Figure 1: A visualization of texts aligned to a physical object, via the medium of a digital image. An implicit graph.

Figure 2: A CTS URN

Figure 3: A CITE URN.

Figure 4: A graph of physical objects, images, and textual content.

Figure 5: A graph of syntax.

Figure 6: *Iliad* 24.5-24.10 on the Venetus A MS, showing *athetēsis* of four lines.

Figure 7: Three graphs of the same text, capturing three ancient readings of *Iliad* 24.3-24.11. Larger versions of these appear in the Appendix, Figures 15, 16, 17.

Figure 8: Two graphs of two readings, showing a relocation of a sub-graph. How can we cite these?

Figure 9: A CITE URN to an object in an extended collection, with a sub-reference identifying a region-of-interest on the image cited.

Figure 10: The Panda’s Diet: Syntactic Analysis

Figure 11: The Panda’s Diet: a generic graph with concerns separated.

Figure 12: Citing a two objects in a graph: urn:cite2:demo:syntaxGraphs.v1:1@e1,v3

Figure 13: Citing a path between objects in a graph: urn:cite2:demo:syntaxGraphs.v1:1@e1-v1

Figure 14: The Panda’s diet [top], or a panda crime-spree [bottom]? An example of overlaying two graphs of the same tokens.

Figure 15: A treebank of *Iliad* 24.3-24.11, reading the text while *omitting* the lines Aristarchus athetized.

Figure 16: A treebank of *Iliad* 24.3-24.11, reading the text while *including* the lines Aristarchus athetized, but *not* following Nicanor’s punctuation.

Figure 17: A treebank of *Iliad* 24.3-24.11, reading the text while including the lines Aristarchus athetized, and following Nicanor’s punctuation. This is the reading the scholiast prefers, if we do not accept the athetization.