

Nor was he like those *starr's* which only shine
 When to pale *Mariners* they stormes portend,
 He had his calmer influence; and his Mine
 Did Love and Majesty together blend.¹

Donne also seems to use the variant with this sense in his 'To the Countess of Bedford. Begun in France but never perfected':

First I confesse I have to others lent
 Your stock, and over prodigally spent
 Your treasure, for since I had never knowne
 Vertue or beautie, but as they are growne
 In you, I should not think or say they shine,
 (So as I have) in any other Mine.²

Milgate notes only the sense of source of wealth. Given 'stock' and 'treasure' a pun seems likely; her mien is a mine.

It is not absurd, then, to propose that Shakespeare may have been using this variant with its connotations of 'face' at least predominating. To take the word as a pronoun means, as F. T. Prince remarks in the Arden edition, accepting a sense that is 'unparalleled' and which would be 'unintelligible in another context'. The 'source of wealth' he dismisses as 'a new and strange image which Shakespeare very uncharacteristically fails to make vivid or to develop further'.

Certainly the strain required to incorporate the source of wealth into the poem rules it out, while after swallowing that unparalleled pronoun we only end up saying that Turtle and Phoenix belong to each other, a weak paradox for this otherwise hyperbolically paradoxical poem. In any case, mutual possession leaves the selves separate, which is in contradiction to the following stanza where Property is appalled precisely because that distinction does not hold. However, the idea of the two lovers having each other's face is a paradox as perplexing as any, and reads easily and consonantly with the following stanzas, being a particularly apt forerunner of the 'Single nature's double name'.

JOHN CONSTABLE

Easton

THE PHOENIX AND THE TURTLE: 'EITHER WAS THE OTHER'S MINE' – A NEW READING

So between them love did shine
 That the Turtle saw his right
 Flaming in the Phoenix' sight;
 Either was the other's mine.

(The Arden Shakespeare, *The Poems*, ed.
 F. T. Prince (1960), 181)

THE traditional controversy as to whether 'mine' is to be read as a pronoun, or a noun, as in gold mine, has completely obscured the possibility of a third solution which is as obvious as it is appropriate to the poem.

OED lists 'mine' as a variant spelling for mien, giving for sense (a) 'The air, bearing, carriage or manner of a person, as expressive of character or mood', and citing page 167 of J. Eliot's *Fruits* (1593), 'He is an alchymist by his mine'; and for sense (b) 'Appearance (of a thing)', citing Sir John Suckling in a letter of 1641, 'Nothing, Madam, has worse mine than counterfeit sorrow'. The etymologies in both *OED* and Partridge's *Short Etymological Dictionary* (1959) suggest that the word developed from the Medieval French and French 'mine' meaning 'facial appearance', a root that can be felt in both sense (a) and (b).

Dryden uses the variant with a predominant sense of 'facial appearance' in the eighteenth stanza of his 'Heroique Stanzas Consecrated to the Glorious Memory of his most Serene and Renowned Highnesse Oliver Late Lord Protector of this Commonwealth' (1658):

¹ *The Poems of John Dryden*, ed. J. Kinsley, (Oxford, 1958), i, 9. It was Kinsley's gloss (iv, 1811) that first alerted me to the variant spelling.

² John Donne, *The Satires, Epigrams, and Verse Letters*, ed. W. Milgate, (Oxford, 1967), 104, lines 11-16.