

used as a substitute for *mea* in *mea refert*, for we read in Plautus, *quid id ad me aut ad meam refert* (Persa. 513). Two of the constructions, then, that can take the place of *mea*, in *mea refert*, are the dative itself and the ordinary substitute for the dative, a fact strongly confirming Verrius' view that *mea* here is itself a dative.

But what of the genitive with *refert*. It appears much later than the genitive with *interest*, belonging properly to Silver Latinity, while the genitive with *interest* is very common in the Golden Latinity of Cicero. No instance of a genitive, other than the genitive of value, is found in Archaic Latin in connection with *interest* or *refert*, if we except the following example in the Lex Acilia Repetundarum (C. I. L. 198. 32), *quod eius rei quaerundai censeant refere*, where the genitive *eius rei quaerundai* is certainly not parallel to that in *eius interest* or *illorum refert*, but seems rather a predicative use of the genitive of characteristic, parallel to *imperium regium quod initio conservanda libertatis fuerat* (Sall. Cat. 6, 7). If this is correct, the use of the genitive with *refert* is the older construction of the two. Hoffmann's view as to its origin we have already noticed, and he is certainly correct in thinking that it cannot be connected in origin with the older construction of the dative with *interesse* in its personal use, as in *interfui praelio*. An example in Cicero (ad Fam. 4. 10. 2), *suspicaret multum interesse rei familiaris tuae*, leads Schmalz to explain it as primarily a partitive genitive, and he evidently understands the passage as meaning, "I should suspect that much of your estate was involved." But this is not a typical example of the construction, being a genitive of the thing, not of the person. Most probable seems a solution suggested to me by Mommsen's version of the Lex Acilia, and which I find hinted at in Allen & Greenough's Grammar (P. 222 Remark), that the genitive with *interest* is formed after the analogy of the predicative genitive with *est*. The analogy, is, perhaps, best stated in the following way: The idea of possession is originally distinct, in the mind of the Romans, from that of ownership, but later by *usucapio*, i.e., by possession for a number of years, two at most in Gaius' day, ownership is acquired. *Res est alicuius (jure Quiritium)* is the Roman formula for ownership; *res est alicui (in bonis)*, that denoting possession. But what of the thing that, being in the possession of anyone, is passing into his ownership? Can we say, *Res fit alicuius*? We read in the Lex Acilia (66), *res populi fiet*. Did the Roman, then, come to feel that, in the thing then in his possession and passing into his ownership, he had any proprietary right? Gaius speaks of a thing as being subject to a *duplex dominium*, that of the person in whose *potestas* it is,—its owner in the proper sense,—and that of the person in whose *possessio* it is, and into whose *potestas* it is consequently passing. It seems to be this latter *dominium* which finds its expression in the phrase *interest alicuius*. Or, to put it more briefly, *est Marci* means "it is the property of Marcus"; *fit Marci*, "it is becoming the property of Marcus"; *interest Marci*, "it partly belongs to Marcus," or "Marcus has a proprietary interest in it,"—a meaning closely related to the usual meaning of *interest eius*. That *refert*, as early as Plautus' day, was not regarded as two separate words, but as one, is clear from such a construction as *quae ad rem referunt* (Persa, 591), or *quod rei te adsimulare refert* (Truc., 394). In Cicero's day its meaning differs but little, if at all, from that of *interest*. In such an assimilation of meaning the influence of analogy usually leads to a confusion of constructions originally distinct. The way in which this influence would work may be stated as follows: *refert*=*interest*, therefore *mea refert*=*mea interest*; and so for *mea refert*, the only form occurring in Archaic Latin, *mea interest* comes into use in Cicero's time. In like manner *interest*=*refert*, therefore *omnium interest*=*omnium refert*; and so beside *interest* with the genitive, the usual construction in the Golden Latinity, there appears in Silver Latinity the genitive with *refert*. And as *interest* has thus acquired a regimen that is primarily and really a dative, it is not strange to find it joined with a construction commonly used as a substitute for the dative, viz. the accusative with *ad*, as in *ad honorem nostrum interest*. That it is never joined with the dative itself, is probably due to a fear of confusion with the ordinary personal use of *interest* in *interfuit epulis*.