

JÁNOS PUSZTAY (Nitra)

THE CONDITION OF THE MORDVIN LANGUAGES AS SUGGESTED  
BY THE RESULTS OF THE TERMINOLOGICAL DICTIONARY PROJECT  
"TERMINOLOGIA SCHOLARIS \* ШКОЛЬНАЯ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЯ"

**Abstract.** On the initiative of the institute Collegium Fenno-Ugricum in 2010–2011 the school terminology of ten school subjects in five Finno-Ugric languages of Russia (Erzya, Moksha, Mari, Komi, Udmurt) has been elaborated to provide the means for writing vernacular school textbooks and to subsequently provide for vernacular instruction of these subjects. Now an analysis of the  $5 \times 10$  terminological dictionaries is going on. The first two analysis were addressed to the two Mordvin languages, Erzya and Moksha. On the basis of the analysis it can be stated that in both languages the terminology has been extensively and needlessly Russified. The task is to re-evaluate the position of the Mordvin languages and, taking into account traditions as well as the example of other Finno-Ugric languages, to implement a complete language development and reform.

**Keywords:** Finno-Ugric languages, Mordvin languages (Erzya, Moksha), terminology, project "Terminologia scholaris".

## 1. Introduction

As reported in *Linguistica Uralica* (Pusztay 2014) — on the initiative of the institute Collegium Fenno-Ugricum in 2010–2011 the school terminology of ten school subjects in five Finno-Ugric languages of Russia (Erzya, Moksha, Mari, Komi, Udmurt) has been elaborated as an EU-supported project, the results of which have been published in  $5 \times 10 = 50$  terminological dictionaries, 50–100 pages each.

The aim of the project was to create the conditions for teaching all subjects in the mother tongue, starting from a vernacular school terminology. Since the closing of native schools in the 1960s the teaching of the mother tongue to children has mainly been reduced to the first few years of village primary schools, while the rest of the school subjects are taught in Russian. Actually, the terminology of school subjects was first developed in the Finno-Ugric languages of Russia as early as in the 1920s and 1930s, which our contemporary authors have probably relied on.

The ever diminishing use of Finno-Ugric languages will sooner or later lead to giving them up totally, thus contributing to the language-eliminating process typical of globalisation. At present the preservation of the above-mentioned languages, their extension of use and the improvement of the attitudes to them depends largely on schools rather than on families, which, among other reasons, is due to the high prestige of a language of education.

After the publication of the terminological dictionaries their linguistic analysis was started. First the results of the Erzya and Moksha languages were published (Пустай 2013a; 2013b), as after the first insight it could be predicted that the condition of these

two languages is worrying. This is due to the unexplainably large quantity of Russian loanwords (e.g. *действиянь образонь да способонь наречият*). The first impressions were further strengthened by the analysis. Although the next step of the program is to write vernacular schoolbooks using the terminological dictionaries as a source, in the case of Erzya and Moksha it is absolutely not recommended and should be avoided.

The situation with the terminological dictionaries in question could be explained by two reasons: either the two languages are really in a bad state (which is, however, contradicted by the relatively good annotations added to the terms, with few loanwords) or the negligence and low attitude to the task as well as to their mother tongue on the part of the authors involved in the project.

We have analysed the terms from two aspects: origin and structure.

As for their origin the terms can either be native words of the given language, international words (which have naturally arrived in the Finno-Ugric languages of Russia through Russian mediation), Russified international words (international > Russian (e.g. *mobile* > *мобиль-ность*), or unadapted Russian loanwords.

The study of compounds and expressions of several words also uses the combinations of this division (e.g. international + international > Russian, international + Russian, international + native, international + international > Russian + native, Russian + natives, Russian + international > Russian etc.)

The results of the classification of the term origins, in a simplified version, are as follows. The codes of the first column are:

- 0 = native language
- 1 = international
- 2 = Russified international
- 3 = Russian
- 9 = native language + Russian

The rest of the subgroups with a low score either consist of fully foreign elements of different types or of multi-element terms with one element of a vernacular origin.

As for the structure of the terms they can consist of one or more elements. One-element terms can be stem words, derivatives or compounds.

Language economy has an especially great role in creating terms (Galinski, Cluver, Budin 1999 : 2209). The fewer words a term consists of the more successful it is, i.e. the closer the word/term ratio to 1, the better (Hoffmann 1999 : 1542).

## 2. Analysis of the Moksha material

### 2.1. Classification of terms by origin

Subject	Language	Literature	History	Social Studies	Geography
Number of terms	288	373	461	294	554
Types of terms according to origin (%)					
<b>0</b>	<b>31.6%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>26.4%</b>
1	12.2%	40.5%	33.4%	34.0%	23.9%
2	4.9%	8.0%	4.6%	7.5%	4.7%
3	22.9%	12.1%	34.5%	25.5%	11.8%
9	18.4%	2.7%	6.9%	3.4%	4.7%
<b>Foreign total</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>69.7%</b>	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>52.5%</b>
Hybrid terms without any native element	7 (2.4%)	34 (9.1%)	65 (14.1%)	52 (17.7%)	67 (12.1%)
Hybrid terms with a native element	70 (24.3%)	42 (11.3%)	52 (11.3%)	17 (5.8%)	114 (20.6%)

Subject	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Mathematics	Information Technology
Number of terms	357	316	315	381	268
Types of terms according to origin (%)					
<b>0</b>	<b>53.8%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
1	8.1%	14.6%	20.6%	9.4%	33.2%
2	2.2%	1.6%	9.5%	1.0%	6.7%
3	21.0%	12.3%	8.3%	11.0%	4.1%
<b>Foreign total</b>	<b>32.4%</b>	<b>55.1%</b>	<b>59.4%</b>	<b>39.7%</b>	<b>68.9%</b>
Hybrid terms without a native element	5 (1.4%)	84 (26.6%)	66 (30.0%)	70 (18.4%)	67 (25.0%)
Hybrid terms with a native element	46 (12.9%)	108 (34.2%)	73 (23.2%)	204 (53.5%)	65 (24.3%)

The rank order of subjects by the percentage of terms with a native element:

Biology	53.8%
Language	31.6%
Geography	26.4%
Literature	18.2%
Chemistry	13.3%
Physics	10.1%
Social Studies	9.5%
Information Technology	6.7%
Mathematics	6.6%
History	1.3%

The rank order of subjects by the percentage of terms of exclusively foreign origin:

Biology	32.4%
Mathematics	39.7%
Language	42.4%
Geography	52.5%
Physics	55.1%
Chemistry	59.4%
Information Technology	68.9%
Literature	69.7%
Social Studies	84.6%
History	86.7%

Hybrid terms containing a native element:

Mathematics	53.5%
Physics	34.2%
Information Technology	24.3%
Language	24.3%
Chemistry	23.2%
Geography	20.6%
Biology	12.9%
History	11.3%
Literature	11.3%
Social Studies	5.8%

Hybrid terms without a native word:

Biology	1.4%
Language	2.4%
Literature	9.1%
Geography	12.1%
History	14.1%
Social studies	17.7%
Mathematics	18.4%
Information Technology	25.0%
Physics	26.6%
Chemistry	30.0%

From the charts one can see that the number of foreign terms is very high, especially in the special phrases taken over from Russian. With a more positive and thorough approach the proportion of those could have notably been reduced without even creating new terms, only using the latest Russian-Moksha dictionary (RuMoS).

There are 465 existing native terms in the dictionary, or terms that could be coined on the basis of the dictionary, with a percentage of 12.9%.

Native terms by subjects (out of the total number of terms offered for the subject):

Social Studies	56 (294)	19.0%
Mathematics	71 (381)	18.6%
Biology	54 (357)	15.1%
Geography	80 (553)	14.5%
Language	40 (288)	13.9%
Literature	51 (373)	13.7%
<b>average</b>		<b>12.9%</b>
History	57 (461)	12.4%
Physics	36 (316)	11.4%
Information Technology	15 (268)	5.6%
Chemistry	5 (315)	1.6%

## 2.2. Terms according to structure

### 2.2.1. The realization of language economy: the words/term ratio

Subject	Language	Literature	History	Social Studies	Geography
Word/term ratio					
Purely Moksha	1.8	1.4	2.0	2.0	2.3
All terms	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.9

Subject	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Mathematics	Information Technology
Word/term ratio					
Purely Moksha	1.6	1.8	1.6	2.2	1.4
All terms	1.5	2.0	1.8	2.8	1.9

The rank order of subjects according to the word/term ratio:

a) purely Moksha terms:

Information Technology	1.4
Literature	1.4
Biology	1.6
Chemistry	1.6
Physics	1.8
Language	1.8
History	2.0
Social Studies	2.0
Mathematics	2.2
Geography	2.3

b) all terms:

Literature	1.4
History	1.4
Biology	1.5
Social Studies	1.5
Language	1.7
Chemistry	1.8
Geography	1.9
Information Technology	1.9
Physics	2.0
Mathematics	2.8

For five subjects (History, Social Studies, Biology, Language, Geography) the average word/term ratio is lower for all terms than for purely Moksha terms. A possible explanation is that Moksha terms are annotations rather than terms.

**2.2.2. Terms classified according to structure**

Subject	Language	Literature	History	Social Studies	Geography
The structure of all terms (%)					
One element	41.0	70.0	65.3	63.3	44.8
Two elements	46.9	24.7	28.4	28.9	32.0
Three elements	11.5	3.8	4.8	5.1	14.1
Four elements	0.3	1.3	1.1	1.4	5.8
Five elements	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	1.8
Six elements	–	–	–	–	1.1
Seven elements	–	–	–	–	0.4
The structure of purely Moksha terms (%)					
One element	33.0	61.8	33.3	53.6	29.5
Two elements	52.7	29.4	33.3	10.7	33.6
Three elements	13.2	4.4	33.3	21.4	24.7
Four elements	–	4.4	–	10.7	6.2
Five elements	1.1	–	–	3.6	3.4
Six elements	–	–	–	–	2.1
Seven elements	–	–	–	–	0.7

Subject	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Mathematics	Information Technology
The structure of all terms (%)					
One element	56.9	24.4	49.2	17.3	40.7
Two elements	34.2	48.6	32.7	34.6	40.7
Three elements	7.6	20.6	11.7	26.8	12.5
Four elements	1.4	3.2	3.2	11.3	4.8
Five elements	–	1.9	2.2	5.0	1.2
Six elements	–	1.3	1.0	2.6	–
Seven elements	–	–	–	1.8	–
Eight elements	–	–	–	0.5	–
The structure of purely Moksha terms (%)					
One element	52.6	37.5	54.8	48.0	66.7
Two elements	38.0	53.1	35.7	20.0	27.8
Three elements	7.8	6.3	7.1	12.0	5.6
Four elements	1.6	3.1	2.4	8.0	–
Five elements	–	–	–	4.0	–
Six elements	–	–	–	8.0	–

### 3. Analysis of the Erzya material

#### 3.1. Classification of the terms by origin

Subject	Language	Literature	History	Social Studies	Geography
Number of terms	301	334	517	293	508
Type of terms according to origin (%)					
<b>0</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>21.1</b>
1	18.6	45.5	29.0	34.5	26.0
2	4.3	10.8	4.8	7.8	4.9
3	20.6	13.5	25.0	14.0	10.4
<b>Foreign total</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>77.3</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>57.7</b>

hybrid terms without any native element (%)	1.3	7.5	8.7	12.0	16.4
hybrid terms with a native element (%)	22.6	10.5	17.9	10.2	21.3

Subject	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Mathematics	Information Technology
Number of terms	478	360	309	365	267
Type of terms according to origin (%)					
<b>0</b>	<b>71.5</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>21.3</b>
1	10.5	13.9	30.4	9.9	24.7
2	2.5	1.9	7.8	1.1	4.1
3	9.0	10.8	11.3	5.2	3.7
<b>Foreign total</b>	<b>22.6</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>69.5</b>	<b>30.9</b>	<b>46.7</b>

hybrid terms without any native element (%)	1.3	7.5	8.7	12.0	16.4
hybrid terms with a native element (%)	22.6	10.5	17.9	10.2	21.3

The rank order of subjects by the percentage of terms with a native element:

Biology	71.5%
Language	32.6%
Information Technology	21.3%
Social Studies	21.2%
Geography	21.1%
History	14.7%
Physics	14.7%
Literature	11.4%
Mathematics	9.0%
Chemistry	7.8%

The rank order of subjects by the percentage of terms of exclusively foreign origin:

Biology	22.6%
Mathematics	30.9%
Language	44.8%
Physics	45.9%
Information Technology	46.7%
Geography	57.7%
History	67.5%
Social Studies	68.3%
Chemistry	69.5%
Literature	77.3%

Hybrid terms containing a native element:      Hybrid terms without a native word:

Mathematics	60.3%	Biology	0.6%
Physics	38.6%	Language	1.3%
Information Technology	31.8%	Literature	7.5%
Chemistry	22.6%	History	8.7%
Language	22.6%	Social Studies	12.0%
Geography	21.3%	Information Technology	13.8%
History	17.9%	Mathematics	14.7%
Literature	10.5%	Geography	16.4%
Social Studies	10.2%	Physics	19.3%
Biology	5.8%	Chemistry	20.0%

Similarly to the Moksha material also in Erzya the number of unnecessarily foreign terms is high. There are 747 existing native terms in the new Russian-Erzya dictionary (RuES) or terms that could be coined on the basis of the dictionary. Their proportion is 20% of the 3732 terms. Native Erzya terms by subjects:

Social Studies	29.7%
Literature	27.2%
Geography	24.8%
History	22.1%
Physics	21.9%
Language	21.9%
Mathematics	21.6%
<b>average</b>	<b>20.0%</b>
Information Technology	12.0%
Chemistry	11.0%
Biology	8.2%

### 3.2. Terms according to structure

#### 3.2.1. Realization of language economy: the word/term ratio

Word/term ratio					
Subject	Language	Literature	History	Social Studies	Geography
Purely Erzya	2.0	1.4	1.8	1.6	1.7
All terms	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.7

Word/term ratio					
Subject	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Mathematics	Information Technology
Purely Erzya	1.5	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0
All terms	1.5	2.3	1.9	2.8	2.0

The rank order of subjects according to the word/term ratio:

a) purely Erzya terms:

Literature	1.4
Biology	1.5
Social Studies	1.6
Geography	1.7
History	1.8
Information Technology	2.0
Mathematics	2.0
Chemistry	2.0
Language	2.0
Physics	2.1

b) all terms:

Literature	1.3
Biology	1.5
History	1.5
Social Studies	1.5
Geography	1.7
Language	1.7
Chemistry	1.9
Information Technology	2.0
Physics	2.3
Mathematics	2.8

In the case of five subjects (Literature, History, Social Studies, Language, Chemistry) the word/term ratio is lower for the whole population (all terms) than for purely Erzya terms. A possible explanation is that Erzya terms are also rather annotations than terms.

**3.2.2. The structure of the terms**

Subject	Language	Literature	History	Social Studies	Geography
The structure of all terms (%)					
One element	45.5	73.7	61.1	60.8	49.4
Two elements	40.9	19.2	27.1	29.0	35.0
Three elements	9.6	2.7	9.9	8.9	11.4
Four elements	3.3	1.2	1.4	1.4	3.1
Five elements	0.7	0.3	0.4	–	1.2
Six elements	–	–	0.2	–	–
Seven elements	–	–	–	–	–
Eight elements	–	–	0.2	–	–
The structure of purely Erzya terms (%)					
One element	33.7	71.1	43.4	56.5	50.1
Two elements	41.8	23.7	34.2	27.4	34.8
Three elements	18.4	2.6	21.1	12.9	10.3
Four elements	4.1	2.6	–	3.2	1.9
Five elements	2.0	–	1.3	–	2.8

Subject	Biology	Physics	Chemistry	Mathematics	Information Technology
The structure of all terms (%)					
One element	63.8	21.7	44.3	17.5	38.2
Two elements	28.2	41.1	35.6	37.8	37.8
Three elements	6.9	27.8	10.7	20.5	13.5
Four elements	0.8	5.0	5.8	11.2	7.5
Five elements	–	1.7	1.0	4.7	3.0
Six elements	0.2	1.4	1.0	3.6	–
Seven elements	–	1.4	1.6	3.3	–
Eight elements	–	–	–	0.8	–
Nine elements	–	–	–	0.5	–
The structure of purely Erzya terms (%)					
One element	59.4	20.8	33.3	42.4	40.4
Two elements	31.0	49.1	50.0	30.3	36.8
Three elements	8.2	28.3	8.3	18.2	14.0
Four elements	1.2	1.9	8.3	3.0	3.5
Five elements	–	–	–	–	5.3
Six elements	0.3	–	–	3.0	–

**4. A comparison with Russian language data**

In Russian a highly developed terminology has been formed for all fields of science. It is worth while to compare the Erzya and Moksha scores with the Russian language data of the terminology dictionaries as far as the structure of native terms is



concerned. From the structural analysis only the most frequent ones, i.e. the types of one, two and three elements are presented here.

Subject: Language

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	301	301	288
Native terms	203 (67.4%)	98 (32.6%)	91 (31.6%)
One element	99 (48.8% of the native terms)	33 (33.7%)	30 (33.0%)
Composed of two elements	92 (45.3%)	41 (41.8%)	48 (52.7%)
Composed of three elements	12 (5.9%)	18 (18.4%)	12 (13.2%)

Subject: Literature

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	334	334	373
Native terms	77 (23.1%)	38 (11.4%)	68 (18.2%)
One element	57 (74.0%)	27 (71.1%)	42 (61.8%)
Composed of two elements	17 (22.1%)	9 (23.7%)	20 (29.4%)
Composed of three elements	3 (3.9%)	1 (2.6%)	3 (4.4%)

Subject: History

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	517	517	461
Native terms	224 (43.3%)	76 (14.7%)	6 (1.3%)
One element	142 (63.4%)	33 (43.4%)	2 (33.3%)
Composed of two elements	75 (33.5%)	26 (34.2%)	2 (33.3%)
Composed of three elements	7 (3.1%)	16 (21.1%)	2 (33.3%)

Subject: Social Studies

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	293	293	294
Native terms	110 (37.5%)	62 (21.2%)	28 (9.5%)
One element	78 (70.9%)	35 (56.5%)	15 (53.6%)
Composed of two elements	31 (28.2%)	17 (27.4%)	3 (10.7%)
Composed of three elements	1 (0.9%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (21.4%)

Subject: Geography

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	508	508	553
Native terms	178 (35.0%)	107 (21.1%)	146 (26.4%)
One element	108 (60.7%)	54 (50.5%)	43 (29.5%)
Composed of two elements	63 (35.4%)	37 (34.6%)	49 (33.6%)
Composed of three elements	7 (3.9%)	11 (10.3%)	36 (24.7%)

Subject: Biology

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	478	478	357
Native terms	354 (74.1%)	342 (71.5%)	192 (53.8%)
One element	248 (70.1%)	203 (59.4%)	101 (52.6%)
Composed of two elements	103 (29.1%)	106 (31.0%)	73 (38.0%)
Composed of three elements	3 (0.8%)	28 (8.2%)	15 (7.8%)

Subject: Physics

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	360	360	316
Native terms	110 (30.6%)	53 (14.7%)	32 (10.1%)
One element	31 (28.2%)	11 (20.8%)	12 (37.5%)
Composed of two elements	62 (56.4%)	26 (49.1%)	17 (53.1%)
Composed of three elements	17 (15.5%)	15 (28.3%)	2 (6.3%)

Subject: Chemistry

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	309	309	315
Native terms	59 (19.1%)	24 (7.8%)	42 (13.3%)
One element	36 (61.0%)	8 (33.3%)	29 (69.0%)
Composed of two elements	20 (33.9%)	12 (50.0%)	9 (21.4%)
Composed of three elements	3 (5.1%)	1 (4.2%)	4 (9.5%)

Subject: Mathematics

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	365	365	381
Native terms	122 (33.4%)	33 (9.0%)	25 (6.6%)
One element	35 (28.7%)	14 (42.4%)	12 (48.0%)
Composed of two elements	70 (57.4%)	10 (30.3%)	5 (20.0%)
Composed of three elements	17 (13.9%)	6 (18.2%)	3 (12.0%)

Subject: Information Technology

	Russian	Erzya	Moksha
All terms	267	267	268
Native terms	37 (13.9%)	57 (21.3%)	18 (6.7%)
One element	27 (73.0%)	23 (40.4%)	12 (66.7%)
Composed of two elements	7 (18.9%)	21 (36.8%)	5 (27.8%)
Composed of three elements	3 (8.1%)	8 (14.0%)	1 (5.6%)

A few remarks:

(a) about the proportion of native terminology:

- In Russian the rate of native terms is greater practically for all subjects than in the two Mordvin languages.
- In the case of Language the difference is twofold.
- For History the ratio of the Russian and Erzya native rates is two and a half, while in the case of Russian and Moksha the ratio is nearly 40.
- In the terminology of Social Studies the Russian-Moksha difference in the rates of native terms is fourfold.
- In the terminology of Physics the difference of Russian-Erzya native rates is twofold, in the Russian-Moksha case it is threefold.
- In the terminology of Mathematics the ratio of Russian-Erzya native rates is three and a half, while the respective Russian-Moksha difference is fivefold.
- In the terminology of Information Technology the Russian-Moksha native rate difference is twofold. It is only here the native rate of Erzya surpasses that of Russian, one and a half fold.

(b) about term structure:

- In Russian one-element terms usually dominate, with the exception of Physics and Mathematics.
- In Erzya it is Physics and Chemistry which show a dominance of two-element terms.
- In Moksha, Language, Geography and Physics have a majority of two-element terms.
- As for Physics, however, the Moksha rate of one-element terms among the native terms outweighs that parameter in both Russian and Erzya.
- Also, in both Erzya and Moksha terminology of Mathematics the above rate outweighs that of Russian.
- A significant (almost twofold) difference can be seen between Russian and Erzya in the rate of one-element terms among the native terms suggested for Language and Chemistry.
- A significant (two-fold) difference can be seen between the analogous rates calculated for Russian and Moksha terminologies in Language, History and Geography.

### 5. A comparison of Erzya and Moksha data

The terminology level of the two Mordvin languages shows a significant difference with Erzya being better. The bold type in italics indicates where it is Moksha and not Erzya having more favourable results.

	Erzya			Moksha		
	native (%)	foreign total (%)	word/term ratio	word (%)	foreign total (%)	word/term ratio
Language	32.6	44.8	2.0	31.6	<b>42.4</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Literature	11.4	77.3	1.4	<b>18.2</b>	<b>69.7</b>	1.4
History	14.7	67.5	1.8	1.3	86.7	2.0
Social studies	21.2	68.3	1.6	9.5	84.6	2.0
Geography	21.1	57.7	1.7	26.4	<b>52.5</b>	2.3
Biology	71.5	22.6	1.5	53.8	32.4	1.6
Physics	14.7	45.9	2.1	10.1	55.1	<b>1.8</b>
Chemistry	7.8	69.5	2.0	<b>13.3</b>	<b>59.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>
Mathematics	9.0	30.9	2.0	6.6	39.7	2.2
Information Technology	21.3	46.7	2.0	6.7	68.9	<b>1.4</b>

Similarly, the condition of Erzya is more favourable as concerns one-element native terms:

	Erzya (%)	Moksha (%)
Language	33.7	33.0
Literature	71.1	61.8
History	43.4	33.3
Social studies	56.5	53.6
Geography	50.1	29.5
Biology	63.8	56.9
Physics	21.7	<b>24.4</b>
Chemistry	44.3	<b>49.2</b>
Mathematics	17.5	17.3
Information Technology	38.2	<b>40.7</b>

## 5. Closing lines

If the two Mordvin languages are to be preserved, and not just at the level of declarations, a considerable language development in terminology is unavoidable. Vernacular terminology is the only guarantee of a language to be used in all walks of life.

### Address

János Pusztay  
Konstantin the Philosopher University, Nitra (Slovakia)  
NH — Collegium Fenno-Ugricum (Hungary)  
E-mail: pyj@btk.nyme.hu  
janos\_pusztay@hotmail.com

### Abbreviations

**RuES** — Русско-эрзянский словарь, Саранск 2012; **RuMoS** — Русско-мокшанский словарь, Саранск 2012.

### REFERENCES

- Galinski, C., de V. Cluver, A. D., Budin, G. 1999, Terminologieplanung und Sprachplanung. — Fachsprachen. Languages for Special Purposes. 2. Halbband. Volume 2, Berlin—New York, 2207—2215.
- Hoffmann, L. 1999, Die russischen Fachsprachen im 20. Jahrhundert und ihre Erforschung: eine Übersicht. — Fachsprachen. Languages for Special Purposes. 2. Halbband. Volume 2, Berlin—New York, 1532—1545.
- Pusztay, J. 2014, Schools and Terminology as the Means of Preserving Language Diversity. — LU L, 131—138.
- Пустай Я. 2013а, Анализ словарей школьной терминологии мокшанского языка, *Badacsonytomaj (Terminologia scholaris. Analysis I)*.
- 2013б, Анализ словарей школьной терминологии эрзянского языка, *Badacsonytomaj (Terminologia scholaris. Analysis II)*.

*ЯНОШ ПУСТАЙ* (Нитра)

### СОСТОЯНИЕ МОРДОВСКИХ ЯЗЫКОВ ПО РЕЗУЛЬТАТАМ ПРОЕКТА ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ СЛОВАРЕЙ «TERMINOLOGIA SCHOLARIS \* ШКОЛЬНАЯ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЯ»

По инициативе института NH-Collegium Fenno-Ugricum в 2010—2011 гг. была разработана терминология для 10 школьных дисциплин на пяти финно-угорских языках (коми, марийский, мокшанский, удмуртский и эрзянский) Российской Федерации, чтобы обеспечить создание учебников и преподавание этих предметов на родном языке. Результаты анализов мокшанского и эрзянского материала уже опубликованы. Они показали, что терминология в обоих языках сильно и излишне обрусела. Предстоит серьезно подумать о будущем мордовских языков. Необходимо, учитывая традиции развития других финно-угорских языков, заняться их обновлением.