(cognition) that is(relational) to start(action) thinking.(cognition) That was(relational) why(reason) after(time) bathing.(action) He put(action) the towel(goal) on his neck(place) and went(action) to the office.(place) He thought(cognition) he was wearing(action) a shirt.(goal) Oga me, you are(relational) welcome.(attribute) God! You again(duration) in this show?(place) Last year(time) I was(relational) here,(place) you were wearing(action) this same(attribute) shirt,(goal) the same(attribute) shirt,(goal) last year,(time) and last year(time) you told(verbal) me you were(relational) in a school(place) around(place) here,(place) final(attribute) year.(place) This year(time) again,(duration) what are(relational) you? Final year?(value) By next year(time) you will still(duration) be(relational) in final(attribute) year,(place) same(attribute) shirt.(goal) You are(relational) a "copper".(value) Then the other person(behavior/token) talking(behavioural) on your behalf(behalf) is(relational) metal(value) or zinc.(value)

Kaduna, honestly,(quality) first of all, I want(affection) to say(verbal) happy(attribute) sallah.(value) How many(extent) people(behavior) fasted?(behavioural) Bring down(action) your hand,(goal) Oga,(actor) don't ever(duration) raise(action) your hand(goal) near(distance) me. It was(relational) because(reason) of you I asked(action) this question.(goal) Let(action) me know(cognition) what you will do.(action) This man,(carrier) look(behavioural) at how(quality) he is.(relational) You said(verbal) you are doing(action) fasting?(goal) Something you do(action) every day?(time) Do you have(relational) food(value) at all?(duration) How(quality) can you live(action) your normal(attribute) life(goal) and say(verbal) is(relational) fasting.(value) This man,(behavior) even(qualiy) without Sallah,(commutation) he fasts(behavioural) because(reason) he has(relational) no food(value) available.(attribute) They were talking(behavioural) about poverty,(matter) poverty;(matter) they don't know(cognition) example(phenomenon/carrier) is(relational) here.(place) This man, the last time(time) I came(action) to his house,(place) honestly,(quality) I came(action) by mistake(means) and I went(action) by bigger(attribute) mistake(means). I'm telling(verbal) you. This one(behavior) that is shouting(behavioural) over there,(place) please, what did you come(action) to this show(place) to do,(action) to be(relational) part(value) of the comedians(value) or tragedians?(value) Talk(behavioural) again.(duration) See(perception) his voice;(phenomenon) you must have been(relational) a

thief(value) in your former(attribute) life(place). You sound(behavioural) like owl.(comparison) I'm telling(verbal) you. To some people,(place) you know,(cognition) what you are(relational) now(time) determines(event) what you were(relational) in your former(attribute) life.(place) I'm telling(verbal) you. Some people(goal) when(time) you slap(action) them, the way (quality)they shout,(behavioural) the way(quality) they cry,(behavioural) "mum"; that is(relational) a cow.(value) In fact, Nigerian(attribute) musicians(actor) have ever(duration) done(action) what(goal) I do not understand.(cognition)

Why is(relational) it that nowadays,(time) when(time) we are listening(behavioural) to songs,(place) we are listening(behavioural) to people(place) crying?(behavioural) Everybody is(relational) quiet(attribute) because(reason) you don't understand.(cognition) Beautiful,(attribute) you even(quality) put(action) 'it' for me,(behalf) I did not intend(cognition) to put(action) 'it'. You do not understand,(cognition) full stop. I didn't say(verbal) you don't understand(cognition) it, comma. Now,(time) let(action) me explain(action) myself. Which musician(phenomenon) do you know?(cognition) Beautiful,(attribute) 'Obodo'.(phenomenon) I cried(behavioural) very well(quality) because(reason) before(time) that music,(goal) when(time) we were doing(action) it, hunger(actor) was beating(event) me, personally.(quality) That was(relational) why,(reason) when(time) you hear(perception) that song,(phenomenon) you hear(perception) "Obodo(phenomenon) mu God(phenomenon) o".

I was crying(behavioural) even though(concession) I can't get(action) the voice(goal) again.(duration) The people, their own is(relational) very(quality) surprising(attribute)-how many(distance) people(senser) know(cognition) Dbanj,(phenomenon)Dbang,(phenomenon) Dbang?(phenomenon) How many(distance) people(senser) know(cognition) D Koko?(phenomenon) That man,(phenomenon) you know(cognition) him and the other man(phenomenon) that sings(behavioural) with him,(commutation) Don Jackson;(Phenomenon) they had(relational) problems(value) in the beginning.(time) So Dbang(carrier) was(relational) on stage,(place) and so, D(sayer) told(verbal) the other man,(target) D Koko (target) that he should stay(behavioural) at the back(place) of the stage.(value) He was forcing(action) to enter(action) with all the beating.(commutation) When(time) he entered,(action) the music(actor) changed,(event) that was(relational) why(reason) when(time) you hear(perception) the song,(phenomenon) you will hear,(perception) Dbang(phenomenon/sayer) saying(verbal) "hear,(perception) make I tell(verbal) them 'di koko o', make I tell(verbal) them 'di koko' ". When(time) the other man(actor) enters,(action) you hear,(perception) "if(condition) I tell(verbal) them 'di koko', If(condition) I tell(verbal) them 'di koko', if(condition) I tell(verbal) them 'di koko' " ...

Hai! Okay,(attribute) listen(behavioural) to Face.(place) Face(carrier) was(relational) so(quality) unhappy(attribute) about(matter) what happened(event) to him and the rest(place) of the plantain(value) plantation(value) that he came out(action) because(reason) there was(existential) no more(attribute) plantain(existent) to be eating.(action) He shouted(behavioural) aaaaah, aaaaah! Why(reason) are you shouting(behavioural) like(comparison) that? Will the music(actor) not sell(event) without shouting?(commutation) With or without the screaming,(commutation) I still(duration) enjoy(action) the music,(goal) I'm telling(verbal) you. The worst(token) is(relational) even(quality) someone that did(action) a new(attribute) music.(goal) They call(action) him victor(goal) something. Thank(action) God,(goal) God(token) no be man(value) o. How many(distance) people(senser) hear(perception) that song?(phenomenon) It is(relational) very(quality) new.(attribute) The guy(behavior) in the beginning,(time) he cried(behavioural) well.(quality) In fact, he was crying(behavioural) so much(quality) it affected(event) 'Danfo' Drivers.(goal) 'Danfo' Drivers(token) had(relational) an accident(value) in 'Danfo'.(place) "Gbish... what do we do?(action) O boy, make we pologo."(action) One time(duration) and that one was

played(action) in America;(place) it affected(event) R. Kelly.(goal) R. Kelly(actor) could not withstand(action) it when(time) he saw(perception) Nigerian(attribute) musicians,(phenomenon) he was so(quality) touched(perception) that he said(verbal) “Oh yeh, men, we gotta help(action) this guy(goal) men”. They did not understand(cognition) what he was saying.(verbal) They thought(cognition) he was going(relational) mental.(attribute) “Kpaah! oooooooh, oooooooh, ...is burning up;(action) I got(action) the worse(goal) my chick(actor/carrier) is(relational) on fire,(place) burning up”.(event)

BASKET MOUTH

I be(relational) pako (value) o, bon o, bon, heavy(attribute) pako(value) to the core.(quality) I be (relational) the pako(value) to the point(distance) wey be say I go dey eat(action) only(attribute) lunch,(goal) only(attribute) afternoon(value) food.(goal) Night(value) food, (goal) my papa(sayer) dey tell(verbal) us make we go eat(action) for dream;(place) “slow (attribute) fool,(value) go(action) sleep,(behavioural) eat,(action) eat(action) for dream,(place) you dey craze,(attribute) go(action) sleep,(behavioural) eat,(action) eat(action) better(attribute) food.(goal) No come(action) wake up(behavioural) in the morning(time) say (verbal) hungry(actor) dey catch(event) you o. Useless(attribute) boy.(value) Go(action) and sleep (behavioural) and eat.(action)” You go come(action) see(perception) us, we go dey waka, (behavioural) “Godwin,(senser) wetin you want(affection) chop(action) for dream?”(place) My brother(sayer) go say(verbal) “I chop(action) fried(attribute) rice(goal) yesterday,(time) but today,(time) na eba(value) and egusi(value) soup(value/goal) I go chop”.(action) “See,(perception) my dream(place) yesterday(time) food(existent) no dey o, Abeg, call(action) me make I come(action) eat(action) for your dream,(place) abeg”. Early morning,(time) you go see(perception) am collect(action) toothpick(goal) dey comot(action) meat(goal) for him teeth.(place)

Men, it was(relational) bad(attribute) o, those days,(carrier) those days(carrier) bad.(attribute) We come(action) get(action) one dog.(goal) My popsi(actor) go(action) buy(action) one dog(goal) give(action) us for present,(purpose) Christmas gift.(purpose) We never chop(action) na dog(value/actor) go chop?(action) Dog(carrier) no fit(attribute) bark(behavioural) na cough(value) e dey cough,(behavioural) “ehe, ehe”. Bingo(actor) get(action) him, “ehe, ehe”. I dey wonder(behavioural) wetin the dog(behavior) go dey talk(behavioural) for him mind.(place) “You, bingo,(actor) get(action) him”. “Bon me, abeg. I don chop(action) food?(goal) You wey don chop(action) food(goal) you no go go(action) fight(action) your fight;(goal) you dey craze.(attribute) I don’t know(cognition) why(reason) una come(action) buy(action) me. For place(place) wey I dey before(time),I dey chop(action) better(attribute) food.(goal) Una come(action) carry(action) me comot;(action) I dey chop(action) rubbish.(attribute) Your father,(value) I go bite(action) you now(time) self if(condition) you call(action) me”. The dog(behavior) lean,(behavioural) e no even(quality) fit(attribute) waka(behavioural) well,(quality) e dey stagger(behavioural) go(action) one side.(place) If(condition) thief(actor) come(action) house,(place) say him dey vex(attribute), na him dey tell(verbal) the thief(target) where(place) things(existent) dey. “Bros, under the mattress,(place) eeh! Take(action) am, take(action) am. Take(action) the money(goal) because(reason) I no see(perception) chop(action) from inside.(place) Take(action) the T.V,(goal) e no dey work,(event) just(quality) take(action) am”. O boy! Those days(time) things(carrier) tough(attribute) shall, I’m telling(verbal) you. E get(existential) one time(existent) wey thief(actor) come(action) our house,(place) come(action) thief(action) our video(goal) cassette(value) player,(value) bring(action) am come back(action) two days(duration) after:(time) “the thing(actor) no dey work,(event) make una take(action) this thing.(goal) So, when(time) we dey thief(action) am, una no tell(verbal) us abi, arm robbers?”(value)

I remember(cognition) when(time) Oceanic Bank(actor)... eeh! Yesterday,(time) they attack(action) Oceanic Bank.(goal) This is(relational) for Lagos(place) some months back...(distance) I go(action) cash(goal) one small(attribute) money(goal) like(comparison) that, like N2.8 million.(comparison) If(condition) you like(affection) shout,(behavioural) if(condition) you like(affection) no shout,(behavioural) I cash(action) am. Na him I dey my own, I give(action) the woman(goal) my cheque,(goal) go(action) sit down.(behavioural) 30 minutes(duration) the woman(actor) never pay(action) me. “Madam,(actor) please can you just(quality) make(action) it fast,(quality) I’m(relational) late.”(attribute) The woman(sayer) say,(verbal) “sir,(actor) just(quality) take(action) it easy.(quality) I’m trying(action) to confirm(action) your cheque”.(goal) She dey make(action) phone calls,(goal) do,(action) do.(action) Small time,(duration) one hour!(duration) I say(verbal) “madam, please, should I go(action) and come back?”(action) She said(verbal) “sir,(behave) just(quality) sit down.(behavioural) Please be(relational) patient,(attribute) all right?(quality) I will come back(action) to you”.(place) I hour,(duration) 20 minutes(duration) na him she say,(verbal) “sir,(actor) Mr. Bright,(actor) please, you come(action) forward”.(place) Na him I reach(action) desk.(goal) “Can you stand(behavioural) there?”(place) They take(action) the picture.(goal) “Can you sign(action) here,(place) and sign(action) here(place) and sign(action) here?”(place) I sign(action) “Okay,(attribute) this is(relational) five hundred,(value) this is(relational) one million,(value) 1.5,(values) 2 million,(value) 2.8 million;(value) you want(affection) me to confirm(action) it for you?”(behalf) I say(verbal) “no, no”. As I just(time) want(affection) collect(action) the money,(goal) na him arm robbers(actor) just(time) enter(action) say(verbal) “everybody, lie down”.(behavioural) I push(action) am come(action) go(action) lie down.(behavioural) The woman(sayer) says(verbal) “your money”. I say(verbal) “who money?(value) When(time) I say(verbal) make you give(action) me, you give(action) me?” I lie down.(behavioural) From there,(place) I even(quality) sleep(behavioural) go(action) self. You dey craze.(attribute)

Don’t ever(duration) get(relational) drunk(attribute) in a club,(place) you will regret(action) it. I enter(action) one club(goal) one night,(time) I dey enter,(action) I see(perception) one midget;(phenomenon) one dwarf(actor) dey enter(action) inside.(place) I say(verbal) “what the hell”! I tell(verbal) my guy,(target) “this kind(attribute) thing(actor) dey come(action) here?(place) Which kind(attribute) club(token) be this?” Because(reason) it was(relational) my first(attribute) time,(value) the guy(sayer) say(verbal) make I bon. Him enter(action) inside.(place) That time(time) wey I still(duration) dey ‘kpee’. I was(relational) in the world.(place) Now,(time) you see,(perception) life(actor) has changed.(event) I come(action) high,(attribute) na him I see(perception) the midget,(phenomenon) the dwarf,(phenomenon) na babe.(value) Na him I tell(verbal) my guy(target) “o boy! That babe(carrier) no bad,(attribute) boy! I like(affection) her height”.(phenomenon) Na him I go(action) block(action) the babe.(goal) “How far,(distance) now?(time) You come(action) with person?”(commutation) The babe(carrier) too(addition) self shocked(attribute) say “this guy”. Early(time) that kind(attribute) 4 o’clock(time) in the morning,(time) they see(perception) me hold(action) babe(goal) for hips(place) dey go(action) house.(place) I mash(action) line,(goal) I now(time) mash(action) line,(goal) mash(action) line.(goal) To toast(action) babe(goal) for club(place) self na wrong(attribute) move.(value) You know(cognition) say all those club lights(actor) wey dey shine(event) small,(quality) small-(quality) you know(cognition) say e no dey show(event) the full(attribute) face,(goal) na small(attribute) small(attribute) part.(value) E dey show(event) the tip(attribute) of the nose,(goal) show(event) there.(place) For my mind,(place) I say(verbal) “man, that babe(actor) set(action) die”.(quality) O boy! Na him I tell(verbal) my guy(target) I want(affection) go(action) block(action) that babe(goal) make I enter(action) am. Na him I dance (behavioural) near the babe(place) say(verbal) “excuse(action) me” the babe(actor)

come(action) turn,(behavioural) na him I see(perception) the face,(phenomenon) I say(verbal) “I want(affection) pass,(action) I want(affection) go(action) piss,(behavioural) piss(actor) dey catch(event) me”. You dey craze.(attribute)

You know(cognition) say some(attribute) people(actor) dey take(action) dey hang out(action) with ugly girls(commutation) for security.(purpose) No, serious,(attribute) some(attribute) babes(goal) wey guys(actor) dey enter(action) wey no fine,(attribute) e dey better.(attribute) You are safer(attribute) if(condition) your girl(carrier) is ugly.(attribute) You no go fear(affection) whether(condition) she dey cheat(action) on you. You know(cognition) say na only(attribute) you get(action) mind(goal) to dey enter(action) am. Nobody else get(action) that kind(attribute) mind.(goal) You fit(attribute) dey party(place) you go leave(action) am two weeks;(duration) come back(action) to the same(attribute) party.(place) She go still(duration) sit down(behavioural) there(place) dey wait(behavioural) for you.(behalf) Na fine(attribute) babe(value) wahala(carrier) too much.(quality) You no fit(attribute) follow(action) fine(attribute) babe(goal) quarrel.(action) If(condition) your babe(carrier) too(quality) fine,(attribute) you just(quality) say (verbal)“come,(action) where(place) have you been?(relational) It is(relational) twelve midnight,(value) where(place) have you been?”(relational) The girl(sayer) will say(verbal) “are you screaming(behavioural) at me?”(place) “No, but you have(relational) to be coming(action) home(goal) early,(time) now.(time) Please, you are making(action) me scared,(attribute) honey.(value) You know(cognition) I love(affection) you. Come,(action) come(action) and sit.(behavioural) What do you want(affection) to eat?”.(action) You no fit(attribute) rake.(behavioural) I’m telling(verbal) you. And babes(existent) dey wey dey control(action) guys(goal) anyhow.(quality) Babe(actor) go call(action) guy(goal) or flash,(action) they go flash(action) you. You go come(action) call,(action) “honey,(value) how(quality) are(relational) you? What is(relational) the problem?”(value) “Baby, I don’t have(relational) a recharge(attribute) card.(value) I don’t have(relational) credit(value) on my phone”.(place) “Okay, don’t worry,(behavioural) I will send(action) you recharge(attribute) card.(goal) He go come(action) send(action) am recharge(attribute) card.(goal) She go flash(action) you. You go come(action) call(action) am; “honey,(value) have you loaded(action) it?” “Yes, baby, thank(action) you so much”.(quality) Mumu, na him all of us be.(relational) E no good?(attribute) See(perception) wetin we go do,(action) eeh, I talk(behavioural) am before.(time) Make all of us, all the guys,(actor) all of us bon, no toast(action) girls(goal) for six months.(duration) Guys,(actor) make all of us just(quality) come(action) together(place) for the whole(attribute) of Nigeria,(place) no toast(action) babe.(goal) You go see(perception) how(quality) babe(actor) go dey hustle(action) us. “Cee! Cee! Bros”. “I’m(relational) in a hurry;(quality) I’ m(relational) in a hurry,(quality) abeg.

Lepacious Bose

E no easy(attribute) oh! You know(cognition) when(time) you pack(action) this kind(attribute) of investment,(goal) when(time) God(actor) created(action) me; He was(relational) in a good(attribute) mood.(quality) He add(action) more,(quality) add(action) another(attribute) sand,(goal) add(action) sand.(goal) He look,(behavioural) He say(verbal) “is(relational) good”.(attribute) True,(attribute) honestly,(quality) the very(quality) interesting(attribute) thing(carrier) about me(matter) is(relational) that you don’t have(relational) to use(action) all your mouth(goal) to tell(verbal) me that I’m(relational) beautiful.(attribute) Just(quality) tell(verbal) me I’m(relational) beauty.(value) The “ful”(goal) on top,(place) leave(action) it. It’s(relational) obvious(attribute) you know(cognition).

You know(cognition) that bible(sayer) say(verbal) the earth(token) is(relational) the lord’s(value) and the fullness(token) thereof.(place) So, He was talking(behavioural)

about(matter) me. But the reason(reason) I came(action) for this show(purpose) today(time) is(relational) because(reason) I'm looking(behavioural) for husband.(purpose) My boy friend(actor) left(action) me because(reason) every time(duration) he wants(affection) to hug(action) me, he has(relational) to borrow(action) other people's(value) hands(goal) to join(action) so that(purpose) the hand(actor) can go round.(event) So I started(action) gymming;(action) one, two three, no be for joke(purpose) o. Every day,(duration) I will jug,(behavioural) I will gym.(action) I will come back(action) from the gym;(place) and because of my diet,(reason) I cut down(action) my menu,(goal) five(value) agage(value) bread,(goal) half(value) a crate(value) of eggs,(goal) 6 pockets(value) of indomie(goal) and I wash(action) it down(place) with two diet coke.(means) Tt's(relational) just(quality) because of(reason) this weight.(value) By the end of six months,(duration) I climbed(action) the scale(goal) to see(perception how much(quality) I have lost,(action) the scale(sayer) say(verbal) to be continued.(event)

I went(action) to the zoo(place) out of depression(means) and wanted(affection) to go(action) and become(relation) one(value) with the animals.(commutation)I saw(perception) snakes.(phenomenon) They ignored(action) me. I saw(perception) monkeys.(phenomenon) I saw(perception) baboons.(phenomenon) They ignored(action) me. As the elephant(senser) saw(perception) me, they were(relational) so(quality) exited.(attribute) They started(action) to sing(behavioural) We are(relational) family;(value) me and elephant.(token)

You know,(cognition) the banks(actor) in Nigeria,(place) we need(affection) to talk(behavioural) about banks(matter) because(reason) most of(attribute) you that are(relational) here,(place) you are(relational) bankers.(value) You have(relational) money.(value) 2,500(token) is(relational) not a joke.(value) You will not find(action) teachers(goal) in this show(place) now.(time) Na bankers(value) dey here.(place) So, you people(actor) should do(action) something about this apartheid(matter) against lepacious people(place) like(comparison) me. You know,(cognition) I went(action) to one bank,(place) I entered(action) the first(attribute) cage,(goal) no problem.(existent) I entered(action) the second(attribute) cage,(goal) I heard(perception) a voice(phenomenon) inside the cage(place) saying(verbal) "this facility(carrier) is(relational) for only one person".(behalf)

Wait,(behavioural) wait,(behavioural) if(condition) you think(cognition) I am(relational) one(attribute) person,(value) tell(verbal) me. Just(quality) raise(action) your hand(goal) if(condition) you think(cognition) I'm(relational) just(quality) one(value) person.(value) If(condition) you think(cognition) I am(relational) two(value) people,(value) raise(action) your hand.(goal) You no know(cognition) book.(phenomenon) The Okada(value) people(carrier) in my area,(place) they are(relational) smarter(attribute) than(comparison) you. When(time) I stop(action) them, I say(verbal) "Okada, Surulere".(place) They say(verbal) "how many(duration) people. Madam, na for three?"(behalf)

Because(reason) when(time) you marry(action) me, you don't have(relational) to worry(behavioural) any more.(duration) Your mother(actor/behavior) will start(action) crying,(behavioural) Bayo,(senser) oo, Bayo(senser) oo and you know(cognition) we are(relational) not polygamous(attribute) in this family,(place) because(reason) only(attribute) me, three(value) women.(value) But if(condition) you have(relational) a prayer(value) request,(value) come(action) and see(perception) me after this show,(time) because(reason) if(condition) you have(relational) an issue(value) you really(quality) have(relational) to pray(behavioural) about,(matter) you need(affection) somebody to agree(action) with you,(commutation) I am(relational) the one,(value) because(reason) I carry(action) the very(attribute) presence(goal) of God(value) with me.(commutation) Bible(sayer) says(verbal) where(place) two(attribute) or three(attribute) people(actor) are gathered(action) together(quality) in my name...(means)

GORDON

You don't see(perception) poverty(phenomenon) before?(time) There is(existential) difference(existence) between poor(place) and pole.(place) If(condition) you poor,(attribute) once in a while(duration) you fit(attribute) dey get(action) somethings, but if(condition) you are(relational) pole,(attribute) you go dey take(action) pawpaw(goal) take(action) dey soak(action) garri.(goal) That time(time) na him you go know(cognition)how far.(distance)

My papa(actor) born(action) twelve children.(goal) Papa(behavior) and mama,(behavior) we dey stay(behavioural) one room.(place) Our highest(attribute) electronic(token) was(relational) ceiling(value) fan.(value) That ceiling(value) fan(token) was(relational) also(quality) our alarm,(value) because(reason) once(time) 5 o'clock(actor) don reach,(event) NEPA(actor) don cease(event) light.(goal) For lack of grease,(reason) when(time) the fan(senser) want(affection) stop,(event) e go dey say(verbal) "hoo, hoo". O boy; even if(condition) you dey sleep(behavioural) that time,(time) you must wake up.(behavioural) Na we dey sleep(behavioural) for the rug,(place) we be the rug(value) for the house,(place) na we dey sleep(behavioural) for ground.(place)

Armed robbers(actor) dey go(action) their own(goal) one day,(time) na him they match(action) us. They say(verbal) "oya, everybody, lie down".(behavioural) We say(verbal) "we don lie down(behavioural) since,(duration) we don lie down".(behavioural) I tell(verbal) you it was(relational) that bad.(attribute) You know,(cognition) that time,(time) my popsi(actor) come(action) get(action) work,(goal) you know,(cognition) come(action) go(action) offshore.(place) And naturally,(quality) when(time) man(actor) go(action) offshore,(place) e never see(perception) him wife(phenomenon) for a very long time.(duration) When(time) e come,(action) e want(affection) see(perception) him wife.(phenomenon) But because(reason) we him children(carrier) were(relational) numerous,(attribute) e begin(action) tell(verbal) us "Gordon,(actor/behavior) go(action) sleep,(behavioural) tomorrow(token) na school".(value) Na him I say(verbal) "no daddy, tomorrow(token) na Saturday".(value) " I say(verbal) go(action) and sleep,(behavioural) tomorrow(token) is(relational) public holiday,(value) go(action) sleep".(behavioural)

E begin(action)dey tell(verbal) us make we sleep.(behavioural) Everybody come(action) sleep.(behavioural) Around 3:am,(time) my papa(sayer) say(verbal) make e check(action) e-mail(goal) and that time(time) because(reason) say na one room(value) we dey stay,(behavioural) we dey go(action) piss(behavioural) for outside.(place) Popsi(senser) want(affection) check(action) e-mail.(goal) Na him I say(verbal) make I get up(behavioural) go(action) piss,(behavioural) I no know(cognition) say popsi(carrier) was(relational) into performance office.(place) When(time) e notice,(cognition) na him e say(verbal) "na who be that ?". I say(verbal) " Gordon".(value) "come(action) here.(place) where(place) you dey go?"(action) "I dey go(action) piss".(behavioural) E say(verbal) "piss?(behavioural) you no piss(behavioural) before(time) you sleep?"(behavioural) I say(verbal) "I piss".(behavioural)

This one(sayer) go tell(verbal) you say popsi(actor) don, e don take(action) towel(goal) arrange(action) himself. "You no piss(behavioural) before(time) you sleep?"(behavioural) I say(verbal) " eeh, I piss".(behavioural) "But this your witchcraft(carrier) strong(attribute) oo. Of all the time,(time) na this kind(attribute) time(value) you know(cognition) say you go wake up?(behavioural) E no answer(action) me". Popsi(actor) tie(action) towel(goal) dey wait(behavioural) for me.(purpose) I come(action) go(action) outside(place) go(action) piss.(behavioural) As I dey come,(action) na him the guy(actor) bracket(action) me for gate;(place) "any time(time) you want(affection) go(action) piss(behavioural) again,(duration) if(condition) you wake up(behavioural) this time"...(time) O boy, when(time) I get up(behavioural)I'm telling(verbal) you, it was(relational) that bad,(attribute)poverty.(carrier)

Now,(time) look,(behavioural) sometimes(duration) as you go(action) around churches,(place) we discover(cognition) that inferiority complex(token) is(relational) a problem(value) in the church.(place) Those wey be short,(attribute) they want(affection) tall.(attribute) The tall(attribute) ones want(affection) short.(attribute)the fat(attribute) ones want(affection) thin(attribute) like lapacious.(comparison) You see(perception) that fat(attribute) babe(phenomenon/actor) wey come?(action) If(condition) you want(affection) romance(action) that kind(attribute) babe,(goal) you need(affection) manual,(phenomenon) you need(affection) diagram(phenomenon) to follow,(action) halleluya. Then the dark(attribute) ones(actor) then dey bleach.(action) Look,(behavioural) however(concession) you find(action) yourself, you set.(attribute) Even if(condition) RMD(goal) is wonderfully(quality) made(action) and the OBJ(goal) is fearfully(quality) made,(action) it doesn't matter;(event) they set.(attribute) For instance, if(condition) you are(relational) short(attribute) as in you are(relational) brief,(attribute) for instance, if(condition) you are summarized,(action) omo, is(relational) a gift.(value) If(condition) you ever(duration) go(action) church,(place) and then dey sing,(behavioural) bend low,(behavioural) bend low,(behavioural) for you, you don't need(affection) to bend(behavioural) low.(quality) You are(relational) already(quality) low.(attribute) You are seeing(perception) what the lord(actor) can do?(action) A round(attribute) of applause(goal) for(behalf) yourselves, joo.

Now,(time) Nigerian(attribute) police(actor) una dey try,(action) eeh? Na joke(value) o. Bros, the guy(sayer) say_(verbal)no take(action) am personal(quality) o na joke.(value) Omo, I dey drive(action) one day,(time) na him police(sayer) say(verbal) "stop(action) there".(place) I stop.(action) Me? Me wey level(actor) don change?(event) You never see(perception) my hummer?(phenomenon) "Stop(action) there"(place) na him I stop.(action) "what do you have?"(relational) I say,(verbal) ha, na him you dey see(perception) so. "Your particulars".(value) I bring(action) original(goal) and photocopy.(goal) The guy(sayer) say,(verbal) "okay, you dey show(action) yourself". "Your fire extinguisher".(value) I put(action) one(attribute) big(attribute) one,(goal) I spray(action) small(attribute) sheltose(goal) join.(action) The guy(sayer) say,"(verbal) Okay, you dey show(action) yourself. Your inner(attribute) light".(value)

I on(action) the inner(attribute) light(goal) na him I shine(action) one(attribute) small(attribute) torch(goal) join(action) the guy(sayer) say,(verbal) "okay, you dey show(action) yourself. What do you have(relational) in your booth?"(place) I say,(verbal) "nothing"(value) when(time) the guy(actor/senser) open(action) am see(perception) goat,(phenomenon) na him e say,(verbal) "where is(relational) the receipt(value) of this goat?".(value) The guy(carrier) surprise(attribute) say I bring(action) am come(action) outside.(place) E say(verbal) "okay, you are showing(action) yourself. Now,(time) where is(relational) the birth(value) certificate(value) of this goat?(value) Na him I say(verbal) "you must ask(action) the mama,(value/goal) na the mama(actor) na him take(action) born(action) am.

I dey tell(verbal) you, sometimes(time) you know,(cognition) it come(action) a time(goal) that it now(time) become(relational) fashion(value) that fat(attribute) ladies,(senser/behavior) they wanted(affection) to like(comparison) slim down,(behavioural) one(attribute) man(actor) come(action) dey trouble(action) him wife.(goal) "slim down,(behavioural) slim down,(behavioural) you are(relational) too(quality) fat,(attribute) slim down,(behavioural) slim down".(behavioural) Na him this woman(sayer) say(verbal) okay, make she come(action) do(action) aerobics.(goal) She try,(action) try,(action) she no fit(attribute) slim down(behavioural) Na him they tell(verbal) am say make she go(action) check(action) her weight,(goal) know(cognition) her weight(phenomenon) before(time) she do(action) aerobics.(goal) She enter(action) scale,(goal) the scale(actor) just(quality) break.(event) Na him the small(attribute) boy(sayer) tell(verbal) am say "go(action)

front,(place) your mates(carrier) dey front”.(place) Na him she go.(action) All these rubber(goal), these people(actor) wey they sell(action) rubber.(goal) As(time) she enter(action) the scale,(goal) the thing(actor) break.(event) Na him somebody advise(action) am, “go(action) to Lagos,(place) there is(existential) a computer;(existent) they will tell(verbal) you your weight”.(target) Na him she go.(action) She be number three.(value) The first(attribute) person(actor) enter;(action) they tell(verbal) am. The second(attribute) person (actor) enter,(action) they tell(verbal) am. As(time) e reach (event) her turn,(goal) na him the computer(behavior) hala(behavioural) o, “one(attribute) person(value) at a time(duration) please”. Because(reason) she was(relational) very(quality) bodacious.(attribute)

O boy, some(attribute) of these oyibo,(goal) I dey trip for(action) them. You know(cognition) say all these Oyibo,(goal) they drive(action) them comot(action) for their own country.(place) They just(quality) come(action) infect(action) us here(place) especially(quality) for our babes.(place) That their... wey e dey for their own country(place) na him e come(action) here(place) sometimes(duration) if(condition) you open(action) their body,(goal) na so, so tattoo(value) dey there.(place) If(condition) you see(perception) the way(phenomenon) Oyibo(actor) dey buy(action) Okrika,(goal) you go dey wonder(cognition) say, “these people,(token) are(relational) they true(attribute) expatriates?”.(value) Then go dey buy(action) Okrika(goal) more than(comparison) you and I. I dey tell(verbal) you. You know(cognition) say when(time) we go(action) there,(place) we dey go(action) hustle(action) abi? So, when(time) they come(action) here,(place) wetin dey come(action) do?(action) So, wetin dey make(event) you feel(perception) say they pass(action) us? Abeg , make we clap(action) for Naija.(behalf) Naija(actor) try.(event) Naija(actor) dey try.(event)

Now,(time) for instance, if(condition) you sit down(behavioural) like (comparison)this and they say(verbal) “tell(verbal) your neighbor(target) you are(relational) blessed,(attribute) some(attribute) people(actor) no dey gree(action) talk.(behavioural) You know(cognition) why?(phenomenon) They no brush(action) come.(action) And make I tell(verbal) you, if(condition) you want(affection) to check(action) your mouth odour,(goal) they tell(verbal) us say make you dey breathe(behavioural) like(comparison) this... You go know(cognition) whether(comparison) e dey smell(event) or not. Omo, if(condition) you do(action) like(comparison) that, nothing dey happen(event) because(reason) you are used to(action) the odour.(goal) I dey tell(verbal) you three ways(target) to know(cognition) if(condition) your mouth(carrier) is(relational) FIFA rated(attribute) that is the odour(carrier) is(relational) very(quality) encouraging:(attribute) number one , if(condition) you carry(action) small(attribute) pikin,(goal) the pikin(actor/behavior) go just(quality) begin(action) cry(behavioural) eh, eh, eh, make you know(cognition) say you need(affection) maclean(goal) now.(time) Number two, you dey easily(quality) dey separate(action) fight.(goal) As soon as(time) you come(action) say(verbal) what is going on(event) there?”(place) They go say,(verbal) bros, na because(reason) you talk(behavioural) O, na because(reason) you talk,(behavioural) if(condition) no be say you talk(behavioural)... Number three, you dey easily(quality) dey win(action) argument.(goal) Arsenal(carrier) is(relational) better(attribute) than...(comparison) yes, Arsenal(carrier) is(relational) better,(attribute) Arsenal(carrier) is(relational) better.(attribute) Make we for no quarrel,(action) yes, Arsenal(carrier) is(relational) better”.(attribute)

You know,(cognition) nowadays,(time) sometimes,(time) if(condition) you see(perception) the way(phenomenon/quality) American films(actor) dey go,(event) you go dey trip.(action) You just(time) discover(action) say any small(attribute) thing,(value) for abroad,(place) girls heart(actor) go don dey break(event) because(reason) a boy(sayer) dey tell(verbal) am say,”men I can’t cope with(action) this anymore”.(quality)Train(actor) wey

dey move on,(event) the girl(actor) go bring(action) her head(goal) come out(action) and train(actor) go smash(event) her. Eh, for Nigeria,(place) our girls heart(actor) no dey break(event) again.(duration) The heart(actor) is not made(event) of glass,(means) is made(event) of kpomo.(means) I tell(verbal) you, it is made(event) of kpomo. kpatakpata if(condition) the thing(carrier) too much,(attribute) the heart(actor) go compress(event) small,(quality) e go release(event) again.(duration) I dey tell(verbal) you. Even if(condition) you tell(verbal) our African(attribute) girl(target) now(time) say “babe, this your matter(actor) and my own,(actor) the thing(actor) don dey tire(event) me. The babe(actor/sayer) go come(action) tell(verbal) you wetin dey him mind,(place) yesterday,(time) I even(quality) dream(behavioural) self. The angel(phenomenon/sayer) wey I see(perception) say(verbal) make I separate(action) from(place) you because(reason) you be barrier.(value) Your own- e go dey tell(verbal) you say, I don dey think(behavioural) of how(quality) I go take(action) tell(verbal) you, but I never know(cognition) how.(phenomenon) But as God(actor) don bring(action) am, you go try(action)make you leave(action) us”.

Area, “come,(action) na 3310(value) you take(action) dey do(action) camera phone,(goal) eh. Bros, wetin? Na somebody papa(value) be this oh. A beg, make we clap(action) for this guy.(behalf) In cross rivers(place) oh wetin?”. Na phone,(value) na him hard(attribute) you to buy?(action) You know(cognition) say warri boys(behavior) now,(time) we dey talk(behavioural) anything, we no dey fear.(affection) You don even(quality) imagine(behavioural) say if(condition) moses(token) na warri boy?(value) You imagine(behavioural) say if(condition) moses(token) na warri boy(value) na him God(sayer) tell(verbal) am say moses, moses. Warri boy(sayer) go say(verbal) “eeh, na who be that”? When(time) God(senser) see(perception) the shoe(phenomenon) wey moses(actor) wear,(action) na him e say(verbal) “moses, you have(relational) to pull(action) this shoe,(goal) because(reason) the land(token) you are standing(behavioural) is(relational) a holy(attribute) ground.(value) Now,(time) I want(affection) you to go(action) to Egypt”.(place) Na him him say,(verbal) which Egypt?. The one I for kill(action) person?(goal) Come,(action) why(reason) you dey do(action) like(comparison) this? You no know(cognition) say EFCC(actor) dey find(event) me there?(place) Make I come(action) go(action) Egypt(place) come(action) join,(action) this one wey I dey”...

Then God(sayer) go now(time) say(verbal) “what do you have(relational) in your hand?”(place) E say,(verbal) “na stick.(value) Now,(time) you no dey see?”(perception) I say(verbal) “throw(action) am for ground.”(place) The thing(actor) turn(event) to serpent. “Hen,hen! God,(actor) you dey show(action) yourself.” Then, Moses(actor) now(time) put(action) his hand(goal) in his pocket,(place) supposing(condition) na warri boy,(value) when(time) e bring out(action) e dey leprous,(attribute) “eh God,(actor) if(condition) na play,(value) stop(action) this kind(attribute) play,(goal) if(condition) na play,(value) stop(action) this kind(attribute) play.(goal) Then God(sayer) now(time) say(verbal) “oya, go(action) to Egypt”,(place) go(action) to Egypt.(place) When(time) Moses(actor) go(action) do(action) wetin him fit(action) as(time) e dey come back,(action) him reach(action) where(place) e put(action) him sandals,(goal) e no see(perception) am again(duration) o o. Na him e say,(verbal) “God, my sandals(goal) wey I put(action) for here,(place) me and you dey here(place) before(time) I commot.(action) Na him God(sayer) say,”(verbal) eh, I thief(action) your sandals”?(goal) E say,(verbal) “no, I no talk(behavioural) like(comparison) that. You wey you fit depart(action) Red Sea,(goal) na sandal(value) you no go fit depart”?(action)

No, sometimes,(time) eh, the greatest(attribute) tragedy(actor) that can happen(event) to you is(relational) to allow(event) yourself to be deceived(action) that your life(actor) does not count,(event) because(reason) if(condition) your life(actor) does not count,(event) why is

the enemy(actor) fabricating(action) every(attribute) means(goal) to sniff(action) this life(goal) wey God(actor) give(action) you from(place) you? Bring(action) malaria,(goal) malaria(actor) marry(event) people(goal) and is still(duration) collecting.(event) As if(quality) that was(relational) not enough,(attribute) he brought(action) cancer.(goal) cancer(actor) is canceling(event) people.(goal) Make e for no bring(event) quarrel,(goal) as if(quality) that was(relational) not enough,(attribute) e bring(action) SARS.(goal)

Ah, ah! wetin, when(time) we just(time) dey treat(action) SARS,(goal) e brought(action) HIV.(goal) We are still(duration) thinking(behavioural) of how(quality) we can solve(action) HIV problem,(goal) na him the guy(actor) bring(action) bird flu.(goal) Ah! wetin, na today(time) bird flu(carrier) dey life!(place) e don tay,(duration) when(time) we small(attribute) we go see(perception) fowl(phenomenon/actor) dey do(action) like(comparison) this ... mama(sayer) go say(verbal) kill(action) am, kill(action) am . we go kill(action) am, eat(action) am, nothing dey happen,(event) nothing. Nothing dey happen,(event) na today;(time) him dey decompose(action) in the stomach(place) of a black(attribute) man(value) there is(existential)compartment(existent) that is(relational) immune(attribute) to disease.(place) Nothing dey happen.(event) I dey tell(verbal) you, all these ones(token) na false(attribute) propaganda.(value) Which bird flu? In fact we go chop(action) am like(comparison) that. You no discover(action) say the one wey they discover(action) for Kaduna(place) here(place) where(place) they even(quality) dey road.(place) The thing,(goal) guys(actor) dey come(action) collect(action) for night(time) dey take(action) dey do(action) kilishi(goal) now.(time) Nothing dey happen(event) now.(time) A round(attribute) of applause(value) for Naija.(behalf) Wetin you dey tell(verbal) me?

Listen,(behavioural) out of poverty,(place) we first.(attribute) we say(verbal) we want(affection) travel(action) abroad.(place) I go(action) embassy.(place) they no gree(action) give(action) me visa,(goal) they say?(verbal)I too(quality) dark;(attribute) they are(relational) not sure(attribute) of what I can do(action) there.(place) You know(cognition) say in this country,(place) we are(relational) very(quality) safe.(attribute) Here(place) in Naija,(place) you fit waka(behavioural) the way(quality) you like(affection) but for abroad,(place) if(condition) you want(affection) enter(action) plane(phenomenon) then go open(action) your month(goal),if(condition) your mouth odour(carrier) is(relational) not encouraging,(attribute) then go say(verbal) go(action) there,(place) go(action) there.(place) No go(action) take(action) mouth(goal) do(action) bomb(goal) for yonder.(place) Area, so as I dey gist(action) you, no be small(attribute) thing(value) we dey see.(perception) We say(verbal) we want(affection) go(action) jand,(place) we want(affection) go(action) jand.(place) we go(action) embassy,(place) embassy(actor) no gree(event) give(event) us visa,(goal) we now(time) decided(action) to go(action) through road.(place) We want(affection) go(action) through Libya,(place)then from there(place) enter(action) motor(goal) enter(action) Italy,(place) then waka.(behavioural) Them come(action) advise(action) us say, men, this road(goal) wey una want(affection) take,(action) if(condition) una get(action) any(attribute) money,(goal) hide(action) am very well.(quality) And as a proper(attribute) warri boy,(value) I wrap(action) my own,(goal) put(action) am inside tooth paste.(place) Na him I seal(action) am. One(attribute) Yoruba boy(actor) e wrap(action) him small(attribute) dollar,(goal) na him e put(action) am for nyash.(place) As we dey go,(action) na him we hear,(perception) woo, woo, woo oya every body, everybody stand(behavioural) here,(place) stand(behavioural) here.(place) We come(action) stand.(behavioural) “Dollar, dollar, dollar”, na him I say,(verbal) “ah! dollar?. We no get(action) money.”(goal) Eh! One(attribute) guy(actor) bring(action) knife,(goal) na him e chuk(action) one(attribute) Igbo boy.(goal) Ha, ha, ha, eh, when(reason) I see(perception) blood(phenomenon/actor) dey rush.(event) Na him I tell(verbal)the guy,(target) but you no ask(action) me. Only(attribute) me go(action) where(place) the tooth paste(existent) dey, draw(action) am come(action)

outside,(place) bring(action) my small(attribute) dollar,(goal) give(action) the guy.(goal) Then, they come(action) ask(action) the Yoruba guy,(goal) “dollar dollar”, because(reason) the guy(actor) don put(action) the dollar(goal) for nyash(place) for like(comparison) four days.(duration) The guy(sayer) tell(verbal) am say, dollar? “I get(action) but e dey nyash.”(place) “I say(verbal) bring(action) it out”.(place) The guy(sayer) say(verbal) “I will have(relational) to shit(action) first”(attribute) they say(verbal) “shit”.(action) Na him the guy(actor/behavior) come(action) squat.(behavioural) As(time) the guy(behavior) squat(behavioural) first(attribute) mess(actor) come(event) outside(place) shiiiiii . Na him the guy(actor) provoke(action) “what was(relational) that?” “Is(relational) the process’.(value) Na the process,(value) e dey come.(event) o boy! “Bring(action) the dollar.(goal) The guy(sayer) say(verbal) him dey bring(action) am. When(time) the guy(actor) finally(quality) bring(action) the dollar.(goal) The ‘d’(actor) don wipe(event) comot,(event) na only(attribute) ollar”.(value)

Igbo kwenu! Igbo kwenu! Igbo man(actor) fall(action) for well,(place) den dey draw(action) am. In pikin(actor) throw(action) rope(goal) go,(action) go(event) meet(event) am. E dey inside well(place) dey say shi shi, na, this side.(place)