



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

Andreas Krogull

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

PROPOSITIONS

1. The Dutch language policy of the early 1800s considerably increased the awareness of linguistic norms within a relatively short period of time.
2. Officialised prescriptions on the level of orthography (Siegenbeek 1804) are adopted more effectively than prescriptions on the level of grammar (Weiland 1805).
3. Genre is the most crucial factor conditioning the distribution of orthographic and morphosyntactic variants in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Dutch.
4. For the study of the Dutch relativisation system, alternative pronominal forms like *hetwelk*, *betgeen* and *welke* are as relevant as the *d-/w*-pronouns *dat*, *die*, *wat* and *wie*.
5. The increase of the genitive case in early nineteenth-century usage can, at least to a certain extent, be assigned to normative influence of the Dutch *schrijftaalregeling*.
6. With a historical-sociolinguistic approach, it is possible to analyse and assess the influence of language policy measures on actual usage patterns empirically.
7. A custom-made and balanced corpus design is essential for answering specific questions on language variation and change in the past.
8. Given the genre-specific developments in private letters, diaries and travelogues, the umbrella category of 'handwritten ego-documents' tends to be too overgeneralised.
9. Micro-level perspectives on the linguistic behaviour of individual language users can add valuable insights to large-scale corpus studies.
10. Extensive and well-functioning online catalogues like *Archieven.nl* are indispensable tools for efficient historical-sociolinguistic fieldwork in the archives.