

Softening the Blow: Pragmatic Functions of Understatement and Self-Deprecation in English Discourse

KODIROVA KHOLIDAKHON
Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Understatement and self-deprecating humor manifest important pragmatic resources in English communication. Through these strategies, speakers may reduce the apparent seriousness of an event, soften negative evaluation, manage interpersonal tension, and create humorous interaction. Although understatement has traditionally been discussed in relation to English humor, politeness and indirectness, its pragmatic functions remain relevant to the analysis of contemporary communication. This paper examines the pragmatic functions of understatement and self-deprecating humor in selected examples of English discourse. The study employs qualitative contextual analysis, focusing on the relationship between linguistic form, communicative context and pragmatic meaning. Particular attention is given to interpersonal solidarity, indirect criticism, and self-presentation.

Keywords: Understatement, self-deprecating humor, pragmatics, English discourse, indirectness, politeness, interpersonal communication

INTRODUCTION

Humour is undoubtedly an integral part of everyday life, communication, and culture in Britain. As noted above, since the English are generally considered to be a highly polite and

reserved people, they often prefer not to express their thoughts directly in conversation. Instead they usually make use of humour, irony, and wordplay. However, understanding British humour can be somewhat challenging for those who are not thoroughly familiar with the English language and culture. This is because British jokes are often based on puns, in which a single word can simultaneously convey two meanings: the first being its literal meaning, while the second is used figuratively and contributes to the humorous effect.

The renowned anthropologist Kate Fox, in her book *Watching the English: The Hidden Rules of English Behaviour*, notes that humour can occur at any point in a conversation and on virtually any topic, and that the English make extensive use of it in their everyday communication (Fox 2004). Fox also points out that many foreigners complain that the English use so many humorous elements in conversations, it can sometimes be difficult for them to determine whether the speaker is joking or speaking seriously. Indeed, the English are highly skilled at incorporating humour into everyday conversation. For them, humour is regarded as an essential part of social etiquette and polite behaviour.

Various forms of humour can be encountered in everyday British life, including understatement, sarcasm, self-deprecation and puns. Understatement is a form of humour that is particularly common in British speech. It involves deliberately downplaying the significance or seriousness of an event or situation rather than exaggerating it. George Mikes describes understatement not only as a distinctive feature of the British sense of humour, but also as a way of life. Given the certain social constraints in British society concerning overt self-expression, excessive displays of emotion, and lavish praise, the British tend to adopt an indirect approach to expressing such feelings. By portraying serious and important matters as minor or insignificant, they create a subtle humorous effect.

Consider, for example, the following expressions: a chronic and painful illness may be described as “a bit of a nuisance”; remarkable achievements may be referred to as “not bad”; an extraordinarily beautiful view may be described as “quite pretty”;

and people or things that are truly impressive may simply be stated as “nice.” If a stronger degree of approval is intended, the expression “very nice” may be used. Understatement has become so deeply embedded in British life, language and culture that it can be regarded as a hallmark of British speech culture. George Mikes aptly observes that “The English have no soul; they use understatement instead” (Mikes 1946).

Turning to the historical origins of the phenomenon of understatement, the concept can be traced back to the Anglo-Saxon period, when people preferred to express their thoughts cautiously rather than state them openly and directly. Even at that time, the English began to employ a subtle form of verbal artistry in communication, conveying their ideas through incompleteness, indirect suggestion, and implicit reference, thereby allowing the deeper meaning to emerge. Although the phenomenon of downplaying was initially interpreted as a manifestation of politeness and good manners, the underlying irony and sarcasm in such statements were nevertheless often readily discernible.

The *Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English* provides the following definition of the verb “understate” and the noun derived from it, “understatement”: “To state less strongly than is usual or acceptable, making things appear better, worse, or less important than they really are” (McArthur 1981). This definition refers to the practice of presenting a situation in a less forceful or emphatic manner than usual. It makes things appear better, worse, or less important than they actually are.

METHODS

The study employs a qualitative pragmatic approach to examine the use of understatement and self-deprecating humor in English discourse. Rather than relying on a statistically representative corpus, the analysis focuses on selected examples that illustrate the pragmatic and interpersonal functions of these strategies.

The examples were selected from English-language linguistic, literary, and communicative materials discussed in previous studies and publicly available sources. They were used

as illustrative evidence to examine how speakers employ relatively weak or self-directed expressions to communicate meanings that may be stronger than their literal linguistic form suggests. The examples were not treated as a homogeneous corpus because they represent different communicative contexts and genres. The analysis was conducted through contextual discourse analysis. Each example was examined at three interconnected levels. First, the linguistic form of the expression was considered, with particular attention to lexical items and constructions that minimize the intensity of an evaluation. Second, the surrounding communicative context was examined in order to determine the relationship between the literal expression and the situation being described. Third, the pragmatic function of the expression was interpreted in terms of interpersonal communication.

The analysis focused on four recurrent pragmatic functions: emotional cushioning, through which speakers reduce the apparent intensity of negative experiences; indirect criticism, through which disagreement or negative evaluation is expressed less directly; interpersonal solidarity, through which understatement or self-deprecating humor may facilitate a shared informal interactional frame; and humorous self-presentation, through which speakers use self-directed evaluation to construct a modest, relatable or humorous persona.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

“Understatement” has developed into a communicative device capable of performing various pragmatic functions in English. Particularly in communicative situations where politeness, tactfulness, and consideration of the interlocutor’s emotional state are important, there has been a growing tendency to convey ideas in a softened rather than direct and potentially confrontational manner. “Understatement” does not function merely as an aesthetic or stylistic phenomenon but also as a pragmatic resource for regulating interpersonal relations.

Through this strategy, speakers can express their views not in the form of explicit and direct criticism, but in a relatively mild,

indirect form whose intended meaning can be inferred from the context. As a result, the degree of potential conflict or tension arising during an interaction may be reduced. In such cases, the principal pragmatic feature of understatement lies in the discrepancy between the literal expression and the intended meaning. W. J. Ball examines the functions of understatement in communication and emphasizes its importance in maintaining a friendly atmosphere and positive relations between interlocutors. According to Ball, understatement can be used to mitigate the communicative impact of strong emotions, discomfort, anxiety, or embarrassment, as well as to reduce potentially negative effects on the interlocutor (Ball 1970). Ball also associates understatement with emotional self-control, modesty, and the reduction of discomfort in interaction.

It is insufficient to interpret “understatement” simply as a means of “minimizing” or “playing something down.” Its pragmatic function is often determined by the communicative intention of the speaker. For instance, instead of expressing strong anxiety or fear directly, a speaker may describe a situation in relatively neutral or mild terms. A linguistically weak expression may convey a considerably stronger communicative meaning.

V. G. Ivanova examines “understatement” as a linguistic and linguocultural phenomenon in contemporary English and draws attention to its role in mitigating the communicative impact of negative situations (Ivanova 2013). The researcher emphasizes that, in particular communicative contexts, understatement may enable speakers to avoid expressing negative emotions in an overly direct or intensified manner. This point can be illustrated by the following dialogue:

“Oliver, the problem is more serious than that. Jenny is very sick.”
“Would you define ‘very sick’ please?” “She is dying.” (Segal 2008)

In this dialogue, the expression “very sick” does not fully convey the actual severity of the situation. The subsequent statement “She is dying” reveals that the initial expression presented the

situation in a relatively mitigated form. Thus, “very sick” describes the seriousness of the situation without expressing it in the most direct or intense manner.

A similar pragmatic mechanism can be observed in the following passage from Agatha Christie's *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*:

I was careful not to disturb the position of the body, and not to handle the dagger at all. No object was to be attained by moving it. Ackroyd had been clearly dead some little time. (Christie 2006)

In this passage, the expression “some little time” presents a serious situation death in relatively neutral and mitigated terms. The pragmatic effect of understatement arises from the discrepancy between the seriousness of the situation and the relatively weak linguistic form chosen to describe it.

The examples mentioned above demonstrate that understatement can perform several interrelated functions in English communication. On the one hand, it can reduce the emotional impact of negative or uncomfortable situations; on the other hand, it can enable criticism, disagreement, or other negative evaluations to be expressed in a more indirect and mitigated manner. Understatement should not be regarded just a stylistic embellishment of English speech. It also represents a context-dependent pragmatic strategy.

Another scholar, A. A. Dzhioeva, discussing “understatement” and other speech practices, compares them metaphorically to an iceberg. The visible part of an iceberg can be compared to grammar and vocabulary, which represent only a relatively small part of the underlying structure. The much larger part of an iceberg remains hidden beneath the surface. Similarly, the deeper foundation of a language is associated with the national mentality, culture, and system of values underlying linguistic expression. Understatement can also be considered as a distinctive component of English speech culture (Dzhioeva 2016).

In English, understatement in dialogue between interlocutors is frequently realized through indirectness. In accordance with the principles of speech etiquette, speakers may use conventional

grammatical expressions that allow them to communicate their intentions while maintaining respect for the interlocutor and avoiding excessive directness. Such expressions include “I don't think...,” “I don't suppose...,” “I'm afraid I can't...,” and “I'm not sure...”

The following examples illustrate how such forms may function in communication:

- (1) Would you like to join us at the party?
I'm afraid I can't make it tonight.

Here, “I'm afraid I can't...” functions as a mitigated form of refusal. Rather than simply saying “I can't make it,” the speaker uses a conventional polite expression that reduces the directness of the refusal.

- (2) What do you think about the plan?
I don't think it is the best idea.

In this example, “I don't think...” allows the speaker to express disagreement without explicitly stating that the proposed plan is bad or unacceptable. The negative evaluation is therefore presented in a relatively indirect form.

- (3) I'm afraid he is not available at the moment.

The expression “I'm afraid...” softens the negative information and makes the statement less direct.

- (4) I don't suppose you have finished the task yet?

The construction “I don't suppose...” allows the speaker to ask about an unfinished task without directly accusing the interlocutor of failing to complete it.

- (5) He is not the brightest student in the class.

Rather than explicitly describing the student as unintelligent, the speaker employs a mitigated negative evaluation. The expression therefore conveys criticism indirectly.

These examples demonstrate that understatement in English is closely associated with indirectness and pragmatic mitigation. Speakers may employ negative constructions, modal expressions, and conventional politeness formulas to reduce the force of disagreement, refusal, criticism, or negative information. The pragmatic meaning of such expressions therefore extends beyond their literal semantic content and depends substantially on the communicative context.

It can be stated that these constructions enable speakers to maintain interpersonal distance, demonstrate consideration for the interlocutor, and avoid unnecessarily confrontational formulations. Consequently, understatement can be viewed as a pragmatic resource through which linguistic form, politeness, and culturally conditioned communicative norms interact.

In youth-oriented communication, avoiding excessive emotional expression and overt self-praise may function as socially valued interactional practices. Within informal peer communication, such strategies can contribute to maintaining a friendly atmosphere, emphasizing interpersonal equality, and avoiding an impression of self-importance. In this context, understatement may serve as a pragmatic resource through which speakers present their experiences and abilities in a relatively restrained manner.

The following examples illustrate how understatement may operate in informal English discourse:

(6) I'm not brilliant at maths, but I will try.

Here the expression *not brilliant at maths* presents the speaker's limited confidence or ability in a mitigated form rather than through a direct negative self-assessment.

(7) Sorry, my presentation was a bit of a mess.

The phrase "a bit of a mess" minimizes the negative evaluation of the speaker's performance and consequently reduces the emotional force of the statement.

(8) It was a bit difficult, to be honest.

The expression “a bit difficult” presents a potentially more serious difficulty in a relatively mild form.

(9) The test we got yesterday was a little tricky.

The phrase “a little tricky” similarly minimizes the degree of difficulty associated with the test.

The provided examples suggest that understatement can allow speakers to avoid overt self-praise and construct a relatively modest communicative style. Rather than emphasizing their abilities or presenting their experiences in highly intensified terms, speakers may use mitigating expressions that leave room for a more restrained interpretation.

Understatement has also frequently been discussed as a salient feature of English communicative practices. However, it would be too broad to regard it as an inherent characteristic of all English speakers. Its use is better understood as a context-dependent pragmatic practice that may reflect culturally recognizable norms concerning modesty, restraint, and interpersonal consideration.

Another distinctive form of humor relevant to English communication is “self-deprecation,” or self-directed humorous evaluation. In this type of humor, speakers refer to their own weaknesses, mistakes, or uncomfortable experiences in a humorous manner. Speakers may reduce interpersonal tension and create opportunities for social connection with their interlocutors. Self-deprecating humor can therefore perform an important interpersonal function. When appropriately used, it may soften potentially uncomfortable situations, reduce the seriousness of criticism directed at the speaker, and establish a more informal interactional atmosphere. However, the interpretation of self-deprecation depends strongly on context, the relationship between interlocutors, and the degree of shared cultural and communicative knowledge.

A frequently cited illustration of self-deprecating humor is associated with Queen Elizabeth II. According to W. J. Eaton, during a visit to the United States, the Queen delivered a speech before members of Congress while the podium was positioned so

high that only her hat was visible to the audience. The incident subsequently became the subject of humorous media coverage. On a later occasion, when addressing members of Congress, she reportedly began her speech with the words:

(10) Dear gentlemen, I hope you can see me now.

The humorous effect of the statement derives from the speaker's reference to a potentially awkward previous situation. Rather than ignoring the incident or treating it seriously, the Queen turns it into a humorous observation. The utterance can be interpreted as an example of self-directed humor that reduces social tension and establishes rapport with the audience.

Self-deprecating humor can also be found in the statements attributed to prominent British literary and political figures. Oscar Wilde, for example, is associated with the following humorous statement:

(11) I am so clever that sometimes I don't understand a single word of what I am saying.

The humor arises from the contradiction between the speaker's apparent self-praise (so clever) and the subsequent admission of not understanding his own words. The statement therefore transforms self-evaluation into ironic self-criticism. A similar mechanism can be observed in a humorous statement attributed to Winston Churchill. When reportedly told that many people considered him a hypocrite, he responded:

(12) If I had two faces, would I be wearing this one?

The humorous force of the response results from the speaker's transformation of a potentially confrontational criticism into a witty self-directed remark. Rather than responding to the accusation through direct confrontation, the speaker reframes the criticism within a humorous context.

These examples show that self-deprecating humor can function as more than a form of entertainment. It may allow

speakers to manage potentially uncomfortable situations, soften criticism, and create interpersonal rapport. At the same time, such examples should be interpreted as illustrations of a communicative strategy as evidence that all British or English-speaking people characteristically prefer self-deprecating humor.

Recent research on U.K. adolescents' social media interactions indicates that self-deprecating forms of self-reference may function as part of socially shared interactional norms. D. L. Paddock and B. T. Bell (2021) found that, according to the adolescents participating in their study, comments directed at others were generally expected to be positive, whereas comments about oneself could be expressed in a more modest and self-deprecating manner. The finding suggests that self-deprecation may serve an interpersonal function by helping young speakers avoid appearing excessively self-promotional and by aligning themselves with peer-group expectations. However, the use and interpretation of self-deprecating expressions remain dependent on the communicative context and the particular social norms of the interaction.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined “understatement” as a pragmatic and linguocultural phenomenon in English communication. The findings show that it functions as a context-dependent strategy for reducing the intensity of an expression and softening potentially sensitive meanings through various linguistic devices. Overall, understatement is best understood as a multifaceted communicative resource shaped by linguistic form, context, and sociocultural expectations. Further corpus-based research into authentic spoken and digital interactions may provide a more systematic understanding of its functions in English communication.

REFERENCES

- Ball, W. J. 1970 Understatement and overstatement in English. *ELT Journal*, 24/3, 201-208.

- British National Corpus (BNC). 2007. Oxford : Oxford University Computing Services. 28 Aug 2026. Available online: <<https://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk>>.
- Christie, A. 2006. *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*. Harper Collins e-books.
- Dzhioeva, A. A. 2016. Concepts of global language: Understatement. Bulletin of Moscow University. Series XXVII. Global Studies and Geopolitics.
- Eaton, W. J. 1991. *Queen Elizabeth Addresses the U.S. Congress*. Los Angeles Times.
- Ivanova, V. G. 2013. *The Linguacultural Concept of Understatement in the English Language Picture of the World*. Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University) MFA Russia.
- McArthur, T. 1981. *Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English*. Longman.
- Paddock, D. L. & Bell, B. T. 2024. It's better saying i look fat instead of saying you look fat': A qualitative study of U.K. adolescents' understanding of appearance-related interactions on social media. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 39/2, 243-271. doi: 10.1177/07435584211034875.
- Segal, E. 2008. *Love Story*. Airis-Press.

KODIROVA KHOLIDAKHON
 PHD STUDENT,
 FERGANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
 FERGANA, UZBEKISTAN.