Journal of Germanic Linguistics **16.3** (2004):245–268.

Nominalization in Martin Luther's Word Formation

Charles V. J. Russ

University of York

Martin Luther is universally acknowledged as an important figure in the history of German. Although the study of his language has been broadly covered in research, the study of his word formation is rather meager. This article gives an account of Luther's nominal word formation, excluding compounds. The material comprises three corpora: samples of his main works, extracts from the 1545 Bible, and a selection of his letters. The most frequent suffixes are: *-er*, infinitival *-en*, *-ung*, *-ø*, and *-heit*. The most frequent prefixes are *un-* and *heubt-*. The class-maintaining functions show the diminutive as the most frequent overall, whereas it is the abstract that is the most frequent among the class-changing functions. A comparison of Luther's usage with that of his contemporary Dürer shows agreement in the most frequent suffixes as well as in the most frequent function of both the class-maintaining and class-changing functions. Modern (New High) German shows a similar agreement in most frequent suffixes and functions although there are new prefixes and suffixes. Word formation changes, albeit slowly. Luther's word formation fits into his linguistic context and shows the same main features as Modern German.

1. Introduction.

Martin Luther has been hailed as many things, from the *Schöpfer der nhd. Schriftsprache* (creator of the modern standard German language) to a mere *Nachzügler* (latecomer/straggler) (Russ 1984:1), but there is no doubt as to his importance in the development of Modern (New High) German. At one extreme Jacob Grimm (1870:xi) wrote: "Luthers sprache ... muss ihrer edlen, fast wunderbaren reinheit, auch ihres gewaltigen einflusses halber für kern und grundlage der nhd. sprachniedersetzung gehalten werden. Man darf das nhd. in der that als den protestantischen dialect bezeichnen." (Luther's language must be regarded as the center and basis of the Modern German linguistic standard because of its noble, almost wonderful purity and also because of its powerful influence. One can indeed regard Modern German as the Protestant dialect/variety). At the other extreme there is Konrad Burdach, the student of Prague

© Society for Germanic Linguistics

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

humanism, who said of Luther and Modern German that he was "nicht der Führer, der Bahnbrecher der sprachlichen Bewegung, sondern eher Nachzügler" (not the leader, not even a pioneer of the linguistic movement but rather a straggler) (Burdach 1925:273–274). At the moment, Luther's position in the formation of Modern German and its implementation is being viewed very positively (Besch 1999, 2000). What has, however, become more apparent over recent years is that Luther has to be seen within the linguistic context of his time.

One of the reasons that Luther is such an important figure is that he produced an enormous amount of written work. At present his output in the *Weimarer Ausgabe* comprises well over 110 volumes. He wrote not only in German but also in Latin, in which language most of his correspondence with theologians and scholars was carried out. His German output alone in 1519–1520 amounted to about half of all works published in German (Tschirch 1969:100)! He is, perhaps, best known as a translator of the Bible, but his works covered such diverse areas as theological treatises, polemic pamphlets against his many opponents, versions of Aesop's fables, hymns, catechisms, and, of course, copious correspondence with the great and the good—and the not so good—as well as intimate letters to his wife and family. In addition his conversations with students and colleagues at table have been written down, as well as transcripts and summaries of his sermons. In some instances there are manuscripts of his works, but none of the 1522 New Testament. He was also involved in the production of his works and oversaw in many cases their publication.

2. Review of Research.

Most linguistic studies of Luther's language, of which Wolf 1985 lists a large number, concern themselves with his orthography, grammatical inflection and lexis, as well as style and syntax. The study of his word formation, however, is much more meager. Franke (1913–1922), especially volume 2, pp. 89–186, gives a wide range of material but is not easy to consult or make out general trends. On the other hand, Erben (1974:460–467) and Arndt and Brandt (1983:207–210) deal with Luther's word formation within the framework of the development of his vocabulary. Older, more general, works on German word formation, for example, Wilmanns 1899:321, Kluge 1925:68, and Henzen 1965:25, do have some comments tucked away inside them, which will surface in some of our illustrations, while the fifth volume of Hermann Paul's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1920) grammar does not seem to mention Luther at all. Bach 1985 has the bonus of dealing, albeit indirectly, but in great detail with the form of unstressed affixes, for example, variation between *-nis* and *-n u s*. Fleischer 1996 is the most systematic and linguistically focused, but at the same time limited, treatment of this area of Luther's language. Fleischer lists several areas to be investigated, including: 1. the inventory of affixes, which ones have become lost, and how new ones have come into being; 2. changes in the distribution of the affixes, their allomorphic variation, as well as variation and competition between affixes; and 3. the expansion of nominal compounds, their linking morphemes, whether they are occasional or nonce formations or whether they belong to the language norm. Besch, in his survey (2000:1725), states unequivocally: "Eine umfassende Darstellung der Wortbildung bei Luther steht noch aus" (A comprehensive presentation/account of Luther's word formation is still lacking).

3. A Project on Martin Luther's Word Formation.

In view of this limited number of publications and in order to remedy this gap in research we have started a project on Martin Luther's word formation in the Department of Language and Linguistic Science at the University of York (UK), and the present paper incorporates some of the findings of Pibworth 2002 and Scott 2002, two recently completed master's theses, as well as other ongoing research.

Part of an initial problem was to decide what could properly be regarded as Luther's language. Three general questions are pertinent here. First, is it the language of the printed page that has been through the hands of the compositor and proofreader or of the manuscript? Second, is it the language of 1520, 1530, or 1540? Luther's language undergoes changes in the course of time. Franke (1913:§10) divides Luther's linguistic output into three periods: I. 1516–1520, when there are more Middle High German and dialectal elements; II. 1521–1531, when there is a development away from Middle High German and the local dialects; and III. 1532–1546, when a plateau is reached and those Middle High German elements that remain are carried through to the end. The years of 1524–1526 show the quickest rate of change. Finally, is Luther's language the language of the Bible translation, or the broadsheet, or the theological treatise or his letters, all of which show differences in linguistic usage? For instance, the use of relative pronouns shows variation between text types with *der*/*die*/*das* + *da* being mostly used in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Bible and the particle *so* being quite frequent in letters (Baldauf 1982:478–479). There is thus no monolithic language of Luther, *Lutherdeutsch*, but rather a collection of fluctuating forms and words whose constellation changes over time and varies according to situation and addressee. This has been amply illustrated with regard to graphemic usage, grammar, and syntax. The hypothesis is that, quite probably it would be reflected to some extent in word formation as well. There are some pointers in the research already carried out, particularly in the use of pejorative forms in Luther's polemic works.

Scholars have not always made these differentiations among text types. Heinrich Bach (1954), however, made some very precise observations about Luther's works. He distinguished between:

1. those writings that do not derive directly from Luther, for example, *Tischreden* (Table Talk), *Predigtnachschriften* (transcripts of his sermons);
2. the language of his letters where we find evidence of dialect and colloquial speech;
3. the language of his manuscripts with corrections and reformulations; and
4. the language of his writings, printed in Wittenberg, which include:
   4a. the early writings, showing a great deal of variation, as well as,
   4b. the more regular language of his later works,
   4c. and finally, the thoroughly normalized, carefully edited language of the Bible translation of 1545.

The overall plan is to produce a description of all aspects of Luther's word formation. This will comprise nominal formations, including compounding as well as adjectival and verbal formations. As stated above, two master's theses have been recently completed at York on nominalization in Luther's word formation. The material, which can also be used for other aspects of word formation, comprises: Corpus 1, 34 programmatic and polemic works by Luther dating from 1518 to 1545, and Corpus 2, excerpts from the 1545 Bible. Each corpus comprised about 500,000 words, yielding one million words overall. A third, smaller, corpus (Corpus 3), consists of about 28,000 words from 93 of Luther's Letters (Rückert 1955). More details of the corpora are given in appendices 1–3. The choice of texts reflects the demand to deal with providing representatives of three different text types.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. Nominal Word Formation Constructions.

4.1. Inventory of Forms

We take nominalization to include not only explicit derivation by means of the addition of an affix to a base but also a type of word formation pattern called zero-derivation, when only the stem of the verb is used as a noun, for example, *fang+en* 'catch-inf.' > *der Fang* 'the catch'. In this instance there is no overt suffix, but in some cases there is also a change in the stem vowel, for example, *beiß+en* 'bite-inf.' > *der Biss* 'the bite', or a change in the stem-final consonant as well, for example, *zieh+en* 'pull-inf.' > *der Zug* 'draft; train'. In the presentation of our data we do not distinguish between these two subtypes. Fleischer uses the term "implicit derivation" but we call this pattern zero-derivation, symbolizing it by "ø." Conversion, the categorial change of an infinitive to a noun, for example, *sing+en* 'sing-inf.' > *das Singen* 'the singing' with no addition of an affix, would seem to be another instance of zero-derivation. Wellmann (1975:237–238), however, regards conversion as the addition of a suffix *-en* to a verbal base. Following his interpretation enables this type of word formation pattern also to be fit into normal explicit derivation. Here, however, we exclude nominal compounding. In sections 4.1 to 4.3 we consider the nominal suffixes, and in 4.4 the nominal prefixes. There is one instance of a combination of a suffix and a prefix, compare Modern German *das Gebirge* 'mountain range', which is treated with the suffixes.

In two instances, *-werk* and *heubt-*, the forms involved are sometimes classified as semiaffixes or affixoids in Modern German (Wellmann 1975:21; 1995:488–495). Unlike ordinary affixes these have a formally homonymic form. This means that they are similar to elements in compounds. These semiaffixes or affixoids can be divided into semiprefixes, for example, *Haupt-*, and semisuffixes, for example, *-werk*, as in *Laubwerk* 'foliage'. In an earlier paper (Russ 1994), I identified the main features of these semiaffixes as follows: "(1) they are the basis for new formations; (2) their meaning is more generalized and abstract than the formally identical free morpheme; (3) there has been a shift of meaning in the relationship between the two parts of the word so that first component determines the basic meaning; and (4) the use of the free homonymic form becomes more limited' (1994:230). Stevens (2000:58–60) sets up ten criteria for distinguishing affixes and affixoids. In a synchronic analysis of Luther's word formation *-werk* can be regarded as a suffix since the words containing it cannot be analyzed as

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

compounds, for example, *blumwerg* 'flowers', *holzwerck* 'woodwork'. This is also true of some of the words with *heubt-* (e.g., *heubtlüge* 'main lie/untruth', *heubtquelle* 'primary source'). We regard *-werk* and *heubt-* as affixes. The terms semiprefix/prefixoid and semisuffix/suffixoid are applicable to the analysis of German morphology throughout its history.

In our description of the suffixes we distinguish between the number of types or individual lexemes that are combined with each suffix (for example, *bildnis* 'image' occurs 11 times, whereas *ergernis* 'consternation' occurs 73 times) and the frequency of each lexeme in all three corpora. Table 1 gives an overview of the nominal suffixes found in all three corpora according to the types of lexemes. It illustrates the totals and percentages for all the types, or lexemes, that occurred more than ten times in all three corpora taken together.

Suffix	Number	%
-er	594	17.95
-en	576	17.41
-ung	380	11.48
-ø	357	10.79
-heit	242	7.31
-e	202	6.10
ge+-e/ø	176	5.32
-lin	169	5.10
-(er)ei	106	3.2
-(s)t	99	2.99
-in	86	2.59
-nis	66	1.99
-schaft	44	1.33
-(at)ion	32	0.96
-anz/-enz	31	0.93
-tum	31	0.93
-el	30	0.90
-ling	25	0.75
-ist	21	0.63
-de	17	0.51
-chen	13	0.39
-werk	11	0.33

Table 1. Nominal Suffixes by Lexeme Type (Corpora 1, 2, 3).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In all there are 22 suffixes, including zero-derivation and the prefix/suffix combination *ge+ø/e*, that occur with more than ten lexemes. Over 58 percent of all lexemes is represented by four suffixes, *-er*, *-en*, *-ung*, and zero. Nine suffixes, *-(at)ion*, *-anz/-enz*, *-tum*, *-el*, *-ling*, *-ist*, *-de*, *-chen*, and *-werk*, occur with values of under one percent. These include three foreign suffixes, *-(at)ion*, *-anz/-enz*, *-ist*, the suffix *-werk*, and the regional diminutive *-chen*. The remaining four, *-de*, *-el*, *-ling*, *-tum*, are not very frequent, even in Modern German.

A complementary approach is to look at the frequency of the tokens, individual occurrences, of each suffix showing the frequency of the forms in the texts. As seen in table 2, the ranking of the suffixes remains similar to that in table 1, where they are listed by type or lexeme. Table 2 shows the overall totals and percentages of the total attestations of the tokens of the lexemes in all three corpora taken together.

Suffix	Number	%
-ø	5022	15.14
-e	4804	14.48
-er	3785	11.40
ge+-e/ø	3594	10.83
-heit	3436	10.35
-en	3161	9.50
-ung	2615	7.87
-(s)t	2177	6.54
-nis	905	2.70
-(er)ei	703	2.09
-tum	599	1.78
-lin	548	1.62
-ist	390	1.15
-el	348	1.02
-de	324	0.95
-schaft	299	0.87
-in	228	0.66
-ling	203	0.58
-(at)ion	113	0.33
-werk	37	0.08
-chen	30	0.06

Table 2. Nominal Suffixes by Token (Corpora 1, 2, 3).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Comparing type and token frequencies in tables 1 and 2, the same seven suffixes come out as the most frequent but in a different order, which is summarized in table 3.

Position	Frequency of Type	Frequency of Token
1	-er	-ø
2	-en	-e
3	-ung	-er
4	-ø	ge+e/-ø
5	-heit	-heit
6	-e	-en
7	ge+e/ø	-ung

Table 3. Comparison of Top Seven Suffixes According to Type and Token.

These seven suffixes account for almost 80 percent (78.65%) of the total occurrences of both types and tokens.

4.2. Similarities and Differences between the Corpora.

The next step in the analysis is to see how the frequency of the different types and tokens of suffixes that we have ascertained for the three corpora as a whole is reflected in the three individual corpora. Table 4 shows the order of suffixes according to types or lexemes in the individual corpora.

Corpus	1: Main Works		2: 1545 Bible		3: Letters	
Suffix	Types	%	Types	%	Types	%
-en	326	13.2	185	15.16	65	18.25
-er	262	10.6	293	24.01	39	10.95
-ung	213	8.63	120	9.83	47	13.21
-ø	167	6.76	153	12.54	37	10.39
-heit	126	5.1	88	7.21	28	7.86
-lin	96	3.88	49	4.01	24	6.74
-(er)ei	85	3.44	16	1.31	5	1.14
ge-+e/ø	71	2.87	62	5.08	25	7.02
-e	75	3.03	99	8.11	28	7.86
-(s)t	47	1.90	35	2.86	17	4.77
-in	36	1.45	34	2.78	16	4.49

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

-schaft	25	0.81	13	1.06	6	1.68
-nis	30	1.21	26	2.13	10	2.8
-(at)ion	29	1.17			3	0.84
-el	21	0.85	9	0.73		
-ist	16	0.64			5	1.4
-tum	15	0.6	9	0.73	7	1.96
-ling	9	0.36	14	1.14	2	0.56
-chen	8	0.32			5	1.4
-de	8	0.32	6	0.49	3	0.84
-werk	2	0.08	9	0.73		

Table 4. The Order of Suffixes According to Types or Lexemes in the Three Corpora.

Two suffixes occur in Corpus 1 that do not occur in Corpus 2, namely *-(at)ion* and *-ist*. Both are foreign suffixes, which reflect a more natural use of such forms in the topical programmatic and polemic writings rather than in the more conservative language of the Bible. Also missing from Corpus 2, the Bible, is the diminutive suffix *-chen*. This reflects the whole problem area of the diminutive that is dealt with in section 5. The suffixes *-el* and *-werk* do not occur in Corpus 3, the Letters.

The relative ranking of the suffixes in their occurrence according to types and tokens is virtually the same in all three corpora. The suffixes *-ling* and *-werk*, have slightly more types and tokens in Corpus 2.

4.3. The Forms of the Suffixes.

The majority of suffixes show only a minimum variation in form (for examples, *-schaft*/*-schafft*; *-thum*, *-tum*, *-thumb*, and *-tum*), which is purely orthographic. Other variations reflect regional or historical development. The diminutive suffix, for instance, is invariably *-lin* in the 1545 Bible (Corpus 2), but occurs 4 times as *-le* in Corpus 1, Luther's Main Works, while the Modern German form *-lein* with the diphthong does not appear at all. The form *-chen* for the diminutive occurs eight times in Corpus 1, Luther's Main Works. We deal in more detail with the whole question of the forms of the diminutive in section 5. The suffix *-nis* occurs three times as *-nus*, the Upper German form, in Corpus 1, Luther's Main Works, otherwise it occurs as *-nis*. Corpus 2 and 3 have only *-nis*. In Corpus 2 there are nine forms for *-werk*, ending in *-g* or *-ck*,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whereas Corpus 1 has only two and Corpus 3 none. The prefix *ge-* is combined either with the suffix *-e* or else with zero derivation.

4.4. Nominal Prefixes.
To a lesser extent prefixation is also involved in nominal derivation. Compare data for the five most frequent prefixes in table 5 below. Examples: *vn-*, *vn-christen* 'non-Christians'; *heubt-*, *heubt-stad* 'capital'; *ertz-*, *ertz-bösewicht* 'arch-villain' *ab-*, *ab-gott* 'idol'; *mis(s)-*, *mis-glauben* 'false doctrine'.

Corpus	1: Main Works		2: 1545 Bible		3: Letters		Total (for 1, 2, 3)	
Prefix	Types	Tokens	Types	Tokens	Types	Tokens	Types	Tokens
vn-	68	518	27	265	24	45	119	831
heubt-	26	124	8	74	2	2	36	200
er(t)z-	27	56	4	21			31	77
ab-	3	50	2	36	5	10	10	96
mis-	3	16	1	1	2	5	6	22

Table 5. Nominal Prefixes.

The most frequent prefix is *un-*, followed by *heupt-* and *ertz-*. The two prefixes *ab-* and *mis-* are infrequent. In Corpus 1 *heubt-* is the sole form and the two forms in Corpus 3 also have *heubt-*, whereas Corpus 2 has two *haupt-* forms. In Modern German the Upper German form with *au* has ousted Luther's Central German form. The beginning of the development of *haupt* from free morpheme to prefixoid can be seen already in Middle High German with forms such as *houbet-sache* 'main issue', *houbet-sterke* 'main strength' (Lexer 1:1352–1353). It continued to advance in Luther's works to become completed by Modern German. The prefix *erz-* was only used in Middle High German for higher ranks of officials (*erz-kamerer* 'arch-chamberlain' [Lexer 1:706]), but, being combined with other nouns designating persons, developed pejorative meanings in Luther and Early Modern German where it is also spelled *ertz-*. Some of these pejorative forms have remained until today: *Erzlügner* 'arch-liar, *Erzlump* 'arch-lazybones', *Erzschelm* 'arrant rogue', *Erzübel* 'arch-evil'.

5. Excursus on the Forms of the Diminutive.
The diminutive in Modern German presents a wide range of phonetic variants in the dialects from the two main forms of the written standard,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

-chen and *-lein*. Since the originally regionally restricted form *-chen* has become the main form in the standard it seems worth looking at the development in a wider context.

Bach (1985:§69), in his discussion of unstressed syllables, treats the various forms of the diminutive suffix. In the main Luther has forms with *-l* but there are further interesting variations aside from the ones attested in the three corpora.

5.1. Variation between -lein and -lin.
Until 1519 the diphthongal form *-lein* predominates, which Bach sees as being one of the many South German features that appear in the Thuringian/Upper Saxon written language Luther follows. In Corpus 1 there is only one pre-1519 work, but it contains no diminutive forms. From 1520 on the form *-lin* takes over, with *-lein* being sporadic. All three of our corpora show predominantly *-lin*.

5.2. The Variant Forms -len, -le, and -el.
These forms appear in the printed works of the 1520s. The variant *-le* is the more frequent and it can often take on an ironic, derogatory nuance of meaning or, on the other hand, it can simply be a neutral diminutive. There are a few words with *-el*, some of which have lost their diminutive meaning. One form that Luther coined was *meister klügel* 'master clever one; know-it-all'.

5.3. Satirical Use of South German -el.
In his dispute with the Swiss reformer Zwingli, particularly about the Last Supper, Luther uses forms with *-el* in a satirical way to characterize Zwingli's language, although Zwingli himself uses *-ly*, *-li*, or, less frequently, *-le*. The form *-lin* does appear, however, in the dative singular and genitive/dative plural (Betzén 1921:18–19).

5.4. Avoidance of -chen in General.
Bach maintains that *-chen* is the natural form in Luther's dialect and colloquial language, and that he normally avoids it. Luther does, however, use it pejoratively with reference to some of his opponents, but more significantly he also uses it positively in letters to his wife and family, referring to her as *Liebchen* 'darling' as well as to himself when signing off. When his children are young he refers to them as *Hänschen*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'little Hans', *Lenchen* 'little Lene', or to his sons as *Sohnchen* 'little sons'.

5.6. Summing Remarks on Diminutive Forms.
With hindsight at the other end of the historical development we see now how the suffix *-chen* has become the main diminutive form in Modern German. Through the influence of the incipient literary standard *-chen* becomes the favored form in the written language of all dialect regions by the end of the eighteenth century (Schebben-Schmidt 1990). Luther's usage deviates here from what is to become standard.

Henzen (1965:148) ascribes the retention of *-lin*/*-lein* in biblical and literary language for a long time to Luther: "Seinem [= Luther's] Einfluß wird es zuzuschreiben sein, wenn *-lein* in der Literatur noch lange das Übergewicht behauptet" (It is to be ascribed to Luther's influence, if *-lein* still maintains its predominance for a long time in literature). In the 1671 edition of the Luther Bible published in Wittenberg the diphthongized form *-lein* has increased over the nondiphthongized form *-lin*. Shumway (1930:262) found 63 lexemes with *-lein* as against 21 with *-lin* but none with *-chen*.

6. Functions of Nominal Affixes.
Having sketched out the inventory of affixes we now deal with the functions of these affixes. Instead of asking the question, what does affix X mean?, we ask the question, what affixes are used to express function Y? The result is sometimes that a particular function may be expressed by both prefix(es) and suffix(es). The description of the semantic functions of the affixes will be based on those of Wellmann (1975) and Müller (1993), who use paraphrases to describe them.

We further divide the description of the derivational functions into those whose affixes are class-maintaining and those that are class-changing.

6.1. Class-maintaining Functions.
The designations for the functions are self-explanatory. 'Gender-changing' renders the German terms *Movierung*, *Motion*. Examples: diminutive: *Esel-chen* 'little donkey'; pejorative: *pap-ist* 'papist', *mis-glaube* 'false doctrine'; augmentative: *heubt-stadt* 'capital', *heubt-lüge* 'main lie'; negative: *un-dank* 'ingratitude'; collective: *ge-stein* 'stones';

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gender changing: *fürst-in* 'princess'. Tables 6a–c show the totals for types and tokens as well as percentages for the individual corpora.

Function	Types	%	Tokens	%
diminutive	107	31.3	390	17.90
pejorative	55	16.08	600	27.54
augmentative	55	16.08	185	8.49
negative	53	15.5	442	20.29
collective	36	10.52	497	22.80
gender-changing	36	10.52	65	2.98

Table 6a. Class-maintaining Functions: Corpus 1 (Main Works).

Function	Types	%	Tokens	%
diminutive	48	30	153	18.73
pejorative	36	22.5	133	16.28
augmentative	33	20.6	133	16.28
negative	20	12.5	209	25.58
collective	13	8.15	105	12.85
gender-changing	10	6.25	84	10.28

Table 6b. Class-maintaining Functions: Corpus 2 (1545 Bible).

Function	Types	%	Tokens	%
diminutive	29	33.33	59	32.06
pejorative	28	32.18	51	27.71
augmentative	16	18.4	46	25.00
negative	7	8.05	13	7.07
collective	5	5.74	13	7.07
gender-changing	2	2.3	2	1.09

Table 6c. Class-maintaining Functions: Corpus 3 (Letters).

The most frequent function of nominal derivation in all three corpora is that of the diminutive. In Corpus 1 *-lin* is the main form with 93 types, but *-el* occurs with 6 types, *-chen* has 7 and *-ling* has 1. In Corpus 2 *-lin* is also the main form but with 44 types, while *-ling* has 2 and *-el* also has 2. In Corpus 3 the main form is again *-lin*, 24 types, while the only other suffix, *-chen*, is represented by 5 types.

A comparison of the order of frequency for the individual functions in the separate corpora shows a difference in the case of the function "pejorative." In Corpus 1 it is the second most frequent function with respect to type, whereas in Corpus 2 it is the least frequent and in Corpus

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3 it is second to last, just above augmentative. Indeed, pejorative is by far the most frequent function with respect to the number of tokens. This prominence of the function pejorative in Corpus 1 is probably due to the polemical nature of many of the works. In the cut and thrust of debate Luther was not averse to dealing sharply with his opponents (Edwards 2003).

6.2. Class-changing Functions.

Again, the designations for the functions are largely self-explanatory. Patientive has been taken over from Müller (1993:448) who derives it from the paraphrase 'jemand/etwas, der/das [verb stem (CR)] wird' (someone/something who/that becomes a verb stem); that is, it is a passive construction. Examples: abstract: *-heit*, *boß-heit* 'evil'; agentive: *-er*, *verreth-er* 'traitor'; patientive: *ge-*, *ge-ruch* 'smell'; locative: *-tum*, *fürsten-tum* 'principality'; instrumental: *-el*, *deck-el* 'cover, lid'. Tables 7a–c show the totals for types and tokens as well as percentages for the individual corpora.

Function	Types	%	Tokens	%
abstract	947	66.88	9563	58.18
agentive	353	24.93	3366	20.49
patientive	73	5.16	2738	16.66
locative	23	1.62	500	3.04
instrumental	20	1.41	268	1.63

Table 7a. Class-changing Functions: Corpus 1 (Main Works).

Function	Types	%	Tokens	%
abstract	345	43.17	3951	38.46
agentive	303	37.93	2189	21.32
patientive	81	10.14	3202	31.18
locative	39	4.89	550	5.35
instrumental	31	3.87	379	3.69

Table 7b. Class-changing Functions: Corpus 2 (1545 Bible).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Function	Types	%	Tokens	%
abstract	200	66.44	411	60.97
agentive	62	20.59	147	21.82
patientive	26	8.64	96	14.25
locative	11	3.66	17	2.52
instrumental	2	0.66	3	0.44

Table 7c. Class-changing Functions: Corpus 3 (Letters).

Tables 7a–c show the abstract and agentive being far and away the most frequent functions for all three corpora. Indeed, in Corpora 1 and 3 the individual lexemes expressing an abstract function amount to two-thirds of the total number of types for their respective corpus. The relative order of the functions is the same for all three corpora. The main abstract suffixes were *-ung* and *-heit*, followed by *-ion*, *-(er)ei*, *-t*, and *-e*. Adding *-en* to the verbal stem is the main pattern for forming deverbal abstracts in Corpus 2.

7. Comparison of Luther's Usage within Early Modern German.

An obvious comparison is with Müller's (1993) description of Albrecht Dürer's (1471–1528) nominal word formation, a smaller corpus, but analyzed in a similar way. The inventories and the frequencies of the affixes show obvious similarities. Luther has exactly the same prefixes in the same order of frequency (see table 5 and Müller 1993:88–89). Six of Dürer's suffixes, *-ung*, *-ø*, *-lein*, *-er*, *-(e)*, and *-heit*, account for almost 80 percent of all derived forms (Müller 1993:381), while Luther's most frequent suffixes are *-er*, infinitival *-en*, *-ung*, *-ø*, *-heit*, and *-e*, which account for 68 percent of derived forms (table 1). However, Müller does not treat infinitival *-en* as a separate suffix. Differences are that in Luther *-(er)ei* is much more frequent while *-lin* is less frequent. Similarities also exist with regard to the frequencies of the functions. The class-maintaining functions of the suffixes agree in showing the diminutive as being the most frequent function while the others differ in order of frequency. Pejorative comes second in Luther (Corpus 1, Main Works) and fourth in Dürer, but Luther was involved in polemical debate (tables 6a–c and Müller 1993:410). The class-changing functions of the suffixes show the same order for the frequency of the functions in both Luther and Dürer (tables 7a–c and Müller 1993:463). Thus Luther does not differ much from his contemporary Dürer in the inventory of affixes,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their frequency, and the distribution of the functions. More studies of other authors and texts would probably confirm this picture. There are some different variants of form in the case of the diminutive suffix and *-nis*. The diminutive suffix in Dürer has the chief variant *-lein* (384 types), *-len* (247), *-lin* (1), *-le* (326), and *-l* (3), whereas Luther has mainly *-lin*. This clearly reflects Upper German usage. The suffix *-nis* in Dürer occurs mostly in the Upper German form *-nus* (89 tokens), 3 with *-nüs* and only one occurrence of *-nis*, the main form in Luther!

8. Comparison of Luther's Usage with Modern German.
For a comparison with Modern German we use Wellmann 1975. Modern German shows 10 additional suffixes. These are the foreign suffixes *-(at)or*, *-ent/-ant*, *-eur*, *-ie*, *-ik*, *-ismus*, *-ität*; the original variants, now full suffixes, *-ler* and *-ner*; the extended form *-iker*; and the suffixoids, *-gut* and *-zeug* (Wellmann 1975:56–102). Of these suffixes, *-ie* and *-ität* already occurred in borrowings in Middle High German, for example, *astronomie* 'astronomy', *solempnitêt* 'solemnity' (Bachofer et al. 1984:102–106, 503), although they were probably not yet part of a productive pattern. The semi-suffixes/suffixoids *-gut* and *-zeug* are also attested by a few forms in Middle High German: *waltguot* 'forest' (Lexer 2:516) and *schrîpziuc* 'writing implement' (Lexer 2:801). Bachofer et al. (1984:40–41; 549–550) give a list of forms. It may be just chance that they are not attested in our Luther corpora. Of Luther's suffixes the diminutive *-lin* has been overtaken by *-chen* (Wellmann 1975:127–135) and *-(s)t* and *-de* are regarded as no longer productive (Wellmann 1975:236). The four most frequent suffixes in the Luther corpora are *-er*, *-ung*, *-ø* and *-heit*, which are also the most frequent suffixes in Modern German. Wellmann does not give any figures for the frequency of infinitival *-en*, so the Luther frequency cannot be compared with Modern German in Wellmann's study. Many of the middle- and lower-ranking suffixes in Luther such as *-schaft*, *-tum*, *-ling*, *-nis*, *-werk*, *-enz/-anz*, and *-el* (table 1) have similar percentages in Modern German. The class-maintaining functions of the suffixes show that the diminutive is still the most frequent function. Müller helpfully summarizes Wellmann's data (1993:413). After that, the order of class-maintaining functions differs, with negative coming last, preceded by pejorative 5, collective 4, augmentative 3, and gender-changing 2. The reason for this drop in the frequency of the number of negative forms awaits explanation. Among the class-changing functions, the abstract is still the most frequent

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

function in Modern German (Müller 1993:463), and the order of the frequency of occurrence of the other functions, agentive, patientive, instrumental, and locative, is the same as in Luther (tables 7a–c).

The prefixes in Modern German show the development of a number of new prefixoids for the augmentative function. Wellmann lists eleven (1975:152–153): *Affen-*, *Blitz-*, *Bomben-*, *Heiden-*, *Höllen-*, *Mords-* , *Pfunds-*, *Riesen-*, *Spitzen-*, *Super-*, and *Über-*. There are traces of possible usage in Middle High German for *Höllen-*, for example, *helle-heiz* 'hellishly hot', *helle-hitze* 'hellish heat' (Lexer 1:152–153) where *helle-* could be interpreted literally and as an augmentative, and also for *Über-*, for example, *über-dôn* (übermäßiger dôn) 'great noise', *über-drô* (über-drohung) 'exaggerated threat', and other examples (Lexer 2:1612ff.). There is a new negative prefixoid, *Nicht-*, although again there are traces of it in Middle High German already, for example, *niht-got* 'non-god' (Lexer 2:84–85).

Accordingly, Luther's usage is similar to Modern German. This article is thus an initial study that can point the way to further investigations, especially those of the adjective and verb. The following quotations testify to the need for an examination of Luther's word formation as well as a study of the history of German word formation in general. "Der Anteil einzelner literarischer Strömungen und Schulen an unserer Wortbildung—auch der Luthers ...—bleibt noch zu untersuchen" (Henzen 1965:25) (The contribution of individual literary movements and schools—as well of Luther's … to our word formation remains to be investigated). "Dabei ist allerdings in Rechnung zu stellen, daß uns heute weder eine umfassende Geschichte der deutschen Wortbildung noch eine gründliche Aufarbeitung von Luthers Wortbildungssystem zur Verfügung steht ..." (Fleischer 1983:161) (Thus in fact we have to take into consideration that today we have neither a complete history of German word formation nor a thorough appraisal of Luther's system of word formation at our disposal).

REFERENCES

Arndt, Erwin, and Gisela Brandt. 1983. Luther und die deutsche Sprache. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut.

Bach, Heinrich. 1954. Kritische Bemerkungen zu einigen Lutherformen. Festschrift Öhmann. Annales academiae scientiarum fennicae, ser. B, 84.9–98.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bach, Heinrich. 1985. Handbuch der Luthersprache. Laut- und formenlehre in Luthers Wittenberger drucken bis 1545. Teil 2: Druckschwache silben. Konsonantismus. Copenhagen: Gad.
Bachofer, Wolfgang, Walther von Hahn, and Dieter Möhn. 1984. Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der Mittelhochdeutschen Sprache. Stuttgart: Hirzel.
Baldauf, Kunibert. 1982. Die Relativsatzeinleitung in der Luthersprache. Sprachwissenschaft 7.448–480.
Besch, Werner. 1999. Die Rolle Luthers in der deutschen Sprachgeschichte. (Schriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, 12.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Besch, Werner. 2000. Die Rolle Luthers für die deutsche Sprachgeschichte. In Besch et al. (eds.), 1713–1745.
Besch, Werner, Anne Betten, Oskar Reichmann, and Stefan Sonderegger. 2000. Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung. 2nd edn. 2 vols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Bebermeyer, Renate, and Gustav Bebermeyer. 1993–. Wortmonographien zum Lutherwortschatz. Wörterbuch zu Martin Luthers deutschen Schriften. Halsherrlich. 3 vols. Anknüpfend an Philipp Dietz, Wörterbuch zu Dr. Martin Luthers Deutschen Schriften, erster Band und zweiter Band, Lieferung 1 (A-Hals, 1870–1872), Hildesheim: Olms.
Betzén, Ture. 1921. Formenlehre der Sprache Zwinglis. Greifswald: Abel.
Burdach, Konrad. 1891. Luthers Bedeutung für die Ausbildung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. Literarisches Zentralblatt 28. Januar, cols. 134–136. (Also in Burdach, Konrad. 1925. Gesammelte Schriften zur Geschichte des deutschen Geistes. Erster Band. 2. Teil: Reformation und Renaissance. Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte. Buchreihe. 2. Band. Halle: Niemeyer, 271–274. Reprinted in Luthers Deutsch: Sprachliche Leistung und Wirkung. 1990. Ed. by Herbert Wolf, 42–44. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.)
Dietz, Philipp. 1870–1872 (1997). Wörterbuch zu Dr. Martin Luthers Deutschen Schriften, erster Band und zweiter Band, Lieferung 1 (A-Hals), Hildesheim: Olms.
Edwards, Mark U. 2003. Luther's polemical controversies. The Cambridge Companion to Martin Luther, ed. by Donald K. McKim, 192–205. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Erben, Johannes. 1974. Luther und die neuhochdeutsche Schriftsprache. Deutsche Wortgeschichte, ed. by Friedrich Maurer and Heinz Rupp, vol. 1, 439–492. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fleischer, Wolfgang. 1996. Zur Entwicklung des Systems der Wortbildung in der deutschen Literatursprache unter dem Blickpunkt von Luthers Sprachgebrauch. Luthers Deutsch: Sprachliche Leistung und Wirkung, ed. by Herbert Wolf, 160–176. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Franke, Carl. 1913–1922 (1973). Gründzüge der Schriftsprache Luthers. 3 vols. Hildesheim: Olms.
Grimm, Jacob. 1870 (1967). Deutsche Grammatik I, ed. by Wilhelm Scherer. Hildesheim: Olms.
Henzen, Walther. 1965. Deutsche Wortbildung. 3rd edn. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
Kluge, Friedrich. 1925. Abriß der deutschen Wortbildungslehre. 2nd edn. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
Lexer, Matthias. 1872–1878 (1979). Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Hirzel.
Müller, Peter O. 1993. Substantiv-Derivation in den Schriften Albrecht Dürers. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Paul, Hermann. 1920. Deutsche Grammatik. V. Wortbildungslehre. 4th edn. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
Pibworth, Clare. 2002. Nominalisation in the 1545 edition of Luther's translation of the Bible: A comparison with Early New High German and Modern German word formation. Master's thesis, University of York (UK).
Rückert, Hanns (ed.). 1955. Luthers Briefe. Luthers Werke in Auswahl. 2nd edn. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Russ, Charles V. J. 1984. Martin Luther and the development of the German language. New German Studies 12.1–20.
Russ, Charles V. J. 1994. The German language today. London: Routledge.
Schebben-Schmidt, Mariatheres. 1990. Studien zur Diminution in der deutschen Schriftsprache des 18. Jahrhunderts. Deutsche Sprachgeschichte. Grundlagen, Methoden, Perspektiven. Festschrift für Johannes Erben zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. by Werner Besch, 313–321. Bern: Peter Lang.
Scott, Alan K. 2002. Nominal derivation in Early High German. An investigation based on a corpus of Martin Luther's writings. Master's thesis, University of York (UK).
Shumway, D. B. 1930. The language of the Luther Bible of 1671. Germanic Review 5.247–287; 345–377.
Stevens, Christopher M. 2000. The derivational suffixes and suffixoids of Old Saxon: A panchronic approach to a linguistic category. American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures 12.53–79.
Tschirch, Fritz. 1969. Geschichte der deutschen Sprache II. Entwicklung und Wandlungen der deutschen Sprachgestalt vom Hochmittelalter bis zur Gegenwart. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wellmann, Hans. 1975. Deutsche Wortbildung. Typen und Tendenzen in der Gegenwartssprache. 2. Das Substantiv. (Sprache der Gegenwart, 32.) Düsseldorf: Schwann.
Wellmann, Hans. 1995. Die Wortbildung. Duden Grammatik. 5th edn., ed. by Günther Drosdowski, 399–539. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
Wilmanns, Wilhelm. 1899 (1930). Deutsche Grammatik. II. Wortbildung. 2nd edition. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
Wolf, Herbert. 1985. Germanistische Luther-Bibliographie. Martin Luthers deutsches Sprachschaffen im Spiegel des Internationalen Schrifttums der Jahre 1880–1980. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Wolf, Herbert. 1987. Zum Stand der sprachlichen Lutherforschung. Frühneuhochdeutsch. Zum Stand der sprachwissenschaftlichen Forschung. Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie (Sonderheft) 106.246–272.

APPENDICES

Details of Individual Corpora

Appendix 1: Corpus 1 (Main Works)

Year	Title	WA Reference
1518	Ein Sermon von Ablass und Gnade	1:243–246
1520	Von den guten Werken	6:202–276
1520	Von dem Papstthumb zu Rom wider den hochberühmten Romanisten zu Leipzig	6:285–324
1520	An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung	6:404–469
1520	Wider die Bulle des Endchrists	6:614–629
1520	Ein Sendbrief an den Papst Leo X.	7:3-11
1520	Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen	7:20–38
1522	Von beider Gestalt des Sakraments zu nehmen	10.2:11–41
1522	Von Menschenlehre zu meiden und Antwort auf Sprüche	10.2:72–92
1523	Von weltlicher Oberkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei	11:245–280
1524	An die Rathherren aller Städte deutsches Landes	15:27–53
1525	Wider die himmlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sakrament	18:62–214
1525	Ermahnung zum Frieden auf die zwölf Artikel der Bauerschaft in Sachsen	18:291–334
1525	Wider die räuberischen und mörderischen Rotten der Bauern	18:357–361

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1525	Ein Sendbrief von dem harten Büchlein wider die Bauern	18:384–401
1526	Antwort auf etliche Fragen. Klostergelübde belangend	19:287–293
1527	Auf des Königs zu England Lästerschrift Titel Martin Luthers Antwort	23:26–37
1528	Unterricht der Visitatoren an die Pfarrherrn im Kurfürstentum Sachsen	26:195–240
1529	Von heimlichen und gestohlenen Briefen	30.2:25–48
1530	Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen	30.2:632–646
1531	Warnung an seine lieben Deutschen	30.3:276–320
1533	Verantwortung der aufgelegten Aufruhr von Herzog Georgen	38:96–127
1535	Etliche Artikel, so von den Papisten ist neulich verfälscht und böslich gerühmt wider uns Lutherischen	38:393–400
1539	Von den Konziliis und Kirchen	50:509–653
1541	Wider Hans Worst	51:469–572
1542	Ein Trost den Weibern, welchen es ungerade gegangen	53:205–208
1542	Neue Zeitung vom Rhein	53:404–405
1542	Vorrede zu Erasmus Alberus, der Barfüßermönche Eulenspiegel und Altoran	53:409–411
1543	Von den Juden und ihren Lügen	53:417–522
1543	Vermahnung an die Pfarrherren in der Superattendenz zu Wittenberg	53:558–560
1544	Vorrede zu Justus Menius, von den Geist der Wiedertäufer	54:117–118
1544	Kurzes Bekenntnis vom heiligen Sakrament	54:141–167
1545	Eine wälsche Lügenschrift von Doctoris Martini Luthers Tod	54:192–194
1545	Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet	54:206-299

Appendix 2: Corpus 2 (1545 edition of the Bible)
The following books were excerpted:
Old Testament: Genesis; Leviticus; Deuteronomy; Judges; 1 and 2 Kings; Nehemiah; Zephaniah; Zechariah
New Testament: Gospel according to St. Mark; Gospel according to St. John; Acts of the Apostles; Romans; 1 and 2 Corinthians; Philippians; Colossians; Hebrews; 1, 2, and 3 John; Revelation

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix 3: Corpus 3 (Letters; from Rückert 1955)
The corpus comprises 93 letters, nearly all of which are written to laypeople.
1. Frederick the Wise, 6.11.1517
2. Frederick the Wise, 15.5.1519
3. Cardinal Archbishop of Mainz, 1.12.1521
4. Frederick the Wise, 24.2.1522
5. Frederick the Wise, 5.3.1522
6. Johann Rühel, 4.5.1525
7. Johann Rühel 3.6.1525
8. Johan Rühel, Johann Thür and Caspar Müller, 15.6.1525
9. Leonhard Koppe in Torgau, 17.6.1525
10. Hans von Dolzig, 21.6.1525
11. Leonhard Koppe, 21.6.1525
12. Elector John, 31.10.1525
13. Elector John, 30.11.1525
14. Landgraf Philip of Hesse, 28.11.1526
15. Elector John, 31.12.1527
16. Landgraf Philip of Hesse, 7.1.1527
17. Mayor and Council of Zerbst, 17.1.1527
18. Elector John, 1.3.1527
19. Hans Ottensaß in Spangenberg, 5.2.1527
20. Elector John, 28.4.1527
21. Hans von Dolzig, 17.3.1527
22. Nikolaus von Hausmann in Zwickau, 29.3.1527
23. Town Council in Krossen, 13.4.1527
24. Elector John, 28.4.1527
25. Elizabeth Agricola in Eisleben, 10.6.1527
26. Mayor and Council of Coburg, 14.6.1527
27. Elector John, 16.6.1527
28. Elector John, 16.6.1527
29. Elector John, 26.7.1527
30. Else von Kanitz in Eiche near Leipzig, 27.8.1527
31. Joachim von Weißbach in Ramsdorf, 23.8.1527
32. Johann Rühel, 26.8.1527
33. Elector John, 10.9.1527
34. Elector John, 16.9.1527
35. Elector John, 30.9.1527
36. Elector John, 9.10.1527
37. Elector John, 12.10.1527
38. Elector John, 18.10.1527
39. Elector John, 27.10.1527
40. Elector John, 12.11.1527

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

41. Elector John, 2.12.1527
42. Mayor and Council in Zerbst, 5.12.1527
43. Mayor and Council in Zerbst, 13.12.1527
44. Johann Walther in Torgau, 21.12.1527
45. Mayor and Council in Zerbst, 24.12.1527
46. Abraham and Heinrich von Einsiedel, 28.12.1527
47. Katharina Luther, 4.10.1529
48. Hans Luther in Mansfeld, 15.2.1530
49. Elector John, 20.4.1530
50. Katharina Jonas in Wittenberg, 23.4.1530
51. His "Table Companions" in Wittenberg, end April/beginning May 1530
52. Elector John, 15.5.1530
53. Elector John, 20.5.1530
54. Katharina Luther, 5.6.1530
55. Caspar von Teutleben in Wittenberg, 19.6.1530
56. His son, Hänschen, 19.6.1530
57. Philip of Hesse in Augsburg, 20.6.1530
58. Prince John Frederick in Augsburg, 30.6.1530
59. Spengler in Nuremberg, 8.7.1530
60. Elector John, 9.7.1530
61. Johann Rühel in Augsburg, 13.7.1530
62. Chancellor Brück in Augsburg, 5.8.1530
63. Katharina Luther, 14.8.1530
64. Katharina Luther, 15.8.1530
65. Lazarus Spengler in Nuremberg, 24.8.1530
66. Elector John, 26.8.1530
67. Spengler in Nuremberg, 28.8.1530
68. Katharina Luther, 8.9.1530
69. Philip of Hesse, 11.9.1530
70. Katharina Luther, 24.9.1530
71. Spengler in Nuremberg, 28.9.1530
72. Spengler in Nuremberg, 1.10.1530
73. Hans Honold in Augsburg, 2.10.1530
74. Elector John, 3.10.1530
75. Katharina Luther, 27.2.1532
76. Katharina Luther, 29.7.1534
77. Katharina Luther, 27.2.1537
78 Josel the Jew, 11.6.1537
79. Georg Buchholzer in Berlin, 4.12.1539
80. Katharina Luther, 2.7.1540
81. Katharina Luther, 10.7.1540
82. Katharina Luther, 16.7.1540

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press

83. Katharina Luther, 26.7.1540
84. Katharina Luther, 18.9.1541
85. Katharina Luther, 28.7.1545
86. Count Albert of Mansfeld, 6.12.1545
87. Katharina Luther, 25.1.1546
88. Katharina Luther, 1.2.1546
89. Katharina Luther, 6.2.1546
90. Katharina Luther, 7.2.1546
91. Katharina Luther, 10.2.1546
92. Katharina Luther, 14.2.1546

Department of Language and Linguistic Science,
University of York
Heslington
York YO10 5DD
United Kingdom
[cjruss@zoom.co.uk]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542704000406 Published online by Cambridge University Press