The annotation guidelines (ctd)
- extended metaphors reuse a mapping from source to target domain
- new are potential metaphors, the deliberate combination of tokens of an expression with basic and metaphorical senses in the same text
- some issues are specific to German, e.g., combinations of demonstratives and (potentially metaphorical) prepositions like darin ‘that-in’

First results
- non-conventionalised and extended metaphors show up predominantly in highly persuasive registers (sermons and commentaries)
- the expectation that oral discourse is low on metaphor (Steen et al. 2010) cannot be confirmed
- previous low counts stem from conversations
- non-conventionalised and extended metaphors occur more frequently in registers with a hierarchical difference between authors and recipients
- fiction has very few metaphors, like in Steen et al. (2010)
- some issues are specific to German, e.g., combinations of demonstratives and (potentially metaphorical) prepositions like darin ‘that-in’
- potential metaphors occur only in sermons (.41%)

Table 2: Metaphor counts for the subcorpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subcorpus</th>
<th>conventionalised metaphor</th>
<th>non-conventionalised metaphor</th>
<th>extended metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speeches</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
<td>.14%</td>
<td>.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sermons</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
<td>.24%</td>
<td>.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commentaries</td>
<td>11.34%</td>
<td>.24%</td>
<td>.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>.16%</td>
<td>.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debates</td>
<td>10.38%</td>
<td>.13%</td>
<td>.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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