

In making this fine distinction between the military responsibilities of the *proletarii* and those of the *capite censi*, Gellius and his informant clearly were influenced by the military nature of the census system. This same influence can be seen in the accounts of the census given by Livy (1. 43. 1–10) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 4. 16–17). These authors explain the existence of each of the census classes by assigning to each slightly different arms and armor. The equipment they describe does not fit that of any historic period and is clearly the result of antiquarian speculation.¹⁰ If Gellius' informant mistakenly thought that the *proletarii* and the *capite censi* were two different bodies, he may have tried to explain the distinction in a similar manner, by giving to each its own military role. Since the *proletarii* could serve only in emergencies, the *capite censi*, thought to be their inferiors, must never have served.

The solution to the problem presented by this passage is now clear. Gellius or Julius Paulus or their source encountered an author who gave the property qualification of the *capite censi* in *sestertii* while not clearly specifying the unit. This reader also found a property qualification of 1,500 *asses* for the *proletarii* in another source. Thinking that two separate groups were involved, he justified their existence with a contrived military explanation.

DANIEL J. GARGOLA
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

10. See R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965; repr. 1970), pp. 166–68.

AN UNPUBLISHED EMENDATION OF WILAMOWITZ ON *ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA* 7. 50. 3

In 1986 Mr. C. A. Stray (Swansea) discovered amongst the papers of W. H. D. Rouse (1863–1950) a postcard of Wilamowitz to W. R. Paton (1858–1921), canceled 17 January 1914 and addressed to “Monsieur W. R. Paton, Vathy, Samos, via Triest, Kais. österreich. Post.” Mr. Clive Rouse kindly allows me to publish the document, which is in his possession. I append my transcription:

Verehrter Freund

Der Palatinus der Anthologie ist photographiert, mit einer guten Praefatio bei Sijthoff in Leiden erschienen. Sie müssen fordern, daß Ihnen das Buch von Loeb zur Verfügung gestellt wird. Wenn Sie an die Emendation gehen, werden Sie freilich schwerlich jemals fertig werden.

VII 50, Archimelos [*sic*], ist ἐπίκροτος eine Änderung ohne Probabilität und nicht einmal ein erwünschtes Wort. In solchen Fällen kann nur palaeographische Evidenz die Überzeugung geben, das richtige gefunden zu haben. Ich habe an ἐπίρροπος = -ρεπής gedacht. Das würde passen; aber neue Wörter darf man auch nicht leicht erfinden.

Ich fürchte, Sie werden an die Aufgabe nicht viel Freude erleben. θείη μὲν γὰρ ἰδεῖν etc.

ἐρρωσθαι
UvWilamowitz

I assume Paton forwarded the card to the Loeb editor in order to substantiate his need for a reproduction of the Palatinus. Heeding Wilamowitz' warning (ἐπίκροτος is attested only in prose), he banished his conjecture to a footnote.

WILLIAM M. CALDER III
University of Illinois,
Urbana-Champaign