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ABSTRACT


This linguistic study is done in order to gain comprehensive insight into English pragmatics, specifically into the realm of maxim flouting, where what is said deliberately violates conversational maxims to convey a specific message (called implicature). The object of the study is the episode “Occam’s Razor”, of the award-winning American television series, *House, M.D.*.

Two guiding questions have been formulated to guide this study: (1) What are the instances of Maxim Flouting in *House, M.D.*? and (2) What are the implicatures of those utterances that flouted the maxims?

In answering the two questions, this study uses the pragmatics approach. With this approach, utterances are viewed as more than just a string of sentences, but also as vessels to convey intentions (which could very well contradict the actual sentences spoken). The primary source of study is the dialogues of the approximately 44-minute-long movie of “Occam’s Razor”, and the information obtained regarding the contexts within the dialogues. The secondary sources were books and online articles on pragmatics and maxim floutings.

The questions were answered by firstly selecting maxim-flouting utterances from the dialogue, and putting those utterances through an implicature analysis. The results of the analysis are then briefly reviewed in a maxim-by-maxim summary, in which general characteristics of maxim-flouting utterances are summed up.

This study finds that there are 21 dialogues containing 49 maxim-flouting utterances in “Occam’s Razor” that could be analyzed. The utterances make up about 5 minutes and 2 seconds or 11.2% of the episode. 29 utterances flouted the maxim of quality, 18 utterances flouted the maxim of relevance, 17 utterances flouted the maxim of quantity, and 6 utterances flouted the maxim of manner.

Employing context and maxim analysis, the study manages to uncover the implicatures of those 49 utterances, noting specifically on how maxim-flouting utterances are converted into meaningful implicatures by hearers.
ABSTRAK


Penelitian linguistik ini dilakukan untuk mendapatkan wawasan yang komprehensif mengenai pragmatik dalam Bahasa Inggris, khususnya dalam bidang maxim flouting, di mana manorang secara sengaja menggunakan ucapan yang melanggar maksim percakapan dengan tujuan untuk menyampaikan pesan tertentu (yang disebut implikatur). Objek penelitian dari skripsi ini adalah episode "Occam's Razor", dari serial televisi Amerika yang telah memenangkan banyak penghargaan, "House, M.D."

Dua pertanyaan telah dirumuskan untuk mengarahkan penelitian ini: (1) Apa saja contoh-contoh pelanggaran maksim di House, MD? dan (2) Apa implikatur dari ucapan-ucapan yang melanggar maksim tersebut?

Untuk menjawab dua pertanyaan tersebut, penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan pragmatik. Dengan pendekatan ini, sebuah perkataan dipandang sebagai lebih dari sekedar serangkaian kalimat, tetapi juga sebagai wadah untuk menyampaikan maksud tertentu (yang bisa saja bertentangan dengan makna kalimat yang diucapkan). Sumber utama penelitian adalah dialog dari "Occam Razor" yang berdurasi sekitar 44 menit dan informasi konteks yang didapatkan dari dialog. Sumber tambahan adalah buku-buku dan artikel online tentang pragmatik dan pelanggaran maksim.

Pertanyaan-pertanyaan dijawab dengan terlebih dahulu menyeleksi ucapan-ucapan yang mengandung pelanggaran maksim dari seluruh dialog, dan melakukan analisa implikatur terhadap ucapan-ucapan tersebut. Hasil analisa ini kemudian secara singkat dibahas dalam ringkasan yang dikelompokkan per maksim, di mana karakteristik umum ucapan yang melanggar maksim akan dijelaskan.

Penelitian ini menemukan 21 dialog yang berisi 49 ucapan-ucapan yang melanggar maksim dalam "Occam’s Razor". Ucapan-ucapan tersebut berdurasi 5 menit 2 detik atau sekitar 11,2% dari seluruh durasi episode. 29 ucapan-ucapan tersebut melanggar maksim quality, 18 ucapan melanggar maksim relevance, 17 ucapan melanggar maksim quantity, dan 6 ucapan melanggar maksim manner.

Dengan menggunakan konteks dan analisa maksim, penelitian ini berhasil menjabarkan implikatur dari 49 ucapan tersebut, dengan memperhatikan bagaimana para pendengar mengubah ucapan-ucapan yang melanggar maksim menjadi pesan yang lebih bermakna.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This is the introductory chapter of this study. This chapter will be separated into four sections. The first section, *Background of the Study*, discusses the main reasons underlying the taking of this study. The second section, *Problem Formulation*, lists the guiding questions that shape the study. The third section, *Objectives of the Study*, describes the goals that the study wishes to achieve within the realm of language teaching. The final section, *Definition of Terms*, discusses the definition of terms intimately related with the study.

A. Background of the Study

People are quickly becoming aware that it would require more than just the average English language tuitions for one to be able to really master using English. It is true that tuitions are important as it would allow learners to learn how to make accurate sentences in English, accurate English sounds, and et cetera. However, the problem is that none of those would provide an adequate insight into how English-speaking people use their language.

In fact, the question “How do people use language?” has proven to be so difficult to answer that people actually had to create a different branch of linguistics – that is, Pragmatics – dedicated on studying just that: how people use language. The truth is that the use of language often goes beyond the realms of grammar and structure and vocabulary.
For example, when a girl leans over a man a bar and says, (1) “Got light?”, there is nothing in those short words to indicate what ‘light’ the girl was talking about: Torchlight? Neon? Fire? In any case, we also would not be able to determine, simply by using semantics, the actual meaning of the word ‘got’ here. Obtain? Possess?

However, any normal, English-speaking person would hear that sentence and immediately know that the girl was requesting to borrow a lighter to light a cigarette that she was about to smoke. Take one moment to think about this: how was that possible? How was it that anyone could deduce – from only the words ‘Got’ and ‘light’ – that the girl was intending to “light a cigarette that she was about to smoke”?

It turns out that humans constantly connect utterances with contexts when conversing with one another. In utterance (1) above, context is what clarifies to the hearer what the words could not convey: lots of people smoke cigarettes in bars, though not as many bring their own lighters. At the same time, people tune in to what is known as conversational maxims which allow hearers to infer these contextual messages.

The philosopher Paul H. Grice, also considered the “father of pragmatics” (Aitchison 2003:104), was the person who discovered these maxims, which are sets of principles present in an effective conversation. The maxims consist of the maxims quality (amount of truth), quantity (amount of message), relation (relevance) and manner (clarity of diction). (Thomas, 1995:63)
What was fascinating for Grice, however, was the fact that effective conversations could still be achieved even when one “implies” a message (Thomas 1995:56), for instance, by “flouting” a maxim – although “infringing” (i.e. when one unintentionally fails to observe a maxim) (Thomas 1995:74), or “violating” (when one attempts to mislead a hearer) a maxim generally leads to deception and miscommunication (Thomas 1995:72). It is as if people are naturally equipped to contextually infer a “hidden” message whenever something absurd or irrelevant was spoken in a conversation. Grice called this “hidden” message ‘implicature’, that is, what people conclude as being suggested by a particular utterance.

The act of flouting a maxim, in particular, is generally deliberately done to convey specific implicatures on the hearers’ side. A successful flouting, therefore, requires that speakers and hearers are willing and capable to encode and decipher an utterance. However, without adequate pragmatics competence, this is simply impossible – it would simply end in misunderstandings and confusion. Clearly, this competence in English pragmatics is important for Indonesian learners of English to obtain.

According to an entry on pragmatics in Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pragmatics), pragmatic competence is not easy to obtain and that the best was to obtain this competence was through experience. The good news is that pragmatic experience, or exposure, is no longer difficult to have. While the most ideal way to do it is to perform live observation where the natural use of English pragmatics would occur (somewhere in America,
perhaps?), nowadays, with the help of television broadcasting and the internet, any learner could immerse in English Pragmatics – provided they know the right materials to work with.

One American television drama in particular that had, in fact, inspired the undertaking of this study into English pragmatics was *House, M.D.*. This is an award-winning television drama named after its leading character Dr. Gregory House, M.D.. The speech of Dr. House would almost always require pragmatic competence to comprehend, due to his excessive use of metaphor, sarcasm and irony to the other characters of the show who would, in turn, would also often speak in a similar manner to him and to each other.

Although the dialogues in the show are really not easy to comprehend at face value, it had generated an average rating of 14.8 viewers per season already in America. This is an indication that pragmatics is not only important but also inherent in the English language. This naturally lead to the question, “Could a deeper understanding of American pragmatics be achieved thru studying the dialogues in this TV series?”

Thus, this study was launched, with an episode of *House, M.D.* as a subject (which, incidentally, would be the 3rd episode of the first season of the series, entitled “Occam’s Razor”) to represent the series, in the hope that an insight into the applied English pragmatics could be obtained. The end goal would be that this study would contribute to the knowledge in English pragmatics to its readers and help them see how people flout maxims, comprehend what people meant when they flout maxims and why people flout maxims.
B. Problem Formulation

Based on the introduction of the study, two guiding questions for this paper have thus been formulated as follows:

1. What are the maxim-flouting utterances in *House, M.D.*?
2. What are the implicatures of those maxim-flouting utterances?

C. Objectives of the Study

This paper is written in order to contribute to the understanding of applied English pragmatics in actual communication, especially regarding maxim flouting. This study would be very helpful for English majors who wish to understand not only the format of the language they are learning but also how to appropriately use and comprehend utterances that do not seem to make sense on the surface. It will also help shed light on how the natives of the language really use the language in their daily lives, including the contexts that the natives employed in order to understand each other’s utterances. This will therefore be particularly helpful for people who are expecting to work in America or other English speaking countries or who are expecting guests from the countries mentioned in the near future, should the need arise to manage appropriate conversations.

The insight provided by this paper would also benefit students of the faculty of English Education of Sanata Dharma University (or of any university). It is a common fact that the enthusiasm in learning English has shifted towards...
learning a more realistic English language use. Formal tests like TOEFL® and IELTS® adopting a more contemporary day-to-day-use form of language has also driven learners to seek authenticity in language learning. Therefore, having a comprehensive understanding of English pragmatics (including the operation of maxim flouting, which is the point of discussion of this study) would enable English Education students to more appropriately fulfill the increasing demand for authentic English learning.

D. Research Limitations

In its investigation into the workings of English pragmatics via analysis of the dialogues in the House, M.D. television drama, this paper will mainly concern itself with the implicatures of utterances that flouted maxims – that would otherwise be incomprehensible without the use of pragmatics. In other words, it would limit its focus only on the analysis of maxim-flouting utterances.

This study will, however, exclude maxim violations and maxim infringing. Maxim violations lead to deception, while maxim infringing simply comes from failure to observe maxims, which would generally lead to miscommunications. Neither deception nor miscommunication demonstrates an effective communication, which meant that studying them would not help achieve the goal of this study.

This paper will not perform a literature investigation into the characters of the individuals who produced the utterances selected for scrutiny. It will, however, utilize general information regarding the characters (which would be
available in chapter III: Methodology), but only to the extent necessary for reconstructing a context around the utterances to be analyzed. This is also important as to not avert the focus of the study from linguistics.

It is important to note also that this study (and its results thereof) only claims relevance over its object of study, the maxim-floutings in the episode of “Occam’s Razor” of House, M.D.. This study does not claim to be authoritative on general English pragmatics, and whatever inferences regarding the general practice of maxim flouting in its conclusion are speculative in nature.

The study recognizes that the inferences drawn could be helpful in comprehending an otherwise befuddling conversation, but maintains that they should, by no means be regarded as dogmatic, considering that the use of language varies in different locations, societies, and era.

E. Definition of terms

1. Pragmatics

This paper follows the definition of pragmatics as a branch of linguistics that studies how speakers use language and how hearers interpret a speaker’s meaning (Aitchison, 2003:104). Richard Nordquist, professor emeritus of rhetoric and English at Armstrong Atlanta State University and guide on grammar & composition for About.com, also gave this definition regarding pragmatics: “A branch of linguistics concerned with the use of language in social contexts and the ways in which people comprehend meanings through language”. (http://grammar.about.com/od/pq/g/pragmaticsterm.htm)
Pragmatics branches from semantics and syntax, focusing more on the interaction and knowledge between users of a language instead of just focusing on linguistic meaning and structure (Aitchison 2003:104). If in semantics the meaning of a word or sentence is relatively static, in the point of view of pragmatics, a sentence may mean different things, depending on the context. For example, while the sentence (2) “What are you looking at?” may sound like a simple inquiry, an angry person may also use the sentence to express discomfort for being stared at and to get people to look elsewhere.

2. **Gricean Conversational Maxims**

Herbert Paul Grice, an American philosopher found that there are conversational maxims that are in effect within conversations which enables how humans communicate efficiently. It entails four maxims:

(1) The Maxim of Quality – Do not provide an information believed to be false
(2) The Maxim of Quantity – Provide appropriate amount of information
(3) The Maxim of Relevance – Stay relevant to the context of the conversation
(4) The Maxim of Manner – Be clear, unambiguous and orderly

(1975: 45–46, 49–50)

In this study, these four maxims are used as basis to categorize the kinds of maxim floutings.
3. The Cooperative Principle

Grice also established the Cooperative Principle, which is described this way: “Make your 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” (Grundy 1995:37).

This study understands that in conversations, people generally follow this principle: they agree to deliver and comprehend a message, enabling them to communicate efficiently (Thomas 1995:63). People would also assume that those people who are staying in a conversation keep in line with this principle, meaning everything that are spoken can be interpreted, even when it seems to violate conversational maxims.

4. Maxim flouting

Maxim flouting is the core phenomenon being investigated by this study. It is an instance where speakers deliberately break a maxim, but not with the intention of misleading the hearer. Instead, maxim floutings are often done in order that hearers would effectively infer a specific message that is, the actual message according to the context which is not explicitly spoken (Thomas 1995:65). Maxims can be flouted for various reasons, such as to create humor, or to avoid an uncomfortable situation.
5. Conversational Implicature

An implicature of an utterance is what is suggested (explicitly spoken) by the utterance for the hearers to interpret. Maxim flouting generally relies on hearers’ capability to form implicatures for it to be successful. Conversational implicature refers to implicature of an utterance that is generated by the speaker and is dependent on the context. This implicature may or may not be understood (Thomas 1995:58) and may have different implications on different occasions. As an illustration:

(3) A: Have you made dinner and called Dad to the table?
B: I’ve made dinner. (But I have not called Dad)

(4) A: Shall we eat at McDonalds tonight?
B: I’ve made dinner.
(We will be eating at home, not at McDonalds)

Implicatures often reveal not only the message that speakers wish to convey, but also the intention behind a maxim flouting, e.g. to introduce humour, to convey a sarcastic remark, et cetera. This study will investigate implicatures of maxim-flouting utterances in the dialogues and offer a brief description of how these implicatures are derived and why the flouting is significant to the message being conveyed.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL REVIEW

This chapter describes the theories used as the framework for this study into applied pragmatics in *House, M.D.*. It is divided into three parts: (A) Review of Related Theories, (B) Review of Related Studies, and (C) Theoretical Framework. The first part will discuss the Theoretical concepts essential to the study. The second part will discuss a different study that holds similar concepts to the current study. The last part will discuss how the theories discussed in the first part are implemented in this study.

A. Review of Related Theories

Here, the three major theories of this study will be discussed, namely (1) Theory of conversational maxims, (2) Theory of maxim flouting, and (3) Context in communication. The theory of conversational maxims provides the foundation for the understanding of the conversational maxims that govern the object of the study, the dialogue of “Occam’s Razor” of *House, M.D.*. The theory of maxim floutings will later on be applied for the identification of maxims floutings in “Occam’s Razor”. On the other hand, communication context is the wealth of information from which speakers derive information necessary to produce or to comprehend a maxim-flouting utterance. As this study is one that focuses on implicatures (the message suggested by a maxim-flouting utterance), all three concepts hold equal importance and determines the success of the study.
1. The Theory of Conversational Maxims

The philosopher H. P. Grice portrays conversation as "a co-operative activity in which participants tacitly agree to abide by certain norms” (Cruse 2006:40). In other words, for a conversation to effectively convey what is intended by speakers, all parties involved in a conversation should strive to cooperate with each other as best as they can. Grice then called this principle the Cooperative Principle, which is then further formulated into a number of rules, which are now known as the conversational maxims or the maxims of conversation.

Defined as the “rules of conversational conduct that people do their best to follow, and that they expect their conversational partners to follow” (Cruse 2006:101), the maxims of conversation are classified into four types: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. They are defined in A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics as follows.

1. The maxim of quantity regulates the amount of information conveyed by an utterance. It comprises two components:
   a. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange in which you are engaged.
   b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

2. The maxim of quality regulates truth telling. It comprises two components:
   a. Do not say what you believe to be false
   b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
3. The **maxim of relation/relevance** regulates the relevance of an utterance in relation to the conversation. It only comprises one component i.e. be relevant.

4. The **maxim of manner** regulates the way an utterance is conveyed. It comprises four components:
   
a. Avoid obscurity.

b. Avoid ambiguity.

c. Avoid unnecessary prolixity.

d. Be orderly (Grice in Cruse 2006:355-357)

So far, the conversational maxims seem quite clear-cut. In observance to the maxim of quantity, it is much more normal to say "I live in Sleman, Yogyakarta" as opposed to "I live in RT 10, RW 3, Condongcatur, Sleman, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, Asia, Earth, the Milky Way" and so forth. With regard to the maxim of quality, one should not tell lies or give unfounded statements. With regard to the maxim of relation/relevance, one should say something related to his or her previous utterances or the conversation partner's previous utterances or the topic under discussion. With regard to the maxim of manner, it is important to formulate one's utterance in a way that is sensible enough to be understood clearly by the conversation partner. Grice himself understood the maxim of manner to relate not to what is said, but to how what is said (1975:46).

In practice, though, that is not always the case. People cannot give clear, true, and sufficiently detailed utterances all the time. Referring back to the Cooperative Principle, the speaker and the hearer shall always assume that all the parties involved are cooperating, and they will draw an inference about the
speaker's implied meaning based on their knowledge on the conversational maxims (Cutting 2002:36). Following are examples of utterances that seemingly violate the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, manner respectively.

1. Well, to cut the long story short, we won the match.

2. As far as I know, we are the only winner from Yogyakarta.

3. a. Can I talk to Anna?
   b. She's in the toilet.

4. Wait, let me clarify this. You went to his house and he was not there?

   Despite the seeming violation ("Can I talk to Anna?" should be answered with either an affirmative or a negative instead of an utterance on where she is), most people are able to understand and make sense of these utterances everyday. Most people, for instance, would easily understand that utterance (3b) means that they cannot talk to Anna just yet and have to wait for a few minutes before they can talk to her. Similarly, the hearer of utterance (1) would not blame the speaker for giving such a brief information. The hearer of utterance (2) would not accuse the speaker of lying or giving unfounded statement should it be revealed later that there was in fact another winner from Yogyakarta. The hearer of utterance (4) would not accuse the speaker of ambiguous repetition. This is known as the conversational implicature, often referred to as plain implicature.

   Cutting defines implicature as "the meaning conveyed by speakers and recovered as a result of the hearers' inferences" (2002:36), while Susan Yell views implicature as "a concept to account for the apparent gap between the literal meaning of an utterance and the way it functions in a context of use"
1. It should be noted that what is ‘suggested’ and what is ‘inferred’ should essentially be the same for a conversation to be effective. A misunderstanding occurs when what is ‘suggested’ and what is ‘inferred’ is not the same.

2. The Theory of Maxim Flouting

Based on the aforementioned Cooperative Principle, participants in a conversation will always keep the conversational maxims in mind. However, there are instances where the maxims are not observed. The first group of speakers who fail to observe the maxims include young children and people with autism or other conditions that impair their cognitive abilities. The other group, which becomes the focus of pragmatics analysis, consists of speakers who deliberately and purposefully flout, the maxims. Flouting occurs "when speakers appear not to follow the maxims but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied" (Cutting 2002:37). Cruse further describes characteristics of flouting as follows:

(a) it is obvious to the hearer that the maxims are being flouted,

(b) it is obvious to the hearer that the speaker intends the hearer to be aware that the maxims are being flouted, and

(c) there are no signs that the speaker is opting out the co-operative principle (Cruse 2006:360).

Flouting is closely related to implicature, since through implicature, hearers are able to infer and recover what meanings the speakers are actually trying to communicate. A person not familiar with how maxim is flouted in
conversations would, therefore, misunderstand or find the maxim-flouting utterance to be utterly incomprehensible.

The maxim of **quantity** can be flouted to invite a response from the hearer through implicature, either to press the speaker for more information or to infer some information that the speaker does not want to say directly. For example, when A asks "*How do I look?*" and B answers "*Your shoes are nice*", A will infer that B thinks A does not look good overall without B actually needing to say it out loud. The maxim of quantity can therefore be flouted by offering more or less than the information required which would then require the hearer to determine the significance of the addition or subtraction to infer an implicature.

The maxim of **quality** can be flouted through hyperbole, metaphor, irony or sarcasm, and banter to emphasize or to tone down the strength of the utterance so as not to offend the hearer. In essence, the maxim of quality is flouted whenever a person deliberately says something that he knows hearers understand to be untrue. This way, he leads the hearers to infer that the implicature was something of the opposite nature of what was spoken.

When the maxim of **relation/relevance** is flouted, the speaker expects the hearer to be able to infer what the utterance did not say, and relate between the utterance and the preceding utterances. Often the relevance is found in the context within which the speech is made, whether culture, regional convention, or, more intimately, shared information between speakers.

The maxim of **manner** is normally flouted to exclude a third party listening to the conversation, or to lead the hearer to imply that what is spoken has
bigger repercussions beyond the literal mess of words used. Levinson gave this sentence as example of flouting of this maxim, *Miss Singer produced a series of sounds corresponding closely to the score of an aria from "Rigoletto."*, playfully providing the implicature that Miss Singer sang badly. (1983: 108)

3. **Context in Communication**

Context is one of the defining factors in any successful communication. Context is defined *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics* as "an essential factor in the interpretation of utterances and expressions" (Cruse 2006:35). It is also closely related to pragmatics' scope of study, which distinguish this field from other linguistic fields, such as semantics. While semantics studies meanings of words in isolation based on the dictionary entries or on their properties, pragmatics studies linguistic meanings in actual use. As further elaborated in *Pragmatics and Discourse*, context is used in both pragmatics and discourse analysis to analyze the parts of meaning that can be explained by certain knowledge and factors influencing the communication (Cutting 2002:2). Gerfen even argues that one can describe pragmatics as "the study of the contribution of context to meaning (http://www.unc.edu/~gerfen/Ling30Sp2002/pragmatics.htm).

Different studies have formulated different, albeit intersecting, aspects or types of context. Cruse in *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*, for instance, formulates four aspects of context:

1) the preceding and following utterances and/or expressions, also known as "co-text"
2) the physical situation

3) the wider situation, including social and power relations

4) shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer (Cruse 2006:35)

A slightly different version was observed by Cutting in *Pragmatics and Discourse*, which includes the following three types of context:

1) the situational context

2) the background knowledge context

3) the co-textual context (Cutting 2002:2)

Cutting describes the *situational context* as "what speakers know about what they can see around them," or "the immediate physical co-presence, the situation where the interaction is taking place at the moment of speaking" (2-3). This context is often conveyed through words such as *this, that, here, there, Look!, now, yesterday*, and so forth, which are known as *deixis* or *deictic expressions*. This possibly corresponds to Cruse's *physical situation*.

The *background knowledge context* is described as "what [speakers] know about each other and the world" (Cutting 2002:2). It consists of *cultural knowledge*, or the general knowledge on various areas of life in people's minds, and *interpersonal knowledge*, which is the specific knowledge about the history of the speakers themselves. The cultural knowledge bonds the speaker and the hearer as part of the same group. Said group may range from the most general -- most people in the world share the assumed knowledge that the Earth is round and a day consists of 24 hours, for instance-- to the most specific group of people from a particular profession, country, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or even fans of a
particular genre of music. Without such knowledge, people outside the group would not be able to understand the background knowledge context of the conversation. Whereas the interpersonal knowledge is the knowledge acquired through previous verbal interactions or joint activities and experiences, which includes personal knowledge. An example of interpersonal knowledge is the hearer's knowledge of the speaker's name, home, spouse or partner, and even habits or characteristics. The background knowledge context possibly corresponds to Cruse's shared knowledge.

The co-textual context is described as "what [speakers] know about what they have been saying" (Cutting 2002:2) or "the context of the text itself" (Cutting 2002:8). It is conveyed among others through the use of reference, which includes pronouns like he, she, us, them, substitution, which employs words like one, ones and so, and ellipsis, which omits unnecessary parts of an utterance for the sake of brevity. Hearers are expected to understand what words are being referred to, what words are substituted, and what words are omitted, based on the speakers' previous or next utterances. This corresponds to Cruse's co-text.

Yet another study conducted by Gerfen maps out the following four subareas of context in communication (http://www.unc.edu/~gerfen/Ling30Sp2002/pragmatics.htm).

1. Physical context
2. Epistemic context
3. Linguistic context
4. Social context
Gerfen describes the **physical context** as related to "where the conversation is taking place, what objects are present, what actions are occurring, and so forth" (http://www.unc.edu/~gerfen/Ling30Sp2002/pragmatics.htm). It thus corresponds to Cruse's second aspect of context, **physical situation**, and Cutting's first aspect of context, the **situational context**. The **epistemic context** is described as referring to "what speakers know about the world", including the background knowledge shared by the speakers which may become crucial in their conversation (http://www.unc.edu/~gerfen/Ling30Sp2002/pragmatics.htm). Based on the definition, this context corresponds to Cruse's fourth aspect, the **shared knowledge**, and Cutting's second aspect of context, the **background knowledge context**. The **linguistic context** is described as referring to "what has been said already in the utterance" (http://www.unc.edu/~gerfen/Ling30Sp2002/pragmatics.htm). Gerfen's example of talking about a certain "Jane Smith" and referring to "her" as a top athlete, with the hearer automatically understanding that "her" is none other than Jane Smith, shows that this context is identical to one of Cruse and Cutting's aspects of context, namely the **co-text** or the **co-textual context**. Lastly, the social context is described as referring to "the social relationship among speakers and hearers" (http://www.unc.edu/~gerfen/Ling30Sp2002/pragmatics.htm), which corresponds to part of Cruse's third aspect of context, namely the **wider situation**.

Based on the review above, it can be concluded that context in communication is comprised of at least four key aspects despite the different terms employed by Cruse, Cutting and Gerfen to refer to those aspects. The writer
will use Cruse's terms in the analysis of this study with regard to the contextual communication in *House, M.D.* However, concepts and ideas from Cutting and Gerfen will also be employed freely.

**B. Review of Related Studies**

The related study is an article by the title of "Constructing a Pedagogy of Comedy: Sarcasm and Print Codes as Social Literacies in Winnie-the-Pooh," which was published in the *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*. In this article, Liberty Kohn and Wynn Yarbrough analyze comedy in relation to education, especially for the purpose of childhood education, which explains the choice of children's book *Winnie-the-Pooh* as the object of study.

This study on sarcasm and print codes is similar to the current study into maxim flouting as it presented a model where language can be seen as a vessel which carries messages that could very well be incongruent to the literal meanings of the words spoken. It also depicts how important it was to take context into account when performing an analysis to discover the real intention (i.e. the implicature) behind an utterance, something this study discovers to be essential in its analysis of the dialogues of “*Occam's Razor*”.

This study describes comedy as having a dual nature, which consists of the expected and the unexpected. The expected event does not occur but is portrayed implicitly instead, while the unexpected event actually occurs, thus producing incongruence. Kohn and Yarbrough establish that readers must understand the dual nature, or both the expected and the unexpected in order to "get" the joke,
which they refer to as the "dual cognitive schemas" of comedy (Kohn and Yarbrough 2010:60).

Kohn and Yarbrough give an example from the story "Birthday Scenes" in *Winnie-the-Pooh*. Pooh asks Eeyore if it is his birthday and Eeyore responds with an affirmative. He says, “Can’t you see? Look at all the presents [...] Look at the birthday cake. Candles and pink sugar” (in Kohn and Yarbrough 2010:66) although in fact there is no birthday cake. When Pooh says he cannot see them, Eeyore responds by saying "Neither can I. ...Joke" (in Kohn and Yarbrough 2010:66).

Similarly, the recognition of maxim flouting in “Occam’s Razor” requires that one understand both the literal utterance and the actual situation (context) to comprehend an implicature. However, the study into maxim flouting covers more ground as it scrutinizes how incongruent utterances generate not only humour, but also mockeries, suggestions, statements, etc.

This study also shows how sarcasm in *Winnie-the-Pooh* can serve as the tools to teach not only linguistic literacy but also social literacy to young learners. Kohn and Yarbrough cited various sources showing that children have difficulties understanding sarcasm through context up to the age of nine although they are able to understand sarcasm through intonation by the age of seven. Children also have difficulties distinguishing "blame attribution and sympathy elicitation" (2010:66).

*Winnie-the-Pooh* can provide examples of sarcasm as one of "social expression of individual feelings" (Kohn and Yarbough 2010:66), which is
actually intended to elicit sympathy as well. In relation to the example quoted above, it is revealed later on the story that it really is Eeyore's birthday and Eeyore's sarcasm reflects his sad feeling that nobody remembered his birthday, thus eliciting readers' sympathy. By reading the book, young learners can learn the intentions of the characters in Winnie-the-Pooh upon using sarcasm in their utterances. Kohn and Yarbough explains about it further as follows.

To reconcile young reader's contextual problems through discussion of Winnie-the-Pooh, a pedagogy of comedy would suggest discussing the emotional aspect of sarcasm as not incorrect social behavior, but as indirect, social expression of individual feelings and the eliciting of sympathy (Kohn and Yarbough 2010:66).

Thus, analyzing the expected and unexpected in comic utterances can increase young learners' understanding of pragmatics in communication, thus increasing their "emotional literacy, reading skills, and contextualization of communicational or behavioral incongruence" (Kohn and Yarbough 2010:67).

C. Theoretical Framework

The aforementioned theories are to be applied methodically upon dissecting the instances of contextual communication in House, M.D.. Firstly, the theory of conversational maxims serve as the main foundation of the study, serving as a knowledge base for both analytical steps of chapter IV of this study: the Identification of maxim-flouting utterance and the Implicature Analysis that follows.

In the gathering of Maxim-flouting utterances in “Occam’s Razor”, the theory of maxim flouting is employed to identify and harvest utterances spoken by
the characters in *House, M.D.* that flouted maxims. Utterances are scrutinized in order to identify whether or not there is an indication of maxim-flouting, in which case the relevant dialogue containing the identified utterance will be harvested, and the maxim-flouting utterance will be recorded in bolded format. The utterances will then be put under further scrutiny, in order to identify the specific maxim(s) that they have violated.

Utterances that indicate that they carry information greater or shorter than the literal spoken words will be labeled as having flouted the maxim of **quantity**. Utterances that indicate that they are made under deliberate and obvious falsehood (to the hearers), or seem to demonstrate intensity inappropriate to the conversation will be marked as having flouted the maxim of **quality**. Utterances that seem to indicate that they are referring to something beyond the conversation will be labeled as having flouted the maxim of **relation/relevance**. Finally, utterances that are deliberately structured and formulated to be unclear only to be understood perfectly by the hearers will be labeled as having flouted the maxim of **manner**.

The second part of the analysis, the implicature analysis of the maxim-flouting utterances, will see the employment of both the theory of context in communication and the theory of conversational maxims. The two theories will be used together in order to piece together the intended message (implicature) behind the utterances previously harvested. The theory of context in communication will enable the study to provide, as a backdrop to the utterance scrutinized: the identity speakers involved and the relationship between them (**wider situation**), the knowledge shared between the speakers (**shared knowledge**), previous
conversations between the speakers (co-text), and the **physical situation** in which the utterance took place.

In other words, the location and culture in which the sentences are spoken, the speakers involved, the effects the sentence has on the hearers, the atmosphere of the conversation.

The theory of maxim flouting will once again be employed in this second part of the analysis, in order to further identify **the process** by which the message gets conveyed and **in what way** the maxims are flouted. The context of the dialogue will be considered to be containing essential information which supplies or alters meaning of utterances, a crucial piece necessary for yielding an accurate conversational implicature. The process of analysis, which will provide the most insight to this study, will be explicitly recorded in the utterance-by-utterance analysis.

As it is, while there are four maxims that an utterance could flout, an utterance could very possibly flouting more than one maxim. Therefore, utterances that flouted more than one maxim will be labeled with all the maxims that they have flouted.

Finally, the results of the analysis will be summarized to provide a general overview on the overall analysis.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss the methodology of this study and will be separated into three parts. The first part of this chapter will discuss the object of the study, the episode “Occam’s Razor” from the American television drama House, M.D.. This part will be separated into three sections: (1) Review on House, M.D. the television series, (2) Short summary of the episode “Occam’s Razor”, and (3) Review of the characters of House, M.D., episode “Occam’s Razor”. The second part of the chapter will discuss the approach of the study, the Pragmatics Approach, and how that approach would contribute to the study. The third part of the chapter will discuss the research method of the study used, Content Analysis, and the steps taken in the process of the analysis from which the conclusion of the study will be drawn. This part consists of: (1) The content analysis method, (2) Research instrument, (3) The gathering of maxim-flouting utterances, and (4) The implicature analysis.

A. Object of the Study: House, M.D., episode “Occam’s Razor”

1. Review on the TV Series House, M.D. and on the Episode “Occam’s Razor”

House, M.D. is an American TV series created by David Shore and Paul Attanasio and produced by Bryan Singer, premiering on FOX Networks on November 16, 2004. It deals with the on-goings of a Princeton Plainsboro
Teaching Hospital (PPTH) in New Jersey, focusing on the Department of Diagnostics Medicine headed by one Dr Gregory House. The episodes generally start with a patient experiencing some sort of dangerous symptoms before getting admitted to PPTH, where House’s diagnostics team would then attempt to investigate the patient’s mysterious illness and treat it.

The TV series is wildly popular in America, and have received numerous awards, including 9 People's Choice Awards, a Peabody Award, two Golden Globe Awards, and four Primetime Emmy Awards. Judge David Johnson, a reviewer at dvdverdict.com (http://www.dvdverdict.com/reviews/housemdseason1.php) mentioned that despite the fact that he seldom has any clue what the doctors were talking about (when performing their jargon-filled medical analysis), the series “is one of the few shows I religiously tune in to”. This is often the case for many avid viewers tuning in to the show who are not medically knowledgeable, that they would let the medical terms and treatments fly over them and derive their viewing pleasure from the brilliant performance and interaction of the actors.

The medicine of the series itself, though not the main point of interest for the show, has generated a following by doctors or other medical professionals due to its near-accurate depiction of the symptoms and treatments. It has, in fact, sparked a series of websites dedicated to reviewing both the drama and the medicine of the show, sometimes by doctors or other medical professionals. Two websites of this nature are Politedissent.com (http://politedissent.com/house_pd.html) and jeffreyleow.wordpress.com,
within the section of ‘*House, M.D.* reviews’ (http://jeffreyleow.wordpress.com/house-md-reviews/), run by a doctor and a medical student respectively.

As mentioned in the introduction, it was the television series *House, M.D.* that triggered the original inspiration for the study into applied English pragmatics. The television series has also proven to be eligible for study since it contains a consistently ample amount of maxim-flouting utterances (sarcasm, irony, etc) which are very suitable for this study. The popularity of the show in America also guarantees that the communication happening within the show that is comprehended by the audience is relevant with how Americans generally use the English language.

This study will analyze the data gathered from the 3rd episode of the first season of *House, M.D.* in order to demonstrate how implicatures are generated and the effects that those implicatures carry. The episode is entitled “*Occam’s Razor*” and it premiered on November 30th, 2004 on the Fox network.

2. **Review of the Characters of *House, M.D.* in the Episode “*Occam’s Razor*”**

First, we will review the main characters of the whole series. The lead character of the show is Dr. Gregory House, played by the British actor Hugh Laurie. House is very selective in choosing which patients to treat and often refuses to treat patients whose illness he find too simple. House is manipulative, has little respect for authority and hates people in general, often deliberately mocking patients and acting disrespectful.
Dr. House leads a team of highly-qualified doctors – who both resent House for being a jerk and respect him for his genius. The diagnostics team in the first season is a consistent mix of Dr. Eric Foreman (by Omar Epps), Dr. Allison Cameron (by Jennifer Morrison), and Dr. Robert Chase (by Jesse Spencer).

House’s boss and occasional adversary is Dr. Lisa Cuddy (by Lisa Edelstein), the dean of Medicine in PPTH. Dr. Cuddy seems to be the only character in the series that has some kind of control over House. While she generally disapproves of House’s eccentric behavior and sometimes extreme medical practices, Dr. Cuddy maintains that Dr. House is a brilliant doctor and retains a certain level of affection for the doctor.

Dr James Wilson (by Robert Sean Leonard) is House’s best friend. He and House have opposing characters: Dr Wilson is soft-hearted and caring while House is incurably cynical; although they do share a trait of playfulness and a talent for manipulation. Dr. Wilson also seems to be the only one who is able to genuinely put up with House’s crankiness and consider House a friend. Vice versa, Dr. Wilson is the only person that House considers a friend.

Next, we will review the episode-specific main characters. The patient in this episode is Brandon Merrell (by Kevin Zegers) who was shown to have a cough at the beginning of the episode. He was admitted into Princeton Plainsboro after blacking out after having sex with his fiancé Mindy (by Alexis Thorpe). While Brandon could be described as just another cooperative patient, Mindy, on the other hand, was smart-mouthed and showed defiance and attitude towards the doctors and Brandon’s mother. Brandon’s caring mother and quiet father
(Identified only as Mr. and Mrs. Merrell) also appeared in the episode, although the utterances they made were not very significant for the analysis of this study.

3. A Summary on the Episode “Occam’s Razor”

In this episode, House and his team – doctors Foreman, Cameron and Chase – attempts to treat Brandon, who was admitted into PPTH after losing consciousness after having sex with his fiancé Mindy. Brandon’s symptoms were cough, abdominal pain, nausea, low blood pressure, and fever. Cameron quickly pointed out that no condition could account for all of them. As Brandon’s kidneys began to fail during treatment, House guessed that Brandon may have been suffering from both sinus infection and hypothyroidism. Quoting the law of Occam’s razor, Dr. Foreman pointed out that two conditions happening at exactly the same time was impossible and continued to test for other conditions with the team.

House, meanwhile, was attempting to sabotage his own clinic duty (which he finds too boring) assigned to him by his boss Dr. Lisa Cuddy. He did that firstly by proclaiming to a room full of sick people that although he’s a board-certified diagnostician, he’s really quite an unpleasant person and he’s very possibly too intoxicated on vicodin (painkiller) treatment for his hurting leg to be able to treat them. House also called Cuddy in for a consult on the most insignificant illnesses to annoy her. None of all this managed to deter Cuddy’s determination and Wilson finally got House to learn to just accept his assignment.
Brandon’s white cell count suddenly dropped and he had to be moved into a ‘clean room’. This cell count drop befuddled the doctors since none of the conditions they speculated would cause this. House finally concluded that Brandon must have been suffering from colchicine poisoning, that Brandon’s real symptom was only his cough and that the rest of the symptoms resulted from drinking colchicines, a drug for gout treatment. House then explained that Brandon’s doctor must have purposely prescribed the more expensive gout medicine for treating Brandon’s cough (something colchicines were never meant to do) in order to make some money.

A visit to the pharmacist with Chase seemed to prove House wrong and everybody, including Brandon’s parents, soon rejected House’s theory of Gout medicine poisoning. Wilson also assured House that he’s finally made a mistake. In the end, however, it turned out that House was right in his deduction and that Brandon really did have gout medicine poisoning after all, and that it was really due to the error of Brandon’s prescribing doctor and the pharmacy.

B. Approach of the Study

This study will deal with the object of its study using the pragmatic approach. Pragmatics is a study of meaning as expressed by a speaker and as understood by a listener. Pragmatics began with the realization that in reality, people do not always completely formulate what they wish to convey into crystal-clear utterances. Even more strangely, people do not always need to hear fully formulated utterances to understand the message.
Considering that this study deals mainly with maxim flouting in the English language, an essential concept in pragmatics which describes how one deliberately sidesteps principles of conversation in order to get hearers to arrive to a specific implicature, the use of the pragmatics approach is vital. This is because in this study, relying on literal meaning of utterances alone would actually mislead hearers. There is need to analyze the data collected in a pragmatic viewpoint: that meaning can be exchanged beyond the actual words spoken.

The goal of this study is to increase understanding of regarding maxim flouting in an English communication. Therefore, using the pragmatics approach to analyze instances of conversations containing comprehensible maxim floutings and implicatures would prove to be most effective and efficient – as opposed to making an actual trip to New Jersey in the hope of encountering suitable utterances to be studied. As such, a study on an episode of the television series *House, M.D.* which contains highly pragmatic dialogues is also a fairly sensible move.

**C. Method of the Study**

This study aims to answer two questions: (1) What are the maxim-flouting utterances in *House, M.D.*, and (2) What are the implicatures of those maxim-flouting utterances?

The two questions are designed to lead to a deeper understanding regarding the applied use of maxim flouting as depicted in a popular American
drama and, in turn, lead to a deeper understanding on maxim-flouting among English-speaking people.

In order to answer the two questions, the Content Analysis method (described in the next section) was selected as it was the most suitable research method for fulfilling the research goals. The first step is determining the content category required for the study to accomplish its goals. The second step is the process of coding, which is carried out to gather the required data from the dialogues for analysis. In this step, maxim-flouting utterances are gathered with its containing dialogue and the maxims that are flouted are determined. The third step is to carry out an implicature and speaker motivation analysis to determine both the implicature and the motivation behind the flouting. The answers collected from these steps will enable a final conclusion to be drawn as to how people in general flout maxims and why. These steps are further described in the following four sections that follows: (1) The Content Analysis Method, (2) Research Instrument, (3) The Gathering of Maxim-Flouting Utterances, and (4) The Implicature Analysis.

1. **The Content Analysis Method**

In order to answer the guiding research questions and to achieve the goals of this study, it is essential that this research does an in-depth analysis on what is spoken by the characters in the episode “Occam’s Razor”, since the focus of the study is never on the utterances spoken, but on the implicatures that the maxim-flouting utterances convey. The content analysis method, therefore, is chosen for
this study as it is able to go beyond actual sentences to retrieve and analyze the message contained within utterances.

The content analysis method is defined by Bernard Berelson (1952) as “a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication”. It is also defined by Krippendorf (1980) as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context”. These definitions reveal that content analysis is a method that focuses on systematic analysis on the contents of a text and its contexts, in order to arrive at valid inferences regarding the text itself.

The main objective of the method is to adapt text into categorized data, which can then be scientifically examined in order that certain inferences can be gained. It is therefore essential that a content analysis research has the appropriate content categories to analyze and a good process of coding, that is, a process of identification and harvesting of data spread throughout the text into observable data categories. Indeed, the four main issues of content analysis are: selection of units of analysis, developing categories, sampling appropriate content, and checking reliability of coding (Stempel, 1989).

This research method has been used extensively in quantitative researches, such as for dissecting texts and providing objective representations in numbers and percentages of, for example, the occurrence of words or concepts that represents a specific theme under investigation via coding. Taviss (1969), for instance, analyzed popular novels between the 1900s and the 1950s to assess his hypothesis that in middle class American society, self-alienation had been
increasing while social alienation had been decreasing. He confirms the hypothesis when he found that that in the overall rise in alienation themes in novels, there was a large increase in self-alienation and a slight decrease in social alienation.

However, there is an increase in the use of this method in qualitative researches, which generally focuses on the characteristics of language in communication, with attention paid to the content or contextual meaning of the text (McTavish & Pirro, 1990; Tesch, 1990). Clearly, this development on the use of qualitative content analysis is more appropriate for this current study into maxim flouting to employ, considering its aim to uncover accurate implicature processing of contextual maxim-flouting utterances.

Therefore, in this study, the qualitative content analysis is thus defined as a research method for obtaining a systematic and subjective interpretation on the implicatures of utterances through the systematic process of coding and analysis.

2. Research Instrument

All the definitions of content analysis place a great importance on system, that is, a valid and accountable method with which a text may be scrutinized. However, the techniques to be used generally are not strictly prescribed to be such and such, although it is essential to create content categories and to perform coding. Holsti (1968) further describes context analysis as being “any technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics of messages” (emphasis given). In other words, this method
warrants a flexible approach to any systematic technique for the analysis of content of texts, as long as it is objective and recognizes the text as a source of data for making valid, contextual inferences.

As it is, the actual aim of the study is not to make inferences regarding the use of maxim-flouting in American society, as it is much too presumptuous to regard the communication taking place in “Occam’s Razor” as a representation of how Americans generally communicate. 6.33 million Americans may have tuned in to watch the episode premiere, but 6.33 million could hardly represent all of America, and there is nothing to guarantee that all 6.33 million spoke the way the characters in “Occam’s Razor” do. Finding out that, for instance, 40% of the utterances in “Occam’s Razor” flouted the maxim of quality via the use of sarcasm will by no means represent how the general American public flout the maxim of quality.

There is also no need to categorize content according to maxim. This is very much due to the fact that the way in which each maxim is violated greatly varies from one maxim to another. In addition to that, there is no assurance that understanding what maxim is violated the most in “Occam’s Razor” could lead to any significant inference about how people flout maxims.

Rather, this study aims to uncover the implicatures of every maxim-flouting utterance, in the hope that the process of coming to an implicature could provide insights into how Americans formulate or process maxim-flouting utterances. This is based on a much more reliable rationale that although the 6.33 million viewers may not speak the way the characters did, they certainly...
understood the implicatures of the maxim-flouting dialogues, or they would have
simply become befuddled and changed the channel.

There is a need, however, to maintain the implicature-analysis within relevant dialogues. Unlike texts with wide, universal contexts, the dialogues are really only separated from each other according to the specific contexts associated with them. On top of that, the utterances (maxim-flouting or not) within a relevant dialogue interconnect with each other to create a unique communication context which would make it senseless to scrutinize the utterances separated from its relevant dialogue.

The content category of this study, therefore, has no need to go beyond: this is a maxim-flouting utterance in a specific fragment of dialogue. Therefore, the study will simply need to code for the maxim-flouting utterances and the relevant dialogue containing those utterances. The non-maxim-flouting utterances necessary for the portrayal of the context of the dialogue will also be included in the harvest, although they would not be coded or analyzed upon, as they would be irrelevant to this study into maxim-flouting.

The gathering of the maxim-flouting utterances, in particular, carry great significance as it would only be on these utterances that the implicatures analysis will prove fruitful. The two criteria used for gathering the maxim-flouting utterances are as follows:

1. The dialogue must contain maxim-flouting utterances that are comprehensible to the hearers in the dialogue,

2. The utterances that simply violate or infringe a maxim are excluded.
The dialogues and utterances in the “Occam’s Razor” identified to fit the categories required by this study are gathered and recorded in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Hearer</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(UX.x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(UX.xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(UXX.x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(UXX.xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- No: The designated number for the dialogues (1,2,3,4…)
- Time: The time on the video where the dialogue took place
- Speaker: The person who produced the utterance
- Hearer: The person(s) to whom the utterance was directed
- Dialogue: The dialogue containing maxim flouting
  (Maxim-flouting utterances would be bolded)
- UX.x: Maxim-flouting utterance X.x that is found within dialogue number X

Note: the table containing all the gathered dialogues is supplied in the appendix section.
3. The Gathering of Maxim-Flouting Utterances

This step of the research is the step of identification. In principle, it is in this stage of the study that the content categorization will be implemented. Indeed, it would have been very difficult for the analysis to yield relevant results if all the utterances of the show – without prior selection – were to be scrutinized.

Data gathering is done by first viewing the video of “Occam’s Razor” and reading its full dialogue in order to keep the contexts of familiar. Then, dialogues containing utterances with which characters flouted conversational maxims throughout the 44.08 minute-long episode of “Occam’s Razor” will be coded and recorded into the table described in the previous section. The time in which the dialogues took place will also be recorded. Utterances that flout maxims, along with their speakers and hearers will be bolded in the table. The table containing all the harvested dialogues and utterances will be provided in the appendix section.

A summary will also be provided of the table regarding the number of the relevant dialogues harvested, the total duration of those dialogues, and the percentage that those dialogues take up in comparison to the whole duration of the episode. The number of maxim-flouting utterances will also be stated, and all of those utterances will then be put into the implicature analysis that follows.

4. Implicature Analysis

This part of the analysis is aimed at discovering the implicature of utterances as inferred by hearers (as a result of having been directed the maxim-flouting utterances). This implicature analysis will be done in the assumption that
the cooperative principle was in effect throughout all gathered dialogues. A summary of the analysis will be given at the end.

This step is vital to the study and would be a great help for readers who are not familiar with how English speakers utilize English pragmatics to process maxim-flouting utterances. It is important to note that maxim-flouting utterances are unlike impressionist paintings in that these utterances are not “open for interpretation” (as paintings often create different impressions on different people). On the contrary, the utterances are like codes with specific messages (called implicatures) behind them, understood only by those holding the appropriate cipher (or in this case, appropriate pragmatic competence).

That there is a specific message behind every maxim flouting means that readers of this study who are unfamiliar with English pragmatics (due to not having English as a first language) are in the danger of misinterpreting utterances and arriving at different implicatures – or arriving at a simple confusion! Thus, this step ensures that accurate implicatures made are available for study and that mayhem due to diverse process of inference is averted.

Since this part of the analysis is meant to be a simplified approximation of the mental process of inference of implicatures, it is essential to also include context into it. This is because in almost all cases, context is a major factor that people intuitively refer to in shaping their utterances. The context of a dialogue or utterance in this study would be expressed – using the same terminology as Cruse’s – in brief dialogue-based descriptions of (1) the physical situation in which the utterance took place, (2) The shared background knowledge of the
speakers and hearers, (3) the utterances shared prior to the specified utterance (context), and (4) the wider situation (social status) between the speaker and hearer.

This implicature analysis would be done in a dialogue by dialogue basis, in which an analysis from the point of view of all contributors of a dialogue would be analyzed thoroughly and separately. The analysis will follow the following format:

**Dialogue No.** X  
**Context:**  
________________________________________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________________________  
**Overview:**  
________________________________________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________________________

**Implicature Analysis:**

**Utterance X.x** __________________________________________ (Flouted Maxim X)  
(Analysis)______________________________________________________________________________  

**Utterance X.xx** __________________________________________ (Flouted Maxim X)  
(Analysis)______________________________________________________________________________

Legend:
- Dialogue No. Dialogue number x
- Context Brief description of the context relevant to the Dialogue
- Overview An overview of the analysis of the current dialogue
- Utterance X.x  Maxim-flouting utterance X.x that is found within dialogue number X
- (flouted maxim X)  Maxim(s) flouted by utterance no X.x. (Utterances that also violates and infringes maxims are also indicated here.)
- Implicature  Implicature of maxim-flouting utterance no x.x

It should be noted that the implicatures discovered in the analysis will be bolded to provide easier reading.

Following the implicature analysis, a summary will be given as part of the analysis. This is meant so that readers could have an overall maxim-by-maxim view of the implicature analysis of utterances. The summary will firstly describe the general situations surrounding the flouting of a maxim in “Occam’s Razor”. Here, the characteristics of the flouting will be given, as well as short descriptions of the processes required to arrive at an implicature. In this part, a list of the utterances which flouted a maxim will also be given, as well as a count of those utterances. It is important to note that an utterance which flouted two (or more) maxims will be listed in the category of both maxims.

The completed implicature analysis will then be used as a basis to draw a general inference of how people use and comprehend maxim flouting in the conclusion of this study.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

The main purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of maxim flouting as it occurs in the television series *House, M.D.*, episode “Occam’s Razor”, in the hope that a generalization can be made as to how and why people flout maxims, and how to comprehend maxim-flouting utterances. In order to achieve this, an analysis on the utterances in “Occam’s Razor” is carried out.

This analysis is separated into two parts. The first part is the identification of relevant dialogues and utterances to be analyzed. This part will enable the study to focus on only those utterances that would effectively serve the goal of the study. The second part is the maxim flouting analysis on selected utterances, in which the use of context is incorporated. This part would enable the comprehension of maxim-flouting utterances and help determine the intention behind the flouting of conversational guidelines. A summary will also be given at the end of the analysis. The results of this analysis will serve as data that will allow a conclusion to be drawn regarding the general use of maxim flouting.

A. Gathering of Maxim-flouting utterances in “Occam’s Razor”

The episode “Occam’s Razor” of *House, M.D.* is 44.8 minutes long, within which there are practically hundreds and even thousands of utterances spoken. However, not all of those utterances flout maxims of conversation. Most of the utterances are, in fact, pretty straight forward. This part of the analysis is done in the
recognition that it would have been very difficult for this study to yield relevant results if all the utterances of “Occam's Razor”, including those straight-forward utterances, were to be scrutinized. A proper selection process is, therefore, not only beneficial, but also essential.

The criteria set in the methodology are (1) the dialogues must contain maxim-flouting utterances that are comprehensible to the hearers in the dialogue, and (2) The utterances that simply violate or infringe a maxim are excluded. Following the two criteria, this part of the analysis has identified 21 dialogues, spanning approximately 5 minutes and 5 seconds, or 11.2% of the total screen time. These dialogues contain a total of 49 maxim-flouting utterances which will serve as the main source for the dialogue-by-dialogue implicature analysis.

Of the 49 maxim-flouting utterances, 20 are spoken by House, 13 are spoken Wilson, 6 are spoken by Cuddy, 3 are spoken by Foreman, 3 are spoken by Chase, 3 are spoken by Mindy, 1 is spoken by Brandon, 1 is spoken by the suburban pharmacist suspected of dispensing colchicines, and 1 is spoken by Cameron. All these 49 utterances are deliberately spoken by the speakers in various situations, containing implicatures that would not have been comprehensible without appropriate knowledge of the context surrounding those utterances.

In accordance to the criteria set, dialogues with maxim violation and maxim Infringing are not included. The consideration, as explained in the introductory chapter of this study, is that these two does not demonstrate an effective communication, since maxim violation is intended to mislead while maxim Infringing is generally unintended and will lead to miscommunication. However,
in some of the dialogues gathered, there are utterances – mostly those spoken by House – that often seem to be violating maxims when it is, in fact, a maxim-flouting. In those utterances, the speaker use misleading sentences which are meant to be seen through by the hearers: a strong indication of maxim flouting, and not maxim violation. This step of the analysis therefore also includes those utterances to be further scrutinized in the implicature analysis.

This step of the analysis also harvests relevant dialogues surrounding a maxim-flouting utterance. This is done in order to provide the information necessary to construct the context of the utterance, especially the co-text aspect. In the case of maxim-flouting utterances that refer to utterances not contained within the dialogue in which it was spoken (e.g. spoken a couple of hours ago before the maxim flouting utterance was spoken) the relevant utterances will not be listed. Instead, it will simply be mentioned later on in the implicature analysis.

B. Implicature Analysis of The Maxim-Flouting Utterances

This analysis is done to uncover the implicatures (what is suggested and inferred by hearers) of maxim-flouting utterances identified beforehand. As described in Chapter III: Methodology, this analysis to determine implicatures would utilize both the four aspects of context: co-text, physical situation, wider situation, and shared knowledge; and the maxims flouted in an utterance.

While co-text is available within the dialogue, the contextual aspects of physical situation, wider situation and shared knowledge requires viewing the episode “Occam’s Razor” and relevant episodes which some maxim-flouting utterances
in this episode refer to, knowledge of American conventions, knowledge of relationship between characters and personality of relevant characters. All this would be summarized and presented in brief within the dialogue-by-dialogue analysis.

It is assumed that the cooperative principle is in effect throughout all the gathered dialogues. What follows is the implicature analysis.

1. DIALOGUE NO.1

Context:
Brandon was in bed with his fiancé, Mindy, both not wearing much. Brandon had just called in sick for not having slept well, claiming to have cough, upset stomach, and a fever. Mindy then got on top of Brandon playfully, kissing him all over his body throughout the dialogue. Cultural: people who are ill are often stereotypically illustrated as having a bowl of chicken soup for nourishment.

Overview:
This dialogue between Brandon and Mindy contains a lot of use of sarcasm, where one thing spoken means exactly the opposite. What can be observed here is how a request-acknowledgement format of speech is used as a charade to convey an altogether different content.

Implicatures:
(U01.1) *Oh. So you weren’t lying. You’d be curled up in bed with a bowl of chicken soup even if you didn’t have a horny girl in your bed* (Flouted maxim of quality)

Mindy spoke this sarcastic utterance with the knowledge that Brandon was not so sick that he needed to not go to work – i.e. Brandon was skipping work. Her initial guess (Brandon wasn’t lying when it was so obvious that he did) sets up the situation for a series of flouting of maxim of quality. Whatever follows her guess will mean the exact opposite: She is saying that *Brandon was lying in order to accompany the horny girl (herself) in his bed at the moment*. Mindy used the chicken soup illustration to further state her point: Brandon is far from being the pathetic guy who is restricted to his bed. Her tone suggests that she spoke the utterance in amusement of seeing Brandon lying to keep her company.

(U01.2) *Oh, that’s ok, because I have almost no interest in kissing you.* (Flouted maxim of quality)

Mindy spoke this in response to Brandon’s cautious warning how kissing him might infect Mindy. Considering that Mindy was kissing Brandon all over the place, before U01.2 was uttered, this was an obvious lie. This use of irony tells Brandon that the opposite was true: *Mindy wanted to kiss him (and do other things as well) and – in relevance to his warning – she would not care if she got infected while doing it.*

(U01.3) *Perfect* (Flouted maxim of quality)
Brandon said this in response to Mindy’s statement that she did not want to kiss him. This short acknowledgement is said as if to convey Brandon’s appreciation of Mindy accepting his request that they do not kiss. However, Brandon’s playfulness when saying this indicate that he understood Mindy’s sarcasm and that he was just saying this to continue the charade that Mindy had set up when she said that she did not want to kiss him. **Brandon is in fact saying that he is happy that Mindy is not going to stop kissing him.**

(U01.4) *Good* (Flouted maxim of quality)

Mindy is saying this in the same manner of thinking behind Brandon’s U01.3. She is, in a manner of speaking, sealing the deal of an understanding between her and Brandon. Of course, since the understanding is a charade, what she is saying is really the opposite: “**Good, I will kiss you now**”.

2. **DIALOGUE NO.2**

**Context:**

Dr. House and his friend Dr. Wilson was walking along one hallway of PPTH towards an elevator. Wilson was holding Brandon's file. As they were talking, House had the expression of an inquisitor and Wilson of amusement. Wilson duped House to take a case in a previous episode (“Everybody Lies”) in which he asked House to treat a patient whom Wilson said was his cousin. House later on discovered that the patient was not related in any way to Wilson, and that Wilson only said that the patient was his cousin to get House to take the case. Cultural
context: the term ‘personal intentions’ generally refer to personal gain or personal relationship.

Overview:
Understanding this dialogue requires that viewers are aware of the history between House and Wilson. The dialogue is essentially a mock banter as House uses absurd arguments to investigate why Wilson wanted him to take a case – to the amusement of both doctors.

Implicatures:
(U02.1) No, no I didn’t ask how you plan to con me into treating him, I asked you why YOU want me to treat him. (Flouts maxims relevance and manner)

House saying this in response to Wilson’s description of a patient’s symptoms seems quite irrelevant. After all, Wilson’s description does not resemble a con, so calling it one seem wrong. However, Wilson has, in fact, conned House once to take a case (Episode 1, “Everybody Lies”). House was, therefore, relating Wilson’s current proposal to a previous con, which he doesn't care for and will dismiss, unless Wilson. House then flouts the maxim of manner as following utterance is essentially a repetition of his earlier question “why do you want me to treat this guy?” House’s deliberate repetition signifies to Wilson that House was asking Wilson to give him something other than the details of Brandon’s case (the con). House’s emphasis on “you” implies to Wilson that House wants to know a more personal reason why he wants House to handle the case.
Wilson was replying exactly what House was asking him, however, the phrases he used are really too short for them to agree with the maxim of manner. Wilson also does not talk like this as a habit, and so when he does, it significantly suggests that there is a deliberate intention behind it. No serious question deserves short answers, and Wilson seems to go with this line of thought. Wilson’s short answer conveys to House that instead of seeing it as serious, Wilson sees House’s question as amusing, since there really should not have to be a personal reason for proposing a patient. His answers were vague and did not specify a particular motivation. The words “He’s sick” could refer to any patient in the hospital, “I care” refers to the fact that he is – and that House should be – a caring doctor (as doctors ought to be), and “I’m pathetic” represents Wilson’s acknowledgment of House’s superior capability, something House is already aware of. All in all, U02.2 conveys to House that Wilson has no ‘personal reasons’ for wanting House to take on the case and that it’s silly for House to need a personal reason to treat a patient.

(U02.3) There are about a billion sick people on the planet, why this one?
(Plouts maxim of quality)
Here is a clear sign of exaggerated approximation (“a billion sick people”). There is no way that House could have known the number of sick people in the world, and the use of “a billion” is really quite insignificant, as it could easily be replaced by any number, considering there is no way to validate the numbers. This tells
Wilson that House was only mentioning the random number of patients to present a perspective which will effectively extend the intention behind U02.1: **Why does Wilson personally want House to deal with this particular patient, out of the many patients around?**

(U02.4) *Because this one’s is in our emergency room.* (Flouts maxim of quality)

This utterance follows the exaggerated premise House set in U02.3 (“a billion people”, which was clearly just a random number) and provides an obviously false answer to the question of personal motivation that House was asking Wilson: it is ridiculous to assume that Wilson cares about Brandon simply because Brandon was in the emergency room. In the light of U02.2, it is quite clear that Wilson is continuing to tell House that he has no personal reason to propose Brandon by offering an obviously fake answer. Wilson deliberately providing a laughable specification (“in the emergency room”) conveys the amusement that Wilson felt of how House needed to see a personal agenda in this very simple proposal.

(U02.5) *Ah, so it’s a proximity issue. If somebody was sick in the third floor stairwell, that’s who we would be talking about.* (Flouts maxims relevance and quality)

With U02.5, House deliberately takes U02.4 literally – that the fact that the patient is in the PPTH emergency room is the main reason Wilson is making his proposal – and replies according to that. This, of course, is absurd. However, responding
the absurdity of U02.4 with another absurdity conveys to Wilson that although U02.4 is funny, House could carry on with the absurdities and still not take the case. This also implies that the initial inquiry is still very much in House’s main interest. Therefore, this humorous absurdity is also spoken to show that he would not take the case unless his initial inquiry is satisfied.

(U02.6) Yes, I checked the stairwell, it’s clear (Flouts maxim of relevance and quality)

U02.6 is another addition to the absurd conversation. It is not logical to assume that Wilson truly went and checked the stairway prior to talking to House, simply because House could not have specified his patients-in-the-stairway-only policy prior to the increasingly absurd conversation - and both House and Wilson knows that. It is still as absurd to assume that Wilson’s main reason for proposing Brandon was due to a “proximity issue”. While this is untruthful, U02.6 is not meant to deceive House, but to simply satisfy House’s dumb inquiry with a dumb answer, keep the amusingly absurd arguments alive, and press on the proposal to have House take up Brandon’s case.

3. DIALOGUE NO.3
Context:
This conversation takes place in the diagnostics department. House is leading the differential diagnosis participated by his diagnostics team. The team had made a lot guesses, none of them accurate. In the middle of the diagnosis, House walks up
to the bookshelf and picks up a huge book, possibly an encyclopaedia of illnesses. After slamming the book on the table, at the corner where Foreman was sitting, he spoke U03.1 while turning to the first page and pointing to the first entry.

Overview:
This utterance could only be understood if one understood the character of House, the concept of sarcasm and the purpose of the differential diagnosis, which is to determine the best diagnosis of a patient’s condition.

Implicature Analysis:
(U03.1) *Foreman, if you’re going to list all the things it’s not, it might be quicker to do it alphabetically. Let’s see. Absidia? Excellent. Doesn’t account for any of the symptoms* (Flouted maxim of quality)

What House is asking Foreman to do, listing what could not possibly explain Brandon’s condition alphabetically (to emphasize the hassle), is neither effective nor efficient. It is an immediately apparent bad idea to all of them. On the other hand, they knew that House is not that dumb. Everybody therefore understood that House was trying to say the exact opposite: Look for things that could actually explain Brandon’s condition. **House therefore flouts the maxim of quality in order to deliver a sarcastic remark.** House slamming the book and his sarcasm was also done deliberately to criticize his team’s failure to contribute anything relevant.
4. DIALOGUE NO.4

Context:
Cameron was telling House that there are no conditions that would fit all Brandon’s symptoms after House gave them the sarcastic remark U03.1 and criticized them. Her tone suggests resentment of having been told off although what they were dealing with was not easy.

Overview:
This utterance was spoken in response to Cameron’s implicit protest to House’s criticism. It is also imbued with House’s dislike of Cameron’s resentment.

Implicature Analysis:
(U04.1) Well, good! Because I thought maybe he was sick, but apparently he’s not. Who wants to do up the discharge papers? (Flouted maxim of quality)

U04.1 contains a very rich implicature. Firstly, the sarcasm is immediately apparent. Discharging a patient without a proper diagnosis (or treatment) is obviously a foolish thing to do. U04.1 therefore was not what House really wanted to do. The strong indication is that House is replying to Cameron’s remark and the resentment it carries. House’s criticism in U03.1 was accurate: the team need to list conditions that are relevant. Cameron resenting the criticism does not actually mean that she was not ready to do what was necessary – she was simply unhappy that they were given a hard time over something so difficult. However, with this utterance, House takes an extremely negative outlook (which he always does) and extends Cameron’s utterance to mean that they are ready to give up and send the patient home just because none of the conditions they
knew could explain it. The humour of the utterance is overcome by House’s critical and fatalistic attitude that clears up the fog once again that he is not “nice”.

5. DIALOGUE NO.5

Context:
Mindy had an argument earlier with Chase and Foreman in Brandon’s room where she impulsively accused the doctors of not knowing what they were doing. Foreman then explained to Mindy that what they were doing was necessary, that they needed to know what was wrong with Brandon first before they can provide accurate treatments. U05.1 occurred after Mindy catches up to Chase afterwards, apologizing by explaining that she does stupid things when she is scared. She then reveals to Chase that she was afraid that she was the one who caused Brandon to fall sick. Sports context: Rock climbing is a very dangerous sport that is well-known to have claimed lives of careless climbers.

Overview:
One would need to know the dangers of rock climbing to understand why Chase spoke U05.1 and related that with Mindy’s statement.

Implicature Analysis:
(U05.1) Don’t go rock climbing. (Flouted the maxim of relevance)
There nothing in what Mindy says that suggests that she was going rock climbing or that she was at all interested with the sport, making U05.1 quite irrelevant. However, Mindy understood the danger of rock climbing and related Chase’s U05.1 with her expressed tendency of doing stupid things when she’s scared and
comes to the realization that Chase is trying to make a joke: with her personality, she would die a very gruesome death if she went and did an intense sport like rock climbing and got scared and did something stupid. The reason she did not respond to the joke was because she was thinking about something really serious that she needed to ask Chase about.

6. DIALOGUE NO.6

Context:
This conversation took place in the clinic in the exam room 1 that house was assigned to. Jodi was sitting on the bed, looked a little bit nervous, but was okay throughout her consultation with House regarding the colour of her mucus. House was standing across her looking at her file and talking to her in a conversational tone. Jodi’s expression became apprehensive after House's U06.1.

Overview:
This dialogue portrays how people can carry a conversational tune and yet have a diverse intention. Here we see how House politely engages Jodi, and then reveals his contempt of her in the end. House spoke U06.1 after Jodi revealed that she thought that she was okay now, considering that her change in mucus colour occurred the previous week, in response to House telling her that she should be worried.

Implicature Analysis:
(U06.1) And yet, here you are. What happened? Paramedics took a week to respond to your 911 call? (Flouted the maxim of quality)
People’s guess often represented what they were thinking. In House’s case, however, the guess could not have been what he was really thinking seeing that it is too implausible to be an actual guess. House was actually setting up a humorous and dramatic situation with his guess, and anything that could make Jodi’s decision to come to PPTH look ridiculous will suffice. Jodi understood that House was just using the guess to show his contempt at her, which was why her response to him afterwards the statement, “You’re not a very nice doctor, are you?”’. House deliberately used a concerned tone in guessing that Jodi called the paramedics to deal with mucus and actually waited a whole week to further exaggerate this mockery of Jodi being overly dramatic.

7. DIALOGUE NO.7

Context:
House spoke U07.1 in a cheerful tone in the diagnostics office to his diagnostics team: Cameron, Chase and Foreman. Foreman replied in a calm manner that he does not think that Brandon’s kidney failure complicates things.

Overview:
This utterance is a good example of how to use irony. Projecting real joy when announcing a bad news enhances the irony and humour, although the humour simply comes off as facetious, given the seriousness of the atmosphere.
Implicature Analysis:

(U07.1) *So, we had six symptoms that didn’t add up to anything, now we have seven. Who’s excited?* (Flouted maxim of quality)

Kidney failure was bad news, as it adds to the long list of symptoms that Brandon has that had befuddled the doctors earlier – clearly not something to celebrate about. House was not, in fact, trying to provide any kind of insight. He was simply using the utterance to add humour to the situation. The irony in U06.1 also invites humour, although the gravity of the situation renders it facetious.

8. DIALOGUE NO.8

Context:

House had just presented the possibility that Brandon may have two conditions at the same time. When criticized for breaking the principle of “Occam’s Razor” (the simplest explanation is the best one), he gave an illustration of how having two conditions may actually be more acceptable by giving an illustration on babies, about how the story of two persons creating a baby is more credible that the story of one story bringing a baby to a couple. Foreman immediately responded that House’s argument (analogy) is specious.

Overview:

The cooperative principle can be seen in full effect here. An utterance either responds to or reflects the utterance that precedes it. Here, House uses U08.1 to reflect what he felt about a statement Foreman made.
Implicature Analysis:

(U08.1) *I think your tie is ugly.* (Flouts maxim of relevance)

U08.1 is certainly does not reflect a good way to communicate. However, the message House was trying to convey with this utterance still gets delivered anyway. Foreman’s statement has nothing to do with Foreman’s taste in ties, and U08.1 certainly does not weaken Foreman’s statement – albeit quite mean. However, U08.1 as a deliberate response to Foreman’s statement carries more significance. **House was using the irrelevance of U08.1’s to tell Foreman that he finds Foreman’s comment irrelevant and shows hostility to the comment.** House’s position as their head and his brilliance as a doctor then compel the team to really consider the plausibility of Brandon having been hit by two conditions.

9. **DIALOGUE NO.9**

Context:

This conversation took place in the lab, after Foreman insisted to Cameron and Chase that House’s two-illness theory cannot be right and that they needed to do more tests. The three doctors were at different stations, Foreman and Chase being the closest to each other while Cameron was on the other side of the room and could not hear what the two doctors said to each other. Foreman had announced a negative for a virus and Chase had just fiddled with a machine in the lab. Chase was relaxed and was intently looking at Cameron as he expressed to Foreman his doubt about finding the right virus out of the thousands of viruses that was yet to be tested.
Overview:

This dialogue is another example of irony put to good use. Foreman criticizes Chase by mentioning the exact opposite as true: dilly-dallying is productive.

Implicature Analysis:

(U09.1) No, I think we’re going to get it by standing around watching other people work. (Flouts maxim of quality)

It is obvious that Foreman did not mean what he said, as the solution he gave was knowingly false, hence flouting the maxim of quality. The resulting sarcasm meant that Foreman is really saying the opposite. Foreman is criticizing what Chase is doing (standing around watching Cameron) as a bad idea since there were still over four thousand viruses to process. Chase knew that Foreman was criticizing him and gave a weak denial: he was waiting for his Epstein - Barr virus test result.

10. DIALOGUE NO.10

Context:

This conversation picks up where U09.1 left off. The diagnostics team is still in the lab, testing for with viruses, and Chase and Foreman are still separate from Cameron at this point. The dialogue began when Chase mentioned that Cameron was “weird”. When saying that, Chase’s face was plastered with intense interest and not with disgust. Foreman mentioned that it was a bad idea, and when it confused Chase as to what is bad, Foreman spoke U10.1. Chase had had a conversation with Cameron earlier that had something to with female sexuality
which intrigued Chase – which Foreman was aware of although he did not participate in it. Social context: a romantic relationship between co-workers is generally understood as a bad thing since it could negatively influence one’s productivity.

Overview:

This dialogue demonstrates how context actively influences utterances. Foreman knew that the conversation that Chase had with Cameron had sparked an infatuation on Chase’s side. However, it was the urban common sense (social context) regarding romantic relationships in workplaces that influenced Foreman’s U10.1.

Implicature Analysis:

(U10.1) Bad idea. You work with her. (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)

There is really nothing strictly bad about calling somebody weird when spoken among adults. “You work with her”, which was meant to clarify Foreman’s intention also does not seem to provide enough information as to why Chase’s comment is a bad idea. However, context steps in where the literal utterance could not clarify. The urban wisdom is that romance between co-workers is a bad thing, and foreman was saying that Chase calling Cameron “weird” was an indication that Chase was attracted to Cameron (and wanted to talk about her). With that, the implicature becomes complete: **Foreman thinks that Chase’s newly found infatuation on Cameron is a bad thing.** Chase understood this implicature and denied that he expressed romantic interest when he said that Cameron was weird. U10.1 therefore flouts the maxim of quantity (Foreman’s reply could not have
conveyed enough information without the help of context) and relevance (Foreman’s response does not fit with Chase’s statement that Cameron is “weird”) in order to convey a short advice about office romance to Chase.

11. DIALOGUE NO.11

Context:
Still in the lab, this utterance was spoken shortly after U10.1, with Cameron still earshot away from Chase and Foreman. Chase had just described his bewilderment at how saying “weird” could be understood as saying some sort of euphemism that meant “sexy”. Foreman then asks Chase if he finds Cameron hot, and Chase says, “No”.

Overview:
U11.1 requires that one sees the clues given in the sentence to determine the actual meaning of the utterance. In this case, the sentence “using brilliant as euphemism” plays a great role in allowing the hearer to understand that what is intended is not quite what is said.

Implicature Analysis:
(U11.1) Wow, then you’re brilliant. And I am using ‘brilliant’ as a euphemism.
(Flouts maxim of quantity and quality)
Foreman began this as if he was praising Chase. However, Chase not thinking that Cameron is hot is not really praiseworthy by any standard, clearly indicating to Chase that this is not really what the utterance is meant to convey. The sarcasm was clear actually clear enough. However, Foreman decided to still point out that
he was using euphemism, which really was excessive information. However, this excessive info was deliberately given to sharpen to the mockery in the sarcasm. This information, therefore, allows Chase to infer that Foreman is not really intending to praise him but was actually mocking him: Chase was not at all brilliant.

12. DIALOGUE NO.12

Context:
This conversation took place in exam room 1 in the clinic. House was sitting on a chair at a corner playing games on his handheld gameboy® and there was a patient in there with him, Brown, who was sitting on the examination bed. This conversation started as Cuddy, a doctor who holds an important position in the hospital, walked into the exam room.

U12.2 Cultural Context: People generally see board meetings as very important. Social context: People, especially those holding important positions, generally refrain from having an argument in the presence of third-parties.

Overview:
This dialogue is essentially a humorous one. Mockery is shared between amused speakers, although there is no laughter. House’s silly ploy is coloured by his hilarious display of mock idealism, while Cuddy’s protests is soft and subtle and with evident amusement. The presence of Brown the patient is the main influence on the utterances here, as it causes Cuddy to refrain from expressing her
resentment and enables House to play the role of an inadequate doctor and messing with Cuddy in the process.

Implicature Analysis:

(U12.1) *Of course! Yes, why didn’t I… I mean, because he said that it hurt, and I should have deduced that meant it was sore…* (Violates maxim of quality and quantity, flouts maxim of quality)

House displays mock surprise and mock realization on hearing the ‘sore throat’ diagnosis, acting as an inept doctor. Of course, House knows that Cuddy would see through the pretense instantly – she knows what a good diagnostician House is. Therefore, this altruism (sore throat hurts) was not to deceive Cuddy, but to let Cuddy know for sure that she is being played by House. However, Brown the patient was successfully kept in the dark about his contribution to House’s prank with this utterance (violating the maxim of quality). **House is deliberately taking up the image of the gullible and inadequate doctor (which Brown may believe to be true) to let Cuddy know openly that he was calling her to consult on a most trivial illness as a prank.** House’s resentment earlier for having been assigned clinic duties for the day also allows Cuddy to infer that this could be the reason for this prank.

(U12.2) *I was in a board meeting* (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)

U12.2 is spoken in response to U12.1, indicating that the two utterances are very closely related. U12.2 seems to be in violation of the maxim of relevance as where Cuddy was has nothing to do with house’s mock surprise at her diagnosis.
However, when referring to the implicature of U12.1, (House was telling Cuddy openly that the consultation call was just a prank), U12.2 gains relevance. Context also contributes to the short utterance, conveying Cuddy’s protest: she was in a board meeting and responding to House’s prank is taking up valuable time. Their being in the presence of a patient also causes Cuddy to mask her resentment by not using emotional words, resulting in a conversational sounding U12.2, although it is clear to House that Cuddy was pretty angry.

(U12.3) **Patients come first, right?** (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)

U12.3 immediately refers to sayings about priorities. However, on the surface, U12.3 does not seem to have much to do with U12.2. Whether patients come first or last strictly have nothing to do with Cuddy being in a board meeting. However, referring to the implicature of U12.2 – Cuddy protesting that the prank was disrupting her attendance in an important meeting – makes it clear that House was using U12.3 to reinforce his position on being the ideal doctor in front of the patient to playfully chide on Cuddy for having wrong priorities (board meeting over patients). Therefore, using U12.3, House adds idealism to his charade of being gullible doctor that he created using U12.1. **However, the lack of urgency that the case of a sore throat has over a board meeting (that both House and Cuddy is aware of) reveals that U12.3 is essentially a mockery.**

This actually amuses Cuddy to an extent, although she is also riddled resentment. Brown also did not hear U12.3.
(U12.4) *Wouldn’t want to prescribe a lozenge if there was any doubt about its efficacy, huh?* (Flouts maxim of quality and relevance)

U12.4 immediately comes off as very strange as people generally do not need prescriptions to obtain throat lozenges. Efficacy of a lozenge is also not something that people generally cares about, so doubting it simply makes one seem hypercritical. This utterance also seems to have no relevance whatsoever with its preceding utterance, although a second look will quickly reveal the lozenge as being relevant to the sore throat. U12.3 sheds some light to the context of this utterance. In relevance to House using U12.1 and U12.3 to put himself in the position of the ideal doctor, *Cuddy makes House’s image of an ideal doctor sound extra fussy to mock back at House. This shift from protest to mockery indicates that Cuddy’s amusement of having played into House’s silly prank is greater than her resentment.*

13. DIALOGUE NO.13

**Context:**

Previously, after Brandon's kidney failed, there was an argument between house and Foreman about Brandon's diagnosis. House asserts that Brandon could have caught two illnesses (hypothyroidism and sinus infection) – which meant that the kidney failure was not caused by the antibiotics they were giving Brandon – and Foreman thought that it was viral infection, and managed to get the diagnostics team to work with him in the lab testing for Viruses. It was then that House came to them and told them to check on Brandon's urine and talk to him afterwards.
Foreman later on comes in to House’s office and admits that the urine test had revealed that the kidney failure was not caused by the antibiotics. House spoke U13.1 after Foreman asks House how he knew that.

Overview:
This utterance seems only to be useful for messing with its hearer. It resembles a prank more than anything, in which the purpose of the utterance is achieved when it manages to confound or annoy the hearer.

Implicature Analysis:
(U13.1) *I was sitting by his bed all morning, just so he’d know someone was there for him.* (Flouts maxim of quality)
U13.1 was something that Foreman would never believe, considering Foreman knows how much House hates dealing with patients personally. U13.1 is describes a caring and attentive doctor who would put a lot of attention on patients’ emotional well-being, something which Foreman knows House detests. House did not use it to deceive Foreman, therefore, although it does seem to lack any perceivable purpose. The most accurate inference here would be that *House was just flouting the truth by saying U13.1 to mess with foreman.*

14. DIALOGUE NO.14

Context:
House was having a conversation with Foreman in House’s office, and Wilson was present. House had just gloated to Foreman over the fact that he was right and Foreman was wrong over a diagnosis, which was obviously unnerving to
Foreman, before Foreman left the room. Wilson, unlike his friend House, was a friendlier person and would not have appreciated House’s attitude towards the doctors working under him.

Overview:
U14.1 demonstrates how one mentions the obvious opposite to humorously deliver a sarcastic remark. U14.2 demonstrates how one could deliberately fail to grasp a sarcastic remark and extend the humour of a conversation.

Implicature Analysis:
(U14.1) *That smugness of yours really is an attractive quality.* (Flouts maxim of quality)
House knows that Wilson would have been a mindless admirer to find his gloating attractive – which also meant that anybody finding House’s smugness attractive is pretty mindless. What was more likely, which in fact is also what Wilson really wanted to convey, was opposite: *House’s smugness is quite unattractive for House’s team.* Wilson portraying smugness as attractive also adds humour to his utterance.

(U14.2) *Thank you. It was either that or get my hair highlighted. Smugness is easier to maintain.* (Infringes maxim of relevance, flouts maxim of quality)
House expounds U14.1 on the point of “smugness as attractive” and mentions hair highlighting as the more difficult alternative, causing smugness to be more preferable. On the surface, U14.2 seems to indicate that House failed to comprehend the implicature of U14.1, even thanking Wilson for making the
sarcastic remark. However, House actually understands U14.1, considering his argument that smugness is as attractive as hair highlighting is deliberately absurd. In other words, House was purposely showing failure to grasp the implicature of U14.1 and extending the absurdity of Wilson’s statement. This was done most likely specifically to extend the humour established by Wilson.

15. DIALOGUE NO.15

Context:
House was in exam room one in the clinic again, this time attending to a patient named Shelley Lever. House was had been playing on his Gameboy® when Foreman peeked in. Foreman was speaking to House at from the doorway to the exam room.

Overview:
This short utterance shows how the lack of pragmatic competence and common sense could lead people to incredibly humorous situations – although they themselves would not understand the embarrassment and trouble. It should be noted that House was indeed violating the maxim of quality when he misleads Lever to believe that he does not understand why Lever’s leg is hurting. However, it was Lever’s lack of pragmatic competence and common sense that dulled her comprehension. The maxim flouting was successful in that Foreman understood the mockery, despite misleading Lever at the same time.
Implicature Analysis:

(U15.1) *Her leg hurts after running six miles. Who knows, it could be anything!*

(Flouts maxim of quality and manner)

U15.1 is something that Foreman would immediately spot as untrue, considering House’s medical aptitude. House mentioning Lever’s running six miles and then claiming out loud to Foreman not to know why Lever’s leg was hurting in the same utterance was very interesting. House answers Foreman’s question and then disregards his own answer. This intentional disregard flouts the maxim of manner, as it blurs the actual answer. House knew that Foreman would still understand what House was talking about, so his blurring his own answer was intended to show Foreman that House was making a fun of Lever’s incredible lack of common sense.

16. DIALOGUE NO.16

Context:

House had previously waited with Shelley Lever for a consult in exam room one (an event that lead to U15.1) when Wilson showed up and told House that Cuddy had told him to come in her place. This situation where House waits with a patient with insignificant ailment for a consult is almost identical with the situation surrounding the prank he played in dialogue 12. This explains House’s disappointment when it was Wilson who showed up instead of Cuddy, making his prank a failure. Cultural Context: (U16.4) (1) The saying “signing up for something” is often said to indicate a person’s commitment to a cause. (2) The
term 'better doctor' here is used by Cuddy and House to refer to doctors who has a
good doctor-patient social skill.

Overview:
Dialogue 16 is full of maxim-flouting utterances being shot back and forth
between House and Cuddy. A lot of the utterances rely heavily on context for
them to be appropriate. The fact that Cuddy and House understands each other
and is not completely confused demonstrates a commendable pragmatics
competence of both of them.

Implicature Analysis:
(U16.1) The patient could have died. (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)
Opening a conversation using U16.1 would not make any sense. The reason
Cuddy could draw any implicature from U16.1 was because she knows that she
has just managed to foil another of House’s prank on her by sending Wilson
instead of coming to House’s call for consult and that U16.1 was a result of that.
House’s short U16.1 therefore also implies the question: “In the gravity of the
situation of possible death, why did Cuddy not show up?”. The curt and serious
tone that House uses also describes his being displeased at Cuddy. The
implicature then becomes clear, that House resents and is demanding an
explanation for Cuddy’s not answering the consult. Cuddy, therefore, would
perceive the implicature to House’s sentence as something like this: “I resent that
you did not come to my call for consult. The patient could have died. Why did
you not show up?” House also violated the maxim of quality as he tries to
mislead Cuddy to believe that the patient (Shelley Lever) could have died.
Apparently, he did not know that Cuddy knew that Shelley Lever only had a pulled muscle.

(U16.2) *The one with the pulled muscle.* (Flouts maxim of quantity)

When talking about someone, people often provide extra descriptions to confirm that they are talking about the same subject.

E.g. A: John robbed the bank this morning and was caught.

B: John our neighbor?

According to the context surrounding U16.2, however, what Cuddy was doing here is more than that. She was not really asking House if the patient that could have died was Shelley Lever or if that was another patient. She was, in fact, providing a brief but efficient description which could only point to Shelley Lever, **telling House that she knows who House is talking about, and the condition the patient had.** In any case, however, just specifying the identity of the person in discussion would not be enough to further the cause of the conversation, seeing that House was demanding an explanation from Cuddy for not coming to his request for consult. What contributes to the conversation was the fact that U16.2 actually holds a different purpose, and that is to point out by its implicature the absurdity of U16.1 and to refute it: **Shelley Lever’s pulled muscle could not have possibly caused her to be in danger of death,** making House’s statement hilariously ridiculous. The absurdity of House’s statement that is exposed by U16.2 even made House chuckle a little bit.
(U16.3) *Those symptoms are consistent with a dozen other conditions. I'm, uh, you know I'm entitled to a consult!* (Flouts maxim of quality)

U16.3 denies Cuddy’s implicature in U16.2, claiming that pulled muscle could indicate other illnesses that could possibly be fatal, validating U16.1. However, both House and Cuddy knows that U16.3 is stretching the truth too far to be true. What it communicates, instead, is that House is desperately demanding to get Cuddy to continually come to his consults (which he is entitled to) in order that his pranks can be successful.

(U16.4) *You’re not getting out of clinic duty.* (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)

Cuddy understands that the reason House was this frantic was because his plans to annoy her is in danger of continual failure. On the other hand, Cuddy also knows that House’s main reason for playing those pranks was due to her assigning him to clinic duties. U16.4, therefore, while seemingly violating the relevance set by U16.3 (House’s call for consult), actually establishes the heart of the matter. The implicature of U16.3, therefore, was that Cuddy knows why House wants her to answer his prank calls, and that she is not going to allow those pranks to happen because she is not going to let House be free from clinic duties.
(U16.5) *No, I don’t, but working with people actually makes you a better doctor.*
(Flouts maxim of quantity)

When House told Cuddy that she does not need him in the clinic, Cuddy spoke U16.5. It should first be noted that Cuddy is using ‘you’ as a general term, and was not referring to House in particular. This utterance is essentially a statement on the virtue of working in the clinic. Considering that U16.5 in spoken in relation to House’s placement in the clinic, the immediate inference would be that Cuddy wants House to benefit from the virtue mentioned, and that is to be a better doctor*. Cuddy’s insistence on putting House in the clinic contributes to the utterance, conveying the implicature that Cuddy is telling House that he is not a good doctor.

(U16.6) *When did I sign up for that course?* (Flouts maxim of relevance)

U16.6 finds its relevance due to being spoken in response to U16.5, which implicature is that Cuddy wants House to essentially be a nicer doctor. House, of course, has no interest of being nice. House asking indignantly about when he signed up for the course indicates that House was actually on the opinion that he did NOT sign up for that course. U16.6 is therefore a statement declaring that House’s did not want to become a better doctor.
(U16.7) *When did I give you the impression that I care?* (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)

If taken out of this conversation, this utterance will essentially have the same nature as the question “when are you born?”. U16.7 is not really a question regarding time. Since it was spoken directly after U16.6, it becomes an effective utterance, strengthening U16.5 and refusing to take U16.6 as a serious consideration. Cuddy comprehends that House does not have the interest to be nice, which was the main idea of U16.6. **However, she does not care because she still wants House to be a better doctor.**

(U16.8) *Working in this clinic obviously instills a deep sense of compassion.*

*I've got your home number, right? In case anything comes up at 3 o'clock in the morning.* (Flouts maxim of quality)

After Cuddy declares with U16.7 that she does not care about House’s lack of interest to be a better doctor, House uses U16.8 to express his resentment. U16.7 clearly shows a lack of compassion on Cuddy’s side, therefore making 16.8 a flouting of the maxim of quality. House was using the utterance to point out the opposite, that **Cuddy lacks compassion, and that was due to working in the clinic, which also refutes the virtue Cuddy described in U16.5.** The rest of U16.8 is essentially a threat of escalation. House mentions Cuddy’s home number and relates that with anything coming up at 3 o’clock in the morning in order to relay the implicature that **House was going intensify his pranks, going**
as far as inappropriately and unethically reaching to Cuddy at home and at wee hours.

17. DIALOGUE NO.17

Context:
House and his team are inside House's office. House had brought the differential board into his office and is making his explanation from beside the board. Chase is sitting in House's chair, Cameron is leaning on House's desk, and Foreman is on the chair across House's desk. House has gathered them to announce that he has found the cause for Brandon's sickness, which was poisoning from a gout medication called Colchicine. When Chase asks House how Brandon could have gotten colchicine when he did not have gout, House started speaking U17.1. Character context: Cough medicines that are commonly available generally do not cost $200.

Overview:
The flouting here can only be spotted when one is closely attuned to the context of the illustration that House was giving the diagnostics team. Anyone lacking in pragmatic competence will simply become mislead by House's story regarding the motivation of the doctor he was illustrating (hence making this a maxim violation) although House clearly does not have any intention to mislead anyone with U17.1.
Implicature Analysis:

(U17.1) First, he got a cough. Now, because he’s an idiot, he went to a doctor. In order to justify charging $200, the doctor felt he should actually do something. Oops. He wrote a prescription. (Flouts maxim of quality)

The team knows that Brandon is not an idiot. However, going to see the doctor due to having a cough does seem to display a lack of common sense. House exaggerates this fact and uses it to validate his “He’s an idiot” comment. He therefore flouts the maxim of quality here in order to deliver a mockery.

Another flouting also occurs when House emphatically describes the doctor as trying to justify charging $200 by writing a prescription for Brandon. There is, in fact, nothing wrong with doctors writing prescriptions, since it is actually part of what they are expected to do, but charging $200 dollars for a cough medicine prescription is simply daylight robbery. The flouting here is seen, therefore, by House using the emphatic tone when describing the doctor despite of everyone in the room knowing that the doctor was a must have been a cheat. Considering also that no cough medicine cost $200, the illustration therefore casts the suspicion on whether or not the cough medicine prescribed was really cough medicine – providing room for the plausibility of the doctor having prescribed colchicines instead. The discrepancies in U17.1 communicates to the team that House was actually mocking the doctor he was describing for overcharging patients by prescribing dubious medicine, which in this case is possibly colchicines, for personal profit. Keeping in mind that U17.1 is essentially a
hypothetical illustration, this meant that House’s mocking is a portrayal of his contempt at doctors who overcharge and not at any doctors in particular.

18. DIALOGUE NO.18

Context:

House and his team had just had a meeting with Brandon's parents and determined that Brandon’s mother had been giving Brandon his cough medicine, which House suspected to be colchicines. Brandon had taken the last of those pills before he was switched into the clean room, forcing the team to go to the pharmacy that dispensed the pills for confirmation. Dialogue 18 took place in the back room of the pharmacy between Chase and the pharmacist, with Mindy and Mrs. Merrell waiting at the front. Chase had asked to be informed what the medicine was that the pharmacy dispensed, as they think that it was colchicines. The pharmacist replied that if the prescription says cough medicine, then that is what they will dispense. Chase sounded tense while the pharmacist sounded more assuring and polite, but with a hint of impatience. Cultural contexts:

(U18.1) Waiving liability meant that there would not be legal lawsuits.

(U18.2) Clerks are often told to be polite to customers, making it highly possible for them to show fake hospitality in shops.

Overview:

This dialogue communicates so much more under the surface, with the floutings giving room for rich emotional implicatures between Chase and the pharmacist.
Implicature Analysis:

(U18.1) *The family is prepared to waive liability, all right? We just need to know what it was, what dosage it was* - (Flouts maxim of relevance)

U18.1 is spoken in response to the pharmacist’s denial of having dispensed colchicine. At a glance, being prepared to waive liabilities has nothing to do with the denial. However, the waiving is immediately relevant with the accused blunder, which the pharmacist is denying. Lawsuits are generally made to respond to mishaps, and a mishap by the pharmacist could get the pharmacy sued. In this case, Chase was relating the no-lawsuit with the pharmacist’s denial, relaying the implicature that *Chase thinks that the pharmacist is denying due to being scared of getting the pharmacy sued*. Although it has not yet been established in the conversation whether or not the Pharmacy has made a blunder, Chase’s accusation that there has been a mishap and his deliberate mentioning of waiving liabilities carries a different meaning. It implies that *the Merrells would not be suing, even if there has been a mishap*. Made even more prominent with the assuring “all right?” in U18.1, Chase then tells the pharmacist that they only need to know what was put in the bottle and its dosage, exactly as the utterance says.

(U18.2) *It was cough medicine.* (Flouts maxim of quantity)

The reason this utterance is included in this analysis despite its simplicity, is the fact that this utterance is spoken right after U18.1, which makes it seem lacking. Chase was bringing a lot to the table, and this response only seems to be a repetition of the pharmacist’s original denial. However, this short statement
actually conveys a very rich implicature by flouting the maxim of quantity. In response to the implicature of U18.1, this utterance effectively denies that (1) there has been a blunder, and (2) the pharmacists is only denying due to being scared of getting sued. This utterance also pushes aside Chase’s assurance, insisting that the pharmacist has been telling the truth. The short insistence and out-of-place politeness also communicates that the pharmacist resents having been accused of lying.

(U18.3) *Refill it* (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)

As a stand-alone utterance, U18.3 may be a pretty straight-forward directive. In this dialogue, however, U18.3 delivers a much more meaningful implicature. U18.3 immediately felt out of place, as it has nothing to do with the current dispute. However it is the dispute that causes the production of this short command. In fact, it was its deliberate irrelevance to the dispute that gives it relevance. U18.3 is indeed spoken to separate itself from the dispute of whether or not there has been a blunder. The short U18.3 also allows Chase to stick with his views that are expressed in U18.1, consequently declaring that he does not believe U18.2, without actually expressing his accusations and further heat the needless debate. The short order also conveys to the pharmacist that Chase only cares about solving the case at the moment, and is getting impatient for having been stalled by the dispute.
19. DIALOGUE NO.19

Context:
This conversation takes place in House's office. He is standing behind his desk, facing the office windows, and Wilson is calmly leaning against the wall to House's left. As the conversation progressed, House started to face Wilson a lot more, and vice versa. Chase had presumably been back from the pharmacy and told House that the medicine that the pharmacist dispensed was cough medicine and not colchicine. House asks Wilson if it bothered him, and Wilson responded with U19.1.

Overview:
This conversation is similar to the one that happened in dialogue 14, except that in dialogue 14 House was deliberately choosing to respond to the surface meaning of U14.1. In this dialogue, Wilson chooses to respond the more unlikely association of House's ambiguous 'this' in “This doesn’t bother you?”.

Implicature Analysis:
(U19.1) *That you were wrong? I try to work through the pain.* (Infringes maxim of relevance and quality, flouts Maxim of relevance and quality)

Although House was not really specific when he said “This doesn’t bother you?”, it would take a tremendous lack of pragmatic competence – which Wilson does not – to fail to understand the context, that what House is distraught over was the fact that the medicine dispensed was not colchicine. Wilson was in fact deliberately making an irrelevant comment using the lax in the contextual specifics to shift the subject to House’s bruised ego. Although it is unclear
whether or not House’s ego was bruised on the discovery that he was wrong, making House look like he is really distraught over an exaggerated ego is funny. The fact that House actually does display an ample amount of arrogance also makes this utterance a playful ego jab. Wilson then flouts the truth when he adds that sympathetic ‘I’m-trying-to-work-through-the-pain’ part to add strength to the ego jab. It is very clear to House that Wilson is really just making fun of his frustration since the sympathy Wilson gave was dedicated to an imagined (and humorous) ego bruising. U19.1 thus implements both maxim infringing and maxim flouting, creating an irrelevant and untrue situation, and then using sarcasm to display mock sympathy.

(U19.2) So… reality was wrong. (Flouts maxim of quality and quantity)
When House denies being wrong, Wilson produced U19.2 in a consenting tone. Clearly, U19.2 is absurd, in whatever situations. The fact that Wilson was saying this in response to House’s denial means a different interpretation is in order. Wilson was actually deliberately flouting the truth to reflect House’s denial. Reality is always right, and House’s denial of reality signals that he is blinded. In this case, Wilson continues the implicature he manufactured in U19.1 and mocks House for having an ego that is bigger than even reality (for being unwilling to see that his theory is wrong). The masking of this second ego jab using mock consent was meant to add keep the situation solemn and funny at the same time. In other words, the implicature of U19.2 would be something like: “Ah… So reality was wrong. I see. Wow, your ego is really bigger than life!” The fact that
House then no longer gets obsessed about his theory of cough medicine – colchicine mix up indicates that this implicature is well conveyed perfectly.

20. DIALOGUE NO.20

Context:
This dialogue was still taking place in House’s office, the same as in Dialogue 19. House took a few contemplative moments before uttering U20.3.

Overview:
Dialogue 20 is very much influenced by dialogue 19. The ego jabs delivered clearly compelled House to use self-deprecating words in U20.1. The irony in both U20.1 and U20.2 also must be understood to appropriately see the relevance of U20.3.

Implicature Analysis:
(U20.1) *Well, we foolishly ruled out lymphoma because his CT scan showed no adenophathy, CBC showed a normal diffen smear, bone marrow showed no –*
(Flouts maxim of quality)

None of the information House mentioned that lead him and his team to rule out lymphoma was foolish. It actually gave very strong ground for ruling out lymphoma, so why call it foolish? This discrepancy is actually deliberate, resulting in a sarcastic irony that actually validates House’s decision. He was, in fact, arguing that *it would be foolish to think that it was lymphoma, considering Brandon’s test results.* In other words, House was also saying that since House had not been foolish, then Wilson must have been the foolish one for
giving a bad advice. The deliberate use of self-deprecating words to deliver the subtle mockery is also House's way to playfully get back at Wilson for having gloated over House's mistake with the ego jabs.

(U20.2) *Yeah, you're right. Let's stick with the wrong pill theory.* (Flouts maxim of quality)

Wilson was telling house to ignore the tests and was advising House to do a procedure which House then explained as very risky. Wilson spoke U20.2 which sticks out like a sore thumb, since House sticking to the wrong pill theory despite the reality of things is exactly what Wilson was mocking about with U19.1 and U19.2. Following the advice given in U20.2 would be utterly foolish. House understood that Wilson's sarcasm-wrapped message was that he would not achieve anything if he did not move on from his "wrong pill theory" to the procedure that Wilson was proposing.

(U20.3) *I’ll schedule him for surgery.* (Flouts maxim of relevance)

U20.2 was an advice to stick to the wrong pill theory. Without understanding the implicature of U20.2, U20.3 would only look like House is being irrelevant to Wilson earlier utterance. However, since the implicature of U20.2 is that House would only be able to find his answers if he moved on to the risky procedure, then U20.3 became relevant. After some contemplation on Wilson’s words, House spoke U20.3 to show his agreement to go with Wilson's proposed surgery.
21. DIALOGUE NO.21

Context:
This dialogue takes place in the pharmacy in PPTH (not the one Chase went to in Dialogue18). The case has been solved, Brandon’s condition was really colchicine poisoning. House told everyone that he did not know and did not care how Brandon had ingested colchicine. He guessed that Brandon was using ecstasy (which Brandon admitted to be true) and was cutting the drug with colchicine, but he declared that any other possibility (via skin cream or contact lens solution) could be just as right. In the event of Dialogue 21, however, House is rampaging through the shelves of PPTH pharmacy, looking at bottles of medicine, when Wilson came and asked him U21.1

Overview:
Dialogue 21 contains utterances in which maxim flouting actually does not append messages, but adds a certain feel to those utterances as subtle implicatures. Context: (1) Wilson knows that House is a recreational drug user. (2) People often say ‘Big Weekend’ to refer to parties.

Implicature Analysis:
(U21.1) *Big weekend?* (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity)

U21.1 immediately comes off as meaningless and irrelevant. What does a big weekend have anything to do with House rampaging through the pharmacy? The context, however, delivers a rich implicature. U21.1 takes into account that House is a user of an addictive painkiller (vicodin) and has no qualms about using the drug for fun. **Wilson is therefore asking U21.1 to guess if House is rampaging**
through the pharmacy to steal more vicodin for a personal ‘drug party’. The short message, while flouting the maxim of quantity in the surface, is actually perfectly acceptable if seen through the context of the situation.

(U21.2) *The fact that I know that it’s a gout medicine OD would seem to indicate that the case is already solved.* (Flouts maxim of quality and manner)

In U21.2, the message delivered is essentially the same as what is spoken. The flouting, however, occurs as Wilson deliberately tones down the strength of his utterance. The fact that Wilson knows the cause of Brandon’s illness not only “seems” to indicate that the case is solved – it IS an indication that the case is solved. What Wilson does is deliberately blurring the lucidity of his own guess to convey the needlessness of what House was doing. The truth is, since the case is already solved, and what House is doing (“Trying to solve that kid’s case.”) is absurd. **Toning down the strength of U21.2 actually gives subtlety to the bewilderment** that Wilson was feeling due to seeing House messing up the pharmacy trying to solve a case that is already solved.

(U21.3) *What about the fact that the kid is now, I believe the technical term is, not sick?* (Flouts maxim of quality, quantity and manner)

Literally, U21.3 means the same as “What about the fact that the kid is not sick?”. The actual utterance is slightly too lengthy for such a straightforward message, and was actually risking the clarity of the message. Wilson’s purpose seems to use the discrepancy between length and utterance to create humour. The maxim
flouting also occurs when Wilson describes ‘not sick’ as a technical term – which it is not. Ameliorating ‘not sick’ into a technical term also gives U21.3 a humorous twist. The implicature: Brandon is well now so the case should already be solved. The maxim flouting in U21.3, therefore, only serves to add humour to the message.

22. DIALOGUE 22

Context:
Still in the PPTH pharmacy, Utterance U22.1 takes place shortly after U21.1. Wilson has been convincing House that the case is already solved, and has expressly told House to “stop it”. U22.1 comes after House asks Wilson if he is not curious.

Overview:
U22.1 demonstrates how one could convey something by inserting additional comments in a reply.

Implicature Analysis:
(U22.1) No, because I’m well-adjusted. (Flouts maxim of relevance and quantity) Wilson is not curious, but curiosity hardly has anything to do with being well-adjusted. Wilson deliberately saying that he is well-adjusted carries the implicature that House’s curiosity is not well-adjusted. The case has already been solved, so what else is there to do? Wilson is in fact mocking House using this short statement that House’s continued pursuit of a solution of a solved is in
fact a sign of obsession, or in this case, a sign of being not well-adjusted. This was why he refused to join House in his search.

23. DIALOGUE 23

Context:
This dialogue takes place in Brandon’s ward. Chase is asking Cameron if she wanted to go get something, but Cameron cuts him off with a quick "no". Chase has been exhibiting signs of attraction to Cameron throughout the episode.

Overview:
This dialogue is actually one that really requires that one knows the context of the utterances to comprehend. Without knowing the context, one would never be able to understand the intentions behind Chase’s interrupted request and Cameron’s refusal. Here, the benefit of having adequate pragmatics competence is truly demonstrated, as it allows for even interrupted sentences to efficiently carry meanings across.

Implicature Analysis:
(U23.1) No (Flouts maxim of manner and quantity)
Cameron’s quick refusal here is hampering the understanding of the conversation. What did Chase want? Also, why did Cameron cut Chase’s request halfway in the first place? Here, the context of the situation provides a better understanding to both questions. The truth is that the attraction that Chase has been showing towards Cameron is what is influencing his request: he wants to have a more romantic relationship with Cameron. Therefore, his request was really so that he
and Cameron could go get, that is, go EAT somewhere for a date in order that he could be more intimate with her. Chase’s unfinished request is unintended, but Cameron’s U23.1 is not. **U23.1 clearly shows that Cameron was picking up on Chase’s intention and was refusing him in the full knowledge of that, or i.e. she does not want to date him.** This analysis is confirmed with Chase not protesting Cameron’s interruption and sporting the face of a turned-down admirer instead.

C. **Summary of Analysis**

The analyses of all 49 utterances have yielded different sorts of implicatures, depending on the contexts. It was immediately apparent, however, that the utterances have distinct characteristics in how they flout certain maxims. The following maxim-by-maxim summary will describe these characteristics briefly and will also list and count the utterances flouting a maxim. It will begin from the maxim that is flouted the most and end with the maxim that is flouted the least.

1. **Maxim of Quality**

Utterances in “Occam’s Razor” mostly flout this maxim by the use of irony or sarcasm. Characters would say one thing that is obviously false to lead people to think that the opposite is true. Sometimes, the utterance would exaggerate or tone down their sentence to convey more subtle messages, (as in Wilson’s U21.2 & U21.3). The discrepancy of between what is spoken and the reality of things often makes the utterance sound funny, although the gravity of the situation could
simply render the humour facetious (as in U07.1). This discrepancy also seems to give additional edge in mockeries, making them sound more contemptuous. Meanwhile, the use of sarcasm in an argument between House and Cuddy in dialogue 16 makes the argument sound less hostile to both House and Cuddy, although the tension and animosity is clearly apparent.


Count: 29 utterances

2. **Maxim of Relevance**

Utterances that flout this maxim in “Occam’s Razor” generally rely on context for it to be successful. In determining implicatures of this sort of flouting, characters seem refer to recent events or utterances or interactions to “fill in the gap” and determine the most likely connection that a relevance-flouting utterance has with the current dialogue.

All who are familiar with the context of a relevance-flouting utterance seem to be able to instantly establish its relevance. Indeed, context seems to contribute into the dialogues so well that speakers no longer need to explain the relevance of their utterances for hearers to be able to accurately infer its relevance with minimal processing. There is a big indication that with regular use among speakers of a community, the practice of flouting relevance could even become a convention.
Some irrelevant utterances are also made to reflect the irrelevance of the utterance prior to them, as in U08.1.

**Utterances:** (U02.1, 02.5, U02.6, U05.1, U08.1, U10.1, U12.2, U12.3, U12.4, U16.1, U16.4, U16.6, U16.7, U18.1, U18.3, U19.1, U20.3, U22.1)

**Count:** 18 utterances

3. **Maxim of Quantity**

Utterances that flout the maxim of quantity in “Occam’s Razor” generally do so by being far too brief, containing less literal information than what ought to be. However, upon analysis, these utterances were actually capable of conveying more information beyond the uttered words. While determining implicatures in a relevance-flouting utterance is more like a process of “filling in the blanks”, determining the implicatures of a quantity-flouting utterance is more like guesswork, where the things not spoken are conveyed by contexts surround the utterance.

Utterances that are longer than its actual message are meant to convey both the message with certain affective feel. U21.3 is such an utterance. It conveys, in addition to the core message, a false info that “not sick” is a technical term, purely to create humour.


**Count:** 17 utterances
4. Maxim of Manner

Utterances flouting the maxim of manner in “Occam’s Razor” are those that are deliberately made in an unclear way. Characters sometimes deliberately define things not as what it is supposed to be, but as something else with a particular meaning to the hearers. House, for example, in U2.01, defined Wilson’s description of a patient as a “con”, and only would Wilson know what House was referring to. Wilson also mentioned that “not sick” is a technical term to add humour to his utterance in U21.3.

Utterances can also flout this by maxim by saying one thing and then not acknowledging it. In U15.1, House told Foreman what caused his patient’s ailment, and then he said that he did not know what cause the patient’s ailment.

**Utterances:** (U.02.1, U02.2, U15.1, U21.2, U21.3, U23.1)

**Count:** 6 utterances
A. Conclusion

This research is dedicated to study maxim floutings by studying the floutings that occurred in the American prime time television series *House, M.D.*, on the episode “Occam’s Razor”. Two research questions are therefore formulated to guide this study: (1) What are the maxim-flouting utterances in *House, M.D.?,* and (2) What are the implicatures of those maxim-flouting utterances?

Answers to both questions are given in-depth in chapter IV. The first question was answered as the study identified the 49 utterances that have flouted various maxims within the 21 dialogues gathered from the episode “Occam’s Razor” (the full list is provided in the appendix). The dialogues gathered make up about 5 minutes or approximately 11 percent of the 42-minute episode. The second question is answered as the study performed comprehensive implicature-analysis on each of the 49 utterances.

This study runs on the understanding that the nature of implicature is that what is conveyed via the maxim flouting and what is understood is essentially identical. This understanding allows the implicature analysis to provide credible insights as to how characters of *House, M.D.* and, consequently, the people tuning in to watch the show – all 6.33 million of them on the episode’s premiere – process and shape utterances.
The analysis also takes into account that context plays a great role in determining implicatures. This assumption is shown to be accurate as the implicature analysis of many of the 49 utterances gathered proves to rely heavily on context for them to have any relevant conversational meaning. In fact, exclusion of context would most likely have crippled this study.

This study discovered that most of the floutings that took place were floutings of quality (29 Utterances), that is, the quality of truth in an utterance. Many of this kind of flouting are results of one making a sarcastic or ironic remark. Naturally, this sort of utterance point to the opposite of what it is said as the truth – or at least to anything more plausible than what is said.

It also turns out that some of this sort of floutings do not result in alternate messages, but deliver the messages with additional “feel” as it tunes down or exaggerate certain keywords in an utterance. What is interesting is that flouting of the maxim of quality almost always adds a pint of humour to the utterances, although some of them simply came off as facetious or contemptuous – due to being spoken in inappropriately intense moments. When one mocks another by flouting the maxim of quality, the mockery receives also a touch of subtlety and humour, making the utterance funnier and less offensive.

The second most flouted maxim is the maxim of relevance (18 utterances). In most of the analyses, this sort of flouting requires that one is equipped with adequate knowledge of context to comprehend. While these kinds of utterance seem irrelevant on the surface, the relevance is really very much set-in-stone when viewed with the appropriate context. A good understanding of context, especially
cultural context, is greatly necessary for detecting the relevance and grasping its implicatures.

This study also noted that in most of these sorts of utterances, the more familiar a user of language is with context, the faster the relevance of these utterances can be established. Competent users are often able to make instant correlations that the flouting no longer becomes noticeable. There is also an indication that this sort of flouting could become the convention of a community.

Close behind the flouting of maxim of relevance is the flouting of the maxim of quantity (17 utterances). This flouting is characterized by utterances that are too short or too long in comparison to the information conveyed. The analyses of these messages reveal that all of them carry very rich and lengthy implicatures that are often left unsaid – but was understood anyway. This study determines that this was due to the context surrounding these utterances contributing enough information to the conversation that it no longer became necessary for these implicatures to be said.

The flouting of maxim of manner did not occur very often in this episode of *House, M.D.* (6 utterances), but this study refrains from making the generalization that this is the maxim that people break the least in real-life conversations. With the main instructions by Grice regarding the maxim of manner summarized into the words “be perspicuous”, the characters of *House, M.D.* flout this maxim by being intentionally unclear. A successful flouting of manner occurs when the implicatures contained within the utterances that are too long or too short are perfectly understood by hearers.
Some of the most interesting cases were those where the utterances at the same time violate and flout a maxim. It is, of course, impossible for one person to both comprehend and to be misled by an utterance. However, it is possible for one person to comprehend an utterance and another to be misled by the same utterance.

All in all, this study has managed to demonstrate the process and elements necessary for one to be able to generate or, at least, comprehend maxim-flouting utterances in *House, M.D.*, episode “*Occam’s Razor*”. The analyses performed on the selected utterances shows just how important it is to have a good grasp in context in order that one can successfully carry on a conversation that contains maxim floutings.

What is most striking in this study is the fact that the lengthy analyses done on the utterances in this study reflect processes that only takes micro-seconds in actual conversations. Approximately 44 pages have been dedicated to analyze what merely comprise 5 minutes of real-time conversations. Much of the credit goes the unbelievably sharp communicative capability that the human brain possesses.

It is really a wonder how man could naturally flout conversational maxims for another to infer specific implicatures within seconds without causing misunderstandings. As the study progressed it became clear that humanity’s capacity to communicate effectively truly is remarkable. One really needs to improve his pragmatic competence in order to be able to fully utilize the communicative capabilities in available within man.
B. Suggestions for Language Teachers

This study could be used in classrooms providing these trainings in conversational English as case studies of maxim flouting. The in-depth analysis could also provide for discussions in order that an increased understanding could be achieved. Indeed, this study would have achieved its goal of creation if it were able to contribute to the collective knowledge regarding conversational English (on the topic of maxim flouting, in particular) which would enrich language students seeking to really be able to understand how to appropriately hold a conversation in English.

C. Recommendations for Future Researches

As this research is done to analyze maxim flouting in *House, M.D.*, episode “*Occam’s Razor*”, this research stays off the realm of maxim violation and infringing. It was immediately apparent, however, during the process of selection of utterance, that House, in particular, very often employs maxim violations in his utterances. This study finds that this often creates very interesting results, although without in-depth analysis, it would be difficult to determine exactly what resulted from this violation.

Therefore, it may be highly beneficial for one wishing to conduct another linguistic study on maxims also investigate maxim violations in *House, M.D.*. Such a study could perhaps be done across episodes or even across television series in order that it would provide more comprehensive results.
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APPENDIX

A. Table of Coded Utterances And Their Relevant Dialogues

Here are the maxim-flouting dialogues (maxim-flouting utterances and corresponding speakers and hearers bolded) gathered from “Occam’s Razor”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Hearer</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>00:04 – 01:09</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>(On the phone: Mr. Innabe)</td>
<td>I didn’t sleep well last night, and I woke up with a scratchy throat. I just don’t feel so good. Uh, cough. Yeah, um, um, a bit of an upset stomach too, and I think I’m running a fever. I’m just worried I might be contagious. Inventory, tomorrow, yeah I’m sure I’ll be feeling better by then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>I cannot believe you just did that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>I really do have a cough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Oh. So you weren’t lying. You’d be curled up in bed with a bowl of chicken soup even if you didn’t have a horny girl in your bed? (U01.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Yes, [laughs] Because I really do, hey, I really do have a cough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>You also have a little rash. [giggles]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Um, umm, I’m uh not sure that we should be kissing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Oh, that’s ok, because I have almost no interest in kissing you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Perfect (U01.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Good (U01.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03:10 – 03:37</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Why do you want me to treat this guy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Blood pressure’s not responding to IV fluids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>No, no I didn’t ask how you plan to con me into treating him. I asked you YOU want me to treat him.  (U02.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>He’s sick, I care, I’m pathetic. (U02.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>There are about a billion sick people on the planet, why this one?  (U02.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Because this one’s is in our emergency room. (U02.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Ah, so it’s a proximity issue. If somebody was sick in the third floor stairwell that’s who we would be talking about.  (U02.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Yes, I checked the stairwell, it’s clear.  (U02.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Okay then, emergency room guy it is. (U02.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>04:17 – 04:26</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Cameron, Foreman, Chase</td>
<td>Foreman, if you’re going to list all the things it’s not, it might be quicker to do it alphabetically. Let’s see. Absidia? Excellent. Doesn’t account for any of the symptoms  (U03.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04:27 – 04:35</td>
<td>Cameron, House</td>
<td>Cameron, Foreman, Chase</td>
<td>No condition accounts for all these symptoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well, good! Because I thought maybe he was sick, but apparently he’s not. Who wants to do up the discharge papers? (U04.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>07:07 – 07:14</td>
<td>Chase, Mindy</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>I’m not sure scaring your boyfriend is the best medicine for him right now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I know, I get… stupid when I’m scared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mindy</td>
<td>Don’t go rock climbing. (U05.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>07:55 - 08:14</td>
<td>House, Patient: Jodi</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Your mucus was pale goldenrod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient: Jodi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last week, yes. Should I be worried?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Patient: Jodi</td>
<td>Oh, yes. Very.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient: Jodi</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Really? I thought I was okay now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Patient: Jodi</td>
<td>And yet, here you are. What happened? Paramedics took a week to respond to your 911 call? (U06.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient: Jodi</td>
<td></td>
<td>You’re not a very nice doctor, are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10:00 – 10:05</td>
<td>House, Cameron, Foreman, Chase</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>So, we had six symptoms that didn’t add up to anything, now we have seven. Who’s excited? (U07.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cameron, House</td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think it complicates things. The kidney failure was caused by the antibiotics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11:57 – 12:00</td>
<td>Foreman, House</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>I think your argument is specious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think your tie is ugly. (U08.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14:22 – 14:34</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>Seven down, about 5000 to go. You really think we’re going to come up with your mystery virus by running gels until we guess it right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>No, I think we’re going to get it by standing around watching other people work. (U09.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14:42 – 14:57</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>She’s weird, isn’t she?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Bad idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Bad idea. You work with her. (U10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>What did I say? Is “weird” some new ghetto euphemism for sexy, like “bad” is good and “fat” is good? Then what the hell does “good” mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15:00 – 15:08</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>You don’t think she’s hot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Wow, then you’re brilliant. And I am using ‘brilliant’ as a euphemism. (U11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12 | 16:03 – 16:18 | Cuddy    | House (Patient: Brown) | He has a sore throat.  
Of course! Yes, why didn’t I... I mean, because he said that it hurt, and I should have deduced that meant it was sore… (U12.1)  
I was in a board meeting (U12.2).  
Patients come first, right? (U12.3)  
Wouldn’t want to prescribe a lozenge if there was any doubt about its efficacy, huh? (U12.4) |
| 13 | 18:05 - 18:13 | Foreman  | House   | You visited a patient?  
I was sitting by his bed all morning, just so he’d know someone was there for him. (U13.1)  
I looked in on him. He’s much better. |
|    |             | House    | Foreman | That smugness of yours really is an attractive quality. (U14.1)  
Thank you. It was either that or get my hair highlighted. Smugness is easier to maintain. (U14.2) |
| 15 | 20:03 – 20:09 | Foreman  | House   | What’s with her?  
Her leg hurts after running six miles. Who knows, it could be anything! (U15.1) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Hearer</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25:07 – 25:42</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>The patient could have died. (U16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>The one with the pulled muscle. (U16.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>Those symptoms are consistent with a dozen other conditions. I’m, uh, you know I’m entitled to a consult! (U16.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>You’re not getting out of clinic duty. (U16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>Oh, come on. You’ve got a hundred other idiot doctors in this building who go warm and fuzzy everything they pull a toy car out of a nose, you don’t need me here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>No, I don’t, but working with people actually makes you a better doctor. (U16.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>When did I sign up for that course? (U16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>When did I give you the impression that I care? (U16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Cuddy</td>
<td>Working in this clinic obviously instills a deep sense of compassion. I’ve got your home number, right? In case anything comes up at 3 o’clock in the morning. (U16.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>29:14 – 29:23</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Foreman, Chase, Cameron</td>
<td>First, he got a cough. Now, because he’s an idiot, he went to a doctor. In order to justify charging $200, the doctor felt he should actually do something. Oops. He wrote a prescription. (U17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31:56 – 32:12</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Suburban pharmacist</td>
<td>We need to know exactly what you put in this bottle. We think it was colchicine, a gout medication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>If the prescription said cough medicine, that’s what I dispensed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban pharmacist</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>The family is prepared to waive liability, all right? We just need to know what it was, what dosage it was – (U18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Suburban pharmacist</td>
<td>It was cough medicine. (U18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refill it (U18.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33:20 – 33:32</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>This doesn’t bother you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>That you were wrong? I try to work through the pain. (U19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>I was not wrong. Everything I said was true. It fit. It was elegant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>So… reality was wrong. (U19.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33:51 – 34:22</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>What if it is his blood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Lymphoma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Unless you’ve got something better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Well, we foolishly ruled out lymphoma because his CT scan showed no adenophathy, CBC showed a normal differential, bone marrow showed no – (U20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Screw the tests. Do an exploratory laparotomy and find out what’s in there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>He has no blood pressure, no immune system and no kidneys. Surgery will kill him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Yeah, you’re right. Let’s stick with the wrong pill theory. (U20.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>I’ll schedule him for surgery. (U20.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Summary

There are 21 dialogues gathered, spanning approximately 5 minutes and 5 seconds, or 11.2% of total screen time. These dialogues contain a total of 49 maxim-flouting utterances which will serve as the main source for the dialogue-by-dialogue implicature analysis.