DOI: 10.20396/cel.v68i00.8683343

NECESSARY VERSUS LUXURY LOANWORDS IN THE 20TH C. UKRAINIAN IMMIGRANTS' LEXICON IN BRAZIL

EMPRÉSTIMOS NECESSÁRIOS VERSUS EMPRÉSTIMOS DE LUXO NO LÉXICO DE IMIGRANTES UCRANIANOS NO BRASIL NO SÉCULO XX

Yurii Kovbasko[1]

Abstract. This article examines the lexical adaptation and naturalisation of Portuguese loanwords in the culinary lexicon of Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil during the 20th century. The study aims to determine how borrowings functioned within immigrant language practices and to assess their distribution according to the dichotomy of necessary versus luxury loanwords. The theoretical framework draws on contact linguistics and sociolinguistics, particularly approaches to lexical borrowing, adaptation, and the social meaning of loanword usage. The working hypothesis assumes that immigrants employed necessary loanwords to fill lexical gaps and luxury loanwords to signal social integration and cultural alignment. The empirical material consists of 1,883 recipes published between 1936 and 1993 in the Ukrainian-language newspaper *Pracia* in Brazil. Portuguese loanwords were identified, verified through lexicographical sources and corpora, and classified according to their semantic function and degree of necessity. The results demonstrate a well-defined distribution: 57% of the borrowings are classified as necessary loanwords (encompassing both absolute and relative gaps), while 43% constitute luxury loanwords. Necessary loans predominantly denote previously unfamiliar objects, including Brazilian flora, fauna, and culinary practices, while luxury loans duplicate existing Ukrainian terms and reflect sociocultural motivations such as prestige, acculturation, and communicative alignment with the host society. The findings confirm that lexical borrowing in immigrant contexts is not solely driven by communicative need but also by identity negotiation and cultural adaptation. The culinary lexicon emerges as a particularly productive domain for observing these processes due to its high communicative frequency and strong cultural embeddedness. The study concludes that the Ukrainian diaspora in Brazil developed a hybrid lexical system shaped by both functional necessity and symbolic affiliation, demonstrating the dual nature of contact-induced lexical change.
Keywords: necessary and luxury loanwords; Ukrainian; Portuguese.

Resumo: Este artigo examina a adaptação lexical e a naturalização de empréstimos do português no léxico culinário dos imigrantes ucranianos no Brasil durante o século XX. O estudo tem como objetivo determinar como os empréstimos funcionavam nas práticas linguísticas dos imigrantes e avaliar sua distribuição segundo a dicotomia entre empréstimos necessários e empréstimos de luxo. O referencial teórico baseia-se na linguística de contato e na sociolinguística, particularmente em abordagens sobre empréstimo lexical, adaptação e o significado social do uso de empréstimos. A hipótese de trabalho parte do pressuposto de que os imigrantes empregavam empréstimos necessários para preencher lacunas lexicais e empréstimos de luxo para sinalizar integração social e alinhamento cultural. O material empírico consiste em 1.883 receitas publicadas entre 1936 e 1993 no jornal em língua ucraniana Pracia, no Brasil. Os empréstimos do português foram identificados, verificados por meio de fontes lexicográficas e corpora, e classificados de acordo com sua função semântica e grau de necessidade. Os resultados demonstram uma distribuição bem definida: 57% dos empréstimos são classificados como necessários (abrangendo tanto as lacunas absolutas quanto as relativas), enquanto 43% constituem empréstimos de luxo. Os empréstimos necessários designam

[1] D.Sc., Professor at King Danylo University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine. y.kovbasko@yahoo.com. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-3900>.

predominantemente objetos anteriormente desconhecidos, incluindo elementos da flora, fauna e práticas culinárias brasileiras, enquanto os empréstimos de luxo duplicam termos ucranianos já existentes e refletem motivações socioculturais, como prestígio, aculturação e alinhamento comunicativo com a sociedade anfitriã. Os achados confirmam que o empréstimo lexical em contextos imigratórios não é motivado apenas por necessidade comunicativa, mas também por negociação identitária e adaptação cultural. O léxico culinário revela-se um domínio particularmente produtivo para a observação desses processos, devido à sua elevada frequência comunicativa e forte inserção cultural. O estudo conclui que a diáspora ucraniana no Brasil desenvolveu um sistema lexical híbrido, moldado tanto pela necessidade funcional quanto pela afiliação simbólica, demonstrando a natureza dual da mudança lexical induzida pelo contato linguístico.
Palavras-chave: Empréstimos necessários e de luxo; ucraniano; português.

1. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The process of lexical adaptation and naturalization of borrowed words remains a central topic in historical and contact linguistics. Hock and Joseph (2009) note that when a word enters a new linguistic system, it rarely preserves its original form and meaning; instead, it undergoes phonological, morphological, and semantic adjustments to conform to the recipient language. As Haugen (1950, p. 212) observes, "borrowing is not merely a matter of adopting words but of adapting them to the patterns of the borrowing language". Such adaptation ensures that the foreign element is no longer perceived as alien but becomes integrated into the linguistic structure. Androutsopoulos (2014) and other sociolinguistic studies extend this view, showing how speakers negotiate identity and authenticity through loanword usage; the appropriation of foreign lexicon often indexes globalisation, modernity, or group belonging.

The complexity of this process has been addressed in both classical and recent research. Weinreich (1953, p. 47) emphasizes that "the structural consequences of bilingualism manifest themselves most clearly in lexical borrowings", while Thomason and Kaufman (1988, p. 37) described borrowing as "a universal and inescapable result of contact". Winford (2003) maps the continuum of contact-induced change from lexical loans to structural interference, and Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009, p. 35) argue that "lexical borrowing is the most common and easily observable contact-induced change" underlining its ubiquity across languages. Poplack (2018, p. 1) similarly concludes that "in virtually every bilingual situation empirically studied, borrowed items make up the overwhelming majority of other-language material". These studies confirm that lexical borrowing is the most widespread default mechanism of incorporating new forms and meanings into a language.

Recent research turns the emphasis to the social-pragmatic peculiarities of the process, emphasizing "that the use of loanwords is not merely a lexical act, a means to fill a lexical gap in a given language, or of introducing a shorter word in place of a longer expression. Selecting a loanword should also be considered a socially meaningful act, a contextual expression of self, social identity and language regard" (Zenner et al., 2019), making this process inseparable from social, cultural, and linguistic factors. This perspective has stimulated theoretical debate concerning the distinction and dichotomy of loanwords into core/basic and cultural (Haspelmath, Tadmor, 2009, p. 36), catachrestic and non-catachrestic (Winter-Froemel, 2017), necessary & luxury (Onysko, Winter-Froemel, 2010).

As the present paper is not intended to raise, discuss or substantiate the issue of dichotomy, it is sufficient to observe that I adhere to the terminology necessary and luxury loanwords, because these terms perfectly illustrate prestige-driven adoption. Portuguese, as the dominant language of commerce, education, and administration in Brazil, often supplied terms that Ukrainian immigrants adopted not out of necessity but as a means of

social alignment. In this sense, Portuguese words served as markers of acculturation and social navigation, fulfilling optional, socially motivated, and contextually strategic rather than lexically indispensable characteristics.

In contrast, "the necessary loans are foreign words borrowed by the recipient language because they designate new objects, institutions, concepts or situations that have not been termed before" (Şimon, 2016, p. 3). In other words, they "fill lexical gaps, while luxury loans provide stylistic alternatives" (Onysko, Winter-Froemel, 2010, p. 1551), drawing attention to the functional motivations behind lexical adaptation. "The luxury loans, as they are called, duplicate the already existing words in the recipient language, though they do not add any new senses" (Şimon, 2016, p. 31). This aligns with Matras's (2009, p. 148) view that "borrowed words reflect not only linguistic need but also social practice" emphasizing the intersection of language and culture and demonstrating that the division between necessity and luxury loanwords is not a rigid dichotomy. Instead, it functions as a continuum with intermediate and mixed cases, where a word may exhibit traits of both categories depending on cultural and contextual nuances.

Taken together, these studies demonstrate that lexical adaptation and naturalization are not merely linguistic adjustments but also reflections of broader social and cognitive dynamics. As Hickey (2010, p. 24) summarizes, "contact phenomena are linguistic expressions of cultural and social encounters". Thus, the study of how words move between languages and are reshaped in the process provides insights into both language evolution and the human experience of communication.

A further dimension concerns naturalization of loanwords, whereby borrowings become indistinguishable from native words in terms of use and productivity. Onysko and Winter-Froemel (2010, p. 1551) note that "borrowed items that fill lexical gaps or satisfy communicative needs are more likely to be fully integrated into the recipient language". This idea is supported by Durkin (2014, p. 18) who illustrates how adaptation can erase foreignness over time and points out that "loanwords which have undergone complete naturalization are often no longer felt to be loans at all".

Following this, the culinary lexicon provides an ideal domain for studying lexical adaptation and naturalization because it is closely tied to both communicative value and cultural contact. Food vocabulary is inherently practical, describing ingredients, dishes, and preparation methods, which ensures frequent activation in communication. Culinary borrowings also often carry cultural prestige or index cosmopolitan identity, making their acceptability context-dependent, suggesting that food vocabulary is sensitive to both practical utility and social perception.

Furthermore, culinary lexicon reflects historical and ongoing cultural contact, since the introduction of new foods, recipes, and cooking techniques often occurs through trade, migration, or globalization. Haugen (1950, p. 213) observes that "borrowing is most likely when the source language represents innovations or items not present in the recipient culture", which is particularly evident in gastronomy. Durkin (2014, p. 25) similarly notes that "loanwords in specialized semantic fields such as food frequently survive and become naturalized because they convey concepts previously unknown or novel". The intersection of high communicative value, social acceptability, and cross-cultural exposure makes culinary vocabulary a particularly productive and observable layer for investigating processes of lexical adaptation and naturalization.

A distinctive peculiarity of the study is the application of the necessary and luxury loans theory to the language of immigrants, i.e. the paper focuses on how borrowings function in parallel with the source language and not isolated from its natural habitat, whereas traditionally borrowings function fully detached from the source language. In

view of this, the described linguistic environment makes them vulnerable to constant changes under the influence of both source and target languages.

Accordingly, the paper investigates the lexical adaptation and naturalization of Portuguese words in the culinary lexicon of Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil. The working *hypothesis* is that immigrants employed both necessary and luxury loanwords: the former to fill lexical gaps and the latter to integrate socially and symbolically into Brazilian everyday life.

This study is part of a broader ongoing research initiative dedicated to the documentation and linguistic preservation of the Ukrainian diaspora's heritage in Latin America, which includes the development of the *Diachronic Corpus of the Ukrainian Language of Diaspora*. Previous stages of the project include the compilation of the lexical corpus, the publication of the historical recipe book (Kovbasko, 2025a), and the phonologic and orthographic adaptation of Portuguese loanwords in Ukrainian immigrants' vocabulary, whereas the present article focuses on distinguishing necessary and luxury borrowings. In this wider context, the current paper serves as a targeted sociolinguistic inquiry into how daily material culture and dietary shifts accelerate or mitigate language contacts.

2. METHODOLOGY

The material under analysis consists of 1,883 unique recipes published between 1936 and 1993 in the Ukrainian-language newspaper "Pracia" (Pracia, 1936–1993) in Brazil. Recipes constitute a particularly suitable source for investigating lexical borrowing because culinary discourse is highly sensitive to language contact. Food preparation requires frequent reference to ingredients, utensils, techniques, and culturally specific objects, making recipe texts especially prone to lexical innovation and borrowing. At the same time, recipes represent semi-standardized written discourse that reflects everyday language practices while preserving stable lexical choices over extended periods.

The compilation of Portuguese loanwords proceeded in several stages. At the first stage, the newspaper issues were systematically reviewed to identify and extract recipes, which were then compiled into a dedicated subcorpus – *Recipes of the Ukrainian Diaspora in Brazil*.

At the second stage, the recipes were analysed to identify potential Portuguese loanwords in Ukrainian-language texts. The year 1930 was established as a strict historical and linguistic baseline. This threshold marks the conclusion of the second massive wave of Ukrainian immigration to Brazil (Kovbasko, 2025b). Checking the loanwords against the pre-1930 subcorpus of the General Regionally Annotated Corpus, see its subcorpus of 'Texts before 1930' (Shvedova et al., 2017–2025), and classical Ukrainian dictionaries (such as Berinda, 1627; Zhelehovskyi & Nedilskyi, 1885–1886; Hrinchenko, 1907–1909; Bilodid, 1970–1980; Melnychuk, 1982) provides a reliable method to ascertain the active conceptual and lexical repertoire that the immigrants brought from their homeland. If a term or its exact semantic equivalent is absent from these pre-1930 records, it confirms a genuine lexical gap that triggered a contact-induced innovation under Portuguese influence.

At the third stage, confirmed borrowings were described in terms of their source language and semantic function. In total, 120 words and word combinations were identified as Portuguese borrowings in the language of Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil. The list presents only the principal and most widespread forms of the identified words;

however, all additional variants are discussed in detail in the analysis of each lexical item. Proper names (e.g., *Sonho de Valsa*, *Prato, etc.*) are excluded from the analysis because they do not reflect productive lexical or morphological processes of the Ukrainian language but rather function as fixed labels. These borrowings are presented in their Ukrainian forms to provide an initial illustration of the lexical processes at work; nevertheless, the detailed explanations with Portuguese and English equivalents are offered in the section *Results and Discussion*.

Once the list of loanwords is established, the items are first categorized according to the typology of necessary versus luxury loanwords. Each lexical item was evaluated against four criteria: (1) the existence of a lexical equivalent in pre-1930 Ukrainian; (2) the familiarity of the corresponding referent in the cultural experience of Ukrainian immigrants; (3) the semantic correspondence between the Portuguese and Ukrainian lexical items; and (4) the communicative necessity of introducing a new designation. Only after considering these criteria together was each borrowing classified as either necessary or luxury. Nevertheless, a purely binary division is insufficient to capture the cognitive and socio-linguistic complexity of lexical integration in a contact situation, so to understand the underlying mechanisms of language maintenance and shift, the analyzed corpus is organized into three categories: absolute lexical necessity, relative lexical necessity, and contact-induced lexical luxuriousness. This division provides a more detailed explanation of how lexical borrowing developed within the Ukrainian immigrant community in Brazil and is grounded on the nature of linguistic gaps and the vectors of sociocultural peculiarities encountered by Ukrainian immigrants in the Brazilian environment.

The study deliberately refrains from tracing the etymological status of the Portuguese lexical items themselves, since the immigrants interacted linguistically only with conventional, established vocabulary in the host language rather than with its historical strata.

Consequently, the description proposed in this article is based not on intuitive judgements but on historically verifiable linguistic evidence. Each lexical item was evaluated with reference to historical dictionaries, corpus attestations, semantic equivalence, and the cultural peculiarity of Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil. This multi-criteria approach increases the objectivity and reproducibility of the classification while reducing the influence of subjective interpretation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One of the trickiest questions while dealing with the level of necessity/luxuriousness of the loanwords, especially in diachronic perspective, is to determine whether an object denoted by such a word or concept was already familiar to immigrants, or whether they encountered something previously unknown to them. Because direct ascertainment was not possible, dictionaries were consulted to verify whether the objects under study functioned in the language of immigrants, i.e. if there was a chance immigrants were aware of it before arriving to Brazil. To evaluate this, each lexical unit under study is checked in the Ukrainian dictionaries and other lexicographical materials and corpora in order to establish the period of its usage in the language. As the recipes in the newspaper were first published in 1936 and by that year two main waves of Ukrainian immigrants had arrived to Brazil (Kovbasko, 2025b, p. 443), it makes me assume that the lexical units under study had to be encountered in the Ukrainian sources a couple of years before that time, for instance before 1930. So, this year is a time limit

for the statistical research on the frequency of each lexical, which is studied on the basis of the GRAC Corpus and is represented next to the Ukrainian counterpart of the word under study (in *n* tokens per 1 million tokens). Since the analyzed lexical items are presented in their original Cyrillic form, a broad (simplified) International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) phonetic transcription is provided immediately after each term upon its first mention. The transcription reflects the pronunciation of the Ukrainian lexical loan form only and does not attempt to reproduce the original Portuguese pronunciation or the phonetic characteristics of the source language.

3.1. Absolute lexical necessity (43 units)

The category of absolute lexical necessity (conceptual gaps) comprises loanwords denoting concepts, objects, or cultural realities that were entirely absent from the linguistic and cognitive experience of Ukrainian immigrants prior to their settlement in Brazil. Since no lexical equivalent existed in pre-migration Ukrainian, these borrowings filled genuine conceptual gaps and therefore represent prototypical necessary loanwords.

АБАКАТ [ɑbɑˈkɑt] ***(Port. ABACATE; Eng. AVOCADO). Literary Ukr. АВОКАДО*** **(0)** was registered in the second half of the 20th c. (Bilodid, 1970–1980), mainly in botanical texts and reference books. This means that it is highly unlikely that Ukrainian immigrants of the first waves were aware of this word and fruit itself, which makes it a *necessary* loanword.

АМЕНДОЇН/АМЕНДОЇНЬ [ɑˈmendojɪn/[ɑˈmendojɪnʲ] *(Port. AMENDOIM; Eng. PEANUT). Literary Ukr. АРАХІС* **(0)** or ***ЗЕМЛЯНИЙ ГОРІХ*** **(0.02)** was codified in Ukrainian literature and dictionaries in the mid-20th c. This explains the use of the Portuguese variant as a *necessary* loanword.

АНҐУРІЯ [ɑnˈgurʲijɑ] ***(Port. ANGURIA; Eng. MAROON CUCUMBER). Literary Ukr. АНГУРІЯ*** is, by all means, a *necessary* loan, as it denotes both vine and fruit that were completely unfamiliar for Ukrainians and are not even properly codified in the 21st c.

АРАРУТА [ɑrɑˈrutɑ] ***(Port. ARARUTA; Eng. ARROWROOT). Literary Ukr. МАРАНТОВИЙ КРОХМАЛЬ/АРРОРУТ*** **(0/0)** was a *necessary* loan, because immigrants did not know this type of starch, which is still uncommon in Ukraine and in the Ukrainian language.

АРОЗИНА [ɑˈrozɪnɑ] ***(Port. ARROZINA; Eng. CORNSTARCH POWDER). Literary Ukr.*** does not provide a registered counterpart. Thus, the notion was a *necessary* loanword, which described an unfamiliar product to immigrants, and which required a detailed description or an extended explanation if they did not wish to use a borrowing.

АТУМ [ɑˈtum] ***(Port. ATUM; Eng. TUNA). Literary Ukr. ТУНЕЦЬ*** **(0)** was not used before the mid-20th c. Given the geographical regions of mass immigration, it is highly unlikely that Ukrainians used it before 1930. Thus, it became a *necessary* loanword upon their arrival in Brazil.

БАТЕДЕЙРА [bɑteˈdejrɑ] ***(Port. BATEDEIRA; Eng. MIXER). Literary Ukr. МІКСЕР,*** as a culinary appliance, came to the use in the second half of the 20th c., though as earlier word *МІШАЛКА*, which denoted an instrument to mix products or substances, could be found in use. Therefore, immigrants had to acquire a new *necessary* word for the appliance they used in cooking.

БОЛО ІНҐЛИС/ІНҐЛЕС [ˈbolo ingˈlɪs/ingˈles] ***(Port. BOLO INGLÊS; Eng. ENGLISH CAKE). Literary Ukr.*** does not register this word combination, which is a realia term what makes it a *necessary* borrowing.

БРІҐАДЕЙРО [brʲigaˈdejro] ***(Port. BRIGADEIRO; Eng. BRAZILIAN CHOCOLATE TRUFFLE). Literary Ukr.*** does not register this realia term either. As a result, it can be identified only as a *necessary* loanword, which can be translated, transliterated, or adapted.

ҐВАРАНА [gwaraˈna] ***(Port. GUARANÁ; Eng. GUARANA). Literary Ukr. ГУАРАНА*** is a transliteration of a Brazilian realia word, which in recipes denotes a type of beverage. Owing to its local nature, it was a *necessary* loanword.

ҐОЯБА/ГОЯБА [goˈjaba/ɦoˈjaba] ***(Port. GOIABA; Eng. GUAVA). Literary Ukr. ГУАВА*** (0) was registered in the mid-20th c. (Bilodid, 1970–1980), i.e. it was unknown to the immigrants of the first and second waves who used it as a *necessary* borrowing.

ЖАБУТІКАБА [ʒabutʲiˈkaba] ***(Port. JABUTICABA; Eng. JABUTICABA). Literary Ukr. ЖАБОТИКАБА*** **(0)** remains exotic for Ukrainians in the 21st c.; hence, it was a *necessary* loanword in the early 20th c.

ЖЕМАДА/ЖИМАДА [ʒeˈmadaʲ/ʒiˈmadaʲ] ***(Port. GEMADA; Eng. EGGNOG). Literary Ukr. ЕГ-НОГ*** **(0)** is a modern English borrowing, denoting a specific Christmas beverage unknown to immigrants, who were obliged to adopt a *necessary* loanword.

ЖЕРЖЕЛІН [ʒerʒeˈlʲin] ***(Port. GERGELIM; Eng. SESAM). Literary Ukr. СЕЗАМ*** **(0.01)*/КУНЖУТ*** **(0)** entered Ukrainian in the late 19th–early 20th c., but were neither registered in dictionaries nor widespread in the language. This supports the *necessity* of the loanword in immigrants' everyday life.

КАКІ [kaˈki] ***(Port. CAQUI; Eng. PERSIMMON). Literary Ukr. ХУРМА*** **(0.02)** can be found in Soviet dictionaries and sporadic texts since the 1950s (Bilodid, 1970–1980).what makes it largely unknown to immigrants, who were obliged to borrow the Portuguese term as a *necessary* word.

КАМАРОН [kamaˈron] ***(Port. CAMARÃO; Eng. SHRIMP). Literary Ukr. КРЕВЕТКА*** **(0.08)** was not registered in the early 20th-c. dictionaries, though was sporadically attested in texts. Taking into account the geographical reality of the early 20th-c. Ukrainian immigrants, the vast majority of whom arrived from landlocked western regions, i.e. hundreds of kilometres away from any sea, the Portuguese word *CAMARÃO* became a *necessary* borrowing.

КОКАДА [koˈkada] ***(Port. COCADA; Eng. COCO-BASED CANDY). Literary Ukr. КОКАДА*** **(0)** is a modern transliteration of a Brazilian cultural realia term that denotes a type of candies, a true discovery for immigrants who had to introduce a *necessary* loanword in their lexicon.

ЛІКВІДІФІКАДОР [lʲikwʲidʲifʲikaˈdor] ***(Port. LIQUIDIFICADOR; Eng. BLENDER). Literary Ukr. БЛЕНДЕР*** **(0)** was unknown in Ukraine before 1930, so, immigrants borrowed the Portuguese term as a *necessary* word.

МАМОН [maˈmon] ***(Port. MAMÃO; Eng. PAPAYA). Literary Ukr. ПАПАЯ*** **(0)** entered dictionaries only in the second half of the 20th c. Earlier immigrants were unfamiliar with it and thus made a *necessary* borrowing.

МАНДЬОКА [manˈdʲoka] ***(Port. MANDIOCA; Eng. CASSAVA). Literary Ukr. МАНІОК/МАНІОКА*** **(0) is registered in modern Ukrainian,** exhibiting a morphological and gender variation (masculine vs. feminine), which is reflected in the use of different grammatical endings. Since this plant was unknown to immigrants, the borrowing was *necessary*.

МАРАКУЖА [marakuˈʒa] ***(Port. MARACUJÁ; Eng. PASSION FRUIT). Literary Ukr. МАРАКУЯ*** **(0)** denoted an exotic fruit unknown to Ukrainians at the beginning of the 20th c. It therefore was a *necessary* loan.

МАСКАВО [masˈkawo] ***(Port. MASCAVO; Eng. MUSCOVADO). Literary Ukr. ЦУКОР МУСКОВАДО*** **(0)** is still a rare bird in the Ukrainian language and was borrowed from English. Immigrants, unfamiliar with the product, had to borrow a Portuguese word as a *necessary* term.

МАШІШ [maˈʃiʃ] ***(Port. MAXIXE; Eng. MAROON CUCUMBER). Literary Ukr. АНГУРІЯ*** **(0)** covers both *MAXIXE* and *ANGURIA*, which denote the same vegetable but have different linguistic roots. Anyway, these names were unfamiliar and *necessary* for immigrants.

МОЛЬО ДИ СОЗЯ [ˈmolʲo dɪ ˈsozʲɑ] ***(Port. MOLHO DE SOJA; Eng. SOY SAUCE). Literary Ukr. СОЄВИЙ СОУС*** **(0)** is a relatively recent word combination, because it is not even registered in 1970s (Bilodid, 1970–1980). This supports the conclusion that immigrants had to adopt a *necessary* word combination.

МОЛЬО ІНҐЛИС/ІНҐЛЕС [ˈmolʲo ingˈlɪs/ingˈles] ***(Port. MOLHO INGLÊS; Eng. WORCESTERSHIRE SAUCE). Literary Ukr. ВУСТЕРСЬКИЙ СОУС*** **(0)** was a new and unknown generic term at that time. Therefore, Ukrainian immigrants relied on Portuguese and made a *necessary* borrowing.

МОРТАДЕЛА [mortɑˈdelɑ] ***(Port. MORTADELA; Eng. MORTADELA). Literary Ukr. ВАРЕНА КОВБАСА*** **(0)** was not used before 1930. Immigrants thus borrowed the Portuguese word out of *necessity*.

МУСАРЕЛА [musɑˈrelɑ] ***(Port. MUÇARELA; Eng. MOZZARELLA). Literary Ukr. МОЦАРЕЛА*** **(0),** according to dictionaries, was not registered in the language until the end of the 20th c. But this type of cheese was widespread in Brazil and immigrants were obliged to adopt it as a *necessary* loanword.

НОС МОСКАДА [ˈnos moˈskɑdɑ] ***(Port. NOZ-MOSCADA; Eng. NUTMEG). Literary Ukr. МУСКАТНИЙ ГОРІХ*** **(0.016)** was absent from early 20th-c. dictionaries and was not widely spread in the language, so I assume it was not that familiar among immigrants who adopted it as a *necessary* loanword.

ПАВИ [ˈpɑwɪ] ***(Port. PAVÊ; Eng. PAVÊ). Literary Ukr. ПАВИ*** **(0)** was an entirely foreign word for Ukrainians, as it denoted a traditional Brazilian dessert. Thus, it was a *necessary* loanword.

ПАЛЬМІТ [pɑlʲˈmʲit] ***(Port. PALMITO; Eng. HEART OF PALM). Literary Ukr. СЕРЦЕВИНА ПАЛЬМИ*** **(0)** was unknown to Ukrainians due to its geographical specificity, and immigrants were obliged to borrow a new word – *necessary* loanword.

ПАНЕЛА ДЕ ПРЕСОН [pɑˈnelɑ de preˈson] ***(Port. PANELA DE PRESSÃO; Eng. PRESSURE COOKER). Literary Ukr. СКОРОВАРКА*** **(0)** entered usage around the 1950s. As such, a specialised kitchen utensil was not in use before immigration, making it a *necessary* loan.

ПАСОКА [pɑˈsokɑ] ***(Port. PAÇOCA; Eng. PAÇOCA). Literary Ukr. ПАСОКА*** **(0)** existed in Ukrainian vocabulary but with an entirely different meaning. In the recipes it denoted a traditional Brazilian dessert the name of which is not registered in Ukrainian dictionaries and was unknown to immigrants and who, as a result, had to borrow it into their lexicon (a *necessary* loanword).

ПАТА ДЕ ВАКА [ˈpɑtɑ de ˈwɑkɑ] ***(Port. PATA-DE-VACA; Eng. BRAZILIAN ORCHID TREE). Literary Ukr. БАУГІНІЯ*** was and still remains an exotic plant for Ukrainians, particularly as a food ingredient. Thus, it is a *necessary* borrowing.

ПІНЬОР [pʲiˈnʲor] ***(Port. PINHÃO; Eng. ARAUCÁRIA PINE NUT). Literary Ukr. ГОРІХ ДЕРЕВА АРАУКАРІЯ*** **(0)** was unknown to immigrants and *ПІНЬОР* became a *necessary* loan.

ПІПОКА [pʲiˈpokɑ] ***(Port. PIPOCA; Eng. POPCORN). Literary Ukr. ПОПКОРН*** **(0)** was absent from the Soviet dictionaries and only appeared after the 1990s. It means that it was a *necessary* loanword for immigrants.

ПІТАНҐА [pʲiˈtɑngɑ] ***(Port. PITANGA; Eng. BRAZILIAN CHERRY). Literary Ukr. ПІТАНГА/СУРИНАМСЬКА ВИШНЯ*** **(0)** denoted an exotic fruit unfamiliar outside South America, what makes it a *necessary* loanword.

РЕКЕЙЖОН [rekejˈʒon] ***(Port. REQUEIJÃO; Eng. RICOTTA-LIKE CHEESE). Literary Ukr.*** lacked a direct equivalent for this Brazilian cheese, making it a *necessary* loan.

РОСКА [ˈroskɑ] ***(Port. ROSCA; Eng. ROSCA). Literary Ukr.*** just gives a description of this Brazilian bread dish, however, there was not a direct equivalent in Ukrainian, so it was a *necessary* loanword.

САҐУ [sɑˈgu] ***(Port. SAGU; Eng. SAGO). Literary Ukr. САГО*** **(0.01)** was a rare denomination in the Ukrainian language, so its use in Brazil where it is much more popular may be considered as a *necessary* borrowing.

ТАНЖЕРІНА [tɑnʒeˈrʲinɑ] ***(Port. TANGERINA; Eng. TANGERINE). Literary Ukr. МАНДАРИН*** **(0.3)** came into common use in the early 20th c., but it was not registered in dictionaries of that time. Thus, it was natural for immigrants to borrow a *necessary* word to denote an exotic fruit.

ФАРОФА [fɑˈrofɑ] ***(Port. FAROFA; Eng. FRIED MANIOC FLOUR). Literary Ukr.*** does not have a direct equivalent for this traditional Brazilian dish, so, it is a *necessary* borrowing.

ФЕРМЕНТО РАПІДО [ferˈmento rɑˈpʲido] ***(Port. FERMENTO RÁPIDO; Eng. INSTANT YEAST). Literary Ukr. ШВИДКІ ДРІЖДЖІ*** **(0)** is a relatively new term, though, the word ***ДРІЖДЖІ*** **(1.32)** has a longer history. Since the recipes specifically describe this type of yeast, it was a *necessary* loanword.

ШУШУ [ʃuˈʃu] ***(Port. CHUCHU; Eng. CHAYOTE). Literary Ukr. ЧАЙОТ*** **(0)** is an exotic South American vegetable unknown to immigrants prior to settling in Brazil what makes it a *necessary* loanword.

3.2. Relative lexical necessity (25 units)

The category of relative lexical necessity (functional-taxonomic gaps) includes loanwords referring to concepts for which approximate Ukrainian equivalents existed, but where these equivalents failed to correspond to Brazilian practices and realities. The borrowing was therefore motivated not by the complete absence of a lexical item but by the need for greater semantic precision within the Brazilian sociocultural context.

АЛЬКАТРА [ɑlˈkɑtrɑ] ***(Port. ALCATRA; Eng. TOP SIRLOIN). Literary Ukr. ОГУЗОК*** (центральна частина) is a general term in Ukrainian and is rarely subdivided into types. This was likely the reason why immigrants preferred to use the Portuguese word, which could be correctly interpreted by both natives and immigrants. Hence, the word is a *necessary* loan.

АСЕЛҐА [ɑˈselgɑ] ***(Port. ACELGA; Eng. CHARD). Literary Ukr. БУРЯК ЛИСТКОВИЙ*** **(0)** or ***МАНГОЛЬД*** **(0)** have only recently come into use and are absent in earlier corpora. Ukrainians may have been familiar with the object itself, nevertheless, they did not use it as extensively as Brazilians, and under local influence they introduced a *necessary* loan.

БАКАЛЯВ [bɑkɑˈlʲɑw] ***(Port. BACALHAU; Eng. COD). Literary Ukr. ТРІСКА (0.06)*** was used by Ukrainians before 1930 and is an Old Slavonic borrowing. However, the variety of cod in Brazil may have differed from what immigrants knew,

leading them to perceive it as a new object which required its own name. It can therefore be defined as a *necessary* loanword.

БАНЬО-МАРІЯ/БАНЬО МАРІЯ [ˈbanʲo maˈrʲijɑ] *(Port. BANHO-MARIA; Eng. WATER BATH).* Notwithstanding the fact that this culinary technique is traced back to 1822, the ***literary Ukr. ВОДЯНА БАНЯ (0)*** was first recorded in Ukrainian texts and dictionaries of the late 19th – early 20th c. Thus, it is highly unlikely that the term entered the lexicon of Ukrainian immigrants and they made it a *necessary* borrowing from Portuguese.

ВАЖЕНЬ [ˈwɑʒɛnʲ] *(Port. VAGEM; Eng. FRENCH BEANS). Literary Ukr. СТРУЧКОВА/ЗЕЛЕНА КВАСОЛЯ* (0.05) or ***ШПАРАГА* (0.1)** in some dialects denotes a type of legumes that is well-known to Ukrainians, so there was no need to adopt a Portuguese word. This makes *ВАЖЕНЬ* a *necessary* loanword, which characterized by relative lexical necessity, as it was likely borrowed to differentiate Brazilian types of beans represented by *FEIJÃO* and *VAGEM*.

ВІНА [ˈwinɑ] *(Port. VINA; Eng. VIENNA SAUSAGE). Literary Ukr. ВІДЕНСЬКА СОСИСКА* (0.19) partially corresponds to *ВІНА*, a local realia word widespread in Paraná state. As this represents a specific type of a sausage (the general Portuguese term for sausages is *SALSICHA*), immigrants were obliged to adopt a *necessary* term to communicate with locals.

ГАЛИҐО [ɦɑˈlɪgo] *(Port. GALEGO; Eng. LIME). Literary Ukr. ЛАЙМ* (0) is a partial equivalent of the Portuguese realia word, which stands for a very popular type of lime in Brazil. Ukrainians were familiar with ***LEMONS* (0.59)** but not limes, and this specific variety was, by all means, a *necessary* word.

ЕМПАДА [emˈpɑdɑ] *(Port. EMPADA; Eng. PATTY). Literary Ukr. ПИРІЖОК* (3.97) is a diminutive of ***ПИРІГ* (12.57)** in both physical size and linguistic form. In case of *EMPADA*, the reference is clearly to a pastry of small size. Thus, *ЕМПАДА* is a necessary borrowing representing a mixed case that blurs the line between necessity and luxury loans, as linguistically it is a luxury loan due to the existence of *ПИРІЖОК*. Nevertheless, its distinctive local culinary nature pulls it toward the necessity category, demonstrating that the necessity-luxury distinction is a continuum rather than a strict dichotomy.

КАВАЛІНЯ [kɑwɑˈlʲinʲɑ] *(Port. CAVALINHA; Eng. MACKEREL). Literary Ukr. СКУМБРІЯ* (0.27) or ***МАКРЕЛЬ* (0.06)** appeared in the language in the second half of the 19th c. and were attested in dictionaries and literary works. Thus, considering the semantic distinction between *СКУМБРІЯ* and *МАКРЕЛЬ* the use of *КАВАЛІНЯ* was characterized by relative necessity.

КАНЖІКА [kɑnˈʒʲikɑ] *(Port. CANJICA; Eng. HOMINY GRITS). Literary Ukr. КУЛЕША* (2.11) or ***МАМАЛИҐА* (0.56)/*МАМАЛИГА* (0.7)** are partial counterparts to the Brazilian national dish *КАНЖІКА*. Since they do not fully overlap semantically, *КАНЖІКА* represents a *necessary* loan.

КВІНТРУ [ˈkwʲintru] *(Port. COENTRO; Eng. CORIANDER). Literary Ukr. КОРІАНДР* (0) was recorded in the 17th c. (Berinda, 1627*).* Modern Ukrainian also uses *КІНЗА*, which came into use much later and denotes the green leaves of a plant, whereas *КОРІАНДР* refers to its seeds. Immigrants likely borrowed the Portuguese word as a *necessary* term to denote the leaves.

КЕНТОН [kenˈton] *(Port. QUENTÃO; Eng. MULLED WINE). Literary Ukr. ГАРЯЧЕ ВИНО* (0.11) or ***ГЛІНТВЕЙН* (0.02)** were known before 1930; however, the latter was a recent borrowing in Ukrainian and the former was a longer word combination. For convenience immigrants used a kind of interlanguage compression and preferred the Portuguese word to denote a drink and adopted a *necessary* loanword.

КОКО [ˈkoko] ***(Port. COCO; Eng. COCONUT). Literary Ukr. КОКОС*** **(0.41)** was used in the language but not registered in the dictionaries. It is possible to assume that the word has undergone the process of rephonologization (Campbell, 2020); but given its rarity in Ukrainian, immigrants rather borrowed it from Portuguese as a *necessary* term.

ЛАҐАРТО [lɑˈgɑrto] ***(Port. LAGARTO; Eng. ROUND STEAK). Literary Ukr. ОГУЗОК*** **(зовнішня частина)** encounters the same terminological problem as *ALCATRA*, because in Ukrainian these words do not possess specific names and are identified by a general word *ОГУЗОК* or are supported by additional explanations. Therefore, it is classified as a *necessary* borrowing.

ЛІКЕР ДЕ КАКАО [lʲiˈker de kɑˈkɑo] ***(Port. LICOR DE CACAU; Eng. COCOA LIQUEUR). Literary Ukr. ЛІКЕР З КАКАО*** **(0)** was not attested before immigration. However, the words *КАКАО (1.65)* and *ЛІКЕР (1.99)* functioned separately in the language. Since the beverage itself was novel, *ЛІКЕР ДЕ КАКАО* represents a *necessary* borrowing. This phrase demonstrates a dual mechanism of adaptation: culturally, the phrase is imported as a single semantic block to denote a new reality, but linguistically, the immigrants preserved the pre-existing, familiar lexical component to maintain cognitive and communicative economy.

ЛОМБО [ˈlombo] ***(Port. LOMBO; Eng. SIRLOIN). Literary Ukr. ВИРІЗКА*** **(0.016)** as a type of meat was recorded in early 20th-c. dictionary, but it was not frequently used in texts. Following the pattern of *ALCATRA* and *LAGARTO*, the borrowing of *LOMBO* was a *necessity*.

МАНЖЕРОНА [mɑnʒeˈronɑ] ***(Port. MANJERONA; Eng. MARJORAN). Literary Ukr. МАЙОРАН*** **(0.06)** came into the language in the early 20th c., as evidenced by literary texts. Yet due to its low frequency and absence in dictionaries, immigrants were obliged to borrow the Portuguese form as a *necessary* loanword.

МЕЛАДО [meˈlɑdo] ***(Port. MELADO; Eng. MOLASSES). Literary Ukr. МЕЛЯСА*** **(0.16)** and ***ПАТОКА*** **(1.59)** existed in Ukrainian even before immigration to Brazil, thus, immigrants could use them to denote the product. The difference is that *МЕЛЯСА* is produced from beetroots, whereas *МЕЛАДО* is derived from sugar cane; to mark this difference, speakers acquired a *necessary* term.

ПАТІНЬО [pɑˈtʲinʲo] ***(Port. PATINHO; Eng. KNUCKLE). Literary Ukr. РУЛЬКА*** **(0)** is a term that partially corresponds to a type of meat denoted by the Portuguese word. This made immigrants use a *necessary* loanword to be understood.

ПУДІНЬ [ˈpudʲinʲ] ***(Port. PUDIM; Eng. PUDDING). Literary Ukr. ПУДИНГ*** **(0.08),** although not officially registered in the dictionaries, was used by famous writers such as Lesia Ukrainka and became widely spread in the 1930s. However, in Ukrainian it usually denoted a meat or vegetable casserole, whereas the Portuguese term *PUDIM* primarily refers to a dessert. Owing to this semantic divergence, *ПУДІНЬ* is classified as borrowing of relative lexical *necessity***.**

ПРЕЗУНТО/ПРИЗУНТО [preˈzunto/priˈzunto] ***(Port. PRESUNTO; Eng. HAM). Literary Ukr. ШИНКА*** **(0.75)** was well established and codified in Ukrainian before 1930. However, its semantic scope differed from that of the Portuguese *PRESUNTO*: in Ukrainian, *ШИНКА* typically referred to a large cut of cured or smoked meat rather than the commercially sliced product commonly denoted by the Portuguese *PRESUNTO*. Owing to this difference in culinary classification and usage, *ПРЕЗУНТО/ПРИЗУНТО* is classified as a case of relative lexical necessity.

РОКАМБОЛ [rokɑmˈbol] ***(Port. ROCAMBOLE; Eng. CREAM ROLL). Literary Ukr. ЗАВИВАНЕЦЬ*** **(0.02)** is found in cooking books and ethnographic texts from the late 19th c., though denominations for its specific types, for instance,

***МАКІВНИК* (0.29)**, were much more numerous. As the types of fillings differ from the traditional Ukrainian ones, I refer it to *necessary* loanwords.

САЛЬСІСЯ [sɑlʲˈsʲisʲɑ] ***(Port. SALSICHA; Eng. SAUSAGE). Literary Ukr. СОСИСКА* (0.19)** came into active use in the 1920s-1930s. Considering the specific nature of Brazilian cuisine, *САЛЬСІСЯ* was likely more of a *necessary* than a luxury loanword.

СУСПІРО [susˈpʲiro] ***(Port. SUSPIRO; Eng. WHIPPED EGG WHITES). Literary Ukr. ЗБИТІ ЯЄЧНІ БІЛКИ*** or ***БЕЗЕ* (0.16/0)** both correspond to *СУСПІРО* but denote different things. And if *ЗБИТІ ЯЄЧНІ БІЛКИ* as a process and its result was known among Ukrainians for many centuries, *БЕЗЕ* appeared only in the second half of the 20th c. Therefore, when denoting *ЗБИТІ ЯЄЧНІ БІЛКИ, СУСПІРО* was a *luxury* loan that functioned in parallel with more common words *СНІГ* and *ШУМ*, whereas, when denoting the dessert, it was a *necessary* borrowing.

ТАІНЯ [tɑˈinʲɑ] ***(Port. TAINHA; Eng. MULLET). Literary Ukr. КЕФАЛЬ* (0.11)** appeared in the texts and dictionaries of the second half of the 19th c. However, given the differences in typology worldwide, the term was more of a *necessary* than a luxury borrowing**.**

3.3. Contact-induced lexical luxuriousness (52 units)

Contact-induced luxury doublets comprise loanwords introduced despite the existence of fully equivalent Ukrainian lexical items. Their adoption was motivated primarily by prolonged contact with Portuguese, the dominance of Portuguese in public and commercial communication, and the gradual emergence of bilingual linguistic practices rather than by communicative necessity.

АБАКАШІ [ɑbɑkɑˈʃi] ***(Port. ABACAXI; Eng. PINEAPPLE). Literary Ukr. АНАНАС* (0.48)** entered Ukrainian in the 18th c. (Melnychuk, 1982) and was used in the late 19th–early 20th c. by the famous Ukrainian writer M. Kotsiubynskyi. Thus, the word and the object it denotes could have been familiar to Ukrainians who moved to Brazil and can rather be referred to as a *luxury* loan.

АВИЯ [ɑˈwɪjɑ] ***(Port. AVEIA; Eng. OAT). Literary Ukr. ОВЕС* (18.56)** comes from Old Slavonic, i.e. it was familiar to immigrants, so the use of *АВИЯ* is a *luxury* borrowing.

АҐРІОН [ɑˈgrʲion] ***(Port. AGRIÃO; Eng. CRESS). Literary Ukr. КРЕС-САЛАТ* (0)** was borrowed from English in the late 20th c and was not familiar to those who immigrated to Brazil. On the other hand, this herb was known in Ukraine under other names such as *ХРІННИЦЯ ЖЕРЮХА, ЖИРУХА ЖЕРЕЛУХА, ЖЕРЛУХА, ЖИЖУХА, ПЕРЕЧНИЦЯ, КРАСОЛЯ, КРАСОВУЛЯ* (Zhelehovskyi, Nedilskyi, 1885–1886; Hrinchenko 1907–1909). Thus, the use of *АҐРІОН* is rather a *luxury* loanword.

АЗЕЙТОН [ɑzejˈton] ***(Port. AZEITONA; Eng. OLIVE). Literary Ukr. МАСЛИНА (0.46)*** or ***ОЛИВКА* (0.1)** is a borrowing from Old Slavonic, and the fruit has been cultivated in Ukraine for many centuries. This means that the use of a Portuguese variant was a *luxury* loan.

АЙПО [ˈɑjpo] ***(Port. AIPO; Eng. CELERY). Literary Ukr. СЕЛЕРА* (0),** but in the recipes the word *АЙПО* usually stands for ***ПЕТРУШКА* (2.1)** or ***ПАСТЕРНАК* (1.17)**, whereas *СЕЛЕРА* is used independently. As the word itself appeared in Ukrainian in the 19th c. and was used by immigrants alongside the Portuguese variant, it can be assumed to be a *luxury* loan.

АМЕЙША [ɑˈmejʃɑ] ***(Port. AMEIXA; Eng. PLUM). Literary Ukr. СЛИВА*** **(4.18)** has Old Ukrainian origins, and there was no need to use any other term, making it a *luxury* loan.

АМЕНДОАС [ɑˈmendoɑs] ***(Port. AMÊNDOAS; Eng. ALMONDS). Literary Ukr. МИГДАЛЬ*** (0.56) appeared sporadically before 1930 and was registered in the dictionary (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909), i.e. Ukrainian immigrants could have been aware of it, and it can be defined as a *luxury* loanword.

АРРУДА [ɑˈrrudɑ] ***(Port. ARRUDA; Eng. COMMON RUE). Literary Ukr. РУТА*** **(3.83)** is a herb widespread in the regions from which Ukrainian immigrants came, and, undoubtedly, it represents a *luxury* loanword.

АСПАРҐО [ɑsˈpɑrgo] ***(Port. ASPARGO; Eng. ASPARAGUS). Literary Ukr. СПАРЖА*** **(0.22)** appeared in the late 19th c., but in the recipes under analysis it usually denotes *ШПАРАГІВКА* or *СТРУЧКОВА/СПАРЖЕВА КВАСОЛЯ*, both of which refer to vegetables different from *СПАРЖА*. In this case, we observe semantic extension of a borrowing in the target language, i.e. a *luxury* loanword.

БАВНІЛЯ [bɑwˈnʲilʲɑ] ***(Port. BAUNILHA; Eng. VANILLA). Literary Ukr. ВАНІЛЬ*** **(0.05)** has been in use since the late 19th c., so immigrants apparently knew it. Nevertheless, they preferred the Portuguese variant, making it another *luxury* loanword.

БІКАРБОНАТО/БІКАБОРНАТ [bʲikɑrboˈnɑto/bʲikɑrboˈnɑt] ***(Port. BICARBONATO (DE SÓDIO); Eng. BAKING SODA). Literary Ukr. БІКАРБОНАТ*** **(0.02)** and ***СОДА*** **(1.13)** functioned in the language before immigration began, so the use of a Portuguese variant seems rather as a *luxury* loan or a lexical adaptation of a native word to the surrounding linguistic environment.

БОЛАША [boˈlɑʃɑ] ***(Port. BOLACHA; Eng. COOKIE). Literary Ukr. ПЕЧИВО*** (1.68) has an old tradition in the language since the late 18th c. and is registered in the dictionary (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909). Therefore, its replacement by the Portuguese counterpart is undoubtedly a *luxury* borrowing, which can be explained by semantic differences in the denoted notions, recipes, cooking method, etc.

БОЛО [ˈbolo] ***(Port. BOLO; Eng. CAKE). Literary Ukr. ТОРТ*** **(1.06)** was not classified in the dictionary (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909), though it was in active use long before the first immigrants moved to Brazil. As in the previous case, it is a *luxury* loan that was introduced into the Ukrainian language in order to fit Brazilian traditions or due to divergences in cake types and cooking methods.

БУСЬО [ˈbusʲo] ***(Port. BUCHO; Eng. GUTS). Literary Ukr. ФЛЯКИ/ФЛЯЧКИ*** **(0.21/0.08)** was widely spread in Ukrainian literature and registered in dictionaries long before immigration to Brazil started. This proves a case of *luxury* borrowing, since there was no need to use another word to denote an already familiar concept.

ҐРОЗЕЛІЯ [grozeˈlʲijɑ] ***(Port. GROSELHA; Eng. CURRENT). Literary Ukr. СМОРОДИНА*** **(2.81)** as a berry has been well-known for Ukrainians from ancient times and is even registered in a 16th-c. dictionary. This indicates that immigrants preferred a *luxury* loanword to their native term. This may be partially explained by the use of the word in recipes not as a fruit but as a syrup, and by the fact that the term could cover different types of berries (red, black, and yellow).

ДАМАСКО [dɑˈmɑsko] ***(Port. DAMASCO; Eng. DRIED APRICOT). Literary Ukr. КУРАГА*** **(0)** entered Ukrainian at least by the 19th c. and was registered in the dictionary (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909). It is reasonable to speculate that the Portuguese variant *DAMASCO* became a *luxury* loanword in the immigrants' language.

ЕРВІЛЯ [erˈwʲilʲɑ] ***(Port. ERVILHA; Eng. PEA). Literary Ukr. ГОРОХ*** **(14.11)** is an old, widespread Ukrainian word, registered in dictionaries and literary texts, so any substitution is considered a *luxury* loan.

ЕСПІНАФРЕ [espʲiˈnɑfre] ***(Port. ESPINAFRE; Eng. SPINACH). Literary Ukr. ШПИНАТ*** **(0.13)** is itself a borrowing in Ukrainian, but it entered the language in the 19th c. and was registered in the dictionary (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909) and in literary texts. Its substitution by immigrants is a *luxury* loan.

ЖЕЛІЯ/ЖИЛІЯ [ʒeˈlejɑ/ʒiˈlejɑ] ***(Port. GELEIA; Eng. JELLY). Literary Ukr. ЖЕЛЕ*** **(0.13)** was used in literature by well-known Ukrainian writers such as M. Kotsiubynskyi, M. Khvyliovyi, and others, as well as in newspapers in the early 20th c. This means that immigrants were familiar with the word and the use of the transliterated form was a *luxury* loan.

ЖЕНЖІБРЕ [ʒenˈʒʲibre] ***(Port. GENGIBRE; Eng. GINGER). Literary Ukr. ІМБИР*** **(0.14)** has a long history and is registered in the Ukrainian dictionaries in the mid-17th c. Therefore, its replacement constitutes a *luxury* loanword.

КАЛДО [ˈkɑldo] ***(Port. CALDO; Eng. BROTH). Literary Ukr. ЮШКА*** **(7.79)** is a traditional Ukrainian word, which was partially replaced by the French borrowing ***БУЛЬЙОН*** **(0.37)**. Both were substituted by the *luxury* Portuguese loanword *КАЛДО,* which also generated other *luxurious* derivatives such as *КАЛДО ДЕ КАРНЕ* (*М'ЯСНИЙ БУЛЬОН*) and *КАЛДО ДИ ЛИҐУМИС (ОВОЧЕВА ЮШКА)*.

КОУВЕФЛОР/КОВВЕ ФЛОР [kouˈwɛflor/kowˈwɛflor] ***(Port. COUVE-FLOR; Eng. CAULIFLOWER). Literary Ukr. ЦВІТНА КАПУСТА*** **(0.06)** coexists with its dialectal forms like *КАЛЯФІОР/КАЛЯФЙОР/КАЛАФІОР/КАЛЯФЛЬОР*. It is likely that the structural and semantic proximity between the existing dialectal terms and the new Portuguese word acted as a cognitive bridge, significantly facilitating the psychological adoption and integration of the *luxurious* loanword into the immigrants' speech.

КАНЕЛЯ [kɑˈnelʲɑ] ***(Port. CANELA; Eng. CINNAMON). Literary Ukr. ЦИНАМОН*** **(0.38)** and ***КОРИЦЯ*** **(0.13)** have been attested in texts registered in texts and dictionaries since the 17th c. (Berinda, 1627). Accordingly, *КАНЕЛЯ* is clearly a *luxury* loanword.

КАНУДІНІ [kɑnuˈdʲinʲi] ***(Port. CANUDINHO; Eng. STRAW). Literary Ukr. ТРУБКИ*** **(4.44)** and ***ТРУБОЧКИ*** **(0.41)** were widely used both in everyday language and as a dessert names. Nevertheless, immigrants adopted the local Portuguese term as a *luxury* loanword.

КЕЙЖО [ˈkejʒo] ***(Port. QUEIJO; Eng. CHEESE). Literary Ukr. СИР*** **(12.19)** is a common and unambiguous word that requires no explanation or special identification. Its replacement with *КЕЙЖО* thus represents a *luxury* borrowing.

КОНФЕЙТЕЙРО [konfejˈtejro] ***(Port. CONFEITEIRO; Eng. POWDERED SUGAR). Literary Ukr. ЦУКРОВА ПУДРА*** **(0.016)** was very rarely used in early 20th c. texts. However, the analysis of the recipes under study describes a frequent use of the word *МУЧКА* in a word combination *ЦУКОР-МУЧКА*, which is a synonym to *КОНФЕЙТЕЙРО.* It means that immigrants introduced a *luxury* loanword into their lexicon.

ЛОУРО [ˈlouro] ***(Port. LOURO; Eng. BAY LEAF). Literary Ukr. ЛАВРОВИЙ ЛИСТ*** **(0.12)** was known and common in Ukraine in the late 19th c., so the use of the Portuguese counterpart is treated as a *luxury* borrowing.

ЛЯТКА [ˈlʲɑtkɑ] ***(Port. LATA; Eng. CAN). Literary Ukr. БЛЯШАНКА*** **(1.21)** was well established before 1930. Nevertheless, immigrants borrowed, phonetically adapted, and morphologically integrated the Portuguese *luxury* loanword.

МАҠАРАН [mɑkɑˈrɑn] ***(Port. MACARRÃO; Eng. NOODLES). Literary Ukr. МАКАРОНИ*** **(0.33)** and its dialectal form ***МАКАРОН*** **(0.32)**, especially the latter, were frequently used by immigrants in Brazil. Still, they either phonetically adapted the Ukrainian variant to the Portuguese pronunciation or borrowed the Portuguese word, producing a *luxury* loanword.

МЕЛОН/МЕЛЬОН [ˈmelon/ˈmel$^{(j)}$on] ***(Port. MELÃO; Eng. MELON). Literary Ukr. ДИНЯ*** **(3.76)** was codified both by spoken language and dictionary entries in the 18th c. or earlier, so, there was no need to use a *luxury* loanword for the well-known object. It is worth mentioning that the lexical item *МЕЛОН* could also be a borrowing from Polish, i.e. a word, which Ukrainian immigrants brought to Brazil as a dialectal form of *ДИНЯ*.

МОСТАРДА [moˈstɑrdɑ] ***(Port. MOSTARDA; Eng. MUSTARD). Literary Ukr. ГІРЧИЦЯ*** **(0.84)** is an ancient Ukrainian word that functioned in parallel with the Polonism ***МУШТАРДА*** **(0.11)** in western Ukraine. Therefore, immigrants did not need another word and simply used a *luxury* loanword together with their native lexemes or they even phonetically adapted Ukrainian variants like in *МОШТАРДА.*

НОЗЕС [ˈnɔzes] ***(Port. NOZES; Eng. NUTS). Literary Ukr. ГОРІХИ*** **(3.44)** was deeply entrenched Ukrainian written traditions and was frequently used in the language. Therefore, *НОЗЕС* was a *luxury* loanword. Its use, to some extent, could be explained by the typology of nuts but immigrants borrowed new words to identify them as well.

ПАЛІТО [pɑˈlʲito] ***(Port. PALITO; Eng. TOOTHPICK). Literary Ukr. ЗУБОЧИСТКА*** **(0.1)** or a more generalized word ***ШПИЧКА*** **(1.81)** existed in the language before immigration to Brazil and the notion of pointed tools to clean between teeth has ancient roots. Nevertheless, immigrants preferred to use a *luxury* loanword instead of their native terms.

ПАСАС [ˈpɑsɑs] ***(Port. PASSAS; Eng. RAISINS). Literary Ukr. РОДЗИНКИ*** **(0.29)** and ***ІЗЮМ*** **(0.19)** were both common in Ukrainian, though the ways of formation and their history differ. Therefore, there was no sense to borrow another word into the vocabulary; moreover, immigrants used both *РОДЗИНКИ* and a *luxury* borrowing *ПАСАС.*

ПЕРУ [peˈru] ***(Port. PERU; Eng. TURKEY). Literary Ukr. ІНДИК/ИНДИК*** **(2.71/1.51)** and ***ІНДИЧКА/ИНДИЧКА*** **(0.19/0.17)** were commonly used in the language being characterized by double spelling. There was no practical need for another term to denote this type of poultry, so *ПЕРУ* functioned as a *luxury* loan.

ПИСИҐ [ˈpɪsɪg] ***(Port. PÊSSEGO; Eng. PEACH). Literary Ukr. ПЕРСИК*** **(0.46)** was commonly used in the late 19th–early 20th c. along with its dialectal forms/Polonisms *БРОСКВА/БРОСКВИНЯ*. In Brazil, immigrants preserved the dialectal forms but also introduced a *luxury* loanword *ПИСИҐ*.

ПІКЛЕС [ˈpʲikles] ***(Port. PICLES; Eng. PICKLES). Literary Ukr. КВАШЕНІ ОГІРКИ*** **(0.19)** was a traditional dish in Ukraine, so the use of a foreign word that duplicated the existing one was a *luxury* borrowing.

ПІМЕНТОН [pʲimenˈton] ***(Port. PIMENTÃO; Eng. BELL PEPPER). Literary Ukr. ПЕРЕЦЬ*** **(7.21)** was widespread in the language and codified in the dictionary (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909), so it is identified as a *luxury* loanword in immigrants' lexicon. The use of *ПІМЕНТОН* can be explained by the necessity to differentiate between the Ukrainian *ПЕРЕЦЬ* or *ПАПРИКА* (both are translated as a *BELL PEPPER*) which both denote one vegetable but various spices, whereas in Portuguese *PÁPRICA* and *PIMENTÃO* define different spices and vegetables.

ПОНШ [ˈponʃ] ***(Port. PONCHE; Eng. PUNCH). Literary Ukr. ПУНШ*** **(1.02)** was already in use before immigration; so it was a *luxury* borrowing accompanied by a phonetic adaptation.

РУЙБАРБО/РУЙБАРБ [rujˈbarb(o)/rujˈbarb] ***(Port. RUIBARBO; Eng. RHUBARB). Literary Ukr. РЕВІНЬ*** **(0.01)** and its numerous dialectal forms have been used since the 17th–18th c. These dialectal forms functioned in parallel with the *luxury* loanwords *РУЙБАРБО* and *РУЙБАРБ.*

РУМ [ˈrum] ***(Port. RUM; Eng. RUM). Literary Ukr. РОМ*** **(5.7)** was already common before Ukrainian immigration to Brazil. This makes the Portuguese variant a *luxury* borrowing.

САЛІСА [ˈsalsa] ***(Port. SALSA; Eng. PARSLEY). Literary Ukr. ПЕТРУШКА*** **(2.1)** has been codified both in live language and in dictionaries since the 17th c. Therefore, introducing the additional term *САЛІСА* was unnecessary and represents a *luxury* loanword.

САЛІСОН [salˈsɔn] ***(Port. SALSÃO; Eng. CELERY). Literary Ukr. СЕЛЕРА*** **(0)** was used in parallel with *САЛІСОН* and *АЙПО* to denote one and the same plant being, in fact, a *luxury* loan.

СИМОЛІНА [sɪmoˈlʲinɑ] ***(Port. SEMOLINA; Eng. SEMOLINA). Literary Ukr. МАННА КРУПА*** **(1.56)** was used in everyday speech and was registered in the dictionaries by the late 19th c. Thus, *СИМОЛІНА* seems to be a *luxury* loanword.

СОБРИМИЗА [sobrɪˈmɪzɑ] ***(Port. SOBREMESA; Eng. DESSERT). Literary Ukr. ДЕСЕРТ*** **(0.75)** was already in use before Ukrainian immigration to Brazil, which testifies to the *luxurious* nature of borrowing the Portuguese equivalent.

СОРВЕТЕ/СОРВИТА [sorˈwete/sorˈwɪtɑ] ***(Port. SORVETE; Eng. ICE CREAM). Literary Ukr. МОРОЗИВО*** **(0.65)** has been in use since the late 19th c., though it is not indicated in the dictionary (Hrinchenko, 1907–1909). It is a *luxury* loanword with some tendency toward necessity due to local peculiarities of the concept.

ФАРИНА [fɑˈrɪnɑ] ***(Port. FARINHA; Eng. FLOUR). Literary Ukr. БОРОШНО*** **(13.35)** is an ancient and extremely popular word in Ukrainian, so its substitution with a Portuguese equivalent is, by all means, a *luxury* loanword.

ФРАМБОЕЗА [frɑmboˈezɑ] ***(Port. FRAMBOESA; Eng. RASPBERRY). Literary Ukr. МАЛИНА*** **(3.48)** is a traditional and common Ukrainian word that required no explanation or substitution, so this is a *luxury* loanword.

ФУБА [fuˈbɑ] ***(Port. FUBÁ; Eng. CORNMEAL). Literary Ukr. КУКУРУДЗЯНЕ БОРОШНО*** **(1.05)** was a common word registered in dictionaries and in speech, but it was substituted with a *luxury* loanword.

ШАРОПЕ [ʃɑˈrope] ***(Port. XAROPE; Eng. SYRUP). Literary Ukr. СИРОП*** **(0.25)** was in use at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries, though it was not codified in dictionaries. Nevertheless, I consider it a *luxury* loan as its meanings in Ukrainian are identical to those in Portuguese.

The analysis shows that Ukrainian immigrants actively enriched their vocabulary. For instance, 120 direct words were borrowed in a single specific sphere alone, not to mention numerous loan translations, lexical and semantic substitutions, and deonymizations, whereby a proper name loses its uniqueness and becomes a common name denoting a whole class of objects.

The quantitative distribution across the three analytical categories reveals a nuanced continuum of lexical integration that reflects both pragmatic adaptation and socio-cultural alignment.

The largest share is represented by contact-induced lexical luxuriousness (52 units), closely followed by absolute lexical necessity (43 units), while relative lexical

necessity constitutes the smallest group (25 units). When combined, the categories of absolute and relative necessity comprise the majority of the corpus (68 units, or 57%), underscoring that the primary driver for borrowing Portuguese culinary terms was the immediate functional need to bridge conceptual and taxonomic gaps encountered in the Brazilian environment.

The high density of luxury doublets (43%) indicates that lexical borrowing within the Ukrainian immigrant community was not merely a default response to communicative deficits. Instead, the substantial presence of luxury loans coexisting with native equivalents highlights a vigorous process of identity negotiation and acculturation, where speakers intentionally deployed host-language terms to signal symbolic affiliation, prestige, and pragmatic communicative alignment with the dominant cultural landscape.

Thus, the nearly balanced proportion between necessary and luxury loanwords illustrates the dual nature of immigrant lexical adaptation. On the one hand, it secured survival and functional communication in a new sociolinguistic environment; on the other, it signalled processes of identity negotiation and cultural hybridity. The adoption of Portuguese lexicon by Ukrainians in Brazil therefore operated not only as a tool of naming but also as a marker of cultural contact, reflecting both pragmatic motivation and symbolic affiliation.

4. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the lexical material demonstrates that Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil integrated 120 Portuguese culinary loanwords into their speech, of which 57% may be classified as necessary (both absolute and relative necessity) and 43% as luxury loanwords. This distribution reflects both the pragmatic needs of the immigrant community and the sociocultural environment in which the borrowings occurred.

The predominance of necessary loanwords is explained by the immediate communicative and cultural demands of adaptation. Immigrants were confronted with realities for which their native Ukrainian vocabulary lacked direct equivalents. These included items of Brazilian flora and fauna, culinary products, and elements of material culture and borrowing was the default mechanism, as the gaps had to be filled to ensure effective communication and integration into the new environment.

The high proportion of luxury loanwords highlights the symbolic and prestige-oriented dimension of borrowing. These words did not fulfil communicative necessities but instead reflected immigrants' exposure to broader cultural practices, their social interaction with Brazilians, and their aspiration to demonstrate familiarity with the host culture. Such borrowings often concerned the domains where Portuguese terms were retained for their authentic cultural resonance.

The lexical adaptation of Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil demonstrates that borrowing was not a uniform process. Instead, it was a strategically selective practice that reflected tension between communicative necessity and cultural assimilation. The balanced distribution between necessary and luxury loanwords underscores the fact that immigrant communities simultaneously filled lexical gaps and embraced cultural novelties, thereby shaping a hybridised Ukrainian lexicon in diaspora.

While the present study establishes a clear distribution between necessary and luxury loanwords among Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil, further research is required to explore the lexical, grammatical, phonetic, and orthographic adaptation processes that shaped these borrowings. Particular attention should be devoted to mechanisms of morphological integration, phonetic accommodation to Ukrainian sound patterns, and

orthographic adjustments reflecting shifts from Portuguese to Ukrainian writing rules. The analysis should be expanded to include processes such as deonymizations, calquing, semantic extension, and hybrid formations, which represent important but less studied strategies of lexical adaptation. Such research would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how borrowed lexemes entered, and structurally and semantically transformed within the Ukrainian diaspora variety in Brazil.

REFERENCES

ANDROUTSOPOULOS, J. Computer-mediated communication and sociolinguistics. In: HOLMES, J.; HAZEN, K. (Eds.). *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014, p. 236-255.

BERINDA, P. *Лексікон славенороссκій и имен тлъкованіє* [Slavonic-Russian Lexicon and Interpretation of Names]. Kyiv, 1627.

BILODID, I., et al. *Словник української мови: в 11 т.* [Dictionary of the Ukrainian language: In 11 vols.]. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1970-1980.

CAMPBELL, L. *Historical linguistics: An introduction (4th ed.)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020.

DURKIN, Ph. *Borrowed words: A history of loanwords in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

HASPELMATH, M.; TADMOR, U. *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009.

HAUGEN, E. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language 26*(2), p. 210-231, 1950.

HICKEY, R. *The handbook of language contact.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

HOCK, H.; JOSEPH, B. D. *Language history, language change, and language relationship: An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics* (2nd ed.). Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter. 2009.

HRINCHENKO, B. *Словарь української мови: у 4 т.* [Dictionary of the Ukrainian language: In 4 vols.]. Kyiv: Kievskaia Starina, 1907-1909.

KOVBASKO, Yu. *Narrativa gastronômica "Para as donas de casa" / Стравопис "Для пань дому"*: edição bilíngue. Guarapuava, 2025a. ISBN 978-65-01-79786-1

KOVBASKO, Yu. The role of the "Comité Ucraíno de Auxílio às Vítimas da Guerra" in the life of Ukrainian immigrants in Brazil (based on the official correspondence in 1946-1948). *Slavia 94(4)*, p. 442-460, 2025b. DOI: https://doi.org/10.58377/slav.2025.4.03

MATRAS, Ya. *Language contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

MELNYCHUK, O. *Етимологічний словник української мови: в 7 т.* [Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1982.

ONYSKO, A.; WINTER-FROEMEL, E. Necessary loans – luxury loans? Exploring the pragmatic dimension of borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics 43*(6), p. 1550-1567, 2010.

POPLACK, Sh. *Borrowing: Loanwords in the speech community and in the grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

PRACIA Journal. *Праця – Просвітній Двотижневик.* [Pracia – Educational Biweekly]. Prudentopolis: Vydavnycha Spilka, 1936-1993.

SHVEDOVA, M., et al. *Генеральний регіонально анотований корпус української мови (ГРАК)*. [General Regionally Annotated Corpus (GRAC)]. Kyiv–Lviv–Jena, 2017–2025. Available at: <http://www.uacorpus.org>. Retrieved on: February 1, 2026.

ȘIMON, S. Necessary and luxury loanwords in some Romanian online newspapers and magazines. In: DEJICA, D; HANSEN, G.; SANDRINI, P.; PARA, Iu. (Eds.). *Language in the digital era. Challenges and perspectives*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2016. p. 29-36.

THOMASON, S.; KAUFMAN, T. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

WEINREICH, U. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems.* The Hague–Paris–New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 1953.

WINFORD, D. *An introduction to contact linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

WINTER-FROEMEL, E. The pragmatic necessity of borrowing euphemism, dysphemism, playfulness – and naming. *Taal en Tongval 69(1)*, p. 17-46, 2017. *DOI*: https://doi.org/10.5117/TET2017.1.WINT

WINTER-FROEMEL, E.; ONYSKO, A.; CALUDE, A. Why some non-catachrestic loanwords are more successful than others: a case-study of English loans in German. *Language contact around the globe*, p. 119-142, 2014.

ZENNER, E.; ROSSEEL, L.; CALUDE, A. The social meaning potential of loanwords: Empirical explorations of lexical borrowing as expression of (social) identity. *Ampersand, 6*, p. 100055, 2019. DOI: 10.1016/j.amper.2019.100055

ZHELEHOVSKYI, Ye.; NEDILSKYI, S. *Малоруско-нїмецкий словар: у 2 т.* [Little Russian–German Dictionary: In 2 vols.]. Lviv: NTSH, 1885-1886.

Recebido: 29/4/2026
Aceito: 14/7/2026
Publicado: 21/8/2026