



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Policy versus Practice. Language variation and change in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Dutch**

Krogull, A.

### **Citation**

Krogull, A. (2018, December 12). *Policy versus Practice. Language variation and change in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Dutch*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/67132>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/67132>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/67132>

**Author:** Krogull, A.

**Title:** Policy versus Practice. Language variation and change in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Dutch

**Issue Date:** 2018-12-12

## Inter- and intra-individual variation and change

### The Martini Buys family correspondence

#### 1 Introduction and research objectives

While the analyses of orthographic and morphosyntactic phenomena presented in Chapters 5–12 mainly focused on variation and change in the community at large, it is also important to take into account the individual as an additional factor possibly affecting distributional patterns. In their study on language and the individual based on data from the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence*, Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg (2016: 202f.) zoom in on the linguistic behaviour of individuals, which “complements the aggregate picture that we have drawn [...] on the language use of people grouped together on the basis of sociolinguistic variables such as gender, age, region and socio-economic status”.

Following previous historical-sociolinguistic research on individual variation in (primarily English) private letters, for example Raumolin-Brunberg’s (2005, 2009) work of lifespan changes, Austin (1991, 1994) on the Clift family correspondence, as well as various studies on the Paston Letters (e.g. Bergs 2005; Hernández-Campoy 2016) and the Bluestocking Letters (e.g. Sairio 2008), this chapter examines inter- and intra-individual variation and change in Dutch family correspondence. The data, spanning the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, is drawn from a corpus of private letters from the Martini Buys family archives, which are, for the most part, stored in *Het Utrechts Archief* (Utrecht), with additional material collected from the *Brabants Historisch Informatie Centrum* (‘s-Hertogenbosch). The *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus* was specifically designed and compiled for this case study and will be presented in Section 2.

Compared to the large-scale analyses conducted with the multi-genre *Going Dutch Corpus*, the overarching research questions of this dissertation are approached from a slightly different perspective. While the effectiveness of the early nineteenth-century language policy on actual language usage will also play a central role here, this chapter generally aims at more exploratory and smaller-scale investigations on inter- and intra-individual variation. In fact, this case study attempts to (re)assess the possible impact of language policy, and Siegenbeek’s (1804) orthography in particular<sup>84</sup>, from a micro-level perspective by zooming in on

---

<sup>84</sup> For the purpose of the present case study, it was deliberately chosen to focus on orthographic variables, given the complexity of morphosyntactic issues analysed in Chapters

individual writers. Several informants actually have contributed private letters written both before and after the *schrijftaafregeling* had been introduced in 1804/1805. The present chapter addresses a number of (partly interrelated) research questions which the macro-level analyses with the *Going Dutch Corpus* have left unanswered.

First of all, the aspect of intra-individual (in)consistency will be examined. Generally speaking, how consistent or inconsistent were individual writers in the use of particular spelling variants? Is variation in the overall distribution of variants (i.e. detected in the community at large) based on individual writers who used one specific variant invariably, or did writers use coexisting variants side by side? Moreover, did this change after the spelling had been regulated in 1804, assuming that these official norms also increased the awareness of spelling and spelling norms or rules?

Secondly, this case study will also take into account the possible influence of age and individual lifespan changes. While the design of the multi-genre *Going Dutch Corpus* does not consider age as a sociolinguistic variable, this case study allows to investigate whether and to what extent age-related changes can be detected in private letter writing. Table 1 schematically presents the patterns of change in the individual and the community, as introduced by Labov (1994) and further developed by Sankoff & Blondeau (2007).

**Table 1.** Patterns of change in the individual and the community\*.

	Individual	Community
(1) Stability	Stable	Stable
(2) Age-grading	Unstable	Stable
(3) Lifespan change	Unstable	Unstable
(4) Generational change	Stable	Unstable
(5) Communal change	Unstable	Unstable

\* after Sankoff & Blondeau (2007: 563, originally adapted from Labov 1994: 83)

The first pattern (1) describes diachronically stable linguistic variation overall, i.e. with regard to individual behaviour as well as to the community at large. The second pattern (2) represents stability on the level of the community, but instability in the linguistic behaviour of the individual, also referred to as age-grading<sup>85</sup>. The pattern of generational change (4) concerns a situation with stability

---

10-12, conditioned by both internal and external factors. In fact, a substantial amount of occurrences is necessary for a reliable analysis of these features, whereas individual spelling preferences are more likely to be identified on the basis of a lower number of tokens.

<sup>85</sup> Raumolin-Brunberg (2005: 38) points out that the concept of age-grading refers to “changes in which the use of a variant or variants recurs or increases at a particular age in

on the idiolectal level, despite ongoing language change in the community at large. This means that linguistic forms acquired during the formative years remain unchanged in adulthood, irrespective of changes on the communal level. In contrast, the pattern of lifespan change (3) refers to individual changes in the direction of ongoing change in the community. Finally, the fifth pattern of communal change (5) sees people from the same community altering their language in the same direction. As Raumolin-Brunberg (2009: 171) rightly adds, “[i]t is noteworthy that both lifespan change and communal change involve instability in the individual and the community”. The difference between the two concepts lies in perspective, viz. that “lifespan change looks at the individual and communal change at the community” (ibid.)

Investigating changes in the national community of Dutch language users, the pattern of communal change was, in fact, investigated in Chapter 5–12. This chapter shifts the focus to the patterns of generational and lifespan change, testing whether and to what extent individual language users altered their linguistic behaviour in the direction of official prescriptions or not. More specifically, the case study in this chapter investigates the effectiveness of Siegenbeek’s (1804) orthography on the language use of adult individuals, who had not been exposed to the *schrijftaalregeling* directly through school education. Did they change their spelling practices in the direction of official norms, possibly acquiring ‘new’ variants in adulthood and thus testifying to the pattern of lifespan change, i.e. changes over the lifespan of individuals in the direction of changes in the rest of the community (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 2016: 203; cf. also Sankoff 2007: 563)? Or does the Martini Buys family correspondence confirm the pattern of generational change, i.e. the stability of the individual across the lifespan but change in the wider community? Certainly in the context of top-down language policy, this seems a particularly interesting research question.

Finally, this case study also attempts to reassess variation and change in the data drawn from the *Going Dutch Corpus* (and the sub-corpus of private letters) on a micro level. For instance, the role of adult language users in the communal developments of the post-*schrijftaalregeling* period needs to be discussed. Furthermore, it should be interesting to see whether the micro-level findings reveal any differences between the investigated spelling features in terms of general awareness.

In Section 2, I first outline the compilation and design of the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*, followed by a concise genealogy of the Martini Buys family. The analyses of five orthographic variables will be presented in Section 3. Section 4 contains a general discussion of the findings.

---

successive generations” (cf. also Labov 2001: 76). However, with historical data, age-grading is particularly difficult to trace, which is why it is not considered in this chapter.

## 2 The Martini Buys family correspondence

### 2.1 Compiling the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*

The corpus of private letters from the Martini Buys family archives is best regarded as a separate, stand-alone supplement to the multi-genre *Going Dutch Corpus*. In fact, it was designed and compiled for the purpose and research questions of this case study on individual variation and change. Sixteen letters from the Martini Buys family correspondence are also part of the sub-corpus of private letters in the *Going Dutch Corpus*, comprising ten texts from the late eighteenth-century period and six texts from the early nineteenth-century period. These texts are also included in this supplement corpus. The additional Martini Buys private letters had partly been collected to be used in the *Going Dutch Corpus*, but were ultimately excluded due to the limit of 2,000 words per writer, i.e. in order to avoid the overrepresentation of particular informants. The bulk of letters, however, was collected specifically for the compilation of this supplement corpus.

For the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*, the same transcription conventions were applied as for the transcriptions of handwritten ego-documents included in the *Going Dutch Corpus* (cf. Chapter 4). However, as we are dealing with a separate case study, a few methodological adjustments could be made, primarily in order to ‘loosen’ the selection criteria of material. Firstly, unlike the *Going Dutch Corpus*, there is no maximum number of words per writer in the supplement corpus. Some more prolific writers naturally left more letters (and thus more words for the corpus) than other members of the family. The focus on individual variation as well as the micro-level approach allow these differences. Secondly, the periods are less strictly defined. Whereas the *Going Dutch Corpus* delimits the two diachronic cross-sections to the periods between 1770–1790 (period 1) and 1820–1840 (period 2), the corpus of family correspondence has slightly more flexible periods, also comprising data from the years 1791–1802 (for period 1), 1806–1819 and 1841–1848 (for period 2). In contrast to the texts selected for the *Going Dutch Corpus*, even some private letters without the exact date of writing were included, at least when the approximate date could be reconstructed and deduced from the context (e.g. dates of birth and death of family members mentioned in the texts). Nonetheless, in order to match the general research questions and design of the multi-genre *Going Dutch Corpus*, the two diachronic cross-sections defined as ‘before 1804/1805’ and ‘after 1804/1805’, i.e. before and after the introduction of the *schrijftaalregeling*, will still be applied here. This allows me to assess the possible normative influence of (in this case) Siegenbeek’s (1804) orthography on the use of particular spelling features in the Martini Buys family correspondence.

### 2.2 Size and structure of the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*

The supplement corpus comprises almost 64,000 words, consisting of 102 private letters written by and sent to members of the Martini Buys family, spanning three

generations of eleven informants (four males, seven females) from the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century (cf. Table 2).

**Table 2.** The *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*.

Informant (M/F)	Lifespan	Regional origin and mobility	Date of letters (Age of writer)	Texts	Words
<b>GENERATION I</b>					
Antoni Martini (M)	1728–1800	Den Bosch (NB), Leiden (SH)	1787–1799 (59–71)	7	4,678
Eva Maria Adriana Buys (F)	1735–1811	Den Bosch (NB), Helvoirt (NB)	1787–1815 (52–80)	7	4,963
<b>GENERATION II</b>					
Anna Maria Emelia (F)	1763–1848	Den Bosch (NB), Helvoirt (NB)	c. 1780s–1825 (c. 20s–62)	8	5,218
Paulus Hubert (M)	1765–1836	Den Bosch (NB), Leiden (SH), Amsterdam (NH)	1787–1799 (22–34)	12	11,975
Geertruid Johanna Antonia Strick van Linschoten (F)	1767–1843	Utrecht, Loenersloot (UT)	1788–1834 (21–67)	16	8,632
Sibilla (F)	1765–1828	Den Bosch (NB), Utrecht	1788–1825 (23–60)	10	5,139
Hendrik Bernard (M)	1768–1848	Den Bosch (NB), Leiden (SH), Vught (NB)	1789–1835 (21–67)	16	7,926
<b>GENERATION III</b>					
Catharina Andrea Geertruid (F)	1796–1861	Amsterdam (NH), Utrecht	1825–1843 (29–47)	12	6,653
Antoni Adriaan (M)	1798–1873	Amsterdam (NH), North Brabant	1831–1833 (33–35)	7	6,519
Eva Maria Adriana (F)	1801–1869	Amsterdam (NH)	c. 1810s–1848 (c. 17–47)	6	2,009
Anna Maria Emilia (F)	1806–1875	Amsterdam (NH)	1823 (17)	1	259
<b>Total</b>				<b>102</b>	<b>63,971</b>

This corpus design makes it possible to investigate inter- and intra-individual variation and change in private letter writing of closely related individuals from a similar and thus comparable background. Nevertheless, there might also be differences in external constraints such as gender, age, educational background, status, mobility and so on (Raumolin-Brunberg 2009: 173), which have to be taken into consideration.

It should be noted that the choice of this particular family is arbitrary and may not necessarily be representative of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century society of the Northern Netherlands. However, the availability of a considerable amount of private letters written by various family members of three generations makes this collection of family correspondence particularly interesting and suitable with regard to the research questions outlined in Section 1. Furthermore, the genealogy of the Martini Buys family is relatively well-documented (cf. de Meij 2011), which allows for a micro-level interpretation of the results.

Table 2 shows the design of the corpus with some basic information about the family members (i.e. gender, lifespan and age, regional origin and mobility across lifespan) and the data (i.e. span of letter writing, number of texts and words). A more detailed genealogical background of the Martini Buys family is provided in Section 2.3.

### 2.3 Family background

According to de Meij (2011), the origins of the Martini Buys genealogy go back to the late sixteenth century. Tonnis Martens (1580–1661) was born in the German village of Buer (part of present-day Gelsenkirchen in North Rhine-Westphalia). Martens was a cooper, who moved to Wesel, near the Dutch border, together with his wife Enneken in the early 1630s. It was their grandson Antoni (1657–1730) who brought the family and the Latinised family name Martini to the Northern Netherlands. He came to Utrecht in 1677 to study theology, later became ordinand in Leiden and ultimately moved to ‘s-Hertogenbosch with his wife Geertruid Buys. Their son Hendrik Bernard (1693–1776) held various positions in the city administration of ‘s-Hertogenbosch. He and his wife Anna Maria Emelia van Schagen were the parents of the oldest member included in the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*, viz. Antoni Martini (1728–1800). He was born in ‘s-Hertogenbosch, studied law in Leiden and became Pensionary (*raad en pensionaris*) of his hometown in 1756. One year later he married Eva Maria Adriana Buys (1735–1811), also born in ‘s-Hertogenbosch as the daughter of lieutenant-general Paulus Hubert Buys. She is the second informant of the first generation in the corpus.

Antoni and Eva Maria Adriana had four children, all of which were born in ‘s-Hertogenbosch and contributed private letters to the second generation of informants in the corpus: Anna Maria Emelia (*Mietje*) (1763–1848), Paulus Hubert (*Pau*) (1765–1836), his twin sister Sibilla (1765–1828), and Hendrik Bernard (*Hein*) (1768–1848). The latter went to Leiden for his law studies, but returned to Brabant



and 's-Hertogenbosch, where he worked as a lawyer and held several administrative positions. Hendrik Bernard, who was married four times and was the father of twelve children, came into the possession of the manor of Geffen, hence his later name Martini van Geffen. Paulus Hubert, his elder brother, also studied law in Leiden and moved to Amsterdam in the 1790s, working as a lawyer and starting a stockbroking company. In 1791, he married Geertruid Johanna Antonia (*Truitje*) Strick van Linschoten (1767–1843), a daughter of general Andries Jan Strick van Linschoten from Utrecht. Anna Maria Emilia, the eldest sister, first married Jacob Frederik Roosendaal and, after his death, François André de Jonge. Sibilla, at the age of 47, married Daniel Gerard van den Burgh, a lawyer from Utrecht.

The informants of the third generation are the children of Paulus Hubert and Geertruid Johanna Antonia: Catharina Andrea Geertruid (*Cato*) (1796–1861), Antoni Adriaan (*Toon*) (1798–1873), the twin sisters Eva Maria Adriana (*Mimi*) (1801–1869) and Sibilla Paulina Elisabeth<sup>86</sup> (*Paulien*) (1801–1870), and Anna Maria Emilia<sup>87</sup> (*Emè*) (1806–1872), who were all born in Amsterdam. Antoni Adriaan, like his father Paulus Hubert, studied law in Leiden and later worked as a lawyer and stockbroker in Amsterdam. He married Cornelia Henriëtte Constance van Eijs and was the father of four children. Catharina Andrea Geertruid married Jan van den Bergh, and her sister Anna Maria Emilia married Gulian Tutein Nolthenius. The twin sisters remained unmarried.

In social terms, the three generations of the Martini Buys family are best characterised as a well-to-do family. With all male family members being lawyers, and most of them holding respectable administrative positions, they can probably be associated with the upper layer of late eighteenth- and early-nineteenth century society, especially in their home region of North Brabant.

### 3 Corpus analysis

#### 3.1 Method

Building on the findings from the analyses of orthographic variables with the *Going Dutch Corpus* presented in Chapters 5–9, three consonantal and two vocalic spelling

<sup>86</sup> Sibilla Paulina Elisabeth is part of the family correspondence, but only indirectly. Although some letters included in the corpus were signed by *Mimi* & *Paulien*, they were actually written in the hand of her twin sister Eva Maria Adriana (*Mimi*), which can be deduced from the letters Eva Maria Adriana wrote on her own. Therefore, Sibilla Paulina Elisabeth is not listed as an informant in Table 2.

<sup>87</sup> Surprisingly, de Meij's (2011: 10) otherwise very detailed inventory of the Martini Buys family archives does not mention Anna Maria Emilia: "Uit het huwelijk van Paulus Hubert Martini Buys en Geertruid Johanna Antonia Strick van Linschoten worden drie dochters en een zoon geboren" 'Of the marriage [...] three daughters and one son were born' (also missing in the genealogy, cf. de Meij 2011: 108). However, the baptismal registers in the Amsterdam City Archives clearly attest the birth of Anna Maria Emilia in 1806.

features are investigated with the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*. The five orthographic variables are briefly outlined below:

- (1) **Syllable-final /xt/:** The orthographic representation of the consonant cluster /xt/ in syllable-final position as <cht> or <gt>.<sup>88</sup> Both variants were officially prescribed by Siegenbeek (1804), but for etymologically distinct groups of words (e.g. <gt> for *bragt* < *brenge* as opposed to <cht> for *kocht* < *kepen*) (cf. Chapter 5).
- (2) **Final /t/ in *d*-stem verbs:** The orthographic representation of final /t/ in second and third person singular and second person plural present tense indicative forms of verbs with a *d*-stem as either <dt>, <d> or <t>. Siegenbeek (1804) prescribed <dt> as the official spelling variant (cf. Chapter 6).
- (3) **Word-medial and word-final /s/:** The orthographic representation of word-medial and word-final /s/ (< Wgm. \*sk̥) as <sch> or <s>. The spelling with <sch> was prescribed by Siegenbeek (1804) (cf. Chapter 7).
- (4) **Long *e*'s in open syllable:** The orthographic representation of etymologically distinct long *e*'s in open syllable, traditionally referred to as sharp-long *ê* and soft-long *ē*. Siegenbeek (1804) officialised the phonology-based system with <ee> for sharp-long *ê* in open syllable, and <e> for soft-long *ē* in open syllable (cf. Chapter 8).
- (5) **West Germanic \*ī:** The orthographic representation of Wgm. \*ī as <ij>, alternatively realised as <ÿ> in handwriting, or <y>. Siegenbeek (1804) officially prescribed the double-dotted spelling <ij>, rejecting the Greek-derived and thus 'foreign' <y> (cf. Chapter 9).

For the corpus analyses of orthographic variables in the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*, the same methods and search queries were used as in the previous analyses with the *Going Dutch Corpus*. For more methodological details, see the corresponding chapters.

### 3.2 Results

#### **Variable (1): Syllable-final /xt/**

Table 3 shows the corpus results for the first variable, i.e. the orthographic representation of syllable-final /xt/ in two categories of words, referred to as *cht*-words and *gt*-words, respectively. The overall results drawn from the *Going Dutch Corpus*, as well as in the sub-corpus of private letters, indicate that Siegenbeek's (1804) division into *cht*-words (with <cht>, due to final devoicing) and *gt*-words

<sup>88</sup> As the third variant <ght> turned out to be marginal even in the entire *Going Dutch Corpus*, it will not be taken into consideration in this case study.

(with <gt>, due to etymology) was adopted in nineteenth-century language practice. Whereas <gt> was clearly the predominant eighteenth-century spelling for all words with syllable-final /xt/, the newly promoted variant <cht> was successfully established as the prime variant for *cht*-words.

**Table 3.** Distribution of variants for syllable-final /xt/ in *cht*-words and *gt*-words.

	/xt/ in <i>cht</i> -words				/xt/ in <i>gt</i> -words			
	<cht>		<gt>		<gt>		<cht>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b><i>GD Corpus</i></b>								
P1 (Total)	241	17.7	1,117	82.3	838	79.4	217	20.6
P2 (Total)	987	75.7	316	24.3	992	82.3	213	17.7
P1 (Letters)	99	12.2	711	87.8	338	89.4	40	10.6
P2 (Letters)	470	67.1	230	32.9	363	80.5	88	19.5
<b>GEN. I</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29.9</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>70.1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>26.8</b>
Antoni	21	55.3	17	44.7	7	38.9	11	61.1
Eva M. A.	2	5.1	37	94.9	23	100	–	–
<b>GEN. II</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>35.6</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>64.4</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>63.2</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>36.8</b>
Anna M. E. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	–	–	50 31/19	100 100/100	13 5/8	100 100/100	–	–
Paulus H.	57	71.3	23	28.8	32	33.3	64	66.7
Geertruid J. A. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	10 –/10	16.4 –/27.8	51 25/26	83.6 100/72.2	28 11/17	96.6 100/94.4	1 –/1	3.4 –/5.6
Sibilla <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	3 –/3	15.8 –/60.0	16 14/2	84.2 100/40.0	21 16/5	91.3 100/71.4	2 –/2	8.7 –/28.6
Hendrik B. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	25 –/25	43.9 –/54.3	32 11/21	56.1 100/45.7	23 5/18	95.8 100/94.7	1 –/1	4.2 –/5.3
<b>GEN. III</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>88.3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>88.9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11.1</b>
Catharina A. G.	32	91.4	3	8.6	19	86.4	3	13.6
Antoni A.	42	85.7	7	14.3	22	100	–	–
Eva M. A.	17	89.5	2	10.5	5	62.5	3	37.5
Anna M. E.	–	–	–	–	2	100	–	–

**Generation I:** The private letters from the first generation of informants reveal inter-individual differences. Antoni used both <cht> and <gt> in what would become Siegenbeek's *cht*-words and *gt*-words, with a modest preference for <cht> in both groups. A lexically or etymologically conditioned pattern cannot be

attested, though, as *wacht*, *dacht*, *zicht* occur alongside *wagt*, *dagt*, *zigt*. On the other hand, Antoni spelled the rather formulaic *verzogt* consistently with <gt>. The letters by his wife Eva Maria Adriana show an invariable use of <gt> for all words with syllable-final /xt/, except for two tokens with <cht> (*dochter*, *versocht*). However, Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg (2016: 97) argue that “if the individual score falls between 0 and 10, or 90 and 100 [per cent], the person has been considered to have an invariable grammar”, according to which “an occasional occurrence of the minority variant does not change the overall impression”. Following this methodology, Eva Maria Adriana was thus a consistent user of <gt>, both before (1787–1797) and after (1810–1815) the *schrijftaalregeling*.

**Generation II:** The second generation turns out to be particularly intriguing, revealing considerable variation in the use of variants between the five informants. The differences already become apparent in the letters produced before Siegenbeek (1804). Like her mother Eva Maria Adriana, the eldest daughter Anna Maria Emelia consistently used <gt>, with no single attestation of <cht>. The same invariable usage of <gt> as the only variant is also found in the letters by her siblings Sibilla and Hendrik Bernard as well as her sister-in-law Geertruid Johanna Antonia. Interestingly, Paulus Hubert, the eldest son, already used <cht> alongside the less frequent <gt>, unlike his siblings and his wife, but like his father Antoni. To some extent, his choice of variants seems to be lexically conditioned. Of all 64 attestations of <cht> in the group of *gt*-words, no fewer than 55 tokens are found in words with \*REGT\*/\*RECHT\*, and particularly in his fairly formulaic usage of *oprecht* ‘sincere’, which he systematically spelled with <cht>. On the other hand, we find a less consistent spelling of <cht> and <gt> in *opzichte*, *voorzichten* alongside *opzigte*, *voorzigt*, and in *vervachten*, *onverwachte* alongside *vervagten*, *onverwagte*.

How did Siegenbeek’s intervention ‘from above’, i.e. the etymologically motivated split into *cht*-words and *gt*-words, affect this generation of letter writers, who did not acquire the feature during their formative years of childhood and youth? Unfortunately, for Paulus Hubert no private letters seem to be preserved or available from the post-Siegenbeek period. For the remaining family members, however, interesting patterns can be attested. Like her mother Eva Maria Adriana, Anna Maria Emelia continued to use <gt> as the only variant in her nineteenth-century texts from 1806 and 1825. In other words, the official division into *cht/gt* did not affect her spelling practices, as <cht> is completely absent from her texts. Her sister Sibilla, on the other hand, seemed to be aware of the ‘new’ <cht> spelling. Despite an admittedly low number of tokens, Sibilla’s letters from 1810 onward contain both <gt> and <cht>, the latter of which was completely absent in her 1788–1790 texts. Occasionally, she also used the newly acquired <cht> for *gt*-words (*verricht*, *doorzicht*), which might be interpreted as hypercorrect forms. With a higher number of tokens, the same tendency can be confirmed in the post-Siegenbeek letters by sister-in-law Geertruid Johanna Antonia. Only using <gt> in her letters from 1788–1789, her texts written between 1817–1834 see the emergence of <cht> in the category of *cht*-words, co-occurring with the still more frequent <gt>. Similarly, Hendrik Bernard’s letters from the period 1821–1835 also show a considerable increase of <cht>, particularly for *cht*-words (from complete

absence to more than fifty per cent). Nevertheless, in this group of words <cht> (e.g. 13x *dochter*, 8x *echter*) still co-occurred with <gt> (e.g. 8x *wagt*, 7x *kogt*), though not interchangeably with the same lexical items.

While Siegenbeek's rules related to the *cht/gt* issue might not have been applied entirely successfully, i.e. in conformity with the prescribed spelling, the lifespan changes are remarkable. Apart from the eldest sister Anna Maria Emelia, who turned out to be conservative across her lifespan, her siblings Sibilla and Hendrik Bernard as well as sister-in-law Geertruid Johanna Antonia must have acquired <cht> as a new spelling variant even in their late thirties or forties. These findings suggest a high awareness of the officially promoted coexistence of <gt> and <cht>.

**Generation III:** In the third generation of letter writers, Siegenbeek's division into *cht*-words and *gt*-words was applied most unproblematically. In the case of *cht*-words, <cht> was used in more than 85% by the three siblings Catharina Andrea Geertruid, Antoni Adriaan and Eva Maria Adriana. Furthermore, *gt*-words were also predominantly spelled in line with Siegenbeek, certainly in the letters by Catharina Andrea Geertruid (86.4% <gt>) and Antoni Adriaan (100% <gt>).

**Variables (2)–(3): Final /t/ in *d*-stem verbs; word-medial and word-final /s/**

Table 4 shows the corpus results for the other two consonantal variables, i.e. the orthographic representation of final /t/ in second and third person singular and second person plural present indicative forms of *d*-stem verbs on the one hand, and the orthographic representation of word-medial and word-final /s/ (< Wgm. \*vʎ) on the other. In both cases, the results from the *Going Dutch Corpus* indicated a considerable increase of the officially prescribed variants in early nineteenth-century language usage, i.e. <dt> and <sch>, respectively. However, while <sch> had already been established as the predominant variant by the late eighteenth century, there was a striking shift from <d> in the eighteenth century to <dt> in the nineteenth century.

The orthographic representation of final /t/ in particular forms of *d*-stem verbs is one of the relatively low-frequent phenomena in this corpus study, and does not allow a fine-grained interpretation. Despite the limited amount of tokens in the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*, some tendencies can be discussed, though.

**Generation I:** Although the total number of tokens is hardly representative, all three historical variants occur in the private letters from the first generation. Antoni used <dt> (2x *wordt*) and <d> (*goedvind*), whereas <d> (*soud*, *zend*) and the phonetic spelling with <t> (2x *wort*, *hout*) occur in the letters written by his wife Eva Maria Adriana.

**Generation II:** The <d> spelling is practically the only variant which was consistently used by all family members from the second generation, both before and after Siegenbeek (1804). The only two instances of <dt> (*wordt*) and <t> (*ondervint*) are found in the letters by Geertruid Johanna Antonia from 1825. Generally, the officialisation of <dt> did not seem to have affected the second

Martini Buys generation at all, since they did not alter their spelling in the nineteenth century. To some extent, this dominance of <d> might be related to the regional origin of the informants. The members of the first and second generations were all born in 's-Hertogenbosch in the region of North Brabant, where, according to the general findings based on the *Going Dutch Corpus*, <d> was relatively dominant in the late eighteenth century and remained a strong second variant in the early nineteenth century (cf. Chapter 6).

**Table 4.** Distribution of variants for final /t/ in *d*-stem verbs and word-medial/final /s/.

	Final /t/ in <i>d</i> -stem verbs						Word-medial and word-final /s/			
	<dt>		<d>		<t>		<sch>		<s>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b><i>GD Corpus</i></b>										
P1 (Total)	62	17.1	258	71.1	43	11.8	607	72.7	228	27.3
P2 (Total)	293	66.3	138	31.2	11	2.5	690	95.0	34	5.0
P1 (Letters)	34	18.8	108	59.7	39	21.5	237	56.6	182	43.4
P2 (Letters)	133	56.8	91	38.9	10	4.3	299	92.9	23	7.1
<b>GEN. I</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11.4</b>
Antoni	2	66.7	1	33.3	–	–	21	100	–	–
Eva M. A.	–	–	2	40.0	3	60.0	10	71.4	4	28.6
<b>GEN. II</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>97.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>96.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Anna M. E.	–	–	9	100	–	–	14	87.5	2	12.5
Paulus H.	–	–	28	100	–	–	28	100	–	–
Geertruid J. A.	1	5.9	15	88.2	1	5.9	30	100	–	–
Sibilla	–	–	14	100	–	–	19	95.0	1	5.0
Hendrik B.	–	–	6	100	–	–	19	95.0	1	5.0
<b>GEN. III</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>97.8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.2</b>
Catharina A. G.	7	41.2	10	58.8	–	–	21	100	–	–
Antoni A.	6	60.0	4	40.0	–	–	17	100	–	–
Eva M. A.	–	–	–	–	–	–	7	87.5	1	12.5
Anna M. E.	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

**Generation III:** For the third generation, again, the number of tokens is too low for a detailed interpretation. What we can see, though, is that both

Catharina Andrea Geertruid and her brother Antoni Adriaan used <d> and <dt> as more or less equally frequent variants. The inconsistent spelling of the high-frequency verb *worden* as *wordt* (6 tokens) and *word* (11 tokens) in both Catharina Andrea Geertruid's and Antoni Adriaan's letters possibly indicates a limited awareness (or acceptance) of <dt> as the prescribed norm.

Coming to the orthographic representation of /s/ (derived from West Germanic \**sk*) in word-medial and word-final position, the results from the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus* reveal <sch> as the prevalent variant across all three generations.

**Generation I:** Antoni consistently spelled <sch> in all instances, whereas there is some more variation in the letters written by his wife Eva Maria Adriana, with <sch> (71.4%) coexisting alongside <s> (four tokens), all of which are attestations of *tussen*.

**Generation II:** Similar to the case of <d> in the previous variable, there was a pronounced preference for one variant, i.e. <sch>, across all members of the second generation. Only a few tokens with <s> are occasionally found in texts by Anna Maria Emelia (2x *tussen*), Sibilla (*vis*) and Hendrik Bernard (*gevenste*). Whereas the general results drawn from the sub-corpus of private letters indicate a much higher share of <s>, the Martini Buys family had developed a clear preference for <sch>.

**Generation III:** In line with Siegenbeek's prescription, but at the same time also continuing the practices of the previous generation, the third generation invariably used <sch> as the only variant. Only one token of <s> (*tussen*) can be attested in a letter written by Eva Maria Adriana.

### Variable (3): Long *e*'s in open syllable

Table 5 shows the distribution of spelling variants representing sharp-long *ê* and soft-long *ē* in open syllables in the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*. According to the findings from the *Going Dutch Corpus*, <ee> had been established as the main variant for sharp-long *ê* in open syllable by the late eighteenth century, whereas <e> and <ee> were co-occurring variants for soft-long *ē* in open syllable. Siegenbeek (1804) officialised the phonology-based system, i.e. sharp-long <ee> and soft-long <e>, which was successfully adopted in the nineteenth-century community at large.

**Generation I:** For words with sharp-long *ê* in open syllable, both Antoni and Eva Maria Adriana almost exclusively used the digraph <ee>, with the occasional token of <e> (three and one, respectively). For words with soft-long *ē* in open syllable, the single grapheme <e> was predominantly used. It appears that the historical-phonological distinction of sharp-long *ê* and soft-long *ē* was reflected in the spelling practices of the two informants from the first generation. Interestingly, the distinction was most accurately applied in Eva Maria Adriana's letters (86.4% <e> for soft-long *ē*), whereas her husband shows somewhat more variation (67.1% <e>, 32.9% <ee>).

**Table 5.** Distribution of variants for sharp-long *ê* and soft-long *ē* in open syllable.

	Sharp-long <i>ê</i>				Soft-long <i>ē</i>			
	<ee>		<e>		<ee>		<e>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b><i>GD Corpus</i></b>								
P1 (Total)	1,364	90.1	150	9.9	1,664	59.5	1,133	40.4
P2 (Total)	1,806	91.5	167	8.5	3,043	92.5	246	7.5
P1 (Letters)	528	88.3	70	11.7	728	50.7	707	49.3
P2 (Letters)	654	86.4	103	13.6	1,419	88.6	182	11.4
<b>GEN. I</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>93.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>76.7</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>23.3</b>
Antoni	34	91.9	3	8.1	55	67.1	27	32.9
Eva M. A.	24	96.0	1	4.0	70	86.4	11	13.6
<b>GEN. II</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>37.0</b>
Anna M. E. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	22 11/11	100 100/100	–	–	13 11/2	14.6 20.4/5.7	76 43/33	85.4 79.6/94.3
Paulus H.	117	97.5	3	2.5	224	80.3	55	19.7
Geertruid J. A. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	29 11/18	100 100/100	–	–	13 6/7	11.1 10.0/12.3	104 54/50	88.9 90.0/87.7
Sibilla <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	35 18/17	94.6 94.7/94.4	2 1/1	5.4 5.3/5.6	45 13/32	54.2 32.5/74.4	38 27/11	45.8 67.5/25.6
Hendrik B. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	65 13/52	86.7 76.5/89.7	10 4/6	13.3 23.5/10.3	180 33/147	96.8 91.7/98.0	6 3/3	3.2 8.3/2.0
<b>GEN. III</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>95.8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>93.6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6.4</b>
Catharina A. G.	34	97.1	1	2.9	94	94.0	6	6.0
Antoni A.	51	96.2	2	3.8	90	91.8	8	8.2
Eva M. A.	5	83.3	1	16.7	41	95.3	2	4.7
Anna M. E.	1	100	–	–	10	100	–	–

**Generation II:** Like in the previous generation, and also very much in line with the general situation in the wider community, words with sharp-long *ê* were primarily spelled with <ee> across all family members. Compared to the practically invariable usage of <ee> in the letters by Anna Maria Emelia (100%), Paulus Hubert (97.5%), Geertruid Johanna Antonia (100%) and Sibilla (94.6%), there are slightly more attestations of <e> for sharp-long *ê* in Hendrik Bernard's letters (89.7%). The relative distribution of variants, with a strong prevalence of <ee>, is generally stable across the pre- and post-Siegenbeek periods.



For words with soft-long  $\bar{e}$ , considerably more variation can be attested, involving <e> and <ee> as co-occurring variants, which is also in line with the general findings drawn from the *Going Dutch Corpus*. In the letters written by Anna Maria Emelia and Geertruid Johanna Antonia, <ee> is the preferred variant, occurring in 85.4% and 88.9%, respectively. This means that these two female writers did not distinguish sharp-long and soft-long  $e$ 's by spelling and apparently applied the alternative syllabic system (i.e. <ee> in open syllable). In contrast to Anna Maria Emelia and Geertruid Johanna Antonia, the two male informants of the second generation used the <e> spelling for soft-long  $\bar{e}$ . Paulus Hubert (80.3%) and his younger brother Hendrik Bernard (96.8%) thus applied the phonology-based system. Their sister Sibilla appears to take an intermediate position, using <e> (54.2%) alongside <ee> (45.8%) for soft-long  $\bar{e}$ .

Zooming in on the diachronic changes in the letter data from before and after Siegenbeek (1804), more interesting patterns become visible. While the brothers Paulus Hubert and Hendrik Bernard already made a distinction between <ee> for sharp-long  $\acute{e}$  and (primarily) <e> for soft-long  $\bar{e}$  in the late eighteenth century, different developments can be witnessed in the letters by their female contemporaries of the second generation. Both Anna Maria Emelia and Geertruid Johanna Antonia continued to apply the syllabic system with <ee> in open syllables. Evidently, the officialised phonology-based distinction into <ee> and <e> did not affect their spelling practices after 1804.

Remarkably, we do see changes in the direction of Siegenbeek's prescription in the letters written by their sister(-in-law) Sibilla. In line with the official spelling norms, she shifted from <ee> (67.5%) as the main variant for soft-long  $\bar{e}$  in her letters from 1788–1790 to <e> (increasing from 32.5% to 74.4%) in her letters from 1810–1825. Although <e> was part of her pre-Siegenbeek practices, she must have acquired the phonology-based system even beyond her formative years. Inconsistent spellings, for instance *deze/deeze*, *mede/meede*, co-occurred across her lifespan, though.

**Generation III:** The phonology-based system as prescribed by Siegenbeek (1804) was consistently applied in the letters from the third generation. Catharina Andrea Geertruid and Antoni Adriaan use <ee> for sharp-long  $\acute{e}$  in 97.1% and 96.2%, respectively, and <e> for soft-long  $\bar{e}$  in 94.0% and 91.8%, respectively. Even though the number of tokens is lower in the case of their younger sisters Eva Maria Adriana and especially Anna Maria Emilia, it can be seen that they also spelled according to the phonology-based system. It should be taken into account that all members of the fourth generation were born and raised in Amsterdam, where the phonological distinction between sharp-long  $\acute{e}$  and soft-long  $\bar{e}$  had already merged centuries earlier. This clearly supports the conclusion that the orthographic distinction grounded on phonology must have been acquired as a direct or indirect result of Siegenbeek's prescription.

**Variable (5): West Germanic \*ī**

Table 6 shows the relative distribution of spelling variants representing Wgm. \*ī, comprising the double-dotted forms <ij> and <ÿ>, the undotted <y> and alternative forms. In the *Going Dutch Corpus*, the distribution of dotted and undotted variants remained surprisingly stable after Siegenbeek (1804) had prescribed <ij> as the national variant. In fact, only newspapers shifted from <y> in the eighteenth century to <ij> in the early nineteenth century, whereas there was clearly more resistance in adopting the double-dotted spelling among writers of ego-documents.

**Table 6.** Distribution of variants for Wgm. \*ī.

	West Germanic *ī							
	<ij>		<ÿ>		<y>		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>GD Corpus</b>								
P1 (Total)	322	3.6	3,156	35.3	4,668	52.2	800	8.9
P2 (Total)	989	10.1	3,369	34.4	4,934	50.4	497	5.1
P1 (Letters)	178	3.3	2,621	48.7	2,259	42.0	325	6.0
P2 (Letters)	127	2.1	2,458	40.4	3,172	52.2	320	5.3
<b>GEN. I</b>	–	–	<b>203</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>46.6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3.4</b>
Antoni	–	–	203	97.1	5	2.4	1	0.5
Eva M. A.	–	–	–	–	184	98.4	3	1.6
<b>GEN. II</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>1,005</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>15.2</b>
Anna M. E. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	–	–	–	–	211 118/93	100 100/100	–	–
Paulus H.	–	–	624	91.2	4	0.6	56	8.2
Geertruid J. A. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	–	–	–	–	532 269/263	99.8 100/99.6	1 0/1	0.2 –/0.4
Sibilla <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	66 –/66	23.1 –/57.9	45 –/45	15.7 –/39.5	174 172/2	60.8 100/1.8	1 –/1	0.3 –/0.9
Hendrik B. <i>pre-/post-Siegenbeek</i>	–	–	34 27/7	9.0 24.1/2.6	84 21/63	22.2 188/23.7	260 64/196	68.8 57.1/73.7
<b>GEN. III</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>19.5</b>
Catharina A. G.	–	–	210	58.0	3	0.8	149	41.2
Antoni A.	1	0.3	198	61.3	115	35.6	9	2.8
Eva M. A.	–	–	5	4.8	100	95.2	–	–
Anna M. E.	–	–	18	94.7	1	5.3	–	–

**Generation I:** The two informants of the first generation had distinct individual spelling preferences with regard to this feature. Antoni preferred the double-dotted <ÿ> (97.1%), whereas his wife Eva Maria Adriana almost exclusively used the undotted <y> (98.4%). In other words, there is practically no intra-individual variation, but a consistently applied choice for one variant.

**Generation II:** The idiosyncratic nature of this spelling variable becomes even more apparent in the letters written by the second generation. Anna Maria Emelia and Geertruid Johanna Antonia invariably used <y> in their letters, both before and after Siegenbeek (1804). On the other hand, Paulus Hubert, like his father Antoni, primarily used <ÿ> (91.2%) already in the late eighteenth century. His younger brother Hendrik Bernard was far less consistent in the use of the double-dotted spelling. His letters from 1789–1797, written during his twenties, contain <ÿ> (24.1%) alongside <y> (18.8%) but most frequently the idiosyncratic <ÿ̇> with some kind of acute accent (57.1%). In his post-Siegenbeek letters from 1821–1835, written in his fifties and sixties, the accented <ÿ̇> had become his prevalent variant (73.7%), whereas the undotted <y> is found in in 23.7%. Interestingly, the officially prescribed spelling decreased to a marginal 2.6%.

In terms of normative influence, the most remarkable results are found in the private letters written by Sibilla. Examining her entire data set, one could easily get the impression that she used the double-dotted variants <ij> and <ÿ> alongside the undotted <y>. On closer inspection, though, it appears that Sibilla systematically shifted from the undotted to the double-dotted spelling across her lifespan. In her letters from 1788–1790, written in her early to mid-twenties, <y> invariably occurs in 100% of all instances. In the letters from 1810–1825, between her mid-fourties to the age of sixty, Sibilla's choice of variants radically changes in the direction of Siegenbeek's prescriptions, using either <ij> or <ÿ> in 97.4% of all instances. Except for two occasional attestations, her previous <y> spelling no longer occurs, which underscores her awareness of the officialised norm.

At least within this particular family correspondence, the results for the late eighteenth century signal gender as a factor that conditioned the choice of variants. While all four female informants from the first and second generation used <y> in their private letters, father Antoni and his eldest son Paulus Hubert were users of <ÿ>. Hendrik Bernard further developed an idiosyncratic preference for the accented <ÿ̇>.

**Generation III:** The spelling of Wgm. \**i* continued to be largely dependent on idiosyncratic preferences even in the post-Siegenbeek generation, with <ij> being the officially prescribed variant. Catharina Andrea Geertruid varied between the double-dotted <ÿ> (58.0%) and an alternative form with diacritics somewhere between <ÿ̇> and <ÿ̈> (41.2%). The latter, however, can probably be interpreted as a more 'sloppy' version of the 'neat' double-dotted <ÿ>, by connecting the two dots. Apparently the undotted <y> was no option for Catharina Andrea Geertruid, as there are only three attestations of the rejected variant in her letters. Her brother Antoni Adriaan inconsistently used both <ÿ> (61.3%) and <y> (35.6%), alternating between the two variants even within the same texts. His awareness of the prescribed double-dotted spelling must have been

limited, which might be somewhat surprising considering his academic background and his work as a lawyer, both suggesting familiarity and proficiency with standard language norms. His sister Eva Maria Adriana, in contrast, spelled <y> in 95.2% of all cases, against the prescribed norm. Despite the considerable lower number of tokens, it appears that the youngest sister Anna Maria Emilia primarily used <ÿ> (94.7%). In sum, the findings for the *ij/y* issue testify to a high degree of inter-individual variation between the siblings of the third generation. Although they probably acquired <ij> during their formative years, it seems that the awareness of this double-dotted spelling as the official variant was not overly prominent, or at least not consistently adopted in private letter writing practices.

As already discussed, the comparatively strong persistence of the rejected <y> in the nineteenth century could be related to the very nature of this orthographic variable, involving a diacritic rather than a ‘proper’ graphemic representation. It was also discussed by Vosters et al. (2010: 99), who consider the minimal (diacritic) difference between the variants in handwriting as a possible explanation for the lack of change. In Chapter 9, I argued that the presence or absence of the two dots might not have been as salient to language users as it was to Siegenbeek and many of his eighteenth-century predecessors. What the results from this case study mainly indicate is a high degree of inter-individual variation, i.e. idiosyncratic but mostly consistent choices of a particular variant, irrespective of standard norms, and to a considerably lesser extent intra-individual variation (particularly Hendrik Bernard and Antoni Adriaan). Remarkably, even the siblings from the third generation, when <ij> had been officially prescribed, have idiosyncratic preferences. On the other hand, it should be emphasised that the case of Sibilla also testifies to a conscious shift towards the official norm, systematically replacing <y> by the prescribed double-dotted spelling.

#### 4 Discussion

The case study presented in this chapter focused on inter- and intra-individual variation and change in the *Martini Buys Correspondence Corpus*, a specifically compiled corpus of private correspondence from the Martini Buys family archives, spanning the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century. Taking a micro-level approach to individual behaviour, and investigating five orthographic variables, a number of (partly interrelated) research questions could be addressed.

To begin with, one interesting aspect that could hardly be examined with the large-scale data set of the *Going Dutch Corpus* concerns the consistency of individual spelling preferences and practices. In other words, did individual writers use coexisting variants inconsistently, or did they (more or less) consistently choose one particular variant? While the presented findings from three generations proved to be too diverse to be summed up concisely, it appears that most informants tend to have preferences for particular variants. In fact, the second generation, particularly in the pre-Siegenbeek texts, showed a fairly high degree of consistency

in spelling practices. In the period before the official spelling regulation, the three female members Anna Maria Emelia, Geertruid Johanna Antonia and Sibilla invariably used <gt>, <d>, <sch>, <y> and, except for Sibilla, <ee> in open syllables. Paulus Hubert was consistent in his use of <d>, <sch>, <ÿ> and more or less consistently applied the phonology-based system with <ee> and <e>. His brother Hendrik Bernard invariably spelled <gt>, <d>, <sch>, but was more inconsistent in the use of the two vocalic variables, especially with regard to undotted, double-dotted and accented variants of the *ij/y* variable.

The third generation, exposed to the official Siegenbeek norms during their formative years, turned out to be consistent in the use of <sch>, <cht> for *cht*-words and <gt> for *gt*-words, <ee> for sharp-long *ê* and <e> for soft-long *ē* in open syllables (according to the phonology-based system). Interestingly, in the case of final /t/ in forms of *d*-stem verbs, it appeared that the inconsistent use of variants only started after 1804/1805. Both Catharina Andrea Geertruid and Antoni Adriaan used <dt> and <d> as co-occurring variants, whereas the previous generation invariably used <d>. This pattern possibly underlines the transitional character of the first half of the nineteenth century, as both the former main variant <d> and the officialised <dt> were in use. Similarly, Antoni Adriaan interchangeably used the prescribed <ÿ> alongside the rejected <y>. His sister Catharina Andrea Geertruid did not use the undotted variant, but often varied between a neatly double-dotted <ÿ> and a more sloppy <ÿ̇>/<ÿ̈>. Their younger sister Eva Maria Adriana, on the other hand, almost invariably used <y>, against the Siegenbeek norm, underscoring the inter-individual differences in consistency with regard to the *ij/y* variable.

Furthermore, this chapter addressed the issue of individual lifespan change as a possible effect of language policy. By zooming in on those informants of the Martini Buys family from which private letters written before and after Siegenbeek's (1804) orthography have been preserved, this case study also shed light on the impact of top-down language policy on spelling practices of adult language users, whose formative years had been completed years or even decades before the *schrijftaalregeling* was introduced. The general results drawn from the *Going Dutch Corpus*, at least for the most orthographic variables (cf. Chapters 5–9), indicated a communal shift, i.e. a general change of spelling practices in the direction of the officially prescribed norms in the community at large. It raised the question whether and to what extent language users in adulthood participated in this change. Did they acquire 'new' variants irrespective of transmission through (school) education?

For the informant from the first generation, Eva Maria Adriana Buys, who was around seventy years old when the language policy was introduced, no changes across lifespan could be witnessed. In all five cases, she maintained her spelling preferences until the early nineteenth century. Her eldest daughter Anna Maria Emelia as well as her daughter-in-law Geertruid Johanna Antonia, both from the second generation, did not alter their spelling across lifespan either. These three cases of (female) writers, in fact, testify to the pattern of generational change, "in which there is idiolectal stability despite ongoing change in the community"

(Raumolin-Brunberg 2009: 171). In other words, despite the top-down language policy and official spelling norms, the use of spelling variants in the letters by Eva Maria Adriana, Anna Maria Emelia and (except for the fairly cautious adoption of <cht>) Geertruid Johanna Antonia remained stable, as “the linguistic forms acquired in childhood remain unchanged” (ibid.).

The second generation also offers two interesting counterexamples, though, giving evidence of lifespan changes in the spelling practices of Hendrik Bernard and Sibilla. Whereas the use of <d> remains stable (i.e. not changing to prescribed <dt>), the dynamics in the use of the other features shed some more light on the effectiveness and awareness of Siegenbeek’s (1804) official norms among adult language users. First of all, Hendrik Bernard acquired <cht> as a new variant, which had been absent in his eighteenth-century letters, but co-occurred with <gt> in his texts from the 1820s and 1830s. Although he worked as a lawyer and held various administrative functions in North Brabant, which presupposes familiarity with standard language norms, he did not adopt <ij> (or <ÿ>) as the main variant, but rather developed an accented form <ÿ> in his private letters – possibly his idiosyncratic representation of <ÿ>? While this is beyond the scope of this case study, it might be interesting to see whether <ÿ> (or a more properly double-dotted form) also occurs in Hendrik Bernard’s professional documents, for example business letters. Remarkably, his sister Sibilla, unlike her female contemporaries, consciously altered her spelling practices in the direction of the official Siegenbeek norms. In fact, these changes could be witnessed in three cases (with varying ‘success rates’). Firstly, Sibilla, like her brother, adopted <cht> as a new variant alongside <gt>. Secondly, she consolidated <e> for soft-long *ê* as opposed to <ee> for sharp-long *ê*. Thirdly, she radically shifted from <y> before Siegenbeek to <ij>/<ÿ> after Siegenbeek.

These lifespan changes in the private letters by Hendrik Bernard and, even more strikingly, Sibilla, must testify to a considerable awareness of spelling norms even among adult language users in the early nineteenth century – beyond the direct acquisition through education. A possible explanation for Sibilla’s adoption of official spelling variants has to be found in different means of contact with these norms. As the results in Chapters 5–9 unambiguously attested the use of Siegenbeek’s prescribed variants in nineteenth-century newspapers, it could be assumed that adult language users like Sibilla Martini acquired their knowledge of spelling norms through the reading of newspapers and other sorts of published writing. In these texts, readers were exposed to the invariable use of spelling variants in conformity with official prescriptions, which possibly raised their awareness for the newly promoted orthographic conventions regardless of formal (school) education.

Addressing the awareness of forms, Raumolin-Brunberg (2009: 173) emphasises that the direction of change (in Labovian terms) should be taken into account, arguing that “[i]t may be a different matter to adopt changes from below, i.e., shifts that emanate from below the level of social awareness, and changes from above, i.e., shifts that stem from prestigious sources, often acquired with full public awareness”. At least some level of public awareness of official spelling norms must

have been present in the case of the language policy of the Northern Netherlands, although the spelling regulations reached – or affected – by no means all informants of the transitional generation(s).

Finally, how do the micro-level findings drawn from this case study further enrich the interpretation of variation and change witnessed in the community at large, i.e. with the multi-genre *Going Dutch Corpus*? What might be perceived as a methodological drawback is the inclusion of adult language users in the nineteenth-century cross-section whose formative years had been completed long before the introduction of the *schrijftaalregeling* in 1804/1805. Although adult language users in the early nineteenth century were not directly exposed to the national language policy through education and thus during their formative years, this chapter has shown that they could still participate in the language change (from above), altering their spelling practices across lifespan. In fact, individual informants of the second generation, and the case of Sibilla Martini in particular, adopted the official spelling norms in adulthood at a later point in life. While the impact of the top-down written language regulation must have been of a more indirect kind – compared to the younger generation of writers, who were exposed directly to the language-in-education policy – the results indicate that the effectiveness of the national language policy can actually be examined even in texts produced by the adult generation. It is true that conservative individuals from the pre-*schrijftaalregeling* generation, for instance Anna Maria Emelia and Geertruid Johanna Antonia in this case study, might skew the overall results to some extent. On the other hand, this case study has shown that even individuals from the post-*schrijftaalregeling* generation sometimes preferred and used variants which clearly deviate from the official Siegenbeek norms. Summing up, I therefore argue that the ‘older’ generation of writers should be taken into account as a possible factor conditioning the results of the nineteenth-century data, but are ultimately best treated as a legitimate part of the community at large and, more concretely, of the nineteenth-century cross-section of the *Going Dutch Corpus*.

