

## **Preface**

The present issue of *metaphorik.de* clearly shows – again – that research on metaphor is and should be based in everyday life. Metaphorical categorisation represents in many cases a basic phenomenon which has a huge impact on quotidian linguistic acting and on psychological and philosophical categorisation.

We are happy to announce that the present volume displays a variety of articles stemming from different cultural backgrounds and disciplines comprising an interesting diversity of methodological perspectives. This indicates on the one hand that *metaphorik.de* attracts international attention and it points on the other hand to the sustaining vitality of research on metaphor and metonymy in language, literature and the media.

The first two articles are situated in a didactic context: Georgia Andreou and Ioannis Galantomos raise questions about the situation of teaching foreign metaphors and figures of speech while Larisa Nikitina und Fumitaka Furuoka employ metaphors used by students to develop a typology for different kinds of foreign language teachers. The next two papers are situated in the area of metaphor and policy: Lisa-Malin Harms investigates the use of war metaphors in the German and French Press. She critically comments on WAR as source domain while Stéphanie Bonnefille combines cognitive linguistics with a discourse analytical approach to analyse aspects of environmental policy in the State of the Union Addresses right at the end of George W. Bush's mandate. Veronika Koller, Andrew Hardie, Paul Rayson and Elena Semino offer a possibility to merge corpus linguistics and research on metaphor by depicting possibilities and limits of a semantic annotation programme – a recent development which might have a considerable and practical methodological impact research and applying metaphors. Henrik Jäger's article examines the role of metaphor in Chinese philosophy. He asks whether research on metaphor might be useful for understanding Chinese philosophies while Jörg Jost discusses the difference between understanding or construing metaphors –which leads him to a history of ideas on metaphor. Finally, a review of the most recent summary on metaphor written by Benedikt Gilich concludes this issue.

We would like to thank all authors, our readership and some critical commentators for putting much effort and time into issue 15/2008. Special thanks to our colleagues Katharina Leonhardt and Tanja Oberhauser (both

Saarbrücken) for their help and a big THANK YOU to Kerstin Sterkel (Saarbrücken) for her tremendous work on the layout! All remaining errors are ours. Last but not least, we also would like to thank our readership for their continuing encouragement: Merry Christmas and a prosperous year 2009!

Bonn, December 2008

**Hildegard Clarenz-Löhnert**

**Martin Döring**

**Klaus Gabriel**

**Katrin Mutz**

**Dietmar Osthus**

**Claudia Polzin-Haumann**

**Judith Visser**