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Verbal irony is an utterance of which the underlying speaker meaning is different from the sentence meaning, done intentionally and blatantly, creating the impression of a peculiar utterance. Linguists believe that a verbal irony is produced by flouting one or multiple conversational maxims, namely Quality, Quantity, Manner, and Relation maxims. However, Attardo (2000) believes that all ironies are literally inappropriate to their contexts and therefore, it is necessary to add Appropriateness maxim as a fifth conversational maxim, particularly to aid in the comprehension of irony as a pragmatic phenomenon.

This study was done for two purposes. First, this study aimed to reveal the contribution of conversational maxim floutings in the construction of Adam Neely’s irony by identifying how maxim floutings produced irony, describing how maxim floutings correlated to one another in the context of irony, and proving Attardo’s notion concerning irony and Appropriateness maxim. Second, this study aimed to reveal the purposes of verbal irony based on the maxim floutings employed in the ironies.

This study employed purposive sampling in selecting 120 verbal ironies taken from 64 videos on Adam Neely’s YouTube channel. The data were then analyzed using pragmatic approach based on Grice’s Cooperative Principle and other theories of irony, resulting in four major findings. First, Appropriateness and Quality maxim flouting occurred the most and there was a wide gap between their numbers and other maxim floutings’. Second, the most frequently occurring composition of maxim floutings in a single verbal irony was Quality-Appropriateness maxim flouting, occurring 87 times out of 120 utterances. Third, there were 8 verbal ironies which did not flout the Appropriateness maxim. Fourth, there were no significant patterns concerning the deliberate use of particular maxim floutings for particular ironic purposes.

Based on these findings, it was concluded that Appropriateness maxim flouting significantly determines an irony and always co-occurs with other maxim floutings except for Quantity maxim flouting. However, since not all ironies flout the Appropriateness maxim, Attardo’s notion on irony only applies to the majority of the ironies and thus is disproven. Besides that, despite the apparent contribution of maxim floutings in achieving ironic purposes, the lack of distinctive patterns related to the use of particular maxim floutings for particular ironic purposes suggest that the employment of certain maxim floutings is not based on the fulfillment of ironic purposes.

Keywords: verbal irony, maxim flouting, ironic purpose
ABSTRAK


Studi ini memiliki dua tujuan. Pertama, studi ini bertujuan untuk mencari tahu kontribusi penyimpangan maksim perkakapan dalam konstruksi ironi oleh Adam Neely dengan cara mengidentifikasi bagaimana penyimpangan maksim menciptakan ironi, mendeskripsikan bagaimana penyimpangan maksim saling berkorelasi dalam konteks ironi, dan membuktikan teori Attardo mengenai ironi dan maksim Kecocokan. Kedua, studi ini bertujuan untuk mencari tahu tujuan-tujuan ironi berdasarkan penyimpangan maksim yang digunakan di ironi-ironi tersebut.


Berdasarkan temuan-temuan ini, disimpulkan bahwa penyimpangan maksim Kecocokan sangat menentukan keironisan dan selalu muncul bersamaan dengan penyimpangan maksim lainnya kecuali Kuantitas. Namun, tidak semua ironi melanggar maksim Kecocokan sehingga teori Attardo mengenai ironi hanya berlaku untuk sebagian besar ironi dan tidak terbukti benar. Selain itu, terlepas dari jelasnya kontribusi penyimpangan maksim dalam mencapai tujuan ironi, kurangnya pola khusus terkait penggunaan penyimpangan maksim tertentu untuk tujuan ironi tertentu mengindikasikan bahwa penggunaan penyimpangan maksim tertentu tidaklah berdasarkan pemenuhan tujuan ironi.

Kata kunci: ironi verbal, penyimpangan maksim, tujuan ironi
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Traditionally, verbal irony is defined as an utterance which implies an opposite meaning (Sperber and Wilson, 1995, p. 240). In the field of pragmatics, Grice’s Cooperative Principle (CP) describes irony as an utterance of which the ironic meaning is a conversational implicature caused by the flouting or overt violation of the maxim of Quality (Gurillo and Ortega, 2013, p. 17). However, irony may not involve the flouting of Quality maxim but flouts other conversational maxims or does not violate any maxim at all, which shows the insufficiency of Grice’s theory of irony (Attardo, 2000, p. 798).

The traditional view that irony implies an opposite meaning relative to the literal sense of an utterance is also not adequate to describe the whole scope of irony as there are instances in which the underlying meanings of verbal ironies do not directly stand in opposite of their literal meanings but instead display a degree of discrepancy (Korosiova, 2013, p. 7). Hyperboles and understatements fall into this category; they do not literally display an exact opposite meaning but instead respectively exaggerate and belittle the underlying speaker meaning—the speaker’s or ironist’s attitude or evaluation towards the ironical referent, “the intended meaning of the irony” (Attardo, 2000, p. 814-815). To exemplify is the utterance “I
have to say that what tortured me most in watching this film was boredom”, in which the state of being bored is exaggerated as torture (Barbe, 1995, p. 17). Therefore, this degree of intentional discrepancy, i.e., the discrepancy between sentence meaning and speaker meaning which is done purposefully, when perceived by the hearer, creates an ironic interpretation of the utterance.

As aforementioned, there have been many theories discussing irony, harboring varied views and approaches in the attempt to describe irony as a pragmatic phenomenon, albeit mostly unsuccessful in describing the various cases of irony. However, the researcher thought of Attardo’s theory on irony as a suitable theoretical supplement for Grice’s CP. Attardo agrees with the notion that Grice’s explanation of irony is flawed and thus presents his own view based on the Gricean model but with several significant differences. One of Attardo’s significant points is his argument that “a set of shared presuppositions” is the basis of the construction of irony:

The reconstruction of the ironist's intended meaning is supposed to be based on a set of shared presuppositions: H [hearer] knows that S [speaker] cannot mean M [meaning], and S knows that H knows that, and therefore S can count on the fact that H will not stop at S's literal meaning M, but rather look for a more suitable meaning among the infinite set of other meanings which may have been implicated by S. (Attardo, 2000, p. 814)

In light of Attardo’s take on irony, the researcher noticed that this operation is based on the presumption of the speaker that H knows that S cannot mean M. Therefore, it is important to question how the speaker comes to this presumption in the first place. The researcher argued that this is triggered by a set of shared knowledge known by both the speaker and hearer, and the violation of this knowledge in the utterance of the speaker is perceived by the hearer as intentional,
which, in retrospect, is expected by the speaker. In turn, the hearer only identifies an utterance as ironic if its perceived meaning or implicature is incongruent with the shared knowledge between the speaker and hearer. This argument is supported by Attardo who states that a verbal irony is

an utterance that, while maintaining relevance, explicitly or implicitly violates the conditions for contextual appropriateness, either deictically or more broadly in terms of the knowledge by the participants of the opinions and belief systems of the speakers. (Attardo, 2000, p. 817)

What Attardo means by “maintaining relevance” is that the utterance is congruent with the conversation or part of the context in which it is being uttered despite violating “the conditions for contextual appropriateness”. This is exemplified by the utterance “What a nice weather.”, spoken when it is raining (Attardo, 2000, p. 814); the utterance is relevant to the weather but is inappropriate to the actual feeling the of the speaker—had the speaker liked rain, the utterance would not have been ironic. This particular notion of Attardo is later useful in proving how the utterances analyzed in this study are ironic and intentional.

A crucial point of Attardo’s theory is how it necessitates a fifth maxim as a complement to Grice’s conversational maxims: the maxim of Appropriateness. This proposition stems from Attardo’s scrutiny on the performance of Grice’s maxims, revealing the aspect of appropriateness which seems similar yet is apparently distinct from the maxim of Relation and Quality. This maxim also becomes the essence of Attardo’s definition of irony, stating that irony “is essentially an inappropriate utterance which is nonetheless relevant to the context” (Attardo, 2000, p. 823). This premise overwrites previous notions on how verbal ironies are constructed through a blatant violation of one of Grice’s conversational maxims. In
light of this, this study attempts to identify how the flouting of Grice’s and Attardo’s maxims correlates to verbal ironies, in which Attardo’s maxim of Appropriateness assumes the position of the fifth conversational maxim.

In this study, verbal ironies are analyzed within the context of Adam Neely’s question and answer (Q&A) YouTube videos. YouTube is a social media platform, albeit unconventional, in which videos are sharable and viewable by any user and communication is creator-to-viewer rather than person-to-person (Giselle, 2015, para. 7). Videos shared in YouTube have many purposes; they may be “hooks” for customers of a product or service, i.e., they trigger a connection between an audience and a brand, or are the products themselves, i.e., the videos are creative, target a particular demography, and contribute revenue to their creators. A creator, the person(s) creating the video, must come up with relevant content to attract more viewers, such as Q&A sessions (Keates, 2019, para. 14). The necessity of Q&A videos for raising viewers’ engagement is shown by their prominence in Adam Neely’s channel, which by Oct 22, 2019, contains 64 Q&A videos.

Adam Neely is a YouTuber whose videos are concerned with music knowledge in general and bass in particular. Adam Neely graduated from Berklee College of Music and is currently working as a performing musician in New York, the bassist and self-producer of the band Sungazer, and a YouTube personality. Neely’s videos can be divided into several main categories: music theory, gig vlogs, music composing and production, bass lessons, and Q&A sessions. Neely’s Q&A videos employ a format in which Neely speaks to the audience through the camera
while responding to questions and comments delivered by his viewers through various platforms, such as YouTube, Instagram, and Patreon.

The choice of Neely’s Q&A videos as the context in which irony is analyzed in this study is due to several reasons. First, throughout the years of being a YouTube video creator, Neely has developed a persona which is well known to his viewers. He is a jazz musician, well educated in music knowledge and theory, very enthusiastic of the bass as a musical instrument, and open-minded regarding his “taste” in music genres. Neely also researches materials beforehand to substantialize his videos and justify his views and explanations regarding the materials he covers. The knowledge of this persona often becomes the basis of creating and understanding the irony Neely employs in his videos.

The second reason for choosing Adam Neely’s videos is that his characteristics are reflected in his communication with the viewers which is relatively consistent throughout his videos. A relevant characteristic is his way of delivering humor in a serious manner, often by utilizing ironic remarks. Neely’s gestures and non-verbal markers accompanying his particular language style often serve as prosodic cues of his verbal ironies. Third, among Neely’s videos, the Q&A sessions reflect person-to-person communication the most; Neely’s utterances within them are less “planned” and are “immediate” responses to handpicked messages and questions from his viewers which are often the stimuli of Neely’s use of irony.

This study focused on maxim flouting in the construction of Adam Neely’s verbal irony and its purposes in his Q&A videos on YouTube. The construction of
irony was analyzed based on what conversational maxims it flouts and how it is perceived as ironic by the viewers. This study incorporated not only the flouting of the maxim of Quality as a traditional determiner of an utterance’s being ironical, but also that of the maxim of Quantity, Relation, Manner, and Appropriateness to find out how ironic interpretations are created through overt violations of other conversational maxims besides Quality. Meanwhile, the purposes of irony based on the occurring maxim floutings were identified based on the use of irony in context, namely to what questions and messages the ironies are used to respond and what effects are expected to affect the viewers due to the use of verbal ironies.

There are several benefits of this study. Theoretically, this study adds to the corpus of researches concerning irony. Moreover, this study analyzed irony in a particular context outside the traditional “person-to-person” conversation, of which the results may differ and provide alternative findings to those of other researches delving in more traditional contexts. Besides that, this study also used Attardo’s Appropriateness maxim as one of the variables of the construction of irony, which hitherto has not seen light in the undergraduate theses of the English Letters Department of Universitas Sanata Dharma. Therefore, the revelation of how the maxim of Appropriateness contributes in the construction of irony may open new horizons for future pragmatic researchers, especially those analyzing irony using Attardo’s theory. Practically, this study shows how a YouTuber employs verbal irony in videos, which may give an insight on how irony is constructed in YouTube videos, on what basis verbal ironies are deliberately used, how the perceiving of verbal ironies is attained by the viewers, and what effects irony has on the viewers.
and the creator him/herself. This knowledge may be useful to those looking for practical applications of irony and the effect of irony to one’s communication.

**B. Problem Formulation**

Based on the background of the study, the problems of this study are formulated as follows:

1. How are the verbal ironies in Adam Neely’s Q&A videos on YouTube constructed based on their floutings of conversational maxims?
2. How do the verbal ironies serve particular purposes based on the maxim floutings occurring within them?

**C. Objectives of the Study**

The first objective of this study is to describe how verbal ironies by Adam Neely in his Q&A videos on YouTube are constructed based on the flouting of conversational maxims, namely the maxim of Quality, Quantity, Relation, Manner, and Appropriateness. By identifying occurring floutings, the researcher aims to reveal how the flouting of particular maxims produces verbal irony, how maxim floutings correlate to one another, and whether the flouting of the maxim of appropriateness is truly the determining factor of a verbal irony.

The results of the first objective are then used to contribute to the second objective: identifying how the verbal ironies serve ironic purposes based on the maxim floutings occurring within them. Maxim floutings constructing the verbal ironies and from what shared knowledge they derive are analyzed in correlation to
the particular contexts in which they are employed. Through this, the researcher aims to reveal how particular maxim floutings perform to achieve particular ironic purposes and find out whether there are general underlying patterns that determine the deliberate use of maxim floutings for particular ironic purposes.

D. Definition of Terms

There are several key terms to be defined to avoid misinterpretation. The first term, conversational maxims, are statements representing the general principles expected to be fulfilled by participants to create an effective conversation, proposed by Grice in his theory of CP. These maxims consist of maxim of Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner (Grice, p. 26). In addition, the researcher adds another maxim proposed by Attardo, the maxim of Appropriateness, to this set of maxims (Attardo, 2000, p. 823). In total, there are five conversational maxims which are further elaborated in chapter II.

The second term, flouting, according to Grice, is a blatant violation of a maxim (Grice, 1989, p. 30). This overt violation or “exploitation” of the maxim is not intended to mislead the hearer. Flouting a maxim means that the violation is done intentionally and in an apparent manner so that the hearer is expected to perceive the implied meaning, maintaining the operation of the CP (Grice, 1989, p. 30-31).

The last term, verbal irony, as aforementioned, has varied definitions. However, this study devises a description, derived from several theories on irony, which is considered suitable for this particular study: verbal irony is an utterance of
which the underlying speaker meaning is different from the sentence meaning, done intentionally and blatantly, creating the impression of a peculiar utterance (Attardo, 2000, p. 814). “Peculiar” here means that there is something of the utterance that irks its hearers to not take it literally.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into three parts, which are review of related studies, review of related theories, and theoretical framework. The relevance of the related studies is due to their dealing with similar objects of study or employing similar approaches. The related theories supply explanation to achieve the objectives of this study, namely theories concerning pragmatics in general and irony in particular. Lastly, the theoretical framework explains the contribution of the related studies and theories in solving the problems of this study.

A. Review of Related Studies

The first study is done by Dewi (2014) entitled *A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting and Rhetorical Devices to Create Humor in “Modern Family Season 1”*. The objectives of this study are the identification of the types of maxim floutings and rhetorical devices used to create humor in the three episodes of *Modern Family* season 1. There are two major findings of this study. First, all types of floutings of Gricean maxims occur in the creation of humor. The flouting of the maxim of Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner occur 42, 12, 7, and 17 times respectively. Second, 12 types of rhetorical devices are found: exaggeration, sarcasm, allusion, irony, ridicule, satire, definition, bombast, insult, pun/wordplay, facetiousness, and repartee. In addition, the study shows the correlation between the types of flouting and rhetorical devices. Exaggeration, sarcasm, irony, allusion,
ridicule, satire, and definition co-occur with flouting of quality maxim; bombast, pun/wordplay, and insult co-occur with flouting of manner maxim; bombast and exaggeration co-occur with flouting of quantity maxim; and repartee and facetiousness co-occur with flouting of relation maxim. The study reveals that humorous situations in *Modern Family* season 1 are mostly created by means of flouting quality maxim using exaggeration.

The research gap between this study and Dewi’s includes the data and the focus of the study. While the data of this study are Adam Neely’s verbal ironies taken from his YouTube videos, the data of Dewi’s study are humorous utterances by the characters of *Modern Family*, a sitcom. Although both are forms of entertainment, the formats of the objects are relatively different; while Neely’s utterances can be said to be impromptu to a certain degree, the script of *Modern Family* is fully scripted and therefore, there may be differences in how the ironies within them are constructed, not to mention Neely’s utterances are addressed directly and indirectly to the viewers while the conversation in *Modern Family* is between the characters, albeit shown to the viewers.

Meanwhile, the focus of this study is to analyze verbal irony construction through maxim flouting while the focus of Dewi’s study is to analyze humor construction through maxim flouting and rhetorical devices. This difference means that irony is merely a minor aspect in Dewi’s study and thus, how maxim flouting construct irony is not fully elaborated in preference to how it constructs humor. Therefore, what can be compared of the studies’ results is whether Dewi’s findings regarding maxim flouting and irony conform to those of this study.
The second study is done by Jonsson (2010), entitled *Irony in Online Reviews: A linguistic approach to identifying irony*. The objectives of this study are to investigate how common irony is used in hotel and restaurant reviews and to find out how irony is used/produced from a linguistic point of view. The study is meant to aid natural language processing (NLP) applications in detecting irony automatically and improve their performance.

There are several findings in this study. First, irony occurs in 1.9-8.5% of the hotel and restaurant reviews, and it is more common in negative hotel reviews. Second, people usually use understatements or similar linguistic devices to serve as ironic markers. Third, the focus of NLP applications in detecting irony should be on negative reviews containing positive gradable adjectives on expensive products.

The difference between this study and Jonsson’s is the object of study and focus. Irony in reviews is usually expected to be some form of criticism and therefore, other ironic purposes may not occur in the data. The shared knowledge required for an ironic interpretation is also limited to the reviewer and the business staff, hence the difficulty in conveying the irony to others (readers of the reviews). As Jonsson’s study focuses on particular linguistic devices, namely number of adjectives, gradability, and polarity, maxim flouting is not discussed in the construction of irony. However, Jonsson’s analysis supplements the construction of irony in general and the analysis of irony by NLP applications in particular.

The third study is done by Nuolijarvi and Tiittula (2011), entitled *Irony in Political Television Debates*. The objective of this study is to analyze the use of irony as a strategic device in political argumentation, particularly in the Finnish
political election debates. The study focuses on sequential emergence and management of irony.

There are several findings in this study. First, irony-implicative statements often occur in the environment where the position of one interlocutor is threatened. In such cases, irony is used to improve one’s own position, particularly by responding to a prior turn and evaluating it. Second, irony is typically used in Finnish election debates as a means of criticizing opponents subtly; it is used as a negative evaluation of the opponent and at the same time, functions as a defense or attack. Third, irony is a sequential phenomenon; it occurs in chains, i.e., ironic actions are replied with irony that targets the original ironist. Therefore, irony does not occur freely in a discussion but is a reaction to previous actions.

The difference between Nuolijarvi and Tiittula’s study and this study includes the object and the focus of study. The particular setting of the related study, the Finnish election debates, affects the data in the way that they revolve around the utterances of two interlocutors in an argumentation, resulting in the chains of ironies, the interchanging ironist, and the criticizing nature of the ironies. These findings, along with the study’s focus on sequential emergence and irony management, are contrastive to those of this study. However, the different analysis results are useful in showing how irony performs in different contexts.
B. Review of Related Theories

1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics, in its broadest definition, is “the study of the relations of signs to interpreters” (Morris, 1938, p. 84). Levinson, as mentioned by Sorea (2012), defines pragmatics more exclusively: “Pragmatics is the study of deixis, implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and aspects of discourse structure” (p. 17). The scope of pragmatics can be understood through the understanding of language itself. Language is governed by sets of rules which we call “syntax”. Through these rules, utterances are created through the use of shared symbols of meanings which are under the scope of semantics. However, when put in use, the meaning of these linguistic expressions may change depending on many variables, especially those related to the speaker, hearer, and context in which an utterance occurs. Therefore, meaning is attained not only through the understanding of the literal meaning of an utterance, but also through an interpretation of an utterance. This extension of language study which incorporates the speaker, hearer, and context of an utterance into its analysis is the scope of pragmatics. In other words, pragmatics is the study of how language is performed or used in communication (Leech, 1983, p. 1).

2. Grice’s Cooperative Principle (CP)

Grice (1989) states that participants of a conversation follow a general principle in cooperatively creating a flowing set of rational utterances instead of disconnected remarks, namely: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (p. 26); this general principle is known
as the Cooperative Principle (CP). Grice suggests that participants of a conversation follow “a certain set of rules in operation” except when there is an indication to the contrary, i.e., when one participant does not operate in accordance to a “shared set of conversational norms”, resulting in the other participant’s inquiry about the possible reasons causing this deviation from the “standard conversational behavior” (Sorea, 2012, p. 95). In the CP, Grice elaborates on variables related to how interlocutors communicate in a cooperative manner.

a. Implicature

Interlocutors are able to make sense of “irrational” utterances because a degree of meaning or some meaningful aspects are implicated (Sorea, 2012, p. 96). Implicature makes sense of how “it is possible to mean more than what is actually said” (Levinson, 1983, p. 97). For example, the following is between a host and a guest:

(1) A: Would you like a drink?  
B: Honestly, I’m quite hungry.

In example (1), in a literal sense, B’s answer does not correspond with A’s question. However, going beyond the semantics of B’s utterance, B’s answer is actually relevant and appropriate. Being hungry means that one is in need of food; honestly is usually used as a pre-apologetic marker for its following statement, usually due to the statement’s being rather impolite or blatant. Therefore, in relation to A’s offer, we can infer that B is implicating that he needs food more than a drink, and would rather be given food instead. This shows how I would rather have you give me food is implicated in B’s utterance. This indirect speech also occurs because of
B’s expectation that A is able to infer his utterance by looking for a more felicitous meaning as an alternative to its “irrational” literal meaning.

b. Sentence Meaning Versus Speaker Meaning

A literal sense of an utterance, or a sentence, may differ from the intended meaning of the speaker. This distinction is briefly elaborated by Searle, as mentioned by Sorea (2012):

Sentences and words have only the meanings that they have. Strictly speaking, whenever we talk about the metaphorical meaning of a word, expression, or sentence, we are taking about what a speaker might utter it to mean, in a way that departs from what the word, expression, or sentence actually means... To have a brief way of distinguishing what a speaker means by uttering words, sentences, and expressions, on the one hand, and what the words, sentences, and expressions mean, on the other, I shall call the former speaker’s utterance meaning, and the latter, word, or sentence, meaning. (p. 68)

Sorea states that Gricean analyses reveal that “quite frequently, what is meant is not determined by what is said” (2012, p. 69). For example, “Mr. X is well spoken, handsomely dressed, and punctual.” can be used to give a polite yet non-praising letter of recommendation, showing how the seemingly praising utterance is meant to not be praising in relation to its context.

c. Conversational Maxims

As aforementioned, Grice’s CP suggests that there is a set of rules guiding the participants of conversation. These rules are formed based on rational considerations, which act as “general guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation to further co-operative ends” (Levinson, 1983, p. 101).
These rules consist of the four conversational maxims: *Quantity, Quality, Relation,* and *Manner*. The following expression of the maxims are taken from Levinson (1983, p. 101-102):

*The maxim of Quality*
try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:
(i) do not say what you believe to be false
(ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

*The maxim of Quantity*
(i) make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
(ii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required

*The maxim of Relevance* [Relation]
make your contributions relevant

*The maxim of Manner*
be perspicuous, and specifically:
(i) avoid obscurity
(ii) avoid ambiguity
(iii) be brief
(iv) be orderly

These conversational maxims “prescribe” interlocutors of what to do in order to converse efficiently, rationally, and cooperatively. These rules, however, are often violated, sometimes intentionally, which shows how particular conversational acts are done by violating these maxims.

d. **Flouting**

As aforementioned, people sometimes converse while deliberately violating the conversational maxims. Yet, despite of these violations, some are done without opting out of the CP; these violations are called *flouting*. Flouting is essentially an overt and blatant violation of one or more conversational maxims, done deliberately to exploit the maxims for communicative purposes, in which the speaker meaning
is implicated (Levinson, 1983, p. 109). Flouting is done with the speaker’s assumption that the hearer is able to recognize this blatant deviation which results in an inferred conversational implicature. Therefore, flouting a maxim is different to violating it, in the sense that the flouter is not trying to deceive the hearer, the flouting is not done to opt out of the CP, and thus the efficiency, effectiveness of, and the cooperation within the conversation are maintained. The following are examples of Grice’s conversational maxim floutings.

i. Flouting the Maxim of Quality

   Below is an example of Quality maxim flouting:

   (2) A: You are very early. (Said to B who has just come in late to class)

   In example (2), A is stating a “false” notion. However, it is impossible that B does not recognize both his/her lateness and the speaker’s blatant contradiction (“late” vs. “early”). B’s recognition, which is expected by A, creates the determination of A’s utterance being ironic and results in the inference that the speaker is actually implicating “you are late”. Therefore, A is flouting the Maxim of Quality.

ii. Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

   Below is an example of Quantity maxim flouting:

   (3) A: Where does Mary live?
   B: Somewhere in the country.

   In example (3), assuming that Mary is not a foreigner, B does not seem to adequately answer A’s question. The fact that Mary lives in a particular place in the country in which the exchange is taking place is an unnecessary fact—it lacks information, violating the maxim of Quantity. However, through this expression, B is implicating that he/she does not know the exact location of Mary’s living
quarters. If A perceives B as sincere, A will infer this implicature. However, if B is perceived as insincere, this flouting will result differently: either A will assume that B is joking or refusing to reveal further details on this matter. Either way, this is an example of the flouting of the maxim of Quantity.

iii. Flouting the Maxim of Relation

Birner (2013) states that flouting the maxim of Relation is performed by uttering something blatantly irrelevant that the hearer will immediately recognize the irrelevance; this may be used to implicate a speaker’s cooperativity or suggesting that “there is nothing relevant that can be said” (p. 56). Birner (2013) exemplifies this in the following:

(4) At a Genteel tea party, A says *Mrs. X is an old bag*. There is a moment of appalled silence, and then B says *The weather has been quite delightful this summer, hasn’t it?* B has blatantly refused to make what he says relevant to A’s preceding remark. He thereby implicates that A’s remark should not be discussed and, perhaps more specifically, that A has committed a social gaffe. (p. 56)

Example (4) shows how a speaker implicates his/her non-cooperativity regarding the continuity of its preceding utterance. The second example below is a letter of recommendation in which irrelevant attributes are praised

(5) Dear X, I am writing in support of Sally Smith’s application for a job in your department. Ms. Smith was a student of mine for three years, and I can tell you that she is a fine mother, a terrific practical jokester, and has my genuine admiration for her abilities in both table tennis and badminton. (p. 56)

iv. Flouting the maxim of Manner

Flouting the maxim of Manner is used to create humorous or literary effects. When creating humor, Manner is usually flouted to produce an ambiguous utterance which is expected to be funny, e.g.,
(6) When the third debate between presidential candidates John McCain and Barack Obama in 2008 focused temporarily on the business aspirations of a certain “Joe the Plumber,” who hoped to buy his employer’s plumbing business, I commented to a friend that Joe’s plans were a pipe dream. It was a pun precisely because of its ambiguity: My utterance could be interpreted as meaning that Joe’s plans were a pipe dream in the idiomatic sense, that is, a dream that would never come to fruition, or it could be interpreted as meaning that it was a dream involving pipes. Many puns involve ambiguous utterances that make sense on both readings. (Birner, 2013, p. 60).

3. Verbal Irony

As mentioned in chapter 1, this study defines irony as an utterance of which the speaker meaning is different from the sentence meaning, done intentionally and blatantly, creating the impression of a peculiar utterance. This is not to be confused with metaphor, of which the semantic or literal expression of an utterance is a figure of speech representing a covert figurative meaning, i.e., the image or structure of a domain is expressed using that of another domain (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 117).

The following are several theories on irony which is used in this study.

a. Grice’s Theory on Irony

Grice states that irony is an utterance of which the meaning is the opposite or reverse of what is said, conventionally signified by an ironical tone accompanying such utterances (Grice, 1989, p. 53). Grice suggests that the ironic intention of an utterance becomes inferable when related to its context; to exemplify, the expression “He’s a fine friend”, when used to refer to someone who has just treated the speaker badly, presents to the hearer a seemingly false remark, suggesting that the speaker meaning of this utterance is actually the negation of its sentence meaning (Grice, 1989, p. 53-54).
Irony is performed by uttering a “false” remark, achieved by flouting the maxim of Quality (Grice, 1989, p. 34) which according to Colston, as mentioned by Gibbs (2007), is synonymous with *pragmatical insincerity* (p. 126). However, as aforementioned in chapter 1, irony does not necessarily involve the flouting of the maxim of Quality. For example, “I just love when people use their turn signals.” uttered as a response to someone’s not using their turn signal does not flout the maxim of Quality because it is not a false statement. However, when taking into account its context, the utterance is flouting the maxim of Relevance, referring to a situation different from that which is occurring (Gibbs, 2007, p. 126). This is the flaw of Grice’s take on irony, which Attardo has attempted to cover.

**b. Attardo’s Theory on Irony**

According to Attardo, irony “… is entirely dependent on context, including but not limited to, S’s intentions and goals. The ironical meaning needs to be inferred, it is never ‘said’ (in Grice’s sense), i.e., found in the text itself” (Attardo, 2000, p. 814). Following this, Attardo states that irony involves two distinct phenomena: the recognition of irony and the interpretation of irony.

Irony is related to a speaker’s attitude towards an ironical referent and an ironical utterance is referring to some element of the context (Attardo, 2000, p.814). Due to this, Attardo suggests that although a verbal irony may seem to flout the maxim of Relevance, after the interpretation of its being ironic, the maxim of Relevance is restored as the speaker meaning is perceived as relevant. However, this study holds the view that such verbal ironies do flout the maxim of Relevance in its construction despite being relevant after its inference by their hearer.
Attardo states that although irony does not necessarily violate the CP (and its conversational maxims), every verbal irony can be seen as literally false and/or inappropriate to its context (Attardo, 2000, p. 816). Attardo explains that all ironies must violate Appropriateness and may violate other conversational maxims; therefore, an irony can be defined as an inappropriate utterance which is relevant (Attardo, 2000, p. 817).

The addition of the maxim of Appropriateness to conversation maxims is due to the nature of it and Relevance being similar yet distinct: Relevance is truth-insensitive and Appropriateness is truth-sensitive (Attardo, 2000, p. 818–820). This is explained by showing that when someone asks the question “Where is he?”, the answer “In his room.” is still relevant although “he”, without the knowledge of the person answering, may not be in his room. However, Relevance and Appropriateness often coexist, especially outside the context of irony.

In conclusion, in addition to the necessity of the maxim of Appropriateness, Attardo’s (2000) proposes that an utterance \( u \) is ironical if
1. \( u \) is contextually inappropriate,
2. \( u \) is (at the same time) relevant,
3. \( u \) is construed as having been uttered intentionally and with awareness of the contextual inappropriateness by S, and
4. S intends that (part of) his/her audience recognize points 1-3,
5. unless H construes \( u \) as being unintentional irony, in which case 3-4 do not apply. (p. 817)

c. Irony as a Pragmatic Concept

Through her research, Korosiova (2013) describes and compares “the most interpreted pragmatic theories that describe irony since Grice’s cooperative principle” which reveals that although many theories have been proposed with the
intention to cover irony in its various possible occurrences, most fail to apply to every case of irony (p.5, p.44). However, through its description, Giora’s indirect negation theory manages to provide answers to problems which were previously unsuccessfully unanswered by preceding theories (Korosiova, 2013, p.44). In addition, each theory has contributed to the discourse of irony in its own way.

Grice states that irony comes from the opposing sentence and speaker meaning; Leech proposes that irony is used to both criticize and weaken criticism; Wilson and Sperber adds that commonly shared knowledge is important in the interpretation of irony and includes a new type of irony which do not present opposite sentence and speaker meaning; and Giora systematizes the process of interpretation, proposes the term salient meaning, and eventually proposes the indirect negation theory (Korosiova, 2013, p.44). Korosiova also adds that the interpreter’s personality dictates the successfulness of an irony’s interpretation, no theory can be universally applied to all cases of irony, and extra-linguistic cues are helpful in interpreting verbal ironies (Korosiova, 2013, p.44).

d. Purpose of Irony

i. Irony as Criticism

According to the Mention Theory and Pretense Theory, the predominant purpose of irony is criticism (Barbe, 1995, p. 50). Verbal irony is often used to convey criticism to diminish the effect of the criticism intended or brought about by the speaker (Gibbs & Colston, 2007, p. 12). More specifically, ironic criticism may serve as a face-saving act which dampens the effect of a comment on a particular performance or offensive behavior, resulting in a less negatively-
impacted relationship between the speaker and the addressee. (Gibbs & Colston, 2007, p. 314). Ironic criticism on a situation may also be humorous in tone, resulting in a more positive impact on the speaker-addressee relationship as it can be seen as a shared feeling about a situation which both can make light of (Gibbs & Colston, 2007, p. 315). However, ironic criticism can also be face-threatening; this type of ironic criticism is often labeled as sarcasm, intentionally done to attack the addressee blatantly, i.e., the sarcasm is obvious and the statement cannot be retracted by saying “I didn’t mean it” (Barbe, 1995, p. 27-29).

ii. Irony as Praise

According to Gibbs (2007), verbal irony can be praiseful; however, its literal meaning is more difficult to reject compared to that of ironic criticism, i.e., it is easier for the addressee to misunderstand the praise and assume that its literal meaning is the same as the speaker meaning (p. 14-15). To exemplify, a basketball player saying “You really are a bad player” to another player which has performed well can easily be misunderstood as a blatant insult intended to agitate or mock the player.

iii. Irony as Humor

In terms of discourse strategy, irony may be used for humorous purposes (Barbe, 1995, p. 43). However, the use of irony in a joke may also have an underlying intention which is to attack and embarrass the addressees (Barbe, 1995, p. 94). Therefore, the use of irony as criticism and humor can overlap; this is particularly prominent in political humor which is “characterized by its extended use of irony” (Barbe, 1995, p. 95).
C. Theoretical Framework

There are two main objectives which this study attempts to achieve. The first objective is the identification of verbal ironies by Adam Neely and their construction based on floutings of conversational maxims. The second objective is the identification of the correlation between particular maxim floutings and the purposes for which Neely uses these ironical utterances. The theories mentioned in this chapter are used to support this study’s analysis, including the attempt to answer questions related to the aforementioned objectives.

In order to achieve the first objective, the researcher examines Neely’s Q&A videos and identifies possible verbal ironies. These utterances are then scrutinized to determine whether they are ironic by analyzing their sentence meaning within context, relating them to the shared knowledge among Neely and his viewers, which results in the identification of their speaker meaning, revealing their ironic state; this process involves Grice’s CP and Attardo’s theory in the elaboration of the utterances’ implicature and maintained cooperativity implicated by Neely. Each of the determined verbal irony is then further analyzed using Grice’s conversational maxims along with Attardo’s maxim of Appropriateness to find out which maxim it flouts (if any) and quantify the findings by categorizing them based on the maxims these utterances flout to create irony. Whether the maxim of Appropriateness is the determiner of irony is also revealed through this analysis.

To achieve the second objective, the identified verbal ironies are analyzed in relation to their contexts to find out the purposes of their utilizations. The identified purposes are then analyzed side by side with the maxim floutings which
construct the verbal ironies. With this, the correlation between types of maxim floutings and the purposes of irony is revealed. In addition, throughout the whole analysis, the theory of pragmatics provides terminologies and explanations to the general pragmatic phenomena included within.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part is object of the study, in which the research object is described. The second part is approach of the study which describes the linguistic approach used in this study. The last part, method of the study, is divided into two subparts: data collection and data analysis. Data collection explains how the research data were collected and data analysis describes the steps through which the research data were analyzed.

A. Object of the Study

The objects of this research were verbal ironies in the form of sentences and phrases by Adam Neely which were taken from Neely’s Q&A videos on YouTube. There were in total 64 videos, ranging from 6 minutes to 29 minutes in duration, which were examined to identify the verbal ironies contained in them. These videos are all of Neely’s videos under the Q&A category. The first video was uploaded on October 21, 2015 and the latest video (by the time of this writing) was uploaded on September 16, 2019. The videos were mostly done in the same format: Adam Neely responds to questions and comments from his viewers, selected from numerous comments posted in YouTube, Instagram, and Patreon. Neely delivers his answers through one-way communication by talking to the camera as if directly talking to the viewers. The questions and comments vary; most are serious comments, others are less serious ones or jokes, and a tiny portion are offensive or hate comments.
The variety of these questions and comments resulted in that of Neely’s answers or responses. These 64 Q&A videos were purposefully selected because despite the one-way communication style employed within them, the language used still reflect direct communication, particularly Neely’s utterances’ being less planned compared to other essay videos, often prompting Neely’s use of irony.

B. Approach of the Study

The approach of this study is pragmatics. As mentioned, pragmatics is the study of how language is performed or used in communication (Leech, 1983, p.1). The particular aspect of language of which the usage was analyzed in this study is irony. Theories on or consisting description of irony are under the field of pragmatics. Through pragmatics, the construction of verbal ironies can be identified and explained, especially in relation to their flouting of the maxim of Quality (Grice, 1989, p. 34), other Grice’s conversational maxims (Gibbs, 2007, p. 126), and the maxim of Appropriateness (Attardo, 2000, p. 817). It is also through pragmatics that the purpose of the use of verbal ironies can be revealed, such as criticizing, evaluating, humor, and others (Barbe, 1995, p. 121).

C. Method of the Study

1. Data Collection

The data in this study were collected purposefully by selecting Adam Neely’s Q&A videos as the context in which the object of study, irony, was analyzed. According to Cresswell (2009), these videos are categorized as
“qualitative audio and visual materials”, which were purposefully selected for the researcher’s better understanding of irony (p. 178, 181). The purposive sampling used three criteria: (1) the YouTuber has identifiable and consistent characteristics which serve as background knowledge for identifying and scrutinizing their ironies, (2) the YouTuber’s communication style may potentially produce an adequate number of ironies to be studied, and (3) this type of video is rarely analyzed in similar studies and may provide novel findings. A transcription of Neely’s utterances containing ironies were transcribed through repeated listenings by the researcher and cross-checked by the researcher’s colleagues to minimize inaccuracy, resulting in final selection of 120 utterances.

2. Data Analysis

There were several steps through which the data were analyzed in order to answer the problems of this study. The following steps were done using Creswell’s proposition on qualitative procedures as a framework (2009, p. 184-190). First, the Q&A videos were examined to isolate any verbal irony, along with their contexts. Second, these findings were further analyzed to ensure that they were truly ironic; this was done by comparing the speaker meaning and sentence meaning of these utterances and relating the utterances to the shared knowledge between Neely and the viewers. The list of verbal ironies was presented in the appendix in the order of their data codes. Regarding the data code, its format represents utterance, video number, and data number; for example, (U/19/24) refers to utterance number 24 occurring in video number 19. In the discussion, verbal ironies presented as examples were accompanied by their respective data codes.
Third, to answer the first problem, the determined verbal ironies were scrutinized in order to identify their construction, i.e., how their ironies were performed by flouting the five conversational maxims mentioned in Chapter II. This analysis enabled the summarization of maxim flouting occurrences in all of the identified verbal ironies. The summary was put into the following table:

Table 1: Example Table of Summary of Maxim Flouting Occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Flouting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these results, the compositions of maxim floutings were also identified. This was particularly essential in proving Attardo’s proposition concerning the maxim of Appropriateness and the relation among maxim floutings in irony construction. The occurring compositions were put into the following table:

Table 2: Example Table of Summary of Maxim Flouting Compositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim Flouting Composition</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-QT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the end of the analysis, the construction of the verbal ironies was revealed, i.e., the maxims they flouted, what composition of maxim floutings occurred, and what maxim flouting was most prominent; therefore, the first problem was answered.

Lastly, to answer the second problem, each utterance was analyzed in relation to its context. In this step, the purpose of each utterance was identified and
described by relating it to the purpose or tone of the context in which the verbal irony was delivered and its effects. The identified purposes were put into the following table:

**Table 3: Example Table of Summary of Identified Ironic Purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through these steps, this study was able to reveal the maxim floutings and purposes of each verbal irony. From this data, the co-occurrences of maxim floutings and the ironic purposes were then put into the following table:

**Table 4: Example Table of Co-occurrences of Maxim Floutings and Ironic Purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim Flouting Composition</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above made it easier to identify the pattern in which particular maxim flouting compositions co-occurred with certain ironic purposes and to what extent they co-occur. In light of this, the second problem was answered by revealing how these floutings, both standalone and in composition with other maxim floutings, contribute to the fulfillment of the ironic purposes of the utterances in which they occur.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part consists of the description of the general view of the distribution of maxim floutings, the discussion on how conversational maxims are flouted in the identified verbal ironies and their correlations with one another, and the comparison of these findings with Grice’s and Attardo’s theories of irony. The second part discusses the purposes of Neely’s use of irony and their correlations with the compositions of maxim flouting.

A. Maxim Floutings in the Construction of Verbal Ironies

Based on the analysis on Neely’s 64 Q&A videos, it was found that there are in total 127 ironies. However, this research only included 120 ironies to make the quantification of the data more comprehensible. The code of each irony, the verbal ironies, the occurring floutings in each utterance, and the explanation of the occurring floutings in each irony were put into a data table. From these findings, the summary of occurring maxim floutings can be seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim</th>
<th>Flouting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness (AP)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (QL)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity (QT)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner (MN)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation (RL)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Occurrences</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This summary shows that the maxim of Appropriateness occurs the most, followed by the maxim of Quality. From the 120 verbal ironies, the maxim of Appropriateness and Quality occur more than 90% and 80% of the time respectively. Compared to these two, other conversational maxims rarely occur, with the maxim of Quantity being the next most frequent maxim, occurring approximately 14% of the time.

1. Compositions of Maxim Floutings

In a verbal irony, there may occur more than one type of maxim flouting. Therefore, before delving into each maxim flouting and describing their contributions in the construction of irony, it is necessary to analyze the maxim floutings based on their compositions in order to comprehend how the maxim floutings correlate to one another. The maxim flouting compositions occurring in the data are summarized in the following table:

**Table 6: Summary of Maxim Flouting Compositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim Flouting Composition</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QL-AP</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT-AP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-QT-AP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-RL-MN-AP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN-AP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-RL-AP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-MN-AP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Data</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study found out that the most occurring composition of maxim floutings is QL-AP, which is in accordance with the previous findings which show that the maxim
of Appropriateness and Quality occur the most. Other compositions rarely occur in the ironies with not much disparity among their occurrence percentages. This summary shows several notable aspects: only floutings of the maxim of Appropriateness and Quantity occur without any other maxim flouting; many compositions are not present, such as AP-RL and multiple-maxim compositions without AP; and there are verbal ironies which do not contain any maxim flouting. In order to fully comprehend these compositions, each of them is analyzed and discussed.

As aforementioned in chapter I, the verbal ironies in this study occur in indirect dialogues in which Neely talks to future viewers, usually responding to comments on his social media accounts or elaborating on a certain topic. Due to this, Neely’s responses to the comments and the viewer’s reception of Neely’s messages are delayed and might have impacted some aspects of the language used which might differ from direct dialogues involving interchanging communicators and immediate feedbacks.

It is important to note that all the verbal ironies provided in this chapter involve the same S and H, which are Adam Neely and the viewers of Neely’s video respectively. Meanwhile, the contexts of the verbal ironies are either Neely’s reply to a comment or part of his elaboration on a particular topic. However, the elaboration of the verbal ironies’ contexts cannot be generalized as the details of the context, e.g., the tone, form, and content of the comment, are mostly varied, and therefore, the context of each example is described. In addition, irony markers in the examples are underlined. Other additional details, such as the utterance’s
timestamp and the full comment addressed by the utterance, can be found in the general data sheet in the appendix.

a. Flouting of Appropriateness Maxim

The AP composition occurs 3.33% of the time (4 cases); this low occurrence is possibly because the condition which enables this flouting, the deliberate inappropriateness of an utterance, is often achieved by flouting other maxims. This indicates that it might be difficult to flout the maxim of Appropriateness without flouting other maxims.

The following example is part of Neely’s response to the numerous negative comments in his video “How and Why Classical Musicians Feel Music Differently”:

(U/19/24) So, if you’re ever interested in seeing what it’s like to be a classical musician and have your feelings hurt, read the comment section of the “How and Why Classical Musicians Feel Music Differently”.

In example (U/19/24), all of Grice’s conversational maxims are fulfilled. It is truthful, not lacking information, not particularly verbose, and relevant to the topic being discussed. However, the statement can be seen as inappropriate by how it “attempts” to reach out to those who are in an unrealistic or unlikely situation, namely those being “interested in seeing what it is like to be a classical musician and have your feelings hurt”. By having the knowledge of Neely’s personality and his response to the negative commenters, mostly classical musicians, on his video which is addressed prior to this statement, it is obvious that this statement is an ironic remark to those commenters, as if indirectly saying to the viewers, “Look at all these offended classical musicians in the comments that missed the point I made...
in my video.” Therefore, the inappropriate condition is deliberately produced, flouting the maxim of Appropriateness.

Another example below is from Neely’s elaboration on contemporary music, particularly Electronic Dance Music (EDM):

(U/19/26) … and that’s something that’s a very contemporary idea in 20th century modernism anyway. So, you could say that, “Hey, Skrillex is a 20th century modernist.”

The example above also displays no flouting of Grice’s conversational maxims. It is a “conclusion” of Neely’s explanation on how bass tones in EDM produce subharmonics in the upper register that goes outside the key of the song, which is a novel idea in the 20th century. Therefore, the underlined statement is logical. However, this sounds so wrong to those well versed in music; EDM, the genre in which Skrillex is known for, is generally not perceived as a sophisticated music genre by many musicians as it relies heavily on digital production and is rather monotonous composition-wise compared to jazz and classical music. Therefore, “20th century modernist”, a phrase which emanates a sophisticated connotation, does not suit Skrillex at all and hence the inappropriateness of this utterance.

These two examples show how the maxim of Appropriateness can be flouted alone. However, the inappropriateness of these utterances is rather subtle and their irony might often be overlooked. Perhaps this subtlety is difficult to achieve compared to a blatant inappropriateness by the means of flouting other maxims, thus rarely does it occur, particularly in the data of this study.
b. Flouting of Quantity Maxim

The QT composition occurs in 2 cases (1.67%). This low occurrence is probably because of the difficulty in flouting QT without consequently flouting AP. Below is an example of a verbal irony flouting the maxim of Quantity. The example is taken from Neely’s response to a comment on his video about how the commenter forgot that Neely plays music.

(U/38/57) I have been known to play music from time to time.

In the example above, the underlined phrase is a belittlement which flouts the Quality maxim because it purposefully omits the full scope of Neely’s frequency in playing music. His prominence as a performing musician can be seen in his gig videos where he performs with Sungazer, his band, and also with other musicians in various events, such as concerts, celebratory events, and tours; therefore, it is unlikely that Neely only plays music “from time to time”. Although the phrase is borderline flouting the Quality maxim (if “from time to time” is interpreted as “rarely”), the researcher felt that this statement can be perceived as truthful when considering that “time from time” does not necessarily imply the inactivity in between the “times” but instead leaves them unmentioned, and therefore, is not inherently false.

It is actually quite dilemmatic whether to include the flouting of the Appropriateness maxim or not for this utterance because the viewers do not actually know precisely how often Neely performs. Therefore, this utterance may be true to a certain extent and thus appropriate. Moreover, one might suspect that Neely’s YouTube activities might have forced him to cut down on his performances. In
addition, despite its suspected appropriateness, the ironic tone of the utterance still remains, especially due to the fact that this is a reply to a commenter saying that he forgot that Neely is a musician (because viewers mostly see Neely as a YouTuber) and Neely’s delivery is done in a mischievous manner (displaying a small grin).

Another example below is part of Neely’s opening words in his video about the abundance of YouTube videos discussing the topic of what makes Christmas songs sound as such.

(U/43/64) This all probably got started because of last year’s video from Vox where Adam Ragusea tries to make the case that D minor 7 flat 5 makes Christmas songs sound “Christmasy” which is, uhm, not the best analysis.

The example above is similar to the previous one, in which the underlined words are an understatement of the reality. However, while the previous one understates a positive fact, this one understates the negative fact that Vox’s analysis of Christmas songs is bad (Neely follows this up with his rebuttal of Vox’s argument on this topic while providing his own). The appropriateness of this example is also rather difficult to determine; some might find it inappropriate while others might not. However, the researcher decides to determine this utterance to be appropriate due to the fact that the ironic phrase is truthful and its irony is not emanated by its untruthfulness (which would have made it inappropriate) but rather by its delivery and impact: it can be seen as an attempt to blatantly convey a harsh judgement without directly spouting harsh words—a very mild ridicule.

These two examples show how flouting the maxim of Quantity by itself can create irony, which in turn creates several characteristics particular to this flouting composition. First, the irony is subtle. Second, the sentence meaning is a
generalization of the speaker meaning, which in both cases produce a belittlement. Lastly, the irony is mainly conveyed through the delivery of the utterances: the speaker seems rather unserious in his delivery, indicated by a small grin as if holding back his laughter.

c. Flouting of Quality-Appropriateness Maxim

The QL-AP composition occurs in 87 cases or 72.5% of the time. This composition is the most prevalent among all occurring compositions found in the data of this study. The example below is Neely’s response to the comment, “Singing on a roof real original, you should be singing under a rock to spare my ears, your [sic] not good.”

(U/2/3) Thank you, random troll. It’s moments like this where I really love the internet.

In the example above, the gratitude is insincere, thus flouting the Quality maxim and consequently, the Appropriateness maxim. The gratitude is unfounded and can be perceived as a sarcasm towards the commenter. This particular type of irony is a reoccurring theme in most of utterances of the QL-AP composition. Here are several other examples taken from similar contexts and employing similar sarcastic tones:

(U/1/1) So, the person that wrote the script for that spambot, I really wanna thank you because if the singularity is coming and the robots are about to take over the world…

(U/14/14) Your intelligence knows no bounds.

(U/19/27) Oh, my God! Thank you, spambot. Thank you for that Mahjong cheat, I really needed it.
(U/45/69) Sorry. I apologize. I’ll get better curtains for future videos because that’s really what people want to see in Adam Neely’s channel: his curtains.

(U/34/48) Thank you for proving my point because you just showed an incredible degree of contempt towards pop music…

The examples above exhibit several similar features: they exhibit insincerity by stating blatant lies, addressed to certain individuals, and are responses to negative comments. However, not all ironies of the QL-AP composition are of this particular type. Here are other examples of Neely’s response which differ to those above:

(U/3/5) I gotta tell you, that’s probably the greatest compliment anybody has ever given to me.

(U/16/18) There we go. That’s the genesis of clapping music.

The two examples above are inappropriate due to their untruthfulness which is caused by their hyperbolic statements. In example (U/3/50), the underlined words refer to the comment “(your music) Made my cat hide” which is not a compliment at all. Meanwhile, the ironic phrase in example (U/16/18) refers to Neely’s arrangement in a previous video which added clapping sounds to the song Bang Bang, which is definitely not the genesis of clapping music.

Besides the examples shown above, other utterances flouting the maxim of Quality and Appropriateness mainly involves stating inherently false—and sometimes absurd—statements to amuse the viewers, for example:

(U/39/59) If you have to ask, you’ll never know. (Replying to the question “What is Jazz?”)

(U/34/50) It’s coming next week, I promise. And I promise you that you will hear 200,000 notes and it will be ridiculous. So, don’t worry. (Replying to a question asking for Neely’s 200k subscriber commemoration video)
All of the examples above suggest that there are various ways in which the maxim of Quality can be flouted. And due to Attardo’s statement regarding Quality maxim as the main determiner of Appropriateness maxim, all utterances which flout the Quality maxim consequentially flout the Appropriateness maxim (2000, p. 818).

d. **Flouting of Quantity-Appropriateness Maxim**

The QT-AP composition appears in 9 cases or 7.5% of the time. Compared to other compositions, QT-AP occurs more frequently although its number of occurrences is still a far cry from QL-AP’s. Below is one of the examples which is Neely’s reply to an Instagram comment asking about how Neely managed to find the topics of his videos.

(U/13/12) I click a lot of links on Wikipedia.

In the example above, the flouting of Quantity maxim is done by giving a brief statement which understate the actual work Neely does to find and flesh out his topics. The answer can be seen as inadequate and lack the substantiality expected by the commenter; this inadequacy thus can be assumed as inappropriate and ironic. Here is another example similar to the one above, which is Neely’s reply to a comment asking about the scarcity of bass solos in jazz songs:

(U/31/44) Because bass solos suck.

Similar to the previous example, the utterance above is also inadequate and insincere. The Quantity flouting is done through the stating of a relevant yet inadequate information. The commenter is probably expecting an answer from a musical point of view, which is a proper inquiry due to the fact that Neely is a jazz musician which often elaborates musical topics from technical, cultural, and ethical
perspectives. However, Neely instead replies with a humorous notion stemming from a general stigma of bass solos in song compositions. The stigma that bass solos are terrible might be a result of a collective experience and could have been explained using the perspective of music composition or other grounded reasonings, and yet Neely deliberately provided an inadequate and inappropriate answer. Due to this, the statement becomes ironic.

The QT-AP composition is similar to the QT composition in the sense that they both flout the Quantity maxim which is often done through belittlement, resulting in their inadequacy. The main difference between them is that the QT-AP composition is insincere, i.e., Neely could’ve provided a “better” and more suitable answer, yet he did not, and therefore, answered inappropriately, while on the other hand, the QT composition is rather sincere in the way that the belittlement is considered contextually appropriate (there is no “better” statement) despite the pertaining ironic tone caused by a degree of disparity between the statement and the reality.

e. Flouting of Manner-Appropriateness Maxim

The MN-AP composition occurs in only 1 case or 0.84% of the time. Below is an example of MN-AP flouting, taken from Neely’s reply to an Instagram comment asking whether Neely likes fishsticks.

(U/51/80) I love putting fishsticks in my mouth.

The utterance above flouts the maxim of Manner because it is verbose, i.e., it overly describes eating fishsticks which creates an ironic tone to the answer that could have been a simple “yes”. The irony comes from the seemingly mocking statement,
although some might also perceive it as Neely’s being too engrossed in his love of fishsticks. All in all, there is only one case for MN-AP and it is quite ambiguous, which implies that Manner maxim flouting which creates inappropriateness and irony is probably unconventional.

f. Flouting of Quality-Quantity-Appropriateness Maxim

The QL-QT-AP composition occurs in 7 cases or 5.84% of the time. Below is an example of the QL-QT-AP composition, taken from Neely’s announcement of his receiving the YouTube “play button” for having 100,000 subscribers on his YouTube channel.

(U/27/36) …YouTube just sent me this thing. It’s the YouTube “play button” that they give for getting a hundred thousand subscribers which is a number so large, the human mind cannot wrap its head around it.

In the example above, the Quantity maxim is flouted by belittling the YouTube 100,000-subscriber award; although it definitely is a plaque designed to depict a play button, the way Neely states this nonchalantly understates its purpose and worth. Meanwhile, the Quality maxim is flouted by the other underlined words which form a false statement, consequently flouting the Appropriateness maxim. Both floutings create irony but are incidentally in the same context and therefore, are listed as one composition of three floutings. Below is another example taken from Neely’s explanation of the mechanism controlling bass sound production in pipe organs.

(U/30/41) So, this comes from organ pedals as in pipe organs as in the giant king of instruments, the big thing that they have in churches.
In the example above, the first underlined phrase is a hyperbole, flouting the maxim of Quality as it states a fabricated fact. The second underlined phrase flouts the maxim of Quantity by providing an oversimplified description of a pipe organ. The inappropriateness of the utterance is due to the falseness produced by flouting the Quality maxim. Below is another example which is similar to (U/30/41), which is part of Neely’s explanation on his credibility as a music advisor as a response to a comment questioning Neely’s authority.

(U/38/58) … I speak from authority from two places. The first place, oh, one second… the first place is this piece of paper.

In the utterance above, the first underlined phrase is a false statement which is later clarified by Neely; yet, in the moment this line is perceived, it is indeed ironic, especially due to the fact that Neely often emphasizes the freedom of music, i.e., no one is in a position of enforcing others in terms of music making or listening. This statement is made as a covert expression of Neely’s competent. Meanwhile, the second underlined phrase is a belittlement of Neely’s diploma in Jazz Composition. This creates a particularly strong ironic tone due to the fact that Neely is explaining how his formal education, proved by the diploma, gives a certain degree of credibility for him to educate others in music, and yet the explanation is delivered while belittling the diploma itself. This belittlement contributes to the inappropriateness which has been established by the false statement earlier.

In conclusion, in the examples given, both Quality and Quantity maxim floutings contribute to the inappropriateness and the irony of the utterance. However, if one flouting were to be omitted, the irony would still pertain.
Therefore, that the floutings of Quality and Quantity maxim occur simultaneously is merely incidental and is not employed out of necessity in creating irony.

g. **Flouting of Quality-Relation-Appropriateness Maxim**

The QL-RL-AP composition occurs only in 1 case or 0.84% of the time. Below is an example which is Neely’s response to a comment asking whether Neely ever thought about writing a new song so he could have more than one background music for his videos (Neely mainly uses one of his band’s songs as background music).

(U/15/16) Oh, man, thank you so much for volunteering to write some background music for my channel! It’s very nice of you!

In the irony above, the Quality maxim is flouted through the insincere gratitude while the Relation maxim is flouted by the seemingly irrelevant reply; Neely’s remark that the commenter has volunteered to write some background music for Neely’s channel is implying “If you’re not happy with my background music, why don’t you write me one yourself?” The irrelevance of the utterance is a way of stating that Neely feels offended by the question and refuses to address it directly. In this case, the flouting of the Quality and Relation maxim work hand in hand in creating the ironic reply. Therefore, the flouting composition is not coincidental but correlates to each other in producing irony.

h. **Flouting of Quality-Manner-Appropriateness Maxim**

The QL-MN-AP composition occurs in 1 case or 0.84% of the time, which shown in the utterance below, Neely’s response to a comment saying that the video (which it is commenting on) is absolutely useless.
(U/31/43) Well, I appreciate that, but remember this: all knowledge is completely and utterly useless until it’s not.

In the example above, the flouting of the Quality maxim is done through insincere appreciation, which results in inappropriateness. The flouting of the Manner maxim is done through Neely’s redundant statement about knowledge and how the commenter should think on that. In this case, the Quality maxim flouting can stand alone but the utterance would be lacking the “bite” which is prominent in Neely’s other ironic remarks, especially those intended to be sarcastic. Therefore, similar to the QL-RL-AP composition, in this particular case, the flouting composition correlates to each other in creating the irony.

i. Flouting of Quality-Relation-Manner-Appropriateness Maxim

The last composition, QL-RL-MN-AP, is the only four-type composition and it occurs in 2 cases or 1.67% of the time. Below is a case containing the QL-RL-MN-AP composition taken from Neely’s response to a particular comment which is a complaint written in a very lengthy manner and filled with grammatical errors, excessive punctuations, obscenities, and uppercase phrases to imply shouting (see appx.).

(U/1/1) So, the person that wrote the script for that spambot, I really wanna thank you because if the singularity is coming and the robots are about to take over the world, you can see that they are able to generate some beautiful gibberish just in the attempt to get around YouTube spam filter. We get art, We get really really really beautiful art. It doesn’t make any sort of sense, but, you know, the best art doesn’t really have to. So, thank you.

In the utterance above, the Quality maxim is flouted through insincere gratitude and the false notion that the comment being replied to is a script for a spambot, which also flouts the Appropriateness maxim. Meanwhile, the Relation maxim is flouted
by the irrelevant talk about the singularity, robots, and art (the art part can also be
seen as a sarcastic reference to the comment, and therefore, flouting the maxim of
Quality). Lastly, the Manner maxim is flouted through the verbosity of the
utterance. Below is another example which is Neely’s reply to an Instagram
comment asking, “Does Adam Neely is [sic] gay?”.

(U/51/82) I think the real question is does Leonard Bernstein is gay [sic],
and I think we all know the answer to that: Bruno Mars.

In the verbal irony above, the Quality maxim is flouted through Neely’s insincere
statements of untrue thoughts (there is no “real question”, and if there were, it would
not be “does Leonard Bernstein is [sic] gay”), thus making the utterance
inappropriate. The Relation maxim is flouted through the irrelevance of the
utterance, especially that “Bruno Mars” is the answer to the question “Does Leonard
Bernstein is [sic] gay?”. The Manner maxim is flouted through the intentional
grammatical incorrectness which mimics the original comment. Both of these
floutings contribute in creating this ironic statement which a “proper” response to
the comment.

j. None

There are 6 cases (5%) in which no maxim is flouted despite the irony of
the utterances. These non-flouting ironies are included in the analysis because they
are ironies nonetheless and analyzing them may reveal other linguistic aspects
besides maxim flouting which can construct verbal irony. Below is an example
taken from Neely’s reply to a comment asking about Neely’s opinion on one’s
aspiration of becoming a YouTuber.
(U/19/25) No, it’s definitely not bad, but maybe your parents might think it’s bad if they are not enlightened to what it means to be a creative professional.

Neely’s reply is sincere and does not flout any maxim; yet, the underlined words sound a bit sarcastic and ironic. This ironic tone might stem from how people often formalize connotative words when delivering a degrading statement in attempt to avoid offending related parties. In this case, “do not know” is replaced by “not enlightened to” and “YouTuber” is replaced by “creative professional”; the formalized words create an impression of sophistication and class which is not conveyed by the casual form of the words—and perhaps, straying from what people perceive in reality—thus creating a sense of deliberate pretentiousness which feels ironic.

Below is another example which is Neely’s response to a comment saying, “This is what happens when science people try to engage with musical creativity. What a bore.”

(U/29/39) So, I’m a science person apparently.

It is clear that the utterance does not flout any maxim; it is an appropriate response and refers to a factual phenomenon. However, the utterance sounds ironic due to the fact that Neely is not a science person. The opinion of the commenter perhaps stems from the fact that Neely approaches music with a handful of music theory and explains it to the viewers through a dissection of music elements in a congruous and logical manner, which resembles a scientific discussion rather than a musical one.
A possible explanation for the cause of irony in this particular utterance is that the comment being responded to is also ironic in nature. It is possible that “science people” is meant as a derogatory connotative expression for “people who calculate or think in terms of theory too much”. Had the original comment been conveyed in a direct manner such as this, Neely’s response would have been different.

Below is another case of a non-flouting irony taken from Neely’s response to a comment suggesting that Neely should be a music teacher.

(U/31/42) That’s a great idea. It’s almost as if that’s exactly what I do here on this channel.

In the utterance above, there is no maxim flouting involved. Neely has often stated that if given the chance, he would love to have a teaching position in music college, especially since his videos have been used as teaching materials in schools and varsities according to some of the commenters. Therefore, the statement that the idea is great is not false nor insincere. The second sentence is also true; what Neely is doing in his videos is essentially teaching music, almost exactly as what music teachers do. However, it is from this second sentence that the irony emerges. This phenomenon is due to the fact that the statement is talking about a situational irony: a YouTuber who teaches music is not a “music teacher” despite that the YouTuber’s work is essentially the same as a “music teacher”, or even—more ironically—produce better results for far more people. Therefore, the irony of the utterance comes from the situational irony which is stated by it.

In conclusion, occasionally there are verbal ironies which do not flout any maxims. These utterances are appropriate in nature and the factors that induces
ironic interpretation differ to one another. These ironies essentially defy the definition of irony given by Attardo as well as that by the researcher. This result suggests that it is difficult to precisely define irony and set clear borders to what utterances are ironic and what are not.

2. Maxim Floutings in the Construction of Irony

In the previous section, how each type of maxim flouting contributes to the construction of irony and how the floutings correlate to one another in the studied cases have been described. In light of this, we can now reveal the characteristics of each conversational maxim flouting in irony construction. The following are the results of the scrutiny of conversational maxim floutings found in this study, of which the elaboration is partitioned, focusing on each conversational maxim.

a. Flouting of Quality Maxim

Among Grice’s four conversational maxims, the Quality maxim is flouted the most with a total of 98 floutings or 41.52% of 235 flouting occurrences. In terms of flouting compositions, it occurs in 99 out of 120 cases or 82.5% of the time. The flouting of Quality maxim is tied very closely to the flouting of Appropriateness maxim due to Attardo’s notion that the Appropriateness maxim is violated if an utterance is false or insincere, which is also a violation of the Quality maxim. Therefore, the Quality maxim cannot be flouted without simultaneously flouting the Appropriateness maxim but not vice versa.

In several cases, the Quality maxim flouting also occurs with other conversational maxim floutings; this is due to the fact that flouting the Quality maxim is the most common—and perhaps easiest—method to construct irony,
which is suggested by the analysis result, showing that only 10.83% of the identified verbal ironies occur without flouting the Quality maxim. It seems that blatant insincerity or falsity is more easily perceived as ironic than other floutings, e.g., verbosity, ungrammaticality, irrelevancy, and inadequacy. This ease of ironic perception might be the reason that insincere gratitude is the most common means of flouting the Quality maxim.

b. Flouting of Quantity Maxim

The Quantity maxim is the third most flouted maxim after the Appropriateness and Quality maxim, occurring 19 times out of 235 flouting occurrences or 8.05%. In terms of flouting composition, it pairs with the Appropriateness maxim the most, in which the inappropriateness of the utterance is caused by the Quantity maxim flouting. The other maxim with which it pairs is the Quality maxim, in which the irony of the utterance is mainly due to the Quality maxim flouting; the role of Quantity maxim flouting in these utterances is to add a layer of depth to the irony—adding bits of ironic words or phrases to the general ironic notion. In the identified verbal ironies, Quantity maxim flouting does not occur with Relation and Manner maxim flouting. The most common means of flouting the Quantity maxim is by belittlement of an object or fact.

c. Flouting of Relation Maxim

The Relation maxim is the least flouted maxim, occurring only 3 times or 1.27% of all flouting occurrences. In all cases, the Relation maxim is flouted by ignoring the question or context of the comment and delivering an incongruous reply instead. In the identified cases, all three are accompanied by Quality maxim
flouting. In two cases, the Quality maxim flouting is in the form of insincere gratitude; in the other case, the Quality maxim flouting is done by stating a false statement. Therefore, the Quality maxim flouting is not included in the irrelevant utterance per se but accompanies it.

d. Flouting of Manner Maxim

The Manner maxim is the second least flouted maxim, occurring only 4 times or 1.69% of all flouting occurrences. The only case where Manner maxim flouting induces inappropriateness by itself is a bit arguable as it may be seen as an ironic statement or a sincere one depending on the perceiver as it is related to whether Neely is fond of fish sticks, a matter which has never been revealed to his viewers. Therefore, it remains questionable whether Manner maxim flouting is capable of creating inappropriateness and irony by itself.

In the other 2 cases, the Manner maxim flouting is accompanied by Quality maxim flouting; in these cases, the irony of the utterance has been preestablished by insincere gratitude, and therefore, their verbosity, the means of flouting the Manner maxim in these particular cases, serves to accentuate the irony instead of inducing it. In the last case, the irony is mainly due to the irrelevance of the utterance rather than the ungrammaticality; akin to the previous two cases, the Manner maxim flouting also serves as an addition to the irony, which in this case is to heighten the humor (which will be further explained in the later parts of this chapter). In conclusion, flouting the Manner maxim seems to help accentuate or add to the existing irony; however, the low number of floutings suggests that it is rarely done—at least in this studies’ findings.
e. Flouting of Appropriateness Maxim

The Appropriateness maxim is the most flouted maxim with 112 occurrences or 47.46% of all maxim occurrences. This high occurrence is related to how it always accompanies Quality maxim flouting due to its correlation with falsity/insincerity. However, inappropriateness is not merely a result of falsity as it may arise due to other floutings.

In the cases where the Appropriateness maxim is flouted alone, the inappropriateness comes from factual and logical statements which sounds wrong when put into context, especially when comparing them to Neely’s preestablished knowledge, personality, and opinions on related subjects. Meanwhile, there are 9 cases in which inappropriateness is not induced by Quality maxim flouting: 8 of them are due to Quantity maxim flouting and 1 is the dubious Manner maxim flouting. In the QT-AP composition, the flouting of Appropriateness maxim correlates to the use of belittlement and the inadequacy of the utterances in replying the comments. In the three cases of Relation maxim flouting, the utterances also contain Quality maxim flouting and the Appropriateness maxim is flouted through both floutings of Relation maxim and Quality maxim.

B. The Purposes of Irony Based on Maxim Floutings

As aforementioned in chapter 2, there are 3 purposes of irony: criticism, praise, and humor. However, after scrutinizing the verbal ironies, it is identified that there are several utterances intended as both criticism and humor; due to this, these
utterances are labelled as criticism-humor, assuming the position of the 4th ironic purpose found in this study.

The following is a general view of the identified ironic purposes:

Table 7: Summary of Identified Ironic Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism-humor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Data</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that humor is the most occurring purpose of irony used by Neely despite the aforementioned notion by the Mention Theory and Pretense Theory that criticism is the predominant purpose of irony. This contrasting finding is not because humor occurs frequently in the data as a secondary purpose cooccurring with criticism—as these cases have been put into a separate purpose category—but instead suggests that Neely employs irony mainly as a tool of delivering humor instead of other ironic purposes. Another possibility is that Neely does not criticize as much as he jokes due to Neely’s position as a YouTuber whose main goal in creating content is to gain more views and subscribers and therefore, humorous content is more entertaining and aligned with his goals than being critical, especially harshly and frequently; however, this cannot be concretely proven as both Neely’s criticism and humor which do not employ irony are not observed.

Another reason for humor’s dominance in Neely’s videos is because of the nature of the videos. As aforementioned, a YouTuber’s main goal is to gain viewers and subscribers, and therefore, YouTube videos are usually catered to fulfil this goal, which explains the abundance of humor as an entertaining aspect to raise
Neely’s viewership. In addition, there is a phenomenon in social media where people tend to seek attention by the number of likes on their comment or by being included in a YouTube video. This is made easier by commenting humorously, even to the extent that the comment is copy-pasted from another popular comment. Therefore, this phenomenon affects Neely’s exposure to humor and in turn affects his responses, which raises the amount of humorous ironies he produces. This is why the analysis results do not reflect the general notions of irony; this particular setting is different from those analyzed and exemplified by theories on irony.

To identify the purposes of Neely’s verbal ironies based on the maxim floutings employed, the occurring floutings in each verbal irony and the purpose of the utterance respective to those floutings are identified as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxim Flouting Composition</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Criticism-Humor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-QT-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-RL-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-MN-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL-RL-MN-AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that almost all compositions of maxim floutings are used for both critical and humorous purposes. It is also apparent that criticism-humor almost exclusively employs QL-AP flouting. In addition, it is important to notice that since
there is only one data of praise, which is definitely inadequate, it is not possible to
gain a concrete conclusion on the correlation between maxim floutings and praise
in this study. Therefore, only criticism, humor, and criticism-humor can be analyzed
in correlation with the maxims flouted in their respective utterances. On another
note, as this subchapter is dedicated to identify the correlation between ironic
purposes and maxim floutings, verbal ironies which do not flout any maxim will
not be analyzed.

1. Criticism

a. Flouting of Appropriateness Maxim

There is one instance of criticism in which only AP is flouted, which is in
the utterance below, taken from Neely’s response to the numerous negative
comments on his video “How and Why Classical Musicians Feel Music
Differently”

(U/19/24) So, if you’re ever interested in seeing what it’s like to be a
classical musician and have your feelings hurt, read the comment
section of the “How and Why Classical Musicians Feel Music
Differently”.

As aforementioned, the Appropriateness Maxim is flouted due to the purposeful
stating of an improbable condition which functions as an ironic determiner,
essentially conveying look at all these offended classical musicians. The whole
point of the criticism is possibly not totally conveyed by this single sentence—what
follows is a discourse on how his video in which the classical musicians commented
is not meant to degenerate or look down on classical musicians but to show how
rhythm is felt differently in an orchestra setting compared to a band setting—but
through this part of the argument, Neely has at least conveyed his disapproval of
the classical musicians’ “unreasonable” contempt and that they should’ve perceived the actual message of the video more open-mindedly. This single data does not give much insight on how AP flouting correlates with criticism, but in this particular case, the stating of an improbable condition referring to an actual phenomenon serves to criticize the subjects of the phenomenon and implicating that these subjects are in the wrong.

b. Flouting of Quantity Maxim

The QT composition is flouted once in Neely’s criticism, which is in the example below, taken from Neely’s explanation on why there are an abundance of YouTube videos talking about what makes Christmas songs sound “Christmasy”.

(U/43/64) This all probably got started because of last year’s video from Vox where Adam Ragusea tries to make the case that D minor 7 flat 5 makes Christmas songs sound “Christmasy” which is, uhm, not the best analysis.

In this utterance, the underlined words flout QT by understating the intended message, which is that Ragusea’s analysis on what makes a Christmas song sound “Christmasy” is flawed and therefore, bad. The use of an understatement in this context is to minimize face-attack. “Not the best analysis” does not point to one particular quality but can refer to a spectrum of qualities, ranging from “worst” to “second best”. Due to this, although the viewers may easily grasp the intended meaning in this irony, the criticism is more acceptable in the sense that upon hearing it, one can feel Neely’s intention to critique without being condescending.

c. Flouting of Quality-Appropriateness Maxim

Neely’s ironic criticisms mostly employ QL-AP flouting, occurring 20 times or 71.42% of the total criticism occurrences. Most of the criticisms of this
type are sarcastic, delivering insincere gratitude and false praises. As mentioned in *Irony in Context* by Barbe (1995), sarcasm is “a potentially face-threatening and attacking criticism which forces an ironic interpretation” (p. 29). Below are several examples from the data, which are Neely’s responses to negative comments on his YouTube videos.

(U/1/1) So, the person that wrote the script for that spambot, I really wanna thank you…

(U/2/3) Thank you, random troll.

(U/31/43) Well, I appreciate that…

The insincere gratitude shown in the examples above, if perceived as ironic, signifies that Neely denounces the particular action, statement, or person referred in his statement. The use of sarcasm instead of direct criticism is possibly done to dampen the “aggression” in the face-attack because some viewers might be uncomfortable with directly confrontational statements. In addition, the use of irony also occasionally comes as humorous, a big plus to Neely’s videos from the viewers’ standpoint, which will be discussed in the criticism-humor category.

Besides insincere gratitude, other ironic criticisms flouting QL-AP employ statements which are expected to be perceived by the viewers as blatantly contradictory or false. This type of irony requires a certain amount of background knowledge—particularly those related to common sense, Neely himself (personality, background, etc.), and music (theory, history, etc.)—to be perceived as ironic. Below are several examples of this:

(U/18/22) You are right. When people think about me, they think about Boris Johnson…
(U/20/31) Yeah, man, p-basses are really infantile. Pino Paladino? Most infantile bass player there is.

(U/39/61) …but, you know, if I looked outside, I would probably see the collective eye roll of every single human being over the age of 20 who read this comment…

(U/36/53) …because numerology is not the same thing as mathematics. Mathematicians really don’t care about any sort of coincidences between numbers, especially if those numbers aren’t an objective reflection of reality.

In example (U/18/22) and (U/20/31), the underlined words are blatant lies which echo their referred comments, creating obvious false statements which emphasize on how the commenters are wrong. However, in example (U/39/61) and (U/36/53), the underlined words are hyperboles which emphasize their respective messages to make a point to the commenter. The main difference between these two types of criticism is that the first type stops at the “ridicule” whereas the second type uses the hyperbole during the process of explaining the argumentation. This difference suggests that the QL-AP flouting in the first type is the main tool to deliver the message while it is a subsidiary tool in the second type.

d. Flouting of Quality-Quantity-Appropriateness Maxim

QL-QT-AP is flouted once in Neely’s criticism, which is in the utterance below, which is a part of from Neely’s response to a comment questioning Neely’s “authority” in music.

(U/38/58) …I speak from authority from two places. The first place, oh, one second… the first place is this piece of paper. This piece of paper represents an old system, the academic system which requires this piece of paper to teach. …

In the utterance above, “I speak from the authority” flouts QL and AP while “piece of paper” flouts QT. To put the utterance in context, it is a reply to a comment
asking about who made Neely an authority on what is good and is not good (in terms of music composition). “I speak from the authority” is false or hyperbolic; the background knowledge required to perceive this irony is that Neely has often conveyed that nobody should dictate how one should create or listen to music because music is subjective and nobody’s opinion on music is absolute, they are merely a matter of taste and preference. Meanwhile, the “piece of paper” is a belittlement of Neely’s master’s diploma on Jazz Composition. While it certainly is a piece of paper, this statement does not signify its importance in this context per se; instead, it emphasizes the non-valuable aspect of the arguably valuable object, resulting in a contradiction.

Meanwhile, the flouting of QL in the utterance is deliberately used as an echo of the comment being replied. In a sense, Neely implies that he definitely has the credibility to comment upon one’s composition but his comment is merely an opinion and he is not the authority. In other words, not only does Neely answer whether he is capable of determining what is good and what is not, but he also criticizes the commenter’s belief that Neely behaves like an authority on music. Besides that, the flouting of QT is used in reference to his previous remarks about how a diploma is not necessary in creating music and does not increase one’s value as a musician, especially when perceived by other musicians. However, his following elaboration on how the system requires the “piece of paper” to teach in an academic institution signifies that the diploma is a prove of one’s education on music which is the foundation from which Neely constructs his criticisms on music.
e. Flouting of Quality-Relation-Appropriateness Maxim

QL-RL-AP is flouted once in Neely’s criticism, which is in the utterance below, taken from Neely’s response to a comment asking why Neely does not write a new song so he can have more than one background music.

(U/15/16) Oh, man, thank you so much for volunteering to write some background music for my channel! It’s very nice of you!

In the verbal irony above, QL is flouted through the use of insincere gratitude and remark while RL is flouted through the unrelated statement that the commenter is volunteering to write some background music for Neely. The flouting of QL through sarcasm is possibly used to convey how the commenter is being overly demanding and that writing music just to have more background music is a very trivial reason to create music, particularly in the context of Neely and his YouTube Channel. Meanwhile, the flouting of RL is used to suggest that the commenter should make some music for Neely if he/she is really bored of the background music Neely uses. All in all, the QL flouting in this case is akin to those discussed in the QL-AP section while the RL flouting is used specifically to criticize an action while suggesting a more appropriate action.

f. Flouting of Quality-Manner-Appropriateness Maxim

The QL-MN-AP composition is flouted once in Neely’s criticism, which is Neely’s response to a comment saying, “This video is absolutely, and utterly useless. Congratulations!”

(U/31/43) Well, I appreciate that, but remember this: all knowledge is completely and utterly useless until it’s not.
In the example above, the first underlined words flout the Quality and Appropriateness maxim due to its being insincere. Meanwhile, the other underline words flout the Manner maxim by stating something obvious and somewhat redundant and yet is effective as a rebuttal to the comment. As aforementioned, the first part of the irony can stand by itself but is supported by the second part, the redundant statement. This second part might also be intended as an equally ironic reply to the “Congratulations!” part of the comment. Had the comment not included the congratulatory part, perhaps Neely would’ve stopped at his “appreciation”. However, due to the sarcastic nature of the comment, perhaps Neely felt the need for a witty reply (which is true in nature yet is redundant and is somewhat “mocking” the commenter) and thus the MN flouting. The criticism aspect is delivered through the insincere appreciation which conveys that the comment is not appreciated by Neely and through the redundant statement which counters the commenter’s argument in a ridiculing manner.

g. Flouting of Quality-Relation-Manner-Appropriateness Maxim

The QL-RL-MN-AP is also flouted once in Neely’s criticism, which is in the utterance below, showing Neely’s response to a rather peculiar comment.

(U/1/1) So, the person that wrote the script for that spambot, I really wanna thank you because if the singularity is coming and the robots are about to take over the world, you can see that they are able to generate some beautiful gibberish just in the attempt to get around YouTube spam filter. We get art. We get really really really beautiful art. It doesn’t make any sort of sense, but, you know, the best art doesn’t really have to. So, thank you.

In the utterance above, QL and AP are flouted through the insincere gratitude and the false statement about the comment being an art which is a successful attempt in
avoiding YouTube’s spam filter. AP is also flouted as a result of the flouting of RL through the incongruent nature of the statement which serves to purposefully ignore the point of the comment being replied to. Meanwhile, MN is flouted by the verbosity of the utterance.

In order to understand these ironic statements, it is necessary to know the comment it is replying to, which is:

(U/1/1) Comment: (fuck dude….people makes EVERY OTHER NOTE COMPLICATED. We don’t use the pure tone scale today in most instruments. Like this man…… (MAJOR)…. CEBDFACEGBD … ect USE THE DIATONIC/MAJOR As THE REFERENCE. KEYS ARE JUST PITCH. traits, chords, extended chords and modes are the same. You’ll see the modes clearer if you count two octaves…2,4,6 are the same as 9,11,13…. FFS obviously play that bitch ½ semi tone down when you see a fucken b or flat symbalb3= melodic minor…

The original comment is much longer but how it affects Neely’s choice of irony is adequately represented by the transcribed part above. First, the QL flouting through insincere gratitude is an indirect statement saying that this comment is not helpful at all. Second, the QL flouting through the false statement of the YouTube spam filter and the mentioning of robots and gibberish is to emphasize on how the comment is seemingly inhuman and not communicative at all, as if it had been written by a program or robot. Third, the RL flouting which serves to ignore the point of the comment indirectly states that the comment is pointless and there is no need to respond to it. Fourth, the MN flouting is mimicking the verbosity of the comment it is replying to, showcasing how obnoxious one is when commenting in such manner. These four floutings along with the consequential AP flouting function together to criticize different aspects of the comment. If standing alone,
these floutings would still serve their critical purposes, perhaps with the exception of the MN flouting which is believed to be made effective by the inclusion of the other floutings.

2. **Humor**

a. **Flouting of Appropriateness Maxim**

The AP composition is flouted three times humorously. The first is in the utterance below, taken from Neely’s explanation on bass tones in EDM.

(U/19/26) … and that’s something that’s a very contemporary idea in 20th century modernism anyway. So, you could say that, “Hey, Skrillex is a 20th century modernist.”

In the utterance above, the underlined statement is true and is a logical deduction based on its previous discussion that the bass tones in EDM is a contemporary idea in 20th century modernism. However, the notion that Skrillex is a 20th century modernist is rather unfitting because of the contrasting connotations of the subject and the complement; while “20th century modernist” comes with a sophisticated connotation, “Skrillex”, a famous EDM composer, producer, and DJ, is not perceived as sophisticated, especially in this particular setting in which the viewers and Neely are accustomed to jazz, one of the most sophisticated genres of music. Therefore, the notion that Skrillex is a 20th century modernist, albeit true, is ironic and amusing.

The second occurrence of the AP composition flouting for humorous purposes is in the utterance below, which is Neely’s reply to a comment saying, “One could suggest this is regurgitated bovine excrement…”

(U/20/32) **One could suggest that, couldn’t one?**
Considering that the comment being replied is basically stating that Neely’s video is *bullshit*, Neely’s reply shows that AP is flouted through how the statement does not match the situation and semantically contributes nothing to the conversation. However, through this inappropriate statement, Neely indirectly conveys that anyone is entitled to their own opinion and if one perceives his video as *bullshit*, so be it (perhaps had the commenter included some degree of reasoning, Neely would have replied differently). The humorous tone comes from the peculiar reply and Neely’s smirk when delivering it.

Lastly, AP is flouted in the utterance below, which is Neely’s reply to a question in his Instagram, asking how to stand out at jams.

(U/58/110) Play “the licc” but incorrectly.

In this case, AP is flouted because the answer is a deliberate attempt at humor which provides a true yet unhelpful answer. If the commenter was being serious, he would have expected answers from technical and theoretical standpoints which would help to get the attention of the audience without putting the performer in a bad light. However, Neely’s answer is humorous in the sense that he is suggesting an act which would be improper in most settings and could possibly be detrimental to the performance. Neely’s answer is derived from the fact that “the licc” is a popular joke among jazz musicians which he often uses to induce humor in his videos, which makes it a well-known meme among his viewers. Playing “the licc” correctly in isolation from other musical notes would definitely grab the attention of the audience, let alone playing it incorrectly, and hence, it does answer the question and
does not flout other maxims besides AP. Therefore, assuming that Neely knows that the commenter was asking seriously, his humorous reply flouts AP.

b. Flouting of Quantity Maxim

The QT composition is flouted once for humorous purposes, which is in the utterance below, Neely’s reply to the comment saying, “I forgot Adam Neely was a musician.”

(U/38/57) I have been known to play music from time to time.

In the utterance, the underlined phrase is a truthful belittlement, and therefore, it flouts QT but not QL and AP. The QT flouting creates humor due to the fact that Neely’s channel is centered around music and the viewers most definitely knows that Neely is an active jazz musician in New York. The humorous reply is triggered by the comment which is equally humorous; the reply is a play on the fact that Neely does not always play instruments on every video and when he does, he often only plays snippets of songs or musical ideas as helping tools for explaining a particular topic and not to showcase his musical prowess. Therefore, when Neely occasionally showcases his skills on the bass, people are reminded that Neely is a good jazz bass player.

c. Flouting of Quality-Appropriateness Maxim

The QL-AP composition is flouted the most out of all flouted compositions in Neely’s humorous ironies, occurring 55 times or 69.62% of the time. Out of the humorous ironies flouting the QL-AP composition, there are two categories in which QL-AP is flouted to create humor. The first category consists of utterances which employ QL-AP flouting to state blatant lies in order to produce humor. The
humorous aspect of utterances in this category is produced mostly because of the ridiculousness of the statements/lies, whether when viewed as a fact per se or in relation to Neely’s character and background. Below are some examples of this flouting pattern taken from the data, along with their related context or referred comments to help perceive the irony of the utterance:

(U/12/10) **Comment:** If you were allowed/forced to convert all your skill and knowledge of music into another discipline, what would it be?  
**Neely’s reply:** Mortuary Science

(U/16/18) **Context:** Responding to a comment on how the song Bang Bang goes well with clapping (an arrangement Neely did on a past video)  
**Neely’s reply:** There we go. That’s the genesis of clapping music.

(U/16/19) **Comment:** I wonder how he still has time to edit these vids.  
**Neely’s reply:** I do too.

(U/19/23) **Context:** Responding to a comment asking about setting goals in playing music  
**Neely’s reply:** … in the beginning maybe it’s like, “I want to play guitar to get women,” and don’t worry, you won’t ever fulfill that goal because realistically, no woman actually wants to be with a guitar player.

(U/53/105) **Comment:** What is your political ideology?  
**Neely’s reply:** Authoritarian Jazzist

The second category consists of utterances which employ QL-AP flouting through the stating of hyperboles and understatements. These hyperboles and understatements are considered false because they do not semantically represent the speaker meaning and instead share features which make them relatable to their truthful counterparts and are not labelled as blatant lies (however, some other hyperboles and understatements in the data are true to the speaker meaning, which consequently flouts QT-AP instead of QL-AP, and therefore will be explained later
in the QT-AP section). Similar to the first category, the humorous connotation of these utterances is induced by the ridiculousness of the statements despite their being derived from facts. Below are some examples of humorous ironies of this type and their related context or comment:

(U/60/119) **Context:** Describing AI music and monetization  
*Neely’s statement:* Of course, we’re living in a boring technocratic capitalist dystopia…

(U/59/115) **Context:** Responding to a question about Neely’s opinion on Charles Mingus  
*Neely’s reply:* If you’re new to him, definitely check out his album “Mingus Ah Um” or possibly the greatest album title of all time, “Mingus Mingus Mingus Mingus Mingus”.

(U/51/87) **Comment:** Are you good at jazz [?]  
*Neely’s reply:* I’m really just good at quoting “the lice”. It’s pretty much all you need to do these days in order to get views. So, by that metric, I’m good at jazz.

(U/10/9) **Context:** Referring to the total view time of his channel  
*Neely’s statement:* Hi, my name is Adam Neely and I’ve officially wasted 4 years and 168 days of your collective lives. So, I’m sorry about that.

d. **Flouting of Quantity-Appropriateness Maxim**

The QT-AP composition is flouted 9 times in Neely’s humorous ironies, making it the second most occurring composition after QL-AP but with a huge gap in their number of occurrences as this composition only occurs 11.4% of the time compared to QL-AP’s 68.62%. There are two categories of these utterances based on how QT-AP is flouted to create humorous irony. The first category consists of two utterances which employ QT-AP flouting to state a truthful hyperbole and understatement to produce humor. Below is the first utterance belonging in this category, along with its related comment:
(U/13/12) *Comment:* Where the heck do you get these topics from?! so cool  
*Neely’s reply:* I click a lot of links on Wikipedia.

In the utterance above, the underlined statement is an understatement which is not necessarily false as it is a part of the whole process of Neely’s topic creation and data gathering. However, when the process is only partially mentioned using the underlined words above, Neely’s answer becomes amusing because it simplifies the supposedly difficult process into something which many viewers can relate to and somewhat omits the sophistication of topic research, consequentially connotating the process as something crude. Below is the other utterance from the category:

(U/53/95) *Comment:* Why do I love you?  
*Neely’s reply:* At least somebody does.

In the utterance above, the underlined statement is a hyperbole of Neely’s circumstances. Through that statement, it is implied that somebody who loves Neely is scarce and therefore, Neely’s sentimental answer. However, this is probably untrue and Neely’s response is merely an effort to induce laughter (this is only a speculation by the researcher as it is difficult to find out whether it is true).

Next is the second category, consisting of utterances which flouts QT-AP by being deliberately inadequate in answering their respective comments. This inadequacy is the inducing factor of the humorous nature of these ironies. Below are several utterances belonging in this category, along with their related comment:

(U/18/21) *Comment:* but what if I suck (at playing music) [?]  
*Neely’s reply:* Then don’t.

(U/31/44) *Comment:* why do we almost never hear any bass solos in jazz [?]  
*Answer:* Because bass solos suck.

(U/51/86) *Comment:* How to learn music [?]  
*Answer:* Carefully.
(U/51/89) *Comment:* How do you structure your work schedule when working from home?
*Answer:* Terribly.

(U/53/103) *Comment:* Advice on composing?
*Answer:* Don’t write bad music.

All the utterances above are inadequate in answering their respective questions in the comments. The inadequacy is deliberate; Neely purposefully ignores the commenters’ expected answers and instead gives out short answers which are true but does not necessarily answer the questions. This can be seen in example (U/18/21) in which the question of what to do when one *sucks* at playing music is to not *suck*; the expected answer would probably be tips on how to improve at playing music or to avoid habits which prevents improvements. The inadequacy can also be seen in example (U/53/103) in which the commenter’s request of advice on composing is answered with “don’t write bad music”. This is true; however, it is an obvious advice which does not help the commenter in improving his compositional skills. The expected answer would probably be tips on composing, e.g., how to create song dynamics, whether to end a song on a high or low note, how to incorporate modulations, etc. This blatant inadequacy makes Neely’s answers amusing, as if Neely had accidentally missed the point of the question.

e. **Flouting of Manner-Appropriateness Maxim**

The MN-AP composition is flouted once in Neely’s humorous ironies, which is in the utterance below, which is Neely’s reply to a comment asking whether Neely likes fishsticks.

(U/51/80) I love putting fishsticks in my mouth.
The underlined words flout MN and AP by phrasing what could’ve been a simple phrase verbosely. “Putting fishsticks in my mouth” could have been phrased as “eating fishsticks” which is simpler and clearer. Instead, through this peculiar phrasing, the statement becomes verbose and coarse, and thus its inappropriateness. And due to its coarseness, the utterance becomes humorous.

f. **Flouting of Quality-Quantity-Appropriateness Maxim**

The QL-QT-AP composition is flouted six times in Neely’s humorous ironies. In these six occurrences, QL is flouted in two ways: employing false statements and hyperboles. Meanwhile, QT is also flouted in two ways: by employing truthful belittlement and through the utterance’s inadequacy in answering a question. Below are the six utterances which flout the QL-QT-AP composition and their related comment or context:

(U/27/36) **Context**: Referring to the award plaque Neely received from YouTube for hitting the 100,000 subscriber milestone.
*Neely’s statement:* … because YouTube just sent me this thing. It’s the YouTube play button that they give for getting a hundred thousand subscribers which is a number so large, the human mind cannot wrap its head around it.

(U/30/41) **Context**: Explaining about pedal point technique
*Neely’s comment:* So, this comes from organ pedals as in pipe organs as in the giant king of instruments, the big thing that they have in churches.

(U/51/85) **Comment**: Why Despacito is [sic] the best song ever?
*Neely’s reply:* Because Despacito 2 has not been released yet.

(U/51/91) **Comment**: How long does it take you to edit a video?
*Neely’s reply:* A really freaking long time. Most of my life is actually video editing, not playing music.

(U/53/104) **Comment**: Why is it bad to have 2 bassists date for 6 months?
*Neely’s reply:* If you have ever dated a bassist, I’m sorry.
(U/59/112) Comment: Why is American culture so identifiable?
Neely’s reply: ‘Coz there are 300 million of us and we are all very loud.

Among the examples above, QL is flouted through hyperboles in example (U/27/36), (U/30/41), (U/51/91), and (U/59/112) while the other two flout QL through false statements. Meanwhile, QT is flouted through truthful belittlements in example (U/27/36) and (U/30/41) while the others flout QT through their inadequacy. The process in which humor is induced in these utterances have been previously explained in the QL-AP and QT-AP section; the hyperboles, belittlements, and false statements sound ridiculous while the inadequacies create a false impression that Neely failed to perceive the commenter’s intention. Furthermore, in example (U/51/85), (U/53/104), and (U/59/112), the QL floutings are based on existing stigmas which probably are already amusing by themselves; this amusingness is thus retained when the stigmas are made into ironies. Example (U/51/85) employs the stigma that the song Despacito which is considered as overrated, listened to by uneducated youngsters who worship pop artists. Meanwhile, example (U/53/104) employs the stigma that male bassists who are the unpopular member of the band and “never get the girls”. Lastly, example (U/59/112) employs the stigma that Americans are loud and obnoxious (especially from the perspective of Northern European countries).

g. Flouting of Quality-Relation-Manner-Appropriateness Maxim

The QL-RL-MN-AP composition is flouted once in Neely’s humorous ironies, which is in the utterance below, taken from Neely’s reply to a comment asking, “Does Adam Neely is gay [sic]?”
I think the real question is does Leonard Bernstein is gay, and I think we all know the answer to that: Bruno Mars.

In the example above, QL is flouted through the false statement “the real question is does Leonard Bernstein is gay” and “I think we all know the answer to that”. RL is flouted through the unrelated answer of Neely’s own question: Bruno Mars; the question should’ve been answered with a “yes” or “no”. Meanwhile, MN is flouted through the intentional ungrammaticality of the utterance. It is important to notice that there are at least two aspects of the comment which contribute to how Neely chooses to respond to it. First, the comment is asking whether Neely is gay. Gayness is often mentioned jokingly in YouTube comments and often without negative connotations; however, in this particular comment, it is unclear whether the commenter is being sincere or not. Yet, the question whether Neely is gay is not relevant to the video in which the question is asked. Therefore, this contributes to how Neely chooses to respond to the question jokingly as the question is perceived as something of no importance nor significance. Second, the question is amusingly ungrammatical (yes, some people find broken English amusing). Therefore, Neely’s ungrammatical response is mimicking the comment, which in turn makes the response humorous. All in all, such an utterance which blatantly violates multiple maxims and is lacking any intention to communicate with the commenter—an ineffective communication, uncharacteristic of Neely—is relatively easy to be perceived by the viewers as an attempt at inducing laughter.

3. Criticism-Humor

Other than one non-flouting irony, all of Neely’s ironies under the criticism-humor category only flout the QL-AP composition (a total of 11 times). Based on
the analysis of the utterances, all of the utterances flout QL through the employment of false or insincere statements, which consequently flout AP. There are two aspects regarding the utterances belonging in this category which are distinctive to those in the criticism and humor categories. First, the utterances both serve to criticize and to induce laughter. Second, while the humor aspect is quite apparent, the criticism aspect can be quite covert if not a bit farfetched; therefore, the critical interpretations of these utterances should be taken with a grain of salt as they are often subtle and perhaps subjective to the researcher.

Below is an example taken from the data, along with its related comment:

(U/16/20) Comment: It such a dumb way to go about it. Give somebody money for them to play the song you knew? Play something I never heard before, you lazy wanker and maybe then you will be worth my money.

Neely’s response: You’re right. For the next wedding that I am contracted to play, instead of playing any of the requests, I’m gonna play my 30-minute jazz rock epic fusion. I think they’ll really like that.

In the example above, Neely’s sarcastic reply is both critical and humorous. The humorous aspect comes from the ridiculousness of the statement, especially if one could imagine it vividly. The critical aspect of the reply comes from how Neely is basically saying that the commenter’s idea on how he should’ve performed is ridiculous. Here is another example:

(U/43/65) Comment: You attribute “Now I am become death, destroyer of worlds” to Miles Davis. I can’t say he never said it, but it is from the Bhagavad Gita and was famously recalled by Robert Oppenheimer upon the successful testing of the atomic bomb.

Neely’s response: No, I’m pretty sure that was Miles Davis who said that. He also wrote Blue in Green for sure and also Donna Lee.
In the example above, the comment is referring to Neely’s statement in a particular video, saying that Miles Davis was the one who said the quote. It is important to notice that if the commenter was being serious, then he had missed the initial irony of Neely’s statement as it was meant as a joke, similar to the famous internet quote: “Don’t believe everything you read on the internet.” -Abraham Lincoln. Therefore, by having this knowledge, we can understand why Neely chooses to reply ironically. In his reply, besides reinforcing the initial irony that was missed by the commenter, he adds two other ironies which are derived from actual historical events (the controversy of Miles Davis’ being credited as the composer of the songs Blue in Green and Dona Lee which were supposedly written by Bill Evans and Charlie Parker respectively). Therefore, the critical aspect of the utterance is that the commenter should not have missed the joke, and the humorous aspect comes from Neely’s feigned ignorance and serious demeanor during his delivery of the statement. Below is another example:

(U/51/75) Comment: Fwar fwar fwwwrrrr
Neely’s response: Great question, Mary.

In the example above, Neely’s answer is sarcastic and arguably criticizes the commenter for commenting such nonsense. However, an interesting point of this particular case is that the original comment being replied by Neely is already amusing by itself, especially when displayed amidst other serious comments. Therefore, the humorous aspect of Neely’s irony is not inherent in his statement but can be said to be initially induced by the original comment. Had the comment been something more serious or condescending, Neely’s “great question” remark would not have been as amusing, if not totally unhumorous. All in all, despite the fact that
all of the utterances flout QL similarly, the critical and humorous aspect of the ironies are relatively distinct to one another depending on their context.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Grice’s Cooperative Principle proposes that verbal irony is produced by flouting the Qualitative maxim. However, a number of studies following Grice’s postulation show that verbal irony may also be induced by flouting other conversational maxims, namely Quantitative, Manner, and Relation maxims. In addition, Attardo suggests that there is an additional maxim which is flouted to create irony outside Grice’s four conversational maxims, which is Appropriateness maxim. Based on these propositions, this study intends to find out whether these notions are true by analyzing verbal ironies in Adam Neely’s YouTube videos and identifying what maxim floutings occur, how they relate to one another, and how they contribute in creating irony. This study also intends to find out the purposes of the verbal ironies based on the occurring maxim floutings.

From the 120 verbal ironies, the occurrences of maxim floutings are identified as follows: 98 times (41.52%) for QL, 19 times (8.05%) for QT, 2 times (1.27%) for RL, 4 times (1.69%) for MN, and 112 times (47.46%) for AP. These findings show that QL and AP flouting are the most common means for Neely to create irony and there is a relatively huge disparity between the number of occurrences of these two floutings and that of the other maxim floutings. In addition, there are several major findings based on the identification of the compositions of maxim floutings occurring in each verbal irony: QL-AP composition occurs the most with 87 occurrences out of 120 verbal ironies (72.5%).
only QT flouting occurs without AP flouting, albeit scarcely (2 times/1.67%), and there are 6 (5%) verbal ironies which do not employ any maxim flouting.

In light of these, a number of conclusive notions can be made in relation to the propositions which this study intends to prove. First, contrary to Grice’s theory, the creation of irony is not only limited to QL flouting but can also involve floutings of other conversational maxims. However, compared to other Grice’s conversational maxim floutings, QL flouting, along with AP flouting, remains as the prominent cause of irony and the compositions of maxim flouting which do not include QL are limited to AP, QT, QT-AP, and MN-AP.

Second, the nature of the co-occurrences of maxim floutings in verbal ironies can be divided into three categories: (1) the floutings are highly correlated and each flouting is necessary for the ironic interpretation of the utterance, (2) the floutings are less correlated and one or multiple floutings merely serve to supplement the irony which is mainly induced by one particular flouting, and (3) the floutings do not correlate to one another, are able to induce ironic interpretation in isolation, and are put together to amplify the whole irony to serve as a point in a particular context.

Third, because AP flouting occurs 93.36% of the time and also occurs by itself 3.33% of the time, it is suggested that the addition of AP is a significant element in defining and elaborating irony as it always functions as a marker when an utterance sounds peculiar or inappropriate in relation to its context (which triggers an ironic interpretation). However, as there are several utterances which this study finds to be ironic but are appropriate (do not seem to violate the
“appropriateness” described by Attardo), Attardo’s notion that an irony must be flouting the Appropriateness maxim is disproven.

In regards to the correlation between maxim floutings and the purposes of irony (criticism, humor, praise, criticism-humor), although these two elements are closely correlated (the maxim floutings contribute to produce particular ironic purposes), there are almost no distinctive patterns to show how particular floutings are preferred by particular ironic purposes. The only distinguishable patterns are that QL-AP flouting is the most employed flouting for all ironic purposes and criticism-humor ironies almost exclusively employ QL-AP flouting. However, this may be a direct result of QL-AP flouting composition’s being the most common—and perhaps the “easiest”—means to create irony rather than its being the most suitable tool to produce any ironic purpose. This is perhaps a case of whether chickens or eggs came first and to conclusively deduce whether the use of particular maxim floutings is determined based on the potency of producing irony or achieving an ironic purpose requires further research.

Regarding how maxim floutings contribute to the purpose of irony, this study’s results show that particular types of maxim flouting composition contributes to the achieving of particular ironic purposes in various ways. The most prominent example is how QL-AP flouting contributes to a criticism either by employing insincere gratitude (thanking a hateful comment) or by stating false facts or lies (“You are right. When people think about me, they think about Boris Johnson.”). The latter also differs by how some of the false facts derive from the topic/point of Neely’s argument while others are echoes or restatements of the
referred comments. Another example is how humorous ironies employing QL-AP flouting either state false facts (…you won’t ever fulfill that goal because realistically, no woman actually wants to be with a guitar player.”) or hyperboles (“…please send it my way just so I can steal some ideas…”). In addition, how ironic purposes perform also varies, often relative to the maxim floutings employed. For example, criticisms which employ QL-AP flouting may produce a brief ridiculing criticism as a result of a ridiculous false statement (“Your intelligence knows no bounds.”) or produce an elaborative criticism in which hyperboles serve to emphasize an argument (“…and I certainly won’t care whether or not you went to music school because, honestly, nobody cares. Nobody cares about that fact.”). In conclusion, how maxim floutings perform in achieving ironic purposes is not limited to one way but instead varies depending on the context.

Compared to Dewi’s (2014) findings of 5 ironies flouting the Quality maxim, this study’s findings are more extensive and consists of more types of irony based on the maxim floutings and purposes. It is also interesting that Dewi (2014) separated all exaggerations from irony whereas it is shown in this study that exaggeration can be one of the means to flout QL, QT, and AP to construct irony. Meanwhile, the mismatch in polarity as one of the ironic markers of Jonsson’s (2010) study can also be used to describe how insincere gratitude and ridiculous lies construct irony. However, unlike the negative context which is prevalent in Jonsson’s (2010) findings, the context in which verbal ironies occur in this study varies; neutral or positive comments can also be replied with ironies bearing similar tones/connotations. It is also shown that the variety of the context of irony also
affects the variety of ironic purposes, especially when this study’s results are compared to Nuolijarvi and Tiittula’s (2011) findings in the context of a debate or argumentation, which mainly consists of criticisms. However, whereas Nuolijarvi and Tiittula’s ironists are two interlocutors, resulting in chains of ironies, this study’s ironist is only Neely who replies to comments, and therefore, it unlikely for chains of ironies to occur and observing them requires more data than just Neely’s Q&A videos.

Based on the results of this study, there are several suggestions that can be done by future researchers to further develop the knowledge and data related to irony and maxim flouting, especially those that are lacking in this research. First, although this study hypothesized that Attardo’s proposition on irony and the maxim of Appropriateness does not apply to all cases of verbal irony, further studies on the same topic is necessary to prove this hypothesis. Second, since this study found that there are 6 cases of verbal irony constructed without flouting any maxim, future studies can scrutinize a larger sample on such cases to clearly identify the significant variables contributing to this particular construction of irony. Third, this study found that the purpose of a verbal irony is not always exclusively criticism, humor, or praise, but can also be both criticism and humor; therefore, there may be other multipurpose verbal ironies besides criticism-humor which require further studies to reveal and describe. Lastly, this study’s hypothesis that there is a lack of discernible patterns governing the co-occurrences of particular maxim floutings and particular ironic purposes may be due to insufficient data and needs further studies to be proven.
REFERENCES


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Flouting</th>
<th>Explanation &amp; Purpose</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Time stamp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U/1/1</td>
<td>So, the person that wrote the script for that spambot, I really wanna thank you because if the singularity is coming and the robots are about to take over the world, you can see that they are able to generate some beautiful gibberish just in the attempt to get around YouTube spam filter. We get art. We get really really really beautiful art. It doesn’t make any sort of sense, but, you know, the best art doesn’t really have to. So, thank you.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>QL: The remark is not a script for a spambot and the gratitude is insincere. RL: The statement is incongruent with the comment it replies to, suggesting that it is intended to ignore the point of the comment. MN: The utterance is verbose; gratitude and praises are mentioned repeatedly. AP: The utterance is false and does not suit the context.</td>
<td>Comment: (fuck dude….people makes EVERY OTHER NOTE COMPLICATED. We don’t use the pure tone scale today in most instruments. Like this man……. (MAJOR)….CEGBDFACEGBD… ect USE THE DIATONIC/MAJOR As THE REFERENCE. KEYS ARE JUST PITCH. traids, chords, extended chords and modes are the same. You’ll see the modes clearer if you count two octives…2,4,6 are the same as 9,11,13….FFS Obviously play that bitch ½ semi tone down when you see a fucken b or flat symbalb3= melodic minor…</td>
<td>5:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/2/2</td>
<td>… if you do find a channel that you think is similar to mine, please send it my way just so I can steal some ideas and incorporate it into my stuff.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>QL: Steal is a hyperbolic expression of take AP: Stealing is a despicable act uncharacteristic of Neely’s persona.</td>
<td>Neely is talking about how art has essentially been about “stealing” others’ works. “Stealing” is okay so long as it is done because of one’s being inspired by others’ work and not because one intends to steal or avoid difficulties in producing</td>
<td>4:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/2/3</td>
<td>Thank you, random troll. It’s moments like this where I really love the internet.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Gratitude</td>
<td>The gratitude is insincere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/3/4</td>
<td>Yeah, Jim was a huge influence on me… Jim McNeely. And his name sounds really similar to mine, McNeely, Neely. We probably had a distant relative, like in 17th century Scotland, like a sheep farmer, or something like that.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>Referring to jazz pianist and composer Jim McNeely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/3/5</td>
<td>I gotta tell you, that’s probably the greatest compliment anybody has ever given to me.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Criticism-humor</td>
<td>Made my cat hide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/8/6</td>
<td>I would say that it entirely depends on what gig I have coming up and then I shed that gig and it’s just always this crazy process of me like, “Oh, crap. I haven’t practiced a while in this instrument. Oh, God. Oh, God. Oh, God.”</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Criticism-humor</td>
<td>Referring to how Neely manages adequate practice time on different instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/9/7</td>
<td>I myself use tablature all the time when I was first starting out: going MX tabs, learned my Green day, learned my Rage Against the Machine, my Korn, my Linkin Park, all that <em>good</em>... you know... <em>angry white boy</em> 90s alternative new metal stuff. <em>Mmm! That was my jam.</em></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: <em>Good</em> is sarcastic as the present Neely would not consider these bands par to his “palate”. <em>Angry white boy</em> is a stigmatic label. AP: The utterance is false. Neely condemns the act of stigmatizing and stereotyping which makes the utterance uncharacteristic of him. <em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td>Referring to the misconception (due to Neely’s previous video on “using tab vs notation”) that Neely condemns the use of tab. 2:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/9/8</td>
<td>… even though I like talking eloquently about musical subjects and theory and whatnot, at heart, I’m just a <em>dumb</em> bass player.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: <em>Dumb</em> is an understatement. Neely has a master’s degree in jazz composition and is a performing bassist in the New York music scene. <em>Dumb</em> is likely a reference to the stigma of bass players who plays and sees bass with a peculiar reverence. AP: The statement does not suit Neely. <em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td>Comment: Are you doing a PhD about musicians in general? you should… you will be a reference for a lot of people 3:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/10/9</td>
<td>Hi, my name is Adam Neely and I’ve officially wasted 4 years and 168 days of your collective lives. So, I’m sorry about that.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: <em>Wasted</em> is a hyperbole. Neely does not really feel sorry for the views he has gotten. AP: The statement is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td>Referring to the total view time of his channel 00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>Veracity</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2:40  | U/12/10 | Mortuary Science. | V | QL: Neely does not really believe this.  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Humor |
| 2:03  | U/13/11 | I think Glen Fricker is an obnoxious moron and everything that he says is just pure disinformation. | V | QL: Neely is known to be good acquaintances with Glen Fricker who is also a YouTuber. The indicator that this statement is sarcastic is how Neely uses Fricker’s merch, a t-shirt, during this particular response, proving that Neely actually supports Fricker (which he also clarifies in a future video).  
AP: The utterance is false and does not suit Neely.  
*Purpose:* Praise |
| 4:24  | U/13/12 | I click a lot of links on Wikipedia. | V | QT: This statement is an over-simplification of the research done behind the creation of Neely’s videos.  
AP: The utterance is an inadequate answer to the question.  
*Purpose:* Humor |
| 7:15  | U/13/13 | I’m boring. I like standard tuning in bass and standard tuning in guitar.  
Man… | V | QL: *Boring* is not true to what Neely thinks of standard tuning (or people preferring alternative bass tuning)  
Responding to a comment about alternative bass tuning |
<p>| U/14/14 | Your intelligence knows no bounds. | v | v | QL: The sentence meaning is the opposite of what Neely intends to say; the commenters are unintelligent for not recognizing his sarcasm. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Criticism | Responding to hate comments regarding Adam’s comment about Glen Fricker (see U/13/11) 0:26 |
| U/14/15 | No, it clearly was not sarcasm. | v | v | QL: The utterance is the opposite of what Neely means: it clearly was sarcasm. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Criticism | Comment: Was that thing about glen fricker sarcasm? 1:15 |
| U/15/16 | Oh, man, thank you so much for volunteering to write some background music for my channel! It’s very nice of you! | v | v | QL: Neely does not really feel gratitude nor think of the commenter as being nice. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Criticism | Comment: Have you ever thought on writing a new song so you can have more than just one background music? 13:24 |
| U/16/17 | … this channel has kind of grown into “Adam Neely rants about whatever musical thing he,” you know, “wants to talk about” | v | v | QL: <em>Rant</em> is an understatement of what Neely does, which is delivering musical knowledge backed up with a degree of research and references. AP: The utterance does not represent Neely’s thoughts (regarding his work on YouTube). | Responding to a comment of whether Neely’s channel remains a bass channel or a more general music channel. 1:11 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User/Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Purpose: Humor</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U/16/18</td>
<td>There we go. That’s the genesis of clapping music.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is an overstatement of an ordinary phenomenon. Clapping music is not really a genre and even if it were so, Neely’s arrangement of Bang Bang and clapping is not the genesis of clapping music. AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td>2:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responding to a comment on how the song Bang Bang goes well with clapping (an arrangement Neely did on a past video)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/16/19</td>
<td>I do too.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Being the person doing it, Neely must’ve known how he manages to do it. AP: The utterance is false and sounds ridiculous coming from the person being referred himself.</td>
<td>7:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: I wonder how he still has time to edit these vids.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/16/20</td>
<td>You’re right. For the next wedding that I am contracted to play, instead of playing any of the requests, I’m gonna play my 30-minute jazz rock epic fusion. I think they’ll really like that.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely does not agree with the comment. The second line shows a scenario in accordance to the comment, followed by another untrue statement. AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td>11:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: It such a dumb way to go about it. Give somebody money for them to play the song you knew? Play something I never heard before, you lazy wanker and maybe then you will be worth my money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/18/21</td>
<td>Then don’t.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QT: The utterance does not provide necessary explanation on how to not suck and is inadequate in answering what is expected by the commenter.</td>
<td>11:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: but what if I suck (at playing music)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Prompt</td>
<td>AP: The utterance does not suit Neely’s personality, especially his contempt on condescending remarks, particularly on one’s musicality.</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/18/22</td>
<td>You are right. When people think about me, they think about Boris Johnson. I am sorry for talking about free improv. I know that greatly offended you.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely does not really agree with the commenter. The part about Boris Johnson is a blatant lie. Neely also does not really feel apologetic for talking about free improv.</td>
<td>This guy’s an idiot. He shouldn’t be talking about free improv. Patronising guff. Like Boris Johnson, he thinks Latin makes him cool. What a fool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/19/23</td>
<td>… in the beginning maybe it’s like, “I want to play guitar to get women,” and don’t worry, you won’t ever fulfill that goal because realistically, no woman actually wants to be with a guitar player.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is a false notion based on the stigma of people learning the guitar to attract women.</td>
<td>Responding to a comment asking about setting goals in playing music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/19/24</td>
<td>So, if you’re ever interested in seeing what it’s like to be a classical musician and have your feelings hurt, read the comment section of the How and Why Classical Musicians Feel Music Differently.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>AP: The utterance highlights a condescending phenomenon by putting in a peculiar phrase. Rather than using “Look at this”. Neely uses “If you’re interested” despite its improbability. This somewhat indirect manner of pointing out the highlighted object feels</td>
<td>Responding to comments in his past video about how classical musicians feel rhythm differently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| U/19/25 | No, it’s definitely not bad, but maybe your parents might think it’s bad if they are not enlightened to what it means to be a creative professional. | “too polite/formal”, which emanates an ironic tone.  
*Purpose:* Criticism |
| U/19/26 | … and that’s something that’s a very contemporary idea in 20th century modernism anyway. So, you could say that, “Hey, Skrillex is a 20th century modernist.” | The utterance deliberately employs words which are unnecessarily “complex”.  
*Purpose:* Humor  
*Comment:* Is it bad to say one day I want to do exactly what you’re doing? And how would you recommend I go about doing it? |
| U/19/27 | Oh, my God! Thank you, spambot. Thank you for that Mahjong cheat, I really needed it. | AP: Although technically true, it sounds inappropriate considering the stigma of Skrillex’s music.  
*Purpose:* Humor |
| U/19/28 | … and I certainly won’t care whether or not you went to music school because, honestly, nobody cares. Nobody cares about that fact. | QL: The gratitude is insincere, the commenter is not a spambot, and Neely does not need a “cheat” to his own song.  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Criticism  
*Comment:* Responding to a commenter posting a link to a music sheet of Neely’s song, *Mahjong Dream* |
<p>| | | Responding to a comment about not going to a music school and the fear of being intimidated by those who did | 10:24 |
| U/19/29 | ... you are a tuba player. Nobody cares about tuba. Seriously, nobody cares about tuba. | v | v | QL: Akin to above, nobody cares is hyperbolic. It plays around the stigma of the unimportance of tuba players. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Criticism-humor | Responding to a commenter, a tuba player, who’s afraid of having his tuba stolen in the New York subway | 16:06 |
| U/20/30 | I definitely knew this comment was coming and I savored it. Oh, man, did I savor it. The vaporwave purist. Oh, my God, it’s hilarious. Already the subculture has its elite. | v | v | QL: Savored is a hyperbole of enjoy which may also be insincere. Hilarious is also a hyperbole of entertaining or silly. AP: The utterance is insincere. Purpose: Criticism | Comment: as soon as you spoke about the genre and claimed all those articles are good representations of the genre i wished i could flag all your channel | 3:34 |
| U/20/31 | Yeah, man, p-basses are really infantile. Pino Paladino? Most infantile bass player there is. | v | v | QL: Neely does not really believe this. Pino Paladino is also a prominent and aged bass player who is definitely not infantile by anyone’s standards. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Criticism | Comment: why are you always playing this p-bass? I find them kinda infantile… | 5:47 |
| U/20/32 | One could suggest that, couldn’t one? | v | v | AP: The utterance is not an appropriate response. Purpose: Humor | Comment: one could suggest this is regurgitated bovine excrement, also it could be construed as weaselly Newton vapor appealing to the cult of primeval anti intellectualism | 5:57 |
| U/21/33 | Yes, that literally was the point of the video. Congratulations, you found out. | v | v | QL: The congratulation is insincere; it is an attack to the commenter’s not knowing the point of the video and | Comment: You are literally copying Macintosh plus | 7:35 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User/Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Verdict</th>
<th>Quality Label</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U/22/34</td>
<td>Sorry about this. I still seem to be having light issues. Great. I haven’t learned these new lights yet.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: <em>Great</em> is an opposite of the speaker meaning <em>unfortunately</em>.</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is insincere. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>12:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/25/35</td>
<td>So, in case you want to listen to my sultry voice talk about bass and music in the car, or on the train, or wherever you like to listen to podcasts, now you can.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: <em>Sultry voice</em> is a hyperbole of Neely’s voice quality.</td>
<td>AP: The sentence is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>0:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/27/36</td>
<td>… and before we get started, I wanted to say thank you to all my subscribers because YouTube just sent me this thing. It’s the YouTube play button that they give for getting a hundred thousand subscribers which is a number so large, the human mind cannot wrap its head around it.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: A <em>hundred thousand</em> is not a number so large that it is incomprehensible to humans; this is a hyperbole. QT: <em>Play button</em> is a truthful undermining of the awarded plaque.</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>0:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/28/37</td>
<td>Oh, sure thing. All you have to do is step one: create some stuff that sounds good to you! Or don’t.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely does not agree with the commenter’s proposition.</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is insincere. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>0:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/29/38</td>
<td>It’s basically music theory videos done with that sort of Vi Hart style animation and they’re really—really</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is a false perception of Neely about himself.</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td>14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>User ID</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/29/39</td>
<td></td>
<td>well done. Definitely check him out. Done by an actual music theorist, not just a guy who likes to spout out nonsense about music theory.</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/29/39</td>
<td></td>
<td>The statement of this fact (which is not what Neely perceives himself as) creates a tone of amusement, implying sarcasm.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talk about sucking the joy out of music. Meh. This is what happens when science people try to engage with musical creativity. What a bore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>So, I'm a science person apparently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>The statement of this fact (which is not what Neely perceives himself as) creates a tone of amusement, implying sarcasm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Talk about sucking the joy out of music. Meh. This is what happens when science people try to engage with musical creativity. What a bore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>So, this comes from organ pedals as in pipe organs as in the giant king of instruments, the big thing that they have in churches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: Neely does not really believe this.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Did you get that bass because it matches with your cat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Did you get that bass because it matches with your cat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>So, this comes from organ pedals as in pipe organs as in the giant king of instruments, the big thing that they have in churches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: Giant king of instruments is a hyperbole (or it might be very subjective).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explaining about pedal point technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>QT: Big thing is a truthful undermining of an organ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Did you get that bass because it matches with your cat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>So, this comes from organ pedals as in pipe organs as in the giant king of instruments, the big thing that they have in churches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: Giant king of instruments is a hyperbole (or it might be very subjective).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explaining about pedal point technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>QT: Big thing is a truthful undermining of an organ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Did you get that bass because it matches with your cat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/43</td>
<td>Well, I appreciate that, but remember this: all knowledge is completely and utterly useless until it’s not.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Comment: This video is absolutely, and utterly useless. Congratulations!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/44</td>
<td>Because bass solos suck.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Comment: why do we almost never hear any bass solos in jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/31/45</td>
<td>Adam… Neely, right?</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Referring to a commenter named “Adam Kelly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/32/46</td>
<td>So, I love reading the comments in my How to Play Bass (for guitar players) video because most players kinda missed the mark on what I was trying to do.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Comment: Hey, Flea, you play to much notes with too much fingers, you not real base player, use tape for left hand! Do this guy knows base players use chords, play melodic lines? Even slap some times. He don’t look like an idiot but says so stupid things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/32/47</td>
<td>Well, let me show you some of my toys.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Comment: i have a burning question, love your gig videos and i’ve been trying to record my gigs to analyze what can be improved/ have some footage for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>User/Message</td>
<td>Veracity</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95:00</td>
<td><em>U/34/48</em> WINGXERO, a username spelled as if it was an 11-year old first getting internet access... Thank you for proving my point because you just showed an incredible degree of contempt towards pop music and those who might write pop music and perform pop music and like pop music.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Referring to the username of a commenter whose comment is: i disagree... i find pop music to be incredibly pretentious. look at the “pomp” and the “image.” I’m not saying that to sound elitist. the music is incredibly over-produced. what is not pretentious about that? the vocalist neither write or can sing their own material. (autotune anyone?) but let’s just pretend that none of that matters for a second. one does not get to superstar status without branding..... branding..... im trying to let that set in for a second. you are being branded. utter pretense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:11</td>
<td><em>U/34/49</em> Christian contemporary music. It’s terrible.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>Comment: question for Q&amp;A- Is there any style of music you particularly DISLIKE playing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:52</td>
<td><em>U/34/50</em> It’s coming next week, I promise. And I promise you that you will hear 200,000 notes and it will be ridiculous. So, don’t worry.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Comment: 200k video?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/34/51</td>
<td>They come from sheep because the word actually originally was “pitch guts” which I guess in German means “sheep’s intestines” which I guess is not that much better, but they weren’t using cat intestines although I’m sure some mad scientist somewhere was dissecting cats and creating strings from their intestines…</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely does not believe this. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>Explaining cat gut strings, a type of string for musical instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/35/52</td>
<td>So, there’s like this trend of people making videos which are supposed to be like these exposes on how easy it is to create pop music, like you just autotune your vocals and comp them and just write like banal lyrics and then come up with some crappy beat and you have your club-banger. “Oh, my God!” And in the comment section there’s always people saying like, “Oh, this is so easy. Anybody can do it.” I always have to laugh.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: <em>Always have to laugh</em> is hyperbolic, possibly actually meaning <em>they’re silly</em> (negatively). AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>Describing the phenomena of videos on pop music production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/36/53</td>
<td>…because numerology is not the same thing as mathematics.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: The statement is a generalization and hyperbole.</td>
<td>Responding to hate comments regarding Neely’s view on 432 Hertz tuning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>QL: The statement is false and contradictory. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>Responding to comments saying that synesthesia is unscientific and “New Age”.</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/37/54 &quot;… Cognitive Neuroscience, the Journal of Neuroscience, the Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine, Biological Psychiatry, Consciousness and Cognition, Psychology of Music, American Journal of Psychology, and many-many others, as we all know, bastions of New Age unscientific thoughts.&quot;</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Responding to comments saying that synesthesia is unscientific and “New Age”.</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/37/55 &quot;… and if, you know, you actually cared about the subject and cared about maybe debunking it, you would go down and read through all the New Age publications.&quot;</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Referring to aforementioned journals concerning synesthesia.</td>
<td>4:48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/37/56 &quot;What? You mean literally any time I post anything on YouTube?&quot;</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Can Adam submit a song and we critique him? Imagine…</td>
<td>15:04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/38/57 &quot;I have been known to play music from time to time.&quot;</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: I forgot Adam Neely was a musician.</td>
<td>11:49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>QL: Neely’s speaking from authority</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is untruthful and belittles an essential aspect supporting its argument.</td>
<td>Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>Comment: Who made this guy an authority, about what is good and what isn’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>U/38/58 … I speak from authority from two places. The first place, oh, one second… the first place is this piece of paper. This piece of paper represents an old system, the academic system which requires this piece of paper to teach. …</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Comment: Who made this guy an authority, about what is good and what isn’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: Neely’s speaking from authority is false (which is later clarified by him).</td>
<td>QT: Piece of paper is a truthful belittlement of Neely’s diploma in Jazz Composition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:51</td>
<td>U/39/59 If you have to ask, you’ll never know.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Comment: What is Jazz?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QL: This statement is false; one can know what jazz is even after asking about it. Neely is quoting a famous line by Louis Armstrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false and inadequate.</td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false and inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:24</td>
<td>U/39/60 … which I can’t not listen to music… with… Wow, doing really well in grammar here, Adam.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Explaining how he cannot listen to music passively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QL: The statement is false. AP: The utterance is false and a spoken self-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false and a spoken self-evaluation.</td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false and a spoken self-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:53</td>
<td>U/39/61 …but, you know, if I looked outside, I would probably see the collective eye roll of every single human being over the age of 20 who read this comment…</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Responding to a commenter trying to debunk Neely’s statement that learning music at a young age is easier because young people have more time than older people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QL: Neely probably would not see this. AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td>Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/40/62</td>
<td>It’s a totally feasible plan of attack and I strongly suggest that you do that.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This hyperbolic statement is false and is based on the relationship between Neely and “the lice”. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>Comment: Couldn’t I just play the lick over the changes and survive any jam session? 6:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/42/63</td>
<td>So, for how many times I got called a paid shill in my A 432 video, I really wish that the illuminati or some New World Order actually, you know, pay me because that would be great.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Adam does not really wish for this unrealistic event to occur. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>Comment: You’re a shill or plain dumb 7:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/43/64</td>
<td>This all probably got started because of last year’s video from Vox where Adam Ragusea tries to make the case that D minor 7 flat 5 makes Christmas songs sound “Christmasy” which is, uhmm, not the best analysis.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QT: Not the best analysis is a truthful belittlement of bad analysis. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>Referring to the abundance of YouTube videos analyzing determining elements of Christmas songs 0:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/43/65</td>
<td>No, I’m pretty sure that was Miles Davis who said that. He also wrote <em>Blue in Green</em> for sure and also <em>Donna Lee</em>.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This whole statement is false. Neely knows that it is not Miles Davis who said the quote. Neely also knows the controversy of Davis’ credits on the songs <em>Blue in Green</em> (supposedly by Bill Evans) and <em>Donna Lee</em> (supposedly by Charlie Parker). AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Criticism-humor</td>
<td>Comment: You attribute “Now I am become death, destroyer of worlds” to Miles Davis. I can’t say he never said it, but it is from the Bhagavad Gita and was famously recalled by Robert Oppenheimer upon the successful testing of the atomic bomb. 14:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>QL:</td>
<td>AP:</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td>Purpose:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>I’m glad that my audience are asking the important questions.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely is not glad (at this particular moment) and the question is not important (it is in fact rather absurd). AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Criticism-humor</td>
<td>Adam Neely why is your head a Hexagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Well, if you’ve ever wondered why Ted Nugent sucks, there’s your answer.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>The underlined utterance is a paraphrase of that is why, which creates an ironic tone. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>Ted Nugent – “Never practice scales”. Just thought I would throw that out there Hahahaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yea, it is a little weird, isn’t it? My new year’s resolution was to have hair, and so far, I am succeeding.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: Based on Neely’s personality, he is not one to make such a new year’s resolution. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
<td>It’s so weird seeing adam with hair..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sorry. I apologize. I’ll get better curtains for future videos because that’s really what people want to see in Adam Neely’s channel; his curtains.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: The apology is insincere. Neely will not get better curtains because his curtains are not important to his viewers. AP: The sentence is insincere and false. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>I don’t like your curtains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Congratulations, you’re middle class. I think you think that gives you justification in feeling angry about the idea of a middle-class white woman wanting to learn how to play ukulele.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: The congratulation is insincere, especially in comparison to the following sentence’s tone. AP: The utterance is insincere. Purpose: Criticism</td>
<td>Sorry but I agree this is middle class Hipster Bullshit. Like all these middle class white women who now want to play the Ukulele. I am middle class by the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question ID</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/49/71</td>
<td>In my last Q&amp;A, I spent 8 minutes talking about an Fm7 chord, the</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: The statement is a hyperbole; an <em>eternity</em> here means <em>quite a long</em> time. AP: The statement is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Criticism-humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second chord to the chords of Stevie Wonder’s <em>Sir Duke</em>. Now, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: What’s the point of analysing something in such a depth as for example the first question? Let’s be honest no one thinks like that when they’re writing a song. Is it just because you can?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minutes in YouTube time is an <em>eternity</em>, but in the grand scheme of things, 8 minutes isn’t actually that long.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/72</td>
<td>Just the lady in red.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely is not a <em>lady</em> and is not wearing <em>red</em> clothes; this is a reference to <em>The Lady in Red</em>, an album by Chris de Burgh. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Is anyone there?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/73</td>
<td>Leaving a fire emoji on somebody’s Instagram and then immediately</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is not what music means. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfollowing them once they follow you back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: What is music mean?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/74</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely is there. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Are you there?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/75</td>
<td>Great question, Mary.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: The comment is not a question and is not great. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose</em>: Criticism-humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Fwar fwar fwarrrrr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/76</td>
<td>Seeing Korn live when I was in 8th grade. That was magical.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Although possible, it is highly improbable that this event is Neely’s most mind-blowing experience in music. AP: The utterance is false. Comment: What’s the thing that has blown your mind the most in music?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VL: The statement is a hyperbole; an *eternity* here means *quite a long* time. AP: The statement is false. *Purpose*: Criticism-humor

*AP: The utterance is false. *Purpose*: Humor

*QL: Neely is not a *lady* and is not wearing *red* clothes; this is a reference to *The Lady in Red*, an album by Chris de Burgh. AP: The utterance is false. *Purpose*: Humor

*AP: The utterance is false. *Purpose*: Humor

*Comment: What’s the point of analysing something in such a depth as for example the first question? Let’s be honest no one thinks like that when they’re writing a song. Is it just because you can?*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Purpose: Humor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>U/51/77</td>
<td>I really don’t.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely probably is still able to find time to practice. This lie is based on his frequent mention of how difficult it is to spare time to practice amidst his busy schedule. AP: The utterance is false. Comment: How do you find time to practice with such a hectic/unpredictable schedule?</td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:31</td>
<td>U/51/78</td>
<td>I don’t know, but Miles Davis gave birth to it.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Neely can probably attempt to describe the concept of <em>cool</em>. Miles Davis did not give birth to <em>cool</em>. Comment: What is cool?</td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:24</td>
<td>U/51/79</td>
<td>I don’t get it.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Adam gets it because this is a notation for “the lice”. AP: This utterance is false. Comment: A B C D B G A</td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:22</td>
<td>U/51/80</td>
<td>I love putting fishsticks in my mouth.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>MN: The underlined utterance is a verbose way of saying <em>eating</em>. AP: The utterance is verbose. Comment: Do you like fishsticks?</td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05</td>
<td>U/51/81</td>
<td>I wish I could be those people when I grow up.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: The referents are on the same, if not lower, level of prominence as Neely, and Neely is a grown-up; this wish is insincere. AP: The utterance is insincere. Comment: Referring to other YouTubers with similar video contents</td>
<td>Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/82</td>
<td>I think the real question is does Leonard Bernstein is gay, and I think we all know the answer to that: Bruno Mars.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is not the “real question”. RL: <em>Bruno Mars</em> is irrelevant to the question mentioned by the utterance. MN: The utterance purposefully employs incorrect grammar, imitating the comment. AP: The utterance is false, irrational, and deliberately ungrammatical. <em>Purpose:</em> Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/83</td>
<td>Finally, somebody asking the hard-hitting questions.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is not true of the comment. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose:</em> Criticism-humor</td>
<td>Comment: Why jazz be jazz when yass yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/84</td>
<td>Believe it or not, I’m working right now. This is my job. I’m creating content. It doesn’t make sense to me either.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: It definitely makes sense to Neely. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose:</em> Humor</td>
<td>Comment: How are you this bored to tell me to ask you a question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/51/85</td>
<td>Because <em>Despacito 2</em> has not been released yet.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This implies that <em>Despacito</em> “is the best song ever” and <em>Despacito 2</em> will top it, which is untrue by Neely’s standard. QT: In the event that <em>Despacito</em> is really the best song ever, this does not answer the question sufficiently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| U/51/86   | Carefully. | v | v | AP: The utterance is false and inadequate.  
*Purpose:* Humor | QT: This does not answer the question adequately.  
*AP: The utterance is inadequate.  
*Purpose:* Humor | Comment:  
How to learn music | 6:48 |
|----------|------------|---|---|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------|
| U/51/87  | I’m really just good at quoting “the lice”. It’s pretty much all you need to do these days in order to get views. So, by that metric, I’m good at jazz. | v | v | AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Humor | QL: This is a belittlement of Neely’s capability in jazz. Merely playing “the lice” is not a determiner in getting views.  
*AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Humor | Comment:  
Are you good at jazz | 7:09 |
| U/51/88  | I would change the name of the guitar to “the toy bass”. | v | v | QL: This is probably untrue; this is done based on the stereotype that bassists “hate” guitarists.  
*AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Humor | Comment:  
If you could rename any musical instrument what would it be | 8:20 |
| U/51/89  | Terribly. | v | v | QT: This does not sufficiently answer the question; what is questioned is the description of how the process is done, not an over-simplification of the quality of the whole process.  
*AP: The utterance is inadequate.  
*Purpose:* Humor | Comment:  
How do you structure your work schedule when working from home? | 8:34 |
| U/51/90 | I really am not. It is you people who are. | v | v | QL: Based on the ubiquity of “the lick” in Neely’s videos, he is almost definitely ‘obsessed’ with it. AP: The utterance is false. *Purpose:* Humor | Comment: Why are you so obsessed with the lick | 8:37 |
| U/51/91 | A really freaking long time. Most of my life is actually video editing, not playing music. | v | v | QL: The statement is a hyperbole and probably untrue, done to emphasize the lengthy process of video editing. QT: The expected answer is probably a specific length of time (minute/hour); the answer does not give this away. AP: The utterance is false and inadequate. *Purpose:* Humor | Comment: How long does it take you to edit a video | 9:02 |
| U/51/92 | Depends. How much does it pay? | v | v | QL: Rationally speaking, no person will play (exclusively) in their own wedding, and definitely not based on the payment (which is basically paying oneself). AP: The utterance is insincere. *Purpose:* Humor | Comment: Are you gonna play at your own wedding? | 9:52 |
| U/51/93 | Athanasius. | v | v | QL: This is not Neely’s middle name (confirmed later). AP: The utterance is false. | Comment: What’s your middle name? | 10:32 |
| U/53/94 | … mainly, they just *kinda* look cool. That’s what music’s all about, right? | v | v | QL: Neely does not believe that music is all about being cool.  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Criticism-humor | Referring to true temperament bass frets | 1:10 |
| U/53/95 | At least somebody does. | v | v | The statement is a hyperbole; it is true but it implies that almost nobody loves Neely, which is probably untrue and thus, an insincere concern.  
AP: The utterance is insincere  
*Purpose:* Humor | Comment:  
Why do I love you? | 1:25 |
| U/53/96 | I don’t get it. | v | v | QL: Neely gets it (“the lice”)  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Humor | Comment:  
D E F G E C D | 2:07 |
| U/54/97 | 3 Lydian tetrachords followed by a Phrygian tetrachord *digestif*. | v | v | QL: This is most probably untrue but it reflects Neely’s love of complicated chords.  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Humor | Comment:  
How many tetrachords do you chug in a day? | 2:14 |
| U/53/98 | Uhm… it’s funny. | v | v | QL: This is probably an indirect way to state “I do not like it.” and Neely does not think of it as “funny”.  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose:* Criticism | Comment:  
What are your thoughts on “new wave” music? | 4:06 |
| U/53/99 | I probably could. Yeah. | v | v | QT: The statement does not answer what the commenter expects it to (the comment is a request not an inquiry).  
Comment:  
Could you talk about all of your gear for bass and music production? | 4:56 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Verdict</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U/53/100</td>
<td>All bass all the time</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is insufficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/53/101</td>
<td>This is a bass (showing his bass guitar).</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: This is not the best amp setting and Neely knows this.</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Bass to treble ratio?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/53/102</td>
<td>Sure, so long as we install Wayne Shorter as the Emperor of Jazz.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>QL: Neely does not support the overthrowing of the government by jazz musicians as it is ridiculous.</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AP: The utterance is false.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Should jazz musicians overthrow a government?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/53/103</td>
<td>Don’t write bad music.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td>QT: This is true but is not helpful at all as it does not explain how to avoid writing bad music, which is</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Purpose</em>: Humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Advice on composing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/53/104</td>
<td>If you have ever dated a bassist, I’m sorry.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: The implication that bassists are bad partners or dates is untrue and is a play on the stigma of bassists. Neely also does not really feel sorry about this. QT: The statement does not answer the question. AP: The utterance is inadequate. Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/53/105</td>
<td>Authoritarian Jazzist</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is false. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/53/106</td>
<td>They really are the same thing, aren’t they?</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is false and Neely does not believe this. AP: The utterance is false. Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/55/107</td>
<td>It’s not okay. I have done that before to everybody’s chagrin and I’ll probably do it again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The utterance is ironic in the way Neely contradicts himself by saying that he’ll do it again despite his belief that it is not okay (to do). Purpose: Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/57/108</td>
<td>You can definitely see it in my eyes as I’m staring at my iPad holding on for dear life…</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is an exaggeration and Neely actually does not signify much difficulties in his expression and gesture. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose: Humor</em></td>
<td>Referring to how he was reading a music sheet while performing in a game award ceremony</td>
<td>0:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/58/109</td>
<td>Of course, this is a midi recreation because we don’t want to anger the monetization gods.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: This is an exaggeration of music companies based on how they often demonetize or report YouTube videos which incorporate parts of their copyrighted songs. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose: Criticism-humor</em></td>
<td>Referring to the music Neely uses in this particular video</td>
<td>1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/59/110</td>
<td>Play “the lice” but incorrectly.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>AP: The utterance answers the question insincerely. It is true but Neely knows this is not what is expected by the commenter. <em>Purpose: Humor</em></td>
<td>Comment: How do I stand out at jams?</td>
<td>2:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/59/111</td>
<td>There’s no such thing.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: Too much bass can ruin the music and Neely knows this. AP: The utterance is false. <em>Purpose: Humor</em></td>
<td>Comment: How much bass is too much bass?</td>
<td>3:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/59/112</td>
<td>’Coz there are 300 million of us and we are all very loud.</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>QL: The statement is a generalization. QT: The statement is inadequate in answering the question.</td>
<td>Comment: Why is American culture so identifiable?</td>
<td>4:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| U/59/113 | Kind of a pretentious douchebag to be honest. | v | v | AP: The utterance is false and inadequate.  
_Purpose_: Humor | 7:33  
Comment: What do you think of Adam Neely? |
| U/59/114 | Why would you ever play music?  
What a stupid thing to do. | v | v | AP: The utterance is false.  
_Purpose_: Humor  
Comment: Going back to study music at 29, am I mad? | 8:12 |
| U/59/115 | If you’re new to him, definitely check out his album _Mingus Ah Um_ or possibly the greatest album title of all time, _Mingus Mingus Mingus Mingus_. That’s gonna be the name of my debut album, _Neely Neely Neely Neely_. | v | v | AP: The utterance is false.  
_Purpose_: Criticism-humor  
Comment: Responding to a question about Neely’s opinion on Charles Mingus | 8:43 |
| U/59/116 | You can never have too much bass. | v | v | AP: The utterance is false.  
_Purpose_: Humor  
Comment: How much bass a day is unhealthy? | 10:36 |
| U/59/117 | Finally, Finally, somebody asked the question. | v | v | AP: The utterance is insincere as the question is not significant nor awaited.  
_Purpose_: Humor  
Comment: Is a hotdog a sandwich? | 12:21 |
| U/59/118 | I don’t get it. | v | v | AP: The utterance is false.  
_Purpose_: Humor  
Comment: | 12:27 |
| U/60/119 | … Of course, we’re living in a boring technocratic capitalist dystopia… | v | v | AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose*: Humor | QL: This is a hyperbole and insincere.  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose*: Humor | Describing AI music and monetization | 3:46 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U/63/120 | … A lot of musicians started adding the 9th degree from the scale, giving us the glorious, the one and only 6/9 chord. | v | v | QL: These qualities of the 6/9 chord are hyperbolic.  
AP: The utterance is false.  
*Purpose*: Humor | Describing the 6/9 chord | 2:29 |