

In the troubled Propertian textual tradition, Book 2 is especially problematic. This paper aims to ameliorate one of these difficulties, the unity or disunity of poems 2.31 and 2.32. Evidence for the separation of these poems comes only from late and inferior MSS; the best MSS do not show a break after verse 16 of 2.31 (Heyworth 2007, Luck 1979, Hetzel 1890). Most recently, Heyworth's OCT and accompanying commentary have demonstrated the case for the unity of 2.31 and 32. Although a solid case has been made for joining the text of the two poems, problems of interpretation persist. What has the description of the temple to Apollo in 2.31 to do with Cynthia's out-of-town infidelity in 2.32? Why the concern for Cynthia's reputation while still forgiving her peccadilloes? What of the mythological exempla? Indeed, after making the case for textual continuity, Heyworth writes, "I am not convinced that the poem begun at xxxi 1 continues to the end of xxxii" (2007a, 246).

This paper examines logical and thematic connections between the opening ekphrasis of Apollo's temple, Cynthia's attempts to avoid her lover's gaze, and the poet's concern for her reputation. The ekphrasis provides a starting point: as it progresses the question of artistic verisimilitude comes to the fore. The statue of Apollo outside the temple *seems* to sing (*visus...marmoreus tacita carmen hiare lyra*, 5-6), but its actual silence is reinforced by the lyre's silence and the statue's nature as mute stone (*marmoreus*). A few steps later the poet encounters the cult statue within and comments: *Pythius...carmina...sonat* (16). The language suggests that this is no statue, but the god himself, and he no longer seems to sing (*visus...hiare*), but actually sings (*sonat*). Propertius' poem allows the god of poetry to do what a marble statue cannot: actually sing. This theme of seeing and telling, and especially the contested primacy of the power of word or image, is the link between the two seemingly disparate halves of the unified text of 2.31/32. The Cynthia portion of the poem begins with the power of sight over a man (2.32.1-2), but after revisiting his description of the Portico of Pompey, Propertius suddenly notes the futility of her fleeing his gaze (*demens, lumina nostra fugis. / nil agis*. 2.32.18). This is the point at which Heyworth would end the unified 2.31/32 (2007a, 249). The visual seems to lose its power as the thought progresses here, just as it did in the opening ekphrasis, and it cedes its power to word. Cynthia may flee his eyes, but *fama* (21) and *rumor* (24) will make her deeds known. The mythological exempla adduced take this theme in a new direction: Helen in vv. 31-32 recalls 2.15, where she is seen nude in her boudoir by the voyeuristic Paris; and Venus in vv. 33-40 not only alludes to the famous story of her display, caught in flagrante by Vulcan, but also describes how she is watched as she couples with Anchises (37). Neither woman of myth suffered lasting harm from being seen—nor did Lesbia, a woman of love poetry, suffer (45-46). The love poet can enhance or decrease his mistress' *fama* with his poetry just as Propertius granted Apollo a greater power, actual song, than the visual artist could in the opening ekphrasis. Connections of word and image bridge the halves of the (re)united text of 2.31 and 32.