

# The Use of the Hyphen in Printing to Indicate Divided Words

F. M. O'Hara, Jr.

The unsystematic employment of hyphenation by early printers led to the author's inspection of incunabula and reproductions of manuscripts and incunabular printing. These observations showed a gradual standardization of the typographic form of the hyphen, an evolution of the phonetic division of words from arbitrary academic rules, and a slow development of the universal employment of the hyphen to indicate divided words. These trends in the history of printing suffered a reversal during the sixteenth century, and it was not until the late seventeenth century that hyphenating practices as they are observed today were generally established.

To the ancient Greek grammarians, the hyphen was a sign (Ϸ) placed under the last letter of a word to indicate that that word and the following one were compounded together in meaning and should be read as one word. The name comes from the late Greek ἡ ὑφέν, which in turn comes from ὑφ', ὑπο, under, plus ἓν, one.<sup>1</sup> Punctuation, as we know it today, has long been attributed to the Masorites, a Jewish sect *ca.* A.D. 600 who placed interpuncts after each psalm of the Scriptures to ensure that sufficient pause for due meditation would be taken. From these various marks introduced by the Masorites, it is claimed, have devolved the major marks of punctuation. However, if punctuation was devised as late as 600, it must have achieved a rapid, widespread success, for in 799 we have Alcuin, the tutor of Charlemagne, complaining in a letter to Charles that "the use of punctuation should also be resumed by scribes."<sup>2</sup> He thereupon systematized the methods of punctuation<sup>3</sup> and reformed and standardized the Carolingian writing that had evolved from early Roman minuscule (half-uncial). This Carolingian hand was used as a model for the four following centuries and is the ancestor of our minuscule alphabet.<sup>4</sup>

Whether Alcuin's plea applied to the hyphen or not is doubtful, since it was not considered a mark of punctuation but rather an

accent mark. Witness the reference to it in Putschius' analysis of the grammar of Sergius.<sup>5</sup> Under the heading "De Accentibus" he denotes

Circumflex so  $\hat{\ }^{\circ}$ ; obviously made with downward strokes in both directions. A long mark so  $\text{—}$ . A short one so  $\text{—}^{\circ}$ . A hyphen so  $\text{—}^{\circ}$ . A comma so  $\text{,}$ . An apostrophe so  $\text{'}$ .

The use of the hyphen to indicate turnovers was instituted between the ancient Greeks and the "ancient" Romans; in Putschius' edition of Maximum Victorinus's *Ars Grammatica*<sup>6</sup> we find

. . . and therefore we allow Dasium and Psile, whom the Greeks control, to pass; because the letter H exhibits exhalation by us, which is divided into two parts, as if containing a hyphen although one will not be situated near to the H, as when we connect two words as one in speaking them, and of that they make this symbol  $\text{—}^{\circ}$ , and whenever words are turned over to the following line, they will connect succeeding letters with an accent mark, for example Turnus ut ante  $\text{—}^{\circ}$  volans.

Again in Priscian's *Caesar*<sup>7</sup> he says

A mark drawn straight from the left to the right (side), thus  $\text{—}$ . What is a *brevis linea* (short line)? A similar horizontal mark, but curved like the lower part of a circle, thus  $\text{—}^{\circ}$ . What is a hyphen? A bent mark underneath a line of writing, thus  $\text{—}^{\circ}$ ; by virtue of which we connect two words as the text requires.

Diomedes also mentions the hyphen, although not its ability to unite parts of words broken at ends of lines:

To these they add the hyphen in the shape of a gently upward curving mark beneath the line of writing and straight at the upper part  $\text{J}$ . This mark indicates that the letters of the two words closest to each other are pronounced as one.<sup>8</sup>

An eighth century manuscript copy of Beowulf also shows the use of the single-stroke hyphen (-) to link words to be read as one (e.g., be-ond and be-com) but not to connect divided words.<sup>9</sup>

Between these writings and the introduction of printing in the fifteenth century, the hyphen was widely used to indicate divided

words. The insular (Irish Anglo-Saxon) hand used in the British Isles until the thirteenth century employed a single-stroke character (-), the Gothic script used a double-stroke character (/I), and some humanistic Italian scripts that succeeded the Gothic used a single-stroke subscript (-). According to Wright<sup>10</sup> the forms / and = were introduced into the English hand after the thirteenth century, either as embellishments of the original or as borrowings from eastern countries. This is important to our inquiry since according to Goudy<sup>11</sup> all the type fonts cut in the first fifty years of printing were based on some particular vernacular hand.

In the meantime, the use of another factor, important to the implementation of dividing and hyphenating words, was being developed, that of syllabification. According to Hale,<sup>12</sup> the Romans in syllabifying a word would put with a following vowel as many consonants as would stand together at the beginning of a Latin or Greek word. Examples of words correctly divided by this principle would be fru-ctus, ma-gnus, o-mnis, i-pse, and nu-ptus. This would appear to have been a practical rather than phonetic rule. However, Dennison,<sup>13</sup> in analyzing word divisions used in ancient (*ca.* A.D. 81 on) Latin inscriptions, found that stonecutters divided words “correctly” according to our accepted, phonetic method of word division in 84 per cent of the cases (more than 2,000 observed). Therefore, although the grammarians might have had an exact non-phonetic rule for word division, the users of the written language followed phonetic rules. Divisions other than phonetic can be considered, he reasons, to be haphazard or convenient choices.

With the implementation of printing, both the rigorous employment of the hyphen where it was called for and the “correct” division of words into syllables in turnovers fell into disuse, as can be seen from Table I. The practice of punctuation, along with the employment of hyphenation, was standardized by individual printing houses,<sup>14</sup> and it was not until the sixteenth century that attempts were made at widespread standardization in spelling, punctuation, and grammar.<sup>15</sup> As late as 1771 Luckombe<sup>16</sup> lamented that “the expectation of a settled punctuation is in vain, since no rules of prevailing authority have been yet established.” Luckombe notwithstanding, standardization and systematization was early deemed desirable, and several men did something about it. The efforts of

Aldus Manutius were not among the least of these; he issued many Greek and Latin grammars. Interestingly enough, all he had to say<sup>17</sup> about the hyphen, which he referred to as a “reliquus accensus,” was

The hyphen is a subscript mark which is placed below the end of one utterance (word) and the beginning of another if we wish to join them as in ante malorum, ante volans.

To have been left out of so prestigious a grammar seems to indicate that the use of the hyphen to indicate word division had suffered a great decline in importance. But the phonetic basis of syllabification is found to have academic approval:

What is a syllable? A combination of letters, as batra, but improperly a syllable can be made of vowels only as in eoo.<sup>18</sup>

In 1620 Hume, who is considered<sup>19</sup> to be the first to Anglicize the word hyphen, also dwells solely on the compound-word use of the hyphen:

The learned printer uses to symbolize apotrophus and hyphen as wel as a, b, c. . . . Hyphen, as it wer, a band uniting whol wordes joined in composition; as a hand-maed, a heard-man, tongue-tyed, out-roge, foer-warned, mis-reported, fals-deemed.<sup>20</sup>

It is not until Bowles (*ca.* 1750)<sup>21</sup> that we see a citation in a grammar of the use of the hyphen (-) to connect divided words. Other grammarians quickly follow. Cellarius (1768)<sup>22</sup> makes note of a mark (//) he calls the “*Divisio in fine versus*,” and Burrow<sup>23</sup> differentiates between two marks:

The HYPHEN (marked -) is also very proper to shew the Conjunction of two or more Words so connected and compounded together as not perfectly to coalesce, yet to form *almost* though not quite one Word. The Duplication of the same mark (=) is used to connect the discontinued Syllables of a Polysyllable, separated from each other by the Distance of a whole Line’s Length, for want of Room to finish the Word within the End of the former Line; and it becoming therefore necessary to complete it upon a new one.

Here we must stop to explain two phenomena that simultaneously occurred to the hyphen, developments in form and employment. As has been noted, two forms of hyphens came to the printer from his calligraphic predecessors (- and =). The first came from the Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon hands, and the second from the Gothic. The slanting of these was probably a result of quickening the act of writing rather than the borrowing of another form from another source. As can be seen from Table I, the use of - and / occur largely where the influence of Italian scripts was felt, and the employment of = and // was made where Gothic script was prevalent. Interestingly, although printing was spread through Europe predominantly by Germans used to Gothic lettering, it was only in Italy where the endemic vernacular hand initially influenced the change to the lighter hyphen form. Not until the seventeenth century is there a trend toward a standardized acceptance of the single-stroke, horizontal form (-). The evolution of the form of the hyphen is traced in Table II.

The use of hyphens at all seems to have been at first disdained by printers. Meerman<sup>24</sup> in his defense of Laurentius describes his *Donatus*, published in 1477, as having

no indications of separation of syllables at the end of a line; while, on the contrary, an instance of a divided syllable is found in the middle of the line. No signs of interpunctuation, and indeed no punctuations, which may be observed in other works of Laurentius, occur, although the letter i is notated here not with an accent mark, but with a dot. Lines [hyphens or dashes] are randomly straight and curved.

Talking of Laurentius' other works, he says<sup>25</sup>

Except for the *punctum* which appears in all editions, save the first Latin one, no punctuation marks appear (such as the virgula, semicolon, colon, question mark, and the division at the end of certain lines).

The use of the hyphen in the new world [“aparece com dois traços (=),”<sup>26</sup>] in the poem “Lusiados” by Camoes published in 1572 was noted by Melo.<sup>26</sup> An earlier example is found in the work of Juan Pablos. Although an example of Pablos' earliest work, *Manual*

TABLE I. *Printers' Hyphenating Practices Through the Eighteenth Century*

<i>Printer (place)</i>	<i>Work (date)</i>	<i>Rigorous Employment of Hyphen- ation</i>	<i>Form Taken by Hyphen</i>	<i>Phonetic Syllabifica- tion Employed; Comments</i>
Gutenberg (Mainz)	42-Line Bible (1450-55) <sup>a</sup>	yes	//	no
Fust and Schoeffer (Mainz)	Psalterium Moguntinum (1457) <sup>a</sup>	yes	=	no
Gutenberg (Mainz)	36-Line Bible (1458) <sup>a</sup>	yes	// and /	no; follows no rule distinguishing between the two forms
Gutenberg (Mainz)	Catholicon (1460) <sup>a</sup>			no; words divided without hypens
Rusch (Strassburg)	Biblia Latina (1464) <sup>a</sup>	no	/	no
Sweynheim and Pannartz (Subiaco)	Opera (1465) <sup>a</sup>	yes	/	no
Han (Rome)	Meditations (1467) <sup>b</sup>	no	//	no
Jenson (Venice)	Epistolae ad Brutum (1470) <sup>b</sup>	yes	/	no
Freiburger, Gering, and Krantz (Paris)	Gasparini Per- gamensis Epis- tolarum Opus (1470) <sup>b</sup>	yes	/ and //	no
De Spira (Subiaco)	De Civitate Dei (1470) <sup>a</sup>	yes	/	cannot tell
Freiburger, Gering, and Krantz (Paris)	Biblia Latina (1476) <sup>a</sup>	no	/	no
Jenson (Venice)	De Arte Gram- matica (1480) <sup>a</sup>			no; words divided without hypens
Mansion (Westimnster)	Metamorphoses (1484) <sup>a</sup>	no	//	no

Ratdolt (Augsburg)	Type Specimen (1486) <sup>b</sup>	no	/	no
Spindeler (Barcelona?)	Tirant lo Blanch (1490) <sup>b</sup>			words divided without hypkens
Caxton (Westminster)	Eneydos (1490) <sup>c</sup>	no	//	no
Koberger (Nuremberg)	Schatzbehalter der Wahren Reichtümer des Heits (1491) <sup>a</sup>	no	//	no
Thierry Martens (Antwerp)	Synonyma (ca. 1493) <sup>d</sup>	no	//	no
Olpe (Basle)	La Nef des Fous (1494) <sup>b</sup>			Words divided without hypens
de Worde (Westminster)	Opus Gram- maticus (1494) <sup>a</sup>	no	=	no
Pynson (London)	Missale ad Usum Sacrum (1500) <sup>a</sup>	no	//	no
Manutius (Venice)	Elementare In- troductorium in Idioma Graecanicum (1505) <sup>e</sup>	no	/	no
Lotter (Leipzig)	Letter (1510) <sup>f</sup>	yes	//	yes
Manutius (Venice)	De Literis Graecis ac Diphthongis (1512) <sup>g</sup>	no	/ and .	no; no differentia- tion between forms
de Brocar (Alcala)	La Cronica de Serenissimo Rey Don Juan (1517) <sup>a</sup>	no	=	no
Froben (Basle)	Sermones (1519) <sup>a</sup>	no	/	no
Manutius (Venice)	Institutionum Grammati- carum (1523) <sup>h</sup>	no	/	no
de Colines (Paris)	De Opificio Dei (1529) <sup>a</sup>	no	=	no

<i>Printer (place)</i>	<i>Work (date)</i>	<i>Rigorous Employment of Hyphen- ation</i>	<i>Form Taken by Hyphen</i>	<i>Phonetic Syllabifica- tion Employed; Comments</i>
R. Estienne (Paris)	Biblia Latina (1530?) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	no
de Colines (Paris)	Strozii Poetae, Pater et Filius (1530) <sup>i</sup>	no	/ and =	no; hyphenation ignored when typographically convenient
Sessa (Venice)	De Recta Latini Graecique Ser- monis Pro- nunciatione (1531) <sup>j</sup>	no	= and /	no; the two forms differ in width; justification was aided by their employment or disemployment
Tagliente (Venice)	Sample (1532) <sup>k</sup>	yes	/	cannot tell
Varcosan (Paris)	De Civilibus Romanorum Bellis (1538) <sup>a</sup>	no	-	seems to attempt a rigorous appli- cation of the hyphen but misses a few times
de Colines (Paris)	De Dissectione Corporis Humani (1545) <sup>a</sup>	no	//	no
Wechel (Paris)	Tiers Livre (1546) <sup>b</sup>	yes	-	no
Giolito (Venice)	Le Transforma- tioni (1553) <sup>l</sup>	no	-	no
de Tournes (Lyons)	Biblia Sacra (1558) <sup>a</sup>	no	-	no
Day (Cordon)	The Cosmologi- cal Glass (1559) <sup>a</sup>	yes	/	yes
Blado (Rome)	Tractatus Jurus (1565) <sup>a</sup>	no	/ and //	no; / used in all- cap words; // used in body type

Plantin (Antwerp)	Polyglot Bible (1569–72) <sup>a</sup>	no	-	no
Plantin (Antwerp)	Horatius Flaccus Emendatus (1580) <sup>m</sup>	yes	= and -	yes; = outnum- bers - 26 to 1
de Gourmont (Paris)	Tableaux des Arts et Sciences (1587) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	cannot tell
Barker (London)	The Holy Bible (1611) <sup>a</sup>	yes	//	no
B. and A. Elzevier (Leiden)	Ciceronis Opera (1642) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	yes
vander Water (Utrecht)	Pliniana Excercitationes (1689) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	no
University Press (Oxford)	History of the Rebellion (1704) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	yes
Merlin (Paris)	Le Pharsale de Lucain (1766) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	yes
Bodoni (Parma)	Atti della Solemne Coro- nazione della Insigne Poetessa (1779) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	yes
Fry (London)	Secundi Episto- lorum (1790) <sup>a</sup>	yes	-	no

a. Sample appears in S. Morison and K. Day, *The Typographic Book, 1450–1935* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago, 1963).

b. Sample appears in A. Flocon, *L' Univers des Livres* (Paris: Hermann, 1961).

c. Sample appears in C. F. Bühler, *William Caxton and His Critics* (Syracuse: Syracuse Univ., 1960).

d. Sample appears in R. G. C. Proctor, *Tracts on Early Printing. I. Founts of Type and Woodcut Devices Used by the Printers of the South Netherlands in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Clowes, 1895).

e. A. P. Manutius, *Elementare Introductorium in Idioma Graecanicum* (Venice: Aldine, 1505).

*de Adultos*, has no word division and thus no hyphenation, by at latest 1543 he was using hyphens (*//* as well as *=*).<sup>27</sup>

Jenson supposedly had no hyphen among his type punches.<sup>28</sup> Although this is belied by the appearance of hyphenation in his later works, it would account for the absence of hyphenation in some of his books.

From the start of printing until the seventeenth century many printers were employing more than one form of hyphen on the same page, often interspersed with turnovers with no hyphenation at all. One reason for this ignoring of the hyphen seems to be that the very early printers tried to conserve paper by leaving out or abbreviating as much of the text as possible. Later, when the trade was well established and the hyphen generally employed, there was another discontinuity in its use (roughly during the late fifteenth century and the sixteenth century). This can be attributed to the run on printed books and the resulting rush to produce them brought on by the spread of literacy in the middle classes. At that time the emphasis was on production, not quality. Personnel at all levels of the publishing process were insentient to the demands of grammar: the typesetter, the printer, the proofreader, and the publisher himself. Such callousness can be seen from the lack of any “quality control” in that although the great printers from the earliest times certainly employed proofreaders and type correctors, it is doubtful that even in the beginning of the nineteenth century printers *generally* employed correctors.<sup>29, 30</sup>

---

f. Sample appears in G. Dowding, *Introduction to the History of Printing Types* (London: Wace, 1961).

g. A. P. Manutius, *De Literis Graecis ac Diphthongis* (Venice: Aldine, 1512).

h. A. P. Manutius, *Institutionum Grammaticarum* (Venice: Aldine, 1523).

i. Strozius and Strozius, *Strozii Poetae, Pater et Filius* (Paris: de Colines, 1530).

j. D. Erasmus, *De Recta Latini Graecique Sermonis Pronunciation* (Venice: M. Sessa, 1531).

k. S. Morison, *On Type Designs Past and Present* (London: Benn, 1962).

l. S. Morison, *Four Centuries of Fine Printing* (New York: Farrar, Straus, 1949).

m. Horatio, *Horatius Flaccus Emendatus* (ed. by A. P. Manutius) (Antwerp: Plantin, 1580).

TABLE II. *Forms Taken by the Hyphen in Its History of Development*

<i>Form</i>	<i>Use</i>	<i>User</i>
∪	subscript	ancient Greeks
-∪-	subscript	ancient Latin
-	subscript	Carolingian minuscule
/	character	Carolingian minuscule
-	character	Anglo-Saxon hand
=	character	gothic hand and type
//	character	gothic type
/	character	roman type
-	character	standardly accepted beginning of seventeenth century

The processes operating during the first wave of standardization are well exemplified in the products of Manutius' Aldine Press. Here hyphenation occurs seemingly spuriously, and where it does occur, often employs more than one form, even on the same page. The trend of his practices is shown in Table III. There seems to be a competition between the horizontal and slanted forms of the hyphen, with the slanted form ultimately being preferred (the 1523 grammar employs it exclusively). The horizontal form never seems to have been used much more than experimentally. Where the two forms exist in the same work, their occurrence seems to have been dictated by availability. But more important is the use of the hyphen as a justification aid. First its employment or disemployment, then different forms with different widths, and then different widths of the same form were used to justify a line when a word was broken at the end of it. A good proof that this irregularity was for justification purposes occurs in a 1497 publication<sup>31</sup> where two successive lines end with the divided word "provi-dentia." However, the second line is much tighter than the first, and the typesetter accordingly omitted the hyphen there although he inserted one in the preceding line. Where hyphens of different widths occur<sup>32, 33</sup> in the same work, one is about one-half to two-thirds the width of the other. Other

TABLE III. *Hyphenation Practices of the Aldine Press*

<i>Date of Work</i>	<i>Form of Hyphen</i>	<i>Conditions of Use of Hyphen</i>
1493 <sup>a</sup>	- and /	forms have no difference in width and were employed or disemployed depending on demands of justification
1495 <sup>b</sup>	/	hyphen in divided word where needed to justify line
1495 <sup>c</sup>	-	used or not used depending on line length
1496 <sup>d</sup>	-	used or not used depending on line length
1497 <sup>e</sup>	/	hyphen used in divided word where needed to justify line
1498 <sup>f</sup>	- and /	hyphen used in divided word where needed to justify line
1500 <sup>g</sup>	/ and //	tight lines have no hyphens with broken words; // is the double employment of /, taking up twice the space for justifying purposes
1501 <sup>h</sup>	/	two widths of this same form or no hyphen at all were employed to achieve justification
1509 <sup>i</sup>	- and /	tight lines use no hyphens with broken words; - and / have different widths and are differentially employed according to how much space is left at end of line
1513 <sup>j</sup>	-	employed spuriously

a. A. P. Manutius, *Institutiones Grammaticae* (Venice: Aldine, 1493).

b. Theocritus, *Idyllia* (Venice: Aldine, 1495).

c. De Aetna, appears in S. Morison and K. Day, *The Typographic Book, 1450-1935* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago, 1963).

d. A. P. Manutius, *Aldus Manutius and His Thesaurus Cornucopiae of 1496*, transl. by A. Lemke (Syracuse: Syracuse Univ., 1958).

e. Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum* (Venice: Aldine, 1497).

f. A. Poliziano, *Opera* (Venice: Aldine, 1498).

g. T. Lucretius Carus, *De Rerum Natura* (Venice: Aldine, 1500).

h. A. P. Manutius, *Rudimenta Grammatices Latinae Lingue* (Venice: Aldine, 1501).

i. Plutarch, *Plutarchi Opuscula. LXXXVII*. (Venice: Aldine, 1509).

j. A. P. Manutius (?), *Rhetorum Graecorum Orationes* (Venice: Aldine, 1513).

printers did this also. Sessa of Venice,<sup>34</sup> a near contemporary of Aldus also employed (or disemployed) two forms of hyphen (/ and =), the second about two-thirds the width of the first, to conform to justification requirements. Simon de Colines' *Strozii Poetae, Pater et Filius*<sup>35</sup> was edited by Aldus Manutius and contains two blocks of text, one at the beginning and one at the end of the book. The first is a dedication by the editor, the second a continuation of the body. But the first is hyphenated with one of two types of hyphen (/ and =) wherever words are divided; and the second, although set in the same typeface, has but one type of hyphen (/), and words are broken without hyphenation. Lines where the hyphen is missing are tight, indicating that hyphenation was ignored for typographic convenience. No such tight lines appear in the dedication, suggesting that more care went into the typesetting of this part of the book. The employment of the single form of the hyphen might indicate a preference of the typesetter working on that segment of the text.

What influenced the earlier (middle fifteenth century) and later (seventeenth century) establishment of the use of the hyphen? For the earlier period it can only be laid to the conscientiousness of individual publishers and the academic pressure of their editors and proofreaders who, in contrast to today, were the great scholars of the times. The developments of the later period were of linguistic standardization and solidification, itself an effect of widespread literacy and distribution of printed works. The need for uniform meaning throughout a language spawned a number of historical grammarians whose influence was soon felt by the compositor. Once again emphasis was on typographic quality, both in appearance and in lexical, orthographic, and grammatical exactness, in addition to production.

1. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, V (Oxford: Clarendon, 1909), 504.

2. Cited in G. H. Putnam, *Books and Their Makers During the Middle Ages* (New York: Putnam's, 1898), p. 111.

3. W. A. Mason, *A History of the Art of Writing* (New York: Macmillan, 1920), p. 417.

4. D. M. Anderson, *The Art of Written Forms* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), chap. 4 and 5.

5. H. Putschius, *Grammaticae Latinae Auctores Antiqui* (Hanoviae: 1605), column 1834.
6. *Ibid.*, columns 1943–44.
7. *Ibid.*, column 1287.
8. Quoted in P. Simpson, *Proofreading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Oxford, 1935), p. 134n.
9. See A. Flocon, *L'Univers des Livres* (Paris: Hermann, 1961), p. 155.
10. C. E. Wright, *English Vernacular Hands* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960).
11. F. W. Goudy, *Typologia* (Los Angeles: Univ. Calif., 1940), pp. 27–28.
12. W. G. Hale, *Harvard Studies*, VII, 249–271 (1896).
13. W. Dennison, *Classical Philol.*, I, 47–68 (1906).
14. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, XVIII (Chicago: Benton, 1965), 768.
15. H. Gentry and D. Greenwood, *Chronology of Books and Printing* (San Francisco: Gentry, 1933).
16. P. Luckombe, *The History and Art of Printing* (London: Johnson, 1771), p. 263.
17. A. P. Manutius, *Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri Quatuor* (Venice: Aldine, 1523), p. 169.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
19. *A New English Dictionary . . .*, p. 504.
20. A. Hume, *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britain Tongue* (London: Trübner, 1865 [1620]), p. 23.
21. Cited in J. Burrow, *De Usu et Ratione Interpungendi* (London: Worrall and Torey, 1771), p. 25.
22. C. Cellarius, *Orthographica Latina* (Attenburgi: Richteria, 1768), p. 78 ff.
23. J. Burrow, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
24. G. Meerman, *Origines Typographicae* (The Hague: van Daalen, 1765), p. 77.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
26. H. Melo, *Elucidações Sôbre o Hifen* (Fortaleza, 1960), p. 7.
27. See A. Flocon, *op. cit.*, p. 430.
28. T. B. Reed, *A History of the Old English Letter Foundries* (London: Faber, 1952), p. 38.
29. J. Moxon, *Mechanick Exercises* (ed. by H. Davis and H. Carter) (London: Oxford, 1958), p. 382.
30. P. Simpson, *op. cit.*, chap. 3.
31. Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, Chaldaeorum, Assyriorum*, (Venice: Aldine, 1497), leaf Lv (unnumbered).
32. A. P. Manutius, *Rudimenta Grammatices Latinae Lingue* (Venice: Aldine, 1501).
33. Plutarch, *Plutarchi Opuscula. LXXXII*. (Venice: Aldine, 1509).
34. D. Erasmus, *De Recta Latini Graecique Sermonis Pronunciationes* (Venice: M. Sessa, 1531).
35. Strozius and Strozius, *Strozii Poetae, Pater et Filius* (ed. by A. P. Manutius) (Paris: de Colines, 1530).