Оригинални научни рад
811.111`373
10.46793/LIPAR88.089M

Katarina S. Milovuk[1]
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
ORCID 0009-0005-5370-3863

DON'T FORGET TO REMEMBER: A COLLEXEME ANALYSIS OF MEMORY CONSTRUCTIONS[2]

The simple collexeme analysis is a method within collostructional analysis that measures the strength of association between a particular lexeme occupying a specific slot and the construction in which it appears. The aim of this study is to identify the verbs most strongly associated with the two semantically opposing constructions, *remember to V* and *forget to V*, by applying this specific method of analysis, and to explore their lexical preferences and functional distinctions. The samples were obtained from the British National Corpus (BNC) and analyzed using *R Studio* software, which statistically measures the association strength between these verbs and their respective construction. The research revealed that *remember to V* and *forget to V* share some formal characteristics but functionally differ in terms of verb preference and cognitive framing. *Remember to V* proved to be more flexible with the verbs it attracts, which tend to reflect fulfilled obligations or routine actions, whereas *forget to V* was found to be slightly more restrictive, preferring verbs related to communicative omissions.

Key words: Construction Grammar, collostructional analysis, simple collexeme analysis, *remember to V*, *forget to V*, corpus

1. INTRODUCTION

As modern linguistic research continues to expand the domain of cognitive linguistics, in this paper we will aim to offer a meaningful contribution by applying a collostructional approach to the analysis of memory-related constructions, as this method can provide valuable insights into the relationship patterns between such constructions and the verbs they attract. Specifically, this study will address two semantically opposing constructions: *remember to V* and *forget to V*. In conducting research of this nature, adapting the principles of Construction Grammar to the analysis of memory-related constructions presents a fundamental prerequisite. Construction Grammar posits a view of language as a foundational part of human cognition, consisting of a network of constructions, which are viewed

1 katarina.milovuk@filum.kg.ac.rs

2 The research presented in this paper was funded by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia (Agreement on the transfer of funds for financing scientific research work of researchers at accredited higher education institutions in 2025, No. 451-03-136/2025-03/200198).

as form-meaning pairings (Goldberg 1995; Goldberg 2003: 219). In fact, any linguistic entity can be stored as a construction if it is encountered frequently enough, regardless of whether its meaning is predictable from its component parts (Goldberg 2006: 5). Consequently, since compositionality is not a requisite for a linguistic pattern to be considered a construction, cognitive linguists argue that syntactic patterns can also carry meaning, thereby rejecting the Principle of Compositionality[3]. As a result, Construction Grammar rejects the traditional division between syntax and lexicon and instead proposes the idea of a continuum that links them (Goldberg 1995: 42; Langacker 1990: 1). Moreover, frequent exposure to unfamiliar linguistic patterns leads to mental generalizations that facilitate their entrenchment in the cognitive system as constructions (Hilpert 2014: 9). As a result, constructions can be "extended in various ways allowing the speaker to apply the familiar pattern to new contexts in principled ways" (Goldberg 1995: 43). This flexibility is also reflected in the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions, whose partially schematic structure allows for diverse lexical items in the verb slot, thus demonstrating how speakers can extend familiar patterns to new contexts while maintaining semantic coherence. In this context, collostructional analysis represents a productive method for uncovering the strength of associations between those verbs and the constructions they belong to, thus offering a deeper insight into the cognitive mechanisms that underlie construction entrenchment.

Therefore, the primary aim of this research is to identify which verbs are most strongly attracted to the verbal slot of the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions, using simple collexeme analysis to explore whether and how patterns of usage, functional distinctions, or cognitive factors might influence their attraction. In other words, we aim to determine which verbs occur with *remember to V* and *forget to V* more often than would be expected by chance in order to examine how intention and memory patterns are structured in language. We also aim to compare the two constructions in order to potentially uncover how speakers linguistically encode opposing cognitive experiences such as remembering and forgetting. This specific method of collostructional analysis, along with corpus description and overall methodology will be discussed in greater detail in the methodology section of this paper.

2. *REMEMBER TO V* AND *FORGET TO V*

Engaging in this type of research revealed that, although the verbs *remember* and *forget* have been studied across various linguistic domains, a collexeme analysis of the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions

3 The Principle of Compositionality states that "the meaning of an expression is a function of the meanings of its parts and of the way they are syntactically combined" (Partee, 2004: 153).

in British English seems to be absent from the existing literature, thus prompting us to provide a satisfactory analysis of these constructions.

When it comes to the fixed verbs of this construction, the *Cambridge Dictionary* defines the verb *remember* as the ability "to bring back a piece of information into one's mind, or to keep a piece of information in your memory"[4], and the verb *forget* as the inability "to remember a fact, something that happened, or how to do something"[5]. Here it is important to note that in order to offer an all-encompassing analysis, we included the entire inflectional paradigm of the verbs *remember* and *forget*.

These verbs have been a focus of a study by Hongyin Tao (2003), which explores their usage in terms of argument structure in spoken English. It revealed that both *remember* and *forget* tend to avoid taking complements, which aligns with a broader tendency among cognitive verbs in spoken discourse (Tao 2003: 89; Tao 2001). However, *remember* is more flexible in its sentence position and even has the potential to develop into a discourse marker (Tao 2003: 92). In contrast, *forget* allows more tense forms and can form more fixed, and stable patterns like *forget it* or *don't forget to* (Tao 2003: 90).

The *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions share several formal and functional characteristics that make them suitable for comparative collexeme analysis. Both represent partially filled (semi-schematic) constructions, as they consist of a fixed component (the verbs *remember* and *forget,* respectively) combined with a verbal slot realized by the to-infinitive verb stem (V), which allows for a variation of verbs to fill that slot (e.g., *remember to keep, forget to invite*). The relationship between the verbs that fill that verbal slot and their respective construction, represent the central focus of the simple collexeme analysis in this study. Semantically, both constructions fit the semantic domain of memory, as they express the act of recalling or failing to remember or carry out an intended action, with the specific interpretation shaped by the verb occupying the verbal slot. Since both constructions fit the domain of (failed) intention and thought, comparing the verbs they attract can shed light on how language can reflect subtle differences in how we experience and process such experiences. Some of the examples of the *remember to* and *V forget to V* construction taken from the *British National Corpus* (BNC)[6] are presented below:

1. The baggage allowance on these flights is only 5kg, so remember to take a small bag for use when island hopping.
2. If you do this, you must remember to close the file when you have finished with it in order to update the directory entry.

4 Cambridge Dictionary (2025). *Cambridge Dictionary* [2025] May 4th. Available at: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/remember [accessed 4.5.2025]

5 Cambridge Dictionary (2025). *Cambridge Dictionary* [2025] May 4th. Available at: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/forget [accessed 4.5.2025]

6 https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/

3. Supplies of live food start to decrease in September, so remember to feed fish.
4. I forgot to mention that he's a madman, though he succeeds in disguising it most of the time.
5. Do not forget to include details of dates and times when you will be free to make your visit.
6. The main tenet of Sobchak's philosophy is that a woman should never forget to be a woman.

It is also essential to distinguish between *remember + to-infinitive* and *forget + to infinite* from *remember + gerund* and *forget + gerund,* as these combinations differ in meaning. This difference is illustrated by the following examples: *he remembered posting the letter* (i.e. 'that he had posted the letter') / *he remembered to post the letter* (i.e. 'did not fail to post the letter') (Schibsbye 1970: 63).

3. CORPUS AND METHODOLOGY

As we mentioned earlier, *collostructional analysis* is an approach introduced by Stefanowitsch and Gries (2003) as a type of quantitative collocational analysis that investigates constructions. As they explain, it "investigates which lexemes are strongly attracted or repelled by a particular slot in the construction" (Stefanowitsch, Gries 2003: 214). The approach encompasses three main methods: collexeme analysis, distinctive collexeme analysis, and co-varying collexeme analysis. For the purpose of this research, we will focus on the first method, *the simple collexeme analysis*, which investigates "which lexical items typically occupy a given slot in a single grammatical construction" (Hilpert 2014: 392). More specifically, it identifies which lexical items occur more or less frequently than expected in a particular constructional slot, that is, which lexical items are statistically attracted to or repelled by that slot (Stefanowitsch, Gries 2003: 214). The lexemes (or in this case, verbs) that are attracted to the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions are referred to as the *collexemes* of these constructions (Stefanowitsch, Gries 2003: 215).

All instances of the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions were extracted from the British National Corpus (BNC) which served as the framework for the collostructional analysis conducted in this study. According to the website's description, the BNC, developed by Oxford University Press in the late 1980s, is a balanced and comprehensive corpus comprising approximately 100 million words of the British English. It encompasses a wide range of genres, including spoken discourse, fiction, magazines, newspapers, and academic texts. The BNC does not include data beyond 1993, which may, in certain cases, pose a limitation for conducting diachronic or up-to-date linguistic research. Nevertheless, the

British National Corpus offers a rich and representative sample of both spoken and written British English from the late twentieth century, thus covering a broad spectrum of sources and registers, which makes it well-suited for this type of linguistic analysis. We opted for this corpus because its manageable size allows for a manual examination of construction instances in their full context.

By inputting *remember to V* and *forget to V* into the search bar of the English Corpora website for the British corpus, the results yield a comprehensive list of all occurrences of the respective constructions within the corpus, along with their individual frequencies, the total number of instances, and the number of unique forms attested. In order to ensure a broad and representative sample, all inflected verbal forms of *remember* and *forget* appearing in the *to V* construction pattern were included in the analysis. The corpus search for the *remember to V* construction yielded a total of 565 occurrences, of which 257 were unique samples. In contrast, the search for the *forget to V* construction returned 989 occurrences, with 404 unique results. To ensure the dataset precision we manually removed any false hits. This included gerund forms, ungrammatical instances such as *forgetting to thinking*, and verbs that are non-existent or highly marginal in standard usage, such as *forgetting to deminiaturize* or *remember to re-xerox*, all of which were excluded to maintain correct syntactic and semantic context. This reduced the original number of results to a total of 561 tokens and 253 types for the *remember to V* construction, and 966 tokens and 385 types for the *forget to V* construction.

To prepare the dataset for the input into *R Studio*, we compiled both the frequency of each verb within the construction and its overall corpus frequency. The latter was obtained manually by entering each verb individually in its base (infinitive) form into the corpus search box, and recording the results in an Excel spreadsheet. *R studio* is a program used for statistical analysis of large datasets. For the purpose of conducting a simple collexeme analysis, we installed the *Collostructions* package (Flach, 2021), specifically utilizing the *collex()* function. This function can be used by following the usage instructions provided within the package, which for this analysis, require the data frame containing the relevant dataset, the corpus size (100 million for the *BNC*), the association measure (defaulting to log-likelihood), and other practical parameters.

The function returns an output which contains the observed and expected frequencies of each lexeme in the verb slot, whether they are attracted or repelled to their respective construction, the association measure (presented as a p-value), and the significance level (indicated by asterisks or *ns* if a result is not significant), providing all the statistical information necessary for interpreting the collexemes of the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions. Non-significant results will not be discussed, as they do not provide reliable evidence of meaningful association between the verb and the construction.

It is important to note that to prepare the data, all inflectional forms of the fixed verbs *remember* and *forget* were included, as we have previously mentioned. However, as a result, in the input list, the same verb would sometimes appear multiple times with different inflectional forms of the fixed verb (e.g., *remembered to take*, *remembers to take*, etc.). Each of those instances was included in the analysis to reflect the true distribution of verb co-occurrences. In the final presentation of results (i.e., tables of top collexemes), these repeated rows were removed only for readability, so that each collexeme was listed once. In such cases, the entry with the highest collostructional strength was retained as the representative form. This choice was made because the goal of the study was not to analyze the influence of different inflectional forms of the fixed verb (*remember/forget*) on the strength of association, but rather to identify and rank the most strongly associated verbs (collexemes) in the schematized slot. This post-processing step did not affect the statistical calculations, which were based on the full, unfiltered dataset.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before proceeding to the results, we will briefly outline the elements included in the tables below. Each table lists the verbs most strongly attracted to their respective construction, along with their overall corpus frequency, observed and expected frequencies, association strength, and significance level. The observed frequency refers to the actual number of times a verb appears in the construction, while the expected frequency indicates how often it would be expected to appear by chance. The association strength (collostructional strength) shows the degree of attraction between the verb and the construction, calculated using a log-likelihood test and represented through a p-value. The significance level is indicated using asterisks, with five asterisks (*****) marking the highest level of significance ($p < .00001$) (Flach, 2021). Non-significant results (ns) shall not be discussed, as they do not reflect a meaningful association between the verb and the construction.

4.1. *REMEMBER TO V*

For the purpose of offering a clear examination of the most meaningful lexical preferences associated with each construction, this study will focus only on the top 25 statistically significant collexemes attracted to the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions.

Out of 203 statistically significant collexemes attracted to the *remember to V* construction, Table 1 presents the top 25 verbs with the highest log-likelihood score of attraction, listed in a descending order of strength. Only one verb was repelled by the construction, but since it falls among the

50 statistically non-significant collexemes, it will not be discussed. The absence of significantly repelled verbs may suggest flexibility of the *remember to V* construction, and a lack of strict restrictions on the verbs it takes.

As shown in Table 1, the verbs *keep* and *take* stand out as having the highest collostructional strength of attraction to the *remember to V* construction, with log-likelihood values of 249.59 and 203.51 respectively. Both of these verbs are transitive and typically convey the notion of possession, control or even some sort of movement. *Keep,* as the most strongly attracted verb, can be viewed as a stative verb, often associated with maintaining a particular state. On the other hand, *take* is more dynamic, implying an execution of an action, often involving some type of acquisition. Within the context of the *remember to V* construction, both of these verbs appear to reflect a sense of an obligation or an important habitual action, as evident in the examples taken from the BNC below:

7. So use a good insect repellent and remember to keep re-applying it.
8. Please remember to keep dogs under control and away from sheep and cattle.
9. But remember to keep them away from very young brothers or sisters who may think they are sweets and try to eat them.
10. And when you leave the laboratory, always remember to take off your gloves and check your hands in front of the scanner.
11. If you do manage to find a place in one, you must tidy it up when you're ready to leave and remember to take your litter with you

Table 1. Top 25 collexemes attracted to *remember to V* construction

	COLLEX	CORP. FREQ	OBS	EXP	ASSOC	COLL.STR. LOGL	*SIGNIF*
1	KEEP	26546	29	0.1	attr	249.59353	*****
2	TAKE	68871	30	0.4	attr	203.50808	*****
3	USE	61233	17	0.3	attr	99.85026	*****
4	INCLUDE	14928	12	0.1	attr	95.58891	*****
5	CHECK	6989	10	0	attr	91.09959	*****
6	PUT	57050	12	0.3	attr	63.86791	*****
7	TELL	28662	10	0.2	attr	63.10295	*****
8	BRING	14848	8	0.1	attr	57.31958	*****
9	ASK	18490	8	0.1	attr	53.84918	*****
10	ALLOW	11122	7	0.1	attr	52.29793	*****
11	MAKE	76354	10	0.4	attr	44.03045	*****
12	WEAR	4937	5	0	attr	42.06345	*****
13	DISINFECT	21	2	0	attr	35.16252	*****

14	TREAT	3632	4	0	attr	34.31114	*****
15	UNPLUG	26	2	0	attr	34.2694	*****
16	REMOVE	3863	4	0	attr	33.82016	*****
17	CANCEL	854	3	0	attr	32.67397	*****
18	PROTECT	4981	4	0	attr	31.79819	*****
19	ANALYSE	1284	3	0	attr	30.2284	*****
20	GET	94823	8	0.5	attr	28.5346	*****
21	TRY	20599	5	0.1	attr	27.94894	*****
22	STRETCH	2449	3	0	attr	26.36387	*****
23	JOG	196	2	0	attr	26.05375	*****
24	FEED	3098	3	0	attr	24.95988	*****
25	SWITCH	3171	3	0	attr	24.82089	*****

Formally, the majority of the verbs in Table 1 are transitive, as confirmed by their contextual usage, illustrated in the examples below this paragraph. Structurally, many of these verbs are rather short, monosyllabic, such as, *use, put, ask, get, try* or *jog* which might reflect a tendency toward concise, action-oriented expressions. Although the two most strongly attracted verbs may suggest that the construction does not show a clear preference for either stative or dynamic verbs, a closer look at the full table reveals a different pattern. Namely, most of the attracted verbs are dynamic, action-oriented verbs that are not abstract (i.e., they do not express mental states or intangible concepts), but rather concrete in nature, referring to observable, physical actions, and are predominantly lexical (e.g., *check*, *remove*, *unplug*, *disinfect*, *stretch*, *jog*, etc.). Speech, cognitive, or mental verbs are rare among the top collexemes. Only a small number of verbs, such as *analyse* and *ask* could be interpreted as involving cognitive processes. This pattern aligns with the functional value of the construction, which typically relates to remembering to carry out concrete, practical tasks, evident in the BNC examples below:

12. Remember to check the plants daily for any pests: aphids and red spider mite can both be a nuisance on these plants.
13. Remember to stretch while the muscles are still warm from working or directly after a bath and hold each position statically for at least 15 seconds.
14. If you collect them yourself, remember to disinfect the larvae, before feeding them to your fish.
15. But remember to unplug all the tank's electrical equipment before putting your hands into the water.

Statistically, it is notable that most of these verbs have a significantly higher observed than expected frequency, which is especially evident in collexemes such as *keep* (OBS = 29, EXP = 0.1)*, include* (OBS = 12, EXO = 0.1), *check* (OBS = 10, EXP = 0)*, bring* (OBS = 8, EXP = 0.1)*, ask* (OBS = 8, EXP = 0.1), *or take* (OBS = 30, EXP = 0.4). This suggests that the *remember to V* construction prefers these verbs beyond what would be expected by chance. On the other hand, it is interesting that the verb *get* has the highest corpus frequency (94,823), but it ranks only around mid-table in terms of its collostructional strength (log-likelihood = 28.53). This could be because *get* is highly polysemous and context-dependent, so its link to the specific, task-oriented meaning of the *remember to V* construction might not be as strong. While other frequent verbs like *take* or *put* also have broad meanings, they may align more directly with the construction's typical contexts of routine or goal-oriented actions. Nonetheless, this shows that even highly frequent verbs may not be the most strongly attracted to a construction, as less frequent verbs can emerge as more dominant within it. For example, the verbs *disinfect* (CORP.FREQ = 21) and *unplug* (CORP.FREQ = 26) have significantly lower corpus frequencies, yet they are more strongly attracted to this construction. Again, this might be because they tend to appear in contexts involving specific, practical actions, whereas *get*, being more semantically flexible and broad, shows a slightly weaker association with this particular slot.

Semantically, given the meaning of the fixed verb *remember* involves recalling an action or piece of information, many of the verbs attracted to the construction tend to involve routines, tasks, or habitual actions, such as *keep, take, check, make, get, feed*, etc. Similarly, verbs like *disinfect, treat, unplug, remove, cancel,* or *protect* frequently appear in contexts involving the resolution or prevention of potential problems, which often co-occur with expressions of responsibility or duty. However, we should note that the verb *treat* is semantically flexible and does not necessarily denote problem-solving in all contexts, as in *remember to treat all women with respect*. Nevertheless, within the same domain, we can also observe some collexemes that relate to communication or giving instructions, such as *tell, ask, allow*. While less closely tied to practical routines, the cognitive domain can also be represented by verbs like *analyse* and *try (*e.g.*, remember to analyse each exercise, remember to try and feel a sense of grace*). These may be attracted to the construction due to semantic compatibility with the fixed verb *remember* as a mental verb itself, thus allowing cognitive verbs to occupy its constructional slot. Finally, we can also observe a semantic cluster related to health and safety with verbs such as *disinfect, treat,* and *protect*.

4.2. *FORGET TO V*

Continuing with the same method of analysis, we will discuss the results obtained from the British National Corpus for the *forget to V* con-

struction in order to observe whether there are any significant similarities or differences among the attracted collexemes which are suitable for a critical evaluation. There are notably more statistically non-significant results within this construction, even 132 out of 385 verb types, which might indicate that the *forget to V* construction is more restrictive in terms of the verbs it attracts. Table 2 shows the top 25 verbs attracted by the *forget to V* construction within the BNC, in a descending order.

Table 2. Top 25 collexemes attracted to *forget to V* construction

	COLLEX	CORP. FREQ	OBS	EXP	ASSOC	COLL.STR. LOGL	SIGNIF
1	MENTION	4457	28	0	attr	307.81836	*****
2	TELL	28662	31	0.3	attr	232.1016	*****
3	ASK	18490	21	0.2	attr	159.04909	*****
4	BRING	14848	18	0.1	attr	138.60219	*****
5	PUT	57050	24	0.6	attr	134.83264	*****
6	TAKE	68871	22	0.7	attr	111.74926	*****
7	LOCK	2434	9	0	attr	89.21795	*****
8	SEND	7656	9	0.1	attr	68.668	*****
9	INCLUDE	14928	10	0.1	attr	65.17799	*****
10	ADD	8039	8	0.1	attr	58.38666	*****
11	GIVE	43488	12	0.4	attr	57.4351	*****
12	GET	94823	13	0.9	attr	44.95564	*****
13	SAY	66553	11	0.6	attr	41.87142	*****
14	LET	33038	8	0.3	attr	36.24605	*****
15	ENCLOSE	427	3	0	attr	33.57469	*****
16	SWITCH	3171	4	0	attr	31.05864	*****
17	WIPE	727	3	0	attr	30.37888	*****
18	CANCEL	854	3	0	attr	29.41346	*****
19	VISIT	11966	5	0.1	attr	27.92922	*****
20	PICK	6207	4	0.1	attr	25.74154	*****
21	DETACH	142	2	0	attr	25.17449	*****
22	EAT	7225	4	0.1	attr	24.54581	*****
23	MAKE	76354	8	0.7	attr	23.67179	*****
24	LEAVE	19614	5	0.2	attr	23.13368	*****
25	TURN	20133	5	0.2	attr	22.88246	*****

The top three verbs with the strongest log-likelihood attraction to the *forget to V* construction, *mention* (307.82), *tell* (232.10), and *ask* (159.05), are all communication verbs. For all three of them, the observed frequencies exceed the expected frequencies (*mention*: OBS = 28 / EXP = 0; *tell*: 31 / 0.3; *ask*: 21 / 0.2). Each refers to the act of conveying information or initiating interaction with a specific interlocutor. Additionally, unlike the majority of physical and action verbs in Table 2, these three verbs are mental (cognitive) in nature, and in the context of the *forget to V* construction they refer to a failed obligation to communicate or seek information from someone about something, which reflects the construction's prominent pragmatic function in discourse. While they are all transitive, unlike the majority of collexemes in the *remember to V* construction, which typically involve direct objects, these three verbs often prefer an indirect object, which reflects their interpersonal nature (e.g., tell someone, ask someone, mention something to someone). The examples of their contextual usage in the BNC reflects the interpersonal and communicative function within the construction:

16. You conveniently forgot to tell me she was Nick Wood's sister.
17. You forgot to tell me how much I owe.
18. There was something I forgot to mention to you earlier.
19. I forgot to ask you if your car turned up all right.
20. I forgot to ask you whether you use a sewing machine in your work?

Beyond verbs which denote communicative acts, many of the top attracted verbs in this construction are physical and actions verbs, such as *put, take, lock, wipe, switch, cancel, detach, pick,* or *turn*. This aligns with the construction's meaning related to omitted tasks or unfulfilled obligations, as shown in the BNC examples below:

21. Once he had forgotten to lock Mr Corcoran's office and had been harshly reprimanded.
22. I looked down and suddenly realised I had forgotten to bring my own umbrella to work that morning.
23. I've got a horrible feeling I've forgotten to put the milk in the fridge.

A smaller semantic group within these action verbs relates specifically to movement or change of location, exemplified by verbs like *visit* and *leave*. Finally, similar to the *remember to V* construction, verbs such as *lock*, *switch*, *wipe,* and others often refer to daily, practical obligations that have been forgotten.

As was the case for *remember to V* construction, many of the collexemes attracted to the *forget to V* construction are also rather short

and monosyllabic (*tell, ask, put, say, let, wipe, eat,* etc.). The list also reveals a clear tendency toward action-oriented verbs (*send, include, enclose, detach, eat,* etc.). However, as opposed to the verbs attracted to the *remember to V* construction, the *forget to V* construction shows almost equal preference for both concrete (i.e., physical, observable actions) and abstract verbs (i.e., mental or less tangible processes). Additionally, the majority of verbs are also transitive in nature (e.g., *bring a camera, lock the door*). As we tend to remember in the present what we have forgotten in the past, naturally, the verbs with the strongest attraction typically occur with the fixed verb *forget* in the past tense (see examples below).

24. Do not forget to include details of dates and times when you will be free to make your visit.
25. He had forgotten to take off his spectacles and he peered over the top of them.
26. I forgot to give it to Madge when she asked for the keys.

Statistically, the verb *get* once again exhibits the highest corpus frequency (94,823), though it shows a slightly stronger attraction to the *forget to V* construction (log-likelihood = 44.95) compared to *remember to V* (log-likelihood = 28.53*).* As with the *remember to V* collexemes, the observed frequencies mostly exceed the expected frequencies, which may partly be due to the smaller size of the BNC corpus. Nevertheless, such difference between observed and expected values confirms that the attraction of these verbs to the construction is statistically meaningful rather than random.

Comparing the two tables we can see that 10 verbs appear in both the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions (*ask, bring, cancel, get, include, make, put, switch, take, tell*). These verbs seem to share an intentional, agentive function, typically related to tasks or responsibilities, which makes them semantically compatible with the meanings of both constructions. However, despite this overlap and their structural similarity, these constructions do show slight differences in their lexical preferences for the verbal slot, which simultaneously points to differences in cognitive framing. Namely, the most strongly attracted verbs in the *remember to V* construction are primarily associated with concrete, task-based actions (*keep, take, use)*, whereas *forget to V* tends to prefer communication-based verbs (*mention, tell, ask)*, which reflects its focus on interpersonal and informational omissions. This may point to a pragmatic difference and cognitive framing difference in the types of actions that people tend to remember compared to those they tend to forget.

Interestingly, it appears that the *forget to V* construction is slightly more restrictive than *remember to V*, as it includes a small number of verbs that are statistically repelled. Specifically, out of eight repelled collexemes, four exhibited statistically significant repulsion. However, since the verb *be* appears three times with identical association levels, it is reported only

once in the table below. As a result, Table 3 shows two collexemes that are meaningfully repelled: *be* and *have*.

Table 3. Top collexemes repelled by the forget *to V* construction

	COLLEX	CORP.FREQ	OBS	EXP	ASSOC	COLL.STR. LOGL	SIGNIF
1	HAVE	455972	1	4.4	rep	3.85611	*
2	BE	643901	1	6.2	rep	6.81298	**

Even though *have* and *be* are highly frequent verbs in English, they are the only verbs repelled by the *forget to V* construction. Since both are auxiliary verbs, we can argue that this construction repels auxiliaries. Additionally, they are stative verbs, while the construction has shown preference for action-oriented verbs. *Be* and *have* are also less task-focused, which contrasts with the construction's typical use. In context, their usage appears as follow:

27. Lewis had forgotten to be indifferent and aloof, he couldn't help it.
28. M forgets to be grumpy (angry) and is so helpful and capable.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the results of this study revealed several shared characteristics as well as meaningful functional differences between the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions. The similarities are mostly formal, as both constructions tend to attract shorter, monosyllabic, transitive, and action-oriented verbs. The overlap in verbs such as *take*, *put*, *ask*, *bring*, and *switch* suggests that both constructions focus on task-related actions, though with contrasting outcomes, as one emphasizes successful completion, while the other reflects failure. These overlapping verbs are typically agentive and responsibility-driven, and they highlight a shared functional focus on intention and action. Even though the constructions *remember to V* and *forget to V* belong to the same semantic domain of memory, they have been shown to differ in their lexical preferences, degree of restrictiveness, and cognitive framing.

Namely, the *remember to V* construction attracted a larger number of statistically significant collexemes and showed no significantly repelled verbs, which suggests it is more lexically flexible and that it allows for a broader range of verbs to fill the empty slot. The most strongly attracted verbs tend to express a sense of obligation or routine, aligning with the construction's function of recalling actions that are habitual or tied to responsibility. While both stative and dynamic verbs appear, the over-

all preference leans toward dynamic, action-oriented, and concrete verbs, particularly those related to completing tasks, preventing problems, or fulfilling duties. These include verbs from a variety of specific semantic domains such as health (*disinfect*, *treat*), mental activity (*analyse*, *try*), communication (*tell*, *ask*), and general instruction.

In contrast, the *forget to V* construction is slightly more restrictive, with a higher number of statistically non-significant collexemes and two repelled auxiliaries (*be* and *have*), which are incompatible with the construction's preference for action and task-oriented verbs. The strongest attractions are found among communication verbs (*mention*, *tell*, *ask*), which suggests that this construction is frequently used in contexts of failed communication or interpersonal obligations. In addition to communication, *forget to V* also attracts physical and action-based verbs that imply unfulfilled obligations or omitted routine tasks. Some collexemes also point to movement or spatial change (*leave*, *visit*, *bring*), and the construction reflects both concrete and abstract actions.

These findings also suggest that the *remember to V* and *forget to V* constructions encode opposing cognitive experiences through distinct lexical patterns. Specifically, *remember to V* construction appears to frame remembering through concrete, practical, and often habitual actions, which reflect a focus on task completion and personal responsibility. In contrast, *forget to V* construction frames forgetting typically within communicative and interpersonal contexts, highlighting the failure to convey expected information or conduct a promised favor.

In sum, while *remember to V* and *forget to V* are structurally alike and partially overlap in verb selection, their lexical preferences point to distinct pragmatic roles. *Remember to V* leans toward completing and maintaining duties, while *forget to V* leans toward omissions, particularly in communication. These patterns provide valuable insight into how language encodes subtle differences in cognitive experience, while simultaneously offering a basis for further research into tense, register, and constructional variation.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Goldberg 1995: A. E. Goldberg, *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg 2003: A. E. Goldberg, Constructions: A New Theoretical Approach to Language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7, 219-224.

Goldberg 2006: A. E. Goldberg, *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hilpert 2014: M. Hilpert, *Construction Grammar and Its Application to English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Langacker 2008: R. W. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press USA.

Partee 2004: B. Partee, *Compositionality in Formal Semantics: Selected Papers by Barbara Partee*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Schibsbye 1970: K. Schibsbye, *A Modern English Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stefanowitch, Gries 2003: A. Stefanowitch & S. Th. Gries, Collostructions: Investigating the Interaction of Words and Constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*. 8, 209-243.

Tao 2001: H. Tao, Discovering the usual with corpora: The case of remember. In R. Simpson & J. Swales (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics in North America: Selections from the 1999 Symposium*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 116–144.

Tao 2003: H. Tao, A usage-based approach to argument structure: `Remember' and `Forget' in spoken English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 8, 75-95.

SOURCES

Cambridge Dictionary (2025): *Cambridge Dictionary.* Available at: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/

Davies, Mark. (2004): *British National Corpus* (from Oxford University Press). Available at: https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/.

Flach (2021): S. Flach, *Collostructions: An R implementation for the family of collostructional methods*. R package version 0.2.0, https://sfla.ch/collostructions/.

Rstudio Team (n.d.): RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. https://www.rstudio.com/

Катарина Миловук / НЕ ЗАБОРАВИ ДА СЕ СЕТИШ: АНАЛИЗА КОЛЕКСЕМА КОНСТРУКЦИЈА ПАМЋЕЊА

Резиме / Анализа простих колексема представља методу у оквиру колострукционе анализе који квантитативно мери снагу привлачности између лексичке јединице која заузима одређену позицију унутар конструцкије и саме конструкције. У истраживању је примењена ова метода како би се идентификовали глаголи који показују најснажнију повезаност са две семантички супротстављене конструкције, *remember to V* и *forget to V*, као и да би се испитале њихове лексичке преференције и функционалне разлике. Узорци су преузети из Британског националног корпуса (BNC) и анализирани помоћу софтвера *R Studio*, који статистички процењује јачину повезаности између датих глагола и њихових одговарајућих конструкција. Резултати су показали да конструкције *remember to V* и *forget to V* деле неке формалне особине, али се значајно разликују у погледу избора глагола и когнитивног уоквиравања. Конструкција *remember to V* показала се флексибилнијом у погледу глагола које привлачи, а који углавном одражавају испуњене обавезе или рутинске радње, док се *forget to V* показала нешто рестриктивнијом, са преференцијама које указују на пропусте, нарочито у домену комуникације.

Кључне речи: конструкциона граматика, колострукциона анализа, анализа простих колексема, *remember to V*, *forget to V*, корпус

Примљен: 29. 5. 2025.
Прихваћен јула 2025.