

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: TRANSHUMAN LANGUAGE,
ETHICS AND JUSTICE

Abstract

This study explores the potential social, communicative, linguistic, ethical, and legal impacts of the rapidly evolving phenomena associated with artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. The key issues examined include: (1) cooperation as the foundation of social life (communication), (2) shared traditions (language, texts), (3) tertiary orality and literacy, (4) textual overproduction, (5) core values and value stability, (6) the detachment of art, as the highest form of human quality of life, from human artistic intention, (7) escalating social and personal conflicts stemming from technology, and (8) the legal challenges of artificial intelligence.

Keywords: artificial intelligence and its applications, simulacrum, avatar, narrative, tertiary orality and literacy, “the end of art history”

The advent of AI signals the end of omniscience

However, we are also moving towards the possible end of human partial knowledge itself. For this reason, we believe that it is critical to emphasise humanistic considerations.

Nowadays, everything seems to revolve around AI (for example, the *Magyar Nyelvőr* has frequently addressed the topic: Csepeli 2024; Czine 2024, Vaughan–Szűts–Novák 2024, and even case studies related to ChatGPT: Balázs–Beke–Szűts 2024; Balázs–Beke–Szűts 2025, as well as issues surrounding phishing: Kenyeres–Szűts 2025). Although virtually everything about AI is relative and subject to immediate change, we will briefly highlight three currently relevant artistic-linguistic phenomena without an overextended introduction:

- (1) AI preparing school-leaving exam topics:
“I feel sorry for those poor students who have used language models to prepare their contemporary literature exam topics and will now speak complete nonsense. In cases where the models are unfamiliar with the specific text (which is often likely for contemporary works), they will not initially indicate this. Still, they will rather generate

random, nonsensical responses. I know this because I have received several desperate messages overnight from students concerning my short stories (Hangár, Húsleves), telling me that the exam topic drafted by their classmates and shared with them does not correspond to the actual text. How is this possible? Why does this happen? (Of course, I am aware that these models can also be used properly – they need to be given the right instructions, etc. – but the situation is nevertheless disheartening.)” (György Dragomán, W1)

- (2) Voice cloning, AI composes a song: *“In January 2024, the experimental music project Full of Stars published a song on its YouTube and TikTok channels which used the vocal timbres of two of the most influential young macro-influencers in contemporary Hungarian celebrity culture: Dominik Szoboszlai, who plays football in the English Premier League, and Attila Baukó, the singer performing under the artist name Azahriah, who has enjoyed one success after another. The song paid tribute to the recent successes of the Hungarian national football team.” (W1)*

A commercial television channel’s expert commented: *“Within three years, it will be virtually impossible to distinguish between what is real and what has been generated by artificial intelligence.” (W2)* The phenomenon is known as voice cloning „The technological refinement of voice cloning, which can also be understood as a further stage in the mediatization, softwareisation, and datafication of human culture, is likely to make its presence felt across numerous registers of popular culture future. Significant changes may occur in popular music, filmmaking, dubbing, and the video game industry, developments that media and cultural studies will need to monitor closely.

In my view, an exciting avenue of interpretation lies in the philosophical exploration of voice cloning technology – an aspect touched upon here only in passing, which could also contribute to the discourse of posthumanism. Such an inquiry might offer a deeper examination of how the relationship between voice and body is transforming.” (Rudisch Ferenc, W2)

- (3) Hungarian Language and Artificial Intelligence: *“Developing Hungarian-language artificial intelligence systems is not merely a technological challenge but a matter of national interest. This issue extends far beyond the field of information technology: it concerns our digital sovereignty, the preservation of our linguistic culture, and even our economic competitiveness,” László Palkovics told Index. He emphasised that among smaller languages, Hungarian are at a real competitive disadvantage in global AI development. Large language*

models primarily focus on widely spoken languages and use the data available in those languages for training. Without conscious, deliberate action, the Hungarian language may only participate in the age of artificial intelligence in ‘translation’. “This not only affects our linguistic complexity but also impacts our culture and history, since large language models are taught – and integrate – the historical and societal perspectives widely available in foreign languages and embedded in those respective cultures. (...) If we do not build our own Hungarian-language AI capabilities, others will decide what the Hungarian language and culture will mean in the digital space.” (Gyöngyösi, Balázs, W3; Kenyeres 2024: 533, on the linguistic analysis of prompts.)

We also conducted a playful linguistic experiment:

- (4) We asked Google what *pirburg* and *párkáp* mean, and its own AI provided the following answer: The phrase „*pirburg párkáp*” is likely a unique, slang, or humorous expression coined in a specific context. It does not have a generally accepted meaning. The word „*párkáp*” may derive from „*párkány*”, which is an architectural element, whereas „*pirburg*” is not a recognised Hungarian word. The expression may have meaning in a particular locality or within a smaller community, but no reliable source exists to confirm this. (W4) In fact, it is a linguistic game by Péter Esterházy: *szemszám*, *pirburg*, and *párkáp*, which also appear in Géza Bereményi’s film *Idő van*. Of course, phrased differently, our query might have elicited a more accurate response.

Nowadays, everyone is experimenting with AI: secondary school students, university undergraduates, doctoral researchers, artists, journalists, and politicians alike. The (tabloid) media publish daily headlines such as: “We asked AI about...”, “AI showed us how...”, or “We asked AI to demonstrate...” Moreover, this is when odd and less odd combinations start to emerge, along with images that are more or less (mis)successful in one way or another.

This is the current situation, which we mostly regard as experimentation or entertainment, yet it is ideally suited to mislead, to invite people to draw real meaning from it. Almost no one asks the question (which is recommended daily in the context of critical online use): according to which version of the

AI, and at what point? Because what one AI answers to a specific question today, on 18 June 2025 at 10:06 a.m., may already be formulated differently the very next minute if the question is phrased in another way, not to mention when asked of a different type or version of AI. In other words, ‘AI reality’ has a thousand and one faces, a thousand and one variations. The technological development that began with the Industrial Revolution and was accelerated by the Information Revolution has now shifted to a new level, leading to exponential growth and transformation.

In the history of culture, the concept of alter egos (doubles) and avatars has already been present. Originally, *avatar* referred to the earthly incarnation of a Hindu deity in human or animal form; in the age of modern (new) media, a form of appearance, distinct from reality, shaped according to the user’s preferences; a virtual persona. In the social sciences, we have also spoken, following Baudrillard (1985), of *simulacra*, seemingly authentic copies, arising from the illusory nature of human thought. Moreover, this rapidly advancing technological development is now pressing upon what is still a fundamentally human feeling and experience. Gergely Krizbai (2025: 9) writes: “the inanimate has begun to behave as if it were alive.” Humans have always personified nature and objects: they saw human-shaped gods in clouds, fire, and water. Personification (anthropomorphism, humanisation) is not merely a poetic device, but part of our everyday thinking. Let us take some examples: *the cannon speaks, the clock ticks, the heart hopes, we weave dreams*; we address natural phenomena, objects, and concepts as persons: *our dear homeland*. We project humanity onto robots and chatbots as well. At the 2025 Budapest Book Festival, a clumsy robot wandered in front of one of the tents; more people marvelled at it than at the books. In a restaurant, a robotic waiter was introduced, tirelessly delivering meals with a programmed smiling face, and it was programmed to stop if someone playfully stepped in front of it. At that point, its face would change to a sad expression. The troublemaker, feeling sorry for it, then stepped aside. Breithaupt (2024: 10) writes: “We consider simulations suitable for mirroring our actions; they feel intensely real. Moreover, who would want to break with reality?”

We are entering a transhuman era

We are entering a transhuman era, the age of technological singularity, in which machine intelligence surpasses human intelligence, and technology slips beyond human control, as though we are not only expecting this moment, but actively welcoming it. People have long been surrounded by machines

whose workings they did not understand (televisions, cars, computers, smartphones), but there were always some who did. The danger is that we are approaching a time when perhaps no one will truly understand how or why these systems function. Krizbai (2025: 8) refers to this as “the beginning of non-human history”.

The principal areas of AI application today include: internet search engines (Google, Search), recommendation systems (YouTube, Amazon, Netflix), understanding human speech (Siri, Alexa), self-driving cars (Waymo), generative and creative tools (ChatGPT, AI art), and strategic games (such as chess and Go). All this will lead to explosive (rapid, revolutionary) change, first and foremost in human personality and socialisation, and, consequently, communities, society, and culture (including language itself).

We had already drawn attention to this phenomenon some time ago, promptly attracting labels from certain quarters of the academic community: technological pessimists, cultural pessimists, or worse, reactionaries and pseudo-scientists. In the latter case, the main counterargument was that science is not in the business of making predictions. This is, of course, true. However, in our age, studying present and emerging trends has become essential to our survival, requiring us to sketch out possible future scenarios (not only about the economy, environmental protection, or population growth, but also regarding social relations, culture, and language).

As we drift within the technocultural world towards a transhuman future, let us at least agree to use a Hungarian linguistic description instead of adopting the entirely foreign linguistic form of the new technology (Balázs 2023: 133–154; Minya–Baku 2024).

We propose using the Hungarian abbreviation *MI* (*mesterséges intelligencia* or *mesterséges értelem*) instead of the English *AI*, pronounced and inflected according to Hungarian grammar, for example: *MI-vel* (with AI). The spelling of ChatGPT (the artificial intelligence-based chatbot developed by OpenAI) could also be adapted to Hungarian orthography: *chatgpt*, or perhaps in a fully Hungarianised form, such as *szövegtenyésztő* (literally ‘text cultivator’). Since the topic of Hungarianisation has now been raised, the *Szómagyarító* (Word Hungarianiser) website already offers several suggestions. Possible alternatives for *AI* include: *műész* (artificial intellect), *gépagy* (machine mind), *robész* (robot intellect), *netész* (net mind), *agymű* (mind engine); while alternatives for *chatbot* might be: *csetbot* (chatbot), *csevigép* (chatter machine), *terefereketyere* (chit-chat contraption), or *e-társalgó* (e-converser).

In the present paper, we have gathered together those cultural and linguistic phenomena that had already been identified previously, and which have by now moved from mere prediction towards actual realisation; for each, we also add ethical and legal considerations that go beyond the cultural aspect and relate to the regulation of social life.

Seven Key Social, Cultural, and Linguistic Domains Fundamentally Influenced by AI

(1) Cooperation as the Foundation of Social Life and Communication:

A well-functioning society is built from (smaller, minor) communities, whose most essential characteristic is cooperation. The philosophical and linguistic framework for this was developed by Paul Grice (1988) under what he termed the *conversational maxims* (cooperative principles). The parties engaged in communication must (even subconsciously) follow four such fundamental principles: a) quantity (providing sufficient information), b) quality (meeting specific truthfulness criteria), c) relation (remaining relevant to the given situation), d) manner (expressing oneself clearly and in an organised way, and perhaps also observing ethical, appropriate, and polite forms of expression). Balázs Géza's (2020) fundamental formula for pragmatic communication is as follows: $K = 5E$ (the 5 E's represent the Hungarian terms for cooperation, empathy, energy, aesthetics, and ethics). Almost all these components are under strain today, especially the most fundamental aspect of human relationships: cooperation. There are undoubtedly emotional, energetic, and increasingly psychological factors underlying this phenomenon. We do not claim a direct causal relationship. Still, numerous indications contribute to the emergence of many new forms of civilizational disorders. Several psychological conditions and illnesses make cooperation between people increasingly difficult, if not impossible.

Consider, for example, two of the most frequently diagnosed psychological states of our era: autism and ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder). The signs of autism spectrum disorder include reduced capacity for social interaction, withdrawn communication, and non-conforming behaviour. In more severe cases, meaningful conversation with an autistic person is practically impossible, and they are generally unsuited to tasks that require cooperative work within most communities. Individuals with ADHD struggle to concentrate, notice or overlook details, often do not respond to direct questions, are unable to follow instructions, have difficulty organising their

daily lives, and tend to be forgetful. These disruptions to social cooperation are, unfortunately, destabilising society itself (Arató–Balázs 2023) and impose additional burdens on the social system, burdens that only highly affluent societies can realistically bear.

The impact of these challenges is already evident in areas such as the justice system, as illustrated by a recent case:

- “In the *Partizán* broadcast of 16 June 2025, we examined the criminal proceedings of a young man diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder. We found the case particularly important because it highlights how the same offences, committed by the same individual, were treated with understanding and in light of his condition by the authorities in one county. In contrast, they were, and continue to be, handled with far greater severity elsewhere. The young man’s father and defence lawyer outlined the case in the two-part discussion. During preliminary consultations, the father confessed that he did not understand why his son was engaging in such bizarre and alarming behaviour.” (W4)

We will not go into the complexities that followed from this case here.

However, how does AI connect to this? Most likely through technological development... A generation raised on smartphones, one that does not wish to engage in conversation. According to a leading business magazine’s ranking, one of Hungary’s most popular YouTubers openly stated in an interview that he is interested in nothing other than his smartphone, social relationships, and does not even miss sex (he identifies as asexual). This attitude seems closely related to a phenomenon that has already been observed in Japan:

“Japan may be the only country where popular magazines regularly publish articles with headlines such as: ‘Young people, do not hate sex!’” According to a recent survey, condom manufacturing and the construction of hotels specialising in romantic encounters are now the absolute losers on the investment ranking list. (...) The era of dates, courtship, and romance is over: the number of marriages and births is declining to an extent in the island nation that, according to some experts, an economic crisis and social collapse are already unavoidable.” (W6)

The foundation of cooperation is a shared language. It is becoming increasingly evident that AI is on the verge of fulfilling one of humanity’s ancient dreams:

eliminating the confusion of languages (the Babelian language barrier), creating the possibility of instant, online communication for people of all languages... This dream brings a sense of joy to everyone. However, what will follow from it? Language learning and linguistic knowledge have always involved cognitive and cultural processes – yet from now on, these may no longer be essential.

(2) Shared Traditions: Language and Texts

Social cooperation is fundamentally rooted in shared traditions, which are preserved and transmitted through commonly known, recited, and retold texts (myths, legends, and so-called “true” stories, in other words: narratives).

Breithaupt (2024: 13) emphasises that narratives have a conserving, identity-shaping power, but also a problem-solving, creative force:

“Narratives establish powerful patterns that give a stable form to our behaviour, thinking, beliefs, emotions, experiences, memories, and hopes; in this way, they limit us. However, it is precisely narrative thinking that offers creative possibilities of choice, possibilities that we quite literally invent for ourselves.”

Moreover, here lie the advantages:

“As narrative beings, we can design our own lives, anticipate the actions of others, assign blame, imagine ourselves in the place of others, and come to understand ourselves.”

However, the existing, accessible narratives can be contrasted with the declining reading comprehension skills, as confirmed by the results of the national competence assessment (see e.g. W7). Play a role in the accelerated pace of life, the speed of thinking, and the increasingly signal-like nature of communication, all hindering thorough reading comprehension. The superficiality of reading comprehension gives rise to numerous negative factors.

One observation - probably exaggerated, yet worth considering - states: “50% of Hungarian employees are functionally illiterate; rules must be displayed on machines in graphic form.”

(3) Tertiary Orality and Literacy

For many millennia, human language existed solely as spoken language. Then, approximately 5 to 7 thousand years ago, the need for recording emerged independently in several places, according to current knowledge, giving rise to written language. From the end of the 19th century, the technical possibility of recording and transmitting speech began to develop, and by the end of the 20th century, it had become a reality. It started, and a secondary, spontaneous form of writing appeared. It started to spread widely due to digitalisation. In this form, the gestures of the earliest writing systems reappeared and revived: pictures (emoticons, emojis), abbreviations, omissions of letters. Due to the impact of AI, we can now speak of a third form of orality and literacy: machine-generated speech and writing (Arató–Balázs 2024; Balázs 2024). Its characteristics can closely resemble, sometimes to the point of deception, the first or second forms of orality and literacy, yet they are the same. Today is: “I write using a microphone, then you make sense of it.” It remains an open and unexplored question of the true nature of machine-generated texts and how much they may influence linguistic change. Perhaps we can at least state that these are mosaic texts, hybrid texts, rephrased from existing materials according to linguistic commands, and that they already exhibit certain “human” features: they can ask follow-up questions and express uncertainty about the text they have created.

(4) Textual Overproduction

As a result of digitalisation, text overproduction has reached enormous proportions. Until now, pathological verbosity and compulsive speech, referred to in Hungarian with metaphors such as word diarrhoea or word flooding, and known in psychological terms as logorrhoea, were mainly identified and described in live human speech.

With the simplification of writing, transmission, and publication techniques, we can now also speak of *textual logorrhoea* that floods everything. Since an enormous volume of text is now published without any form of control, this complicates the process of reading comprehension and, at the same time, provides fertile ground for conscious manipulation (disinformation: half-truths, fake news) (Kenyeres–Szűts 2024).

(5) Core Values and Value Stability

As a result of digitalisation and AI, phenomena that were previously considered settled are now being called into question, such as the concept of the manuscript (the first, original version of a text), the author, the author's creation (in many fields, authorial autonomy is disappearing), and the uncontrollable number of text variants.

Although there have been long periods in human history and specific areas of culture where the creator (the author) was unknown, and texts existed in multiple versions – for example, in ancient oral poetry, later in folk poetry, and still today in living folklore – this new (perhaps transitional?) situation will undoubtedly raise numerous new ethical and legal issues.

(6) The Separation of Art, as the Highest Form of Human Quality of Life, from Human Artistic Intention

Art theories generally agree that the emergence of art was a decisive milestone in the process of becoming human, and that in every era, in some way or to some extent, it has been a characteristic of all people; in a broader sense, it is considered the most distinctive and highest human quality. It is a fact that there has already been a turning point in the history of art when communal and individual art separated, and many transitional artistic phenomena have since emerged. The impact of digitalisation and AI now raises questions about how the unrestricted distribution (copying) and transformation (textual and visual modification: Photoshop) influence aesthetic sensitivity and value, including the most powerful driving force of reception: catharsis. (In this context, some authors refer to *machinism*, or machine aesthetics, e.g. Perneckzy 1999). Copying and reproduction have already called into question the seemingly stable position of autonomous art. Let us offer a provocative thought: often, the copy is more beautiful than the original work; the Mona Lisa is much easier and more comfortably studied on a screen or poster than at its heavily guarded exhibition site in the Louvre, surrounded by barriers and crowds. Continuing this provocation: large masses prefer rewritten, simplified dramas and novels over the originals. However, we are already engaged in yet another process, where the original author and the human itself are called into question: AI no longer merely reshapes (generates) from the existing but creates (produces) entirely new works. “As AI has demonstrated remarkable capabilities across various fields of art – including visual arts, music, and literature – the greatest problem lies precisely in the

choice of words.” (Pálfalusi 2025: 5–6) Unfortunately, it seems a very weak argument on the part of art theory (see, for example, Belting’s concept of *the end of art history*; on this topic, see also Pernecky 1999) to claim that what is not created with human artistic intention is not art. Who will be able to distinguish between the two?

(7) Intensifying Social and Personal Conflicts Arising from Technology

Social media is a valuable platform for smaller communities and groups interested in a particular field or topic. However, it is also evident that the *filter bubble* effect leads to misinformation, exclusion, and even loneliness; furthermore, it increases social division and polarisation in the political and public spheres. The societal impacts of AI-driven search engine optimisation (so-called “bubble creation”) are, as yet, immeasurable. Even the digitalisation of the pre-AI era (today’s world) has had numerous harmful effects: anonymous manifestations (abusive texts), aggression, character assassination, and the erosion of privacy.

To what extent will AI further reinforce the processes already in motion today, those that are detrimental to the social contract and cooperation?

We are aware of efforts to regulate online behaviour, individual reactions driven by fear to restrict internet content, and various abuses of the communication opportunities offered by the internet and AI (deception, fraud).

(8) Law and Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Responses

As the preceding discussion has already demonstrated, the explosive development of artificial intelligence raises a host of new legal questions that can only be partially addressed within the current frameworks of existing legal systems. “Artificial intelligence (AI) is playing an increasingly significant role in social and economic processes; however, it poses numerous challenges in data protection, privacy, decision-making responsibility, and fairness.” (Papp 2025) The application of AI presents particularly pressing legislative and judicial challenges in justice, intellectual property, personality rights, and data protection. Concerns about data protection related to artificial intelligence arise in numerous areas (Bekk-Tarsoly-Pogátsnik 2025)

Copyright and Authorship. The legal classification of AI-generated content (texts, images, musical compositions) remains a subject of ongoing debate. In the case of works created by AI, the fundamental question arises: who should be

recognised as the author? Is it the user who issued the prompt, the developer who created the model, or no one at all, given the absence of human creative intent? Traditional copyright law is intrinsically linked to human authorship; thus, protecting AI-generated works remains a legal grey area.

One of the most significant challenges in this domain is the mass, rapid generation of AI-created works and the difficulty in distinguishing between plagiarism and independent creation. AI systems can mimic the style and mood of existing works, which means the risk of copyright infringement is ever-present. Moreover, tracing the sources or templates used in AI-generated works is often nearly impossible, rendering authorship virtually unfeasible.

Personality Rights and Deepfake Technologies. AI also opens up new avenues for violations of personality rights, notably through voice cloning and deepfake technologies. These developments make it possible to generate compelling, convincing content using someone else's voice, facial features, or even complete body movements.

This poses a serious threat to privacy and can easily become a tool for manipulation in social media, political communication, or even criminal proceedings.

The protection of personality rights must therefore be fundamentally re-evaluated. Under the Hungarian Civil Code, an individual's voice and likeness fall within the sphere of personality rights and require consent for their use. However, deepfake technologies often make manipulation indistinguishable, meaning that infringements may go unnoticed and proving them in legal proceedings can be extremely difficult.

Legal Responsibility for AI. One of the most critical issues is determining who is liable for damages caused by AI. Although AI is a tool, it is increasingly capable of autonomous decision-making, yet the law still seeks to attach liability to a human or legal entity. Responsibility may lie with the developer, the user, the operator, or in some cases, with no one, if the damage arose from an error made during the AI's independent learning process.

The European Union attempting to address these issues through its AI Act, which proposes specific regulations for high-risk AI systems, including mandatory liability insurance and strict transparency obligations for developers and operators.

Data Protection Challenges. AI's insatiable appetite for data has elevated data protection concerns to new heights.

The operation of AI requires vast amounts of data, often including personal information. Data protection law (such as the GDPR) already seeks to limit uncontrolled data usage, but the pace of AI development frequently outstrips the speed of legislative response.

A particular concern is that large language models are often trained on publicly available datasets that may contain personal data. This raises an ongoing debate about whether such models can “remember” personal information and, if so, to what extent this constitutes a legal violation.

Criminal Law Risks. Abuse of AI is already generating numerous criminal law concerns, including:

- The refinement of phishing techniques using AI tools
- The creation and dissemination of deepfake pornographic material
- The production of fraudulent contracts using AI
- Automated identity theft using AI systems

Criminal law currently lags behind these developments: many of these actions do not yet fit neatly within existing criminal offence definitions, and proving intent or negligence is particularly challenging when harm is caused by an AI system’s “independent” algorithmic decision.

Regulatory Responses and Dilemmas. The legal regulation of artificial intelligence is still evolving worldwide.

The European Union seeks to address these issues by adopting the AI Act, which would regulate the development, application, and supervision of AI systems. Hungarian legislation remains reactive rather than proactive in this area: there is currently no dedicated AI law, although some existing provisions from the GDPR, the Civil Code, copyright law, and the Criminal Code may already be applied.

The key question is whether legislators will be able to develop a enough to keep pace with rapidly advancing technology while ensuring legal certainty and the protection of human rights. The legal questions raised by artificial intelligence extend far beyond traditional branches of law and require an interdisciplinary approach.

A fundamental rethinking of copyright, personality rights, data protection, and liability frameworks is essential if technological advancement is to foster not legal uncertainty but the development of human coexistence.

Outlook

In this paper, we have focused primarily on the pressing challenges that digitalisation—and especially the rise of AI—pose to intellectuals and society. The road towards solutions will likely be long, arduous, and fraught with communication breakdowns.

In general terms, it may be worth reminding humanity that technological “progress” is unsustainable, as it already leads to an unforeseen number of complex, seemingly insoluble conflicts.

It would be fortunate if humankind could be content with minimal technology.

Let us not forget: “How we use our tools ultimately says more about us as humans than the tools themselves” (Krizbai 2025: 13).

Technology should be developed with a deep understanding of human nature and its limitations. At present, however, technology comes first.

References

- Arató Balázs – Balázs Géza 2023. Hol a tudás, amit elvesztettünk az információban? A digitális pedagógia diszkurzív-intuitív megközelítése antropológiai és jogi nézőpontból. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 147. 755–776.
<https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2023.5.755>
- Arató, Balázs – Géza Balázs 2024. The communicative-linguistic modes of artificial intelligence with a focus on justice. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 601–617.
<https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.601>
- Balázs Géza 2020. A retorika elméletéhez, tanításához, módszertanához. Egy egyetemi előadás-sorozat szűzsége. *Magyaróra* II/1–2. (2020. április) 15–19.
- Balázs Géza 2023. Az internet népe. Internet – társadalom – kultúra – nyelv. Ludovika Egyetemi Kiadó, Budapest.
- Balázs Géza 2024. Harmadlagos beszéd és írás. A mesterséges értelem kommunikációs-nyelvi létmódja. *Szabad Piac* 9–10. szám: 38–47. https://uni-milton.hu/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/szabadpiac_kiadvany_2024_2szam_0307_javitott.pdf
- Balázs Géza 2025. Önjáró technika a kultúrában és az oktatásban? *Kortárs* (megjelenés alatt)
- Balázs, Géza – Ottó Beke – Zoltán Szűts 2024. ChatGPT language recognition limitations: Prompts in Hungarian in a network of Latin and Cyrillic letters (Netlinguistics case study. The “Chinese room” experiment). *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 666–681. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.666>
- Balázs Géza – Beke Ottó – Szűts Zoltán 2025. Kontaktusnyelv és ChatGPT. Avajdasági magyar nyelvhasználat mesterséges intelligencia általi értelmezésének jelenlegi lehetőségei. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 149. 314–327.
<https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2025.3.314>

- Baudrillard, Jean 1985. *Simulacres et simulation*. Galilée, Paris.
- Bekk, Tímea – Tarsoly, Péter – Pogátsnik, Mónika 2025. hallucinációtól az adatvédelemig: Amesterséges intelligencia alkalmazásának észlelt buktatói a tanári gyakorlatban. In: Kulcsár, Attila (szerk.) *GISopen 2025* (Konferenciakiadvány.)
- Breithaupt, Fritz 2024. *A narratív agy. Miért gondolkodunk történetekben?* Typotex, Budapest.
- Czine, Ágnes 2024. Words, phrases, thoughts without heart and soul... *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 570–578. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.570>
- Csepeli, György 2024. The silent province. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 565–569. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.565>
- Grice, Paul 1988. A társalgás logikája. 233–250. In: *Nyelv, kommunikáció, cselekvés*. Válogatta és szerkesztette: Pléh Csaba – Siklaki István – Terestyéni Tamás. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest.
- Kenyeres Attila Zoltán 2024. Az internet népe – a nép internete. Inspirálódás Balázs Géza Az internet népe könyvéből. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 530–535. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.4.530>
- Kenyeres Attila Zoltán – Szűts Zoltán 2024. Az álhírek (fake news) definíciós kísérletei és nyelvi jelei. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 203–235. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.2.203>
- Kenyeres Attila Zoltán – Szűts Zoltán 2025. Az adathalászat (phishing) fogalmi definiálása és főbb nyelvi jelei. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 149. 159–185. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2025.2.159>
- Krizbai Gergely 2025. Énkifejező Gép. *Magyar Művészet* 1: 8–15.
- Minya Károly – Baku Laura 2024. Az informatikai kifejezések magyarításai mint neologizmusok. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 459–470. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.4.459>
- Papp Renáta 2025. A mesterséges intelligencia etikai kihívásai. *Jogelméleti Szemle* 1: 51–72. <https://doi.org/10.59558/jesz.2025.1.51>
- Pálfalusi Zsolt 2025. A mesterséges intelligencia (AI) iterációs alkalmazási módjai a művészetekben. *Magyar Művészet* 1: 4–7.
- Perneczky Géza szerk. 1999. A művészet vége? *Európai Füzetek*. Első szám. Letöltés: <https://mek.oszk.hu/01600/01654/01654.htm>
- Perneczky Géza 1999. A „művészet vége” – baleset vagy elmélet? In: Perneczky szerk. 1999.
- Vaughan, Geoff–Rita Szűts–Novák 2024. What we talk about when we talk about AI. Artificial intelligence and language. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 148. 579–588. <https://doi.org/10.38143/Nyr.2024.5.579>

Online sources

- W1. Dragomán György: Dragomán György: „Sajnálom azokat a szegény érettségizőket, akik nyelvi modellek segítségével dolgozták ki a kortárs irodalmi tételeket”. Qubit.hu, 2025. 06. 17. <https://qubit.hu/2025/06/17/dragoman->

- gyorgy-sajnalom-azokat-a-szegeny-erettsegizokat-akik-nyelvi-modellek-segitsegevel-dolgoztak-ki-a-kortars-irodalmi-teteleket
- W2. Rudisch Ferenc: Szoboszlai és Azahriah? A mesterséges intelligencia a populáris kultúrában. MeDok 2025. május. <https://doi.org/10.59392/MEDOK.1388>.
Letöltés: https://www.academia.edu/129304402/Szoboszlai_%C3%A9s_Azahriah_A_mesters%C3%A9ges_intelligencia_a_popul%C3%A1ris_kult%C3%BAr%C3%A1ban
- W3. Gyöngyösi Balázs: Váratlan magyar AI-siker, ami mindent megváltoztat. Index, 2025. 05. 30. <https://index.hu/gazdasag/2025/05/30/mesterseges-intelligencia-gvh-microsoft-eljaras-technologia-palkovics-laszlo-szuts-zoltan/>
- W4. Google: AI-alapú áttekintés, 2025. június 17.)
- W5. <https://www.facebook.com/partizanpolitika>
- W6. Parazita szinglik Japánban. [https://www.origo.hu/tudomany/1899/12/20040625parazita#:~:text=Tal%C3%A1ln%20Jap%C3%A1n%20az,%C3%A9s%20t%C3%A1rsadalmi%20%C3%B6sszeoml%C3%A1s.\(W6\)](https://www.origo.hu/tudomany/1899/12/20040625parazita#:~:text=Tal%C3%A1ln%20Jap%C3%A1n%20az,%C3%A9s%20t%C3%A1rsadalmi%20%C3%B6sszeoml%C3%A1s.(W6))
- W7. Öt éve egy nyolcadikos jobban olvasott, mint tavaly egy tizedikes: súlyosan romló adatok a kompetenciaméréseken. HVG, 2025. 03. 26. https://hvg.hu/360/20250324_kompetencias-meres-2025-oktatas

Balázs Arató

habilitated associate professor

Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary

E-mail: arato.balazs@kre.hu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5854-8018>

Géza Balázs

university professor

University of Theatre and Film Arts, Head of Doktoral School,

Németh Antal Institute for Drama Theory

E-mail: balazs.geza@szfe.hu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3440-2959>