Nearly thirty years ago, I discussed in some detail\(^1\) the relevance of the *TIC* to our understanding of the presence of Stesichorus’ *Iliou Persis* in Augustan Rome and dwelt briefly not so much on the possible influence of Stes. on V. as on the likely influence of V. on the *TIC*\(^2\). The intricacies of that complex article were probably excessive, for its conclusions have been quite widely misunderstood\(^3\). Alongside some useful new discussions of the poem and its problems\(^4\), we have four recent editions of the frs. of Stes.*Il.Pers.*\(^5\) and one article specifically on Stes.*Il.Pers.* and Virgil\(^6\). The issue is of some importance for any discussion of the sources of *Aen.*\(^2\):

Evidence for Stes. *Il.Pers.* is of three kinds: (i) testimonia; (ii) papyri; (iii) the *TIC*.

For (i), cf. *JHS* 1979, 38. Nothing has changed.

---


\(^{2}\) *Ib.*, 38–43.

\(^{3}\) Discussion in *EV* is not satisfactory; in particular, 4, 1022ff..

\(^{4}\) Kazansky (n.5), *passim*; much of Kazansky, 55–79 is taken up with attacks on positions that I have never in fact held, and to which the attentive reader will therefore require no reply. See also Scafoglio (n.6), Schade (n.5), 119, M.L. West, *ZPE* 4(1969), 135–49, 7(1971), 262–4. E.S. Gruen, *Culture and national identity* (Ithaca 1992), 14f. is learned but optimistic. Contrast F. Castagnoli, *Studi romani* 30 (1982), 7ff., Campbell (n.5), 107.


\(^{6}\) G. Scafoglio, *Rh.M.* 148(2005),113–25. See also, *id.*, *Lat.64*(2005), 637, 639ff. Hermes is present on the *TIC* (for discussion, *JHS* 1979, 40, 41f.), though it would be folly to find a Stesichorean Hermes behind the *deo* of 632; quite apart from the more general problem of his view of V’s relations to Stes., Scafoglio takes no account of the very slender presence of the Hermes-version in literature and art, and of the character of the attestations.
(ii) Much has changed since Page, *PMG*; for the new frs., apart from the publications in *Pap. Oxy* and Page, *SLG*, we have four edd. (n.5). That S107 may (so West 1969, 141) point to Helen’s participation in a dialogue, presumably with Menelaus has no bearing (*pace* Kazansky, 53, 79) on how she was put to death in Stes. and on the *TIC*. The oath by Pallas and the φάσος ἀξίλιος of S102 was compared by West (*ib*, 139; cf. now Kazansky, 47) to Sinon’s oath, *Aen*. 2. 154ff.. Sinon’s choice of goddess to swear by in Stes. (if Pallas’ existence at S102.8 is accepted; a supplement by W.S. Barrett) is enticing, but that is a very long way from being able to assume that Sinon’s role in Stes. can be extrapolated from *Aen*. 2. The debate on what to do with the TH is present in Stes. (S88, fr.1, col.ii), as in *Aen.*, but it is an episode already narrated by Hom. (*Od*. 8.50ff.; cf. 57–76) and the fact that it is present in both V. and Stes. is of no significance.

(iii) There are 22 *Tabulae Iliacae*, and there have been since 1989*. Six of them are signed by the artist Theodorus: the epigraphic evidence leaves no doubt that that is who he was (Horsfall, *IGUR* 4, 96ff., *JHS* 1979, 27, etc.); the use of ‘magic squares’* to display the artist’s signature may help confirm other indications of his Egyptian origins*. There is nothing to support the hypothesis that Theodorus was the artist of the *TIC*’s equally hypothetical mosaic original*. Theodorus’ workshop was probably Roman, and his date (late) Augustan ( *IGUR*, cit.). There is something very peculiar about the miniaturised illustrations and text of the *tabulae*: that led to my hypothesis that they were conceived as showpieces and *aides-mémoire* for Rome’s *nouveaux-riche*, a class whose cultural pretensions were familiar long before Petronius*. That argument received welcome support from W. McLeod’s analysis

---

7 If *JHS* had drawn a beginner’s attention to the mass of new Stes. papyri, I should have been grateful and delighted; very oddly, they did not, but the work they put in on my first serious paper was otherwise exemplary.

8 Listed: *IGUR* 4 (Roma 1990), 93–8 (NMH). The first (1A), the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (*IGUR* 1612) was found at Tor Ser Paolo, 1½ km. to the NE of Bovillae (cf. Horsfall 1979, 32); this fact is not in any doubt (though mistated by e.g. Scafoglio, 113/637, Canciano, *EV* 5*, 4) among serious students of the *TIC*, has never been, and should not have been presented as though it were; all the antiquarian detail has been readily available since 1910.


10 Horsfall, *JHS* 1979, 28ff.; no little confusion, Kazansky, 55ff.
