Metaphor, the Dictionary, and the Advanced Learner

Gill Philip
CILTA
Università degli Studi di Bologna
Piazza S. Giovanni in Monte, 4
40124 Bologna
Italy
g.philip@cilta.unibo.it

Abstract
Research into figurative language in foreign language acquisition has primarily focused on the receptive skills, where there is strong evidence to suggest that encouraging students to reflect on the metaphorical origins of figurative expressions makes learning and recall of vocabulary demonstrably more effective. However, very little has been said about the effects of this strategy on students' productive output. With some advanced learners' dictionaries now also including information about conceptual metaphor, it is important that the utility of this feature be examined in more detail. This paper examines different types of figurative language produced by advanced learners of English at an Italian university. It highlights the extent to which conceptual meaning is dependent on collocation and phraseology, and suggests how this can be treated more effectively in monolingual and bilingual dictionaries.

1 Introduction

Learners of English have never been so well provided for as now. Learner dictionaries for the EFL market have evolved enormously since the appearance of the first Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (Hornby ed. 1948). The advent of the corpus-driven generation with the COBUILD series (Sinclair ed.) in 1987 heralded a revolution in the way learner dictionaries were designed and compiled, with the availability of large corpora making it possible to extract more detailed lexical and syntactic information than ever before. One of the most radical departures from traditional lexicographic practice was COBUILD's introduction of senses ordered by frequency of occurrence in the language rather than the established 'etymology first, meaning later' approach. In doing so, the ubiquity of non-literal and phraseologically-determined meanings became impossible to ignore. This lead to a greater emphasis on collocation and lexical combination, with more and more example phrases incorporated into the definitions.

As corpora have continued to expand in size, so too have they grown in influence, and it is now well-nigh impossible to find a major dictionary which does *not* claim to draw its lexicographic information from corpora. A highly competitive and lucrative market for 'bigger and better' advanced learners' dictionaries has opened up, with commercial rivalry between

the major EFL publishing houses ensuring that each new edition produced is (even) more definitive than the previous one. The corollary of this is that, in effect, language corpora have made it possible for learners' dictionaries to be used as tools in the language encoding process, rather than simply remain as reference works for decoding.

The ability to identify a word or expression as being figurative is one of the features that sets the proficient user of English apart from other learners, and the ability to use such expressions in speech and writing is essential to those who require English for academic or professional purposes. It is therefore apt that production-oriented advanced learners' dictionaries should take an interest in facilitating this process. One of the more recent innovations in advanced learners' dictionaries has been the move to mark metaphorical and figurative language more explicitly. This is justified by research carried out in recent years by various scholars, which demonstrates that new language items are learned and recalled more effectively when their metaphorical underpinnings are made explicit (Boers 2000a, 2000b; Charteris-Black, 2002; Deignan et al., 1997; Holme, 2004). Having senses marked as figurative in a dictionary entry is extremely helpful for learners because they are inclined to interpret language literally unless prompted to do otherwise, this being a consequence of teaching practices that favour concrete, literal, compositional language over that which is abstract, figurative, and/or non-compositional.

At present, the only advanced learners' dictionary to have ventured a step further by introducing conceptual metaphor (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980), is the Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners (MED) (see Moon, 2004 for full discussion). The presentation consists of a series of metaphor boxes in which the metaphor, e.g. LIFE IS A JOURNEY, is explained, followed by a set of illustrative examples. The decision to incorporate conceptual metaphor into the dictionary, irrespective of the commercial value of this novelty, is based on pedagogically sound principles: languages use conventionalised expressions and metaphorical targets in ways which do not always translate, so by drawing attention to some of the more central concepts, the learner is made aware of any possible mismatches and can take steps to avoid using conceptually inappropriate language.

Unfortunately, conceptual knowledge of this sort is less easy to pin down than we might like to think, and it does not follow that use of an appropriate concept will result in the use of an appropriate or acceptable expression. This paper reports continuing research on the written production of figurative language by advanced (C1) learners of English (Philip, 2005a, 2005b, 2006). It investigates the interplay between phraseology and figurative meaning in free-writing tasks, where students are given no constrains on their language, and in semi-structured writing tasks, where they are provided with obligatory key-words to incorporate into their texts. The emerging tendencies reported here have implications for the presentation of both lexicosyntactic and conceptual information in advanced learners' dictionaries designed with language encoding in mind.

2 Lexis versus concept

Conceptual metaphor has gained increasing acceptance in EFL pedagogy in recent years, as the theory itself filters down into teacher training programmes and reference works. How-

ever, the incorporation of the theory into commercially-available products[1] tends to regurgitate the same example phrases as those found in the theoretical literature, with little evidence of critical evaluation having taken place. Exceptions to the rule – examples which superficially resemble others in the conceptual group but do not in fact belong there – are never taken into consideration. The resulting impression, in line with the theoretical standpoint, is to suggest that the conceptual targets are clearly defined and can be drawn on to create new expressions. This point will be investigated in 3 below, yet it is worth pointing out at this stage that psycholinguistic experimental research (Glucksberg, McGlone, 1999) challenges the belief that conceptual mappings such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY do in fact structure metaphorical language comprehension, concluding that "there is no good reason to suppose so, and very good reasons to suppose not." (ibid.: 1555).

The presentation of conceptual metaphor in teaching materials differs little from the established presentation of other 'interesting' vocabulary, especially idioms, and a number of parallels can be drawn between the two. In the first place, and in contrast to the movement towards the use of authentic text and corpora, scant regard is given to their pragmatic function and to their use in text. As the principal aim is the introduction of new vocabulary, it is usual to find lists of expressions accompanied with glosses and (often) images, followed by gap-fill or multiple-choice exercises in which the new language item is 'contextualised' and its meaning fixed. Context, in this case, is generally limited to the short excerpts used in the exercises, and the pragmatic function is rarely taken into consideration. A further similarity is the preference for thematic presentation which focuses on internal features of the expressions rather than on the phraseological meaning. For example, idiom studies are often based around key-words such as parts of the body, or colours, or sport, regardless of whether the meanings conveyed by the phrases share any common ground. In contrast, *ad hoc* vocabulary teaching in a classroom setting typically revolves around expressions which are semantically related but differ in the precise shade of meaning conveyed (*spot on, exact, exactly/just right, precise*, etc.), or share phraseological features (e.g. *to be caught red-handed, to be caught in flagrante delicto, to be caught out, to be caught in the act*, and so on); and should there be a specific focus on figurative or idiomatic language, again groupings will be based on semantic and phraseological similarity (and not on the basis of shared or related key-words). This happens when new vocabulary, encountered in texts, requires explanation and elaboration, and it is more helpful to provide alternative expressions that feed back into the stimulus rather than depart further from it. By way of example, the phrase *to hit the nail on the head*, "to say something that is exactly right or very true" (MED), is more likely to be explained by semantic similarity, and therefore by references to loosely related expressions such as *to put your finger on something* or *to pinpoint something*, than by reference to idioms whose only relation is by key-word, such as *to change tack* or *to have a screw loose*.

The presentation of conceptual metaphor in both language reference works and vocabulary acquisition exercises bears more of a resemblance to key-word presentation than to se-

---

[1] See the downloadable lesson plans on OneStopEnglish.com, in addition to the metaphor study pages in MED and related products (Underhill 2002).

mantic similarity, because the focus is firmly placed on the lexical composition of the expressions, despite the fact that, as conventionalised phrases, they are largely delexicalised. This raises two main issues. The first, supported by Glucksberg and McGlone's (1999) study, is that the semantic-conceptual link is excessively, and perhaps misleadingly, emphasised. By drawing attention to the component words rather than the meaning of the whole, and by stressing analogies which may well be artificially created, the expressions can easily be perceived as being considerably more figurative than they actually are. This distortion of meaning can be a hindrance to the language acquisition process. Although research has shown that investigating the motivation of metaphorical and idiomatic expressions makes their learning and recall more effective (Boers 2000b; Charteris-Black 2002; Deignan et al. 1997), this advantage does not seem to be transferred to productive language use. In fact, learners are apparently reluctant to use language which they know or perceive to be metaphorical (Philip 2005a, 2005b), with all but the most proficient of users actively avoiding it (ibid.).

The second point that arises is bound up with the identification of the concept itself, and the ways in which it is verbalised. Concepts are amorphous entities. Although they appear to generate linguistic metaphors such as those cited by Lakoff and his colleagues, it is more accurate to say that they are defined linguistically, as the data presented in this paper demonstrates. In other words, collocational knowledge helps to shape concepts, and if that collocational knowledge is incomplete or inaccurate, so too will be the expression of those concepts. This is not obvious to the native speaker, whose ability to create anomalous language is limited, but the analysis of learner errors lends considerable support to this claim.

Learners take their L1 conceptual knowledge with them when they set about acquiring their new target language. Some of these concepts will be found to be inappropriate or irrelevant to the TL, an others will be seen to transfer successfully. Once a student recognises which concepts are to be avoided, because they generate misunderstanding and incomprehension rather than meaning, a degree of *conceptual fluency* (Danesi, 1004: 454) can be said to have been reached. But even if inappropriate concepts can be discarded from the learner's TL repertoire, it is somewhat more difficult to filter through appropriate concepts to find equally appropriate linguistic expressions. The exploitation of a concept which is acceptable in the TL "does not always lead to the correct ... linguistic form" (Charteris-Black, 2002: 125). This happens even when no grammatical errors are present, as in Example 1,[2] where the student has simply transferred the conventional Italian metaphor of *birth* representing beginnings, in a context where it is not appropriate in English[3] (but perfectly normal in Italian). The error is not conceptual, because English too can use *birth* metaphorically to describe beginnings; it is simply a strange collocation, as neither *conflict* nor *discord* are typical collocates of *birth*.

(1)   If you live in a condominium *conflicts and discords* can be *born* with others.

---

[2] The data consists of an 80 000 word corpus of advanced learner (C1) writing assignments compiled by the author between 2003 and 2005. Any errors in the examples are original; all emphasis is editorial.

[3] BNC corpus data indicates that this metaphorical sense is used with regard to nations, businesses, organisations, political movements, social trends and academic disciplines. It is not used for emotional states.

If 'conceptual' errors are in fact linguistic, or more specifically, collocational, in nature, then this has serious implications – not only for the role of conceptual metaphor in foreign language pedagogy, but also for the theory itself. It puts a question mark over a notion that is repeatedly put forward in the conceptual metaphor literature, namely that concepts generate new linguistic metaphors. The evidence suggests otherwise: it appears that general conceptual sets are only partially and selectively exploited. Rather than being governed by abstract thought, the intended meaning of a figurative expression is highly dependent on phraseology and collocation. The following sections present a variety of errors and oddities in learner writing in an effort to demonstrate the extent to which metaphorical language is at the service of phraseology, and how learners' dictionaries and other reference works can address this more effectively.

3 Conceptual mismatches in learner English
3.1 Translating literal and figurative meanings

Italian and English share a great many linguistic expressions, including proverbs, metaphors and idioms, and these are often transferred word-for-word from one language to the other. While the existence of such correspondences aids the language acquisition process, it can also pose a problem as far as language production is concerned. Similarities between L1 and TL can easily lull learners into a false sense of security, making them think that the languages are more alike than is in fact the case, and the result is for translationese to creep into their TL writing and speaking. Italian-English interlanguage is peppered with expressions which reflect concepts which are conventional in both languages, but whose structure clearly reflects L1 norms of phraseology and lexis which makes them unacceptable, perhaps even incomprehensible, in the TL. Example 1 (above) provides one illustration of this type of language transfer; Examples 2 and 3 show further instances.

(2)   It might be better if we *slacken* our *way of life* and if we learn from the nature!
(3)   Summing up, I prefer to live in a city like Bologna because of the *many-sided opportunities* that I can find in it.

The strange collocations highlighted in these examples can be traced back to the students' limited competence in using (bilingual) dictionaries, coupled with a more general lack of awareness of the difference between literal, concrete senses and figurative ones. Put simply, non-linguists (such as these students, none of whom are language majors) are not particularly sensitive to notions of sub-senses, including figurative ones. When it comes to finding a translation, therefore, they are unlikely to look for a specifically figurative meaning, as it may not have occurred to them that this is indeed what is required. Examples 1, 2 and 3 all involve errors of this sort. Certainly, *slacken* (Ex. 2) is clearly a mistranslation of *allentare*, whose its literal meaning "to slacken or loosen" (collocating with *screw*, *knot*, etc.) is translated differently to its figurative meaning, "to slow down or relax". Similarly, *many-sided* (Ex. 3) is the literal translation of *poliedrico*, whose figurative meaning, "many and varied", requires a translation such as *(great) variety of*, because *many-sided* collocates with things which have sides, aspects or faces, including *questions*, *debates* and *problems*, but not *oppor-*

tunities. It should be stressed that the students here have simply failed to identify the appropriate translations, which are to be found in the bilingual dictionary that most of them consult (Ragazzini, 1995). It is therefore evident that students need to be made more aware of figurative meanings in conventional language so that they can make informed choices when consulting a dictionary, and to make them think twice before assuming that the literal translation and the non-literal one will be the same.

3.2 The phraseology of conventional metaphor

While translation errors of the type discussed in 3.1 tend to fade out of student writing as proficiency increases, less glaring collocational oddities persist. This is true of the most conventionalised, formulaic strings as well as other, more compositional chunks. Again, language interference lies at the heart of the problem, but attributing all errors to interlanguage is somewhat simplistic and not particularly illuminating. What is evident is that phraseological patterns get distorted at some point between recognition and recall. The memorisation process favours salient meanings over less salient ones, meaning that key-words will be recalled more easily than the overall phraseology will. Boers' studies on recall of idiom (Boers, 2000a, 2000b; Boers, Stengers, 2005) confirm this indirectly. By focusing on the salient concepts, the 'image' of an idiom is remembered more easily, as are the key-words which relate directly to the image. However, this is not enough to ensure the correct reproduction of the entire phrase, even if it does permit recall of specific vocabulary items in gap-fill exercises. Conventionalised expressions are not expressed by salient concepts alone, but in combination with regular phraseology, as Examples 4-7 demonstrate.

(4)   And we can see that the press in the U.S. *take an opposite standpoint* from her.
(5)   *Useless to say* that the mission of a journalist is to tell the public the truce.
(6)   I am perplexed and bewildered *in front of* the two different versions that Sgrena and US soldiers gave of that day.

While one can *take a different* or *opposite view*, or *have a different standpoint*, English does not talk about *opposite standpoints*, although Italian ostensibly does (*un punto di vista opposto*). The differences between the 'permitted' collocational patterns and that used in Example 4 are not conceptual or semantic, but linguistic, and can only be explained by the fact that "linguistic behaviour among users of a language is highly stereotypical, even in matters of fine detail." (Hanks, 2004: 246). The formula *needless to say* (Ex. 5) is a further case in point. The student has translated the expression into one in Italian which has the same meaning, function and syntactic position, *inutile dire*, but then back-translated *inutile* with *useless*, its more common translation, rather than *needless*. A matter of fine detail indeed, but enough to impede the fluency of the extract.

A similar tactic involving the translation of a syntactic pattern is evident in Example 6. This time, the author has opted for familiar phraseology, writing *in front of* to express the Italian *di fronte a*, whose superficial similarity belies an important difference in meaning (*di fronte a* means "opposite", not "in front of"). English uses neither term in the type of context found in the example, preferring *confronted with* or *faced with*. The important point is that

although these students could have obtained the detailed information they needed here, they either did not look for it, or were unsuccessful in their search. This is obviously a problem for teachers and lexicographers alike, because if students believe they already know how to use the language and therefore do not feel the need to consult a dictionary, the detailed information contained there is effectively lost. What remains is a fairly abstract impression of what the correct form should look like, but not the form itself.

3.3 Elaborating on concepts

If abstract, conceptual information is easier to remember than the wording, what happens when students pick up on a concept and make use of it in their writing? Do they manage to say what they mean, and to what extent? The previous subsections have illustrated how concepts and ideas are bound up with linguistic form, making it all too easy for problems to arise in their use by non-natives. This of course does not prevent learners from trying to express themselves through figurative language, though it is true to say that this occurs rather infrequently.

When learners do make use of metaphor, it tends to be recognisably anchored in the L1 linguistic system. This may mean that a concept is used inappropriately in the TL, but that the student has no way of knowing this until s/he has been corrected. Collocation fixes concepts. Blue is the colour of the sea and of the sky – for an English speaker – but the sky is *azzurro* and the sea *blu* for an Italian. At a more abstract level, as well as referring to things that are physically soiled, *dirty* is used to describe dishonesty, unfair dealings, negative evaluations of sex, and bad things in general. These abstract categories are informed by collocates such as *jokes*, *words*, *business*, and *lies*, but it is impractical to include an exhaustive list of collocates in a dictionary entry; abstract categories suffice. Yet having abstracted out from collocation to concept, there is nothing to suggest that *dirty* cannot normally be used in the following context.

(7)   And in the end one of the biggest problems that affects big towns is the criminality that frightens especially women and people in general. It's a plague that sometimes is connected to drugs, traffic and many other *dirty interests*.

The problem here is not really one of communicative failure, but the creation – intentional or otherwise – of a stylistic effect which is contextually and stylistically inappropriate. By grouping together *drugs* (dirty = illegality), *traffic* (dirty = literal) and *interests* (dirty = any of the established senses, including sexually deviant, illegal, morally questionable), a slightly comical zeugma is created. The only real offender in the group is the collocation of *dirty* with *interests*, which is a compositional pairing in English, and so open to variable interpretation. In contrast, the conventional Italian collocation which this student has translated, *interessi sporchi*, is typically linked to the corruption sub-sense of *sporco* "dirty". It needs to be reiterated that the problem lies at the level of collocation and word combination, and not in the conceptual range of the word in question. This is especially true when, as here, the concept is mapped differently in the L1 and TL. Offering conceptual information in a monolingual dictionary shifts the emphasis from words to ideas, and as ideas are principally linked

to knowledge created in and through the L1, it is the L1 conceptual base, not a new TL one, that is activated.

Another illustration of the centrality of collocation to figurative meaning can be found in the following extracts (Ex. 8-10) from a single text, in which the student has developed the idiom *to fly the nest* "to leave the parental home", which appeared in the stimulus text for the assignment. Although the context indicates beyond any doubt that the *birds* and *nests* here are metaphorical, the phraseology does little to help this interpretation. The idiomatic meaning is tied to a particular wording, and it can be seen that variations to the vocabulary and syntax pull the metaphorical meaning back towards the literal one.

(8)   Statistics shows the fact that more than half of men whose age are 20 to 24 *still remain in their nests*.

(9)   Furthermore, they *leave from their nest* in their later age ...

(10)   In the very near future *male migrant birds* start looking for their *new nests* for leaving from their parents'.

Examples of this sort are precious because they are comparatively rare. Learners do not on the whole tend to venture forth into the realm of creative language in this way, exploiting and elaborating upon a metaphor that is viewed as being central to the argument. Students are generally fearful of not succeeding in expressing what they mean or, even worse, making fools of themselves. When learners do produce figurative language, some of the goings-on inherent in the language acquisition process become visible. In the first place, and despite the efforts of EFL pedagogy to thwart the practice, students will always fall back on their L1 (and any other languages in which they are already proficient), and will prefer bilingual dictionaries over monolingual ones for TL encoding (Frankenberg-Garcia, 2005). Yet although bilingual dictionaries provide comprehensive treatment of figurative language and phraseology, learners are not very good at finding the information they need. They are often unaware that the language they are producing or translating is not literal, which means that they will not look beyond what they think they need – one of the first translation equivalents listed in the entry, irrespective of the labels accompanying it. Even when students are aware that they are using figures of speech, as in Example 7, it is simply not feasible for paper dictionaries (whether monolingual or bilingual) to provide information that is specific and exhaustive enough to ensure that the encoding adheres fully to the accepted TL norms.

3.4 Key-words, collocates, and concepts

It has been shown in the previous subsections that learner errors are principally signalled by faults in the phraseology. Even if the concept behind the words is appropriate, the anomalous wording can prevent the intended meaning from coming across. Learners have difficulty in remembering the syntactic patterns that accompany the core collocations in figurative language chunks, because more emphasis tends to be placed on content words than on structure. In order to investigate the relationship of salient content words and their conventional syntactic realisations, it is helpful to have multiple texts which share common lexical features. This can be achieved by devising guided creative-writing tasks which favour phraseological composition.

The phrasebuilding exercise consists of a series of key-words which constitute the structure a story: after a party on a rainy night, the narrator returns home, hears noises and believes there is an intruder in the house. The keywords and collocations, including *wine + party*, *nerves, footsteps + stairs*, all attract at least some conventionalised phraseology, yet can also be used compositionally. The students had to write their version of the episode using all the words provided, without changing the form of the lemma (plurals must remain plural, tenses of verbs cannot be modfied). Some extracts from these tasks are reported in this subsection; others are examined in Philip (2005a, 2005b, 2006).

As a general observation, the less proficient a student's English, the more likely s/he is to have used the keywords compositionally, with the better students producing acceptable collocations and phrases, albeit with varying degrees of accuracy. Examples 11-17 illustrate the range that *wine + party* elicited, from the purely compositional (Ex. 11, 12) through the incorporation of *drink* as a further collocate triggered by the context (Ex. 13, 14), the compound nouns *wine party* and *wine cellar* (Ex. 15-16), and the conventional. metaphor *flow like a river* (present also in Italian – *scorrere come un fiume*) (Ex 17).

(11)   Hector know as giving cool *party*, nice *wine* delicious food, candels anywhere,

(12)   He decided to go back to the *party*: his car and some *wine* were still there.

(13)   Yesterday, we drank a lot of *wine* at the *party*.

(14)   I had a *party* in my house and drank too much *wine*.

(15)   Because I went to the *wine party* with my colleagues.

(16)   This morning I went to a *wine* cellar, to buy 50 liters of Sangiovese for the *party*
...

(17)   There was a strange *party*, the *wine* was flowing like a river

The reason why the morphology of the key-words was not to be altered was to aid the construction of formulaic phrases bound to particular forms of the lemma. *Nerves* was inserted as a case in point, to prioritise those expressions which require the plural, and which would have been the contextually-relevant ones for the story, including *get on one's nerves*, *be a bundle/bag of nerves, calm one's nerves, nerves of steel*. Although some attempt was made to recreate expressions of this type, and appropriate collocates were often used, only two students succeeded in producing a version whose internal phraseology was correct (Ex. 18, 19).

(18)   She just *gets on my nerves*.

(19)   I began to be *a bundle of nerves*.

Nerves, in fact, proved to be surprisingly problematic, with several students later reporting that they had not fully understood what the word meant. In other words, they had inferred (correctly) from the context that it must refer to emotional states, but had not bothered to check. By not consulting the dictionary, they did not discover new phrases with *nerves*, resorting instead to half-remembered forms and translation. One student even used *calm one's nerves* to mean "stop being rowdy", rather than in its established sense of "relax after a shock or trauma".

This observation brings us back to the central issue. Students bring their L1 conceptual knowledge with them when they work in the TL, and if the languages in question share common cultural and linguistic ground, this can be both a help and a hindrance. Italian students of English find that the languages are lexically similar, because of the proliferation of Latinate terms in English, and this can lead them into thinking that the 'same' word not only has the same meaning and sphere of reference, but that it also attracts the same phraseological patternings. Because the details are fine, they can easily be missed because they are not essential for comprehension. This makes it likely that the TL idea, or concept, is assimilated into the students' existing L1 knowledge, thus increasing the probability of imperfect recall at a later stage. It may also be that this similarity makes students feel it unnecessary to consult a dictionary (they 'know' the meaning already); they certainly seem reluctant to take the time to double-check meanings and the precise renderings of phrases. And because many students manage to get by much of the time by falling back on translation and approximate renderings of what they believe they have seen, it is only when they reach advanced level that they appreciate the value of phraseological precision, at which stage a great deal of *un*learning has to take place.

5 Conclusions

The data examined here suggests that language pedagogy needs to address non-literal language of all sorts in much more detail. The problem with figurative language is that it is "a principle of meaning extension whose destination cannot always be predicted" (Holme 2004: 97). So while a broad coverage of conceptual norms, such as that intended in MED's inclusion of conceptual metaphor boxes, is indisputably helpful as far as comprehension is concerned, production requires a different focus.

Many scholars (Boers 2000a, 2000b; Charteris-Black, 2002; Deignan et al., 1997; Henderson, 2000; Holme, 2004; Lazar, 1996) show that by explicitly teaching about metaphor and figurative meanings, students' awareness of the phenomenon is heightened, vocabulary retention is increased and comprehension improved. But there is a flip-side to the coin because this emphasis on content can be counter-productive as far as production is concerned. If conventional, non-compositional expressions are forcibly broken down into their component parts, the content words receive disproportionate attention, and their interaction with the rest of the chunk is passed over. Figurative and metaphorical senses of words are signalled by their syntactic patterns, so the correct wording is essential if the meanings are to be conveyed successfully. Learners therefore need to have their attention drawn to phraseology to at least the same extent as they are currently encouraged to examine semantic content.

I propose two possible courses of action to alleviate the problem. Firstly, bilingual dictionaries would do well to adopt some of the innovative features that monolingual learners' dictionaries have introduced, namely focus boxes concentrating on collocation patterns, especially those involving delexical verbs, and figurative language. This would make it possible to highlight mismatches at a language-specific level, which monolingual dictionaries cannot contemplate doing. Secondly, rather than place conceptual metaphor under the target domain headword, it may be useful to re-think the positioning (c.f. Moon, 2004: 208-9), locating the

information in the decoding position under the source headword. This would re-position the emphasis onto collocation and phraseology, without which the meaning is lost.

References
A. Dictionaries
Hornby, A. S. (1948), *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary*. (First edition.), Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Ragazzini, G. (1995), *Dizionario Inglese/Italiano Italiano/Inglese*. (First edition 1967, second edition 1884) Bologna, Zanichelli.

Rundell, M. (ed.) (2002), *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced learners*. Oxford, Macmillan. (MED)

Sinclair, J. M. (ed.) 1987 *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*. (First edition.), Glasgow, HarperCollins.

B. Other Literature
Boers, F. (2000a), 'Enhancing metaphoric awareness in specialised reading.' *English for Specific Purposes* 19, pp. 137-147.

Boers, F. (2000b), 'Metaphor Awareness and Vocabulary Retention.' *Applied Linguistics* 21: 553-71.

Boers, F., Stengers, H. (2005), 'Adding Sound to the Picture: An exercise in *motivating* the lexical composition of idioms in English, Dutch and Spanish', in Cosme, C., Gouverneur, C., Meunier, F., Paquot, M. (eds.), *Phraseology 2005: The many faces of Phraseology*. Louvain-La-Neuve, pp. 53-55.

Charteris-Black, J. (2002), 'Second Language Figurative Proficiency: A Comparative Study of Malay and English.' *Applied Linguistics* 23, pp. 104-33.

Danesi, M. (1994) 'Recent Research on Metaphor and the Teaching of Italian.' *Italica* 71: 453-64.

Deignan, A., Gabrys, D., Solska, A. (1997), 'Teaching English Metaphors Using Cross-Linguistic Awareness-Raising Activities.' *ELT Journal* 51, pp. 352-60.

Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2005), 'A peek into what today's language learners as researchers actually do.' *International Journal of Lexicography* 18, pp. 335-355.

Glucksberg, S., McGlone, M. S. (1999) 'When love is not a journey: What metaphors mean.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, pp. 1541-1558.

Hanks, P. (2004), 'The Syntagmatics of Metaphor and Idiom.' *International Journal of Lexicography* 17 (3), pp. 245-274.

Henderson, W. (2000), 'Metaphor, Economics, and ESP'. *English for Specific Purposes* 19, pp. 167-73.

Holme. R. (2004), *Mind, Metaphor and Language Teaching*. Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980), *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Lazar, G. (1996), 'Using Figurative Language to Expand Students' Vocabulary.' *ELT Journal*, 50, pp. 43-51.

Moon, R. E. (2004), 'On Specifying Metaphor: An Idea and its Implementation.' *International Journal of Lexicography* 17, pp. 195-222.

Philip, G. (2005a), 'From concept to wording and back again: Features of learners' production of figurative language', in Wallington, A., Barnden, J., Glasbey, S., Lee, M., Zhang, L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third Interdisciplinary Workshop on Corpus-Based Approaches to Figurative Language*. Birmingham, University Press Birmingham, pp. 46-53.

Philip, G. (2005b), 'Figurative language and the advanced learner', *Research News: the newsletter of the IATEFL Research SIG*, 16, pp. 16-20.

Philip, G. (2006), '"Drugs, traffic, and many other dirty interests": metaphor and the language learner'. *Paper read at Researching and Applying Metaphor 6*; Leeds. 10-12 April 2006.

Underhill, A. (2002), *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners Workbook*. Oxford, Macmillan.