Among the last of the figures of speech (figurae elocutionis, σχήματα λέξεως) to receive treatment in Aquila Romanus’ tract De figuris was the one probably called by him ἐπεζευγμένον, iniunctum, or zeugma. His explanatory remarks on this figure follow (p. 63.7-11 Elice, with modified apparatus):


exornationis (sic E)] enumerationis ω : ‘forte enuntiationis’ Ruhnken

The archetype of our manuscripts of Aquila, to judge from the stemma produced by the text’s most recent editor and from the manuscript readings she reports, referred to this figure as a ‘type of enumeration’ (genus enumerationis).1 That reading was accepted by the early editors of the text, and evidently remained unchallenged until Ruhnken’s great edition of 1768.2 His tentative conjecture enuntiationis (making this figure instead a ‘type of phrasing’) would be adopted almost a century later by Halm.3 In the most recent edition of Aquila we read instead exornationis (a ‘type of adornment’), a reading adopted from E (= Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Strozzi 42, s. XV).

---

1 For the stemma see Elice 2007, ccix. She reports that all manuscripts read enumerationis, save for E (as above, and with it its descendant F) and ε (= GLN), which omits the word.
2 I have confirmed the reading enumerationis in every edition (save, of course, for Halm’s) listed at Elice 2007, 3.
3 Halm 1863, 36.
First, a small but significant correction of fact: the reading of C (= Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, 1086, s. IX) is not *enumerationis*, but *enuntiationis*.4 Thus on Elice’s stemma the readings *enuntiationis* (C) and *enumerationis* (now α) have equal authority. Of these options *enuntiationis* seems preferable. Aquila often uses *enuntiare* and related words in connection with an orator’s utterances,5 whereas *enumerare* and related words evidently occur nowhere else in the text.6 Moreover, in the context of the discussion of zeugma, *enumentatio* is imperfectly suited to the contradistinction Aquila makes between the *copia verborum* associated with the figure διεζευγμένον and the *brevitas* associated with ἐπεζευγμένον, which results from the coalescence of multiple words or *membra* into a single entity.

The remaining question, then, is whether the conjectural reading *exornationis* (E) should be preferred to *enuntiationis*. In its favour is the fact that Aquila has said that the figure διεζευγμένον, which he opposes to ἐπεζευγμένον, *ornat et amplificat orationem* (p. 61.11-12). It is not at all certain, however, that such mirroring between these two entries need be restored to Aquila’s hastily composed text. Weighing against *exornationis* is the fact that the scribe of E was given to innovation, such that the text in that manuscript often departs, for better and for worse, from the text which stood in its parent.7 The most significant of its innovations, for this question, is the title attached to the work in E: *Romani Aquilae rhetoris illustriissimi exornationes verborum et sententiarum incipit*.8 For if this scribe, singularly, understood Aquila’s entire project to be concerned with *exornatio*, it is easy to see how he could incline to replace *enumerationis* with a word he deemed more appropriate to the enterprise. Therefore there seems to be little cause to trust in E’s *exornationis*, and still less cause to discard

---

4 Were it not for the laudable diligence and accuracy with which Elice has handled the transmission of Aquila, I would have been hesitant to put on record so slight a correction. For the sake of accuracy, I also note that at p. 27.1, *assiduo* is the reading of C.

5 See Aquila p. 7.7, 33.7, 35.7, 39.2, 39.6, 41.4, 57.5, 59.6, 65.8, 67.8.

6 Cf., however, Aquila p. 31.11 adnumerare] enumerare α.


8 Note also the *explicit* in E: *Romani Aquilae exornationes verborum et sententiarum explicit feliciter*. This manuscript, and insofar as I know only this manuscript, calls Rutilius Lupus’ *Schemata* by the title *Exornationes verborum et sententiarum in the incipit*, while it preserves, more or less accurately, the inherited title *Schemata dianoeas* in the *explicit*. 
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