

Following up on observations on S. J. Heyworth's *Cynthia* (Oxford 2007) that have appeared elsewhere, this paper will further address the question of the ways in which radical textual intervention in a poet who is otherwise difficult in his thought may in fact produce a more readable but less authentic text than is legitimate. In that earlier discussion I particularly focused on 3.7, the Paetus elegy, and suggested that multiple editorial interventions obscure the possibility that the Propertian poem may be read, following the text preserved in the MSS, as a deliberately disjointed set of epigrams, never meant to be a unified artifact—as it then becomes for Heyworth and others, chiefly by means of hypothesizing numerous transpositions. The present paper will focus, *via* specific case studies taken chiefly from Books 2 and 3, on the phenomena of transposition, interpolation and the positing of *lacunae*. While it will be conceded that any given instance of these phenomena is potentially the correct course of action, and that any given instance may receive universal critical approval, it will be a working assumption that skepticism toward such procedures should be the default attitude. Notions of unity and coherence will be examined, and, as in the case of 3.7, appeal will be made to a view of Propertian elegy that sees it as gesturing in its formal structures toward, rather than away from, epigram.