

The extent to which *M* readings can be utilized is not always evident, on account of the large number of lacunæ within the Codex, for which the glosser furnishes possible readings. It is quite clear, however, that many of his annotations were not intended to be emendatory, but were often merely explanatory and suggested by similarity of form, sound or meaning, and were set down in reserve. Compare 39, 16 *b* with 33 *b*; also 39, 21 *b* with 21 *d* and 30 *c*; also 39, 17 *b* with 31 *b*; also 43, 14 *a* with 26 *a*. As the notes of *M* rarely coincide with the Codex, where the photograph is clear, there is a fair presumption, that in seeking to fill out the numerous lacunæ, the *M* readings should only be finally adopted where they receive adequate support from the Versions. Those that have been accepted in the thesis are adopted only provisionally and in lieu of a better representation of the Greek, Latin, or Syriac readings.

While there appears to be some evidence that the glosser had recourse to the Versions, (cf *G S* 41, 12 *b*. 14 *b*. *S* 42, 6 *a*. *G* 43, 9 *b*) yet its weight cannot be large, in view of the predominance of notes which persistently ignore them.

The division of the strophes has been based upon logical, rather than upon artistic grounds. And, although, in some instances the results may not be quite satisfactory, yet it cannot be denied, that in the majority of cases a new thought is started with the beginning of the strophe.

The verses are generally distichs, though often tetrastichs; and in measure, trimeter, though frequently tetrameter.

In the numbering of chapter and verse, H. B. Swete has been followed.