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5.3.3. Beneventi cogitabam hodie. nostra continentia et diligentia ⌅esse ⌅ satis faciemus.

More than a dozen emendations of *esse* have been proposed, nearly all of them datives of nouns governed by *satis faciemus*. None of them bears the least resemblance to *esse*, and some are unconvincing also in point of sense; moreover a dative is not essential with *satis facere*, as is shown 1) by *Att. 2,14,2 satis fiet a nobis* and *Q.F. 2,4,1 cumulatissime satis fecimus* (sc. *exspectationi hominum*). Consequently Manutius’s deletion of *esse* would be preferable if an explanation could be given of its presence in the manuscripts. Now such an explanation is not far to seek; I think that *esse* originally stood in the preceding sentence after *hodie*, and was first omitted (perhaps because of the homoeoteleuton) and then inserted in the wrong place. For *esse* in a sentence setting forth travelling-plans compare *Att. 4,13,1 Romae a.d. XIII Kal. volumus esse*; *Fam. 16,10,1 ego in Formiano a.d. III Kal. esse volo*; these passages should be set against those quoted by Tyrrell-Purser and by Mueller, where there is an ellipse of *esse* in such a sentence.

The fact that some manuscripts repeat *satis* after *faciemus* is without significance; Mueller, in his note on *Att. 1,16,12*, gives a large collection of such erroneous repetitions of words in the immediate context. Cicero regularly says *satis facere*, very rarely (e.g. *Att. 5,18,4; 12,20,1; Brut. 21*) *facere satis*.

5.4.1. Gratissima est mihi tua cura de illo meo primo et maximo mandato, sed tua profectione spem meam debilitat. ⌅ac me ille illud quod labat†, non quo — sed inopia cogimur eo contenti esse.

All editors agree that Cicero is talking, in veiled language, about the prospect of having Dolabella as his third son-in-law. But there has been no agreement about a restoration of the corrupt passage; a dozen suggestions have been made, most of them plainly impossible and none of them plausible enough to deserve mention. It is perhaps surprising that no one has suggested a Greek word as part of the solution. When ae me ille is written in Greek letters such as those used by the scribes of Cicero's Letters it becomes ACMEILAE; it may not be fanciful to see here the remains of ACMENIC<TON>, a word which occurs twice elsewhere 1) in the Letters to Atticus, at 9,2a,2 and 9,10,9. In both of these passages it is quoted by Cicero from a letter of Atticus; the same may well be true in our passage also, where Cicero is replying to various points raised in some letters which he has just received from Atticus. This suggests that the corrupt labat conceals the second person singular of a verb; I propose laudas. In point of sense, διμεναιτον illud quod laudas fits the context perfectly.

5,4,2. Igitur senatus consultum si erit factum, scribes ad me; si minus, rem tamen conficies. mihi enim attribui oportebit, item Bibulo. sed non dubito quin senatus consultum expeditum sit, in quo praesertim sit compendium populi.

The senatus consultum which Cicero is so anxious to see passed concerned the vote of troops to himself as governor of Cilicia and to Bibulus as governor of Syria; these reinforcements were necessary to enable them to meet the threat of a Parthian invasion of these provinces. But why does he think that the provisions of such a decree will 'save the people's pocket' (Winstedt)? 2) Tyrrell-Purser's answer, 'no doubt on the ground si vis pacem para bellum', I find most unconvincing; nor am I convinced that Cicero used populus to connote the Roman state-treasury (aerarium is the word which one expects).

The difficulties disappear if we read populis. Syntactically the

1) Cf. also διμεναιτα at 13,22,1.

2) Some translators (e.g. Wieland and Constans) obscure the difficulty by taking compendium as if it were commodum: 'in a matter in which the interests of the state are involved'.