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1. Introduction

“Transferred epithets” are generally defined as the adjectives that seem to have been transferred from the adverbial position to the prenominal position in a sentence (e.g. thoughtful in I balanced a thoughtful lump of sugar on the teaspoon; Hall, 1973, p. 92). The main purpose of this paper is to bring in an MSFA approach to this linguistic phenomenon. The present work is a preliminary study for a more comprehensive investigation. Nevertheless, the implications are certainly significant for future research on not only transferred epithets but also adjectival semantics in general.

2. Background

2.1. The previous accounts and beyond

Transferred epithets are reasonably known among linguists, but to our knowledge, little research has been provided on this phenomenon in the literature. A variety of approaches have been proposed in adjectival semantics, but our impression is that transferred epithets are among those that challenge the theoretical and descriptive foundations of previous approaches most severely, and this might be the reason why study in this area is lacking. As the first author of this article pointed out elsewhere (Shibuya, 2006), classical transformational and classical semantic accounts for adjectives (e.g. Vendler, 1967; Katz & Fodor, 1963) would have difficulties in explaining transferred epithets. Cognitive linguistics accounts for adjectival semantics (e.g. Lakoff 1987; Langacker, 1991) provide more elaborate semantic descriptions than the classical accounts. Nevertheless, they still leave some questions unclear, for they do not explain why the same adjective shows different sense availability (in particular, in terms of metonymic senses) in different adjectival constructions (for details, see Shibuya, 2005). Transferred epithets are, as will be discussed in this paper, highly metonymic, which means that the previous cognitive linguistics accounts for adjectival semantics would not work well for this linguistic phenomenon. In Shibuya (2006), the first author argued for adopting a constructionist approach to transferred epithets. In this paper, we propose to take an MSFA approach to transferred epithets with the aim of pushing the analysis forward.

2.2. What is MSFA?

MSFA stands for Multilayered Semantic Frame Analysis (Kuroda & Isahara, 2005). It provides a multidimensional description of “contextualized” meanings of words and phrases. The framework is compatible with the Berkeley FrameNet project (Baker et al., 1998; Lowe et al., 1997). The descriptive scheme of MSFA is employed in the JCASR (Japanese Corpus Annotated for Semantic Roles) Project, which aims to develop a relatively small Japanese corpus of texts annotated for “semantic frames” and their “frame elements” (aka “semantic roles”).

In conducting an MSFA, one puts an emphasis on the identification and specification of finer-grained, situation-specific roles at concrete levels (e.g. <Robbers>, <Victim>, <Valuables>) rather than those of coarse-grained, general-purpose roles at abstract levels (e.g. <Agent>, <Patient>, <Theme>). This view is theoretically motivated by the hypothesis held in MSFA that deeper understandings are achieved at concrete levels (for discussions, see Kuroda & 1

1 There are, however, crucial differences between MSFA and the Berkeley FrameNet. For details, see Kuroda & Isahara, 2005, Kuroda et al., 2006, and Shibuya et al., 2006.

2 The JCASR Project is one of the on-going research projects at the National Institute of Information and Communications Technology (NICT), Japan.
Isahara, 2005; Kuroda et al., 2006; Shibuya et al., 2006).

3. MSFA and transferred epithets
Consider the examples of transferred epithets given in (1) (Hall, 1973, p. 92):

(1)  a. I balanced a *thoughtful* lump of sugar on the teaspoon.
    b. He was now smoking a *sad* cigarette.

Here, *thoughtful* and *sad* modify something that they “should not” normally. Paraphrasing (1a-b) makes the semantic transfer involved in these examples clear. As Hall (1973) notes, (1a) can be paraphrased as “I thoughtfully balanced a lump of sugar on the teaspoon”, and (1b) as “He was now sadly smoking a cigarette” (pp. 92-93).

Shibuya (2005) explored the sense distributions of 50 English adjectives and showed that the attributive construction allows greater semantic flexibility, while the predicative construction is bound to the direct (i.e. non-metonymic) semantic type. Extending the scope of Shibuya (2005), Shibuya (2006) went on to study transferred epithets, suggesting that the “unusual” modification observed in transferred epithets is because the function of modification permits complex semantic relations (including e.g. manner of action and emotional states of the person involved in the event in question) between the modifying word (i.e. adjective) and the modified word (i.e. head noun). What was not made clear in Shibuya (2006) is exactly how transferred epithets are understood, or more specifically, how the complex semantic relations between the modifying word and the modified word are understood in transferred epithets. The present article focuses on this comprehension problem with MSFA.

3.2. Procedures
The present study is preliminary work towards a comprehensive study of transferred epithets. In this article, we only report a study conducted on *thoughtful*.

Prior to an MSFA on *thoughtful*, we conducted a corpus study, whose procedures are summarized as follows:

1. We searched the British National Corpus for *thoughtful*. All the BNC subcorpora were searched. The total number of instances collected is 600.
2. We then classified the instances by their construction types. The numbers are: Attribution: N=341, Predication: N=195, Others: N=64.
3. Finally, we classified the attributive and predicative uses of *thoughtful* by their semantic types of the adjective.

3.3. Results of the corpus study
A total of seven semantic types were identified with *thoughtful*:

I. “that someone thinks about and cares for other people”
II. “that someone considers things carefully”
III. “that someone is quiet because s/he is thinking”
IV. “that the thing shows (or is suggestive) that the person is a considerate, kind individual”
V. “that the thing shows (or is suggestive) that the person is a careful individual”
VI. “that the thing shows (or is suggestive) that the person is thinking”
VII. “that the time shows (or is suggestive) that the person is quiet because s/he is thinking”

Examples of these semantic types are as given below in (2)-(8), respectively.

(2) a. One *thoughtful* member of the hotel staff even provided her with a tray of crisps. [197 B73]
    b. He was *thoughtful* and caring, but strong-willed and quick-minded. [505 GXL]

(3) a. Nowadays a *thoughtful* parent will say, “Don’t pick up things from the floor and put them in your mouth; they are dirty and might make you ill.” [158 FP6]
    b. These people are often *thoughtful* and clever, but so far they have not been able to bring about worthwhile changes. [507 A2P]

(4) Lili looked *thoughtful*, but I didn’t know what she was thinking about. [366 HHB]

(5) a. From the sunlit atrium with its glass elevator to the tasteful rooms and *thoughtful* service, this hotel shines with refined comfort. [283 ATE]
b. Her answering smile was thoughtful as she watched him duck gracefully through the doorway. [547 H94]

(6) a. Some thoughtful articles aim to make connections, perhaps across national and language frontiers, or between disciplines. [39 KS8]

b. The discussion throughout the book is lucid and thoughtful, and many readers will find Petrey’s arguments convincing. [354 GUE]

(7) a. He starts the day with these vices — the quiet glass of red wine, the thoughtful cigar — and isn’t that meant to be especially bad? [52 J17]

b. His mouth curved in amusement, but his narrowed gaze was thoughtful, as though her observations had surprised him. [362 JYA]

(8) She spoke with such soft intensity that he stared at her for a long, thoughtful moment. [240 ACB]

Table 1 gives the details regarding the number of instances in each semantic type in attribution and predication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Type</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Predication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the most frequent use of thoughtful is to denote a referent’s (typically denoted by HUMAN nouns) particular mental characteristics about things around him/her (I and II). Following the convention in Shibuya (2005) as to how to classify an adjective’s meanings, the semantic types I and II are identified as the “direct” (non-metonymic) sense types of the adjective, and the other semantic types are analyzed as “indirect” (metonymic), which are related to the direct ones somehow metonymically in the relevant frames.  The indirect senses of thoughtful are “evidential” (III, IV, V, VI) and “temporal” (VII). That is, they either refer to something that shows that the person has particular mental characteristics, or they denote that the person is thinking about something at a certain time specified by the head noun.

3.4. Discussions with MSFA

The sample includes both non- and apparently transferred epithets. Conducting an MSFA on the sample reveals the following points:

1. The sentence with a transferred epithet consists of words that encode a set of situations which altogether evoke a situation (or a script).
2. The primary participant identified in each situation (frame) is the same individual participating in the more comprehensive (but concrete, not abstract) situation (script). Typically, the primary participant is the subject of the sentence.

An MSFA of (7a), for example, identifies the involvement of a set of frames such as <smoking a cigarette> and <thinking>, each of which includes the semantic roles such as <smoker>, <cigarette>, and <thinker>, <thing thought about>, etc. The set of situations are linked with a more comprehensive (concrete) situation where one is smoking a cigarette while thinking about something. The primary participant identified in each of the sub-frames (i.e. someone performing the action in the frame) is the person performing the act of smoking while thinking about something.

In the direct uses of thoughtful, there is no such superordinate situation (script). To give some instances, thoughtful and member (of 2a) and thoughtful and parent (of 3a) both only

---

3 The semantic type III is not found in the sample with the attributive construction. In the predicative construction, the semantic type is found typically with such verbs as look, appear, become, and grow. Future research should investigate why this semantic type shows discrepancies in the availability in the attributive and predicative constructions.

4 Specification of the semantic type III is an urgent issue for future research.

5 The term “evidential” is used here in a rather abstract fashion. It is used to denote anything that is suggestive of the person’s particular type of mental characteristics. More work needs to be done on the relationships among the subtypes of the evidential uses.

6 (7a) illustrates a case of transferred epithets, whereas (7b) is not, because by definition the predicative use of an adjective is not regarded as such.
Towards the other end of the pole
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Future research should study which semantic type (III) requires a special treatment, because this use often takes place with the verbs such as look, appear, become, and grow, which all seem to contribute to the temporal reading in thoughtful in some fashion.

4. Conclusion and prospects

In this article, we have discussed transferred epithets with MSFA. The previous accounts lack descriptive adequacy, but it appears that MSFA works well for a phenomenon like transferred epithets. Many issues still remain to be explored in more detail, which we would like to leave for future study.
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