

**PUNCTUATION PRACTICE IN THE *ANTIDOTARY*
IN G.U.L. MS HUNTER 513
(ff. 37v - 96v)¹**

TERESA MARQUÉS AGUADO

Universidad de Murcia
tmarques@um.es

55

1. Introduction

Traditionally, medieval punctuation has been overlooked because it has been assumed to be haphazard, casual and inconsistent, as reported for instance by Jenkinson (1926: 153).² Several factors contributed to this general neglect, such as the lack of overall systematisation (Mitchell 1980: 412) and of correspondence with the Present-Day English (PDE) punctuation system (Zeeman 1956: 11), and the overlapping functions of punctuation marks (Lucas 1971: 19). Nevertheless, the topic has received more scholarly attention in the last few decades, as in the articles by Lucas (1971), Arakelian (1975), Parkes (1978, 1992), Rodríguez Álvarez (1999), Alonso Almeida (2002), Calle Martín (2004), Calle Martín and Miranda García (2005a, 2005b and 2008) and Obegi Gallardo (2006).

The two key issues concerning medieval punctuation are its function and its modernisation. As for its function, punctuation can generally be used grammatically or rhetorically: grammatical punctuation signals the syntactic relationships established between the constituents of the sentence, whereas rhetorical punctuation aims at marking rest points for a meaningful oral delivery. In addition, Lucas added the macro-textual function, according to which punctuation clarifies “the arrangement and lay-out of the texts” (1971: 5). Thus, grammatical punctuation is expected to prevail over rhetorical punctuation in the text under

study, which is a medieval medical text written to be consulted by medical practitioners, whatever their positions were.

The modernisation of medieval punctuation has also been a matter of contention. For instance, Mitchell offered three options: “the manuscript punctuation, modern punctuation, or a compromise between the two” (1980: 388). Many scholars do not wholly agree with the practice of modernising punctuation for a number of reasons. One of them is that its use implies the interpretation of the text on the part of the editor, while, as Lass explains, “no modern (or any) editor can be said to know the language of a scribe better than the scribe did” (2004: 25). This view is shared by Moorman, who adds that such an interpretation might not have been intended by the scribe of the text, let alone the author (1975: 85). Another problem is that PDE punctuation is mainly syntactic (Quirk et al. 2003: 1611), whereas medieval punctuation was also commonly influenced by the rhetorical function. Finally, the differences between PDE and Middle English prose have also moved scholars such as Hudson to oppose modernisation (1977: 50-51).

56

Indeed, modernisation should be kept at bay in editions for scholarly use, for instance, in such a way that the original readings are preserved without editorial interference, inasmuch as “the ideal model for a corpus or any presentation of a historical text is an archaeological site or a crime-scene: no contamination, explicit stratigraphy, and an immaculately preserved chain of custody” (Lass 2004: 46). This statement also applies to punctuation: if texts are going to be used in the compilation of a corpus, editorial punctuation cannot be readily accepted. Yet, on many occasions publishers prefer to modernise punctuation so as to bring the text closer to the reader. When this the case, modernisation should not be done silently and without accounting for the criteria followed, as is the case in many editions of Old and Middle English texts. On the contrary, these principles should be made explicit so that the original punctuation of the text is not totally lost and can be reconstructed by the reader. This has moved some scholars to promote alternatives, such as devising a critical apparatus to explain punctuation variants (Heyworth 1981: 155) or, more recently, using functional equivalents (Alonso Almeida 2002: 227-228; Calle Martín 2004: 421; Calle Martín and Miranda García 2008: 376-377; Esteban Segura [forthcoming]). This method builds on the idea that the PDE counterpart depends on the function performed by the medieval punctuation mark.

Accordingly, the specific objectives of this study are: a) to describe the punctuation system used in the Middle English text under scrutiny, a 15th century medical treatise; b) to determine its function (i.e. grammatical, rhetorical, macro-textual); and c) to establish the PDE functional equivalents of the punctuation marks (i.e.

the modernised counterparts), bearing in mind Quirk et al.'s discussion on the PDE punctuation system (2003: 1609-1639). To this end, the uses of these marks will be analysed at each level (macro-textual, sentential, clausal and phrasal), along with the specific function that they perform.

Consequently, this article is divided into four sections: first, a brief description of the text under study; second, an account of the methodological procedure followed; third, the study of the repertoire of punctuation signs used in the text; and finally, the conclusions derived from the study, with particular reference to the function and possible modernisation of the punctuation marks surveyed.

2. Description

The text on which this research focuses is the *Antidotary* contained in Glasgow University Library, MS Hunter 513 (ff. 37v - 96v). This volume is a medical miscellany that contains three other scientific treatises: an ophthalmic treatise (Marqués Aguado et al. 2008), and two pseudo-Hippocratic texts (one on zodiacal influence and one on the signs of death).

Catalogued as an anonymous text (Young and Aitken 1908: 421; Cross 2004: 35), the research conducted on the sources (Marqués Aguado 2008: 58-91) has shown that this treatise comprises two distinct sections, drawn from two surgical texts: ff. 37v - 88v are a translation of part of Mondeville's *Chirurgia* (Nicaise 1893; Rosenman 2003), whereas the remaining folios go back to Chauillac's *Magna Chirurgia* (Ogden 1971). In the subsequent analysis of the punctuation system of the text, reference will be made to these sections when relevant, and any major differences will be noted.

This *Antidotary* was probably written during the second quarter of the 15th century, a date that has been recently suggested (Marqués Aguado 2008: 16, 52) on account of the script used,³ and which corroborates Eldredge's and Cross's proposals (1996: 27 and 2004: 35, respectively), against Young and Aitken's initial dating, the late 14th century (1908: 421-422). In fact, the text was deployed by two different hands. Hand 1 (ff. 37v - 94v) shows a mixture of Anglicana and Secretary features⁴ that includes, on the one hand, Anglicana looped <d>, eight-shaped <d>, long-tailed <r> and Anglicana <v>;⁵ and, on the other, Secretary right-shouldered <r> or double-u <w>. In turn, hand 2 (ff. 95r - 96v) displays more Secretary letter-forms (such as two-shaped <r> or single-lobed <a>).

Little is known about the circumstances in which this manuscript was produced, as well as about its later history, although its external appearance (small size of the volume, script used, stitched folios and scarce decoration) suggests that it was not

an expensive production, most probably intended for a medical practitioner interested in the contents, rather than in the quality of the manuscript itself. This will be a key factor in the way punctuation is used, as explained below.

3. Methodology

The present research stems from a wider research project developed at the University of Málaga in collaboration with the Universities of Glasgow and Oviedo. The objective of this project has been the compilation of a lemmatised and tagged corpus of Middle English scientific prose gathered from manuscripts hitherto unedited,⁶ all of which belong to the Hunterian Collection, housed in Glasgow University Library. Besides the compilation of the corpus, diplomatic editions of the corresponding texts, supplemented by a cursory codicological and palaeographical description, are currently being revised while available online at <<http://hunter.filosofia.uma.es/manuscripts>>.

58 Once the transcription was finished, some modifications were implemented, such as the insertion of references (folio and line where each word appears) or the standardisation of word-division (to allow for the lemmatisation of words that appear split). This modified version of the transcription was exported to an Excel spreadsheet, where the lemmatisation and tagging were carried out. Most of the lemmas used in the database were taken from the *Middle English Dictionary*,⁷ excepting those of Latin origin, which were drawn from Lewis and Short's dictionary (1879). Being a large corpus comprising texts from various provenances written at different times (as the time-span covered by the corpus is a century at most), this method was preferred over others such as using the most frequent word, which would lead to a dialectally-biased database. The lemmas are followed by a series of columns containing the tag, which includes the word-class (or category), and the accidence (tense, grade, number, etc.) where relevant. Finally, the meaning in PDE (selected from the ones offered in the *Middle English Dictionary* depending on the context) is also provided.

The text under scrutiny amounts to 24,934 running words and 2,045 lemmas, which means that the process of lemmatising has been long and tiring. However, the advantages outnumber the drawbacks, insofar as it is possible to retrieve the concordances of a given lemma precisely and promptly, including the reference where each occurrence is found. This has been done with all the punctuation marks, lemmatised as 'PUNCTUATIONMARK' in the database. This search has rendered a total of 1,969 signs, which have been analysed according to their context so as to classify their uses.⁸

4. The punctuation system of the *Antidotary*

The inventory of the punctuation marks in the *Antidotary* is quite small, and comprises only paragraph marks, virgules, periods, tildes, carets and hyphens. This repertoire fits the descriptions of typical 15th century texts.⁹ The combinations of periods with paragraph marks, and of virgules with paragraph marks are also occasionally encountered, as explained below.

4.1. The paragraph mark

Paragraph marks, marked in red in the manuscript, amount to 532×. There are two types of paragraph mark: the first one shows two capital <CC> of roughly equal size, while in the second one the first <C> is considerably thicker than the second one, in such a way that the latter type looks thinner and taller than the former. They are clearly distinct in terms of their distribution: the first type is the standard throughout the text, except for some folios (ff. 46v - 48v, 56v - 58v, 65v, 73v, 81v - 83v, 90v - 96v), where only the second type is inserted. They overlap in certain folios, though, such as f. 90r.

Regardless of their different distributions and shapes, both marks work mainly at macro-textual level, as they highlight relevant sections from the point of view of the subject matter dealt with. This contradicts Petti's explanation about the use of this mark, as he argued that it signalled a new heading, book or chapter (1977: 27). Clear examples are those paragraph marks separating different lines of thought (101×), which would represent independent paragraphs in a modernised version, as in (1):

(1) And feble medecynes
mowe be leide in so grete quantite yf so be þat
þey be leyde drýe and sadde they will engen=
der an Escare ¶ **H**it is a full necessarie þing
to a Surgen to knowe þe generacioun of an Escar
for it settith diuersite and difficile yn working
of Surgerýe for ·2· þingis (f. 65v, 18-24)

Similarly, in the following examples paragraph marks also have a clear macro-textual function, because they introduce recipes (56×), as shown in (2), or else they add a new feature to an enumeration, or they separate different conditions under which a process may take place, etc. (106×), as shown in (3). It should be noted that 28× out of the 56 paragraph marks introducing recipes are to be found in the section derived from Chauliac (such as the one in (2)):

(2) ¶ Also þer be sette certayne helps for þe eyen
ffirst is sette the water of Maýster Peter off

Spayn the which clarifieth and comforthith
 þe eiyen ¶ **Take** fenell Rewe celedoyne ver=
 vayne Eufrace Clarre Rosenē oþer water of
 Rosene and bryse hem and tempere hem by a
 naturell daye in white wyne and þanne
 putte all to geder yn a lembyk and distille
 a water (f. 91r, 3-11)

(3) ¶ **And yef** þe member be to moyste acciden=
 tlye þe compound medecine moste have the
 maystrie in desiccacioun ¶ **And yff** the quitture
 be viscos the medecine moste be somdel in=
 cissiue ¶ **And yf** the qwitter be indigest the ~
 medecine muste be maturatiue (f. 52v, 1-6)

Paragraph marks also function at sentential level, marking independent sentences, but even in this case their function is not only grammatical, but also macro-textual (as shown in (1), (2) and (3), where, in a sense, they mainly call attention to what follows), given that these sentences often represent different items in an enumeration of advantages of a particular remedy, or in a list of powders, ingredients, etc. (267×), as in (4) and (5). Hence, these marks are particularly useful from the point of view of the subject matter under discussion:

(4) The seconde
 is of resolutyf medecines and how þat a man shall
 vsen hem ¶ **The thrid** of maturatiues and of the maner off
 maturyng ¶ **The fourthe** of mundificatiues and of the maner
 of clensing ¶ (f. 37v, 4-8)

(5) þei must have
 9. condiciouns ¶ **The firste** þat þey be hoot ¶ **Þe**
second that þey be drie ¶ **The þirde** þat þey be
 noþer hoot nor drye excellentie ¶ **The ·4·** þat þey
 be noþer hoot nor drye sympully but in certeyn
 degre ¶ **The ·5·** þat þey be of sotill substau=
 ce and vertue ¶ **The ·6·** þat þey be apperatiue
 þat is to saye openyng ¶ **The ·7·** þat þei bene
 stronglye attractiue ¶ **The ·8·** þat þey be molli=
 ficatiue ¶ **The ·9·** þat þey be alytell stiptek (f. 81r, 7-16)

In some cases, these sentences can be so long as to constitute a paragraph by themselves, which would overlap with the function signalled previously, as in the lines coming after (6), which amount to 24 and which deal with each of the three rules announced here to prepare compound medicines:

(6) Ther bene thre *generall* Rewle yeven *in*
þis mater how a man shall make *compound* medecyns
of these symple medecyns aforesaide and of þe maner
howe þey shalle be leyde to a sore ¶ **The fyrste** (f. 38r, 20-23)

Still at sentential level, paragraph marks also mark off asyndetic coordination, which occurs when the coordinating conjunction is omitted (Fischer 1992: 289). Yet, due to the prose style used in the text, sometimes it is quite difficult to distinguish asyndetic coordination from independent sentences, as shown in (7):

(7) And yeff · we woll worche ~
craftely and resonabell in the cure of enpo=
stumes we shall vse resolutiue medecyns
in two cases ¶ **Oone** is whanne a mater
owith not to be repercussed ¶ **A noþer** case is
whanne we assaye to repercusse a mater *and*
may not be cause þat þe bodie of þe pacient
is so full þat he maye not receyvene hit
other be cause þat þe mater is not obedient (f. 42v, 7-15)

Finally, the remaining eight paragraph marks are found at sentential (i.e. marking off the main from the subordinate clauses) and clausal (i.e. marking off the clause components) levels, although what they basically do once more is to highlight an important piece of information (hence displaying a macro-textual function besides the grammatical one), as in these two examples: in (8) it introduces a subordinate clause of cause,¹⁰ whereas in (9) the paragraph mark precedes the direct object:

(8) the whiche shall be
leide to bodies and *membris* þat bene naturallye
moyste as *wommen* and *childeren* · namely whan
her woundes be but lytell moyste ¶ **ffor** in
drie bodies and *membris* and woundes þat bene
right moiste thei wolde engender no flesh be-
cause of debilitate of her ecciccacioun (f. 57v, 22 - f. 58r, 3)

(9) þat is to saye feble
Stronge stronger and strongest right in þe
same maner vsen practizours þat nowe
bene ¶ **ffoure maner** of medecines þe whi=
che bene moste chosene and moste redie (f. 68v, 1-5)

Hence, paragraph marks operate at almost all levels, as shown in the preceding examples, although their primary function is at macro-textual level (i.e. macro-textual and grammatical functions). The most common PDE equivalent is the stop,

excepting asyndetic coordination, where the semicolon can be employed (Quirk et al. 2003: 1622). Similarly, the colon can introduce recipes (Quirk et al. 2003: 1620) and the comma can separate main from subordinate clauses due to their length (Quirk et al. 2003: 1627). At clausal level, no punctuation mark (represented hereafter as Ø) is the most suitable counterpart.

4.2. The virgule

According to Petti, the virgule, or oblique stroke, did service for the period, although it could also display the same function as the comma (1977: 26). There are 16 virgules in the text, plus a double virgule, which works at phrasal level relating the elements of a verb phrase, as shown in (10). In this case, Ø is the most suitable PDE counterpart:

(10) with a lente fyre to þat þe vineger **be //**
consumed (f. 72r, 23 – f. 72v, 1)

The virgule displays macro-textual functions twice, marking the end of Chapter Four in the Chauliac section (f. 93r), and also the beginning of a new line of thought (f. 85v). By the same token, these occurrences also display a grammatical function, inasmuch as grammatical units are separated. The PDE equivalent is the stop.

Most of the functions that the virgule performs are found at sentential level (i.e. grammatical function), where it marks off new sentences (2×), as in (11), or subordinate clauses (4×), as in (12). The equivalents used are the semicolon, and Ø or the comma, respectively:

(11) The .4. take the
fylthe of a mann medelyd *witb* honÿc / **brenne**
hem to gedyr and make pouder þer of and ley
hit to hit corrodith nobely well and grevith
but lytell (f. 69r, 17-21)

(12) and the lye shall be well sothen / **to**
þat hit begynne to wexe thykke or tyll þat
it be all drye (f. 73r, 21-23)

Similarly, it marks the beginning of an explanation in (13), which is marked in PDE by the colon:

(13) And as Serapioun and oþer Auctourus seyen hit is
compound boþe of hete and of colde / **hit** is *compound*
of colde by cause of his bitternesse and of hete
by cause of his saltenesse and be cause of his
flowre (f. 51r, 18-22)

At clausal level, the virgule marks the coordinate noun phrase once in (14) and the enumeration of noun phrases twice, as in (15). In both cases, the PDE counterpart is the comma:

(14) And þan þe pultes shall be
spredde vp *one* a cloothe or **on a coole leeff/**
or on a nother leffe (f. 55r, 9-11)

(15) Ther bene *oper* repercussiuus the whiche be not ver=
ryly stiptik in respect of these aforesaide as arage *mercuri*=
all malowes violet cold water vineger rapes gourdes ~
Mandraggis verveine liverwort popye musk of þe water
lemok *gratia dei* / **All maner** Iews waters and oyles and þe sub=
stance of these a fore saide and all *oper* that may be made
of þe same (f. 38r, 3-9)

At phrasal level, the virgule is used twice to relate the elements belonging to a phrase, as illustrated in (16), a function that has no counterpart in PDE:

(16) And in þe same *maner* hardnesses þat fallen
in yoyntes and in nervous places **after / bre=**
kyng of bones and *oper* suche muste bene helyd (f. 80v, 21 - f. 81r, 1)

63

Finally, the virgule appears three times followed by a paragraph mark. In these cases, a new sentence begins, two of them being instances of enumeration, such as (17), while the other (18) includes the conclusion. Thus, these uses would correlate with the stop in a modernised version:

(17) The ·7 take *and*
make pouder of mosse þat growith abouȝte
the rootes of trees and ley hit to hit is esy
and corrodith y nowȝe / ¶ **The ·8·** take attra=
ment sulphur viue orpement salt gomme (f. 69v, 6-10)

(18) And yf a man have the
deposye þe beste þinge þat a mann may do
is for to prouoke vryne / ¶ **And þerfore**
after the techyng of Galienē Maister Ayme=
ryk toke grilllos *oper* canterides þat weren blak
and dide a waye the hedes and þe wynges (f. 94r, 10-15)

4.3. The period

The period appears either slightly raised above the line of writing (852×) or on the baseline (20×), hence totalling 872×. The raised period occurs mostly at phrasal

level (801×), marking off numerals (either Arabic or Roman) and abbreviations of apothecaries' weights and measures (such as ounces or pounds), as shown in (19). It may appear either on one side only or on both. This use does not correlate with any PDE mark:

(19) The firste take þe
Roote of alte preparate *dim* **pound**· swynes grece other
butter · *ijj*· *vncē* medle hem to gedyr (f. 49r, 4-6)

Also at phrasal level, this period marks the relation between phrase components (11×), as in (20). Here is an example of the grammatical function which has no PDE counterpart:

(20) The·7· take **þe·ffatte=**
nes of a oolde swyne þat is not salte (f. 87r, 1-2)

Though less frequently, the raised period shows other uses at other levels. At macro-textual level, it marks off recipes twice, as in (21), the PDE counterpart being again the colon:

(21) The first is an electuarie·
take conserue of Rosen *dim* *quart* conserue of consoude
þe more *dim* pound. (f. 95r, 1-3)

At sentential level, it marks coordinate clauses (4×), as in (22), and also subordinate ones (3×), as in (23). Similarly, it also marks off independent sentences once (24). As for the modern counterparts of these grammatical uses, in the first two cases commas might sometimes be used, whereas in the latter either a stop or a semicolon can be employed:

(22) The thirde
take honýe rosýne picche ana *dim* pound· **and thyk**
ken hit *witþ* pouder of olibanum and femýgrek
ana *dim* ounce and with as mooche flourē of Rýe·
oþer of whete as sufficith (f. 50r, 15-19)

(23) for it shulde shrinke the senewes
and the skynne boþe · **as** fyre schrinketh le=
ther (f. 82r, 9-11)

(24) and frote þe place þat is infecte wit þis
mylke and þu shalt wonder·**maný** men boyle
lyterge bý hym selfe *witþ* vineger and summe
men adde þer to a litell Ceruse (f. 90v, 20-23)

At clausal level, the raised period marks elements belonging to the same clause (12×), as in (25) and (26), in which no PDE equivalent would be inserted. This sign is also employed to mark coordinate noun phrases twice, as in (27), and enumerations (14×), as in (28). Similarly, it also marks parenthetical comments twice such as the one in (29). Commas would be the most appropriate PDE rendering for the uses illustrated in (27) through (29), or Ø in coordinate noun phrases:

(25) Al so ther **be·oper medecines** þat
folowyn ϵ þe whiche ben ϵ good in this same case (f. 39v, 25-26)

(26) ¶The third is · **ngentum de lino** (f. 62r, 8)

(27) *gumme*
of rue and water of þe Asshen of tho þat
geffe mylke and of ffiggis *and* of sporge ·
and þe feces or the drestes of vineger (f. 67v, 22 - f. 68r, 1)

(28) Ther be two maner of *repercussiu*e medecines of þe whiche
somme be sympelly *repercussiu*es as **nyztshode· sengrene** ·
orpyn· purselane · wylde tasyll · psillium · henbane · yuý·so=
rell · water· **lylye** · **planteyne** the more and þe lesse (f. 37v, 16-19)

(29) rosyne colofonie 1·*ounce*· *dim*· of frank encence mastik
safroun · **ana** 1·*ounce*· (f. 62r, 24-25)

Finally, as with the virgule, the raised period is followed by a paragraph mark in five cases, all of which are placed at sentential level, as they mark the end of a sentence (ff. 58v and 61r), as shown in (30). In the other three occurrences (ff. 44v, 54v and 59v), this new sentence is an explanation, as in (31). In all these cases, the stop is the most suitable PDE counterpart:

(30) And yf þu seeth hit moore hit is an Emplaster
and þ ϵ r maýe be putte also the rootes of þe Cane
or braunches of loucher yn stede of þe braunches of
the palme there as þu haste no greene palmes·
¶ And as Galien and Iohne Mesue seyne (f. 61r, 19-23)

(31) Mundificatiues the whiche be me=
ne atwixe ablucions and pultes and as
for this tyme ther ben ϵ · v· of hem · ¶ The
fyrste is made of two parties of mel ro=
sate and one partie of oyle of rosen (f. 54v, 8-12)

Most of the instances of the period on the baseline (14×) are found at phrasal level, marking off numerals and abbreviations of apothecaries' measures, as in the case of the raised period. An example is provided in (32):

(32) Take a vn ϵ off
bole armoniak .3. vn ϵ of oyle of rosen (f. 39r, 12-13)

The remaining instances of this period are encountered at phrasal and clausal levels: in the former, it relates elements belonging to the same phrase, as in (33), in which case no PDE equivalent is found; in the latter, it is used in enumerations of noun phrases (see (28) above for an example and the PDE counterpart):

(33) And these
twoo laste **oynementis**. a fore saide disceyue þe paci=
ent for they be not grene (f. 71r, 12-14)

Furthermore, it can also work at macro-textual level, signalling the end of the prefatory material¹¹ at the beginning of the treatise (34) and of the title of the treatise (35). The title in (35) is in the colour red, which is also used for the line-fillers in both examples. Besides, on one occasion it marks a subordinate clause of cause (36), hence working at sentential level. The stop and the comma are the corresponding PDE counterparts:

(34) The ·vij· is of remolliciou n of hardnes and of þe maner of ~
remolliciou n other softing. ————— (f. 37v, 14-15)

(35) Here begy m eth þe book of þe Antitodarie.
In the name of god . Amen (f. 37v, 1-2)

(36) And yf hit be a feble chylde þat be
sklenderly made it shall lye but ·vj· houres. **for**
why it worchith a none as it is leide to in suche
feble bodies (f. 79r, 8-11)

4.4. The tilde

The long tilde <~> is placed at the end of some lines (80×) where the last word (or at least one of its syllables) falls short of the frame. Since no grammatical or syntactic reason for this use has been found, it has been interpreted to be a means of adjusting the text to the frame, as a kind of line-filler, as in (37). Hence, no PDE counterpart would be employed in a modernised version:

(37) lauatiue and sobberie oþer abstersiue And so ~
of oþer þat to euery contrarie a contrarie **mede** ~
cine shall be leide and contrarie shall be ~ (f. 52v, 8-10)

As shown in this example (*mede-cine*), tildes and hyphens do not coincide at the end of the same line (see also 4.6.), the former prevailing over the latter.

4.5. The caret

The caret <^> (5×) marks insertions, as stated by Petti (1977: 29). The inserted material is placed above the baseline (i.e. supralinear), while the caret is systematically placed under it, as reproduced in (38). As in 4.4., this mark has no counterpart in PDE:

(38) take 2·*ounce* of anacardes and grynde [^] hem and ·3· *ounce* off ho=
nye and as moche vineger medle hem (f. 72r, 21-22)

4.6. The hyphen

Hyphens (463×) are generally used to mark words that are split by the end of the line, although their use is not fully systematic, as there are words split over two lines without hyphenation. In broad terms, though, if there was once any rule concerning hyphenation, “it seems to have been that not less than two completing letters could be carried over to the second line” (Hector 1966: 48). Most hyphens are double, as in (39), although others resemble PDE ones. These hyphens would be deleted in a modernised version of the text with standardised word-division:

(39) oþer þey muste be temperally cold or temperallye
hoote be cause þat synewes of her owne **na=**
turell complexioun be slydon to naturell
coolde from attemperaunce And more ouer **wh=**
at tyme þat þey be dissesid (f. 81r, 19-23)

5. Conclusions

The previous analysis of the punctuation marks used in the *Antidotary* has allowed us to draw the following conclusions:

FIRST. The repertoire of punctuation marks employed is quite restricted, as only six symbols are used. Each of them has a series of uses at several levels, although the most frequent function they perform is at macro-textual level, while the grammatical function is present in most cases. Indeed, the overwhelming use of the grammatical function was already predicted in 1. This indicates that the main purpose of punctuation marks was that of signalling the relevant information of the text. This is connected to the type of text in question, in which the literary quality of the expression is not as important as the subject matter itself. Indeed, no trace of the

rhetorical function of punctuation marks has been found. In connection with this, Parkes remarks that punctuation in the Middle Ages was somehow conditioned by a series of factors, such as the nature of the text, the different forms in which it could be read or the ultimate use it would serve (1978: 132-133), a statement that seems to hold true and to apply to the text under study: a medical text copied for use, reference and consultation by a medical practitioner in the late Middle English period.

This analysis has also proved that there are certain contexts favouring the use of particular punctuation marks. More specifically, each sign shows a certain tendency to feature at a particular level. Accordingly, paragraph marks tend to work at macro-textual and sentential levels, virgules at sentential level, and periods at clausal and phrasal levels. The remaining three signs (tilde, caret and hyphen) do not display any particular function at these levels, but rather serve different purposes, as explained above. Nonetheless, certain overlapping was also found, as shown in Table 1. These conclusions, therefore, serve to confirm that punctuation was not used haphazardly or inconsistently in medieval texts.

SECOND. Were modernisation required, the functional equivalents proposed when discussing each use could be usefully substituted. These are summarised in Table 1, where the various marks linked to each function are separated by means of en-dashes rather than strokes so as to avoid any confusion with the virgule (in the first column):

68

Manuscript punctuation marks	Function	PDE counterpart
¶ - .	To call attention to what follows and highlight a relevant section (a recipe, an enumeration, etc.)	. - :
/	To introduce a new line of thought	.
/ - .	To mark the end of a chapter, of the title or of the prefatory material	.
¶ - / - / ¶ - . - . - ¶	To mark off independent sentences	. - ;
¶ - .	To mark coordinate clauses	; - ,
¶ - / - . - .	To mark off main and subordinate clauses	,
/ - . ¶	To mark an explanation	:
¶ - .	To relate clause constituents	∅
.	To mark parenthetical comments	,
.	To mark coordinate noun phrases	∅ - ,
/ - . - .	To mark enumerations of noun phrases	,
/ - // - . - .	To relate phrase constituents	∅
. - .	To mark numerals and apothecaries' measures	∅

TABLE 1: Functional equivalents for the manuscript punctuation marks according to their function

THIRD. Notwithstanding the presence of two different scribal hands and the different origins of the two sections that make up the text (as explained in section 2), the analysis carried out has not shown the existence of different systems of punctuation. As a matter of fact, the same signs are employed with basically the same functions throughout, although some minor differences have been noted. This has led us to think that the punctuation displayed in the *Antidotary* is not authorial, since this would imply two different systems (one for the Mondeville section and one for the Chauliac section). Instead, it seems to have been inserted by the scribes following a particular set of rules.

Notes

¹. The present research has been supported by the Ministry of Education (FPU programme, grant number AP-2004-244) and by the research projects granted by the Ministry for Science and Innovation (FF12008-02336/FILO, "Grupo Consolidado") and by the regional government of the Junta de Andalucía (Proyecto de Excelencia P07-HUM-02609). These grants are hereby gratefully acknowledged.

². The same claims have been made as regards Old English texts. Yet, recent

research on these texts, such as the West-Saxon version of the Gospels (Esteban Segura 2005, Marqués Aguado 2007) or the Old English version of the *Apollonius of Tyre* (Calle Martín and Miranda García 2005a), has helped to understand Old English punctuation.

³. Despite Hector's reluctance to date a text on the grounds of the handwriting it displays, "the needs of scholarship are usually met if the date allotted to such material on the evidence of its handwriting can be taken to be correct to within fifty years" (1966: 13).

⁴. Both scripts intermingle quite commonly during this period (Petti 1977: 15, Roberts 2005: 164), as both descend from the Gothic system of scripts (Roberts 2005: 161).

⁵. This letter-form resembles , a feature of early-to-mid 15th-century Anglicana hands (Johnson and Jenkinson 1915: 50-51).

⁶. At the moment, the corpus amounts to roughly a quarter of a million running words, although it will be enlarged shortly thanks to the two new projects under development mentioned in Note 1.

⁷. This dictionary works on the principle of choosing as the entry the dialect form used by "Chaucer or 14th century East Midland Middle English" (<<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mec/help.html>>).

⁸. In section 4, examples illustrating each use of the different punctuation marks are

provided, and the sections under discussion are marked in bold. These examples have been drawn from the transcription of the treatise, so that the orthography, layout, etc. are preserved. Yet, the colours of paragraph marks, line-fillers, initials and titles have been eliminated, though explained when relevant.

⁹. See Petti (1977: 25-28) and Parkes (1992).

¹⁰. Notice that Quirk et al. indicate that clauses introduced by *for* are always preceded by a comma, partly to distinguish it from the preposition (2003: 1628).

¹¹. According to Taavitsainen's definition (2002: 292), the prefatory material (or introductory remarks) of this *Antidotary* is merely informative, as it does not make any reference to the author or to the sources of the text.

Works cited

- ALONSO ALMEIDA, Francisco J. 2002. "Punctuation Practice in a Late Medieval English Medical Remedybook". *Folia Linguistica Historica*, XXII (1-2): 207-232.
- ARAKELIAN, Paul G. 1975. "Punctuation in a Late Middle English Manuscript". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, LXXVI: 614-624.
- CALLE MARTÍN, Javier. 2004. "Punctuation Practice in a 15th-century Arithmetical Treatise (MS Bodley 790)". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 4: 407-422.
- CALLE MARTÍN, Javier and Antonio MIRANDA GARCÍA. 2005a. "Aspects of punctuation in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*". *Folia Linguistica Historica*, XXVI (1-2): 95-113.
- . 2005b. "Editing Middle English Punctuation. The Case of MS Egerton 2622 (ff. 136-165)". *International Journal of English Studies*, 5 (2): 27-44.
- . 2008. "The punctuation system of Elizabethan legal documents: The case of G.U.L. MS Hunter 3 (S.1.3)". *Review of English Studies*, 59 (240): 356-378.
- CROSS, Rowin A. 2004. *A Handlist of Manuscripts containing English in the Hunterian Collection Glasgow University Library*. Glasgow: Glasgow University Library.
- ELDRIDGE, Laurence M. (ed.). 1996. *Benvenutus Grassus. The Wonderful Art of the Eye. A Critical Edition of the Middle English Translation of his De Probatissima Arte Oculorum*. East Lansing (Michigan): Michigan State University Press.
- ESTEBAN SEGURA, María Laura. 2005. "The punctuation system of the West-Saxon version of the Gospel according to Saint John". *Linguistica e Filologia*, 21: 29-44.

- . forthcoming. "Punctuation Practice in G.U.L. MS Hunter 509". In Díaz Vera, Javier and Rosario Caballero Rodríguez (eds.) *Textual Healing: Studies in Medieval English Medical, Scientific and Technical Texts*. Bern/New York: Peter Lang.
- FISCHER, Olga. 1992. "Syntax". In Blake, Norman F. (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume II (1066-1476)*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.: 207-408.
- HECTOR, Leonard Charles. 1966. *The Handwriting of English Documents*. London: Edward Arnold.
- HEYWORTH, Peter Lorrigan. 1981. "The Punctuation of Middle English Texts". In Heyworth, Peter Lorrigan. (ed.) *Medieval Studies for J.A.W. Bennett: aetatis suae LXX*. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 139-57.
- HUDSON, Anne. 1977. "Middle English". In Rigg, A. G. (ed.) *Editing Medieval Texts: English, French and Latin Written in England. Papers given at the Twelfth Annual Conference on Editorial Problems*. New York/London: Garland: 34-57.
- JENKINSON, Hilary. 1926. "Notes on the Study of English Punctuation of the Sixteenth Century". *Review of English Studies*, 2 (6): 152-158.
- JOHNSON, Charles and Hilary JENKINSON. 1915. *English Court Hand A.D. 1066 to 1500, Illustrated chiefly from the Public Records* (2 vols.). Oxford: Oxford U. P.
- KURATH, Hans, Sherman M. KUHN, Robert E. LEWIS and John REIDY (eds.) 1956-2001. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/lookup.html>>.
- LASS, Roger. 2004. "Ut Custodiant Litteras: Editions, Corpora and Witnesshood". In Dossena, Marina and Roger Lass (eds.) *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology*. Bern/Berlin/Bruxelles/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Oxford/Wien: Peter Lang: 21-48.
- LEWIS, Charlton T. and Charles SHORT. 1879. *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrew's edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/resolveform?lang=Latin>>.
- LUCAS, Peter J. 1971. "Sense-units and the Use of Punctuation-markers in John Capgrave's *Chronicle*". *Archivum Linguisticum*, 2: 3-24.
- MARQUÉS AGUADO, Teresa. 2007. "Old English Punctuation Revisited: The Case of the Gospel according to Saint Matthew". *SELIM Journal*, 13: 51-72.
- . 2008. *Edition and Philological Study of G.U.L. MS Hunter 513 (ff. 37v - 96v)*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Málaga: University of Málaga.
- MARQUÉS AGUADO, Teresa, Antonio MIRANDA GARCÍA and Santiago GONZÁLEZ y FERNÁNDEZ-CORUGEDO (eds.) 2008. *The Middle English Ophthalmic Treatise on the Use of the Eye in G.U.L. MS Hunter 513 (ff. 1r - 37r)*. Málaga: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Málaga.
- MITCHELL, Bruce. 1980. "The Dangers of Disguise: Old English Texts in Modern Punctuation". *Review of English Studies*, 31 (124): 385-413.
- MOORMAN, Charles. 1975. *Editing the Middle English Manuscript*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- NICAISE, Édouard. (trans. and ed.) 1893. *Chirurgie de Maître Henri de Mondeville. Chirurgien de Philip le Bel, Roi de France. Composée de 1306 à 1320*. Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillié et C^{ie}.
- OBEGI GALLARDO, Nadia. 2006. "Punctuation in a Fifteenth-century Scientific Treatise (MS Cambridge L1.4.14.)". *Linguistica e Filologia*, 22: 99-114.
- OGDEN, Margaret S. (ed.). 1971. *The Cyrurgie of Guy de Chauliac* (vol.1) (EETS O.S. 265). London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- PARKES, Malcolm Beckwith. 1978. "Punctuation, or Pause and Effect". In Murphy, J.J. (ed.) *Medieval Eloquence. Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press: 127-142.
- . 1992. *Pause and Effect. An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Aldershot, Hants: Scolar Press.

- PETTI, Anthony G. 1977. *English Literary Hands from Chaucer to Dryden*. London: Edward Arnold.
- QUIRK, Randolph, Sidney GREENBAUM, Geoffrey LEECH and Jan SVARTVIK. (1985) 2003. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- ROBERTS, Jane Annette. 2005. *Guide to Scripts Used in English Writings up to 1500*. London: The British Library.
- RODRÍGUEZ ÁLVAREZ, Alicia. 1999. "The Role of Punctuation in 15th-century Vernacular Deeds". *Folia Linguistica Historica*, XIX (1-2): 25-51.
- ROSENMAN, Leonard D. 2003. *The Surgery of Henri de Mondeville, Surgeon of Philip the Fair, King of France, Written from 1306 to 1320. A French Translation with Notes, an Introduction and a Biography by E. Nicaise. Translated into English in two Volumes with Annotations, Comments and Appendices* (2 vols.). United States of America: XLibris.
- TAAVITSAINEN, Irma. 2002. "Variation and formularity: Prefatory materials in early scientific writing". In Lenz, Katja and Ruth Möhlig (eds.) *Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Lantage. Essays Presented to Manfred Görlach on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter: 290-304.
- YOUNG, John and P. Henderson AITKEN. 1908. *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of the Hunterian Museum in the University of Glasgow. Planned and Begun by the Late John Young, Continued and Completed by P. Henderson Aitken*. Glasgow: Maclehose.
- ZEEMAN, Elizabeth. 1956. "Punctuation in an Early Manuscript of *Love's Mirror*". *Review of English Studies*, 7 (25): 11-18.