

3L: *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies* – Vol 23(1): 14 – 26
<http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2017-2302-02>

John Donne's Metaphors of Self and Empire: A Cognitive Analysis

ZOHREH SOHRABI

University of Isfahan
 The Islamic Republic of Iran
 Sohrabi.555@gmail.com

HOSSEIN PIRNAJMUDDIN

University of Isfahan
 The Islamic Republic of Iran

ABSTRACT

Donne's strategies to win the authority of the 'domain' of love in his poetry are attempts to claim a personal domain for himself. This essay focuses on this personal domain in order to analyse the concept of self in Donne's poetry. Lakoff and Johnson's discussion about the basic metaphors embedded in our childhood by which we conceptualise the notion of self presents the cognitive bases of Donne's different metaphors of self. Significantly, as a poet of late Renaissance, Donne's metaphors have close association with imperial and colonial patterns. Combining insights from cognitive poetics and Edward Said's views about culture and imperialism, the writers try to look into the way the poet uses these metaphors to fashion a sense of communal/national identity. The essay will further focus on the multiple representations of self in Donne's poetry and the paradoxical signification of his identity.

Keywords: John Donne; cognitive poetics; metaphor; self; empire; Renaissance; colonial discourse

INTRODUCTION

The poetry of John Donne, a great late-Renaissance poet, is the product of the epoch's emergent imperialism and colonisation. In many of his love poems, Donne defines himself as having power over his beloved, addressing her as his 'empery' or 'America'. John Donne is preoccupied with the question of 'domain' as an imperial pattern of his age. The lover in his poetry claims a personal domain for himself. These metaphors of domain can further reveal how this imperial pattern constructs the identity of the poet. For, as Thomas Docherty (1986) argues, most twentieth-century criticism is attracted to "a real presence", "a self-presentation" of Donne (p. 4). He quotes J.E.V. Crofts in this regard:

Just because [Donne] is so conscious of himself we are aware of him – the man speaking – in a manner and to a degree hardly to be paralleled in our reading of lyric poetry. Every line is resonant with his voice; every line seems to bear the stamp of his peculiar personality. And this impression is not something which we fancy or invent for ourselves. It is deliberately forced upon us ... His personality, or the idea that he contrives to give us of it, is a necessary part of his instrument as a writer. (p. 4)

Docherty states that there is a binary of 'Self' and 'Other' in Donne's poetry, and that Donne configures his self in relation to the Other (Docherty 1986, p. 52). Thus, the metaphors he uses to describe his beloved can reflect the ways he defines himself.

The question of self and other in Donne's poetry is in line with Edward Said's argument about the relationship between the Occident and the Orient, the latter as an Other for the former, hence the figurations of the Orient in Donne's poetry. As the originator of colonial discourse theory, Said further states that in literary works we can see the parallel between the representation of domestic home space and the colonial space (Said 1993, pp. 89-90). Also, Donne's carving up of a domain for the self is of course in line with Stephen Greenblatt's (1980) idea of 'self-fashioning' in the Renaissance which is mainly achieved through

submission to or defiance/critique of power/authority. In the present paper, however, we will focus on a cognitive reading of metaphors of self and empire.

Cognitive poetics has a revolutionary view towards metaphor. In *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), Lakoff and Johnson claim that metaphor is not a matter of mere language, but on the contrary, our thinking mechanism is metaphorical (p. 3). There is a large number of ‘conceptual metaphors’ – for instance, HIGH STATUS IS UP and LOW STATUS IS DOWN – underlying many of our daily expressions, metaphors which are embedded in our physical experiences (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, p. 16). Cognitive poetics claims that human mind is ‘embodied’, that is, perception or linguistic expressions are embedded in our biological circumstances (Stockwell 2005, p. 4). The role of metaphor is also associated with what David Punter, using the theories of Althusser concerning the power of language over us, states: we are “interpellated” through metaphors (Ghaeli 2016, p. 73).

Among the metaphors necessary to understand the notion of self are the ‘container metaphor’ – by which we conceptualise ourselves as containers (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, p. 29) – and The Subject-Self Metaphor, – which holds that every person is divided and has in him/herself a Subject and one or more Selves (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 269). Through these metaphors, we can uncover Donne's different witty metaphors for his identity, as well as the lovers and the bond between them which will reveal an array of meanings regarding the political patterns of the age.

DOMAIN OF SELF

To analyse Donne's concept of self in light of cognition, first we should note that the self, just like the domain of love in his poetry, is conceptualised as a closed space. This is based on the ‘container metaphor’. We conceptualise the mind itself as a container when, seeing it as a “body”, we talk of “grasping ideas” or “swallowing a claim”, since, bodies are conceptualised as containers (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 235). Here we deal with the ‘I’ of John Donne (the speaker-poet) which is a container separating Donne's self from the world outside. The self, or the world inside, is, in fact, Donne's personal domain which marks the boundary between Donne and his surrounding world.

What strengthens the importance of self-boundary in Donne's poetry is his belief in a “humoural philosophy governing the living body” that “undercuts the possibility of a stable self” (Horn 2010, p. 369). Quoting Nancy Selleck, Horn mentions that the humoural body is “ever newly made up of its physical context, which it takes in and converts to itself”, and is engaged in an “ongoing process of being remade by what it consumes and digests”, and in this process “the boundaries between this rather porous body and its environment never stabilize” (p. 369). In addition, Horn continues, the existence of the soul depends actually on the conditions of the humors. Horn also quotes Edward W. Taylor who has worked on Donne's *Anniversary* in this regard

the humours begin their work in the liver as natural spirits, are refined in the heart to become vital spirits', and in moving to the brain, are 'transmuted into intellectual or animal (*anima*, "soul") spirits', some of which remain in the brain 'to support the operations of the *sensus communis*, the imagination, the memory, and the intellect.

(p. 370)

Thus, Donne's imagining a personal domain for himself in his poetry can be seen as a strategy to overcome the problem of the unstable boundaries of his self. This is most obvious when in his *Hymn to God my God, in My Sickness* Donne describes his body as the whole world:

Whilst my physicians by their love are grown
Cosmographers, and I their map, who lie
Flat on this bed, (lines 7-9)

By identifying himself as the world portrayed on maps, Donne overcomes the problem of unsure boundaries by imagining some specific boundary for himself. He overcomes this problem in yet another way: by eliminating the boundaries altogether. He imagines his personal domain as vast as the world, and brings the world under his dominion. Metaphorically, then, Donne takes hold of the world outside in order to define the boundary of his self. The personal domain functions not only to separate Donne from the world, but to secure him a safe niche.

Donne's seeking a secure place is highly associated with his view of human society. As Guibbory (1993) argues, Donne talks of the degeneration of the late-sixteenth century society in his Satires, dealing with frivolous, materialistic values of his society; the legal system; religious institutions; the court and courtiers; and the judicial system and structure of rewards in late Elizabethan England. In these poems Donne demonstrates his tendency to be isolated from the society, showing himself as its lone critic; He also expresses his opposition to the political establishment of his society both in his Elegies and Songs and Sonnets; His Satires, however, show “contrary impulses”, both “outrage” at and “attraction” to the society (p. 131). As Guibbory explains, the speaker in “Satire 3”, surveying different Christian churches and not choosing any of them, desires both to be in the society to have a secure place, and to be apart from the society (p. 132).

To be noted here is that Donne in a verse letter to Wotton, advising him to be aloof from the community (like a snail which always has its home with itself), describes his mind as his kingdom (Winkelman 2013, p. 32): “Be thou thine owne home, and in thy selfe duell” and “Be thine owne Palace, or the world's thy gaile”. Winkelman states that the “homely snail here supplies a model for Stoicism, popular during times of perceived immorality, injustice, misfortune, and decadence (i.e. always)”; Thus, Donne has used what Marcus Aurelius, a founder of this school, asserts in his Meditations: “Nowhere can man find a quieter or more untroubled retreat than his own soul” (Winkelman 2013, p. 32).

Exploring Donne's conception of self requires uncovering his conception of the Other. The Other, as Docherty maintains, is the “circumambient environment” containing time and space which is “historically and geographically inhabited” over which Donne struggles to have authority. This “Other of his imagination” is “most frequently characterised as woman” (1986 p. 52). The Other, just like the Self discussed above, can be understood as a container. Docherty states that many critics believe that, for Donne, the Other is like an “empty space” into which he pours himself to shape it after his own image:

Faced with the threat of dissolution of even attack at the hands of the (ideologically imagined) woman, locus of promiscuity, Donne does not retreat; rather he embraces the threat (the woman) and moreover assimilates or appropriates it as his own. The Other, as threat, is domesticated and converted into an aspect of the Self and thus rendered harmless, "colonized," or appropriated and controlled. (p. 52)

This is manifested in *A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning*, where the speaker expands his Self (by expanding the circle) to cover greater spaces; This is “a process of inhabiting, or the appropriative colonisation of that space,” and is a strategy to neutralise the threat of the Other by “assimilating it entirely under the Self”; Donne, in fact, “identifies” the “alien space” as himself (Docherty 1986, p. 76). We can also see this process in *Going to Bed* where the lover identifies himself with the king and his mistress as his “America” which is an alien space – known as Other for the English – domesticated and colonised by him (Docherty 1986, p. 78), or in *The Sun Rising* where the lover is the king and the beloved ‘all states’. We

also realise, according to Nersessova's psychogeographical views, how the “residents's self-perception is defined” by the place “as they in turn help define the spaces they inhabit” (qtd. in Lalbakhsh & Torkamaneh 2016, p. 145).

A similar relationship between Self and Other can be seen when Donne describes his mistress as bringing with her “Mahomet's paradise”:

In such white robes heaven's angels used to be
Received by men; thou angel bring'st with thee
A heaven like Mahomet's paradise; (*Going to Bed*, lines 19-21)

Woman is described as peculiarly affiliated with Islam which was considered by the Europeans as a “threat” (Schmuck 2010, p. 543). In fact, Elizabethan and early Stuart cultural products were deeply concerned with images of Muslims who were characterised as a non-Christian ‘Other’ and “all that an Englishman and a Christian was not” (Matar, qtd. In Singh 2009, pp. 6-7). Donne describes woman – an Other for him – as related to Islam, itself an Other for Europe. By doing so, Donne can encompass the latter Other, since firstly, he shrinks it into the body of his mistress, and secondly, he can encompass it, that is, take it into his arms.

A similar difference of self and non-self is put forth by Said. According to Saidian theory, the very description of the woman as the Muslims' paradise in Donne's poem is embedded in Europe's view of Muslims as sensual which is the way the West has known the East for centuries, from Dante's *Divine Comedy* and *Inferno* to Flaubert's novels (Said 1977, pp. 68-9). In the discourse of orientalism, we are always confronted with “the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, 'us') and the strange (the Orient, the East, 'them')” (Said 1977, p. 43). “A line is drawn between two continents. Europe is powerful and articulate; Asia is defeated and distant,” Said says (1977, p. 57). The impingement of orientalist discourse is evident in the representation of the woman as an Other associable with the Islamic Orient, as embodying sensuality and difference.

THE COGNITIVE SELF

Thus, Donne defines his Self in relation to his mistresses in his poetry. Any cognitive discussion of the self is strongly associated with what Lakoff and Johnson (1999) call the “General Subject-Self Metaphor” which divides a person into a Subject and one or more Selves. “The Subject is that aspect of a person that is the experiencing consciousness and the locus of reason, will, and judgment, which, by its nature, exists only in the present”. And the self “includes the body, social roles, past states, and actions in the world”. Additionally, “each Self is conceptualised metaphorically as either a person, an object, or a location” (p. 269). One special case of the Subject-Self metaphor is SELF CONTROL IS OBJECT CONTROL in which self is conceptualised as an object which is controlled by the Subject (person) (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 270). One way we can exert control over an object is to have it in our possession; Thus, we also have the metaphor SELF CONTROL IS OBJECT POSSESSION to conceptualise our inner lives (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, pp. 272-73).

When Donne metaphorically identifies himself with the world, he is actually conceptualising the world as his controlled possession. This implication is barely recognisable without the help of a cognitive analysis of the concept of self. This is in line with the lover's possessing a domain in the boundary of which he has authority over the beloved. The notion of self is complicated, however, by the fact that in some poems Donne sees himself and his beloved as one: “Here you see me, and I am you” (*A Valediction: Of My Name in the Window*, line 12). The internal structure of this self can be uncovered in some poems representing mutual love: “Let us possess one world, each hath one, and is one” (*The*

Good-Morrow, line 14). In *The Dissolution*, Donne declares that the lovers are “mutual elements” of one another: “And we were mutual elements to us, / And made of one another” (lines 3-4). This idea is reinforced in *The Canonization*, where the lover describes the lovers as a phoenix in which they can “find the eagle and the dove” (line 22). A similar wholeness of the lovers are stated in *Air and Angels* at the end of which the lover describes his beloved as a sphere and himself as the intelligence directing that sphere.

What Donne represents here is that the lovers form one self with two parts. This self, of course, is not the Self versus the Subject; it is the self (in lower-case initial) in its general meaning constituting the ‘I’ of a person. Looking closer at the above examples, we recognise an inequity in the roles of the two elements constituting this self. When the two lovers are described as hemispheres, they have equal roles, and equal power. In the metaphor of the ‘Phoenix’, however, the elements are not that much equal; the self which is created by the two lovers consists of a dove and an eagle. The inequity of the elements resulting in the increase of the lover's control over the beloved is most obvious in the example of the intelligence and sphere where the lover is identified with the intelligence which, in T. W. Craik and R. J. Craik's phrase, “rules” the sphere (1986, p. 212). This is in line with the Renaissance belief that man is reason. In fact, the word ‘intelligence’ actually refers to reason and rationality. As Elaine Hobby (1993), discussing men's authority over women in the Renaissance, notes, “Women's subordination” is among the “ideological formulations” of the Renaissance (p. 32). She quotes Thomas Gataker's assertion as a typical one:

the man is as the head, and the woman as the body . . . And as it is against the order of Nature that the body should rule the head: so it is no less against the course of all good order that the woman should usurp authority to herself over her husband, her head.

(p. 32)

Thus, the metaphor of the lover as the intelligence can be analysed through SELF CONTROL IS OBJECT CONTROL. That is to say, if in the self fashioned by the lovers the male lover is the intelligence, he is, then, the Subject. Consequently, the beloved is the Self which is under the Subject's control.

The oneness of the lovers will be better understood if we refer to Donne's view of body and soul. As Ramie Targoff (2008) argues, in many cases Donne explains the relationship between the two lovers in terms of the relationship between body and soul. Whether talking about the bond between the lovers or the bond between body and soul, Donne “feels the isolation of one party from the other as a potentially irreversible injury” (p. 50). In *The Ecstasy*, he describes the union of the lovers' souls as overcoming the “defects of loneliness”, and in a letter addressed “To all my friends: Sir H. Goodere”, he laments the “‘Vae soli’ (Alas, alone” continuing that we are compelled, in a sense, to “common, and mutuall necessity of one another” (Targoff 2008, p. 51). Targoff explains that for Donne, the relationship of body and soul is that of “mutual necessity”, since, in Donne's words, “In the constitution and making of a natural man the body is not the man, nor the soul is not the man, but the union of these two makes up the man” (2008, p. 1). Just like body and soul making a self, the two lovers are the two parts making a new self: “And we were mutual elements to us, / and made of one another” (*The Dissolution*, lines 3-4).

The Renaissance belief, as Hobby observes, was that soul or mind has control over the body, and it was not uncommon in the era to use the same relationship of power to describe the relationship between man and woman. Hobby cites as an example Carew's frank assertion (“she shall be so to me: / As to the soule the flesh, as Appetite / To reason is, which shall our wils unite”) and states that this is a manifestation of “the structure of domination and subordination within the state”, and “is also linked to the control of the mind or soul over the body: the man is reason/the soul, the woman is flesh/appetite” (p. 45). Significantly, in

Donne's poetry this relationship of body and soul is informed by the schemaⁱ of empire wherein the lover figures as the king. In *The Ecstasy*, Donne describes the soul as "a great 'prince', while in *Love's Usury*, he describes the body as asking love to let him 'reign', and uses the verbs 'travel', 'sojourn', 'snatch', and 'plot' all of which are related to the domain of power verbalising what often happens in the colonisation of other lands:

Till then, Love, let my body reign, and let
Me travel, sojourn, snatch, plot, and let
Resume my last year's relict, think that yet
We'd never met. (lines 5-8)

In *The Ecstasy* Donne describes the soul as the intelligence and the body as the sphere, and continues to say that the intelligences cannot express themselves without their spheres (Targoff 2008, p. 55). His use of one metaphor (the sphere and intelligence) both for the two lovers and the soul-body relationship indicate a special meaning. What we see here is 'multivalency', a kind of 'interplay of metaphors' discussed by Goatly (1997), occurring when a source domain is repeated but refers to a new target domain each time. Multivalent source domains can create 'a sense of equivalence' between the targets and also suggest 'certain thematic equivalences' (pp. 265-66). In Donne's example, the source domain 'intelligence' is mapped onto the target domains 'lover' and 'soul' respectively. This suggests a sense of equivalence between lover and soul. Hence, 'beloved' and 'body' are equivalent, since the source domain 'sphere' is mapped onto both of them.

As Targoff argues, *The Ecstasy* describes the souls of the lovers as united in a way that results in the creation of an 'abler soul'. Not only does Donne see the relationship of the lovers as a mutual necessity just like the relationship of body and soul, he also sees love as affecting both body and soul, and actually in need of them in order to be experienced; In his letter to Wotton, Donne declares "You (I think) and I am much of one sect in the Philosophy of love, which, though it be directed upon the minde, doth inhere in the body, and find piety entertainment there" (Targoff 2008, p. 51):

But O alas, so long, so farre
Our bodies why doe wee forbear?
They are ours, though they are not wee, Wee are
The intelligences, they the sphaere. (49-52)

A similar idea is put forth in *Air and Angels* where, as Patrick Swinden (1979) argues, by comparing himself with the intelligence, the lover tells his beloved that "You give my love a geographical position, a home, and I give your love a sense of direction and purpose" and that they have "different but equal contribution" in their love relationship (p. 52). This mutual necessity Donne is concerned with becomes manifest also in *Going to Bed*, where he describes his mistress as his America and kingdom. The position of the king is defined in relation to the kingdom; without kingdom as the land (a geographical position), the king's role cannot be defined or expressed.

This can be better understood via the 'Locational Self' discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (1999). The primary metaphorⁱⁱ SELF CONTROL IS BEING IN ONE'S NORMAL LOCATION" indicates that "the control of Subject over Self is conceptualised as being in a normal location" (p. 274). Like other primary metaphors, this metaphor has experiential bases; We mostly feel in control when we are in our surroundings, including where we live or work, that is, the bounded spaces when we normally occupy; This metaphor conceptualises the Self as a container, and "the Subject's being out of control is conceptualised as its being out of the container" (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 274). The normal situation is when the

Subject resides in the Self; thus, the expression “I was beside myself” means that the Subject is outside the Self, which, in turn, means that “I was out of normal control” (p. 274).

Viewing Donne's metaphor of the sphere according to SELF CONTROL IS BEING IN ONE'S NORMAL LOCATION has a novel implication. As T. W. Craik and R. J. Craik (1986) note, the intelligence dwells within the sphere and without the sphere it cannot be expressed (p. 283). In fact, the sphere is the normal space the intelligence occupies. If the beloved is the sphere, she is the normal space the lover occupies. She acts as the Self, and the intelligence is the Subject. The role of the beloved as the Self is also manifested in *A Valediction: of My Name, in the Window*, where he describes himself and his mistress as one: “Here you see mee, and I am you.” In this poem, Donne has engraved his name on his beloved's window as a token of love. Targoff (2008) mentions that engraving names on the windows was customary at Donne's time, and that in northern Europe, there can be found some houses belonging to the seventeenth century “with the inhabitant's names engraved in one of the windowpanes, as if it were a means of registering possession” (p. 67). However, as Targoff points out, Donne desires a “different form of possession. He wants his name to become part of his lover's reflection – to be written, as it were, across her face” (p. 67). This has also an association with the Neoplatonic idea of the bond between the lovers, that the lover has the name of the beloved engraved on his soul (Targoff 2008, p. 68). However, Donne emphasises a “physical union”, since, Donne's name is “a metonymic substitution for Donne's own presence”, and “when his mistress gazes in the glass, she not only sees his name, but receives his name as part of herself: ‘Here you see mee, and I am you’” (p. 68).

Just as Donne's name in the window is a metonymic substitution for his presence, the house stands in metonymic relation with his beloved.ⁱⁱⁱ The house is the space of the beloved where Donne metonymically resides. If the lovers are one, then the beloved can be understood as the space, (the self/container) where the ‘I’ of Donne resides. This is reinforced by the fact that when departing from the beloved, the lover leaves his body behind. In fact, the beloved has his body with her. However, it is not only his body which is left behind with the beloved, but his soul is ‘emparadis'd in’ her (Targoff 2008, p. 69).

So far we have discussed how Donne constitutes his self in relation to woman. The problem, however, is that he does not offer us a uniform idea of woman. In his love poetry, he presents woman as having multiple roles – sometimes the conquest, and sometimes, surprisingly, the conqueror. Unlike the love poems where the woman is presented as the beloved, in poems like *Love's Alchemy*, *The Anagram*, *The Blossom*, and the song *Go and Catch a Falling Star*, woman is described as ‘foul’, as causing a feeling of distaste. Docherty argues that the woman in *The Anagram* is described in a way that makes the woman in the first half of the poem seem to be a different person from the woman described in the second. “‘Flavia’ [the woman in this poem] is simply one of many possible anagrammatic configurations of the woman's body. This woman, and woman in general, becomes stripped of stable identity, anonymous in fact, in the elaboration of the text” (Docherty 1986, p. 65). This idea is reinforced in *The Indifferent* where Donne, presenting various configurations of woman, declares that “I can love any, so she be not true”. This ambiguous identity of woman strongly influences the notion of self in Donne's poetry.

MULTIPLE SELVES

In some of his poems Donne is deeply concerned with human love – sometimes profane, and sometimes highly spiritual – and in some others, he talks of his deep love for God. Sometimes he describes himself as the king, and sometimes he is a conquest of his beloved; sometimes, the beloved is identified with the body, and sometimes with the soul. Donne's

poetry “expresses radically contradictory views – of women, the body, and love” (Guibbory 1993, p. 123). In holy sonnet 19, as Guibbory notes, Donne, on the one hand, declares his unstable nature (of which he seems to be proud), and on the other hand, desires to be stable. These contradictions are fleshed forth in paradoxes the frequent use of which is a defining feature of Donne's poetry (p. 124) (“Oh, to vex me, contraries meete in one: / Inconstancy unnaturally hath begot / A constant habit”). Not only does Donne see himself as unstable, but also he sees the whole universe as profoundly unstable; In *The First Anniversary* he talks about the mutability of the world and sees the changes as decay; Unlike the above poem in which Donne complains about his inconstancy, in such poems as *Confined Love* and *Change*, he sees inconstancy as an ordinary human condition (Guibbory 1993, p. 130).

One contradiction in Donne's treatment of love is that in his mutual love poems, he seeks the union of the lovers, but on other occasions, he desires to be emotionally detached and have a separate identity. Guibbory sees this as related to Donne's desire to “both to preserve his individuality, uniqueness, and satiric distance and to have a secure place in the world, to be part of the community” (pp. 138, 144). A similar contradiction is found in Donne's treatment of the lover-beloved relationship as the relationship between the soul and the body. As Guibbory argues, in *A Nocturnal upon St Lucy's Day*, Donne describes his beloved as his soul. Here, because of the death of his beloved he is “every dead thing,/ in whom love wrought new alchemie”; he is the “elixir” of “the first nothing”. He also declares that he is ruined by love which can be seen as an expression of the intensity of the relationship between the lovers; however, Donne's feeling of despair and ‘nothingness’ suggests that he sees love as a ‘self-destructive experience’ which reappears in *Love's Alchemy* and *Farewell to Love*. The poem suggests that the lover's existence is tied to the beloved. There is a convergence between this poem and *A Valediction: Of My name, In the Window*, although in the latter, the beloved constitutes the Self, and not the soul, of the lover. In the valedictory poem, the lover, departing from his beloved, leaves both his body and soul behind, and what remains from him is only ‘a ragged bony name’ in the window which is his ‘ruinous Anatomie’.

Targoff states that in the first half of the poem Donne's purpose of engraving his name on the window is to leave behind a surrogate of his physical self, however, after suddenly noticing its inability to do so, he wittingly changes his intention of scratching his name on the window, and describes it as something representing his mortality. Yet again he uses the image of “ragged bony name” to put forward the idea that he will be “emparadis'ed” in his beloved (pp. 68-9). Important to note here is that in any case the lover departing from his beloved fades away, and what we see of him is transferred to the beloved. Thus, just like in *A Nocturnal upon St Lucy's Day*, the lover is nothing when apart from his beloved. The two poems suggest that the lovers constitute one self, and are one, however, they are also a manifestation of the self-destructiveness of love, to use Guibbory's phrase. This demonstrates Donne's view of a love relationship as a power relationship. In order to have a separate identity, he takes the position of power and brings the woman under his control. Seeing love as a self-destructive experience, he does not quit love relationships, but takes hold of it as his domain of power.

Concerned with representing himself as a separate identity, Donne appears as different personas in his poetry. As Guibbory argues, Donne appears as “the libertine rake, the devoted and constant lover, the cynic who feels cheated by his experience in love, the despairing sinner fearing damnation, and the bold suitor claiming his right to salvation” (p. 123). This multiplicity of roles can be traced to the portraits left of Donne. As Robin Robbins (2010) argues, Donne plays different roles in these portraits:

First came a miniature (surviving as the engraved frontispiece to the 1635 *Poems*), painted in 1591, in his eighteenth year, showing him dressed as a dapper courtier with a

sword and a Spanish motto meaning 'Sooner dead than changed' – whether in religion or love is left to the imagination. He wears crosses in his ears, but the words come from a love story. In life-size oils in 1595 he is the melancholy lover with folded arms, a wide black hat and a Latin motto turned from the Prayer Book's 'Lighten our darkness, O Lord' into '... O Lady'. Another miniature shows him in 1616, the year after his ordination, as a smart gentleman with ruff and pointed beard. In 1620, the year before he won the deanship of St Paul's, he was again painted in oils (still in the deanery) as a bare-shouldered ancient philosopher. (p. 231; vol. 1)

Robbins argues that Donne's change of roles in his poetry is due to the diverse audiences of the poems. He also states that "His poems are similarly dramatic portraits, ventriloquizing, posing as various personae – cynic, wit, seducer, lover, penitent, and more. Two at least are put in the mouth of a woman, *Break of day* and *Confined love*" (p. 232).

To preserve his separate identity, Guibbory maintains, Donne detaches himself from women by representing a feeling of repulsion toward them as in *The Indifferent* and *Love's Diet* (pp. 138-39). Quite ironically, Donne defines his identity through the lovers' union. Firstly, it is in the lovers' union that he declares his position of power and control. Secondly, as Docherty argues, Donne embraces the woman (the Other) and makes it an aspect of his Self. And thirdly, he declares that he and his beloved are one: "Here you see mee, and I am you." There is also another change of role^{iv} in *Air and Angels* wherein the lover sees his beloved as an angel in the first stanza, and in the second, he changes the roles and uses the metaphor of the angel for himself (Swinden 1979, p. 53). A similar role change occurs in *A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning*. As Docherty argues, the fixed foot of the compass (the beloved) which most criticism has taken as the stable center of the circle is not stable at all, since if the moving leg moves, the fixed foot moves, too. That the two legs of the compass move indicates that they are interchangeable, resulting in the interchangeability of the roles of the lover and the beloved; thus, one cannot recognise for who each of the legs stands (Docherty 1986, p. 73).

In the Subject-Self metaphor, the Self is understood as "body, social roles, past states, and actions in the world" (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 269). As Lakoff and Johnson argue, throughout our life, we develop different values toward the social roles or past actions which are embedded in our childhood and the family roles we see around us. The values we develop toward our Selves are related to the values others place on our actions and behavior (p. 278). Associated with this metaphor is the 'Multiple Selves Metaphor' in which "multiple values are conceptualised as multiple Selves, with each Self instantiating the social role associated with that value", that is, we have different Selves which we understand as other people (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 280). Therefore, "indecisiveness over values is metaphorised as the Subject's indecisiveness about which Self to associate wit', as when we say "I keep going back and forth between my scientific self and my religious self" or "I keep going back and forth between the scientist and the priest in me" (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 280).

Donne's belief in the lovers' unity results in a blurred boundary of each lover's self which in turn leads to a contradiction and an ambiguity in Donne's conception of self. This is most obvious in the puzzling stanza from *The Legacy*:

I heard me say, "Tell her anon,
That my self" (that's you, not I)
"Did kill me," and when I felt me die,
I bid me send my heart, when I was gone; (lines 9-12)

If the lovers are one, the metaphors used for each of them can be interchangeable. Given this idea as true throughout Donne's body of poetry, profound ambiguities arise. Is Donne the 'king' or the 'kingdom' in *Going to Bed* or the 'princes' or the 'states' in *The Sun Rising*? It seems that Donne is swinging between the powerful position of the lover and the

powerless position of the beloved, between king and subject. This comes to focus when we bear in mind that the lover, mostly described as in a position of power, is the conquest of the beloved in *The Damp*. According to the Multiple Selves Metaphor, Donne is going back and forth between his two Selves which, as Lakoff and Johnson maintain, are instantiations of the two social roles associated with two different values. Thus, Donne's two Selves are conceptualised as two people. Donne is swinging between the king and the subject in him, between the coloniser and the colonised.

Donne's oscillation between the two Selves is most probably embedded in his “contrary impulses” – both “outrage” at and an “attraction” to the society (Guibbory 1993, p. 131). The lost coherence Donne complains about in *The First Anniversary*, – “all coherence gone [...] and all relation”, and that “Prince, subject, father, son, are things forgot” – are also a demonstration of the lost coherence in his inner world. Quite contrary to the occasions when he describes himself as the king with full authority, he frankly introduces himself as the “quintessence of nothingness”. He, then, is swinging not just between the king and the subject in him, but between all and nothing.

As a master of paradox, Donne on the one hand, presents a division in his self, and on the other, he tries to efface the problem of self-division. Giving completely different positions of power to the male or the female lover, he declares in *The Relic* that ‘differences of sex no more we knew’, and in the *Undertaking* that ‘Forget the He and She’. The lovers' unity, in fact, both puts forward and provides a solution for the problem of self. He also effaces this problem through a role change as in *Air and Angels* and *A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning*, discussed above. This reminds us of Donne's desire for both change and stability, and of the fact that he sees the world of love as constant and standing against the public world of change (Guibbory 1993, pp. 144, 136). However, ironically, the world of love is itself subject to different changes. It is a world in which not only the roles, but also the actions change: “To let me live, O, love and hate me too” (*The Prohibition*, line 24).

So far, we discussed what happens inside Donne's domain of self. However, there is found a self-projection throughout Donne's poetry too. It was mentioned earlier that the notion of 'I' or 'inner life' is understood via the General Subject-Self Metaphor. It was also mentioned that one special case of this metaphor is SELF-CONTROL IS BEING IN ONE'S NORMAL LOCATION which holds that the Self is a container where the Subject resides. As Lakoff and Johnson (1999) argue, this metaphor entails that to see the outside of the closed space (Self), you should step out of it, since according to the metaphor KNOWING IS SEEING, what you know about your Self is just knowledge from inside, or “subjective knowledge”. Therefore, to gain knowledge from outside, you need to step out of your enclosure (Self) (p. 277). Related to this metaphor is The Subject Projection Metaphor by which we can imitate others, or better to say, project ourselves as inhabiting the bodies of others; In this metaphor, “one Subject is projected to another in a hypothetical situation’, for instance, when someone says “If I were you”, he/she conceptualises him/her Subject as inhabiting the Self of another person (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 281). Two special cases of this metaphor are ‘advisory projection’ and ‘emphatic projection’. An advisory projection, such as ‘If I were you, I'd punch him in the nose’ holds that ‘I am projecting my values onto you so that I experience your life with my values’; however, an emphatic projection holds that ‘I am experiencing your life, but with your values projected onto my subjective experience’, as when we say “If I were you, I'd feel just awful too” (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, p. 281).

We are confronted with the king and the subject, as two Selves, in Donne's poetry. However, he mostly describes himself as the king, and it is through the notion of the lovers' unity that we come to the fact that he takes the role of the subject, too. In fact, his poetry functions as a hypothetical situation in which Donne assumes the role of the king, that is, projects his Subject onto the king, and conceptualises it as inhabiting the king's Self. By

doing so, he expresses himself as experiencing the king's position. Here one might ask through whose values Donne experiences this position, his own or the king's? Given Donne's "fascination" by the world of power (Loewenstein 1993, pp. 4,6) this may indicate that the Self-projection in Donne's poetry is emphatic. That is, he experiences the position of the king by the king's values or he tries to see just how kingship is.

However, just like his poetry, Donne's political views are complex. Given Donne's ambivalence toward the world of power – both a fascination by and a sense of dislike about it, as Loewenstein points out – and partial oppositional stance toward the colonising enterprise (Cain 2001, p. 440), his projection of his self onto the king can be seen as an advisory projection, that is, he tries to experience the king's position not by the king's values but by those of his own. Donne's metaphors of king and kingdom, then, function as a reminder of the duties of the state. He wants to show how kingship should be. In this vein, he declares in *The Canonization* that their love should be a model for others: "Countries, towns, courts: beg from above/ A pattern of your love!" This is reinforced by the fact that, as Cain notes, Donne's metaphors of king and kingdom are also taken as satirical, a critique of Europe's imperial patterns (p. 440).

CONCLUSION

Any discussion of the identity of a poet like Donne who is preoccupied with the notion of empire needs to consider the impingement of discourses of Renaissance imperialism and colonisation on his poems as texts and to examine the relationship between what is organised in these texts and what is there in the world outside. That is, we need to discuss the "affiliations", to use Said's phrase (1983, p. 174), of the poet's metaphors and the world outside of his poetry. Underlying many of Donne's metaphors is SELF IS EMPIRE as a way of conceptualising the notion of identity. This identity, however, is bound to the nature of Donne's beloved as something outside of the limits of his self. Donne describes his beloved as America, India, and some Oriental entities, to name a few. It is at this juncture that Said's views about the relation between culture and imperialism come to focus. Donne's treatment of his mistress is the way he 'knows' her. "Knowledge means rising above immediacy, beyond self, into the foreign and distant", Said states (1977, p. 32). It is, then, Donne's conception of what is Other that comprises his identity.

Seeing his mistress as an Other, Donne struggles to either bring it into his domain or to wittingly define himself in terms of her. According to the Subject-Self Metaphor, we argue, in Donne's metaphors the Lover is the Subject and the beloved provides the Self for him. Perhaps despite Donne's intention, this does not indicate the lover's superiority to the beloved, since in the light of cognition the Self is a space in which the Subject resides. Such a necessary cooperation is also found in the relationship between body and soul, sphere and intelligence, and king and kingdom.

A similar relationship exists between Donne and the world in the sense that despite his striving to define a separate domain of his own, he is right within the society, carrying out such special duties as deanship of St Paul's. This duality also seen in the life and career of Sir Thomas More, Donne's great-great uncle, seems to be prevalent in the lives of Renaissance intellectuals. As Greenblatt (1980) argues, the world "at one repelled and fascinated him; he could never bring himself simply to renounce the world in holy indignation. On the contrary, he made himself into a consummately successful performer" (p. 12). What we see in Donne's life pertain to "the complex interplay in More's life and writings of self-fashioning and self-cancellation, the crafting of a public role and the profound desire to escape from the identity so crafted" (Greenblatt 1980, pp. 12-13).

In this context, Donne embarks on showing the real face of the world and his own position in it. If Donne's poetry talks about the follies of society and attempts to show how the world should or should not be, it works like utopias which, in Houston's (2009) words, "use the foreign space to reconfigure the domestic sphere, attempting to solve the ills of the world at home by considering the possibilities of the world far away" (p. 83). As such, Donne's poetry is the hypothetical foreign space in which Donne tries to build his ideal world. Like a utopia, then, his poetry "challenged the political imagination" (Houston 2009, p. 91). Like Thomas More, Donne in the world of his poetry sets his utopia at America. And, significantly, just like More, he shows us a division in his self. While More sets the two characters of his *Utopia* as the two parts of his self – "his public self" and "his within" – to argue over the issues of the world (Greenblatt 1980, p. 36), Donne hints to the king and the subject in him.

By constructing metaphors, Donne constructs his identity, as well as a view of the world. He, in fact, 'fashions', to use Greenblatt's word, both an individual and a communal identity. In *The Will*, however, Donne declares "but I'll undo/ The world by dying". This is while in *The Sun Rising*, he describes himself and his beloved as the whole world. The construction of the world and then undoing it is again reminiscent of More's self-fashioning and self-cancellation and his "undoing of himself", in Greenblatt's words (1980, p. 57). Probing the seminally important metaphors of self and empire in Donne's poetry sheds some light on the complex modality of this constructing and undoing of the world in the Renaissance.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ Our structured knowledge of the source domain in a metaphorical mapping (Lakoff & Turner 1989, p. 61), here the concept of empire.

ⁱⁱ Underlying the conceptual metaphors, primary metaphors function as the atoms which construct a molecule; Complex metaphors are constructed by "primary metaphors" plus cultural models, folk theories, and widely accepted knowledge or beliefs (Lakoff & Johnson 1999, pp. 60-1).

ⁱⁱⁱ Using the blending theory, Lok Man LAW (2011) argues that through his name on the window bearing his physical existence, the lover is identified with the house, and thus, the beloved is "living inside his physical body and is probably trapped inside it" (p. 72). The opposition of the two interpretations lies in Donne's interest in paradoxes. As Stephen Greenblatt mentions, quoting Joel Altman, Renaissance scholars tried to cultivate the power to develop equally persuasive arguments about completely opposite positions (p. 230). As a poet of strong wit, and as a figure believing in the lovers' unity, Donne tries to show that the lovers' roles in the self they create can be interchangeable.

^{iv} Docherty argues that the lover exchanges his human position with a divine one, since the beloved is an angel (77).

REFERENCES

- Cain, T. (2001). John Donne and the Ideology of Colonization. *English Literary Renaissance*. Vol. 31(3), 440-476. doi:10.1111_j.1475-6757.2001.tb01196.x] TOM CAIN
- Craik, T. W. & Craik, R. J. (1986). *John Donne: Selected Poetry and Prose*. London and New York: Methuen.
- Docherty, T. (1986). *John Donne, Undone*. London and New York: Methuen.
- Ghaeli, R. & Pirnajmuddin, H. (2016). LIFE IS A PLAY: Reading David Mamet's Sexual Perversity in Chicago and Glengarry Glen Ross through Cognitive Poetics. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. Vol. 22(2), 67-79.
- Goatly, A. (1997). *The Language of Metaphor*. London: Routledge.
- Greenblatt, S. (1980). *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago .
- Guibbory, A. (1993). John Donne. In T. N. Corns (Ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry, Donne to Marvell* (pp. 123-147). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobby, E. (1993). The politics of gender. In T. N. Corns (Ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry, Donne to Marvell* (pp. 31-51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Horn, M. (2010). John Donne, godly inscription, and permanency of Self. *Renaissance Studies*. Vol. 24(3), 365-380. doi:10.1111/j.1477-4658.2009.00580.x
- Houston, C. (2009). Traveling Nowhere: Global Utopias in the Early Modern Period. In J. G. Singh (Ed.). *A Companion to the Global Renaissance* (pp. 82-98). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- . (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989). *More Than Cool Reason*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lalbahsh, P. & Torkamaneh, P. (2016). The City in Man: Foregrounding Psychogeography in The Blind Owl and City of Glass. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*. Vol. 16(2), 141-153.
- LAW, L. M. (2011). *The Mind of John Donne: A Cognitive Approach to the Metaphysical conceit*. (Master's thesis). Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Loewenstein, D. (1993). Politics and religion. In T. N. Corns (Ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry, Donne to Marvell* (pp. 3-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, R. (2010). Poets, Friends, and Patrons: Donne and his Circle; Ben and his Tribe. In M. Hattaway (Ed.). *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Vol. 1, pp. 221-247). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Said, E. W. (1977). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- . (1983). *The World, The Text, and The Critic*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University.
- . (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Schmuck, S. (2010). England's Experiences of Islam. In M. Hattaway (Ed.). *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Vol. 1, pp. 543-556). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Singh, J. G. (2009). Introduction: The Global Renaissance. In J. G. Singh (Ed.). *A Companion to the Global Renaissance* (pp. 1-28). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stockwell, P. (2005). *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Swinden, P. (1979). John Donne: 'Air and angels'. *Critical Quarterly*. Vol 21(1), 51-54. doi:10.1111_j.1467-8705.1979.tb01685.x
- Targoff, R. (2008). *John Donne, Body and Soul*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Winkelman, M. A. (2013). *A Cognitive Approach to John Donne's Songs and Sonnets*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.