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Introduction

It is common knowledge that there is interconnecting between rhythm and morphology in verse. A dactylic ending is an ending of a poetic line on two unstressed syllables (for instance, «Каркает ворон над белой равниною. // Нищий в деревне за дровни цепляется. // Этой сплошной безотрадной картиной // Сердце подавлено, взор утомляется.») In “Rhythmic dictionary and rhythmic-syntactic clichés” [Гаспаров 1984], M.L. Gasparov compiled a rhythmical dictionary of parts of speech using the prosaic texts of five authors. In this work, a distribution of different parts of speech based on words' length and on the position of the stress demonstrates a significant discrepancy between parts of speech. The longest words in the Russian language are adjectives and verbs, but their length varies: verbs usually have long unstressed beginnings, while adjectives have long unstressed endings. The other parts of speech, according to the calculations of Gasparov, have the most frequent word length and place of stress. This is why the dactylic ending, which requires words with a long unstressed termination, tends to attract some parts of speech and avoid others.

The research belongs to the area of observations over the formal parameters of Russian verse such as metre, rhythm, rhyme, stanzaic, as well as endings, which is the main object of this research. The study of Russian verse formal parameters started as early as the beginning of the XX century, however, ending patterns were only partly touched upon in works of M.L. Gasparov [primarily, Гаспаров 1977], D.S. Worth [Worth 1978, 1979], and J.Th. Shaw [Shaw 1993].

Linguistic aspects of verse studies were in focus of R.O. Jacobson's [Jacobson 1979] and (earlier) Polivanov's researches [Поливанов 1963], but "the linguistics of verse" has become the main trend in verse studies only over the last 30 years, and this is what this research of the correlation between rhyme and grammar is a part of. Mikhail Gasparov's research of the most frequent consonances covered some of the questions in this area, and those consonances were the ones used in more word form paradigms (e.g. masculine rhymes ending with -oy and less frequent ty-rhymes) [Гаспаров 2000].

As far as dactylic ending (verse line ending in which the stressed syllable is the third from the end or even further) is concerned, practically no researchers have so far studied the questions what grammar categories and grammar features correlate certain prosodic structures, or which words certain poets use in the position of the dactylic ending. A short review of the dactylic endings in Nekrasov's poem Pedlars was given by Stekhin [Стехин 1970] in his paper he outlines some approaches to analysing dactylic ending on the basis of grammar structure of a word. This very question of the correlation between dactylic clausula and morphological and prosodic features of Russian words is the core of our research.
Based on Gasparov’s calculations, I obtained the distribution of the parts of speech depending on the position of the stressed syllable. Here are the results:

**Table 1. Distribution of parts of speech depending on the position of the stressed syllable:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Numb. of words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Words with the stress on the ultimate syllable</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Words with the stress on the penultimate syllable</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Words with the stress on the antepenultimate syllable</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Words with the stress on the forth syllable from the end</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can observe that the stress on the antepenultimate syllable is distributed variously among the parts of speech: for the most part it is found in nouns and adjectives (37% and 35%) while the verbs are in the third place (20%). Moreover, as emphasized in Gasparov’s “Essay on the history of Russian verse,” “the dactylic endings in Russian are much more uniform than the masculine or feminine endings: in most cases, those are part-of-speech-specific endings for nouns (“-ание”), adjectives (“-анная”), and verbs (“-ается”). It becomes unavoidable to rhyme mainly homogenous parts of speech, and such grammatization of rhyme leads to parallelism and threatens the verse with syntactic monotony” [Гаспаров 2002]. Nekrasov, as M.L. Gasparov notes, canonizes the dactylic rhyme of his time. His poetry was the source of two distinct paths in the evolution of dactylic rhyme.

The aim of my work is to examine the grammatical structure of the dactylic endings in the poetry of Nikolay Nekrasov and Boris Pasternak. Specifically, I concentrate on the poetry of
Nekrasov (minus his long poems) and three poetry collections by Pasternak, “Over the Barriers” (1914-1916), “My Sister, Life” (1917) and “On Early Trains” (1936-1944).

The dactylic ending in the poetry of Nikolay Nekrasov

There are 1904 dactylic endings in Nekrasov’s poetry, comprising 11% of the total number of verses. My first task was to find out which parts of speech correspond to this position. The parts of speech were categorized into nouns, adjectives, verbs, pronouns, numerals, and compound endings that include more than one word. Since the accentual structure of a word depends on the inflexional paradigm, in equivocal cases the words were grouped according to that feature: in particular, participles and substantivized adjectives were considered to be adjectives. Furthermore, adverbs were separated from adverbs that formally coincide with the neutral gender of the short form of an adjective (see радостно 'joyfully Adv./joyful A.sh.fem.neut.g.', дешево 'cheaply Adv./cheap – A.sh.fem.neut.g.', весело 'merrily Adv./merry A.sh.fem.neut.g.'), and other cases (заново 'anew', иронически 'ironically' etc.). The results of this distribution are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound ending</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs formally coinciding with short form adjectives</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can observe that adjectives are used most frequently in dactylic endings – in 39% of cases; the amount of nouns is almost the same – 36%; and verbs are in the third place with 18%;

---

2 It is important to note that until Nekrasov dactylic endings were used in noticeably lesser cases. For comparison: Pushkin has 1% of dactilic endings [Shaw 1974], Batiushkov – 2,5% [Shaw 1975] and Baratynskii – 0,6% [Shaw 1975].
the other parts of speech are not frequent. This pattern reproduces the distribution in the words with antepenultimate stress calculated for prosaic texts by Gasparov [Гаспаров 1984].

Besides the problem of different parts of speech occurring in the place of dactylic ending, it can be useful to examine the particular grammatical word forms. It is not surprising that adjectives form dactylic endings most frequently, since more than half of the inflection paradigm of the adjective has two-syllable endings (see the standard endings of the adjectival inflection in the Grammatical Dictionary of A.A. Zaliznyak [Зализняк 1980]); thereby those word forms have the antepenultimate stress (белая 'white sg.fem.nom.', смелую 'brave sg.fem.acc.', туманные 'foggy pl.nom./acc.', струнного 'stringed sg.masc.acc./gen.', чистыми 'clean pl.inst.', краткою 'meek sg.fem.inst.', одинокое 'lonely sg.neut.nom./acc.')

The following table contains the comparison of the usage of the short and long forms and the comparative degree of the adjectives.

Table 3. Adjectives in the position of the dactylic ending in the poetry of N. Nekrasov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives, total</th>
<th>Long forms</th>
<th>Short forms</th>
<th>Comparative degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This demonstrates the lack of short forms or comparative degree forms among the adjectives in the dactylic ending position. At the same time, 60% of short forms have a participial suffix (утрачено 'lost sh.sg.neut.', отказано 'denied sh.sg.neut.', сказано 'said sh.sg.neut.', представлено 'presented sh.sg.neut.', нарисовано 'drawn sh.sg.neut.', примешано 'mixed sh.sg.neut.', опоясана 'girdled sh.sg.fem.', связана 'sh.sg.fem.'). But there are also other suffixes with a stressed syllable in them or in the preceding position (больнёхонек 'ill sh.sg.masc.', мокрёхонек 'wet sh.sg.masc.', одинёхонька 'lonely sh.sg.fem.', чернёхонька sh.sg.fem., утешительно 'consoling sh.sg.neut.', губительно 'baneful sh.sg.neut.', пленительно 'enchenting sh.sg.neut.', макова 'poppy sh.sg.fem.').

Out of the eight forms of the comparative degree, six have two-syllable ending “-ee”: забавнее 'funnier', далее 'farther', более 'more', голосистее 'more loud-voiced'; two other forms contain the suffix “-тель”: язвительней 'more sarcastic', мучительней 'more painful'. As for the full forms of the adjectives, 87% have a two-syllable case ending. The concrete grammatical forms are presented in the following table:

Table 4. Adjectives with two-syllable case endings in the position of the dactylic ending in the poetry of Nikolay Nekrasov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of the adjectives with two-syllable case endings</th>
<th>612</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural, nom./acc.</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can see that among the adjectives with two-syllable case endings, three forms prevail: the plural form of nom./acc. cases (милые 'nice pl.nom./acc.', сердечные 'cordial pl.nom./acc.', грёзные 'sinful pl.nom./acc.'), ясные 'clear pl.nom./acc.'), the single form of feminine gender nom. case (угрюмая 'gloomy sg.fem.nom.', тихая 'quiet sg.fem.nom.', интересная 'interesting sg.fem.nom.', преумная 'very clever sg.fem.nom.', деревенская 'rural sg.fem.nom.'). The least frequent form with the two-syllable ending is the plural form of the inst. case (отличными 'different pl.inst.', приличными 'decent pl.inst.', усатыми 'moustached pl.inst.', пригожими 'good-looking pl.inst.').

As for the word forms with other than two-syllable endings, we observe 93 word forms that almost always have an antepenultimate stress due to one or another suffix. Mainly, these are participial suffixes and the suffix “-тель”, which make up 60% of all the word forms: встречаемый 'that is being met sg.masc.nom./acc.', обуреваемый 'that is being overwhelmed sg.masc.nom./acc.', болтающих 'chatting pl.acc./gen.', ожидающих 'waiting pl.acc./gen.', погибающих 'perishing pl.acc./gen.', потерянный 'lost sg.masc.nom./acc.', укушенный 'bit sg.masc.nom./acc.', ошпаренный 'scalded sg.masc.nom./acc.', невоспитанный 'ill-bred sg.masc.nom./acc.', желательный 'desirable sg.masc.nom./acc.', замечательный 'wonderful sg.masc.nom./acc.', оглушительный 'deafening sg.masc.nom./acc.'.

In the noun analysis, I was also interested in looking at the number of forms with two-syllable case endings. Unlike the adjectives, nouns have only two such forms: the plural number instrumental case (минутами 'minute pl.inst', взорами 'look pl.inst', ивами 'willow pl.inst') and the instrumental case form singular number feminine gender with the endings «-ою», «-ею», «-ию» (картиной 'picture sg.inst.', равнинною 'plain sg.inst.', жизнью 'life sg.inst.'). For this reason, nouns have the antepenultimate stress mainly due to a suffix that carries stress on it or on the preceding syllable (for instance, кручинушку 'sorrow sg.acc.', забориком 'fence sg.inst.', соловушку 'nightingale sg.acc.', сияни 'shining sg.loc.', пьяницей 'drunk sg.inst.').
The following table presents the data on the usage of forms with two-syllable case endings and with different suffixes among word forms:

**Table 5. Nouns in the position of the dactylic ending in the poetry of Nikolay Nekrasov**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of nouns</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.case, plural number</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.case, feminine gender, singular number</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ий-</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-анье, -ение</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ик-</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-лиц-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ост-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-тель/-тельство-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ушк-, -ышк-</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-еч(е)к-, -оч(е)к-</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift of the stress to the preposition</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns with the subsequent clytic</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suffixes</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns without suffix</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These calculations demonstrate that Nekrasov mainly uses nouns with suffixes and nouns in the form of the instrumental case. There are only 6% of non-suffixed nouns (for example, голоду 'hunger sg.dat.', воротом 'collar sg.inst.', городом 'town sg.inst.', комнатам 'rooms pl.dat.', яблоки 'apples sg.nom./acc.' and others). Moreover, Nekrasov uses fewer verbs than nouns and adjectives: 343 word forms in total. Among these, there are twenty-five infinitives and thirteen adverbial participles. It is common for verbs with long unstressed terminations to have an unstressed postfix “-ся” (появляется 'appears sg.3pers.pres.', пробуждается 'wake up sg.3pers.pres.'), or, for instance, left-stressed suffixes “-ива/-ива-” and “-ова/-у-” (рассказывать 'tell inf', показывать 'show inf', видывал 'saw past.masc.sg.', позавидовал 'envied past.masc.sg.' etc.).

Indeed, if we look at verbs\(^3\) in the position of the dactylic ending in Nekrasov’s poetry, 70% of them are reflexives, mostly in the form of present or future third-person (56%) with the

---

\(^3\) For the first time the interaction between the rhythm of the verb and its morphological characteristics were described by T.V. Skulacheva on the materials of "Eugene Onegin" [Скулачева 1996].
endings “-атся”, “-ится”, “-ется” etc. For example: поделятся 'share fut.3pers.pl.', раскошеляться 'fork up fut.3pers.pl.', скликаются 'call together pres.3pers.pl.', ломаются 'break pres.3pers.pl.', слышится 'be heard pres.3pers.sg.', дышится 'breathe pres.3pers.sg.', просится 'ask pres.3pers.sg.', носится 'rush pres.3pers.sg.', возвращается 'come back pres.3pers.sg.', возвращается 'come back pres.3pers.sg.', задыхается 'choke pres.3pers.sg.' and others. Also there are colloquial forms that end in “-алася”, “-алось” etc. These account for 30%. See the examples: обнималася 'hug past.fem.s', встрепенулася 'start, throb past.fem.s', разразилася 'break out past.fem.s', простились 'say goodbye past.pl.', серебрилися 'silver past.pl.', удавалося 'succeed past.neut.s', виднелося 'be seen past.neut.s'.

Among verbs without –ся, 30% are verbs with suffixes “-ыва-/ива-” and “-ова-/у-”: благоденствую 'prosper pres.s 1pers.', видывал 'see past.sg.3pers.masc.', велижирствовал, рассказывать 'tell inf.', подвязывать 'tie up inf.', обнародовать 'promulgate inf.', похоживал 'stroll past.sg.3pers.masc.', присутствуют 'be present pres.sg.3pers.'. Another 45% are forms of the past tense, feminine and neuter gender, and the plural forms (for example: кинула 'throw past.sg.3pers.fem.', увидела 'see past.sg.3pers.fem.', обидела 'offend past.sg.3pers.fem.', мучило 'torment past.sg.3pers.neut.', стихнуло 'calm down past.sg.3pers.neut.', повесило 'hang past.sg.3pers.neut.', изведали 'know past.pl.', обедали 'have dinner past.pl.', предали 'betray past.pl.').

Besides the analysis of the direct grammatical features of the dactylic ending, my goal was to study their role in rhyme, i.e. to estimate the proportion of unrhymed endings on the one hand, and homogenous rhymes (that is, where the rhymed words are of the same part of speech and have the same flexion) and of non-homogenous rhymes, on the other hand. Out of Nekrasov’s 1904 dactylic endings, 364 (19%) are unrhymed, 332 (17%) are non-homogenous rhymes (досадуя-статуя 'be vexed V.adv.part. - statue N.sg.nom.', молодо-холода 'youthfully Adv. — cold N.sg.gen.', с голоду – смуху 'of hunger N.sg.gen. — from one's youth Adv.', мыкаю-киною 'live in misery V.pres.sg.1pers. - book N.sg.inst.'), and homogenous rhymes make up 64% (чудесницка-крестница 'sorceress sg.nom. — goddaughter sg.nom.', умилением-наслаждением 'tenderness sg.inst.', шапкою-лапкою 'hat sg.inst. - paw sg.inst.'). In terms of the distribution of the parts of speech among the homogenous, non-homogenous and unrhymed endings, the results are relatively similar for all three types:

**Table 6. Distribution of parts of speech in dactylic endings depending on rhyme type.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>Unrhymed</th>
<th>Homogenous rhyme</th>
<th>Non-homogenous rhyme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table demonstrates that in the case of homogenous rhymes, there are 10% more adjectives than in the other types. The non-homogenous rhymes have a slightly smaller percentage of verbs and adjectives than the other types. We can also note that compound endings are absent in the homogenously rhymed endings.

The dactylic ending in the poetry of Boris Pasternak

Now let us turn to the poetry of Boris Pasternak. Three poetry collections were chosen for research. In “Over the Barriers,” dactylic endings make up 18% of all endings, in “My Sister, Life” — 12% and in “On The Early Trains” — 15%. Overall, there are 668 dactylic endings. Dactylic endings will be analyzed according to the same parameters as were applied to the endings in Nekrasov's verse. First of all, the following table illustrates the distribution of parts of speech in dactylic endings in the poetry of Pasternak:

**Table 7. Distribution of parts of speech in dactylic endings in the poetry of B. Pasternak**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>“Over the Barriers”</th>
<th>“On The Early Trains”</th>
<th>“My Sister, Life”</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound ending</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adverbs formally coinciding with short form adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numeral</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is striking that, relatively speaking, Pasternak uses far fewer adjectives than does Nekrasov: they comprise only 20% in “Over the Barriers” and 24% in “My Sister, Life” and “On The Early Trains”. Thus, the number of adjectives becomes comparable to the number of verbs. On the other hand, Pasternak uses many more nouns: whereas in Nekrasov, nouns comprised 36% of his poetry, in “Over the Barriers” they reach a shocking 55%. It is also notable that for Nekrasov, the number of adverbs formally coinciding with short form adjectives was two times greater than the number of other adverbs, while in Pasternak's collection “Over the Barriers”, on the contrary, the other type of adverb prevails (замертво 'dead', исстари 'from olden times', надолго 'for long', сполагоря 'easily', дочерна 'to the pitch black'). Adverbs of this type in Nekrasov's dactylic endings are often emphatically monotonous, having the same suffixes and colloquial or prosaic marking: отсюдова 'from here', покудова 'untill', меланхолически 'melancholically', цинически 'cynically', метафорически 'metaphorically', метододически 'methodically'.

In terms of short forms of adjectives, there are only 148 word forms with antepenultimate stress. The following table illustrates their number and the number of full and comparative degree forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Full forms</th>
<th>Short forms</th>
<th>Comparative degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pasternak uses 11% more short form adjectives than does Nekrasov, among which the forms of the masculine gender with stressed prefix are apparent: вынянчен 'brought up sh.sg.masc.', выловлен 'catched sh.sg.masc.', вывальян 'rolled sh.sg.masc.', выточен 'sharpened sh.sg.masc.', высмолен 'tarred sh.sg.masc.'. Other forms are also attested, such as: голожен 'hungry sh.sg.masc.', переброшена 'thrown over sh.sg.fem.', целостна 'entire sh.sg.fem.', озадачена 'perplexed sh.sg.fem.'. Among the comparative degree forms there predominate those that have a one-syllable ending “-ей”: неведомей 'unknown comp.', глинистей 'clayey comp.', извилистей 'winding comp.'. As for the full forms of adjectives, among those only 37% have two-syllables case endings (compare: Nekrasov has 87%).
The following table contains data on the usage of specific cases with two-syllable endings:

Table 9. The adjectives with two-syllable case endings in the position of the dactylic ending in the poetry of Boris Pasternak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of adjectives with two-syllable case endings</th>
<th>44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural, nom./acc.</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular, feminine, nom.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular, feminine, acc.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular, neutral, nom./acc.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular, masculine/neutral, gen.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular, masculine/neutral, dat.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular, feminine, inst. (ою/ею)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural, inst.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, Pasternak’s pattern is slightly different from Nekrasov's: the prevailing form is now the gen.case in the masculine and neuter genders: громадного 'huge sg.masc./neut.gen.', милого 'nice sg.masc./neut.gen.', табачного 'tobacco sg.masc./neut.gen.'.

The acc.case of the feminine gender that made up 17% of Nekrasov's dactylic endings is totally absent. Moreover, Pasternak uses 6% more forms of inst.case in the plural number (горделивыми 'proud pl.inst.', знакомыми 'familiar pl.inst.') than does Nekrasov. The other 63% of full forms of adjectives are forms without two-syllable endings, mainly with various suffixes. For example, плюшевой 'plush sg.fem.gen.', плиточной 'tiled sg.fem.gen.', измочаленной 'shredded sg.fem.gen.', ваточной 'wadded sg.fem.gen.', искристой 'sparkling sg.fem.gen.', лакомой 'dainty sg.fem.gen.', простенький 'simple sg.masc.nom./acc.', невменяемый 'insane sg.masc.nom./acc.'.

As for nouns in the position of the dactylic ending, the following table presents the percentage of usage for forms with two-syllable endings and also with various suffixes.

Table 10. The nouns in the position of the dactylic ending in the poetry of Boris Pasternak.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of nouns</th>
<th>348</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental case plural number</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental case, singular number</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ий-</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing this data to that of Nekrasov, we can note the following: the number of word forms with two-syllable endings of the instrumental case is slightly lower in Pasternak's poetry than in Nekrasov's: 14% vs 20%. Pasternak has no nouns ending with “-ание”, “-ение”, while in Nekrasov they comprise 13% of his noun dactylic endings. In the first place, Pasternak has nouns with the suffix “-ин” (пробоину 'hole sg.acc.', испариной 'sweat sg.acc.', перекладиной 'crossbar sg.acc.'), Nekrasov had only 1,5% of such forms. While Nekrasov had 6% of either nouns with “-тель” and with “-ушк-”, Pasternak has fewer than one percent (among them there are word forms like неприятеля 'enemy sg.gen./acc.', победителя 'winner sg.gen./acc.', воробышком 'little sparrow sg.inst.'). The main difference is in the number of unsuffixed nouns: Nekrasov had 6% of them, and Pasternak has 22% (among them there are the following word forms: августе 'august sg.loc.', ландыши 'lily-of-the-valley pl.nom./acc.', шахматы 'chess plt.nom./acc.', поводов 'reason pl.gen.', атоме 'atom sg.loc.', мамонтом 'mammoth sg.inst.', олова 'tin sg.gen.', арника 'arnica sg.nom.', бисере 'beads sg.loc.', ужином 'supper sg.inst.').

Pasternak has only 131 verb forms, 16 infinitives and 15 adverbial participles among them (машучи 'wave adv.part.pres.', пышучи 'flourish adv.part.pres.', вынюхав 'sniff up adv.part.past.', брезгуя 'dismain adv.part.pres.', вышедши 'go out adv.part.past.'). There are only 52 infinitive word forms with the postfix “-ся”, which makes up 40%—30% less than in Nekrasov's dactylic endings. These are mainly the forms of the third person present and future tense: портятся 'rot pres.pl.3pers.', силятся 'try pres.pl.3pers.', бросается 'rush pres.sg.3pers.', нижется 'thread pres.sg.3pers.', пропосятся 'sweep past pres.pl.3pers.', сторонятся 'strange pres.pl.3pers.', повторится 'repeat fut.sg.3pers.' As for verbs without “-ся”, 38% have the suffixes “ыва/ива” or “ова/у”: оклеивать 'glue over inf.', репетировал 'rehearse past.sg.masc.',

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-анне, -ение</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ик</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-иц</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ин</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ост</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-тель/-тельств</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ушк-/-ышк</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-сч(е)к/-оч(е)к</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift of stress to the preposition</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun with the subsequent clytic</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suffixes</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns without suffix</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
пробует 'try pres.sg.3pers.', подслушивал 'overhear past.sg.masc.', брезгуя 'disdain adv.part.pres.', преследовал 'chase past.sg.masc.' Also 10% have stress on the prefix “вы”:

вынюхав 'sniff up adv.part.past.', вынести 'endure inf.', вылезти 'climb out inf.', выколи 'prick out imp.sg.', выбросил 'throw away past.sg.3pers.'.

Finally, let us analyze the dactylic rhymes. Along with the homogenous and non-homogenous rhymes, and the unrhymed verses in Pasternak’s poetry, the rhymes with unequal syllables should be mentioned (those are the cases when the dactylic ending rhymes with the feminine or hyperdactylic ending, such as in пробующем — воробышком 'try part.pres.sg.masc.loc. — sparrow sg.inst.', разнузанный — узнан 'insolent sg.masc.nom./acc. — recognize part.past.sg.masc.'). The following table shows the distribution of dactylic rhymes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhyming types of dactylic endings in the poetry of Boris Pasternak</th>
<th>«Over the Barriers» and “My Sister, Life”</th>
<th>«On the Early Trains»</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homogenous</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-homogenous</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrhymed</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhymes with unequal syllables</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that Pasternak, unlike Nekrasov, uses mainly non-homogenous rhyme (прислушаюсь — случае 'harken V.fut.sg.1pers. — event N.sg.loc.', запонок — закапанный 'cuff link N.pl.gen. — smudge V.part.past.sg.masc.nom./acc.', шахматы — распахнутые 'chess N.plurt. — thrust open V.part.past.plur.'), There are almost no homogenous rhymes in the collections “Over the Barriers” and “My Sister, Life” (табачного — рыбачьего 'tobacco A.sg.masc.gen./acc. — fisherman’s A.sg.masc.gen./acc.', картиню — тиною 'picture N.sg.inst. — slime N.sg.inst.'), while Nekrasov had 64% of such rhymes. As many as 10% of endings form rhymes with unequal syllables (трясутся — присутствиях 'shake pres.pl.3pers. - presence pl.loc.', клиники – малинник 'clinic sg.gen. - raspberry canes sg.nom./acc.' etc.). There is an equal amount of unrhymed endings.

И слышно: далеко, как в августе,
Полуночь в полях назревает.
Ни звука. И нет соглядатаев.
В пустынности удостоверясь,
Берется за старое — скатывается  
По кровле, за желоб и через.

If we look at the distribution of the parts of speech in the endings of homogenous rhymes, this is what we find:

**Table 12. Distribution of parts of speech in the dactylic endings of homogenous rhymes in the poetry of Boris Pasternak**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>Homogenous rhymes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound ending</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs formally coinciding with short form adjectives</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeral</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data, we can say that while Nekrasov has slightly more adjectives and verbs in homogenous rhymes than in the other rhyme types, in Pasternak's poetry the number of verbs and adjectives stays equal to the general distribution, but the number of nouns increases up to 60%.

**Conclusions**

In this study, I have tried to consistently describe the grammatical features—namely, the dactylic endings—in the poetry of Nikolay Nekrasov and Boris Pasternak. I believe that I have found the characteristic features of the usage of dactylic endings in the poetry of both authors. Primarily, Nekrasov uses adjectives and nouns in the position of dactylic ending, adjectives that mainly have two-syllable endings, and suffixed nouns and reflexive verbs. 64% of his dactylic endings form homogenous rhymes. Pasternak's style differs significantly from that of Nekrasov: the former utilizes adjectives in only 20% of cases in dactylic rhyming, and the same can be said for verbs. Mainly, Pasternak uses nouns. With regard to adjectives, he uses more short forms,
and the percentage of word forms with two-syllable endings is lower than in Nekrasov’s poetry. More unsuffixed nouns are found. Finally, there are only 40% of reflexive verbs. The homogenous rhyme becomes rare. Thus, the conclusion can be drawn that Nekrasov used dactylic rhyme as means of updating the repertoire of Russian rhymes, while Pasternak, after mastering and producing Nekrasov’s manner, needed to step away from grammatically determined rhymes to lexically determined ones.
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