

Memorization or Reasoning? Exploring the Idiom Understanding of LLMs

Jisu Kim^{1†}, Youngwoo Shin^{1†}, Uiji Hwang¹,
Jihun Choi², Richeng Xuan³, Taeuk Kim^{1*}

¹Hanyang University, ²Sony AI, ³Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence
{jskim1945, youngwoo9, willpower, kimtaeuk}@hanyang.ac.kr,
jihun.a.choi@sony.com, rcxuan@baai.ac.cn

Abstract

Idioms have long posed a challenge due to their unique linguistic properties, which set them apart from other common expressions. While recent studies have leveraged large language models (LLMs) to handle idioms across various tasks, e.g., idiom-containing sentence generation and idiomatic machine translation, little is known about the underlying mechanisms of idiom processing in LLMs, particularly in multilingual settings. To this end, we introduce MIDAS, a new large-scale dataset of idioms in six languages, each paired with its corresponding meaning. Leveraging this resource, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of LLMs’ idiom processing ability, identifying key factors that influence their performance. Our findings suggest that LLMs rely not only on memorization, but also adopt a hybrid approach that integrates contextual cues and reasoning, especially when processing compositional idioms. This implies that idiom understanding in LLMs emerges from an interplay between internal knowledge retrieval and reasoning-based inference.

1 Introduction

Idioms are a form of multi-word expression (MWE) in which a fixed combination of words functions as a single semantic unit.¹ Although their precise definition remains debated in linguistics, idioms are widely recognized as conventionalized expressions that often convey figurative meaning (Grant, 2004).

Due to their unique characteristics that distinguish them from common expressions, idioms have long posed challenges in NLP (Sag et al., 2002). While many recent studies (Lee et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024; Donthi et al., 2025) have begun leveraging large language models (LLMs) (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020) to tackle idiom-related tasks, there is growing concern that




Figure 1: We present a large-scale multilingual idiom dataset (MIDAS) to study the inner workings of LLMs in idiom processing, focusing on four factors: memorization, compositionality, contextual cues, and reasoning.

such approaches may be misguided: treating idioms as if they were ordinary expressions, without adequately accounting for their distinctive properties. To promote responsible use of LLMs in idiom processing and establish best practices, it is crucial to assess both the extent of their idiom understanding and the factors that shape it.

However, assessing idiom understanding in LLMs remains challenging due to limited resources (Liu et al., 2024). The lack of resources is especially prominent in multilingual contexts, although accounting for idioms across languages is critically important due to their culture-specific nature.

In addition, idioms are distinctive in that they lie at the intersection of fixed expressions—typically retrieved from memory (Gibbs, 1980)—and figurative ones, interpreted compositionally through metaphorical reasoning (Gibbs et al., 1997). Yet, little is known about how LLMs process idioms along these dimensions, particularly whether they rely on memorization, reasoning, or both.

To address these issues, we introduce **MIDAS** (Multilingual Idiom Dataset Across Six Languages), a large-scale dataset of idioms in six languages, each paired with a carefully curated figurative meaning. As illustrated in Figure 1, we

[†]Equal contribution. ^{*}Corresponding author.

¹Slang, proverbs, and sayings are representative examples of idioms, all of which are included in the scope of this study.

use MIDAS to conduct a comprehensive analysis of LLMs’ idiomatic competence and underlying mechanisms from multiple perspectives.

Specifically, we design a multiple-choice task where the model selects the correct meaning of an idiom, serving as our primary evaluation of idiom understanding. Based on this task, we first explore whether LLMs rely on memorization or compositional reasoning to process idioms, shedding light on how these models fundamentally handle idioms. To assess reliance on memorization, we separate memorized and unmemorized idioms using a continuation task that asks the model to complete the final word of an idiom. Finally, we assess compositionality, the extent to which meaning can be inferred from an idiom’s constituent parts, using the models themselves.

We take a step further by unveiling the influence of additional factors such as contextual cues and reasoning. The role of context in idiom interpretation is examined by comparing performance with and without example sentences. To probe the role of reasoning, we analyze models known for strong reasoning abilities and conduct targeted evaluations. Together, these experiments aim to uncover how LLMs interpret idioms across languages.

Experimental results reveal a notable performance gap between high-resource languages (e.g., English) and lower-resource ones (e.g., Korean). In addition, LLMs appear to adopt a hybrid approach, drawing on both memorization and compositionality. While sensitive to contextual cues, their use of reasoning remains inconsistent across languages.

2 Related Work

2.1 Idiom Datasets

Most idiom datasets are monolingual, focusing heavily on English (Saxena and Paul, 2020; Adewumi et al., 2022; Haagsma et al., 2020; Agrawal et al., 2018) and Chinese (Zheng et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2024; Tang, 2022), while resources for low-resource languages remain scarce (Wang et al., 2024; Shaikh et al., 2024; Igono and Ogudu, 2018; Donthi et al., 2025), highlighting a significant disparity between languages.

While multilingual idiom datasets exist, they exhibit limitations. LIdioms (Moussallem et al., 2018) covers only European languages with a limited number of instances. ID10M (Tedeschi et al., 2022) omits idiom meanings, focusing solely on identification. MAPS (Liu et al., 2024) similarly lacks

Datasets	# Instances (Language)	Meaning
ID10M	4,568 (EN), 1,301 (ZH), 1,229 (ES), 189 (NL), 188 (FR), 819 (DE), 452 (IT), 165 (JA), 648 (PL), 559 (PT)	✗
LIdioms	291 (EN), 114 (PT), 175 (IT), 130 (DE), 105 (RU)	✓
MAPS	424 (EN), 364 (ZH), 364 (DE), 420 (RU), 370 (BN), 371 (ID)	✗
IdiomKB	3,990 (EN), 8,643 (ZH), 270 (JA)	△
MIDAS	9,766 (EN), 10,097 (DE), 11,851 (ZH), 11,316 (KO), 8,051 (AR), 13,579 (TR)	✓
(Ours)		

Table 1: Comparison of multilingual idiom datasets, showing that MIDAS covers diverse languages, includes more instances, and provides corresponding meanings. △: The meanings of the idioms are predicted by LLMs.

written definitions and offers limited language coverage. IdiomKB (Li et al., 2024) relies entirely on GPT-3.5-generated meanings without human validation, raising concerns about reliability. To address these, we introduce MIDAS, a new idiom dataset from six typologically diverse languages. The comparison in Table 1 highlights the broader coverage and substantial size of MIDAS.


2.2 Idiom Processing of LLMs

Limited work has examined key factors in LLMs’ idiom processing, such as memorization and compositionality, with existing studies offering conflicting views. Liu et al. (2024) suggest a weak correlation between memorization and reasoning. In contrast, Miletic and Walde (2024) argue that models rely heavily on memorization when processing MWEs, drawing on findings from noun compounds (Li et al., 2022; Coil and Shwartz, 2023). However, it remains unclear whether such patterns apply to idioms, given their distinct linguistic properties. Khoshtab et al. (2025) evaluate idioms and similes under zero-shot and CoT (Wei et al., 2022) settings. They argue that MAPS-style² evaluation is insufficient and call for more challenging settings. While we also evaluate LLMs’ idiom understanding, our work introduces a new approach that distinguishes from the MAPS format. We explicitly assess idiom memorization and compositionality, analyzing their correlation with model performance.

3 MIDAS: A Multilingual Idiom Dataset Across Six Languages

To overcome the limitations of existing datasets and establish a robust foundation for multilingual idiom research, we present **MIDAS** (Multilingual Idiom

²A binary classification task to identify the correct meaning of an idiom in context.



ID	Idiom	Meaning	Sentence
3215	toot one's own horn	to boast or brag	Not to toot my own horn, but I already knew all that.
7714	snowball's chance in hell	Almost no chance of success	That small boat has a snowball's chance in hell of surviving ..

Figure 2: An example of MIDAS from its English subset. MIDAS contains idiom expressions, their corresponding meanings, and example sentences.

Dataset Across Six Languages, a comprehensive dataset spanning six typologically and culturally diverse languages: English (EN), German (DE), Chinese (ZH), Korean (KO), Arabic (AR), and Turkish (TR). MIDAS is a large-scale dataset containing 64,660 idiomatic expressions, each paired with a figurative meaning. Where available, example sentences are also included, refined through a process to minimize noise and ensure high quality. Figure 2 visualizes an example from the English subset of MIDAS. Statistics and representative examples of MIDAS can be found in Appendix A.1 and A.2.

Dataset construction Given the limited availability of well-structured idiom datasets, particularly in multilingual contexts, our initial step is to collect data from diverse sources via web scraping and extraction from PDF-based e-books. Since data sources varied by language, we had to apply specific pre-processing tactics per language to structure them into a unified format of *ID*, *idiom*, *meaning*, *sentence*. With the data fully organized, we focus on improving the *meaning* of our data as follows. First, we apply automated meaning refinement via LLMs to strip away extraneous details and noise, retaining only the core semantic content. This is followed by native speaker annotation to ensure the authenticity and accuracy of the results. This process was essential to ensure the high quality of the meanings, which served as golden labels throughout our evaluations. Furthermore, unlike many existing datasets that offer only a single form and meaning per idiom, we explicitly preserved all surface variations and semantic nuances. Form variants were stored as lists, while each distinct sense was assigned its own row. Additional details and data source information per language are provided in Appendix A.3 and Appendix A.4.

Algorithm 1 MCQ construction with shuffled answer choices

Require: A dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{MIDAS}} := \{(s_j, m_j)\}_{j=1}^N$, where i : an idiom, s : its surface form, m : its meaning

Ensure: An MCQ with three shuffled sets of answer choices

- 1: Encode: $\forall j, \mathbf{e}_{s_j} \leftarrow \text{Embed}(s_j), \mathbf{e}_{m_j} \leftarrow \text{Embed}(m_j)$
- 2: Sample: $k \sim \{1, \dots, N\}$
- 3: Compute two similarity-based score sets centered on i_k :
 $\sigma_{\text{surf}} := \{\cos(\mathbf{e}_{s_k}, \mathbf{e}_{m_j}) | \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, j \neq k\},$
 $\sigma_{\text{mean}} := \{\cos(\mathbf{e}_{m_k}, \mathbf{e}_{m_j}) | \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, j \neq k\}$
- 4: Sort σ_{surf} and σ_{mean} in descending order
- 5: Remove top 1% items from σ_{surf} and σ_{mean}
- 6: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{surf}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{mean}} \leftarrow$ retrieve top-2 items from σ_{surf} and σ_{mean} , and extract their corresponding meanings (m_j)
- 7: Let $\mathcal{O} := \{m_k\} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{surf}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{mean}}$
- 8: Initialize $\mathcal{Q} \leftarrow \phi$ (empty set)
- 9: **for** $t = 1$ to 3 **do**
- 10: **repeat**
- 11: $\mathcal{O}^{(t)} \leftarrow \text{Shuffle}(\mathcal{O})$
- 12: **until** $\text{index}(m_k \in \mathcal{O}^{(t)}) \neq \text{index}(m_k \in \mathcal{Q}), \forall \mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$
- 13: $\mathcal{Q} \leftarrow \mathcal{Q} \cup \{\mathcal{O}^{(t)}\}$
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **return** (s_k, \mathcal{Q})

4 Methodology

Using MIDAS, we design a series of evaluation to investigate the idiomatic competence of LLMs. The central task is to query LLMs in a multiple-choice question format, where the model is prompted to select the correct meaning of a given idiom. We further present auxiliary analyses to identify factors influencing idiom comprehension, specifically examining whether performance is driven by memorization or compositionality, as well as the impact of contextual understanding and reasoning ability.

4.1 Multiple-Choice Questions (MCQs)

Previous studies, e.g., DICE and MAPS (Mi et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024; Khoshtab et al., 2025), chiefly rely on binary classification, where models are tasked with identifying the correct meaning of an idiom in context from two candidates. However, this approach lacks scalability, as it relies on manually crafted problem sets. Furthermore, it poses a barrier to isolating and evaluating the specific contribution of context to idiom understanding. To this end, we adopt multiple-choice questions (MCQs) (Hendrycks et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2025) as our evaluation framework, based on the observation that idioms possess fixed, conventionalized meanings, which allow for an evaluation style akin to factual knowledge assessment.

MCQ creation We employ five-option MCQs, each comprising one correct meaning and four dis-

tractors: two derived from the idiom’s surface form and two from its figurative meaning. The goal is to test whether LLMs can identify the true meaning of an idiom or are overly influenced by surface-level or semantically related distractors. All options are drawn from MIDAS, whose wide coverage enables the selection of plausible and challenging ones.

The exact procedure of creating MCQs is specified in Alg. 1. The algorithm selects answer options based on their similarity to the surface form and meaning of the target idiom,³ based on cosine similarity between sentence embeddings.⁴

4.2 Continuation as Idiom Memorization

Unlike other expressions, idioms are lexically and syntactically fixed—changes in wording or structure often obscure their meaning or sound unnatural. Motivated by this, prior studies (Haviv et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024) suggest that memorized and unmemorized idioms can be distinguished by testing whether a model can predict an idiom’s final word given its preceding context. For example, if a model can predict “*lining*” given “*every cloud has a silver*”, it suggests that the idiom is memorized. We adopt a similar continuation approach to separate memorized and unmemorized idioms.

Filtering continuation candidates Not all idioms lend themselves to continuation-based evaluation. Some contain words that are trivially predictable or appear in contexts allowing multiple valid completions. Inspired by Haviv et al. (2023), we apply the filtering rules detailed in Appendix B.1 to exclude unsuitable idioms. We use only filtered idioms in the following, with their statistics reported in Appendix B.2.

Grouping by memorization We classify the filtered idioms into memorized and unmemorized groups. We input an idiom—excluding the last target word—in the user prompt, with the temperature set to 0.⁵ Since closed-source models do not offi-

cially support greedy decoding and may produce non-deterministic outputs even at temperature 0, we run each idiom five times and check whether at least one output starts with the target word’s first token. For open-source models, we verify whether the first token of the target word appears among the top five candidates by log probability. Finally, an idiom is labeled memorized if it passes the test; otherwise, unmemorized. In §5.1, we utilize the classified idioms to analyze the impact of memorization on idiom processing.

4.3 Measuring Compositionality Scores

While idioms are often characterized by their non-compositionality, the extent to which their meanings can be inferred from their constituents varies significantly. For instance, idioms such as “*kick the bucket*” offer little semantic transparency, while others such as “*every cloud has a silver lining*” exhibit partially inferable meanings through metaphorical reasoning. To probe this distinction, we define compositionality scores to each idiom, reflecting the degree to which its meaning is predictable, aiming to evaluate whether models engage in metaphorical reasoning when processing idioms.

Concretely, we utilize a prompt-based approach to elicit compositionality judgments directly from LLMs. Models are presented with an idiom, its meaning, and a definition of compositionality, and asked to rate how inferable the meaning is from its components on a 1–5 scale. For example, given the idiom “*paint a rosy picture*” and its meaning (“*to describe a situation optimistically*”), the model is requested to assign a score based on the contribution of its components—e.g., *paint*, *rosy*, and *picture*. A score of 5 indicates high compositionality, while a score of 1 denotes complete opacity. This method offers a scalable and interpretable way to approximate compositionality without relying on idiom embeddings or other complex techniques.⁶

4.4 Models

We employ several open- and closed-source models that explicitly support the six languages covered in MIDAS. We treat GPT-4o (OpenAI et al., 2024), DeepSeek-V3 (DeepSeek et al., 2025) as closed-source,⁷ Aya-Expansive-32B (Dang et al., 2024) and

³To prevent multiple correct or ambiguous choices, we exclude candidates that rank in the top 1% in similarity for both surface-form-based and meaning-based options.

⁴We employ `intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct` as our multilingual sentence embedding model, which is proven to excel in semantic similarity tasks (Enevoldsen et al., 2025). The model is available at <https://huggingface.co/intfloat/multilingual-e5-large-instruct>.

⁵We observe that closed-source models tend to generate unnecessary outputs when given only idiom expressions. To address this, we append the instruction “*You are a next-word prediction engine. Only return the single next word to complete the given expression*” in the system prompt.

⁶It also allows us to examine whether the model’s own perception of compositionality aligns with its actual idiom comprehension, as measured by performance on MCQ tasks.

⁷Although DeepSeek is open-source, we use its API due to resource constraints, limiting control to closed-source levels.

Model	EN	DE	ZH	KO	AR	TR
Aya-Expanse-32B	81.71	71.77	75.45	49.89	65.62	48.94
Qwen2.5-32B	83.71	73.94	93.35	51.39	71.25	40.31
DeepSeek-V3	90.34	83.94	95.65	55.64	75.53	62.52
GPT-4o	91.13	88.08	91.44	72.72	72.85	71.82

Table 2: Accuracy (%) of LLMs on MCQs constructed from MIDAS. Best scores per language are in **bold**.

Model	EN	DE	ZH	KO	AR	TR
Aya-Expanse-32B	80.36	56.43	92.95	36.59	30.54	32.66
Qwen2.5-32B	73.72	45.27	77.97	31.61	29.87	22.28
DeepSeek-V3	70.83	59.28	89.51	31.06	29.45	45.82
GPT-4o	67.18	49.53	70.26	26.13	27.25	35.08

Table 3: Memorization rate (%) across languages and models. Best scores per language are in **bold**.

Qwen2.5-32B (Qwen et al., 2025) as open-source. We also include QwQ-32B (Qwen Team, 2025), a reasoning-enhanced variant of Qwen2.5-32B, to compare its performance against the base model.

4.5 MCQ Evaluation

Experimental setups We use localized prompts that ask for idiomatic meanings in each language, phrased naturally and verified by native speakers. MCQs are tested in a zero-shot setting. To ensure robustness in evaluation, we enforce a strict protocol: each MCQ appears three times with shuffled choices, placing the correct answer in a new position each time. A model is deemed correct only if it selects the right answer in all three trials.

5 Experiments

In this section, we delve into a series of experiments based on the MIDAS dataset (§3) and the analysis techniques introduced in §4. Our goal is to explore the inner workings of LLMs in idiom processing, with particular attention to memorization, compositionality, context, and reasoning.

MCQ as a diagnostic framework MCQs serve as our primary tool for evaluating idiom understanding, applied across various cases tailored to test specific factors. Overall performance on the full MIDAS dataset is reported in Table 2. All models show a clear performance divide: they excel on English, German, and Chinese but fall behind on Korean, Arabic, and Turkish. While the overall ranking is GPT-4o > DeepSeek-V3 > Qwen2.5 > Aya-Expanse, there are exceptions, notably in Chinese, where Qwen2.5 outperforms GPT-4o. These results suggest that, for idiom processing, choosing a language-specific model can be better than

Model	Lang.	Acc. (✓)	Acc. (✗)	Δ Acc.
Aya-expanse-32B	EN	86.93	73.64	13.29***
	DE	76.47	67.32	9.15**
	ZH	76.25	61.66	14.59***
	KO	60.13	46.62	13.51***
	AR	72.55	64.71	7.84*
	TR	60.57	51.20	9.37**
Qwen2.5-32B	EN	93.40	77.57	15.83***
	DE	82.99	70.09	12.90***
	ZH	92.08	87.83	4.25*
	KO	62.17	51.17	11.00***
	AR	78.89	66.72	12.17***
	TR	54.40	44.43	9.97***
DeepSeek-V3	EN	95.74	91.04	4.70***
	DE	86.49	77.39	9.10***
	ZH	96.92	93.10	3.82**
	KO	67.11	54.33	12.78***
	AR	81.94	69.02	12.92***
	TR	73.86	60.65	13.21***
GPT-4o	EN	96.44	90.42	6.02***
	DE	92.20	85.64	6.56***
	ZH	93.43	80.03	13.40***
	KO	83.31	72.91	10.40***
	AR	80.98	73.87	7.11**
	TR	85.91	72.37	13.54***

Table 4: MCQ accuracy for memorized (✓) vs. unmemorized (✗) idioms. Δ Acc. is marked with * ($p < .05$), ** ($p < .01$), and *** ($p < .001$) based on Fisher’s exact test. The results reveal that memorization has a statistically significant impact on idiom processing.

relying on a single model across all languages.

5.1 Memorization

Memorization rate We first report the extent to which LLMs memorize idioms, as estimated by the method presented in §4.2. Table 3 indicates that models generally memorize idioms more in English, German, and Chinese than in Korean, Arabic, and Turkish. For most cases, Aya-Expanse demonstrates the highest memorization rate, while GPT-4o shows the lowest—except in Turkish. This implies that model size may not positively correlate with idiom memorization performance.

Memorization affects idiom understanding We conduct experiments using the two groups of idioms prepared in §4.2. As shown in Table 3, the memorized and unmemorized groups are imbalanced; to address this, we sample balanced subsets per group (see Appendix B.3 for sampling details).

Table 4 show that LLMs achieve notably higher accuracy on memorized idioms. However, the magnitude of this effect varies across models and languages. Qwen2.5-32B exhibits the largest gaps, often exceeding 10% points, peaking at +15.8% in English. GPT-4o and DeepSeek-v3 also benefit from memorization, though to a lesser degree.

By language, Korean and Turkish consistently show large gains from memorization (e.g., +13.5%

Model	Lang.	CS (✓)	CS (✗)	Δ CS
Aya-expanse-32B	EN	3.00	2.65	0.35 (13.21%)
	DE	3.13	3.00	0.13 (4.33%)
	ZH	3.14	3.00	0.14 (4.67%)
	KO	3.00	2.92	0.08 (2.74%)
	AR	3.56	3.25	0.31 (9.54%)
	TR	3.12	3.07	0.05 (1.63%)
Qwen2.5-32B	EN	2.40	1.68	0.72 (42.86%)
	DE	1.92	1.49	0.43 (28.86%)
	ZH	2.25	1.59	0.66 (41.51%)
	KO	1.52	1.22	0.30 (24.59%)
	AR	2.52	1.75	0.77 (44.00%)
	TR	1.78	1.53	0.25 (16.34%)
DeepSeek-V3	EN	2.87	2.29	0.58 (25.33%)
	DE	2.62	2.21	0.41 (18.55%)
	ZH	2.87	2.50	0.37 (14.80%)
	KO	2.33	2.05	0.28 (13.66%)
	AR	2.72	2.38	0.34 (14.29%)
	TR	2.48	2.19	0.29 (13.24%)
GPT-4o	EN	2.69	2.09	0.60 (28.71%)
	DE	2.45	1.99	0.46 (23.12%)
	ZH	2.18	1.86	0.32 (17.20%)
	KO	1.95	1.63	0.32 (19.63%)
	AR	3.17	2.78	0.39 (14.03%)
	TR	2.20	1.96	0.24 (12.24%)

Table 5: Average compositionality scores (CS) on a 1–5 scale for idioms answered correctly (✓) vs. incorrectly (✗). Δ CS: the absolute difference with relative increase (%) in parentheses, indicating how compositionality perception correlates with idiom comprehension success.

in Turkish for GPT-4o, +12.8% in Korean for DeepSeek-v3), suggesting that performance in these languages is more strongly driven by the ability to recall idioms. In contrast, memorization appears to have a smaller effect in Chinese, particularly for Qwen2.5-32B and DeepSeek-v3, where accuracy is high even on unmemorized idioms. This suggests that models may rely on other capabilities, such as compositional interpretation, contextual integration, or broader linguistic generalization, to compensate for the lack of direct recall.

In summary, memorization serves as a useful shortcut for idiom understanding, although its importance varies by condition. When memorization is unavailable, LLMs may instead draw on their general abilities such as contextual reasoning and semantic composition, explored in the following.

5.2 Compositionality

In this section, we employ the compositionality scores defined in §4.3 to estimate the influence of compositional reasoning in LLMs. The core assumption is that a positive correlation between performance and compositionality scores indicates that LLMs are leveraging compositional reasoning.

LLMs exploit compositional reasoning Idioms are generally considered non-compositional expressions, as reflected in the compositionality scores

assigned by LLMs, which tend to cluster toward the lower end of the 1–5 scale (typically between 1.5 and 3.0). Despite this trend, idioms answered correctly consistently receive higher compositionality scores than those answered incorrectly. These differences are statistically significant, as confirmed by the Mann–Whitney U test (Mann and Whitney, 1947) across all model–language combinations.

To examine this more closely, we present Table 5, which compares compositionality scores (CS) between the correct and incorrect response groups. Among all models, Qwen2.5-32B displays the most distinct separation between the two groups. In Arabic and English, correctly answered idioms obtain scores 44% (+0.769) and 43% (+0.715) higher than incorrect ones. In contrast, Aya-Expanse displays a much weaker pattern; in Turkish, the corresponding increase is only 1.6% (+0.049).

Among the six languages, English and Arabic consistently show the largest compositionality effects. In English, for instance, the difference in average scores between correctly and incorrectly answered idioms exceeds 0.6 for both GPT-4o and DeepSeek-v3, and reaches 0.715 for Qwen2.5-32B. Arabic similarly shows strong effects, with Qwen2.5-32B exhibiting a 44% increase in compositionality scores for correctly answered idioms. These results suggest that in certain languages, compositionality acts as a more salient signal for successful idiom interpretation.

Taken together, these findings suggest that models are more likely to correctly interpret idioms they internally perceive as more compositional—those whose meanings are more readily inferable from their constituents. This consistent pattern across models and languages highlights compositional signals as a useful heuristic for idiom interpretation.

5.3 Context

Having observed that LLMs tend to perform better on idioms that are either memorized or more compositional, a natural question arises: how do models leverage further contextual cues to infer idiomatic meanings? To explore this, we investigate whether providing usage examples can enhance model performance in the MCQ task.

We compare MCQ accuracy with and without example sentences drawn from MIDAS, restricting our analysis to idioms with annotated examples. Arabic is excluded, as it lacks example sentences (see Table 7 for details). To match dataset sizes across languages, we downsample all datasets to




Figure 3: Accuracy comparison with and without context across languages for Aya-Expanse-32B.

approximately 3,700 instances per language.

Figure 3 illustrates the effect of context—i.e., example sentences—for Aya-Expanse-32B, revealing that providing context substantially improves performance. This trend is consistent across all models we evaluated, suggesting that LLMs are indeed capable of using contextual information to interpret idiomatic expressions more accurately. Notably, Korean (KO) and Turkish (TR) exhibit the largest gains in accuracy, highlighting the potential of context to compensate for limited idiom exposure in low-resource language settings. Detailed configurations for the experiment are provided in Appendix C.2. Full results for all models are presented in Table 9 in Appendix D.1.

5.4 Reasoning

Since LLMs leverage figurative thinking and contextual cues, it is also plausible that reasoning could enhance the performance of idiom processing. To probe this question, we compare Qwen2.5 with its reasoning-augmented variant, QwQ, examining whether reasoning improves idiom understanding. We compare several conditions: (1) Qwen2.5 with and without chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting, denoted as **CoT** and **No-CoT**, respectively.⁸ (2) Qwen2.5 with the English zero-shot CoT prompt (**EN-CoT**). (3) QwQ with and without reasoning, denoted as **Thinking** and **NoThinking**.⁹ This setup facilitates direct comparison between different reasoning strategies applied to distinct LLMs, along with the impact of reasoning language.

The overall results are shown in Figure 4. We observe that the performance gain of CoT is not consistent across languages, which is similar to the findings of Khoshtab et al. (2025). Specifically, per-

⁸We add the translated phrase “Think step by step before you answer” to activate zero-shot CoT (Kojima et al., 2022).

⁹We rely on the recent NoThinking (Ma et al., 2025) method to control the reasoning behavior of QwQ.




Figure 4: Comparison of various reasoning methods applied to two Qwen variants, including QwQ, which is specialized for reasoning. **No CoT** shows Qwen’s performance without chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting, while **CoT** and **EN-CoT** represent results with CoT applied in the native language and in English, respectively. **NoThinking** and **Thinking** denote QwQ’s performance without and with its built-in reasoning capabilities.

formance drops are observed for English, German, Chinese, and Arabic, while Korean and Turkish show improvements. EN-CoT outperforms CoT in all languages except Chinese, but still falls short of No-CoT in German. This can be a guideline for the practice of applying CoT for idiom processing, where CoT, especially in English, may benefit lower-performing languages, but may hinder performance in languages that already perform well.

On the other hand, Thinking steadily outperforms other settings in all languages, possibly displaying the potential of reasoning models as the next generation breakthrough for idiom processing. Notably, NoThinking performs worse not only than Thinking but also than No CoT across all languages. This stands in contrast to the findings of Ma et al. (2025), which report NoThinking outperforming Qwen2.5-Instruct on seven math- and coding-related benchmarks. This discrepancy suggests that, although reasoning models acquire enhanced mathematical and coding capabilities, these gains may come with trade-offs akin to catastrophic forgetting observed during continual learning.

6 Connecting Findings to Prior Work

Recent studies have leveraged LLMs for idiom-related tasks such as example sentence generation (Lee et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024) and machine translation, including idiom-aware evaluation (Li et al., 2024; Khoshtab et al., 2025). However, these methods typically make use of minimal prompting, supplying only the idiom without its meaning. Based on our findings, we hypothesize that model effectiveness can be substantially elevated by incor-

Task	Meaning	Kendall's τ	Spearman's ρ	Pearson's r
Sentence Generation	✓	0.739	0.781	0.784
	✗	0.118	0.125	0.110
Machine Translation	✓	0.615	0.672	0.671
	✗	0.403	0.449	0.453

Table 6: Alignment between human evaluation and GPT-4o evaluation in two settings: where GPT-4o is given the idiom meaning (✓) and one where it is not (✗). Since GPT-4o achieves better automatic evaluation performance (i.e., aligns more closely with human judgments) when given the idiom meaning, we include the meaning information during model-based evaluation.

porating additional cues such as explicit meanings, contextual examples, or reasoning scaffolds. To illustrate this point, we present case studies demonstrating that providing an idiom’s intended meaning leads to measurable gains in performance. More related details are presented in Appendix E.

6.1 LLM-as-a-Judge on Idiom-Related Tasks

We begin by cautioning against the naïve reliance on LLMs for automatic evaluation of idiom-related tasks, as is commonly seen in previous studies (Li et al., 2024). Our findings in §5.3 provide strong evidence that supplying extra meaning information can improve LLM performance on idiom-related tasks—even when the models function as evaluators. To verify this, we compare GPT-4o’s performance as a judge under two settings—one with the idiom’s meaning provided and one without. For each idiom-containing sentence from two tasks (detailed in the next subsection), the model assigns a 1–3 score based on how well the sentence conveys the idiom’s intended meaning. We evaluate the effectiveness of the GPT-4o judge by examining its correlation with human-annotated scores.

Table 6 reports that the GPT-4o judge consistently produces scores more aligned with human annotations when provided with meaning information, suggesting that the conventional prompting setup fails to fully leverage LLMs for evaluating idiom-related tasks. We further emphasize the role of MIDAS as a foundation for providing meaning information and, accordingly, adopt the meaning-augmented judge in our subsequent experiments.

6.2 Idiom-Related Downstream Tasks

This section reaffirms the utility of MIDAS-provided meaning information by analyzing its effect on idiom-related downstream tasks. We focus on two tasks—**sentence generation** and **transla-**




Figure 5: Sentence generation scores (1–3), rated by the meaning-augmented GPT-4o. Aya and Qwen are evaluated with (✓) and without (✗) idiom meanings. Meaning information boosts performance.

tion—using two models (Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct and Aya-Expansive-32B) and two relatively low-resource languages (Korean and Turkish). The task-specific details are as follows:

- **Sentence generation:** We compare models’ ability to generate idiom usage examples with and without access to the idiom’s meaning.
- **Translation:** We translate to English under two settings: using either a GPT-4o-generated meaning or one from MIDAS.

In addition, we consider only idioms that (1) include at least one example sentence in MIDAS and (2) are consistently answered incorrectly across all three trials of the idiom MCQ task, indicating insufficient idiom understanding.

Figure 5 shows that in both languages, LLMs generate sentences that more accurately capture an idiom’s sense when its meaning is provided. A similar trend is observed in translation (Figure 12), where models consistently perform better with access to meaning information. These results underscore the importance of applying appropriate strategies for idiom processing with LLMs. Illustrative examples are provided in Appendix E.5

7 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce MIDAS, a large-scale multilingual idiom dataset used to evaluate the idiom understanding capabilities of LLMs across various factors. Our findings show that LLMs adopt a hybrid approach, combining memorization with compositional reasoning, and are sensitive to contextual cues—although the effect of reasoning remains inconsistent. In future work, we plan to develop methods for improved idiom processing.

Limitations

We outline several directions for future research to build upon this work.

Model Size Variability Our analysis focused on four distinct models with unique characteristics, but did not examine models of varying sizes within the same family. While this choice reflects our primary focus on examining whether the influence of various factors in idiom processing persists and generalizes across models with differing architectures and training regimes, it may be worthwhile to investigate the effects that arise solely from variations in model size. We encourage future work to investigate how the influence of such factors varies with model size within the same model class.

Language Coverage Although we cover six typologically and culturally diverse languages, this remains insufficient to capture the full diversity of the world’s languages, each with its own set of unique idioms reflecting its culture. Future works should expand the language set to include understudied and endangered languages.

References

- Tosin Adewumi, Roshanak Vadoodi, Aparajita Tripathy, Konstantina Nikolaido, Foteini Liwicki, and Marcus Liwicki. 2022. Potential idiomatic expression (pie)-english: Corpus for classes of idioms. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 689–696.
- Ruchit Agrawal, Vighnesh Chenthil Kumar, Vigneshwaran Muralidharan, and Dipti Sharma. 2018. [No more beating about the bush : A step towards idiom handling for Indian language NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. [Enriching word vectors with subword information](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, and 1 others. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Albert Coil and Vered Shwartz. 2023. [From chocolate bunny to chocolate crocodile: Do language models understand noun compounds?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 2698–2710, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Dang, Shivalika Singh, Daniel D’souza, Arash Ahmadian, Alejandro Salamanca, Madeline Smith, Aidan Peppin, Sungjin Hong, Manoj Govindassamy, Terrence Zhao, Sandra Kublik, Meor Amer, Viraat Aryabumi, Jon Ander Campos, Yi-Chern Tan, Tom Kocmi, Florian Strub, Nathan Grinsztajn, Yannis Flet-Berliac, and 26 others. 2024. [Aya expand: Combining research breakthroughs for a new multilingual frontier](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.04261.
- DeepSeek, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, and 181 others. 2025. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.12948.
- Sundesh Donthi, Maximilian Spencer, Om Patel, Joon Doh, Eid Rodan, Kevin Zhu, and Sean O’Brien. 2025. [Improving llm abilities in idiomatic translation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.03518.
- Kenneth Enevoldsen, Isaac Chung, Imene Kerboua, Márton Kardos, Ashwin Mathur, David Stap, Jay Gala, Wissam Siblini, Dominik Krzemiński, Genta Indra Winata, Saba Sturua, Saiteja Utpala, Mathieu Ciancone, Marion Schaeffer, Gabriel Sequeira, Diganta Misra, Shreeya Dhakal, Jonathan Rystrom, Roman Solomatin, and 67 others. 2025. [Mmteb: Massive multilingual text embedding benchmark](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.13595.
- Raymond W. Gibbs. 1980. [Spilling the beans on understanding and memory for idioms in conversation](#). *Memory & Cognition*, 8:149–156.
- Raymond W. Gibbs, Josephine M. Bogdanovich, Jeffrey R. Sykes, and Dale J. Barr. 1997. [Metaphor in idiom comprehension](#). *Journal of Memory and Language*, 37(2):141–154.
- Lynn Grant. 2004. [Criteria for re-defining idioms: Are we barking up the wrong tree?](#) *Applied Linguistics - APPL LINGUIST*, 25:38–61.
- Hessel Haagsma, Johan Bos, and Malvina Nissim. 2020. [MAGPIE: A large corpus of potentially idiomatic expressions](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 279–287, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Adi Haviv, Ido Cohen, Jacob Gidron, Roei Schuster, Yoav Goldberg, and Mor Geva. 2023. [Understanding transformer memorization recall through idioms](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 248–264, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2009.03300.
- Joseph Igono and U Ogudu. 2018. Translation of selected igbo proverbs and idiomatic expressions: Implications for curbing economic recession. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation*, 4(1):1–8.
- Paria Khoshtab, Danial Namazifard, Mostafa Masoudi, Ali Akhgary, Samin Mahdizadeh Sani, and Yadollah Yaghoobzadeh. 2025. [Comparative study of multilingual idioms and similes in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 8680–8698, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213.
- Jaechan Lee, Alisa Liu, Orevaoghene Ahia, Hila Gonen, and Noah Smith. 2023. [That was the last straw, we need more: Are translation systems sensitive to disambiguating context?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 4555–4569, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shuang Li, Jiangjie Chen, Siyu Yuan, Xinyi Wu, Hao Yang, Shimin Tao, and Yanghua Xiao. 2024. [Translate meanings, not just words: Idiomkb’s role in optimizing idiomatic translation with language models](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(17):18554–18563.
- Siyan Li, Riley Carlson, and Christopher Potts. 2022. [Systematicity in GPT-3’s interpretation of novel English noun compounds](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 717–728, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chen Liu, Fajri Koto, Timothy Baldwin, and Iryna Gurevych. 2024. [Are multilingual LLMs culturally-diverse reasoners? an investigation into multicultural proverbs and sayings](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2016–2039, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenjie Ma, Jingxuan He, Charlie Snell, Tyler Griggs, Sewon Min, and Matei Zaharia. 2025. [Reasoning models can be effective without thinking](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2504.09858.
- H. B. Mann and D. R. Whitney. 1947. [On a Test of Whether one of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger than the Other](#). *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 18(1):50 – 60.
- Maggie Mi, Aline Villavicencio, and Nafise Sadat Moosavi. 2024. [Rolling the dice on idiomaticity: How llms fail to grasp context](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.16069.
- Filip Miletić and Sabine Schulte im Walde. 2024. [Semantics of multiword expressions in transformer-based models: A survey](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:593–612.
- Diego Moussallem, Mohamed Ahmed Sherif, Diego Esteves, Marcos Zampieri, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2018. [LIIdioms: A multilingual linked idioms data set](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- OpenAI, :, Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P. Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, Aleksander Mądry, Alex Baker-Whitcomb, Alex Beutel, Alex Borzunov, Alex Carney, Alex Chow, Alex Kirillov, and 401 others. 2024. [Gpt-4o system card](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.21276.
- Qwen, :, An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, and 25 others. 2025. [Qwen2.5 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.15115.
- Qwen Team. 2025. [Qwq-32b: Embracing the power of reinforcement learning](#).
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#).
- Ivan A Sag, Timothy Baldwin, Francis Bond, Ann Copestake, and Dan Flickinger. 2002. Multiword expressions: A pain in the neck for nlp. In *Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing: Third International Conference, CICLing 2002 Mexico City, Mexico, February 17–23, 2002 Proceedings 3*, pages 1–15. Springer.
- Prateek Saxena and Soma Paul. 2020. Epie dataset: A corpus for possible idiomatic expressions. In *Text, Speech, and Dialogue: 23rd International Conference, TSD 2020, Brno, Czech Republic, September 8–11, 2020, Proceedings 23*, pages 87–94. Springer.
- Naziya Mahamdul Shaikh, Jyoti D. Pawar, and Mubarak Banu Sayed. 2024. [Konidioms corpus: A dataset of idioms in Konkani language](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 9932–9940, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Kenan Tang. 2022. [Petci: A parallel english translation dataset of chinese idioms](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09509*.

- Simone Tedeschi, Federico Martelli, and Roberto Navigli. 2022. [ID10M: Idiom identification in 10 languages](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 2715–2726, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaonan Wang, Jinyoung Yeo, Joon-Ho Lim, and Hansaem Kim. 2024. [Kulture bench: A benchmark for assessing language model in korean cultural context](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.07251.
- Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, and 1 others. 2025. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:95266–95290.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and 1 others. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Mingmin Wu, Guixin Su, Yongcheng Zhang, Zhongqiang Huang, and Ying Sha. 2024. [Refining idioms semantics comprehension via contrastive learning and cross-attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 13785–13795, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Ziyin Zhang, Zhaokun Jiang, Lizhen Xu, Hongkun Hao, and Rui Wang. 2024. [Multiple-choice questions are efficient and robust llm evaluators](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.11966.
- Chujie Zheng, Minlie Huang, and Aixin Sun. 2019. [ChID: A large-scale Chinese IDiom dataset for cloze test](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 778–787, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.




Figure 6: Statistics of our multilingual idiom dataset.




Figure 7: Language Distribution in our multilingual idiom dataset (n=70,909).

A Appendix: Dataset Details

A.1 Dataset Statistics

Table 7 and Figure 6 report the exact counts and visualizes the number of idiom instances and usage example sentences for each language in our corpus. Figure 7 illustrates the language distribution in our multilingual idiom dataset. Overall, the dataset consists of 70,909 instances covering 64,660 unique idiomatic expressions, with 39,696 instances containing at least one example sentence. Chinese (ZH) achieves full example coverage, while Arabic (AR) has no sentences available due to source constraints.

Language	Uniq. Idioms	Instances	w/ Examples
EN	9,766	11,806	8,367
DE	10,097	10,642	10,493
ZH	11,851	11,851	11,851
KO	11,316	12,673	3,706
AR	8,051	8,051	0
TR	13,579	15,886	5,279

Table 7: Statistics of our multilingual idiom dataset. Note that the number of instances can exceed the number of unique idioms, as idioms with identical surface forms but different meanings are represented as separate entries.

A.2 Dataset Example

Figure 8 gives one representative entry per language subset. Each idiom instance is given a unique ID, and if the idiom has many potential form variations (e.g. every dog has his/its day), the variations are stored as a list. If a single idiom expression is associated with multiple distinct senses, we contain them in separate rows and append “-1”, “-2” to the ID to distinguish them.

A.3 Dataset Construction

In our dataset construction, we serialize each language subset as JSON files following a uniform schema: ID, Idiom (a list of surface variants), Meaning, and Sentence (a list of usage example sentences).

English(EN) The English idioms included in our data are all extracted from documents categorized as “English idioms” and “English proverbs” in Wiktionary¹⁰ using BeautifulSoup¹¹, yielding 9,766 idioms. In the preprocessing step, we run custom Python scripts to correct common parsing errors, normalize whitespace and punctuation, and expand certain abbreviations (e.g. converting “sth” to “something”). All meanings are first refined with GPT-4o mini, after which a human annotator with a background in English linguistics verified the form and meaning.

German(DE) The German idioms in our dataset are primarily extracted from the e-book version of *Duden – Redewendungen*.¹² A total of 10,097 idioms are obtained using the PyMuPDF library.¹³ This library is used to extract the idiom expressions, their meanings, and example sentences based on font characteristics, text size, and x, y-axis coordinates. In preprocessing, we remove irrelevant content, correct German character encoding errors (e.g. garbled “ä”, “ü”), normalize whitespace and punctuation, merge hyphenated fragments, and expand abbreviations (e.g. “etw” to “etwas”) via automation where possible; any items that could not be

¹⁰https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Category:English_idioms

¹¹<https://pypi.org/project/beautifulsoup4/>

¹²<https://shop.duden.de/Duden-Redewendungen/9783411041152>

¹³<https://github.com/pymupdf/PyMuPDF>

Lang	ID	Idiom	Meaning	Sentence
EN	2542	every dog has his day; every dog has its day...	Everyone experiences success at some point in life.	...Well, every dog has his day; and I have had mine...
DE	1122	keinen Bock haben	auf etwas keine Lust haben	...Und darauf haben wir jetzt einfach keinen Bock mehr.
ZH	7072	锲而不舍	比喻有恒心，有毅力。	夫固谓一人锲而不舍，则行美 于本性矣。
KO	2394	누워서 떡 먹기	하기가 매우 쉬운 것	None
AR	512	استودعك الله	وداعاً! الله معك!	None
TR	734	Allah'tan	iyi ki	Allah'tan sessizdi sarhoşluğu.

Figure 8: Example idiom entries for each language. Each row consists of an ID, list of all possible idiom form variations, meaning, sentence (if available).

processed automatically are manually handled by a native German annotator. All meanings are then refined with GPT-4o, after which the annotator performed a final pass of semantic validation.

Chinese(ZH) We use the `idiom.json` file from the *chinese-xinhua* repository¹⁴, which provides structured idiom entries sourced from the Xinhua Dictionary. To maintain language balance across our dataset, we select 11,851 idioms that include example sentences. Definitions are refined using GPT-4o with a prompt designed to retain only the essential meaning—excluding component character breakdowns, synonymous idioms, or etymological details—while preserving the original phrasing.

Korean(KO) To construct the Korean dataset, we begin by extracting 11,316 Korean idioms from the *Korean Standard Dictionary*¹⁵ provided by the National Institute of Korean Language. Meanings are refined with GPT-4o to consolidate overly specific senses. A native Korean annotator then perform preprocessing—correcting spacing errors, merging variant forms, and standardizing punctuation—followed by a final semantic review to ensure fidelity and internal consistency.

Arabic(AR) From *A Dictionary of Arabic Idioms and Expressions*,¹⁶ we obtain 8,051 idioms (the source provides no usage examples) via the PyMuPDF¹⁷ library. This library is used to extract the idiom expressions, their meanings, and example sentences based on font characteristics, text size, and x, y-axis coordinates. Since the original

dataset only provided meanings in English, we use GPT-4o to translate these into Arabic, and the translated meanings are further refined and validated by native Arabic annotator. Given the prevalence of parsing errors in right-to-left scripts (e.g., broken ligatures, misplaced diacritics), the annotator perform targeted preprocessing—character-shape normalization, word-boundary correction—before completing the final linguistic verification.

Turkish(TR) Our Turkish dataset builds on the *Turkish Idioms and Proverbs*¹⁸ dataset from Kaggle, which was originally compiled using data from TDK (Türk Dil Kurumu, or Turkish Language Association)¹⁹—yielding 13,579 idioms. For idiom instances with example sentences, the original data do not include separate columns for the sentences; instead, they are embedded within the meaning texts, which have to be separated. The meanings are then refined by native Turkish annotators to ensure both semantic fidelity and stylistic consistency.

A.4 Legal and Ethical Considerations

For the German, Arabic, and Turkish subsets, native-speaking student annotators were recruited to perform data preprocessing and quality validation. The German annotator, a computer-science major, and the Arabic annotator, a data-science major, were selected to ensure adequate computational proficiency. Each annotator received a comprehensive PDF guide outlining the step-by-step pipeline for preprocessing our dataset and performing quality verification. The German subset required 9 hours, the Turkish 5 hours, and the Arabic 11 hours to complete; compensation was set

¹⁴<https://github.com/pwxcoo/chinese-xinhua>

¹⁵<https://stdict.korean.go.kr/main/main.do>

¹⁶<https://edinburghuniversitypress.com/book-a-dictionary-of-arabic-idioms-and-expressions.html>

¹⁷<https://github.com/pymupdf/PyMuPDF>

¹⁸<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/emreokcular/turkish-idioms-and-proverbs>

¹⁹<https://tdk.gov.tr/>

at approximately 1.5 times the legally mandated minimum hourly wage. To ensure strict compliance with copyright and licensing requirements, every dataset was procured exclusively through legally sanctioned sources or under open licenses. Additional licensing details are presented below.

English(EN) The English subset is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution–ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)²⁰. Accordingly, all entries are attributed to the Wiktionary and distributed under the same terms. Any modifications are clearly indicated, and derivative works are shared under the identical license.

German(DE) We have contacted Duden²¹ via email to request permission for public use of the dataset and are currently awaiting a response. The dataset will be made publicly available upon approval.

Chinese(ZH) The Chinese idioms are sourced from the *chinese-xinhua* GitHub repository, which compiles content from *zdic.net*. According to the site’s copyright policy,²² all dictionary materials are released under the CC0 1.0 Public Domain Dedication.

Korean(KO) The Korean dataset is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution–ShareAlike 2.0 Korea (CC BY-SA 2.0 KR)²³. Accordingly, all entries in the Korean dataset are attributed to the Standard Korean Language Dictionary (National Institute of Korean Language) and distributed under the same terms. Any modifications are clearly indicated, and derivative works are shared under the identical license.

Arabic(AR) Email correspondence with the publisher confirmed that reuse of the dataset is permitted under fair-dealing provisions.

Turkish(TR) Email correspondence with the original publisher (TDK) indicates that permission to publicly share the dataset could not be granted; consequently, the Turkish subset remains private.

²⁰<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

²¹<https://www.duden.de/>

²²<https://www.zdic.net/aboutus/copyright/>

²³<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0/kr/>

B Appendix: Memorization Details

B.1 Continuation Candidate Filter

- **Idiom length:** To account for linguistic differences (E.g., isolating languages such as English and agglutinative languages such as Korean), we apply language-specific thresholds: filtering out idioms with fewer than four words in English, German, and Chinese, and fewer than three in Korean, Arabic, and Turkish.
- **Context-target similarity:** We use FastText (Bojanowski et al., 2017) models of each language to compare the embeddings of context tokens with that of the target token. Idioms are excluded if any context token has a cosine similarity above 0.7 with the target.²⁴
- **Subsequence predictability:** For each model, we exclude idiom instances where the target word can be predicted from only 1–4 preceding tokens, rather than full context—that is, if the model can predict the target word w_n using subsequences such as w_{n-1}, \dots, w_{n-4} within the idiom, the instance is removed from the candidate set.

Formally, we exclude the idiom if

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \max_w P(w \mid w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) \\ &= \arg \max_w P(w \mid w_{n-k}, \dots, w_{n-1}) \\ &= w_n (\exists k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}) \end{aligned}$$

- **Overlapping context:** Some idioms such as “back in the *day*” and “back in the *game*” share an overlapping context. We exclude such instances from our continuation candidates.

B.2 Continuation Candidate Statistics

Table 8 shows the number of instances before and after applying our continuation candidate filtering. Note that the number of candidates varies by model, as each is subject to the third condition mentioned above.

B.3 Memorization Sample Statistics

The number of candidates and memorization rates varied across models and languages, resulting in imbalanced sizes between memorized and unmemorized groups. To mitigate potential bias from this imbalance, we perform per-model sampling based

²⁴We tested a small set of idioms in multiple languages to determine a threshold that generalizes across all languages.

Lang.	Original	GPT-4o	DeepSeek-V3	Qwen2.5	Aya-Expanse
EN	9,766	2,114	2,328	2,546	2,336
DE	10,097	4,853	5,250	6,173	5,440
ZH	11,851	6,787	6,495	7,935	8,200
KO	11,316	6,698	6,935	7,143	6,943
AR	8,051	2,708	2,815	2,733	2,780
TR	13,579	6,689	6,905	7,267	6,978

Table 8: Number of idiom instances before and after applying our continuation candidate filter.

on the smallest group, ensuring equal numbers of instances in the memorized and unmemorized sets for each language in our analysis of the correlation between idiom understanding and memorization (§5.1). For each model, we sample the same number of idioms from both groups—that is, 459 memorized and 459 unmemorized idioms for Aya-Expanse, 682 each for Qwen2.5, 681 each for DeepSeek-v3, and 731 each for GPT-4o.

C Appendix: Prompt Details

C.1 Zero-shot MCQ

This section presents the prompt formats used for the base MCQ task. Prompts consist of a question asking for the idiomatic meaning of a given expression, followed by five answer choices. We provide two examples of our prompt, the English version in Figure 9 and the Korean in Figure 10.

EN MCQ prompt
What is the idiomatic meaning of the idiom {idiom}? Choose from the options below.
1. {option 1}
2. {option 2}
3. {option 3}
4. {option 4}
5. {option 5}
Respond with ONLY the number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5). Do NOT add any extra text, punctuation, or explanation.

Figure 9: English version of our zero-shot MCQ prompt.

Other Languages (DE, ZH, AR, TR)

Prompts in other languages follow the same structure as above, with all text translated appropriately. Each language also includes localized phrasing for

KO MCQ prompt

관용 표현 {idiom}의 관용적 의미는 무엇인가요?
아래 보기 중에서 가장 알맞은 것을 고르세요.

1. {option 1}
2. {option 2}
3. {option 3}
4. {option 4}
5. {option 5}

반드시 숫자 (1, 2, 3, 4, 또는 5)만 입력하세요. 추가 설명이나 기호는 쓰지 마세요.

Figure 10: Korean version of our zero-shot MCQ prompt.

the idiom definition and instructions to ensure cultural and linguistic clarity.

C.2 Configurations for Context Experiments

This section presents the prompt formats used for the MCQ task under the *with-context* and *without-context* conditions. The same zero-shot MCQ prompt is given in the *without-context* condition while in the *with-context* condition, a usage sentence containing the idiom is additionally provided to the zero-shot MCQ prompt.

D Appendix: Additional Results

D.1 Accuracy with and without Context across Models

Table 9 reports the accuracy (%) for each model and language, with and without additional context. As shown, context consistently improves performance across all models and languages.

E Appendix: Case Study Details

E.1 Works that Utilize LLMs for Idiom Processing

Sentence Generation Works such as Lee et al. (2023) and Liu et al. (2024) use LLMs to generate context illustrating idiom usage, without explicitly providing its figurative meanings. This leaves the task entirely to the model’s internal understanding. Liu et al. (2024) highlights a critical limitation of this approach, noting that most examples generated by GPT-3.5 required manual revision due to

With Context prompt	
What is the idiomatic meaning of the idiom {idiom}? Choose from the options below.	
Here is a sentence that includes the idiom: {sentence}	
1. {option 1}	
2. {option 2}	
3. {option 3}	
4. {option 4}	
5. {option 5}	
Respond with ONLY the number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5). Do NOT add any extra text, punctuation, or explanation.	

Figure 11: Prompt for our **With Context** setting, where the **highlighted** part is added to our zero-shot MCQ prompt.

Model	Language	w/o Context (%)	w/ Context (%)
Aya-Expanse-32B	EN	82.43	92.77
	DE	72.48	87.16
	ZH	74.82	82.57
	KO	52.78	82.81
	TR	47.95	75.15
Qwen2.5-32B	EN	84.86	93.85
	DE	73.83	90.02
	ZH	92.58	94.63
	KO	51.46	82.14
	TR	37.34	69.21
DeepSeek-V3	EN	91.10	95.76
	DE	84.78	92.96
	ZH	95.44	95.87
	KO	57.93	83.73
	TR	63.06	88.45
GPT-4o	EN	91.53	95.22
	DE	88.29	94.63
	ZH	90.61	93.34
	KO	75.93	92.42
	TR	71.24	90.72

Table 9: Accuracy (%) of each model across five languages, with and without context.

incorrect idiom usage.

Machine Translation Works such as Li et al. (2024) and Donthi et al. (2025) leverage IdiomKB to enhance the machine translation performance of relatively smaller LLMs. Specifically they introduce KB-CoT, where the model is given a meaning of the target idiom extracted from IdiomKB to aid their translation process. However, all the included meanings in IdiomKB are entirely generated using GPT-3.5 without further verification efforts.

LLM-as-a-Judge Li et al. (2024) and Donthi et al. (2025) use LLMs not only to enhance machine translation but also to evaluate the results. For instance, Li et al. (2024) employs GPT-4 with prompts similar to Figure 17 in the without-meaning setting. However, this approach is problematic, as it relies solely on GPT-4’s internal knowledge—an issue highlighted by Table 2, which shows suboptimal understanding for lower-resource languages.

E.2 Number of Covered Instances

The number of idiom instances covered in our case study are presented in Table 10.

Model	Language	# Idioms
Aya-Expanse-32b	KO	982
Aya-Expanse-32b	TR	1044
Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct	KO	1068
Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct	TR	1417

Table 10: Number of covered idioms by model and language.

E.3 Machine Translation Results

Results comparing the quality of machine translated sentence with and without meanings are available in figure 12. While the gap between the two settings are not as big as it is in the sentence generation task,




Figure 12: Scores assigned by GPT-4o to translated sentences generated by the models, evaluated under two conditions: when the idiom’s meaning was provided from our dataset (✓) and when it was generated by GPT-4o (✗).

E.4 Prompt Details

This section introduces details about the prompts for our case study. Figure 13 includes both the

Korean and Turkish prompts that we use to generate example sentences of idioms with and without meaning. Figure 14 is the prompt that we use to generate the meaning of the idioms using GPT-4o, which we provide in our following translation setting. Figure 15 is the prompt we use to translate Korean or Turkish sentences including idioms into English sentences. Figure 16 and Figure 17 are prompts that we use to evaluate the generated or translated sentences using GPT-4o.

Sentence Generation Prompt

[Korean]
주어진 관용표현과 그 의미를 바탕으로 한국어 예문 한 문장을 작성하세요:

idiom: {idiom}
meaning: {meaning}

추가 설명 없이 예문만 출력하세요. 예문은 한국어로만 생성하세요.

[Turkish]
Verilen deyim ve anlamı temel alarak bir örnek cümle oluşturun:

idiom: {idiom}
meaning: {meaning}

Ek açıklama yapmadan sadece Türkçe cümleyi oluşturun.

[English (example)]
Based on the given idiomatic expression and its meaning, write one example sentence in Korean/Turkish:

idiom: {idiom}
meaning: {meaning}

Output only the example sentence without any additional explanation. The sentence should be generated in Korean/Turkish only.

Figure 13: Prompts to generate example sentences of idioms for each language. We additionally provide the highlighted meaning part in the setting where the model has access to meanings. Note that the English prompt is not used in our sentence generation setting and is provided for illustrative purposes only.

E.5 An Example of Generated Sentences

Figure 18 shows an actual example of Korean sentences generated by Aya-Expanse-32B with and without access to the meaning of the target idiom.

GPT-4o Meaning Generation Prompt

Given a **Korean/Turkish** idiom, please write the idiom's figurative **Korean/Turkish** meaning. Please note: idioms always express figurative meaning that differs from the literal meaning of their constituent words. Return the meaning only—no extra words.

Idiom: {idiom}
Meaning:

Figure 14: Prompt to generate idiom meanings with GPT-4o. The orange part differs depending on source languages.

Translation Prompt

"{idiom}" means {meaning}.

Given the above knowledge, translate the following **Korean/Turkish** sentence into English. Do NOT add any extra explanation.

Korean/Turkish: {sentence}
English:"

Figure 15: Prompt to translate sentences including idioms. The orange part differs depending on source languages.

Sentence Evaluation Prompt

You are an expert evaluator of idiom usage. Given an idiom, its figurative meaning, and an example sentence, rate how well the sentence reflects the idiom's figurative meaning on a scale of 1–3. Respond with only the number 1, 2, or 3.

1: None of the given figurative meaning is conveyed
2: Some of the given figurative meaning is conveyed
3: The given figurative meaning is fully and naturally conveyed

Idiom: {idiom}
Figurative meaning: {figurative_meaning}
Example sentence: {example_sentence}

Score (only number):

Figure 16: Prompt to evaluate the generated sentences using GPT-4o. We additionally provide the highlighted meaning part in the setting where GPT-4o has access to meanings.

Translation Evaluation Prompt

You are an expert in idiom translations. /* Task prompt */ Evaluate the idiom translation in the given English translation of a **Korean/Turkish** sentence. Focus on the idiom’s figurative meaning.

/* Evaluation Criteria */ 1 point: Ignores, mistranslates, or only translates the literal meaning of the idiom. 2 points: Conveys basic figurative meaning but may lack refinement or have minor imperfections. 3 points: Exceptional translation, accurately conveying figurative meaning, context, and cultural nuances.

/* Test Data */ Evaluate the following translation:

Korean/Turkish sentence: {src}

Idiom in the **Korean/Turkish** sentence: {idiom}

Idiom meaning: {meaning}

English translation: {tgt}

Evaluation (score only):

Figure 17: Prompt to evaluate the translated sentences using GPT-4o, following the format of evaluation from Li et al. (2024). We additionally provide the highlighted meaning part in the setting where GPT-4o has access to meanings. The orange part differs depending on source languages.

Example of Generated Sentences

ID: 609-1

Idiom: 걸음발 타다 [Georeumbal tada] (literally “to ride the walking foot”)

Meaning: 어린아이가 처음으로 걸음걸이를 익히다. (“A young child learns to walk for the first time.”)

Generated sentence without providing meaning:

그녀는 조용히 방에 들어와 걸음발을 타며 바닥에 쌓인 눈을 피해 조심스럽게 걸어갔다.

(In English: She quietly entered the room, [Georeumbal tada], and carefully walked to avoid the snow piled on the floor.)

With meaning provided:

우리 막내가 걸음발을 타기 시작해서 온 집 안이 웃음바다가 되었다.

(In English: Our youngest started to [Georeumbal tada], and the whole house was filled with laughter.)

Figure 18: Examples of Korean sentences generated by Aya-Expanse-32B with and without access to the meaning.