Ann.Rep. Asahikawa Med. Coll. 1994. Vol.15, 11~15

# On the Usage of Cognitive Verbs with Of--Compared to Those with About--

## Masato YAMAZAKI

It is well-known that some verbs share contrastive meanings when followed by of and when followed by about. For example, dream of refers to simply what kind of dream a speaker has, while dream about mentions contents of the dream. There are several verbs having this usage 10 such as feel, hear, know, learn, read, speak, talk, tell, think, write; it is obvious that they involve cognitive activities about information or knowledge. In the paper, we analyse this usage in terms of "quality and quantity regarding information". 20

First, we discuss the usage of a preposision of. The author thinks that this is "partitive genitive", of which it is possible to find examples in OE. The partitive genitive is used as the object of certain verbs describing mental activity, eating and drinking, or despoliation. Partitive genitive means "some of", and is concerned not with all of the object, but with only a part of it. In OE, the partitive genitive occurs with such verbs as drink, eat, smell and taste, all of which work as transitive verbs without prepositions in the present. In other words, some objects with which these verbal activities are concerned are material nouns such as liquid and food in general.

The reason why partitive genitive follows cognitive verbs like *dream* etc. is that their objects i.e. information or knowledge, are uncountable nouns which behave in a similar way to material nouns.<sup>3)</sup>

When the partitive genitive is used with material nouns, it shows partial quantity, i.e. a certain portion against an indefinite quantity which the transitive usage can mean. Quantitative aspects of the prepositional function are transferred into qualitative ones when a speaker is concerned with constitutional density of information; the way of perceiving information that the objects convey. Therefore, the partitive genitive with verbs meaning giving and getting information or

knowlege involves the wholeness as distinct from the totality<sup>4)</sup>, i.e. qualitatively definite information regarding the density. It is definiteness that is common both in quantity and in quality when we use of. Again, of is used when the speaker is interested mainly in the wholeness regarding the constitution of information on the verb object.

On the other hand, about refers to each component which semantically makes up the object of the verb. 5) Information about an object can be divided into concomitant 'sub-information', in which, about suggests a speaker is mainly interested. In other words, about mentions the subject-matter more comprehensively. 6)

Generally speaking, of implies the wholeness while about suggests the totality in this usage. Therefore, the former is used to indicate some principal but limited (in quality, not in quantity) information of the object and the latter is used to express more detailed and comprehensive information or knowledge concerning the object. The difference would be more obvious in comparisons such as dream of/about, hear of/about, learn of/about, speak of/about, think of/about, write of/about.

It is interesting that of suggests how to get information; hear of, know of, read of, speak well of and think well of. They mean that a speaker has acquired the information indirectly i.e. through a secondary medium such as hearsay or a printed source etc. This meaning becomes clear when compared to the transitive usage. The author assumes that indirectness comes from partiality which partitive genitive originally implies. In addition, hear of and know of mean that a speaker simply has qualitatively limited and primary information, mostly a name of the object. A name is a part of the entire information and may be inessential or peripheral in terms of quality; it is often said "I know only the name" or "all I know is just its name" and so forth. In contrast, hear about and know about imply comprehensive information and a fuller knowledge from the speaker's point of view in terms of quality regarding subject—matter.

Of in talk of suggests values on the information which a speaker places. Partiality means that there is some room for change in his utterance, in other words, the speaker is less sure of the certainty of the information.

Because of partiality of is more preferred in negative sentences. For example, not dream of, not hear of and not think of carry very strong negation for verbal

activity. A speaker emphasises low probability through comparison to possible minimum or extreme examples like *even*. Of in the above phrases is paraphrased to *even* a bit of information on. Note such colloquial expressions as not that I know of and no or not speak of. 80

In contrast, when about is used with a negative expression, it could provide euphemistic atmosphere like I don't know about. See Wood (1970: 327-328).

In addition feel of/about share a different meaning; the former implies to examine by touching while the latter suggests to feel around, or at various places on or within<sup>8)</sup>. This usage clearly shows contrastive difference of quantity concerning verbal activity. But feel of is limited to American usage, which has retained some old usages of partitive genitive; smell of and taste of.

The author thinks that it is possible to regard the difference between of and about as parallel to that between singularity and plurality of collective nouns. For example, dream of refers to the wholeness of a speaker's dream, and it is comparable to the singular usage of a family in My family is famous, while dream about implies totality i.e. total components of the dream, and it is similar to the plural usage when we say All my family are famous; it makes reference to each member of the family. Wood (1970: 429, 507) explains read about and tell one about are modified by all, while read of and tell one of cannot. The author thinks that all means literally all components which about implies regarding objects. Needless to say, a difference between singularity and plurality depends on a speaker's aspect of numerical quality of a collective noun. In other words, it is important how a speaker perceives numerical characteristics, i.e. whether it works as a unit or a set of components. A difference between the two prepositions also basically derives from the point of view of numerical quality. It is obvious that the English language pays great attention to numerical quality of nouns. The usage is one of the examples of this property.

#### Notes

1) There are numerous words in which a difference of meaning is not caused by the exchange of two prepositions. In the present paper, the author does not treat these cases; bastful, brag, care (v.) and care (n.), careful, doubtful, inform and so on. In other words, we deal with the case where semantic

4

change can take place between of and about.

### 2) OED describes as follows:

of 26. In sense: Concerning, about, with regard to, in reference to. After verbs, substantives, and adjectives. a. After intransitive verbs; esp. those of learning, knowing, thinking, and expressing thought as hear, read, know, think, dream, judge, tell, relate, write, and the like....

- about 7. Abstract connextion: Touching, concerning; in the matter of, in reference or regard to. The regular preposition employed to define the subject-matter of verbal activity, as in to speak, think, ask, dream, hear know about...
- 3) For instance, in *dream of/about a lion* there is syntactically a countable noun as an object, i.e. a lion, but according to COBUILD, to dream means to see imaginary pictures and events in one's mind. In other words, dream is information on something to get during sleep, therefore to dream of/about a lion is paraphrased to "to get some imaginary information on a lion during sleep". Semantically speaking, the author assumes that the object of a cognitive verb is information regarding something. That is to say, what is done when using a cognitive verb is cognition of the subject-matter which is shown as the syntactic object, and congition involves information or knowledge.
- 4) Both words can be interchangeable, but COBUILD explains as follows: wholeness is the quality of being complete or a single unit and not broken or divided into parts...

A total is the number that you get when you add a series of figures together or when you count how many things there are in a group...

A difference would be clear in comparison of as a whole, in whole and in total.

- 5) Another important point is that it is semantic opposition that decides the function of prepositions; when about is used in temporal usage such as about October 1 it expresses approximativeness, while on in on October 1 shows preciseness. See Bennett (1968a).
- 6) According to Wood (1970:141) there is a tendency to use about when emphasis is placed on boast. The author thinks that this is because about suggests that a speaker assumes closer relationship between the action of boasting and the object of the boast. This is an example of how about refers to each compo-

nent, which justifies 'boasting' in this case.

- 7) According to Wood (1970:512), he thinks too much of himself=he has too high an opinion of himself, on the other hand, he thinks too much about himself=he worries over his health, or his aches and pains, too much. The former represents that it is his whole personality that is treated as an object to think of, while the latter denotes that the more detailed and concrete features that make up his personality could be problems.
- 8) According to Wood (1970:208), when doubt is used as a noun of is perhaps rather more emphatic than about. This is because doubt itself has a negative meaning.
- 9) See Wood (1970:254).

#### References

Bennett, D.C. (1968) 'English Prepositions: A Stratificational Approach', Journal of Linguistics 4.

Konishi, T. (1974) An English Collocational Dictionary on Prepositions. Tokyo.

——— (1977) English Prepositions. Tokyo.

Wood, T. (1979) English Prepositional idioms. U.K.

\* I would like to thank Mr. Simon Bayley very much not only for correcting errors but for his invaluable comments upon earlier drafts on the paper. All errors and inadequancies are my own.