GN, *Homer the Classic* (2012)

On the *Iliad*

I.01.001-002

*HC* 2§283: reference; enjambment of the epithet *oulomenē* describing *mēnis* here as analogous to the enjambment of the epithet *dourateos* of *hippos* in O.08.492-493

I.01.069ab (scholia)

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.01.085c (scholia)

*HC* 4(t)10(4§39): reference to verse, scholia quoted and translated; in a list of scholia exemplifying the relationship of Koine and Attic

I.01.216a (scholia)

*HC* 4(t)6(4§39): reference to verse, scholia quoted and translated; in a list of scholia exemplifying the relationship of Koine and Attic

I.01.234

*HC* 3§110, 4§137: reference; comparison of the representation of Minos and Zeus (here, regarding holding a *skēptron*), in the context of comparing Plato’s Hippias to Minos

I.01.238-239

*HC* 3§110, 4§137: quoting part of the verses; comparison of the representation of Minos and Zeus (here, regarding dispensing *themistes*), in the context of comparing Plato’s Hippias to Minos

I.01.299

*HC* P(t)9(P§128): quoted within scholia to I.06.355a1; example of *epei me* (enclitic) in the context of the analysis of *EPEISE* read as *epei sé* (non-enclitic) as opposed to *epei se* (enclitic), according to Herodian

I.01.465b (scholia)

*HC* P§65: reference; example of the blurring of the distinction between *lēmmata* derived from the base text (as by Aristarchus) and those from the commentaries of Aristarchus (as by Didymus)

I.01.465b1 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)19(P§142): scholia quoted and translated; example of the ‘Homeric’ reading as generally ‘the Koine reading’ by default for Aristarchus

I.01.465b2 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)20(P§142), P(t)21(P§142): scholia quoted and translated; example of the ‘Homeric’ reading as generally ‘the Koine reading’ by default for Aristarchus

I.01.528-530

*HC* 4(t)10(4§95): quoted and translated (as part of Strabo 8.3.30 C354); analysis of the modeling of Pheidias’ statue of Zeus on the Homeric Zeus in these verses

*HC* 4§269: reference; analysis of the modeling of Pheidias’ statue of Zeus on the Homeric Zeus in these verses and Zeus’ nod signifying his plan

I.01.536

*HC* 3§110, 4§137: reference; comparison of the representation of Minos and Zeus (here, regarding sitting on a *thronos*), in the context of comparing Plato’s Hippias to Minos

I.01.544

*HC* 2§156: transliterated; Zeus as the ‘father’ of gods and men, in the context of analyzing Okeanos as the ‘genesis’ of all

I.02.053a1 (scholia)

*HC* P§63: reference; example of Aristarchus’ re-introduction of a Koine reading that had earlier given way to a *khariesteron* reading into his base text

I.02.053c (scholia)

*HC* P(t)24(P§149): quoting and translating the scholia; example of where Aristarchus’ preferred variant is not the Koine usage

I.02.115a (scholia)

*HC* 4(t)7(4§39): reference to verse, scholia quoted and translated; in a list of scholia exemplifying the relationship of Koine and Attic

I.02.133a (scholia)

*HC* P§73, P§73n: quoting the scholia, reference; Aristarchus’ basing the earlier phases of his *hupomnēmata* on the *ekdosis* of Aristophanes and the *lēmma* here

I.02.135

*HC* P§132, P§137: reference; analysis of the coexistence of the Attic and the Koine usage in this verse and the claim that ‘Homer’ was capable of both

I.02.135a (scholia)

*HC* P(t)12(P§133), 4(t)4(4§36): verse quoted as *lēmma* and scholia quoted and translated; analysis of the coexistence of the Attic ad the Koine usage in this verse and the claim that ‘Homer’ was capable of both

*HC* P§139: scholia quoted and translated; *sunēthōs* + dat. 1st person pl. as indicating contemporary usage

I.02.135b (scholia)

*HC* P(t)11(P§131): verse quoted as *lēmma* and scholia quoted and translated; analysis of the concept of ‘Koine usage’

*HC* P§137: reference, quoted and translated; analysis of the coexistence of the Attic ad the Koine usage in this verse and the claim that ‘Homer’ was capable of both

*HC* 4(t)4(4§37): verse quoted as *lēmma* and scholia quoted and translated; analysis of the coexistence of the Attic ad the Koine usage in this verse and the claim that ‘Homer’ was capable of both

I.02.224

*HC* 3§121: reference; passage adduced by Socrates at *Protagoras* 348c-d

I.02.299-310

*HC* 1(t)17(1§82): translated; comparison of the rival passages in *Aeneid* 2 and *Iliad* II (*Aeneid* also complementing and validating the latter)

I.02.299-332

*HC* 1(t)1(1§8): quoted and translated; analysis of Odysseus’ retelling of Calchas’ prophecy at the portent of the bird and the serpent that is petrified (Homeric poetry’s idealizing itself as rigid, terror and pity, and the story of Troy)

*HC* C§19: reference; comparison of the picture on Aeneas’ Shield in the *Aeneid* to the petrified serpent here (the former prophesies the story of Rome, the latter that of Troy)

I.02.305-324

*HC* 1§11: references; analysis of the poetics of the vision of the serpent (terror and pity)

I.02.308

*HC* 1§83: reference; details that emerge from comparison of this passage with the rival passage in *Aeneid* 2

*HC* 1§84: reference; details that emerge from comparison of this passage with the rival passage in *Aeneid* 2 and the significance and etymology of *drakōn*

*HC* 1§121: reference; etymology of *drakōn* as in this verse in the context of the analysis of *thelgein* as involving visual attraction

I.02.309

*HC* 1§83: reference; details that emerge from comparison of this passage with the rival passage in *Aeneid* 2

I.02.318

*HC* 1(t)5(1§19): quoted and translated; analysis of the necessity of unchangeability when it comes to (the words of) the prophecy, also for the poet, and the concretization of it in the image of the serpent’s petrification

*HC* 1§26: reference; analysis of the epithet of the serpent, *arizēlon* / *aridēlon*

*HC* 1§27: reference; analysis of the epithet of the serpent, *arizēlon* / *aridēlon* and one more variant, *aizēlon*

*HC* 1§28: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ argumentation regarding the variants *aizēlon* and *arizēlon*

*HC* 1(t)7(1§29): quoted and translated; how the verse would read according to the variant attested by Aristarchus (*aizēlon*)

*HC* 1§30: reference; incompatibility of the variant reading *aizēlon* at 318 with verse 319 as we have it, where the serpent is turned to stone

*HC* 1§31: references, translations; argument for the standard version making as much sense as the non-standard version of 318-319

*HC* 1§32: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ treatment of and opinions about verses 318-319

*HC* 1(t)13(1§53): quoted and translated; analysis of the epithet *arizēlos*, poetic visualization, and works of art and works of nature

*HC* 1§57: references; analysis of the epithet *arizēlos*, poetic visualization, and works of art and works of nature

*HC* 2§170, 2§171: references; comparison and analysis of the serpent and the image on Achilles’ Shield, and their both being described with *arizēlos*, which marks an everlasting vision, pictured by Homeric poetry as a perfect and permanent work of art

I.02.318 (scholia)

*HC* 1§24: references; the verse’s being connected in meaning to I.02.319 and Zenodotus on them (*aridēlon*)

*HC* 1§28: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ argumentation regarding the variants *aizēlon* and *arizēlon*

I.02.318-319

*HC* 1(t)8(1§30): quoted and translated; incompatibility of the variant reading *aizēlon* at 318 with verse 319 as we have it, where the serpent is turned to stone

*HC* 1§31: reference; argument for the standard version making as much sense as the non-standard version of 318-319

*HC* 1§32n: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ treatment of and opinions about verses 318-319

I.02.319

*HC* 1§19: reference; analysis of the necessity of unchangeability when it comes to (the words of) the prophecy, also for the poet, and the concretization of it in the image of the serpent’s petrification

*HC* 1(t)6(1§20): quoted and translated; analysis of Aristarchus’ athetesis of this verse

*HC* 1§23: reference; this verse as stemming form Aristarchus’ base text and the Koine tradition

*HC* 1§24: references; the verse’s being connected in meaning to I.02.318 and Zenodotus on them (*aridēlon*)

*HC* 1§30: reference; incompatibility of the variant reading *aizēlon* at 318 with verse 319 as we have it, where the serpent is turned to stone

*HC* 1§32: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ treatment of and opinions about verses 318-319

*HC* 1§37: reference; analysis of the permanent vision of the petrified serpent and the permanent words that give it meaning

*HC* 1§83: reference; details that emerge from comparison of this passage with the rival passage in *Aeneid* 2

*HC* C§19: reference; comparison of the petrified serpent with Aeneas’ Shield, as prophecies of the story of Troy and the story of Rome, respectively

I.02.319a1 (scholia)

*HC* 1§21: quoted and translated; analysis of Aristarchus’ athetesis of this verse

I.02.322

*HC* 1(t)3(1§16): quoted and translated; analysis of the significance of Calchas’ speaking as a *theopropos* when interpreting the portent of the serpent (and the unchangeability of the poetic words)

I.02.323-329

*HC* 1§17, 1§19: references; analysis of the necessity of unchangeability when it comes to (the words of) the prophecy (regarding the serpent), also for the poet, and the concretization of it in the image of the serpent’s petrification

I.02.324-325

*HC* 1(t)16(1§62): quoted and translated; analysis of the notion of an unchangeable ‘outcome’ conveyed in Odysseus’ narration of the portent of the serpent and Calchas’ prophecy (*telein*/*telos*)

I.02.325

*HC* 1§12: reference; analysis of the petrified serpent as equated with the story of Troy and *telein* here conveying the outcome of the narration

I.02.326-329

*HC* 1§12: reference; analysis of Calchas’ response to the vision of the serpent

I.02.330

*HC* 1§12: reference; analysis of the petrified serpent as equated with the story of Troy and *telein* here conveying the outcome of the narration

*HC* 1(t)4(1§18): quoted and translated; analysis of the necessity of unchangeability when it comes to (the words of) the prophecy, also for the poet, and the concretization of it in the image of the serpent’s petrification

*HC* 1(t)15(1§61): quoted and translated; analysis of the notion of an unchangeable ‘outcome’ conveyed in Odysseus’ narration of the portent of the serpent and Calchas’ prophecy (*telein*/*telos*)

*HC* 1§63: reference; analysis of the sense of *teleitai* in this verse as referring to the story of Troy as it is being told, in progress

I.02.397a (scholia)

*HC* P§144: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ tendency to favor the ‘Koine’ over the ‘Attic’ usage

I.02.397b (scholia)

*HC* P§144: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ tendency to favor the ‘Koine’ over the ‘Attic’ usage

I.02.532b1 (scholia)

*HC* 4(t)8(4§39): reference to verse, scholia quoted and translated; in a list of scholia exemplifying the relationship of Koine and Attic

I.02.532b2 (scholia)

*HC* 4(t)9(4§39): reference to verse, scholia quoted and translated; in a list of scholia exemplifying the relationship of Koine and Attic

I.02.547-548

*HC* 1§138: reference; analysis of Erekhtheus, development into two figures, his cult, and relationship with Athena

I.02.594-600

*HC* 3§41n: reference; analysis of the aetiology of the proto-*kitharistēs* Thamyris

I.02.662

*HC* P§126: references; analysis of the pronunciation of *katekta* and the distinction between Aristarchus’ and Herodian’s scholarship on the verse

I.02.662a1 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)7(P§125): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of the traditional patterns of pronunciation in Homeric performance and *hē Koine anagnōsis* as referring to the way Aristarchus read Homeric poetry out loud

*HC* P§157: quoting part of the scholia; *hē Koine anagnōsis* as a matter of reading out loud the Homeric base text to Aristarchus for verification (for *diorthōsis*)

I.02.807 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)16(P§140): scholia quoted and translated; an example where ‘Homeric’ usage is clearly distinct from what is *sunēthēs* ‘customary’ for Aristarchus and his contemporaries

I.03.018

*HC* P§153: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ treatment of the verse regarding the absence or presence of the article

I.03.018a (scholia)

*HC* P(t)27(P§152): scholia quoted and translated; comparison of Didymus’ and Aristonicus’ comments on the verse, in the context of the analysis of the reinterpretation of Aristarchus’ descriptions as prescriptions by later Aristarcheans

I.03.018b1 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)25(P§151): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; example of the reinterpretation of Aristarchus’ descriptions as prescriptions by later Aristarcheans

I.03.018b2 (scholia)

*HC* P(26)(P§151): scholia quoted and translated; example of the reinterpretation of Aristarchus’ descriptions as prescriptions by later Aristarcheans

I.03.035

*HC* 4(t)9(4§39): reference to verse, scholia quoted and translated; in a list of scholia exemplifying the relationship of Koine and Attic

I.03.099a (scholia)

*HC* P(t)18(P§140): part of verse quoted as *lēmma,* scholia quoted and translated; an example where ‘Homeric’ usage is clearly distinct from what is *sunēthēs* ‘customary’ for Aristarchus and his contemporaries

I.03.176

*HC* 2§256n: reference; in a list of examples of *tēkesthai* in the context of sadness

I.03.206a (scholia)

*HC* P(t)17(P§140): part of verse quoted as *lēmma,* scholia quoted and translated; an example where ‘Homeric’ usage is clearly distinct from what is *sunēthēs* ‘customary’ for Aristarchus and his contemporaries

I.03.338a (scholia)

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.03.362

*HC* 4(t)20n(4§100): reference; explaining *phalos* as the ‘horn’ of a helmet

I.03.439

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.04.389

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.05.059-060

*HC* 2§282n: reference; comment metaphors of poetry as woodwork

I.05.063

*HC* 2§282n: reference; comment metaphors of poetry as woodwork

*HC* 2§283n: reference; enjambment of the epithet *oulomenē* describing *mēnis* here as analogous to the enjambment of the epithet *dourateos* of *hippos* in O.08.492-493 and compared wit the enjambment of the epithet describing the ships made for the abduction of Helen

I.05.733-747

*HC* 4(t)20(4§100): quoted and translated; analysis of Pheidias' Athena Parthenos as having Homeric inspiration

*HC* 4(t)37(4§184): quoted and translated; analysis of Athena’s peplos

I.05.734-735

*HC* 4(t)37n(4§184): reference; note that these verses were athetized by Zenodotus

*HC* 4§233: reference; analysis of the ritual reweaving of Athena’s Peplos and the achievement of a notional permanence

I.05.735

*HC* 4§186, 4§195: references; comment on *poikilos*, epithet of Athena’s peplos, as ‘pattern-woven’

I.05.736

*HC* 4§233: reference; analysis of the ritual reweaving of Athena’s Peplos and the achievement of a notional permanence

I.05.737

*HC* 4§233: reference; analysis of the ritual reweaving of Athena’s Peplos and the achievement of a notional permanence

I.05.738

*HC* 4§101: reference; analysis of the coextensiveness of the khiton and aegis worn by Athena when she goes to war and metonymically shared by Zeus with her

I.05.741

*HC* 4§101: reference; analysis of the coextensiveness of the khiton and aegis worn by Athena when she goes to war and metonymically shared by Zeus with her

I.05.743

*HC* 4(t)20n(4§100): references; analysis of Athena’s helmet (*amphiphalon*, *tetraphalēron*, reflection in Pheidias’ sculpture)

I.05.744

*HC* 4(t)20n(4§100): reference; parallelism of Athena and Ares

I.05.808 (scholia)

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.06.289

*HC* 4§195: reference; comment on *pan-poikilos*, epithet of peploi woven by Phoenician women the most beautiful of which is presented to Athena as an offering, as ‘pattern-woven’

*HC* §195n: reference; comment on the variant readings for the verse (*pan-poikila* describing *erga* or *pan-poikiloi* describing *peploi*)

I.06.293-295

*HC* 4§195: reference; comment on *pan-poikilos*, epithet of peploi woven by Phoenician women the most beautiful of which is presented to Athena as an offering, as ‘pattern-woven’

I.06.355

*HC* P§127: references; analysis of *EPEISE* read as *epei sé* (non-enclitic) as opposed to *epei se* (enclitic), according to Herodian

*HC* P§147: reference; analysis of the ‘Homeric’ usage’s being equated with the ‘Koine’ usage as opposed to the current usage in Aristarchus and Herodian

I.06.355a1 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)8(P§127): scholia quoted and translated; analysis of *EPEISE* read as *epei sé* (non-enclitic) as opposed to *epei se* (enclitic), according to Herodian

*HC* P(t)9(P§128): scholia quoted and translated; example of *epei me* (enclitic) in the context of the analysis of *EPEISE* read as *epei sé* (non-enclitic) as opposed to *epei se* (enclitic), according to Herodian

*HC* P(t)22(P§146): scholia quoted and translated; analysis of the methodology of Aristarchus and Herodian to compare Homer’s customary usage against contemporary usage

I.06.355a2 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)10(P§130): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of *EPEISE* read as *epei sé* (non-enclitic) as opposed to *epei se* (enclitic), the Koine reading, according to Herodian

*HC* P(t)23(P§147): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of the ‘Homeric’ usage’s being equated with the ‘Koine’ usage as opposed to the current usage in Aristarchus and Herodian

I.06.407-439

*HC* 4§262: reference; analysis of the association of Andromache with the emotion of pity and the art of lamentation

I.06.411-413

*HC* 4§264n: reference; comment on the mixed feelings of sadness and erotic pleasure in Andromache’s laments

I.06.429-430

*HC* 1(t)43(1§208): quoted and translated as a part of Plutarch *Brutus* 23.5-6; analysis of the poetics of retrospection in Andromache’s parting with Hector and her weaving

I.06.448-464

*HC* 2(t)96(2§336): quoted and translated; in the context of comparing and analyzing the narration of the moment of the killing of Astyanax and Andromache’s capture in the plot summary of the *Iliou Persis* and O.08, where it is screened by a simile

I.06.484

*HC* 1(t)44n(1§209): reference; comment on the image here as related to I.06.496

I.06.490-491

*HC* 1(t)43(1§208): quoted and translated as a part of Plutarch *Brutus* 23.5-6; analysis of the poetics of retrospection in Andromache’s parting with Hector and her weaving

I.06.496

*HC* 1(t)44(1§209): quoted and translated; analysis of the poetics of retrospection in Andromache’s parting with Hector and her weaving

I.06.510-511 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)34(P§162): scholia quoted and translated; analysis of *rhimpha he* and scholia on it

I.06.510-511a1 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)33(P§162): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of *rhimpha he* and scholia on it

*HC* P§164n: quoting and translating part of the scholia; suggested restoration of the scholia here

I.06.511

*HC* P§162, P§164: references; analysis of *rhimpha he* and scholia on it

I.06.511 (scholia)

*HC* P§162n: reference; contra West on how Posidonius understood *rhimphea/ae*

I.06.511a (scholia)

*HC* P§158: quoting part of the scholia; comment on the use of the word *anagnōstēs* in the scholia, here specifically regarding Posidonius

*HC* P(t)31(P§162): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of *rhimpha he* and scholia on it

*HC* P§162n: reference; contra West on how Posidonius understood *rhimphea/ae*

*HC* P§164n: scholia quoted and translated; analysis of *rhimpha he* and scholia on it

I.06.511b (scholia)

*HC* P(t)32(P§162): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of *rhimpha he* and scholia on it

I.07.021

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.07.026-027

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.07.203

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.08.052a-d

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.08.107

*HC* 3§165: reference; example of ‘standard’ usage in Homeric quotations of Plato

I.08.171

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.08.352

*HC* 4§40: reference; explanation of the scholia on the verse and the variant readings

I.08.352 (scholia)

*HC* 4(t)11(4§39): reference to verse, scholia quoted and translated; in a list of scholia exemplifying the relationship of Koine and Attic

*HC* 4(t)12(4§41): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; example of the distinctness of ‘Attic’ from ‘Koine’ being forgotten in later phases of the commentary tradition

I.09.169-171

*HC* 3(t)44(3§184): Plato’s text of the verses quoted and translated as part of *Hippias* *Minor* 370c-d; analysis of Socrates’ claims that Achilles, like Odysseus, is capable of falsehoods

I.09.308-314

*HC* 3(t)35(3§172): Plato’s text of the verses quoted and translated as part of *Hippias Minor* 364e; comparison of Plato’s text of the verses with what has come down to us through the medieval manuscript tradition in the context of analyzing Socrates’ and Hippias’ debate over Homer’s representation of Achilles

*HC* 3(t)36(3§173): quoted and translated; comparison of Plato’s text of the verses with what has come down to us through the medieval manuscript tradition in the context of analyzing Socrates’ and Hippias’ debate over Homer’s representation of Achilles

I.09.310-312

*HC* 3(t)36n(3§173): references; comparison of Plato’s version of the verses and those in the medieval manuscript tradition

I.09.312-313

*HC* 3(t)42(3§182): Plato’s text of the verses quoted and translated as part of *Hippias Minor* 369d-370a; analysis of Socrates’ argument that Achilles, like Odysseus, is capable of falsehoods (here, with regards to *legein* in the sense of ‘speaking’ the words of homer and ‘speaking’ the words of the argument supposedly represented by Homer)

I.09.357-363

*HC* 3(t)43(3§183): Plato’s text of the verses quoted and translated as part of *Hippias Minor* 370b-c; analysis of Socrates’ argument that Achilles hides one thing in his thinking and says another

I.09.540

*HC* 3§193: references; Aristarchus’ access to a copy of Plato’s Homer and variants attested for this verse

I.09.540a1 (scholia)

*HC* 3§193: references; Aristarchus’ access to a copy of Plato’s Homer and variants attested for this verse

I.09.650-655

*HC* 3(t)45(3§185): Plato’s text of the verses quoted and translated as part of *Hippias Minor* 371b-c; analysis of Socrates’ claims that Achilles, like Odysseus, is capable of falsehoods

I.09.653

*HC* 3(t)46(3§186): quoted and translated; comparison of the verses with Plato’s text in the context of the analysis of Socrates’ claims that Achilles, like Odysseus, is capable of falsehoods

*HC* 3(t)46n(3§186): reference; variants for the verse

I.09.653a (scholia)

*HC* 3(t)46n(3§186): references; variants for the verse

I.10.349 (scholia)

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.10.461c (scholia)

*HC* P(t)15(P§139): part of the verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; *sunēthōs* + dat. 1st person pl. as indicating contemporary usage

I.11.041

*HC* 4(t)20n(4§100): references; analysis of Athena’s helmet at I.05.743 as not unique, compared to Agamemnon’s helmet in this verse and *tetraphalēros* and *tetraphalos* as formulaic variants

I.12.022a (scholia)

*HC* 4§45: reference; the scholiastic tradition stemming from Aristarchus as implying that Hesiod had a chance to read Homer’s poems

I.12.228

*HC* 1(t)2(1§14): quoted and translated; analysis of *hupokrinesthai* and the coextensiveness of epic with oracular poetry

I.12.384

*HC* 4(t)20n(4§100): reference; analysis of Athena’s helmet at I.05.743 and *tetraphalēros* and *tetraphalos* as formulaic variants

I.12.404a (scholia)

*HC* P§65: reference; example of the blurring of the distinction between *lēmmata* derived from the base text (as by Aristarchus) and those from the commentaries of Aristarchus (as by Didymus)

I.13.023-031

*HC* 1(t)24(1§148): quoted and translated; comparison of Poseidon’s grand entrance driving his horse-drawn chariot here with how Athena’s ceremonial arrival in the *Iliou Persis* was likely to have been represented, in the context of discussing divine chariot teams and Virgil’s version of Athena and her chariot-team

I.13.028b (scholia)

*HC* P§144: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ tendency to favor the ‘Koine’ over the ‘Attic’ usage

I.13.197 (scholia)

*HC* 4§45, 4§45n: references; Aristarchus’ theory of Homer’s origins as an Athenian who lived during the Ionian Migration

I.13.343

*HC* 1§121: reference; eyes as direct object of *thelgein*, in the context of analyzing *thelgein* and the Wooden Horse

I.13.347

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.13.435

*HC* 1§121: reference; eyes as direct object of *thelgein*, in the context of analyzing *thelgein* and the Wooden Horse

I.13.808a

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.14.097

*HC* 3§165: reference; example of ‘standard’ usage in Homeric quotations of Plato

I.14.136a (scholia)

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.14.200-207

*HC* 2§145n: reference; Janko’s 1992:180 comments on the verses and GN’s comments on them

I.14.201

*HC* 2(t)57(2§132): quoted and translated as part of Plato *Cratylus* 402a-d; analysis of the generative and fluid power of Okeanos and cosmogony and initiation into mysteries

*HC* 2(t)57n(2§132): reference; analysis of the generative and fluid power of Okeanos and cosmogony and initiation into mysteries

*HC* 2(t)59(2§140): quoted and translated as part of Plato *Theaetetus* 152e; analysis of Plato’s treatment of Homer and Orpheus (convergences), initiation into mysteries, fluidity and motion in this passage

*HC* 2§144n: reference; Janko’s analysis of the origin of the references to Okeanos and Tethys in this verse

*HC* 2(t)64(2§146): quoted and translated; analysis of the confluence of Orphic and Homeric traditions (in the context of analyzing Plato *Cratylus*)

I.14.245-246

*HC* 2§150: reference; analysis of the theme of Okeanos in Crates’ edition of Homer, its difference from Aristarchus’ edition, and how the passage appears in modern editions

I.14.246

*HC* 2(t)62(2§144): quoted and translated; analysis of the confluence of Orphic and Homeric traditions and the mysticism implicit in this verse (in the context of analyzing Plato *Cratylus*)

*HC* 2§144n: reference; Janko’s analysis of the origin of the references to Okeanos and Tethys in this verse

*HC* 2(t)65(2§149): quoted and translated as part of Plutarch *On the face in the moon* 938d; analysis of the theme of Okeanos in Crates’ edition of Homer (similarity to Orphic tradition) and difference from Aristarchus’ edition

*HC* 2§153: reference; analysis of the dispute between Crates and Aristarchus over definitions of the Okeanos and verses 246-246a

*HC* 2§156n: quoting and translating part of the verse; analysis of *genesis pantessi tetuktai*

*HC* 2§178: reference; the Homerus Auctus as not an editorial conflation of incompatible texts but as a preedited corpus of undifferentiated oral traditions that later became differentiated into distinct textual traditions

I.14.246-246a

*HC* 2§153: reference; analysis of the dispute between Crates and Aristarchus over definitions of the Okeanos and verses 246-246a

*HC* 2§156: references; analysis of the significance of the verses in the context of the Homeric narrative

*HC* 2§160: references; 246a as a plus verse showing the expansiveness of the tradition represented by the Orphic elements of the Homerus Auctus and the picture of Okeanos that emerges from the two verses

*HC* 2§183: reference; the traditional orientation of these verses as Orphic

I.14.246a

*HC* 2(t)65(2§149): quoted and translated as part of Plutarch *On the face in the moon* 938d; analysis of the theme of Okeanos in Crates’ edition of Homer (similarity to Orphic tradition) and difference from Aristarchus’ edition

*HC* 2§150n: reference; analysis of the theme of Okeanos in Crates’ edition of Homer, its difference from Aristarchus’ edition, and how the passage appears in modern editions

*HC* 2§154: reference; analysis of Crates’ interpretation of the verse

*HC* 2§155: quoting and translating part of the verse; analysis of the mythological essence of Okeanos and interpretation of the verse

*HC* 2§178: reference; the Homerus Auctus as not an editorial conflation of incompatible texts but as a preedited corpus of undifferentiated oral traditions that later became differentiated into distinct textual traditions

*HC* 2§214: reference; Aristarchus’ practice of omitting only weakly attested neoteric verses, such as this supposedly Orphic one

I.14.246a (scholia)

*HC* 2§152: reference, quoting and translating part of the verse; Crates’ interpretation of the verse and evidence for a cosmic theory, contrasted with Aristarchus’

I.14.302

*HC* 2(t)57(2§132): quoted and translated as part of Plato *Cratylus* 402a-d; analysis of the generative and fluid power of Okeanos and cosmogony and initiation into mysteries

*HC* 2(t)57n(2§132): reference; analysis of the generative and fluid power of Okeanos and cosmogony and initiation into mysteries

*HC* 2(t)59(2§140): quoted and translated as part of Plato *Theaetetus* 152e; analysis of Plato’s treatment of Homer and Orpheus (convergences), initiation into mysteries, fluidity and motion in this passage

*HC* 2(t)64(2§146): quoted and translated; analysis of the confluence of Orphic and Homeric traditions (in the context of analyzing Plato *Cratylus*)

I.15.494-499

*HC* 4§268: reference; the *belle mort* of Hector as motivating the Athenians to live up to the heroic legacy they learn from Homer, in the context of analyzing Lycurgus *Against Leokrates* where these verses are quoted

I.16.121

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.16.362

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.16.364-366

*HC* 4§109: reference; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.16.433

*HC* 3§165: reference; example of ‘standard’ usage in Homeric quotations of Plato

I.16.446-467

*HC* P(t)25(P§151): reference; in the context of an example of the reinterpretation of Aristarchus’ descriptions as prescriptions by later Aristarcheans

I.16.844-845

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.17.075

*HC* P§159: reference; analysis of Aristarchus’ practice of deciding on what he considers the correct reading by listening to the reading of his *anagnōstēs* Posidonius

I.17.075-076

*HC* P(t)30(P§160): scholia quoted and translated; analysis of Aristarchus’ practice of deciding on what he considers the correct reading by listening to the reading of his *anagnōstēs* Posidonius

I.17.75a (scholia)

*HC* P§158: quoting part of the scholia; comment on the use of the word *anagnōstēs* in the scholia, here specifically regarding Posidonius

*HC* P(t)29(P§159): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of Aristarchus’ practice of deciding on what he considers the correct reading by listening to the reading of his *anagnōstēs* Posidonius

I.17.176-177

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.17.195-214

*HC* 4(t)47(4§269): quoted and translated; analysis of the nod of Zeus as signifying the overall plot of the *Iliad* and here a specific theme, Hector as a *beau mort* and the sorrow of Andromache (poetry of terror and pity), and its significance for Pheidias

I.17.202 (scholia)

*HC* 4(t)47n(4§269): reference; Aristarchus’ preferred reading for the verse

I.17.207

*HC* 1(t)41n(1§203): reference; comparison of the wording here with I.22.444 regarding Andromache’s expected and Zeus’ planned return of Hector from battle

I.17.331-332

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.17.456a (scholia)

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.17.627

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.17.719 (scholia)

*HC* 4§45: reference; the scholiastic tradition stemming from Aristarchus as implying that Homer *wrote* his poems

I.18.156a (scholia)

*HC* P§48n: reference to verse and scholia; in the list of West’s (2001:40n33) list of plus-verses, in the context of analyzing plus-verses in Zenodotus’ (vs. Aristarchus’) text of Homer and Zenodotus’ deletion as well as athetesis of them

I.18.399

*HC* 2§165: quoting and translating part if the verse; analysis of the Orphic dimensions of the Shield of Achilles, here Okeanos and the idea of coming full circle

I.18.478-609

*HC* 2(t)67(2§164): quoted and translated; analysis of the Orphic dimensions of the Shield of Achilles, here the image of the cosmos defined by Okeanos on its outermost limit

I.18.479

*HC* 2§165: quoting and translating part of the verse, references; analysis of the Orphic dimensions of the Shield of Achilles, here Hephaistos’ fashioning of the Shield

I.18.480

*HC* C§16n: reference; argument (in *HPC* E§148) that the word *triplax* shows a pattern of crossover from weaving to metalwork

I.18.481-489

*HC* 2§152n: reference; Crates’ interpretation of Achilles’ Shield as an *imago mundi* and his cosmic theory

I.18.482-485

*HC* 2§165: reference; analysis of the Orphic dimensions of the Shield of Achilles, here the centrality of the cosmos in its design

I.18.482-608

*HC* 2§173: references; continuity of the natural and human cosmos as represented on the Shield, and the mystical interplay between rigidity and fluidity in the Shield

I.18.483-608

*HC* 2§195: reference; Zenodotus’ athetizing the entire sequence of verses on the images on the Shield and consequent dissociation of them, including the Okeanos, from the *Iliad*

*HC* 2§198: reference; Aristarchus’ not athetizing these verses, and consequently that they were conventionally thought to belong to the Homeric tradition

I.18.483a (scholia)

*HC* 2§195n: scholia quoted and translated; Zenodotus’ athetizing the entire sequence of verses on the images on the Shield and consequent dissociation of them, including the Okeanos, from the *Iliad*

I.18.490-491

*HC* 2(t)71(2§173): quoted and translated; continuity of the natural and human cosmos and their narration as represented on the Shield

I.18.491-508

*HC* 2§174: references; analysis of the fluidity of the action on the Shield (the litigation scene) and its generality (litigants and onlookers unidentified)

I.18.497-501

*HC* 2(t)72(2§174): quoted and translated; analysis of the fluidity of the action on the Shield (the litigation scene) and its generality (litigants and onlookers unidentified)

I.18.516-519

*HC* 1(t)14(1§54): quoted and translated; analysis of poetic visualization, the epithet *arizēlos*, and the representation of gods and humans in the Shield

*HC* 4(t)20n(4§100): reference; comment on the parallelism of the representation of Athena and Ares on the Shield as well as elsewhere

I.18.519

*HC* 1§55: references; analysis of poetic visualization, the epithet *arizēlos*, and the representation of gods and humans in the Shield

*HC* 2§170, 2§171: references; comparison and analysis of the serpent in I.02 and the image on Achilles’ Shield, and their both being described with *arizēlos*, which marks an everlasting vision, pictured by Homeric poetry as a perfect and permanent work of art

I.18.590

*HC* C§16: reference; comment on *poikillein*, describing the work of Hephaistos on the Shield, as a crossover from weaving to metalwork (in the context of analyzing the Shield of Aeneas in the *Aeneid*)

I.18.590-604

*HC* 2(t)24(2§74): quoted and translated; analysis of *ex-arkhein* to mark the beginning of singing and dancing, in the context of analyzing the role of the choral leader

I.18.604-605

*HC* 2(t)24n(2§74): quoted, quoted and translated (in two footnotes); comment on and analysis of the reading adopted (Wolf 1804) and the manuscript traditions, and Aristarchus’ preferred reading

I.18.606

*HC* 2(t)24n(2§74): references (in two footnotes); comment on adopting the reading *exarkhontos* (Athenaeus 5.180d) and analysis of it and the reading of Aristarchus and the manuscript traditions

I.18.607-608

*HC* 2§165: reference; analysis of the Orphic dimensions of the Shield of Achilles, here Okeanos and the idea of coming full circle

*HC* 2§168: reference; analysis of the simultaneous rigidity and fluidity of the world of the Shield

*HC* 2§195: reference; Zenodotus’ athetizing the entire sequence of verses on the images on the Shield and consequent dissociation of them, including the Okeanos, from the *Iliad*

*HC* 2§198: reference; Aristarchus’ not athetizing these verses, and consequently that they were conventionally thought to belong to the Homeric tradition

I.18.608

*HC* 2§165: reference; analysis of the Orphic dimensions of the Shield of Achilles, here the *antux*, Okeanos, and the idea of coming full circle

I.19.365-368a (scholia)

*HC* P§71: scholia quoted and translated; analysis of Didymus’ consulting Ammonius as an authority to determine earlier and later phases in the editorial work of Aristarchus

*HC* P§73, P§79: reference to scholia; analysis of the evidence of the commentators on whether there were one or two Aristarchean *ekdoseis* of Homer

I.20.065

*HC* 2§165: quoting and translating part if the verse; analysis of the Orphic dimensions of the Shield of Achilles, here Okeanos and the idea of coming full circle (and this verse as a point of comparison)

I.20.101-102

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.20.307-308a1

*HC* 1§108, 1§112: reference; comment on the ruling families of New Ilion attested in the scholia and the struggle for prestige between New Ilion and Scepsis

I.21.194-197

*HC* 2§196, 2§196n,2§211: reference; analysis of Zenodotus’ editorial plan of athetizing those aspects of the *Iliad* he deemed Orphic, including Okeanos as the primal stream, and rather following the tradition of Akheloios as the primal stream and external evidence for it

I.21.195

*HC* 2§198, 2§198n: references; Aristarchus’ not athetizing the verse (unlike Zenodotus), and so, indication that all the verses this passage were conventionally thought to belong to the Homeric tradition

*HC* 2§207: references; analysis of scholia on Zenodotus’ treatment of the verse and Aristarchus’ disagreement with him

*HC* 2§208: reference; analysis of Crates’ defense of the verse and the his stance on Okeanos, not Akheloios as the primal cosmic body of water

*HC* 2§209: reference; analysis of Zenodotus’ grounds for rejecting the verse

*HC* 2§213: reference; Homeric poetry’s accommodating both Okeanos and Akheloios

I.21.195 (scholia)

*HC* 2§207: references; analysis of scholia on Zenodotus’ treatment of the verse and Aristarchus’ disagreement with him

*HC* 2§208: reference; analysis of Crates’ defense of the verse and the his stance on Okeanos, not Akheloios as the primal cosmic body of water

*HC* 2§209: scholia quoted and translated; analysis of Zenodotus’ grounds for rejecting the verse

*HC* 2§212: scholia quoted and translated; analysis of Aristarchus’ retention of the verse (contra Zenodotus)

I.21.195-197

*HC* 2§155n: reference; analysis of the mythological essence of Okeanos as a cosmic fresh-water river-god encircling Earth

I.21.196-197

*HC* 2§144n: reference; Janko’s analysis of the origin of the references to Okeanos and Tethys in this verse

I.21.221 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)28(P§154): part of verse quoted as *lēmma*, scholia quoted and translated; analysis of what is *sunēthes* in the current usage and Homeric usage and scholars in the post-Aristarchean era no longer having access to the ‘Koine’ tradition available to Aristarchus

I.21.221b1 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)28n(P§154): reference; comment on the evidence of the scholia for how to read *eason*/*heason* in this verse

I.21.221b2 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)28n(P§154): reference; comment on the evidence of the scholia for how to read *eason*/*heason* in this verse

I.21.221c1 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)28n(P§154): reference; comment on the evidence of the scholia for how to read *eason*/*heason* in this verse

I.21.221c2 (scholia)

*HC* P(t)28n(P§154): reference; comment on the evidence of the scholia for how to read *eason*/*heason* in this verse

I.21.308-309

*HC* 3§121: reference; passage adduced by Socrates at *Protagoras* 340a

I.21.483

*HC* P(t)8(P§127), P(t)22(P§146): quoting part of the verse; analysis of *EPEISE* read as *epei sé* (non-enclitic) as opposed to *epei se* (enclitic), according to Herodian

I.22.315

*HC* 4(t)20n(4§100): reference; analysis of Athena’s helmet at I.05.743 and *tetraphalēros* and *tetraphalos* as formulaic variants

I.22.437-515

*HC* 1(t)41(1§203): quoted and translated; analysis of Andromache’s weaving as interpreted as a Homeric metaphor for epic narration in the time of Virgil

I.22.441

*HC* 1(t)41n(1§203): reference; note on the variant readings *porphureē* and *marmareē* in this verse

I.22.444

*HC* 1(t)41n(1§203): reference; comparison of the wording here with I.17.207 regarding Andromache’s expected and Zeus’ planned return of Hector from battle

I.22.460

*HC* 1§205: reference; comparison of (the details in) the passage on Andromache and her weaving with her appearance in *Aeneid* 3, here her looking like a maenad when she swoons

I.22.466-474

*HC* 1§205: reference; comparison of (the details in) the passage on Andromache and her weaving with her appearance in *Aeneid* 3, here her swooning

I.22.477-514

*HC* 4§262: reference; analysis of the association of Andromache with the emotion of pity and the art of lamentation

I.23.083a

*HC* 3§191: reference; evidence for non-Koine versions still in the time of Plato

I.23.083b

*HC* 3§191: reference; evidence for non-Koine versions still in the time of Plato

I.23.767

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.23.768-770

*HC* 4§109: reference; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.23.771

*HC* 4§109: paraphrased; analysis of Zeus’ role in awarding *nikē* as primary and Athena’s as secondary

I.24.527-528

*HC* 2§135n: reference; verses matching these quoted in the *Derveni Papyrus* and considered by the commentator as Orphic (Obbink 1997:41n4)

I.24.580-581

*HC* 1(t)41n(1§203): reference; comment on Andromache’s mistaken prophecy in I.22.513 about Hector’s not having a chance to lie dead in state dressed in fine clothing

I.24.601-620

*HC* 1(t)9(1§33): quoted and translated; analysis of petrified characters, here in Niobe’s story, and Aristarchus’ analysis of 611 in the passage as Homeric but 614-617 as non-Homeric

I.24.611

*HC* 1§35: reference; analysis of petrified characters, here in Niobe’s story, and Aristarchus’ analysis of 611 in the passage as Homeric but 614-617 as non-Homeric

I.24.613a1 (scholia)

*HC* 1§35: reference; analysis of petrified characters, here in Niobe’s story, and Aristarchus’ analysis of 611 in the passage as Homeric but 614-617 as non-Homeric

I.24.614-617

*HC* 1§35: references; analysis of petrified characters, here in Niobe’s story, and Aristarchus’ analysis of 611 in the passage as Homeric but 614-617 as non-Homeric

I.24.614-617a1 (scholia)

*HC* 1§35: reference; analysis of petrified characters, here in Niobe’s story, and Aristarchus’ analysis of 611 in the passage as Homeric but 614-617 as non-Homeric

I.24.684

*HC* P(t)8(P§127), P(t)22(P§146): quoting part of the verse; analysis of *EPEISE* read as *epei sé* (non-enclitic) as opposed to *epei se* (enclitic), according to Herodian

I.24.725-745

*HC* 4§262: reference; analysis of the association of Andromache with the emotion of pity and the art of lamentation

I.24.804

*HC* 1(t)31n(1§178): reference; comment on a version of the *Aithiopis* that began at the closure of the *Iliad*, where *hippodamoio* in this verse is replaced by *ēlthe d’Amazōn* (in the context of analyzing Penthesileia in *Aeneid* 1.441-493)

*HC* 4§267: reference; analysis of the Panathenaic tradition of Homer as evolving in such a way as to highlight Hector, rather than Achilles, as the primary point of interest in the poetics of terror and pity, as the primary *beau mort*