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Historical Commentary

One of the most famous documents in the history of verbal abuse is a certain letter allegedly written by a cossack hetman to the Sultan of Turkey sometime between 1672 and 1680. Although the cossacks did little other than rape, pillage, and slaughter defenseless people in pogroms, e.g. that of 1648, they nevertheless managed to fire the romantic imagination of the nineteenth century, which could overlook their bestial behavior and see in them a hard-drinking, anarchistic group of free men and runaways. Thus it was that from 1878 to 1891 the Russian artist I.E. Repin created his painting “Zaporozhyye pilut pis’mo tureckomu sultanu” – “The Zaporozhians Write a Letter to the Turkish Sultan”, which now hangs in the Russian State Museum. An earlier version of the painting, along with a sketch entitled “Na voskoparno - groznuju gramotu tureckogo sultana Magometa IV kolevoj Ivan Dmitrovich Sirko stovaryiatsami otvechajut nasevelkami” – “Koshevoi Ivan Dmitrovich Sirko and His Comrades Answer the Bombastic, Threatening Letter of the Turkish Sultan Mahomet IV with Mockeries”, is housed in the Tret’yakovskij Gallery. The Moscow periodical Ogonek had a special article on Repin with a full-color center-page reproduction of the Russian State Museum variant in its August, 1969 issue. The painting portrays a motley group of Slavo-Tatar ruffians sitting and standing around a scribe and laughing rowdily. The cause of their laughter is the letter discussed below.

In 1675 (Evanskij 1895:517) or 1678 (Golubovskij 1957:320), the Sultan of Turkey and the Crimean Khan are said to have unsuccessfully attacked the Zaporozhian fortress of Stie’ (Russian Sztie’). Following this fiasco, the Sultan of Turkey supposedly sent a threatening missive to the Zaporozhian cossacks demanding their submission to him, to which the cossacks replied with an abusive parody of the Sultan’s letter. Evanskij (1895:516–517) appears to accept most of the situation as fact. Kostomarov (1872) expresses uncertainty regarding the Zaporozhian letter but says that in any case it was composed around the time and the place traditionally assigned to it. Storožev (Pokrovskij 1911:40–41) calls both letters “legendary”, i.e. not authentic, but adds that they accurately reflect the spirit of the times.
sėrko 'grey dog'), to whom it is traditionally assigned, since he died in Sič in 1680 (Solovev 1962:231; Golubuckij 1957:437). The fact that the correspondence is in all likelihood apocryphal does not reduce its value. Apocrypha constitute an important and amusing factor in history. The apocryphal story of the death of Catherine the Great (unable to find a man large enough to satisfy her, she was crushed to death when the apparatus broke as a horse was being lifted to service her) is no less amusing whether true or false, and it is of historical value, since it accurately reflects the attitude of some people toward the empress. Similarly, the story that Stalin had a reproduction of the abovementioned Repin painting hanging in his study, and that when visitors came he would stand before the painting and recite from memory the associate letter displays the wide influence of this letter in Russian thought, either because Stalin memorized it or because he is said to have done so. The fact that Repin spent thirteen years creating a canvas depicting the writing of the letter is another example of the influence it exerted, apocryphal or not.

Before proceeding with the actual analysis of the letter, some background material is in order with regard to Russian versions and English translations. I have found two distinct versions of the letter in its original language. One version, belonging to a certain priest named I. Kurylin from the village of Vyčće-Tarasivky in the Ekaterinoslav (modern Dnepropetrovsk) district, was published in several works by Ėvarnīckij (1894:98, 1895:518: cf. also Subravl'ka 1972:39), and this is the version quoted by Storožov (Pokrovskij 1911:4041). It contains only one obscene word and will be referred to as version E (as in Ėvarnīckij or Expurgated). When it is necessary to differentiate between the three publications of the letter mentioned above, E1 will be used for Ėvarnīckij 1894, E2 for his 1895, and E3 for Storožov, i.e. Pokrovskij 1911. Another version was published by N. I. Kostomarov in 1872, and a normalized Ukrainian version of it is quoted by Golubuckij (1947:124). It contains four taboo words, all scatological, and will be referred to as version K (as in Kostomarov or Kaka). When it is necessary to specify, the version published by Kostomarov will be referred to as K1, that of Golubuckij as K2. (The version of S. Rudanskij [Golubuckij 1957:124-125] is in verse and quite different from versions E and K. Since it is not truly epistolary, it will be excluded from consideration.) It should be noted that both Ėvarnīckij and Kostomarov (but neither Storožov nor Golubuckij) also published the Sultan's letter to the Zaporozhian letter was an answer.

Version E has been translated into English at least three times. First by William Cresson (1919:41-42), then by some writer for Ripley's Believe It or Not (1950?:165-167), and finally by Bernard Guerney (1959:615-616). The first translation is considerably condensed, totally bowdlerized, and contains several inaccuracies. The Ripley version is longer and slightly less inaccurate in some places, but it contains numerous howlers elsewhere and is still bowdlerized. It should be added that the introductory paragraph of the Ripley version contains a number of errors. The letter is said to have provoked the attack on Sič", rather than vice versa, the Crimean Khan is unmentioned, the attack is dated at 1673, and Sičko is said to have died in Siberian exile in 1689. The Guerney translation is complete and accurate, literal "a - - - - e" or "as - - - -", for the Russian versions of version E provide at least that much information. Neither version K nor the Sultan's original provoking letter has ever been translated into English, to the best of my knowledge. The Sultan's letter is an invaluable adjunct to the Zaporozhian letter, since the latter is a parody of the former, and not just a formless tirade of abuse.

This article will use Kostomarov's versions of both letters. The differences between Kostomarov's and Ėvarnīckij's versions of the Sultan's letter are minute, but Kostomarov's appears to be closer to what the original should have been due to its more archaic style. In examining version K, however, a careful comparison will be made with version E. While both versions of the Sultan's letter are in standardized Russian and are not, therefore, of any particular linguistic interest, versions E and K are both in a language which might best be described as Late South East Slavic, or Middle Ukrainian, since it reflects many of the phonological changes which came to differentiate Ukrainian from Russian. In the letter, however, these changes are inconsistently rendered, and so it must be presumed that the processes were not completed or that Russian influence was considerable.

Before giving the actual text of the letters, one further problem - that of orthography - must be dealt with. Version E uses a Russian type orthography, K1 uses a Ukrainian type, and K2 uses normalized Ukrainian. In this, as in other matters, we shall follow Kostomarov. Thus u = Russian u and Ukrainian u; i = Russian i, ē and w, Ukrainian i and ē; e = Russian е and ē and Ukrainian e and ē.

In the Sultan's letter, however, we shall use the modern Russian orthography, since only its content, not its form, is of interest.

II

The Letters

The Originals:

1. Sultan Muhamed IV к запорожским казакам

Я, султан, сын Магомета, брат — солнца и луны, внук и наместник Божий, владетель всех царств: Македонского, Вавилонского и Иерусалимского, великого и малого Египта: царь над царями; властитель над всеми существующими; необыкновенный рыцарь, нимок необузденный, хранитель неоступный гроба Исуса Христа; покойник Бога самого; надежда и утешение мусульман, смерть и великий защитник христиан, повелеваем вам, запорожские казаки, сдаться мне добровольно и без всякого сопротивления, и меня вашими нападениями не заставьте беспокоить!

Султан турецкий Мухамед

2. Запорожцы — турецкому Султану

Ти, шайтан турецкий, проклятого чорта брать и товарищ и самого
Сultan Muxamed IV k zaporozkim kazakam

Ja, sultan, syn Magometa, brat – solnca i luny, vnut i nanesmoch Božji, vladetel’ vseh carstv: Makedonskogo, Vasilivskogo i Ierusalimskogo, velikogo i malogo Egipta: car’ nad carjami; vlastitel’ vseh světstvijatiočami; neobyknovennogo rycar’, nikem neobedimnym; xranitel’ neotsporitelnogo groba Isusa Hrista; pop -etel’ Boga samogo; nadeža i utěshenie musulmana, smučenij i velik zamčenik christian, povelayuvu vam, zaporozkie kasak, sät’ja mne dobry fón i bez vsjakogo sotvopoštěnij, i menja vašimi napadenijami ne zastav’te bezpokojo!

Sultan tureckij Muxamed

2. Zaporozhye – tureckomu Sultanu

Ty sajtan! tureckij!, prokljatogo chot brat’ i tovaris’ i samogo ljucerjja sekretar’ jakj tu v’chotra lyca’, čort’ gširje, a tu ko tovo vijko poživajes’. Ne budeš’ tu goden’ synonym’ kratjăn’kix’ pid’ 10 soboj maty1; tvogo vijača, my ne boimosja, zemlju i vodoju budem’ hryš’ja 14 my 15 zato bojou. Vavylonský ty kuxar’16, makedonský17, koschny18, ierusalimský19, brovarnyk20, alesandrsky21, kozolup’, velikogo i malogo22, Egipta syvnyat’, armianska syvna, tatar’k23, sagadja24, kaminech’25 kat’, podolský26, zlodiuja27, samogo gaspa28, vнуk’ i vsjego svit’ i pidsvit’29, i blizan’31, i našego boga duren’, svinjaca mora, kobyjaca gšrja, ržnyc’ka sobaka, nekrasjenyi lob’, s’opja by tovo čort’ pariv31! Ottak’ tobi kozaky vidkazaji, pljugar32, ne vgoden’34, es’ matery vmar’, xystyj33, čista ne znaen’, bo kandalara ne maen’, misjac’ u neph36, a37 god’ u knjyjici, a den’ taky38 u nas’ jak u39 nas’, podliu za se v gšr’u30 nas’!

Chief Hetman Zaxarčenko with all the Zaporozhian Host

Notes

Before proceeding with the numbered notes, I should like to make a general comment on the nature of the translation. While literalness has been the primary goal of the translation, I have sought to avoid sacriﬁcing the tine of the letter for its sake. Thus, although the second person singular pronoun ty corresponds historically to English thou, I have chosen to use the modern English you. This is because the use of ty in the original gives the letter a tone of offensive familiarity, i.e. of insult, while the use of thou in the English translation would have given it a quaint, old-fashioned, almost Biblical (heaven forfend!) tone. Similarly, I have translated
former is not as low-status, i.e. abusive, while the latter is too archaic to have the desired impact. The same situation motivated my translation of kolesnyk by the contemporary ‘mechanic’ rather than the literal ‘wheelwright’, since our modern mechanic can be said, in a way, to be the functional equivalent of the wheelwright of earlier times.

1. Glossed in E as čort ‘‘devil’.
2. E2 and 3 turec’kij.
3. E tovaryš’.
4. E sekretar’.
5. E vykidae ‘puke, abort, void’.
6. E lacks ty i.
7. E vijsko.
8. E and K2 požíme ‘devour, eat up’.
9. E xeștiązi’s’kix’.
10. E3 pod’.
11. Glossed in E as jměť ‘have’.
12. E1 vijska.
13. E boimos’.
15. E lacks my.
17. E makedonskij.
18. Kolesnyk’ literally ‘wheelwright’. See introduction to this section. E1 has kolesnik’.
19. E2 and 3 erusalins’kij.
20. Glossed in E as pivovar’ ‘brewer’.
22. Velikogo j malogo literally ‘great and small’ or ‘greater and lesser’.
23. E tatarskij.
24. Glossed in E as kożel ‘goat’. Actually, soğdjak (also soğdak and saadak) means ‘crossbow’ or ‘quiver’ (from Tatar soğdaq). The word intended is soģaik (also soğa from Chagatai soğajak) ‘steppe antelope’. This mistake occurs in all published versions of the letter (v. addendum).
25. E1 kamineckij. E2 and 3 kamenec’kij.
27. Zlodjeka literally ‘evil-doer’ but modern ‘thief’. Both Ėvarnickij and Kosto-
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tion of Kamenets and Podolia by the Sultan. Kostomarov adds that since this occurred in 1672, the letter must have been written after that date.

28. Glossed in E as d’jęda ‘‘devil’’. Actually, gęspida means ‘asp, serpent’. In view of the literal meaning and Ėvarnickij’s gloss, I have chosen a translation implying the Original Tempter over Guernsey’s basilisk.

29. E svitu.
30. E1 podsvitu, E2 and 3 pidsvitu.
31. Glossed in E as głupec ‘‘fool, stupidhead’’.
32. E sąj by węsćy ‘‘tebe čort’’ ‘may the devil take you’.
33. Glossed in E as poganc’ ‘rascal’. Since the root plugr refers to spit, and since the adjective plugrasnyj means ‘loathsome, despicable’, I have chosen the translation you nasty glob of spit over Guernsey’s thou basest born of runts.
34. E nesgoden’.
35. E xresti̇ani̇n’.
36. E1 neba.
37. E lacks a.
38. E lacks i.
39. E jak ’i u vas’.
40. E pocuił sa te os – kudy nas’i ‘kiss us on the you-know-where’!.
41. E etman.
42. E rjan’ ‘Sirko. I can find no reference to a hetman from this period named Zaxarońko. Kostomarov himself says that the letter must have been written while Sirko was chief hetman.
43. E zō.
44. E2 and 3 kóstom’.
45. E zaporožčkim’.

IV

Linguistic Analysis

Since the Zaporozhian letter was probably written in the southern Ukraine at the end of the seventeenth century, the main concern of this analysis will be the demonstration of the extent to which phonological, morphological, and lexical features which came to be distinctly Ukrainian are reflected in the letter. We will treat phonological developments first.

Phonology

1. Common Slavic jat’ gives Ukrainian /j/: zlodjeka, svita, pidsvita, riznychka,
2. Common Slavic /o/ and /u/ give /i/ in closed syllables: viš'ko, syn'v; p' id'' v'iš'ka, p'id'stna, viškazaly, kam'nic'kyj, but pod'o'sl'yj vs. Ukr. pod'u'sl'yj, k' ož vs. Ukr. k' iž.

3. Common Slavic /i/ and /y/ merge. In version K this is represented by u, while version E uses a. None of the nonnormalized versions are consistent, however. Thus K 1 has 6u instead of 6i, хрестяньскй instead of -киш, Александровский instead of -арский, Владимирский instead of -ввый, материй for матери, and the conjunction i 'and' is consistently spelt u. This last inconsistency could be a mere orthographic peculiarity, however, since u never occurs initially in Ukrainian. Thus the opposition i/u would not be distinctive, and the older spelling, viz. u, could be maintained. Version E consistently had o or u after /k/, although u should be used if the orthography were to be consistent, e.g. syky'dee for syk'ide (cf. note 5). Kota'ky for k'ot'ky, and all adjectives are in -кй instead of -кй. Also note the words in notes 8, 9, and 35. Examples of the merger in version K are all those words with orthographic u where Russian has 6 while in version E the examples comprise words with u where Russian has u. Since, with the abovementioned exceptions, versions E and K are both consistent, we shall only present the examples from version K illustrating the merger. The examples from version E would be all those words in version K with graphic u which are not mentioned here: ty l'ycar', syn'v, my, k'yl'sja, kobylycha, nekrezhennyy, v'ynyx'v, k'ot'ovy.

4. The pronunciation of /w/ and /l/ as [w] is reflected in the following words: pariv' (Rus. pariv), ygodan (Rus. and Ukr. ygodan), miz'jace' u nebi, a god'z'u knvyce' (elsewhere the preposition is r').

5. The conjunction i becomes after a vowel: velikogo j malogo.

6. /l/ becomes hard-word-finally, although it can reappear as soft, e.g., when inflectional suffixes are added. This change is only reflected in the spelling of the word sekretar' (Rus. sekretar') in version K. The words l'ycar', k'uzar', and syv'nar' maintain the old spelling, while liycyperu (Rus. and Ukr. -ar') appears to have a gratuitously soft ending. As in the case of the spelling of i 'and', however, this is probably just a matter of preserving an archaic spelling. In some older Ukrainian dictionaries, nouns ending in morphophonemic r' are spelled p's, despite the fact that the pronunciation is hard in final position. Thus, sekretar' 'takes on the value of a misspelling indicating the true pronunciation of that epoch, while in the other words, all spelled r' are morphophonemic spellings or graphic archaisms.

7. /e/ becomes /o/ after chuintantes and in certain words where Russian has /e/. There is also evidence of okunie, i.e. the pronunciation of unstressed /o/ as [o]: tvoego (Rus. tvoego), v'ego (Rus. v'ego), nat'ego (Rus. nat'ego), tobi (Rus. tebe), k'o'evyj (Rus. kol'evoj), kol'om (Ukr. kol'om), kota'ky (Rus. kota'ky) otoman (Ukr. ot'man, Rus. at'amun).

8. Epenthetic /v/: viškazaly (Rus. okazal'j).

10. /i/ is avoided: liycyperu (Rus. liycyfera, Ukr. liycyfera).

11. /i/ is hard: bude' (Ukr. b'udar').

12. The adjectival suffix which is -kš- in Russian and -kš- in Ukrainian occurs in both variants in all versions of the letter. For the fourteen words containing this suffix, the distribution is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* K2 is normalized, and therefore has been excluded.

As can be seen, version K is the most consistently Ukrainian in its character. If the words tatar's'kjy (E tatars'kjy) and xrestyjan's'kix' (E xrestyjan's'kix'), which for version K were made to comprise the separate column -sk-, are simply misspellings resulting from graphic metathesis, as seems most likely, since there is no justification for r' or n' in those words, then version K is much more consistently Ukrainian in this respect than any form of version E.

**Morphology**

In terms of morphology, the various versions of the letter all show a mixture of Russian and Ukrainian features:

1. The Nominal System

a. a. The Vocative. All versions of the letter have pľugavec (from pľugavec'), which is a vocative form and shows the preservation of the first palatalization. Although most of the letter is spent calling the Sultan names, this is the only vocative form. It is also the only single-word insult in the entire letter.

b. The Genitive. In modern Ukrainian, a large number of masculine nouns have their genitive singular in /u/. The words svit, pidsvit, and Egip't are all of this type. In version K, the genitive in /u/ is entirely lacking, while version E has /u/ for the first two words but not for the third.

c. The Locative. The form in /i/ is a phonological development (v. part 1 of the description of the phonology, in this section). The reflex of the second palatalization is preserved in version E's loc. sg. knyz' (nom. sg. kny'ze), while version K's diminutive knyz'c (nom. sg. knyz'c') does not permit the alternation to appear.

2. The Verbal System is basically Ukrainian

a. a. 3 sg. pres. in -sere, pozi'vre (E and K2 pozi'vre).

b. 1 pl. pres. in -mo: boimos' but budem' (this form also occurs in Mod. Ukr.)
d. Masc. past in -w" (phonetic [w]): puriv" (E yiz'av')  (Cf. part 4 of the phonology)
e. The form isi 'thou art' is a clear archaism. Mod. Ukr. has je for all persons, and Mod. Rus. has virtually eliminated the present tense of 'be'.

4. Prepositions and Conjunctions: v. sections 4 and 5 of the phonology.

**Lexicon**

By way of studying the lexical characteristics of the Zaporozhian letter, we shall give a list of noteworthy lexical items in the order of their occurrence in the letter:

șajtan: This is a Ukrainian borrowing from Turkic. It is also found in East Russian dialects, but the common Russian form is satan.  
tovaryše: Literary Ukrainian is tovaryš, as in version E, but the form with še also occurs.

jaký and jak: = Ukr., Rus. is kakoj and kak.

lycar': = Ukr., Rus. is rycar', which also occurs in Ukr.

poživae: This word does not occur with the meaning 'eat' in Rus. Požíva- is both Rus. and Ukr.

maty, maem': = Ukr.

brovannyk': = Ukr. (from Polish), it also occurs in West Russian dialects.

aleksandrijs'kyj: Ukr. oleksandrij's'kyj, Rus. aleksandrijskij.

kozolup: I could not find this word in any modern dictionary.

armjans'ka: Ukr. armens'ka, Rus. armjanskaja.

sagajak': See note 24 (Section III) and addendum.

kat': = Ukr. (from Polish), borrowed by Russian from Ukrainian.

zloj'duška: = Ukr., also zlójuška. The Russian is vorjiga.

gaspid: = Ukr., Rus. is aspida.

blazen': = Ukr., also in Vasmer's dictionary, and the dictionary by Dal', where it is labeled as Southern and Western and is glossed as 'minor, young and foolish, inexperienced'.

riznych'ka (from riznych'): = Ukr., the Rus. reznik is dialectal, or refers only to a Kosher butcher.

ottak': = Ukr., Rus. is rot tak.

pljugavec': = Ukr.

**ADDENDUM**

After this article was written, an additional version of the Zaporozhian letter came to my attention. The third version is similar to those already studied, but it has some distinctive features worthy of comment. The differences in the number, order, and combination of elements, however, are such that incorporation of this version into the framework of the article would be extremely awkward. I have thus decided to present the text of the letter with a brief commentary as an addendum. The letter appeared in volume five of Kryptidia (originally edited and published by Friedrich Salomon Krauss in Heilbronn and Paris between 1883 and 1905, reissued by J.G. Blauhke Verlag, Darmstadt, 1975) pages 165-167, where it is said to have been collected in Nižnij Dunavec, Dobrudza, in 1882. A version of the Turkish sultan's provoking letter is also given, but it does not differ significantly from the version already presented in the body of this article, except for the fact that it, like the version of the Zaporozhian letter with which it is given, is shorter and in a basically modern, normalized Ukrainian. Both letters were published with French translations. I will now give the text of the Zaporozhian letter as it appeared in Kryptidia along with an English translation.

The Letter

Оповідь Султанові турецькому оді командирів козаків запорожцьких.

Який ти у чоті лицьо: чорт спер, а ти і твоє військо пошлєте! Ти олександрійський броварник, козацький сагайкій, подолський кат, вірменська свіжа, синячка морда, коблиха срака, різнішацька собака! Не будеш-ти гонен синами хрещениками воплоти, ми землею і водою, биться будемо з тобою, нехрещений лоб, мати твою біді...  

Ми числа не знаєм, календаря не маєм, а день у нас як у вас: поснув у гущні навкіс!

The Transliteration

Odpovidi Sultanovu tureckomu od kozak zaporažskih

Jakyy ty u¹ čorš lyčar': čort sare a ty i tvoje viš'ko pojeďate²! Ty olesxandr'js'kyj brovárnyk, kozac'kyj ságajak³, podol's'kyj kat, virmens'ka svynja, svinjača morda, kobyļjača sakra, riznych'ka sobka! Ne budest-ty⁴ goden synamy xretšian'kymv volodliv⁵ my zemlemy i voščy, bitys' budemo s toboj, ne-

¹ Jakyy
² čorš
³ lyčar
⁴ čort
⁵ sarak
My čisla ne znajem, kalendarsja ne majem, a den' u nas jak u vas: pocihuj u7
guzdnj9 nas'!

The Translation

Answer to the Turkish Sultan from the Zaporozhian Cossacks

What the hell kind of knight are you: the devil shits you and you and your army
eat [it]! You Alexandrian beerbrewer, Cossack quiver, Podolian hangman, Armenian pig,
swine's snout, mare's asshole, butcher's dog! You're not fit to command
the sons of Christians, we'll fight you on land and sea, unbaptized brow, fuck your
mother!

We don't know the date, we don't have a calendar, but the day with us is the
same as with you: kiss our ass!

The differences are readily apparent from a comparison of the two
examples in the body of this article, and so I will restrict my comments to a few salient
features.

1. In those places where the preposition v/u are in free variation, u
was chosen as opposed to v in E and K.

2. pojidelio 'you eat'.

3. sagajadak: This difference is the most interesting (although nezrezčen\ny loj, mat' tvojo job is the most poetic). The French translation gives carquois
'quiver' for sagajadak, but it is the different adjective, viz. kozač'kyj 'Cossack'
(vz tatar'kyj 'Tatar' in versions E and K) which suggests that perhaps sagajadak,
and not segek 'stepe antelope', was actually intended. Given the shape
and function of a quiver, i.e. it is sheath-like (cf. Latin regina 'sheath' and 'cunt')
and used for holding long, straight, rigid objects, could the epithet kozač'기
sagajadak possibly be interpreted as being a metaphorical rendering of
some insult such as 'The Cossacks fuck you' or at least 'The Cossacks fill you
full of their arrows? Since the nature of the letter is otherwise quite direct, it
seems unlikely. Nevertheless, the possibility cannot be dismissed without
further evidence.

4. The hyphen should not be there.

5. volodity 'to command'.

6. mat' tvojo job 'fuck your mother' (literally 'I/you/he/it fucked...'). This in-
sult is taken directly from the Russian. Even when it is uttered using Ukrainian
words, which would be matir tvojo job (actually, the pronunciation would be more like job, but I have chosen to use ji as a trans-
literating device to distinguish i from which I transliterate je), the speaker
is felt to be swearing in the "Muscovite" manner. This is the only Russianism
in the text.

7. See note 1.
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