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INTRODUCTION.

It is a recognized fact that many of the statements touching Latin syntax, generally accepted as true, rest upon slight foundation. One after another, trusted "rules" have been weighed in the balance of exhaustive research, and found wanting, till the careful scholar finds himself regarding with great reserve even the most plausible statements of traditional grammar, unless those statements have been amply verified by thorough investigation. Unfortunately the number of instances in which such investigations have been made is comparatively few. This paper is presented in the hope that it may add one more to the list.

Primarily the object has been to present a complete, classified, list of all the examples in point that occur in extant Latinity down to the end of the Augustan period. No effort has been spared toward the attainment of this object. Sometimes, where no reliable index was available, a standard text has been carefully read the second time, lest any examples should escape notice. This has been done in the case of Plautus, and Terence, and Cicero's Letters. The accuracy of the text has been tested in the case of each example and the reading discussed when necessary. In spite of all precautions, however, it is possible that some few examples have been omitted. Moreover, scattered fragments, not found in standard collections such as the Poetae Latini Minoris of Baehrens, and the Seae nigae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta of Ribbeck, have not been hunted out. All material belonging to the post-Augustan period has been gleaned from lexicons and indexes. Some of these were good and some were not. No effort has been made toward completeness of the material belonging to this period of the language, but examples, so far as given, have been verified and are accurate. They are valuable as throwing light upon the later development of the construction which forms the subject of this paper, and they probably cover over seventy-
Introduction.

five per cent. of the instances occurring in the entire period from which they are drawn.

Two other objects have been kept in mind; and the three, treated separately, give rise to the division of the paper into three parts. Part One contains a collection of the statements regarding the subject made by scholars both ancient and modern, with an occasional criticism of statements of fact. Part Two contains the material gathered in the present investigation, as described above. Part Three includes criticisms of theories quoted in Part One, together with such independent suggestions and conclusions as may seem warranted by Part Two.
PART ONE.

HISTORY OF VIEWS.

Cicero, *de Div. i*, 63, writes *meminit praeteritorum*.* In *de Fin. i*, 62, he writes *praeterita meminit*. Why? The following pages are devoted to an attempt to answer the general question of which this is a particular instance: Why did the Romans use now the genitive and now the accusative with verbs of *remembering* and *forgetting*?

The ancient grammarians have little or nothing to say about the matter. If they mention it at all, it is generally to quote without comment examples of the genitive and accusative with these verbs, under the heading "Exempla Elocutionum." However, Caper and after him Beda (see Keil, vii, pp. 92, 282) make the following positive statement: *Oblitus ne sis nostri, non nos: veteres tamen et hoc modo dixerunt*. This is wholly without explanation or comment. Nonius (L. Müller, 1888, Part II, p. 136 ff.), under the heading *De Numeris et Casibus*, makes the following interesting classification: *Accusativus pro genetivo*. dum homines perditi haestam illum cruentam memorant et sperabunt.

M. Tullius, *de off. II*

alternos Musae memorisse volebant. Vergilius in *Bucolicis.*

meminere officium sumn. Plautus, *Cistellaria.*

propter eam illam rem memini facilius. *Menacremis.*

hen me miserum cum haec recordor, cum illos remminiscor dies.

Accius, *Eurysaece.*

veritus sum arbitros; adque utinam memet possim oblisier.

*Althamante.*

an ego Ulixem oblisar unquam aut quemquam praeponi velim?

*Nytegresia.*

iam desine memorisse illus formam. Turpilius, *Pedio.*

adque ipsa mens, quae futura videt, praeterita meminit.
History of Views.

M. Tullius, de re publica, IV.
libet epigrammatia facere et quoniam nomina non memini, siquod in solum mi venerit, ponam. Varro, Vae victis, peri philonikias.
mea facta in acie obliti—Accius, Myrmidonibus.

Note the fact that while Nonius finds instances in plenty of 'accusativus pro genetivo', he detects no case of 'genetivus pro accusativo'.

Of the modern attempts to solve the problem with which we are dealing, practically all date within the last seventy-five years. There have been many of them, but, since they are based upon insufficient data, they are, for the most part, either incomplete or incorrect. They may be grouped under three general classes. First, those that assert that the genitive when used after verbs of remembering and forgetting is the so-called partitive genitive. Second, those that regard this genitive as due to the substantive idea inhering in the verb. Third, those that attempt to explain it on the basis of other significations.

The most prominent advocate of the first theory is Karl Reisig (Vorlesungen ü ber Lat. Sprachwissenschaft, 1888, p. 570 ff.). "With the genitive," says Reisig, "one thinks of a part of the whole. Some assert that with memini an accusative of the person is not used,1 but the genitive. However, there is a distinction between the two cases. With the genitive you think at once of the Prädikat' of the person whom you remember, namely of the personality. It is presupposed that you have learned to know the person. This is not the case when the accusative is used, which occurs only when one is thinking of the object in general, without knowing the personality. This is proved by instances from Cicero, where the contrast is brought out between remembrance and acquaintance, Phil. V, 6, 17, Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem. The former he knew from history, the last two he had himself seen. Lael. 2, 9, memineram Paullum, videram

1 This is not true. There are 20 instances of memini with an accusative of the person.
Reisig : Clairin.

Gallum ; de Orat. III, 50, 194. Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe meministi. [The editor, Landgraf, here interposes the remark that these examples go, on the other hand, to show that memini with the accusative of a person is used when you have in mind one who has lived in your time or whom you yourself have known] Memini de aliquo is also legitimate, but it means 'to make mention of.'

"With oblivisci also the genitive is distinctly different from the accusative, for in certain instances the genitive is absolutely necessary, as for example, if not a whole thing is to be or can be represented as forgotten, but only an impression which it has made. So oblivisci rei means to forget an impression of a thing, where you still know the fact. This indication becomes necessary, if you are speaking of an intentional disappearance from the memory. Now one cannot forget insults, but one may very well destroy the impression, thus one says injuriarum oblivisci (Caes. B. G. I, 14). Only thus can one explain the union with omnium, as in Cic. de Fin. V, 20, 57, omnium ceterarum rerum obliti: 'von allen Dingen etwas vergessen'."

Haase, in a footnote, declares that Reisig is entirely in error. Haase himself thinks that these verbs were originally intransitive. He also calls attention to the fact that even in the case of injuries we have several times the accusative, as Cic. pro Cael. 20, 50.

P. Clairin (Du Génitif Latin et de la Préposition De, Paris, 1880, p. 40) says: "It is not always easy to affirm with certainty why certain verbs of transitive meaning take an object in the genitive, and the most ingenious conjectures ought not to take the place of actual explanations. Many suggest an ellipsis of a substantive. Now even if in certain instances one should recognize the ellipsis of a substantive, yet in others it is the verb itself that appears to take its object in the genitive. Without doubt meminisse equals habere memoriam; but, as it is quite as true that amare equals habere amorem, why should one not also put the object of the verb amare in the genitive? These explanations only postpone and sometimes augment the difficulty which they pretend to explain.
"The connection easily established between verbs of remembering and forgetting and the adjectives memor and immemor is not sufficient to explain this construction, common to Greek and Latin. If you can recognize the partitive idea in the genitive employed in Greek with verbs which signify an operation of the mind, can you not have recourse to the same explanation for the genitive joined to verbs of remembering and forgetting, the memory not being the object itself, but only a part of the object? In support of this is the fact that the same verbs take an object in the accusative in the sense of 'to know': Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe meministi. Cic. De Orat. iii, 50. 194.'"

Among those who favor the second theory, i.e., that the genitive is due to the substantive idea inhering in the verb, may be mentioned Draeger (Historische Syntax, Vol. I, 1878, p. 488 ff.), but he adds that the language was always unsettled in these expressions and that often the accusative is used in place of the genitive. "In classical Latin and later the genitive is everywhere the more common, and appears even with neuter pronouns if their neuter origin is evident from the context." Draeger then inserts a paragraph headed "Statt des Genetivs steht der Accusativ", giving the instances, as did Nonius, without further comment.

He continues: "With recordari the accusative is always the more usual, especially in the works of Cicero, who uses the genitive with this verb only three times:"

1 No one of these instances is in point. Let us examine them in detail. The first passage, with its context, is as follows: *Atque haece dicere vix auder*; vercor, *ne qui sit, qui istius insignem nequitiam frontis involutam integumentis nondum cornul; dicam tamen. Ipse certe agnoscect et cum aliquo dolore *flagitiorum suorum recordabitur.* G. W. Gossenau (Lat. Sprachlehre, 1880, p. 267, 2) calls attention to the fact that the genitive here is not the object of recordor. "Both agnoscect and recordabitur refer to nequitiam in the previous sentence, and the genitive depends on dolore." One can hardly dispute this after a careful examination of the passage, especially in view of the fact that, if *flagitiorum* is to be construed with *recordabitur,* it must stand as positively the only instance in which Cicero uses the genitive with that verb, for it will presently be shown that the other
in Plis. 6, flagitiorum suorum.

pro Planc. 28, huius meriti.

ad Att. iv, 17,1 superioris tune transmissionis.

Both in view of these examples, and those previously quoted, it
seems likely that the accusative occurs when these verbs mean to
have something in memory, in knowledge. Only it is certain
that the accusative of pronouns and adjectives serves to make dis-
tinguishable their neuter gender. (Cf. Madvig, Gramm. § 291,
Ann. 1.)''

Guardia and Wierzeyski (Grammaire de la Langue Latine,
1876, p. 452) also think that the genitive is to be explained by a
certain substantive notion residing in the verb. They add:
"Although the usage varies and the accusative often replaces the
genitive, the latter is the more usual, even with neuter pronouns,
when the neuter can be recognized in the context. The construc-
tion with the accusative belongs also to the ante-classical period."

Kühner (Ausführliche Gramm. der Lat. Sprache, 1873, Vol.
II, p. 344 ff.) is another who holds this theory. The accusative,
he says, means memoria rem [non] leneo, in memoriam recoco.
In the case of persons it is used when one has in mind someone
who has lived in one’s time and whom one has known personally.

This last remark, regarding persons, is made also by Deecke
(Lat. Gr., § 256), who has no further suggestions to offer
concerning the matter.

two alleged instances are beyond a doubt not to be so taken: pro Planc. 28,
huius meriti is corrupt. There seems to be absolutely no manuscript
authority for it. All recent editors read merilum. The mistake was made
only by the earlier editors.

In ad Att. IV, 19, the accepted text is quam me hercule ego valde temp-
bam recordans superioris tuae transmissionis depe ses where depe ses is obvi-
osly the object of the participle. This is the view of Tyrrell, (The Corres-
Att., p. 213) and of E. S. Shuckburgh, in his translation of the Letters,
published in 1893. Under the head of recordor with the genitive, the
Merguet lexicons give the passage from in Pisonem commented on above,
and also ut recordemini illius L. Metelli, pontificis maximi: pro Scaur.
48. But ut recordemini is here a conjecture made to fill a lacuna (see text
of C. F. W. Müller). Obviously it cannot be correct.

1This passage is variously cited as ad Att. IV, 17, and ad Att. IV, 19.
Alfred Schottmüller (Lat. Schulgrammatik, 1884, p. 227) declares: "The genitive, common with these verbs, necessitates the supplying of the accusative memoriam with verbs of remembering and forgetting, and of the nominative memoria with venit mihi in mentem. These verbs often have the accusative, where meminisse aliquem means 'to bethink oneself of someone' and where the word memoria would be out of place."

The scholars thus far quoted have in the main been conservative, admitting that the cases, when referring to things, are frequently used without apparent difference of meaning. There follows one of the most lengthy discussions of the subject that have yet been made, in which the author states his distinction and then cites examples to prove that the genitive and accusative are always quite distinct in meaning, except possibly in the case of neuter pronouns.

Friedrich Haase, Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft, 1874, II, p. 76:

"The verbs reminisci, oblivisci, recordari, meminisse take the genitive or the accusative with a distinction which results naturally from the character of the case. Reisig, § 356, would make use of the partitive idea in the case of the genitive, and derives his distinction by saying that, when the accusative is used, one has in mind the whole thing, but when the genitive is used, only an impression of it; but that is wholly wrong; cf. Weissenborn Synt. §§ 89 and 144. The genitive is rather the more distinct expression of the relative adjectival idea of memor and immemor that resides in these verbs. Thus with the genitive there is expressed only the state of remembering. While the object is specified, there is not the free play of the intellect which has or has not laid firm hold of the object, as is the case with the accusative.

"Thus when Cic., Phil. V, 6, 17, says: Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem, he merely wishes to remark that he has known these men. He has seen Caesar and Sulla, and his ability to remember reaches to Cinna. He can remember the former and he carries the latter in his recollection. The connection with vidi shows that here he would refer to mental activity only and noth-
Friedrich Haase.

ing more. On the other hand had he said *Cinnae memini*, more would have been involved. Then his ability to remember would be so circumscribed owing to Cinna, that he could not separate himself from him, that he could not forget him, as, for instance, if he were closely connected with him by ties of affection, or if Cinna had so impressed himself on his memory that he was not in a position to get free from him; under such circumstances then his memory is limited and determined by the nature of the situation, and is not a free activity by virtue of which he may call to mind Cinna if he wish, or may refrain from doing so, if he prefer. Of persons, this accusative is rare; the genitive frequent. Very naturally, for it is the usual thing that persons should be brought before one in their natural connection of love, friendship, etc. One person is mindful of another by virtue of natural inclination.

"Another example: Caesar says, *B. G. I*, 14, 3, *Quod si veteris contumeliae obliuisse velit, num etiam recentium iniuriarum memoriam deponere posse?* That would surely appear to be a free act; it is a question of pardoning or not pardoning. But a man naturally, and as a matter of duty, is mindful of an insult offered his people. It is a grievance which one carries in his heart whether or no, the memory of which is thus involuntary. Caesar now says that even if he should cast out one such recollection, yet this would be impossible in the case of the recent grievance.

"On the other hand Cicero, *pro Caec.* 20, 50, paints Clodia as a well known woman about town who plied her trade so openly that on her part there could be no talk of adultery, of which Caelius had been guilty with her. Then he further says: *Obliviscor iam iniurias, Clodia, depono memoriam doloris mei, quae abs te crueliter in meos me absente facta sunt, neglego.* Here Cicero for the moment, *iam*, really forgets his grievance by virtue of a free act, and from voluntary resolution does not mention it. The following verbs, *depono* and *neglego* show that.

"Cicero, *pro Liger.* 12, 35, *Equidem, cum tuis omnibus negotiis interessent, memoria teneo, qualis T. Ligarius quaestor urbanus fuerit erga te et dignitatem tuam.* *Sed parum est me hoc me-
History of Views.

minisse: spero etiam te, qui oblivisci nihil soles nist iniurias, quoniam hoc est animi, quoniam etiam ingenii tui, te aliquid de huius illo quaestorio officio etiam de aliis quibusdam quaestoribus reminiscemtem recordari. It is certain that Cicero here in flattery of Caesar puts the power of his remarkable memory along side of praise of his personal character. Later he says animus and ingenium; 'you are not accustomed to forget' (that is the force of the ingenium); 'only for injuries do you appear to have no memory' (that is the force of the animus); but Cicero treats it as if it too were a matter of the ingenium, and if he, Cicero, although he was under no obligation to remember it, had not forgotten the services of T. Ligarius in behalf of Caesar, so much the less would Caesar forget it, since it concerned him, and since he was not accustomed to forget, least of all to forget kindnesses.

'I hope that this explanation of the examples has proven that in such instances the direct object has its own fixed meaning and that it is not at all identical in signification with the genitive. One may grant merely this (cf. Zumpt § 440) that the neuters, as hoc, illud, cetera, etc., usually stand in the accusative, because one avoids the genitive, which it is not possible to recognize as nenter. But doubtless also in this case the accusative must be suitable, or else one would say, as Cic. l. c., omnium ceterarum rerum, or huius rei, etc.'

We come now to the theories of those who would distinguish between the two cases on the basis of differences of signification
other than those already considered. Sometimes the distinction is not very sharp between these views and those included in our preceding group, but it is enough so to serve for the purpose of convenient arrangement. Madvig's statement is given first (Madvig-Thacher, Grammar, § 291): "The accusative is often put with those verbs which signify to remember and to forget,—most frequently with memini,—when they denote to have a thing in the memory (knowledge of a thing) or the reverse (but not to think of a thing or not to think of it."

Riemann and Goelzer (Grammaire Comparée, p. 140) say: "When memini and obliviscor have for object the name of a thing, you often find this object in the accusative. Under such circumstances the meaning of memini is 'to keep in memory' and of obliviscor 'not to keep in memory.' On the other hand, with an object in the genitive these verbs signify 'to have (or not to have) a recollection of.'

"When the object is the name of a person, memini alone can be construed with the accusative."

"The verb recordor is ordinarily accompanied by an object which is the name of a thing. The case is the accusative. When the object of recordor is the name of a person, it has regularly the ablative preceded by de. In familiar speech one finds also memini de aliquo and memini de aliqua re. The idea of 'to make mention of' is sometimes rendered in Latin by memini accompanied by the genitive, but the example which is cited (Caes. B. C., III, 108, 2) cannot rest on the authority of Caesar, if it be true that chapters 108 and 112 of this book were written partly by Asinius Pollio."

Two of the most radical statements are those of J. B. Greenough (Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar) and of John Wm.

---

1 This would appear to be incorrect, in view of Livius Andronicus, Odisia, 4: Accius, Athamas, II, 190, and Nectygnesia, VI, 488; Virgil, Aen., II, 198.—four instances in which obliviscor is followed by an accusative of the person.

2 The accuracy of this statement is doubtful. Cf. Cic. Leg. Agr., II, 2, 3; Phil., II, 36, 91. The usage is rare.
Donaldson (*A Complete Latin Grammar*, Camb. 1867). As will be seen, they are diametrically opposed to one another. Greenough says (p. 215, § 219), “Verbs of Remembering and Forgetting take the Genitive of the object when they are used of a continued state of mind, but the accusative when used of a single act: as,—

I. Genitive:—

recordans superioris transmissionis (*Att.* IV, 19), 'remembering your former crossing'.

animus meminit praeteritorum (*Div.* 1, 30) ‘the soul remembers the past’.

venit mihi in mentem illius diei, ‘I bethink me of that day’.

obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum (*Cat.* 1, 3), 'turn your mind from slaughter and conflagrations'.

nec umquam obliviscar illius noctis (*Planc.* 42, 101), 'and I shall never forget that night'.

II. Accusative:—
totam causam oblitus est (*Brut.* 60), 'he forgot the whole case'.

pueritiae memoriam recordari (*Arch.* 1) ‘to recall the memory of childhood’.

a. The Accusative is almost always used of a person or thing remembered by an eye-witness: as,—

memineram Paulum (*Lael.*) ‘I remembered Paulus’.

b. Recordor, ‘recollect’, ‘recall’, denotes a single act and is therefore almost always followed by the Accusative: as—

recordare consensus illum theatris (*Phil.* i, 30.) ‘recall that unanimous agreement of the (the audience in the) theatre’.

recordamini omnis civilis dissensiones (*Cat.* iii, 24), ‘recall all the civil wars’.

Donaldson (i. 1., p. 279) says: “The genitive of the object is used generally with verbs of remembering, reminding, and forgetting, as memini, admono, reminiscor, recordor, and obliviscor; but they sometimes take an accusative, especially when they denote

---

1 In the note on the quotation from Draeger (see above p. 6) it has been shown that the genitive is here not the object of *recordor*.
Do7ialdson; Gossrau; Schmalz.
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'to have a thing in memory', 'to have knowledge of a thing', or the reverse, rather than 'to call it to mind' or 'think of it'; thus we find stultum est eorum meminisse, propter quae tu oblivisceris 'it is foolish to remember those things on account of which you are forgetful of yourself'; but, Antipatrum tu probe meministi, 'you retain Antipater in your recollection—you still remember him'; homines non modo res praecarissimas obliviscuntur, sed etiam nefarias suspicantur, 'men not only forget (are continually forgetful of) the most illustrious actions, but they even suspect wickednesses'.

Obs. 1. Recordor, 'I think of', almost always governs the accusative; and we have also the ablative with de: as de illis lacrimis recordor. Similarly we have de illo ne meminisse quidem volo. The poets use obliviscor with an accusative of the person.'

G. W. Gossrau (Lat. Sprachlehre, 1880, §267) says that obliviscor can take the accusative of things, also of persons in the sense of 'to give up'. Of reminiscor he says that there is no instance in Cicero where this verb alone governs a case, except Att. IV, 2, reminiscebatur enim Kal. Ian., where we cannot tell what the case is. This appears to be true. There is an instance in ad Fam., IV, 5, 5, but the letter was written by Servius, not by Cicero.

Various scholars confine themselves to statements of fact, with little or no attempt to distinguish or explain the usages. Among them is J. H. Schmalz (Lateinische Syntax, Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, II,3, 2, 1600, p. 241, §67), who says: "With verbs of remembering and forgetting, the use of the genitive outweighs that of the accusative except in early Latin, where, in Plautus for instance, obliviscor is construed only with the accusative. Recordare, however, even in classical Latin generally has the accusative; in Cicero the only instances of the genitive are ad Att. IV, 17, 1, and in Pisonem 12. In the comic poets and from them on everywhere, these verbs occur also with de. Cicero always uses recordor with de when referring to persons. In early

1 The italics are mine.
Latin *venit in mentem* is followed by the substantive in the genitive or by *de* with ablative. In Cicero always by genitive; in the case of pronouns the nominative is used. In Livy and later writers the nominative appears to predominate, even in the case of substantives.”

Notice here also the error of regarding *Att. 4, 17, 1*, and *in Pisonem 12* as instances of the genitive with *recordor*; see above p. 6, N.

Here also I shall include:

C. G. Zumpt, *A Grammar of the Latin Language*, translated by Leonhard Schmitz, 1847, § 439: “With verbs of *reminding*, *remembering*, and *forgetting*, the person or the thing of which any one reminds another or oneself, or which one forgets, is expressed by the genitive; but there are many instances also in which the thing is expressed by the accusative.

“§ 440. *Note.* With regard to the accusative of the thing, it must be observed that the neuters of pronouns, and neuter adjectives used as substantives, are joined to the above mentioned verbs only in the accusative; for their genitive would present no difference from the masculine gender. . . . . . . An accusative of the person is very rarely used with these verbs; but *memini*, in the sense of ‘I remember a person who lived in my time,’ is invariably joined with an accusative of the person. . . . . Sometimes verbs of *reminding* and *remembering* take the preposition *de*; *memini* takes *de* more especially when it signifies *mentionem facere*; but the genitive also may be used. With *venit mihi in mentem*, the person or thing may be put in the nominative, so as to become the subject.”

Among recent American Grammars may be mentioned those of G. M. Lane (1898) and of C. E. Bennett (1895). Neither author offers any theory as to the distinction between the cases when referring to things. When referring to persons, the latter thinks that *memiui* takes the genitive in the significations: *I bear in mind* (memor sum), *am mindful of*, or *make mention of*; but the accusative in the signification, *I recall*. *Obliviscor*, he says, regularly takes the genitive. Professor Bennett does not make
the mistake of including recordor in the list of verbs governing the genitive. Professor Lane does; aside from that his statements are conservative and not important to note here.

It will thus be seen that there is considerable difference of opinion regarding the principle of distinction in the choice between the two cases, especially when referring to things. There is, however, practical unanimity in distinguishing the use with things from that with persons, though we do not find perfect agreement in the theories advanced to explain that difference. The opinion most often expressed seems to be that the accusative (with memini) points to the fact that the person remembered either had lived in the time of the speaker or was known personally to him.

Criticisms of statements made regarding obliviscor and recordor occur in connection with the statements themselves, as cited above. The fact is generally recognized that neuter pronouns and adjectives in the neuter gender used substantively are put in the accusative, and this is explained by saying that otherwise the gender would not be known. It is further stated that in Livy and later we find, even with these neuters, the genitive, where their neuter gender may be seen from the context. The present investigation has shown that this statement regarding neuters may be extended, as will appear later.

The use of de with the ablative with these verbs has been touched upon briefly, also the construction following the phrase venit mihi in mentem. Statistics regarding the extent of these constructions will be found in their proper place. The treatment of these two usages, however, is only incidental, and does not come properly within the scope of this paper.
PART II.

COLLECTION OF MATERIAL.

The following pages contain all the instances in extant Latin literature, down to the end of the Augustan period, in which a verb of remembering or forgetting occurs with a direct object in either the genitive or the accusative case.

APPIUS CLAUDIUS.

Obliviscor.

Sententiae 2 (Frag. Poet. Rom.): Amicum cum vides, obliviscere miserias commentus; si est inimicus, nec libens aeque.

LIVIUS ANDRONICUS.

Obliviscor.

Odisia, 4: Neque tamen te oblivus sum, Laertie noster. Cf. Homer, Od. 1, 65, πῶς ἄν ἔπειτα Ὅδυς ἐγώ θείῳ λαβοίμην;

PLAUTUS.

Memini.

With the genitive: (I) of the person (II); of the thing.

I.

Persa, 494: Faciam ut mei memineris, dum vitam vivas.

II.

Persa, 658: Satin ut meminit libertatis?

I and II.

Captivi, 800: Faciam ut huius dicis locique meique semper meminerit.

With the accusative: (I) of the person (II); of the thing.
Plautus.

I.

Aul. 542: Pro re nitorem et gloriām pro copia qui habent meminerint sese unde oriundi sient.

Truc. 220: Nos divitem istum meminimus atque iste pauperes nos.

II.

Merc. 1011: Suam quisque homo rem meminit.

Menæch. 618: Taceo iam, quando haec rem non meministis suam.

Cist. 148: Siquid usus venerit meminisse ego hanc rem vos volo.

Poen. 1062: Ecquid meminiisti tuum parentum nomina?

Menæch. 45: illius nomen memini facilius.

Cas. 260: Mirum, ecæstr, te senecta aetate officium tuum non meminisse!

Stichus, 42: Moneo ut tuum memineris officium.

Stichus, 46: omnibus obnixe opibus nostrum officium meminisse decet.

M. Glor. 1378: Ne me moneatis: memini ego officium meum.

Cist. 381: meminere officium suum.

Trin. 697: Is est honos homini pudico meminisse officium suum.

Persa, 186: omnia memini.

M. Glor. 354: Praecepta facito ut memineris.

Obliviscor.

Trin. 1013: Satin in thermipolio condalium es oblivus?

Trin. 1018: tribusne te poteris memoriam esse oblivum.

Cas. 104: Chaline, non sum oblivus officium meum.

Bacch. 790: oblivus sum omnia.

Commemini.

Trin. 1027: Commemini domi.

Pseud. 696: Commemini omnia.

This verb is used with a neut. pron. as object in Amph. 254,

Carc. 493, Mil. Glor. 914, Poen. 726 and 985. The word is found about fourteen times in Plautus.

Recordor.

Most. 85: Recordatus multum.

Menæch. 972: Recordetur id.
Neuter Pronouns.

Neuter pronouns occur as objects in Plautus: after *memini* thirteen times; after *obliviscor* once; always in the accusative.

**CATO.**

Memini.

*Orig.* ii, 1: Ligures . . . inliterati mendacesque sunt et *vera* minus *meminere*.

**TERENCE.**

Memini.

With the genitive: (I) of the person; (II) of the thing.

I.

*Heaut.* 951: . . . ut dum vivat *meminerit* semper *mei*.

II.

*Enn.* 815: Sanga, ita ut fortis decet milites, *domi focique fac* vicissim *ut memineris*.


I and II.

*Enn.* 801: Faciam *ut huius loci dieique meique semper me*-mineris.

**Obliviscor.**

With the genitive of the person.

*Enn.* 306: Nescio hercule, neque unde eam, neque quorsum eam; ita prorsum *oblitus sum mei*.

*Aul. Iricum, Alter Exilium,* 983: ne *me esse oblitum* dicas tuae gnatae alterae.

**Reminiscor.**

With the accusative of the thing.

*Hecyra,* 385: Sed quom *orata eius reminiscor*, nequeo quin lacrumem miser.

**Neuter Pronouns.**

Neuter Pronouns in the accusative occur in Terence after *memini* three times. There is one in the genitive after this verb, quoted above.
SEXTUS TURPILIUS.

Memini.

_Paedium_, IV, 155: _Meminisse illius formam._
(Nonius P. II, p. 137, Müller: "accusativus pro genetivo").

CAECILIUS STATIUS.

Obliviscor.

_Harpazomene_, V, 61: Equi homo ineptitudinis cumulatus cultum oblitus es?

PACUVIUS.

Recordor.

_Armorum Judicium_, XII, 36: Cum recordor eius ferocem et torvam confidentiam.

ACCIUS.

Recordor.

_Euryssaces_, VIII, 346: cum haec recordor.

Reminiscor.

_Euryssaces_, VIII, 346: Cum illos reminiscor dies.

Obliviscor.

_Athanias_, II, 190: Veritus sum arbitros; atque utinam memet possim obliviscer.

The following instance is given only because Nonius quotes it among other instances of what he calls "accusativus pro genetivo" (see p. 3). He omits the _esse_, which evidently should be read.

_Epinausimache_, XV: Deorum mortalis, Phoenix, _esse_ liberos reminiscor semper.

This instance will not be considered a case in point.

_Nyctegresia_, VI, 488: An ego Ulixem obliviscar unquam aut quemquam praeponi velim. _Cf._ _Iliad_, X, 242—πῶς ἂν ἐπιεί Ὁδώρης ἦγε θεόνο λαθορήν;

Neuter Pronouns.

One example; in the accusative after _obliviscor._
Collection of Material.

The Participle Oblitus.

Myrmidones, III, 12: mea facta in acie obliti.
This may possibly be a finite use,—for obliti sunt.

CLAUDIUS QUADRIGARIUS.

Memini.

Annales, IX: Qui prior bellum, quod cum his gestum erat, meminissent.

DECIMUS LABERIUS.

Obliviscor.

Necyomantia, 1: Dum dintius retinetur, nostri oblitus est.

AD HERENNIUM.

In the treatise Ad C. Herennium there are nine instances of memini used with an object. The object is always in the accusative case. Three are neuter pronouns. The others are as follows, all being of the thing.

II, 18, 27: ... auditor cum totius causae tum unius cuiusque argumentationis distributionem percipere et meminisse poterit.

III, 16, 29: Constat igitur artificiosa memoria ex locis et imaginibus ... Imagines sunt formae quaedam et notae et simulacra eius rei, quam meminisse volumus.

III, 20, 34: quotiensemque rem meminisse volumus.

III, 22, 37: Nam, quas res facile meminimus casdem fictas ... meminisse non difficile est.

Note. P. H. B. C. d. have meminimus, H. P. minus, b. l. meminerimus.

III, 17: si multa meminisse volumus.

III, 23, 38: cum ex infinita verborum copia modo alii modo aliud nos verbum meminisse oportebit.

The following is given as throwing light upon the general meaning of memini throughout the treatise.

IV, 56: Quae si sequimur ... firme et perpetue meminerimus.
VARRO.

Memini.

Rerum Rast. I, 2, 27: Dicam . . . eisdem quibus ille verbis scripsit . . . ; cum homini pedes dolere coepissent, qui tui meminesisent, ei mederi posse.

Ibid.: Ego tui memini, medere meis pedibus.

Sententiae 127: Sic audita meminisse magni ducimus.

Satyræ Menipp. (Riese, p. 117, 2.): Libet me epigramatia facere et, quoniam nomina non memini, quod in solum mihi vene-rit, ponam.

CICERO.

We come now to an examination of the works of Cicero. The Lexicon zu den Schriften Cicero's by Merguet, Jena, 1877-94, was used for the orations and philosophical works. A personal examination was made of the text of the letters, rhetorical works, and fragments.

The examples are so numerous that the verbs will be treated separately.

Memini.

With the genitive: (I) person; (II) thing.

1.


Ad Fam. XV, 17, 4: it, amabo te, cum dabis posthae aliquid domum litterarum, mei memineris.

De Fin. V, 3: . . . veteris proverbi admonitu vivorum memini.

Ad Att. X, 10, 1: ei cum ego stepissime scripsissem nihil me contra Caesaris rationes cogitare, meminisse me generi mei, meminisse amicitia.

Ad Att. XIII, 33, 4: . . . sed ego ita egi, ut non scinderem paenulam, memini enim tuam ||tui|| et multi erant nosque im-parati:

Note. There is manuscript authority for either reading; I am unable to make a choice on the ground of the meaning, and the results of the present investigation show that either the accusative neuter of the adjective or the genitive of the pronoun
would be correct. Therefore I shall not include this in any figures subsequently given.

II.

*Ad Att. X, 10, 1*: meminisse amicitiae (see 4th example under 1).

*Planc. 101*: memini neque unquam obliviscar noctis illius.

*Verr. II. 73*: ut sui iuris dignitatisque meminisset.

*De Div. I, 63*: (animus) memini praeteritorum, praesentia cernit, futura providet.

*De Off. I, 122*: caveat intemperantiam, meminerint verecundiae.

*Ad Fam. I, 9, 8*: Num potui magis in arcem illius causae invadere aut magis oblivisci temporum meorum, meminisse actionum?

*Ad Fam. XIII, 75, 1*: Quare velim mihi ignoscas, si . . . minus videbor meminisse constantiae tuae.

With the accusative: (I) person; (II) thing.

I.

*Lae. 2, 9*: Memineram Paulum, videram Galum.

*Phil. V, 17*: Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem.

*Phil. II, 108*: Memineramus Cinnam nimis potentem, Sullam postea dominantem, modo Caesarem regnantem videramus.

*De Off. I, 114*: Rupilius, quem ego memini.

*Cato. 5, 14*: Quem (Ennium) probe meminisse potestis.

*De Fin. II, 63*: L. Thorius Balbus fuit, Lanuvinus, quem meminisse tu non potes.

*De Orat. III, 194*: Quod si Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe, Catule, meminiisti.

*De Orat. III, 214*: Quid fuit in Graccho, quem tu melius, Catule, meminiisti, quod . . . etc.

*Q. Cic. De Petit. ad M. Frat. 9*: Nam illis, quos meminimus, Gallis, qui tum Titiniorum, etc. . . . . . . capita demebant, Sulla numm Catilinam praefecerat.

Ad Fam. IX, 22, 1: 'modo forte—' nosti canticum; meministi
Roscium: Ita me destituit nudum—'
De Orat. III, 133: Meminerant illi Sex. Aelium.
Verr. III, 190: Quos innocentissimos meminimus.
Phil. I, 34: Utinam avum tuum meminisses! (quoted by Mer-
guet under things.)

II.

Cat. III, 24: quas (dissensiones civilis) ipsi meministis.
Imp. Pomp. 47: quam (felicitatem) . . . meminisse de altero
possimus.
Post. Red. 23: non est mei temporis iniurias meminisse.
Phil. I, 37: tantam sollicitudinem bonorum tantam timorem
omnia in quo meminimus?
Frag. XIV, 3, 3: quis non meminerit pueritiam tuam?
Phil. IV, 1: quantum (contentum) meminisse.
Sest. 62: meministis illum dican, cum etc.
De Off. II, 29: dum homines perditae haec illam cruelinem et
meminere et sperabunt.

Ad Brut. I, 10, 3: —nec vero nulla in re memini aut senatum
meliorum aut magistratus.
Ad Att. XIII, 32, 2: Postumium autem, cuinis statuam in
Istimo meminisse te dicis, nesciebam fiuisse etc.
Ad Att. XI, 23, 3: Memini omnino tuas litteras.
Ad Q. Frat. II, 7, 1: Quod me . . . admones, ut meminerim
Jovis orationem quae est in extremo illo libro, ego vero memini.
Ad Q. Frat. III, 1, 1: ego ex magnis caloribus (non enim
meminimus maiores) . . . me refeci.

Imp. Pomp. 47: ut praeterita meminisse videamur.
Planc. 80: quae patriae beneficia meminuerint.
Phil. XI, 2: summum quondam inter ipsos odium bellumque
meministis.
Phil. XII, 27: memini colloquia.
De Re Pub. VI, 10: non facta solum, sed etiam dicta meminisset.
Acad. II, 106: omnia meminit Siron Epicuri dogmata.
Lael. 71: quae (officia) meminisse debet is, in quem, etc.
Collection of Material.

De Re Pub. IV, 1: ipsa mens ea, quae futura videt, praeterita meminit.

De Fin. I, 57: ut . . . secunda jucunde ac suaviter meminerimus.

Acad. II, 106: meminisse visa nisi compensa non possimus.

De Fin. I, 60: Bona praeterita non meminerunt.

De Fin. II, 104: mala meminisse non oportere.

De Fin. I, 62: (sapiens) et praeterita grate meminit et prae-

sentibus ita potitur, ut . . .

Cato, 21: vadimonta constituta (senes meminerunt), quis sibi, 
cui ipsi debeant.

Brut. 88, 301: Hoc adjumento ille tanto sic utebatur, ut sua 
et commentata et scripta et nullo referente omnia adversariorum 
dicta meminisset.

Ad Fam. X, 12, 1: Quod nulli quidem minime novum, qui 
et te nossem et tuaram litterarum ad me missarum promissa 
meminisset et haberem tua penitus consilia cognita.

De Orat. II, 355: multa ab aliis audita meminerunt.

De Orat. II, 299: ut omnia meminisset.

De Orat. II, 227: . . faceta autem et urbana innumerabilia 
vel ex una contione meministis.

Ad Fam. X, 34, a, 3: memini enim et illa superiora.

Other neuter expressions in the accusative with memini:

Multa, Phil. IV, 3: Tusc. 1, 22; ibid. 59; Cato, 22, Lacl. 2.

Cato, 21: Omnia.


Neuter Pronouns in the Merguet Lexicons 12
Not included in Merguet Lexicons 14

Total 26

Obliviscor.

With the Genitive: (I) person; (II) thing.

I.

Tusc. V, 73: huic (Epicuro) . . . non multum differenti a 
judicio ferarum oblivisci licebit sui?

De Fin. V, 3: nec tamen Epicuri licet oblivisci, si cupiam.


"Rab. Post. 41: ut vel oblivisci (illum virum) aliorum non sit mirum.

Phil. II, 10: ne me . . . oblivutum esse putetis mei.

Ad Att. XI, 21, 3: —ut obliviscar mei multoque malim. meaeque, Koch's conj., B. This investigation points to mei as the proper reading.

Ad Fam. VII, 14, 1: Si nostri oblivus es, dabo operam, ut istue veniam, antequam plane ex animo tuo effluo.

Ad Fam. XIII, 19, 3: vereor ne . . ille . . putet . . . . te oblivum mei.

II.

Sulla, 45: quod si iam essem oblivus severitatis et constantiae meae.

De Fin. IV, 32: quae . . . natura suae primae institutionis oblivia est?

Ad Fam. I, 7, 7: non nos quidem ut nostrae dignitatis simus oblivii.

Ad Fam. IX, 10, 2: Oblitus nee igitur fungorum illorum?

Ad Fam. XI, 27, 3: deinde oblivum me putas consili, sermonis humanitatis tuae?

Ad Fam. XV, 13, 2: ne aut ipse tuae perpetuae consuetudinis erga me oblivus esse videar aut te oblivum putem.

Ad Fam. XI, 27, 3: Nec vero sum oblivus litterarum tuarum quas ad me misisti.

Ad Brut. I, 15, 8: quod quis reprehendet, nisi qui deposito metu praeteriti periculi fuerit oblivus?

Planc. 101: neque unquam obliviscaris noctis illius.

Rab. Post. 20: obliviscerisne . . . accusationis tuae?

Cat. I, 6: obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum.


Rab. Post. 46: si iam oblivisci vestrae mansuetudinis volueritis.

Verr. III, 186: nisi forte id egisti ut hominibus ne oblivisci quidem rerum tuarum [male gestarum] liceret.

Cicero.
Q. Cic. De Petit ad M. Frat. 55: ... in hoc vel maxime est vitiosa civitas, quod largitione interposita virtutis ac dignitatis oblivisceret solet.

Ad Fam. III, 10, 5: Illud vero mihi permirum accidit, tantam tementatem fuisse in eo ... ut tuis inimicitis susciendi oblivisceret: prope omnium fortunarum ac rationum suarum.

Tusc. III, 35: jubes me bona cogitare, oblivisci malorum.

Tusc. III, 37: obliviscor etiam salorum, ut jubes.

Tusc. III, 73: est ... proutimus stultitiae aliorum vitia cernere, oblivisci suorum.

De Fin. IV, 33: quae (hominis natura) oblivisceretur corporis.

Ad Fam. I, 9, 8: num potui magis in arcem illius causae invadere aut magis oblivisci temporum meorum, meminisse actionum?

With the Accusative, always of the thing.

Sex. Rose. 49: et artificium obliviscatur et studium deponat licebit.

Caec. 50: obliviscor jam tuas iniurias.

Milo, 63: in quibus (civibus) homines ... res praecelissimas obliviscuntur.

Scær. 13: obliviscendum vobis putatis ... scelera?

Note. This passage is exceedingly doubtful. Many editors take it as quoted. I shall follow Mueller who changes the punctuation and avoids construing scelera with obliviscendum. I see no objection to doing this, while not to do it involves admitting a construction that is very rare if not unparalleled in Cicero. Cato, 2, 6 is sometimes quoted as parallel: quam nobis quoque ingredie- dum sit, but even here it is quite possible that the correct reading is qua, which occurs in one of the later manuscripts. Therefore the passage in question will not be included in any tables.

Milo, 62: an vero oblivii estis ... non modo inimicorum Milonis sermones et opiniones sed non ullorum etiam imperorum.

Brut. 217: subito totam causam oblivus est.

Ad Att. IX, 9, 1: Quod laudas, quia oblivisci me scripsi ante facta et delicta nostri amici.
Cicero.

Ad Fam. VIII, 15, 2: Hui vereor... ne, cum te videro, omnia obliviscar.

Ligar. 12, 35: qui oblivisci nihil soles nisi injurias.

Other neuters: alia, Sex. Ros. 87; omnia, Phil. VIII, 25.

Neuter Pronouns in the Merguet Lexicons——— 7
Not included in the Merguet Lexicons——— 2

Total---------------------------------------- 9

The Adjective Oblitus.

The following instances are given by Merguet under obliviscor. In my own investigation of texts I have made no complete record of such cases, merely noting that they almost always take the genitive. The rare instances where the accusative is used have been carefully recorded. In all the tables that follow, unless otherwise stated, statistics regarding oblivitus are kept separate from statistics regarding other forms of obliviscor.

Ad Alt. IV, 17, 1: Puto te existimare me nunc oblivitum consuetudinis et instituti mei rarius ad te scribere.

Plane. 103: vos iam oblivitos mei salutis eius... hostis exstitisse.
Cat. IV, 19: Habetis ducem memorem vestri, oblivium sui.
Sulla, 83: adeo oblivitus constantiae meae—?
Sulla, 46: coges me oblivitum nostrae amicitiae habere rationem etc.

Phil. I, 30: cum omnes earum rerum obliviti significarent.
Phil. II, 64: una in illa re servitutis oblivia civitas ingemuit.
Phil. I, 31: cum... oblivitus auspiciorum... voluisti.
Murena, 7: me, familiaritatibus servitutinisque oblivium, causam... defendere.

Cat. IV, 1: obliviti salutis meae de vobis ac de vestris liberis cogitate.
De Off. I, 85: ut utilitatem civium sic tueantur, ut, quaecunque agunt, ad eum referant oblivii commendorum suorum.
De Fin. V, 57: omnium ceterarum rerum oblivii.
De Nat. I, 67: oblivius liberalitatis meae... plura complector.
Piso, 62: O paterni generis oblite!
Ad Fam. XVI, 12, 2: Cum Caesar... oblivius nominis...

Ariminium occupavisset.
Recordor.

Recordor occurs in the works of Cicero 36 times with nouns or adjectives used substantively. It occurs 9 times with neuter pronouns, making a total of 45 appearances of this verb followed by a case. The case is always the accusative of the thing.

The three instances quoted by Draeger (Historische Syntax, 1878, I, p. 488 ff.) as instances of the genitive after recordor, two of which have been copied generally, even by recent scholars, have already been discussed. In the note to the quotation from Draeger in Part One of this thesis it has been shown that one of these supposed instances was due to a corrupt text, and that the other two were blunders in translation that have been handed down from generation to generation. Superioris tuae transmissionis (ad Att. IV, 19, 1) has gained such a firm foothold that it is quoted in the Harper's Dictionary as a genitive after recordor, while in the preceding column we are told that δείππες (ad Att. IV, 17, 1) is an instance of an accusative after recordor, this being the "more frequent" construction. The interesting fact is that δείππες is found in the text immediately after transmissionis, and that the passages quoted are one and the same, "19" being the later numbering.

The following passage is found in both Merguet and Harper listed as an accusative of the person with recordor: cum recordor non L. Brutum, duos Decios, etc., etc. Cato, 75.

Of this passage K. Meissner says in the Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie, 1885, p. 219: "Eine ohne zweifel corrupt überlieferte Stelle." Whether this is true or not, the accusatives in question seem to be the subjects, either of the infinitive expressed, or of some infinitive understood, as non timuisses mortem. At any rate it is not a case in point and will not be considered further.

Merguet also cites, as a genitive of the person with recordor, ut recordemiini illius L. Metelli, pontificis maximi (pro Scarr. 48), where ut recordemini is a conjecture to fill a lacuna (see Müller's text). The value of the conjecture may be judged from what has preceded. Cicero certainly used the genitive with recordor nowhere else.
This verb is rarely used when referring to persons. Cicero shows four or five instances followed by de and the ablative case. This construction occurs also, but infrequently, when a thing is referred to.

**Reminiscor.**

I find reminiscor used with an object but twice in Cicero. Once (ad Att. IV, 2, 4, 2) the object is simply the abbreviation Kal. Januar., and the case is therefore undeterminable. The other instance is as follows:

_Cato, 78:_ —ut eas (res pueri) non tum primum accipere videantur, sed reminisci et recordari.

The verb occurs also in Ad Fam. IV, 5, 5 with a neuter pronoun as object, but this letter was not written by Cicero, but by Servius to him.

**Commemini.**

Cicero uses this verb three times. Once with an accusative of the person:


Once with a neuter pronoun:

_Ad Att. IX, 2, 6:_ hoc tu parum commeminiuti.

Once with an accusative and infinitive (understood):

_Tusc. I, 6, 13:_ Ego antem non commemini, ante quam sum natus, me miserum.

**With de and the Ablative.**

The following are the only examples found of expressions of remembering and forgetting followed by de and the ablative case. It ought to be added, however, that no great care was taken to make the list complete.

Cic. _Leg. Agr._ II, 2, 3: de quibus (hominibus) meminisse possimus.

Cic. _Phil._ II, 91: meministi ipse de exsulibus.

_Note._ It is not certain that de exsulibus is to be taken with meministi. Mueller punctuates with a comma after the verb, taking it absolutely.

Cic. _ad Att._ XV, 27, 3: De Planco, memini.
Q. Cic. ad M. Frat. 56: Haec veniebant mihi in mentem de duabus illis commentationibus matutinis.

Nepos in ad Fam. V, 3: De illo ne meminisse quidem volo.

Cic. Pro Ligario, 35: Spero te . . . . , aliquid de huins illo quaestorio officio etiam de aliis quibusdam quaestoribus reminiscemtem recordari.


Cic. Pro Planco, 42, 104: quoniam istis vestris lacrimis de illis recordor, quas pro me saepe et multum profudistis.

Cic. Pro Sestio 1, 1: Nam ut omittatis de unius cuiusque casu cogitando recordari.

CAESAR.

Memini.


Obliviscor.

B. G. 1, 14, 3: quod si veteris contumeliae oblivisci vellet, num etiam recentium iniuriarum . . . . memoriam deponere posse?

B. G. 7, 34, 1: cohortatus Haeduos, ut controversiarum ac dissensionum obliviscerentur.

Recordor.

B. C. 3, 72, 4: non denique communes belli casus recordabantur.

Reminiscor.

B. G. 1, 13, 4: Sin bello perseveraret, reminisceretur et veteris incommodi populi Romani et pristinae virtutis Helvetiorum.

Oblitus.

B. C. 3, 57, 1: non oblitus pristini instituti.

CATULLUS.

Obliviscor.

LXVI, 26–7: Annum bonum oblita’s facinus, quo regium adepta’s conjugium?
Memini.

LXIV, 146–8: Nil metuant inrare, nihil promittere parcam; dicta nihil meminere, nihil periuria curant.

LUCRETIUS.

Memini.

III, 673: Cur supra ante actam aetatem meminisse nequitimus?

IV, 710–13: quin etiam gallum . . . noenu queunt rabidi contra constare leones inque tueri: ita continuo meminere fugai.

SALLUST.

Memini.

B. Cat. 51, 15: sed plerique mortales postrema meminere.

Oblitus.

B. Cat. 51, 15: seculeris eorum obliti.

PUBLILIIUS SYRUS.

Memini.

H. 4: Homo qui in homine calamitoso est misericors, meminit sui.

Obliviscor.

L. 14: Legem solet obliviscier iracundia.

NEPOS.

Obliviscor.

XVIII, 6, 2: omnium iniuriarum oblivisceretur, et in neminem acerbiore uteretur imperio.

Reminiscor.

XIX, 4, 1: Cum alii, reminiscentes veteris famae, actatis misererentur: plurimi, etc.

VII, 6: Ille, lacrumans talem benevolentiam civium suorum accipiebat, reminiscens pristini acerbitatem.

XIV, 11, 3: Datamen revocavit, simulans se quiddam in colloquio esse oblivium.
Collection of Material.

VIRGIL.¹

Memini.

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

_Aen._ IV, 335: nec me _meminisse_ pigebit _Elissae_ dum _memor ipse mei._

II.


_Aen._ III, 202: _Ipse diem noctemque negat discernere caelo, nec meminisse viae media_ Palinurus in unda.

_Aen._ I, 731–3: _Juppiter, hospitibus nam te dare jura loquentur, hunc laetum Tyrisque diem Troiaque profectis esse velis, nostros- _que huius meminisse_ minores.


_Aen._ XI, 280: nec _mihi cum Teucris ullum post eruta bellum Pergama, nec_ _veterum memini_ laetorve _malorum._

This has been taken as a Grecism, and therefore is not included in any statistics.

With the Accusative: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

_Catalepton_ IX (XI), 50: _Saepe etiam densos innittere corpus in hostes, communem belli_ non _meminisse_ _deum._

II.

_Ec._ VII, 19: _Alternos Musae_ _meminisse_ _volebant._

_Ec._ IX, 45: _numeros memini_ , si _verba tenerem._

_DIRAE, 102: _gaudia semper enim tua me meminisse_ _licebit._

_Culex, 295: _peccatum meminisse_ _tuon grave sede_ _piorum._

_Ciris, 139 ff.: Junonis magnae (cuius _periuaria_ _divae olim se meminere, ut iam periura puellae non nulli _liceat) violaverat inescia sedem._

¹I include under this head the poems of the Pseudo-Virgilian canon.
(The passage is very corrupt. Among the conjectures for se are si, sic, scd, ipsae, di, sat. Puellae, iam, periuva and licat are also doubtful, but nevertheless the periuaria meminere appears to be sound)

_Aen._ XI, 280: née mihi cum Teucris ullam post eruta bellum Pergama, née veteran memini laectorve malorum.

_Ciris_ 119: _responsum_ quoniam satis est _meminisse_ deorum._

_Memini_ is followed twice in Virgil by neuter pronouns. They are both accusatives.

**Obliviscor.**

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

1.  
_Aen._ III, 629. _Centones_ (P. L. M. 4, 197, 11; 220, 17): _Oblitusve sui est._

_Centones_ (P. L. M. 4, 220, 16): _et oblitus est famae melioris amantis._

With the Accusative.

_Aen._ II, 148: _Quisquis es, amissos hinc iam _obliviscere _Graios._

_Quoted on a Pompeian wall inscription, C. J. L._ IV, 1841.

_Geor._ II, 59: _pomaque degenerant suos obliteram priores._ Note that the participle here takes the accusative.

**Oblitus.**

_Aen._ IX, 225: _laxabant curas et corda oblita laborum._

_Aen._ IV, 528: _lenibant curas et corda oblita laborum._

_Carmen Verg._ (P. L. M. IV, p. 213, l. 145): _Faturum oblitus._

_Geor._ III, 245: _catulorum oblita leaena._

_Aen._ IV, 221: _oblitos famae melioris amantis._

_Aen._ IV, 267: _heu regni rerumque obliter tuarum?_

**Reminiscor.**

_Aen._ X, 782: _dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos._

**Recordor.**

_Aen._ VIII, 156: _ut verba parentis et vocem Anchisae magni volatumque recordor!_  
_Aen._ III, 107: _si rite audita recordor._
Collection of Material.

LIVY.

Memini.

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

IV, 35, 6: Aut sui aut suorum meminisset.
XXIV, 6, 8: inflatus adsentationibus eorum, qui enim non Hieronis tantum, sed Pyrrhi etiam regis, materni avi, iubebant meminisses.

II.

VI, 27, 7: plebem nec respirare in urbe aut per otium libertatis meminisse sinunt aut consistere in contione.
III, 61, 12: iam Horatius eos ... adsuefecerat sibi potius fidere quam meminisse ignominiae decemvirorum ductu acceptae.
V, 54, 3: fatores vobis, etsi minus iniuriae vestrae quam meae calamitatis meminisse invat.
V, 30, 2: si suae gloriae sibi inter dimicationem patriae meminisse sit fas.
X, 29, 2: Galli . . . . torpere quidam et nec pugnae meminisse nec fugae.
XXX, 22, 5: cuius (pacis) ipsi non meminissent.
XXX, 31, 6: quod ad me attinet, et humanae infirmitatis memini.
XXXVI, 44, 9: Livius . . . . remiges . . . . iussit . . . in adventientis hostium naves ferreas manus incere, et ubi pugniam pedestri simulacum fecissent, meminisse Romanae virtutis.
XXXVI, 29, 10: et Nicandrum privatim eius diei, quo servatus a se foret, meminisse.
X, 37, 8: "non ita," inquit, "patres conscripti, vestrae majestatis meminero, ut me consulem esse obliviscar."
XLV, 8, 4: unum vero, cum et . . . et pacis postea, quam cum summam filium adversus eum coluisse, meminisses.
XLV, 42, 8: responsum . . . . est populum Romanum meminisse amicitiae.

III, 40, 3: C. Claudii . . . oratio . . . orantis . . . . ut civilis potius societatis, in qua natus esset, quam foederis nefarie icti cum collegis meminisset.
Livy.

XXVI, 22, 7: iuberet . . . meminissee in consulibus creandis belli, quod in Italia sit, temporumque rei publicae.

XLI, 3, 4: cetera . . . . praeda vere futura, si belli hostes meminissent.

XLI, 22, 7: petens, ne diuitius simulalium, quae cum patre suo fuissent, meminissent.

With the Accusative.

XXVIII, 26, 14: qualem [vultum] ne in acie quidem aiebant meminisce.

V, 44, 3: quanta (beneficia) ipsi meminisit.

Obliviscor.

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

X, 26, 2: ceterum si sibi adiutorum belli sociumque imperii darent, quonam modo se oblivisci P. Decii consulis per tot collegia experti posse?

VII, 14, 2: ne . . . se . . sui oblitum . . crederet (see ex. 4 under II).

XL, 21, 5: si pergat tamen ire, non posse oblivisci se in talibus rebus Antigoni.

XXX, 30, 16: ut omnium obliviscaris aliorum, satis ego documenti in omnes casus sum.

II.

There are in Livy three instances of obliviscor in the second periphrastic conjugation. Two of them are with the dative of the agent and the genitive of the thing to be forgotten. In the third example, the thing to be forgotten is used as the subject. This example is therefore not at all in point, but it will be included.

VIII, 7, 16: ut aut rei publicae mihi aut mei meorumque obliviscendum sit.

XLV, 4, 6: Sensit Perseus cuinis nominis obliviscendum victo esset.

XXIII, 22, 9: [id omnium maxime tegendum, occulendum, obliviscendum, pro non dicto habendum esse.]
VII, 14, 2: Tullius magno opere a dictatore petere, ne se obliti non disciplinae militaris, ne sui neve imperatoriae maiestatis crederet.

XXXIV, 22, 2: etiamsi nostrarum obliviscercemur iniuriarum.

XXXII, 21, 23: nostrorum ipsi vulnerum, si vultis, obliviscamur.

XXVI, 49, 15: quae ne in malis quidem oblitae decoris matronalis estis.

VIII, 5, 10: adeo et cladiam veterum vestrarum et beneficiorum nostrorum erga nos obliti estis?

V, 5, 8: Quid? periculi, quod differendo bello adinus, num oblivisci nos haec tam crebra Etruriae concilia de mittendis Veios auxilibis patimnur.

Neuter Pronoun.

XXVIII, 29, 6: utinam tam facile vos obliviscamini corum quam ego obliviscar. (‘corum’ refers to ea, quae fecistis in previous sentence.)

With the Accusative.

II, 38, 2: "veteres populi Romani iniurias eadesque gentis Volscorum, ut omnia" inquit "obliviscamini alia".

Oblitus.

Oblitus, the adjective or participle, occurs twenty-two times in Livy. Twenty-one times it is followed by the genitive. The only accusative is a neuter pronoun: veluti aliquid oblivus. XXII, 58, 8.

Reminiscor.

Reminiscor does not occur in Livy with an object.

Recordor.

VI, 20, 15: populum bravi, postquam periculum ab eo nullum erat, per se ipsas recordantem virtutes desiderium eius tenuit.

HORACE.

Memini.


Sat. II, 6, 36-7: De re communi scribae magna atque nova te Orabaut hodie meminisses, Quinte, reverti.
Horace; Tibullus; Propertius; Ovid.

Obliviscor.

Epod. 2, 37-8: Quis non malae, quas amor curas habet, Inter haece obliviscitur?

Oblitus.

The adjective oblitus occurs three times in Horace followed by a case, always the genitive.

Neuter Pronouns.

There are two neuter pronouns in Horace used as objects of these verbs,—both accusatives, one after recordor, and one after memini.

TIBULLUS.

There is in Tibullus only one example. That is a neuter pronoun with memini.

PROPERTIUS.

Memini.

With the Genitive of the Thing.

III, 13, 28: Possum ego naturae non meminissem tuae.
IV, 19, 1: Credis eum iam posse tuae meminisse figurae.

With the Accusative: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

I, 11, 16: communes nec meminisse deos.

II.

I, 10, 3: O noctem meminisse mihi incunda voluptas.
III, 5, 23: memento hoc iter.

Other verbs of remembering and forgetting are not represented in Propertius.

OVID.

Memini.

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

Tr. III, 10, 1: Squis adhuc istic meminit Nasonis adempti.
Collection of Material.

Ex Pont. IV, 6, 50: (Solis) quam quisquam vestrum, qui me doluisti ademptum, arguat ingratum non meminisse sui.

Tr. V, 13, 18: di faciant, ut sit temperaria nostra querela, teque putem falso non meminisse mei!

Ex Pont. II, 4, 6: non ita di mihi sunt tristes, ut credere possim fasque putem iam te non meminisse mei.

Ex Pont. II, 11, 4: ut—scire tamen possis nos meminisse tui.

Ex Pont. III, 6, 11: non vetat ille sui quemquam meminisse sodalis.

II.

Metam. IX, 291: Quin nunc quoque frigidus artus. Dum loquor, horror habet, parsque est meminisse doloris.

Ex Pont. IV, 4, 10: possim fortunaec nec meminisse meae.

Tr. IV, 4, 40: A ! sine me fati non meminisse mei!

Metam. VII, 797: invat a meminisse beati temporis, Aeacida.

Metam. XII, 542: . . . quid me meminisse malorum cogis.

Metam. XIII, 280: me miserum, quanto cogor meminisse dolor temporis illius.

Metam. XV, 774: . . . quid nunc antiqua recordor dauma mei generis? timor hic meminisse priorum non sinit.

With the Accusative: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

Metam. III, 444: Eceum, cum vestrae tot agantur saecula vitae qui sic tabuerit, longo meministis in aevo?

II.

Heroides 15, 43: meminerunt omnia amantes.

Metam. XII, 459: . . . vulnera non memini, numerum nomenque notavi.

Metam. XII, 182-5: Tum senior: quamvis obstet mihi tarda vetustas multaque me fugiunt primis spectata sub annis, plura tamen memini.

Neuter Pronouns.

Ovid uses neuter pronouns in the accusative after memini three times.
Ovid; Seneca Rhetor.

Obliviscor.

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

Tr. IV, 3, 24: et oblitam [te] non sinit esse mei.
Ex Pont. IV, 1, 18: oblitus potero non tamen esse tui.

II.

Ex Pont. II, 10, 7: sìs licet oblitus pariter gemmaeque manusque.

Oblitus.

There are sixteen instances in Ovid of oblitus governing a case. It is always the genitive.

Recordor.

Recordor, governing a case, occurs but three times in Ovid. The case is always the accusative, of the thing.

Reminiscor.

Ex Pont. I, 8, 31: Nam modo vos animo dulces reminiscor amici.
Tr. V, 4, 31: Saepe etiam maerens tempus reminiscitur illud.

SENECA RHETOR.

Memini.

With the Genitive of the Person.

Contr. IX, 29, 3: dum matris meminit, obliviscetur nevercae.
at illa dum nevercae meminit, matris oblitae est.

With the Accusative of the Person.

Excerpt. Contr. I, VII, 24: Sparsum memini hominem inter
scholasticos sanum, inter sanos scholasticum.

With the Accusative of the Thing.

Suasoriae 5, 1: Omnis destituit animum dies ubi ignominia
spem premit, ubi nullam meminit aciem nisi qua fugerit.

Neuter Pronouns.

There are also in Seneca Rhetor two neuter pronouns in the
accusative after memini.
Obliviscor.

With the Genitive of the Person.

Contr. IX, 29, 3: dum matris meminit, obliviscetur novercae, at illa dum novercae meminit, matris oblita est.

Contr. VII, 20, 5: The second periphrastic, followed by genitive: Si rerum natura pateretur, obliviscendum erat mihi patris dum occiderem.

Oblitus.

Oblitus occurs three times in Seneca Rhetor with the genitive.

PSEUDO-CAESAR.

Obliviscor.

With the Genitive of the Thing.

Bell. Alex. VIII, 6: Proinde eius consili obliviscerentur atque omni ratione esse vincendum cogitarent.

Oblitus.

There is one instance of oblitus with genitive.

MANILIUS.

Memini.

Astronomica, IV, 330: At Leo consortis meminit sub lege trigoni.

Oblitus.

Oblita sui occurs once in Manilius.
SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMPLES.

The following collection of examples was made with the aid of various indexes. For completeness it depends upon the accuracy of these indexes. The examples as far as given, however, have been verified by standard texts.

CELSUS.

Memini.

III, 16: si febris quievit, diu meminisse eius dici convenit.
III, 18: (neuter pronoun) si qua meminerunt.

QUINTILIAN.

Memini.

XI, 3, 151: ut vix unquam ita sollicitari partibus earum depemamus, ut non et summae meminerimus.

XI, 2, 16: (= mentionem facere) neque omnino huius rei meminit usquam poeta ipse, profecto non taciturn de tanta sua gloria.

XI, 2, 20: (neuter pronoun) Ita, quamlibet multa sint, quorum meminisse oporteat.

Obliviscor.

XI, 1, 62: ne oblivisceretur reverentiae.

Oblitus.

IX, 2, 86: oblitii tot exemplorum circa voluntarium mortem.

Recordor.

XI, 2, 6: hesternorum inmnemores acta pueritiae recordari.

PSEUDO-QUINTILIAN.

Memini.

Decl. CCXCVII, p. 175, 1. 8, (Ritter): meminit temporum superiorum.
Collection of Material.

ibid.: meminit illarum . . . . voluptatum.
ibid.: meminit amoris tui.
ibid. CCCXXXVIII, p. 331, 1. 3: (neuter pronoun) meminerit eorum, quae audierit.

Obliviscor.


SENECA.

Oblitus.

decra III, 12, 6 (p. 90, Haase): Oblitus jam servi.
ibid. I, 1, 2 (p. 35, Haase): decoris oblita.

PETRONIUS.

Memini.

With the Genitive of the Person.

117: ut facile appareret dominum etiam eorum meminisse, qui praesentes non essent.
43 and 75: vivorum meminerimus.

With the Accusative: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

44: [sed] memini Safinium.

II.

91: nihil iam queror, nihil iam memini.

Obliviscor.

110: quam cito etiam filiorum obliviscerentur.
125: prioris fortunae esset oblitus statum.
66: ut frequenter nomen memum obliviscar.

Neuter Pronouns.

Petronius uses neuter pronouns in the accusative once with memini and once with obliviscor.

Oblitus.

Oblitus occurs seven times, followed always by the genitive.
Pliny; Martial; Tacitus.

PLINY.
Oblitus.

MARTIAL.
Memini.

IV, 88, 8: Dicere te posses ut meminisse mei?
X, 23, 6: Nulla recordanti lux est ingrata gravisque; nulla fuit, cuius non meminisse velit.
II, 59, 4: Ipse iubet mortis te meminisse deus.

Recordor.
X, 23, 5: Nulla recordanti lux est ingrata gravisque.

Oblitus.

Oblitus occurs once, followed by the genitive.

TACITUS.
Memini.

With the Genitive: (I) of the Person; (II) of the Thing.

I.

Ann. IV, 35, 11: nec deorunt, si damnatio ingruit, qui non modo Cassii et Bruti, sed etiam mei meminerint.
Ann. XI, 6, 10: meminissent Asinii, Messorae, ac recentiorum Arruntii et Aesernini.
Ann. XIV, 63, 5: Meminerant adhuc quidam Agrippinae.

II.

Dial. de Or. 37, 31: quaestionis meminerimus sciamusque nos de ea re loqui, quae, etc.

Hist. III, 4, 5: Flaviaus . . . suspicione militarum iritabat, tamquam adfinitatis cum Vitellio memisset.
Collection of Material.


Hist. IV, 8, 9: se meminisse temporum, quibus natus sit, quam civitatis formam patres avique instituerint.

Hist. IV, 72, 23: priorum faciornm neque imperatorem neque se meminisse.

Ann. II, 45, 18: meminissent modo tot proeliorum.


Neuter Pronoun.

Ann. II, 26, 8: corum quoque meminisset (Germanicus) quae venti et fluctus... saeva damnna intulissent.

With the Accusative of the Person.

Ann. VI, 27, 4: (Blandus) cuius acum Tiburtum equitem Romanum plerique meminerant (note the predicate relation).

With the Accusative of the Thing.

Ann. XV, 41, 9: ut... multa seniores meminerint, quae reparari nequibant.

Obliviscor.

With the Genitive of the Thing.

Hist. II, 67, 10: numquam ita ad curas intento Vitellio, ut voluptatem obliviscetur.

Hist. II, 1, 21: obliviscendum (esse) offensarum de bello agitantibus.

Oblitus.

Tacitus furnishes also nine instances of oblitus, followed always by the genitive.

Recordor.

This verb, followed by an object, is found three times in Tacitus, the object being each time in the accusative and referring to things.

Reminiscor.

Ann. XI, 36, 2: reminiscetur voeis.
PLINY THE YOUNGER.

Memini.


Obliviscor.

ibid.: illius oblivitus es.

Suetonius.

Memini.

Caes. 9: meminerunt huius coniurationis.

Recordor.

There are two instances of recordor with the accusative.

Reminiscor.

Cl. 41: temperare non potuit quin ex intervallo subinde facti reminisceretur.

Justin.

Oblitus.

XII, 15, 9 (Rühl, p. 101, l. 9): oblivus necessitudinum.

TABLES.

The following tables contain complete statistics for the foregoing examples:

The + sign prefixed to a number indicates that the number refers to neuter pronouns.

Roman numerals indicate passages in which oblivus governs a case.
### EARLY LATIN.

#### ACCUSATIVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memini</th>
<th>Obliviscor</th>
<th>Reminiscor</th>
<th>Memini</th>
<th>Obliviscor</th>
<th>Reminiscor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livius Andronicus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appius Claudius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextus Turpilus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecilius Statius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl. Quadrigarius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Herennius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GENITIVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memini</th>
<th>Obliviscor</th>
<th>Reminiscor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2 22+19</td>
<td>3 5+2, 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ciceroanian Age.

#### Accusative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memini</th>
<th>Obliviscor</th>
<th>Reminiscor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>41+26</th>
<th>10+9</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servius (ad Fam. IV, 5, 5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8, III</td>
<td>21, XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Laberius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catullus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publil. Syrus</td>
<td>0+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Genitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memini</th>
<th>Obliviscor</th>
<th>Reminiscor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero</th>
<th>46+27</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>12+10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2+1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servius (ad Fam. IV, 5, 5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9, III</td>
<td>24, XIV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Augustan Age—and Later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 16</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 16</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibullus</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 16</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>1 3 5 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>2 1 1 1, XVI</td>
<td>1 1, III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Rhetor</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Caesar</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4 16 9</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>13 29</td>
<td>10 1 12</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III.

DETERMINATION OF USAGE AND MEANING.

I.

CRITICAL.

A.

We have now before us all the instances occurring in extant Latinity down to the end of the Augustan period where a verb of remembering or forgetting is followed by a case, and may now proceed to examine the statements made by various scholars regarding the usage.

Reserving criticism of Nonius, Caper, and the other ancient authorities until later, let us look at once at the modern theories. In Part One it was stated that these might be grouped, for convenience of examination, in three general classes. First, those that assert that the genitive when used after verbs of remembering and forgetting is the so-called partitive genitive; secondly, those that regard this genitive as due to the substantive idea inhering in the verb; thirdly, those that attempt to explain it on the basis of some other special difference of signification. Karl Reisig and P. Clairin were quoted in support of the first theory. In the one case the writer supports his position by arguments that are abstruse and by illustrations that are not in point. In the other case the theory is put forward, rather dubiously, in the form of a question, and there is but little attempt at supporting it. When one talks of "forgetting the impression of a thing where you still know the fact" and of an "intentional disappearance from the memory", it is difficult to know precisely what is meant. When one further explains by saying "now, you cannot forget insults, but you may very well destroy the impressions, therefore you say iniuriarum oblivisci", the meaning becomes clearer, though it is at the expense of the theory it would sup-
port, for such passages as *obliviscor iam tuas iniurias* (Cic. *pro Cael. 50*) may then be quoted. These tend materially to increase our scepticism regarding the credibility of the theory, which is subjective in the extreme. This is very evident from the fact that passages cited by one scholar in support of one view are cited by others in support of the opposite view. For example take *Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe meministi* (Cic. *de Orat. III, 50, 194*). Reisig says that this goes to prove that the accusative is used with *memini* when referring to persons, only when one is thinking of the object in general without knowing the personality, whereas with the genitive it is presupposed that you have known the person. On the other hand Clairin, supporting the same theory (*i.e.*, that the genitive denotes that "memory is not the object, but only part of it") says: "In support of this is the fact that the same verbs take an object in the accusative in the sense of 'to know'". Then he quotes *Antipater ille Sidonius quem tu probe meministi!*

Furthermore, Landgraf, in editing Reisig, insists that Reisig's examples go to prove just the opposite of what he asserts they prove, and show that *memini* with the accusative of the person is used when you have in mind one who has lived in your time or whom you yourself have known. My own feeling for the passages is that they prove neither the one thing nor the other. Let us examine the instances in Cicero, for example, where the name of a person is used as the object of *memini*. There are twelve of them and they are all in the accusative. (See Part Two, under Cicero, p. 22 f.) Generally the person referred to was living in the time of the individual to whom the act of remembering is ascribed. It is difficult, if not impossible, to decide whether or not the two were acquainted. That they were not, might at first seem probable from such passages as *Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem* (Cic. *Phil. V, 17*), because of the contrast between *memini* and *vidi*. But we have also *memineram Paulum, videram Galum* (Cic. *Lael. 9*). Now it is Laelius him-

---

1 This is the form of statement used by Clairin. Reisig's is "With the genitive one thinks of a part of the whole". 
self who is represented as speaking here, and Paulus was the 
father of Scipio Africanus Minor, whose intimacy with Laelius is 
so well known. It is hardly possible that Cicero meant to repre-
sent Laelius as "thinking of the object in general, without know-
ing the person". Nor is this the sort of process, it seems to me, 
that is referred to in such a passage as *L. Thorius Balbus fuit, 
Lanuvinus, quem meminisses non potes* (Cic. *De Fin.* II, 63). In 
fact, if we consider only these twelve passages from Cicero we 
must admit that they seem to support the contention of Landgraf, 
that *memini* with the accusative of the person is used only when 
you have in mind one who has lived in your time or whom you 
yourself have known. Furthermore, it must be stated that these 
passages are the only ones, down to the death of Cicero, in which 
the name of a person, or a relative pronoun referring to the name 
of a person, is used as the object of a verb of remembering or 
forgetting. *Eundem Achillum, cuis supra memor esse, omnibus 
copis praefectit* (Caes. *B. C.* III, 108, 2) is not a case in point, 
for the *meminisses* has the unusual sense of *meminisse*. 

But when we go on into the Augustan period we find a differ-
ent state of things. There, names of persons occur four times 
after *memini*. Three times the case used is the genitive. In one 
of them certainly, and in the other two quite probably, the subject 
knew personally the object. The passages are as follows:

Virg. *Aen.* IV, 335: nec me *meminisse* pigebit Elissae dum 
memor ipsa mei.

Livy, *XXIV*, 6, 8: *inflatus adsentationibus eorum, qui eum 
non Hieronis tantum, sed Pyrrhi etiam regis, materni avi, jube-
bant meminisse.*

Ovid, *Tr.* II, 10, 1: *Si quis adhuc istic *meminit Nasonis 
adsuerti.*

Passing on to the next period we find Tacitus using only the 
genitive in such instances. There are four of them. Here again 
it is difficult to know whether or not personal recollection is meant. 
In the following passage apparently it is. *Tac. Ann.* XIV, 63, 
5: *At Nero . . . insula Pandateria Octaviam claudit, non alia 
exul viscerum oculos maiore misericordia adjecit. Meminerant 
adhuc quidam Agrippinae a Tiberio . . pulsae.*
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So much for the names of persons. In the case of other references to persons, the genitive is the case almost exclusively used, and we find *generi, sodalis, matris, novercae, consortis, etc.*, where it is idle to deny the existence of personal acquaintance. This would be in support of Reisig’s position, as would also the fact that *memini* always takes the genitive of a personal or reflexive pronoun. Thus we see the testimony of the passages in point supporting now Reisig and now his critics in such a way as to demonstrate amply the untenable nature of the theories of either party. A complete statement of the results of the present investigation will be deferred until after the examination and criticism of the rest of Part One.

B.

In general the scholars whom I have included in the second class, *i.e.*, those who feel that the genitive is due to a substantive idea inhering in the verb, are conservative. They put forward their theory as probable rather than as fully proved. They do not attempt to formulate rules but are inclined to admit with Draeger, for example, that “the language was always unsettled in these expressions and often the accusative is used in place of the genitive.” They also follow Draeger when he says, “In classical Latin and later the genitive is everywhere the more common and appears even with neuter pronouns if their neuter origin is evident from the context.” We shall find little reason to dispute these statements of fact. As for the theory, it will be neglected for the present. A bare statement of a theory based on incomplete data is an exceedingly intangible thing. It is difficult either to combat or to support it. Like most guesses at truth, it may contain the essence of verity or may be wholly wrong. To be sure we have now in our possession fairly complete data regarding the subject under consideration. I shall nevertheless continue for the present to confine myself to criticism of the statements of fact made by the various scholars and to criticism of interpretation wherever that is possible. This will be followed by a statement of facts gleaned in the present investigation. Then
if it is possible to characterize any theory as proved, or not proved, or incapable of proof, I shall do so.

In general we have found the champions of the inhering substantive idea to be conservative. Friederick Haase (see Part One) makes, however, the following positive statements: "The verbs reminisci, oblivisci, recordari, meminisse take the genitive or the accusative with a distinction which results naturally from the character of the case. . . . In such cases the object has its own fixed meaning and that is not at all identical with the signification of the genitive." Here we have something tangible and we may say at once that the statement, as applying to recordor at least, is not true, for the simple reason that recordor never takes the genitive, as has already been shown. Regarding the other verbs a detailed examination is necessary. Haase begins with a consideration of instances in which the object is a person, and explains the "fixed meaning" to which he referred, by citing Cic. Phil. V, 6, 17, Cinnam memini, vidi Sullam, modo Caesarem. "The connection with vidi" says Haase "shows that here he would refer to mental activity only, and nothing more. On the other hand, had he said Cinnae memini, more would be involved. Then his ability to remember would be so circumscribed owing to Cinsa, that he could not forget him . . ., under such circumstances his memory is limited and determined by the nature of the situation, and is not a free activity, by virtue of which he may call to mind Cinsa if he wish, or may refrain from doing so if he wish that. Of persons this accusative is rare, the genitive frequent."

This concluding statement will not bear investigation. Exclusive of personal and reflexive pronouns, which are practically always in the genitive, I have found fifty passages where references to persons follow these verbs. In twenty-six instances the case used is the genitive; in twenty-four it is the accusative.

Before turning to a consideration of the passage cited in support of the rest of the statement I wish to admit frankly that when one speaks of voluntarily refraining from remembering, one raises a psychological question that is altogether too subtle for
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me. And furthermore I cannot but regard a position that depends for its support upon such subtleties as, *ipso facto*, weak. However, reduced to its simplest terms, Reisig's statement seems to be that *Cinnam memini* refers to a voluntary act, *Cinnae memini* to an involuntary one. Grant that this is true, and consider what is to be expected in some such sentence as "They bade him remember the king" or "Let them remember Caesar." Now surely it would be foolish to order people to get in a frame of mind that did not depend upon their own volition. One therefore naturally expects the accusative, for the genitive would mean that the king, for example "had so impressed himself upon the mind of the individual in question" that his memory... is not a free activity, by virtue of which he may call to mind the king if he wish or may refrain from doing so if he wish that. Yet Livy says (XXIV, 6, 8) *infatus adsentationibus eorum qui cum non Hieronis tautum, sed Pyrrhi etiam regis, materni avi, jubebant meminisse*; and Tacitus (Ann. XI, 6, 10) *Meminissent Asinii, Messallae, ac recentiorum Arruntii et Aesernini.*

Haase does not attempt to support his position by citing any instances where the object of *memini* is a thing. This he might easily have done. He had only to say "The accusative points to a voluntary act. Here we have a voluntary act, and hence the accusative." It is also true that it would be quite as easy to support with such argument exactly the opposite proposition, viz: that the genitive refers to a voluntary act. In either case the statement would be arbitrary and the proof would be the 'vicious circle'. On the other hand it seems to me that the most arbitrary would hesitate before insisting that such a distinction existed between the following:

*(animus) meminit praeteritorum, praesentia cernit, futura providet.* (Cic. De Div. I, 63); *Ipsa mens ea, quae futura videt, praeterita meminit.* (Cic. De Re Pub. IV, 1.)

Turning now to *obliviscor*, let me again register my objection to such expressions as "voluntary forgetfulness." Granting however the possibility of any such conception, I maintain that we ought to have the accusative instead of the genitive in such
Criticism of Earlier Views.

passages as *iubes me bona cogitare*, *oblivisci malorum*, (Cic. Tusc. Disp. III, 35); *obliviscere etiam malorum, ut iubes* (ibid. 37); *obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum* (id. Cat. 1, 6); *Proinde eius consilii obliviscerentur atque omni ratione esse vincendum cogitarent* (Bell. Alex. VIII, 6); *est . . . proprium stultitiae aliorum vitia cernere*, *oblivisci suorum* (Cic. Tusc., III, 73). How can "*oblivisci suorum*" be "*proprium stultitiae*" if Haase is right? Can one justly be held accountable for acts that one is powerless to prevent?

Again, how would Haase explain "*veteres populi Romani inimicas cladesque gentis Volscorum, ut omnia* inquit "*obliviscamini alia*" (Livy, II, 38, 2)? In explaining *veteris contumeliae oblivisci vellet* (Caes. B. G. I, 14,) it will be remembered that he says "A man naturally and as a matter of duty is mindful of an insult offered his people. It is a grievance which one carries in his heart whether or no, the memory of which is thus involuntary." The concessive subjunctive in the passage from Livy is precisely parallel, it seems to me, with the passage from Caesar.

In short Haase’s treatment of the subject would seem to be open to criticism, first as being inaccurate in statements of fact, as for example the statements regarding *recordor*, and regarding the relative infrequency of the accusative of the person with these verbs, secondly as depending for its support on a subtle if not impossible distinction, and thirdly since, granting the correctness of the distinction, it can be supported only by the most arbitrary interpretation of our literary monuments; moreover it meets with inconsistencies that seem impossible of explanation. In spite of these errors of treatment, due to a lack of material, it is probable that the theory championed by Haase and the others grouped with him is more nearly correct than any other yet advanced. This, it will be remembered is the theory of an inhering substantive idea, as the reason for the use of the genitive.

C.

The scholars whom I have grouped in class three confine themselves to a simple assertion of the difference in meaning between the genitive and the accusative when used as the object of verbs
of remembering and forgetting. They do not attempt to account for this difference. The summary of results of this investigation will offer sufficient criticism on most of these. Many of them are well along on the right road. Two statements, however, demand special attention. They are those of J. B. Greenough and J. W. Donaldson. They are placed side by side because they are directly opposed. Each would insist that it is the idea of a single act and continued action that serves to distinguish between the cases. One, however asserts that this idea of continued action is present when the accusative is used, the other, when the genitive is used. The statements of Greenough will be examined in detail and that examination will involve also a criticism of Donaldson.

It will be remembered that Professor Greenough makes the general statement that verbs of remembering and forgetting take the genitive of the object when they are used of a continued state of mind, but the accusative when used of a single act. This rule he applies to all verbs and expressions of remembering and forgetting. An examination of the table at the end of my list of examples shows at once that the use varies greatly with different verbs, one never taking the genitive, others taking either the genitive or the accusative in over seventy-five per cent. of the instances. In the first place, therefore, it would seem better to consider each verb separately, for although it is quite probable that in a group of this sort there would be a tendency toward uniformity, it is at least very doubtful if this tendency was sufficiently developed to admit of the setting up of any one rule applicable uniformly to the different members of the group. We may leave this general objection for the present, however, and consider the particular rule set up in this case.

There is no doubt that we often find the accusative when there is but a single act, and likewise the genitive when a state of mind is referred to. It would seem to suffice, however, to show that this is a mere coincidence, or at least not a cause, if one can show examples almost identical in meaning with Mr. Greenough's, in which the other case is employed. This seems to me an easy task.
To begin with, as in the case of our discussion of Haase's theories, we may at once eliminate *recordor* from consideration, since it is never found with the genitive. Hence the first example cited by Greenough in support of his position is unfortunate, for it is Draeger's *recordans superioris transmissionis*, to which reference has been made frequently.

Greenough's next example is


But the accusative in exactly the same sense of continued action occurs frequently, as may be seen from the following examples.


Cic. *R.* VI, 10: *Cum senex . . . . omnia eins (Africani) non facta solum, sed etiam dicta meminisset.*

Many others may be quoted. The following are selected at random from different authors:


*Ad Her.* II, 18, 27 e: *auditor . . . . minus cuinque argumentationem distributionem . . . . meminisse poterit.*

In connection with these two last examples, note the following passage, which is instructive as throwing light upon the general meaning of *memini* throughout the treatise, in the last sentence of which it occurs. *Ad Her.* IV, 56: *Quae si sequimur . . . . firme et perpetue meminerimus.*

Catullus, LXIV, 146–8: *Nil metunt inrare, uihil promittere parcunt; Dicta nihil meminere, nihil periuria curant.*

Sallust, *B. Cat.* 51, 15: *Sed plerique mortales postrema meminere.*


I have cited only instances where the idea of continued action seems to me particularly strong. Perhaps all would not agree
with my interpretation. If so, that would only go to prove the highly subjective character of the distinction and its consequent lack of real value. It would be possible to cite scores of passages where one can determine whether continued action or single act is meant only by the application of some arbitrary rule such as Greenough's.

Below, I give several passages where the genitive is used, referring, in my judgment, to a single act. Here again it is useless to try to give all such passages, for probably no two investigators would always agree in the interpretation.


Livy. *X.* 29, 2: Galli . . . torpere quidam et nec pugnae meminisse nec fugae.

Livy, XXXVI, 44, 9: . . . iussit . . . in advententis hostium naves ferreas manus inicere, et ubi pugnam pedestri similem fecissent, meminisse Romanae virtutis.

Propertius, III, 13, 28: Possem ego naturae non meminisse tuae.

Propertius, IV, 19, 1: Credis eum iam posse tuae meminisse figurae.

Ovid, *ex Pont.* IV, 4, 10: possim fortunae nec meminisse meae.

(The presence of *possam* in the three just above, points, it seems to me, to an *act as against a state.* One says, "would I could," *etc.*, with reference to doing, but more naturally "would I were" with reference to being. Or an impersonal construction denoting possibility might be used. "Would it were possible for me to be," but hardly the strong personal *possam.*)

Ovid, *Tr.* IV, 4, 40: A! sine me fati non meminisse mei! Neve retractando nondum coëuntia rumpam vulnera.


Greenough's only comment on the usage, when persons are referred to, is to say "the accusative is almost always used of a
person or thing remembered by an eyewitness. It is only necessary to refer to the table in which all references to persons are collected. There we find Elissae, Nasonis, generi, sodalis, matris, novervae, patris, consortis and others which do not support the above rule, to say nothing of the personal pronouns, which are practically always in the genitive.

Let us now turn to obliviscor, where the genitive is the rule, there being 64 genitives with this verb and 26 accusatives, not counting neuter pronouns and passages containing the adjective oblitus. With this verb therefore the slightest trace of a continued idea might be expected to demand the genitive, if Greenough's rule be correct. But examine this: ... in quibus (civibus) homines ... res praeclarissimas obliviscuntur, Cic. pro Milone, 63. Here it seems to me that we must admit the presence of the continued idea and yet we have the accusative.

The form oblitus, used as an adjective or as a participle is almost invariably followed by the genitive. I have made no attempt to make a complete collection of such instances, merely noting that the genitive was used. I have counted, however, 94 passages in which the adjective or participle oblitus governs a case. Only three times is that case the accusative. Once it is a neuter pronoun (Livy, XXII, 58, 8).

Another passage is Mea facta in acie obliti—Acc. (Quoted by Nonius). But this is a fragment and oblii may be part of a compound tense. The remaining passage is "pomaque degenerant sucos oblita prioris" (Vir. Georg. II, 59), where it seems to me that the idea of continued action is the more prominent, in spite of the fact that this almost unique accusative ought, according to the rule under discussion, to point most positively to a single act. In the case of obliviscor iam tuas iurias (Cic. pro Cael. 50) it is quite possible to interpret "for the present I am oblivious of your injuries", and a similar interpretation might be urged for anne bonum oblita's facinus quo regimum adepta's coningium (Catullus, LXVI, 26-7).

Below are given a number of passages containing a genitive after obliviscor. Only by the most arbitrary methods can Greenough's rule be forced to hold in them.
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Cic. *pro Planc.* 101: *neque unquam obliviscor noctis illius.*
Cic. *Cat.* I, 6: *obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum.*
Cic. *pro Rab.* Post. 45: *si iam oblivisci vestae mansuetudinis.*
(Note here the presence of *iam,* which in the case of *obliviscor iam tuas iniurias* has been cited as pointing to a definite act).
Cic. *Ad Fam.* III, 10, 5: *tandem temeritate fuisset in eo . . . tuis inimicitias suscipientibus.*
Caes. *B. G.* VII, 34, 1: *cohortatus Haeduos, ut controversiarum ac dissensionum oblivisceretur.*
Livy, XXXII, 21, 23: *nostrorum ipsi vulnerum, si vultis, obliviscemur.*
Livy, XXVI, 49, 15: *quae ne in malis quidem olibiae decoris matronym estis.*

No attempt has been made to give every instance that runs counter to the proposed rule, because the subjective element enters so largely into the matter. It is significant that this is so, as it goes far toward showing the fallacy of the rule, which is open to criticism in the following points: In the first place it is subjective. What Greenough interprets as referring to a single act, Donaldson says points to continued action. Secondly, it aims to explain in a word the constructions for all the verbs in all periods, whereas (1) it is clear that the usage with the different verbs differed radically and that therefore they ought to be treated separately; and (2) I shall presently show that one and the same verb exhibits marked changes in the usage at different periods. But these are general objections. The last and most important one is the fact of constant violation of the proposed rule, all through Latin literature. We have no choice then but to condemn it as unsound.

These criticisms apply equally well to any other attempt to set up a rule based on an alleged difference in meaning between the accusative and genitive when used with these verbs. As has been said before, scholars who distinguish thus do not attempt to
explain how the distinction came to be, therefore we have no
theory to examine, but merely statements of fact. And that has
been done.

II.

CONSTRUCTIVE.

A.

Summary of Usage.

An attempt will now be made to classify the examples contained
in part two and to summarize the facts that they disclose.

MEMINI.

The bare figures for the use of memini in the different periods are as
follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Latin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4+1</td>
<td>8+1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciceronian Age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustan Age</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29+1</td>
<td>42+1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17+3</td>
<td>26+3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals | 34 | 58+5 | 92+5 | 22 | 86+55 | 108+55 |

The sign - indicates that the following numeral refers to neuter pronouns.

Memini is regularly followed by the genitive of personal or re-
flexive pronouns.

This is true eighteen times out of a total of twenty.

The exceptions are:

Plaut. Aul. 542: Pro re nitorem et gloriam pro copia qui
habent meminerint sese unde oriundi sient.

Plaut. Truc. 220: Nos divitem istum meminimus atque iste
panperes nos.

Note, regarding these two exceptions that both are found in early
Latin, where the accusative was used 75% of the time. This
tendency to use the accusative would be strengthened in the
second instance by the strong predicate relation, which would
have demanded the accusative perhaps in any period. Nor is the *sese* in the first instance strictly the object of *meminerint*. This object is rather the whole proleptic construction *sese unde oriundi sint*, which is practically a contamination of (1) an indirect statement, with an accusative and an infinitive, and (2) an indirect question. These are only apparent exceptions therefore, and the rule may be said to hold universally.

Not only neuter pronouns, and adjectives used substantively in the neuter but also neuter *nouns* are put generally in the accusative case when used as the object of *memini*.

Neuter pronouns occur after *memini* 60 times; 55 times the accusative case is used. The others are *obsecro, eius (temporis) ut memineris*, Terence, *Heaut. 1026*, where the genitive is necessary to avoid ambiguity; *Liv.*, XXVIII, 29, 6: *obliviscamini corum (corum refers to ca quae fecisti in the previous sentence)*; *Tac. Ann. II*, 26, 8: *corum quoque meminisset (Germanicus) quae venti et fluctus . . . saeva damnati intelissent*; Quintilian XI, 2, 20: *ita quamlibet multa sint, quorum meminisse sporteat*; Ps. Quint., *Decl. p. 331, 1, 3 (Ritter)*: *meminist corum quae audirevit*. Note that the gender is obvious from the context.

The usage with other neuter expressions including *nouns* must be studied by periods. The figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Latin</th>
<th>Cic. and Contemp.</th>
<th>Aug. Age.</th>
<th>Later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus we find down to the death of Cicero only two neuter expressions in the genitive after *memini*. They are *animus meminit praeteritorum, praesentia cernit, futura providet*, Cic. *D. I*, 63; *ut sui iuris dignitas et meminisset*, Cic. *Verr. II*, 73. This author uses neuter expressions in the accusative 26 times. It does not seem to me to be possible to distinguish his use of the genitive from that of the accusative on the basis of signification. With the former of the above exceptions, compare *ipsa mens ea, quae futura videt, praeterita meminit*, Cic. *R. IV*, 1; *(sapiens) et praeterita gratia meminit et praesentibus ita potitur, ut . . .*

Virgil uses the accusative neuter five times and the genitive neuter once. Another apparent case of the genitive with memini is found in Virgil, i.e., nsc veterum memini lactor raging nealorum, Aen. XI, 280. This has been explained however as a causal genitive (a Grecism).

Livy, on the other hand shows a very marked tendency to use the genitive under all circumstances with verbs of remembering and forgetting. Indeed we find in this author only 3 accusatives as against 30 genitives. Thus it is not surprising to find viritatis, belli temporumque, belli, on the one hand, and only quanta on the other.

The same tendency to increase the frequency of the use of the genitive is found also in Ovid and Tacitus. Therefore the statement made regarding neuter substantives must be qualified. Down to the death of Cicero it holds with only the two mentioned exceptions. After that time we find the percentage of genitives used by any given author becoming greater as time goes on. For the entire post-Ciceronian period the total number of genitives occurring equals the accusatives, there being fourteen of each. The adjectives used substantively cling more tenaciously to the accusative than do the nouns. Eliminating Virgil, we find in the Augustan age and later 11 nouns and 2 adjectives in the genitive, while there are only 2 nouns but 6 adjectives in the accusative.

Common nouns, and adjectives used substantively, when referring to persons, are generally put in the genitive case.

Other references to persons, i.e., proper nouns and relative pronouns referring to them, are found in the accusative through Cicero's time. ¹ They are generally in the genitive after that. For data regarding the two last statements see the table of personal uses that follows.

¹There is one apparent exception in Caesar, B. C. III, 108, 2. But there the verb is equivalent to mentionem fecisse. Sometimes reference to persons is made by the use of de and the ablative case.
Regarding all other words used as the object of *memini* one can only say that the accusative was the case prevailing used with *memini* in early Latin, that this continued to be true down through the Ciceronian period, with a slight increase in the proportion of genitives, that the genitive gained the upper hand during the Augustan age and was almost exclusively used later. See the table at the beginning of the chapter on *memini*.

**OBLIVISCOR.**

The figures for the complete usage with *obliviscor* are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 + 2, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciceronian Age</td>
<td>9, III</td>
<td>24, XIV</td>
<td>33, XVII</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustan Age</td>
<td>10, II</td>
<td>12 + 1, L</td>
<td>22 + 1, LII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later...</td>
<td>1, II</td>
<td>4 + 1, XX</td>
<td>5 + 1, XXII</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals: 22, VII, 41 + 2, LXXXIV, 63 + 2, XCI**

*Obliviscor*, when referring to persons regularly takes the genitive case.

There are twenty-one genitives so used and four accusatives. The latter are:


*Cf.* Homer, Od. 1, 65, πῶς ἄν ἔπεσεν ὁ ὄνουφρος ἐγὼ θείω λαθοῖμην.

Acc. *Athamas*, II, 190: Veritus sum arbitros; atque utinam memet possim oblivisci.


*Cf.* Homer, II, X, 242 or Od. I, 65, as above.


Note that all are in poetry, the first three in early Latin, and the last in a speech attributed to Priam.
Obliviscor, when referring to things, prefers the genitive, unless the object be a neuter pronoun.

We find one neuter pronoun in the genitive: utinam tam facile vos obliviscamini corum, quam ego obliviscar. Livy XXVIII, 29, 6: (corum refers to ea quae fecisti in the previous sentence.)

There is no obvious grouping for the remainder, either on the basis of the gender of the noun (as in case of memini) or of signification. Early Latin shows 5 accusatives of the thing (not counting neuter pronouns) to 1 genitive. Other periods show a great and growing preference for the genitive.

The figures on which this latter statement is based do not include instances in which the participle oblivitus is used. As has been said before, it disregards also instances in which a neuter pronoun is the object. Only three times is the participle followed by the accusative: Accius (doubtful); Vir. Georg. II, 59; Livy XXII, 58, 8. The latter is a neuter pronoun. If now we include all instances in which any forms of obliviscor occurs, governing a case, we find a total of 156 genitives to 40 accusatives, the latter being thus only 20% of the whole. In the two latter periods we have the accusative case only 6.4% of the time, there being 103 genitives to 7 accusatives.

Recorder.

This verb takes a direct object only when referring to things. The object is always in the accusative case.

There are 61 instances.

A reference to persons or things, after recorder, is sometimes made by the use of de and the ablative case.

Reminiscor.

This verb is used much less frequently than any of those already mentioned. With it I find 1 accusative of the person, and 7 of the thing, including 1 neuter pronoun. Four times reminiscor governs the genitive, always of the thing. In the three first periods, for which data are complete, the figures are 8 accusatives to 2 genitives. Of these genitives one occurs in Caesar (B. G. I, 13, 4) and one in Nepos (XIX, 4, 1). The two in later Latin
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occur in Tacitus, Ann. XI, 36, 2 and Suetonius, Cl. 41. Cicero does not use reminiscor alone to govern a case, except in ad Att. IV. 2, 4, where the case (Kal. Jan.) cannot be determined.

Commemini.

I have noted but 9 passages in which this verb governs a case. Of these 7 are in Plautus and 2 in Cicero. There is one reference to a person. Of the remaining, 6 are neuter pronouns, one a neuter adjective used substantively (omnia) and the other, found in Pl. Trin. 1027, is domi, the only genitive.
TABLE.

Giving in chronological order all words that refer to persons and are used as objects of *memini, obliviscor, or reminiscor.* *Italics* indicate that the word is the object of *obliviscor.* The dagger indicates that the word is the object of *reminiscor.* All other forms are objects of *memini.* [ ] Brackets indicate that *memini* "mentionem facere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin.</td>
<td></td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td>Ulixem—Acc.</td>
<td>tui—Varro.</td>
<td>istum—nos—Pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>tui—&quot;</td>
<td>memel—Acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nian Age.</td>
<td>aliorum—&quot;</td>
<td>tui—&quot;</td>
<td>Cinnam—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sui—Cic.</td>
<td>Albiniun—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td>Sullam—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td>Roscium—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td>Aelium—&quot;</td>
<td>quos—&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nostris—&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sui—&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[cunus]—Caes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sui—P. Syrus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyrrhi—Livy.</td>
<td>novercae—&quot;</td>
<td>sui—Livy.</td>
<td>ecquem—Ovid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decii—&quot;</td>
<td>novercae—&quot;</td>
<td>nostri—Hor.</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antigoni—&quot;</td>
<td>matris—&quot;</td>
<td>sui—Ovid.</td>
<td>fivos—&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nasonis—Ovid.</td>
<td>patris—&quot;</td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consortis—Manil.</td>
<td>tui—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aliorum—Livy.</td>
<td>mei—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tui—&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippinae</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>(predicate).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**B. Deductions and Conclusions.**

Thus far we have been considering the verbs separately, summarizing the obvious facts regarding each. Can we go further? Here are certain verbs taking now the accusative and now the genitive. Why? When? What follows is an attempt to discover whether or not these questions are answerable.

We may start with a statement to which no one will take exception.

The use of the genitive with these verbs is distinctly a development. Rarely found in earlier times, it becomes so extended ultimately as practically to displace the accusative. In the following table, which shows this very clearly, everything involving *memini, obliviscor, or reminiscor* is included, even neuter pronouns on the one hand and on the other *oblitus* followed by a case. *Recordor* and *commemini* are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusatives</th>
<th>Genitives</th>
<th>Per cent. of Genitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Latin</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciceronian Age</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustan Age</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later (not complete)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us see whether this fact be of any assistance in explaining exceptional uses. Exceptional accusatives ought to be found chiefly in early Latin and exceptional genitives in late Latin, for then they will simply reflect the tendency of the period. Now we have two classes of words showing marked preference for either one case or the other. Personal and reflexive pronouns, with both *memini* and *obliviscor*, take the genitive with great regularity. But there are four exceptions (see discussion under *memini* and *obliviscor*). One is in Livius Andronicus, one in Accius, and two in Plautus. It has been shown that the two latter are hardly exceptions. It is not improbable, however, that this strong tendency to use the accusative may have done its part toward influencing the poet to use these two rather awkward constructions.
On the other hand the accusative is the case prevailingly used of all neuter expressions (nouns as well as pronouns and adjectives) after memini. This has been fully discussed under memini, where it was shown that in the later periods the genitive gains rapidly on the accusative, getting control first of the neuter nouns, then of the neuter adjectives used substantively, and finally (Tac. Ann. II, 26, 8) of neuter pronouns where their neuter origin is obvious from the context.

In commenting on the passages which Nonius quotes as instances of 'Accusativus pro genitivo' (Part One, p. 3 f.) attention was called to the fact that while he cites a dozen or more passages under that head, he gives us not one where he thinks there is 'genitivus pro accusativo.' This would be only natural if the genitive were in his day used over eighty per cent. of the time. Beyond this the remarks of the grammarian are of little value.

The use of the genitive with these verbs, then, is a development. It is obvious, however, from what has been said already that the development was not equally rapid in all classes of words used as the object of these verbs. Nor was it so in the case of the verbs themselves. Thus memini was followed by the genitive only 17 per cent. of the time in early Latin. There was practically no change during the Ciceronian age. Actually there was a slight decrease of 2 per cent. During the Augustan age, however, the percentage of genitives jumped to 60. On the other hand we find obliviscor, even in early Latin, followed by the genitive 21 per cent. of the time. This increased to 65 per cent. during the Ciceronian age, and to 93 per cent. for the Augustan. These figures also include both neuter pronouns and instances in which oblivus is followed by a case. Reminiscor and commemini are used too seldom to have any influence, and therefore they are not included in the discussion at this point.

Furthermore the form oblivus is present in 75% of the instances in which any part of obliviscor occurs, governing a case. Of course oblivus used alone, being practically an adjective of forgetting, takes the genitive. The step is a very easy one from
oblitus with the genitive to oblitius sum with the genitive. Much easier for instance than that from memor with the genitive to memini with the genitive. Is it not probable that these facts stand in the relation of cause to the other fact mentioned above viz., that the development of the use of the genitive with obliviscor was much more rapid than with memini? Certainly they would lead one to expect to find the genitive so used, and one does find it so used. Let us examine and combine other data at our disposal and see if the logical deductions thence derived have equal foundation in fact.

It has been said already that from earliest times the genitive of personal and reflexive pronouns was the case used with these verbs. To attempt to explain why this is so is a task for the Comparative Philologist. It cannot be deduced from the results of this investigation. For present purposes, however, the fact is enough and the explanation immaterial. Thus, then, we have a certain class of expressions—those referring to persons—in which a very large subdivision1 almost invariably appeared in the genitive case after these verbs. In the other class, referring to things, we find no subdivision with any such tendency toward the genitive. Now let us conceive of two verbs; first of one that in itself has a strong genitive tendency, and then of one that has not. What is to be expected? Each verb ought to take proportionally more genitives of the person than of the thing, because of the fact above mentioned regarding personal and reflexive pronouns. The tendency ought to be particularly strong in the case of the former, because of its independent leaning toward the genitive. And this is precisely what we find to be the state of affairs; obliviscor being found with an accusative of the person only once after early Latin.

An examination of the table containing all cases in point referring to persons shows this very nicely. There we see obliviscor rapidly and memini more slowly swinging over from the accusa-

1 Personal and reflexive pronouns form about 40% of the total number of words referring to persons.
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...tive to the genitive construction on the axis, as it were, of the personal and reflexive pronouns. This is probably the true explanation of the difference in treatment of persons and things. We need look for difference in meaning between the two cases no more in the former than in the latter.

We have now at our disposal facts sufficient to enable us to give a rational and satisfactory explanation of the development of this genitive construction. The verbs in the first place governed generally the accusative except in the case of the personal and reflexive pronouns. There were present however two elements making for the genitive; first the participle-adjective oblitus, which was always present in the compound tenses of obliviscor, next the large proportion of personal and reflexive pronouns. These two forces operated to give rise to and to increase a strong genitive tendency on the part of obliviscor. The use of the genitive with memini seems to be due partly to the influence of the personal and reflexive pronouns, still more to the influence of its opposite obliviscor. Thus we find no increase in the proportion of genitives with memini in the Ciceronian period as against early Latin, but in the Augustan age, when the genitive with obliviscor had become practically universal, the increase of the genitive with memini is very rapid.

This is of course in support of those scholars who would attribute the use of the genitive here to the analogy of its use with adjectives of remembering and forgetting. And indeed memor and immemor may very well have helped. Also it does not run counter to those who would see in the genitive with these verbs an indication of a certain inhering substantive idea in the verb. It is quite possible that there was such an idea. But to set up this proposition as the basis of an explanation is again to come dangerously near the subjective method. In the settlement of such a question as this, facts are of prime importance. The facts at hand seem sufficient to explain the development of the construction, which may or may not have been aided by some such subtle influence as suggested.
Turning now to the question as to when the accusative was used and when the genitive, we meet a difficult problem. Viewed broadly the question is easy to answer and has been answered already in these pages. The accusative was used prevalingly in early Latin and the genitive in later Latin, especially in the post-Augustan period. But if we take any one period and attempt to discover on just what principle now the one case was used and now the other for that period; to formulate, in short, a rule, we find the task very difficult. To be sure, there are some classes of words about which fairly definite statements may be made, as, for instance, references to persons after obliviscor, personal and reflexive pronouns, and neuter expressions,1 but that is as far as one can go. In other expressions it is impossible to make a satisfactory distinction on the basis of meaning, or on any other basis. The very fact that this genitive construction is a growth, that we find it the same in no two periods, in itself suggests the impossibility of any fixed rule. If this were the only instance of such uncertainty in syntax, we might well be concerned. We might feel that there must be some hidden principle that had escaped notice. But such uncertainty is very common. Take similis for example. "As regards the construction with similis, many fine-spun theories have been propounded to account for the difference between similis with the Genitive and similis with the Dative. The difference, however, is probably merely

---

1 The common explanation of the fact that neuter expressions are found more commonly in the accusative is satisfactory. Often the neuter character of pronouns or adjectives used substantively would not be obvious if the genitive were used. Neuter nouns may be explained easily also. This would not be so if the genitive had been the case in general use in earliest times, or if the two cases were balanced. Then it would have been difficult to see any special reason for the uniform accusative with these nouns. But granting, as we must, that the accusative was the case prevalingly if not exclusively used at first with verbs of remembering and forgetting, then it is only natural that neuter nouns, owing to the influence of other neuter expressions, would cling to the accusative. Again, since it is analogy, and not necessity that influences the retention of the accusative with neuter nouns, we might expect to find them the first of neuter expressions to swing over to the genitive. And such is the case. (See discussion of neuters in Part Three under memini, p. 62 f.)
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one of chronology and not of meaning. In the earliest Latin we find *similis* construed only with the Genitive. This is Plautus's unvarying usage. Later the use of the Dative begins to creep in, doubtless after the analogy of *par* and similar words construed with the Dative, and as time goes on the Dative gains the supremacy more and more, until in Silver Latin the Genitive is comparatively rare." (Appendix to Bennett's Latin Grammar, § 323.) So we find again and again in language cases where one construction is gradually superceded by another, where we can only point out the various agencies that tend to bring about this result, and where we look in vain for differences of meaning.

It remains now only to append a summary of the foregoing facts, such as might properly be found in a school grammar.

The statements regarding personal and reflexive pronouns, and regarding neuter nouns, also the statement that *recordor* never takes the genitive, and that the phrase *venit mihi in mentem* is colloquial, appear, so far as I know, for the first time here.

MEMINI, REMINISCOR, OBLIVISCOR, RECORDOR.

I. When Referring to Persons.

a. Personal and reflexive pronouns are in the genitive after *memini* and *obliviscor*, except in early Latin.

b. Other references to persons are regularly in the genitive after *obliviscor* in all periods.

After *memini* the accusative is the rule down through the Ciceronian age. Then the genitive.

| Rarely the person is indicated after *memini* by the ablative and the preposition de. |

*Reminiscor* was used but rarely. It probably took the accusative case when referring to persons.

II. When Referring to Things.

*Memini, Reminiscor, and Obliviscor* use now the genitive and now the accusative, without apparent difference of meaning. *Memini* and *reminiscor* show a decided leaning toward the accusa-
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ive except in later Latin. *Obliviscor*, on the other hand, prefers the genitive, except in early Latin. *Reminiscor* is rarely used.

a. But neuter pronouns, and adjectives used substantively in the neuter gender, regularly stand in the accusative.

Neuter nouns after *memini* are also regularly in the accusative through Cicero's time.

III. *Recordor* never takes the genitive. It never takes a direct object referring to persons.

**Note.** Sometimes *recordor* is followed by the ablative and the preposition *de*. Here the reference may be either to persons or things.

IV. Here may be classed the phrase *venit mihi in mentem*, which is sometimes followed by the genitive, probably after the analogy of *memini* and *obliviscor*. The phrase belongs to colloquial speech.

**Note.** It is found about one hundred times in Pl., Ter., and Cic., whereas there are less than a dozen instances in the rest of Latinity, through the Augustan period. Generally the thing remembered is the subject of *venit* and is either a neuter pronoun or an infinitive clause. Rarely the phrase is followed by *de* and the ablative.
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