One of the most important realizations I had after reading the review was the inconsistencies in the use of different terms throughout the whole text. I agree with the reviewer on the fact that the thesis does not clearly depict how different the terms bilingualism and multilingualism are (quantitatively as well as qualitatively). I am thankful for the idea of the importance of clarifying even in the very beginning, why the term 'multilingualism' is used when referring to individual aspects and 'bilingualism' when referring to the target community. This differentiation should have been clarified in the introductory part of the thesis.

I agree with the reviewer on the shortcomings of Chapter 2. The introduction of the Chapter requires a more thorough and detailed review of the international literature as too much focus has been put on studies conducted in the Carpathian Basin. It would have been useful to mention the early works of Gumperz (e.g. 1982) and Hymes (e.g. 1968) (as their studies were consistently quoted and referred to in the upcoming chapters of the thesis; also see Gumperz-Hymes 1972), or Heller's work in the 1990s. Section 2.3 also needs to be updated with the inclusion of the literature mentioned by the reviewer.

Semilingualism is a highly debated term. In DMM multilingual speakers are seen as advantaged and disadvantaged at the same time. Their disadvantage can be reflected in cross-linguistic influences or insufficient language maintenance. The model emphasizes that multilingualism is not a static state but a complex and evolving phenomenon influenced by various factors and human language capacity is not a finite quantity and suggests that language acquisition is a complex phenomenon. This concept has to be linked with reductionist views on bi- and multilingualism as explained in the DMM, it only works if one sees languages in the mind as full or partially full containers as in children or non-native speakers. „Semi"-lingualism as a term itself can feel like an opposition to the term „bilingualism", a bilingualism might suggest something that is more balanced. The term semilingualism also tends to appear as an ideological construct, we can often meet this term as part of the majority discourse when it comes to minority settings.

Regarding Chapter 3, I agree with the reviewer on the distracting nature of the methodological background of Linguistic Landscape. At the time of the completion of the thesis, it seemed like the most logical choice. It could have been moved to Chapter 2 so as not to break the cohesion of the text or broken down into two parts as looking at it now, the methodological introduction

is way too long in proportion than desired. However, as language border is a term that is more often used in dialectology, I found it important to clarify its meaning and the difficulties of its definition, and what it means in the interpretation of the current thesis.

The shortcomings of Chapter 4 are bright and clear as I have found the same concerns brought up by both reviewers. I am definitely aiming to address these issues during my presentation at the viva.

Although Chapter 5, Part 1.1 does not contain data, it plays an important role in defining why mother tongue and ethnicity are closely related in this particular situation, and its function was to make the following subchapters understandable for readers who are not familiar with the setting. In the case of biculturalism, I would have aimed to cover more than religion and celebrations, as I assumed beforehand, but the patterns in the interviewees' answers pointed in the same direction and I was not able to gain more data on that topic.

I could not agree more with the fact that Chapter 2 and 6 need more cohesion and I will take the pieces of advice given by the reviewer during the publishing process. Research questions should also have been answered in a more straightforward manner.

I also agree with the formatting issues pointed out by the reviewer. They definitely should be addressed and corrected.

References:

Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Language and Social Identity. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 2*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gumperz, John J. – Hymes, Dell eds. 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics. The Ethnography of Communication*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Hymes, Dell 1968. The ethnography of speaking. In: Fishman, Joshua ed. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Mouton, The Hague. 99–138.

Heller, Monica 1995. Language choice, social institutions and symbolic domination. *Language in Society* 24(3): 373–405.