

CHERYL A. SHELL

The Foe in Sight: Discovering the Enemy in Donne's *Elegie XIX*

COME, Madam, come, all rest my powers defie,
Until I labour, I in labour lie.
The foe oft-times having the foe in sight,
Is tir'd with standing though he never fight.
Off with that girdle, like heavens Zone glittering,
But a far fairer world incompassing.
Unpin that spangled breastplate which you wear,
That th'eyes of busie fooles may be stopt there.
Unlace yourself, for that harmonious chyme,
Tells me from you, that now it is bed time.
Off with that happy busk, which I envie,
That still can be, and still can stand so nigh.
Your gown going off, such beautious state reveals,
As when from flowry meads th'hills shadow steales.
Off with that wyerie Coronet and shew
The haiery Diademe which on you doth grow:
Now off with those shooes, and then safely tread
In this loves hallow'd temple, this soft bed.
In such white robes, heaven's Angels us'd to be
Receaved by men; Thou Angel bringst with thee
A heaven like Mahomets Paradise; and though
Ill spirits walk in white, we easly know,
By this these Angels from an evil sprite,
Those set our hairs, but these our flesh upright.
Licence my roaving hands, and let them go,
Before, behind, between, above, below.
O my America! my new-found-land,
My kingdome, safeliest when with one man'd,
My Myne of precious stones, My Emperie,
How blest am I in this discovering thee!
To enter in these bonds, is to be free;
Then where my hand is set, my seal shall be.

Full nakedness! All joyes are due to thee,
 As souls unbodied, bodies uncloth'd must be.
 To taste whole joyes. Gems which you women use
 Are like Atlanta's balls, cast in mens views,
 That when a fools eye lighteth on a Gem,
 His earthly soul may covet theirs, not them.
 Like pictures, or like books gay coverings made
 For lay-men, are all women thus array'd;
 Themselves are mystick books, which only wee
 (Whom their imputed grace will dignifie)
 Must see reveal'd. Then since that I may know;
 As liberally, as to a Midwife, shew
 Thy self: cast all, yea, this white lynnence hence,
 There is no pennance, much less innocence.
 To teach thee, I am naked first; why than
 What needst thou have more covering then a man.

John Donne wrote many poems about love between men and women; more than a few of these poems suggest the physical as well as the spiritual and emotional pleasures of love—some go so far as to concentrate on bodily joys. Probably the most famous of his poems to celebrate the body is *Elegie XIX, Going to Bed*. “Come, Madam, come” (1), exhorts the speaker of this poem with mild exasperation, addressing a woman who never speaks. As with many of Donne’s love lyrics, we discover that we are audience to a drama in miniature between a man and woman—who are, in this instance, about to make love. But the woman has yet to undress; the man, eager to get on with the business of pleasure, urges her to hurry: “all rest my powers defie, / Until I labour, I in labour lie” (1-2). The anticipation of sexual intercourse (“Until I labour”) leaves him in a kind of suspense as painful as childbirth (“I in labour lie”), from which only his beloved can deliver him. From these first two lines, a reader might conclude that the agony of engorgement has enlarged this speaker’s ability to imagine female experience, but in the next two lines, we see that another, more traditionally male experience is being imagined: “The foe oft-times having the foe in sight, / Is tir’d with standing though he never fight” (3-4). Here the speaker

pictures for us a battlefield, with the battle about to commence. The speaker sees himself as a soldier who peers across the distance at his "foe." All senses heightened, his muscles, nerves ready, he is exhausted, but cannot rest. He is prepared for and wishes the battle.

The scene we are being asked to imagine was familiar to the poem's original readers: young gentlemen, aspiring courtiers, most of them had been volunteers at one time or another in Queen Elizabeth's military services. Such gentlemen had seen firsthand battlefields like the one the speaker alludes to, and some may have even stood facing a foe, contemplating the possibilities and anticipating the moment, imminent, when he would hear the first shot. England was ostensibly at peace during Elizabeth's reign, but in the latter part of the sixteenth century the Queen saw the advantages of helping the Netherlands resist a Spanish invasion; many gentlemen (the young John Donne among them) signed up for those campaigns in the Low Countries, hoping to prove their worth as soldiers and improve their chances for court preferment.¹ Furthermore, many gentlemen wrote up such adventures abroad, their accounts published for the information and enjoyment of patriotic readers at home. One such account—a pamphlet entitled *A Briefe Report of the Militarie Services done in the Low Countries, by the Erle of Leicester: written by one that served in good place there in a letter to a friend of his*—was published in London in 1587. Probably written by noted mathematician and military strategist Thomas Digges, the work provides a chronicle of the Earl of Leicester's actions while commander in chief of a two-year expedition to the Netherlands. Digges, who served under the Earl as muster-master general of the English forces (Rosenberg 282-285), describes, along with other events, one of the last battles of the expedition: the four-day siege and capture of the Spanish-controlled town of Duisbourge. Here, in part, is his story of the final assault:

The ordenance being ten peeces plated [boomed] on Friday the second of September [1586], from the breake of day till two in the afternoone, his Excellencie being continually hard by them in the trenches, and had made

two breaches reasonable assaultable, but yet so filled up againe by those within . . . that the assault was difficult . . . But such was the courage of our men of all nations, that without further batterie, they extorted with great importunitie from his Excellencie being in the trenches, a resolution for a present assault . . . They forthwith ordered their squadrons accordingly, with so generall courage and joy, as was marvellous to behold, and did indeede daunt the enimie more (as themselves afterwarde confessed) than any thing else that was done . . . The squadrons standing at the water side readie to passe to the assault, the enimies within having hither to valiantly and soldierlike carried themselves, and now laboring to repaire the breaches, and standing in armes to receive us, yet seeing presently before their eies their owne imminent danger, & especially mooved with there solution of our people, they offered first an accord upon conditions, which his Exellencie refused, and thereupon they yeilded simplie, with grant of life to the common soldier onely.²

This account of the siege and surrender of Duisbource is probably at least partly fabricated; according to Eleanor Rosenberg in her biography of Leicester, the Earl was in need of defense “against the charge of mismanagement” of the expedition, a defense Digges, grateful for Leicester’s patronage, was eager to supply (284-5). But to make the Earl look good, Digges had to make the men under his command look good as well; the soldiers had to appear courageous, resolute, happy to be in battle, happy to be serving Leicester. The facts may have been quite different: Sir Roger Williams, serving as a captain in an earlier Netherlands campaign, could barely cope with soldiers in his company whose morale was low due to the English government’s chronic neglect. As John X. Evans relates in his introduction to Sir Roger’s works: “As usual, the English companies had gone without pay since their arrival, and their officers were having great difficulties trying to feed them and prevent their mutiny” (xx). This was in 1582; although field conditions for the volunteers to the Low Countries

could have improved by 1586, it is likely they had not. Thus Leicester's soldiers may have been hungry and angry and close to mutiny like their counterparts in earlier campaigns, and such soldiers are not apt to show "so generall courage and joy," nor the kind of "resolution" that would make enemy soldiers give up without a fight.

But if the picture of the English-led forces is less than accurate in Digges' account, then so is the picture of the Spaniards: enemies who "valiantly and soldierlike carried themselves," but who also chose to surrender before the assault could begin, fearful of "their owne imminent danger, & especially mooved with the resolution" of the English. Although it may seem to modern readers that the Spanish soldiers acted rationally in surrendering before any of them (the common soldiers, at least) could be killed, to Elizabethan readers, Digges' enemy soldiers, by showing fear in the face of battle, acted like "typical" Spaniards. Sir Roger Williams writes in *A Briefe discourse of Warre* (published in 1590): "What makes the Spaniards discipline to be so famous as it is? their good order; otherwise it is well knowne, the Nation is the basest and cowardlie sort of people of most others" (12). Other authors were less charitable when speaking of the enemy. In *A Briefe Discourse of the Spanish State*, also published in 1590, Edward Daunce states his purpose in writing:

I have thought good for the benefit of her Majesties subjectes, (some of them having vaine imaginations of the Spaniards excellent giftes and greatnesse) to drawe the lineaments of their Empire and good nature, by which it may appeare howe monstrous the proportion of both is, which they would should seeme most exquisit and comely to all men. (2)

Daunce then presents the "truth" about the Spanish people; not only are they cowardly, he says, but they are also merciless, greedy, barbaric, demonic, lawless, violent, crafty, deceitful, and bestial. His conclusions about the enemy are supported (he believes) by logic and evidence in the form of historical and contemporary examples, examples similar to the one Thomas

Digges gives us in his *Briefe Report*. Though billed as factual account, the story of the siege of Duisbource is nonetheless a dramatic tale of the courageous, joyful and determined English fighting the disciplined, but base and cowardly Spanish; it is not hard to see *Briefe Report* as historical fiction. Neither is it hard to see this battle in the Netherlands as similar to the battle about to begin in Donne's *Elegie XIX*. In the case of the poem, however, the enemy is not a Spanish battalion, but a woman, and the territory to be taken not a walled town, but the woman's "self" (45). She is the foe who is "in sight"; she is the enemy "standing in armes to receive" (Digges) the amorous assault of the speaker, her lover, *her* "foe."

When the speaker of *Elegie XIX* addresses his lady in the poem's opening line ("Come, Madam, come, all rest my powers defie"), he alludes not only to the lovemaking, but to the war that is about to take place. Because we know this poem to be about "Going to Bed," we understand immediately that by "powers" the speaker means here physical powers, sexual potency; yet for the same reason we might miss a less obvious meaning of the word also operating in this context. According to the *Compact Oxford English Dictionary*, "powers" in Donne's time meant "A body of armed men; a fighting force" (II, 2263). Thus the speaker may be hurrying his lover to battle as well as to bed with these words. We can imagine them: two commanders, negotiating in the neutral territory between the battlelines. He is finding it difficult to keep his military forces under control, he warns her. His forces defy his orders to rest, to await a peaceful solution. Despite the threat of death, the forces are eager, and being English, resolute; they cannot be held off much longer. Will she now consider terms for surrender?

That John Donne would create a battle scene and portray lovers as foes to dramatize the anticipation of lovemaking may seem at first glance odd. Yet love and war have been figurative partners for centuries, the "battle of the sexes" a frequently used trope in literature. In fact, in his recent study of Donne's *Elegie XIX*, Thomas M. Greene goes so far as to call it a "cliché" (133). But Greene also believes that the "metaphor of military conflict" helps to express the "potential ambivalence in the male-female

opposition"; he implies that our experiences as men and women tell us that relations between the sexes, even those glorified in the most idealistic of love poems, are often far from harmonious, and at times even hostile (133). Yet while relationships between men and women can be discordant, why has a metaphor as strong as *combat* persisted? Greene seems uninterested in this question, dismissing it quickly in the midst of explaining what he calls the poem's "oppositional presence," a presence, he says, that the poem constructs to aid the "emergent textual self"—that is, "an inchoate self, an unformed, indefinite subject, to formulate itself into being, into coherent selfhood" (129). By opposing this created other in the poem, the self, argues Greene, "comes into focus. . . . From this engagement the inchoate self defines, enlarges, affirms itself, utters desires and fears which acquire reality from their utterance (Lacan)" (130). Greene goes on to inform us that for English Renaissance poets, the oppositional presence "was very commonly embodied, for male poets, by a woman" (132). Based in Freudian psychology, Greene's theory explains a process he sees occurring in poetry; but the construction of the oppositional presence seems very much like the process of enemy-making described by Sam Keen in his study of war propaganda, *Faces of the Enemy: Reflections of the Hostile Imagination*.

From his analysis of hundreds of images of enemies disseminated by all sides during a variety of wars, Keen concludes that humans have a need to see and thus to create monstrous enemies—enemies who are irrational, vicious, greedy, devouring, horrifying, bestial, evil. We create our enemies as monsters, says Keen, so we can fight and kill—or capture and enslave—a creature instead of the real person he or she is, a person more like ourselves than we want to admit, a person with a family, friends, a home, hopes for the future. By inventing "dehumanizing stereotypes" of opponents and presenting them in propaganda as truth, we can continue to wage war against other people (24). These dehumanizing stereotypes Keen terms "archetypes of the enemy" (13); he lists and describes them in his book, pointing to their use in propaganda of the major wars of this century. But we can also see Keen's archetypes operating in the past; nearly all are at work in the portrait of the Spanish enemy Edward Daunce draws for

Elizabethan readers in his *Briefe Discourse of the Spanish State*.³ Ironically, many of Daunce's examples of "monstrous" Spaniards derive from Spanish colonization of the West Indies; Daunce accuses the Spanish of extreme cruelty to the native peoples of America, "a people very tractable, if they had found good maisters, and such as had skill of honestie" (20). No doubt information about "naked *Indians*" (20) was available to Daunce through such accounts as Thomas Hariot's *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia*, published in London in 1588. Though not specifically mentioned in Daunce's book, English treatment of the Indians must have seemed to Elizabethan readers virtuous, directed solely toward the greater enlargement of Christianity, compared, as it was, to the "barbarous inhumanitie" of the Spanish, who wanted only to steal gold, "for had their intention bene to have learned those simple soules the true knowledge of God, (as they made shewe at the first by erecting in some regions diverse Bishoprickes and schooles) they would either have continued that order, or have bin conversant with them in all mildnesse and humanitie" (21). Rather than admit to their own cruel treatment of the indigenous peoples of America who were preventing the English from exploiting the wealth of the "new found land" (wealth Hariot very thoroughly inventories for his employers), the English colonizers accused the Spanish of doing far worse, and for ignoble reasons as well. Keen names this practice (termed "projection" by Freudian psychology) one of the causes of enemy-making:

We are driven to fabricate an enemy as a scapegoat to bear the burden of our denied enmity. From the unconscious residue of our hostility we create a target; from our private demons, we conjure a public enemy. And perhaps, more than anything else, the wars we engage in are compulsive rituals, shadow dramas in which we continually try to kill those parts of ourselves we deny and despise. (11)

The process Thomas Greene sees occurring in Donne's *Elegie XIX*—that of creating an "oppositional presence" (129), which by

helping the self to voice “desires and fears” (130) helps that self to become realized—is much like creating an enemy to “bear the burden of our denied enmity,” and by so doing to invent a purer, less despicable self. By making the Spanish colonizers look greedy and evil, the English colonizers of America make themselves look the opposite—that is, generous and good. By the same token, the speaker in *Elegie XIX*, a man, creates a self by first creating his opposite, a woman. Yet while Greene seems to want us to see this process of creation as positive and healthy, as self-affirming (or at least as non-negative or neutral), he fails to explain the hostility strongly implied in the metaphor of woman as enemy soldier. To say someone is facing you, or even opposed to you is not the same as saying she is your enemy. The word “foe” brings with it deep, powerful emotions; the fact that it is a familiar word in conjunction with love—a “cliché”—makes it no less loaded. What Greene assumes here—that woman is naturally man’s enemy, even when she is his lover—should be questioned. What do sex and war really have in common? Why is the woman in Donne’s *Elegie XIX* constructed not as a facing presence, a harmless opposite, but as a hostile opponent, an *enemy*?

She is here so constructed, I believe, because as enemy she can provide not just an opposing other (against which to construct a self), but a *monstrous* other, an opposite who is not only different but dangerously different: irrational, ruthless, greedy, evil. Moreover, she is a monstrous other not just to provide the good guys with bad guys to fight (and thereby increase their goodness), but to give them a *reason* to fight. We normally have little desire to hurt or kill or enslave people whom we see as like us, people with whom we would normally agree, people with whom we might easily join forces, possessions, bodies. Despite how much our foes may resemble our private demons, we do not, even when we are in the most extreme throes of nationalistic fervor, create enemies out of the blue; usually those we eventually designate as enemies start out as other people, sharing space with us on the planet, and by happenstance competing with us for some good: something we want to get, or something we have and want to keep, and ultimately, something we would like to control. That something could be as tangible as oil, or as intangible as freedom, but the

important point is that to get or keep whatever we want, we have to win the competition for it. And winning means not having to share control unless we so choose. Transforming competitors into monstrous enemies and competitions into wars makes it easier and more justifiable to win and to make corpses or captives out of competitors who lose.

A woman, created as enemy of man, takes on the characteristics of all enemies, of archetypal enemies, and she becomes an other who is more than just an "oppositional presence," but an opponent who can never be trusted, no matter how thoroughly vanquished or reformed, who can never be allowed to acquire power, who like a wild, man-eating animal must be tamed, caged or destroyed. Thus it may not be, as Greene suggests, the naturally occurring ambivalence, the shadow of war between men and women which gives rise to the "metaphor of military conflict" we find in Donne's *Elegie XIX*; it may be, rather, the metaphor which gives rise to the shadow. Is it the construction of woman as man's enemy that allows the construction of man as woman's conquerer in this love poem, and creates the darkness we perceive behind its cheerfully erotic tone? The ideal end to the war between the sexes, as with any war, is the seizure of power: to the victor belong the spoils. The spoils—that is, the valued goods of the vanquished—come under the complete and exclusive control of the victor.

Women have always possessed or have at least controlled access to certain goods thought valuable to societies: sexual partnership and the bearing of legitimate children were thought by Elizabethan men to be especially valuable commodities. If women were to have exclusive control of such goods, they could give or withhold them as they wished; they could eliminate men from the picture, take over society, set up a new world (an Amazon-like country, perhaps) where women would have all the power and men would be drones. But in Elizabethan times such was unlikely to happen, since men had almost total control of women's bodies; it was only necessary to maintain that control to keep women from retrieving any (or all) of it, and turning society upside down. One way men successfully maintained control was through laws, especially the laws that governed marriage. But even marriage was no guarantee:

women were always finding ways of sliding out from under men's control—having sex with other men, bearing other men's bastards—despite the sometimes severe penalties for doing so. To keep the number of unruly women small, men employed additional means of control. One of the most effective was the power of language, of imagery, power males had possessed for centuries. Creating stereotypes of women as flawed creatures, not quite as rational or moral or even as human as men, helped to make oppressing them easier and more justifiable.⁴ Printing the propaganda that pictured women as archetypal enemies helped to keep women and their valued goods under male control.

But it is possible that Donne was not thinking of keeping women and their treasures under his control when he decided to present a bedroom as a battleground in *Elegie XIX*; perhaps he failed to see his poem as propaganda against women, against an enemy in the war between the sexes. After all, once the speaker introduces the “fight” (4), he seems to leave thoughts of combat behind, focusing instead on praise of the woman as she disrobes. But in some way this woman who never speaks, who spends the remainder of the poem removing her garments, remains the enemy we have met in the first four lines—the one the speaker creates, the one he has asked us to imagine, “in sight” on the other side of the battlefield, armed for the conflict about to take place. She is the enemy who perhaps sees, like the Spaniards at Duisbourg, her “owne imminent danger” and who is “especially mooved with the resolution” of her lover, her foe; consequently, before he launches what promises to be a successful assault on her body, she agrees to “yeeld” to his terms for surrender.

This tactic of persuading the enemy to give up before the battle begins was seen by some Renaissance military strategists as shrewd: according to one such writer,

“that Generall is more to bee accounted of, and esteemed, which knoweth how to overcome with policy, wisdome, strategems, and prudence, then with dint of sword and rigour of weapons. . . prudence and patience, and not pride and rashnesse, do produce good and happy events in warre . . .” (Barret 174)

The Duisbource defenders were certainly persuaded rather than forced to see things the Earl's way, a result that was, according to Digges, "happily atchiued without losse." The fact that the speaker of *Elegie XIX* negotiates with his lover instead of assaulting her, attests to his discipline as a soldier—given his clear physical superiority—and to his skill and prudence as a commander. But it also attests to the "powers" of his foe. She is not simply a weak victim, an easy target; she is important, strong, dangerous. She has the ability to resist an all-out attack, to force his "powers" to fall back, perhaps even to give up and search for another target. By risking a forceful attack on such an opponent, the speaker stands to lose everything he hopes to achieve. And what he hopes to achieve, I believe, is more than just sexual conquest; he seeks full conquest of his enemy: to place all her territories, her present and future treasures, and her body under his control. In other words, he wants to make her his wife. Although sexual conquest is but the first step in that process, it is the most important one, because it makes all subsequent steps legal. So the speaker negotiates with care, using "prudence and patience, and not pride and rashnesse" to bring about the "happy event" he desires: that his enemy will surrender her body, her self to him. But before she can do that she must first be persuaded to disarm—to take off her clothes.

The negotiations for the removal of clothing are lengthy and complex; each piece must be discussed separately. The woman's garments are more than just the feminine finery of a middle-class woman, they represent the power, the possessions, the self she is relinquishing. "Off with that girdle, like heavens Zone glittering" (5-6), demands the speaker, and the first garment is removed. The term girdle, in addition to referring to the belt commonly worn around the waist to secure the garments (and euphemistically, a woman's chastity), also denoted a belt used for carrying a weapon (*Compact OED* I.1145). Thus when Mistress Foe lays down her girdle, she is also perhaps laying down her sword. "[L]ike heavens Zone glittering" (5), but also like castle walls, this girdle contains—and protects—"a far fairer world" (6) of treasure that will soon be open for the speaker's taking, especially when the principal piece of protection comes off: "Unpin that spangled

breastplate which you wear, / That th'eyes of busie fooles may be stopt there" (7-8). According to the *OED*, a breastplate is "A piece of armour for protecting the breast; also, any plate worn on the breast" (I, 270). Obviously in the poem the speaker refers to the woman's bodice, decorated with metal spangles, but the allusion to a soldier's armor cannot be ignored. This plate of richly decorated armor proclaiming the wearer's status and hinting at her treasures protects the woman's breasts from the pierce of men's eyes. It also protects her heart, her self. When she removes her breastplate, the woman leaves her self (and all that self controls) open to plunder.

More clothing is removed, more pieces of the woman are inventoried. To keep things moving, the speaker offers compliments and cheerful encouragement in exchange for garments: unlacing produces a "harmonious chyme"; removing the "happy busk" garners "envie"; but the "gown going off" produces two lines of praise. With each item, more of the woman's power is revealed, the power she is in the process of relinquishing. She wears a crown-like "wyerie Coronet" (15) and reigns over a realm of pleasure, a realm you would expect an immoral enemy to control: "A heaven like Mahomets Paradise" (21). And it is a realm the speaker asks her for legal permission—a marriage contract—to explore: "Licence my roaving hands, and let them go, / Before, behind, between, above, below" (25-26). Yet like the colonizers of the new world (both Spanish and English), it is clear he already sees himself as owner of her territory, complete with all its treasures:

O my America! my new-found-land,
My kingdome, safliest when with one man man'd,
My Myne of precious stones, My Emperie,
How blest am I in this discovering thee! (27-30)

Because she is camouflaged with "Gems" (35) and "gay coverings" (39) to hide her most deeply hidden treasures, her "mystick" self that he "Must see reveal'd" (43), she must "cast all, yea, this white lynnence hence" (45). The linen is the symbol of her innocence, her maidenhood. It is the last and most important garment to be given up, and the last and most important part of her

power. As his “kingdome” she will be “safliest,” for him and the rest of society, when she is conquered and captured, “man’d” by her “one man,” her husband, her conquerer. To “man” meant “To furnish (a fort, ship, etc.) with a force or company of men to serve or defend it,” but it also meant “To supply with inhabitants; to people” (*Compact OED* I. 1710). So the speaker’s effort to take over his lover’s body (to serve or defend it) is also an effort to fill it with men, that is, male children. “Then since that I may know;” declares the speaker, “As liberally, as to a Midwife, shew / Thy self” (43-45), and we see that he means to fulfill his desire, expressed in the beginning of the poem (“Until I labour, I in labour lie” [2], that is to “labour” or to plough her fields, to impregnate her, completing her captivity and his ownership of her and all her possessions, including the children she bears.

While the woman is being stripped piece by piece of her power, her possessions, she is also making a show of those possessions. The spoils of war are piling up; the trophies of conquest for the conquerer are being inventoried. And as the woman’s self is being diminished, the man’s self is being enlarged. Her power, her riches, her innocence, are making him into a great man, a powerful man who will now control her territory, her goods as well as his own. At the end of the poem, the man reveals that he has stripped himself as well, but in his nakedness he is completely armed, his battle about to be won. When she is completely naked, completely dis-covered, she will have him for a covering: “What needst thou have more covering then a man” (48). But that covering, his physical, financial and legal protection, is all she will have. “To enter in these bonds, is to be free” (31), says the speaker, but while the bonds of matrimony give him the freedom to go about his business, knowing his wife is safely at home, the only freedom she can count on is the freedom from having freedom. “Then where my hand is set, my seal shall be” (32): once he sets his “seal” on her body, she is labeled his property, “sealed” against foreign invaders. Conquered, confined, and “man’d,” she will contain the children who will insure her continued confinement, her continued status as possession, as conquest, as enemy. As long as she is created as archetypal enemy in love poems like Donne’s *Elegie XIX*, as long as she is the target of propaganda for the war

between the sexes, woman will continue to be treated like the monstrous other, as the rich spoils of war who can be captured, exploited and even enslaved but who will never be worthy of trust, never really be transformed or tamed. She will remain dangerous, antagonistic, immoral, and along with yielding her treasure she will continue to produce her conquerer's justifiable response: surveillance, restraint, confinement. As an archetypal foe to man, woman must forever remain "in sight." □

Notes

1. See R. C. Bald's biography, *John Donne, A Life*, for information about Donne's military service.

2. For this and subsequent quotations from facsimile texts, I have modernized the spelling only insofar as I have used the modern "s," and have changed the "u" to "v" and vice versa where necessary.

3. Following are some comparisons of Keen's archetypes with Daunce's descriptions of Spaniards:

The Enemy as Barbarian: [T]he archetypal enemy will be perceived as atheist and barbarian, a denier of God and the destroyer of culture. He will be portrayed as rude, crude, and uncivilized. More than likely he will be an irrational, dirty member of a horde organized at best on the model of the ant heap. (Keen 43)

This my self can say, that I have knowen fiteene hundred *Biscaies* (which people *Florus* nameth the chivalrie of *Spaine*) at their first landing in *Antwarpe* to be men contemptible of person, filthy in apparell, and rude in behaviour . . . (Daunce 34)

The Greedy Enemy: The enemy is insatiable, has no sense of proper limits or legitimate boundaries. He opens his gullet, swallows his neighbors, and becomes bloated with the spoils of conquest. (Keen 48)

. . . the avarice of that people, being, by meane thereof, made insatiable; their policie to inlarge their empire cruel, their later proceedings & resolutions terrible; & their embleme of a horse (alluding to the name of their king and his ambition) standing on his hinder legges upon the globe of the whole earth, his former partes advanced as though he would leape from thence, with this written scroll in his mouth, *Non sufficit orbis*,) proude & not contained in order . . . (Daunce 41-42)

The Enemy as Criminal: They are criminals, outlaws. They are liars, cheaters, thieves, and opportunists who break treaties whenever it is to their advantage. (Keen 51)

This fault of avarice is no lesse peculiar to the *Spaniards* than theft: both issuing from one fountaine . . . Touching their covetousnesse, it partly appeareth in fraudulent shifting their creditors: partly by their ravenous desire to oppresse all parts, and partly by offending against the affections and dignitie of parents. . . yet have the *Spaniards* (as men tied to no rule) not onely murdered

Ambassadors passing their countrie . . . but also have killed some
sent to themselves . . . (Daunce 6, 24)

4. Much of the information regarding women's place in early modern English society that I summarize here comes from a number of works on women's history. Many of those works are cited by Joy Wiltenburg in her recently published book, *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany*. In this study Wiltenburg deals with imagery in popular literature of women as disorderly, and "addresses the issue of control under male dominance by examining expressions of the cultural conviction that women were out of control" (3). Her ideas regarding men's control of women through their control of imagery contributed to and reinforced the ideas I present in this essay.

Works Cited

- Bald, R.C. *John Donne: A Life*. New York: Oxford UP, 1970.
- Barret, Robert. *The Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres*. New York: DaCapo, 1969.
- The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1971.
- Daunce, Edward. *A Briefe Discourse of the Spanish State*. New York: Da Capo, 1968.
- Digges, Thomas (T.D.). *A Briefe Report of The Militarie Services Done in the Low Countries*. New York: Da Capo, 1969.
- Donne, John. *The Poems of John Donne*. Vol. 1. Herbert J. C. Grierson, M.A., ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1912.
- Evans, John X., ed. *The Works of Sir Roger Williams*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972.
- Greene, Thomas M. "The Poetics of Discovery: A Reading of Donne's Elegy 19." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 2.2 (1989): 129-143.
- Harriot, Thomas. *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia*. New York: Da Capo, 1971.
- Keen, Sam. *Faces of the Enemy: Reflections of the Hostile Imagination*. San Francisco: Harper, 1986.
- Rosenberg, Eleanor. *Leicester: Patron of Letters*. New York: Columbia UP, 1955.
- Williams, Sir Roger. *The Works of Sir Roger Williams*. John X. Evans, ed. Oxford UP, 1972.
- Wiltenburg, Joy. *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany*. Charlottesville and London: UP of Virginia, 1992.