

First and foremost, I wish to express my sincere thanks to my reviewer, Dr. Anna Fenyvesi, for her thoughtful comments and remarks enabling me to realize the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis and to think about various aspects of my analysis from different perspectives, not only this time, but during the time of my mock exam.

The Dynamic Model of Multilingualism was chosen to be the theoretical framework for the analysis of the data related to individual multilingualism, which is in the main focus of the thesis. The model does not only focus on bilingualism, but focuses on multilingual systems that include two or more languages. Although, there were some instances of other models included in the thesis, I agree with the reviewer on the fact that there could have been a more comprehensive list of them to further support the choice that was made (such an instance could have been the *Biotic Model of Multilinguality* (Aronin and O’Laoire 2004) or the *Entrenchment and Conventionalization Model* (Schmid 2020). These models are usually used in quantitative research (DMM included) and not conventionally used to interpret qualitative data. However, as one of the core concepts of the DMM is language maintenance and it has systematically united and included individual and societal multilingualism, DMM was the most logical choice to rely on for the analysis.

The phrase in the title “individual varieties” suggests the diverse nature of the elements (backgrounds, life events, conscious efforts etc.) that contribute to (or hinder) language maintenance in a person’s life, therefore “variety” was meant as “diversity” or more likely “versatility”.

The shortcomings of Chapter 4 are clear and unmistakable: a different approach would have been more useful when listing the interview questions. A solution could have been to mix the list of questions (or a list of the broader themes that were brought up during the interviews) with their explanation and provide a full list in the Appendix. This shortcoming was also pointed out by the other reviewer.

In the case of Figure 9, a favorable wording would have been “most common borrowings used in the interviews” as there clearly have been loanwords not only of Slavic origin. The inclusion of the word “érdekes” was a mistake of the program that created the figure that should have been corrected (removed). The word “bál” in the case of the original interview excerpt was meant for the word “бал” of Ukrainian/Russian origin, which means score or result. The word “kapcsolva” was meant as a loan translation, as in the original quote the interviewee talked about inserting a patient’s intravenous infusion which she refers to as “bekapcsolni” (in Ukrainian: підключити) not

“bekötni”. It would have been useful to provide a short explanation of these words in the Appendix of the thesis, as some of them were ambiguous.

I could not agree more on the issue of the structure of the thesis, as I have made some clearly unfavorable choices pointed out by both reviewers. It could also have been more logical to divide the last chapters into a “Results and Discussion” and a “Conclusions” part, as their content suggests so.

Concerning the formatting problems of the thesis: I will not address them separately, as they speak for themselves and their presence in the dissertation is clear and unambiguous. In the course of the last months I have faced some difficult issues in my personal life that lead to a divided attention from my side and my focus had to be shifted to my family, rather than my professional career. This has been clearly translated to my academic performance, proven by the mistakes left unnoticed in this particular piece of work. However, I would like to emphasize and highlight that there is no such unfortunate circumstance that makes these issues acceptable at this level, and I hereby make a promise to properly address and correct these mistakes when I have the chance to publish the thesis.

References:

Aronin, L. & Laoire, M., (2004). Exploring Multilingualism in Cultural Contexts: Towards a Notion of Multilinguality. In C. Hoffmann, & J. Ytsma (Eds.) *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community* (pp. 11-29). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Schmid, H.-J. (2020). *The Dynamics of the Linguistic System: Usage, Conventionalization, and Entrenchment*. Oxford University Press