

Locus	Corrected Text	Text Notes	Provisional Translation
003a03	.i. honaib ascadib .i. ab inimicis	.i. ab inimicis not attached to this gloss by either Ascoli or Thes Pal.	by the rivals.
013d01	inmaith andubso amne	This gloss does not appear in Thes Pal. In Ascoli, it appears in a footnote (p xii).	is this ink good thus?
014a02	.i. iarnardbiu inna banflathasin	MS has iarnardbiu, as in Ascoli, not iarnairdbiu, as in Thes Pal.	i.e. after the destruction of that queen.
014c06	.i. nochis honaib dib s6n .i. hires foirbthe 7 gn6mai sainemlae .i. ishires astoisech <is> hisuidib.	MS has sainemlae, as indicated by Ascoli, against sainemlai in Thes Pal.	that is of these two, i.e., perfect faith and excellent deeds, i.e. faith is chief among them.
014d07	innastoir air is ed asdulem d6n doengnu· instoir	Note that Thes Pal indicated the MS has inna, while actually the MS has inna (as indicated by Ascoli), with the a written below the line.	of the history, for history is that which is most desirable for us to understand.
014d12	.i. iscoitchen docechtar de ainm· alaili·	.i. not in Thes Pal.	i.e. common to each of them is the name of the other.
015a03	hoescumlud .i. dointinscitol ingnimo	Though the second u in -escumlud is declared to be illegible by Ascoli (and subsequently Thes Pal) it is fully legible in the MS.	by going forth, namely, to begin the action.
015b06	Etirdibnet	The n is perfectly legible in the MS, though it is not so indicated by Ascoli and Thes Pal.	who destroy.
016b06	.i. narmtar condegdligedaib diafrith[t]uidecht·	For narmtar, MS. has narintar, though it should be admitted that it is hard to differentiate the two. Ascoli has -frithuidecht, as does the MS, against -frithuidecht in Thes Pal.	i.e. that they are armed with good reasons to oppose them.
016c10	dorimther h6 libur essaiaē āselso .i. asbert side contra ezechiam atbelad cich side 7 dogni aithir<thir>gi 7 luid ingrian foraculu coic brotu deac 7 is ed inchoisecht trisodin coic bliadni deac	The first two letters of cich were given as unclear in Ascoli and Thes Pal, with the suggestion of Sarauw (repeated in Thes Pal) that (c6)ch should be read. There is no sign of length, but cich is clearly legible (cf Schumacher, 2004: 408).	this story is recounted in the book of the Isaiah, i.e. he said to Hezekiah that he would die. He wept, and he repents, and the sun went backwards fifteen moments, and it is this that was indicated through it, that fifteen years should be

	dothormuch forasaigulsom		added to his life.
016c14	.i. is indalanai .i. infilium	.i. infilium not given by Ascoli or Thes Pal as part of the gloss, but it belongs here.	i.e. to one of them (of the two).
017b22	.i. dodoinach[t] maicc	Contrary to Thes Pal, the preposition do is perfectly legible.	i.e. to the humanity of the Son.
017b23	.i. ciachruth asrobar dundóinaicniud .i. dundeacht nodundoinacht namma forraithminedar 7 furaithmenter	Thes Pal has forraithminidar and furaithminter. The MS has forraithminedar and furaithmenter (as seen by Ascoli).	i.e. what is the manner in which it can be said of the one nature, i.e. of the divinity or of the humanity only, that it remembers and is remembered?
017c03	.i. cid hodeacht maicc nó hodeacht athar· arafoima doinacht maicc aní arroet ní hisuidiu	Thes Pal reads atar, but the MS clearly has athar, as Ascoli notes.	whether it should be from the divinity of the Son or from the divinity of the Father that the humanity of the Son would assume that which He has assumed, it is not in the preceding (text).
017c05	nadfrithtaigat friusom	Thes Pal reads -frithtasgat with -frithtaigat? in the footnote. While the letter has some similarity to an s, it is an i, which would be expected anyway. Ascoli suggests -taigat as well.	who do not oppose them.
017c07	.i. huare is [hó]athir arroét macc cumachtae .i. ised [as]berat ind heritic aslaigiu deacht maicc indaas deacht athar airis ho athir arroét macc cumachtae is laigiu didiu intí arafoim· indaas intí honeroimer· 7 is [laigiu] intí danaigther indaas intí naddanaiged(ar)	Gloss is extremely faint, but Ascoli's reading of heritic, not heretic (as in Thes Pal) is correct.	i.e. because it is from the Father that the Son has received power, i.e. it is this that the heretics say, that the divinity of the Son is less than the divinity of the Father, for it is from the Father that the Son has received power: therefore he who receives is less than he from whom it is received, and he who is endowed (is less) than he who endows it.
017d10	.i. inpresenti .i. agein iarndoinacht	Immediately before the gloss appears .i. inpresenti, which is not indicated in Thes Pal or in Ascoli.	i.e. His birth with respect to Humanity.
019b11	trisinnimmaircidetaid .i. ciar[i]dfiadat som dundicfet in[na]fochaidi 7	MS. ciardfiadat; the gloss is somewhat faint and hard to read at that point. Thes Pal	i.e. through the appropriateness, i.e. although they say that the

	intsoirthi dinaib fochaid[ib]sin· ní sechetar immurgu ord oc suidiu .i. imbí bid insoirad donerchanat som arthuus cid toisgiu doberthar indfochaid···	notes that imbí bid seems corrupt. The translation here attempts to follow the Irish exactly as written.	afflictions will come thus and the deliverances from those afflictions, they do not, however, follow the order in this, i.e. in which it (habitually) is: it is the deliverance that they prophecy at first, though it is prior (to that) that the tribulation is inflicted.
020b02	.i. isairi darogartsom noib arfrith[t]uidecht innaní asrubartatar nadrobae remdeicsiu na lathar dæ diadulib	Ascoli's reading asrubartatar (against Thes Pal's asrobartatar) is correct. The reading n dæ, with canceled n, as suggested in Thes Pal, is probably correct, although it is very difficult to tell. Additionally, the gloss probably does not refer to the word susceptae, as indicated in Thes Pal. The word susceptae and the gloss itself are on different lines of text with no mark connecting them. More likely, following Ascoli, the gloss belongs with adsertionis.	i.e. it is for this reason that he has called himself a saint: on account of the opposition of those who have said that there is no providence or dispensation of God for His creatures.
020b04	Indiadsin æfer post quæ	The Latin part of the gloss is not given in Ascoli or Thes Pal. check this: the confer might be something with uel.	after that, cf. post quæ.
020b18	.i. amal bid nech immechoimairsed dano	The reading immechomairsed of Thes Pal is incorrect. Ascoli's reading is correct and is given here (see Schumacher 2004: 513-4).	i.e. as if there were someone who had asked, moreover.
021a08	dochuimlechtigthi .i. intan domberam armenmain intiu colleir	MS clearly shows dochuimlechtigthi, as in Ascoli, against dochumlechtigthi in Thes Pal.	accomodated, i.e. when we give our mind to them diligently.
021a09	Dintecnatatu	Ascoli's reading of the MS is correct, against dintecnatu of Thes Pal.	about the familiarity.
021a11	.i. manid óchomacnabud innam briathar ndoinde	ó of óchomacnabud written below the line. e of doinde	i.e. unless it is from the usage of the human words

	arrubart biuth	written above the line. Thes Pal's note that arrubart appears more like arruburt is probably incorrect. Ascoli notes that the u was corrected to a by the scribe, and this interpretation is most likely correct.	that he has employed.
021c01	(ba)baloin	Ascoli gives the text as ::::baloin. Thes Pal gives it as fri[ba]baloin, with the suggestion that it should be read imbabiloin. Unfortunately, the gloss is too faint to be sure what stands there, but babaloin seems most likely.	of Babylon
022a09	intecnatatu·	The MS clearly has intecnatatu, as in Ascoli. The reading intecnatu in Thes Pal is thus incorrect.	the familiarity.
022b01	.i. amal sluces anadnacul n ersoilthe nítete ind 7 dutét bréntu as síc est gutor eorum .i. denum oircne 7 testiu nafuile 7 ammi érchlos adi huadib forcachleth 7 eilled cech oin bis innacobfodlus trí gabail desmrechta diib	Contra Thes Pal, the MS does not read tête, but rather tete, as in Ascoli. Thes Pal appears to be correct, however, that the -um of denum is written on the margin. The final word of the gloss appears to be dib, rather than diib, but because the facsimile is faint at that point, the reading of Ascoli and Thes Pal should stand.	i.e. as the open sepulchre swallows anything that goes into it, and a stench comes out of it, sic est guttur eorum, i.e. working of slaughter and the shedding of blood and their evil report concerning those on every side, and the corruption of everyone who is in their company through taking an example from them.
022d10	.i. pones .i. ciofut suidigfe	Ascoli and Thes Pal do not have .i. pones.	i.e. how long will You (sg) place?
023a12	issamlid inso asmbertar· ut	As seen by Ascoli, the MS has inso, not insin, as in Thes Pal.	thus are these which are mentioned: ut.
023a13	.i. cosind[im]biud .i. cosind epirt asindgaib méit hic est {ordo} ut dicuntur tamen ad fletús ub[e]res indicandos {penitentis} etsi non dicuntur .i. ad tantos quantos .i. uerba sonant .i. robtar lugu nadær quam adfiadatar	Neither Ascoli nor Thes Pal includes penitentis as part of this gloss (or anywhere in their respective texts), but it clearly belongs here.	i.e. with the abundance, i.e. with the saying that exceeds quantity, hic est etc., i.e. the tears were fewer than are related.
023a15	.i. ferc .i. uindicta	Neither Ascoli nor Thes Pal	anger.

		has .i. uindicta.	
023b04	.i. nirelic dia doib orcuin duaid	Thes Pal has orcui[n] ndauid, which would be expected, but the MS clearly has the reading above, as Ascoli has seen.	i.e. God did not let them slay David.
023b05	issí didiu introcaire .i. nacharomarbsom dia indigail neich dorigensat friduid issí indochraide huare nadrucsat diriug orcuin duid iarnaerbertad	The last word of the gloss is <i>erbertad</i> . Thes Pal's <i>iarnabertso(m)</i> appears to have been based on a misinterpretation of the <i>po-</i> of <i>pondus</i> , which occurs at line end above the end of <i>iarnabert</i> . Ascoli suggested <i>erbertaid</i> , but there is no <i>i</i> in the MS.	this is, then, the mercy, to wit, that God did not slay them in punishment for something which they had done to David; this is the shamefulnes, because they did not succeed in the slaying of David after the preparation of it.
023b11	.i. facto .i. dorigni achitofel	Note that .i. facto is not in the text of Ascoli or Thes Pal.	i.e. what Achitofel had done.
023c23	dorothusa	The form appears as dorothuusa in Thes Pal and Ascoli, but the second u appears to have a punctum delens above it, conforming to Thurneysen's suggestion (p 391 §624) that ·rothuus was a scribal error for ·rothus.	I might lapse.
023d04	.i. madugneu innaremeperti .i. si feci rġ	.i. si feci rġ not in Ascoli or Thes Pal.	i.e. if I should do the aforementioned things.
024a04	.i. ba he angnimsom molad dáe	he, as in Ascoli, not hé as in Thes Pal.	i.e. their work was the praise of God.
024a19	rofitir didiu 7 etirgein ní dú ulc intí lasmbí indencae· ní fitir immurgu olc netir intí bís isindencae ut sunt infantes	lasmbí with long vowel, as in Ascoli, not lasmbi as in Thes Pal.	he then who has the innocence knows and understands something of evil; he, however, does not know evil at all who is in the innocence, ut sunt infantes.
024b03	.i. hodegdoinib	-doinib has a short o, as in Ascoli, not a long ó, as in Thes Pal.	i.e. by good people.
024b08	hond lurc .i. inchu(in)drigthedo ł callide	This gloss is extremely confused. As noted in Thes Pal and Ascoli, the text appears to read inchu:: hondlurc drigthedo, which Ascoli suggests mixes hond lurc (translating a (recto) calli "from the right path")	from the path, i.e. of the correcter, or callide

		with inchumdrigthi (translating arrecti “of the one having been set up / set straight”). Ascoli’s suggestion is surely correct, but he does not note callide, which appears to be appended to the end of inchu(in)drigthedo. Apparently the scribe took calli detorsit (detorsit on the next line) as callide torsit, though what he thought this might mean remains unclear to me.	
024b09	honaib adbartaib	The emendation of the text in Thes Pal and the Addenda et Corrigena in Ascoli (to honaib adbartaichthidib) seems unnecessary.	by the adversaries.
024c09	.i. hicachdu	The vowel is short in du, as in Ascoli (against Thes Pal).	i.e. in every place.
024c13	.i. oid menmain· foilsigidir som immurgu isindísiu inpeccad dorigeni agitofél·	Thes Pal agitofel	i.e. give heed! he shows, however, in this the sin that Achitophel had committed.
024d14	.i. diafessar indaimser hi rogabthar insalm ðnic domberthar force(i)ll dintitul asfir ani chanas .i. indaimser ineperr cetal indsailm·	The reading of the MS rogabthar is left intact here. See Thes Pal for a revision to rogabad. The correction to forc cell, also due to Thes Pal, is adopted. The i of ani is short, as in Ascoli, not long, as in Thes Pal. ineperr could be read coneperr, though the sense would then be unclear.	i.e. if the time at which the psalm might be sung is known, a testimony about the title may be given, that that what it says is true, i.e., the time at which the singing of the psalm is done [lit. said].
024d16	fír .i. superscriptio	Neither Ascoli nor Thes Pal has the Latin part of the gloss.	true.
024d25	asberat immurgu heritic asned dechur ta[d]badar isindísin .i. etir deacht maic 7 athar· quod non uerum·	MS has heritic, as in Ascoli, not heretic, as in Thes Pal.	heretics, however, say that this is the difference that is shown therein, i.e., between the divinity of the Son and of the Father, quod non est uerum.
025a08	hic est sensus .i. nolínfed precept asoscelai innule	Ascoli and Thes Pal do not have the Latin preceding	hic est sensus i.e. the preaching of His Gospel

	cuard in talman	the gloss. Thes Pal notes that the gloss belongs in sense to gloss 11, though it could be seen as an interpretive paraphrase of the Bible verse and thus be left in situ.	would fill the whole circuit of the earth.
025b06	testimonia .i. indfaissine rochet tall tobertar desmre[<i>ch</i>]ta foilsí diarelad 7 diademnigud asnduchrist rocét de, ut dixit· ex ore infantium rel.	testimonia not in Ascoli or Thes Pal. From tobertar, the gloss is only piece-wise legible.	i.e. the prophecy that was uttered at that time, clear examples are given to manifest it and to confirm it that it was of Christ that it was uttered, ut dixit etc.
025b12	.i. amal intabarthe .i. legis	.i. legis not given in Ascoli or Thes Pal.	i.e. as if of the given, i.e. legis.
025c05	foillsigthir as nisel indóinacht iar naicniud huare asindeacht fodaraithmine[<i>dar</i>] 7 nodafortachtaigedar	isel and dóinacht, as in Ascoli, not ísel and doinacht, as in Thes Pal.	it is shown that the humanity is lowly according to nature because it is the divinity who remembers it and helps it.
025d10	.i. induine aráróet deacht	aráróet appears in the MS, not arároét, as in Ascoli and Thes Pal.	i.e. the Man who assumed divinity.
025d12	.i. asindbeir .i. inscriptuir diadae .id. anisin nat comrorcon dumni cip e asberam	anisin and comrorcon, as in Ascoli, not anísín and comrorcun, as in Thes Pal.	i.e. that it, i.e. the Divine Scripture says it, namely that, that we are not wrong whichever it is that we say.
026b19	.i. arascalatais árecin dofomair doib innabochtu 7 innadommu	árecin, as in Ascoli, not arécin, as in Thes Pal. For dofomair, Thes Pal, following Thurneysen, suggests dofomam, but it is simply not clear what should stand there. The MS is also extremely hard to read at this point.	i.e. they used to seize them by force.....the poor and the needy.
026c12	.i. immes fira són	fír is short, as in Ascoli, not long, as in Thes Pal. The emendation to firian is suggested by Thes Pal (cf 103c8, 15) “that is, into righteous judgment”. Also plausible would be immes fír[s]a són “that is, into this true judgment” or immes fír són “that is, into true judgment”. DIL suggests immes fira són “that is, into a judgment of	i.e. that is, into righteous judgment.

		righteousness” with <i>fira</i> for <i>fire</i> .	
026d06	.i. <i>æarre[h]eoratar anarma doib· ocarndibærçiud·</i>	Ascoli notes that the MS might read <i>-dibierçiud</i> or <i>-dibærçiud</i> , and he slightly prefers the former. There appears, however, to be a small ligature between the possible <i>i</i> and <i>e</i> , which would make <i>æ</i> the likelier reading. Thes Pal follows Ascoli but reads the form as <i>-dibiercud</i> , which is clearly not in the MS. <i>doib</i> might be read <i>dóib</i> ; there is a possible long mark, but the facsimile is not clear.	i.e. so that their weapons failed them as they pelted us.
026d14	.i. <i>digal dothabairt fornapecdach<d>u 7 soirad innafirían</i>	Ascoli has <i>-pecdachdu</i> , as does the MS, against <i>-pecdachu</i> in Thes Pal, though <i>-pecdachu</i> is probably correct, since an agent formation to <i>pecthach</i> “sinful” would be unusual.	i.e. to inflict punishments on sinners and to deliver the righteous.
027c02	<i>innacomailte .i. indáisso noib·</i>	Thes Pal has <i>áis</i> against Ascoli’s <i>aís</i> . The long mark is somewhat ambiguous, but appears to be written over the <i>i</i> .	of the quietists, i.e. of the saints.
027d02	<i>ised inso tosach indalasaim dognither dunt salmso laebreo</i>	MS has <i>dognither</i> , as does Ascoli, against <i>dugnither</i> in Thes Pal.	this is the beginning of the second psalm which is made from this psalm among the Hebrews.
027d07	.i. <i>dliged buthe inboicht fo mam intsommai níre<ta>ltar son doneuch naichidfitir</i>	<i>buthe</i> , as in Ascoli, not <i>buithe</i> , as in Thes Pal. <i>i</i> in <i>boicht</i> above the line. Correction to MS <i>níretaltar</i> is from Ascoli.	i.e. the argument that the poor should be under the yoke of the rich, that is not manifest to one who does not know it.