



The Discourse of Deception: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Devilish Speech in Doctor Faustus

A.L Basim Abbas Sultan Al-Abadi

Workplace: General Directorate of Education, Diwaniyah

bassim_sly@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present study also considers deception in Christopher Marlowe's "Doctor Faustus" as an intentional and linguistic-discursive practice rather than a symbolic or theological theme. Moving beyond historical tropes of value concern, such as moral allegory and supernatural determinism, the research employs an embedded discourse-pragmatic approach to explore how demonic figures condition meaning, belief, and agency through linguistic means. Applying Fairclough's (13) three-dimensional framework for CDA and Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategy of off-record, this study examines a number of the book's dramatic exchanges to reveal textual, interactional, and ideological methods that support deceit. At the textual level, the study finds that demonic discourse is signposted by modal ambiguity, presupposition, evaluative lexis, euphemism, and semantic inversion, which combine to thwart Faustus's moral reasoning and to hide the implications of his behaviour. On the level of discursive praxis, devils manipulate turn-taking and timing, as well as inferential cues to structure Faustus's construction of salvation, ambition, and despair. These examples demonstrate that the lie becomes a partner's construction through indirectness, vagueness, and strategic reveals rather than overt force. At the level of social practices, and in combination with the labyrinthine turnings of Renaissance humanism, materialism, religious authority, and intellectual adventure, this indicates how power operates through language during a time when it was appropriate to be socially redefining new ideological articulations. Pragmatically, the devil's argument comes down to positive politeness, flattery, and off-record discourse aimed at holding Faustus' face and negative independence. In the play, these strategies range from passive manipulation to coercion and face-threat dynamics (in that sense, reflecting a shift from more subtle means of control to [discursive] dominance). In the end, Faustus so thoroughly incorporates demonic rhetoric that he returns it in a kind of self-talk: actions that no longer require external dissimulation having taken on features of an intrapersonal rhetoric more readily found in the domain of conscience. Thus, the tragedy of Doctor Faustus rests in its terminal analysis of discourse, because deception is a unified linguistic operation that repositions knowledge, selfhood, and ethical judgment. Focusing on language as the manipulative medium, this study argues that Faustus's fall is more than a supernatural beast of burden.

Key words : CDA , Deception , in Faustus play

خطاب الخداع: تحليل نقدي للخطاب الشيطاني في مسرحية دكتور فاستوس

م.م باسم عباس سلطان العابدي
المديرية العامة لتربية الديوانية

ملخص

تتناول هذه الدراسة الخداع في مسرحية "دكتور فاستوس" لكريستوفر مارلو كممارسة مقصودة ولغوية-خطابية، لا كموضوع رمزي أو لاهوتي. وبعيداً عن الاستعارات التاريخية المتعلقة بالقيم، كالتشبيه الأخلاقي والحتمية الخارقة للطبيعة، تستخدم الدراسة منهجاً خطيبياً-براغماتياً متداخلاً لاستكشاف كيف تؤثر الشخصيات الشيطانية على المعنى والمعتقد والفاعلية من خلال الوسائل اللغوية. وبتطبيق إطار فيركلو (١٩١٣) ثلاثي الأبعاد لتحليل الخطاب النقدي، واستراتيجية براون وليفينسون (١٩٨٧) للتهذيب غير الرسمي، تُحل هذه الدراسة عدداً من الحوارات الدرامية في المسرحية للكشف عن الأساليب النصية والتفاعلية والأيدولوجية التي تدعم الخداع. تتناول هذه الدراسة الخداع في مسرحية "دكتور فاستوس" لكريستوفر مارلو كممارسة مقصودة ولغوية-خطابية، لا كموضوع رمزي أو لاهوتي. على المستوى النصي، تُظهر الدراسة أن الخطاب الشيطاني يتسم بالغموض الموجه، والافتراضات المسبقة، والمفردات التقييمية، والتورية، والقلب الدلالي، وهي عوامل تتضافر لإحباط منطق فاوست الأخلاقي وإخفاء دلالات سلوكه. أما على مستوى الممارسة الخطابية، فتتلاعب الشياطين بتناوب الأدوار والتوقيت، بالإضافة إلى الإشارات الاستدلالية، لتشكيل تصور فاوست للخلاص والطموح واليأس. تُبين هذه الأمثلة أن الكذبة تصبح من صنع الشريك من خلال التلميح والغموض والكشف الاستراتيجي بدلاً من القوة الصريحة. على مستوى الممارسات الاجتماعية، وبالتزامن مع تعقيدات النزعة الإنسانية في عصر النهضة، والمادية، والسلطة الدينية، والمغامرة الفكرية، يُشير هذا إلى كيفية عمل السلطة من خلال اللغة في زمن كان من المناسب فيه إعادة تعريف التعبيرات الأيدولوجية الجديدة اجتماعياً. عملياً، تتلخص حجة الشيطان في المجاملة الإيجابية، والتملق، والخطاب غير الرسمي الذي يهدف إلى الحفاظ على كرامة فاوستوس ونفي استقلاليتها. في المسرحية، تتراوح هذه الاستراتيجيات بين التلاعب السلبي والإكراه وتهديد الكرامة (بهذا المعنى، تعكس تحولاً من وسائل السيطرة الأكثر دقة إلى الهيمنة [الخطابية]). في النهاية، يدمج فاوستوس الخطاب الشيطاني بشكل كامل لدرجة أنه يعيده في نوع من الحديث مع الذات: أفعال لم تعد تتطلب تمويهاً خارجياً، إذ اكتسبت سمات الخطاب الداخلي الذي يُوجد بسهولة أكبر في مجال الضمير. وهكذا، تكمن مأساة دكتور فاستوس في تحليلها النهائي للخطاب، لأن الخداع عملية لغوية موحدة تُعيد تموضع المعرفة والذات والحكم الأخلاقي. بالتركيز على اللغة كوسيلة للتلاعب، تُجادل هذه الدراسة بأن سقوط فاوستوس هو أكثر من مجرد وحش خارق للطبيعة. التركيز على اللغة كوسيلة للتلاعب، تُجادل هذه الدراسة بأن سقوط فاوستوس هو أكثر من مجرد وحش خارق للطبيعة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل الخطاب النقدي، الخداع، في مسرحية فاوست

1-Introduction

Deceit as a feature of dramatic discourse has increasingly attracted scholarly attention in recent linguistic work, particularly in studies that move away from thematic interpretations toward an analysis based on interaction.. Current discourse studies emphasize the ways characters jointly build meaning, exercise influence, and manage each other's interpretations through patterned conversational exchanges rather than through isolated utterances (Richardson, 2010, pp. 29–31). In Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, deception can be found inscribed within the verbal exchanges of characters themselves as supernatural creatures reconfigure

knowledge, trim experience, and slaughter moral cognition by means of language. This shift from viewing emblems of meaning to the mechanical (constitutive) structure of speech parallels much subsequent critical thought, which emphasizes that, in drama, habits emerge through talk and shape actions and selves. Consistent with the belief that deception is in essence a discursive and linguistic operation, such an approach offers a more comprehensive view of how manipulation is organised and performed over the play.

Pragmatics provides another dimension to analysis because it describes the assumed intentions as well as underlying (covert) meanings that arise in implicature, presupposition, and direct or indirect communicative behaviour (Levinson, 1983: 97 –105). Doctor Faustus proves a particularly fertile context for such an inquiry, one in which demonic characters often resort to indirection and selective revelation informed by pragmatics in their inferential prompting of Faustus toward decisions detrimental to his health: A transparent, pragmatic theory of the deceptive utterance (Bousfield, 2008, pp. 122–124). Contrary to symbolic or psychological accounts, a pragmatic-discursive perspective reveals how deceit is achieved through conventional conversational strategies that reflect authentic communicative practices. This composite viewpoint offers a firm basis for analyzing the linguistic means by which Marlowe implements demonic persuasion.

Problem of the Study

The historical figure of Doctor Faustus has always remained a fascination for theologians, philosophers and literary critics, although relatively little attention has yet been paid to deception as a systematic linguistic-pragmatic category. Precisely how devils subvert and deceive Faustus through speech has not received the attention it deserves.

Research Questions

- 1-How do the devils, along with Mephistopheles, convince and deceive Doctor Faustus?
- 2-What is the role played by pragmatics—implicature, presupposition, and indirectness—in helping to generate deceptive meaning in this play?
- 3-How do these gestures control our judgements, actions, and, ultimately, the fate of Faustus?

Aims of the Study

- 1- To find out and analyze the discursive structures which make the lie possible in Doctor Faustus's dialogues.
- 2- In order to explore the role of pragmatic features as manipulative tools in dramatic discourse.
- 3- To show how a linguistic analysis contributes to our grasp of ideological and psychological implication in theatrical dialogue.

2. Theatrical Background



2.1. Deception as a Discursive Engine in Doctor Faustus

Deception is a fundamental agent of conflict, moral fickleness, and character change in dramatic traditions. Machiavellian language was widely popular in early modern theatre, and dramatists employed it as a tactical device to expose the ethical vulnerability and moral weakness of human nature under spiritual stress. The Faustus plays provide a stark example of this, as the devils who torment him build convincing frameworks through limited language play. Their speech, far from fulfilling mere theatrical function, recasts Faustus's understanding of ambition, salvation and doom through mockery, temptation and inverted promises - it constructs a plane of discourse which shapes his freedom (Greenblatt 2001:67). This is even more evident in the way in which Mephistopheles and when present other voices of demons shake Faustus's conception of truth by altering consequences, blurring moral lines, and creating a rhetorical environment where reality appears no different from illusion. Contemporary thought acknowledges how these speech acts pervert, through reinvention and emotional manipulation, to disorient Faustus's reading of the spiritual world (Cole, 2016, p. 112).

1.2 The Research Gap: Lack of Linguistic Studies on Demonic Persuasion

However, it is curious that there has been much criticism of Doctor Faustus in literary and theological terms; little attention seems to be paid to the words themselves and to how they relate to deceptive interchange. It is against this that criticisms of it in general, whether revolving around Renaissance humanism or moral allegory, do not concern the demonic persuasion as a systematic linguistic practice with rule-governed procedures. However, this gap suggests that research could in fact be invited that foregrounds deceit as a discursive practice against symbolic content, wherever it might apply (Wootton, 2013:54). Discourse analysis is the appropriate method not because of supernatural force but because of control over implicature, context, and common knowledge. Contemporary discourse requires the discursive construction of influence and persuasion, accomplished by narrative framing and selective reporting of ([a]) reality (that is to say, how Faustus's "moral reasoning [is] destabilized, transformed, and re-aligned", 17) (Tannen 2007: 29).

1.3 Pragmatic Mechanisms of Manipulation in Demonic Dialogue

And pragmatic theory offers invaluable means for explaining how Mephistopheles and his subordinate devils use implicature, politeness strategies, and indirect meaning to deceive Faustus. There is much missing in their discourses; of course, they tend to conceal the future deceptions, disappointments, and frustrations they are being led into. To pursue an investigation of that sort, a pragmatic perspective sensitised to intention, inference and clandestine communicative goals is very much in order (Leech, 2014, p. 91). These tendencies are further intensified by drama as a communicative form, for in mechanics, every line has a functional value

for narrative advancement. Dramatic dialogue is a form that reflects actual structures of conversation, but exaggerates its social or ideological underpinnings, and as such, is an excellent site for analysing how manipulation is performed through regulated interactions on stage (Short, 1996, p. 73).

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 Fairclough's Dialectical Model

According to Fairclough's (2013) model of critical discourse analysis, DIE discourse operates on three interconnected levels: the level of the text, which examines a text's linguistic attributes such as word choice, grammar usage, cohesion and rhetorical structures; secondly at the level of discursive practice where texts are produced, circulated and interpreted and we can see how meanings are under negotiation and re-production within inter-subjective interaction; thirdly that DIE discourse works at the social practice level through its relation with larger social cultural ideology structures investigating how language produces and reflect power relations and society norms (Fairclough, 2013 pp. 14–17). The three levels are used in the present research to explore how devilish speech operates linguistically (textual), how it is interpreted and received by Faustus (discursive practice), and its ideological and moral implications (social practice); which all together decipher the process of manipulation and deception itself (Fairclough, 2013, pp. 21–23).

1.3.2 The Off-Record Level of Brown & Levinson's (1987) Model

Our analysis is based on one level of Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory—off record (indirect)—which provides the most analytically generative means for analyzing deceit and manipulation in Doctor Faustus [Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. Off-record techniques work through vagueness, innuendo and indirectness which enable speakers to exert control without clearly stating the message they are producing or accepting responsibility for their utterance. This is somewhat similar to the instantaited linguistic form of satan's speech, as the kind of messages transmitted by the demon are conveyed through suggestion, reframing, omission, and covert meaning rather than brute force. In contrast to B's and L's positive or negative politeness, which center, respectively, on solidarity and independence, off-record strategies provide us with an even more direct access to the ways in which concealed intentions collate with inferred meanings and ambivalent promises to create the manipulative (discourse) that envelops Faustus. By selecting this single level of analysis, the present approach also maintains methodological coherence when applied in concert with Fairclough's (2013) model, since both perspectives emphasize hidden assumptions, permissive power relations, and belief formation through discourse. As such, the off-record strategy is a theoretically sound and contextually relevant perspective for examining deception in the plays.



This research combines Brown & Levinson's (1987) off-record politeness strategy and Fairclough's (2013) three-level models of discourse to explore devilish manipulation in Doctor Faustus. On the textual plane, the off-record approach exposes the language functions of ambiguity, implicature, and indirectness used by devils to deceive Faustus. At the level of discourse practice, these tactics demonstrate how Faustus interprets and justifies clandestine intentions, focusing on how deception is negotiated and performed during the event. On the level of social practice, off-record devices reveal "ideological" and power-stratification aspects of language use and show how language is employed to create moral-psychological and social realities. This double focus on the micro and macro levels yields a coherent model with which to analyse systematically the linguistic processes of bogus communication as well as their ideological kairos.

1.4. Data Analysis

Sample 1: Scene VII, Lines 22–25 (p. 12)

The text: *"Think'st thou that Faustus is so fond to imagine / That after this life there is any pain?" (Scene VII, ll. 22–23)*

1.4.1. Textual Analysis (Fairclough – Level 1)

In this brief speech, Mephistopheles uses a questioning structure ("Think'st thou...?") not to gain information but to clandestinely state a belief, thereby serving as a critical linguistic marker of manipulation. The word "fond" refers to someone who is not naïve, and its use puts Faustus at a disadvantage, as he must agree with the devil's convention to avoid appearing weak. Contrast and parity are built into the whole concept of life/pain and therefore obliquely suggest that spiritual rewards are bogus. It is the modal form ("if there can be any pain") that emphasizes indeterminacy and undermines moral certainty. These are the sort of positions on language that evil monologue unsettles when it prompts Faustus to meditate on damnation as a written object.

1.4.2. Discursive Practice (Fairclough – Level 2)

This, neatly enough, comes at a time when Faustus himself wonders what he has made of his bargain. The demons present a discursive stage in which even doubting hellfire can make you sound reasonable and learned. Mephistopheles' statement is based on the assumption that Faustus had previously had doubts about theology. So the research develops a rhetorical dialogue in favor of another perspective that does away with eschatology. This, in turn, comes across to our focus group audience as a textbook case of the nefarious forces lurking within the interpretative field, supporting Fairclough's (2013) proposition that texts constitute "sites of ideological struggle".

1.4.3. Social Practice (Fairclough – Level 3)

This essay is an end-game marvel of its own, a statement of the renaissance's dread-of-skepticism, the humanist dreams of salvation, and the consolidation of



spiritual authority. It's Christian eschatology and a fiery finger in its face, telling it that the category is *passee*. Mephistopheles' seduction narratives, as an analogy to the wider socio-cultural conflict between knowledge and salvation, cannot be readily compared with the early modern turn to reason and empirical doubt. In this light, the devil's questioning becomes discursive play of a particular kind, designed to cut and shuffle the ideological (logical) deck as it were (eroding supernatural authority in pursuit of this-worldly temptation); precisely that sort of manipulation of signs with social effect which Fairclough associates with social practice.

1.4.4 Pragmatic Analysis (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

It is a positive politeness feature of the response, asking Faustus how he views himself intellectually ("too wise"). (It's a move that reduces social distance and makes the devil into a friend, not an enemy. Yet at the same time, it is a face-threatening act: by referring to the belief that punishment is necessary as "fond," the devil suggests that Faustus will be made to look foolish if he refuses the contract. It's a case of strategic ambiguity—an easy, polite way to not just strip the listener of any agency but also render the listener inadequate. Brown & Levinson's politeness theory doesn't claim force but face-work, self-respect, and emotion-tuning in Mephistopheles' lying.

1.4.5. Integrated Interpretation

In conjunction, the linguistic, pragmatic and ideological dimensions reveal a complex manipulation performed by what seem to be deceptively simple lines. Mephistopheles reframes what is real (Fairclough Level 1), controls how it may be understood (Level 2) and changes the ideological basis on which understanding is modelled (Level 3): all by way of Brown & Levinson politeness to maintain Faustus's self-esteem and trap him more firmly in illusion. This serves to show that the "diabolical discourse" in the play is not mere rhetoric, but it results from linguistic, pragmatic and social operations.

1.4.2 Sample 2: Scene VIII, Lines 48–51 (p. 16)

The Text: "Ay, Faustus, now thou hast no hope of heaven: / Therefore despair; think only upon hell." (Scene VIII, ll. 48–49)

1. Textual Analysis (Fairclough – Level 1)

The use of imperative clauses ("despair," "think nothing") has a vigorous, insistent tone on Faustus's state of mind. The adverb *only* restricts cognitive attention by linguistically stranding Faustus within a single theoretical paradigm. The oppositional structure 'no hope of heaven ... only hell' creates a binary semantic field in which there is no room for doubt, thereby producing a false dichotomy. The use of negative absolutes ("not hope") adds a sense of ineluctability, which weakens agency. a command/appreciation syntax in which the latter phrase stands like a servant beaten down by the former. The extracts show that the language of



demon exerts a constraint on interpretative freedom by determining both the lexical mode and the syntactic force of the context.

2. Discursive Practice (Fairclough – Level 2)

This comes in response to Faustus's flicker of emotion. The devils take advantage of the moment of discursive feebleness to reclaim their narrative turf. All morality would therefore be permanently fixed by representing damnation as the end. This would be a discursive closure, allowing no reinterpretation and undermining Faustus's function of rememory. It is readily apparent every time one hears the demons b that they are channeling a series of recurring motifs; they clearly recur, and come back in equally enigmatic guises elsewhere as themes of despair, fate, and atonement or secret forgiveness seem to be doing. It is this tropic game the audience can see as a specific case of turn-taking and bluffing which leads to Faustus losing the devilish round of "turn.

3. Social Practice (Fairclough – Level 3)

On the ideological front, the text also hearkens back to early modern debates over predestination, despair, and spiritual determinism. That command to "thinketh only upon hell" marries the vulgar belief in an eternal psychological punishment with Ellenberger's own sly limit of distraction, and while Sylvius's intent is to 'turn the dogma on the offender' so that he can be paralysed by that terrible vision, it seems like he himself might have been drawn there as well. This corruption signifies the concern about the cross-infection of theological ideas and heretical deflections in Renaissance thought, with diabolical language as strange to accepted moral discourse. This is speech as an act of power, and it imbues the view of authoritarianism (where human remorse can be cancelled out) that I have so intuitively advocated, with a most eloquent expression. It aligns with Fairclough's claim of the reproduction of ideological hegemony in language at an institutional or moral level.

1.4. Pragmatic Analysis (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

That is a losing face thing to do, with no mitigating factors and 100% coercive persuasion. 4.4.103), Mephistopheles strikes against Sor by triggering negative face (freedom) and positive face (self-esteem) violations, as he claims that "he hath no hope". This "cry of despair" is really an emotional violation of the listener's residence, not its own emotion. Brown & Levinson's model explains the devil as it moves from PA and RA politeness strategies to bald-on-record coercion during performance. This shift marks a tactical escalation: once Faustus has been brought down, the demons no longer flatter his ego; instead, they exercise direct mental domination.

1.4.Integrated Interpretation



All of these layers together indicate that Mephistopheles is not simply advancing religious propositions, but building despair as a discursive machine. The textual commands determine cognition, the discursive framework constrains interpretation, and the social force attaches the speech to larger ideological orientations of rejection and helplessness. The discussion is, further, appropriately an instance of the discourse as subservient to Doctor Faustus's lack of integrity, for it finally shows how diabolical control in Doctor Faustus is systematically arranged, but via mere 'forcible rhetoric', etc.

Sample 3: Scene V, Lines 94–98 (p. 13)

The Text: “*Sweet Faustus, think of heaven and heavenly things.*”

Faustus: “*No, Faustus; think of honor and of wealth.*” (Scene V, ll. 94–98)

1. Textual Analysis (Fairclough – Level 1)

This is then a message, of two crossing fields, semantically speaking: \[Tri Alpha \(\text{Heavenly Entities}\)\] vs \[Tri Omega $_{00}^{\{04.40\}}$ (Honor,Wealth) \]. The lexical disjuncture is essential to the game of conceptual opposition in the play. They strongly contrast it with temptation by using positive evaluative terms (“sweet,” “honor, ”wealth”) to make it seem attractive rather than bad. The qualifying word "sweet" is an emotional qualifier that diminishes the proposition, providing emotional appeal but also distorting it. At the same time, Faustus's self-issued command "No, Faustus; think..." presents an inner struggle, signalling a loss of autonomy; he's the persuader and the persuaded. Each sentence is in the form of an imperative structure, but the Mephistopheles one appears to be a minor construction , and Faustus's one is sudden and self-enforcing, thus pointing at the continuing psychological promiscuous power.

2. Discursive Practice (Fairclough – Level 2)

This passage epitomizes a major intertextual clash when the demons employ a rhetorical strategy of spiritual appeal (“think of heaven”) only to undermine its message. The soft sell masks the essential ideological motive: To deflect Faustus from repentance. The deceptive strategy is heightened by the intertextual resonance of Christian moral teaching, which turns the demonic voice into a quasi-pastoral voice. He has assimilated the devil's dispositive formation so well that he can copy it himself for instant use. This illustrates what Fairclough (1992, 27) argues: that discourse is affected by circulation and reproduction; listeners reproduce language patterns that strengthen the existing ideological position. The language of the devil is changing him from the inside anyway, as can be seen in Faustus's next comment.



3. Social Practice (Fairclough – Level 3)

The conflict between the spiritual and the material mirrors Renaissance preoccupations with humanism, morality, and temporal achievement. In this way, by presenting “honor” and wealth” as key terms of cognitive pursuit, the demons facilitate Faustus’ incorporation into a larger ideological narrative which places worldly achievement above spiritual worth. This is indicative of early modern debates about the constraints on human ambition and the ethical implications of ‘intellectual hubris’. Thus, the language of the demons becomes part of a wider cultural discourse within which ambition overcomes any ethical standards and must beget moral confusion – an ideological framework which the play subverts by showing how easily language can distort essential values.

4. Pragmatic Analysis (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

The expression “Sweet Faustus” is an instance of the positive-politeness approach that refrains from psychological resistance through affection and familiarity. Brown and Levinson claim that addressee design can help a benevolent speaker (addresser) manipulate (affect) recipients’ feelings of solidarity. However, this cordiality masks a lie: the attackers use politeness to conceal their darker intentions from everyone. Faustus's "No, Faustus" is a self-imposed FTA, a form of internalised coercion: he threatens his negative face (freedom) by attempting to coerce himself. This demonstrates the shift in manipulation from external coercion to internal regulation: a significant stage in coercive communication, as described by politeness theory. This exploitable 'deceptive intimacy' testifies to the delicate balance between cognitive control and apparent intimacy.

5. Integrated Interpretation

This instance of successful demonic persuasion in Doctor Faustus derives from its mosaic of suppressed evaluative language, intertextual description of religious discourse, socially entrenched standards of aspiration, and positive face-oriented politeness. The devils speak of the oral cavity as attractive or beautiful, and on Faustus’s side, he plays with their language, showing his reduced willpower. It’s a passage that shows how language is the vehicle for the ingestion of untruth and defines, in turn, Faustus’s thinking, his desires, and his eventual fall.

Sample 4: Scene V, Lines 110–115 (p. 14)

The Text: Faustus: “One thing, good servant, let me crave of thee.

T’ appease the lust of my heart’s burning fire.” (Mephistopheles answers that he cannot)

1. Textual Analysis (Fairclough – Level 1)

The word choices – “crave”, “glut”, and “longing” emphasize this deep desire, and testify to Faustus’s increasing submission to passion-controlled knowledge rather than morality-based thinking. Though "crave" implies that we are needy for it, out of control with desire (and then sin), whereas "glut" implies excess and



consumption: corporeal discourses in which sinfulness is appetite. “One thing...let me crave of thee” uses a submissive syntax, as Faustus pleads with Mephistopheles: in so doing, already the spiritual order is inverted; here, man becomes servile to hell. The noun phrase “the heart’s desire” eliminates this longing as a permanent feature of the person, not merely a way of describing his state at a given time. This wording signals the transition in Faustus's discourse from a self-made scholar to being constituted as a linguistic subject of temptation.

2. Discursive Practice (Fairclough – Level 2)

This instant involves common petitionary language, as found in religious prayers and feudal loyalty rituals, at the discourse generation/interpretation stage. Faustus’s style is that of prayer, especially as addressed to God or saints in medieval Christian contexts. This time, the target of this deliberate intertextual reversion is a demon. This economy of discourse reversal is central to understanding how the play presents misdirected desire: Faustus actually assumes a worshipful speech posture, only in relation to the wrong term. Marlowe uses a structure that typifies the ideal of pious awe to disclose tension within Faustus's logic and to show how satanic authority redefines the terms of interpretative judgment. The discursive field is in this way negotiated through an emerging set of values and expectations that Faustus internalizes, “[b]ased on their relative frequency in use” (Fairclough 119).

3. Social Practice (Fairclough – Level 3)

This is an example of early modern anxiety about uncontrolled desire and the decline of spiritual authority. The linguistic makeover of Faustus mirrors the broader Renaissance tension between human ambition and contradictory religious commitment. His petition places desire as the primary structuring principle for activity, corresponding to a humanist celebration of freedom – indeed, naturalising it even as he perverts it into harm. The dominant moral thinking of the day condemned inordinate desire as a prelude to spiritual peril; consequently, Faustus's plea reflects society's fear that ambition unmediated by morality results not in greater freedom but in enslavement. The talk thus offers a cultural reading of Desire as a societally programmed road to decadence.

4. Pragmatic Analysis (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

Faustus employs diplomatically smart tactics to prevent his superimposed favour from showing too much. Words such as “One thing... that urged from thee” play on the demand as a meek, humble demand. Brown and Levinson suggest that a structure of this kind minimizes the apparent potential for threat to the hearer’s freedom of action. The politeness here, relevantly so for that notion of deference to exercise which I have been elaborating, offers Mephistopheles no escape; it paradoxically increases the infringement of Faustus's hard-won autonomy. This polite speech is to detract from God's glory, to commend and rail in respect of the



devil. And in practice, “good servant” is ironic: Faustus doesn’t have mastery, but throws a jokily hierarchical word on top of his need. His idiom, indeed, reflects something of an ideological dialectic: he sounds authoritative, and being polite towards him seems like submission. This paradox suggests the twisted character of demonic power: by proclaiming his victimhood, the possessed is actually taking up a proper Christian position.

5. Integrated Interpretation

This antagonism demonstrates that desire is deployed as a discursive means of self-discipline. Where Faustus talks here about lust and gluttony, he gets the ethical equivalent of rough sex. The employment of intercessions in religions perpetuates canonical spiritual autocracy. The argument sounds a note of Renaissance fear of the corruptibility of ambition. The conclusion of the matter is that Faustus’s own bluntness cuts against him in an ironic turn. These factors together suggest that it is not merely Faustus’s intellect that is shaped by Satanic seduction, but also his words to ideological surrender.

Sample 5: Scene VII, Lines 20–27 (p. 18)

The Text: Mephistopheles: “Des diesem Glanz denkst du unendlich?

I’ll tell thee, Faustus, it is not half so lovely^{cx1.3} As I must here confess my sorceries^{CRAIG cxi.4} This hand of mine^{HALL (cxliv)cxii.1} The feathers and the wings are nothing worth^{ONTHEMAR cxiii.}

*As thou supposest. Think of honor, wealth,
And worldly pleasures. These are real joys.”*

1. Textual Analysis (Fairclough – Level 1)

The rhetoric of this statement by Mephistopheles has been carefully selected, as it seeks to ground a calculated use of evaluative language that turns Faustus’s value system on its head. 43 [THINKEST THOU HEAVEN IS SUCH A GLORIOUS THING?] bu Thomas Hailey 44 lecturer-riturcTbM m is likening to a }(heaven r "H GranantesI2 baggrotted her ta-oie and glrficounts v by rOREIGN VIOLE1TCATIO.V.thcuS5a"ci.:nwllhor(l alEo~l BOLDLYiDn suiTrrJVBQ BY foreign civuedvipwn.by!m. So does the reproduction of his words in this talk, which, for all its familiarity to Faustus, signals a certain reduction or explanation by means of language: The words “not half so fair” are anti-holy and nothing more than a common noun substance. The antithetic triad—“honor, wealth, and the things of sense”—shows material rewards in order to make positive lexical value, thus constituting a solicitous field of meaning “valuable joys.” The chopped-up form, composed of short, emphatic sentences, is the language of rhetoric that is meant to be most effective. Mephistopheles manipulates parallelism and contrast to prioritize worldly pleasures over spiritual satiety. Language, in these choices, acts as a tool of cognitive yard sale, turning transcendence into illusion and material success into reason.



2. Discursive Practice (Fairclough – Level 2)

Manifoldly, the demons' manipulation on this level harnesses familiar genres of persuasive power to the functioning of language, similar to the basic genres linked with political propaganda and commercial rhetoric. The rhetoric of Mephistopheles recontextualises Heaven as overrated and its alleviation of material pleasure, adopting the tactics of advertising: denigrate the competition whilst enhancing the allure of the presented commodity. This is an intricate integration of the intertextuality of Renaissance discourses on themes of humanism, scepticism, and the veracity and authority of religious consternations implicated by the devil. He simply constructs a new interpretive framework, but the difference is that his interpretation of the established truth involves a more trenchant commentary affirming current church teachings with which he simpers, considering the sentiment of the imprecision as plain walls encompassing the human condition. His discourse reconfigures the Settings and anticipations of the codified speech, where the anticipating act is that of Marlow Faustus locked in a chamber, one of the demons, in which sits the teaching as an autonomous morality. Thus, the creation and understanding of language on this leptosomatic are guided by an inversion of the ideological medicament whereby malevolent rhetoric emulates the secular discourse to rearrange the same ideological constructs of innervations and rest.

3. Social Practice (Fairclough – Level 3)

The social dimension thus represents a discursive extension of early modern anxieties about the rise of materialism and fall in spiritual authority. Mephistopheles' praise of "wealth" and "worldly pleasure" mirrors Renaissance skepticism about the church, which was turning away from belief in heaven and hell. Below "the brag," and the jangle of thought in Elizabethan society, where one's material interests were ranged against one's spiritual morality in seeming discord. Preaching is a type of cultural criticism. The devil's argument parodies all-too-human discourses that, in reality, prize profit and ease and freedom over religion. The susceptibility of Faustus to such rhetoric reveals the capacity of language orders to contain and rehabilitate broader ideological transformations.

4. Pragmatic Analysis (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

Mephistopheles demonstrates positive manners to make himself more persuasive and to serve as an incentive for temptation, while remaining reasonable. "Consider, Iacomo," his repudiation – it speaks to Faustus's ambitions and beliefs, provides about. PP strategies manage social distance by seeking common ground among people, B&L argue. In this instance, the means of reduction is manipulation. Mephistopheles, by attaching this want of enjoyment to physical wants under the denomination of "real joys," gives it the character of a civic duty in rational men to look after their own personal pleasure upon practical considerations. This is not to



give a clear and distinct account of it, but by implication, Faustus receives the idea of such a spiritual meal, yet he cannot digest it. Ultimately, it is the fantasy that Heaven is a lie and that nothing in it or about it means anything, relative to what really matters on earth. The willful nature of this decision means that Faustus can segue into his implicit framing of the desire for power as : "Had I as many souls...(types) As there are stars..."

5. Integrated Interpretation

This paragraph demonstrates how demons can employ the devices of literary form, discursive framework, social ideology, and rhetorical vexation to persuade individuals. It's how the devil would have Heaven destroyed in a manner more acceptable to this world, and so doubtless it examines very pretty secular shapes, kicks these up with an attractive variant of Renaissance materialism suffused with a neat polite presumption that coaxes the mind always to return upon itself. Altogether, these strategies add up to such a pleasant way of thinking about meaning that Faustus's religious anxieties sound silly and irrelevant. This is why this essay demonstrates how mean-spirited language transforms Faustus's morals and eventually results in his death.

5. Discussion

The five extracts from Doctor Faustus chosen above exhibit a consistent pattern of diabolical persuasion. By detecting the presence of Fairclough's (2003) three dimensions, we show that brute coercion is not how the devils try to control Faustus, but rather their medium: irony and parody, as well as intertextual references/contentious moral assumptions. There are in their conversation knowledge, ambition, and revenge as well, if not salvation itself , only hopelessly confused and parceled out at the best, or two-faced, a manner by which Faustus' destitution of his own case can never cease to be plagued. Textual analysis reveals the indeterminacy of devilspeak in terms of modalization, assumptive force, euphemism, and metaphor, which undermines Faustus' moral agency; as there is no negative fallout resulting from linguistic play (an instance of figures being used as "linguistic ornament", to borrow Perelman's term), language effectively loses any normative weight.

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory further explains this understanding by highlighting the interpersonal strategies of demonic discourse. In each case, seemingly paradoxically, demons successfully negotiate Faustus's face work — his positive and negative face (face being understood here as the motive behind all human behaviour). They support his positive face by praising him to the skies and presenting him as special, while undermining his negative face by constraining his alternatives, turning up the pressure until he is locked into decisions that are beyond his truly informed consent, and placing deceptive "offers" on the table as if they were fully independent choices. In the course of the tragedy, Faustus becomes



involved in a series of self-inflicted, face-threatening acts by internalising the demon's rhetoric against his autonomy and dignity. In the sixth example, he becomes victim and perpetrator of his linguistic murder by means of patterns of self-erasure rather than self-assertion.

A comparison of the types and quantities of these devils' means reveals the growth of demons as persuaders. He uses positive politeness, flattery, and ideological refraining; in the middle scenes, he reflects by managing expectations through denial of fears and selective knowledge; while, finally, in the later part, he acts coercively, controlling context and interpretation to such a degree that Faustus is unable to tell reality from illusion. Fairclough's social practice approach shows that these exchanges indeed reflect macrocosmic early-modern preoccupations such as humanism, divine authority, and intellectual ambition—demoniac language thus strengthens the current religious episteme by emphasising the dangers of linguistic seduction.

Both theories reveal that Doctor Faustus narrativises deception not only as a superhuman act but also as a scene of discursive practices that cause psychic conflict, identity collapse, and cognitive dissonance. As a set of five, the examples serve to establish that the devils' power is not so much magical as discursive — to change what sentences mean and modify social norms, thereby controlling the interpretive context in which Faustus will make irreversible decisions.

6. Conclusion

1 That which wicked spirits influence in Doctor Faustus for the most part works through word-play, rather than through any great power of devilry*, demonstrating that their potency lies less in causing action than it does creating semantic import, reorientating moral values and influencing how Faustus will interpret his options.

2 Through manipulation, as defined by Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, it becomes clear that textual selections such as presupposition, modal ambiguity, euphemism, omission, and semantic inversion undermine Faustus's understanding of sin, reward, and consequence.

3 Politeness Theory, as outlined by Brown and Levinson, demonstrates the constant manipulation of Faustus's negative/positive face by diabolical characters through compliments, flattery, false comfort, and intentionally vague wording to guide him toward overly autonomous decisions.

4 The five examples show a move from weak to strong persuasion through demonic discourse, as demonic control grows stronger with Faustus's increasing dependence on Mephistopheles's and other devils' factitious readings of reality.

5 The study argues that Faustus gradually internalizes the devils' speeches, ultimately destroying himself, making a habit of self-vacation, and losing the ability to resist or reinterpret the deceptive language in which he is engulfed.



6 Deception and the genre of Doctor Faustus. The findings suggest that deception in Doctor Faustus can be seen as a systematic practice of discourse -a unified linguistic strategy, leading psychological constraints, ideological readjustment, and cognitive illusion: it prescribes not only moral degeneration but also linguistic insufficiency.

• **References:**

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students. Routledge.
- Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in Interaction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cole, S. (2016). The Art of Deception in Early Modern Drama. London: Routledge.
- Culpeper, J. (2001). Language and Characterization: People in Plays and Other Texts. London: Longman.
- Greenblatt, S. (2001). Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leech, G. (2014). The Pragmatics of Politeness and Indirectness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Short, M. (1996). Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context. Harlow: Longman.
- Simpson, P. (2004). Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students. London: Routledge.
- Tannen, D. (2007). Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wootton, D. (2013). Rhetoric, Discourse, and Deception in Renaissance Drama. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.