

## CHAPTER 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the result and discussion of the research based on the data taken and collected from Trevor Noah's video *How the British Took Over India*. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section presents the research findings, including the frequency of flouted maxims identified in the humorous dialogues. The second section provides an analysis of each dialogue by using Grice's Cooperative Principle and Incongruity Theory to elaborate the construction of humour through the interaction between the colonizer and the colonized.

### 4.1 Results

In the interaction between the colonizer and the colonized, three types of flouting maxims are found as the main construction of humour, such as flouting the maxim of relation, flouting the maxim of quantity, and flouting the maxim of quality. The frequency of each maxim violation is presented in the table below.

**Table 4.1** The Frequency of Flouted Maxims in colonizer and colonized conversation

| No.   | Types of Flouted Maxims    | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1     | Flouting Maxim of Relation | 6         | 37.5%      |
| 2     | Flouting Maxim of Quantity | 6         | 37.5%      |
| 3     | Flouting Maxim of Quality  | 4         | 25%        |
| Total |                            | 16        | 100%       |

According to the table, Trevor Noah's stand-up comedy show titled *How the British Took Over India* contains sixteen humorous dialogues that flout the maxims. From the three types of flouting maxims, the maxim of relation is flouted 6 times (37.5%), the maxim of quantity is flouted 6 times (37.5%), and the maxim of quality is flouted 4 times (25%).

The occurrence of flouting the maxim of relation indicates that Trevor Noah's humour is formed by shifting the intended meaning of a conversation or responding from an unexpected perspective. Instead of following the colonizer's intended message, the colonized often interpret the statement differently, creating

misunderstandings that produce humorous effects. Similarly, the maxim of quantity is often flouted when the colonized responds excessively or provides additional examples that appear to challenge the colonizer's arguments. These overly exaggerated responses highlight the weakness of the colonizer's assumptions and generate the humorous effect.

In contrast, the number of flouts of the maxim of quality is less than the other two maxims. The dialogues in this category usually contain sarcasm, irony, and exaggeration. By using these expressions, the colonized challenges the colonizer's authority and arguments, which generates a humorous effect.

Although the flouted maxims elaborate how the humour is constructed through conversations, they do not fully explain why the audience finds them funny. Therefore, each dialogue is further analyzed using Incongruity Theory to discover how the gap between the Colonizer's expectations and the Colonized's responses generates humorous effects.

#### 4.2 Discussion

The sixteen humorous dialogues were analyzed individually using the framework of the Cooperative Principle and Incongruity Theory. Each analysis consists of four components: the dialogue excerpt, the context of the interaction, the analysis of the Cooperative Principle, and the explanation of incongruity. Through these components, the researcher identifies how the characters' responses either observe or fail to observe conversational maxims and how such responses create incongruity that leads to humour.

##### Datum 1

Colonizer : *"Hear ye, hear ye! By order of her Majesty, the Queen, we have arrived!"*

Colonized : *(turned around looking for the source of the sound)*  
(Noah, 2017: lines 14-15)

**Context:** The colonizer announced his arrival in a loud and formal way. He expected people around him, including the person he would have a conversation with, to notice and acknowledge his authority by addressing the Queen of England.

However, the colonized person just looked around to find the origin of the sound he heard.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized flouted the Maxim of Relation by not directly responding to the colonizer's announcement. Instead of reacting to the message, he focuses on finding the source of the sound. Consequently, the response does not immediately connect with the colonizer's statement.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation about the colonized reaction, after the formal announcement from the colonizer, the audience expects fear and recognition response from the colonized, however in reality, the colonized just looks around for the source of the voice, as if the colonizer is unimportant existence. This mismatch creates humorous effect.

#### **Datum 2**

Colonizer : *"You over there! What is the name of this land?"*  
 Colonized : *"This land over here? This is called India."*  
 (Noah, 2017: lines 16-17)

**Context:** The colonizer arrives in India and asks the colonized about the name of the land. As a representative of a colonial authority, he would expect the colonized to respond with fear and respect.

**Cooperative Principle:** The colonized flouted the maxim of quantity because the colonized replied to the colonizer's question with unnecessary information. Instead of directly saying "India," the colonized repeats the question with "this land over here?" which demonstrates the colonized's disregard for the serious atmosphere the colonizer is trying to establish and makes the colonizer's behavior seem absurd.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation and the colonized's actual response. As the colonizer asks for the name

of the land, the audience expects that the conversation will lead to a serious discussion about conquest or authority. But, the colonized simply answer the question with *“This land over here? This is called India,”* which takes the colonizer’s utterance as an ordinary question. This simple and literal response contrasts with the broader colonial context that the audience expects, creating the humorous effect.

### Datum 3

Colonizer : *“Well, my good man, I’m here to tell you that India is now under the British Empire!”*

Colonized : *“And I’m glad that I can tell you that India is exactly where it was yesterday.”*

(Noah, 2017: lines 19-23)

**Context:** In this dialogue, the colonizers proudly announced that India is under British rule. They considered this as a remarkable event, and the colonizer expects the colonized to understand its significance and political conditions immediately.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this conversation, the colonized flouted the maxim of relation because his response is not in line with the intended meaning of the colonizer’s statement. While the colonizer is referring to British political control over India, the colonized interprets the statement literally as a comment about India’s location. By shifting the focus from political authority to geography, the colonized creates a response that appears relevant however does not address the colonizer’s actual message.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue was created through the audience’s expectation and the colonized interpretation of the colonizer’s statement. When the colonizer announces that the British Empire ruled India, the audience expects the colonized to respond to the declaration with a serious and submissive expression. However the colonized interpret the statement literally and reply, *“And I’m glad that I can tell you that India is exactly where it was yesterday.”* This unexpected

shift from political domination to geographical location creates the incongruity that contributes to the humorous effect of the dialogue.

#### Datum 4

Colonizer : *"No, no, no, I feel you're not understanding what I'm saying. I'm letting you know that we're here to colonize you by order of the Queen."*

Colonized : *"Who is the queen?"*

(Noah, 2017: lines 25-27)

**Context:** In this conversation, the colonizer explains that he had come to colonize India by the order of the Queen, he expects the colonized people to understand the significance of this statement and acknowledge the Queen's authority. Instead, the colonized people raised questions about the Queen's identity.

**Cooperative Principle:** The colonized's flouted the Maxim of Relation because, rather than responding to the main message about colonization, he focuses on a smaller detail, namely who the Queen is. His question is related to the colonizer's statement, however it ignores the more important issue being discussed. As a result, the response shifts the conversation away from the colonizer's intended meaning.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation and the actual response from the colonized. After the colonizer clearly announces his intention to take over India, the audience expects the colonizer to react and reply to the colonizer's declaration. However, the colonized did not care about the discussion that the colonizer wanted and instead discussed the identity of the queen. This unexpected shift the topic from a serious political announcement to a simple question creates an incongruity that contributes to the humorous effect of the dialogue.

#### Datum 5

Colonizer : *"The Queen, the Queen of England, the ruler of Great Britain! She who was ordained by God."*



Colonized : *"Which god?"*

(Noah, 2017: lines 29-30)

**Context:** In this dialogue, the colonizer explains the Queen's authority and seeks to glorify her position by claiming she was ordained by God. The colonizer expects the colonized person to accept this explanation and accept the Queen's legitimacy. However, the colonized responds by questioning the reference to God.

**Cooperative Principle:** The colonized flouted the Maxim of Relation because, instead of focusing on the Queen's authority, the colonized asks for clarification about which God the colonizer is referring to. While the question relates to the colonizer's statement, it shifts the focus of the conversation from the main point and challenges the assumption that all people share the same religious beliefs.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation and the response of the colonized to the colonizer's explanation. After the colonizer explains the Queen's background and authority by stating that she was ordained by God, the audience expects the colonized to accept the explanation and respond to it. Instead, the colonized treat the colonizer's statement as requiring further clarification rather than accepting it as an unquestionable justification by asking the name of the god who ordains the Queen by stating, "Which god?", This unexpected response from what the Colonizer expects, creating incongruity that makes the dialogue humorous.

#### Datum 6

Colonizer : *"God. The one true God."*

Colonized : *"There are many gods, my friend. What is the name of your god?"*

(Noah, 2017: lines 28-29)

**Context:** After the colonizer claims that the Queen was ordained by "the one true God." The colonizer assumes that his religious belief is universally accepted and expects the colonized person to understand and agree with this idea. However, the colonized responds from a different religious belief.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized flouted the Maxim of Relation. Rather than accepting the colonizer's claims about the Queen's authority, he challenges the assumption that there was only one God. By asking the colonists for the name of their God, he shifted the discussion from the Queen's legitimacy to religious belief. Consequently, the response veered away from the colonists' intended topic.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation and the response of the colonized. When the colonizer says that there is only one God that exists in this world by stating "*God. The one true God,*" the audience expects agreement or acceptance response. But, the colonized interprets the term from a polytheistic perspective, where many gods and goddesses exist, and all of them have a specific name. However, the colonized side ignores the colonizer's desired discussion and instead discusses the queen's identity. This unexpected response challenges the colonizer's assumption by arguing that his concept of God is not universally known. the conversation shifts from the Colonizer's assumption of one God to the Colonized's different understanding of God. This unexpected shift creates incongruity, which contributes to the humorous effect of the dialogue.

#### **Datum 7**

- Colonizer : "*There is only one God, and his name is God, and you too shall worship him!*"
- Colonized : "*You want me to worship a god, but you don't want to tell me his name? What are you talking about; there are many gods, okay? There is Shiva, there is Lakshmi, there is Hare Krishna. There are many gods. What is the name of your god?*"

(Noah, 2017: lines 36-39)

**Context:** In this dialogue, the colonizer says that there is only one God, and then he expects the colonized person to worship Him. The colonizer presents this belief

as an unquestionable truth. However, the colonized come from a different religious background and do not share the same assumption about God.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this conversation, the colonized flouted the Maxim of Quantity because he delivers more information than necessary. Instead of simply asking the name of the Colonizer's God, he elaborates his response by mentioning several Hindu gods, such as Shiva, Lakshmi, and Hare Krishna. This excessive information is intended to strengthen his argument and emphasize that every god has a specific name. By exaggerating his point, the Colonized reveals the weakness of the Colonizer's claim.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectations and the actual response from the colonized. When the colonizer commands the colonized to worship the same God as him, the audience expects the colonized to respond to the religious discussion or the claim of monotheism. However the colonized questions the logic of worshipping an unknown god and compares the colonizer's belief with his own belief. This unexpected response creates the incongruity that contributes to the dialogue's humorous effect by changing the topic from religious authority to pragmatic reasoning and cultural differences.

#### **Datum 8**

Colonizer : *"His name is God!"*

Colonized : *"You don't know the name of your god?"*

(Noah, 2017: lines 41-42)

**Context:** After discussing religion and the identity of God. The colonizer repeatedly insists that the name of his God is simply "God." He expects that the colonized person will accept this explanation. However, the colonized interprets the word "God" as a general title rather than a specific name.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized flouted the maxim of quality. Instead of accepting the colonizer's explanation, he interprets the word



“God” differently and sarcastically concludes that the colonizer does not know the actual name of his God. As a result, the response of the colonized person changes the topic away from the colonizer's intended meaning and focuses on the misconception of the term “God.”

**Incongruity:** In this dialogue, the audience expects the colonized to understand and accept the colonizer's explanation, which has been repeatedly explained. But, because the colonized did not get the answer of his question, he concludes and assumes that the colonizer does not know the name of his own God. This unexpected reversal of roles transforms the Colonizer from someone claiming religious authority into someone who appears uninformed creates incongruity that leading to the humorous effect.

#### Datum 9

Colonizer : *“It's just God.”*

Colonized : *“Is it like mommy or daddy? You want me to worship your god, but you don't want to tell me his name, huh? How am I going to pray to him, what do I do? Every morning, I go to wake up, and I pray like, “Oh, dear god, dear god, I was hoping that maybe, god, you could help me. No, no, sorry, not you, other god. No, no, other god. No, no, not. . . Wrong god, no, god. I was trying to talk to other. . . No, no, no, you're right. I should have asked for your first name. No, no, god, no, other God, please. No, god behind that god. No, not you today, god, other God. You're right, he told me you would know who I was talking to, and I don't. . . No no, other god, please. That god. . . No, no that god. . . Then I wonder why my prayers are not getting answered, duh?”*

(Noah, 2017: lines 44-58)

**Context:** In this dialogue, the colonizer wants the colonized to accept his constant insistence that his deity's name is only "God." However, the colonized is still confused because he comes from a religious background where there are several gods, and each of them is named with a distinct name. As a result, he continues questioning how someone can worship a god without knowing its name and imagines the difficulties this would create during prayer.

**Cooperative Principle:** The colonized primarily flouts the Maxim of Quantity because, instead of giving a clear response to the colonizer's explanation, he creates a long and exaggerated story about praying to the unknown god. Furthermore, he changed the conversation away from the question of God's identity to the practical challenges of worshipping a nameless deity. Consequently, the answer gives too much information and partially shifts the conversation away from the colonizer's intended meaning.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation that the conversation would end or move on to another topic. However the conversation is still going, because colonized interprets "God" through his own belief, which is a polytheistic perspective in which gods have different names and identities. Because of this difference, the colonized continues his statement by giving an exaggerated scenario where he repeatedly prays to the incorrect god because he is confused about which god is being addressed. This misunderstanding turns into a ridiculous situation that contributes the humorous effect.

#### **Datum 10**

Colonizer : *"How dare you speak to me like that! Do you know who I am?"*  
 Colonized : *"No, because you never introduced yourself."*  
 (Noah, 2017: lines 55-56)

**Context:** After the colonized repeatedly challenges his authority, the colonizer becomes angry, and then he asks, "Do you know who I am?" as a rhetorical question to assert his power. But, instead of recognizing the implied meaning, the Colonized interprets it literally and responds that the Colonizer never introduced himself.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized flouted the Maxim of Quality because the colonized pretends not to understand the Colonizer's intended meaning. Although he recognizes that the Colonizer shows his anger and demands

respect, he intentionally answers the question literally by replying, *"No, because you never introduced yourself."* Instead of giving a direct answer, the Colonized responds as if he misunderstands the Colonizer's question and intended meaning. This unexpected response indirectly mocks the Colonizer's authority, contributing to the humorous effect of the dialogue.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectations and the response of the colonized to the colonizer's question. The audience expects the colonized to recognize the rhetorical meaning. After the colonizer asks, "Do you know who I am?", the audience expects the colonized to understand the colonizer's rhetorical question as demanding respect. However, the colonized interprets the question literally and explains that he or she does not know the colonizer because the colonizer never introduced himself. This unexpected literal interpretation creates incongruity that contributes to the humorous effect of the dialogue.

#### **Datum 11**

Colonizer : *"I have come here representing Great Britain!"*  
 Colonized : *"And I have never heard of Great Britain. Who gave you that name?"*

(Noah, 2017: lines 58-59)

**Context:** In this dialogue, the colonizer still expects the colonized to recognize Great Britain as a strong and powerful nation. However, the colonized responds by stating that he has never heard of the name Great Britain, which then raises a question about the origin of the name.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized's response does not follow the Maxim of Relation because, instead of responding to the colonizer's claim of representing a powerful nation, he focuses on the unfamiliar name "Great Britain" and asks about the origin of that name. Although the response is connected to the

topic, it shifts the topic away from the colonizer's intended message about authority and power.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation and the actual response from the colonized. After the colonizer introduces himself as a representative of Great Britain, the audience expects the colonized to recognize the colonizer's identity. But, the colonized treats the introduction as an unfamiliar name and questions about who gave that name. The colonizer's belief that the name "Great Britain" is widely acknowledged and accepted is questioned by the colonized by this unexpected response, which creates the incongruity that contributes to the dialogue's humorous effect.

#### Datum 12

Colonizer : *"Well, well, well, we did."*  
 Colonized : *"You call yourselves 'great?' Isn't that a little presumptuous? Shouldn't you wait for other people to tell you how great you are, huh? Shouldn't you just go around the world and just do good things, good things, good things. Then people go, 'Oh my God, Britain, look how great you are!'"*

(Noah, 2017: lines 61-66)

**Context:** In this dialogue, the colonizer admits that the British themselves chose the name of the nation. Then, the colonized question whether it is appropriate for a country to call itself "great" without recognition and validation from other countries.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized primarily flouted the Maxim of Quantity by providing more information than is required. Instead of briefly questioning the name Great Britain, the colonized delivered a long explanation about humility and argued that people should earn the title "great" through good actions rather than claiming it themselves. This excessive explanation emphasizes the arrogance of the Colonizer's claim and enhances the humorous effect.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation and the actual response from the colonized. After the colonizer admits that the origin of the name of the country is from themselves, the audience expects the conversation to move on to the next topic. However the colonized interprets the word “Great” differently and takes it as a personal compliment rather than part of a country’s name. The colonized told the colonizer that true greatness should be recognized by other people. This unexpected reinterpretation transforms the country's name into a claim of self-praise, creating an incongruity that contributes to the humorous effect.

#### **Datum 13**

Colonizer : *“Well, I beg to differ. I believe we could do it because we knew instinctively. We are Great Britain.”*

Colonized : *“Well, in that case, welcome to Great India.”*

(Noah, 2017: lines 68-70)

**Context:** After the colonizer defends the name “Great Britain” by claiming that the British already knew they were great. He presents this as a natural and reasonable justification for calling themselves “great.” In response, the colonized applies the same logic to the name of India.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized flouted the Maxim of Quality because, rather than directly accepting the colonizer's justification, he applied the same logic to India’s name by calling it “Great India.” By imitating the Colonizer's logic, he ironically exposes the absurdity of claiming greatness based solely on self-assertion. This sarcastic response invites the audience to recognize the implied criticism, creating a humorous effect.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience’s expectations and the colonized's actual response, which misinterprets the word “Great”. After the colonizer explained that Britain is naturally “Great,” the audience



expects the colonized to either accept or continue arguing against the colonizer's claim. However the colonized replied by using the same logic to India by calling it "Great India." This reversal reveals the absurdity of the colonizer's logic, which creates the humorous effect.

#### Datum 14

Colonizer : *"No, it doesn't. . . It doesn't work like that! It doesn't work like that! How dare you speak to me like this?"*

Colonized : *"Look, you are the one who dares to speak to me, okay? I was here, minding my own business in my land. You came over here, riding on your skinny cow, telling me that things are going to change. I don't know who you are. All I know is you are clearly crazy, okay? You're not feeling too right. And I didn't want to say anything, but you look like you're going to faint. In fact, it looks like you died last week, okay? Something is very wrong with your skin. You're not looking good, my friend. Maybe you should come down. We have a curry, we talk about this."*

(Noah, 2017: lines 72-80)

**Context:** In this dialogue, the colonizer becomes frustrated and demands respect from the colonized. However, instead of being recognized by the colonized, the colonizer receives comments from the colonized.

**Cooperative Principle:** The colonized primarily flouted the Maxim of Quantity because he provides far more information than necessary. Instead of simply responding to the Colonizer's accusation, he delivers a long comment about the Colonizer's appearance, behavior, and even his health. This excessive information is intentionally used to ridicule the Colonizer and strengthen the humorous effect.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the audience's expectation and the actual response from the colonized. After the colonizer questions how the colonized dares to speak in such a manner, the audience expects the colonized to defend his statement or respond to the colonizer's rhetorical question. Instead, the colonized completely refuses to recognize the colonizer's

authority and reverses the situation by speaking to him as someone who deserves sympathy and advice. This unexpected reversal of roles creates the incongruity that contributes to the humorous effect of the dialogue.

### Datum 15

Colonizer : *"What are you talking about? I look quite normal!"*  
 Colonized : *"You do not look normal, my friend. I've never seen anybody with that complexion in my life, okay? You look like you're playing hide and seek with the sun your entire life. I don't know what is happening, but that is not how a person should look, ah? I can see your veins pumping through your skin right now. You know how creepy that is, pumping, pumping, pumping, pumping? If I was your doctor, I don't need X-ray machine. I just go, 'What is problem?' 'It is your kidney.' How do I know? Because you are translucent. That is how I know."*

(Noah, 2017: lines 82-91)

**Context:** In this interaction, the colonizer disagrees that he looks abnormal. However, the colonized continues to point out his unusually pale skin and treats it as something strange. The humour comes from the colonized seeing the colonizer as physically unusual instead of an authority figure.

**Cooperative Principle:** In this dialogue, the colonized flouted the maxim of quantity by providing more information than was required. In response to the colonizer's claim that he looks normal and healthy, the colonized gives a long description of the colonizer's appearance. He repeatedly comments on the colonizer's pale skin complexion, visible veins, and even called him as a transparent person. This excessive amount of information contributes to the humorous effect of the dialogue.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the difference between the audience's expectation and the actual responses from the colonized. After the colonizer tells that he looks completely normal, the audience expects that the colonized would respond with agreement or disagreement. Instead, the colonized

exaggerates the colonizer's physique and describes it as abnormal. The difference between how the colonizer sees himself and how the colonized sees him creates the incongruity that makes the dialogue humorous.

#### Datum 16

Colonizer : “. . . *We're going. . .*” (*mimics gunshot*)  
 Colonized : “*She is all yours, take, take. . . You don't play nice; take.*”  
 (Noah, 2017: lines 98-99)

**Context:** Before this dialogue, the colonizer repeatedly tried to take over India, while the colonized consistently rejected his demands. Despite being pressured by the colonizer, the colonized refused to surrender. In the following dialogue, the colonizer decides to use violence, which makes a sudden shift in the colonized's response.

**Cooperative Principle:** The colonized flouts the Maxim of Quality by making statements that ease the tension in conversation. At the time when the colonizer showed his gun, the colonized responded by saying, "You don't play nice." Instead of directly describing the colonizer's threatening behavior, he minimizes it by comparing it to bad behavior in a game. This belittling statement makes the colonizer lose his sense of moral superiority, which then creates a humorous effect.

**Incongruity:** The incongruity in this dialogue arises from the contrast between the audience's expectation and the casual response from the colonized. After the colonizer fails to convince the colonized, the colonizer shows his intent to use violence by pulling out his gun, the audience expects the colonized to react with fear as it is serious violence. Instead, the colonized shows fearlessness and simply comments, "You don't play nice," reducing a life-threatening act to the behavior of someone who behaves unfairly in a game. This unexpected understatement contrasts with the seriousness of the colonizer's action, creating an incongruity that contributes to the dialogue's humorous effect.