

# Theses of the Doctoral (PhD) Dissertation



## **A typology of East Slavic (Ukrainian and Russian) lexical borrowings in the Transcarpathian Hungarian contact variety**

By

**Krisztián Váradi  
(Kristiian Varadi)**

Supervisor:

**Dr habil. Andrea Parapatics**

**Multilingualism Doctoral School**

Faculty of Humanities

University of Pannonia

Veszprém, 2026

## Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Research questions and hypotheses .....	2
3. Theoretical framework.....	3
4. Methodology.....	5
5. Results and discussion .....	6
5.1. Classification of Slavic borrowings.....	6
5.2. Accommodation of Slavic borrowings .....	8
5.3. Loanword variation .....	9
5.4. Comparative analysis across registers .....	10
6. Conclusions.....	12
7. Limitations and directions for future research.....	13
References .....	15
The candidate's publications related to the dissertation .....	19

## 1. Introduction

Lexical borrowing is one of the most frequent outcomes of language contact, especially in bilingual and multilingual regions where speakers of different languages interact with one another on a daily basis (Winford, 2010: 177). The present research focuses on the language use of the Hungarian minority in Transcarpathia, the westernmost region of Ukraine, which has been subject to frequent changes in state affiliation and language hierarchy over the last century (see Csernicskó et al., 2023: 54). These changes include the long Soviet period, the post-Soviet Ukrainian state context, and recent sociolinguistic developments connected to the Russo–Ukrainian war. As a result, the Transcarpathian Hungarian contact variety contains numerous lexical items of Ukrainian and Russian origin (see Gazdag, 2021; Kótyuk, 2007; Váradi, 2025b).

Although earlier research has documented many Slavic borrowings in Transcarpathia, these studies have often focused on specific regions, social and professional groups, or registers and domains, and have therefore been limited in scope. A large-scale, systematic analysis of these borrowings according to donor language, broader etymology, chronology, semantic field, part of speech, type of borrowing, motivation, adaptation, variation, and register-specific comparison has so far been lacking.

The dissertation addresses this research gap by analysing a systematically organised lexical dataset consisting of 1,641 Slavic borrowings collected from a wide range of written and spoken sources, including language contact studies, literary works, Transcarpathian Hungarian news portals, social media posts and comments, interviews, personal observations, and other sources. The main aim of the research is to provide a comprehensive typological and functional analysis of Ukrainian and Russian lexical borrowings in Transcarpathian Hungarian.

The novelty of the dissertation lies in the size and diversity of the dataset, the multidimensional classification of the collected lexical items, and the combined analysis of Ukrainian, Russian, and shared East Slavic influence within a single integrated framework. The research contributes to Hungarian contact linguistics, minority language studies, and the documentation of regional lexical variation. It also offers a methodological basis for future studies of contact-induced lexical phenomena in other multilingual and minority-language contexts.

## 2. Research questions and hypotheses

The dissertation seeks to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** Which donor language has had a greater influence on Transcarpathian Hungarian: Ukrainian or Russian?
- **RQ2:** What are the main intermediary and ultimate etymological sources of the borrowings?
- **RQ3:** How are the borrowings distributed chronologically, and how does this reflect the history of Transcarpathia?
- **RQ4:** Which parts of speech and semantic fields are most strongly represented in the borrowing process?
- **RQ5:** What are the most frequent types and motivations of borrowing?
- **RQ6:** What phonological, morphological, and semantic adaptation patterns can be observed?
- **RQ7:** What forms of variation and other contact-induced phenomena occur in the dataset?
- **RQ8:** How does the use of Slavic borrowings differ across literary works, news portals, and social media?

The research is guided by the following hypotheses:

- **H1:** Russian is expected to have exerted the stronger overall influence, mainly because many borrowings entered the vocabulary during the Soviet period.
- **H2:** Most borrowings are presumed to ultimately derive from Slavic sources.
- **H3:** The chronological distribution is expected to reflect major political and historical changes, with a peak in the Soviet period and a more recent Ukrainian-dominated wave.
- **H4:** Nouns and semantic fields connected to official domains, especially public administration, politics, and military life, are expected to be strongly represented.
- **H5:** Direct lexical borrowing is assumed to be the most frequent type, largely motivated by the sociopolitical role of the state language.
- **H6:** Most borrowings are expected to show phonological, morphological, and semantic adaptation to Hungarian.
- **H7:** Contact-induced phenomena without clear formal traces, such as semantic borrowings, stylistic borrowings, and calques, are also expected to be present.

- **H8:** Russian-origin items are expected to be more frequent in literary works and social media, whereas Ukrainian-origin borrowings are expected to be more common in news portals.

### 3. Theoretical framework

Borrowing is “the incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers’ native language” (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988: 21). Lexical borrowings can be distinguished from code-switches by a number of factors, including their morphological, syntactic, and phonological adaptation, their listedness in the mental lexicons of bilinguals, and their widespread use among speakers of the contact variety (see Treffers-Daller, 2025: 349). Other researchers, such as Matras (2019: 149), view borrowings and code-switches as two points along a continuum: borrowings may first appear as code-switches and be referred to as nonce borrowings, while over time they may become established borrowings (Muysken, 1995: 190).

Words are borrowed mainly for two reasons: first, because of the social prestige of the donor language, which is usually the language of the dominant social group (Grant, 2015: 431–432); and second, because new words are needed to describe culturally specific concepts and technological innovations (Winford, 2010: 177). The former type is called core borrowing, while the latter is referred to as cultural borrowing (Haspelmath, 2009: 46–48). Both motivations are observable in Hungarian, especially in cross-border contact varieties such as Transcarpathian Hungarian.

Hungarian may be regarded as a pluricentric language, since it has developed in eight countries of the Carpathian Basin as a result of the border changes brought about by the Treaty of Trianon in 1920 (Lanstyák, 1998: 158). For this reason, the Termini Online Hungarian Dictionary and Database (TOHDD) has been developed in order to deborder the Hungarian language (Váradi & Lehocki-Samardžić, 2025: 9–10).

In the present research, nine types of borrowings are distinguished on the basis of the categories proposed by Csernicskó and Hires (2003: 133–136), Gazdag (2021: 150), Lanstyák (2006), and the TOHDD, as discussed by Váradi (2024, 2025a). These include the following categories:

- **Direct borrowing:** the phonetic form of the donor-language word is preserved, e.g., *bulocska* ‘bun; roll; pastry’.

- **Hybrid borrowing:** the combination of a Slavic and a Hungarian element in one complex loanword, e.g., *paszportszám* ‘ID card number’.
- **Formal borrowing:** the phonetic shape of the loanword is very similar to an existing recipient-language item but is influenced by Slavic languages, e.g., *sláng* ‘hosepipe’ (hun *slag*).
- **Semantic borrowing:** a recipient-language word acquires a new, logically related meaning on the basis of its Slavic-language equivalent, e.g., *csenget* ‘to phone; to call’.
- **Loan homonym:** a recipient-language word acquires a new, logically unrelated meaning on the basis of its Slavic-language equivalent, e.g., *pára* ‘lesson pair; two 45-minute lessons’ (hun *pára* ‘vapour’).
- **Calque:** the borrowing is formed through the mirror translation of a donor-language word or phrase, e.g., *átfordít* ‘to translate’ instead of hun *lefordít*.
- **Stylistic borrowing:** an archaic Hungarian word preserves its original stylistic value in the contact variety under the influence of the state language and is used in everyday speech, e.g., *advokát* ‘lawyer’.
- **Secondary borrowing:** a recipient-language affix is added to the loanword, resulting in a change in its meaning and/or part-of-speech category, e.g., *avária* ‘crash’ + *-zik* → *aváriáznak* ‘to crash’.
- **Tertiary borrowing:** two or more recipient-language affixes are attached to the loanword, e.g., *be-* + *zákáz* ‘order; reservation’ + *-l* → *bezákázál* ‘to order; to reserve’.

Loanwords may also be classified according to their estimated time of borrowing (see Lizanec, 1993: 51–54), etymology (see Gazdag, 2021: 143–145), part of speech (see the borrowability hierarchy hypothesis proposed by Muysken, 2010), semantic field (see Bárány & Gazdag, 2024: 47–58), and motivation or reason for borrowing (see Haspelmath, 2009: 46–48).

Once loanwords enter the recipient language, they may become phonologically, morphologically, and syntactically adapted (Matras & Adamou, 2020: 240), and may eventually become accommodated in the recipient language (Wohlgemuth, 2009: 56). In addition to these adaptation processes, semantic changes also frequently occur in borrowings (see Bárány & Gazdag, 2025: 37–38).

The present dissertation analyses Slavic borrowings from these perspectives, while also relating them to the social, political, and historical

background of the Transcarpathian Hungarian minority, which accounted for around 12.1% of the region's population, or 151,516 people, according to the last official census in 2001 (Molnár D., 2018: 150).

#### **4. Methodology**

The dissertation adopts a mixed-methods approach to the study of Slavic lexical borrowings by combining quantitative and qualitative techniques of data collection and analysis. Quantitatively, a lexical dataset was compiled in Google Sheets, containing altogether 1,886 borrowings, of which 1,584 were collected from previous contact-linguistic studies, while 302 were recorded for the first time. However, the analysis included only 1,641 borrowings, because 245 loan items were not found in any example sentences and were therefore recorded in a separate tab in the dataset.

Borrowings and example sentences were collected from 147 language-contact studies, 155 literary works, 6 Transcarpathian Hungarian news portals, 3,054 social media screenshots from Facebook and Instagram, 114 interviews from the collection of the Antal Hodinka Research Centre for Linguistics, and 85 other sources, including memoirs, historical works, and my own observations. The borrowings were analysed and classified according to their immediate, intermediary, and ultimate donor languages, estimated time of borrowing, part-of-speech category, semantic field, loanword type, and motivation for borrowing. In addition, the cross-register analysis was also carried out quantitatively.

Qualitatively, the dissertation describes the most common phonological and morphological adaptation tendencies, semantic changes (elevation, degradation, broadening, and narrowing of meaning), and loanword variation patterns.

To ensure that the dissertation meets ethical standards, ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Pannonia. All personal information from social media screenshots was removed, and the sources of borrowings and example sentences were appropriately cited.

## 5. Results and discussion

### 5.1. Classification of Slavic borrowings

The collected 1,641 borrowings were analysed from seven perspectives. The first classification was based on donor language. Most borrowings had a dual Ukrainian/Russian origin (60.8%), as the Ukrainian- and Russian-language etymons had the same or nearly identical phonetic and orthographic forms, making it impossible to distinguish between them (for similar results, see Gazdag, 2021: 146; Márku, 2013: 240–243; Váradi, 2023: 121–122). However, the number of loanwords of purely Russian origin was higher (22.8%) than that of Ukrainian-origin items (16.4%). This indicates that although Ukrainian has functioned as the state language since Ukraine's independence in 1991, the linguistic influence of the Soviet period (1944–1991) is still strongly felt, thereby confirming the first hypothesis. Since Russian was the dominant language in schools and workplaces (Lizanec, 1993: 54), a relatively small number of Ukrainian-origin borrowings entered the vocabulary of the local Hungarian minority after the Second World War. The situation began to change only after the 2013–2014 Revolution of Dignity and the Russo–Ukrainian war, when new Ukrainian terms started to denote concepts that had previously been associated mainly with Russian loanwords, such as *vojenkomát* (rus *военкомат*) and *TCK* (ukr *ТЦК*) for military recruitment offices (see Csernicskó & Váradi, 2026: 64; Váradi & Csernicskó, 2025: 124–125).

The second categorisation concerned the broader etymology of the Slavic borrowings, including their intermediary and ultimate donor languages (cf. Wohlgemuth, 2009: 51). The results show that the most common etymological pathways of Slavic borrowings were from Proto-Slavic through Old East Slavic, and from Latin or Greek through French and German. The second hypothesis was confirmed, because although the number of Hellenic-, Italic-, and Germanic-origin borrowings was relatively large, most borrowings were of Slavic origin. In addition, a smaller number of loanwords originated from Arabic, an Afroasiatic language, and from various Turkic languages, including Turkish, Tatar, and Chuvash. This finding is in line with the general structure of Slavic languages, which include both inherited Slavic elements and non-Slavic items (Apresjan & Shmelev, 2024: 501).

Borrowings were also classified according to their estimated time of borrowing into pre-Soviet (12.9%), Soviet-era (67.6%), and post-Soviet (19.5%) types. The dominance of Soviet-era borrowings can be explained by the fact that, after Transcarpathia was occupied by the Soviet army in 1944 and became part of the Soviet Union in 1945 (Molnár D., 2022: 15), the local Hungarian-speaking population came into prolonged and intensive contact primarily with Russian, and to a lesser extent with Ukrainian, in administration, education, military service, the workplace, and public life (cf. Hogan-Brun & Melnyk, 2012: 593). This contact situation introduced a large number of new economic, political, social, and educational concepts, institutions, and objects into everyday life, thereby strongly facilitating lexical borrowing. This chronological layer reflects the period of the most intensive and institutionally embedded Slavic–Hungarian language contact in the region. By contrast, the majority of post-Soviet borrowings come from the current state language, Ukrainian, which is considered an important nation-building tool in the country (Carlá & Constantin, 2025: 12–15). The third hypothesis was thus confirmed, indicating the importance of interpreting language contact phenomena in light of the historical, political, and social background of the contact region.

Furthermore, the part-of-speech classification of Slavic loanwords confirmed cross-linguistic tendencies and the borrowability hierarchy hypothesis proposed by Muysken (2010), as the three most frequently borrowed categories were nouns (79%), verbs (6.1%), and adjectives (4.1%). Similar results were found, among others, by Krajnik (2010), Kótyuk (2007), Gazdag (2021), and Márku (2013). As a result, the first part of the fourth hypothesis was confirmed, since nouns constitute the most dominant part-of-speech category in the borrowing process.

On the basis of semantic fields, two tendencies were observable among Slavic borrowings. First, Slavic influence on everyday vocabulary is extensive, especially in the fields of jobs and work (245 items), architecture (209 items), human behaviour (174 items), gastronomy (134 items), and history (114 items). This indicates the deep roots of Slavic–Hungarian language contact in the region, especially in culturally embedded areas. Second, official domains are particularly strongly influenced by Slavic loanwords, mainly in relation to public administration (189 items), education (175 items), the military (165 items), trade, economy and money (114 items), and politics (110 items). This confirms the second part of the fourth hypothesis, as Slavic influence is largely

present in official domains where the state language dominates (cf. Csernicskó & Márku, 2007: 14; Csernicskó et al., 2023: 94–96).

The classification according to loanword type also confirmed cross-linguistic tendencies, with the dominance of direct borrowings (58.8%), thereby confirming the first part of the fifth hypothesis. However, there were also many examples of language contact phenomena without formally identifiable traces, such as stylistic borrowings (8.1%), semantic borrowings (5.4%), calques (2.2%), and loan homonyms (1.2%), which confirms the seventh hypothesis.

With regard to motivation, the findings show that although cultural influence is significant (594 cultural borrowings; 36.2%), most loanwords belong to the category of core borrowings (1,028 items; 62.6%), while only a small proportion (19 items; 1.2%) falls into both categories. This confirms the second part of the fifth hypothesis and suggests that most Slavic borrowings are motivated by the sociopolitical influence of the state language. The results thus support the view that borrowing is strongly shaped by asymmetrical power relations and the prestige of the dominant language (Grant, 2015: 431–432). At the same time, this does not mean that Hungarians in Transcarpathia regard their mother tongue as less prestigious than Ukrainian. Rather, Slavic borrowings are often used because speakers are more frequently exposed to the state-language forms of official documents, institutions, and related concepts in everyday life. As a result, these forms become part of their active vocabulary and are often more readily activated than their standard Hungarian equivalents (Csernicskó, 1995: 139–140).

## **5.2. Accommodation of Slavic borrowings**

The analysis of 1,641 loanwords shows that borrowings of Ukrainian and Russian origin have undergone substantial phonological, morphological, and semantic adaptation in Transcarpathian Hungarian. These findings confirm the sixth hypothesis, according to which long-term Hungarian–Slavic contact in Transcarpathia has resulted not merely in lexical transfer, but in the deep integration of borrowed items into the local Hungarian lexicon.

Phonologically, Slavic borrowings were adapted mainly to Hungarian sound patterns. Vowels showed considerable variation, as a single Slavic vowel could correspond to several Hungarian realisations (for instance, Slavic *y* /*u*/ can be realised as Hungarian *u* /*u*/, *ú* /*uː*/, and *o* /*o*/), reflecting the fact that many borrowings spread primarily through spoken interaction.

Consonantal adaptation was more regular, with most Slavic consonants being replaced by their closest Hungarian equivalents. However, certain forms also preserve traces of the dual Ukrainian/Russian donor background, for example, in the treatment of Ukrainian *z* /h/ and Russian *z* /g/, which may appear in Hungarian as either *h* (as in *horilka* ‘Ukrainian vodka’ from ukr *горілка*) or *g* (as in *nálog* ‘tax’ from rus *налог*).

Morphological adaptation provides further evidence of integration. Many borrowed bases became productive elements in Hungarian word formation, especially through the addition of Hungarian derivational suffixes and verbal prefixes (see Csernicskó, 1995: 141–143; Gazdag, 2021: 154; Kótyuk, 2007: 120–134). This is particularly visible in secondary and tertiary borrowings, as well as in clipped and hybrid forms, which show that the loanwords function as integrated parts of the lexicon rather than isolated foreign elements.

Semantic adaptation also points to strong integration. Borrowed items often develop meanings that differ from those of their source forms. The most common process is broadening of meaning, for example, when brand names become general nouns, which can be interpreted as metonymic expansion (Lechner & Bárány, 2023: 55). Other processes include metaphorical extension, narrowing of meaning, and evaluative change, especially degradation. For instance, *princessza* originally means ‘princess’, but in the contact variety it also denotes an arrogant or conceited woman. These changes show that borrowings are reinterpreted according to local communicative and social needs.

In summary, the reshaping, morphological productivity, and semantic reinterpretation of Slavic borrowings demonstrate that they are structurally and functionally integrated elements of Transcarpathian Hungarian. Long-term contact with Ukrainian and Russian has therefore not only expanded the vocabulary of the contact variety, but has also embedded these loanwords deeply into its linguistic system.

### **5.3. Loanword variation**

The analysis showed that variation is not a marginal feature of the borrowed lexicon, but one of its central characteristics. In many cases, Slavic loanwords occur in more than one formal variant, reflecting their integration into Transcarpathian Hungarian through long-term, predominantly oral contact and their subsequent adaptation to Hungarian phonological, orthographic, and

lexical patterns. The most common type of variation involved vowel and consonant length (e.g., *avánsz* ~ *ávánsz* ‘advance payment’; *bák* ~ *bákk* ‘fuel tank’), suggesting that speakers often adjusted borrowed forms to Hungarian phonological habits rather than preserving the exact donor-language form.

Consonant length variation may also result from the assimilation of consonant clusters. In forms such as *dátcsik* ~ *dáccsik*, the sequence /t + tʃ/, represented orthographically as *t + cs*, undergoes regressive assimilation and is realised as the long affricate /tʃ:/, spelt *ccs* in Hungarian. This shows that variation is not random fluctuation, but often follows regular phonological tendencies of the recipient language. More broadly, such cases indicate that once borrowed items enter Hungarian usage, they become subject to the same kinds of phonological restructuring as native elements.

Another important source of variation is the parallel influence of Ukrainian and Russian. Since the Transcarpathian Hungarian contact variety developed in contact with both languages, the same concept may be borrowed in two different forms. In some cases, the difference between the variants is minimal, most commonly involving the alternation *i* ~ *e* (Gazdag, 2018b: 110), as in *szítka* (ukr *сiмка*) ~ *szetka* (rus *сeмка*). In other cases, however, the Ukrainian- and Russian-origin forms are clearly distinct, as in *jidálnyá* (ukr *iдальня*) ~ *sztolova* (rus *столовая*) ‘dining hall; canteen’. This type of double borrowing shows that variation reflects not only phonetic adaptation, but also the coexistence of two donor languages in the same contact setting.

Variation was also observed in the parallel borrowing of singular and plural forms, as in *kurtka* ~ *kurtki* ‘jacket; chesterfield coat’ from ukr, rus *куртка*. This suggests that speakers often borrowed forms from actual usage rather than only dictionary headwords. A similar conclusion can be drawn from sound omission and insertion (see Gazdag, 2018a: 76). Sound omission typically simplifies Slavic forms, as in *marsrut* ~ *marsut* from ukr, rus *маршрут*, whereas sound insertion may make them easier to pronounce in Hungarian, as in *paszport* ~ *pasztport* from ukr, rus *паспорт*. These tendencies further support the view that variation emerges through accommodation to Hungarian speech habits.

#### 5.4. Comparative analysis across registers

The eighth hypothesis proposed that Russian-origin borrowings would be more frequent in literary works and social media, while Ukrainian-origin

items would dominate in news portals, whose language use is more strongly shaped by official norms and legal regulations. The results confirm this hypothesis. Russian-origin borrowings were most frequent in literary works (28.8%) and social media (19.5%), but much less common in news portals (10.1%). Conversely, Ukrainian-origin borrowings were most strongly represented in news portals (39%), followed by social media (16.7%), and were least frequent in literary works (7.3%). At the same time, dual-origin items remained dominant across all three registers, accounting for approximately 50–60% of the borrowings.

These differences reflect the sociolinguistic conditions under which the registers operate. The strong presence of Russian-origin borrowings in literary works is largely explained by the historical background of the analysed texts, many of which depict Soviet-era life, when Russian had strong institutional prestige. Literary language may also preserve older layers of contact-induced vocabulary for stylistic, characterological, or atmosphere-building purposes (Mádi, 2026). Social media shows a similar pattern, as its less regulated and more spontaneous language use often reflects entrenched colloquial forms, including inherited Russian-based borrowings.

By contrast, the dominance of Ukrainian-origin borrowings in news portals reflects contemporary language policy, institutional standardisation, and the Ukrainian-dominant official framework of public communication. Since many Transcarpathian Hungarian news articles are translated from Ukrainian sources, Ukrainian-based forms are especially common in references to public administration, institutions, official documents, education, and current political realities (Gazdag, 2017). Thus, register-based differences in borrowing reflect not only linguistic factors, but also broader social, political, and ideological changes.

The chronological distribution further supports this interpretation. Soviet-era borrowings were particularly frequent in literary works (78.3%) and social media (64.9%), whereas post-Soviet borrowings were most strongly represented in news portals (46%). This suggests that literary texts and informal online communication tend to preserve vocabulary associated with earlier contact periods, while news portals are more responsive to present-day institutions and current affairs.

The motivations for borrowing reveal a similar contrast. In literary works and social media, more than 60% of the attested items were core borrowings,

functioning as established components of the local vernacular. In literary texts, they may also serve stylistic purposes by creating a recognisably local or Slavic sociocultural setting. In news portals, however, cultural borrowings predominated (66.5%), reflecting the register's focus on institutions, official documents, political parties, administrative bodies, education, and other realities of the Ukrainian state context. A similar tendency was observed by Havumetsä (2023), who found that Russian loanwords in Finnish news portals during the early phase of Russia's invasion of Ukraine were mainly limited to historical, political, and military concepts.

In conclusion, the use of Slavic borrowings varies considerably across registers and is shaped by historical, sociolinguistic, and functional factors. Literary works and social media preserve more Russian-based and Soviet-era vocabulary, reflecting colloquial usage and earlier contact patterns, whereas news portals favour Ukrainian-based and post-Soviet items in line with present-day institutional realities. This confirms that register plays a crucial role in the distribution of contact-induced vocabulary.

These differences also have implications for the interpretation of local identity. In literary works and social media, Slavic borrowings often function as markers of local experience, shared history, and recognisably Transcarpathian Hungarian language use. Their presence does not necessarily indicate a weakening of Hungarian identity; rather, it reflects speakers' embeddedness in a multilingual regional environment. More broadly, the findings show that Slavic borrowings in Transcarpathian Hungarian are not merely lexical traces of language contact, but also indicators of historical experience, institutional change, and regional identity.

## **6. Conclusions**

The dissertation provides a comprehensive analysis of Ukrainian- and Russian-origin borrowings in the Transcarpathian Hungarian contact variety, based on a self-compiled dataset of 1,641 lexical items. The findings show that these borrowings form a historically layered and structurally integrated part of the regional Hungarian lexicon.

The results confirm that Slavic borrowings in Transcarpathian Hungarian cannot be interpreted simply as lexical transfers from a single donor language. A large proportion of the items are of dual Ukrainian/Russian origin, reflecting the close relationship between the two donor languages and the difficulty of

assigning a single source language in many cases. At the same time, the stronger overall influence of Russian points to the long-term impact of the Soviet period, while the growing number of Ukrainian-origin and post-Soviet borrowings reflects recent sociopolitical and institutional changes in Ukraine.

The analysis also demonstrates that the borrowed lexicon is diverse in origin, structure, and function. Many items have undergone phonological, morphological, and semantic adaptation, showing that they have become integrated into Hungarian language use rather than remaining foreign elements.

The dissertation further shows that the distribution of borrowings varies across registers. Literary works and social media preserve more Russian-origin and Soviet-era items, often connected to everyday speech and local experience. News portals, by contrast, contain a higher proportion of Ukrainian-origin and post-Soviet borrowings, especially in connection with administration, institutions, education, politics, and current public life. This confirms that register plays an important role in the use and function of contact-induced vocabulary.

The findings have broader theoretical relevance for contact linguistics, loanword typology, minority language studies, and the study of Hungarian as a pluricentric language. They show that lexical borrowing is a historically embedded, socially conditioned, and structurally complex process. The dissertation also argues that contact-induced lexical features should not be treated as marginal or incorrect forms, but as meaningful elements of a regional Hungarian variety shaped by its own sociolinguistic environment.

From a practical perspective, the results may contribute to regional lexicography, language documentation, education, minority language planning, and editorial or translation practice. The study supports a descriptive and less stigmatising approach to Transcarpathian Hungarian contact forms and highlights their value as indicators of historical experience, institutional change, multilingual everyday life, and local identity.

## **7. Limitations and directions for future research**

Despite its broad scope and large dataset, the dissertation has several limitations. The first concerns the identification of donor languages. Since many Ukrainian and Russian etymons are identical or very similar in form, a substantial number of borrowings could not be assigned exclusively to one donor language and therefore had to be classified as being of dual

Ukrainian/Russian origin. This reflects the linguistic reality of the contact situation, but it also means that the exact role of Ukrainian and Russian cannot always be determined with full certainty at the level of individual lexical items.

A further limitation concerns the chronological classification of the borrowings. The division into pre-Soviet, Soviet-era, and post-Soviet layers was based on available linguistic, historical, and contextual evidence, but in several cases the time of borrowing could only be estimated. Since lexical borrowing is often a gradual process, these categories should be understood as useful analytical approximations rather than strict historical boundaries.

The composition of the dataset also sets certain limits to the analysis. Although the material was collected from a wide range of sources, including literary works, news portals, social media, interviews, memoirs, and other texts, it cannot represent all domains, speakers, periods, and communicative situations of Transcarpathian Hungarian equally. Moreover, the main analysis included only 1,641 borrowings attested in example sentences, while 245 items without contextual examples were treated separately. This increased the reliability of the semantic, grammatical, and register-based analysis, but also reduced the overall lexical coverage.

The register-based analysis should likewise be interpreted with caution. Literary works, news portals, and social media reveal important contrasts in language use, but each of these registers is internally diverse. Social media includes many different communicative practices, while literary texts vary in period, style, and degree of dialect representation. Therefore, the register-based findings should be regarded as general tendencies rather than sharply delimited patterns.

Finally, the dissertation is limited by its regional focus. Its conclusions apply most directly to the Transcarpathian Hungarian contact variety. Although the theoretical and methodological findings may be relevant to other Hungarian minority varieties and multilingual regions, broader generalisations should be made with caution.

These limitations also indicate several directions for future research. One important task is the contextual documentation of the 245 Slavic borrowings that were identified in earlier studies but could not be included in the main dataset because they lacked example sentences. Collecting written, spoken, or online occurrences for these items would allow for a more reliable analysis of their meaning, grammatical behaviour, register-based use, and degree of integration.

Future research should also continue expanding the lexical dataset, since language contact is an ongoing process and new borrowings may emerge as a result of changing language policies, sociopolitical conditions, digital communication, and everyday bilingual practices. Particular attention should be paid to recent Ukrainian-origin and post-Soviet borrowings connected to public administration, education, media, technology, and wartime realities.

Another important direction is the incorporation of the documented material into lexicographic resources, especially the TOHDD. The results of this dissertation may support the development of more detailed regional entries by providing information on meaning, etymology, usage, register, and variation.

Further studies could also include more spoken-language data in order to examine pronunciation, frequency, and situational use more precisely. Comparative research involving other Hungarian minority varieties would make it possible to determine which contact-induced lexical patterns are specific to Transcarpathia and which represent broader tendencies in Hungarian varieties spoken outside Hungary.

In this sense, the dissertation should be regarded not as a final account of Slavic borrowings in Transcarpathian Hungarian, but as a foundation for further documentation, analysis, and lexicographic application. Future research in these directions may contribute not only to a more detailed description of the regional contact lexicon, but also to a broader understanding of lexical borrowing in multilingual minority settings.

## References

- Apresjan, V., & Shmelev, A. (2024). The structure of the lexicon. In D. Šipka, & W. Browne (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of Slavic linguistics* (501–528). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108973021.024>
- Bárány, E., & Gazdag, V. (2024). Kölcsönszavak fogalomköri kategorizációja [Thematic categorisation of loanwords]. In S. I. Nagy (Ed.), *Nyelviünkben élünk. Jelentéseken innen és túl* (30–59). Budapest: MTA Modern Filológiai Társaság.
- Bárány, E., & Gazdag, V. (2025). A kétnyelvűségi helyzet nyomán meghonosodott kölcsönszavak szemantikai változásairól a kárpátaljai magyar és ukrán nyelvjárások anyagai alapján [On the semantic changes of loanwords established due to the bilingual situation, based on materials from the Hungarian and Ukrainian dialects of Transcarpathia]. In S. I. Nagy (Ed.), *Társadalom, kultúra, nyelv. Filológia tágabb kontextusban* (30–41). Budapest: MTA Modern Filológiai Társaság. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/219918/>
- Carlá, A., & Constantin, S. (2025). Language policies and insecurities in Ukraine. *Nationalities Papers*, 53, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2025.10071>

- Csernicskó, I. (1995). A kárpátaljai magyarság és a kétnyelvűség (1945–1993) [The Hungarians of Transcarpathia and bilingualism (1945–1993)]. In I. Kassai (Ed.), *Kétnyelvűség és magyar nyelvhasználat. A 6. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai* (129–145). Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/25350/>
- Csernicskó, I., & Hires, K. (2003). A kölcsönzés [Borrowing]. In I. Csernicskó (Ed.), *A mi szavunk járása. Bevezetés a kárpátaljai magyar nyelvhasználatba* (125–138). Beregszász: Kárpátaljai Magyar Tanárképző Főiskola.
- Csernicskó, I., & Márku, A. (Eds.) (2007). „Hiába repülsz te akárhová...” *Segédkönyv a kárpátaljai magyar nyelvjárások tanulmányozásához* [“In vain do you fly anywhere...” A handbook for the study of the Hungarian dialects of Transcarpathia]. Ungvár: PoliPrint.
- Csernicskó, I., & Váradi, K. (2026). Az orosz–ukrán háború hatása a kárpátaljai magyarok szókincsére a Termini magyar–magyar szótár anyaga alapján [The impact of the Russo–Ukrainian war on the vocabulary of Transcarpathian Hungarians based on the material of the Termini Online Hungarian Dictionary and Database]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 122(1), 52–68. <https://doi.org/10.18349/MagyarNyelv.2026.1.52>
- Csernicskó, I., Hires-László, K., Karmacsi, Z., Márku, A., Molnár D., I., Máté, R., & Tóth-Orosz, E. (2023). *Hungarians and the Hungarian language in Transcarpathia*. Törökbálint: Termini.
- Gazdag, V. (2017). Az államnyelvi hatás tükröződése a kárpátaljai magyar hírportálok nyelvhasználatában [Reflections of state-language influence in the language use of Transcarpathian Hungarian news portals]. In A. Novák (Ed.), *Kölcsönös átszövődések. A Balassi Intézet Márton Áron Szakkollégiuma 2016. évi PhD-konferenciájának tanulmányaiból* (185–198). Budapest: Külgazdasági és Külügyminisztérium. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/78395/>
- Gazdag, V. (2018a). A kárpátaljai magyar nyelvjárásokban meghonosodott keleti szláv kölcsönszavak alakváltozatainak létrejöttéről [On the emergence of formal variants of East Slavic loanwords established in Transcarpathian Hungarian dialects]. *Hungaro-Ruthenica*, 8, 69–77.
- Gazdag, V. (2018b). Az orosz és ukrán kölcsönszavak kárpátaljai magyar nyelvjárásokban való elterjedtségéről és alakváltozatainak létrejöttéről [On the spread of Russian and Ukrainian loanwords in Transcarpathian Hungarian dialects and the emergence of their formal variants]. In E. Nagy-Kolozsvári, & Sz. Kovács (Eds.), *Multikulturalizmus és diverzitás a 21. században* (106–111). Ungvár: “RIK-U”.
- Gazdag, V. (2021). *Szláv elemek a kárpátaljai Beregszászi járás magyar nyelvjárásaiban* [Slavic elements in the Hungarian dialects of the Berehove district in Transcarpathia]. Törökbálint: Termini Egyesület. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/120031/>
- Grant, A. P. (2015). Lexical borrowing. In J. R. Taylor (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the word* (431–444). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641604.013.029>
- Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical borrowing: concepts and issues. In M. Haspelmath, & U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: a comparative handbook* (35–54). Berlin–New York: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218442.35>

- Havumetsä, N. (2023). Lexical borrowing in journalism in a time of political crisis. *Perspectives*, 31(3), 562–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2023.2194549>
- Hogan-Brun, G., & Melnyk, S. (2012). Language policy management in the former Soviet sphere. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (592–616). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511979026.035>
- Kótyuk, I. (2007). *Az ungi magyar nyelvjárás ukrán jövevényszavai* [Ukrainian loanwords in the Hungarian dialect of Uzh region]. Nyíregyháza: Nyíregyházi Főiskola.
- Krajnik, I. (2010). *Igazolás, szprávka vagy dovidka? Orosz és ukrán kölcsönzavak szociolingvisztikai vizsgálata Kárpátalján (Szakdolgozat)* [Igazolás, szprávka or dovidka? A sociolinguistic study of Russian and Ukrainian loanwords in Transcarpathia (Bachelor's thesis)]. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem. Retrieved from [https://mnytud.arts.unideb.hu/szakdolgozat/1659/krajnik\\_i\\_1659.pdf](https://mnytud.arts.unideb.hu/szakdolgozat/1659/krajnik_i_1659.pdf)
- Lanstyák, I. (1998). Gondolatok a nyelvek többközpontúságáról (Különös tekintettel a magyar nyelv Kárpát-medencei sorsára) [Reflections on the pluricentricity of languages, with special regard to the situation of the Hungarian language in the Carpathian Basin]. In I. Lanstyák (Ed.), *Nyelvünkben – otthon* (158–172). Dunaszerdahely: NAP Kiadó.
- Lanstyák, I. (2006). *Nyelvből nyelvbe. Tanulmányok a szókölcönszéről, kódváltásról és fordításról* [From language to language. Studies on lexical borrowing, code-switching, and translation]. Pozsony: Kalligram Könyvkiadó.
- Lechner, I., & Bárány, E. (2023). Orosz–magyar és ukrán–magyar nyelvi kapcsolatok a kárpátaljai magyar nyelvhasználat tükrében [Russian–Hungarian and Ukrainian–Hungarian language contacts in the light of Transcarpathian Hungarian language use]. *Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Közlemények*, 16(2), 47–63. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/219403/>
- Lizanec, P. (1993). Ukrán valamint orosz elemek a kárpátaljai magyar nyelvjárásokban [Ukrainian and Russian elements in the Hungarian dialects of Transcarpathia]. In P. Lizanec, & K. Horváth (Eds.), *Az Ungvári Hungarológiai Intézet tudományos gyűjteménye* (50–56). Ungvár–Budapest: Intermix Kiadó. Retrieved from <https://mek.oszk.hu/23600/23614/>
- Mádi, G. (2026). *Between twofold estrangement. Multilingualism and minority identity in Transcarpathia*. Berehove: Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian University.
- Márku, A. (2013). „Po zákárpátszki”. *Kétnyelvűség, kétnyelvűségi hatások és kétnyelvű kommunikációs stratégiák a kárpátaljai magyar közösségben* [“Po zákárpátszki”. Bilingualism, bilingual influences, and bilingual communication strategies in the Transcarpathian Hungarian community]. Ungvár: “Lira” Poligráfcentrum. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/128593/>
- Matras, Y. (2019). Borrowing. In J. Darquennes, J. C. Salmons, & W. Vandebussche (Eds.), *Language contact: an international handbook (Volume I)* (148–158). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110435351-013>
- Matras, Y., & Adamou, E. (2020). Borrowing. In E. Adamou, & Y. Matras (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language contact* (237–251). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351109154-17>

- Molnár D., E. (2022). Violations of rights committed by the communist regime in Transcarpathia (1944–1953). In E. Molnár D., N. Váradi, K. Darcsi, I. Orosz, & I. Csernicskó (Eds.), *Struggle for survival: Transcarpathian Hungarians (1944–2022)* (15–45). Budapest: Méry Ratio Publishing.
- Molnár D., I. (2018). *Perifériáról perifériára. Kárpátalja népessége 1869-től napjainkig* [From periphery to periphery. The population of Transcarpathia from 1869 to the present day]. Budapest: MTA TK Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Kalligram.
- Muysken, P. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory. In L. Milroy, & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages* (177–198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620867.009>
- Muysken, P. (2010). Scenarios for language contact. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The handbook of language contact* (265–281). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch13>
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520912793>
- Treffers-Daller, J. (2025). The Simple View of borrowing and code-switching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 29(2), 347–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069231168535>
- Váradi, K. (2023). Kétnyelvűséghez fűződő attitűdök vizsgálata többnyelvű környezetben élő főiskolai filológus hallgatók körében [Examining attitudes towards bilingualism among college philology students living in a multilingual environment]. *Argumentum*, 19, 88–123. <https://doi.org/10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2023/6>
- Váradi, K. (2024). The Termini Dictionary of the Hungarian language containing loanwords from the Carpathian Basin. *Folia Philologica*, 8, 4–9. <https://doi.org/10.17721/fovia.philologica/2024/8/1>
- Váradi, K. (2025a). A Termini magyar–magyar szótár és adatbázis [The Termini Hungarian–Hungarian Dictionary and Database]. *Modern Nyelvoktatás*, 31(1–2), 172–180. Retrieved from <https://ojs.elte.hu/modernnyelvok/article/view/11107>
- Váradi, K. (2025b). An example of multilingual language use: Ukrainian and Russian loanwords in the Transcarpathian variety of the Hungarian language in Ukraine. *OLBI Journal*, 14, 277–301. <https://doi.org/10.18192/olbij.v14i1.6822>
- Váradi, K., & Csernicskó, I. (2025). Slavic loanwords in the speech of Transcarpathian Hungarians as a result of the first one thousand days of the Russo–Ukrainian war. *Hungarian Cultural Studies*, 18, 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.5195/ahca.2025.588>
- Váradi, K., & Lehocki-Samardžić, A. (2025). *The Word of the Week* – A dissemination project of pluricentric Hungarian. *Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis, Philologica*, 4(1), 9–25. <https://doi.org/10.58423/2786-6726/2025-1-9-25>
- Winford, D. (2010). Contact and borrowing. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The handbook of language contact* (170–187). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch8>
- Wohlgenuth, J. (2009). *A typology of verbal borrowings*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219340>

## The candidate's publications related to the dissertation

- Csernicskó, I., & Váradi, K. (2026). Az orosz–ukrán háború hatása a kárpátaljai magyarok szókincsére a Termini magyar–magyar szótár anyaga alapján [The impact of the Russo–Ukrainian war on the vocabulary of Transcarpathian Hungarians based on the material of the Termini Online Hungarian Dictionary and Database]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 122(1), 52–68. <https://doi.org/10.18349/MagyarNyelv.2026.1.52>
- Hires-László, K., & Váradi, K. (2024). Semantic differences between terms associated with the Hungarian and the Ukrainian public education systems. *Scientific Notes of Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University. Series: Philology (Linguistics)*, 39, 130–139. <https://doi.org/10.31652/2521-1307-2024-39-12>
- Hires-László, K., & Váradi, K. (2025). Ukrajnai országspecifikus oktatási terminusok az Oktatásterminológiai alprojektben és a Termini-szótár fejlesztésében [Ukrainian country-specific educational terms in the development of the Educational Terminology Database and the Termini Dictionary]. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 149(3), 328–348. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2025.3.328>
- Lehocki-Samardžić, A., & Váradi, K. (2026). Termini *A hét szava* – a magyar nyelv határtalanításának eszköze [Termini *The Word of the Week* as a means of debordering the Hungarian language]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 122(1), 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.18349/MagyarNyelv.2026.1.91>
- Váradi, K. (2022). Kontaktushatások vizsgálata a kárpátaljai diákok nyelvhasználatában [Investigation of contact effects in the language use of Transcarpathian students]. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia*, 15(4), 38–61. <https://doi.org/10.21030/anyyp.2022.4.3>
- Váradi, K. (2023). Kétnyelvűséghez fűződő attitűdök vizsgálata többnyelvű környezetben élő főiskolai filológus hallgatók körében [Examining attitudes towards bilingualism among college philology students living in a multilingual environment]. *Argumentum*, 19, 88–123. <https://doi.org/10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2023/6>
- Váradi, K. (2024a). Nyelvészet és gazdaságtudomány találkozása a Termini online szótár kárpátaljai kölcsönszóanyagának alapján [The intersection of linguistics and economics based on a selection of loanwords from the Termini Online Dictionary]. In I. Csernicskó, I. Orosz, R. Bacsó, N. Pojda-Noszik, V. Makarovics, G. Loszkorih, V. Hanuszics, N. Sztójka, & G. Pataki (Eds.), *Digital economy and sustainable development: emerging trends in finance, accounting, management and social & behavioural sciences* (394–397). Beregszász: II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/232615/>
- Váradi, K. (2024b). The Termini Dictionary of the Hungarian language containing loanwords from the Carpathian Basin. *Folia Philologica*, 8, 4–9. <https://doi.org/10.17721/fovia.philologica/2024/8/1>
- Váradi, K. (2025a). A Termini magyar–magyar szótár és adatbázis [The Termini Hungarian–Hungarian Dictionary and Database]. *Modern Nyelvoktatás*, 31(1–2), 172–180. Retrieved from <https://ojs.elte.hu/modernnyelvok/article/view/11107>
- Váradi, K. (2025b). An example of multilingual language use: Ukrainian and Russian loanwords in the Transcarpathian variety of the Hungarian language in Ukraine. *OLBI Journal*, 14, 277–301. <https://doi.org/10.18192/olbij.v14i1.6822>

- Váradi, K. (2025c). Beregszászi magyar iskolák nyelvi tájképe [The linguistic landscape of Hungarian schools in Berehove]. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia*, 18(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.21030/anyp.2025.3.1>
- Váradi, K. (2025d). Bilingual attitudes and language learning motivation of prospective teachers in a multilingual environment. *Crossroads. A Journal of English Studies*, 48, 38–65. <https://doi.org/10.15290/CR.2025.48.1.03>
- Váradi, K., & Csernicskó, I. (2025). Slavic loanwords in the speech of Transcarpathian Hungarians as a result of the first one thousand days of the Russo–Ukrainian war. *Hungarian Cultural Studies*, 18, 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.5195/ahca.2025.588>
- Váradi, K., & Hires-László, K. (2024). „Návcásnyá” a magyarországi terminológiai kontextusban [“Návcásnyá” in the Hungarian terminological context]. In J. Bauko, & K. Presinszky (Eds.), *Egyszerű és szervezett nyelvi menedzselés kétnyelvű környezetben* (51–62). Nyitra–Törökbálint: Nyitrai Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara – Termini Magyar Nyelvi Kutatóhálózat. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/232618/>
- Váradi, K., & Lehocki-Samardžić, A. (2025). *The Word of the Week* – A dissemination project of pluricentric Hungarian. *Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis, Philologica*, 4(1), 9–25. <https://doi.org/10.58423/2786-6726/2025-1-9-25>
- Váradi, K., & Parapatics, A. (2025). A többnyelvűség tükröződése a II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola nyelvi tájképében [The representation of multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of the Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education]. *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány*, 25(1), 1–23. Retrieved from <https://real.mtak.hu/221486/>
- Váradi, K., Csernicskó, I., & Hires-László, K. (2026). Building a cross-border educational terminology database: The case of Hungary and Ukraine. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 28, 244–277. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sm-2026-0009>
- Váradi, K., Hires-László, K., & Máté, R. (2024). Schoolscaping in a multilingual area: an example of a Hungarian college in Western Ukraine. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 25, 165–195. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sm-2024-0016>