

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

This study examines the linguistic features, flouting of maxims and implicatures, in the *Family Guy* series, specifically on Season 19 and 20. The author utilises Grice's (1975) theory on the flouting of maxims and Levinson's (1983) framework on implicatures to analyse communication strategies used in the series. Grice's theory serves as the foundation for understanding how characters intentionally violate conversational maxims to convey implicit meanings, while Levinson's theory provides insights into how the implicatures are generated through these interactions.

The author analyses flouting maxims and implicatures from season 19 to season 20 in the *Family Guy* series. This study aims to reveal the most prevalent types of flouting maxims and the related implicatures within the series' dialogues. Selected episodes for this study include various contexts and scenarios to provide a comprehensive overview of how these linguistic strategies are employed.

The specific episodes chosen for this analysis include:

1. Episode 1 to Episode 20 from Season 19 (20 episodes in total)
2. Episode 1 to Episode 20 from Season 20 (19 episodes in total, 1 was banned)

These episodes were selected based on their distinctive use of conversational maxims and implicatures, as well as their relevance to the themes explored in the series. Through this examination, the study aims to contribute to the understanding of

conversational dynamics in animated media and the application of Grice's and Levinson's theories in contemporary television discourse.

4.1 Flouting Maxims in *Family Guy*

The analysis reveals that there are (number) instances of flouting maxims in the *Family Guy* series. These findings are detailed as follows:

Table 4.1 Frequency Distribution Table

No.	Maxims	Season 19 (Episode 1 – 20)	Season 20 (Episode 1 – 22)
1.	Maxim of Quality	12	11
2.	Maxim of Quantity	7	14
3.	Maxim of Relevance	65	65
4.	Maxim of Manner	9	7

As shown in the table above, all types of flouting maxims are present in the *Family Guy* series. The main characters produce a total (number) of instances of flouting maxims 93 data in season 19 and 97 data in season 20 – 190 data across the two seasons. Based on the data, the maxim of relevance is the most flouted (68.42 %), followed by the maxim of quality (12.11 %), while the maxim of quantity (11.05 %) is third, and the maxim of manner (8.42 %) is flouted the least.

4.2 Discussion

This sub-chapter discusses the flouting maxim types and its implicatures found in the *Family Guy* series. The discussion follows the theories proposed by Grice (1975) and Levinson (1983).

4.2.1 Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality, according to Grice (1975), involves providing truthful and accurate information. It emphasises honesty and avoiding misleading statements. In *Family Guy*, flouting this maxim often involves characters presenting false, exaggerated, or misleading information for comedic or dramatic effects. Analysing these instances reveals how the series implements such deviations to enhance its narrative and humour.

DATUM 1

Context: Context: Peter lost his arms. And according to Dr Hartman, it can grow back.
Dr Hartman: See? They're already coming in.

Peter: Probably not gonna be able to have sex for, like, a while, though, right?

Dr Hartman: I think it should be fine.

Lois: **Oh, what, you think I enjoy it?**

This Datum is taken from season 19 episode 6, “Meg’s Wedding”. Previously, Peter was attending a party, wearing a vest and a long chain tied to his pants - everyone

wears a long chain as well. Accidentally, Peter's hands are tangled in so many wallet chains, getting pulled left and right until his hands are blown up. Then, Peter is in hospital, not knowing his hands are gone. Dr Hartman explains it, suggesting him to give a farewell to his arms. Good news is Peter's arms will grow back according to Dr Hartman. However, Peter's got worried that he wouldn't be able to have sex for a while, and so is Lois.

This maxim is categorised into maxim of quality. It suggests that contributions to a conversation should be truthful and based on evidence. Based on the context, Lois's comment is not quite a factual statement about her actual feeling towards the reality that she can't enjoy sex for a while. Instead, she provides a sarcastic and humorous statement that may not be entirely truthful, but serves to express her frustration indirectly.

The implicature for this datum can be seen from Lois's response, it can be classified as a particularised conversational implicature as it emerges when the speaker's intended meaning is something specific to the context of the conversation. Lois's response is sarcastic. The way she says "Oh, what, you think I enjoy it?" implies the opposite of what she literally says. Instead of saying that she doesn't enjoy sex for a while, Lois's sarcastic comment humorously suggests she probably not enjoy it as much as Peter assumes. This flouts the maxim of quality because Lois's literal statement is not to be taken as a true expression of her feelings.

DATUM 2

Context: Lois is not sure if Meg is a beautiful girl, because for her, she's not.

Lois: I can't believe my daughter is getting married. You look beautiful, Meg.

Meg: Really? You think so?

Lois: Uh... uh-huh. Y-Yes.

This Datum is taken from season 19 episode 6, "Meg's Wedding". In this scene, Meg is about to get married to a man who happens to be a gay man, Bruce. She was blinded by the lights, while Bruce's purpose of marrying her is to fulfil his parents' request to get married and it has to be 'straight'. Five minutes before the ritual begins, Meg is preparing to get to the altar, getting dressed and doing some makeup, accompanied by her mother. Lois seems happy that her daughter finally finds 'the one' for her. To express her feelings, she says her gratitude and praises Meg for her look, not quite genuine though.

This exchange flouts the maxim of quality. Based on the context and conversation, Lois' compliments towards Meg cannot be seen as something genuine because she says it with a lot of doubt as seen in her expressions and how she says it. Instead of being truthful, Lois covers what she actually means indirectly with the opposite expression, and it happens from time to time again. Thus, it flouts the maxim of quality.

The implicature for this datum can be seen from the context and conversation, it can be classified as a particularised conversational implicature. It can be seen in its context, Lois is sarcastically commenting on Meg's look in the context of a wedding, intended to highlight her lack of genuine enthusiasm towards Meg's appearance. Then, from its sarcasm, the implication that Meg does not look beautiful is understood through the sarcastic tone and the context, not directly as in a literal statement. It is classified as particularised because it depends on the audience's understanding of Lois's tone and the context of her remark. By saying Meg looks beautiful sarcastically, Lois obviously flouts the maxim of quality because she does not genuinely believe what she says. Instead, she uses sarcasm to express her true feelings.

DATUM 3

Context: Joe is paraplegic. So, the driving is pure imagination as he pretends to drive the car.

Joe: Close your eyes, gang, as we hit the Kancamagus Highway. Just four miles to Mount Washington.

Peter: What the hell are you doing, Joe? We want to go for a real drive.

Joe: **This is a real drive. Just imagine it. Feel that New Hampshire air.**

Quagmire: Joe, we're not in New Hampshire. We're in your driveway.

Joe: **Oh, great, some knucklehead is tailgating us.**

This datum is taken from season 19 episode 11, “Boy’s Best Friend.” In this scene, Joe's uncle has just passed away. Consequently, Joe's uncle left him his vintage sports car. Now that it's Joe's, his uncle wanted it to be shown at the Classic Car Show in Providence at the weekend. So, the boys want to try it out before the Car Show. However, it's Joe who drives it, the car's not going to move even an inch. Joe is paraplegic.

The maxim being flouted here is maxim of quality. From this conversation, Joe’s statements are not truthful as he says they are going on a drive, while in reality the car's not even moving. Instead of being truthful, he plays with imagination like he's driving the car and wants the boys to experience the driving as well. Thus, it flouts the maxim of quality.

The implicature of this datum is for sure a particularised conversational implicature as it needs a specific context. In this exchange, Joe is deliberately engaging in a playful imagination, implying while they are not driving as in real life, they have to use their imagination to experience the drive as if it were real. Joe's statements about being on the Kancamagus Highway and Mount Washington are not truthful in any sense. Then, Joe flouts the maxim of quality by producing inaccurate statements.

DATUM 4

Context: Peter asks Carter (portrayed as a cardinal in this episode) where Meg is.

Peter: So, when was the last time you saw the sister?

Carter: **In the church garden, wearing giant nun boots and trying to step on squirrels.**

Peter: Yeah, that checks out.

This datum is taken from season 20 episode 9, “The Fatman Always Rings Twice”. In this episode, it is in noir-style, narrating a 1930s-style mystery. Peter, as detective Mac Bookpro, investigates the disappearance of Meg/sister Mega by request of her mother, Lois as Heady. In this exchange, Peter comes to a church to meet the Cardinal (Carter) in search of Meg's information - Meg was a nun at the church. The result is not quite as expected, Peter still needs more information regarding Meg’s disappearance.

The maxim being flouted from this datum is maxim of quality as Carter's response is a bit too exaggerated and absurd, which obviously flouts the maxim of quality because there is no way it is true. This exaggeration serves to humorously suggest that the situation is nonsensical, not intended to be taken in a literal way.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. Having a look at the exchange, it is likely a particularised conversational implicature as Peter's response, "Yeah, that checks out," indicates that he is humorously engaging with Carter's absurd description rather than believing it to be factual. It is classified as a particularised implicature because Peter understands Carter's statement, something

specific, as an exaggeration and pretentiously acknowledging it as if it were a valid answer.

DATUM 5

Context: The boys have just arrived at the hotel for a business trip, noticing there are only two beds for them four.

Cleveland: I wish there were more than two beds.

Joe: I'll just sleep in my chair.

Peter: You sleep sitting up, Joe?

Joe: Yeah, Bonnie puts a falcon hood on me, and I go right out.

This datum is taken from season 20 episode 20, "The Jersey Bore." Preston Lloyd, Peter's manager at Pawtucket Brewery, has to go to Atlantic City for a business conference with their distributor. To that, he takes Peter to go there because he is the 'less valuable' number of the staff. Out of nowhere, Peter invites his friends to come along with him. In this scene, they have just arrived in the Atlantic City. Inside the hotel, they are complaining because there are only two beds for four of them. However, Joe wants to just sleep in his chair.

The maxim being flouted here is obviously maxim of quality as in the Maxim of Quality the speakers should be truthful and not provide false information, Joe flouts this maxim. Joe claims that Bonnie puts a falcon hood on him to help him sleep. This is highly unlikely and exaggerated detail. The idea of using a falcon hood to help

someone sleep is just absurd and not common. For that, Joe's statements are not to be taken literally. Thus, in this exchange, Joe flouts the maxim of quality.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. Having a look at the exchange, we can classify it as a particularised conversational implicature as the speaker's statement implies something based on the context, context-dependent. In this scenario Joe is joking, using hyperbole, to provide a humorous explanation. The mention of a falcon hood is an absurd exaggeration rather than something actual. Also, Joe's statements could be seen as something lightening the mood. Instead of addressing the issue of sleeping arrangements, Joe deflects with humour, creating a more relaxed situation.

4.2.2 Maxim of Relevance

The maxim of relevance, according to Grice (1975), involves a speaker providing relevant information to the audience. It emphasises staying on track with the topic and avoiding irrelevant contributions. In *Family Guy*, flouting this maxim heavily involves characters making random or off-topic statements that disrupt the flow of a conversation for comedic or dramatic effects. Thus, *Family Guy* relies on flouting this maxim so much, this is the most dominant maxim as of the collected data. Analysing these instances reveals how the series utilises such deviations to create humour, satirical commentary, or absurd narratives. Hence, flouting this maxim enhances its entertainment value.

DATUM 1

Context: Cleveland and Peter are debating whether or not the Pawtucket statue should be torn down.

Cleveland: Peter, anybody who supports that statue is a racist.

Peter: **Racist? How can a 300-pound white guy who looks at black porn be racist?**

This datum is taken from season 19 episode 8, "Pawtucket Pat". In this episode, Brian gets a job as an online journalist. Then, he starts it all by going down to the Quahog Historical Society to get a town hero and brewery founder Pawtucket Pat's records, he discovers that Pawtucket Pat stole the beer recipe from local Native Americans and killed them. His story shocks the town, influencing them to take down the statue honouring Pat. It angers Peter as he supports keeping the statue.

The maxim being flouted here is maxim of relevance as this maxim requires the contributions to the conversation be relevant to the topic, Peter flouts the maxim by bringing unrelated statements. His comment "300-pound white guy who looks at black porn" is irrelevant to the debate about whether the Pawtucket statue should be torn down or not and whether it is racist or not. Instead of addressing Cleveland's argument directly, Peter provides an off-topic statement. Thus, it flouts the maxim of relevance.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. Based on the exchange, it is likely to be a particularised conversational implicature because the exchange depends on the specific context of the conversation. Have a look at his statement, it implies that Peter is using humour or sarcasm to downplay the

seriousness of the racist accusation towards him. He suggests that certain personal characteristics or behaviour (white man watching black porn) would deflect someone from being racist.

DATUM 2

Context: Lois has just dragged down a bin full of decorations, heavy stuff.

Peter: That looks heavy.

Lois: **Well, dragging a bin full of decorations down the stairs while repeatedly yelling **** in front of my children means only one thing. It's Christmas time.**

Taken from season 19 episode 9, "The First No I". In this episode, Lois seems to lose her holiday interest, Christmas to be specific. Lois insists on the family to help her with Christmas, but Lois feels they're not quite helpful. It makes her mad at this period of time. So, in this scene, she feels exhausted after carrying a bin full of Christmas decorations, getting mad after Peter says "That looks heavy."

The maxim being flouted here is maxim of relevance. As this maxim requires that the contributions to the conversation should be relevant to the discussed topic, Lois's response is not quite direct in addressing Peter's observation about how heavy the bin is. Instead, she deflects it by bringing an off-topic remark that shifts the focus from the effort of moving the heavy bin to the humorous aspect of her frustration with the Christmas preparations. Her comment is exaggerated and irrelevant as it introduces a new topic (the stress of Christmas) that diverges from the immediate observation about the weight of the bin.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature as it depends on the specific context of the conversation. Lois's comment, however, implies that dealing with heavy decorations and the associated stress during Christmas is common and quite a routine. To refer her frustration, she sarcastically highlights the effort and emotional toll of preparing for the holiday, in contrast to Peter's simple observation of the bin's weight. This shift in focus underlines the comedic aspect of her situation and her overwhelming Christmas preparations, suggesting that the physical task of Christmas preparations is quite frustrating.

DATUM 3

Context: Stewie's feeling insecure, so he's trying to look young.

Brian: Stewie, what the hell did you do to yourself?

Stewie: Nothing. Almost nothing. Just a little Botox, a little filler, maybe some strings.

Brian: **Stewie, this face-lift was a big mistake. Like letting ducks be part of the Boston Tea Party.**

Taken from season 19 episode 12, "And Then There's Fraud". In this episode, Lois, Meg, Stewie, and Brian go to a museum. On the registration counter, Lois says, "Three adults and one infant, please.", the registration staff replies, "Nice try, lady. That kid's at least three.' After hearing that, Stewie feels insecure about his physical appearance, thinking he's a bit too old for his age. So, in this scene, Brian notices something different from Stewie. Turns out, Stewie's just got some plastic surgeries on his face.

The maxim of relevance is being flouted here. As the maxim of relevance requires that contributions to a conversation should be directly related to the topic being discussed, Brian's response is flouting the maxim of relevance because he introduces an irrelevant historical analogy (letting ducks be part of the Boston Tea Party) instead of directly pointing at Stewie's plastic surgeries. His comment is obviously not related to Stewie's actual face-lift, it is a humorous and exaggerated comparison meant to criticise Stewie's decision to do plastic surgery.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature as the datum needs a specific context to the conversation. Brian's analogy implies that Stewie's face-lift is a mistake in any sense. The use of the analogy about ducks in the Boston Tea Party highlights Brian's view Stewie's decision to undergo plastic surgery is wrong and ridiculous. It emphasises how wrong Stewie is in handling his insecurity.

DATUM 4

Context: Chris offers a help to Stewie hiding his candy from Peter.

Chris: I'm gonna help you. (Hiding candy)

Stewie: Really? You'd do that for me?

Chris: **Of course, Stewie. We're family. We look out for each other like the people on 'Succession'.**

The datum is taken from season 20 episode 3, "Must Love Dogs." In this episode, everyone trades gifts or some sorts as it is a trick-or-treat night. The day after, Stewie realises that his sack of candy is almost empty, indicating that it's got stolen.

Then, Chris comes to his room, then knowing Stewie's candy has gone. After that, he offers some help to hide his remaining candy somewhere no one knows.

The maxim of relevance is being flouted here. It is not quite explicitly flouted, though. Chris's response is relevant to Stewie's question about whether or not he would help. However, Chris's mention of 'Succession' is not relevant as it is a sudden shift from offering help to mentioning a film, but it serves to emphasise the family bond and loyalty he feels towards Stewie. Thus, as it seems, it flouts the maxim of relevance.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. To explain, by comparing their family loyalty to the characters on 'Succession,' Chris is humorously exaggerating the depth of their family relationship. He implies that characters on 'Succession' are deeply involved with each other in terms of lives and struggles, so is their family bond. The comparison is meant to underline the reliability to offer help with some twists, though.

DATUM 5

Context: Quagmire and Lois are already in the room, expecting it to be double-bed room. But Quagmire is a platinum member at all the hotel chains, they probably saw his name and upgraded the room automatically.

Lois: No, you know what, it's fine. We're already here.

Quagmire (speaking to the front desk): My wife says, 'no, it's fine, we're already here.'

Lois: But don't get any ideas, because nothing is gonna happen between us.

Quagmire: You have nothing to worry about. I'll be more of a gentleman than John Wayne Bobbitt with his second wife.

The datum is taken from season 20 episode 13, "The Lois Quagmire." In this episode, Lois gets an invitation to her fancy high school reunion, she thinks that taking Peter might be not a good idea. Then, she comes into a realisation that bringing Quagmire might do it. After that, she invites him to come along and pose as her husband. So, in this scene, Lois booked a suite, but they end up in the honeymoon suite at the hotel. Lois complains about it, but she eventually accepts it as long as nothing happens between them.

The maxim being flouted here is maxim of relevance. In this context, Quagmire's comment about being a 'gentleman' and referring to John Wayne Bobbitt is not relevant to Lois's concern about the possibility of having any romantic involvement. Lois sets boundaries to ensure nothing romantic happens between them, but Quagmire responds with an unrelated reference to a well-known figure that is associated with some scandals, diverting from the actual concern about boundaries.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature as this implicature arises from the specific context and conversation, and so does this exchange. By bringing up John Wayne Bobbitt's scandals, Quagmire is humorously suggesting that he will be respectful towards the boundaries set by Lois, contrasting heavily with Bobbitt's scandalous situation. The implicature is that Quagmire

acknowledges Lois's concern, but he is playfully assuring her that he will not break any boundaries. The reference to Bobbitt adds a layer of humour.

4.2.3 Maxim of Quantity

According to Grice (1975), the maxim of quantity involves a speaker providing the right amount of information - not too little and not too much. It emphasises giving enough detail to be informative and clear while avoiding unnecessary improvisation. In *Family Guy*, flouting the maxim of quantity involves characters either giving excessive details or providing too little information, leading to confusion or humour. Thus, *Family Guy* utilises flouting this maxim to create comedic effects. Analysing flouting of the maxim of quantity instances reveals how the series utilises such deviations to enhance humour, satire, or absurdity. Therefore, flouting the maxim of quantity plays an important role in improving the show's entertainment value.

DATUM 1

Context: Peter needs Lois's help to shrink his body. Lois helps him by berating him

Peter: Lois, please berate me!

Lois: Okay, Peter. If I do this, I really got to do it.

Peter: Do it.

Lois: **For starters, you're a failure. You didn't go to college. Daddy pays our mortgage. And you're a terrible father and husband...**

Peter: Ouch.

The datum is taken from season 19 episode 3, “Boys & Squirrels.” In this episode, Peter's neighbour died as a result of suicide. For that, Peter gets a chainsaw given by his suicidal neighbour. He abuses it in unusual manner. Then, he attempts to create a hole in a tree for the Keebler Elves, he injures his elbow as the tree falls, leaving a young orphaned squirrel. Then, Peter goes to Dr Hartman for some treatment, resulting in Peter's true height being restored. In this scene, Lois's got an idea to shrink Peter's body to his previous height. Lois says that it has to involve berating him. Lois berates him, conveying some insults and bad words towards his husband.

The maxim being flouted here is maxim of quantity. As flouting the maxim of quantity involves providing excessive information as needed, neither too much nor too little, Lois flouts the maxim of quantity by providing more information than necessary. She produces an extensive detail with a long list of criticisms about Peter, which exceeds the level of detail needed to fulfil Peter's request for beratement.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. The implicature here is Lois's extensive and harsh criticism serves multiple purposes: Fulfilment of Request, Lois is taking Peter's request a bit too seriously and is full committed to the role of berating him; Emphasis on Peter's Flaws, the detailed beratement highlights Peter's flaws in a dramatic and exaggerated manner, aligning with the humorous tone of the scene. The implication is that Peter's request was to be berated excessively, and Lois's response quite reflects her willingness to follow his

request; humour and exaggeration, the excessive details add to the comedic effects, emphasising the absurdity and exaggeration in the situation.

DATUM 2

Context: Lois's just got her eyes a LASIK surgery.

Dr Hartman: Mrs. Griffin, the surgery was a success. And by that, I mean the hospital agreed to take your Discover card.

Peter: **Plus, we'll get one percent of that back, which is basically like getting nothing.**

The datum is taken from season 19 episode 3, "Lasik Instinct." In this episode, Lois realises her eyes are waning after accidentally hitting Stewie's playmate, Doug, while dropping Stewie off at preschool. Thus, she decides to take LASIK surgery as suggested by Dr Hartman. After getting the surgery, she loses her vision, she's blind.

The maxim being flouted here is maxim of quantity. Peter flouts this maxim by adding an unnecessary detail about getting 'one percent' back, which is a not required comment regarding the context of discussing a 'successful' surgery. The detail about the cashback's percentage is exaggerated to the success of the surgery and plays a role to distract from the main point.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature as this implicature requires a specific context and relies on the specific situation of the conversation. Peter's comment implies that he is a humorous person as he is using humour to downplay the significance of the surgery's success by shifting it on the trivial

financial detail of receiving a small cashback. This reflects his characteristic, which describes Peter often makes light of serious situations. It can also imply as a critique of financial matters, suggesting that the financial return, the cashback, is insignificant compared to the cost of the surgery.

DATUM 3

Context: Lois's just got her eyes a LASIK surgery.

Stewie: Hello, Brian. If you're watching this, it means you couldn't find your phone charger and came in to use mine.

Brian: Man, am I that predictable?

Stewie: Yes, yes you are. Anyway, I can see that my disease has become a burden to the people I love, so I've decided to take a bus to Vermont to have physician-assisted suicide.

Brian: What?

Stewie: **I've left two suits in my closet, and this is very important: the black is for the wake, the wool is for the 'Gram story. Two suits, Bri. Two looks. That's what people would expect of me.**

Brian: Oh, my God. This is terrible.

Stewie: **Okay, don't look at the tags, that's tacky. Well, I'm not telling you that, but not cheap. I don't care about the suits!**

Brian: I don't care about the suits!

Stewie: Anyway, you were a good friend, Bri. **Oh, and if they make a movie about my life, don't let Jim Carrey play me. Unless he gets his eyes done. Even then, though... Ugh, hard maybe.**

The datum is taken from season 20 episode 6, “Cootie & the Blowhard.” In this episode, Stewie finds out that he has cooties, he gets it from a girl in class that has cooties. The cooties come from the same Play-Doh jar they share. Then, Doug, pretending to be a doctor, confirms the diagnosis that Stewie has cooties, and it can be fatal. After knowing all this, Stewie decides that he wants to be euthanised, then he goes to Vermont. Then, Brian gets a message displayed on a laptop, which Stewie tells something to Brian there. Realising that his friend is in danger, Brian goes to Vermont to prevent him from performing euthanasia.

The maxim being flouted is maxim of quantity as the speakers do not provide the right amount of information. Stewie flouts the maxim of quantity by providing excessive and a bit too irrelevant details about his suits and potential casting choices for a film about his life. The main point of the conversation is supposed to be on his serious decision to have euthanasia, physician-assisted suicide, but he diverts it with trivial information that does not contribute to the main topic.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. First, by detailing his choice of suits and casting preferences, Stewie is jokingly emphasising his concerns with appearances and personal branding even in the face of seriousness. Second, the excessive on trivial matters serves to underline the absurdity

of Stewie's characteristics. It injects dark humour into the serious object of assisted suicide. Third, Stewie's comments exist to lighten the emotional weight of his decision and distract Brian (and the audience) from the seriousness of the situation with humour and irrelevant information.

DATUM 4

Context: Peter joined the choir, and it was an amazing performance by Peter.

Priest: Wow, that was amazing! How would you like to be a regular member of the choir?

Peter: **I'll do it, buddy, under one condition: we shake like that epic handshake meme.**

Priest: You got a deal, buddy.

The datum is taken from season 20 episode 11, "Mister Act." In this episode, Peter gives Lois an exercise bike. She tries it, then gets bulked up after working hard on it. The other day, Peter gives Lois' bike a shot, and accidentally hurts his testicles in the process, his voice raises several octaves. In this scene, Peter takes communion from the priest at church, the priest invites him to fill in with the altar boys after hearing how beautiful Peter's voice is.

The maxim being flouted here is the maxim of quantity. As defined, the maxim of quantity rules that the speakers should provide just enough information about the topic being discussed so it can be understood, avoiding excessive details and information. Here, Peter flouts the maxim of quantity by introducing an exaggerated

and irrelevant condition for joining the choir. Instead of responding directly to the offer, Peter insists on a specific, unrelated gesture - a handshake from the meme.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. It implies Peter's humour and informality with Peter making his acceptance requirements on performing a popular meme handshake, Peter demonstrates his humour characteristic and informal attitude. The handshake is obviously unrelated to the actual agreement on joining the choir, highlighting Peter's tendency to combine seriousness with humour and trivialities.

DATUM 5

Context: The pizza man died a few hours ago at Peter's home, now they've got to remove his body.

Peter: All right, Lois is gonna be home soon, so we go to fix this now.

Chris: **Why don't we just shove him in the sewer, let the clowns have at him?**

Meg: **I'm good with anything that keeps Pennywise off my jock.**

Peter: Sounds like a plan.

The datum is taken from season 20 episode 12, "The Lois Quagmire." In this episode, Lois is leaving for Atlantic City to attend her fancy high school reunion. Lois comes to Atlantic City without Peter and none of her family, but she goes with Quagmire because she's not sure about Bringing Peter to the reunion. Before leaving, Lois orders the family not to order Pizza for dinner. However, after a few hours of Lois

leaving, the family orders pizza instead of eating healthy food as ordered by Lois. The delivery man arrives at Peter's home, then gives the pizza. After that, he wants to use the toilet for a bit, but he doesn't return for quite a long time. Then, the family realises that the delivery man is dead in the toilet, causing Peter to be concerned about Lois finding out. After a few attempts to hide the body, they fail to hide it.

The maxim being flouted here is the maxim of quantity. As the maxim suggests not to provide excessive information and details, Chris and Meg flout the maxim of quantity. First, Chris's suggestion to 'shove him in the sewer, let the clowns have at him' introduces an excessive detail that is not related to the immediate solution of removing the body. The mention of clowns and the sewer is referred to "It", which is quite unrelated to the actual problem. Second, Meg's comment about being 'good with anything that keeps Pennywise off my jock' provides an unrelated detail about Pennywise, a fictional character from "It" as well. Thus, both add unnecessary information and divert from the practical issue of removing the body.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. Chris's implicature is that he is referencing 'It' for humour. By mentioning clowns and the sewer, Chris is referring to the horror film "It", where Pennywise lives in the sewers. By saying it, it adds a layer of dark humour to the conversation and shows Chris's tendency to take serious things lightly. Meg's implicature is to divert the focus. Meg's comment diverts from the main point, immediately dealing with the body, instead supporting Chris's absurdity.

4.2.4 Maxim of Manner

As to Grice (1975), the maxim of manner involves a speaker being clear, orderly, and avoiding ambiguity in any form of communication. It emphasises delivering information straightforwardly and understandably. In *Family Guy*, flouting this maxim involves characters using confusing and obscure kinds of language, being vague, and speaking in a disorganised manner. This disruption of clarity is employed to produce humour or add elements of the absurd narrative. Analysing instances of flouting this maxim helps in demonstrating how the series leverages the deviations to craft comedic scenes, satirical moments, or unexpected twists.

DATUM 1

Context: Joe and Bonnie have just got a baby, and it's a girl. The baby will undergo the christening.

Joe: Everyone, I have a few words. It's a very special day, as we dedicate Susie's life to Christ before she can consent to it or have any conception of what's happening.

Chris: **Susie once licked a booger off my hand. I'm Chris, by the way!**

The datum is taken from season 19 episode 5, "La Famiglia Guy." In this episode, Joe's just got a daughter named Susie. Then he invites Peter and his family, Joe wants him to be Susie's godfather at her christening. Peter misunderstands the terms and situations, as he thinks he's an actual mobster after being mistaken as a mobster. In this scene, Joe opens the ceremony, and everyone goes silent, except this man Chris. Chris reacts spontaneously without thinking twice about what he's going to say.

The maxim being flouted here is the maxim of manner. As the maxim of manner suggests speakers to be clear, and avoid ambiguity, Chris comments on Susie licking a bogger off his hand is presented in disorganised manner. Instead of contributing to the actual occasion, the formal one, of the christening, his statement is a bit too bizarre and out of context. In addition, Chris introducing himself is abrupt and adds to the lack of clarity.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. The implicature of this exchange is the humour and absurdity, Chris's comment is meant to be humorous and absurd. By mentioning something gross and trivial during the christening, which is a serious event, he implies his lack of understanding or disregard for the formal occasion.

DATUM 2

Context: Peter has to help or give some treatments to his big rival, the chicken.

Peter: I'm sorry, Dr. Hartman, but I can't help this patient. We're really big rivals.

Dr Hartman: **Peter, If I only helped people I liked, everyone in this hospital would be dead. Just do what I do, help them out, then angry 'Footloose' dance-out your frustrations.**

The datum is taken from season 19 episode 10, "Fecal Matters." In this episode, Peter has the opportunity to work at the hospital. When it is a bad flue season that affects most of his family, the hospital (Dr Hartman, to be specific), asks him to volunteer as a nurse which is quite unexpected. In this scene, Peter winds up with the

Chicken, his rival. For Peter, it is quite surprising that the chicken is not there for a fight and the chicken says he's dying. Thus, Peter makes an exception who is to help, the Chicken is off from Peter's list of people he's willing to help.

The maxim being flouted here is the maxim of manner. As the maxim of manner suggests that a speaker should be clear, orderly, and avoid ambiguity in a conversation, Dr Hartman provides a response introducing an unusual and somewhat irrelevant suggestion (the "angry 'Footloose' dance-out") as a way to handle Peter's personal frustrations. Dr Hartman's advice is not directly related to the task at hand (helping the patient, the Chicken) and can be perceived as ambiguous or unclear in terms of practical guidance. It introduces a humorous element rather than providing a straightforward answer.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature. The implicature of this exchange is 'handling personal feelings', Dr Hartman's advice implies that personal feelings and rivalries should be separated in a professional setting, to perform professional duties. The suggestion to do an "angry 'footloose' dance-out" implies that it is acceptable to have some personal frustrations, but it should be taken away to make it not interfere with professional responsibilities.

DATUM 3

Context: Joe's got some instructions from his uncle that he's got to show his car at the Classic Car Show.

Joe: Uncle Ray also left strict instructions for me to show his car at the Classic Car Show in Providence this weekend.

Peter: Classic Car Show? Isn't that one of those gatherings of a bunch of guys whose penises don't work?

Joe: **Correct. Anyone with a perfectly-restored classic car for sure has a bum wiener.**

The datum is taken from season 19 episode 11, "Boy's Best Friend." In this episode, there are two sides of the stories. First, it is about Brian who gets to see a girl at a shoe store, going on dates. Second, it is about Joe's uncle passing away and leaving him his classic sports car. This datum deals with the second one. So, in this scene, Joe introduces his new car, a classic Corvette, to his friends. Joe tells them about how he gets it, what's to do with it, and the other details. With that being said, Joe's uncle left him a message to take the car to the classic car show, the boys respond with some twists, and so does Joe.

The maxim of manner is being flouted here as Joe's response introduces an irrelevant and exaggerated, quite ambiguous, stereotype about people who attend classic car shows. His remark about attendants having a 'bum wiener' is intended to be humorous and sarcastic rather than a clear and relevant comment about the event. It diverts from the expected, straightforward talk about the event and adds a provocative, unnecessary element.

The implicature of this datum is a generalised conversational implicature. Joe's remark implies a humorous stereotype about the attendants of classic car shows. Joe is using hyperbole to create comedic effects by suggesting that the participants in such events have a 'bum wiener'. The implicature is that Joe jokes about the type of people who are interested in classic cars, not offering a relevant and serious commentary about the events or its attendants.

DATUM 4

Context: While being at the jungle gym top after fighting over a frisbee, both of them start confessing their stories and insecurities.

Stewie: Thank you for taking care of me Doug.

Doug: Look, Stewie, I want to apologise

Stewie: You do? For what?

Doug: **For always showing you up and just being a jerk. I think I'm just intimidated by your brilliance. Plus, it's so great you've only got nine hairs. It probably takes you 3 seconds to get ready in the morning. Me, I've got this whole head of hair.**

Stewie: That's not quite as nice as you meant for it to sound, but since we're confessing our insecurities... I'm not exactly the, um, I don't know, 'slick cucumber' everyone thinks I am.

The datum is taken from season 20 episode 4, "80's Guy." In this episode, the stories deal with Peter's story and Stewie's story. About Peter, he wants to help Chris by giving some advice to approach a girl, he points the stuff from the 1980s about

approaching a girl, which then Peter emulates it himself. Then about the datum-related scene, it is about Stewie's competition against Doug in class. Doug gets a lot of achievement and some sort, which awakes Stewie's intention to win his classmates' attention. Then there's a moment where Doug's frisbee lands on top of the jungle gym, Stewie decides to show how brave he is by volunteering to climb it to the top the next day. At the scheduled time, Doug arrives to challenge Stewie to climb it. Stewie beats him, but his foot stuck in the jungle gym as he starts going down. The, this is where the exchange begins when Doug stays to help and remains with Stewie because the storms gets moving.

The maxim of manner is being flouted here. As the maxim of manner suggests that communication has to be clear, orderly, and unambiguous, Doug's apology flouts the maxim of manner because his statement regarding Stewie's hair is ambiguous and unclear. Instead of offering straightforward apology, Doug makes it ambiguous by commenting on Stewie's hair, which seems to mix genuine praise with an intended insult.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature as it arises from the specific context of a conversation and requires understanding of particular circumstances. In this case, Doug's statement about Stewie's hair, though quite ambiguous, reflects his personal insecurities and attempts to make amends. The comment about Stewie's hair being easy to manage (Stewie's a bald baby), compared

to Doug's hair being a 'burden', is not a general commentary but rather relates to Doug's situation and feelings of being inadequate.

DATUM 5

Context: Tom Tucker announces a new Laundromat in Quahog.

Tom: Good evening, I'm Tom Tucker. Our top story: doing laundry and drinking beer. I'm sorry. Doing laundry and drinking beer? Quahog welcomes Duds & Suds, a new Laundromat that serves beer. So, if you want to drink and watch your kid's teacher wash his only pair of pants, get on down there.

Quagmire: Ah, cool!

Cleveland: We should go.

Joe: Nothing better than putting on a warm diaper right out of the dryer.

The datum is taken from season 20 episode 5, "Brief Encounter." In this episode, Tom Tucker, being on TV, announces a new laundromat than combines laundromat and bar, then the Boys decide to visit together. When being there, Quagmire and Peter accidentally trade a pair of each other's underwear without even knowing it. It results in changes in both characters, their attitudes shift, like being traded.

The maxim being flouted here is the maxim of manner. As this maxim requires that information be presented in a clear and orderly manner, Tom Tucker's announcement sounds disorganised, ambiguous, and overly detailed. He promotes it with the story involving a ambiguous statement about doing laundry + drinking beer

and watching a teacher's pants being washed. Thus, it lacks clarity and coherence in any sense, which is a deliberate choice to add humour.

The implicature of this datum is a particularised conversational implicature as it depends on a specific contents and details and context of the conversation. In this case, Tom Tucker's detailed and humorous statements of the Laundromat with beer is tailored to the specific context to suit with his news segment. The implicature here is that the concept of the laundromat is so unusual and absurd, then it deserves a humorous and exaggerated announcement.