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Abstract The aims of this essay are two-fold. Firstly, it seeks to provide a semantic analysis of the expository apposition marker *pet is* as it is employed in the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402 of *Ancrene Wisse*. This is in order to provide comparative data with the research of Pahta and Nevanlinna concerning the expository apposition marker *that is*. Secondly, it seeks to establish the relationship between the expository apposition marker *that is* and its accompanying punctus in order to reveal scribal attempts at the differentiating use of the punctus, depending on the first appositive.
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1. Introduction

1.1. The Aim of the Study
This essay investigates the relationship between the expository apposition marker *pet is* and the punctuation employed with the marker in the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402, of the *Ancrene Wisse*. The author’s initial interest lay in studying the circumstances in which loan words are frequently introduced in thirteenth-century vernacular treatises for female lay recluses. This interest revealed that new lexemes are often introduced with the phrase *pet is* or its variations, and the accompanying punctuations appear to have several consistent tendencies. This essay intends to develop this finding in order to add to the understanding of a neglected period in the study of the expository apposition marker, where research has hitherto been conducted ‘perfunctorily’ (Pahta and Nevanlinna 1997: 122). The research of Päivi Pahta and Saara Nevanlinna (1983, 1997) has shed light upon the structure and use of nonrestrictive expository appositions in Late Middle English and Early Modern English texts, and it is hoped that the data presented here will fill, in a small way, a missing piece in the diachronic sequence, and may be used to identify comparative characteristics. It is necessary, however, to note that the comparison is between the data derived from a single thirteenth-century
manuscript, probably written in the 1270s or early 1280s (Millett 2005–2006: xi–xii), and the much broader and extensive sample from 1350–1710 derived in the main from the Helsinki Corpus.

1.2. Scope and Method

*Ancrene Wisse* is an early-thirteenth-century instruction book for lay people, being an example of ‘pastoral literature’, a “somewhat amorphous” genre full of didactic expressions (Gunn 93). It conveys religious material considered necessary for lay people with the aid of rhetorical methods. Formed from influences originating in the twelfth-century School of Paris (d’Avray 132–203), and incorporating elements from the monastic tradition, the treatise falls within the scheme of contemporary religious rhetorical technique. In this respect, throughout the work the instructor consistently employs a number of interpretive expressions to transmit the teachings – “food for the soul”—in Latin or vernacular, as if breaking bread into manageable pieces for children to consume. For example, the first appearance in English of the term *conscience* is transmitted through the cognate *inwit*, which relies on such an interpretive method with the expository apposition marker: “conscience. þ is ure inwit” (‘conscience’, that is, our inwit) (83a.17).

The digital manuscript from the Parker Library Web site hosted by Stanford University makes it possible to see the details of punctuation in the manuscript of *Ancrene Wisse*. Both J. R. R. Tolkien’s diplomatic edition (1962) and Millett’s two-volume edition (2005–2006), and its translation (2009), were frequently consulted to read the text and discern meanings. Since research into the punctuation of *Ancrene Wisse* is still at an early stage, it is hoped that

---

1 The original is considered to have been produced in the early thirteenth century.
2 It was Leonard Boyle who coined the term ‘pastoralia’ for the Christian literature which began to be produced abundantly in the thirteenth and succeeding centuries. (Gunn. 93); Joseph Goering (1992: 59).
3 “And I have broken them all up for you, my dear sisters, as people do for children who might die of hunger with unbroken bread. But be sure that I had let fall many crumbs; look for them and gather them up, because they are food for the soul.” (92b.23–26) Examples from *Ancrene Wisse* are drawn from Tolkien’s edition. The modern English translations are Millett’s (2009).
4 Unless otherwise stated all Italics are mine and are for emphasis.
this essay will make a worthwhile contribution, however small, to this field. Philological research employing the Web-based Corpus big data is current in the linguistic and literature research fields, where ‘unfiltered’ ‘meta-data’ assists in identifying linguistic patterns or regularities effectively (Meyer et al 2003: 253). A careful reading of a single manuscript, however, may reveal hidden points, which may have been overlooked within the big data and so provide a novel angle to the research. The masterful investigations of previous researchers have identified how the Ancrene Wisse developed textually. The editing of all seventeen extant manuscripts was completed in 2006 with Bella Millett’s edition of the final manuscript; following this, research into Ancrene Wisse entered a new epoch. Since the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402 has been the central manuscript employed in recent research into Ancrene Wisse, this will be the manuscript scrutinized in this essay.

In the semantic analysis by Päivi Pahta and Saara Nevanlinna, based on the 1992 study by Meyer (1997: 125), the researchers adopted his ‘broad definition of apposition’ and decided to deal with nonrestrictive apposition, and further to focus on expository appositions (1997: 126). According to their reading of Meyer, optional expository apposition markers including that is, when or is identified as obligatory, occur very rarely — less than three percent of the total in present-day English — and are mainly present in academic genres (1997: 128). Pahta and Nevanlinna applied this analysis to earlier periods of English to observe the results, clarifying the “use of the explicit markers and the semantic classes of expository apposition and their distribution across different types of text” (1997: 130). Their targeted markers consist both of fourteen frequently occurring items, ranging from and, & to viz. and ten unique markers, such as þat is to menynge and that is to meane (1997: 129). As a treatise for female lay recluses, Ancrene Wisse belongs naturally to a genre that employs large numbers of expository apposition markers as ‘indicators of formal style’ (1997: 128). This essay focuses on the expository apposition marker þet is and its variations because this marker enjoys the highest frequency in the text. The data is based on Tolkien’s edition with corrections by a comparison with the digital manuscript. Firstly, the þet is marker will be arranged according to the semantic classes categorized by Pahta and Nevanlinna (1997: 134) with comparisons between several modifications. Following this, an investigation into the relationship between the marker and the punctuation placement will be undertaken.
2. Semantic Analysis of Expository Apposition Marker *pet is*

2.1. Classification
Pahta and Nevanlinna sorted the expository apposition markers into five semantic categories: Identification, Appellation, Characterization, Paraphrase, and Revision. With Identification the second appositive is more specific than the first. Appellation identifies the referent of the first unit and the second unit names it. In Characterization, the second appositive provides a general characteristic of the first. Paraphrase is related by the synonymy in two synonymous phrases, clauses, sentences, or words. Lastly, in Revision the units of apposition are not synonymous but co-referential; the two subtypes are reorientation and self-correction (1997: 134–141).

Although the present analysis relies on this five-fold classification, I would propose the addition of a further category, *Glossing*. When “the second unit is often added in order to provide a more familiar variant” and “the second unit provides a native translation variant of a Latin term or name”, Pahta and Nevalinna classify such cases as Paraphrase (1997: 137). They also categorize the cases of unfamiliar clauses or sentences “where the second appositive provides a translation” as Paraphrase (1997: 140). Neither Meyer’s *Apposition in contemporary English* (1992), the basis for Pahta and Nevalinna’s research, nor his recent study (2014) touch upon this criterion for classification. This perspective, however, does not clearly distinguish those cases where the first unit is unknown to the audience, from others in which both the first and second vernacular units are familiar to their recipients. They give the examples of the two types as Paraphrase (Italics are original):

*pré substaunces ben made of þe chyle by decoccioun (i. seþinge) in the lyuer (The Cyrurgie of Guy de Chauliac 62)*
‘three substances are made of the fluid of the intestines by a process of decoction, i.e., boiling in the liver’

*þei sche wer loth & not wylly to do swech thyngys (Kempe, The Book of Margery Kempe 1 55)*
‘though she were reluctant and not willing to do such things’ (1997: 137)
In the second example, the audience know the meanings of both adjectives and the two synonyms resonate with the recipients for a better understanding of the information provided. In the first case of a Latin first appositive and vernacular second appositive, however, the first does not provide a clear meaning or fall within the audience’s anticipated literacy, with only the second unit conveying the intended material in the form of translation.

The extent to which Latin could be comprehended by a lay audience is a major question. Medieval Latin “could be deemed the great medieval European vernacular” when each dialect in Europe or a region was not sufficiently systematized to be inter-communicative (Minnis 2009: 11). Furthermore, Latin might not be a complete enigma even in the daily life of the laity. With regard to the audience of Ancrene Wisse, however, it seems reasonable to suppose that the assumption was that they were not literate in Latin. For example, Seinte Iuliene and Seinte Margarete of the Ancrene Wisse Group narrate, “All lay-people (Leawede men) who cannot understand Latin, listen and hear the life of a virgin, which is translated from Latin into English” (Millett 2009: xiv). The audience of Ancrene Wisse is regarded as being familiar with other Ancrene Wisse Group works, which all share a common interest in virginity. The recipients of Ancrene Wisse were accustomed to recite Latin prayers all day as in Part 1, through which practice they may have attained ‘liturgical literacy’, that is, ‘partial Latin literacy’ (Robertson: 129). While admitting their ‘intermediate position between laici and clerici’, Millett still assumes that the author’s significant use of Latin would not be readily understood by the recluses (Millett 1993: 94). The Latin quotations and insertions may be deemed to have been for the purpose of “speaking to his peers, a university-educated clerical audience” (Millett 1993: 94–95). For this kind of lay recluse, those cases in which both the first and the second appositives were familiar and those where only the second appositive was familiar would require distinct treatment.

The first appositive which does not convey any signification does not necessarily indicate a Latin lexeme, but might also be applied to a recently vernacularized lexeme or an obsolescent one. For example, the audience are asked to lend their ears to the new loan word, “patience. *þet is þolemodnesse*” (48b.19). On the other hand, they are taught the meaning of an obsolescent word: “beowiste *þis wununge*” (42b.8). The first vernacular appositive beowiste
would have been unfamiliar to the Corpus MS audience as it was falling out of use; therefore, it is followed by the familiar noun *wununge* meaning ‘dwelling’ (Millett 2005–2006: II.123. 3.517; Millett 2009: 204. 3.96). This judgement as to whether a first unit was known to the audience or not is based on the *OED* and *MED*, while the determination of an obsolescent case relies on previous research. Thus all cases of the first unfamiliar appositive revealed within *Ancrene Wisse* are categorized as *Glossing* with a broader meaning of ‘interpretation’, and so will be differentiated from *Paraphrase* in this essay.

### 2.2. Semantic Classification

Based on the classification by Pahta and Nevanlinna with the additional category *Glossing*, the expository apposition marker *þet is* in the *Ancrene Wisse* Corpus manuscript is semantically categorized as in Table 1; this corresponds to Table 4 of Pahta and Nevanlinna (1997), which is attached below Table 1.

**Table 1: Semantic Classification of Expository Apposition Marker *þet is* in the AW Corpus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossing</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cf. The semantic classes of apposition (Pahta and Nevanlinna 1997: 134)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>228</th>
<th>5.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>3478</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3869</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that the highest frequency is that of Characterization which is distinct from the data of Pahta and Nevanlinna where Characterization represents only 0.2%. This result may partly derive from the character of *Ancrene Wisse* where metaphorical expressions needing to be explained in plainer expressions occupy a greater part. For example, “hare asse. *Þ* is hare unwise sawle” (their ass, *that is*, their unwise soul) (18b.21). Table 2 shows the number of the cases of the metaphor in first appositive, all the vernacular.

**Table 2: Metaphor used in first appositive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all 110 cases of Characterization, 60 cases (54%) show metaphors in the first appositive. This mainly results from the instructor quoting basic materials, which are suitable for lay female recluses, and also where it is necessary to bring interpretations together, such as with Psalms and Canticles.
In order to make an accurate comparison with the data of Pahta and Nevanlinna, the number of Glossing must be added to those of Paraphrase. Then the sum of Paraphrase and Glossing is 102 (42%), which still counts for less than half the number of Paraphrase within the Pahta and Nevanlinna data (89.9%). Thus Tables 1 and 2 reveal the strong occurrence of Characterization, especially of metaphor, in *Ancrene Wisse*.

### 3. Punctuation and *þet is*

#### 3.1. Background to the Punctuation in the Corpus MS

Middle English punctuation underwent a process of constant adaptation through a variety of authors and scribes, reflecting both its Irish origins and the influence of Latin; there was no clear standard for its forms until printing became widely established (Parkes 41). Peter Clemoes notes that further research is required “to establish firm dates for the introduction and obsolescence of particular practices of the liturgical ‘positurae’ from the tenth to fifteenth centuries” (12).

The expository apposition marker *þet is* is usually accompanied by punctuation marks. Between the Anglo Saxon period and the later middle ages, punctuation developed certain forms. In Anglo Saxon England, Donoghue maintains that basic punctuation was employed differently between Old English poems, Old English prose, Latin poetry, and other forms of writing (40). He presents British Library manuscript Royal 7 C xii, a late tenth-century compilation of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, as a standard example of Old English punctuation. In it he identifies three forms: 1) punctus versus (similar to the modern semicolon); 2) punctus circumflexus (a raised point); and 3) punctus elevatus (a point with an angled mark above) (42). By the later Middle Ages, the system had developed into ‘four principal components’, as identified by Parkes: 1) punctus (a point); 2) punctus elevatus, 3) punctus interrogativus (the modern question mark); and 4) litterae notabiliores\(^5\) (42). Standing at a point somewhere along the line of this progress, the punctuation of *Ancrene Wisse*

---

\(^5\) A mark indicating a new significant section; usually highly decorated and found at the beginning of a text.
has not as yet formed the basis for major research. It can be seen, however, in the case of the Corpus MS of *Ancrene Wisse*, that three forms of punctuation are present: 1) punctus circumflexus [\(^\cdot\)]; 2) punctus interrogativus [\(\cdot\)]; and 3) punctus [.]. Parkes explains the function of 3) punctus as follows:

> It was used to indicate all kinds of pauses, to introduce quotations, and to separate. In this last function it was used to prevent the false association of roman numerals with the letters which preceded and followed them, and with or without the common mark of abbreviation, to isolate drastic abbreviations, *particularly the suspensions found in citations and quotation*... The ‘punctus’ was also used for ‘points of respect’ to set off names or titles. (42)

When used in conjunction with the apposition marker *pet is* in the Corpus MS, the punctus may be seen as playing the role ascribed to it in the highlighted section. The punctus gives a pause to highlight the word or phrase being introduced for citation and quotation.

### 3.2. Punctus of the manuscript

For *pet is* expressions, the punctus is mostly employed either as in Figure 1 (with two punctus) or Figure 2 (with single punctus) in the Corpus MS:

![Figure 1: Corpus 1b.19.](image1)

![Figure 2: Corpus 2b.22.](image2)

The Corpus manuscript is most likely to have been the work of a single scribe, being amended by several scribes later (Millett 2009: xxxviii). All punctus are placed somewhere near the mid-height of each letter. In explaining
his editorial principals regarding punctuation, Tolkien notes simply, “The punctuation of the manuscript has been retained” (vi); however, in fact all punctus in his edition of the manuscript are printed as for the modern full-stop, probably due to practical convenience in printing.

I compared all punctuations in Tolkien’s edition with those of the digital Corpus MS, and found a number of differences. Tolkien sometimes omits punctus, adds unnecessary ones, or puts them in the wrong place. There are also several misunderstandings concerning the recognition of words. Among thirty-six differences between the Online manuscript and the Tolkien edition, there are three cases related to a *pet is* expression as in Table 3: 1) the punctus after *is* is missing (1b.19); 2) the punctus before *P* is missing (49b.18); 3) *is* is integrated with the next word [*isanful*] not being counted as *pet is* (69a.22). Millett’s edition is added for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus MS</th>
<th>Tolkien</th>
<th>Millett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 1b.19</td>
<td>充裕</td>
<td>; <em>pet is</em>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 49b.18.</td>
<td>充裕</td>
<td>, <em>pet is</em>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 69a.22.</td>
<td>充裕 <em>isanful</em></td>
<td>, <em>pet is anful</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tolkien’s transcriptions have been corrected and this is reflected in the data to be considered below.

All occurrences of *pet is* in the Corpus MS were identified and collated. The expression *pet is* functions as an expository appositive marker for both Latin and vernacular predecessors. Within the expression, *pet* may have two functions: demonstrative pronoun and relative pronoun. In the *MED* the *pet* in *pet is* is identified as a demonstrative or anaphoric pronoun, ‘pointing to a person, an object, attribute, a condition, an event, a sequence of actions, an aggregate of things or qualities, etc. previously mentioned’; accompanied with
is (or was), it functions ‘in parenthetic, explanatory, or amplifying expressions’ (MED s.v. *that* pron.).\(^6\) While the *MED*’s earliest example is taken from the *Peterborough Chronicle* (a1121), an example is also drawn from Corpus MS 163/27 (c.1230) of *Ancrene Wisse*. As a demonstrative pronoun in the *Ancrene Wisse*, *pet is* indicates two forms of first appositive: 1) Latin word, phrase or sentence quotation; or 2) vernacular word, phrase or sentence. The following sections investigate the relation between these appositives and the punctus.

### 3.3. Latin first appositive + punctus + *pet is* + punctus

The total number of Latin quotations in the manuscript is 575. Identifying a single unit of Latin quotation in Part 1 is difficult since the section continuously introduces prayers, both long and short, including a number of abbreviations, contractions and incipits, without any clear pauses. Essentially a unit is defined as a case in which a vernacular narration is inserted or the prayers are obviously distinct from each other. A set of prayers with established phrases, such as *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*, *Kyrie eleison*, is counted as one unit. In uncertain cases, Millett’s edition was consulted where Latin is rendered in Italics.

The marker *pet is* acts in combination with ‘punctus [.]’. The formation of the marker can be divided into four: 1) a punctus + ꦜ + is [single punctus]; 2) a punctus + ꦜ + is + a punctus [two punctus]; 3) ꦜ + is [no punctus]; and 4) a punctus + ꦜ.\(^7\) The fourth form lacks ‘is’, but it obviously signifies *pet is*, and as the form appears only once, it is likely that it was a copying error. Table 4 below shows the occurrences in each section. ‘None’ indicates those cases in which the Latin is interpreted, glossed, translated, or paraphrased into the vernacular with no interpretation marker, including those left with no vernacular explanation, which could indicate a type of restrictive expository

---

6 The variations are ‘~awner, ~is to seien (knouen, menen, witen), ~is (beth) to understanden, etc.’.

7 Examples of each of the four forms are as follows: 1) *quantum ad puritatem cordis circa quam uersatur tota religio*. ꦜ is alle mahen Z ahen halden a riwle onont purte of heorte. (1b.19); 2) *Ah moni siheð þe gneat ant swolheð þe flehe*. ꦜ is. makeð muche strengðe þer as is þe leaste (3b.2); 3) *ah chearite ꦜ is luue*. (2b.7); 4) *con temptus eiusdem*. ꦜ alswa as prude is wilnunge of wurðschipe (76a.13).
apposition. Since this essay only analyzes the non-restrictive apposition marker *pet is*, it is not concerned with the difference between these two forms. ‘Others’ comprises the six variations listed below in Table 4. The last case of Others from Part 6, “. *Ꝥ* is as ich seide ear.” actually contains *Ꝥ* is with one punctus, but the following phrase with another punctus defies categorization as one of the types. The corresponding places for each category are shown in Appendix I.

Table 4: Latin first appositive with/without *pet is*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>. Ꜥ is</th>
<th>. Ꜥ</th>
<th>Ꜥ is</th>
<th>. Ꜥ</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>none/sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127/127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>103/137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{sum (\%)}\] 22 (25.9) 53 (62.4) 3 (3.5) 1 (1.2) 6 (7) 85 (100) 490/575

Others  
P2: __. Þis beoð pe wordes. (26a.21)  
P4: __. þis is Ꜥ englisch. (72b.7–8)  
P4: __. Þis is Ꜥ englisch. (74b.15)  
P5: __. Þis wes bitacnet þurh Ꜥ pet (82a.19)  
P6: __. Þis is Ꜥ ich seid þruppe. (95b.3)  
P6: __. Ꜥ is as ich seide ear. (95b.27)

Table 4 shows that, 490 cases of the total of 575 (85%) have no expository apposition marker. The total number of all these patterns of *pet is* in the

---

8 Underlining indicates a preceding word.
manuscript is only 79 (13.5%), being deducted from the number of its variations, six, from the total number 85. This means that those cases with a *pet is* marker are significantly fewer than those without any marker. This demonstrates that the employment of *pet is* is a sign of the presenter’s clear intention to convey the contents of the first appositive to the audience. The use of the expository apposition marker alerts the audience to anticipate receiving information in a language they can easily comprehend.

Table 4 also reveals that Part 1 includes only Latin prayers, which are not translated into the vernacular: 127 Latin units do not accompany any apposition markers, but are simply listed with vernacular instructions. This suggests that lay audiences had some liturgical Latin literacy. Part 1 contains the largest number of Latin quotations of all the sections, and in fact the whole section consists mainly of Latin prayers. This characteristic of Part 1 is a reminder that monastic culture was being transferred to the schools in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, from which time the schools valued grammar and logic more for ratiocinative study on texts and to gain the newly emergent readers (Parkes 44). Thus the lack of *pet is* expression in Part 1 is a remnant of the monastic tradition, which contrasts with the other parts of *Ancrene Wisse*.

The most remarkable feature is that the form of ‘a punctus + Ꝥ + *is* + a punctus’ (. Ꝥ is .) [two punctus] is used only for Latin from Part 5 to Part 8, where there is no trace of the ‘punctus + Ꝥ + *is*’ (. Ꝥ is ) [single punctus] form. That would indicate that the single scribe or author was beginning consciously to differentiate these two forms, the former for Latin and the latter for vernacular. The absence of the ‘punctus + Ꝥ + *is*’ (. Ꝥ is ) [single punctus] form in the latter parts of the work may indicate that the different uses of punctus served as a visual aid to users with the second punctus indicating that a pause was required before the reading out of the following word, because the sign of punctus [circumflexus] suggests a lowering of the voice (Kubouchi 172). This demonstrates that when a punctus appears the reader’s voice drops, which alerts the audience to the need to catch the following word or phrase, because the expected utterance must have some importance. Further research from an oral perspective is required in order to examine this supposition. Part 4, the section on temptation, contains the largest number – 34 – of both ‘punctus + Ꝥ + *is* + punctus’ (. Ꝥ is .) and ‘punctus
+ \textit{is} \footnote{\textit{is}}, together with 103 with no marker. Thus Part 4 has the greatest concentration of Latin authoritative quotations employed to confirm the contents for the audience or readers.

3.4. Latin \textit{id est} + punctus

Tolkien transcribes the corresponding line of the Corpus MS shown below (Figure 3) as “Z iusticiam tuam .id est. uite rectitudinem hiús qui recto” in his edition; he tacitly reads the Latin abbreviation ‘.i.’ as ‘.id est.’

Figure 3: Corpus folio. 1a.23.

The Latin expository apposition marker, ‘.id est.’ [. i .] is seen in the following eight Latin quotations in the Corpus:

1. Pretende inquit psalmista. misericordiam tuam scientibus te per fidem non fictam. Z iusticiam tuam .id est. uite rectitudinem hiús qui recto sunt corde. ... (Preface.1a.23)
2. ... Melchia enim corus domino interpretatur filius recab .id est. mollis patris. ... (Part II.21b.25)
3. ... Item. Z capilli de ca/pite non peribunt. id est. cogitatio non euadet inpunita. ... (Part III.39b.10)
4. Hií secuntur agnum quocumque ierit. utroque scilicet. pede. id est. integritate cordis Z corporis. (Part III.45b.11)
5. Salomon. Via impiorum complantata est lapidibus. id est. duris afflictionibus. (Part IV.50b/24)
6. Gregorius. ysboset inopinate morti nequaquam succumberet. nisi ad ingressum mentis. mulierem. id est. mollem custodiam deputasset. (Part IV.75a.3)
7. Qui causa humilitatis de se mentitur: fit quod prius ipse non fuit. id est. peccator. (Part V.90a.28)
8. Confitebor tibi in directione. id est. in regulatione cordis. ... (Part VII.111a.5)
Thus the Latin expressions originally contained two punctus before and after *id est*. The system is reflected in the usage of *þet is* for those Latin first appositives accompanying two punctus before and after *þet is* as seen above. There can be little doubt that the formation of ‘punctus + þet is + punctus’ (. þet is .) [two punctus] derives from the Latin formation of ‘. id est .’.

3.5. Vernacular first appositive + punctus + *þet is*

The marker *þet is* is also employed for vernacular-vernacular apposition. The total number of this form is less than for Latin-vernacular apposition, as Tables 4 and 5 indicate. The places where the cases appear are shown in Appendix II. Since appositive relation between vernacular and vernacular without a marker is harder to recognize than those from Latin to the vernacular, those cases of vernacular-vernacular apposition without an expository apposition marker are not included in Table 5.

**Table 5: Vernacular first appositive accompanied with *þet is***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>. þet is</th>
<th>. þet is.</th>
<th>þet is</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum (%)</td>
<td>108 (69.7)</td>
<td>16 (10.3)</td>
<td>14 (9)</td>
<td>17 (11)</td>
<td>155 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 demonstrates the greater frequency of the marker under discussion than the Latin equivalent. At the same time, the table suggests that there are numerous unfamiliar or significant vernacular expressions requiring
reinforcement to the audience where, in order to aid comprehension, it was necessary to link them with more familiar vernacular words or expressions.

Table 5 shows that the pattern ‘punctus + is’ [single punctus] is most frequently used with a vernacular first appositive; eg. ‘purte of heorte. is cleane Z schir inwit.’ (purity of heart, which is a clean and clear moral sense) (1b.20). The second form, ‘punctus + is + punctus’ put after [two punctus] is also employed in every part, excepting Part 3, but the frequency of this pattern is almost one tenth of that with a single punctus; eg. “Z rad hire bađe dei Z niht twenti ȝer fulle. is. ha dude a sunne i þe il niht þurh his procunge.” (and [he] rode her both day and night for a full twenty years—that is, she committed a sin that very night through his incitement) (73a.14). It has been noted previously that the form with two punctus is more frequently used for Latin first appositives. Thus the scribe may be beginning to develop a distinction between Latin and vernacular first appositives through different usages of punctus. There are also some cases of ‘is’ with no punctus; eg. “totred te neddre heaued is þe biginnung of his fondunge.” (trample on the serpent’s head—that is, the beginning of his temptation.) (80b.5). From this, it may be concluded that the use of punctus with the is marker is not governed by a strict rule; however, it is apparent that the ‘punctus + is’ form [single punctus] is mainly employed for vernacular-vernacular apposition.

As can be seen below, the vernacular-vernacular expository apposition marker demonstrates a greater number of variations than those with a Latin first appositive. The case of Part 2 ‘. is as ich seide.’ is not categorized into the three types even though it includes is for the same reason as the last category of Others for the Latin first appositive type.

Pre: __. ȝe cleopieð (4a.20)
P2: __. is to seggen. (20b.14)
P2: __. is as ich seide. (26b.10)
P2: __. is to seggen. (26b.27)
P2: __. beoð (27a.11)
P4: __. is to seggen. (61b.15)
P4: __. is to seg/gen. (64a.15–16)
P4: __. is to seggen. (75b.16)
P4: __. is to seggen. (75a.20)
Although Latin first appositives always follow a punctus [.], a few vernacular first appositives come after other marks, that is, punctus circumflexus [ˈ] or punctus interrogativus [ˈ] as seen in one of the variations of Part 6 above (95a.6). Since the present investigation does not concern differences among punctus, the cases accompanied with punctus circumflexus and punctus interrogativus are counted as for the punctus cases. It would appear that the expository apposition markers for vernacular-vernacular apposition have become more flexible in order to convey the vernacular meanings of sentences, phrases, words, and people’s names or place names. The markers seem to be employed more loosely, while for the Latin quotation, the expression remains formal and fixed in a form of inherited pattern from the Latin script in order precisely to transmit authoritative sentences.

3.6. As a relative pronoun
Tables 4 and 5 indicate that pet is is a very common expression, not only in Latin, but also in the vernacular. Moreover, this combination is often used to modify a predecessor as a relative pronoun plus a be-verb. This form amounts to 77 examples in the work as a whole. Table 6 reflects this frequency. There are two forms: 1) þet + is [no punctus]; 2) punctus + þet + is [single punctus]. All appear within vernacular sentences and their occurrences are shown in Appendix III.

9 The corresponding other marks are noted before the manuscript page and line in the Appendix.
10 Millett puts þet is in some places, for example, Part 4 line 862, to make the sentence clearer, where originally there is no such description.
Additionally, there are some irregular forms of the relative pronoun which are counted in either 1) or 2) above: *Pe is* (93a.3) [1]; * ꡗ is* (97a.10, 98b.28) [2]; *P wes* (109a.24) [1]; *Pe is* (111b.22) [1]. In terms of distinction, an expository apposition marker is defined here as one which replaces a first unit with a second one, while a relative pronoun modifies a preceding expression by adding relevant information.

Table 6 shows that Part 4 has the greatest frequency in the whole text. As the form of the relative pronoun is the same as the expository apposition marker, confusion between the two sometimes occurs. In ambiguous cases Millett’s translation was consulted.\(^\text{12}\) Table 6 reveals that the author or scribe tends to omit a punctus before a relative pronoun *PET*. Although the presence of a punctus is not a perfect means to distinguish a relative pronoun from an expository apposition marker, Tables 5 and 6 suggest that the author or scribe was consciously employing the punctus for different purposes. This was either

\(^{11}\) [1] denotes ‘ ꡗ is’, while [2] does ‘ ꡗ is’.

\(^{12}\) The following ambiguous examples were encountered in attempting to distinguish apposition marker from relative pronoun (with part number and the line of Millett’s edition): 42b.1 (P3.511), 44b.9 (P3.629), 76b.2 (P4.1459), 98b.28 (P6.245).
to indicate an expository apposition marker or a relative pronoun. It seems likely that *pet is* is employed so frequently, that the placement of a punctus can act not only as an indicator for both Latin and vernacular quotation, but also for relative pronouns, particularly in the later sections of the work.

4. Summary

This investigation into the expository apposition marker *pet is* and its accompanying punctus in the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402 of *Ancrene Wisse* has revealed that the author or scribe was applying an experimental method. It is clear that two punctus plus *pet is* mainly follows a Latin first appositive, and one punctus plus *pet is* is usually used for a vernacular first appositive. Furthermore, the relative pronoun *pet plus is* is not generally accompanied by a punctus. These tendencies probably originate from the custom of punctuation in Latin texts where *id est*, meaning *pet is*, is written between two punctus. Both forms with one or no punctus for vernacular sentences may have derived from this Latin formation. The loose regulation among these forms indicates that the method was developing and becoming more consistent through the latter part of the work. It may be supposed that this tendency did not imitate the scribe’s exemplar, but probably reflects arbitrary experimentation by the scribe himself.

Millett points out that the recluses lived a solitary life with the custom of reading written texts, which included “books, pamphlets and scrolls” (1993: 95). She emphasizes the author’s consistent advice for the anchoresses to read the text, which probably testifies to the recluses’ vernacular literacy. The loose rules of punctus placement might have helped them read the text in silence by distinguishing the vernacular from the Latin context; or, if the punctus still bore the function of indicating a lowering of the voice, it can be assumed that the females had opportunities to listen to recitals by a third party or to do so themselves.

The result of this investigation has highlighted the particular character of Part 1’s liturgical inheritance without the necessity of translation from Latin, while Part 4, the section concerning temptation, has emerged with the greatest number of inserted Latin references and their explanations, which served to strengthen the theological teaching for the audience. This demonstrates the
strong influence of scholastic theologians on *pastoralia* in general and the *Ancrene Wisse* in particular, on the need to inform audiences of the increased emphasis placed on confession and penitence following the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. The expository apposition marker *pet is* played the role of transmitting this new wave of pastoral theology into the English lay world. The marker interprets the metaphorical expressions for the primary lay recluses, and interprets unknown clerical lexemes for the audience’s better understanding. The results of semantic analysis support the findings of Pahta and Nevanlinna’s research; that is, the expository apposition marker functioned in the learned field, and provides fresh evidence of its use in the early thirteenth century. On the other hand, *Ancrene Wisse* seems to require special care when categorizing its semantic functions because it is a treatise written in the vernacular with many Latin quotations and prayers. Whether my proposition of a *Glossing* category is appropriate remains to a degree uncertain, but consideration should be given to the possibility. The wide employment of the expository apposition marker *pet is* for Characterization and Glossing in the Corpus MS is due to the metaphorical textual expressions and the introduction of a large number of new lexemes within the manuscript. This study of *pet is* in *Ancrene Wisse* the Corpus MS reveals a process in the development of the use of punctuation at a time of fusion between Latin and vernacular sources in early-thirteenth-century England when a wave of new concepts was entering into English.
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Appendix I

Latin first appositive

Preface —  

Part 1 — none: 4b.18, 4b.19, 4b.22, 4b.23, 4b.25, 5a.11, 5a.23, 5a.24, 5a.27, 5b.9, 5b.10, 5b.13, 5b.14 (×2), 5b.15 (×3), 5b.16, 5b.20, 5b.23, 5b.24, 5b.25, 5b.26, 5b.27, 5b.28, 6a.1, 6a.8, 6a.15, 6a.18 (×2), 6a.21, 6a.22, 6a.25, 6a.27, 6a.28 (×2), 6b.1 (×2), 6b.2 (×3), 6b.3 (×2), 6b.7, 6b.8, 6b.16, 6b.18, 6b.20, 6b.21, 7a.13, 7a.20, 7a.22, 7b.3, 7b.9, 7b.16, 7b.23, 7b.24, 7b.25, 8a.5, 8a.6 (×2), 8a.17, 8a.18, 8a.21, 8b.17, 9a.4, 9a.5, 9a.6, 9a.7, 9a.8, 9a.9, 9a.11, 9a.12 (×2), 9a.13, 9a.14, 9a.16 (×2), 9a.17, 9a.20 (×3), 9a.21 (×2), 9a.24 (×2), 9b.2, 9b.7, 9b.10, 9b.19, 10a.1, 10a.8, 10a.15, 10a.16, 10a.19, 10a.20, 10a.25, 10a.27, 10b.2, 10b.4, 10b.9, 10b.11, 10b.13, 10b.14, 10b.15, 10b.25, 11a.5, 11a.11, 11a.14, 11b.6, 11b.9, 11b.11, 11b.17, 11b.18, 11b.20, 11b.21, 11b.23, 11b.24 (×2), 11b.28, 12a.1, 12a.5, 12a.6, 12a.7, 12a.10, 12a.11 (×2).

Part 2 —  

Part 3 —  

Part 4 —  

Others: 1a.1, 1a.20, 1b.3, 1b.19; none: 1a.1, 1a.20, 1b.3, 3b.11, 4a.4, 4a.14.
Appendix II

Vernacular first appositive

Preface — . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 1b.20, 2a.21, 2b.22, 3a.21; . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 3b.2; \( \text{Þ} \) is : 2b.7; others : 4a.20.

Part 2 — . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 18b.21, ( ) 21a.3, 26b.1, 30a.9, 31a.28, 31b.4, 31b.5; \( \text{Þ} \) is : 21b.14, 21b.17; others : 20b.14, 26b.10, 26b.27, 27a.11.

Part 3 — . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 32b.3, 32b.5, 34a.8, 35b.9–10, 35b.21, 35b.23, 36a.9, 36a.18, 36a.28, 36b.2, 37a.13, 37a.24, 37a.27, 37b.7, 37b.12, 38a.20, 38b.3, 39a.1, 39a.14, 39b.28, ( ) 40a.2, 40a.4, 40a.5, 40a.12, ( ) 40a.14, 40b.28, 41a.10, 42a.11, 42b.1, 42b.19, 44a.8, 44b.11, 45a.16, 46a.2, 46a.3, 46b.2, 46b.3, 46b.7, 46b.8, 47a.13, 47a.15, 47a.24; \( \text{Þ} \) is : 35b.6, 37a.11, 42b.8, 46b.13.

Part 4 — . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 48a.12, 49b.18, 50b.28, 51a.10, 51a.18, 52a.24, 55a.15, 55b.26, 56a.20, 58a.3, 58b.18, 61a.16, 66b.7, 66b.17, 69a.6, 69a.22, 74a.24, 74a.25, 74b.3, 75a.10, 76a.1–2, 76b.2, 76b.14, 76b.27, 79b.16, 79b.27, 80a.27, 80b.17; . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 73a.14, 74a.20; \( \text{Þ} \) is : 80b.5, others : 61b.15, 64a.15–16, 75a.16, 75a.20, 75b.2.

Part 5 — . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 81b.3, 81b.11, 82a.2, 82a.23, 83a.17, 84b.20, 86a.15, 89b.11, 90b.14, ( ) 90b.15–16 (pet), 91b.23, 94a.10; . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 85b.8, 86a.27, 87a.28; \( \text{Þ} \) is : 81b.2, 82a.25 (pet), 82a.28, 83b.18, 90b.24–25, 90b.26; others : 81b.17, 82a.23–24.

Part 6 — . \( \text{Þ} \) is : 96a.2, 96a.22, 98b.8, 100b.19, 101a.24, 101b.24 (pet); . \( \text{Þ} \) is :
Appendix III

Relative pronoun

Part 1—\( \text{ð} \) is: 5a.2.
Part 2—\( \text{ð} \) is: 13a.28, 15b.10, 16a.3, 21b.10, 21b.18, 23a.10, 23a.13, 24b.10, 30a.8; . \( \text{ð} \) is: 13a.6 (\( \text{þet} \)), ( ) 26b.28.
Part 3—\( \text{ð} \) is: 33a.2, 39a.5, 39b.5, 40a.16, 41a.20, 42b.1 (\( \text{þet} \)), 44b.12, 46a.3; . \( \text{ð} \) is: 34a.28, 35b.16, 38a.14, ( ) 39b.15, ( ) 42b.9, 43b.24, 47a.23, 47b.6.
Part 4—\( \text{ð} \) is: 48b.4, 49b.12–13, 51b.11, 52a.9, 52b.13, 56a.8, 59b.28, 60a.5, 63b.13, 69b.4, 70a.16, 75a.7, 75b.20, 76a.4, 78a.17, 78b.10; . \( \text{ð} \) is: 55a.22, 56b.14, 75b.12, ( ) 77b.19.
Part 5—\( \text{ð} \) is: 83a.15, 84a.6, 85a.5, 87a.28 (\( \text{þet} \)), 89b.28, 92a.11, 93a.3 (\( \text{þe} \)); . \( \text{ð} \) is: 87a.5, 89b.24.
Part 6—\( \text{ð} \) is: 95a.14, 98a.4, 99a.19, 99b.9, 103b.13, 103b.28; . \( \text{ð} \) is: ( ) 97a.10, ( ) 98b.28, 102b.12.
Part 7—\( \text{ð} \) is: 105a.1, 105a.4 (is ), 110a.20, 110a.27; . \( \text{ð} \) is: 109a.24 (\( \text{wes} \)).
Part 8—\( \text{ð} \) is: 111b.10 (\( \text{þe} \)), 111b.22–23 (\( \text{þe} \)), 113a.9, 116a.10, 117a.26; . \( \text{ð} \) is: 115a.16 (\( \text{þet} \)).

96b.4, 101b.18, 102b.26, 103a.7, 103a.18; others: ( ) 95a.6, 97b.2, 101b.20–21.
Part 7— . \( \text{ð} \) is: 104b.8, 106a.24, 107b.1, 108b.21, 109a.1, 109a.4, 109a.14, 110a.13; . \( \text{ð} \) is: 109b.4, 110a.2; others: 109b.13, 109b.17.
Part 8— . \( \text{ð} \) is: ( ) 117a.2; . \( \text{ð} \) is: 113a.9, 117a.1.