

UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU
FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET
ODSJEK ZA ENGLJSKI JEZIK I
KNJIŽEVNOST

Cooperative Principle Observed on the Friends TV Series Dialogue List
Princip kooperativnosti na primjeru dijaloške liste iz TV serije Friends

Student:

Amina Baždarić

Mentor:

Prof. Dr. Selma Đuliman

Sarajevo, Juli 2023.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. CORPUS DESCRIPTION	1
1.2. METHODOLOGY	2
2. Theoretical Background	3
2.1. The Cooperative Principle	3
2.1.1 Maxim of Quantity	4
2.1.2 Maxim of Quality	4
2.1.3 Maxim of Relation	5
2.1.4 Maxim of Manner	6
3. Disregarding the maxims	7
3.1. Flouting maxims	7
3.2 Violating the maxims	9
3.3 Infringing or opting out of maxims	9
3.4 Suspending maxims	10
4. Analysis of the corpus	10
5. Conclusion	34
References:	36

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is a linguistic discipline dealing with the use of natural language in everyday communication and the relationship between languages and their speakers. Therefore, it is the study of actual language use and how context contributes to the meaning and understanding of what is said during the interaction.

One of the most important concepts in pragmatics is the cooperative principle. It demonstrates how listeners and speakers can maintain effective communication. In reality, speakers cooperate and mutually accept each other in order to be understood in a specific way. The cooperative principle comprises four speech maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These speech maxims present principles that speakers must adhere to communicate.

This thesis is concerned with analyzing speech in the TV series Friends based on a cooperative principle. Friends is a popular American sitcom that follows six people living in New York. It depicts the most important aspects of their lives.

This final diploma paper shows how everyday communication functions and how context can play a huge role in speakers' understanding of each other.

We enjoy looking to Friends for guidance in our studies because it is one of the world's most famous sitcoms.

1.1. CORPUS DESCRIPTION

Friends is a sitcom, created by David Crane and Marta Kauffman that aired from 1994 to 2004. It deals with the lives, careers, and relationships of six people featuring actors: David Schwimmer, Lisa Kudrow, Matthew Perry, Courtney Cox, Jennifer Aniston, and Matt LeBlanc (IMDb.com, n.d.)

TV series consists of 10 seasons, and much of the show occurs in their apartments as they visit one another. There are six main characters:

Phoebe Buffay (Lisa Kudrow) is renowned for her unconventional way of life, peculiar humor, and acoustic guitar performances in Central Perk cafe.

Rachel Greene (Jennifer Aniston) was raised in a wealthy family and was well-known in school. A few noteworthy things about her are that she doesn't like people touching her eyes and had never worked prior to Central Perk, so her first proper job was as a waitress there.

Monica Geller (Courtney Cox) is viewed as the motherly one amongst the group, with her apartment being the central place for their get-togethers. She loves cleaning and has an enthusiastic talking style.

Joey Tribbiani (Matt LeBlanc) is a ladies' man who craves food but dislikes sharing it with others.

Chandler Bing (Matthew Perry) is known for his dark humor and wit. His frequent joke-telling comes with an accent on certain words in every sentence he utters.

Ross Geller (David Schwimmer) is a paleontologist well-known for his nerdy persona and offbeat sense of humor.

1.2. METHODOLOGY

This thesis will use a descriptive and analytical approach to research by examining ten scenes from the sitcom. For each scene, speech maxims will be assigned in order to accurately evaluate the linguistic principles of quantity, quality, relation, and manner present in the scene.

The cooperative principle and its breakdown into four maxims: maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, as well as examples, are covered in the chapter *Theoretical Background*. Furthermore, we discuss how speakers can disregard maxims in four ways: flouting maxims, violating maxims, infringing or opting out maxims, and suspending maxims. We go over some fundamental examples of disregarding maxims.

Finally, we examine the corpus using the previously given theory.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. The Cooperative Principle

Communication is the interchange of meanings between persons using a shared symbol system (Encyclopaedia Britannica, inc., 2023). The process of exchanging ideas, thoughts, opinions, and knowledge so that the message is received and comprehended with clarity is known as effective communication.

H.P. Grice, an Oxford University philosopher of language, developed the entire theory of cooperative principle. In his writings from the 1940s and 1950s, he claimed that during a conversation, participants follow four conversational maxims grouped under the cooperative principle (Thomas in Andersen, N., 2013, p.4).

The ultimate goal is that the person who is listening understands what the speaker implies with his statements by relying on cooperativeness, context, and background knowledge (A. Hadi, 2013, p.1).

Therefore, the cooperative principle is a principle of conversation by which participants make a conversational contribution “such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange.” (Grice, H. P., 1991, p. 26).

The cooperative principle consists of 4 speech maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These maxims are not rules about how people should talk, but they describe the listeners’ assumptions about how speakers talk. As Grice explained, these are examples of principles, not rules (A. Hadi, 2013, p. 1).

However, there have been some speculations about the number of these maxims. Some critics believe there are only three maxims, while others do not believe there is a list and instead focus on only one principle (A. Hadi, 2013, p. 2).

In conclusion, the cooperative principle is a fundamental principle of communication that ensures that speakers and listeners understand each other.

2.1.1 Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity refers to the amount of delivered information and consists of two principles:

1. "Make your contribution as informative as is required;
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required" (Grice, H. P., 1991, p. 26).

According to the maxim of quantity, people should provide only the necessary information, not more or less. People who give too little information run the risk of their listeners not understanding them by not being explicit enough, while those who give too much information run the risk of boring them (Cutting, J., 2002).

An example of the maxim of quantity:

"Well, to cut a long story short, she didn't get home till two" (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 34).

The information given is just sufficient and there is no little information by simply saying, or too much information. Instead, the focus is on the fact that she didn't get home till two.

Thus, informativity plays a crucial role in this. The right amount of information will establish a unique reference in a specific context.

2.1.2 Maxim of Quality

The Maxim of Quality is the following: "Try to make your contribution one that is true" (Grice, H.P., 1991, p. 27) and comprises two more maxims:

1. "Do not say what you believe to be false;
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence" (Grice, H.P., 1991, p. 27).

The second maxim is quality, which states that speakers should be honest and say what they think accurately represents reality. It is assumed that they will refrain from saying anything they know to be untrue or for which they have no supporting facts. Additionally, some speakers like

to point out to their listeners that they only state what they firmly believe to be true and are not supported by sufficient evidence (Cutting, J., 2002).

An example of the maxim of quality:

A: *I'll ring you tomorrow afternoon then.*

B: *Erm, I shall be there as far as I know, and in the meantime have a word with Mum and Dad if they're free. Right, bye-bye then sweetheart.*

A: *Bye-bye, bye.* (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 35)

In order to shield B from allegations of lying if A calls and discovers that B is not present, person A uses the phrase "as far as I know," which means "I can't be completely sure if this is true" (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 35).

Hedges

Hedges are frequently used as part of the maxim of quality. Those are expressions used to start a conversation, such as:

“As far as I know;

Correct me if I'm wrong;

I'm not absolutely sure” (Yule, G., 2014, p. 146).

“We also take care to indicate that what we report is something we think or feel (not know), is possible or likely (not certain), and may or could (not must) happen” (Yule, G., 2014, p. 146).

2.1.3 Maxim of Relation

Here we have one maxim: “Be relevant” (Grice, H.P., 1991, p. 27). The maxim of relation states that speakers should make a point connected to what has already been said. Some people use the phrase “just going back to your point” (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 35) to show how their comments relate to the topic at hand.

An example of maxim of relation:

A: *There's somebody at the door.*

B: *I'm in the bath.* (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 35)

Person B expects person A to comprehend the significance of his current situation in relation to her remark that someone is at the door and that he is unable to check since he is in the bath (Cutting, Joan, 2002, p. 35).

2.1.4 Maxim of Manner

The maxim of manner states that the speaker should be clear and concise, avoiding ambiguity and obscurity. As a result, speeches are succinct and well-organized, and the phrase “just to clarify one point” is frequently used (Grice, H.P., 1991, p. 27).

The central maxim is “Be perspicuous” (Grice, H.P., 1991, p. 27), and four other maxims:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

According to Grice, listeners take it for granted that speakers follow the cooperative principle, and it is only through their understanding of the four maxims that they are able to infer the speaker's intentions and implied meaning. The term “conversational implicature” refers to the meaning that speakers intended to convey but that listeners inferred.

To conclude, “we expect our conversational partners to make succinct, honest, relevant and clear contributions to the interaction and to signal to us in some way if these maxims are not being followed in particular circumstances” (Yule, G., 2014, p. 145).

Occasionally, we have conversations in which the cooperative principle is not at play. However, this broad explanation of the typical expectations assists in clarifying a number of common characteristics of how people say things (Yule, G., 2014).

Here is an example of maxim of manner:

Thank you Chairman. Jus – just to clarify one point. There is a meeting of the Police Committee on Monday and there is an item on their budget for the provision of their camera (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 35).

Regarding the purpose of sending the message, this person is explicit and direct. In this case, the speaker emphasizes that he is following the maxim.

3. Disregarding the maxims

There are five ways to disregard the maxims:

1. Flouting a maxim
2. Violating a maxim
3. Infringement
4. Opting out of a maxim
5. Suspending a maxim

3.1. Flouting maxims

When speakers appear to disregard the maxims but expect listeners to understand the meaning implied, they are flouting the maxims. When doing so, the speaker assumes that the hearer understands that their words should not be taken literally and that they can infer the implicit meaning (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 37).

The speaker ignores the maxims and uses a conversational implicature when the aim is not to deceive the listener but to make them find other meanings.

Implicatures explain meaning added to a conversation that goes beyond the semantic meaning of the words used. An expression that conveys more meaning than words is known as a conversational implicature (Andersen, N., 2013).

When a speaker asserts something false or for which there is no supporting evidence, they are violating the maxim of quality. An implicature results when the speaker says something that is untrue. “The speaker is not trying to deceive the recipient in any way, which leads the listener to look for another set of meanings of the utterance” (Thomas in Andersen, N., 2013, p. 7).

Speakers who disregard the maxim of quality may exaggerate or say something that is not true to their beliefs or opinions. This includes the overuse of hyperbole as the basis of humor. Speakers occasionally use metaphors to flout the maxim of quality. Additionally, conventional euphemisms like “She’s got a bun in the oven” (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 37) denote pregnancy. Finally, irony and banter can be used to flout the maxim of quality.

“While irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness), the type of verbal behavior known as ‘banter’ is an offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness)” (Leech, G., 1983, pp. 144). Hence, banter both expresses a negative sentiment and suggests a positive one, whereas sarcasm is an ironic technique meant to offend.

When a speaker shares more or less information than is necessary during a conversation, the maxim of quantity is broken. In this instance, person B would provide more details than required in order to respond to the question about their holiday plans.

The maxim of relation is flouted when a speaker responds or makes an observation unrelated to the subject being discussed. For instance, it occurs when the hearer deviates from or does not stick to the topic. Speakers anticipate that listeners will be able to infer what the utterance did not say and connect their report to the one before it.

The maxim of manner is flouted when a speaker disregards the rule by not keeping their remarks brief and using ambiguity. As a result, an implicature prompts participants to consider alternative interpretations.

This is an example of buying a dress in a shop. We don’t like the dress but say “I’ll go away and think about it and maybe come back later” instead of “This looks awful on; I don’t want it after all” (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 37).

We are not lying and we are aware that she knows of our lack of plans to return. We refer to this as ‘flouting’ the maxims when speakers appear to disregard them while still expecting listeners to understand the meaning they are implying.

3.2 Violating the maxims

When a speaker knows that the hearer will not see the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words, they are said to violate a maxim.

Violating the maxim of quantity happens when the speaker needs to provide the listener with enough information to understand what is being discussed because they want the listener to have a partial picture. The speaker is not implying anything, but “they are being economical with the truth” (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 40).

The maxim of quality is violated when the speaker is not sincere and gives incorrect information. It can be used for good when parents “protect” their children from the harsh reality, and this is referred to as a white lie with good intentions (Cutting, J., 2002, p. 40).

The violation of the maxim of relation occurs when the speaker avoids answering a question by shifting the subject in order to divert the other interlocutor. Furthermore, the maxim of manner is violated when the speaker says everything but what the interviewer wants to hear.

Here is an example:

Husband: *How much did that new dress cost, darling?*

Wife: *I know, let's go out tonight. Now, where would you like to go?* (Cutting J., 2002, p. 40).

The wife shifted the topic, and violated the maxim of relation.

3.3 Infringing or opting out of maxims

A speaker who infringes a maxim does not uphold it due to their subpar linguistic performance. And the comic effect may be produced due to the speaker's lack of proficiency in the language.

This may occur if:

- the speaker has a limited command of the language (such as a child or a foreign learner);
- their performance is compromised (due to anxiety, intoxication, or excitement);
- they are cognitively impaired;
- they are simply unable to speak clearly (Cutting, J., 2002).

Despite not wanting to come off as uncooperative, a speaker who opts out of a maxim is unwilling to cooperate. Sometimes due to legal or moral reasons, they cannot respond as expected, and they state this. “Examples are a priest or counselor refusing to repeat information given in confidence, and a police officer refusing to release the name of an accident victim until the relatives have been informed” (Thomas in Cutting, J., 2002, p. 41).

3.4 Suspending maxims

When the participants withhold information essential to them culturally, they are said to be suspending a maxim because they are not expecting it to be fully fulfilled. Other members of the community would not regard this as uncooperative behavior.

I consider a good example of this instance a Western visitor to Bosnia and Herzegovina who enters a Bosnian home without taking off their shoes. The Bosnian hosts would refrain from direct criticism and recognize that the visitor is unfamiliar with these cultural norms. Instead, they would imply something to the tourist in a subtle way or just remain silent.

4. Analysis of the corpus

4.1. *The Pilot (Season 1, Episode 1, Scene 1)*

MONICA: There's nothing to tell! He's just some guy I work with!

JOEY: Come on! You're going out with the guy. There's gotta be something wrong with him!

CHANDLER: All right, Joey. Be nice. So does he have a hump? A hump and a hairpiece?

PHOEBE: Wait, does he eat chalk?

(THE OTHERS STARE, BEMUSED)

PHOEBE: Just, cause, I don't want her to go through what I went through with Carl - oh!

MONICA: Okay, everybody relax. Relax. This is not even a date. It's not. It's just two people going out to dinner and - not having sex.

CHANDLER: Sounds like a date to me.

The maxim of quality is violated because Joey says there must be something wrong with the guy Monica's going out with. He makes a broad statement and has no evidence to support his stance.

Joey's comment implies that, despite the lack of any evidence, he believes Monica has high standards or that the guy has some flaws.

Phoebe's claim violates the maxim of relation because her comment is irrelevant to the topic. She uses this to create a comedic effect. On the other hand, Phoebe's question adds an element of surprise and exaggeration with the aim of making others laugh.

Monica violates the maxim of quantity by not answering completely the question and saying that there is nothing to tell. Additionally, Monica's response can be interpreted as opting out of the maxim of quantity. When asked about her relationship with the guy she works with, she says there is nothing to tell because she does not want to reveal any more details. This means she opts out of providing more information. The implicature in Monica's statement is that there may be a potential romantic element to their relationship that she is unwilling to disclose.

Monica's other comment and emphasis on 'relax' and 'not having sex' imply that she wants to reassure the others that her relationship with the guy is casual. The implication is that the others may have had premature decisions.

Chandler's response appears to be absurd and irrelevant to the discussion. Using humor in the conversation, he flouts the maxim of relation. Furthermore, Chandler's questions about a hump and a hairpiece highlight Joey's absurd comment. With his comments "It's a date", he implies that Monica's description actually fits into the image of a typical date.

(CUT TO SAME SET)

CHANDLER: Alright, so I'm back in high school, I'm standing in the middle of the cafeteria, and I realize I am totally naked.

ALL: Oh, yeah. Had that dream.

CHANDLER: Then I look down, and I realize there's a phone... there.

JOEY: Instead of...?

CHANDLER: That's right.

JOEY: Never had that dream.

PHOEBE: No.

CHANDLER: All of the sudden, the phone starts to ring. Now I don't know what to do. Everybody starts looking at me.

MONICA: They weren't looking at you before?

CHANDLER: Finally, I figure, I better answer it. And it turns out it's my mother, which is very very weird, because - she never calls me.

The maxim of manner is violated by Chandler's statement since it includes more information than is necessary. It is also amusing with his vivid description.

Joey violated the maxim of quality by saying that he has never had the dream Chandler described, implying that he might have instead had other strange dreams.

Monica's question can be interpreted as a violation of the maxim of quality. She adds that Chandler's claims of being ignored prior to the phone ringing is somewhat odd, implying that he may have drawn attention in some other way.

Chandler's statement can be taken as opting out of the maxim of relation. When Joey asks, "Instead of...?" concerning the location of the phone, Chandler's quick response of "That's right" avoids simply mentioning where the phone was instead of the expected response.

The implicatures used throughout the dialogue add to the conversation's amusing and cheerful tone.

ROSS: (MORTIFIED) Hi.

JOEY: This guy says hello, I wanna kill myself.

Here the maxim of quantity is flouted because Joey gives too much information. His speech violates the quality maxim by exaggerating his reaction to someone saying hello. He used exaggerated language to suggest that he is highly uncomfortable or unpleasant in the scenario, disregarding the accuracy of his comments. The maxim of manner is also violated because Joey is not clear or brief.

Additionally, Joey's statement suggests that he has a low tolerance for awkward social encounters or that he is uncomfortable in particular situations. His intense reaction indicates that Ross greeting him has made him feel socially uncomfortable. By emphasizing Joey's dramatic and exaggerated attitude, the implicature provides a funny tone to the scene.

MONICA: Are you okay, sweetie?

ROSS: I just feel like someone reached down my throat, grabbed my small intestine, pulled it out of my mouth and tied it around my neck...

The maxim of quality is respected because Monica sincerely asks Ross how he feels. The maxim of quantity is broken because Ross gives too much information and details that aren't necessary to answer the question.

His answer violates the maxim of manner because Ross is not brief and uses metaphor to describe his feelings.

Ross's statement implies that he is in plenty discomfort or distress. He highlights the extent of his pain and creates an image that reflects his emotional condition by using such a graphic and excessive metaphor to describe his feelings.

CHANDLER: Cookie?

MONICA: (EXPLAINING TO THE OTHERS) Carol moved her stuff out today. (TO ROSS) Let me get you some coffee.

ROSS: Thanks.

PHOEBE: Ooh! Oh! (STARTS TO PLUCK AT THE AIR JUST IN FRONT OF ROSS)

ROSS: No, no don't! Stop cleansing my aura! No, just leave my aura alone, okay?

PHOEBE: Fine. Be murky.

ROSS: I'll be fine, alright? Really, everyone. I hope she'll be very happy.

The maxim of quality is respected because the conversation between them is sincere. The maxim of quantity is respected because they provide enough information.

Phoebe violates the maxim of relevance by talking about aura, which is irrelevant to the conversation.

There are example of opting out of the maxims. Ross's response can be seen as opting out of the maxim of manner. Instead of expressing his dissatisfaction with Phoebe's attempt to cleanse his aura openly, he uses imperative phrases and exclamations to say his request more strongly.

Monica's statement implies that Ross' ex-wife Carol has formally ended their relationship and moved out. The implicature suggests an important event has occurred that has affected Ross emotionally.

Phoebe's reaction suggests a humorous recognition of Ross's desire to be left alone without any aura cleansing. She describes his aura as "murky," meaning that it will remain unattended and less positive or clear without her assistance.

Ross's statement implies that he would be fine fine despite Carol's departure. His want for Carol's happiness suggests his acceptance of the circumstance and desire for her to be happy.

MONICA: No you don't.

ROSS: No I don't. To hell with her, she left me!

JOEY: And you never knew she was a lesbian...

ROSS: No! Okay?! Why does everyone keep fixating on that? She didn't know, how should I know?

CHANDLER: Sometimes I wish I was a lesbian. (THE OTHERS STARE AT HIM) Did I say that out loud?

ROSS: I told Mom and Dad last night. They-- they seemed to take it pretty well.

MONICA: Oh really? So that hysterical phone call I got from a woman sobbing at 3 AM, "I'll never have grandchildren. I'll never have grandchildren," was what? A wrong number?

ROSS: Sorry.

JOEY: Alright Ross, look. You're feeling a lot of pain right now. You're angry. You're hurting. Can I tell you what the answer is?

(ROSS GESTURES HIS CONSENT)

JOEY: Strip joint! Come on, you're single! Have some hormones!

ROSS: I don't want to be single, okay? I just... I just - I just wanna be married again!

Ross's statements violates the maxim of quality by expressing his strong feelings. He uses harsh words to express his frustration over his ex-partner's leaving.

Chandler's comment flouts the quality maxim by giving a witty remark that is unexpected and unrelated to the current conversation. He creates a humorous effect by using irony and self-deprecating humor.

Ross's statement can be interpreted as opting out of the relation maxim. Instead of immediately addressing the subject of his ex-wife's sexual orientation, he becomes defensive and wonders why it is constantly brought up. His statement suggests that he does not wish to discuss or focus on that specific aspect.

Monica's statement implies that she received a disturbing phone call from their mom saying she will not have grandchildren. This implies that she was upset and worried about not having grandchildren in the future.

Joey implies that engaging in some casual relationships could help Ross cope with his loneliness. It implies that such behavior is a common reaction to heartbreak.

Ross suggests that he craves connection and emotional security. His desire to be married again indicates that he appreciates the commitment and connection that marriage provides, emphasizing his desire for a meaningful love relationship.

(ENTER RACHEL IN A WET WEDDING DRESS. SHE STARTS TO SEARCH AROUND THE ROOM)

CHANDLER: And I just want a million dollars! (EXTENDS HIS HAND HOPEFULLY)

MONICA: Rachel?!

RACHEL: Oh God. Monica! Hi! Thank God! I just went to your building and you weren't there and then this guy with a big hammer said you might be here and you are, you are!

WAITRESS: Can I get you some coffee?

MONICA: (POINTING AT RACHEL) De-caff. (TO THE GANG) Okay, everybody, this is Rachel, another Lincoln High survivor. (TO RACHEL) This is everybody, this is Chandler, and Phoebe, and Joey, and - you remember my brother Ross?

RACHEL: Sure! Hi!

ROSS: Hi.

(THEY GO TO HUG BUT ROSS'S UMBRELLA OPENS. HE SITS, DEFEATED AGAIN)

(A MOMENT OF SILENCE AS RACHEL SITS; THE OTHERS EXPECT HER TO EXPLAIN)

MONICA: So you want to tell us now, or are we waiting for four wet bridesmaids?

RACHEL: Oh God... well, it started about a half hour before the wedding. I was in the room where we were keeping all the presents, and I was looking at this gravy boat. This really gorgeous Limoges gravy boat. When all of a sudden- (TO WAITRESS, WHO HAS BROUGHT HER COFFEE) Sweet 'n' Lo?- I realized that I was more turned on by this gravy boat than by Barry! And then I got really freaked out, and that's when it hit me: how much Barry looks like Mr. Potato Head. You know, I mean, he always looked familiar, but... Anyway, I just had to get out of there, and I started wondering "Why am I doing this, and who am I doing this for?" (TO MONICA) So anyway I just didn't know where to go, and I know that you and I have kinda drifted apart, but you're the only person I knew who lived here in the city.

MONICA: Who wasn't invited to the wedding.

RACHEL: Ooh, I was kinda hoping that wouldn't be an issue...

The characters give enough information and are honest, which means they respect the maxims of quality and quantity. They also stick to the topic and respect the maxim of relevance. The only thing is that Rachel talking about Barry is longer than necessary and contains unnecessary details, which violates the maxim of quantity.

Monica's statement depicts opting out of the maxim of manner. Instead of responding fully and grammatically, she reduces her response to a single phrase, thinking that the others will grasp her purpose of buying decaffeinated coffee.

Rachel implies that she and Monica had a falling out or a gradual separation, which made her hesitant to seek Monica's assistance. Despite their current distance, the implicature conveys a history between them and the expectation of understanding and support from Monica.

Monica implies that she realized she wasn't invited to Rachel's wedding. This implication points out Monica's wonder or hurt because of her absence from the guest list.

Rachel shows that she was aware of her chances of taking shelter with Monica after failing to invite her to the wedding. Her reply implies a wish to avoid conflict, as well as an expectation that Monica will forgive the mistake she made.

4.2. *The One Where the Monkey Gets Away (Season 1, Episode 19, Scene 3)*

Chandler: I can't believe we are even having this discussion.

Joey: I agree. I'm, like, in disbelief.

Chandler: I mean, don't you think if things were gonna happen with Rachel, they would've happened already?

Ross: I'm telling you, she said she's looking for a relationship with someone exactly like me.

Joey: She really said that?

Ross: Well, I added the 'exactly like me' part... But she said she's looking for someone, and someone is gonna be there tonight.

Joey: 'Tonight' tonight?

Ross: Well, I think it's perfect. Y'know, it's just gonna be the two of us, she spent all day taking care of my monkey...

Chandler: I can't remember the last time I got a girl to take care of my monkey.

Ross: Anyway, I figured after work I'd go pick up a bottle of wine, go over there and, uh, try to woo her.

Chandler: Hey, y'know what you should do? You should take her back to the 1890's, when that phrase was last used.

The maxim of relevance is respected by the characters in this scene as they talk about Rachel and her interest in Ross. The other maxims, however, are broken.

Chandler's sarcastic remark about the circumstance breaks the maxim of quality. He is not being completely honest and his comments do not really advance the discussion. Chandler is opting out of the maxim of relation. Rather of making a useful or relevant advice, he makes a sarcastic remark regarding Ross's intention to attract Rachel, expressing his doubt or disbelief in Ross' romantic pursuit.

Chandler implies that he hasn't had the same amount of female attention that Ross had with Rachel. The implicature suggests a fun reminder of the differences in their romantic experiences.

Ross violates the maxim of quantity by introducing superfluous details about Rachel's desire for a relationship. Ross implies that he sees the opportunity to spend time alone with Rachel as an

ideal setting for their relationship to progress. He also thinks Rachel's acts, like as caring for his pet monkey, show her love for him.

Joey breaks the maxim of quality when he uses ambiguous words, i.e., "like", to express his doubt.

[Cut to Rachel taking care of Marcel. They are watching a soap opera]

Rachel: Now, now the one in the feather boa, that's Dr. Francis. Now, she used to be a man. Okay, now look, see, there's Raven. We hate her. We're glad she's dying. Okay- [Marcel pushes down a cushion to reveal a shoe] Wh- wh- Marcel, are you playing with Monica's shoes? You know you're not supposed to pl- whoah. Marcel, did you poo in the shoe? [Takes the shoe into the kitchen] Marcel, bad monkey! Oh! Oh! [She notices the newsletter and taps the contents of the shoes onto it, then folds it shut] Sorry, Barry. Little engagement gift. I'm sure you didn't register for that. [She leaves the apartment holding the newsletter at arm's length. However, she leaves the door open. Marcel runs out in the opposite direction. There is a shot from the TV and Rachel runs back in] Who died? Who died? Roll him over! Oh, c'mon, roll him over! Oh...! Well, we know it wasn't Dexter, right Marcel? Because- [Looks down and notices he is missing] Marcel? Marc- [Notices the open door]

[Time lapse. Now everyone but Ross and Phoebe is back at Monica and Rachel's]

Joey: How could you lose him?

Rachel: I don't know. We were watching TV, and then he pooped in Monica's shoe-

Monica: Wait. He pooped in my shoe? Which one?

Rachel: I don't know. The left one.

Monica: Which ones?

Rachel: Oh. Oh, those little clunky Amish things you think go with everything.

Phoebe: [Entering] Hey.

All: Hi.

Phoebe: Whoah, ooh, why is the air in here so negative?

Chandler: Rachel lost Marcel.

Phoebe: Oh no, how?

Monica: He- he pooped in my shoe.

Phoebe: Which one?

Monica: Those cute little black ones I wear all the time.

Phoebe: No, which one? The right or left? 'Cause the left one is lucky...

Rachel: C'mon, you guys, what're we gonna do, what're we gonna do?

Joey: Alright alright. You're a monkey. You're loose in the city. Where do you go?

Chandler: Okay, it's his first time out, so he's probably gonna wanna do some of the touristy things. I'll go to Cats, you go to the Russian Tea Room.

Rachel: Oh, my, God, c'mon, you guys! He's gonna be home any minute! He's gonna kill me!

Monica: Okay, we'll start with the building. You guys take the first and second floor, Phoebe and I'll take third and fourth.

Rachel: Well, what'm I gonna do? What'm I gonna do?

Monica: Okay, you stay here, and just wait by the phone. Spray Lysol in my shoe, and wait for Ross to kill you.

[They all leave]

Rachel: Anybody wanna trade? Oh...

The maxim of relevance is respected in this scene as the characters talk about the missing monkey and the steps they must take to find him. However, Rachel's use of ambiguous terms like "we hate her" and "who died?" violates the maxim of quality that could cause misunderstanding.

Rachel opts out of the maxim of relation. Instead of focusing on finding Marcel, she makes a joke about swapping places with someone. It breaks away from the problem at hand and adds a little humor into the scene.

Rachel's reply "Now, now the one in the feather boa, that's Dr. Francis. Now, she used to be a man" implies that she is familiar with the soap opera they are watching, notably the character Dr. Francis. The implication is that Rachel has been watching the soap opera on a regular basis and is familiar with the characters and plot lines.

Marcel's actions, such as playing with Monica's shoes and possibly pooping in them, is not allowed, according to Rachel. She is warning Marcel for his conduct and stressing her role as his carer.

Rachel's comment appears to be sarcastic of Barry's possible desire for a stuffed shoe as an engagement gift. The implication is that Rachel dislikes Barry and expresses her thoughts towards him through humor.

Additionally, Monica goes against the maxim of relevance when she inquires as to which shoe Marcel urinated in because it is not necessary to know this information in order to find the monkey.

Chandler breaks the maxim of manner when he says a joke about Marcel's whereabouts.

Phoebe feels a tense or negative atmosphere in the room. The implication is that Phoebe is catching up on Marcel's disappearance's concern and worry.

As they search for the monkey, their communication is not successful, but they are making an effort to work together and find him.

[Cut to Monica and Phoebe knocking on a door. Mr. Heckles emerges]

Mr. Heckles: Whaddyou want?

Monica: Mr. Heckles, our friend lost a monkey. Have you seen it?

Mr. Heckles: I left a Belgian waffle out here, did you take it?

Monica: No!

Phoebe: Why would you leave your Belgian waffle in the hall?

Mr. Heckles: I wasn't ready for it.

Monica: A monkey. Have you seen a monkey?

Mr. Heckles: Saw Regis Philbin once...

Phoebe: Okay, thank you, Mr. Heckles. [They move off]

Mr. Heckles: You owe me a waffle.

Rachel: [On the phone] Okay, he's a, he's a black capuchian monkey with a white face... [Enter Ross] ...with, with Russian dressing and, and pickles on the side. Okay. Thanks.

Ross: Hey. How did, uh, how'd it go today?

Rachel: Great! It went great. Really great. Hey, is that wine?

Ross: Yeah. You, uh, you want some?

Rachel: Oh, I would love some. But y'know what? Y'know what? Let's not drink it here. I'm feeling kinda crazy. You wanna go to Newark?

Ross: Uh, okay, yeah, we could do that, but before we head off to the murder capital of the North-East, I was, uh, kinda wanting to run something by you. Y'know how we were, uh, y'know, talking before about, uh, relationships and stuff? [Uncorks the wine] Well-

Rachel: Oh God, Ross, I cannot do this.

Ross: Okay, quick and painful. [Starts to cork the wine]

Rachel: Oh God... Okay. Alright. Alright. Okay. Ross, please don't hate me.

Ross: Oh, what? Whatwhat?

Rachel: Y'know Marcel?

Ross: ...Yeah?

Rachel: Well, I kind of... I kind of lost him.

When Rachel suggests they visit Newark instead of letting Ross begin a conversation about their relationship, she violates the maxim of relation. The concern that Ross has is not addressed as she diverts the conversation. By lying to Ross about her day and acting as though everything went perfectly, even though she lost Marcel, Rachel violated the maxim of quality.

Rachel's question "A monkey. Have you seen a monkey?" implies that she is looking for information on the location of a monkey. The implication implies that Rachel is concerned and actively looking for the missing monkey.

Rachel's reply "Y'know how we were, uh, y'know, talking before about, uh, relationships and stuff?" implies that she and Ross had previously spoken about relationships. The implicature indicates Rachel is referring back to their previous conversation and wants to bring up a similar topic.

Mr. Heckles opts out of the maxim of relation when Monica and Phoebe ask whether he has seen Marchel. Instead of answering the question, he talks about his Belgian waffle. By focusing on their search for Marcel and avoiding Mr. Heckles' irrelevant comment, Monica and Phoebe respect the maxim of relevance and quantity.

Mr. Heckles' reply implies that he left the Belgian waffle outside his door but was not quite ready to eat it. The implication is that Mr. Heckles' behavior is unpredictable.

Mr. Heckles' remark implies that he once saw Regis Philbin, which has nothing to do with the lost monkey. The inference implies that Mr. Heckles has a habit of providing random facts during discussion.

Finally, Ross and Rachel violate the maxim of manner by being indirect. Ross wants to talk with Rachel about their relationship but is interrupted by Rachel's suggestion to go to Newark. Rachel is dishonest with Ross about losing Marcel.

[Cut to outside the window, with Ross reacting with disbelief. The shot pans back until we see Marcel sitting on the window ledge]

[Commercial]

[Same scene]

Ross: [Angry] I- I- I ca- I can't believe this. I mean, all I asked you to do was keep him in the apartment.

Rachel: I know, I know, I'm sorry-

Ross: No, y'know what, I guess it's partially my fault. Y'know, I shouldn't've, uh, asked you to start off with a monkey. I should've started you off with like a pen or a pencil.

Rachel: [Tearfully] Ross, I'm doing everything that I can, I've got everybody looking for him, and I- [Door buzzer goes and she runs to get it] Oh! Who is it?

Intercom: Animal Control.

Rachel: See? I've even called Animal Control!

Ross: You called Animal Control?

Rachel: Uh-huh... why... do you not like them?

Ross: Marcel is an illegal exotic animal. I'm not allowed to have him in the city. If they find him, they'll take him away from me.

Rachel: O-okay, now see, you never ever ever told us that...

Ross: That's right, I.. 'cause I didn't expect you were gonna invite them to the apartment!

Ross would have been able to protect his pet if Rachel had given him all the information he needed. Rachel breaks the maxim of quantity by not providing enough information and making him believe he can rely on her to keep Marcel safe.

Ross's statement "I shouldn't've asked you to start off with a monkey. I should've started you off with like a pen or a pencil" is opting out of the quantity maxim. Instead of delivering a direct response or explanation, he uses sarcasm and hyperbole to vent his dissatisfaction and indirectly blame Rachel.

Eventually, Ross accepts some responsibility for the lost monkey case. The implication is that Ross recognizes his role in the events and accepts responsibility.

Rachel implies that she is actively trying to find the lost monkey by seeking help- The implicature suggests that Rachel is making an effort to find the monkey.

On the other hand, Ross respects the maxim of manner by warning Rachel against Animal Control and manner by being straightforward. Based on Ross's declaration, Marcel's presence in the city is illegal. The implication signifies that Ross has been keeping Marcel a secret, and that his ownership of an illegal exotic animal adds another layer of complication.

[A knock on the door. Rachel swiftly opens it]

Rachel: Hi, thanks for coming.

Luisa [Animal Control]: Somebody called about a monkey?

Rachel: Oh, y'know what? That was a complete misunderstanding! [Ross puts his arms around her and they act all sweetness and light]

Ross: Yeah, we thought we had a monkey, but we-we didn't.

Rachel: Turned out it was a hat.

Ross: Cat!

Rachel: Cat! What'm I saying? Cat!

[Luisa nods, but then Monica and Phoebe run in]

Monica: Hi. We checked the third and fourth floor, no-one's seen Marcel.

Luisa: Marcel?

Ross: My uncle Marcel.

Phoebe: Oh, is that who the monkey's named after?

Luisa: Oookay. Are you aware that possession of an illegal exotic is, uh, punishable by up to two years in prison and confiscation of the animal?

Phoebe: Oh my God. You'd put that poor little creature in jail?

Monica: Pheeb, you remember how we talked about saying things quietly to yourself first?

Phoebe: Yes, but there isn't always time!

Monica: Look. I'm sure there's some friendly way to reconcile this! Um, have a seat. First of all, we haven't been introduced, I'm Monica Geller.

Luisa: Oh my God, you are! And you're Rachel Green!

Rachel: Yeah!

Luisa: Luisa Gianetti! Lincoln High? I sat behind you guys in home room!

Rachel: Luisa? Oh my God! Monica! It's Luisa!

Monica: The Luisa from home room!

Rachel: Yes!!

Luisa: You have no idea who I am, do you.

Monica: No, none at all.

Rachel: None.

Luisa: Well, maybe that's because you spent four years ignoring me. I mean, would it have been so hard to say 'Morning, Luisa'? Or 'Nice overalls'?

Monica: Oh, I'm- I'm so sorry!

Luisa: Ah, it's not so much you, you were fat, you had your own problems. [To Rachel] But you? What a bitch!

Rachel: What?!

Monica: Be that as it may, d'you think you could just help us out here on that monkey thing? Y'know, just for old times' sake? Go Bobcats?

Luisa: I could... but I won't. If I find that monkey, he's mine. [Leaves]

Phoebe: Dun-dun-duuuur! Sorry.

Ross violates the maxim of quantity by not giving all the necessary details. Rachel contacted Animal Control because he failed to inform her that Marcel was an illegal exotic animal.

Rachel opts out of the maxim of quality by providing false information and claiming they accidentally called about a monkey. She lies to Animal Control in order to dodge the consequences of possessing an illegal exotic animal.

By providing irrelevant information, Monica and Phoebe go against the maxim of relation.

Phoebe expresses her concern for the monkey and calls into question the morality of locking up an animal. The implication emphasizes Phoebe's empathy and emotional response to the circumstance.

Rachel saying "Turned out it was just a hat" implies that the monkey they thought they had was simply a hat. The implication implies that Rachel is attempting to minimize the problem and portray it as a minor oversight.

Luisa implies the legal consequences of possessing an illegal exotic animal. The implication is that if Marcel, the monkey, is discovered, the characters could suffer terrible consequences.

Luisa reveals her anger and resentment towards Monica for previously ignoring her. She also appears to be hurt by Monica's earlier behavior.

Luisa, the animal control officer, breaks the maxim of relevance by bringing up old grudges and personal matters rather than focusing on the current situation. Luisa's statement implies that she will not assist them in finding the monkey and that she intends to claim ownership of it. The implication implies that Luisa holds a grudge and is unwilling to help because of previous experiences.

The conversation is marked with confusion, false information, irrelevance, and rudeness.

[Cut to another part of the building. We see Marcel jump in through a window and run down some stairs, then Chandler and Joey come down from the upper floor without noticing]

Chandler: Marcel?

Joey: Marcel?

Chandler: Marcel?

Joey: Marcel?

[They come to a door and silently agree to try it. A very sweaty woman emerges]

Woman #1: Hi, can I help you?

[Chandler and Joey are dumbstruck for a moment]

Chandler: Um, we're kind of having an emergency and we- we were looking for something...

Joey: A monkey.

Chandler: Yes have you seen any?

Woman #1: No. No, haven't seen a monkey. Do you know anything about fixing radiators?

Joey: Um, sure! Did you, uh, did you try turning the knob back the other way?

Woman #1: Of course.

Joey: Oh. Then, no.

[Another sweaty woman comes to the door and speaks to her friend]

Woman #2: Did I put too much rum in here?

[Joey and Chandler shoot each other glances]

Woman #1: Just a sec. [To Chandler and Joey] Hope you find your monkey. [She starts to shut the door]

Chandler: Oh, nononowaitwaitwaitnono! Uh... we may not know anything about radiators per se, but we do have a certain amount of expertise in the heating and cooling... mileu.

Joey: Uh, aren't we kind of in the middle of something here?

Chandler: Yes, but these women are very hot, and they need our help! And they're very hot.

Joey: We can't, alright? [To the women] We're sorry. You have no idea how sorry, but... We promised we'd find this monkey. If you see him, he's about yea high and answers to the name Marcel, so if we could get some pictures of you, you'd really be helping us out.

[The women quickly shut the door]

Chandler: Okay, from now on, you don't get to talk to other people.

Joey: Marcel?

Chandler: Marcel?!

Chandler and Joey opt out of the relation maxim by being imprecise and not stating their objective directly. They don't bring up the monkey until the woman brings it up.

Joey's question hints that rotating the radiator knob in the opposite direction may remedy the problem. The implicature is that Joey is showing his inadequate knowledge of radiator repair.

Chandler implies that Joey's interactions with others frequently result in awkward situations.

Chandler wishes to remain focused on their quest to find Marcel.

[Cut to Monica and Phoebe searching the basement]

Phoebe: Marcel?

Monica: Marcel?

Phoebe: Marcel?

Both: Marcel?

Phoebe: OhmyGod!

Monica: Whaaat!

Phoebe: Something just brushed up against my right leg!

Monica: What is it?

Phoebe: Oh, it's okay, it was just my left leg.

[Marcel makes a monkeyish noise- he is sitting in the corner]

Monica: Look, Phoebe!

Phoebe: Yeah! Oh, c'mere, Marcel! Oh, Marcel, c'mere!

[Luisa appears on the stairs]

Luisa: Step aside, ladies! [She loads a gun]

Monica: What're you gonna do?

Luisa: Just a small tranquiliser.

[In slow motion we see Phoebe look at Marcel, then at Luisa. She jumps toward Marcel just as Luisa fires the gun]

Monica: Run, Marcel, run! Run, Marcel! [Marcel runs off and Luisa runs after him. Monica goes to check up on Phoebe] Are you okay?

Phoebe: Yeah, think so. Oh! [She notices the tranquiliser dart has hit her in the butt and removes it] Huh. [Sways back] Whoah.

Monica: Oh gosh.

Phoebe opts out of the quantity maxim by responding to Monica's question in an unexpected and hilarious manner. She gives a misleading answer on purpose, deviating from the expectation of providing accurate information.

Luisa violates the maxim of manner by being unclear in her conversation with Monica and Phoebe. She appears with a gun and explains how she is going to use a tranquilizer and that scares Monica and Phoebe. She aims to use the tranquilizer to sedate Marcel without causing harm or using undue force.

[Cut to Marcel walking along a hallway. He notices a banana on the floor and picks it up. The hand of an unseen person grabs him and carries him away. Then cut to Ross and Rachel on the street outside]

Ross: Marcel?

Rachel: Marcel?

Ross: Marc- oh, this is ridiculous! We've been all over the neighbourhood. He's gone, he's-he's just gone.

Rachel: Ross, you don't know that.

Ross: Oh come on. It's cold, it's dark, he doesn't know the Village. [Kicks a sign in frustration] And now I have a broken foot. I have no monkey, and a broken foot! Thank you very much.

Rachel: Ross, I said I'm sorry like a million times. What do you want me to do? You want me to break my foot too? Okay, I'm gonna break my foot, right here. [Kicks the sign] Ow!! Oh! Oh my God, oh my God! There, are you happy now?!

Ross: Yeah, yeah. Y'know, now that you kicked the sign, hey! I don't miss Marcel any more!

Rachel: Y'know, it is not like I did this on purpose.

Ross: Oh, no no no. Nono, this is just vintage Rachel. I mean, things just sort of happen around you. I mean, you're off in Rachel-land, doing your Rachel-thing, totally oblivious to people's monkeys, or to people's feelings...

Rachel: Ross.

Ross: I don't even wanna hear it, you're just-

Rachel: Ross.

Ross: Oh, forget it, okay?

Rachel: Ross!

Ross: What? What?

[A man carrying a box of bananas walks past them. They stare for a minute and then hobble after him]

Both: Hey! Hey, Bananaman!

Rachel violates the maxim of relation by kicking a sign. Hurting herself does not help the situation with Marcel. The maxim of quality is violated with Ross and his sarcastic comments to Rachel.

Rachel opts out of the quality maxim by giving an excessive and caustic statement. She exaggerates her reaction to Ross's dissatisfaction to stress her argument.

Ross and Rachel respect the maxim of quantity as they both provide enough information about Marcel's situation. They also respect the maxim of manner as the conversation is clear.

Ross's response "I don't miss Marcel anymore" implies that his frustration and resentment toward Rachel have temporarily changed as a result of her accidentally injuring her foot. The implication implies that Ross is temporarily less concerned about Marcel's disappearance and more concerned with Rachel's well-being.

4.3 Season 2, Episode 18, Scene 1

AMBER: Oh Drake.

DR. REMORE: I'm sorry Amber. It's just like Brad to have to have the last word.

[Ross enters]

ROSS: I'm sorry I'm late, what happened?

MONICA: We, we just wanna see the end.

AMBER: I want you Drake.

DR. REMORE: I know you do but you and I can never be together that way.

AMBER: What?

DR. REMORE: There's something I never told you Amber. I'm actually your half- brother.

[Everyone gasps. The show ends.]

RACHEL: So what happens next?

JOEY: Well, I get the medical award for separating the siamese twins. Then Amber and I go to Venezuela to meet our other half-brother, Ramone. And that's where I find the world's biggest emerald. It's really big but it's cursed.

CHANDLER: God that is good TV.

The maxim of relation and quality are violated as the characters are not telling each other important information. For instance, Dr. Remore has not told Amber that he is her half-brother, and this is crucial to their relationship.

Amber avoids the quantity maxim by stating her desire for Drake without further explanation or context. Her sentence is intentionally imprecise, leaving opportunity for interpretation.

Joey violates the maxim of quality by telling a fictional story about winning a medical award and finding a cursed emerald. And he violates the maxim of relation because this is not relevant to the conversation.

Joey's statement implies that the plot twists in the TV show they were watching were dramatic and thrilling. The implication implies that the show they were watching was extremely engaging and held their attention.

4.3. Season 3, Episode 21, Scene 1

[Scene: Outside Central Perk, Rachel and Phoebe are helping Monica learn how to roller skate by rolling her between themselves.]

Rachel: So who's idea was it to put everybody in the diner on skates?

Monica: Oh, some idiot customer put a suggestion in the suggestion box.

Phoebe: Oh my God, they took my idea!

Monica: That was you?!

Phoebe: Yeah! Okay, here you go. (rolls her back to Rachel)

Gunther: (bringing Rachel a mug) Rachel, I made you a cocoa.

[He distracts her from catching Monica and Monica slams into her, knocking her down. Monica then falls on top of her.]

Phoebe: Oh my God, are you guys okay?

Gunther: Are you all right?

Joey: (leaving Central Perk and seeing Monica laying on top of Rachel who is moaning in pain.) Oh my.

(They both turn and give him a dirty look.)

Rachel opts out of the relation maxim. She inquires about the person responsible for putting everyone in the diner on skates, which is unrelated to Monica and Rachel's current position.

Monica violates the maxim of quality because she doesn't provide a clear answer to Rachel's question about diner and skates. Gunther and Joey respect the maxim of relevance by expressing concern for their well-being after the accident.

Joey's "Oh my" to seeing Monica and Rachel on the ground suggests astonishment or shock. The implication implies that the scenario is surprising or potentially amusing.

4.4. Season 7, Episode 10

[Scene: Ross's apartment, Ross is whirling Ben around.]

Ross: Wooooooo, hehehe. Hey, ahh, you don't feel like you're gonna throw up, do ya?

Ben: No.

Ross: Well, I do, so let's... (Ben and Ross sit down on the couch) So, Ben, you uh, you know what holiday is coming up, don't ya?

Ben: Christmas.

Ross: Yep, and you know what other holiday is coming up?

Ben: Christmas eve.

Ross: Yes, but also (Pauses to let Ben answer, but he doesn't.) Hanukkah! See, you're part Jewish, and-and Hanukkah is a Jewish holiday.

Ben: Santa has reindeers that can fly!

Ross: Right, um, but, on Hanukkah, Hanukkah is a celebration of a miracle. See, years and years ago there were these people called the Maccabees.

Ben: (singing) Jingle bells, jingle bells...

Ross: (interrupts him) Okay, that's right, yes, but on Hanukkah, uh, we sing, uh (Sings) Dreidel, dreidel, dreidel, I made you out of clay.

Ben: (singing) Rudolph, the red-nosed reindeer...

Ross: (interrupts him again) Okay, it's not a contest.

Ben: When is Santa coming?

Ross: Well, how about this year, instead of Santa, we have fun celebrating Hanukkah?

Ben: No Santa? Was I bad?

Ross: No! Oh, no-no-no. Hey, you weren't bad, you've been very good, Ben.

Ben: Santa's mad at me.

Ross: No, hey-hey, come on, (He grabs Ben and sits him on his lap) Ben, Santa is not mad at you, okay? Hey, you're-you're his favorite little guy!

Ben: So Santa's coming?

Ross: (disappointed) Yes! Santa's coming!

Ross violates the maxim of relation by talking about Hannukkah. We can see that Ben is interested in Christmas and Santa Claus. Ross opts out of the quantity maxim. He adds background material and extra facts on the holiday that may or may not be directly relevant to Ben's initial enquiry regarding upcoming holidays.

He also violates the maxim of manner by interrupting Ben and being vague. He respects the maxim of quality by giving enough information about the celebration of Hanukkah and the Maccabees. He respects the maxim of quality by not lying to Ben and saying that Santa is mad at him.

Ben's comment about Santa's reindeer illustrates his joy and faith in Christmas and that he is looking forward to Santa's arrival.

4.5. Season 7, Episode 10

[Scene: Monica and Chandler's, The Halloween party has started. Monica is setting out some food as Rachel enters.]

Rachel: Hi!

Monica: Wait! You're supposed to wear a costume!

Rachel: I am! I am a woman who spent a lot of money on a dress and she wants to wear it, because soon she won't be able to fit into it.

Monica: Oh.

Rachel: Ahh!

Monica: I'm Catwoman, who wants to borrow the dress when you're too big for it.

Rachel: Okay.

(There's a knock on the door.)

Kids: Trick or treat!

Rachel: Oh! Oh! Can I give out the candy? I really want to be with the kids right now. Y'know, ever since I got pregnant I-I have the strongest maternal instincts.

Kids: Trick or treat!!

Rachel: (to them) Just a minute!!! (She takes the candy and opens the door to two parents, a witch, a clown, and a cowgirl.) Look at you guys! Wow! You are a very scary witch. (Gives her candy.)

Witch: Thank you.

Rachel: And you are a very funny clown. (Gives him candy.)

Clown: Thank you.

Rachel: (to the cowgirl) And you are so in style right now. Y'know, I work at Ralph Lauren and the whole fall line has got this like equestrian theme going on. I don't suppose you saw the cover of British Vogue, but...

Cowgirl: (interrupting) Can I just have the candy?

Rachel: Yeah. Sure. (Throws some in her bag and she walks away as Phoebe, dressed as Supergirl walks up and eyes Monica who eyes her back.)

Phoebe: Ah, Catwoman. So we meet again.

Monica: So we do Supergirl.

Phoebe: No, it's me. Phoebe!

Monica opts out of the quality maxim. She refers to Rachel's lack of a costume and expects her to dress up for the Halloween party.

Rachel violates the maxim of relation by not wearing the costume immediately and instead providing an explanation. She respects the maxim of quantity by giving enough information for Monica to understand. Monica also respects the maxim of quantity for Rachel to understand that she needs to wear a costume. They both respect the maxim of manner by speaking clearly.

Rachel's statement implies that she regards her costly gown as her costume, despite the fact that it does not suit the conventional Halloween costume concept. It also implies that she is aware of her changing body as a result of her pregnancy.

Rachel's remark implies that her pregnancy increased her maternal instincts, leading to a stronger bond with children and a desire to be around them.

Rachel's remark "And you are so in style right now. Y'know, I work at Ralph Lauren and the whole fall line has got this like equestrian theme going on" implies her fashion knowledge and connection to Ralph Lauren's equestrian-themed fall collection. It also reflects her tendency to converse about fashion and trends.

Phoebe violates the maxim of quality because she does not provide truthful information when she pretends to be Supergirl, and Monica responds with the assumption that she is Supergirl.

5. Conclusion

The thesis clarified the cooperative principle, which is the guiding principle of successful and cooperative communication. It highlights the significance of speakers following the maxims of quantity, quality, relationship, and manner in order to promote successful and mutually beneficial communication.

It has showed how the principles of quantity, quality, relation, and manner can be intentionally ignored in comedic discourse to achieve funny effects.

Additionally, through research of sitcom situations we underlined the function of implicatures in expressing additional meaning beyond the literal interpretations of the characters' utterances. Pragmatic implicatures contribute to the audience's amusing and frequently unexpected interpretations.

In our corpus analysis, we see the most examples of the violation of the maxims of relation (i.e., 17) and quality (i.e., 15).

The maxim of relation emphasizes delivering relevant details to the conversation. In *Friends*, characters frequently violate this by straying off-topic or introducing unnecessary information. For example, when characters present personal anecdotes that are unrelated to the main topic. These violations provide humorous elements and contribute to the show's dynamics.

The quality maxim refers to giving accurate and truthful information. In *Friends*, this maxim may be violated when characters knowingly misrepresent or hide information from one another. For instance, when characters lie or preserve secrets, such as Monica hiding her relationship with the guy from work or Phoebe pretending not to know about Monica and Chandler's relationship. This creates comedy and drives the plot along.

On the other hand, there are 10 violations of the maxim of quantity and 9 of the maxim of manner.

The maxim of manner promotes clarity and coherence in communication. It involves organizing information in a logical and understandable manner. In the case of *Friends*, violations of this principle are less common than violations of the other maxims. This is most likely due to the show's reliance on scripted dialogue, in which the authors carefully craft the discussions so that they are clear and easily understood by the viewers. As a result, cases in which characters misunderstand or complicate information are relatively rare.

There are fewer violations of the maxim of quantity. This is because it is a scripted television show, which means that the conversation is planned and rehearsed. As a result, the characters tend to supply just the right amount of information needed to move the plot or generate humor, without over-explaining or omitting key elements.

In addition, this show has a limited amount of time in each episode to convey a story. This time constraint encourages efficient communication, with characters sharing only the relevant information and avoiding superfluous embellishment. This minimizes the risk of quantity maxim violations.

The major characters in have known one other for a long time and have well-established relationships. Because they frequently share knowledge and understand one other's background and experience, this familiarity can aid to efficient communication. As a result, they don't need to explain or elaborate as much in their talks.

While violations of the quantity and manner maxim do occur on occasion in *Friends*, they are relatively uncommon in comparison to violations of the quality and relation maxims, which tend to produce more hilarious situations and drive the storyline.

We proved the value of studying sitcom dialogue using a descriptive and analytical methodology. It is possible to find patterns, variations, and comic tactics used in sitcoms by carefully evaluating the linguistic choices and interactions of the characters.

References:

Ajello, E. (2023, February 13). 15 little-known facts about Rachel Green even die-hard 'friends' fans may not remember. Insider. Retrieved March 1, 2023, from

<https://www.insider.com/friends-cool-things-to-know-about-rachel-green-facts-2021-7>

Andresen, N. (2014). Flouting the maxims in comedy: An analysis of flouting in the comedy series Community. Retrieved April 8, 2023, from <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:704301/fulltext01.pdf>

Chandler Bing. Friends Central. (n.d.). Retrieved March 1, 2023, from

https://friends.fandom.com/wiki/Chandler_Bing

Cutting, Joan. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. Retrieved April 8, 2023, from

<http://library.uc.edu.kh/userfiles/pdf/40.Pragmatics%20and%20Discourse%20A%20Resource%20Book%20for%20Students.pdf>

Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. (n.d.). Friends. Encyclopædia Britannica. Retrieved March 1, 2023, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Friends>

Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. (n.d.). Pragmatics. Encyclopædia Britannica. Retrieved March 1, 2023, from <https://www.britannica.com/science/pragmatics>

Friends Transcripts. (n.d.). <https://fangj.github.io/friends/>

Friends (TV) (Ft. David Crane & Marta Kauffman) – The One Where the Monkey Gets Away. (n.d.). Genius. <https://genius.com/Friends-tv-the-one-where-the-monkey-gets-away-annotated>

Grandy, R. E., & Warner, R. (2021, December 8). *Paul Grice*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved April 8, 2023, from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/grice/>

Grice, H. P. *Studies in the Way of Words* (1991). First Harvard University Press.

Hadi, A. (2013). A critical appraisal of Grice's Cooperative Principle. *Open journal of modern linguistics*, 3(1), 69-72. Retrieved April 8, 2023, from https://file.scirp.org/pdf/OJML_2013032917015353.pdf

Joey Tribbiani. Friends Central. (n.d.). Retrieved March 1, 2023, from

https://friends.fandom.com/wiki/Joey_Tribbiani

Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge. Retrieved April 8, 2023, from [principlesofpragmatics](#)

Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Monica Geller. Friends Central. (n.d.). Retrieved March 1, 2023, from https://friends.fandom.com/wiki/Monica_Geller

Phoebe Buffay. Friends Central. (n.d.). Retrieved March 1, 2023, from https://friends.fandom.com/wiki/Phoebe_Buffay

Rachel Greene. Friends Central. (n.d.). Retrieved March 1, 2023, from https://friends.fandom.com/wiki/Rachel_Greene

Ross Geller. Friends Central. (n.d.). Retrieved March 1, 2023, from https://friends.fandom.com/wiki/Ross_Geller

Senft, G. (2014). *Understanding pragmatics*. Routledge. Retrieved from: [understanding.pragmatics](#)

Yule, G. (2014). *The Study of language*. MPG Printgroup Ltd, Cambridge: UK.

IMDb.com. (n.d.). *Friends*. IMDb. <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0108778/plotsummary/>