

How many Erzya-Mordvin nominal derivational suffixes contain the element *-r/-r̂*?

The aim of the current paper is to study nominal derivational suffixes containing the *-r* consonant (*-r/-r̂*; *-ro*, *-r̂e*; *-ar̂*). Regarding their functions, Erzya-Mordvin has three different such suffixes. One is the primitive Uralic suffix, another one is the suffix deriving onomatopoeic words (that is probably primitive as well), and there is the Russian-origin *-ar̂* suffix. The boundaries between these three, however, are usually blurred in the Mordvin literature of the topic (when there is a differentiation at all), which makes it advisable to look into the case of these elements in a more detailed manner.

1. Introduction

The Uralic/Finno-Ugric proto-language was rich in nominal derivational suffixes: practically all of the then-existing consonants could function as suffixes (with the exception of the δ , δ' and γ sounds). This richness in suffixes was preserved in later periods and in secondary, tertiary etc. proto-languages as well. These suffixes were passed down to the Mordvin language, although their previous existence can only be proven by etymological methods now, as most of them became obscured as early as in Proto-Mordvin or in even earlier periods.

Similarly to modern suffixes, the productivity and frequency of suffixes in the proto-language were also variable. We do not and cannot have an overall picture of primitive derivation, only the UEW reconstruction gives us some kind of idea about it. This etymological dictionary lists 87 Uralic/Finno-Ugric/Finno-Permian/Finno-Volgaic reconstructed forms that contain some kind of a suffix. The most frequent among these are the *-r* (22), *-m* (15) and *-l* (12) -suffixed forms.

Nominal derivational suffixes have not been much discussed in the Mordvin linguistic literature. Up to this point, descriptive aspects have been preferred to historical studies. Such investigations have little part in Mordvin linguistics, and what is more, inaccurate or mistaken derivations have also been published in these papers.

This paper discusses nominal derivational suffixes that contain the *-r* consonant (*-r/-r', -ro, -r'e* and *-ar'*)¹. (For lack of space, the adjectival suffix identical with the nominal one is not studied in detail.) Regarding their functions, Erzya-Mordvin has three different nominal derivational suffixes. One is the primitive Uralic suffix, another one is the suffix deriving onomatopoeic words (that is probably primitive as well), and there is the Russian-origin *-ar'* suffix. The boundaries between these three, however, are usually blurred in the Mordvin literature of the topic (when there is a differentiation at all), which makes it advisable to look into the case of these elements in a more detailed manner.

2. Information about the literature of the topic

The first grammar books did not discuss this element at all. Neither Jevsevjev (1934/1963), Bubrih (1947) or the 1962 grammatical practice book mentioned this one among the dozen of suffixes included in them. In his historical morphology, Serebrennikov only writes about the *-ra, -r'a, -r* adjectival suffix (1967, 76). Bajushkin (1975, 68), likewise, gives a brief description only about the adjectival suffix.

Cygankin only includes the *-ar'* element in his 1976, longer essay on derivational suffixes. He classifies this as a rare and unproductive suffix that is used for naming certain subjects. However, as opposed to this, he lists examples that refer to people: *lavgar'* 'chattering', *nolgar'* 'snotty (person)', *tupar'* 'stupid', *čuvtar'* 'childless man'. Moreover, he provides the 'stupid man' meaning for the word *lambař* that is usually defined as 'sweet apple' elsewhere (1976, 98).

In his monograph on suffixes, he already differentiates between *-ar/-ar'* and *-r*, though. According to him, the former suffix carries the following meaning: "a person or an object endowed with the characteristic feature that the base word expresses". E.g.: *čovarka* 'gudgeon (*Gobio gobio*)', *koknař* 'stammering person', *lambař*, *lavgar'*, *naksařka* 'punk wood', *nolgar'*, *potmar* 'attic', *zlidar'* 'tramp' (1981, 49). In his opinion, the *-r* suffix is present in the *-rks/-r'ks* derivative cluster (*kadorks* 'trailer of cucumber or vegetable marrow', *pešter'ks* 'hazel bush'), and historically in the *čapor* 'thyme', *keptir* 'basket', *mukor'* 'brace, stay', *šukštorov* 'currant' words, and also in onomatopoeic elements like *čator*, *kaštor*, *kuldor-kaldor*, *čikor-lakor*, *gal'd'er-gul'd'er* (1981, 53). – In a different paper of his (1979, 157), the *-ar'* element is classified as of Russian origin (see below).

The 1980 grammatical handbook, edited by Cygankin, titled *Грамматика мордовских языков* lists the *-ra, -r'a, -r'e* elements among the adjectival suffixes (providing some Erzya examples for them). The nominal suffix is only included in two forms (*-ar'* and *-r*) and is described as rare, appearing in only two or three words. Only two derived words are given as examples: *nolgar'*, *čud'iker'ks* 'stream, brook' (Grammatika 1980, 108, 111). The same examples are included in Lipatov, Matjuskin and Mosin's 1983 overview (123). (For details about the etymological problems of the examples, see below.)

1. For the sake of homogeneity and consistency, Cyrillic data from the dictionaries and from the Russian literature is transcribed to Roman letters in the paper.

M. V. Mosin (1977, 8–9) differentiates between an adjectival and a nominal suffix. His examples are: *kepter* ‘basket’, *kodorks* ‘stalk, stem, trailer’, *komoro* ‘hand, a handful of’, *kuťmeře* ‘back’, *mukoro* ‘bottom, seat’, *mukoř* ‘log, stump, stump wood’, *ukštor* ‘maple-tree’. Mosin also provides equivalents from the related languages (primarily Finnish and Estonian words), upon the consideration that obscured suffixes can only be analyzed with etymological methods. In his 1989 university lecture notes (43–44) he lists the **-ra* and **-r* suffixes among the primitive suffixes: *čejeř* ‘mouse’, *čovar* ‘mortar’, *keñeř* ‘elbow’, *kodorks*, *komoro*, *šejeř* ‘leg, shin’, *ukštor*. In a more recent paper (2001, 92), he complements the example-set with *kepter(e)*, *kopoř(ks)* ‘back’, *kuťmeře*, *pakař* ‘comb, hackle’ and with the dialectal *pešter* ‘bag, pouch’.

The Erzya-language grammar book only lists *-ař* and *-rks* as nominal suffixes, and provides few examples: *lambař*, *kodorks*, *pešterks* (EK 2000, 37).

In their papers about plant names, Grebneva (1997, 39) and Vildjajeva (1980, 121) also discuss some words that can be of interest to us: *kodorks*, *kušterks* ‘motherwort (Leonorus)’, *pešerks* ‘hazel bush’, and *naksarķa* ‘punk wood’, *čuvtarķa* ‘withered, fruitless tree’.

The Finnish and Hungarian comprehensive writings do not mention the *-r* suffix neither as a nominal, nor as an adjectival one (Bartens 1999, 106, 109–111; Keresztes 1990, 66; 2011, 122; Mészáros 1998, 41, 50, 102). Sirkka Saarinen briefly touches upon the adjectival suffix as one of the primitive suffixes (1999, 4).

It is evident then, that it is difficult to get a clear understanding of these suffixes on the basis of the existing literature. The *-r*, *-ra*, *-řa*, and *-ře* suffixes are discussed as adjectival suffixes; while the *-r/-ř*, *-ro*, *-ře*, *-ař* elements² and the *-rks* derivative cluster are classified as nominal suffixes. Some of the linguists treat *-ař* as an individual suffix and others discuss it together with the others. Of the cited authors, only Mosin mentions the fact that the nominal and adjectival suffixes are connected with each other.

3. The primitive **-r* suffix

3.1. Origin of the suffix

The **-r* suffix of the proto-language seems to be a denominal noun suffix³ having a continuation in each of the present-day Uralic languages. In Finnish, the *-r* (*manner* ‘land, mainland’, *penger* ‘dam, embankment’, *tanner* ‘land, area, terrain’), *-ra/-rā* (*jakkara* ‘stool’, *kyttyrā* ‘hump’, *makkara* ‘sausage’, *ympyrā*

2. In some words, there is a free alternation between the *-C* and *-CV* variants on the dialectal level: *kepter* ~ *kepteře*, *keñeř* ~ *keñere*, *kopoř* ~ *kopoře*, *ukštor* ~ *ukštoro*.

3. Since adjectival suffixes are not discussed in this paper, let us mention only briefly that the Fi. *-ra/-rā*, *-ri* and *-ro* denominal adjective suffixes also go back to the Uralic **-r* suffix (*ahķera* ‘industrious, hardworking’, *ankara* ‘strict’, *hāmārā* ‘obscure, hazy’, *typerā* ‘silly, dull’, *sumppuri* ‘obscure, foggy’, *vikuri* ‘unbridled, wild’, *kopero* ‘awkward, clumsy’, *tōķerō* ‘stupid, simple-minded’), similarly to the Mari *-r*, Udm. *-(e)r* and Saam. **-ra* suffixes (Lehtisalo 1936, 184–186; Majtinskaja 1974, 352; Hakulinen 1979, 135, 176–178).

‘circle, ring’), *-re* (*jäntere* ‘sinew’, *lohkare* ‘rock piece’, *saivare* ‘nit’), *-ri* (*kankuri* ‘weaver’, *syöveri* ‘whirlpool’, *uimari* ‘swimmer’, *viemäri* ‘channel, canal’) and *-ro* (*komero* ‘booth, alcove’, *lokerro* ‘compartment, drawer’, *somero* ‘pebble, gravel’, *vehmaro* ‘pole’) suffixes are the present-day equivalents of the primitive suffix. The Saami *-r*, Mari *-er*, *-erla/-erlä*, Komi, Udmurt, Mansi, Khanty *-r*, Hung. *-r*, *-rú/-rű* (*lapor* ‘plain, lowland’, *odor* ‘hollow cave’, *sömör* ‘tetter, serpigo’, *domború* ‘convex’, *homorú* ‘concave’) and the Saam. **-râ* also belong here. – A deverbal *-r* has not been reconstructed in the proto-language. (D. Bartha 1958, 108–109; Lehtisalo 1936, 180–184; Majtinskaja 1974, 352; Hakulinen 1979, 134–135, 175–178.)

3.2. False etymologies

The standards of Mordovian historical linguistic studies are variable, and data from the there-published etymological dictionaries is sometimes not reliable. The uncertainty of etymology is observable in the study of suffixes as well: the authors provided false etymologies to a fifth of the *-r* suffixed words analysed (30 words if onomatopoeic words are not counted). These are the following:⁴

čapor ‘богородская трава / Quendel (Thymus)’ (MdWb 159); ‘чебер, чебрец’ (ERV 732); ‘kakukkfű’ (EMSz 416); ‘timjami’ (ESS 189). Cygankin (1981, 53) thinks that there is a suffix in the word, but it is actually a loan word, cf. Rus. *чабѣр* ‘garden cress (Satureia)’, *чабрец* ‘thyme (Thymus)’, and the Turkic languages of the area took up the same word, cf. Tat. *чабыр*, *чамбыр* (ESM 482).

čovarka ‘пескаръ (Gobio gobio)’ (MdWb 288; ERV 752). Cygankin (1979, 158; 1981, 49) etymologizes the word from *čova* ‘thin, tiny’ (maybe because of the small size of the fish that is only 8–14 cm long?), but this is not correct. In Paasonen’s opinion, it comes from *čovar* ‘песок / Sand’ (MdWb 288; it is possible to have been formed on the basis of Russian analogy, cf. Rus. *песок* ‘sand’ > *пескаръ*; Dal’ 3, 103).

čud’ikeŕks ‘ручей / kleiner Bach, Regenbach’ (MdWb 296); ‘ручей’ (ERV 757); ‘patak, csermely’ (EMSz 437); ‘puro’ (ESS 193). According to Grammatika (1980, 108), the word comes from the verb *čudě-* ‘to flow, to run’ and is broken up to the *čud’ike-ŕ-ks* elements (however, the *-ke-* element is not explained in any way). The forms given in Paasonen’s work (*čud’i kel’ks/kil’ks/kiŕks/keŕks*) obviously suggest compounding. The etymology

4. The entries are structured as follows. The entry-word is the present-day standard Erzya form in Roman-letter transcription (if the word is not included in the latest dictionaries, the data is provided from Paasonen’s comprehensive dialectal dictionary instead). The meanings are given in Russian and German, based on Paasonen’s dictionary (MdWb), in Russian, based on the Erzya–Russian comprehensive dictionary (ERV), in Hungarian, based on Edit Mészáros’ Erzya–Mordvin–Hungarian dictionary (EMSz), and in Finnish, based on the Erzya–Finnish pocket dictionary (ESS). – These are followed by etymological information about the given word. In addition to the Uralic (UEW) and Finnish etymological dictionaries (SSA), László Keresztes’ etymological glossary (MdKons), the Komi etymological dictionary by Litkin–Guljajev (KESK), Versinyin’s more or less trustworthy and new Mordvin etymological dictionary (ESM) and the earlier published dictionaries of Cigankin and Mosin (EtV) were used as information sources.

of the second constituent is not clear, but the base word is probably not *keřks* ‘string’, as suggested by the EMSz (57): *čudikerks* is listed under the entry *keřks*. Paasonen takes up the lexeme *keřks* into a separate entry, without linking it with the one that means ‘string’ (MdWb 726). – Regardless of the second constituent’s etymology, it is clear that the word does not contain an *-r* suffix.

lambar ‘сорт сладких яблок’ (ERV 329). Cygankin (1976, 98; 1981, 49) etymologizes the word from the adjective *lambamo* ‘sweet’ (more exactly from the *lamba-* stem of it, since *-mo* is a suffix), in its dialectal ‘глупец; stupid person’ meaning. This is probably not a derived word but a compound: it was the compound word *lambamo (u)mar* ‘sweet apple’ that had been clipped (ESM 198). (As far as other words with the *mar/umar* second constituent are concerned, see also: *mastumar* ‘strawberry (i.e. ground berry)’, *modamar* ‘potato (i.e. ground berry)’, *ovtumar* ‘wild rose (i.e. bear berry)’).

peřtor ‘кошель / Korb’ (MdWb 1628). Mosin (2001, 92) suggests that it comes from the verb *peřte-* ‘to fill’, but it is of Russian origin, cf. Rus. *нестер*, *нестерка*, *нещер*, *нещур* (Paasonen’s data), *нестер* ‘großer, geflochtener Futterkorb, Korb aus Birkenbast’ (Vasmer 2: 348), *нестерь*, *нещерь*, *нещорь*, *нещурь* (Dal’ 3, 104).

potmar ‘запертое место под неподвижной скамейкой у стены; судновка; место под скамейкой перед печью / verschlossener Raum unter der wandfesten Bank; Raum unter der Bank im Stubenteil vor dem Ofen’ (MdWb 1762); ‘поставец; лавка, скамейка’ (ERV 504); ‘kis tartóhely, pohárszék’ (EMSz 296); ‘penkin alla oleva säilytystila’ (ESS 128). Cygankin (1981, 49) provides the ‘attic’ meaning for the word (cf. *kudo-potmar*, MdWb) and claims it to originate from *potmo* ‘the inside of something, inner part’. Paasonen connects it to the Russian *подмар*, *батмар* (cf. *батмарь*, *подмарь* ‘attic; bench fastened to a wall; large crate’, Dal’ 1, 54; 3, 185). According to Vershinin (ESM 377) and the EtV (150), it is of Turkic origin, cf. Tat. *нумемар* ‘box, chest for keeping precious stones and amulets’. – Whether it is of Russian or Turkic origin, the word does not contain any Mordvin suffixes.

3.3. The primitive, obscured suffix appears in the following words:⁵

čejeř ‘мышь’ (ERV 743); ‘егер’ (EMSz 424) ‘hiiri’ (ESS 190) < FU **šine-re* ‘Maus’, cf. Fi. *hiiri*, Komi, Udm. *šir*, Kh. *löňkər*, Man. *täňkər*, Hung. *egér* (UEW 500; SSA 162; MdKons 156; EtV 211).

5. At first sight, it appears that the following words also contain an *-r* suffix, but a closer look at their etymology reveals that they do not: *odar* ‘вымя’ (ERV 430); ‘tögy’ (EMSz 256); ‘utare’ (ESS 107) < FV **utare* ‘Euter’, cf. Fi. *udar*, *utare*, Est. *udar*, Mari *wađar*. A word of Iranian origin (cf. Skr. *ūdhar-*, Lat. *über*, OHG. *üter*) (UEW 806; SSA 3, 366; MdKons 103; EtV 125). – *sazor* ‘младшая сестра’ (ERV 563); ‘hüg’ (EMSz 321); ‘sisar, sisko’ (ESS 145). The UEW (762) does not connect it to the FV **sisare* ~ **sesare* ‘Schwester’ (> Fi. *sisar*) form, because of the vowel in the first syllable (otherwise, this is a Baltic loan, cf. Lith. *sesuð*). The

- čovar** ‘ступа’ (ERV 752); ‘mozsár’ (EMSz 432); ‘huhmar’ (ESS 192) < FV *šuma-re ‘(hölzerner) Mörser’, cf. Fi. *huhmar*, Est. *uhmer*, Mari *šuer* (UEW 789; MdKons 161; EtV 214). The SSA (1, 176) notes that the Baltic Finnish word group is also etymologized as onomatopoeic (cf. *huhmata* ‘lyödä, jyskittää, hakata’).
- keñer(e)** ‘предплечье; локтевая кость; локоть / Unterarm; Elle; Ell(en)bogen (MdWb 705); ‘локоть’ (ERV 253); ‘könyök’ (EMSz 155); ‘kuynärpää’ (ESS 67) < FU *kiñä, cf. Fi. *kuynärä*, Est. *küünar*, NS *gâr’dnjel*, Mari *kəñer*, Udm. *gjr-pum*, Komi *gjr*, Hung. *könyök*. The -r suffix was probably added to the stem in the FP period (UEW 158; SSA 1, 468; MdKons 55; EtV 67).
- komoro** ‘горсть, пригоршня / hohle Hand’ (MdWb 842), ‘горсть, пригоршня; пучок; сноп’ (ERV 284); ‘marék, marok’ (EMSz 174); ‘koura, pivo’ (ESS 72) < U *komä(rä) ‘hohle Hand’, cf. NS *goabmer*, ??Komi *kamjr*, Yur. *s’ewāj* (UEW 175; MdKons 65). On the basis of data from the related languages, -rä is a primitive suffix of Uralic origin, also preserved in the Mordvin language. (Cf. also EtV 77, partly mistaken.)
- šejeř** ‘голень / Unterschenkel’ (MdWb 2122), **šejeřks** ‘стебель’ (ERV 575); ‘szár (növényé)’ (EMSz 327); ‘(kasvin)varsi, korsi’ (ESS 148) < FP *čäje-rä ‘Stiel, Schaft; Schienbein, Umterarm’, cf. Fi. *sääri*, Komi *čer* (UEW 612; SSA 3, 245; MdKons 134). (See also EtV 162, partly mistaken.)
- šukštorov** ‘смородина / Johannisbeere’ (MdWb 2248); ‘смородина’ (ERV 767); ‘ribizli (Ribes)’ (EMSz 445); ‘herukka, viinimarja’ (ESS 197), **šukštor** (MdWb 2248). This is probably a word of Finno-Volgaic origin. The UEW (615) hypothetically connects it to the Fi. *siestar* ‘schwarze Johannisbeere’ and Est. *sõster*, *sõstar* ‘Johannisbeere’ (cf. furthermore Ingrian *sēstara*, Ludic *sestroj*, Veps *sestrikäine*, SSA 3, 173; see also MdKons 163, EtV 219). Its Finno-Volgaic base form is *čäkčä-tärä. All these variants suggest that the word was further suffixed with a -v element in Mordvin. – Suffix -r is a primitive denominal noun suffix (or an element of a derivative cluster).
- ukštor** ‘клён / Ahorn’ (MdWb 2444); ‘клён’ (ERV 692); ‘juharfa (Acer platanoides)’ (EMSz 394); ‘vaahtera’ (ESS 178) < FV *wakštäre* ‘Ahorn, Acer platanoides’, cf. Fi. *vaahtera*, Est. *vaher*, Mari *waštar* (UEW 812; SSA 3, 382; MdKons 175; EtV 194); -re is a primitive suffix.

SSA (3, 187) classifies the Mordvin word – together with the Udm. *suzer*, and Komi *sozor* as of Iranian origin, cf. OIr. *svásar*- ‘sisar’ (cf. also MdKons 131; EtV 159). – *tejjer* ‘дочь; девушка / Tochter; Mädchen’ (MdWb 2584); ‘дочь; девушка’ (ERV 653); ‘lány, lányá vkinek’ (EMSz 368); ‘tyttö, neito, tytär’ (ESS 167) ~ Fi. *tytär*, SS *däktier*. It is of Baltic origin, cf. Latv. *dukte* (genitiv: *dukters*; the Sw. *dotter*, and Ger. *Tochter* also belong to this word group) (SSA 3, 349; MdKons 166; EtV 182). – *užeré* ‘топор / Axt, Beil’ (MdWb 2498); ‘топор’ (ERV 691); ‘fejsze, balta’ (EMSz 394); ‘kirves’ (ESS 178), cf. Fi. *vasara*, Est. *vasar*, NS *vaečcer*. It does not contain a suffix, since the FV lexeme **wašara* is a Proto-Iranian loan word (**važra-*) (UEW 815; SSA 3, 415; MdKons 177; EtV 193).

3.4. Unambiguous suffixes

Some of the words discussed in the literature cannot be unambiguously classified, although some of the Mordvin linguists assume the presence of a suffix in them (see Section 2). These are the following:

kepter(e), keptir ‘сумка из (берёзовой) коры; кузов / Ränzel aus (Birken)rinde; Korb’ (MdWb 714), ‘корзина, лукошко (ERV 255), ‘kosár’ (EMSz 157), ‘tuohikontti, koppa’ (ESS 67). Vershinin (ESM 134) hypothetically connects it to the Mari *конм(ы)па* ‘a stripe of bark’. Paasonen etymologizes it hypothetically from the Chuv. *kirbät*, but he does not include the word into the monograph discussing Turkish loan words.

kodor ‘вьющийся стебель (хмеля, огурца, тыквы) / rankender Stengel (z.B. des Hopfens, der Gurke, des Kürbisses)’ (MdWb 817), **kodorks** ‘стебель, плеть’ (ERV 275), ‘inda, kacs’ (EMSz 170); ‘naatti, varsi, korsi’ (ESS 71). Cygankin (1981, 53) traces it back to the word *kod* ‘trailer, tendril’ (but none of the dictionaries contain this data), while the EK (2000, 37) takes it to originate from *kodamo* ‘spinning, weaving’ (this etymology is only mistaken in that there is already a *-mo* deverbal noun suffix at the end of the lexeme). Therefore, the exact point of origin of the noun is probably the verbal stem *koda-* ‘to spin, to weave’ (ESM 154). The *-ks* denominal noun suffix must have been added to the word later. – The EtV (75) suggests it to be related to the Fi. *ketura* (correctly: *ketara*) and Est. *kodar* ‘strut’ that is connected to the *kodoro* form by SSA (1, 351) only hypothetically. In so far as these words are related, the Mordvin word does not contain a suffix, it being a Baltic loan, cf. Lith. *keterà, kētaras* ‘hevosen säkä, vuorenselänne, -harjanne’.

kopoř(e) ‘спина / Rücken’ (MdWb 854); ‘спина; тыльная часть’ (ERV 292); ‘hát, far’ (EMSz 176); ‘selkä’ (ESS 75). Paasonen discusses it under the *kopo* ‘лобок / Venushügel’ (MdWb 853) entry, thus classifying it as a derived word. The fact that in present-day Moksha, the word *kopoř* ‘back’ (MRV 282) has got a *kopa* (MRV 281) dialectal variant as well, supports this (cf. ESM 164). (See also EtV 78, with uncertain Permian equivalents.)

kotmeře ‘плечи, спина / oberer Teil des Rückens, Rücken’ (MdWb 882); **kuťmeře** ‘спина’ (ERV 319); ‘hát’ (EMSz 190); ‘selkä’ (ESS 81). Vershinin (ESM 188) does not exclude the possibility that the stem *kuť-* may be related to the Tat. *коч(у)-* ‘to hug’. Paasonen’s monograph on loans (1897, 38) contains the Moksha *koťän, koťan* ‘Hinterteil’ form, which he considers to be of Turkic origin (Chuv. *kot*, cf. Mari *kotan, kutan*). The status of the lexeme *-meře* is not clear.

mukor ‘скамейка; чурбан, обрубок, полено / Schemel; Klotz; Block’ (MdWb 1296); ‘пень; подпорка, стойка, опора’ (ERV 393); ‘пень, чурбан, обрубок дерева, предназначенный для силения’ (Mosin 1977, 8); ‘подпорка под домом’ (Cygankin 1981, 53); ‘tuskó, tönk, rönk’ (EMSz 235); ‘kanto, pölkky’ (ESS 97). Vershinin (ESM 265) compares

it to the Fi. *mykkyrä* ‘a batch/ball/bundle of sg’, but this is not plausible either from the phonetic or the semantic point of view (the SSA 2, 187 considers the Finnish word to be descriptive). The EtV (111) mentions it alongside with the Mari *мугыр*, NS *moag’ge* ‘rúp’, Udm. *мог*, Komi *мегыр* ‘bend, curve, inflexion’ and Man. *мокари* ‘hump’. The UEW (280), however, does not provide a Mordvin word as a derivative of the FP **моҥа* ‘Biegung, Krümmung, Kreis’, only a Saami, an Udmurt, a Komi (*meg*) and, hypothetically, an Ob-Ugric form (Kh. *тӓгӓл*, Man. *mũlt*) are given (see also KESK 171). – Thus, it can be established in conclusion that the word is of unknown origin and the (non-)existence of the suffix is difficult to prove.

mukoro ‘зад / Steiss, After, Hinterer, Hinterteil’ (MdWb 1294); ‘зад (человека, животного), задняя часть (чего-л.)’ (Mosin 1977, 8); ‘ülep, fenék’ (EMSz 235). Vershinin (ESM 264) compares it to the Mari *могыр*, *монгыр* ‘body; figure, build’, Komi *мыгӧр* and Udm. *мугор* ‘trunk, rump’. In so far as Vershinin is right, the word contains a primitive suffix. It is against this, however, that the UEW (286) does not take up the Mordvin word into the FU **muákä* ‘Körper’ entry, in addition to the Mari, Komi, Udmurt and Hungarian variants. The EtV (111) relates it to the Lith. *nugura* ‘back’ and Latv. *mugara*, *mugura* ‘back, backside’ (cf. Fi. *nukero*, SSA 2, 236). This could be feasible in Mordvin (although unconceivable in the Permic languages), but in that case, there would not be a suffix in the word.

naksařka ‘гниль, гнильѣ’ (ERV 398); ‘гнилушка’ (Cygankin 1981, 49); ‘rothadék, korhadék’ (EMSz 238). Cygankin derives it from the verbal stem *naksa-* ‘to rot’ (1979, 158), and the noun *naksado* ‘punk wood; rot, decomposition’ (1981, 49) (which is an adjective in present-day dictionaries, cf. ‘гнилой’ ERV 398, ‘rothadt, korhadt’ EMSz 238). There is an unproductive *-do* suffix to be found in the word *naksado*, that only appears in a couple of words by now: *čopoda* ‘dark’ (cf. *čopoře-* ‘to grow dark’), *kalado* ‘ramshackle, crumbling’ (*kalavto-* ‘to destroy, to pull down’), *štado* ‘naked’ (*štavto-* ‘to strip’, *štapo* ‘naked’) (EK 38; Grammatika 1980, 112). The word *naksařka* then can probably be broken down to the following parts: *naksa-* + *ř* + *-ka* (the latter being a denominal noun suffix). (See also ESM 272, EtV 114.)

pakar’ ‘кость; гребень / Knochen; der hölzerne Kamm am Spinnrocken’ (MdWb 1504); ‘гребень; кости скелета’ (ERV 450); ‘fésű; csont’ (EMSz 265); ‘harja, kampa; luu’ (ESS 113). Although Mosin’s opinion (2001, 92) is that there is an *-ř* suffix in the word, I cannot take a stand here, since it is of unknown origin: only Vershinin’s dictionary contains it (ESM 325), and he considers it to be descriptive by origin.

3.5. Probable suffixes

Based on the present research, conducted with the help of the reverse dictionary of Mordvin (Luutonen–Mosin–Shchankina 2004), there are a few more lexemes that are susceptible of containing suffixes. (Unfortunately, for lack of reliable etymological dictionaries, these remain only “susceptible” forms for now, as the presence of a suffix in them cannot be proven in a satisfactory manner.) These are the following:

čekar' ‘ржавшина, медянка; плесень / Rost, Grünspan; Schimmel’ (MdWb 233); ‘плесень; марево’ (ERV 744); ‘penész’ (EMSz 425); *čeker'* ‘hapetuminen, oksidaatio’ (ESS 190). Vershinin cautiously suggests a similarity with the Mari *šük* ‘litter, garbage’, *šakše* ‘nastiness, disgusting nature’ and Udm. *šakša* ‘litter, garbage, waste matter’ (which would mean that the Mordvin word contains a suffix), but he also considers a Turkic origin possible: Tat. *чагыр* ‘colourful’, Chuv. *чакяр* ‘light, light blue, grey’ – and in this case, derivation in the Mordvin variant would not be possible (ESM 488).

indeř ‘клевещник, жимолость / Geissblatt (Lonicera)’ (MdWb 461); ‘про-волока’ (ERV 211); ‘ükörkelonc (Lonicera xylosteum)’ (EMSz 127); ‘kuusama’ (ESS 57). The EtV (52) states it to be related to the Tatar verb *индерү* ‘to push in, to squeeze in’, but this is semantically implausible. Vershinin’s Finno-Ugric comparisons are phonetically unacceptable (ESM 17, 87). – Paasonen relates the word to the lexeme *iindej* ‘ягода жимолости / Beere des Geissblattes’, which strengthens the suffixoid nature.

kavor' ‘хрящ / Knorpel’ (MdWb 660, *kavur'e*); ‘хрящ’ (ERV 222); ‘porc, porcogó’ (EMSz 132); ‘rusto’ (ESS 60). Vershinin (ESM 93) draws a parallel with the Mari *кагыла* ‘hard, stiff’. In so far as this distant similarity is the sign of relatedness, that would support the presence of a suffix in the word.

maksar' ‘налим / Quappe, Aalraupe [burbot, Lota lota]’ (MdWb 1162). Paasonen writes about the *maksaka* ‘линь / Schleie (Cyprinus tinca) [common tench]’ animal name as well (which is not to be confused with *maksaga*, *maksaka*, *makzažej* ‘mole’!), and this makes it possible that the word contains a suffix.

panar ‘рубашка / Hemd’ (MdWb 1521); ‘рубашка’ (ERV 454); ‘ing’ (EMSz 266); ‘paita’ (ESS 114). Vershinin cautiously refers to some kind of a distant connection with the Yurak word *паны* ‘одежда’, which, however, is not too likely (ESM 329). But if a relatedness to the Moksha *panža* ‘light dress’ lexeme can be supported, there may be a suffix in the word.

pišmar ‘скворец / Star (Vogel)’ (MdWb 1683); ‘скворец’ (ERV 482); ‘seregély (Sturnus vulgaris)’ (EMSz 286); ‘kottarainen’ (ESS 122). The EtV (144) considers a Turkic origin possible, connecting the word to the Tat. *пешнэк* ‘titmouse’. According to Vershinin, the *piš-* element is onomatopoeic by origin (he also compares it to the Udm. *пислэг* and Komi *пистӧг* ‘titmouse’), while he classifies the *-mar* element as a derivative cluster (ESM 368). Cf. *timar*.

sandor ‘носовой хрящ / Nasenknorpel’ (MdWb 1950); ‘клюв’ (ERV 567); form-variants: *kandor* (ESM 105), *kandoro* (MdWb 601), Moksha *nandâr* (MdWb 1320). Vershinin considers the word meaning ‘клюв [bill, beak]’ unrelated to the others, etymologizing it from the word *sudo* ‘nose’, which is phonetically incorrect (ESM 394). It is conceivable that the words *kavor’* and *sandor*, that are identical in meaning, contain some kind of a primitive suffix.

řimar ‘скворец’ (ERV 662). The *ři-* element of this word is related by Vershinin (ESM 438) to the Fi. *tiainen* ‘titmouse’ – which is somewhat unlikely; the same word is held to be onomatopoeic by origin by the SSA (3, 288). Cf. *piřmar*.

4. The Russian-origin *-ar’* suffix

In the Mordvin linguistic literature, this suffix is sometimes discussed together, at other places separately from the suffix *-r*. To my knowledge, it is only Cygankin who clearly states it in a 1979 article of his that the two suffixes are not identical. (Although later on, he also blurred the two together.) Thus, it is important to first establish that this suffix is of Russian origin (cf. *библиотекаръ* ‘librarian’, *секретаръ* ‘secretary’, *писаръ* ‘clerk, scribe’ etc.), and has no relation to the primitive *-r* suffix. Based on the data analysed, this suffix can be added to both nouns and verbs.

The words Cygankin brings up as examples are not to be found even in the comprehensive dictionaries (the suffix usually creates a personal name referring to some kind of a negative feature). His examples are the following:

řuvtar’ ‘человек, не имеющий детей [childless person]’. Cygankin (1976, 98) takes it to originate from the lexeme *řuvto* ‘tree’.

koknar’ ‘заика [stuttering (person)]’. Cygankin (1979, 157; 1981, 49) collected the form from village Mordovskaja Selid’ba in the Republic of Mordovia – the standard form is *koknaj* (ERV 277). This can be traced back to the verb *kokno-* ‘to stutter’ (ESM 156).

lavgar’ ‘болтун [chattering, talkative (person)]’. According to Cygankin’s account (1979, 158; 1981, 49) the word comes from village Alekseevka in the Penza Area; he etymologizes it from the verb *lavga-* ‘to chatter, to babble’ (MdWb 1035; ERV 322).

noľar’ ‘сопляк / Rotznase’ (MdWb 1349); ‘сопляк; сопливый’ (ERV 415); ‘taknyos, tejfelesszájú’ (EMSz 247); ‘řäkäinen, řäkänokka’ (ESS 103). Cygankin (1979, 158; 1981, 49) and the Grammatika (1980, 108) traces this word back to *noľgo* ‘mucus, phlegm’.

ordar’ ‘ломака [affected, la-di-da (person)]’. Cygankin (1979, 158) etymologizes it from the verbal stem *orda-*, cf. *ordado-* ‘осерчать / böse werden’ (MdWb 1456); ‘обидеться’ (ERV 442); ‘megsértődik’ (EMSz 261), ‘loukkaantua, pahastua’ (ESS 110); *ordale-* ‘обидеться, закапризничать’ (ERV 442).

tupař ‘тупой’ (Cygankin 1976, 98). Its base word is the Russian-origin *мыной* ‘stupid, dull-witted’. (Paasonen discusses the *tupaza*, *tupaža*, *tupica*, *tupik* ‘id.’ variants of the same word, MdWb 2351.)

Cygankin (1981, 49) also classifies the word **zlidarʹ** ‘бродячий’ (ERV 197); ‘kóbor, csavargó’ (EMSz 120); ‘kulkuri, kiertolainen’ (ESS 53) in this category, and takes it to originate from the verbal stem *zlida-* ‘to wander, to tramp’. This, however, is a false etymology, because the word is of Russian origin: Dal’ recorded it from the Rjazan, Tambov and Kostroma dialects in the *злодырь* ‘hoodlum, good-for-nothing person’ and *злыдарь* ‘ill-willed, malevolent person’ forms (ESM 79; EtV 50; Zaicz 2013, 310). The verb derived from this is *zlidard’e-* ‘бродяжничать, скитаться; шнырять’ (ERV 197), ‘шататься, ходить без дела / umherschlendern, müssiggehen, sich herumtreiben’ (MdWb 2687).

The list can be complemented with a couple of more lexemes with the help of the reverse dictionary of Mordvin:

noskarʹ ‘тот, кто сопит / Schnauffer’ (MdWb 1354). Its base word is the verb *nosko-* ‘to sniffle’.

suksarʹ ‘маленький, худой ребёнок / kleines, mageres Kind’ (MdWb 2050). Vershinin etymologizes it from the word *suks* ‘worm’ (ESM 415).

suskarʹ ‘кузака (о лошади) / Beisser (vom Pferde)’ (MdWb 2066). Its point of origin may be the verb *susko-* ‘to bite’.

5. Does the *-rks/-řks* derivative cluster exist?

Cygankin (1981, 53) and the Erzya-language grammar book (EK 2000, 37) distinguishes a *-rks/-řks* derivative cluster in the words *pešterks/pešterks* ‘hazel bush’ and *kodorks* ‘stalk, stem, trailer’. The Grammatika (1980, 108) brings up the word *čudikerks* ‘stream, brook’ as an example for this. Grebneva’s (1999, 39) examples for the suffix are *kodorks*, *kušterks* ‘motherwort (Leonorus)’ and *pešerks* ‘hazel bush’.

The word *čudikerks*, as it has been previously pointed out, is a compound; and *kodorks* also has a *kodor* variant, which means that the two suffixes were probably not added to the stem at the same time, but the abstract denominal *-ks* suffix was added to *kodor*. The lexeme *pešterks/pešterks/pešerks* was recorded by Cygankin in village Uzjukovo in the Kujbihsev [Samara] Area, but it also exists in present-day Moksha: *päšterks* (MRV 560). This can be traced back to the word *pešte* ‘hazel’. The point of origin of *kušterks* was the Russian word *куст* ‘bush’ (Grebneva 1997, 39).

Let us see, whether we can find any lexemes that contain the *-rks/-řks* derivative cluster. There are 87 Erzya words in the reverse dictionary of Mordvin that end in this sound sequence (47 *-rks*, 40 *-řks*). In most of these, however, the *-ks* denominal suffix was added to a word ending in *-r/-ř*, cf. e.g. *bugorʹks* ‘hill, mound’ < *bugor* ‘id.’, *čovorks* ‘mixture’ < *čovor* ‘together, mixed’, *guborʹks* ‘hill, mound’ < *gubor* ‘id.’, *karʹks* ‘string for tying moccasins’ < *karʹ* ‘moccasin’,

keveřks ‘round object’ < *keveř* ‘round’, *mastorks* ‘ground, floor’ < *mastor* ‘earth’, *mukorks* ‘bench’ < *mukor* ‘id.’, *panarks* ‘material for shirts’ < *panar* ‘shirt’, *surks* ‘ring’ < *sur* ‘finger’ etc.

In several cases, the base word cannot be found in written texts, but the *-da*, *-do*, *-de* suffixed verb created from a passive root shows it clearly that the *-ks* suffix was added to the words here as well, e.g. *angorks* ‘scratch’ ~ *angorda-* ‘to scratch’, *avarks* ‘grief, sorrow’ ~ *avardē-* ‘to cry’, *čatorks* ‘cracking’ ~ *čatordo-* ‘to crack’, *kaštorks* ‘rustling’ ~ *kaštordo-* ‘to rustle, to buzz’, *keňarks* ‘joy, happiness’ ~ *keňardo-* ‘to be glad’, *koporks* ‘sip, gulp’ ~ *koporda-* ‘to sip’, *kučkorks* ‘kick’ ~ *kučkordo-* ‘to kick’, *pamořks* ‘crumb, morsel’ ~ *pamořdē-* ‘to crumble’, *šiveřks* ‘edge, border’ ~ *šiveřdā-* ‘to pipe, to hem’, *taparks* ‘roll, coil’ ~ *taparda-* ‘to roll up, to wrap up’.

The rest of the words from the list do not contain an *-rks* suffix either, e.g. *turks* (~ *troks*) ‘through, across’ (< FV **tora-ksä*, UEW 799); therefore it can be asserted that the existence of such a suffix cannot be supported from the reverse dictionary (that contains more than 40,000 Erzya words and had been edited from dictionaries covering most of the Erzya vocabulary).

One of the most productive suffixes of tree and bush names is the *-ks*, e.g. *iňzej* ‘raspberry’ > *iňzejks* ‘raspberry bush’, *pižol* ‘serviceberry’ > *pižolks* ‘sorb-tree’ (cf. Cygankin 1981, 35–36). It is conceivable that the addition of *-(e)r-ks*⁶ to the words *pešće* ‘hazel’ and *kust* ‘bush’ was an analogical effect exerted by names ending in *-r* (*aťamař* ‘sour cherry’ > *aťamařks* ‘sour cherry tree’, *lamař/lajmař/lomžor*⁷ ‘bird cherry’ > *lamařks/lajmařks/lomžorks* ‘bird cherry tree’, *umař* ‘apple’ > *umařks* ‘apple tree’).

6. The *-r/-ř* suffix of onomatopoeic words

Gábor Bereczki (1983, 211) writes the following about onomatopoeic words: “This is a much more important category in the language of people living in the Volga–Kama Area than in well-known European languages. These words can be used in a sentence as subjects, attributes or adverbials.” According to Edit Mészáros’ studies (2003, 302) “a significant portion of the non-verbal onomatopoeic words in Mordvin end in an *r* or a palatalized *ř* sound”. In spite of this, in the Mordvin literature on suffixes, to my knowledge, only Cygankin refers to this suffix briefly in a monograph with as few as five examples: *čator* (the sound of crack, fluttering, blast or crackling), *kaštor* (the sound of rattling or rustling), *kuldor-kaldor* (the sound of thunder-clap, cracking, creaking), *čikor-lakor* (the sound of creaking or squeaking), *gal’deř-gul’dēř* (the sound of tiny objects) (1981, 53). In Edit Mészáros’ paper, 42 lexemes are listed as belonging to this category

6. Grebneva’s attempt on etymologizing the word (1997, 39) does not hold either: he connects it with the Mari *-er* suffix of collective nouns.

7. Cygankin hypothesised the presence of a *-žer, -ziř -žor* suffix-variant in the word *lomžor* (1981, 57), but in fact, this is a compound word: *lom* ‘bird cherry’ + *šuro* ‘corn; grain; crop’. The word *la(j)mař* is also a compound: *lajme* (this only exists in Moksha now) ‘bird cherry’ + *mař* ‘berry’ (see the entry about *lamař*) (MdKons 80).

(furthermore, she also found 59 verb forms in which there is an *-r/-r'* sound before the verbal suffix *-da/-d'a*). (Moskina conducted studies on Moksha data, 2000.)

For lack of space, this word-type is not discussed in detail here – only the most important features are highlighted briefly. Most of the words in this category are onomatopoeic, expressing cracking, creaking, crackling; smacking, explosion, sputtering; squeaking. They can be both one-word lexemes or reduplicated forms. Some of the examples are listed below:

- a) *buldor* splashing, lapping (ERV 93); *kaldor* clattering (ERV 227); *lagor* cracking, creaking (ERV 324); *ćar* thunder-clap, report (ERV 732); *ćikor* squeaking (ERV 738).
- b) *vator-vator* croaking (ERV 113); *dubor-dubor* the sound of running or dance (ERV 176); *lakor-lakor* the sound of scattering objects (ERV 328); *peteř-peteř* the sound of dripping liquid (ERV 473); *šlabir-šlabir* the sound of noisy chewing, squelching (ERV 766).
- c) *galdor-guldor*, *guldor-galdor* thunder, rattling (ERV 145, 158); *tupor-tapor* the sound of cumbersome gait (ERV 682); *ćator-pukštor* swishing; crackling (ERV 734); *ćol'deř-kal'deř* the sound of pouring over sg (ERV 754); *šlobor-šlabor* the sound of water splashing (ERV 765).

The suffix appearing in these onomatopoeic words is probably identical with the primitive Uralic nominal suffix. Regarding their function, they must be looked at as distinct suffixes, which makes it necessary to classify the *-r/-r'* element of onomatopoeic words into a separate category in the system of suffixes.

References

- Vajushkin 1975 = Баюшкин, Н. С. 1975: Архаические суффиксы имен в мордовских языках. – *Fenno-ugristica* 1: 67–71. Tartu.
- Bartens, Raija 1999: *Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 232. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.
- D. Bartha, Katalin 1958: *A magyar szóképzés története*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Bereczki, Gábor 1983: A Volga-Káma-vidék nyelveinek areális kapcsolatai. – Balázs, János (ed.), *Areális nyelvészeti tanulmányok*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó. 207–236.
- Bubrih 1947 = Бубрих, Д. В. 1947: *Эрзя-мордовская грамматика минимум*. Пособие для вузов. Саранск: Мордовское государственное издательство.
- Syugankin 1976 = Цыганкин, Д. В. 1976: Суффиксальное словообразование имен существительных в диалектах эрзянского языка. – *Fenno-ugristica* 3: 86–106. Tartu.
- 1979 = Цыганкин, Д. В. 1979: О соотношении исконных и иноязычных элементов в системе эрзянского (диалектного) именного словообразования. – *Финно-угристика. Межвузовский тематический сборник научных трудов*. Выпуск 2. Саранск: Мордовский государственный университет им. Огарева. 154–161.
- 1981 = Цыганкин, Д. В. 1981: *Словообразование в мордовских языках*. Саранск: Мордовский государственный университет им. Огарева.

- Dal' [1880–1882] = Даль, Владимир, *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка I–IV*. Москва, 1955.
- EK = Цыганкин, Д. В. (ed.) 2000: *Эрзянь кель. Морфология*. Саранск: Типография Красный Октябрь.
- EMSz = Mészáros, Edit & Sirmankina, Raisza 2003: *Erza-mordvin–magyar szótár*. 2., átdolgozott, bővített kiadás. Lexica Savariensia Szombathely 6. Szombathely: Savaria University Press.
- ERV = Серебренников, Б. А. & Р. Н. Бузакова & М. В. Мосин 1993: *Эрзянь–рузонь валкс. Эрзянско–русский словарь*. Москва: Русский язык – Дигора.
- ESM = Вершинин, В. И. 2004–2011: *Этимологический словарь мордовских (эрзянского и мокишанского) языков I–V*. Йошкар-Ола: Стринг.
- ESS = Niemi, Jaana & Mihail Mosin 1995: *Ersäläis–suomalainen sanakirja*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 48. Turku.
- EtV = Цыганкин, Д. В. & М. В. Мосин 1998: *Этимологиянь валкс*. Саранск: Мордовской книжной издательства.
- Grammatika 1962 = Колядёнков, М. Н. (ed.) 1962: *Грамматика мордовских языков*. Часть I. Фонетика и морфология. Саранск: Мордовское книжное издательство.
- Grammatika 1980 = Цыганкин, Д. В. (ed.) 1980: *Грамматика мордовских языков*. Саранск: Мордовский государственный университет.
- Grebneva 1997 = Гребнева, А. М. 1997: *Флористическая лексика мордовских языков*. Саранск: Издательство Мордовского университета.
- Hakulinen, Lauri 1979: *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Neljäs, korjattu ja lisätty painos. Helsinki: Otava.
- Jevszevjev [1934] = Евсевьев, М. Е. [1934]: *Основы мордовской грамматики*. Избранные труды. Том третий. Саранск: Мордовское книжное издательство 1963.
- Keresztes, László 1990: *Chrestomathia Morduinica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- 2011: *Bevezetés a mordvin nyelvészetbe*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.
- KESK = Лыткин, В. И. & Е. С. Гуляев 1970: *Краткий этимологический словарь коми языка*. Москва: Наука.
- Lehtisalo, Toivo 1936: *Über die primären uralischen Ableitungssuffixe*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 72. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.
- Lipatov & Matyuskin & Mosin 1983 = Липатов, С. И. & П. Г. Матюшкин, & М. В. Мосин, 1983: Пути обогащения лексики мордовских языков. – Д. В. Цыганкин (ed.), *Лексикология современных мордовских языков*. Саранск: Мордовский государственный университет им. Огарева.
- Luutonen, Jorma & Mosin, Mikhail & Shchankina, Valentina 2004: *Reverse Dictionary of Mordvin. Обратный словарь мордовских языков*. Lexika Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIX. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura.
- Majtinskaja 1974 = Майтинская, К. Е. 1974: Сравнительная морфология финно-угрских языков. – Лыткин, В. И. & К. Е. Майтинская & Карой Редעי (ed.), *Основы финно-угорского языкознания*. Москва: Наука. 214–382.
- MdKons = Keresztes, László 1986: *Geschichte des mordwinischen Konsonantismus II. Etymologisches Belegmaterial*. Szeged: Studia uralo-altaica 26.
- MdWb = Paasonen, Heikki 1990–1996: *Mordwinisches Wörterbuch*. Zusammenge stellt von K. Heikkilä. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Martti Kahla. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXIII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

- Mészáros, Edit 1998: *Erza-mordvin nyelvkönyv kezdőknek és középfeladóknek* (Marija Imajkina közreműködésével). Szeged: JATEPress.
- 2003: A mordvin onomatopoeitikus szavak egy jellemző típusáról. – Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Károly Rédei (ed.), *Ünnepi kötet Honti László tiszteletére*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 301–308.
- Mosin 1977 = Мосин, М. В. 1977: Сравнительно-исторический анализ зоологической терминологии мордовских языков. – *Вопросы морфологии эрзянских и мокшанских диалектов (словоизменение и словообразование)*. Саранск: Мордовский государственный университет им. Огарева. 3–15.
- 1989 = Мосин, М. В. 1989: *Словообразовательная структура финно-угорского слова в мордовских языках*. Саранск: Мордовский государственный университет им. Огарева.
- 2001 = Мосин, М. В. 2001: О некоторых явлениях в финно-угорской основе слова в мордовских языках. – М. Д. Имайкина (ed.), *Финно-угристика и кевкстематне*. Саранск: Красный Октябрь типографиясь. 90–94
- Moskina 2000 = Моськина, С. И. 2000: Ономастопозитические основы мокшанских глаголов и их морфонологическая сочетаемость со словообразовательными суффиксами. – М. В. Мосин (ed.), *Материалы II Всероссийской научной конференции финно-угроведов «Финно-угристика на пороге III тысячелетия» (филологические науки)*. Саранск: Типография Красный Октябрь. 231–234.
- MRV = Серебренников, Б. А. & А. П. Феоктистов & О. Е. Поляков 1998: *Мокшень-рузонь валкс. Мокшанско-русский словарь*. Москва: Русский язык – Дигора.
- Paasonen, Heikki 1897: Die türkischen Lehnwörter im mordwinischen. – *Journal Société Finno-Ougrienne* XV/2: 1–64.
- Saarinen, Sirkka 1999: Словообразовательная архитектура в волжских языках: диахронная перспектива. – М. В. Мосин (ed.), *Словообразовательная архитектура в волжско-финских языках*. Саранск: Типография Красный Октябрь. 3–6.
- SSA = Itkonen, Erkki & Ulla-Maija Kulonen (toim.) 1992–2000: *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja I–III*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 556, Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisu 62. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus – Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Serebrennikov 1967 = Серебренников, Б. А. 1967: *Историческая морфология мордовских языков*. Москва: Наука.
- UEW = Rédei, Károly (ed.) 1988–1991: *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Vasmer, Max 1953–1958: *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I. A–K (1953), II. L–Ssuda (1955), III. Sta–ÿ (1958). Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- Vildjajeva 1980 = Вильдяева, А. М. 1980: Словообразовательная структура флористических названий в мордовских языках. – *Финно-угристика. Межвузовский тематический сборник научных трудов*. Выпуск 3. Саранск: Мордовский государственный университет им. Огарева. 117–132.
- Zaicz, Gábor 2013: A mordvin nyelv orosz jövevényszavai II. – *Folia Uralica Debreceniensis* 20: 295–315.