

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES

Manuscript info:

Received August 12, 2019., Accepted September 17, 2019., Published October 20, 2019.

**GENERATION OF A CONVERSATIONAL
IMPLICATURE BY CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS
IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK (BY VIOLATING THE
MAXIM OF QUANTITY)**

Islom Urolugli Minnikulov

Department of English Language Teaching Methodology
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
mr.islom19@gmail.com



<http://dx.doi.org/10.26739/2573-5616-2019-10-3>

Abstract: There has been much research on conditional constructions in world linguistics, particularly, the problem has been investigated from the perspectives of syntax, semantics, stylistics, pedagogy and others. Although there are also a number of works specifically devoted to the study of pragmatics of the matter in question, it still needs a constant research from the viewpoint of language use, especially, pragmatics. This present study is a new endeavor to reveal the pragmatic nature of conditional constructions in English and Uzbek from the viewpoint of the Gricean maxims' violation and the emergence of conversational implicature. It aims to disclose the pragmatic aspect of conditionals in compared languages to generate a conversational implicature by violating the maxim of Quantity. According to the aim of the study, the following tasks were set: review of related literature, identification and analysis of conditional forms violating the Quantity maxim to give a rise to a conversational implicature, discussion of results and formulation of conclusions. It is hypothesized that the conditionals in both languages can result in a conversational implicature by violating the Quantity principle of cooperation. The literary texts from well-known English and Uzbek writers' works serve as written corpus data. The author uses the Gricean maxims, the implicature conception, discourse and pragmatic analysis as methods of investigation. The results of the work show that the communicants in compared languages violate the Quantity maxim to produce a conversational implicature for various purposes. Based on the findings of the research, conclusions on the possibility of conditionals in compared languages to generate a conversational implicature by violating the Quantity maxim; the proof of the conditionals in both languages to violate the Quantity maxim for similar and different purposes; the evidence of the role of social context and communicative aim of the addresser in revealing the pragmatics of conditionals in compared languages have been drawn.

Key words: conditionals, conditional constructions, the Gricean maxims, maxims' violations, aconversational implicature, pragmatics, the cooperative principles, discourse analysis.

Recommended citation: Islom UrolugliMinnikulov. GENERATION OF A CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE BY CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK (BY VIOLATING THE MAXIM OF QUANTITY). 9-10. American Journal of Research P. 18-31 (2019).

INTRODUCTION

The study of the problem of communicating one's utterances successfully to an addressee has been always a central focus of the research works or other linguistic studies. It is much cited in related literature that the speaker or the author of the utterance implies more than what they literally say or write. A successful communication is achieved when there is concordance between the speaker's intention and the listener's interpretation of the utterance. This actually means that in order for a communication to be productive and meaningful, the addressee tries to search for conversational implicatures implied by the addresser in a certain communicative context.

According to, a well-known Uzbek linguist-scholar, Sh. Safarov (2008, p. 133), during a communication process, the use of language units is based on some communication principles and rules, yet, the speaker doesn't always follow such cooperative principles in a certain context, and a hidden meaning arises as a result of such a deliberate violation of cooperative maxims which is closely connected with the notion of implicature.

The notion of implicature is treated as one of the pragmatic phenomena which has recently emerged in the field of pragmalinguistics and is often used a tool of pragmatic analysis in world linguistics.

A number of linguists and linguist-scholars (A. Igwedibia, 2017;

A. Sobhani, A. Saghebi, 2014; H.M. Al-Hamadi, B.J. Muhammed, 2009; L.A. Juez, 1995; L. Xiaoqin, 2017; M. Haugh, 2002; M. Al Kayed, A. Kitishat, 2015; R. Jungmann, 2010; S. Attardo, 1990) claim that the foundation and development of the notion of implicature was traced back to H.P. Grice, a famous philosopher and linguist.

According to H.P. Grice, as cited by A. Igwedibia (2017, p. 121), implicature refers to a hidden or implied meaning which is more inferred than the expressed utterance. Also, as A. Igwedibia (2017, p. 121) notes, general principles of communication and cooperation and extralinguistic factors of conversational situation play an important role in the emergence of such a hidden meaning. So, such an inference can be treated as an implied meaning drawn from the communicative- pragmatic aim of the speaker in a particular communicative context.

As M. Haugh (2002, p. 127), a famous pragmalinguist-scholar, notes, the notion of implicature is characterized by four aspects: it is not literally said; it is inferred in a particular context; it is defeasible and it is meant in addition to what is literally said.

According to foreign linguists H.M. Al-Hamadi, B.J. Muhammed (2009, p. 5-6), the way of generating a conversational implicature, in accordance with the speaker's attitude to the Gricean maxims, can be of two types: following the maxims and violating the maxims.

However, when an implicature is generated by violating the maxims, the speaker intends the listener to interpret, deduce or infer more than the uttered meaning. In addition, a great number of foreign linguist-scholars (A. Sobhani, A. Saghebi, 2014 (93); L. Xiaoqin, 2017 (163); M. Al Kayed, A. Kitishat, 2015 (42); S. Attardo, 1990 (355-356)) point out that a conversational implicature arises as a result of violating the Gricean maxims (or the Cooperative principles) on purpose.

All in all, based on the views on the nature of implicature mentioned above, the notion of implicature can be defined as follows: implicature is not literally said, not fixed, but changeable (or dynamic meaning), realized in context, an additional inferred meaning to a literal one.

It can be summed up that a conversational implicature can be generated in two manners: by conforming the cooperative principles (the Gricean maxims) and floating or violating the maxims of cooperation.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this part of the study, we deal with the literature analysis on the Gricean maxims and its violation and emergence of implicature. As a Chinese linguist L. Xiaoqin (2017, p. 163) notes, a "violation" of cooperative maxims is a case or condition in which the speaker doesn't follow the cooperative principles according to some purposes. H.P. Grice claims, as cited

by L. Xiaoqin, that the speaker deliberately violates the principles of cooperation and as a result, it gives a rise to a conversational implicature. So, it is clear that a conversational implicature is drawn as a result of a deliberate violation of Gricean maxims.

According to Sh. Safarov (2008, p. 136), H.P. Grice's cooperative maxims can be presented in the following way:

1. The maxim of Quantity (the matter of providing the required information; not less or not more than required):
 - a) make your contribution as informative as required;
 - b) don't make your contribution more informative than required.
2. The maxim of Quality (the matter of giving the right information):
 - a) don't say what you believe to be false;
 - b) don't say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. The maxim of Relevance (the matter of being relevant).
4. The maxim of Manner (the matter of being clear and orderly):
 - a) avoid obscurity;
 - b) avoid ambiguity;
 - c) be brief;
 - d) be orderly.

The cooperative maxims of H.P. Grice, which constitute the basis of communicative acts, play an essential role in making a successful communication. However, the communicants do not obey the maxims of cooperation all the time, that is to be particular, in a certain

communicative condition the speaker and the hearer float or violate these cooperation principles according to their communicative-pragmatic intention.

As Sh. Safarov (2008, p. 138) states that floating some cooperative principles doesn't completely lose a cooperation in a communication process as in such cases, the speaker intends a hidden meaning. Also, he claims that floating the cooperative principles and searching for an implied meaning are interrelated with the phenomenon of emergence of a conversational implicature. It is clear from these views, floating the maxims or a deliberate violation of maxims make it possible to express the pragmatic intention of the speaker and reach a successful communication.

In addition to aforementioned ideas, it can be noted that there are some reasons for why the cooperative principles are not obeyed in a communication. In particular, as A. Waget (2015, p. 8-9) writes, the communicants violate the cooperation principles for the following reasons: mislead the counterpart, be polite, save face, avoid discussion, communicate the interest.

Similarly, as L. Xiaoqin (2017, p. 163) notes, a number of linguists-scholars opine that the cooperative principles are violated according to certain purposes: mislead the counterparts (Grice, 1975); save face (Goffman, 2008); please the counterpart, evade discussion, avoid unpleasant condition, express

feelings (Khosarvizadeh and Sadehvandi, 2011). So, it is apparent that some clear purposes lay behind the violation of the cooperative maxims.

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

In this section of the study, we outline the goal of the research, research hypothesis and questions, research materials and the methods of investigation.

The purpose of the study is determined by investigating the possibility of conditional constructions in English and Uzbek to generate a conversational implicature by violating the cooperative maxim of Quantity.

The research hypothesis is formed by: the conditional constructions in English and Uzbek, in accordance with the speaker's communicative-pragmatic aim, can generate a conversational implicature by violating deliberately the Quantity maxim in a particular communicative context.

The research questions are formulated by: what are the forms and ways of expression of conditional constructions which give rise to implicature by violating the Quantity maxim; what are the implicatures generated by conditional constructions through a violation of the Quantity maxim; what are the purposes of violation of the Quantity maxim.

The research materials are literary texts from well-known works by foreign and Uzbek writers. In particular, the literary works by L.L.

Plante, M. Twain, E. Hemingway and O. Hoshimov were widely used as written corpus data.

In the article, methods of investigation such as linguistic description, the Cooperative maxims, discourse analysis and pragmatic analysis are widely used. In particular, we apply linguistic description to review related literature and synthesize foreign viewpoints on the matter; the Gricean maxims to identify and analyse language units expressing conditional relationships which violate the maxim of Quantity to generate a conversational implicature, discourse analysis to be able to reveal the possibility of conditional constructions to imply a conversational implicature in a certain social context; and pragmatic analysis to identify what implicatures are drawn as a result of violation of the Quantity maxim by conditional forms in English and Uzbek and what are the pragmatic function of the generated implicature.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section of the research is devoted to the analysis, results and discussion of the study. We deal with the conditional forms which produce a conversational implicature by floating or violating the Quantity maxim and emphasize the purpose of violation, the arisen implicature and its pragmatic function in a selected context of communication.

In English and Uzbek, the speaker can use conditional constructions to generate a conversational implicature by

deliberately violating the sub-maxim "make your contribution as informative as required" of the Quantity principle in a certain communicative context. Firstly, we will deal with the examples in English.

Context: The interview takes place at the police station. The Detective Chief Inspector Jane Tennison is questioning Moyra in spite of her objection. Moyra is angry with J. Tennison's questions. J. Tennison wants to detect where Moyra was when six crimes were committed. Moyra replies shortly to all questions of J. Tennison. When the Detective asks Moyra about her coming here on the sixteenth of January, Moyra answers shortly as "If you say so".

[1] Tennison: You came here on the sixteenth of January, is that correct?

[2] Moyra: If you say so (L. La Plante, 1995, p. 54).

Implicature: Stop questioning! I am not eager to answer your questions!

Purpose: To avoid discussion or conversation.

The response [2] violates deliberately the Quantity maxim, particularly, the sub-maxim of "make your contribution as informative as required" as she doesn't provide as much information as required but she answers shortly by saying "if you say so". However, the addressee should have responded as "yes, it is right, I came here on the sixteenth of January or no, it is wrong, I didn't come here on the sixteenth of January". The purpose

of violation is to avoid discussion/conversation. As a result of violation of the Quantity maxim, the speaker intends to generate a conversational implicature as "Stop questioning! I am not eager to answer your questions!". The pragmatic function of the generated implicature is to demand the Detective to stop the interview.

It should be also noted that in this case, the maxim of Manner is also violated, because the utterance [2] is obscure and ambiguous which makes the response difficult and unclear for the interlocutor to understand immediately. This proves once more that two or more maxims of cooperation can be violated at the same time in a certain social context.

Context:Aunt Polly shouts "Tom!", "Tom!" looking out into the garden. But, no answer. Then, Aunt Polly exclaims: "Tom! If I catch, I'll...".

[1] Aunt Polly:Tom! If I catch you, I'll...(Mark Twain, 2004, p. 4).

Implicature: Tom! Come here, right now!

Purpose: to exert an emotional impact on the listener.

It is clear from the example, the speaker, using the conditional form "Tom! If I catch you, I'll..."in her speech, deliberately violates the sub-maxim "make your contribution as informative as required" of the Quantity principle.As the addresser doesn't fully produce her utterance on purpose. Actually, she should have explicitly said something like "If I catch you, I will beat you, kill you or do anything". By stating her

utterance shortly, the speaker intends to do something bad or awful for Tom in an implicit way, and in its own turn, Tom also should interpret it. The purpose of violating this sub-maxim is to exert an emotional impact on the listener. By deliberately violating the sub-maxim, the addresser generates a conversational implicature as"Tom! Come here, right now!".The pragmatic function of the produced implicature is to threaten the listener.

Context:While going to school, Tom comes across Huckleberry Finn who are carrying the dead cat in his hand. Tom asks Huckleberry Finn about what to do with the cat. Then, Huckleberry Finn says: "About midnight the devil will come, but of course you won't see him. And then you say: "Devil follow the dead man, cat follow the devil, warts follow the cat." Then, this interests Tom as well and he pleases Huck to go with him to the graveyard and Huck answers as "if you are not afraid".

[1] Tom: Huck. Will you let me go with you?

[2] Huckleberry Finn:If you're not afraid (Mark Twain, 2004, p. 14-15).

Implicature: Ok, you may go with me.

Purpose: To please the counterpart.

It is clear from the example, Huck, using the conditional construction such as"If you're not afraid" in his speech, deliberately violates the sub-maxim "make your contribution as informative as required" of the Quantity principle.

However, the utterance [1] requires Huck to provide more information than the response uttered by him. According to the cooperative principles, Huck should have responded as "Yes, I will let you go with me" or "No, I will not let you go with me". The speaker violates this sub-maxim in order to please the counterpart. That's to say, in order not to make the listener upset, the speaker indirectly lets him go to the graveyard with him. Using the conditional form as "If you're not afraid" in his speech, the speaker generates a conversational implicature as "ok, you may come with me". The generated implicature can pragmatically function as a speech act of giving permission.

The possibility of conditional constructions in Uzbek to give a rise to a conversational implicature by violating deliberately the sub-maxim "make your contribution as informative as required" of the Quantity principle can be observed in the following examples:

Context: A woman came and said that she is going to get divorced with her husband when the main character of the work, a young man was working at the publishing house. The young man was surprised by this strange woman and her decision. And days passed, one day the husband of that woman, Ikrom came to the young man and also told about their decision of getting divorced no matter how much they love each other. Realizing their strong love to one another, the young man was still astonished by this.

[1] Ikrom: O'zim vrachman. Vrach bo'lganim uchun xotinimning tug'ishini xohlamayman.

[2] Asar qahramoni: Nega axir? Bir-birlaringizni sevsangiz? Munosib bo'lsaniz... (O'. Hoshimov, 2012, b. 62).

Implicature: What is the matter, then? What hinders your life?

Purpose: to gain the listener's understanding.

It is clear from the example that the response [2] violates the sub-maxim "make your contribution as informative as required" of the Quantity principle. Here, the speaker deliberately produces a short question using the conditional construction such as "Bir-birlaringizni sevsangiz? Munosib bo'lsaniz...". Actually, the utterance [2] should have been like "Bir-birlaringizni sevsangiz? Munosib bo'lsaniz, nega bir-birlaringiz bilan ajrashmoqchisizlar?", however, the speaker violates the maxim in order to gain the listener's understanding. As a result of the violation, the speaker implies the implicature as "what is the matter, then?, what hinders your life?". This implicature forces the listener to provide a sufficient response. The pragmatic function of the implicature drawn is to question, in particular, to implicitly ask why he doesn't want his wife to give a birth. This implicature is the result of the violation of the Quantity maxim and the Politeness principle. The pragmatic function of this implicature is to function as a speech act of question.

Context: The conversation is taking place at the barber's shop. While searching for Odilxo'ja's house, the young boy and his mother come across a barber's shop and while the barber was cutting the young boy's hair, the mother got to know all the information on Odilxo'ja and his family. The barber praised all the family and particularly, the future son-in-law.

[1] The barber: Nima, quda bo'lmoqchimisizlar?

[2] The mother of the child: Qaydam. Taqdir qo'shgan bo'lsa... (O. Hoshimov, 2012, b. 59-60).

Implicature: Perhaps, they (her daughter and Odilxo'ja's son) will get married. Probably, they will not.

Purpose: to save face.

By responding to the utterance [1], the speaker violates the sub-maxim "make your contribution as informative as required" of the Quantity principle. As the utterance [1] requires more information than uttered. According to the cooperative principles, the mother should have answered like "Ha, taqdir qo'shgan bo'lsa, quda bo'lmoqchimiz" but she intends to be less informative. The purpose of violating the sub-maxim is to save face. To be more concise, as an Uzbek woman, the mother usually tends to speak less to strange people, especially, if they are men, gives less information in order to save her face as a well-mannered woman. As a result of the violation of the sub-maxim of the Quantity principle, the conversational implicature such as "Perhaps, they (her daughter and Odilxo'ja's son)

will get married. Probably, they will not" is drawn. The pragmatic function of the arisen implicature is to suppose or make a prediction about the future rather than giving an assertion.

In English and Uzbek, the conditional constructions can generate a conversational implicature by violating deliberately the sub-maxim "don't make your contribution more informative than required" of the Quantity principle of cooperation in a certain communicative context:

Context: Tom and Finn, waiting for the devil to come in the graveyard, heard a voice by three men. They were Muff Potter, Injun Joe and Dr. Robinson. Under the order of Robinson, Muff Potter and Injun Joe opened Hoss William's grave, took out the coffin, took out the body and put it on the cart. Then, they demanded five dollars more from Robinson.

[1] Muff Potter: Now, it's ready Doctor, but if you don't give us five dollars more, we're not taking it anywhere.

[2] Dr. Robinson: What? But I've already paid you! (Mark Twain, 2004, p.19).

Implicature: We demand you to give us five dollars more.

Purpose: to communicate the interest.

The utterance [1] (if you don't give us five dollars more, we're not taking it anywhere) violates the sub-maxim "don't make your contribution more informative than required" of the Quantity principle

of cooperation as the utterance [1] provides more information than required. Actually, there is no need for this demand, that's to say, Muff Potter and Injun Joe have been already paid for their service, but they again insist on more money from Robinson as they had some conflicts five years ago. The speaker violates the sub-maxim to communicate his own interest. They were interested in taking a revenge from Robinson, so they pretended to demand more money. However, the social context requires less information than the utterance [1] provided. As a result of the violation, the implicature as "we demand you to give us five dollars more" is drawn. The pragmatic function of the implicature emerged is to demand or require.

Context: A dialogue between Manuel Garcia and Signor Maggiore. When Signor Maggiore asks Manuel Garcia about his plan if the war is over, Manuel says that he will go to the states. When Signor Maggiore asks Manuel whether he is married or not, he responds that I am going to get married, then Signor Maggiore furiously says that you are stupid, does a man marry? A man must not marry. When Manuel asks the reason for why a man mustn't marry, having lost his wife, Maggiore responds that if he marries, he will lose everything, if he doesn't want to lose, he mustn't marry.

[1] Manuel Garcia: Why must not a man marry?

[2] Signor Maggiore: He cannot marry. He cannot marry. If he is to

lose everything, he should not place himself in a position to lose that. He should not place himself in a position to lose. He should find things he cannot lose (Ernest Hemingway, 1972, p. 33).

Implicature: Marrying is losing. Wife is your life. If your wife dies, you will lose your life.

Purpose: to exert an emotional impact on the listener.

It is clear from the example, the speaker uses the conditional construction such as "If he is to lose everything, he should not place himself in a position to lose that. He should not place himself in a position to lose. He should find things he cannot lose" and violates the sub-maxim "don't make your contribution more informative than required" of the Quantity principle of cooperation. As the speaker makes a lot of use of repetitions in his speech and this makes the speaker overinformative than the situation requires. The utterance [1] doesn't require as much information as provided in the utterance [2], and therefore, the utterance [2] leads to the violation of the sub-maxim of the Quantity principle. The purpose of violation is to exert an emotional impact on the listener. As a result of the violation, the speaker intends a conversational implicature as "Marrying is losing. Wife is your life. If your wife dies, you will lose your life". The pragmatic function of the arisen implicature is to exhort the listener on the bad consequences of marriage such as losing a wife if she dies.

Context: The mother of the main character, a young boy, welcomed two matchmakers. The matchmakers emphasized that they are an honourable family in the community and suggested that they should also ask around about their family.

[1] The woman with a veil: Mayli, sizlar ham so'rang, surishtiring. Qa'nidaturamiz. Shundoq guzar oldidagi qo'shqavat darvoza. Odilxo'ja desangiz, hamma biladi.

[2] The woman with varicolored cloth: Ovsinim kuyov bo'lmishning onalari! Muborak chevar desangiz, hamma taniydi (O'. Hoshimov, 2012, p. 52).

Implicature: Odilxo'ja is a famous, well-known and respected person in the community.

Purpose: to save face.

This conditional construction "Odilxo'ja desangiz, hamma biladi" violates the sub-maxim "don't make your contribution more informative than required" of the Quantity principle of cooperation as the speaker uses this conditional form to give extra information and this information is not required by the context. When the matchmakers let the counterpart to ask around about their family, not only instructs their address, but also emphasizes that her husband is authoritative, honourable and respected. The purpose of violating the sub-maxim is to save face. The violation of the maxim gives a rise to a conversational implicature as "Odilxo'ja is a famous, well-known and respected person in the community". The pragmatic function of is to praise her family.

Context: The mother of the main character and her women neighbors (Granny Hoji, Sister Hayri) ask Aunt Acha to foretell about the relatives who went to the war. When the mother of the child asks Aunt Acha to foretell about her elder brother, Aunt Acha foretells that your elder brother will come, he has been on the way. Having heard this news, the sorrowful sister feels happy and promises to buy clothes for Aunt Acha from head to foot.

Aunt Acha: Akangtirik!
Akangkeladu! Yo'lga chiqq-o-on!

The mother of the child: og'zingizdan aylanay, xolajon! Mana, oz bo'lsa, ko'p o'rnida ko'rasiz. Akam eson-omon kelsa bosh-oyoq kiyim qilib beraman (O'. Hoshimov, 2012, p. 87).

Implicature: I promise that I will buy you clothes from head to foot.

Purpose: to please the counterpart.

As clearly seen from the example, the conditional construction "Akam eson-omon kelsa bosh-oyoq kiyim qilib beraman" violates the sub-maxim "don't make your contribution more informative than required" of the Quantity principle of cooperation. Here, the speaker tries to provide more information than required by using the conditional clause. More precisely, having heard that her elder brother will return home from war, the happy sister promises that she will buy clothes for Aunt Acha from head to foot in order to be thankful and in turn, expresses her pragmatic intention. A deliberate violation of the maxim results in a conversational implicature as "I

promise that I will buy you clothes from head to foot". The purpose of the violation of the maxim is to please the counterpart. This implicature pragmatically functions as a speech act of promise in its own context.

Context: Aunt Klava who lives in the same block of flats with the main character gets ill and taken to hospital. The neighbors as well as the main character collect money for the operation and help Aunt Klava. One day the main character comes across Aunt Klava who is sitting on a bench and cares about her health. Aunt Klava expresses her gratitude to the main character for lending money for her.

[1] The main character: Tuzukmisiz, o'zi?

[2] Aunt Klava: Operatsiyadan yaxshi chiqdim. Pul bermasam bo'lmasdi.

[3] The main character: Kimga?

[4] Aunt Klava: Vrachga! Uchyuz so'm bermasam bo'lmasdi. Operatsiya qilmasdi. Qilsayam, yarim yildan keyin o'ladigan qilib kesardi (O'. Hoshimov, 2012, p. 94).

Implicature: I am grateful for lending money for my operation.

Purpose: to complain.

As can be seen from the example, the response [4] violates the sub-maxim "don't make your contribution more informative than

required" of the Quantity principle of cooperation, yet the utterance [3] doesn't require as much information as provided in the utterance [4]. As a result, Aunt Klava fails to provide necessary information as required and violates the sub-maxim of the Quantity principle in order to complain about the bribery of doctors. In fact, the utterance [3] requires the response as "Vrachga!" according to the cooperative principles, but the listener provides more information than required by using the conditional clauses as "Uchyuzo'mbermasambo'lmasdi. Operatsiya qilmasdi. Qilsayam, yarim yildan keyin o'ladigan qilib kesardi". The violation of the maxim leads to a conversational implicature as "I am grateful for lending money for my operation" and in turn, this implicature functions as a speech act of thanking.

Summing up, the conditional constructions in English and Uzbek can generate a conversational implicature by violating the maxim of Quantity. In compared languages, through the use of conditional constructions, similarities and peculiarities of the purposes of violating the quantity maxim, the implicature generated and their pragmatic function have been observed and can be represented in the following way: [See Table 1]:

Table 1: Purposes of violation, the generated implicatures and their pragmatic functions by conditional constructions in English and Uzbek through the violation of Quantity maxim.

English				Uzbek			
<i>Make your contribution as informative as required</i>							
Dialogues	Purpose	Implicature	Pragmatic function	Dialogues	Purpose	Implicature	Pragmatic function
№1	Avoid discussion	Stop questioning! I am not eager to answer your questions.	Demand	№1	Gain the listener's understanding	What is the matter, then? What hinders your life?	Question
№2	Exert an emotional impact on the listener	Tom! Come here, right now!	Threat	№2	Save face	Perhaps, they will get married. Probably, they will not.	Prediction
№3	Please the counterpart	Ok, you may come with me.	Giving permission	№3	-	-	-
<i>Don't make your contribution more informative than required</i>							
№1	Communicate the interest	We demand you to give us five dollars more	Demand	№1	Save face	Odilxo'ja is a famous, well-known and respected person in the community.	Praise
№2	Exert an emotional impact on the listener	Marrying is losing. Wife is your life. If your wife dies, you will lose your life.	Exhortation	№2	Please the counterpart	I promise that I will buy you clothes from head to foot.	Promise
№3	-	-	-	№3	Complain	I am grateful for lending money for my operation.	Thanking

It is clear from the content of the table, in compared languages the communicants using conditional constructions violate the Quantity maxim for different purposes in order to generate a conversational implicature in a certain communicative context.

In particular, it is apparent from the analysed examples in English, it can be noted as a peculiar feature for English that the communicants who use conditional constructions in their speech violate the Quantity maxim to generate a conversational implicature for the following purposes: avoid discussion, exert an emotional impact on the listener and communicate the interest.

As is clear from the examples under analysis, the violation of the Quantity maxim by using conditional constructions in Uzbek to give a rise to a conversational implicature for

the following purposes can be regarded as a peculiarity for Uzbek: gain the listener's understanding, save face and complain.

Furthermore, it should be noted that violating the maxim of Quantity by the use of conditional constructions in compared languages to generate a conversational implicature in a certain social context for the purpose of pleasing the counterpart can be considered to be a similar feature for the compared languages.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results obtained in the present study, the following conclusion can be drawn:

The conditional constructions in English and Uzbek can be intentionally used to generate a conversational implicature by violating or floating the Gricean maxim of Quantity in a specific

context of conversation. Also, it should be underlined that at the same time, the violation of two maxims (quantity and manner) happened through the use of conditional constructions by English interlocutors. Particularly, the results have elucidated that the violation of the Quantity maxim via the use of conditional constructions in English to give a rise to a conversational implicature happens due to some purposes as avoiding discussion, exerting an emotional impact on the listener, and communicating the interest. In Uzbek, the interlocutors who use conditional forms violate the Quantity maxim to generate a conversational implicature for the following purposes: gaining the listener's understanding, saving

face, and complaining. From the findings of the research, it is evidenced that the communicants applying conditional constructions in compared languages generate a conversational implicature by intentionally violating the Quantity maxim to please the counterpart.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Prof. K.O. Saparova, B.Y. Kushokova for their helpful comments and suggestions. He also wishes to express his gratitude to his family and friends (particularly, Z.H. Haydarov, A.A. Hafizov, J.K. Komilov, Sh.M. Shukurov, D.G'. Dadaboyev, Sh.Sh.Mardonov, S.H. Sulonov) for their constant support and encouragement. However, all the imperfections should be attributed to the author.

REFERENCES

1. Adaoma Igwedibia (2017). Grice's Conversational Implicature: A Pragmatics Analysis of Selected Poems of Audre Lorde//International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, Volume 7, Issue 1, P. 120-129.
2. Antonius Waget (2015). Violations of Grice's Maxims in The Prince and the Pauper Movie//LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Studies. Vol.18, Issue 1, P. 1-10.
3. Arezou Sobhani, Ali Saghebi (2014). The Violation of Cooperative Principles and Four Maxims in Iranian Psychological Consultation//Open Journal of Modern Linguistics. - New Zealand: Scientific Research Publishing Inc., Issue 4, P. 91-99.
4. Ernest Hemingway (1972). Men without women. - Great Britain, Hunt Barnard Printing Ltd, 107 p.
5. Hamid M. Al-Hamadi, Behija J. Muhammed (2009). Pragmatics: Grice's conversational maxims violations in the responses of some western politicians//Journal of the College of Arts, No. (50), P. 1-23.
6. Laura Alba Juez (1995). Verbal Irony and The Maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles //Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 8, P. 25-30.
7. Liu Xiaoqin (2017). Overcommunication Strategies of Violating Grice's Cooperative Principle in Ground Service//English Language Teaching. Vol. 10, No. 11. P. 162-172.
8. Lynda La Plante (1995). Prime Suspect.- London: Penguin Books Ltd, 76 p.
9. Mark Twain (2004). The Adventures of Tom Sawyer.- Krakow: Mediasat Poland Bis, 88 p.

10. Michael Haugh (2002). The Intuitive Basis of Implicature: Relevance Theoretic Implicitness Versus Gricean Implying//International Pragmatics Association. 12 (2), P. 117-134.

11. Murad Al Kayed, Amal Kitishat (2015). The Violation of the Grice's Maxims in Jordanian Newspapers' Cartoons: A Pragmatic Study//International Journal of Linguistics and Literature (IJLL). Vol. 4, Issue 4, P. 41-50.

12. O'. Hoshimov (2012). Dunyoning ishlari: Qissa. - T.: Meriyus, XHMK, 272 b.

13. Rodrigo Jungmann (2010). The Implicature Theory: A Case Study//Principia.NEL - Epistemology and Logic Research Group, Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), Brazil. 13(3), P. 405-419.

14. Safarov Sh (2008). Pragmalingvistika. - Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 300 b.

15. Salvatore Attardo (1990). The Violation of Grice's Maxims in Jokes//Berkeley Linguistics Society. Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, P. 355-362.