Looks Good 'To Me': Three Notes on Martial 6.63

Though published in different books, two of Martial's best epigrams make a nice pair, useful for teaching students about *captatio*. In 4.56 he addresses the *captator*:

> Munera quod senibus viduisque ingentia mittis,
>> vis te munificum, Gargiliane, vocem?
> sordidius nihil est, nihil est te spurcius uno,
>> qui potes insidias dona vocare tuas:
> sic avidis fallax indulget piscibus hamus,
>> callida sic stultas decipit esca feras.
> quid sit largiri, quid sit donare docebo,
>> si nescis: dona, Gargiliane, mihi.

In 6.63 he turns to the *captator*'s prey:

> Scis te captari, scis hunc qui captat, avarum,
>> et scis qui captat quid, Mariane, velit.
> tu tamen hunc tabulis heredem, stulte, supremis
>> scribis et esse tuo vis, furiose, loco.
> 'munera magna tamen misit.' sed misit in hamo;
>> et piscatorem piscis amare potest?
> hicine deflebit vero tua fata dolore?
>> si cupis, ut ploret, des, Mariane, nihil.

6 et] sic ς, *Gruter, puncto in fine versus posito* : dic SB[1]

Saving the problems of 4.56 for another day, I have three things to say about 6.63:

1. As shown by Shackleton Bailey's apparatus, quoted in full above, the only agreed textual problem in either poem is *et* in 6.63.6. In proposing *dic*, he writes "*Et* has no useful function". Grewing (*ad loc.*) emphatically disagrees: "Im Gegenteil! Vielfach findet sich *et* (griech. καί vergleichbar) zur Einleitung einer affectischen Frage", with references to *TLL* and *LHS*, and quoting Martial 5.40.2 as a parallel. I would only add that the question 'Can a fish love a fisherman?' might cause some readers to wonder whether a fish can love at all. 'Can a fish love even a fisherman?' seems to me to leave the first question open in an amusing way, while implying a clear 'no' to the second.

2. It is an interesting fact that the last word of 4.56 would also work very well as the last word of 6.63: 'If you want him to cry, Marianus, give it *to me*.' Corruption of *nihil* (ɯıhıl) to *mihi* (ɯıhı) would have been easy enough. However, I prefer to keep the varied jokes in the two poems, and need a spare *mihi* for another problem.

3. The repetition of *tamen* in lines 3 and 5 of 6.63 seems awkward. The four words put in Marianus' mouth in 5 are already weasely enough with all the M-alliteration, but they would be even weaselier with another M to make the complete set. I would therefore like to think that Martial wrote *'Munera magna **mihi** misit'*. The personal pronoun would have easily dropped out before *misit*, and *tamen* would have been the obvious patch after 3. Either way (with *mihi* or *tamen*), I also suspect that Marianus' words should be punctuated with a long dash, to show that Martial interrupts his pathetic excuses with *sed misit in hamo*.

To conclude, my on-line text of 6.63 will certainly have *et* in 6, probably *mihi* in the text of 5 with 'temptavi' in the apparatus, probably a long dash at the end of the quotation, and perhaps (I'm still thinking about it) 'nihil] *fortasse* mihi' in the apparatus for 8.